THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;

JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;

HISTORY OF HERETICS;

AND HIS SERMONS AND TRACTS;

WITH

GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

ANDREW KIPPIS, D.D. F.R.S. AND S.A.

VOLUME III.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, N° 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

CONTENTS

OF THE

THIRD VOLUME.

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY,

PART II. VOL. IV. V. VI.

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE.
XL.	DIVERS WRITERS IN THE FORMER PART OF THE THIRD CENTURY - - - - - - - - - - ...		1
XLI.	NOETUS, AND OTHERS, CALLED *HERETICS*, IN THE FORMER PART OF THE THIRD CENTURY, OR SOON AFTER - - - - - - - - - - - ...		7
XLII.	GREGORY, BISHOP OF NEOCÆSAREA - - - - -	243	25
XLIII.	DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	247	57
XLIV.	CYPRIAN, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE - - - - - -	248	133
XLV.	WRITINGS ASCRIBED TO CYPRIAN, OR JOINED WITH HIS WORKS - - - - - - - - - - ...		183
XLVI.	ST. CORNELIUS AND ST. LUCIUS, BISHOPS OF ROME	251	203
XLVII.	NOVATUS, OTHERWISE CALLED NOVATIAN - -	251	206
	A NOTE UPON CHAP. XLVII. - - - - - - - - ...		248
XLVIII.	DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF ROME - - - - - - -	259	253
XLIX.	COMMODIAN - - - - - - - - - - - - -	270	257
L.	MALCHION, PRESBYTER OF ANTIOCH - - - -	270	261
LI.	ANATOLIUS, AND THREE OTHERS, BISHOPS OF LAODICEA - - - - - - - - - - - - -	270	265
LII.	THEOGNOSTUS - - - - - - - - - - - -	282	273
LIII.	THEONAS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA - - - - -	282	277
LIV	PIERIUS, PRESBYTER OF ALEXANDRIA - - -	283	279
LV.	1. DOROTHEUS, PRESBYTER OF ANTIOCH - - - - -	290	283
	2. DOROTHEUS, AUTHOR OF THE SYNOPSIS, ETC. - ...		284
LVI.	VICTORINUS, BISHOP OF PETTAW - - - - - -	290	286
LVII.	METHODIUS, BISHOP OF OLYMPUS IN LYCIA - -	290	303

CHAP.		A.D.	PAGE.
LVIII.	LUCIAN, PRESBYTER OF ANTIOCH, AND HESYCHIUS, BISHOP IN ÆGYPT	290	322
LIX.	PAMPHILUS, PRESBYTER OF CÆSAREA	294	335
LX.	PHILEAS, BISHOP OF THMUIS IN ÆGYPT; AND PHILOROMUS, RECEIVER GENERAL AT ALEXANDRIA	296	351
LXI.	PETER, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA, AND THE MELETIANS	300	354
	AN ANSWER TO MR. JACKSON'S REMARKS	...	360
LXII.	ARCHELAUS, BISHOP IN MESOPOTAMIA	...	368
LXIII.	MANI AND HIS FOLLOWERS		
SECT. I.	A GENERAL HISTORY OF THE MANICHEES	...	374
II.	THE HISTORY OF MANI	...	415
III.	MANI'S PREDECESSORS AND WORKS	...	428
IV.	THE SENTIMENTS OF THE MANICHEES CONCERNING DIVERS POINTS	...	437
V.	THEIR WORSHIP	...	489
VI.	THE MANICHÆAN DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES	...	493
VII.	VARIOUS READINGS AND SELECT PASSAGES IN FAUSTUS THE MANICHEE	...	537
VIII.	THE CONCLUSION OF THE HISTORY OF THE MANICHEES	...	539
IX.	THE PAULICIANS	...	545
	REMARKS UPON MR. BOWER'S ACCOUNT OF THE MANICHEES	...	549

ERRATA.

Page. line.		*read.*
79	Title, *for* 264	247
138, 140, 142, 144,	in titles,	Ch. XLIV.
224 1	—— ——	Marcian
239 1	after called, insert	g
330 2	—— ——	Huet
378 5	—— ——	presumption
384 10	—— ——	Heraclean
421 11	—— ——	Sapor.
	IN THE NOTES.	
14	note [c], *for* p. 200	450.
28	col. 2. penult. —	ετος
30	col. 1. l. 1. ——	Ορω
76	col. 2. l. 5. ——	πε ων
80	col. 1. l. 3. ——	καιεστιν
108	n. [r], *for* Vol. iii. p.	See Vol. ii. p. [381, 385, 519.

P.			*read.*
110	(z)	——	Vol. ii. p. 378.
—	(A)	——	Vol. ii. p. 412.
172	col. 1. l. 4.	—	judicanti
208	l. 2.	——	αιτιαφιας
216	col. 2. l. 13.	—	crimina
218	col. 2. antepen.		μετρων
256	col. 2. l. 4.	—	λογοειδων
280	col. 2. penult.		χριστου.
307	col. 2. l. 5.	——	παραβεβλημενας
373	col. 1. l. 2.	—	immensam
388	col. 1. l. 1.	—	Lucam
425	col. 1. l. 14.	—	συγκεχυκοτες
462	col. 1. l. 4.		ejusdem splendidissima
464	col. 2. l. 11.		origo.

THE

CREDIBILITY

OF THE

GOSPEL HISTORY;

PART II.

[VOL. IV. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXL.]

CHAP XI.

DIVERS writers in the former part of the third century.

I. *Judas.* II. *Anonymous Author of the Paſſion of Perpetua and Felicitas.* III. *Proculus.* IV. *Geminianus.* V. *Typhon.*

I. 'AT that time,' ſays [a] Euſebius in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, 'lived alſo Judas, another writer, who publiſhed a 'Commentary upon Daniel's Seventy Weeks, concluding his 'computation of the times at the tenth year of Severus; who 'likewiſe thought, that the ſo much talked of coming of 'Antichriſt was then at hand. So ſtrangely did the raiſing of 'that perſecution diſturb the minds of many.'

St. Jerom, likewiſe, in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, has a chapter for this perſon. But he mentions no other work of his beſide this. He ſays, that [b] Judas commented largely upon Daniel's Seventy Weeks, and brought down his Chronology of former times to the tenth year of Severus. This writer is placed by Cave at the year of Chriſt 202, where his Chronology ended. It is probable, this Commentary would afford many teſtimonies to the New Teſtament, if it were ſtill extant. It might be uſeful alſo on other accounts.

II. In that perſecution ſuffered in Africa, at Tuburbium, as [c] ſome have thought, or, as [d] others more probably, at

[a] Euſeb. L. vi. cap. 7.

[b] Judas de ſeptuaginta apud Danielem hebdomadibus pleniſſime diſputavit, et chronographiam ſuperiorum temporum uſque ad decimum Severi produxit annum. De Vir. Ill. cap. 52.

[c] Vid. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Admonit. in Paſſionem S. S. Perpetuæ, &c. § 2. p. 90.

[d] Ruinart. ib. et. § 3. Baſnag. Ann. 203. n. iv. Tillemont Mem. Ecc. tom. 3. part. i. p. 233. Sainte Perpetue, &c. Art. i. et Note iv. p. 503. Pagi 198. n. v. et 203. n. v.

Carthage, Perpetua, Felicitas, Revocatus, Saturninus, Saturus, and Secundulus. The year is not certain. Ruinart [e] thinks their martyrdom happened in 202 or 203; Baſnage, [f] in 203; Tillemont, [g] in 203 or 205.

Perpetua is celebrated [h] by Tertullian as a martyr who ſuffered with great firmneſs. St. Auguſtine publiſhed [i] three diſcourſes pronounced by him on the anniverſary of thoſe martyrs, which are ſtill extant [k] among his ſermons. The day was called by the names of Perpetua and Felicitas, ſuch fortitude being eſteemed, as [l] he ſays, more admirable in the weaker ſex than the other.

St. Auguſtine [m] has alſo in other places made mention of Perpetua and her paſſion. We ſtill have ſuch a piece, entitled [n] The Paſſion of the Saints Perpetua and Felicitas, with their Companions. Baſnage [o] allows it to be ancient; and [p] Tillemont ſays it is one of the fineſt monuments of antiquity. Indeed, the ſtory is affecting, and the piece is curious in divers reſpects: but I muſt not ſtay to tranſcribe particulars; it may ſuffice to ſay, that Secundulus [q] died in priſon; Saturninus, Revocatus, Saturus, and the two women, according to [r] the ſentence pronounced by the judge, [s] were expoſed to the wild beaſts in the amphitheatre, on [t] the birth-day of Antoninus Geta, Cæſar, and ſon of the emperor Severus, ſuppoſed to be the ſeventh day of March. Vivia Perpetua [u] was about two and twenty years of age, of a good family, well educated, honourably married, had a father and mother and two brothers then living, and a young child not yet weaned from her breaſts, at the time of her impriſonment: and, as it ſeems, the [w] whole family was Chriſtian, except her father,

[e] Ib. n. 4. p. 91. [f] Baſn. ibid.

[g] Tillam. ib. et Note iii.

[h] Quomodo Perpetua fortiſſima martyr ſub die paſſionis in revelatione paradiſi ſolos illic commartyres ſuos vidit. Tertull. de Anima, cap. 55. p. 353, D.

[i] De natali Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, tractatus tres. Poſſid. Ind. Opuſc. S. Aug.

[k] Serm. 280, 281, 282.

[l] Refulget et præemineat inter comites martyres et meritum et nomen Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, ſanctarum Dei famularum. Nam ibi eſt corona gloriosior, ubi ſexus infirmior. Aug. Serm. 281. in.

[m] Quam multos parentes filii prohibebant mori, ſicut novimus et legimus in paſſione beatæ Perpetuæ. Auguſt. in Pſ. 47. p. 423. B. T. iv. Bened. Vid. eund. de Anima. l. 1. cap. 10. l. 3, cap. 9. l. iv. cap. 18. tom. x. Bened.

[n] Ap. Act. Mart. p. 92, &c.

[o] Baſn. ib. n. viii.

[p] As before, Art. i. p. 232.

[q] Paſſ. Perpet. &c. num. xiv. p. 99. Act. Mart. Ruinart.

[r] Ibid. n. vi. p. 95.

[s] N. xix. et ſeqq. p. 100, 101.

[t] Muncre enim caſtrenſi eramus pugnaturi. Natale tunc Getæ Cæſaris, ibid. n. vii. p. 96.

[u] N. ii. p. 93.

[w] Et ego dolebam canos patris mei, quod ſolus de paſſione mea gaviſurus non eſſet de toto genere meo. Ib. n. v. p. 95.

who

who did his utmoſt to perſuade his daughter to ſave her life by renouncing her religion.

The author of this hiſtory is called Anonymous by [x] Cave. Some have [y] gueſſed that Tertullian might be the writer of it. But though that opinion be for the preſent given up, there is a diſpute ſubſiſting among learned men about the character of the writer, whether he was a Montaniſt or a Catholic. Indeed, the compoſer of this piece is now generally called not an author, but [z] a collector; for [a] Perpetua here relates her own hiſtory herſelf, with the viſions ſhe had in priſon, till [b] the very day before her paſſion. Here is beſides a [c] viſion of Saturus, ſaid likewiſe to be written by himſelf. Tillemont therefore ſays, 'That [d] the principal and beſt part of this piece 'was written by Perpetua herſelf on the eve of her martyr-'dom. There is alſo a viſion written by Saturus himſelf. The 'reſt is the work of a contemporary author, as appears from 'the preface; where he profeſſes to write what he knew, ap-'pealing to thoſe who were preſent at the martyrdom.' So Tillemont, and to the like purpoſe others. Nevertheleſs, I do not perceive Auguſtine to [e] allow that Perpetua wrote any part of her paſſion. However, whether author or collector of theſe Acts, [f] Baſnage, after [g] Henry Valeſius, contends ſtiffly that he was a Montaniſt. And from the character of the writer of the Acts he farther argues, that [h] Perpetua, and the reſt who ſuffered martyrdom with her, were all of the ſame ſect. On the contrary, Ruinart [i] is perſuaded the writer was a catholic. And [k] Dodwell has argued ſtrongly on the ſame ſide of the queſtion.

In this piece there are not many texts of ſcripture. However, we ſhall obſerve a few particulars.

1. Here are words of [l] John xvi. 24.

[x] Hiſt. Lit. P. i. p. 64.

[y] Vid. Ruinart, ib. p. 91. n. 5.

[z] Inquirendum tandem, quiſnam fuerit horum actorum auctor, ſeu potius collector, cum eorum maximam partem a Perpetua et Saturo ſcriptam fuiſſe nemo inficiari poſſit. Ruinart, ib. Cont. Baſnag. 203. n. vi.

[a] Hæc ordinem totum martyrii ſui jam hinc ipſa narrabit, ſicut conſcriptum manu ſua, et ſuo ſenſu reliquit. Ap. Ruinart. ib. p. 93. n. ii.

[b] Hoc uſque in pridie muneris egi: ipſius autem muneris actum, ſi quis voluerit, ſcribat. Ib. p. 98. n. x.

[c] Sed et Saturus benedictus hanc viſionem ſuam edidit, quam ipſe conſcripſit. Ib. p. 98. n. xi.

[d] Tillem. as before. p. 232.

[e] De fratre autem Sanctæ Perpetuæ Dinocrate, nec ſcriptura ipſa canonica eſt, nec illa ſic ſcripſit, vel quicunque illud ſcripſit, &c. Aug. de Anima. lib. i. cap. x.

[f] Baſn. Ann. 203. n. v.

[g] Vid. Ruinart. Act. M. p. 91. n. 6.

[h] Baſn. ib. n. vi. [i] Ruinart. ib.

[k] Diſſ. Cypr. iv. n. 12. 13.

[l] Sed qui dixerat, Petite et Accipite, petentibus dedit eum exitum, quem quiſque deſideraverat. ap. Ruin. p. 100. n. xix.

2. The paſſage of Joel ii. 28, is [m] here at length, the ſame that is cited by St. Peter, Acts ii. 17. But I do not obſerve any proof of its being taken out of the book of the Acts.

3. If I miſtake not, there is an alluſion, [n] or reference to 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

4. The writer in the preface alludes to [o] the beginning of St. John's firſt epiſtle, and adopts ſome of the words of it; ſee 1 John i. 1, 2, 3.

III. Proculus has been already (A) taken notice of, as mentioned by Tertullian, together with divers other eccleſiaſtical writers; and on account (B) of the dialogue or conference of Caius upon the point of Montaniſm, I think it proper to take ſome farther notice of him in this place.

It is undoubted, that the perſon with whom Caius diſputed was then a Montaniſt. He is expreſsly called by Euſebius [p] a leader or patron of the Cataphrygian ſect, and a follower of Montanus by [q] Jerom and [r] Photius. According to the author of the Catalogue of Heretics at the end of Tertullian's book of Preſcription againſt Heretics, who is ſuppoſed by Dodwell [s] and [t] Pagi to have been contemporary with Tertullian, and by [u] Tillemont, to have written about the year 200, there were [w] two parties of the Montaniſts; the one called after Proclus or Proculus, the other after Æſchines: and the former are reckoned to [x] have been more orthodox than the latter in the doctrine of the trinity.

It is certain, therefore, that there was one Proculus, a Montaniſt, at the beginning of the third century, with whom Caius diſputed. But whether he be the ſame whom Tertullian mentions and highly commends, together with ſeveral ancient eccleſiaſtical writers, admits a queſtion. Valeſius [y] thinks they

[m] Ibid. p. 93. n. i.

[n] Cum ſemper Deus operetur quæ repromiſit, non credentibus in teſtimonium, credentibus in beneficium, ibid.

[o] Et nos itaque quod audivimus et contrectavimus annuntiamus et vobis, fratres et filioli, ut et vos qui interfuiſtis, rememoremini gloriæ Domini: et qui nunc cognoſcitis per auditum, communionem habeatis cum ſanctis martyribus, et per illos cum Domino Jeſu Chriſto. ibid.

(A) See Ch. xxvii. numb. 1.

(B) See Ch. xxxii. numb. i.

[p] προκλῳ της κατα φρυγας προισαμενῳ γνωμης. H. E. l. 2. c. 25, p. 67. D. προς προκλου της κατα φρυγας αιρεσεως υπερμαχουντα, id. l. 6, cap. 20.

[q] Adverſum Proculum, Montani Sectatorem. De V. I. cap. 59.

[r] Κατα προκλον δε σαββατα μειται, Cod. 48, p. 37. in.

[s] Diſſ. Sing. p. 216. ap. Pearſon. Op. Poſt. [t] Crit. 171, numb. iv.

[u] Tertull. Art. iv. p. 344, et note vii.

[w] Acceſſerunt alii hæretici, qui dicuntur ſecundam Phrygas. Sed horum non una doctrina eſt. Sunt enim qui Kata Proclum dicuntur, ſunt qui ſecundum Æſchinem pronuntiantur. ap. Tertull. de Præſcr. Hær. cap. 52, p. 254. c.

[x] See Caius. in Tillem. Mem. T. 3, P. i. p. 295.

[y] Ann. in Euſ. l. iv. cap. 20, p. 123.

were

were two different perſons; the former an Aſiatic, the latter an African. But, by Cave, [z] his arguments are reckoned of no great weight: and Tillemont [a] allows it to be very probable that one and the ſame perſon is intended, and thinks that he whom Tertullian ſpeaks of may have been the means of drawing him into the Montaniſt ſcheme.

That Proculus is commended by Tertullian [b] as an excellent example of chaſtity and Chriſtian eloquence. He wrote againſt the Valentinians; and for that reaſon is joined by him with Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, and other the moſt eminent writers of the church. But the work itſelf is not in being; nor doth there remain any other account of it, that I remember.

I have all along ſuppoſed, that Proclus and Proculus are one name, only written differently; the former chiefly uſed by the Greeks, the other by the Latins; for, in ſpeaking of the ſame affair, Caius's antagoniſt is called Proclus by Euſebius and Photius, Proculus by Jerom.

About this time there were ſeveral of this name; as Proculus Torpacion, a Chriſtian, mentioned by [c] Tertullian, as well known to the emperor Severus, of whom we may have occaſion to ſay more at ſome other ſeaſon.

There was likewiſe a proconſul of Aſia, named [d] Proclus Quintilianus, who pronounced ſentence againſt Pionius: but when that excellent martyr ſuffered, whether in the time of Marcus Antoninus, or of Decius, is a point much conteſted [e] by learned men; though Euſebius has expreſsly mentioned his martyrdom in his [f] Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

Beſide theſe, there is one Proclus, a biſhop, who joins with five other biſhops in a letter [g] to Paul of Samoſata, ſuppoſed to have been written ſome time between 264 and 270.

[z] Hiſt. Lit. p. 65.

[a] Tillem. as before. See him likewiſe in Tertullien Art. viii. p. 363, 364, et note xv. p. 552.

[b] . . . quas tot jam viri ſanctitate et præſtantia inſignes, nec ſolum noſtri anteceſſores, ſed ipſorum hæreſiarcharum contemporales, inſtructiſſimis voluminibus et prodiderunt et retuderunt: ut Juſtinus philoſophus et Martyr, ut Miltiades. . . . ut Irenæus. . . . ut Proculus noſter, virginis ſenectæ, et Chriſtianæ eloquentiæ dignitas: quos in omni opere fidei, quemadmodum in iſto, optaverim aſſequi. Teſt. adv. Valent.

[c] Ipſe etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Chriſtianorum memor fuit. Nam et Proculum Chriſtianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodiæ procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requiſivit, et in palatio ſuo habuit uſque ad mortem.

[d] Επι πρόκλε κυιντιλλιανε ανθυπατυ της ασιας. Chr. Paſch. p. 270. D. Conf. Act. Mart. Ruinart. p. 138, 149, 151, et Tillemont note v. Sur S. Pione. p. 450.

[e] Vid. Ruinart. ib. p. 137, et ſeqq. Baſnag. Ann. 269, n. 21, et ſeq. 250, n. 7, 8, et Saint Pione, p. 230, et note ii. p. 445, dans Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. iii. P. ii.

[f] Lib. 4. cap. 15, p. 135. C. D.

[g] Ap. Labb. Concil. T. i. p. 844, &c.

But the genuineneſs [h] of that letter has been called in queſtion.

I need not here take notice of any more of this name, who lived a good while before, or after this time; and therefore are in little danger of being confounded with our Proculus, or any of the other juſt mentioned.

IV. 'Geminus,' ſays [i] Jerom, in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, 'preſbyter of the church of Antioch, compoſed a few monuments of his wit, flouriſhing under the emperor Alexander, and Zebennus, biſhop of his city, chiefly about the time that Heraclas was ordained biſhop of the church of Alexandria.'

In his Chronicle, Euſebius, or rather Jerom, at the ſixth of the emperor Alexander, of Chriſt 227, writes—'Gemi-nianus, [k] preſbyter of Antioch; and Hippolytus, and Beryllus, biſhop of Boſtra in Arabia, are eſteemed famous writers.'

Here is a ſmall difference; for in the Catalogue Jerom ſays, Geminus or Geminianus flouriſhed in the time of Zebennus; whereas in the Chronicle he puts him a year before Zebennus was biſhop of Antioch, whoſe ordination is there placed at the ſeventh year of Alexander. Tillemont [l] reconciles this difference thus: that Geminianus appeared in the world at the year 227, but was more eſpecially famous about the year 231 or 232, when Heraclas was biſhop of Alexandria. I think, that in the Chronicle, where Jerom was pleaſed to name ſeveral perſons together, and put them at one and the ſame year, it is not to be expected that the time ſhould ſuit them all alike; and he was at liberty to mention their time more exactly in his Catalogue, if he thought fit, and had room. This writer is placed by Cave at the year 232.

I have formerly mentioned (c) the ſucceſſion of the biſhops in the church of Antioch from the time of the apoſtles to Serapion, the eighth biſhop of that church. Aſclepiades the ninth ſucceeded him in 211. The tenth was [m] Philetus, ordained about 220. The eleventh [n] Zebennus, or Zebinus, in

[h] Vid. Baſnag. Ann. 264, n. vi. vii.

[i] Geminus Antiochenæ eccleſiæ preſbyter, pauca ingenii ſui monumenta compoſuit, florens ſub Alexandro principe, et epiſcopo urbis ſuæ Zebenno eo vel maxime tempore, quo Heraclas Alexandrinæ eccleſiæ pontifex ordinatus eſt. De Vir. Ill. cap. 64.

[k] Geminianus preſbyter Antiochenus, et Hippolytus, et Beryllus, epiſcopus Arabiæ Boſtrenus, clari ſcriptores habentur. Chron. p. 173.

[l] See Saint Urbain. Tillem. Mem. Ecl. t. 3, P. ii. p. 46.

(c) See Ch. 20. and Ch. 26.

[m] Euſ. H. E. l. vi. c. 21, p. 223. C.

[n] Id. ibid. cap. 23, p. 224. C. Conf. Euſeb. Chr. p. 172, 173.

228. The twelfth [o] Babylas, who had the honour to die a martyr for Chriſt in the Decian perſecution, in the year [p] 249 or [q] 250: the year of his ordination is not certain; it is ſuppoſed by ſome [r] to have been 237 or 238. He was ſucceeded [s] by Fabius, who died [t] in the beginning of the year 252. His ſucceſſor was [u] Demetrian; whom Paul of Samoſata ſucceeded in [w] 260.

V. 'Tryphon,' ſays [x] Jerom in his Catalogue, 'a diſciple 'of Origen, to whom ſeveral of his letters, ſtill extant, were 'written, was very ſkilful in the ſcriptures; as his many 'pieces every where ſhew, but eſpecially that book which he 'publiſhed about the red heifer in Deuteronomy, [It 'ſhould be Numbers; ſee Chap. xix.] and the half pieces 'of the living creatures laid by Abraham's pigeon and turtle-'dove in Geneſis.' See Gen. xv. 9, 10, 11. This learned man is placed by Cave at the year 233. His works are not extant.

CHAP. XLI.

NOETUS, and others, called heretics, in the former part of the third century, or ſoon after.

I. *Noetus.* II. *Valeſians.* III. *Angelics.* IV. *Apoſtolics.* V. *Origeniſts.*

I. BASNAGE [a] ſuppoſeth that Noetus aroſe about the year 240. Fabricius [b] about 245. And, indeed, as Epiphanius compoſed his work againſt hereſies in 375 or 376, and he there ſays that [c] Noetus lived about 130 years before that time, we are carried up to the year 245: but Epiphanius

[o] ib. cap. 29.

[p] Vid. Baſnag. Ann. 239, numb. iii.

[q] See Saint Babylas in Tillem. tom. 3, P. ii. p. 192.

[r] Vid. Baſn. ib. n. i. et Tillem. ib. p. 288, et note i. et ii. ſur Saint Babylas.

[s] Παραπλησιως εν αιτιοχεια τω βαβυλα μετα την ομολογιαν εν δεσμωτηριω μεταλλαξαντος, φαβιος της αυτοθι προιςαλαι εκλησιας. Euſ. l. vi. cap. 39.

[t] Vid. Pagi 252, num. vi. Tillemont St. Denys d'Alex. Sect. vii. Mem. t. iv. P. ii. p. 563, 564.

[u] Vid. Euſeb. l. vi. cap. 46, p. 248, A. et lib. vii. cap. 14.

[w] Vid Pagi. 261, n. vi.

[x] Tryphon Origenis auditor, ad quem nonnullæ ejus extant epiſtolæ, in ſcripturis eruditiſſimus fuit. Quod quidem et multa ejus ſparſim oſtendunt opuſcula, ſed præcipue liber, quem compoſuit de vacca ruſa in Deuteronomio, et de dichomematibus, quæ cum columba et turture Abraham ponuntur in Geneſi. De V. I. cap. 57.

[a] Vid. Baſnag. Ann. 256, n. 14.

[b] Vid. Philaſtr. de Hær. 53, not. [a] p. 105, Ed. Fabr.

[c] αλλ' ως προ χρονω των τετων εκατον τριακοντα, πλειω η ελασσω. Epiph. H. 57, p. 479. C.

does not pretend to be exact; and ſince we have ſuppoſed Hippolytus, who wrote againſt the Noetians, to have flouriſhed about the year 220, we cannot place Noetus much later. Beauſobre [d] has argued after a like manner. He ſays, that Noetus muſt have publiſhed his notion ſooner than is intimated by Epiphanius; becauſe Hippolytus, who flouriſhed about the year 222, ſpeaks of Noetus as dead ſome time before he wrote againſt him. However, this argument of that learned man depends in part upon the ſuppoſition that the work aſcribed to Hippolytus is genuine. Huet [e] obſerves, that Noetus was contemporary with Origen, which I preſume will not be denied by any.

The piece referred to by Beauſobre, ſometimes called a homily againſt Noetus, by others ſuppoſed to be the concluding article of Hippolytus's work againſt hereſies, begins in this manner: 'Others [f] there are who advance another opinion, 'being diſciples of one Noetus, of Smyrna, who lived not 'long ago. He, elated with pride, ſaid that Chriſt was the 'Father himſelf, and that the Father was begotten, and ſuf-'fered and died. He likewiſe ſaid, that he himſelf was Mo-'ſes, and his brother Aaron. When the bleſſed preſbyters 'had heard of theſe things, they called him before the church, 'and examined him. At firſt he denied that he held ſuch a 'doctrine; but at length, after having concealed himſelf for 'a while, when he had got ſome few to be of the ſame erro-'neous opinion with him, he became more ready to defend it 'publicly. The bleſſed preſbyters then called him before them 'again; when he ſaid, "What [g] harm do I do in honouring "Chriſt?" To whom the preſbyters anſwered, "We alſo know "there is one God, we own Chriſt, and know that the Son "ſuffered, died, and roſe again the third day, and is at the "right-hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick "and the dead." Thus, having convicted him, they caſt him 'out of the church.' This writer adds ſoon after, that [h] Noetus argued in this manner: 'The ſcriptures declare one God, 'even the Father. This being manifeſt, and it being acknow-'ledged that there is but one God, it follows of neceſſity that

[d] Vid. Hiſt. de Manich. P. ii, l. 3, ch. vi. p. 533, not. (7) T. i.

[e] Vid. Huet. Origenian. l. 2, c. ii. qu. 2, n. xi. p. 37. c.

[f] Ετεροι τινες . . . γενομενοι τινος νοητε μαθηται, ος το μεν γενος ην σμυρναιος, η πρ: πολλου χρονου τετελευτηκως. . . Εφη τον χριστον αυτον ειναι τον πατερα, και αυτον τον πατερα γεγεννησθαι και πεποιθεναι και αποτεθνηκεναι. Hippol. contr. Hær. Noet. n. i. p. 5, 6. T. ii. Ed. Fabric.

[g] Τι ουν κακον ποιω δοξαζων τον χριστον; ib. p. 6.

[h] ib. n. ii. p. 7.

'he

'he ſuffered; for [i] Chriſt was God, and he ſuffered for us, 'being the Father, that he might be able to ſave us.'

This is in ſhort the hiſtory of Noetus, which is contained in that Homily, or elſe a fragment of ſome larger work. But here ought to be remembered the account formerly given (A) of the works aſcribed to Hippolytus, and that few or none of them can be relied upon as genuine and uncorrupted. If this piece be his, yet it is to be feared that there are in it ſome interpolations. Tillemont's obſervation upon this piece was, that (B) the ſentiments concerning the trinity are agreeable to thoſe of the third century. And undoubtedly many things are here expreſſed after the manner of the ancients. But there are alſo ſome expreſſions which ſeem to have prevailed chiefly after the Nicene council. Another thing may be fit to be obſerved. It is allowed that Hippolytus did not receive the epiſtle to the Hebrews as the apoſtle Paul's. But here is an expreſſion, which ſome may think to be taken from thence, where the writer ſpeaks of Chriſt being [l] *without ſin*; ſee Heb. iv. 15. However this piece, for the main part, muſt be reckoned ancient, for the ſake of ſeveral internal characters of antiquity; and becauſe much the ſame account is given of Noetus by Epiphanius, though he does not ſay that he borrows from any other writer.

He is to be produced in the next place. In his work againſt hereſies, he ſays, that [m] Noetus was of Epheſus in Aſia. In his Summary, or Recapitulation, he ſays, he [n] was of Smyrna, as the above quoted fragment of Hippolytus does. In the large work againſt hereſies, Epiphanius ſays, 'that [o] Noetus taught 'a doctrine not held by the prophets, or apoſtles, or the church 'after them. For ſuch was his pride, that he dared to ſay, 'that the Father ſuffered. And with a like arrogance he ſaid, 'that he himſelf was Moſes, and his brother Aaron. In the 'mean time the bleſſed preſbyters of the church called him 'before them, and examined him about theſe things, and whe-'ther he had uttered ſuch a blaſphemy againſt the Father. 'At [p] firſt he denied it, being aſhamed to own a horrible and

[i] χριστος γαρ ην θεος, και επασχεν δι ημας αυτος ων πατηρ, ινα και σωσαι ημας δυνασθη. ibid.

(A) See ch. xxxv. p. 95, &c. And be pleaſed likewiſe to conſult Beauſobre, as above, p. 553, not. (7) and p. 534.

(B) See ch. xxxv. p. 97.

[l] γεγονως παντα οσα εστιν ανθρωπος, εκτος αμαρτιας. Hippol. contr. Noet. n. xvii. p. 18. Conf. Hebr. iv. 15. χωρις αμαρτιας.

[m] Epiph. H. 57, n. i. p. 479. C.

[n] Anaceph. n. xi. p. 145, T. 2.

[o] Adv. Hær. 57, num. i.

[p] . . και ει ταυτην βλασφημιαν περι πατρος τετολμηκεν. ο δε τα πρωτα μεν ηρνειτο, επι τω πρεσβυτεριω αγομενος, δια το μηδεπω προ αυτου εξεμεισαι ταυτην την δεινην και ολεθριον πικριαν. ib. p. 480. A.

'pernicious doctrine, never taught by any before him. Af-
'terwards, having propagated his mad opinion, and gained
'himself a few followers, about ten in number, he became
'more bold and open. Whereupon the presbyters call him
'and his adherents before them, and examine him again, as
'formerly: then he said, "What harm have I done? I worship
"one God, I acknowledge one God, and no other beside him;
"who was born, suffered, died." As he persisted in that doc-
'trine, they expelled him out of the church, together with
'those who were of the same opinion with him. Soon after
'which he and his brother died; and [q] they were left as apos-
'tates and outcasts, for none of the pious would bury them.
'After this his followers endeavoured to uphold the same doc-
'trine, induced thereto by the like considerations with their
'master; for when, being examined by the presbytery, he
'answered, I worship one God, they replied, "Truly, that is
"well said, for we also worship one God, but as he ought to be
"worshipped. And we have also one Christ, as we know him
"to be, the Son of God, who suffered, died, rose again, as-
"cended to heaven, and is at the right hand of the Father, and
"will come to judge the quick and the dead. This we say, ac-
"cording as we have been taught by the divine scriptures."

In his Summary, Epiphanius says, 'that Noetus, with a few
'that followed him, taught Christ to [r] be Father and Son;
'that the same was Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. [Or, that
'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the same.]' He said, like-
wise, 'that he himself was Moses, and his brother Aaron.' Af-
terwards, in the same work, in [s] the article of the Sabellians,
Epiphanius says, they held the same doctrine with the Noetians,
except that they denied the Father to have suffered.

Philaster writes, that [t] Noetus said, 'the Almighty Father
'himself was Christ, and that he was born, and suffered, and
'died. This person likewise said, that he was Moses, and his
'brother Elias the prophet.'

St. Augustine, who had read Philaster, and Epiphanius's Re-
capitulation or Summary, but not his Panarium, or large work
against heresies, writes in his book of Heresies, 'that [u] the

[q] εφριψαν γαρ ως παραβαται, και υδεις αυτους των θεοσεβων περιεστειλε. ib. C.

[r] υιοπατορα τον χριστον εδιδαξε, τον αυτον ειναι πατερα, και υιον και αγιον πνευμα. Epiph. Anaceph. p. 145, n. xi.

[s] Ib. p. 146, n. xvi.

[t] Alii autem Noetiani, insensati cujusdam nomine Noeti, qui dicebat Patrem omnipotentem ipsum esse Christum, et ipsum natum, et ipsum passum fuisse in corpore. Hic etiam dicebat se Mosen esse, et fratrem suum Heliam prophetam. Philast. H. 53, p. 107. Ed. Fabric.

[u] Noetiani a quodam Noeto, qui dicebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum. Aug. de Hær. n. xxxvi.

'Noetians

'Noetians were ſo called from one Noetus, who ſaid that Chriſt 'was alſo the Father himſelf and the Holy Ghoſt.' This is Auguſtine's whole article of the Noetians. But afterwards he enlarges in the article of the Sabellians; 'Who,' he [x] ſays, 'are 'reckoned to have borrowed their opinion from Noetus. Nor 'does he know any good reaſon why Epiphanius ſhould make 'two hereſies of them, for their opinions ſeem to be the ſame; 'only Sabellius was better known than Noetus: for very few, 'at that time, knew any thing of the Noetians; but Sabellians 'were often mentioned. He adds, that ſome call them Prax-'eans, from Praxeas; and they might alſo be called Hermo-'genians, from Hermogenes, for they were both of the ſame 'opinion. Auguſtine farther [y] blames Epiphanius for making 'any difference in opinion between the Noetians and Sabelli-'ans. For inſtance, where he ſays, that the Sabellians agreed 'with the Noetians, except that they denied the Father to have 'ſuffered; Auguſtine thinks that not rightly ſaid; and affirms, 'it was ſo well known that the Sabellians taught the Father to 'have ſuffered, that they were oftener called Patripaſſians than 'Sabellians:' ſo Auguſtine in his book of Hereſies. He does alſo [z] elſewhere treat the Sabellians as Patripaſſians. Ruffinus, [a] upon the Creed, likewiſe ſays, that the Sabellians were called Patripaſſians. Moreover, [b] Auguſtine blames Philaſter alſo for

[x] Sabelliani ab illo Nocto, quem ſupra memoravimus, defluxiſſe dicuntur. Nam et diſcipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuiſſe Sabellium. Sed qua cauſſa duas hæreſes eas Epiphanius computet, neſcio: cum fieri potuiſſe videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iſte famoſior, et ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæreſis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficile ab aliquo ſciuntur: Sabelliani autem ſunt in ore multorum. Nam et Praxeanos eos a Praxea quidam vocant; et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene vocari potuerunt: qui Praxeas et Hermogenes eadem ſentientes, in Africa fuiſſe dicuntur. Nec tamen iſtæ plures ſectæ ſunt; ſed unius ſectæ plura nomina, ex his hominibus qui in ea maxime innotuerunt. Aug. ib. c. 41.

[y] Unde ergo ſit factum, ut Noetianos et Sabellianos, non unius hæreſis duo nomina, ſed tanquam duas hæreſes ſupradictus Epiphanius poneret, liquido invenire non potui .... Loco quippe iſto .... Sabelliani, inquit, ſimilia Noeto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non eſſe paſſum. Quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi poteſt, cum ſic innotuerint dicere Patrem paſſum, ut Patripaſſiani quam Sabelliani crebrius nuncupentur? ... Vel quomodo poſſunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem paſſum fuiſſe non dicere, cum dicant eundem ipſum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum? Id. ibid.

[z] Nam Sabelliani dicti ſunt quidam hæretici, qui vocantur Patripaſſiani, qui dicunt ipſum Patrem paſſum. Aug. Tr. 36, in Joh. Ev. p. 548, A. T. 3, P. 2. Bened. Breviter ergo heſterno die inſinuavimus caritati veſtræ eſſe hæreticos qui vocantur Patripaſſiani, vel a ſuo auctore Sabelliani. In Joh. Tr. 37, p. 552, F. ib.

[a] ... hæreſeos cauſſa Sabellii, illius profecto quæ a noſtris Patripaſſiani appellatur; id eſt, quæ Patrem ipſum vel ex virgine natum dicit, et viſibilem factum, vel paſſum affirmat in carne. Ruffin. in Symb. ad artic. Credo in Deum Patrem.

[b] Philaſter autem Brixianus epiſcopus ... Sabellianos continuo poſt Noetianos ponens, Sabellius inquit, diſcipulus ejus, qui ſimilitudinem ſui doctoris itidem ſecutus eſt, unde et Sabelli-

making

making two ſeveral hereſies, or ſects, of the Noetians and Sabellians, though he was ſenſible of their great agreement together, and with the others above named by Auguſtine, and allows the Sabellians to be Patripaſſians as well as the Noetians.

And certainly it is fit to be obſerved by us, that Philaſter, as well as Auguſtine, computes Praxeas, Hermogenes, Noetus, and Sabellius, to have all had the ſame doctrine concerning the Deity.

Theodoret writes to this purpoſe: 'Noetus [c] was of Smyrna. 'He revived the hereſy which one Epigonus firſt publiſhed, 'and Cleomenes maintained after him. The ſum of their he- 'reſy is this: they ſay, that there is one God and Father, the 'Creator of all things; not appearing when he thinks fit, ap- 'pearing when he pleaſeth; and that the ſame is inviſible and 'viſible, begotten and unbegotten; unbegotten from the be- 'ginning, begotten when he pleaſed to be born of a virgin; 'impaſſible and immortal, and again paſſible and mortal. For 'when he was impaſſible, they ſay, he willingly ſuffered on 'the croſs. Him they call both Son and Father, as occaſion 'is. They who embraced this hereſy were called Noetians. 'After Noetus it was maintained by Calliſtus, who made ſome 'additions to that impious doctrine.'

I need not tranſlate the article in Prædeſtinatus. But there is a particular omitted by other writers; that [d] Noetus was condemned by Tranquillus, biſhop of the Chalcedonians, in Syria.

Theſe are accounts of Noetus and his opinion, which we find in ancient writers; from whence it appears probable, that he, and others who agreed with him, believed one divine perſon only, and denied a diſtinct and proper perſonality of the word and ſpirit: but their doctrine ſeems to be ſet in a bad light. It is affirmed, that they ſaid, the Father was born, and ſuffered, and died, and was Chriſt. Beauſobre, who ſhews a great deal of candour and equity in his judgment of thoſe called heretics, declares, 'that [e] this is ſo abſurd, and ſo ma- 'nifeſtly contrary to many texts of the New Teſtament, that

ani poſtea ſunt appellati, qui et Patripaſſiani, et Praxeani a Praxea et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, &c. Et tamen Noetianos et Sabellianos ſub duobus numeris tamquam duas hæreſes poſuit; qua cauſſa, ipſe viderit. Aug. de Hær. cap. 41.

[c] Ὁ δε νοητος, σμυρναιος μεν ην το γενος· ανανεωσατο δε την αιρεσιν, ην επιγονος μεν τις; ουτω καλεμενος απεκυησε πρωτος, κλεομενης δε παραλαβων εβεβαιωσε. κ. λ. Theodor. H. F. l. 3, c. 3, p. 227, 228.

[d] Hic damnatus eſt a Tranquillo epiſcopo Chalcedoniorum Syriæ, &c. Prædeſtin. H. 36, ap. Bib. Patr. Max. T. 27. p. 544. F.

[e] See his Hiſt. de Manichée, &c. as before, p. 533.

'it

'it appears ſcarce poſſible it ſhould be maintained by any 'reaſonable man; which makes him ſuſpect, that this was 'not the opinion of thoſe perſons, but a conſequence, which 'the orthodox drew from their principles.' This appears to me not unlikely: a paſſage of Auguſtine will confirm the ſuppoſition; for he argues and affirms, 'that [f] all who are of that 'opinion, that the ſame is Father, Son, and Spirit, muſt alſo 'ſay, that the Father ſuffered.' This ſeems to ſhew, that he had no proof from their own writings, or expreſſions, that the Sabellians, and others, whom he charges with that opinion, were Patripaſſians, but he inferred it from their doctrine concerning the unity and ſimplicity of the Deity.

Whereas it is related, that Noetus ſaid he was Moſes, and his brother Aaron: Beauſobre [g] thinks this to be 'an extra-'vagance, that is not at all credible, and that renders the reſt 'of the hiſtory more than ſuſpected: the truth,' ſays he, 'is 'this; Noetus and his brother pretended to defend the doc-'trine of the unity of God taught by Moſes and Aaron, and 'to be ſent to cleanſe the church from the heathen error 'of the plurality of gods.' So Beauſobre. It is obſervable, that Theodoret makes no mention of this particular: and Philaſter differs from Hippolytus and Epiphanius, who may be conſidered as one. They ſay, he declared his brother to be Aaron; but Philaſter, that he was Elias the prophet. This ſtory ſeems to me to have no other foundation but this; that ſome of their enemies ſaid of Noetus and his brother, that they acted as if they had been, the one another Moſes, and the other another Aaron; whilſt ſome other people ſaid of them, they behaved as if they were another Moſes and Elias.

Another obſervation of Beauſobre may be inſerted here: 'When,' ſays [h] he, 'the ancients deſcribe Sabellianiſm, they 'perpetually confound the Word and the Son of God. In the 'theology of the church, the Word and the Son are the ſame 'perſon; but in the Sabellian theology they are two very diffe-'rent things. The Word is not the Son of God; he is only an 'attribute, a faculty, a property of the divine nature. It is [i] 'the man Jeſus Chriſt, who became the Son of God by the 'communication of the Word, as Marcellus ſays in Euſebius. 'Hence it came to paſs, that the Noetians reproached the or-

[f] Vel quomodo poſſunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem paſſum fuiſſe non dicere, cum dicant eundem ipſum eſſe et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum? Aug. De Hær. cap. xli. Vid. etiam ſupra not. y. p. 446.

[g] See him, as before, T. i. p. 534, 535.

[h] See Beauſobre, as before, Hiſt. de Manichée. t. i. p. 539.

[i] Διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίαν (τὸ λόγου) υἱὸς θεοῦ γενέσθαι. ap. Euſeb. de Ecc. Th. l. 2. c. viii. p. 113.

'thodox

'thodox with [l] introducing a ſtrange and new language in 'calling the Word the Son of God. That appellation '[of 'Son of God] agrees only to the man Jeſus, mere man, as 'to his nature, how great ſoever he was by his gifts.' So that learned writer deſcribes the Sabellian, or the Noetian theology, which are both one.

What Epiphanius aims at when he ſays the faithful, or more orthodox Chriſtians, refuſed to bury Noetus and his brother, I cannot tell. Noetus had friends and followers; whoſe buſineſs, I think, it was to bury him and his brother when they died, as I ſuppoſe they did.

Once more: Epiphanius ſaid that Noetus was the firſt who advanced the opinion he maintained; but Philaſter and Auguſtine ſay, that it was the ſame opinion that was before taught by Praxeas and Hermogenes, and afterwards by Sabellius: and Theodoret ſtill increaſes the number of thoſe who were of this opinion about that time; for, beſides thoſe mentioned by the Latin writers, he ſpeaks of two others, predeceſſors of Noetus, and another after him. And indeed learned moderns are now ſenſible, that what Epiphanius ſays is a miſtake. He is [m] corrected for it by his editor and commentator Petavius. And [n] Huet ſays, that Noetus rather propagated an old hereſy than invented a new one.

That there were ſuch people as theſe among Chriſtians about that time, we have clear evidence from Origen's writings, and Euſebius's Hiſtory of him. I formerly (c) gave an account of Beryllus, once of this opinion, afterwards converted by Origen. And Origen himſelf refers to Beryllus, or Noetus, or ſome others of this ſentiment, in ſeveral places of his ſtill remaining works; particularly in his Greek Commentary upon St. Matthew, publiſhed by Huet, where [o] he ſpeaks of 'ſome who con-'founded the notion of Father and Son, making the Father 'and Son to be one ſubſiſtence, differing only in thought and 'names. Which ſentiment, he ſays, is falſe; though thoſe 'perſons think thereby to do honour to the Deity.' Of theſe [p]

[l] Αλλ' ερει μοι τις· ξενον μοι φερεις, Λογον λεγων υιον. [id eſt; ſed dicet mihi aliquis: Novum mihi affers, cum Verbum Filium vocas.] Hipp. contr. Noet. n. xv. p. 16. [m] Petav. Animadv. p. 224.

[n] Origen. l. 2. qu. 2, n. xi. p. 37.

(c) See ch. xxxviii. p. 200.

[o] . . . φαντασια τε δοξαζειν αυτον. οποιοι εισιν οι συγχεοντες πατερα και υιον ειναι, και τη υποστασει εν διοντες ειναι τον πατερα και τον υιον, τη επινοια μονη και τοις ονομασι διαφεροντες το εν υποκειμενοι. Orig. in Matt. Huet. T. i. p. 470. D. Conf. Huet. in loc.

[p] Sed et eos qui hominem dicunt Dominum Jeſum præcognitum et prædeſtinatum, qui ante adventum carnalem ſubſtantialiter et proprie non extiterit; ſed quod homo natus patris ſolam in ſe habuerit deitatem, &c. Vid. Pamph. Ap. ap. Hieron. T. v. Ed. Bened. p. 226, Conf. Origen. Huet. ubi ſupra p. 37, Vid. etiam Origen. in Rom. cap. x. p. 583. m.

Origen

Origen is ſuppoſed to ſpeak in a paſſage of his Commentary upon Titus, preſerved in Pamphilus's Apology for him, which we have now in Latin only. An anonymous author of an Apology for Origen, in [q] Photius, ſpeaks of Origen's having oppoſed, or written againſt the Sabellian hereſy; which, as [r] Huet explains it, ought not to be underſtood of Sabellius himſelf, who did not appear till after Origen, but of Noetus, or ſome other perſons who held the like unitarian ſentiment. And [s] in his Greek Commentary upon St. John's goſpel, Origen ſays, that many well diſpoſed perſons went into that opinion to avoid polytheiſm. Perhaps Origen has an eye to this ſame thing in his books againſt Celſus. That Epicurean had ridiculed the veneration which Chriſtians had for the Son of God. Origen, in his anſwer, [*] ſays; 'Grant, that in a vaſt multitude of be-
'lievers, ſome, differing from the reſt, ſhould raſhly affirm our
'Saviour to be the great God over all: nevertheleſs, we do not
'hold any ſuch thing, believing what he himſelf ſays; *The*
'*Father that ſent me is greater than I.*' See John xiv. 28. Cyprian [t] likewiſe, among other heretics, mentions Patripaſſians.

Though the writers above tranſcribed may have been guilty of ſome miſtakes in their Hiſtory of Noetus, and their repreſentation of his ſentiment; yet we are very much indebted to them, upon the whole, for the accounts they have left us, and in particular for the teſtimony they bear to Noetus and his followers, that they received the holy ſcriptures, and depended upon them; how much ſoever in the judgment of theſe writers they may have miſunderſtood and miſinterpreted them. Of this we are now to take notice.

In the piece aſcribed to Hippolytus, of which we have already made ſo much uſe, it is ſaid, the Noetians argued for their opinion in this manner: 'It [u] is written in the law; *I am*
'*the God of your fathers, ye ſhall have no other gods beſide me.*' See Exod. iii. 6. xx. 3. 'And [x] again in another place: *I*, ſaith
'he, *am the firſt, and the laſt, and beſide me there is no other.* Thus
'[y] they ſay they prove there is but one God.' See Iſ. xli. 4. xliv. 6. xlv. 5. They inſiſted likewiſe upon Iſ. xlv. 14. 'You

[q] Cod. 117, p. 296.
[r] Huet. Origen. p. 37.
[s] Και το πολλες φιλαθεες ειναι ευχομενες παρασσοι· κ. λ. Orig. Comm. in Jo. p. 46. D. T. 2. Huet.
[*] Εγωδε τινας ως ει πληθει πιστευοιτων, και δεχομενων διαφασιν, δια την προπετειαν υποπιπτειν τη σατηρα ειναι τον μεγιστον επι πασι θεον· αλλ' ετι γε φημι τοιουτον, κ. λ. Or, contr. Celſ. l. 8, p. 387. Cant. § 14, p. 752. E. Bened.
[t] Vid. Cypr. ad Jub. Ep. 73, p. 200.
[u] Οι γαρ δειξαι βουλομενοι σοφασιν τω δογματι, λεγοντες, ειπε ο νομος· Εγω ειμι ο θεος των πατερων υμων, κ. τ.λ. Hippol. contr. Noet. n. ii. p. 6.
[x] ib. p. 6, 7.
[y] ουτω φασκουσι σαφως ειναι θεον. ib.

'ſee,'

'[z] ſee,' ſay they, 'how the ſcriptures declare one God.' They add; 'We [a] can go no farther, for the apoſtle alſo acknow-
'ledgeth one God, ſaying, *whoſe are the fathers, and of whom as*
'*concerning the fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all God bleſſed for ever.*'
The [b] like things are to be ſeen in Epiphanius. The author, ſuppoſed to be Hippolytus, replies to the foregoing argument:
'The [c] ſcriptures ſpeak truth, but Noetus does not underſtand
'them. But though Noetus does not underſtand, the ſcriptures
'nevertheleſs are not to be laid aſide.' In this piece againſt the Noetians, there are many texts alleged out of the goſpels, and Paul's epiſtles, and the book of the Revelation, and ſome out of the [d] book of the Acts of the apoſtles; which ſhews, that theſe people received the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, as other Chriſtians did.

In the ſame piece againſt Noetus is this remarkable paſſage:
'There [e] is indeed, brethren, one God, whom we can know no
'otherwiſe but from the holy ſcriptures. For, as he who is
'deſirous to learn the wiſdom of this world muſt acquaint
'himſelf with the ſentiments of philoſophers, if he would ob-
'tain his end; in like manner, whoever of us are deſirous to
'underſtand religion, and be truly pious, ſhould apply our-
'ſelves to the oracles of God. Whatever therefore the divine
'ſcriptures declare, that let us embrace; what they teach, let
'us learn; and as the Father willeth we ſhould believe, ſo let
'us believe; as he willeth [or requireth] the Son ſhould be
'honoured, ſo let us honour him; as he willeth [f] the Holy
'Ghoſt ſhould be given, ſo let us accept; not according to
'any particular pre-conceived opinion, nor according to any
'particular notion of ours, nor wreſting the oracles given by
'God; but ſo underſtanding things as he has been pleaſed to
'ſhew them to us by the holy ſcriptures.' In a note upon this paſſage, Fabricius obſerves, that it contains a ſignal teſtimony concerning the ſufficiency of ſcripture. I think it likewiſe to be herein implied, that the Noetians were ſtrenuous aſſertors of the authority of holy ſcripture.

[z] Ορας, φησιν, πως; υια θεον κηρυσσουσιν αι γραφαι. ib. p. 7.

[a] Αλλο δε, φησιν, ο δυναμεθα λεγειν· και γαρ ο αποστολος ενα θεον ομολογει, λεγων· ων οι πατερες, εξ ων ο χριστος το κατα σαρκα, ο ων επι παντων θεος ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας. ib. p. 7.

[b] Vid. Epiph. H. 57, num. ii. iii.

[c] αι μεν γραφαι ορθως λεγουσιν, αλλα ουκ και ουτος νοει· Ουκ τοιν δε ει ουτος μη νοει, παρα τουτο εκβλητοι αι γραφαι. ib. num. iii. p. 7.

[d] Vid. ib. num. vi. p. 11, n. xiii. p. 15, n. xviii. p. 19.

[e] ib. n. ix. p. 12, 13.

[f] . . και ως θελει πνευμα αγιον δωρεισθαι, λαμβανει· Μη κατ' ιδιαν προαιρεσιν, κατ' ιδιαν νευι, μηδε βιαζομενοι τα υπο του θεου δεδομενα, αλλ' ον τροπον αυτος εβουληθη δια των αγιων γραφων δειξαι, ουτως ιδωμεν. ibid.

Epiphanius

Epiphanius confirms our allegations from the forementioned writer; for in his article of the Noetians he quotes many books of the Old and New Teſtament, and has this paſſage, with which I conclude this article. 'So that,' ſays [g] he, 'the writ-'ings [or oracles] of the prophets agree with thoſe of the 'apoſtles, and the apoſtles agree with the evangeliſts, and the 'evangeliſts with the apoſtles, and the apoſtles with the pro-'phets.'

After this there can be no reaſon to think, that the Noetians rejected any books of ſcripture generally received by Chriſtians at that time, or that they ſhewed a leſs regard to them; though they did not underſtand them altogether as ſome others did.

One thing ſhould be obſerved here: if the piece againſt Noetus be really a work of Hippolytus, the extracts now made out of it afford additions to his teſtimony to the ſcriptures, as (n) formerly exhibited by me: but when I compoſed that chapter, I doubted the genuineneſs of this piece, and therefore was cautious of making much uſe of it; nor am I yet fully ſatisfied in that point. I have therefore quoted this fragment, or homily, as an ancient piece aſcribed to Hippolytus; but poſſibly interpolated in ſome places ſince it's original compoſition.

It was fit I ſhould give the hiſtory I have now done of Noetus and his followers. There follow ſome articles in Epiphanius, which appear to be but inconſiderable. Nevertheleſs I ſhall give ſome account of them likewiſe. If I ſhould quite omit them, they might be thought by ſome to be more material than they are.

II. The next article in Epiphanius is that of the Valeſians. They dwell, as [h] he gueſſeth, at Bacathus, a conſiderable village of Philadelphia in Arabia. He ſays, they are moſt of them eunuchs, and make thoſe ſo who come over to them: they have alſo, as he adds, ſome other heretical notions and ſhameful practices: they [i] reject the law and the prophets: ſo writes Epiphanius in his Summary or Recapitulation.

In his larger work againſt hereſies he ſays, 'We [l] have often 'heard of the Valeſians; but we could never learn who their 'leader Vales [or Valens] was, where he lived, whence he 'came, what were his principles, precepts, or ſayings: but his

[g] οπως συμφωνη τα προφητικα τοις αποστολικοις, κ. λ. Epiph. H. 57, p. 486. B.

(n) See Chap. xxxv.

[h] Epiphan. Anaceph. T. 2, p. 145.

[i] αθετιζοντες τον νομον και τους προφητας. ibid. [l] Περι Ουαλησιων ακηκομεν πολλακις, ε μεν τοι εγνωμεν πη, πως, η ποθεν ωρματο, η τι ην εγω, η ιδιωτων, η φθεγγομενος ο Ουαλης υτος. Adv. H. 58. p. 489.

'name being Arabic, I suspect him to be of the same opinion 'with some who live at Bacathus in Philadelphia beyond Jor-'dan, and are called Gnostics by the people of the country; 'although they are not Gnostics, for their opinions are diffe-'rent. What we have learned of them is to this purpose: at 'first they were of the church, but after a while, when they 'were increased, they separated from it: they are all eunuchs: 'when any embrace their institution, they are obliged to for-'bear all flesh, till they have been made eunuchs, either with 'their own consent, or by force; then they may eat what they 'please. Nor do they only serve their own people in that man-'ner, but others also, strangers and travellers, as is commonly 'said.' Epiphanius, having given that account of this sect and their principles, proceeds to argue against them from the New Testament.

These people are not mentioned by Philaster, nor Theodoret.

Augustine [m] agrees with Epiphanius; and it is manifest he had no other knowledge of these people than what he had from him.

The author of Prædestinatus follows Augustine; but he adds one thing omitted by the other two; that [n] the Valesians were condemned by a synod of Achaia. I wish that author had told us whence he had this particular.

Damascen has nothing beside what is in the Recapitulation of Epiphanius.

It is plain that this was a very obscure sect, if ever there was such an one. Epiphanius indeed says, he had often heard of them: however he seems not to have known any thing in particular concerning them, but what he had received by doubtful and uncertain information. If ever there were such people, they seem to have received the books of the New Testament without scruple: for, though Epiphanius says they rejected the law and the prophets, he brings no charge against them with regard to the New Testament, either of adding to it, or detracting from it; and in his brief confutation of them, he alleges divers texts of St. Matthew's gospel, and another from the first epistle to the Corinthians. I do not pretend to assign any particular period to these heretics, whose very existence is uncertain.

III. The next article in Epiphanius (whose order is followed likewise by Augustine, the author of Prædestinatus, and John Da-

[m] Valesii et se ipsos castrant, et hospites suos, hoc modo existimantes Deo se debere servire. Alia quoque hæretica docere dicuntur et turpia: sed quæ illa sint, nec ipse commemoravit Epiphanius, nec uspiam potui reperire. Aug. de Hær. cap. 37.

[n] Hi a synodo sunt damnati Achaiæ.

maſcen,) is that of the Pure, or Novatians. But of them I ſay nothing now, intending to ſpeak of them in the hiſtory of their founder Novatus; or, as he is more commonly called, Novatian. After them follow Angelics: of whom Epiphanius ſays, in his Summary, that [o] they were then no where to be found, but had entirely ceaſed. They ſeem to have been ſo called, either becauſe they boaſted of their having an angelical inſtitution, or elſe becauſe they invoked angels.

In his larger work Epiphanius ſays, 'We [p] have heard of the 'hereſy, [or ſect] of the Angelics, but it is by name only: for 'we could never gain any certain information wherein their he-'reſy conſiſted; probably becauſe it haſtened to it's period ſoon 'after it had ſprung up. Nor do we ſo much as know, certainly, 'what was the original of the name: whether it was, becauſe 'they ſaid the world was formed by angels, as ſome have done, 'or [q] that they boaſted of being an angelic ſort of people, and 'that they lived a moſt excellent life; or whether they had 'their name from ſome place; for [r] there is a country beyond 'Meſopotamia, called Ingilin, [or Angelin.] About this we 'can ſay nothing poſitively.'

This is the account which Epiphanius gives of theſe people. It is his uſual method to add, after the hiſtory of any heretics, a confutation of them. But he forbears to attempt any thing of that nature here, not knowing what their principles were.

Philaſter makes no expreſs mention of theſe Angelics. Nor is there any thing concerning them in Theodoret.

Auguſtine [s] ſays, 'they were inclined to the worſhip of angels, 'and that Epiphanius aſſures us, they had ceaſed in his time.' This ſhews that Auguſtine had no particular knowledge of this ſect.

Let us however take the account in *Prædeſtinatus*: it may ſerve to convince us that he is an author not to be relied upon. 'The thirty-ninth hereſy,' ſays [t] he, 'is that of the Angelics. 'They choſe to be ſo called: for they ſay that angels ought to 'be adored and reverenced in the mind, and that prayers ought 'to be preſented to them; that, as they are able, they may be in-'duced by the petitions of men to give them help. Epiphanius 'aſſures us that theſe people had quite ceaſed, having been over-

[o] . . ετοι παντελως εξλιποι. αιχμητες δε τινες αγγελικην ταξιν εχειν, η δια το αγγελους προσκεκλησθαι. Epiph. Anac. p. 146, n. 14. [p] H. 60, p. 505. [q] ητοι δια το ει ταξει αγγελων εαυτους σεμνυειν, κ. λ. ib. c. [r] . . . επειδη χωρις της εστι Ιγγιλιης. ib. [s] Angelici, in angelorum cultum inclinati, quos Epiphanius jam omnino defeciſſe teſtatur. Aug. de Hær. c. 39. [t] . . . Hi Angelicos ſe vocari voluerunt. Dicunt enim angelos debere adorari et excoli animo, et ipſis preces effundi . . . . Hos Epiphanius jam omnino defeciſſe teſtatur,

'come by Theophilus, bishop of Apamea.' So this writer. But Epiphanius says no such thing, nor yet Augustine, nor [u] John Damascen; who has nothing more relating to this sect, than what was transcribed above from the Summary of Epiphanius.

The reader has a right to think for himself: but possibly some will be of opinion, that there never was any sect of this name distinct from all others; and that Angelics is only an appellation, sometimes bestowed in the way of ridicule, upon some rigid and conceited sect, which ordinarily went under another denomination.

IV. The people next mentioned by Epiphanius, are 'the [x] 'Apostolics; who,' as he says, 'are also called Apotactics, [or Re-'nouncers.] They are to be found in Pisidia. They receive none 'but renouncers; [that is, such as are of the same opinion with 'themselves.] They mightily resemble the Encratites, though 'they have some notions different from theirs.' So writes Epiphanius in his Recapitulation. And [y] the Encratites are summarily described by him in the same work after this manner; 'That they condemned marriage as proceeding from Satan, and 'forbid the eating any kind of animal food.'

In the Panarium he writes: 'Others there are who call them-'selves Apostolics and Apotactics: for this is their darling 'maxim, to possess [z] nothing. They are a sort of sprout from 'Tatian's sect, partaking of the principles of the Encratites, Ta-'tianists, and Pure. They divide and wound the holy church 'of God by their superstition and will-worship. They likewise 'overthrow the divine clemency; for they no more receive any 'one that has once offended. With regard to marriage and other 'matters, their sentiments have a near affinity with those of the 'people before spoken of: [that is, the Novatians.] But 'whereas the Pure are contented with the scriptures commonly 'received, these are very fond of the Acts of Andrew and Tho-'mas, and [a] are altogether averse to the ecclesiastical canon.' He afterwards says, that [b] this sect is confined to a very small tract, and are no where to be found but in Phrygia, Cilicia, and Pamphylia.

In his confutation of these people, Epiphanius quotes the gospels, the Acts, and divers of St. Paul's epistles, very freely. He argues, from reason and scripture, that marriage is not de-

victos a Theophilo Apameo episcopo. Præd. l. i. h. 39. [u] Vid. Joh. Dam. de Hær. cap. 60, ap. Coteler. Mon. Gr. T. i. p. 295. [x] Anac. p. 146, n. xv. [y] Ib. p. 144, n. i. [z] . . . φυλαττεται δε παρ' αυτοις το μηδεν κεκτησθαι. Adv. H. 61, n. i. p. 506. B. [a] . . . παντα παση αλλοτριοι τη καινοις τη εκκλησιαστικη. ib. c. [b] n. ii. p. 507.

filing

filing or abominable; and that there is no crime in being rich, when an eſtate has deſcended to any by legal inheritance, or has been gained in the way of honeſt induſtry and fair dealing, and is employed in good uſes. However the church, too, as he adds, has it's renouncers; but then it does not teach them to be proud and arrogant, and to deſpiſe and condemn all others. If [c] any are diſpoſed to part with their goods, and aim at an apoſtolical life, they are at liberty; provided they ſtill maintain favourable ſentiments of other men, and keep up a friendly correſpondence with them. The ſame is to be ſaid of thoſe who forbear marriage, provided they do not look upon it as a thing abominable in itſelf, and refuſe not communion with thoſe who are ſo contracted. The church, ſays he, may be compared to a ſhip, which does not conſiſt of one plank only, but of many: beſide the keel, it has it's forecaſtle, and ſtern, maſts, and ſails, and anchors; it's company too is various, and it refuſes none but robbers and pirates. In like manner the church excludes none but great and ſcandalous ſinners: it receives all who are ſincerely deſirous to be ſaved, and [d] conducts them all to ſalvation in the way ſuitable to their ſeveral capacities, ſtations, and conditions. So Epiphanius.

The Apoſtolics are not mentioned in Philaſter or Theodoret.

Auguſtine [e] ſays, 'that theſe people arrogantly called themſelves Apoſtolics, or Apoſtolical, becauſe they received not any into communion who lived in the marriage ſtate, or that poſſeſſed any thing of their own. Indeed, the catholic church has many ſuch, both monks and clergy: but theſe are therefore heretics, becauſe they ſeparate themſelves from the church, and allow no hopes of ſalvation to thoſe who enjoy ſuch things as they have not. They reſemble the Encratites, and are likewiſe called Apotactics; but they are alſo reported to teach ſome other, I know not what, heretical things peculiar to themſelves.'

The author of Prædeſtinatus [f] ſo agrees with Auguſtine, that no particular notice needs to be taken of him.

Damaſcen has nothing beſide the Recapitulation of Epiphanius; and entirely agrees with it, except that, whereas it is

[c] Ib. n. iv. p. 508.

[d] ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν πάντας σώζειν, ἕκαστον δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν πραγματείαν καὶ σωτηρίαν. ib. n. iv. p. 509. B. [e] Apoſtolici, qui ſe illo nomine arrogantiſſime vocaverunt, eo quod in ſuam communionem non reciperent utentes conjugibus et res proprias poſſidentes: quales habet catholica et monachos et clericos plurimos. Sed ideo illi hæretici ſunt, quoniam ſe ab eccleſia ſeparantes, nullam ſpem putant eos habere, qui utuntur his rebus, quibus ipſi carent, &c. Aug. de Hær. cap. 40. [f] Hær. 49, apud Bib. Patr. T. 27, p. 549. H.

there ſaid, the Apoſtolics are to be found in Piſidia, he ſays, they [g] had their riſe there.

The time of this people does not appear: however, it is obſervable, that the Apoſtolics, as well as Angelics, are placed after the Pure, or Novatians, and a great way below Tatian and the Encratites, both in Epiphanius and the other writers that mention them. They renounced the world, and condemned all others that did not: this was their peculiar principle, againſt which Epiphanius has argued very well; his confutation of them is a rational and ſenſible performance. But perhaps it may be queſtioned, whether there ever was any ſect of this name different from all others. The reaſons of this doubt are ſuch as theſe: they are not mentioned by Philaſter, or Theodoret. Auguſtine ſeems not to have known any thing of them, but what he had learned from Epiphanius. Whereas if there had been any ſuch people, who aroſe after the Novatians, one would think they ſhould have been well known to thoſe learned ancients. According to all the accounts we have of them, they mightily reſembled the Encratites and Novatians. Poſſibly therefore, Apoſtolic, or Apoſtolical, is nothing but a different appellation of ſome rigid ſect, that ordinarily went by another name; whoſe rigid ſentiment too, as may be ſuppoſed, is here aggravated beyond truth and reality. If, after all, there ever was ſuch a ſect, it made little progreſs, and had but a ſhort duration. What Epiphanius ſays, therefore, of their admiring the Acts of Andrew and Thomas, needs not to give us much concern.

V. The next article in Epiphanius, and the writers that follow him, is that of the Sabellians; of whom I have already taken ſome notice in this chapter, in the article of Noetus, and ſhall be obliged to ſay more in the (E) hiſtory of Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria. After them follow two diſtinct articles, concerning two different ſorts of people, called Origeniſts; the former generally called impure, or infamous Origeniſts: of whom, in his Recapitulation, Epiphanius ſays, that [h] they were ſo called from a certain Origen. In his Panarium, or larger work againſt hereſies, he declares, that he [i] did not know from whom they were ſo called, whether from Origen Adamantius, or from ſome other; all he could ſay was, that he underſtood they were called Origeniſts. The others [l] he plainly ſpeaks of, as ſo named

[g] Και ουτοι περι πισιδιαν φανερωσεις. Joh. Dam. ap. Cotel. Mon. G. T. i. p. 296. (E) See Chap. xliii. num. vii. [h] . . . τινος ωριγενες. Anaceph. p. 146, n. xvii. [i] καλουνται δε ωριγενιοι· α παυ δε σαφως ισμεν τινος εινεκα, η απο ωριγενες τε αδαμαντιου, καλεισθαι σεβαστε, η αλλε τινος ειναι, αγνοω. κ. λ. adv. H. 63, n. i. Vid. etiam H. 64, n. 3, p. 526. D. [l] Vid. Anaceph. p. 146, num. 18. Adv. Hær. 64, n. i.

from

from Origen, called Adamantius, the famous writer, and ſon of Leonides, the bleſſed and holy martyr. Of theſe laſt I ſay nothing here, not chooſing to give any farther account of the opinions of Origen, or his followers and admirers, than I have already done in the hiſtory of him: it is no neceſſary part of my deſign, nor will it be expected of me by any body.

Of the former Origeniſts, Epiphanius ſays, they [m] were guilty of things not fit to be mentioned. He charges them with licentious principles, as well as ſhameful practices; and ſays, that they reſembled thoſe called Gnoſtics. They [n] received and read, as he adds, divers ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, and alſo ſome apocryphal ſcriptures, particularly thoſe called the Acts of Andrew, and of ſome others. Auguſtine, who had read only the Recapitulation of Epiphanius, follows that work, ſaying, that [o] theſe Origeniſts were not ſo called from that Origen, who was well known to almoſt every body, but from ſome other, he knew not whom: then he adds in general, as from Epiphanius, that they were guilty of ſhameful actions. Auguſtine plainly had no knowledge of this people, beſide what he had from that writer. The author [p] of Prædeſtinatus follows Auguſtine, but adds a particular of his own head; that this ſect had it's original from a wicked Syrian, named Origen. John Damaſcen [q] has nothing different from the Recapitulation of Epiphanius.

It is diſputed by learned moderns, whom theſe people followed, and from whom they were named. Baſnage [r] thinks it likely, that there was ſome other Origen, unknown to us, who was the author of this ſect. I do not perceive that [s] Tillemont determines this queſtion one way or other. Baronius [t] thought there was but one Origen about this time, and that theſe Origeniſts had their name from him: of this opinion too are [u] Huet and [x] Pagi; who deſerve to be conſulted; comparing likewiſe a note of the Benedictines, upon the forty-ſecond chapter of Auguſtine's book of Hereſies. I cannot but own, that I am much inclined to be of the ſame opinion: and, if I may be allowed to proceed ſomewhat farther, I would ſay, it ſeems to me that

[m] Vid. Anac. ubi ſupra. Adv. H. 63, p. 520. . . . 524. [n] γραφας δε ετι αναγινωσκουσι διαφορους καινης και παλαιας διαθηκης. adv. H. 63, n. i. p. 520. Κεχρηται δε, ως εοικε, διαφοροις γραφαις, και καινης διαθηκης, και αποκρυφοις τισι, μαλιστα τοις Ανδρεου πραξεσι φησι και των αλλων. ib. n. ii. in. [o] . . a quodam Origine dicti ſunt, non illo qui fere omnibus notus eſt, ſed ab alio neſcio quo, &c. Aug. de H. c. 42. [p] . . . ſed ab alio Syro quodam ſceleratiſſimo. Præd. ib. c. 42. [q] Dam. de Hær. c. 63. n. 5. [r] Quidni igitur ignotus et Origenes aliquis turpibus Origeniſtis ſe fontem præbuit? Baſn. A. 203, num. 25. [s] Tillem. Origene Art. 26, M. E. T. 3. P. 3, p. 209, 210. [t] Baron. Ann. 256, n. 47. [u] Origenian. l. i. c. i. n. vii. p. 5. [x] Pagi, 253, n. 25.

this whole ſtory of the impure Origeniſts is without foundation. For, firſt, it depends entirely upon the authority of Epiphanius: this appears from what was obſerved before. Secondly, the account is in itſelf improbable; there are wicked people at all times: but it exceeds all bounds of probability, that men ſhould avow principles and practices ſo abſurd and ſhameful as thoſe imputed to this people. Farther, thirdly, theſe people made high pretenſions to ſtrict picty: for, as [y] Epiphanius ſays, they ſpoke diſadvantageouſly of marriage, as not ſufficiently pure; and [z] they had among them men and women who profeſſed a monaſtic, or ſolitary life; and [a] they ſometimes cenſured the looſeneſs of other Chriſtians, finding fault with thoſe eccleſiaſtics who had ſubintroduced women in their houſes. The account thereof in Epiphanius is inconſiſtent, and overthrows itſelf. Fourthly, if Epiphanius had had any certain knowledge, or good information, concerning this people, as a diſtinct ſect, he would have been able to ſay whom they followed: but he owns he was an abſolute ſtranger as to that point. This ſect, therefore, of impure Origeniſts is a fictitious and imaginary ſect; owing it's ſuppoſed exiſtence to the calumnies of ſome bitter enemies of Origen and his admirers; the credulity of Epiphanius, and his too great facility in receiving the ſtories brought to him; together with his favourable ſentiments of the virtue of the great Origen: for, being perſuaded that [b] Origen was a good man, when ſome angry, not to ſay wicked, people brought him the relations he refers to, he concluded there was ſome ſect called Origeniſts, whoſe riſe and original he could not account for: whereupon he makes a diſtinct hereſy of them.

It is eaſy to ſuppoſe there were ſhameful things done by ſome called Origeniſts; but ſo there were likewiſe by thoſe who were for appropriating the title of good catholics to themſelves: and perhaps ſuch things were no where more frequent than among thoſe who affected a monaſtic life. But I can ſee no good reaſon to make a new ſect, for the ſake of accounts which have ſo much the appearance of proceeding from the enmity and bitterneſs of a party ſpirit.

We need not labour to ſettle the time of theſe people; they were in being in the time of Epiphanius, and probably had their beginning when ſome perſons were firſt diſtinguiſhed by the name of Origeniſts. I have ſpoken of them here out of

[y] αθετησι δε γαμοι. H. 63, n. i. p. 520. D. [z] οι μεν γαρ εισι προσχηματι μοναζοντων, οι δε συν αυτοις οσαι προσχηματι μοναζουσιν. ib. [a] κατηγορουσι δε δηθεν των εν τη εκκλησια τας αγαπητας λεγομενας συνεισακτους γυναικας κεκτημενων. ib. n. ii. in. [b] Vid. Epiphan. H. 64. n. ii. iii.

regard

regard to the order in which they are placed by Epiphanius; and becauſe I was willing to put together ſome things of a like nature, and which are not of the utmoſt importance.

Nor need we to be at all concerned about what is ſaid of their making uſe of ſome apocryphal ſcriptures, particularly the Acts of Andrew, and of ſome others; for they who forged the other calumnies againſt this people, that is the Origeniſts, or ſome of the followers of the great Origen, would make no ſcruple to add a particular or two of this ſort: and yet perhaps they did uſe ſome ſuch writings, but not as writings of authority, any more than other Chriſtians did.

Next after the two laſt mentioned articles, ſucceeds in Epiphanius, and divers other authors who write of hereſies, that of Paul of Samoſata. I ſhall have occaſion to take notice of this in the hiſtory of the above-named (F) Dionyſius.

CHAP. XLII.

St. GREGORY, biſhop of Neocæſarea.

I. *His hiſtory.* II. *Teſtimonies to him.* III. *His time.* IV. *His works.* V. *His character.* VI. *His teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament.*

I. I HAVE already mentioned Gregory of Neocæſarea in Pontus, as (A) one of Origen's moſt noted ſcholars, and (B) an account of Origen's letter to him. It is fit we ſhould now have a more particular hiſtory of this renowned convert and biſhop, of the beſt times, or near them; who is uſually called Thaumaturgus, or the Wonder-worker, for the many and great miracles wrought by him.

Says [a] Jerom, in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, 'Theo-
' dore, who was afterwards called Gregory, biſhop of Neocæſa-
' rea

(F) See Ch. xliii. num. viii.
(A) Chap. xxxviii. vol. ii. (B) p. 209.

[a] Theodorus, qui poſtea Gregorius appellatus eſt, Neocæſareæ Ponti epiſcopus, admodum adoleſcens, ob ſtudia Græcarum et Latinarum literarum, de Cappadocia Berytum, et inde Cæſaream Paleſtinæ tranſiit, junct. ſibi fratre Athenodoro. Quorum cum egregiam indolem vidiſſet Origines, hortatus eſt eos ad philoſophiam; in qua paulatim fidem introducens, ſui quoque ſectatores reddidit. Quinquennio itaque eruditi ab eo remittuntur ad matrem, e quibus Theodorus proficiſcens παναγυρικον ευχαριστιας ſcripſit Origeni, et convocata grandi frequentia, ipſo quoque Origene præſente, recitavit, qui uſque hodie exſtat. Scripſit et μεταφρασιν in eccleſiaſten brevem quidem ſed valde utilem. Et aliæ hujus vulgo feruntur epiſtolæ, ſed præcipue ſigna atque miracula, quæ jam epiſcopus cum multa eccleſiarum gloria perpetravit. Hieron. De Vir. Ill. c. 65.

' rea

'rea in Pontus, being yet very young, for the ſake of Greek and 'Roman learning, came with his brother Athenodorus from Cap-'padocia to Berytus, and thence to Cæſarea in Paleſtine. Origen, 'perceiving their fine genius, recommended to them the ſtudy 'of philoſophy, with which he gradually inſtilled into them the 'faith of Chriſt, and took them into the number of his diſci-'ples. Having ſtaid with him five years, they returned to their 'mother: [perhaps it ſhould be country.] Theodore, before 'he went away, compoſed a panegyrical oration, to thank Origen, 'and recited it in a numerous audience, Origen being preſent; 'which is ſtill extant. He wrote likewiſe a ſhort, but very uſe-'ful, paraphraſe upon the book of Eccleſiaſtes. There are alſo 'ſeveral of his epiſtles to be found. But he is chiefly famous 'for the miracles he wrought when biſhop, to the great honour 'of the churches.'

That is a ſummary of Gregory's whole life. There is an authentic hiſtory of the former part of it in the farewel, or panegyrical oration at Cæſarea, juſt mentioned, which was ſpoken in the year 238 or 239, as is generally ſuppoſed; though perhaps ſome may place it a few years ſooner.

Gregory's parents [b] were Gentiles. He loſt his father when he was not more than fourteen years of age. Having received thoſe rudiments of learning which are uſually taught young perſons of a plentiful condition, his [c] mother ſent him and his brother Athenodorus to a maſter of rhetoric. He had beſides another maſter to teach him the Latin tongue; not indeed with a deſign he ſhould ſpeak it, but that he might not be altogether ignorant of the language of the empire. This maſter was well ſkilled in the Roman laws. He earneſtly recommended that ſtudy to his ſcholar: Gregory complied, and his maſter taught him with great application. It happened that at this time Gregory's ſiſter married to a lawyer, in eſteem with the governor of Paleſtine, and choſen by him to be one of his aſſeſſors or counſellors, was ſent for by her huſband to come to him at Cæſarea. The [d] officer, who came to conduct the lady to her huſband, brought with him a good number of carriages, more than ſufficient for her and her neceſſary attendants; and Gregory was induced to accompany his ſiſter to Cæſarea, partly with a view of accomodating her and rendering her journey more agreeable, partly becauſe of the convenience that offered for going to Berytus in Phœnicia, where

[b] Gregor. Orat. Paneg. ad Orig. p. 55, B. Ed. Pariſ. 1621. [c] εὐθὺς τὴν μοίρην ἐκ τῶν γονέων κηδεσθαι πᾶσι παραλειπόμενον μητρὶ, τἄλλα ἐκπαιδεύομενος, ὑπὸ παιδὰς ἐκ ἀγενεῖς ὀνθεὶς καὶ φοιτᾶς καὶ τρεφομένους, φοιτᾶσι καὶ ῥήτορι, ὡς δὲ ῥήτορας ἐσομένους. ib. p. 56. B. [d] P. 57. B. C.

lie

he might improve himself in the law under the celebrated professors of that science who resided there. Thus Gregory, by attending his sister, was conducted not to Berytus, but to Cæsarea, where [e] Origen was newly arrived from Alexandria, as if on purpose to meet them.

As soon as Origen saw Gregory and his brother Athenodorus, he was desirous of retaining them with him; and he neglected no means to inspire them with a love of philosophy, as [f] a foundation of true religion and piety. At length they were persuaded by the force of his arguments, and the charms of his conversation. Of [g] Origen they learned logic, physics, geometry, astronomy, ethics. He [h] encouraged them likewise in the reading of all sorts of ancient authors, poets and philosophers, whether Greeks or barbarians; restraining them from none but such as denied a deity or a providence, from whom no possible advantage could be obtained. But [i] above all he inculcated a diligent attention to the mind of God, as revealed in the prophets; he himself explaining to them the obscure and difficult passages, when any such occurred; as certainly, says Gregory, there are many such in the sacred scriptures.

This is a very brief abstract of that oration, which, I think, if read throughout, must appear a monument of the composer's eminent abilities, and demonstrate likewise Origen's excellent method of educating those who were under his care; which indeed is honourable both to himself and the Christian profession of that age.

Gregory now left Cæsarea with much regret. What was the reason is not certain; though there are some expressions [k] near the conclusion of the oration, which may lead us to think that some affairs of the family required his presence at home.

Gregory, of Nyssa in Cappadocia, brother of St. Basil, who flourished [l] about the year 372, and about a hundred years after Thaumaturgus, has left us a panegyric upon him, entitled, An Oration upon the Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus. We can by

[e] Τοι δε ιερα, τητα ωδεν εκ της Αιγυπτου εκ της Αλεξανδρεων πολεως, ειδα την εκειθεν εχων ετι χε πρωτης, και αι τα εκειθεν και μεταιστη επι τοδε τι ιερον, ωστ' αναιτητοντα πιειν, ετερα πραγματα. p. 57. B. [f] Ου τοινυν ηδε ειδεβειαν ως δικαιαν ειναι εφασκεν, ορθως λεγων, μη φιλοσοφησαιτι. p. 59. C. [g] P. 63, 64, 65. [h] φιλοσοφειν. και γαρ κειν αιρεομενος των αρχαιων τα τοιαυτα και φιλοσοφων και ρητορων, εις γραμματα πασι διαμει μηδεν εκποιησεως, ουδ' αποδοκιμαζοντας . . . πλην οσα των αθεων εν, οσοι . . . εκ εισι Θεοι, η προνοια, λεγουσι . . . τοις δε λοιποις πασιν ειτυγχανειν και προσομιλειν, γενος μεν ηδε εν, ηδε λογον φιλοσοφοι προτιμησαιτας, ουτε αν αποδοκιμασαιτας, ητε ελληνικοι, ητε βαρβαροι, παιτων δε ακεοιτας, p. 69. C. D.

[i] μειζω δε προσεχειν Θεω, και τοις τητε προφηταις, αυτος υποφητευειν και σαφηνιζων, οτι ποτε σκοτεινον και αινιγματωδες η, οια πολλα εν ταις ιεραις εστι φωνοις. ib. p. 72. D.

[k] Φερωτες εκ τα σπερματα. και τες καρπες και τας οπωρικας, τελειας μεν ηχι. πως γαρ; οσας δε δυνατοι ημιν απο των εν πολιτειᾳ πραξεων. κ λ. p. 76. C. D. [l] Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. 369, xvii.

no

no means omit to take particular notice of this piece; but I ſhall tranſcribe only the moſt material things, and in as brief a manner as is ſuitable to our deſign.

The native country of our author, whom Nyſſen calls the Great Gregory, was Pontus, his city Neocæſarea, and his family was rich and noble. But [m] theſe things, the advantages of that country, the ſplendour of his city, the honourable offices and tities of his anceſtors, he forbears to inſiſt on, having more important things to mention. His parents were involved in the error and folly of idolatry, which [n] Gregory abandoned, and became a diſciple of the goſpel, when he was enriched with the treaſures of all the Greek learning; herein reſembling Moſes, of whom the ſcripture ſays, that *he was learned in all the wiſdom of the Egyptians*, Acts vii. 22. Thus our Gregory [o] renounced heatheniſm, at a time when he was able to judge of the ſtrength or the weakneſs of all the Gentile philoſophy and theology.

Nyſſen ſays, that [p] Gregory ſtudied ſecular learning for ſome time at Alexandria, where there was a great reſort of youth from all parts for the ſake of philoſophy and medicine. Our young Gregory [q] was even then diſtinguiſhed by the ſobriety and diſcretion of his behaviour. And a lewd woman having been employed by ſome idle people to diſgrace him by indirect but impudent inſinuations of intimacy with her, his reputation was vindicated in a remarkable manner: for the woman was immediately ſeized with ſuch horrible fits, as demonſtrated them to be a judgment of Heaven; nor [r] was ſhe relieved from the dæmon that had taken poſſeſſion of her, till Gregory had interceded with God for her, and obtained the pardon of her fault.

Hitherto Gregory was a heathen; but his converſion was near: for ſoon after this he [s] was conducted to Origen, then the chief maſter of the Chriſtian philoſophy, and ſtill celebrated for his writings. To his inſtructions Gregory now committed himſelf; and when he returned into his native country, as Nyſſen ſays, he retired from the world to a private life in a deſert place.

[m] αλλ' ωδε των προγονων αυτω των προκεκηρυγμενων της κατα σαρκα γενισεως μνημην επι τω λογω ποιησομαι, πλουτον και φιλοτιμιας, και τας κοσμικας περιφανειας αυτων διηγησομαι. Greg. Nyſſ. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. Tom. iii. p. 537. D. vid. ib. A. B. C. et p. 536. D. [n] P. 538, 539.

[o] Ουτως και ο μεγας ουτος δια πασης ελθων της των ελληνων παιδευσεως, και γυμνος τη πειρα των παρ αυτοις δογματων το ασθενες και ασυστατον, μαθητης τω ευαγγελιω καθισταται. p. 540. A. [p] Εις ην και η παιτα-χοθεν συνερρει νεοτης των περι φιλοσοφιαν τε και ιατρικην εσπουδακοτων. p. 540. B.

[q] p. 540, 541, 542. [r] Και ο προτερον αυτην κατεπηγον αυτην το δαιμονιον, πριν η τον μεγαν εκεινον επικαλεσασθαι τον Θεον, και υπερ αυτης ιλεωσασθαι. p. 541. B.

[s] καταλιπων πασαν την περι της εξω φιλοσοφιας σπουδην, προσφοιτα μετ' εκεινου τω κατα τον χρονον εκεινον της των χριστιανων φιλοσοφιας καθηγεμονι. Ωριγενης δε ουτος ην, ου πολυς επι συγγραμμασι λογος. p. 542. D.

His

His ordination was very remarkable, if not ſingular. Phedimus, biſhop of Amaſea, knowing the worth of this young man, and being grieved that a perſon of ſuch accompliſhments ſhould live uſeleſs in the world, was deſirous to conſecrate him to God and his church. On the other hand, Gregory was ſhy of ſuch a charge, and induſtriouſly concealed himſelf from the biſhop of Amaſea, whoſe deſign he was aware of. At length Phedimus, tired of his fruitleſs attempts to meet Gregory, and being bleſſed with the gift of foreknowledge, looking [t] up to God, to whom they were both preſent, inſtead of laying his hands upon Gregory, addreſſed a diſcourſe to him, and conſecrated him to God, though bodily abſent; aſſigning him alſo a city, which till that time was ſo addicted to idolatry, that in it, and in all the country round about, there were not above ſeventeen believers.

Gregory was then at the diſtance of three days journey. Nyſſen does not inform us how Gregory came to the knowledge of what had been done: however, he ſays, that now Gregory thought himſelf obliged to acquieſce; and that afterwards he was ordained with the uſual ceremonies. He only deſired [u] of him, by whom he had been ordained, a ſhort time to prepare himſelf for the office to which he was appointed: nor [w] had he courage to undertake the work of preaching, till he had been informed of the truth by revelation. And, [x] whilſt he was engaged in deep meditation, he had a magnificent and awful viſion in his chamber: two perſons appeared, one in the habit of a man, the other of a woman; encompaſſed alſo by a bright light, too ſtrong for him to look upon directly. He heard theſe perſons diſcourſe together about the doctrines in which he deſired to be informed: and he perceived who they were; for they called each other by name. The perſon in the habit of a woman deſired, that John the evangeliſt would teach that young man the myſtery of piety: and he replied, that he was not unwilling to do what was deſired by the mother of our Lord. John then gave him the inſtruction he wanted; which, when they had diſappeared, Gregory wrote down. According to that faith he always preached, and [y] left it with his church, as an invaluable treaſure, a doctrine received from heaven: by which

[t] p. 544. D. 545. A. [u] και βραχυν χρονον αιτησαμενος παρα τυ την ιερωσυνην επικηρυξαντος. κ. λ. p. 445. A. [w] και υ προτερον επεθαρσησε τω τυ λογυ κηρυγματι, πριν δια τινος εμφανειας εκκαλυφθηναι αυτω την αληθειαν. ibid. B. [x] p. 545. C. D. 546. [y] Τον δε παραχρημα την θειαν εκεινην μυσταγωγιαν γραμμασιν ενσημηνασθαι, και κατ' εκεινην μετα ταυτα κηρυσσειν εν τη εκκλησια τον λογον· και τοις εφεξης, ωσπερ τινα κληρον την θεοσδοτον εκεινην διδασκαλιαν καταλιπειν· οἱ' ης μυσταγωγειται μεχρι τυ νυν ο εκεινος λαος, πασης αιρετικης κακιας διαμενοντας απειρατος. p. 546. B. C.

means

means his people from that time to this were preſerved pure from all heretical pravity. Nyſſen then puts down the faith or creed which Gregory received from John; of which I ſhall ſpeak more diſtinctly hereafter. And then he adds, 'If [z] any are 'deſirous of farther ſatisfaction about this matter, let him in-'quire of the church, in which Gregory preached that doctrine, 'and with whom it is ſtill preſerved in the hand-writing of that 'bleſſed man.'

Gregory, being now well qualified for his work, both by a certain knowledge of the truth, and a ſufficient degree of aſſurance, left [a] his ſolitude, and went directly toward the city that had been aſſigned him, and in which he was to form a church to God. As he was in his journey, being benighted, and overtaken by a violent ſtorm, he and his friends with him were obliged to take ſhelter in a heathen temple. It was a temple of great fame, in which the dæmon who was there worſhipped uſed to appear evidently to the prieſts, and deliver oracles. Gregory having gone away early in the morning, the prieſt performed the accuſtomed rites: but he was anſwered by the dæmon, that he could no more appear in that place, becauſe of him that had lodged there the foregoing night. The prieſt, greatly enraged at hearing this, purſued Gregory; and, having overtaken him, threatened to inform the magiſtrates againſt him: but Gregory, not at all diſmayed, told the prieſt, that he had ſuch confidence in the power of the Being whom he ſerved, that he not only relied upon his protection from men, but was alſo perſuaded, that with his aſſiſtance he could expel dæmons from any place, and readmit them as he ſaw fit. And as a demonſtration of ſuch power, he took a ſlip of paper, and [b] wrote upon it, 'Gregory to 'Satan: Enter.' This paper being laid upon the altar, and the accuſtomed rites performed, the dæmon appeared as uſual. The prieſt was now convinced that Gregory was guided by a power ſuperior to dæmons: he therefore returned to him, relating what had happened, and deſired to be farther inſtructed in the Chriſtian religion. But ſome doubts ſtill remaining, Gregory wrought another evident miracle: at his command [c] a large heavy ſtone lying before them moved, as if it had life, and ſettled again in the place Gregory directed. The prieſt was now fully ſatisfied; and, forſaking all things, wife, children, relations, his prieſthood, home, and all his poſſeſſions, followed Gregory; eſteem-

[z] Ὅτῳ δὲ φίλον περὶ τούτων πεισθῆναι, ἀκουέτω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐν ᾗ τὸν λόγον ἐκήρυττεν, παρ' οἷς αὐτὰ τὰ χαράγματα τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης χειρὸς εἰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν διασώζεται. p. 547. A. [a] Ib. D. 548, 549. [b] Ἦν δὲ τὰ γράμματα ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς λέξεως ταῦτα· Γρηγόριος τῷ Σατανᾷ· Εἴσελθε. p. 549. C. [c] p. 550. A. B.

ing

ing his company, and fellowship with him in his divine philosophy, instead of all other things. This priest [d] was afterwards one of Gregory's deacons.

The [e] fame of these great works out-went Gregory, so that the city was before-hand provided for his reception; and he entered in the midst of a vast crowd of people, who even came out to meet him with their wives and children. Gregory, as [f] Nyssen says, had before now disposed of all his estate, and at this time had nothing of his own; no land, no house, no habitation. His friends therefore, who accompanied him, were in pain for him; but he trusted in God; and when he entered the city he had many kind and pressing invitations made him. He took up his abode with one Musonius, a man of the greatest distinction in the city for his quality, estate and authority, and who had made the first offer of entertaining our young bishop. That very day, before sunset, he had made many converts. Early the next morning, men and women, of every rank and age in the city, were before the door of the house; and his success continued. Every one who had need of help was relieved, whether possessed with dæmons or afflicted with any bodily distemper; and all were admonished of the duties peculiarly suited to their age, relation, or station in life. He [g] preached, he argued, he persuaded, he healed.

The number of believers being greatly increased, in a short time he [h] formed a design of building a church, to which all readily contributed by their labour or their purses. Tillemont [i] observes, that this is no unlikely thing, the Christians enjoying all manner of liberty under Philip, who began his reign in the year 244. But, as he adds, this is the first church of which history gives us any certain and express information. This church, as [k] Nyssen says, was standing in his time: it must therefore have escaped the general demolition of churches in the Diocletian persecution; as it did likewise a terrible earthquake afterwards, in which, as Nyssen [l] affirms, almost all the other buildings of the city, public and private, were overthrown.

Gregory being in great reputation for wisdom, abundance of people referred their differences to him, who readily acquiesced in his determinations. But [m] there were two brothers whom he could by no means reconcile. A certain lake was the matter in dispute. When they were about to decide the cause by arms, the

[d] Vid. p. 569. D.

[e] 551, 552. [f] ibid. [g] Και εν μεσοις ειλις προς την εκαστου των συνειλεγμενων χρειαν αρμοττως τη δυναμει του πνευματος μεβοηθειας, χαρισσων, συνεξεταζων, νουθετων, διδασκων, ιωμενος. p. 553. D. [h] p. 554. B.

[i] S. Gregoire Thaumaturge. Art. vii. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 679. [k] p. 554. A. B. [l] Ibid. C. [m] p. 555, 556.

tenants

tenants of the two brothers fighting on each side, Gregory went to the lake the night before, and at his prayers it was dried up. The [n] river Lyc, or Lycus, often overflowing, to the great damage of the neighbouring country, at the desire of the people who suffered by those inundations, Gregory prescribed it proper limits, which it never passed afterwards.

Gregory Nyssen [o] then relates the story of our Gregory's remarkable ordination of Alexander, called the collier, at Comana. As Gregory was returning home from thence, two men agreed to put a trick upon him. One of them laid in the road as dead; the other begged of the bishop to give him somewhat to bury his poor companion. As Gregory passed by, he threw his cloak upon the pretended dead man. As soon as Gregory was out of sight, the other called to his companion to get up; but he had expired at the very instant Gregory cast his cloak upon him, which therefore now served for his burial cloth. Sozomen, [p] relating a like story concerning Epiphanius, recollects this also of Gregory, and he thinks they may be both true.

After his return to Neocæsarea, Gregory [q] cured a young man possessed of a dæmon: and [r] many people were delivered from dæmons, and relieved of their diseases, by only having pieces of linen brought to them, which had been breathed upon by him.

During the episcopate of Gregory, a [s] persecution of the Christians was ordered by imperial edicts, which was very severe in those parts. It is universally allowed that Nyssen means the Decian persecution, though he does not name the emperor. Gregory, [t] considering the weakness of human nature, advised his people, as many as could, to save themselves by flight: and, to remove all scruples, he gave them an example by retiring into a solitary place, taking with him the priest beforementioned, now his deacon. Here Gregory was sought for, but was miraculously preserved: for though his pursuers came to the place where he and his companion were, they did not see, or did not know them. In short, their eyes were so withheld, that they could see nothing but two trees. However, notwithstanding the forementioned good advice of Gregory, many [u] of his people were taken up, and imprisoned, and endured divers torments, and even death itself; he assisting them by his prayers, and by the counsel which he sent to them.

[n] p. 558, 559, 560. [o] p. 561, 562.
[p] Zozom. l. vii. cap. 27. [q] Nyssen. p. 566. [r] αλλ' αρκειν προς τε την των δαιμονων απαλλαγην, και προς την ιασιν των αρρωστηματων τε σωματος το εκ τε στοματος αυτε ασθμα δια της οθονης τω καμνοντι προσαγομενον. p. 567. A. [s] p. 567, 568.
[t] p. 569. C. D. [u] p. 570, 571, &c.

When the persecution was over, Gregory returned to Neocæsarea; and peace being restored to the church about the year 253, as may be supposed, he visited the several parts of his diocese, and [w] transferred the bodies of divers who had suffered martyrdom in the late persecution to several places at proper and convenient distances; where he appointed anniversary festivals and solemnities in memory of the martyrs, indulging the people upon those occasions a little more than ordinary mirth: which, says Nyssen, was wisely done; for many weak and ignorant people being fond of the heathen superstition, because of the diversions it allowed of, Gregory approved that people should be merry and divert themselves on the memorials of the martyrs; hoping by that means to bring them off from idolatry to the general principles of religion, and gradually to more complete virtue.

In some part of Gregory's episcopate the country of Pontus was afflicted with a sore and terrible plague. As Gregory [x] gave some intimations of it beforehand, and he was helpful to many, not only by the charitable relief he afforded, but [y] likewise by the miraculous cures he wrought, great numbers were brought to the profession of Christianity at that season. In a word, when [z] this bishop was near his death, reflecting upon his labours, and hearing there were still seventeen unbelievers in that country, it gave him no small concern: however, he thought it matter of much joy and thanksgiving, that he left his successor no more idolaters than he had found Christians.

This is the account which Gregory of Nyssa has given of his namesake of Neocæsarea; upon which many remarks might be made. It is plain it is a panegyric, not a history. Nyssen is so intent upon the marvellous, that he has scarce any regard to common things: he relates distinctly the mysterious faith which Gregory received one night from John the evangelist; but he dispatches in a very few words the instructions which Gregory received from Origen; though he was five years under his tuition, and had before him excellent materials to enlarge upon concerning that part of our bishop's history. Then he takes little or no notice of circumstances of time and place, or the names of persons; these he omits as things of no moment. Indeed he has been so good as to inform us of Gregory's native city and country, and that he studied some while, as he says, at Alexandria: but he does not let us know where Gregory was

[w] Τας υπερ των ενθληκοτων τη πιστει παννυχιδας συνεθετησας. και διαλαβοντες αλλος αλλαχη των μαρτυρων τα σωματα, κατα την ετησιον τε ενιαυσιαιε κυκλε περιοδον συνιοντες ηγαλλοντο, τη τιμη των μαρτυρων παννυχιζοντες. p. 574. A. B. [x] p. 576. [y] p. 577. [z] p. 574. D. 575. A.

acquainted with Origen; whether at Alexandria, or at Cæsarea. He has not once named the city where Gregory was bishop: and in the description of Gregory's arrival in the city assigned him, and where he was to reside, there is no notice taken that it was his native place: nay, one might be almost apt to think he was an absolute stranger there, and unknown to every body. He does not inform us of the temple where Gregory lodged and silenced the dæmon; neither where it stood, nor to what god it was dedicated. He has not so much as once mentioned the name of the priest who was converted in so extraordinary a manner; who, so far as appears, was our bishop's first convert, and was afterwards a deacon of the church. Nor has he mentioned the name of any one of the many persons, subjects of Gregory's miraculous works. However, it should be owned that he has not concealed the name of the river, whose inundations are said to have been restrained by this mighty man. As before observed, he omits the name of the emperor, author of the persecution that was so severe, and which was so remarkable for Gregory's flight and preservation, and many glorious martyrdoms. Finally, perhaps it may be reckoned by some an inexcusable defect, that in this long oration not any the least notice is taken of Athenodorus, Gregory's brother, and the companion of his travels and studies and conversion to the faith, and afterwards bishop likewise in the same country of Pontus. All these omissions seem unaccountable.

Possibly it will be said, that it was contrary to the rules of rhetoric to be more particular in an oration. If that be so, and all that Nyssen aimed at was to entertain his hearers or readers with a fine piece of oratory, we must consider it as such: but then, though it may afford us some good entertainment, it will hardly be a ground of much faith: for a story to be amusing is one thing, to be credible another.

Farther, the relations of most of the miracles are liable to some other exceptions. The story of the woman at Alexandria is trifling and unlikely. Nay, [a] Basnage says, Gregory never studied at Alexandria. And he may be in the right as to this, so far as I know: then this is a mere fiction, as the same learned writer argues. The moving of the stone at the command of Gregory is silly and romantic, or at least vain and insignificant, and therefore also improbable. The silencing the dæmon by a message sent in writing must surely appear absurd, though it should be

[a] Quæ igitur de meretrice Alexandriæ, quæ sese cum Gregorio consuescere simulavit, et numerata scorto pecunia, et dæmone in fauces ejus involante, narrantur, lepidæ sunt fabulæ, quæ fractis illabentis Alexandrinæ profectionis ruderibus obtruuntur. Bas. Ann. 240, iv.

allowed

allowed to be referred to by ſome other (n) writers. Beſides, Gregory leaves Satan in poſſeſſion of the temple, which I think was not well done, if he was able to ſend him away: and this continuance of Satan at the temple confutes the former account; it ſeems to ſhew it to be a mere fiction. If Gregory had once diſpoſſeſſed Satan, he would not have allowed him to reſume and keep poſſeſſion afterwards. Baſnage, though he does not diſpute every thing related by Nyſſen, greatly diſlikes this [b] ſtory.

I do not intend to deny, that Gregory wrought miracles; for I ſuppoſe he did, as I ſhall acknowledge more particularly by and by: nevertheleſs, there is no harm in making theſe remarks, if they are juſt; or in ſhewing that Nyſſen's relations are defective, and want ſome tokens of credibility, with which we ſhould have been mightily pleaſed.

As for what he ſays of Gregory's appointing anniverſary feſtivals and ſolemnities in honour of the martyrs that had ſuffered in his dioceſe, and allowing people upon thoſe occaſions ſome unuſual mirth and rejoicings, I am ſure this is no apoſtolical method of making converſions; nor was it practiſed in the moſt primitive times next after the apoſtles: and I am not ſatisfied of the truth of what Nyſſen ſays. As I am unwilling to lay hold of every thing he writes to advance this biſhop's honour, ſo neither do I take this particular upon his credit, which tends to diminiſh that honourable idea I am willing to have of him, and for which I think I have good ground. This childiſh method of making converts appears unworthy of ſo wiſe and good a man as Gregory. Nor is it likely that thoſe feſtivals ſhould be inſtituted by one who had the gift of miracles, and therefore a much better way of bringing men to religion and virtue.

We have now peruſed the ſummary of Gregory's life in Jerom: the hiſtory of the early part of his life we have had from himſelf; and Gregory of Nyſſa has afforded us an entertaining account of this great man from the beginning to the time of his death.

II. Gregory is mentioned by many ancient writers. I ſhall here add ſome of their paſſages; they may be conſidered as teſ-

(n) Socrates certainly refers to it. L. iv. cap. 27. And Baſil is thought to do ſo likewiſe, when he ſays, Gregory had a power terrible to dæmons: ος φοβερον μεν ην τα της τυ πνευματος συνεργιας κατα δαιμονων το χρατος. De Sp. S. cap. 29 n. 62. D. But here the reference to this matter is not clear and certain. Baſil might intend ſome of Gregory's miracles, diſpoſſeſſing dæmons out of the bodies of men. [b] Fidem tamen a nobis non impetrat feſtiva Nyſſeni narratio. Non æquum dæmoni, quem tam longo ex tulerat, negatum a ſacerdote ut rurſus in æternam ſuam ex lem introduceret, in exiguo libri fruſtulo ſcriptum fuiſſe: Gregorius Satanæ; Intra. Quæ licentia vix alteri peccato dari potuit, neque vel a veram confeſſionem, miſſa a diabolum eiſdem opus fuit. Quod ſane mirum eſt ſcribendi genus, ac indig-

timonies. The writers I shall cite are, Origen, Eusebius, Jerom again, Basil, Theodoret, and Socrates; omitting some others, as not so material witnesses, and for avoiding too great prolixity.

Origen, in his letter to Gregory, probably written not many months after his return home, tells him, 'his [c] capacity was 'such, that he might be either a Roman lawyer of the first rank, 'or a celebrated Greek philosopher.' But he adviseth him to make the Christian religion his chief study.

Eusebius, speaking of Origen's scholars, says, 'The [d] most 'noted of them were Theodore, called also Gregory, the most 'renowned bishop of our time, and his brother Athenodorus; 'whom when Origen observed to be too fond of Greek and Ro-'man learning, instilling into them a love of philosophy, he 'drew them off from their former studies to divine things. 'Having stayed with him five whole years, they made such pro-'gress in the knowledge of the divine oracles, that whilst they 'were yet very young they were both appointed bishops in Pon-'tus.' In another place, relating things under Gallienus, about the year 260, he says, 'At [e] that time Gregory and his brother 'Athenodorus governed the churches in Pontus.' And among the bishops assembled from several parts in the first council at Antioch in 264, 'The most considerable,' he [f] says, 'were Fir-'milian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the two brothers 'Gregory and Athenodorus, pastors of the churches in Pontus, 'Helenus of Tarsus, and some others.'

Jerom, in his letter to Magnus, so often cited already, among other eminent Christian authors, mentions [g] Theodore, afterwards named Gregory, and calls him a man of apostolical signs and wonders.

What Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, has written of our Gregory may deserve some special notice.

In his Treatise of the Holy Spirit, after having mentioned divers ancient ecclesiastical writers of chief note; such as Irenæus, Dionysius of Rome, and him of Alexandria, Origen, Africanus, and others; he adds; 'But [h] where shall I place the 'great Gregory, and his words? Ought he not to be ranked 'with the apostles and prophets; a man who walked in the same

nissimum virosancto commercium Basil. A. 240. vi. [c] Δυναται δε η ευφυια σου Ρωμαικες νομικος ποιειν τελειον, και Ελληνικον τινα φιλοσοφον των νομιζομενων ελλογιμων αιρεσεων. Orig. Ep. ad Greg. T. i. p. 30. D. Bened. [d] αν επισημως μαλιστα εγνωμεν Θεοδωρον, . . . ος ην αυτος ουτος ο καθ' ημας επισκοπων διαβοητος Γρηγοριος, κ. λ. H. E. L. vi. cap. 30. [e] l. vii. cap. 14. [f] ib. c. 28. [g] Exstant et Julii Africani libri, qui temporum scripsit historias; et Theodori, qui postea Gregorius appellatus est, viri apostolicorum signorum atque virtutum. Hieron. ep. 83. [al. 84.] p. 656 m. [h] Basil. De Sp. S. cap. 29. T. iii. p. 62, 63. Bened.

[6] spirit

'spirit with them, who always followed the footsteps of the 'saints, and in the whole of his conduct was a complete model 'of the evangelical life? 2 Cor. xii. 18. For my part, I must 'say, we should be injurious to the truth, if we do not reckon 'that soul in the number of those who were dearest to God, 'who shined in the church as a large burning lamp, who by the 'mighty operation of the spirit had a power terrible to dæmons, 'who received such grace of the word *for the obedience of faith* '*among all nations*, (Rom. i. 5.) that though at first he found only 'seventeen Christians, he brought over to the acknowledgment 'of God all the people both of the city and the neighbouring 'country. He also turned the course of rivers, commanding 'them in the all-powerful name of Christ; and dried up a lake, 'which was the subject of contention between covetous brothers. 'His predictions of things future are such, as not to be inferior 'to those of other prophets. But it would be too long to reckon 'up all the miracles of this person, who for the abundance of 'the gifts wrought in him by the Holy Spirit, *in all power*, [or, 'mighty deeds] *signs and wonders*, (2 Cor. xii. 12.) was called a 'second Moses by the enemies of the truth. Such was the grace 'of all his words and actions, that he appeared to be adorned 'with a peculiar light and splendour, an indication of the hea-'venly power by which he was conducted. He is still the ad-'miration of all the people of that country; and the memory of 'him is ever fresh and lively in the churches, not at all abated 'by length of time; for [i] which reason they have not taken up 'any custom, word, or mystical rite, beside what they received 'from him. Insomuch, that that church appears defective in 'many respects, because they have nothing but what is ancient; 'for they who have succeeded him in the government of the 'churches would admit of none of those things that have been 'since invented, but have kept entirely to the first institutions, 'as derived from him.'

This is the great character which Basil gives of Gregory, and this is what he says here of his people. Nevertheless, this church of Neocæsarea, the people of Gregory, were very troublesome to the same Basil, or he gave himself a great deal of trouble and uneasiness about them; for in divers of his letters he complains that they were all Sabellians; and he laments the strange aversion they

[i] ηκει η πραξις τινα, ου λογον, η τυπον τινα κυριον παρ' ον εκεινοις κατελιπε, τη εκκλησια προσεθηκαν. Ταυτη τοι και πολλα των παρ' αυτοις τελουμενων ελλειπως εχειν δοκει, δια το της καταστασεως αρχαιστροπον. ουδεις γαρ ητισχυντο οι κατα διαδοχην τας εκκλησιας οικονομησαντες, των μετ' εκεινον εφευρεθεντων παραδιξασθαι εις προσθηκην. ib. p. 63.

had for him; which appears to have been general in the biſhop, clergy, people, and even the near relations of Baſil in that church.

In a letter to the Neocæſareans, written about the year 375, entreating their good will and reconcilement to him, he ſays, 'That 'k one thing which ſhould unite them in affection is, that he and 'they had the ſame inſtructors in the myſteries of religion, and 'the ſame ſpiritual fathers: I mean, ſays he, the great and admir-'able Gregory, and thoſe who have ſucceeded him in the epiſco-'pal chair with you, as ſtars ariſing one after another, all walk-'ing in the ſame ſteps, leaving to all who are diſpoſed to attend 'manifeſt traces of an heavenly converſation.' Afterwards, in the ſame letter, 'And [l what ſtronger proof can there be of [the 'orthodoxy of] our faith, than that we were educated by our 'grandmother, that bleſſed woman ſprung from among you? I 'mean the celebrated Macrina, by whom we were taught the words 'of the moſt bleſſed Gregory, as ſhe had received them and pre-'ſerved them in her memory, when ſhe taught us in our child-'hood the principles of religion and virtue.'

In another letter written to the clergy of Neocæſarea, after complaining of their [m] univerſal agreement with their biſhop in an oppoſition againſt him, he writes, 'Do [n] not follow thoſe who 'introduce among you impious doctrines; nor do you ſit ſtill 'whilſt in your ſight the people of God is ſubverted by corrupt 'principles. Sabellius, an African, and Marcellus of Galatia, are 'the only perſons that have taught and written thoſe things, 'which ſome leading men among you now produce as inventions 'of their own; talking, indeed, with much aſſurance, but bringing 'no plauſible arguments for what they ſay. Theſe men reproach 'us without any regard to truth, but will not come to diſcourſe 'with us.... Yea they are arrived at ſuch impudence as [o] to ca-'lumniate our doctrine as pernicious.' He goes on: 'And [p] 'what is the ground of this implacable hatred of me? They ſay 'that I have introduced pſalms and a method of ſinging different 'from your cuſtom; and other ſuch like things they ſay, which

A. B. [k] Ep. 204. [al. 75.] p. 303. C. D. ibid. [l] Πιστεως δε της ημετερας, τις αν γενοιτο μαρτυρια αποδειξις, η οτι τραφεντες ημεις υπο τιτθη μακαριᾳ γυναικι, παρ' υμων ωρμημεθη; Μακρινην λεγω την περιβοητον, παρ' ης εδιδαχθημεν τα της μακαριωτατης Γρηγοριυ ρηματα, οσα προς αυτην ακολουθια μνημης διασωθεντα αυτη τε εφυλαξε, και ημας ετι νηπιους οντας επλατε και εμορφου τοις της ευσεβειας δογμασιν. p. 306. B.

[m] Η μεν συμφωνια της καθ' ημων μισους, και το μεχρις ενος παντας ακολουθησαι τω προιστωτι της καθ' ημας πολεμου. κ. λ. Ep. 207. [al. 63] p. 309 D. [n] Ibid. E. [o] διαβαλλοντες ημων τας διδασκαλιας, ως βλαβερας. ibid. p. 310. B. [p] Και την αιτιαν ερωτηθεις της ακηρυκτου ταυτης και ασπονδου πολεμου, ψαλμους λεγουσι και τροπον μελωδιας, της παρ' υμιν κεκρατηκυιας συνηθειας παρηλλαγμενον, και τοιαυτα τινα, εφ' οις εχρην αυτους εγκαλυπτεσθαι. Εγκαλυμεθα δε, οτι και ανθρωπους εχομεν της ευσεβειας ασκητας, αποταξαμενους τω κοσμω, και πασαις ταις βιωτικαις μεριμναις. κ. λ. ib. p. 310. C.

'they

'they might be ashamed to mention. We are likewise accused 'that we have among us men who *exercise themselves unto godliness*, 'who have renounced the world and all earthly cares, which the 'Lord compares to *briars and thorns, which suffer not the word to 'bring forth fruit to perfection*; men, who *bear about the dying of Jesus 'in their body*, and *take up the cross*, and follow God.' 1 Tim. iv. 7. Matt. xiii. 22. Luke viii. 14. 2 Cor. iv. 10. Matt. xvi. 24. Basil adds, he hears there are already such men in Egypt, and perhaps likewise in Palestine and in Mesopotamia, and more than in his diocese. 'Moreover,' says he, 'if some women, chusing an 'evangelical life, prefer virginity to marriage, bringing into subjection the desires of the flesh, practising that *mourning* on which 'a blessing is pronounced; (Matt. v. 4.) blessed are they for this their 'purpose, in whatever part of the world they are. .... For [q] I 'would have you to know that we glory in this, that we have so-'cieties of men and women whose *conversation is in heaven*, (Philip. 'iii. 20.) who *have crucified the flesh with it's affections and lusts*, '(Gal. v. 24.) who are not solicitous about meat and dress, but are '*without distraction*, (1 Cor. vii. 35.) and constantly attend on the 'Lord, and *continue in supplications night and day*, (1 Tim. v. 5.) whose 'mouth speaketh not the works of men, but they sing hymns to 'our God without ceasing, *working with their own hands, that they 'may give to him that needeth*,' (Eph. iv. 28.) Then he returns to the charge brought against him for the new psalmody, by which especially, as [r] he says, they terrified the more simple people, and exasperated them against him. Here Basil describes that new way of singing which gave offence, and then goes on again: 'But [s] 'these things, they say, were not in the time of the great Gregory. 'To which I answer, Nor yet the litanies [penitential prayers] 'you make use of: not that I blame you for that, for I could 'wish that you all lived in tears and in continued penance.... 'But after all,' says Basil, 'you retain nothing of Gregory; for '[t] he did not pray with his head covered.... He did not swear. '... He did not call his brother fool.... He did not come to 'the altar before he had been reconciled to his brother.' Thus Basil goes on, giving these men hard words, when perhaps the same, or like things, might be said too truly of Basil's own friends and admirers, or any other people; especially if a man is out of humour with them because they do not submit to his will and

[q] γινωσκειν δε υμας θελομαι, οτι ημεις ευχομεθα, και ανδρων και γυναικων σεμνειον εχειν, κ. λ. p. 310. E. 311. A. [r] Προς δε το εν ψαλμωδιαις εγκλημα, ω μαλιστα απλουστερους φοβουσιν οι διαβαλλοντες ημας. p. 311. A. [s] Αλλ' ουκ ην, φησι, ταυτα επι του μεγαλου Γρηγοριου. p. 311. D. [t] Γρηγοριος ο κατακαλυπτετο επι των προσευ-

pleasure. 'But,' says [u] he, 'we forgive every thing; only let 'the great things of religion be preserved: let there not be any 'innovations made in the faith: do not overthrow the subsist-'ences, [hypostases:] do not deny the name of Christ: do not 'misinterpret the words of Gregory.'

From these several passages I think it appears, that Gregory's church at Neocæsarea were now an old-fashioned people, Christians of the primitive sort. There were some new hymns, or psalms, begun to be made use of by others which they did not approve of. They likewise disliked the new psalmody, which was a more artificial way of singing than was heretofore in use in the churches of Christ. Monasteries of men and women were another innovation which gave them offence: and when it is considered that Basil was fond of all these things, particularly of monasteries, and was the [w] first person who introduced them into the countries of Cappadocia and Pontus, some will be able to account for the angry and contemptuous treatment which Basil gives the Neocæsareans. The opposition which those good people made to his new schemes was, it seems, a high provocation. But some may think that those Christians had good reason to oppose some of his measures and take offence at them; and not a few persons of good judgment may still be displeased when they observe how he debaseth the sublime sense of many texts, and perverts the scriptures in support of his monastic institutions.

Basil says, that the Neocæsareans then had litanies, or penitential prayers, not used in Gregory's time; and insinuates, that they prayed with their heads covered. What they would say for themselves with regard to these two points, I cannot tell; but as for their doctrine about the hypostases, or subsistences, it is plain from Basil, that they defended their sentiment out of Gregory's writings. What Basil says of their having nothing of Gregory left among them, is extravagant. He has himself bore them this testimony, that they had a vast respect for the founder of their church; and that they were so shy of admitting later inventions, that they appeared defective and antiquated, in comparison of many other churches of that age.

We must make extracts out of another letter of Basil, written to the chief men of Neocæsarea. Basil was then at a place in the neighbourhood of that city: his coming so near them put the whole city into confusion: to abate their resentments, he reminds

χων. ibid. E. [u] Μονον ερρωσθω τα προηγυμενα, και τας περι την πιστιν καινοτομιας κατασιγασατε· τας υποστασεις μη αθετειτε· το ονομα του Χριστου μη απαρνεισθε· τας του Γρηγοριου φωνας μη παρεξηγεισθε. ib. p. 312. C. [w] Vid. Vit. St. Basil. cap. vi. num.

them

them of his education [x] by his grandmother, in that very place, and assures them, that he came thither now for retirement. He reminds them also of the respect they formerly had for him, when their whole city invited him and pressed him with much earnestness and importunity to undertake the education of their youth. 'But,' says he, 'I will tell you what is the ground of 'this animosity against me, which prevails to such a degree in 'your city. It is no other than this: there [y] is among you a 'design to overthrow the faith, in opposition to the apostolical 'and evangelical doctrine, and the tradition of the truly great 'Gregory, and all his successors to the blessed Musonius, whose 'words must still sound in your ears. For the heresy of Sabel-'lius, which some now endeavour to revive, was formerly ex-'tinguished by the tradition of that great man.... Sabellianism [z] 'is Judaism, brought into the church under the name of Christ-'tianity.... These [a] men pretend, in a letter to Anthimus, bishop 'of Tyana, who is of the same mind with us, that Gregory says, 'in his Exposition of the Faith, that the Father and Son are two 'in our conception, but one in hypostasis. These acute and subtle 'people, it seems, cannot see that that is not spoken dogmatical-'ly, [or as a point of doctrine;] but agonistically, [or, in the haste 'and fervour of disputation] in his conference with Ælian; in 'which too there are many faults of the transcribers, as I will 'shew, if God permit. Besides, teaching a Gentile, he did not 'think it necessary to be accurate in his expressions; for it was fit 'to yield a little to a man that was to be brought over to the faith, 'that he might not reject the chief things: insomuch, that you 'may find there several words which afford the greatest advan-'tage to the heretics of this time; such as creature, made, and 'the like.'

Thus writes Basil. Certainly this is a slight apology: no one can think that Gregory owes any thanks to the author of it. However, let us make a few remarks.

i. p. 53. B. C. D. Bened. [x] ειταυθα γαρ ιτραφην παρα τη εμαυτυ τιτθη. Ep. 110. al. 64. p. 313. D. [y] Πιστεως διαστροφη παρ' ημιν μιλεταται, εχθρα μεν τοις αποστολικοις και ευαγγελικοις δογμασιν, εχθρα δε τη παραδοσει τυ μεγαλυ ως αληθως Γρηγοριυ, και των εφεξης απ' εκειυ, μεχρι τυ μακαριυ Μουσωνιυ· α τα διδαγματα εισαυλα υμιν εστιν ετι και νυν δηλοντι. το γαρ Σαβελλιυ κακον, παλαι μεν κινηθεν, καταστβεσθεν δε τη παραδοσει τυ μεγαλυ επιχειρυσι νυν ανακινεισθαι δοκει. p. 314. D. E. [z] p. 315. A. [a] Καλουσι δε τινα πειραν δι' επιστολης, και προς τον ημετερον ημων Ανθιμον των Τυανεων επισκοπον κοπον· ως αρα Γρηγοριυ ειποντος εν εκθεσει πιστεως, πατερα και υιον επινοια μεν ειναι δυο, υποστασει δε εν. Τυτο δε οτι υ δογματικως ειρηται, αλλ' αγωνιστικως, εν τη προς Αιλιανον διαλεξει, εκ ηδυνηθησαν συνιδειν οι επι λεπτοτητι των φρενων εαυτυς μακαριζοντες· εν η πολλα των απογραψαμενων εστι σφαλματα, ως επ' αυτων των λεξεων δειξομεν ημεις, εαν ο Θεος θελη. Επειτα, μεντοι τοι Ελληνα πειθων, υκ ηγειτο χρηναι ακριβολογεισθαι περι τα ρηματα· αλλ' εστιν οτε και συνιδοται τω εθει τη εναγομενη, ως αν μη αντιτεινοι προς τα καιρια. Διο δη και πολλας αν ευροις εκει φωνας, τως εν τοις αιρετικοις μεγιστη ισχυν παρεχομενας·

1. Basil

1. Baſil ſays, the people of Neocæſarea had been taught the right faith by all their biſhops down to Muſonius; whoſe ſucceſſor therefore, their preſent biſhop, was the firſt perſon who taught among them the doctrine which Baſil diſlikes: and Baſil here ſays fine things of that Muſonius, and calls him a bleſſed man, now he was dead and gone; but when he was living Baſil did not agree with him; no better, perhaps, than with his ſucceſſor, the preſent biſhop. That they differed to a great degree Baſil owns in a letter [b] written ſoon after the death of Muſonius; though he ſays it was not about doctrinals that they differed, but only about ſome matters relating to the diſcipline or peace of the churches.

In that letter, which is a conſolatory epiſtle to the Neocæſareans upon occaſion of the death of their paſtor, and written ſix or ſeven years before this, he gives ſuch an account of Muſonius that I cannot forbear inſerting it in this place. He ſays, 'he was 'an ornament of the churches, *a pillar and ground of the truth, a 'ſupport of the faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus*, (1 Tim. iii. 15. Col. ii. 5.) 'an [c] enemy of all novelty; ſhewing in himſelf a pattern of the 'primitive conſtitution of the church, ſo that they who converſed 'with him might imagine to themſelves that they ſaw one of the 'lights that ſhined two hundred years ago and more.' This is a moſt glorious character! Heu pietas, heu priſca fides! If Muſonius was ſuch a man, how can it be for Baſil's honour to have diſagreed with him? May there not be ſome reaſon to apprehend that, by this commendation of another, Baſil has paſſed a cenſure upon himſelf, who ſeems to have countenanced all the innovations of the times?

2. Baſil ſays, the hereſy of Sabellius had been extinguiſhed by the tradition of Gregory: but what is meant by this I do not know. Gregory was at the firſt council againſt Paul at Antioch, but Paul was not then depoſed; nor was Gregory at the ſecond council. Beſides, by his tradition, I gueſs to be intended not Gregory himſelf, whilſt living, but rather his doctrine after his death. But what Baſil refers to in that expreſſion I cannot ſay.

3. Baſil does not deny that Gregory uſed the words alleged by the Neocæſareans.

4. Baſil labours extremely in the reſt of his anſwer. Since the paſſage inſiſted upon is genuine, what does it avail to ſay, there

ως το κτισμα, και το ποιημα, και ει τι τοιυτον. ibid. p. 316. C. D. [b] Τυτο δε ειδεναι υμας βυλομεθα, οτι ει και προς την ειρηνην των εκκλησιων συντρεχοντα ημιν υκ ειχομεν τον μακαριον . . αλλ' υν γε της προς αυτον ομοδοξιας, και τυ αει κοινωνον επικαλειϛαι των προς τυς αιρετικυς αγωνων, . . υθεν αναγκαιον απελειφθημεν. Ep. 28. [al. 62.] p. 108. E. [c] . . . νεωτεροποιας εχθρος· ιν εαυτω δειξυς το παλαιον της εκκλησιας σχημα, οιον απο τινος ιεροπρεπυς εικονος, της αξιοχρεως καταϛασεως, το ειδος της υπ' αυτον εκκλησιας διαμορφων· ωϛτε τυς αυτω συγγενομενυς, τοις προ διακοσιων ετων και επεκεινα

are

are faults of transcribers, perhaps in things of little moment only? Then he owns that Gregory spoke inaccurately, at least in his judgment: nay, he makes Gregory disguise or conceal the truth, and thus cast a mist before an honest heathen, in order to make a proselyte of him. This is not defending Gregory, but abusing him: that the Neocæsareans may be confuted, Gregory is vilified.

5. As for the doctrine now held by the Neocæsareans, whether downright Sabellianism, or somewhat differing from it; I think that, considering the passages before alleged, and the great respect they had for Gregory, it seems probable that there must have been some grounds in his writings for the doctrine which now obtained among them. It is not easy to suppose that a sentiment entirely different from Gregory's, in a point of importance, should universally prevail in a church that greatly respected his memory; who were averse to novelty in all other matters, and had been all along blessed with bishops, who were great admirers of antiquity, and tenacious of ancient doctrines and customs.

We have now seen Basil's passages relating to our bishop, and have made some remarks upon them.

Theodoret, who flourished about the year 423, speaking of the council of Antioch in 264, says, 'They [d] of the first rank among 'those who assembled there were, Gregory the great, the re- 'nowned, who by the indwelling grace of the Spirit performed 'those wonderful works which are celebrated by all mankind; 'his brother, Athenodorus; Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cap- 'padocia, an illustrious person, equally master of divine and hu- 'man knowledge; and Helenus, who presided in the metropolis 'of the Cilicians,' meaning Tarsus.

Socrates, who flourished before the middle of the fifth century, speaks of our Gregory after this manner: That [e] he was born at Neocæsarea, and that to his time Gregory was famous at Athens, and Berytus, and in all Pontus, and, in a word, all over the world. Having been some while at Athens, he went to Berytus for the sake of the law. Being informed that Origen explained the sacred scriptures at Cæsarea, he went immediately thither; and, giving over the study of the Roman laws, became a disciple of Origen. Having learned of him the true philosophy, he returned home at the desire of his parents. 'There [f] he did many mira-

φιλοσοφιαν τροπον εκλαμψασι συγγεγονεναι ειναι. Id. p. 106. D. [d] των δε συνελθοντων επρωτευον γρηγοριος τε ο μεγας, ο περιβοητος, ο τας παρα παντων ανθρωπειας δαιμοσιουργιας επιτελεσας δια της εισοικησης του πνευματος χαριτος. . . . Hær. Fab. l. 2. c. 8. [e] Socr. l. 4. c. 27. [f] κακει πρωτον μεν λαικος ων, πολλα σημεια εποιησε, νοσουντας θεραπευων, και δαιμονας δι' επιστολων φυγαδευων, και τους ελληνιζοντας, τοις τε λογοις, και πλεον τοις γινομενοις υπ' αυτου προσαγομενος. ibid. p. 244. C.

'cles,

'cles, even (E) whilſt he was yet a layman, healing the ſick, and 'driving away dæmons by his letters. He converted many 'Gentiles by his diſcourſes, and yet more by his works. Pamphi-'lus the martyr makes mention of him in his Apology for Ori-'gen; to which he added Gregory's farewel oration, ſpoken in 'praiſe of Origen.'

III. Theſe I ſuppoſe to be the moſt valuable, as well as moſt ancient, accounts of our author. We will now, ſo far as we are able, collect from them his age, and ſome other particulars, which have not been ſo diſtinctly expreſſed by the ancients as might be wiſhed.

Dr. Cave, in his Hiſtoria Literaria, [g] placeth Gregory at the year 254; but for what reaſon he has ſet him ſo late I do not know, when he uſually placeth eccleſiaſtical writers, if they are biſhops, about the time they were ordained; and he ſuppoſeth that Gregory was a biſhop before the Decian perſecution. He digeſts the hiſtory of Gregory in this order: after the rudiments of learning received at home, he went to Alexandria; thence to Athens; afterwards to Berytus; and at laſt, about the year 234, he came with his brother Athenodorus to Origen at Cæſarea in Paleſtine, where he ſtayed five years; having been at the council of Antioch in 265, he died the ſame year.

Du Pin [h] ſays, Gregory was ordained about the year of Chriſt 240: that having been preſent at the firſt council in the affair of Paul of Samoſata, he died a ſhort time after, in the year 265.

Baſnage [i] thinks that Gregory came to Cæſarea in 231, the ſame year that Origen arrived there from Alexandria: that he took his leave of Origen in the year 235, at the beginning of the perſecution under the emperor Maximinus, having been with Origen five years, the firſt and laſt years both incomplete. It is true, Euſebius ſays, that Gregory and his brother were [k] five whole years with Origen: nevertheleſs, Baſnage thinks thoſe years may be underſtood as juſt now explained. He farther [l] argues, that Gregory did not ſtudy at all at Athens, nor Berytus, nor Alexandria; but only at Cæſarea, whither he came directly

(E) even whilſt he was yet a layman.] I have tranſlated agreeably to Valeſius, whoſe words are: Ubi primo quidem, dum adhuc laicus eſſet, multa fecit miracula, &c. But I would propoſe that the Greek ſhould be rendered thus: And there, having been firſt for ſome while a layman, he wrought many miracles, healing the ſick, and driving away dæmons by his letters, and converting Gentiles by his words, but more eſpecially by his works. If the words are ſo underſtood, Socrates agrees with Gregory of Nyſſa, and I kewiſe with Jerom in his Catalogue. See above p. 26. According to this ſenſe Valeſius's verſion may be amended with only a ſmall alteration in this manner: Ubi, quum aliquamdiu laicu fuiſſet, multa fecit miracula, &c.

[g] Part i. p. 93. [h] Nouv. Bib. St. Greg. Thaumaturge. [i] Baſn. Ann. 240. n. iii. [k] ἑπτὰ δὲ ὅλοις ἔτεσιν αὐτῷ συγγιγομένοις. Euſ. l. vi. c. 30. p. 230. A. [l] Baſn. ib. n. iii. iv. v.

from

from his native country: from which place also he returned home, according to Gregory's own history of himself in the panegyrical oration; which, as that learned writer supposeth, confutes the stories of all the other journies. He says Gregory was ordained in 240, and died in 265.

Tillemont [m] supposeth, that Gregory came to Origen at Cæsarea in 231: that in 235, Origen being obliged to retire, upon occasion of the persecution under Maximinus, Gregory took that opportunity to go to Alexandria, where he was in 235, 236, and 237; and, returning thence to Cæsarea, he completed his five years with Origen, or made up eight years from the time he first came to him, and then left him to go home in 239; and [n] Fabricius appears to approve of this method of removing the difficulties relating to this matter. As for the time when Gregory was made bishop, Tillemont thinks it not easy to be determined: all that we can find, says [o] he, is, that Gregory left Origen in 238 or 239, and that Nyssen gives us ground to think he had laboured a good deal, when his church was tried by the Decian persecution in 250; and [p] he observes, that [q] Baronius computes the death of Gregory to have happened soon after the first council relating to Paul, for no other reason but this, that we have no particular account of him after that; whereas the modern Greeks say, he lived and flourished under Aurelian, who did not begin his reign till 270: and, adds Tillemont, perhaps we ought to read Aurelian in Suidas, where the printed editions of that author say Gregory died under Julian. This may be reckoned a happy conjecture; for Kuster says, that two manuscript copies of Suidas have Aurelian in that place instead of Julian, which manuscripts he has followed in his edition. And Fabricius [r] declares it to be his opinion, that Gregory died in the time of Aurelian, not before the year 270. However, Pagi [s] gives it as his judgment, that Baronius was in the right to conclude that Gregory died soon after the forementioned council, since his attendance there is the last thing we hear of him.

Such are the opinions of learned moderns, very skilful in these matters; and though these things may appear to some of no importance, I must own I should be glad to settle the time of this great man, or come near it, upon probable grounds. As for Gregory's journey to Athens, it is mentioned by Socrates only, who makes many mistakes in what he says of this writer; as all may

[m] Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. St. Greg. Thaum. Art. iv. p. 669, et note (i) p. 903, &c. [n] Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 247. [o] Ibid. Art. vi. P. 675. [p] Ibid. Art. xi. p. 691. [q] Baron. Ann. 266. n. xiv. [r] Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 248. [s] Pagi

perceive

perceive from what has been taken from others, without our ſtaying here to ſhew thoſe miſtakes diſtinctly. Therefore I think there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe that Gregory ever ſtudied in that city. The journey to Alexandria likewiſe I could willingly ſet aſide with Baſnage; for neither Euſebius nor Jerom make any mention of it. It ſeems to have been put down by Nyſſen without any ground. But Alexandria was a flouriſhing city, and much reſorted to. It coſt him little or no labour to ſend Gregory thither, and tell a ſtrange adventure or two of him whilſt there; or perhaps Nyſſen thought Origen was ſtill at Alexandria; though if he did he was plainly miſtaken, it being very evident from Gregory's Oration, that Origen was ſettled at Cæſaria before he became acquainted with him: but as for the journey to Berytus, methinks there is ſomewhat to be ſaid for it; becauſe it is particularly mentioned by Jerom, and Socrates, and Suidas; though it muſt be owned, that this laſt only tranſcribes Sophronius's Greek tranſlation of Jerom's Catalogue. It is true likewiſe, that Gregory in his Oration affords us no authority for this ſuppoſition. Nevertheleſs, perhaps this opinion is not inconſiſtent with the oration; for Gregory there mentions a term of eight years; and yet Euſebius, who could not but be well informed, ſpeaks of Gregory's being with Origen but five years. There was therefore in that ſpace of eight years room for him to make an excurſion from Cæſarea. And Berytus appears to me as likely a place as any, becauſe it is mentioned by the authors before cited; and becauſe, though at Origen's requeſt Gregory laid aſide his firſt intention of being a lawyer, yet he might think it not improper to viſit the place, for the ſake of which he left his native country, and ſtay a ſhort ſeaſon there. This might be thought likewiſe a piece of reſpect due to thoſe who had recommended to him the ſtudy of the Roman laws. Nor was Berytus far from Cæſarea. Finally, it may be thought by ſome, that what Origen writes to Gregory, of his ability to become a lawyer of the firſt rank, implies, that his ſcholar at his return home had gained ſome farther knowledge of the law than he brought thence, which yet he could not receive from him at Cæſarea.

As Origen was ſettled at Cæſarea, when Gregory arrived there, he could not come thither before 231, if ſo ſoon. Since that is the earlieſt date poſſible of his arrival, and he mentions a term of eight years in his oration, I think he could not leave Origen before the year 239. And ſince from Origen's letter to Gregory, written ſome while after his return home, he was a mere layman, and there appears no proſpect of his being immediately devoted

Crit. in Baron. 265. n. v.

to

to the ſervice of the church; and ſince Nyſſen ſays, Gregory lived retired for ſome time, and when Phedimus ſought for him he kept out of the way; it appears to me probable, that he could not be ordained before the year 243, if ſo ſoon: I am indeed inclined to a later date, and ſhould chuſe to place him at 245. And ſuppoſing him endowed with extraordinary gifts, (of which I make no doubt but he was at the time of his ordination, or ſoon after) he would convert many Gentiles, and make large additions to the ſmall church he at firſt found in Neocæſarea, before the perſecution in 250, when he retired; and afterwards, peace being reſtored, he returned to his people. He was certainly at the firſt council of Antioch in the cauſe of Paul in 264. Euſebius and Theodoret put that out of queſtion. I do not at preſent recollect any learned moderns, who ſay he was at the ſecond council in that city. Undoubtedly the generality of learned men have not been of opinion, that Gregory was preſent at that ſecond council, becauſe they have ſuppoſed he died very ſoon after the firſt. And Fabricius, who thinks he lived to the year 270, mentions only his preſence at the firſt [t] council, as having no ground to ſay he was at the ſecond. However, Tillemont [u] obſerves, that there is one Theodore among the biſhops of the laſt council; and, as he adds, he may be our ſaint. But I think that to be very improbable; for, in the account which [w] Euſebius gives of the firſt council, he calls our biſhop Gregory, not Theodore; and placeth him and his brother Athenodorus next after Firmilian, who is the firſt. But in his Catalogue of the names of thoſe who were preſent at the ſecond council, Theodore, meant by Tillemont, is the fourteenth; and the next is Malchion, a preſbyter; therefore he cannot be our biſhop: that Theodore was either a preſbyter, or the youngeſt of the biſhops expreſsly named as preſent. In the account which Theodoret gives of the biſhops at the firſt council, Gregory is firſt, his brother next, and after him Firmilian, as we ſaw (F) before. I think, therefore, that our Gregory did not attend at the ſecond council of Antioch.

And perhaps ſome will here recollect what was ſaid formerly (G) concerning the different reſults of thoſe two councils. At the firſt, when Firmilian was preſent, and by his advice Paul was ſpared; at the ſecond, when Firmilian was dead, he was depoſed. If it be now farther conſidered, that thoſe other two great lights, Gregory and his brother, were wanting in the ſecond council,

[t] Fabr. ib. p. 248. [u] Ibid. Art. x. fin. [w] Vid. Euſeb. L. vii. cap. 28, 29, 30.
(F) See before, p. 43. (G) See vol. ii. chap. 39.

perhaps

perhaps we may ſtill better account for the ſentence then pronounced, which by ſome has been reckoned indiſcreet, and not for the honour of the Chriſtian name at that time.

The exact time of Gregory's death cannot be determined. I have mentioned two opinions; one ſuppoſing that he died in 265, ſoon after the firſt council at Antioch; the other ſuppoſing him to have lived till the reign of Aurelian, and not to have died before the year 270. I muſt leave it to every one to judge for himſelf, which of theſe two opinions is the more probable. I have before mentioned the reaſons for each of them, and have nothing farther to add.

IV. Gregory's works, ſo far as we know any thing of them, are ſuch as theſe.

1. A Panegyrical Oration, in praiſe of Origen, pronounced in 239, ſtill extant, and unqueſtionably his. Du Pin [x] ſays of it, 'that it is very eloquent, and that it may be reckoned one of the 'fineſt pieces of rhetoric in all antiquity.' It is the more admirable, becauſe perhaps it is the firſt thing of the kind among Chriſtians.

2. A Paraphraſe of the Book of Eccleſiaſtes, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue, and quoted by him [y] in his Commentary upon that book, and ſtill extant.

3. Jerom afterwards adds in his Catalogue, that Gregory wrote ſeveral epiſtles; of which, however, we have now only one remaining, called a Canonical Epiſtle, to an anonymous biſhop, written, [z] in 258 or [a] 262; conſiſting, as we now have it, of eleven canons, all allowed to be genuine, except [b] the laſt, which is doubted of, or plainly rejected, as no part of the original epiſtle, but ſince added to it.

Theſe are all the works of Gregory taken notice of by Jerom.

4. To theſe may be added the Creed, or Faith, before referred to in Gregory Nyſſen; and which, he ſays, our Gregory received from John the evangeliſt, before he began to act in his epiſcopal character. Of this Du Pin [c] ſpeaks after this manner. 'St. 'Gregory of Nyſſa, in his Life of this father, puts down a for-'mulary of faith, which he pretends [or affirms] our ſaint re-

[x] As before. [y] Vir Sanctus Gregorius Ponti epiſcopus, Origenis auditor, in Metaphraſi Eccleſiaſtæ, ita hunc locum intellexit. Hieron. Comm. in Eccl. Cap. iv. v. 13, ... 16. [z] Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 253, and Tillemont, as before, Art. xii. [a] Baſnag. Ann. 240. n. vii. et 262, n. ii. [b] See Fabricius and Tillemont as before. [c] Saint Gregoire de Nyſſe rapporte dans la Vie de ce Pere une formule de Foi qu'il pretend que ce ſaint avoit recu de Saint Jean dans une viſion qu'il avoit eue pendant la nuit, et qu' on conſervoit encore a ce qu'il dit ecrite de la main de Saint Gregoire Thaumaturge. Bib. T. i. p. 184, 185.

'ceived

'ceived from St. John in a vision which he had in the night, and 'was preserved till that time, as he says, in the hand-writing of 'St. Gregory the wonder-worker.' It seems to me, therefore, that Du Pin was not satisfied of the genuineness of this creed. But that others who are able may with the less trouble judge of the force of his expressions, I have put the original French in the margin. It is, however, received as genuine by [d] Fabricius, [e] Bull, and many others. Basnage [f] says, it may be supposed to have been written in the year 240. He owns that Jerom's silence might occasion some doubt, in that he has not mentioned it with Gregory's other pieces. But since it is in Nyssen and Rufinus, he readily allows it, with other learned moderns, to be genuine. Frederic Spanheim, if I understand him, rejects [g] not only the Particular Exposition of Faith, to be mentioned hereafter, but likewise this creed. Mr. Lampe [h] seems to reject both the creed and the history of it; for he says, if those things related by Nyssen were true, and John had been sent from heaven on purpose to deliver this Formulary, it ought to be esteemed at least equally with his other writings.

For my part, I think this creed can by no means be relied upon as Gregory's. I shall mention the following reasons.

1. The account which Nyssen gives of the revelation of this creed is altogether improbable. Gregory, as he says, would not preach till he had a revelation of the faith made to him. But what need could Gregory have of such a thing? had he not been taught the Christian faith by Origen, under whose instruction he sat five whole years? if he still needed some farther light, was not Phedimus, bishop of Amasea? were not other bishops able to inform him? not to add, that Gregory had before him continually the sacred scriptures, in which all necessary truths are clearly revealed; and that he had been trained up by Origen in a high veneration for those divine writings. There is, therefore, no reason to think that Gregory would desire a particular revelation; and still less to suppose it would be granted, if desired; and that

[d] Ut supra, p. 249. [e] Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 136, 137. [f] Mystica igitur expositio hæc anno 240, videtur exarata. Num autem ita sit Gregorio, movere scrupulum potest silentium Hieronymi, qui Gregorianis operibus illam non inseruit. At cum a Nysseno, et a Rufino vindicetur, recentiores ut prætereamus, faciles largimur esse Gregorii. Basn. Ann. 240. n. vii.

[g] Plurima tamen Gregorii hujus nomen falso præferunt, ver. gr. Expositio Fidei, adversus Arianos, seu Symbolum quod-dam ex revelatione scilicet Johannis, et Mariæ Virginis, in quo expressa vox πρόσωπον, et quod in apparitione tradiderint Gregorio, ut Nyssenus, et hodieque Mss. extat in Græcorum monasteriis, teste Sponio Itin. Spanh. Hist. Ecc. p. 778.

[h] Hæc si vere ita gesta essent, formula talis ab ipso Johanne apostolo cœlitus misso communicata merito omnibus ejus scriptis mortali digito exaratis esset aut præferenda, aut saltem æquiparanda. Jo. Frid. Lampe in Evang. Johann. Prolegom.

in so profuse a manner, and without any occasion for it; by sending to him not only John, (though [i] he by some people has been thought better acquainted with the doctrine of the trinity than any other apostle or evangelist) but likewise our Lord's mother; as if John, or any other evangelist, could not have been sufficient. This overdoing ruins the credit of a relation with men of judgment and sedate thought. And Basnage, though he allows the creed to have been composed about the year 240, as before shewn, disputes [k] the account of this revelation by a variety of arguments, and seems to give no credit to it. It follows therefore, I think, that Nyssen is not to be relied upon in this matter.

2. The whole history of this matter is more suitable to the affairs of the fourth than of the third century, and that the middle or even former part of it. This creed contains nothing but the mysterious doctrine of the trinity. But why should Gregory desire information about that only? Was there nothing else to be taught by a Christian bishop? This shews that this story is a fiction of the fourth century, when the controversy about the trinity filled all men's heads. In the early times of Christianity the creeds, though short, usually contained in them, beside the doctrine of the one God, divers historical matters relating to our Lord's life, death, resurrection, exaltation, and other important articles, concerning future retributions; as, our Lord's second coming to judgment, the resurrection of the body, and the like: of all which things there is not one article, one tittle, in this creed.

3. This creed is not taken notice of in Jerom's Catalogue. Indeed, in some copies of that work there is added after Gregory's Epistles, and Of the Faith, [et de Fide.] But it is allowed [l] by the best critics that those words are not genuine; whereas, if Jerom had known of that creed, and believed it to be genuine, he could not have omitted it. Would any author, writing the life of Moses, though in the most brief and summary way conceivable, take no notice of the ten commandments delivered to him in so honourable a manner? Nor could any writer of Gregory's life omit to mention a creed received from John the evangelist, and preserved in his own hand-writing in the records of his church,

[i] Ἀλλ' ομως ο τοιυτος, ο αγραμματος, . . . ιδε ποιυ τετυχηκε πνευματος, ωστε α μηδεις των αλλων ευαγγελιστων ημας εδιδαξεν, αυτος ταυτα βρουτησαι. Theophyl. Proleg. in Joh. Evang. Conf. Lampe Prolegom. in Joh. Ev. Lib. 2, cap. ii. init. et cap. iii. p. 178. [k] Revelationis ejusmodi nobis est difficillima fides. Tanto nil opus miraculo fuit ad indicandum beatissimæ trinitatis mysterium, quod oraculis scripturæ diserte panditur. Neque Deo moris est, sanctos e cœlo mittere, qui scripturarum contenta consignent in animo, &c. ibid. n. v.

[l] lib. i. cap. vi. p. 102.

and

and publiſhed, and often copied thence, undoubtedly, if there was any ſuch thing. Whether this argument be deciſive or not, it is of ſome force. They who made the interpolation before-mentioned did not like this omiſſion.

4. If Baſil may be relied on, in a dialogue now loſt, Gregory expreſſed himſelf inaccurately about the doctrine of the trinity. This may be thought to weaken, if not to overthrow, Nyſſen's relation: for if, as he ſays, Gregory was [m] particularly ſolicitous to have information in that doctrine, before he begun to preach, and did actually receive a [n] diſtinct revelation of it, he muſt have diſcourſed accurately upon that head at all ſeaſons, when arguing with heathens, and upon every other occaſion; nor could he ever be at a loſs for the greateſt propriety of expreſſion. One would think, likewiſe, that Baſil ſhould not have dared to cenſure any expreſſions of Gregory relating to the trinity, if it had been a thing well known in thoſe times, that he had been inſtructed in that doctrine by expreſs and particular revelation.

5. St. Baſil, in all his diſputes with the people of Neocæſarea, ſays nothing of any written creed of our Gregory. He reminds them, over and over, of his grandmother Macrina, that bleſſed and famous woman, ſprung from among them, who had the doctrine of Gregory ſafely preſerved in her memory, which ſhe likewiſe as carefully delivered to him in his childhood; but not one word of a written creed depoſited with the Neocæſareans. This argument appears to me unanſwerable: and every one is able to judge of it from St. Baſil's epiſtles, which have been ſo largely tranſcribed. It appears to me to a great degree probable, that either there was no written creed at Neocæſarea reputed Gregory's, or that it was not to Baſil's purpoſe; otherwiſe he muſt have referred to it. What good reaſon can be aſſigned why, in ſo warm a diſpute, Baſil ſhould ſo often appeal to the inſtructions he received from his grandmother when he was a child, but ſay nothing of a written creed in Gregory's hand-writing, which he had, or might have ſeen and read, when a man, if there had been any ſuch thing? Baſil, who made ſo good uſe of that circumſtance, that he had been educated by a relation, his grandmother, ſprung from among them, to ſhew the Neocæſareans that his faith was the ſame with that of their great Gregory, would have triumphed much more if there had been an authentic written creed, and his ſentiments had been agreeable to it. Nyſſen, in an oration de-

[l] Vid. Fabr. ib. p. 221.
[n] Vid. ibid. p. 546. B.
[m] Vid. Greg. Nyſſ. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. p. 545. A. B.

livered we know not where nor to whom, talks of a creed at Neocæſarea in Gregory's hand-writing: but Baſil, in his epiſtles to the Neocæſareans themſelves, mentions no ſuch thing, though extremely to his purpoſe, much more than any thing ſaid by him. I think it not difficult to know who ought moſt to be regarded, Baſil, or his brother Gregory of Nyſſa.

The creed then in Nyſſen is not the creed of our great Gregory, but a fiction of the fourth century, after the riſe and heats of the controverſy about the Trinity; when the whole church was divided upon that head, and ſome people were willing to have Gregory on their ſide, to ſupport their doctrine, or their manner of expreſſion.

6. There are ſome other pieces which have been publiſhed as his; as, A particular Expoſition of the Faith, three or four Homilies, and ſome other things. But [o] learned men being now generally agreed that they are ſuppoſititious, I need not take any farther notice of them.

7. However, there are ſome Fragments in a Greek chain, which Fabricius [p] ſeems to allow to be Gregory's: they are four in number; I intend to make uſe of three of them hereafter in the article of Teſtimonies to the books of the New Teſtament.

V. Having ſeen ſuch a hiſtory, and ſuch teſtimonies to Gregory, as time has ſpared us, and having likewiſe obſerved what are his genuine works, we are better able to form to ourſelves ſome idea of him; and may now take at leaſt his more remarkable features, which are extremely beautiful.

His farewel Oration at Cæſarea is the monument of a bright genius improved by education; here likewiſe appears a mind of a fair and candid complexion, with a grateful temper toward the conductor of his ſtudies. The nobility of his family is unqueſtioned. Origen himſelf, who was well acquainted with our Gregory, and was no flatterer, bears witneſs to his excellent capacity, which he conſecrated to God and true religion, abandoning all earthly purſuits and expectations. He was a biſhop of ſingular note and eminence, as appears from Euſebius and the concurring teſtimony of many other eccleſiaſtical writers. His hiſtory, as delivered by authors of the fourth and following centuries, particularly by Nyſſen, it is to be feared, has in it ſomewhat of fiction; but there can be no reaſonable doubt made but he was very

[o] Vid. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Du Pin. Biblioth. Fabr. ib. p. 253, 254. Tillem. ib. Art. xii.

[p] Fragmenta quædam Gregorii Thaumaturgi occurrere in Catena ad Jeremiam Ghillerianâ, Tom i. . . . jam notavit præſtantiſſimus Caveus. Illa non ex Commentario in Prophetam, ſed ex Homilia quadam vel epiſtola videntur eſſe repetita. Fabric. ib. p. 254.

ſucceſsful

successful in making converts to Christianity in the country of Pontus, about the middle of the third century; and that, beside his natural and acquired abilities, he was favoured with extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and wrought miracles of surprising power. The plain and express testimonies of Basil and others, at no great distance of time or place from Gregory, must be reckoned sufficient grounds of credit with regard to these things. Theodoret mentioning Gregory, and his brother, and Firmilian, and Helenus, all together, ascribes miracles to none but him alone. *They* were all *bishops of the first rank*: nevertheless Gregory had a distinction even among them. It is the same thing in Jerom's Letter to Magnus: there are mentioned Hippolytus, Julius Africanus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and many others, of great note and eminence for learning and piety. But Theodore, afterwards called Gregory, is the only one who is called a man of apostolical signs and wonders. Jerom's words (H) likewise in his Catalogue, though somewhat obscure, are very remarkable. I have rendered them thus; 'he is chiefly famous for the miracles 'he wrought when bishop, to the great honour of the churches.' They imply, if I mistake not, that Gregory was in his time the admiration of all mankind, not only in Pontus and the neighbouring countries, but also in other parts. The extraordinary gifts of the Spirit had not then entirely ceased: but Gregory was favoured with such gifts greatly beyond the common measure of other Christians or bishops at that season. This was much taken notice of, and it was greatly to the honour of the Christian profession all over the world. So Jerom. I see no reason, therefore, why we may not adopt the words of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the fifth century, as containing in short a just and true character of this person; 'that [†] he was at first great and eminent 'in the world for philosophy and eloquence, but afterwards 'greater and more eminent for his virtues,' or miracles.

His church continued stedfast in the faith after his death; and near the end of the fourth century the Neocæsareans were all Christians, having been all along to that very day blessed with pastors who were men of true worth. As Gregory therefore was an honour and ornament to the churches in his time, so his church continued to be an honour to him. The people of Neocæsarea retained for a long while remarkable impressions of religion; and they had an affection for the primitive simplicity, very rare and

(H) See before, p. 26.

† Gregorius e Ponto sacerdos, philosophiæ primus apud mundum et eloquentia præstans; sed postea major præstantiorque virtutibus. Eucher. ad Valerian. ap. Bibl. Patr. Max. T. vi. p. 859. H.

uncommon, almost singular at that time, when innovations came into the church apace. In particular, they could by no means approve of the common zeal for the monastic life. Those good people must have been apprehensive of the bad consequences of that institution, if they did not actually see some inconveniences attending it: for [r] Basil complains that they made reflections upon the conduct of the women in those societies; which it is not easy to think they would do without ground. It seems that they made the best stand they were able against that and other innovations. But popular things will have their course, notwithstanding the most judicious reasons and the most pathetic remonstrances to the contrary. Every age of the world seeth examples of this kind both in the church and in civil life.

And now I cannot but think there is reason to lament two things:

1. That no more of this great and excellent man's works are come down to us. It is plain some of his writings are lost; for Jerom speaks of his epistles, whereas we have no more than one remaining. And Basil mentions an Exposition of Faith, or a Dialogue with a Gentile, which is not in being.

2. That we have no history of his life, written by some contemporary in the plain and simple way he lived. This I take to be the greatest loss of the two: for though he might leave behind some letters and some other pieces, which were both edifying and instructive, yet it is likely, as Jerom intimates, that he was more eminent for his signs and wonders than his writings. It may be well supposed that this apostolical man was chiefly employed in increasing his church, or in building it up in knowledge and virtue, by oral instructions and works of goodness, charitable or miraculous. Possibly such a history as we now wish for was composed, but was seldom transcribed, and therefore soon lost, as not suiting the taste which not long after prevailed in the church. This may be thought very probable, that if such a relation had been then drawn up, and still preserved, it would be more valuable than any thing written afterwards. A father of the fourth century, destitute of the gifts of the Spirit, whose chief talent is oratory, whose mind is heated with the controversies, and tainted with the credulity and partiality of his age, is not fit to write the life of a man of primitive simplicity, endowed with a large measure of apostolical gifts and virtues.

[r] Εἰ δὲ τινα ἀκοσμίαν τῷ βίῳ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπιφέρουσιν, ἀπολογεῖσθαι μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν οὐ κατα δέχομαι. Ἐκεῖνο δὲ ὑμῖν διαμαρτύρομαι, ὅτι ἃ μέχρι νῦν ὁ κατάσας ὁ πατὴρ τὸ ψεῦδος εἰπεῖν οὐ κατεδέξατο, ταῦτα αἱ ἀφῳδοὶ καρδίαι, καὶ τὰ ἀγαλλιώντα σώματα οὐ φθέγγεται ἀδίως. Basil. Ep. 207, al. 63. p. 310. E.

VI.

VI. Nothing farther remains, but that we obſerve Gregory's teſtimony to the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament.

1. And here, ſince nothing appears to the contrary, it ought to be taken for granted, that he had the ſame or very near the ſame canon of ſcripture with his maſter Origen. However, I ſhall take notice of ſome particulars, though much cannot be reaſonably expected in the few and ſhort pieces of his which we now have.

2. When Gregory came to Origen he was ignorant of the ſcriptures, as he plainly [s] intimates; but when he left him he was well acquainted with the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, as appears from his quotations and alluſions to them in his Panegyrical Oration.

3. In his Canonical Epiſtle are theſe words: 'the [t] apoſtle 'ſays; *Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God ſhall 'deſtroy both it and them:* 1 Cor. vi. 13. And our Saviour alſo, 'purifying all meats ſays; *Not that which goeth into the mouth de-'fileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth;*' Matt. xv. 11.

4. The Fragments, formerly mentioned as preſerved in a ſort of Greek chain, are fine ſentences. It is not certain from what work they are taken; but, if they are genuine, it appears not improbable that they are taken from ſome homily or epiſtle of our Gregory.

In one of thoſe fragments he ſays: 'The [u] ſcribes and pha-'riſees of the Jewiſh people would never have received ſuch re-'peated woes from our Saviour, if it had not been for their 'hypocriſy: for our Lord's reproofs of their faults continually 'begin and are prefaced in this (κ) manner; *Woe unto you, ſcribes 'and phariſees, hypocrites.* And he calleth them *whited ſepulchres, 'which indeed appear to men beautiful outward, but are within full of 'dead men's bones and of all uncleanneſs:*' Matt. xxiii. 27.

5. In another of theſe fragments he ſays; 'For [w] if we do any 'good to our neighbour out of ſincere and undiſſembled love, 'we ſhall hear from our Saviour: *Inaſmuch as ye have done it unto*

[s] Ταῦτα χιλιῶν μὲν ὕστερον ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐμάθομεν. Orat. ad Orig. p. 60. A.

[t] Ὁ μὲν ἀπόστολος φησι, Τὰ βρώματα. . . . ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς σωτὴρ ἅπαντα καθαρίζων τὰ βρώματα. κ. λ. Ep. Can. cap. i. p. 38. A.

[u] Καὶ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ Ἰουδαίων λαοῦ τοσοῦτοι καὶ παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐλοιδορήσαντο, εἰ μὴ διὰ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν. ἐκ γὰρ τῶν ἐλέγχων ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπαύσατο κατὰ πᾶσαι αἰτίαν προλέγων ὁ κύριος· Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, κ. τ. λ. ἐκ τούτου τοίνυν τοῦ ῥητοῦ ἀποκαλῶν αὐτοὺς· οἱ ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὡραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ὀστέων νεκρῶν, καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας. ap. Mich. Gliſſerium in Jeremiam cap. ix. v. 4. T. i. p. 788, 789. Lugdun. 1623. (κ) See Matt. xxiii. 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 27.

[w] Ἐὰν γάρ τι εἰς τὸ πλησίον ἀγαθὸν ἐργασώμεθα διὰ τῆς ἀνυποκρίτου ἀγάπης, ἀκούομεν παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος· Ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε. κ. λ. ap. eund. in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 8, 9. p. 796.

'*one of the leaſt of theſe my brethren, ye have done it unto me;*' Matt. xxv. 40. What follows in this fragment is a fine reproof of falſe pretences of kindneſs, and the practice of artifice and deceit toward honeſt and undeſigning perſons. But I muſt not allow myſelf to tranſcribe it here at length.

6. In his Panegyrical Oration he refers to and enlarges upon the hiſtory of the poor widow, which we have in Mark xii. 41. ...44. Luke xxi. 1....4. which he ſays is in the [x] ſacred books; referring however, perhaps, more particularly to St. Luke's than St. Mark's goſpel; and calling again our Lord's eſtimation of that poor widow's gift [y] a determination of the divine word.

7. In the ſame Oration he has a beautiful alluſion [z] to the parable of the prodigal, which is in Luke xv. He there alſo alludes to [a] Luke x. 30.

8. It is very probable from that Oration, that he was acquainted with [b] St. John's goſpel, particularly the beginning of it.

9. In the Canonical Epiſtle he ſays, 'it is not eaſy [c] to repre-'ſent in one letter all that the divine ſcriptures have ſaid, not 'only againſt ſo horrible a ſin as robbery, but even againſt covet-'ouſneſs, or the love of filthy lucre.' However, he largely quotes one place of ſcripture, thus; 'but [d] *fornication,*' ſays he, '*and covetouſneſs, let it not be named among you: for which things* '*ſake the wrath of God cometh upon the children of diſobedience. Be* '*not ye therefore partakers with them: for ye were ſometime darkneſs.* '*but now are ye light in the Lord. Walk as children of the light, (for* '(L) *the fruit of the light is in all goodneſs, and righteouſneſs, and* '*truth;) proving what is acceptable to the Lord. And have no fellow-*'*ſhip with the unfruitful works of darkneſs, but rather reprove them.* '*For it is a ſhame even to ſpeak of thoſe things, which are done of them* '*in ſecret. But all things that are reproved are made manifeſt by the* '*light.* Theſe things ſays the apoſtle,' Eph. v. 3...13.

10. Origen, in his Epiſtle to Gregory, refers to ſeveral texts of ſcripture, and among others to [e] Hebr. iii. 14.

11. In the third of the fragments beforementioned it is ſaid; 'Pride [f] cannot but be evil, it being founded in much falſe con-

[x] Ουτως εν ιεραις βιβλοις φερεται, οτι δη μικρα τις και πτωχη γυνη. κ. λ. Orat. ad Orig. p. 60. A. [y] ο ιερος λογος εταυμασατο. ib. D. [z] Vid. p. 75. A. B. [a] Ib. p. 76. B. [b] Ib. p. 53. D. 54. A. [c] Δεινη δε πλεονεξια, και εκ εστι δι' επιστολης μιας παραθεσθαι τα θεια γραμματα, ε οις. κ. λ. Ep. Can. ii. p. 38. C. [d] Πορνεια γαρ, φησι, και πλεονεξια μηδε ονομαζεσθω εν υμιν.... (ο γαρ καρπος του φωτος εν πασι αγαθωσυνη, και δικαιοσυνη, και αληθεια)... Ταυτα γαρ αποστολος. ibid. p. 38. D. 39. A. B. (L.) *fruit of the light.*] This reading deſerves to be taken notice of. It is no uncommon reading, but is found in MSS. verſions, and writers. Perhaps it is the true reading. See Mill. Grot. Beauſobre and Lenfant, upon the place. [e] Orig. Ep. ad Greg. T. i. p. 32. C. Bened. [f] εκ καλον η υπερηφανια, ψευδοδοξιαν εχουσα

'ceit.

'ceit. For it is moſt manifeſt, that every perfect good cometh 'from God: nor is it otherwiſe to be obtained by man.' Here ſeems to be a reference to James i. 17. and if this fragment is genuine, it may be reckoned a proof that Gregory was acquainted with the epiſtle of St. James, and had a reſpect for it.

I have now quoted three of the fragments which I ſpoke of formerly. I have no occaſion at preſent to make any uſe of the fourth.

12. In Gregory's Panegyrical Oration is ſuppoſed to be a reference [g] either to Rev iii. 7. or to Iſ. xxii. 22.

13. He ſpeaks of Origen's advices [h] to attend to God and his prophets. He there likewiſe makes mention of the aſſiſtances Origen gave him for underſtanding the difficult places of the ſacred ſcriptures. His veneration for which ſcriptures has appeared in ſeveral paſſages above cited.

14. If the laſt, or eleventh canon of the epiſtle had been genuine, I ſhould here have obſerved ſomewhat in it: but ſince it is an addition of later times, it ought not to be taken notice of in this place.

It is needleſs to add any thing more, conſidering the relation Gregory had to Origen and his reſpect for him. They muſt both have had the ſame canon of ſcripture, or very much alike, as was obſerved before; and undoubtedly they agreed in a peculiar regard for thoſe writings, which they received as ſacred and divine.

CHAP. XLIII.

DIONYSIUS, biſhop of Alexandria.

I. *His hiſtory in general.* II. *Some revelations vouchſafed to him.* III. *More ſelect paſſages.* IV. *His concern in the controverſies of that time, as Novatianiſm.* V. *The millennium.* VI. *The baptiſm of heretics.* VII. *Sabellianiſm.* VIII. *The affair of Paul of Samoſata.* IX. *Dionyſius's works.* X. *His character.* XI. *His teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament, as the four goſpels.* XII.

τ·λλον· Δηλον γαρ ὡηλον ως παν αγαθον τελειον θεοθεν ερχεται· και ουκ εστι λεπτον αλλως αναμαρτ. κ. λ. ap. Ghiller. in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 23, 24. p. 831.

g p. 73. B.

h μοιω δε προσεχειν Θεω, και τοις τουτω προφηταις, αυτος υποφητευων και σαφηνιζων, οτι ποτε συνετικον και αινιγματωδες ν, οια πολλα εν ταις ιεραις εστι φωναις. ib. p. 72. D.

The

The Acts, Paul's epiſtles, and to the Hebrews. XIII. *The Catholic epiſtles.* XIV. *The Revelation, and other books of the New Teſtament.* XV. *What Dionyſius writes of the Revelation largely examined.* XVI. *A brief review of that whole argument, with remarks.* XVII. *The ſum of his teſtimony.*

I. UPON the promotion of Heraclas to the biſhopric of Alexandria, in the year of Chriſt 231 or 232, Dionyſius [a] ſucceeded him in the chair of the catechetical ſchool of that city: and Heraclas having died in the year 246 or 247, Dionyſius was choſen biſhop in his room, in the year [b] 247 or [c] 248, and died in the twelfth of the emperor Gallienus, in the year of Chriſt 264, or at the utmoſt in [d] 265. He is [e] reckoned the thirteenth biſhop of Alexandria. He was ſucceeded by Maximus.

We may obſerve ſome paſſages of ancient authors concerning the time of his death. Euſebius, ſpeaking of the firſt council of Antioch in the affair of Paul, biſhop of that city, computed to have been held in [f] 264, ſays, 'At [g] this time died Dionyſius, 'in the twelfth year of the reign of Gallienus, having been biſhop 'of Alexandria ſeventeen years. His ſucceſſor was Maximus.' Theodoret [gg] ſays, 'that Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria, a man 'of uncommon learning, in a letter excuſed his coming thither, 'becauſe of the infirmities of age.' The biſhops of the ſecond council of Antioch, aſſembled in [h] 269, ſpeak of Firmilian and Dionyſius as dead, calling [i] them men of bleſſed memory. Moreover, Euſebius aſſures us, that their ſynodical epiſtle was [k] ſent to Dionyſius biſhop of Rome, and Maximus biſhop of Alexandria, and to all the provinces of the empire. This latter council therefore was not in the time of Dionyſius himſelf, but of his ſucceſſor.

It is generally taken for granted that he was an Alexandrian: and from ſome things ſaid by himſelf it has been concluded that

[a] Dionyſius Alexandrinæ urbis epiſcopus ſub Heracla ſcholam κατηχησεως preſbyter tenuit, et Origenis valde inſignis auditor fuit. . . . Moritur duodecimo Gallieni anno. Hieron. de V. I. cap. 69. Conf. Euſeb. H. E. l. vi. c. 29 et 35. vii. cap. 28. [b] . . . tandemque anno 247, mortuo Heraclæ in ſede Alexandrina ſucceſſit. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. P. i. p. 95. Heraclæ, qui ſuperiore anno mortem invenerat, ſucceſſit Dionyſius qui annis xvii. Alexandrinæ præfuit eccleſiæ, initio a currente deducto. Baſn. An. 247. n. v. [c] See Tillemont Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 539, 540. St. Denys d' Alexand. Art. ii. and Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 263. [d] Vid. Pagi Crit. 265. n. iv. et Fabric. ib. [e] Alexandrinam eccleſiam tertius decimus epiſcopus tenuit Dionyſius ann. xvii. Euſeb. Chron. p. 174. [f] Vid. Baſn. Ann. 264, n. iii. &c. [g] Euſ. l. vii. cap. 28. [gg] . . . ἀπῆλθε μὲν τὴν ἐκδημίαν, διὰ τὴν τῆ γήρᾳ ἀσθένειαν. Hær. Fab. l. 2. c. 8. Conf. Euſ. H. E. l. 7. cap. 27. p. 277. D. [h] Vid. Pagi Crit. 269. xii. 271, ii. iii. Baſn. Ann. 269. n. iv. [i] . . . τῆς μακαρίτου. ap. Euſeb. ib. c. 30. p. 279. D. [k] ibid. B.

he

he [l] was of an honourable and wealthy family, and that [m] for some time he was involved in the darkness and errors of Gentilism. He had Origen [n] for his master, and was one of the most noted of his scholars. His episcopate was full of troubles; there having happened in the time of it the two persecutions of Decius and Valerian, beside a pestilence that ravaged the whole Roman empire, and other calamities in common, and some civil commotions with which Alexandria in particular was affected. It was likewise a busy and active period, on account of the controversies about Novatianism, the millennium, the baptism of heretics, and the doctrine of the trinity, in all which Dionysius had some concern, and signalized himself by his learning, zeal, moderation, and prudence. This is a summary account of the life of this bishop of Alexandria: but his eminent merit, and the time in which he flourished, require of us a more particular history.

The Decian persecution [o] began in the year 249, or the beginning of 250: but there was a persecution raised against the Christians of Alexandria in the year [p] 248, whilst other churches enjoyed great peace under the emperor Philip. This persecution [q] lasted a whole year, and was concluded by nothing but a sedition and disturbance among the Gentiles themselves. In a fragment of a letter of Dionysius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, is an account of several who [r] suffered martyrdom in that popular persecution, and of the breaking open and plundering the houses of Christians in that city. 'Nor [s] had we,' says Dionysius, 'a safe passage any where, through high streets or nar-'row lanes, neither by night nor by day; but continually, and 'every where, the people were universally crying out, "If any "one refuse to pronounce such or such impious words, let him "be immediately taken up and thrown into the fire." So things 'went for a long time, till a sedition among themselves, and a 'civil war, returned this cruelty upon them. We [u] had then a 'little breathing time: but presently news came of the end of 'that reign which had been favourable to us, and all were seized

[l] . . . πολλα γε ειπειν εχει καθ' εαυτε γενομενα, ουκ αριθμησαι δυναται περι πραξεων αποφασεις, ενδειξεις, παραγραφας, επαρχικων αιτιαγας, αξιωματων αποθεσεις, δοξης κυριακης διωξεις, εταιρειων πλεονεκτικων και βιαιων καταθρησεις. κ. λ. Dionys. ap. Euf. L. vii. cap. xi. p. 260. A. B.

[m] και τοι γεγονε τετο εξαρχης, και της πιστεως ημων. ap. Euf. l. vii. cap. 7. p. 253. C. [n] See before note [a].

[o] Vid. Pagi, ann. num. iv Baſnag. Ann. 250. num. ii. iii. [p] Vid. Pagi Crit. 248. n. viii. [q] ουκ απο της βασιλικης προσαγματος ο διωγμος παρ ημιν ηρξατο, αλλα γαρ ολον εαυτον προυλαβε. Dionyſ. in Euſ. ad Fab. ap. Euſ. l. vi. c. 41. in.

[r] ibid. p. 236. 237. [s] ib. p. 237. D.

[u] και σιλικρον μεν προσανεπνευσαμεν. . . . ευδιως δε η της βασιλειας εκεινης της εμεσερας μεταβολη διηγγελται . . και δη και παρη το προσαγμα. ib. p. 238. A.

'with

'with fears of an impending storm. Then came the edict;' that is, Decius's edict of persecution, published at Alexandria in the beginning of the year 250.

Soon [w] after the arrival of that edict, as Dionysius writes to Germanus, Sabinus, prefect of Egypt, gave orders for apprehending him. The officer, supposing he must needs have fled and absconded in such a time of manifest danger, made a diligent search every where, excepting only the bishop's own house, where Dionysius continued four days after the prefect's order for taking him up; but on the fifth day, having received a special direction from God, who likewise opened a way for his escape, he removed, accompanied [x] by his servants and many of the brethren. He was nevertheless very soon after, that very night as it seems, apprehended by a band of soldiers, and carried to Taposyris, a small village in that part of Egypt which was called Mareotis. Then he was taken out of their custody by some country people in a very odd and unexpected manner, and against his own consent. Being thus rescued out of the hands of that strong guard by which he had been first taken, he retired and lived privately in a desert part of Libya, distant three days journey from Parætonium. The Decian persecution being over, Dionysius returned to his charge at Alexandria some time in the year 251.

Gallus succeeded Decius before the end of the year 251; and Dionysius speaks of a persecution in his reign: for he says expressly that [y] 'Gallus banished those holy men that offered up 'prayers to God for his peace and safety.' Whether any suffered at this time in Egypt is not certain; nor is there much notice taken of this matter in ancient ecclesiastical writers. Pagi [z] therefore concludes, that this was only a local persecution, and that it was felt in few places except Rome, where Cornelius, and afterwards Lucius, were banished by this emperor.

In the year 253, Valerian and his son Gallienus succeeded Gallus and Volusian. The persecution began in the year 257, and ended in other parts of the empire in 259, when Valerian was taken captive by the Persians; but at Alexandria it continued till the year 261, when Gallienus overcame Macrian, in whose power Egypt had been till that time. Then Gallienus sent the same favourable edicts to Alexandria which had been sent before to several other parts of the empire. Our Dionysius speaks of this persecution having lasted [a] forty-two months, or three years and a half; which ought to be understood of Egypt only, not of the

[w] Vid. Euseb. l. vi. cap. 40. [x] ἐγώ τε καὶ οἱ παῖδες καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἅμα συνεξήλθομεν. Ib. p. 235. C. [y] Eus. l. vii. cap. i. [z] Pagi 252. n. x. xii. xvi. . . . xxi. [a] ap. Euseb. l. vii. cap. x. in.

rest

reſt of the empire. The difficulties relating to this point have been finely cleared up by Pagi, to [b] whom I refer, and [c] to Baſnage, who does not much differ from him.

Soon after the arrival of the edict at Alexandria, before the end of the [d] year 257, as ſeems moſt probable, Dionyſius was ſummoned before Emilian, then prefect of Egypt. He went to him, as [f] Dionyſius himſelf writes, 'attended by his fellow-'preſbyter Maximus, and by Fauſtus, Euſebius and Cheremon, 'deacons, and a Chriſtan brother from Rome, then at Alexan-'dria. Emilian requiring him to renounce the Chriſtian reli-'gion, Dionyſius anſwered without delay, that *we ought to obey 'God rather than men*, (Acts v. 29.) and aſſured the prefect that 'he was a worſhipper of the one God, and could worſhip no 'other, nor could he ever ceaſe to be a Chriſtian. Whereupon 'he ordered them to a place called Cephro, in Libya, forbid-'ding them to hold any aſſemblies. Nor could Dionyſius ob-'tain a delay of one day, though he was ſick.'

In his baniſhment he retained a tender affection and concern for his people, and watched over them, carefully convening them, as he [g] ſays, *abſent indeed in body, but preſent in ſpirit*; 1 Cor. v. 3. At Cephro he had a large number of the faithful, partly ſuch as came to him thither from Alexandria, partly ſuch as came from other places of Egypt. 'And here,' ſays [h] he, '*God opened a door 'to us for preaching the word*; 1 Cor. xvi. 9. 2 Cor. ii. 12. At firſt 'the people of the place were rude, and ready to pelt us with ſtones, 'but afterwards not a few of the Gentiles, *forſaking idols turned unto 'God*; 1 Theſſ. i. 9. Then firſt the ſeed of the word was ſown among 'them by us; for hitherto it had not been preached unto them: 'and, as if for that purpoſe God had brought us to them, when 'we had *fulfilled that miniſtry*, he removed us; Acts xii. 25. For 'Emilian, as if deſirous to ſend us into ſome more uncomforta-'ble place than Libya itſelf, gave orders for diſperſing ſome 'others in ſeveral villages of Marcotis; and us he commanded 'to reſide in the diſtrict of Colluthio, near the great road, that 'we might be the nearer at hand to be brought to Alexandria, 'if he ſhould think fit.'

How long this baniſhment laſted, is not abſolutely certain. Tillemont [i] ſays, it is evident that Dionyſius continued in this exile about two years at leaſt, becauſe in that time he wrote two

[b] Pagi 261. n. viii. et ſeq. [c] Baſn. l. vii cap. xi. p. 251. [f] ib. p. 259. A.
257. n. iii. [d] Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar. [h] ib. p. 259. A. B. C. [i] Mem. t. iv.
257. n. iv. Baſn. 247. n. vi. [g] ap. Euſeb. P. ii. p. 588. S. Denys d' Alex. Art. xiii.

feſtal

festal epistles, concerning the observation of Easter, as [k] Eusebius relates. One of those epistles was directed to Flavius, the other to Domitius and Didymus. I would just observe, that in the same place Eusebius adds; 'beside these, Dionysius wrote 'another letter to his fellow-presbyters of Alexandria, and other 'letters to divers other persons, the persecution still raging.' Pagi [l] has taken notice of several of the letters written at that time. Basnage [m] computes Dionysius's exile to have lasted four years, supposing him to have been banished in 257; as does [n] Pagi: but I do not see any proof of so long a continuance of that exile; though it might be full three years, or somewhat more.

In the year [o] 261, if [p] not before, Dionysius returned to his people at Alexandria, and officiated again among them, to their great satisfaction and profit. But, as [q] Eusebius observes, the peace was of short duration at Alexandria; for that city was again afflicted with sedition and war, and then [r] with pestilence. The disturbance here intended, Valesius [s] and [t] Pagi and [u] Basnage suppose to be the rebellion of Emilian, which broke out in the latter part of the year 261. The Festal, or Paschal epistle of Dionysius to Hierax an Egyptian bishop, of which [w] Eusebius has preserved some fragments, describing the unhappy circumstances of Alexandria in the time of that sedition, is supposed by [x] Pagi and [y] Basnage to have been written in the year 262. There follow in [z] Eusebius fragments of a letter to Dionysius, giving an account of the pestilence in that city, which letter appears plainly to have been written in [a] the year of Christ 263. Tillemont [b] thinks this may be the same that Jerom calls [c] the Letter concerning the mortality. After this Eusebius [d] mentions one more Festal epistle of Dionysius, and consequently written in the year 264. Eusebius [e] particularly observes, that the city of Alexandria then enjoyed peace. And thus we have brought down our general history of this great man to the end of his life, or near it; for it is not improbable that [f] he died in this very year 264.

[k] l. vii. cap. 20. [l] Crit. 257. n. iv. [m] Pace apud Ægyptum constituta, post extinctum Macrianum, ejusque liberos Macrianum et Quietum, Dionysius quadriennii exilium passus edicto Gallieni Alexandriam anno 261, revocatur. Basn. A. 247. n. vi. [n] Vid. Pagi 257. n. iv. [o] Vid. Basn. ib. et Pagi 262. n. ii. [p] επιλαβεσης δε οσοι υστερον της ειρηνης, επανηεισι μεν εις την αλεξανδρειαν. Euseb. l. 7. cap. 21. in. [q] Vid. Euseb. ib. [r] Ibid. cap. 22. [s] Vales. Ann. in Eus. p. 151. [t] Pagi 262. n. ii. [u] Basn. 247. vi. [w] l. vii. cap. 21. [x] Pagi 262. n. ii. [y] An. 247. n. vii. sub fin. [z] ib. c. 22. [a] Vid. Basnag. An. 247. n. vii. sub fin. Tillem. St. Denys d'A. Art. xiv. p. 595. [b] as before. [c] et alia de Mortalitate. De V. I. cap. 69. [d] ibid. p. 269. D. [e] ειρηνευσαιτων των κατα την πολιν. ibid. [f] See Tillemont, p. 594. Basn. 247. n. vi. and before, page 58. note [d].

II. Dionysius

II. Dionyſius was favoured with ſome revelations from heaven: We (A) formerly ſaw an account of a ſpecial direction he received [g] from God to leave Alexandria, at the beginning of the perſecution under Decius. He had another like direction, to encourage him to try all things, and to read all ſorts of books. For Euſebius informs us, that Dionyſius, in his third letter concerning baptiſm, ſent to Philemon, preſbyter at Rome, writes after this manner; 'As [h] for me,' ſays he, 'I have read the works 'and the traditions of the heretics; defiling my mind undoubt-'edly, for a while, with their execrable opinions. But then I 'have had this advantage in the end, that I have been more 'fully convinced of their falſehood, and my deteſtation of them 'has been increaſed. One of the brethren, a preſbyter, would 'have diſſuaded me from this courſe, fearing the conſequence, 'and telling me that my mind would be defiled: and indeed 'I am ſenſible he ſpoke truly: nevertheleſs, I thought I ought 'to proceed as I had begun: and [i] I was confirmed therein 'by a viſion from heaven; for a voice came to me, expreſsly 'commanding me to this purpoſe; "Read whatever comes to "your hands, for you are able to examine and try all things; "and this was the firſt occaſion of your embracing the faith." 'I therefore gladly received the viſion, as agreeing with (B) the 'apoſtolical precept, directed eſpecially to ſuch as are ſtrong: '*Be ye ſkilful money-changers,*' or, in (C) other words, *prove all things*; and what follows. 1 Theſ. v. 21.

Nothing certainly more worthy to be the matter of a revelation than this command; nor could any thing be more honourable to Dionyſius than this viſion. Here is an admirable argument for freedom of inquiry; it had been the firſt occaſion of Dionyſius's becoming a Chriſtian; it muſt therefore be advantageous afterwards. By this means Chriſtianity was ſpread at the beginning; and by this means it cannot be obſtructed: the reaſon is, becauſe it is true; and examination and inquiry are

(A) See p. 60. [g] Και μολις μετα τουτον τον χρονον κελευσαντος μοι μεταστηναι τοτε θεου, και παραδοξως οδοποιησαντος . . . Και ουτω της του Θεου προνοιας εργον εκεινο φησιν, τα εξης τολμωσιν. Euſ. l. 6. c. 40. p. 235. C. [h] Εγω δε και τοις συνταγμασι και ταις παραδοσεσι των αιρετικων ενετυγχανον. κ. λ. l. 7. c. vii. p. 253. A.

[i] Οραμα θεοπεμπτον προσελθον, επερρωσε με. Και λογος προς με γενομενος, προσεταξε διαρρηδην λεγων· πασιν επιτυγχανε οις αν τις γνησια λαβοις· δυνασθαι γαρ εκαστα και δοκιμαζειν και σοι γεγονε τουτο εξαρχης και της πιστεως αιτιον. Αποδεξαμην το οραμα, ως αποστολικη φωνη συντρεχον τη λεγουσῃ προς τους δυνατωτερους. Γινεσθε δοκιμοι τραπεζιται. ib. p. 253. B. C.

(B) Mr. Whiſton ſuppoſeth that Dionyſius refers to the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. Lib. ii. cap. 36. See his Eſſay on the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, chap. iv. § 24, in his Primitive Chriſtianity, &c. Vol. iii. p. 425. But Mr. Whiſton's arguments have been fully confuted by Mr. Robert Turner, in his Diſcourſe of the pretended Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. Ch. xiv. p. 134. . . . 136. (C) See before, Vol. ii. Ch. xxxviii. § xxvii. 14.

prejudicial

prejudicial and detrimental to error, beneficial and friendly to truth. Such Christians, therefore, as discourage inquiry in matters of a religious nature, disparage their religion or their judgment. They give men ground of suspicion, that the Christian religion will not bear examination; or that they do not know it to be so excellent, and so well founded, as it is. For if they are persuaded that their religion is true and excellent, and supported by sufficient evidence, why are they afraid it should be tried and examined? If it have those properties, it must be the more respected the more it is examined and considered. I would therefore humbly recommend to these persons, for their improvement, the observation of the apostle's precepts, referred to likewise by Dionysius, and which are directed to such as were already Christians: *Prove all things: hold fast that which is good: abstain from all appearance of evil*: 1 Thess. v. 21. 22. that is, examine all things that are proposed to you; embrace that which is good, and reject every thing that is evil.

III. Alexandria [k] seems to have had a large share in the affliction of the plague that raged about this time in the Roman empire. In the fragments of the Festal epistle of Dionysius,[l] before-mentioned, there is a description of the very laudable temper and behaviour of the Christians in that time of distress; which I could gladly have inserted here, but shall content myself with this [m] reference to it.

I hope therefore it will be allowed me to transcribe a part of another letter, containing some account of the persecutions, and likewise taking some notice of the plague at that time. The letter just mentioned was written, as [n] was formerly shewn, in the year 263. But that which I now intend to make some extracts out of, is the letter to Domitius and Didymus, written in the time of the persecution under Valerian, in the year 259 or [o] 260, certainly before Dionysius's return home, and before the peace granted to the church of Alexandria by Gallienus. Since therefore here likewise is notice taken of that pestilence, it must have raged a great while at Alexandria, or have broken out there more than once. I would premise one thing more for preventing scruples; that though this letter was written about the year 260, before the end of the persecution ordered by Valerian, yet Dionysius may possibly in the former part of it refer to the sufferings and fortitude of Christians under Decius. It is to this

[k] Pestilens morbus multas totius orbis provincias occupavit, maximeque Alexandriam et Ægyptum, ut scribit Dionysius, et Cypriani de Mortalitate testis est liber. Euseb. Chron. p. 175. [l] See p. 62. [m] Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 22. p. 268, 269. [n] See p. 62.

purpose;

purpose: 'Moreover,' says [p] Eusebius, 'the same Dionysius, in his 'Letter to Domitius and Didymus, writes again of the persecu-'tion after this manner: "It is needless to mention the names of "all our people that have suffered, since they are many, and most "of them unknown to you. It may suffice therefore to assure "you, that (D) persons of both sexes, and of every age and con-"dition, and soldiers and country people, have been victorious "in this combat, and been crowned; some by scourging, some "by fire, others by the sword. Nevertheless, in all this space of "time, some there are who do not yet appear to be acceptable "to the Lord. Me, in particular, he seems pleased to reserve for "some other season, according to the words of the prophet, "Is. xlix. 8. *In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of "salvation have I accepted thee.*" Then, after a few words inter-'vening, he says: "At present I have with me only Caius and "Peter, deprived of the rest of the brethren." And soon after-'wards: "Some have hid themselves in the city, that they may "privately visit the brethren; as, Maximus, Dioscorus, Deme-"trius, and Lucius, presbyters: for Faustinus and Aquilla, be-"ing much known, travel up and down Egypt. The deacons "that survive, after those that have died of the plague, are, "Faustus, Eusebius, Chæremon: Eusebius, I say, whom God "qualified from the beginning, and furnished with great re-"solution and ability, for fulfilling the office of ministration "to the confessors in prison, and for burying the bodies of "the perfect and blessed martyrs, not without the utmost peril. "For to this very day the prefect does not cease to treat our peo-"ple in the most cruel manner, killing some, torturing others, "making others pine away in fetters and dungeons; forbidding "any one to be admitted to them, and strictly inquiring likewise "whether his orders be obeyed. Notwithstanding which, such is "the courage and alacrity with which God inspires the brethren, "the afflicted are not without the consolation suited to their exi-"gence." So writes Dionysius.'

What follows in Eusebius appears very affecting. 'It [q] ought 'to be observed,' says he, 'that Eusebius, whom Dionysius 'mentions as deacon, was afterwards bishop of Laodicea in 'Syria. Maximus, whom he speaks of as presbyter at that time, 'succeeded Dionysius himself in the care of the brethren at 'Alexandria. And Faustus, who had then the honour to be a

[p] l. 7. cap. vi. p. 260. C. D. 261. (D) Here may be a reference to some things that happened under the Decian persecution. Comp. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 40, 41, 42.
[q] Ibid. p. 261. C.

'confessor together with Dionysius, having been preserved to 'the persecution in (E) our time, when he was very old, and 'full of years, was perfected by martyrdom, having been be-'headed.'

Certainly these were honest and upright men. They were fully persuaded of the truth of the Christian religion; for they suffered for it, and yet continued to make a profession of it, till their life was taken away. By such as these was the Christian doctrine received at that time, and by such has it been delivered down to us.

IV. I shall in the next place give some account of the several controversies before-mentioned, and the part Dionysius had in them.

Cornelius was chosen bishop of Rome in [r] June 251. Soon after, Novatus, presbyter in the same church, got himself also ordained bishop of Rome: and beside the schism he is charged with on that account, he set up a rigid notion against all who had lapsed in time of persecution, not allowing any such to be again restored to the communion of the church, whatever tokens of repentance they might shew: whereas all other Christians in general allowed those who had fallen to be restored to such communion, either in the approach of death, or when they had performed penance, proportioned to the nature or aggravations of the fault they had been guilty of.

Of the part which Dionysius acted upon this occasion, and in this controversy, there is the following account in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History. He [s] wrote a letter to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, who is supposed to have been too favourable to Novatus, or Novatian, as he is often called, and his rigid sentiments concerning the discipline of the church. Basnage [t] thinks it probable that this letter was written some time before the end of the year 251. Dionysius also sent a letter to Novatus himself, in answer, as is supposed, to one received from him. Eusebius has preserved a copy of that epistle. The letter to Fabius seems to have been upon the point of penance, confuting Novatus's rigid notions relating to that matter. The letter to Novatus himself concerns rather his schism. Novatus, as Eusebius [u] says, endeavoured to cast the blame of all he had done upon some of the brethren, by whom, as he pretended, he had been constrained to take the course he did, to whom he had yielded unwillingly, and as it were by compulsion. The answer therefore re-

(E) Diocletian's persecution. [r] Vid. Pagi 251. n. xix. [s] Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 42, 43, 44. [t] Vid. Basnag. 247. n. vii. init. [u] Euseb. ib. cap. 45. in.

turned

turned by our biſhop was this: 'Dionyſius [w] ſends greeting to 'our brother Novatus. If, as you ſay, you have been ordained 'unwillingly, you will make it appear by a voluntary reſigna- 'tion; for a man ſhould undergo any thing rather than divide 'the church of God; and the martyrdom you ſhould ſuffer ra- 'ther than make a ſchiſm would in my opinion be more glori- 'ous than a martyrdom for not ſacrificing to idols: for in this 'caſe a man ſuffers for his own ſoul only, in the other for the ſake 'of the whole church. Now, therefore, if you can perſuade or 'oblige the brethren to reunite, your merit will exceed your 'crime. This will be no longer imputed to you; that will be 'applauded. If there remain any whom you cannot perſuade, 'however ſave your own ſoul.'

Dionyſius muſt have written many letters upon this argument: for, as Euſebius [x] adds immediately after having tranſcribed that letter to Novatus, 'he alſo wrote a letter to the brethren through- 'out Egypt concerning repentance, in which he delivered his 'opinion concerning thoſe that had fallen, diſtinguiſhing the ſe- 'veral degrees of offences. There is likewiſe a diſtinct piece 'concerning repentance, directed in particular to Conon, biſhop 'of Hermopolis, and a letter of reproof to his flock at Alexan- 'dria. Here may be mentioned his epiſtle concerning martyr- 'dom, ſent to Origen. He wrote alſo to the brethren of 'Laodicea, over whom preſided Thelymidres as biſhop; and 'in like manner concerning repentance to the Armenians, 'who had Meruzanes for their biſhop. He wrote alſo to Cor- 'nelius, biſhop of Rome, after he had received his letter againſt 'Novatus; in which he informs him, that he had been invited 'by Helenus, biſhop of Tarſus in Cilicia, and by others with 'him, and by Firmilian of Cappadocia, and Theoctiſtus of Pa- 'leſtine, to meet them at a ſynod at Antioch, where ſome en- 'deavoured to eſtabliſh the ſchiſm of Novatus. He writes like- 'wiſe, that he had heard that Fabius was dead, and that Deme- 'trian was appointed biſhop of Antioch in his room. There is 'another letter of his ſent to the brethren at Rome by Hippo- 'lytus, concerning the office of a deacon; another letter to the 'ſame perſons concerning peace and repentance; and again 'another to the confeſſors of the ſame city, who ſtill favoured 'the opinion of Novatus; and two more to the ſame perſons, 'after they were returned to the church. He wrote, as Euſebius 'there adds, many other letters to divers perſons, from which

[w] ap. Euſeb. L. vi. cap. 45. Hier. De V. I. cap. 69.
[x] Ibid. cap. 46.

'they who are curious to inquire after his labours, (as certainly 'many are,) may receive much profit.'

The forementioned letter to Cornelius is ſuppoſed to [y] have been written in 252, and moſt of the others relating to penance, and to Novatianiſm, in the ſame or the foregoing year. The letter to Origen was [z] probably written in the Decian perſecution, in the year 250, to comfort, animate and encourage him when [a] in priſon.

Finally, in a letter to Stephen, biſhop of Rome, (probably [b] written in 256;) as Euſebius aſſures us, he acquaints him, that all [c] the churches, having rejected the novel principles of Novatus, with regard to the treatment of ſuch as had lapſed, were come to an unanimous agreement with each other. 'Know, 'brother,' ſays [d] he, 'that all the churches of the Eaſt, which be- 'fore were divided, are now united.' And a little lower he ſays: 'And all the preſidents of the churches are of one mind, 'and are beyond meaſure filled with joy for the unexpected 'peace: I mean Demetrian, biſhop of Antioch; Theoctiſtus of 'Cæſarea; Mezabanes, biſhop of Ælia ſince the death of Alex- 'ander; Marinus, of Tyre; Heliodorus of Laodicea, ſucceſſor of 'Thelymidres; Helenus of Tarſus; and all the churches of Cilicia; 'and Firmilian, and all Cappadocia with him: for I mention the 'names of the principal biſhops (F) only, that I may not be trou- 'bleſome by the too great length of my letter. But I would be un- 'derſtood to mean the churches throughout all the provinces of 'Syria and Arabia, whom [e] you often relieve in diſtreſs, and to 'whom you have lately written: as alſo, Meſopotamia, Pontus, 'and Bithynia. And, in a word, all every where rejoice and praiſe 'God for the unanimity and brotherly love which reign among 'them.'

V. It is not eaſy to ſay the exact time of Dionyſius's diſpute about the millennium. But it was occaſioned by the writings of Nepos, an Egyptian biſhop, then dead; who flouriſhed, as [f] Cave thinks, about 244, or, as [g] Baſnage, about 241. Baronius [h] ſuppoſed this opinion to have given diſturbance to the church in 263. Accordingly, it is ſpoken of by [i] Pagi at the ſame time. Tillemont [k] ſays, that Valerian, who begun his reign about the middle of the year 253, was very favourable to the Chriſtians, till the year 257. Theſe firſt three years of his reign, in which

[y] Baſnag. Ann. 247. n. vii. [z] Id. ib. [a] Vid. Euſeb. L. 6. c. 39. [b] Vid. Baſn. ut ſupra. et Conf. Pagi Crit. An. 256. n. xiv. xv. [c] Euſ. l. vii. cap. iv. [d] Euſ. ib. cap. v. init. (F) This letter of our Dionyſius, written in the year 256, is an authentic witneſs of the vaſt progreſs which Chriſtianity had made in the Eaſt. It had had a like progreſs in the Weſt. [e] ὡς ἐπαρκεῖτε ἑκάστοτε, καὶ οἷς νῦν ἐπιστείλατε. ibid. p. 252. A. [f] Cav. H. L. P. i. p. 86. [g] Ann. 240. n. viii. [h] Ann. 264. n. i. et ſeq. [i] Crit. An. 263. ii. [k] St. Den. d'Alex. Art. ix.

it

it seems that Egypt, as well as the church, enjoyed great tranquillity, are therefore very proper for considering the affair of Nepos; the time of which we do not know, but which seems to suit a time of peace. So that learned writer just mentioned.

Nepos wrote a book entitled, A Confutation of the Allegorists. This being in great repute with some persons, who had too carnal notions of an expected millennium, Dionysius wrote a confutation of it in two books, entitled, Concerning the Promises. St. Jerom makes particular mention of this work in his Catalogue. I say no more of this matter here; I shall give a particular account of it from Eusebius, in the article of Dionysius's testimony to the books of scripture.

VI. When there arose a controversy between Stephen of Rome, and Cyprian of Carthage, about the baptism of heretics, Dionysius [m] wrote a letter to Stephen. It is the same letter, a part of which was before transcribed, where Dionysius informs Stephen of the peace of the eastern churches, with regard to Novatianism, and is supposed to have been written in 256. The second letter concerning baptism was sent to Xystus, or Sixtus, successor of Stephen, as [n] Eusebius expressly says. This letter must have been written in 257, or 258. And herein, as [o] Eusebius likewise informs us, Dionysius referred to his letter to Stephen, and then adds: 'I [p] wrote likewise to our beloved and fellow-presbyters, Dionysius and Philemon, who were of the same mind with 'Stephen, and wrote to me upon that question. To them I 'wrote formerly in a few words, but now largely.' And the letter now sent to Philemon I suppose to be that which Eusebius afterwards [q] calls Dionysius's third letter upon baptism. The [r] fourth, concerning the same matter, according to Eusebius's way of computing, is that sent to Dionysius, then presbyter, afterwards bishop of Rome. Jerom [s] likewise reckons two distinct letters, one to Philemon, another to Dionysius. In this letter, as Eusebius says, Dionysius writes of Novatus to this purpose; 'We [t] do with good reason abominate Novatus, who has 'divided the church, and drawn some of the brethren into im-'piety and blasphemy, and has calumniated our most gracious

[l] Et duo libri adversum Nepotem episcopum, qui mille annorum corporale regnum suis scriptis asseverat: in quibus et de Apocalypsi Joannis diligentissime disputat. De V. I. cap. 69. [m] Euseb. l. vii. cap. 4, 5. [n] ταυτῳ δευτερᾳ ὁ Διονυσιος περι βαπτισματος χαραξας επιστολην. κ. λ. ib. p. 252. A. [o] Ib. A. B. [p] Ib. C. [q] και εν τῃ τριτῃ δε των περι βαπτισματος, ἡν Φιλημονι τῳ κατα Ρωμην πρεσβυτερῳ ὁ αυτος γραφει Διονυσιος. ib. cap vii. in. [r] η τεταρτη αυτου περι βαπτισματος επιστολων προς τον κατα Ρωμην εγραφη Διονυσιον, τοτε μεν πρεσβειαν τιξιωμενον. κ. λ. ib. p. 254. A. [s] Et ad Philemonem et ad Dionysium Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyteros, duas epistolas. De V. I. cap. 69. [t] Ibid, cap. viii.

'Lord Jeſus Chriſt as unmerciful.' Afterwards Euſebius adds, 'that [u] Dionyſius's fifth letter concerning baptiſm was written 'to Xyſtus, biſhop of the Romans:' out of which Euſebius tranſcribes a paſſage relating to that matter, and then adds; 'There '[w] is extant yet another letter of the ſame perſon concerning 'baptiſm, as from himſelf and his people, to Xyſtus and the 'church at Rome, in which he treats largely of this queſtion.' Thus, according to Euſebius, there were at leaſt ſix letters of Dionyſius upon this point ſent to Rome; three of which were to Xyſtus, though Jerom in his Catalogue, [x] among the works of Dionyſius, reckons but two letters to that biſhop. And immediately after the words laſt cited from Euſebius, it is added, that [xx] beſide theſe there is another letter of this Dionyſius to Dionyſius of Rome, concerning one Lucian.

What was our Dionyſius's own opinion in this controverſy is not certainly known. Jerom ſays plainly, 'that [y] Dionyſius, 'agreeing with Cyprian and the African ſynod in the opinion 'of rebaptiſing heretics, wrote to divers perſons a great number 'of letters ſtill extant.' And [z] Valeſius and [a] Pagi allow, that Dionyſius [b] was ſomewhat inclined to Cyprian's ſide of the queſtion. Nevertheleſs, there are ſome learned moderns who venture to contradict St. Jerom; though one would think he might be better able to judge of this matter than we at this time, who have ſo ſmall a part of thoſe letters come down to us. The learned moderns whom I mean are [c] Du Pin and [d] Baſnage, whom any may conſult that are ſo diſpoſed. However it may be obſerved here, that the former of thoſe two learned writers ſays, 'Dionyſius was of opinion that all churches ſhould be at liberty to 'follow their own cuſtoms. Some only required heretics to abjure their errors upon returning to the church: others, as the 'Africans, and divers churches in the Eaſt, had a different method of receiving heretics, not without baptiſm; and every one 'ſhould do as he ſaw fit. This,' ſays Du Pin, 'was Dionyſius's 'ſentiment; and Jerom is to blame for ſaying that he ſided with 'Cyprian.' Cave [e] expreſſeth himſelf after this manner; 'That 'Dionyſius, together with Firmilian, biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, and a great many others in the Eaſt, ſtood on Cyprian's

[u] Ib. cap. ix. in. [w] Ib. p. 255. C. [x] Ad Xyſtum, qui Stephano ſucceſſerat, duas epiſtolas ib. cap. 69. [xx] Euſeb. ib. p. 255. C. [y] Hic in Cypriani at Africæ ſynodi dogma conſentiens de hæreticis rebaptizandis ad diverſos plurimas miſit epiſtolas. De V. I. c. 69. [z] Valeſ. An. in Euſ. l. vii. c. v. p. 141. [a] A. 256. n. xii. [b] In Afrorum et Orientalium ſententiam magis propendebat. [c] Bibl. Tom. i. p. 188. [d] Baſn. A. 247. n. x. [e] See Cave's Life of St. Dionyſius of Alexandria, p. 289. in his Hiſtory of the Lives of the Primitive Fathers. London, 1677.

'ſide,

'side, maintaining that heretics ought to be baptised. But, 'however, he carried himself with great temper and moderation. 'Besides that, he engaged more as a mediator than a party, writ-'ing to pope Stephen to use moderation in the case; as he did 'also to Sixtus his successor, and most other bishops of that 'time.' This may be the truest judgment; for Dionysius's moderation is manifest. He is [f] against excommunicating churches upon this account: but what was his own opinion any farther in this point, does not appear clearly from the fragments or history in Eusebius.

VII. In the first letter to Xystus before-mentioned, the second upon the subject of baptism, written in 257 or 258, Dionysius, as [g] Eusebius says, informs him of the great increase of the Sabellian heretics at that time, in these words: 'For as con-'cerning the opinion now advanced in Ptolemais, a city of Pen-'tapolis, which is full of impiety and blasphemy against God 'Almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; containing like-'wise much infidelity toward his only begotten Son, and the first 'begotten of every creature, the word that became man, and a 'stupid notion concerning the Holy Spirit; there having been 'brought to me letters from both parties, some also having come 'from thence to discourse with me; I sent thither some letters, writ-'ten according to the ability which God has given me, wherein 'I have spoken largely. Herewith you receive copies of them.'

Afterwards, in another chapter, Eusebius speaks after this manner: 'Beside [h] these, there are many other epistles of Dio-'nysius; as those against Sabellius, written to Ammon, bishop of 'Bernice; and that to Telesphorus, and that to Euphranor; and 'again to Ammon and Euporus. He [i] composed likewise four 'other pieces upon the same subject, which he addressed to his 'namesake Dionysius of Rome.'

Concerning this matter, St. Jerom in his Catalogue [k] makes no additions: he only recites, as it were, the same words of Eusebius, or part of them at least; for he omits somewhat, and scarce expresseth himself so clearly as Eusebius. However, in another place, [l] he speaks again of four volumes of Dionysius against Sabellius.

[f] Vid. Eus. H. E. L. vii. cap. v. p. 252. B. C. [g] Συγκαιων δε εν ταυτῳ και περι των κατα σαβελλιον αιρετικων ως κατ' αυτον επιπολαζοντων, κ. λ. H. E. L. vii. cap. 6. [h] L. vii. cap. 26. [i] συνεταξε δε περι της αυτης ὑποθεσεως και αλλα τεσσαρα συγγραμματα, α τῳ κατα Ρωμην ομωνυμῳ Διονυσιῳ προσεθηκεν. ib. p. 277. A. [k] Et adversus Sabellium, et ad Ammonem Beronices episcopum, et ad Telesphorum, et ad Euphranorem, et quatuor libri ad Dionysium Romanæ urbis episcopum. De V. I. cap. 69. [l] Et Dionysium Alexandrinæ urbis episcopum, virum eruditissimum [scribit] contra Sabellium quatuor voluminibus disputantem, in Arianum dogma delabi. Hieron. adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 409. m.

Sabellius, as is ſuppoſed, publiſhed his peculiar notions a little before [m] the year 257, [n] about 255, or [o] in 256. Dionyſius's letter beforementioned to Xyſtus was written in 257 or 258. The books inſcribed to Dionyſius of Rome could not be ſent to him before 259; probably [p] not till 260, or a ſhort time after.

But Athanaſius informs us of particulars omitted by both Euſebius and Jerom. It ſeems, ſome Arians of that time endeavoured to ſupport their doctrine by ſome paſſages of Dionyſius in his writings againſt Sabellius. This gave occaſion for the Treatiſe, or rather Epiſtle of Athanaſius concerning the opinion of Dionyſius of Alexandria. Here then Athanaſius writes to this purpoſe: 'In [q] Pentapolis, of the Upper Libya, at that time ſome 'biſhops went into the notions of Sabellius.... Dionyſius hearing of it ſent to them, admoniſhing them to renounce their 'error. But they perſiſting in it, he was compelled to write that 'epiſtle;' which the Arians made uſe of to ſupport their doctrine. In this piece Athanaſius often mentions the Letter [r] to Ammonius, and [s] the Letter to Euphranor and Ammonius; meaning, I ſuppoſe, either one and the ſame letter, or two letters, and the ſame that are mentioned by Euſebius.

Farther, Athanaſius informs us, that after Dionyſius had written that letter to Euphranor and Ammonius, 'ſome [t] of the brethren of the church, of orthodox ſentiments indeed, but without conſulting him, that they might underſtand from himſelf 'the true meaning of what he had written, went to Rome, and 'accuſed him to his nameſake Dionyſius, biſhop of Rome.... 'who then wrote to Dionyſius, to inform him of what had been 'laid to his charge. He [u] ſoon replied, entitling his books a 'Confutation and Apology.' Afterwards Athanaſius calls this work [w] an Epiſtle. He likewiſe [x] quotes the ſecond book of it. By this work, entitled in Athanaſius a Confutation and Apology,

[m] Il commença un peu avant l' an 257, à troubler la Pentapole, dans la Libye Cyrenaique, en combatant la diſtinction des trois perſonnes divines. Tillem. Saint Denys d' Alex. Art. xv. T. iv. P. ii. p. 595.
[n] Sabellius n' a commencé à decouvrir ſon hereſie que vers l' an 255, dans le tems que l' egliſe jouiſſoit de la paix ſous Valerien. Tillem. Les Sabelliens. ibid. p. 531.
[o] Vid. Baſnag. 247. n. ix. 256. xv.
[p] Vid. Baſn. 247. n. ix. [q] εν πεντα-πολει της ανω λιβυης τινικαυτα τινες των επισκοπων εφρωνησαν τα σαβελλιου.... τουτο μαθων διονυσιος.... πεμπει και συμβουλευει τοις αιτιοις παισασθαι της κακοδοξιας· ως δε ουκ επαυοντο, ..., ηναγκασθη προς την αναιδειαν εκεινων γραψαι την τοιαυτην επιστολην, κ. λ. Athanaſ. de Sent. Dionyſ. § 5. p. 240. D. E. T. i. Bened. [r] ει δε γραψας την προς Αμμωνιον επιστολην υποστευθη, κ. λ. ib. p. 247. B. [s] ουτως ουν αρειανος ο διονυσιος, δια την προς ευφρανορα και αμμωνιον κατα σαβελλιου επιστολην. p. 249. B. vid. etiam 251. C. 252. B. 261. C. [t] Ib. p. 252. B. C. Conf. eund. de Synodis, &c. p. 757, 758. [u] και αιτιγραψεν ευθυς αυτος, και επιγραψε τα βιβλια ελεγχου και απολογιας. ib. p. 252. C.
[w] πρωτον μεν ουν ελεγχου και απολογιας εγραψεν εαυτου την επιστολην p. 253. A.
[x] ορα παλιν πως εν τω δευτερω βιβλιω γραφει περι τουτων. p. 260. E.

or Accuſation and Apology, I ſuppoſe to be intended the four pieces mentioned by Euſebius, as ſent to Dionyſius of Rome. For it is upon the ſame argument of Sabellianiſm, and ſent to the ſame perſon. And though Athanaſius in one place calleth it an Epiſtle, it appears from him to have conſiſted of ſeveral parts: and St. Baſil quotes, as he expreſſeth himſelf, Dionyſius's [y] ſecond Epiſtle to his nameſake concerning the Confutation [or Accuſation] and Apology. I think learned men do generally allow that [z] Euſebius and Athanaſius ſpeak of the ſame writing.

The learned Benedictine, editor of St. Athanaſius's works, in the advertiſement before the Epiſtle of Athanaſius, concerning the opinion of Dionyſius, paſſeth a ſevere cenſure upon Euſebius; 'That, [a] being an Arian, he has been ſilent about this hiſtory, becauſe it is prejudicial to his cauſe.' But, in anſwer to this, ſeveral things may be ſaid. Firſt, Euſebius has made mention of Dionyſius's writings againſt Sabellius, and particularly the pieces ſent to Dionyſius of Rome. Secondly, the deſign of Euſebius's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory might not lead him to give a more particular account of that affair, or of the works compoſed upon that occaſion, or to tranſcribe any paſſages from them. Though Euſebius enlarges conſiderably upon Dionyſius, he has not written a complete hiſtory of him, or his works. Beſides, Jerom was no Arian, and yet he adds nothing to Euſebius; ſcarcely ſays ſo much. And Theodoret, having given an account of Sabellius himſelf, and his doctrine, adds only in theſe few words; 'Againſt [b] him wrote Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria.' Thirdly, allowing Euſebius to have been an Arian, he might be well enough ſatisfied with Dionyſius's ſentiments relating to the doctrine of the trinity: and there is at leaſt as much reaſon to think he was ſo as not; for the great reſpect he has ſhewn for Dionyſius affords an argument that he did not look upon him to be a man of the adverſe ſide. It is plain from Athanaſius, that ſome Arians did boaſt of Dionyſius as a favourer of their doctrine: and why may not Euſebius form the ſame judgment of that great man? St. Baſil, too, who is generally allowed to be

[y] . . . εν τη δευτερα προς τον ομωνυμον ταυτε επιστολη περι ελεγχε και απολογιας, κ. λ. Baſ. de Sp. S. cap. 72. p. 60. E. Tom. 3. Ben. [z] Apud Euſebium vii. 26. Hiſt. ubi librorum quatuor Dionyſii Alex. ad Dionyſium Rom. adverſus Sabellium mentio, (ελεγχε και απολογιας vocat Athanaſius) &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 261. Conf. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 96. de Dionyſ. Alex. Tillemont, Les Sabelliens, Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 535. [a] Quod autem Euſebius, qui Dionyſii geſta fuſe ſatis proſequitur, ne verbum quidem de hac hiſtoria fecerit; hinc ſane augetur jam vulgata de ipſo, nimiſque firma Arianiſmi ſuſpicio. Callide profecto tacuit hæreſi ſuæ exitioſam hiſtoriam: quam incautius, ut ait Athanaſius, alii Ariani, in ſuamque perniciem evulgârunt. ap. Athanaſ. ib. p. 243. [b] κατα τουτε συνεγραψε διονυσιος ο της αλεξανδρεων επισκοπος. Theod. H. F. l. 2. cap. ix.

orthodox,

orthodox, says he [c] does not like every thing in Dionysius; that [d] he had given encouragement to the Anomœan doctrine; and [e] that he expresseth himself differently **in speaking** (G) of the trinity. Gennadius [f] calls Dionysius the fountain of Arianism, speaking very agreeably to St. Basil. Rufinus endeavours to defend Dionysius, by saying that [g] his works had been interpolated by the Arians; though this is now esteemed a groundless assertion by learned moderns, particularly by [h] bishop Bull. Undoubtedly the abovementioned piece of Athanasius is well written. It is the work of one who knew how to manage an argument to the best advantage. But, as Dionysius had expressed himself differently, there might be ground for debating what was his real sentiment. And Eusebius might think Dionysius held the same doctrine that he did. But it was not proper to be more particular than he has been in his Ecclesiastical History, where he was to write of general things, about which Christians for the most part were agreed; not of points controverted by the Christians of his time. This is said in defence of Eusebius, not of Arianism, with which I have no particular concern in this work, no more than Eusebius had in his Ecclesiastical History.

[c] ὃ παντα θαυμαζομεν τ' ανδρος. Basil. Ep. ix. [al. 41.] p. 90. c. [d] σχεδον γαρ ταυτησι της νυν περιθρυλλουμενης ασεβειας, της κατα το ανομοιον λεγω, ὑτος εστιν, οσα γε ἡμεις ισμεν, ὁ πρωτος ανθρωποις τα σπερματα παρασχων. ibid. [e] και παντοδαπος εστιν εν τοις συγγραμμασιν. ib. E. (G) After all these, and other things, said by St. Basil in his Letter to Maximus, it appears to me very strange, which is said by **Theodoric** Ruinart: Ex his fuit Basilius **Magnus**, qui in Epistola 41, ad Maximum philosophum proferre non dubitavit, Dionysium, quantum sibi liqueret, primum hominibus impietatis Anomœanæ seminaria præbuisse, non ex malitia quidem, sed quod Sabellio obluctari cuperet. At paullo ante fassus fuerat, se nullum ex Dionysii libris legisse. Venerunt quidem ad nos, inquit, illius admodum multa, libri vero nondum adsunt. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Sinc. et Select. p. 181. Here, to vindicate Dionysius's reputation upon this head, and invalidate the character which Basil gives him, Ruinart is pleased to say, that Basil had never read any of his works; whereas it is plain from that letter to Maximus, that Basil was well acquainted with them; otherwise he could not have spoken of them as he does. Nor is the passage, on which Ruinart builds that strange supposition, at all to his purpose. He understands Basil according to the Latin translation of Godfrey Tilman: libri vero nondum adsunt. But if he had looked upon the Greek, he would have perceived that Basil only said he had not Dionysius's works with him, and therefore he could not send them to Maximus, as he had desired. ὰ παρεστι γε μην τα βιβλια, διοπερ ουκ απεστειλαμεν. Cæterum quæ postulas Dionysii scripta, venere quidem illa ad nos, et valde multa: sed non adsunt libri, et idcirco non misimus. Basil. T. 3. p. 90. B. C. Ed. Bened.

[f] Nihil creatum aut serviens in trinitate credendum, ut vult Dionysius, fons Arii. Gennad. de Ecc. Dogm. cap. iv. ap. Aug. T. 8. Append. p. 75. Bened.

[g] Dionysius quoque Alexandrinus episcopus eruditissimus assertor ecclesiasticæ fidei, cum in quamplurimis in tantum veritatem atque æqualitatem trinitatis defendat, ut imperitioribus quibusque etiam secundum Sabellium sensisse videatur: in his tamen libris suis, quos adversus Sabellii hæresim scribit, talia inveniuntur inserta, ut frequenter Ariani auctoritate ipsius se defendere conentur. Rufin. de Adult. libr. Orig. ad Macar. sub. fin. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 250, 251. Bened. [h] Deceptus vero in eo est Rufinus Aquilienſis, dum existimavit Dionysii scripta ab Arianis fuisse corrupta et depravata, &c. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. cap. xi. p. 129.

Bishop

Biſhop [i] Bull has no ſcruples here. But Baſnage ſays, that [k] though Dionyſius thought juſtly and orthodoxly, he expreſſed himſelf improperly. Le Moyne [l] likewiſe, another defender of Dionyſius, ſays his expreſſions need and ought to be mollified to make ſound divinity.

This is what we have to ſay of Dionyſius's conduct in the affair of Sabellianiſm; which, as Euſebius informed us, ſpread greatly at that time in Egypt.

But before we leave this article it will not be improper to take ſome further notice of Sabellius and his opinions.

Dionyſius himſelf, as [m] before quoted, ſpeaks of the riſe of that doctrine in Ptolemais, a city of Pentapolis. Theodoret ſays, Sabellius [n] was an African, [or Libyan,] of Pentapolis. St. Baſil likewiſe calls [o] Sabellius a Libyan: and Iſidore of Peluſium ſays Sabellianiſm [p] had it's riſe in Libya.

With regard to his notions, Epiphanius ſays, 'that, [q] except-'ing a few things only, Sabellius agreed with the Noetians: 'that [r] Sabellius and his followers teach that the ſame is Fa-'ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; ſo that there are only three denomi-'nations in one hypoſtaſis, [or ſubſiſtence;] or, as in man, body, 'ſoul, and ſpirit.' In that which is called his Recapitulation, Epiphanius ſays 'the [s] Sabellians agreed with the Noetians, 'except in this one thing, that they ſaid the Father did not ſuf-'fer.' This is Epiphanius's whole article concerning the Sabellians in that work.

Damaſcenus ſays 'The [t] Sabellians agree with Noetus, except 'that they do not ſay the Father ſuffered. They ſpeak of the 'Word brought forth and again reſumed.' This is the ſame as the Summary, or [u] Synopſis, of Epiphanius.

The laſt ſentence is difficult to be rendered in our language. I am far from thinking there is any particular propriety or exactneſs in my tranſlation; but it was neceſſary that I ſhould put down ſome Engliſh words inſtead of the original. What I have tranſlated 'the Word brought forth' might perhaps be as well

[i] Vid. Bull. ibid. [k] Rem quod attinet, de auguſtiſſimo trinitatis myſterio vera ſenſiſſe Dionyſium exiſtimamus; incommodam tamen duramque locutionem ipſius prorſus improbamus. Baſn. Ann. 247. n. ix. [l] Cui licet quædam exciderint minus veritati congrua, ea ſunt tamen benigniori interpretatione mollienda et condienda. Le Moyne Notis ad Var. Sacr. p. 256. [m] See p. 71. [n] Hæret. Fab. L. ii. cap. 9. [o] Baſ. Ep. 207. [al. 63.] p. 210. A. [p] Lib. i. Ep. 247. [q] Hær. 62. n. i. p. 513. A. [r] .... τον αυτον ειναι πατερα, τον αυτον ειναι αγιον πνευμα· ως ειναι εν μια υποστασει τρεις ονομασιας, η ως εν ανθρωπω σωμα, και ψυχην, και πνευμα. κ. λ. ib. B. [s] .... τα ομοια ιουδαιοις δοξαζοντες, παρα τουτο μονοι· λεγουσι γαρ μη πεπονθεναι τον πατερα. Epiph. Anac. T. ii. p. 146. n. xvi. [t] οι τα ομοια ιουδαιοις δοξαζοντες, παρα το μη τον πατερα λεγειν πεπονθεναι· λεγοντες προφορικον και παλιν αναχωρουμενον τον λογον. J. Dam. de Har. n. lxii. p. 296. [u] Vid. Epiph. T. i. p. 398.

rendered

rendered 'the Word pronounced, or uttered, ſpoken forth, ſhew-'ed, or diſcovered.'

In order to judge of this matter, it ſhould be obſerved that logos [word,] in the Greek language has two ſenſes; reaſon, or thought, and ſpeech. They therefore ſometimes ſpeak of λογος ενδιαθετος, inward, or internal logos, or word, that is, thought; and λογος προφορικος, outward, or declared logos or word, that is ſpeech. With regard to God, therefore, the Word is either the reaſon, thought, wiſdom, counſel, power of God within himſelf; or his reaſon, wiſdom, power, diſplayed and manifeſted; or, in other words, the command, the will of God, active and effective. Beauſobre, ſpeaking of this matter, and particularly of the ſentiment of the Sabellians concerning the Word, expreſſeth himſelf thus: 'The * Word never proceeds out of the Father but as our 'reaſon proceeds, as I may ſay, out of us, when it makes known 'by words and commands what are our thoughts and our de-'ſires. So the Word, which was in Jeſus Chriſt, is only a decla-'rative Word, which manifeſted to Jeſus the knowledge of ſal-'vation, and an operative Word, which conferred upon him 'miraculous power. It is only an operation of the Deity, a full 'effuſion of the divine wiſdom and power in the ſoul of our 'Lord.' So that learned writer.

Perhaps ſome may be of opinion that ſome ancient Chriſtians by λογος προφορικος, outward word, when applied to our Saviour, endeavoured to expreſs and explain *God was manifeſted in the fleſh*; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Compare John i. 14. xvi. 28. Prov. viii. 25. Iſ. lv. 11.

Epiphanius intimates, that the Sabellians embraced that which was their peculiar opinion out of a dread of polytheiſm: for, as he [x] ſays, when they met with other Chriſtians, eſpecially ſuch as were unlearned, they would put this ſhrewd queſtion to them; 'Well, good friends, what is our doctrine? Have we one god, 'or three gods?'

Philaſter [y] calls Sabellius a diſciple of Noetus: but poſſibly he meaneth no more than that, as to his doctrine, he agreed with or followed Noetus, who was more ancient. But I ſhall not ſtay

* Le verbe ne ſort jamais du Pere que comme notre raiſon ſort, pour ainſi dire, hors de nous, lorſqu' elle fait connoître, par des paroles et par des commandemens, quelles ſont nos penſées et nos volentez. Ainſi le Verbe, qui a été en J. Chriſt, n eſt qu' un Verbe declaratif, qui a manifeſté à Jeſus la ſcience du ſalut, et un Verbe operatif, qui lui a conferé une puiſſance miraculeuſe. . . . Ce n' eſt qu' une operation de la Divinité, une pleine effuſion de la ſageſſe et de la vertue divine dans l' ame du Seigneur. Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. P. ii. l. 3. ch. 6. n. ix.

[x] . . την πιστιν αυτοις υφηγηνται ταυτην· τι αν ειπωμεν, ο αγαθοι ειμα θεον εχομεν, η τρεις θεους. Epiph. Har. 62. n. ii. p. 514. B.

[y] Phil. H. 54.

to

to tranſcribe him here, nor [z] Auguſtine, at large. The reader may remember that I ſome time ago quoted ** Auguſtine's article of the Sabellians in his book of Hereſies.

St. Ambroſe ſays, in ſhort, 'that *,* the error of Sabellius 'lay in confounding the Father and the Word.'

St. Baſil repreſents Sabellius and the Sabellians as teaching 'the || Father, Son, and Spirit, to be three perſons in one hy-'poſtaſis,' or ſubſiſtence. To †* the like purpoſe Iſidore of Peluſium.

If the author of the Conference between Zachæus and Apollonius may be relied upon, the †† Sabellians ſaid, that by the Holy Ghoſt in the New Teſtament ought not to be underſtood a perſon, but a gift; being ſpoken of as given and received. They argued particularly, as he ſays, from John xx. 22, and Acts xix. 2.

Sabellianiſm muſt have been very agreeable to the apprehenſions of many people. Euſebius [a] ſpeaks of it's increaſing very much in Egypt, when Dionyſius of Alexandria oppoſed it. According to Athanaſius, the occaſion of Dionyſius's writing upon that head was, 'that [b] ſome biſhops of Africa followed the doc-'trine of Sabellius, and they prevailed to ſuch a degree, that the 'Son of God was ſcarce any longer preached in the churches.' Perhaps this paſſage may give ſome ground to think that Sabellius himſelf was a biſhop, though none of the authors I have quoted or referred to expreſsly ſay any ſuch thing. Iſidore, before cited, ſays, that [c] Sabellianiſm ſpread to a great degree. Epiphanius, in 375, ſays there [d] were then many of that opinion in Meſopotamia and at Rome. Tillemont [e] concludes that theſe people had a body of communion in 381, becauſe the council of Conſtantinople [f] rejects their baptiſm. The frequent

[z] Aug. de Hær. c. 41. ** See p. 11.

, Neque, ut Sabellius, Patrem confundamus et Verbum; ut eundem Patrem adferamus et Filium. Ambr. de Fide. l. 1. c. 1. T. ii. p. 445. A. Bened.

|| Ου γαρ εν πραγμα πολυπροσωπον λεγων πατερα και υιον και αγιον πνευμα, και μιαν των τριων την υποστασιν εκτιθεμενος. κ. λ. Baſ. Ep. 210. al. 64. p. 315. A.

†* την προσκυνητην και μακαριαν τριαδα μιαν τινα τριπροσωπον υποστασιν εξελληνισεν. Iſid. l. 1. Ep. 247. †† Credo teneas in præcedente titulo prænotatum, a Sabellianis præcipue Sanctum Spiritum denegari, et donum potius quam donatorem impiorum traditionibus dici; malique hujus auctoritatem ſacris vel maxime teſtimoniis uſurpari, quia et dari legatur et accipi, Salvatore ad apoſtolos ſic loquente: et inſufflans eis dixit; accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Quidam etiam diſcipulorum a Paulo interrogati, An acceperitis Spiritum Sanctum? neque accepiſſe, nec ſi eſſet ſcire ſe, dixerunt. Conſulta. Zach. et Apoll. l. 2. cap. 14. in. ap. Acherii Spicileg. T. x. p. 81. qto.

[a] Euſ. l. 7. c. 6. [b] ... τινες των επισκοπων εφρωνησαν τα Σαβελλιου· και τοσουτοι ισχυσαν ταις επινοιαις, ως ολιγου δειν μηκετι εν ταις εκκλησιαις κηρυττεσθαι τον υιον του Θεου. De Sent. Dionyſ. p. 246. D. [c] η Σαβελλιου κακοηθεια, εκ Λιβυης ατοφασα, εις πολλους δε χωρησασα. Iſid. l. 1. Ep. 247. [d] Πολλοι δε ειν τη Μεση των ποταμων, και εστι τα μερη της Ρωμης τα αυτα δογματα υπαρχουσιν. Hær. 62. p. 513. B. [e] Les Sabelliens. p. 535. [f] Can. vii. Labb. T. ii. p 951.

notice

notice which †† Auguſtine takes of Sabellians, in his tracts and ſermons to the people, is an argument that in his time there was ſome conſiderable number of perſons who maintained this opinion.

Of the ſcriptures received by Sabellius, and others of his ſentiments, we have the following informations. Epiphanius expreſsly ſays, that [g] they uſed all the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament; and that there were ſome texts which they principally inſiſted on for the ſupport of their doctrine. Nevertheleſs he afterwards adds, that [h] their whole error, and all the ſtrength of it, is taken from ſome apocryphal writings, eſpecially from the goſpel according to the Egyptians. Moreover Epiphanius argues againſt them from many books of the New Teſtament, particularly [i] from the Acts of the Apoſtles, (ch. i. and vii.) and complains of them, not that they rejected ſcripture, but that [k] they did not underſtand the meaning of the ſcriptures†.

Theodoret's account of Sabellius is, 'that [l] he taught the 'Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be one hypoſtaſis, '[ſubſiſtence,] and one perſon with three names; that he ſpeaks 'of the ſame ſometimes as Father, ſometimes as Son, and ſome-'times as Holy Ghoſt; and ſays, that in the Old Teſtament he 'delivered the law as Father, and in the New dwelt among men, '[or was incarnate] as the Son, and deſcended on the apoſtles 'as the Holy Spirit.' This paſſage confirms what Epiphanius ſaid, that Sabellius received all the ſcriptures.

It appears likewiſe from the arguments of [m] Athanaſius, and others, that the Sabellians received the holy ſcriptures as other Chriſtians did.

I was obliged juſt now (H) to give a hint of the time of Sabellianiſm. I would here add [n] in the margin the ſentiments of divers learned men upon that point.

†† I quoted ſome ſuch paſſages from Auguſtine in Ch. XLI. p. 11. note z. They who are deſirous of ſeeing more may conſult the Index to T. iii. P. ii. and T. V. Ed. Bened. V. Sabelliani. [g] Κεχρηνται δε ταις πασαις γραφαις παλαιας τε και καινης διαθηκης. κ. λ. ib. p. 513. D.

[h] την δε πασαν αυτων πλανην, και την της πλανης αυτων δυναμιν εχουσιν εξ αποκρυφων τινων, μαλιστα απο τε καλουμενε Αιγυπτιε Ευαγγελιε, ω τινες το οικειον επεθεντο τετο. ib. p. 514. A. [i] p. 518. A. [k] μη νοησας την φωνην των αγιων γραφων. ib. B.

† Non exſtet evangelium Johannis, ne Sabellius diſcat: *Ego et Pater unum ſumus.* Joh. x. 30. Hilar. De Synod. n. lxxxv. p. 1199. A. [l] μιαν υποστασιν εφησιν ειναι τον πατερα και τον υιον, και το αγιον πνευμα, και εν τριωνυμον προσωπον· και τον αυτον, ποτε μεν ως πατερα καλει, ποτε δε ως υιον, ποτε δε ως αγιον πνευμα· και εν μεν τη παλαια, ως πατερα νομοθετησαι, εν δε τη καινη, ως υιον ενανθρωπησαι, ως πνευμα δε αγιον τοις αποστολοις επιφοιτησαι. Theodoret. H. Fab. l. 2. cap. 9. [m] Vid. Athan. de Sent. Dionyſ. p. 261, 262. et Or. iv. contr. Arian. p. 636. E. F. 637. T. i. Bened.

(H) See p. 72. [n] Sed Libycus [Sabellius] ab illo Pentapolitano neutiquam diverſus eſt, qui hæreſim præceptoris ſui

VIII. Before

VIII. Before Dionyſius died there aroſe another diſpute of a like nature about the doctrine of the trinity. The principal perſon concerned herein was Paul of Samoſata, who had been biſhop of Antioch from [o] about the year 260. We have already had divers references to this affair. I think it may now be proper to take Euſebius's account of it pretty much at length.

Says our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, 'Xyſtus, [p] biſhop of the 'church of Rome, was ſucceeded by Dionyſius of the ſame name 'with the biſhop of Alexandria. About the ſame time Deme-'trian (1), biſhop of Antioch, dying, Paul of Samoſata ſucceeded 'him in the epiſcopate of that city. He [q] having a low and ab-'ject opinion of Chriſt, contrary to the doctrine of the church, 'as if he had been no more than a man, a ſynod was appointed. 'Dionyſius, biſhop of Alexandria, when invited, excuſed his 'coming thither on account of his age and bodily infirmity: 'however, he ſent a letter containing his opinion upon the point 'in queſtion. The reſt of the paſtors of the churches from all 'parts haſtened to Antioch, and were convened there as againſt 'a deſtroyer of the flock of Chriſt. The [r] moſt eminent of 'which were Firmilian, biſhop of the church of Cæſarea in Cap-'padocia; Gregory and Athenodorus, brothers, paſtors of the 'churches in Pontus: and, beſide theſe, Helenus, biſhop of the 'church in Tarſus; and Nicomas, of Iconium; Hymenæus, bi-'ſhop of the church at Jeruſalem; Theotecnus, biſhop of Cæ-'ſarea in the ſame country; Maximus, who with great reputa-'tion preſided over the brethren at Boſtra; with many others, 'beſide preſbyters and deacons. Theſe had divers meetings, 'and in every aſſembly there were many queſtions and diſputes: 'Paul of Samoſata on the one hand endeavouring to conceal his 'heterodox notion, they on the other hand ſtriving to detect and 'expoſe his hereſy and blaſphemy againſt Chriſt. In the mean 'time Dionyſius dies, in the twelfth year of the reign of Gal-'lienus, having been biſhop of Alexandria ſeventeen years. His 'ſucceſſor was Maximus. Gallienus, having reigned fifteen 'years, was ſucceeded by Claudius: he having been emperor

Noeti diſſeminare latius cœpit A. C. 257, ut notarunt Benedictini notis ad S. Ambroſium T. ii. p. 445. [circiter annum 257.] Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii. p. 33. ſeq. et Rev. Chriſtianus Wormius in Hiſtoria Sabellianiſmi edita Francof. 1698, capite 3. Idem de Marcello Ancyrano videndus, capite 5. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 25. Tom viii. p. 335. Conf. Philaſtr. de Har. n. liv. p. 108. not. [a] Ed. Fabric.

[o] Vid. Pagi 261. num. vi. H. E. l. 7. cap. 27.

[p] Euſ. (1) Demetrian had ſucceeded Fabius in 252, and was ſucceeded by Paul in 260. Vid. Pagi 261. n. vi. Baſnag. 264. n. iii.

[q] τετε δε ταπεινα και χαμαιπετη περι τε χριτε παρα την εκκλησιαστικην διδασκαλιαν φρονησαντος, ως κοινε την φυσιν ανθρωπε γενομενε. ib. p. 277. C.

[r] ib. cap. 28.

'two

'two years, was succeeded by Aurelian. In [s] his time the last 'synod was convened, consisting of a very great number of bi-'shops.' In this synod, as Eusebius proceeds to relate, Paul was evidently convicted of the heresy laid to his charge, and was excommunicated from the whole catholic church under heaven. The chief author of the conviction and condemnation of Paul was Malchion, presbyter in the church at Antioch. 'The 'pastors of the churches, then assembled together, with one 'consent wrote an epistle to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, and 'Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, which was also sent to the 'churches all over the provinces.' In this epistle, written in the name of Helenus, and [u] the other bishops, and of the presbyters and deacons and the churches of God, an [w] account is given of their own labour and pains, of the perverse and obstinate heresy of Paul, their convictions of Paul, and conferences with him, and of his life and morals. Here the fathers of this council say 'they had sent to many bishops of the remotest provinces to 'come to their assistance upon this occasion; particularly to 'Dionysius of Alexandria, and Firmilian of Cappadocia, men 'of blessed memory: that the former had sent a letter to An-'tioch, but did not so much as vouchsafe a salutation to the au-'thor of that heresy: nor did he write to him by name, but to 'the whole church [of Antioch]; of which letter we here sub-'join a copy.' Firmilian, they say, had been twice at Antioch; and condemned, as they are well assured, Paul's novel doctrine. 'But, [x] believing and hoping the matter might be determined 'without bringing any reproach upon the Christian religion, he 'deferred the sentence, being deceived,' as they say, 'by him 'who had denied his God and Lord: and he was willing to come 'once more to Antioch; but when he was got as far as Tarsus 'he there died.' The [y] council then proceeds, blackening Paul's character, charging him with pride, avarice, exaction, an exorbitant love of praise and applause from all sorts of people. They say 'that [z] he accepted secular dignities, and chose rather to be 'considered as a judge [or officer of the revenue] than a bi-'shop. He has been used to walk through the high streets, re-

[s] Cap. 29. [t] Cap. 30. [u] ... και οι λοιποι παντες οι συν ημιν πασοικουντες τας εγγυς πολεις εθνη επισκοποι και πρεσβυτεροι και διακονοι, και αι εκκλησιαι του Θεου, αγαπητοις αδελφοις εν κυριω χαιρειν. p. 279. C. [w] την αυτων σπουδην τοις πασι φανεραν καθιστανται, και του Παυλου την διαστροφην επεροδοξεσαν, ελεγχους τε και ερωτησεις ας προς αυτον αιακεκινηκασι, και ετι τον παντα βιον τε και προ-σων. ibid. p. 279. B. [x] επαγγειλαμενου δε μεταθησεσθαι, πιστευσας και ελπισας ανευ τινος περι του λογου της αδοξιας το πραγμα εις δεον καταστησεσθαι απεβαλετο. κ. λ. ib. p. 280. A. [y] ib. p. 280. B. C. D. 281, 282. A. B. [z] κοσμικα αξιωματα υποδυομενος, και δικαστης μαλλον η επισκοπος θελων καλεισθαι. p. 280. C.

'ceiving

'ceiving letters, and dictating anſwers as he went along, at-
'tended by a great number of people as his guards, ſome go-
'ing before, others following him. It is not neceſſary,' they ſay,
'to inſiſt on his vain-glorious behaviour in the eccleſiaſtical aſ-
'ſemblies, where he affects all imaginary pomp proper to amaze
'and aſtoniſh weak ignorant people: for he has erected to
'himſelf a tribunal and lofty throne, not like a diſciple of
'Chriſt, but after the manner of civil magiſtrates, with a cloſet,
'as he calls it. It has been uſual for him alſo to clap his hand
'upon his thigh, and ſtamp with his feet. And †† if there are
'any who do not applaud him, nor, as it is cuſtomary in the
'theatre, ſhake their handkerchiefs, nor make loud acclama-
'tions, nor leap up and down as ſome of his creatures do, but [a]
'hear with a compoſed attention and reverence, as becometh the
'houſe of God, he reproveth and abuſeth them.' Afterwards they inſinuate, that from views of intereſt he neglected to keep up a ſtrict diſcipline among his clergy. 'What [b] ſhall we ſay

†† An exceſſive fondneſs for praiſe and commendation is far from being juſtifiable in any man. But, if Paul's whole fault conſiſted only in receiving and encouraging applauſes and acclamations, when he ſpoke in public, the fathers of the council may be reckoned to have aggravated to a great degree; for it is certain that theſe things were common in church aſſemblies in the fourth and fifth, and following centuries. The paſſages of authors relating to this matter are too numerous to be inſerted or referred to in this place. It has been obſerved by ſome learned moderns, that Chryſoſtom, a man of a ſevere temper, reproved and checked thoſe acclamations, but that Auguſtine received them very willingly. Ac videtur admirandæ ſanctitatis vir B. Auguſtinus eum morem tuliſſe non invitus, atque adeo non improbaſſe: quod ex libro iv. de Doctrina Chriſtiana, cap. 26. aliiſque locis licet intelligere. Non ita Joannes Chryſoſtymus: qui vir divinus, ut erat auſteriore ingenio, morem hoc ſeculorum improbavit damnavitque. H. Caſaub. Not. in Vulcat. Gallicani Avid. Caſſ. cap. 13. p. 467. Conf. Ferrar. lib. v. cap. 2. There is ſcarce any kind of acclamation or applauſe here mentioned by this council but was in uſe in Chryſoſtom's time. The people applauded his ſermons by making their looſe garments, moving their plumes, waving their handkerchiefs. Vid. Ferrar. l. v. c. 9. Jerom reminds Vigilantius that, when he preached upon the reſurrection, Vigilantius himſelf had applauded him with hands and feet, leaping up and down, and crying out orthodox. Recordare quæſo illius diei, quando me de reſurrectione et veritate corporis prædicante, ex latere ſubſaltabas, et plaudebas manu et applodebas pedem, et orthodoxum conclamabas. Ad Vigilant. Ep. 36. al. 75. p. 277. m. In another place Jerom ſpeaks of his being preſent at a ſermon where the people applauded a certain interpretation of a text by ſtamping with the feet: Scio me audiſſe quemdam de hoc loco in eccleſia diſputantem, . . . certe tunc in populo dicta placuerunt, et quodam plauſu ac tripudio ſunt excepta. In Ep. ad Eph. cap. 5. 14. It appears from Auguſtine that the acclamations of the people were very cuſtomary in Africa: Unde autem crebro et multum acclamatur ita dicentibus, &c. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. l. 4. c. 26. How can it then be thought ſtrange by any, that this practice ſhould prevail in the Eaſt, where it had it's original? Concerning the acclamations of the ancients, may be ſeen, beſide others, Fr. Ferrarius de Veterum Acclam. et Plauſu; Suicer. Theſ. V. Κρότος; J. Bingham Antiquities of the Chriſtian Church, B. xiv. ch. 4. § xxvii. Caſaub. ut ſupra; Neocori Bibl. Librorum Novorum. p. 18, &c. A. D. 1697.

[a] τοις δ' εν ως εν οικω Θεου σεμνοπρεπως, και ευτακτως ακουουσι, επιτιμων και πυκτιζων. p. 281. A. [b] τας σειεισακτους αυτου γυναικας, ως αντιοχεις ορχαζουσι, κ. λ. ib. C.

'of his **** ſubintroduced women, as the Antiochians call them, 'and of thoſe belonging to his preſbyters and deacons? with re- 'gard to whom he conceals and tolerates this, and many other 'crimes, which he knows very well, and of which he has con- 'victed them, that he may keep them in dependence; and that, 'ſtanding in fear of him on their own account, they may not 'dare to bring accuſations againſt him for his unrighteous ac- 'tions: moreover, he has enriched them; for which reaſon 'he is beloved and admired by men of covetous and worldly 'diſpoſitions. But why do we write theſe things? We are per- 'ſuaded, brethren, that a biſhop and all the clergy are bound to 'give the people an example of all good works. And we are 'not ignorant, that by introducing women ſome have fallen into 'ſin, and others have been ſuſpected. Although [c] therefore 'it ſhould be granted, that he has done nothing contrary to mo- 'deſty, yet the very ſuſpicion that ariſes from ſuch a practice 'ought to be guarded againſt, for fear of giving offence or a 'bad example to any. For how can he reprove another, or ad- 'moniſh another not to [d] converſe frequently with a woman, and 'to *take heed leſt he ſlip*, as [e] it is written; who, though he has 'ſent away one, ſtill has two in his houſe that are handſome 'and in the flower of their age; whom he likewiſe carries about 'with him wherever he goes; at the ſame time living well, and 'indulging himſelf in a plentiful diet?' At [a] the cloſe of the epiſtle they ſay; 'Having therefore excommunicated this contu- 'macious enemy of God, we have been obliged to ordain another

*** According to this account, Paul's conduct was not exemplary, ſcarce reputable; but yet I am apt to think it was not criminal. The women here ſpoken of were not wives, nor concubines, but perſons maintained as objects of charity, or elſe for the ſake of domeſtic affairs. The thing was diſliked by many, but nevertheleſs it was practiſed by ſome virtuous eccleſiaſtics. Vid. Epiphan. Hær. 63. n. ii. Cyprian. ad Pompon. Ep. 62. al. 4. It ſeems that Paul was not the firſt perſon who begun this practice at Antioch. This may be argued from the name by which the Antiochians called ſuch women, which appears to have been then common and well known. And as much might be argued from ſome other conſiderations. That Paul was innocent, or free from crime, is probable, in that the fathers of the council do not charge him directly with unchaſtity or immodeſty; which they would not have failed to do if there had been any ground for it, as we may be aſſured from the temper of the compoſer or compoſers of this Synodical epiſtle: and I think that Paul's open way of acting, without any reſerve, muſt be of great uſe to prevent ſuſpicion, or to remove it if it ſhould ariſe in the mind of any one. The third canon of the council of Nice in 325 is to this purpoſe: 'That no biſhop, or preſbyter, or deacon, 'or any other of the clergy, ſhould have 'an introduced woman, unleſs ſhe be a 'mother, or ſiſter, or aunt, or however a 'perſon liable to no ſuſpicion.' Vid. Moſhem. de Reb. Chriſtian. p. 703, 704.

[c] ὡς εἰ καὶ δοίη τις τὸ μηδὲν ἀσελγὲς πεπρᾶχθαι. p. 281. D. [d] . . . μὴ συγκαταβαίνειν ἐπιπλέον εἰς ταυτὸν γυναικὶ· μὴ ὀλισθήσῃ φιλαττόμενος, ὡς γέγραπται. p. 282. A.

[e] Valeſius thinks the council intends ſomewhat in the xxvth chapter of the book of Eccleſiaſticus: but it does not clearly appear to me what text is here referred to. Intelligit locum qui habetur in cap. 25. Eccleſiaſtici. Valeſ. in Euſeb. p. 157. n.

[a] p. 282. B. C.

'biſhop

'bishop in his stead in the catholic church, and, as we are per-
'suaded, not without the providence of God. The person we
'have ordained is son of Demetrian, of blessed memory, who
'formerly presided so well in this see, by name Domnus, a man
'endowed with all the accomplishments requisite in a bishop.
'To him therefore you are to write. Paul, having fallen from
'the faith and the episcopate,' as Eusebius adds, 'Domnus took
'upon him the care of the church of Antioch. But when [b]
'Paul refused to leave the house of the church, a petition hav-
'ing been presented to the emperor Aurelian, he rightly de-
'termined the matter, giving orders that the house should be
'delivered to them, to whom the bishops of the Christian reli-
'gion in Italy and at Rome should write. Thus the foremen-
'tioned person, with the greatest disgrace, was thrust out of the
'church by the secular power.'

So writes Eusebius. There were therefore [c] at least two councils at Antioch upon this occasion; one, at which Firmilian was present, when Dionysius likewise was living, and sent a letter, supposed to have been convened in 264; another, and the last, when Paul was excommunicated, computed to have been held [d] near the end of 269, and beginning of 270. Eusebius indeed seems to say, that the last council was held in the time of Aurelian, who did not [e] begin his reign before November 270; whereas [f] this council most probably was begun and ended in the time of Claudius. For the synodical epistle is sent to Dionysius of Rome, who died in December 269, and must therefore have been drawn up before the news of his death arrived at Antioch. But Paul, though excommunicated by the council in 269 or 270, could not be removed till 272 or 273, after [g] Aurelian be-

[b] Ἀλλα γαρ μηδαμως εχεσθαι τε Παυλε τε της εκκλησιας οικε βελοιτο, βασιλεις επιτιχθεις Αυρηλιανος, αισιωτατα περι τε πραγματος διελυσε, τουτοις κελευσας περισαττειν τον οικον, οις αν οι κατα την Ιταλιαν και την Ρωμαιων πολιν επισκοποι τε δογματος επιστελλοιεν. Ουτω δητα ο προειρημενος ανηρ μετα της ισχατης αισχυνης, υπο της κοσμικης κρατησεως εξωθειται της εκκλησιας. ib. p. 282. D.

[c] Ainsi il faut admettre trois conciles au moins sur cette affaire, celui qui la commença à la fin de l'an 264. Un second, dont on ignore le tems; et le dernier, qui la termina à la fin de 269, ou fort peu après. Tillem. Paul de Samosates Art. iv. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 624. Conf. Basn. A. 264. n. vi. [d] Secunda Synodus Antiochena adversus Paulum Samosatenum celebrata est autumno anni ducentesimi sexagesimi noni, sequentique continuata; quod colligitur ex epistola Synodica, quam episcopi ad Dionysium Romanum pontificem scripsere. Dionysius autem, ut mox videbimus, die vicesima octava Decembris illius anni ad Deum migravit. Quare hæc Synodus ad eum annum retrahenda. Pagi Crit. in Bar. A. 271. ii. Conf. Tillemont. Paul. de Sam. p. 625, 626. [e] Vid. Pagi 270. n. iii. [f] Hactenus creditum fuit, Synodum hanc, Aureliano imperante, habitam fuisse; nisi quod Valesius in notis Eusebianis eam partim sub Claudio, partim sub Aureliano celebratam autumavit. Sed principatus Aureliani initio tempori suo reddito constat, illam Claudio imperante inchoatam et finitam, &c. Pagi 271. n. iii. vid. Till. ib. 625, 626. [g] Sed Paulus anno tantum 273, quo Zenobia ab Aureli-

came maſter of that country, upon the conqueſt of Zenobia. For Paul, as [h] is ſaid, was favoured by Zenobia, and would not yield the houſe of the church, meaning either the biſhop's dwelling-houſe, or the houſe in which the Chriſtians held their aſſemblies, till compelled by the authority of Aurelian. And [i] perhaps Euſebius ought to be underſtood to mean as much; that when the council had been held under Claudius, it's reſult had not it's full effect till the reign of Aurelian, when Paul was actually thruſt out of the church.

It may be beſt for us, in the next place, to take Theodoret's account of this matter, but briefly. He ſays, 'Paul [k] of Samoſata was biſhop of the church of Antioch. At that time Zenobia reigned.... He went into the hereſy of Artemon, [l] in complaiſance (κ) to her who followed Jewiſh notions.' Then, having mentioned the names of the principal biſhops preſent at the firſt council, he adds; 'And at firſt they endeavoured by entreaties to induce Paul to renounce his falſe doctrine. But when he openly denied that he held any ſuch opinion, and affirmed that he adhered to the apoſtolical doctrines; praiſing God for the common agreement, they returned to their ſeveral flocks. But when ſome time had paſſed, fame again publiſhed every where Paul's perverſion. Nevertheleſs, even then, thoſe excellent men did not immediately proceed to his exciſion; but firſt of all endeavoured to remedy the evil by letters. But when they ſaw the caſe to be deſperate, they readily came again to Antioch; applying, however, ſtill healing medicines, exhorting and admoniſhing the man, and reminding him of former promiſes and agreements. At length, he denying, and the accuſers being poſitive, and engaging to make good their charge, they convened in council. Here Malachion, formerly a ſophiſt, now honoured to be a preſbyter, diſputing with Paul, he [m] was convicted of ſaying that Chriſt was a man eminently favoured with the divine grace. Then they unanimouſly pronounced ſentence, ſtriking him out of the ſacred regiſters. But when he refuſed to yield, and retained the government of the church; informing Aurelian, who then reigned, of Paul's

ano capta, ab eccleſia penitus exturbatus; non vero eodem anno, ut videtur exiſtimaſſe Baronius. Pagi ib. n. iv.

[h] Ἰουδαια ἡν Ζηνοβια, και Παυλῳ προσκειτο Σαμοσατεις. Athan. Hiſt. Arian. n. 71. p. 386. D. Bened. [i] Vid. Pagi 271. n. iii. iv. Conf. Tillem. ibid. note iv. ſur Paul de Sam. p. 897. [k] Theodoret. H. Fab. L. 2. cap. 8. [l] εις αιτιαν αιρεσιν, ταυτῃ νομιζων θεραπευειν ἑκεινην τα ἰουδαικα φρονουσαν. ib. init. (κ) St. Chryſoſtom ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. ἁτινα και τουτον γυναικι τινι χαριζομενον, την σωτηριαν φασι αποδοσθαι ἑαυτῳ. Chryſ. in Joh. Hom. vii. p. 57. A. [m] ἐφωραθη, τον Χριστον ἀνθρωπον λεγων θεια; χαριτος διαφεροντως ἠξιωμενον. ib. p. 223. B.

obſtinacy

'obſtinacy, they petitioned him to expel him the church. And 'even an idolater judged it fit, that a man who refuſed to ſubmit 'to the determination of thoſe who were of the ſame religion 'ſhould be ſeparated from their communion.'

Thus ended that affair; in which Firmilian was ſhy of pronouncing any ſentence, fearing ſome bad conſequences of it, and that thereby a reproach might be brought upon the Chriſtian church: and, in all probability, it muſt have made a great noiſe in the world at that time. But the preſbyter Malchion having been diſobliged, as it ſeems, could not be ſatisfied, till his biſhop was removed. I do not juſtify Paul in withſtanding the decree of the council: ſo far as I am able to judge, he ought to have yielded, for peace ſake, and ſhould have ſubmitted to the determination of the majority; eſpecially if the majority of his own people, the church of Antioch, concurred with the ſynod; which, however, I think is not certain. Nor do I abſolutely blame †† the biſhops of that time, who applied to a heathen emperor to expel one of their brethren out of the church, provided they freely allowed Paul and his followers to worſhip God, according to the beſt of their knowledge, in ſeparate aſſemblies, as perhaps they did. Much leſs would I take upon me to judge of the reaſons or policy of his imperial majeſty's determination. But for the vaſt diſgrace of being thruſt out of the church by the ſecular power, I ſhould think the juſtneſs of that remark of our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian may be diſputed. If Aurelian condemned Paul, Zenobia favoured him; and her protection may be reckoned no ſmall honour, if ſhe was ſo excellent a princeſs as fame proclaims her. A learned writer, who ſtyles himſelf Phileleutherus Dublinienſis, has lately given Zenobia this ſhort character: 'That [n] ſhe was the greateſt woman of her own, or 'perhaps of any other age.' To the many other things that have been ſaid in her commendation, it may be added, that ſhe was no perſecutor. Du Pin [o] ſays; 'Of all the councils held in the 'firſt three ages, the moſt famous are the two councils of An-'tioch, aſſembled againſt Paul of Samoſata, biſhop of that city.' They muſt have been both held under Odenatus or Zenobia; the laſt undoubtedly in her time. And the numerous biſhops, and other clergy, and all other Chriſtian people, belonging to that

†† Biſhops of that time, &c.] It does not certainly appear who thoſe biſhops were. They could not be the biſhops aſſembled in council, by whom Paul was deprived; for their Synodical Epiſtle was drawn up in 269, or the beginning of 270, ſoon after which the council broke up. But this application to Aurelian could not be made till 272 or 273.

[n] See Reflections upon Polygamy; by Phileleuth Dublin. London: 1737. p. $\frac{156}{160}$.

[o] Nouv. Bib. T. i. p. 213.

council, had come to Antioch, and returned without hindrance or moleſtation. They likewiſe iſſued out their Synodical Epiſtle, and ſent it abroad all over the provinces without control or oppoſition: for we have received no complaints of any obſtruction whatever; no, though a ſentence too had been pronounced againſt that princeſs's favourite divine. It is true, we do not know that ſhe ratified that ſentence; nor did ſhe compel Paul to leave the houſe of the church. What were her reaſons I cannot ſay: perhaps, being in the main of the ſame opinion with Paul, and being likewiſe a woman of ſolid virtue, ſhe could not in conſcience join with his adverſaries. Poſſibly ſhe was not ſatisfied that the fathers of the council had any proper authority out of their own dioceſes; or there might be danger of diſobliging a large part of her ſubjects, and ſhe might be apprehenſive of creating diviſions among her own people: nay, ſhe might not be fully convinced of her right to interpoſe in ſuch eccleſiaſtical affairs. That theſe were the reaſons of her conduct I do not affirm; but I make no queſtion that her majeſty was governed by reaſons and conſiderations of no ſmall importance.

After all, human judgments, unleſs impartial, and well informed of the point in debate, are of little value. And if Paul had been reſpected by Zenobia, he could look for no favour from Aurelian, let his merit be ever ſo diſtinguiſhed, and his cauſe ever ſo juſt. There are, I ſuppoſe, few Chriſtians but regret Aurelian's putting to death that incomparable critic Longinus; though it ought to be remembered, that [p] he died ſo nobly as to comfort thoſe who lamented his calamity. Nor does Euſebius vindicate all Aurelian's reſolutions; but, preſently afterwards, when that emperor's favourable diſpoſitions toward the Chriſtians were altered, and he was preparing his edicts to be publiſhed againſt them, Euſebius plainly ſays, that [q] 'divine 'vengeance laid hold of him.'

Euſebius informs us, that upon this occaſion were aſſembled [r] very many biſhops: St. Athanaſius [s] ſays, they were ſeventy in number; St. Hilary, [t] eighty. Some later writers may mention a larger number: but it may be ſuppoſed that [u] Athanaſius, from whom Hilary differs very little, is as much to be depended on as any one. Perhaps they were between ſeventy and eighty.

One thing principally to be obſerved, as concerning the perſon whoſe hiſtory we are writing, is Dionyſius's letter, containing

[p] . . . ουτω γενναιως ηνεγκεν ο Λογγινος, ωστε και συμπαθησαντας επι τω παθει παραμυθησασθαι. Zoſim. l. i. p. 659. v. 21, 22.
[q] l. vii. cap. 30. p. 283. A.
[r] πλειστων εσων επισκοπων. ib. c. 29.
[s] Athan. de Syn. p. 757. E. F.
[t] Hilar. de Syn. p. 1200. B. ed Bened.
[u] Vid. Benedictin. Not. in loc. Athanaſii.

his

his opinion upon the queſtion, and ſent by him at the time of the firſt council. It is mentioned, as we have ſeen, by Euſebius, and by the fathers aſſembled in the laſt council; and it was ſubjoined by them to their Synodical Epiſtle. It is alſo taken notice of by St. Jerom, who [w] ſays it was written by Dionyſius a few days before his death. He likewiſe calls it an excellent epiſtle. Whether it be ſtill extant will be conſidered hereafter.

In the fragments of the Synodical Epiſtle itſelf, preſerved in Euſebius, and undoubtedly genuine, out of which I have already made large extracts, the fathers of the laſt council ſay, 'that [x] 'Paul had departed from the canon, or [y] rule (L) of faith.' They preſently afterwards charge him with [z] eſteeming *gain to be godlineſs*; referring to 1 Tim. vi. 5. But I need not ſtay to inſiſt upon ſuch references, or alluſions to ſcripture.

Beſide thoſe fragments in Euſebius juſt mentioned, we have an [a] epiſtle written to Paul of Samoſata in the name of Hymenæus, Theophilus, Theoteenus, Maximus, Proclus, and Boianus. Baronius has inſerted this epiſtle entire into his [b] Annals: and [c] Tillemont ſays, he does not know that the genuineneſs of it is conteſted by any one; but whereas Baronius aſcribes it to the firſt ſynod, he thinks it more probable, with [d] Valeſius, that it was written by the laſt council, at the beginning of their aſſembling, before Malchion had fully convicted Paul. Of this opinion too is [e] Pagi. But [f] Baſnage thinks that, if it be genuine, it was written ſome time between the firſt and laſt council. However he denies it to be genuine, and alleges divers [g] arguments, which I refer to the reader's conſideration. Du Pin [h] likewiſe declares it to be his opinion that this letter is ſuppoſititious.

I only obſerve therefore briefly, that in this epiſtle are cited many texts of ſcripture, both of the Old and New Teſtament, particularly [i] Luke i. 2. And [k] *the doctrine of the apoſtles, the law and the prophets, the Old and New Teſtament,* are more than once

[w] Sed et adverſus Paulum Samoſatenum, ante paucos dies quam moreretur, inſignis ejus fertur epiſtola: De V. I. cap. 69. fin. [x] αποστας του κανονος. . . . H. E. l. 7. c. 30. p. 280. B. [y] Vid. Valeſ. Annot. p. 156. (L) Compare ch. 12. Dionyſius of Corinth, Vol. II. chap. 12. [z] p. 280. C. [a] Vid. Concil. ap. Labb. T. i. p. 844, &c. [b] A. 266. n. iv. &c. [c] As before, art. 2. p. 627. [d] Ann. in Euſ. p. 157. C, D. [e] A. 265. n. iii. [f] A. 264. n. vi. [g] ib. n. vii. [h] Bibl. T. i. p. 214. Amſt. [i] Και εχομεν παραδεδωκοτας, και τηρουντας τον της καθολικης και αγιας εκκλησιας μεχρι της σημερον ημερας εκ διαδοχης υπο των μακαριων αποστολων, οι και αυτοπται και υπηρεται γεγοιασι του λογου, καταγγελλομενην εκ νομου και προφητων, και της καινης διαθηκης, ταυτα εκθεσθαι. Epiſt. miſs. ad Paul. Sam. ap. Labb. Conc. T. i. p. 848. E. [k] ει τι παλαια και νεα διαθηκη εγινωσκοτες ουκ ολιγωμεν και νηφυσσομεν. ib. p. 845. A. Vid. etiam ſupra not. [i].

mentioned as the rule of judging concerning the controverted queſtion.

Here ſome notice muſt be taken of Paul's opinions, according as we are informed of them in the accounts given by ancient writers; though, perhaps, we now have nothing remaining of Paul himſelf, or any of his followers.

Euſebius, as we have already ſeen, aſſures us, that [l] 'Paul 'had low and abject thoughts of Chriſt, as if he was no more 'than a man.' In another place of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory he ſays, that [m] Paul of Samoſata had endeavoured to revive the hereſy of Artemon. In the like manner, again, in [n] his Chronicle, as we now have it in Latin from St. Jerom; where it is alſo ſaid, that Domnus, ordained in Paul's room, was the ſixteenth biſhop of the church of Antioch.

The fathers of the ſecond council, by whom Paul was depoſed, write in their Synodical Epiſtle, 'that [o] he had laid aſide 'the hymns uſually ſung in honour of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, 'as modern, and the compoſitions of modern men—that [p] he 'refuſed to acknowledge, with them, that the Son of God came 'down from heaven—that [q] he had abjured the myſtery of our 'religion for the accurſed hereſy of Artemas.' And at the concluſion they ſay, 'Let [r] him write to Artemas, if he pleaſeth; 'and let the followers of Artemas hold communion with him.'

St. Athanaſius repreſents Paul's ſentiments after this manner: 'That [s] he believed Chriſt to be God from a virgin; God 'from Nazareth, ſeen there, and taking there the beginning of 'his exiſtence, and of his kingdom. And he acknowledgeth 'in him the powerful Word from heaven, and Wiſdom; by 'predetermination before all ages, in fact manifeſted at Naza-'reth. So that, as he ſays, there is one God over all, even the 'Father. This is his impiety.' In other places he ſpeaks of [t] Paul's thinking 'Chriſt to be a man, and different from God

[l] l. vii. cap. 27. [m] l. v. cap. 28. in.

[n] Paulus Samoſatenus a cunctorum prædicatione deficiſcens Artemonis hæreſim ſuſcitavit. In cujus locum Antiochenæ eccleſiæ ſextus decimus ordinatur epiſcopus Domnus. Euſeb. Chr. p. 176.

[o] ψαλμους δε τους μεν εις τον κυριον ημων Ιησουν χριστον πασας, ως δε νεωτερους και νεωτερα συγγραμματα. ad. Euſ. H. E. l. 7. c. 30. p. 281. A. [p] Τον μεν γαρ υιον του θεου ε θελειαι συνομολογειν εξ ουρανου καθελημυθεναι. ib. C. [q] Τον δε εξορκησαμενον το μυστηριον, και εκπομπευσαντα τη μιαρα αιρεσει τη αθεμα. ib. p. 282. B. [r] ib. C.

[s] επειδη και παντες αιρετικοι τουτο λεγειν εωθασιν, ως παυλος ο σαμοσατευς θεον εκ της παρθενου ομολογει, θεον εκ ναζαρετ, ορθεν, και απευθεν της υπαρξεως την αρχην εσχηκοτα, και αρχην βασιλειας παρειληφοτα· λεγει δε ενεργον εξ ουρανου, και σοφιαν εν αυτω ομολογει· τω μεν προορισμω προ αιωνων ουσαν, τη δε υπαρξει εκ ναζαρετ αναδειχθεισαν· ινα εις ειη, φησιν, ο επι παντα θεος ο πατηρ. Ath. contr. Apollin. l. 2. T. i. p. 942. A. Bened.

[t] ινα μη ο σαμοσατευς ψιλον ειρη, ανθρωπον αυτον λεγων, ως αλλον κατα παντα των θειων λογων. Ath. Ep. ad Max. T. i. p. 920. A.

'the

'the Word; and [u] that he was as to his nature a mere man, 'but after his birth as a man he became God by his advance-'ment in virtue.' In a piece aſcribed to Athanaſius, but [w] now generally ſuppoſed to be the work of a later writer, the followers of Paul are ſpoken of as believing, that [ww] God dwelled in Chriſt, or the man Jeſus, in an eſpecial manner.

St. Epiphanius ſays, that [x] Paul revived the hereſy of Artemon: that [y] he taught God the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, to be one God: that [z] the Word and Spirit of God are always in God, as reaſon in the heart of man: and that the Son of God has no diſtinct ſubſiſtence, but ſubſiſts in God himſelf: that [a] the Word came and dwelled in the man Jeſus: that [b] in the main he agreed with Sabellius, and Novatus, and Noetus, and others; though in part he differed from them: and that [c] upon the doctrine of the Deity his followers ſaid no more than the Jews.

Philaſter ſays, beſide other things, 'that [d] Paul taught that 'Chriſt was a juſt man, not the true God: thus Judaizing, and 'likewiſe teaching circumciſion. He alſo converted Zenobia, 'a certain queen of that time in the Eaſt, to Judaiſm.'

But it is ſuppoſed that [e] Philaſter is miſtaken in ſaying that Paul taught circumciſion; neither Euſebius, nor the fathers of the ſecond council at Antioch, charging him with ſuch a doctrine. It is not improbable, that this is a mere innocent miſtake of Philaſter; for as Arianiſm is [f] ſometimes compared to heatheniſm, ſo it was likewiſe common with ſome Chriſtians to call Unitarians Jews, or Judaizers. We (M) formerly ſaw how St. Baſil writes, that Sabellianiſm is Judaiſm brought into the

[u] οτιοι εισιν οι απο παυλε τε σαμοσατεως, υστερον αυτον μετα την εναιθρωπησιν εκ προκοπης τεθεοποιησθαι λεγοντες, τω την φυσιν ψιλον ανθρωπον γεγονεναι. De Syn. T. i. p. 739. E. Conf. Socrat. H.E. l. 2. c. 19. p. 98. D. [w] Vid. Admon. in Ep. de Incarnat. Dei Verbi. T. ii. p. 33.

[ww] ει γαρ και θεον ενοικειν εν τω ανθρωπω λεγουσι, ου παραδεχομεθα. De Incarnat. ap. Ath. Op. T. ii. p. 35. A. [x] και ανεκαινισε την αιρεσιν τε αρτεμωνος. adv. Hær. lxv. p. 608. A. [y] φασκει δε ουτος, ειναι πατερα, και υιον, και αγιον πνευμα εν θεον. ibid. [z] εν θεω δε αει ονλα τον αυτον λογον και το πνευμα αυτε, ωσπερ εν ανθρωπω καρδια ειναι τον λογον· μη ειναι δε τον υιον τε θεε ενυποστατον, αλλα εν τω θεω. ibid.

[a] ελθειν δε τον λογον, και ενοικησαντα εν τω ανθρωπω ειναι. ib. B. [b] ib. A. B. [c] ειτε παρα των ιεδαιων, ως εφην, δοξαζοντες. p. 609. B. [d] Hic Chriſtum hominem juſtum, non Deum verum prædicabat, judaizans potius; qui et circumciſionem docebat. Unde et Zenobiam quandam reginam in oriente tunc temporis ipſe docuit judaizare. Philaſt. Hær. 17. [e] Vid. Baſn. An. 264. n. v. Tillemont, et ſupra Art. ii. p. 619. [f] ενιοι δε χλισμα λεγουσι τον εκ τε παιδος υιον τε θεε και λογον, ειδει διαφερουσιν εθνικων. κ. λ. ap. Athanaſ. de Vit. Anton. p. 848. Ed. Bened. Fit igitur Ario, . . . ad familiaritatem Conſtantii imperatoris promtus aditus et facilis via. Suadetur Conſtantio, et quoſdam in Deo gradus credat: et qui per januam ab errore idololatriæ fuerat egreſſus, rurſus in ſinum ejus, dum in Deo deos quærit, tamquam per pſeudothyrum inducitur. P. Oroſ. Hiſtor. lib. ii. cap. 29. p. 542. ed. Havercamp. (M) See p. 41.

church

church under the name of Christianity. In another place he says, we [s] abhor Sabellianism, as we do Judaism. So Epiphanius, who [r] had more learning than Philaster, said just now that, 'upon 'the doctrine of the Deity, the followers of Paul said no more 'than the Jews.' And again he says, 'that [t] the Paulians, introducing Judaism, and teaching nothing more than them, are 'Jews, and ought to be so called:' though, as he adds, 'to 'speak the truth, they do not practise circumcision, nor keep 'the sabbath, nor follow any other Jewish customs.' And St. Chrysostom, at the same time that [u] he says the followers of Paul resembled the Jews, allows they differed from them in the point of circumcision.

We have farther to observe from St. Chrysostom, that he supposeth the followers of Paul to deny that [w] the only begotten pre-existed before all ages.

St. Augustine writes, 'The [x] Paulians, so called from Paul 'of Samosata, deny Christ's eternity, and affirm that he then 'began to be when he was born of Mary: nor do they think 'him any thing more than a man. This heresy of Artemon, 'which was in a manner extinguished, was revived by Paul, 'and since by Photinus; so that now the Photinians are better 'known than the Paulians:' or, they are now oftener called Photinians than Paulians.

What Marius Mercator writes of Paul's sentiment at the beginning of the fifth century deserves notice; I therefore put his words in the †† margin for the sake of the learned, by whom

[s] οτι επισχες τω ιυδαισμω και την τοιαυτην αιρεσιν φριττομεν. Ep. 80. al. 189. p. 277. D. [r] Cum Epiphanium longe Philastrio doctiorem invenerimus. August. Ep. 222. T. ii. p. 878. Bened. [t] ουτοι δε τον ιυδαισμον παραφθειροντες, ουδεν περισσοτερον των ιυδαιων κεκτημενοι, δευτεροι ιυδαιοι κληθησονται. κ. λ. Hær. 65. p. 608. D.

[u] τ' αληθη δε, οτι ουτε περιτομην εχουσιν, ουτε σαββατον. κ. λ. ibid. [w] Αλλα προς μεν ιυδαιους αρκει και ταυτα· επειδαν δε οι χωρις περιτομης τα εκεινων μιμουμενοι και ζηλωται οι παυλε τε σαμοσατεως. κ. λ. Chrys. in. Ps. viii. p. 120. C. T. Tom. iii. [x] Επαυθα και τους απο παυλε τε σαμοσατεως επεγομενους ικανως, οι την προαιωνιον υπαρξιν αναιρεσι τε μονογενους. Ει γαρ προ τε τοκε της μαριας ουκ ην, ουδε υπηρχε πριν η φανηναι εν σαρκι, πως ενομισθετει ο μη ων; Serm. 24. T. V. p. 347. B. C. [x] Pauliani, a Paulo Samosateno, Christum non semper fuisse dicunt; sed ejus initium, ex quo de Maria natus est, asseverant: nec eum aliquid amplius quam hominem putant. Ista hæresis aliquando cujusdam Artemonis fuit, sed cum defecisset, instaurata est a Paulo; et postea sic a Photino confirmata, ut Photiniani quam Pauliani celebrius nuncupentur. Aug. de Hær. cap. 44. T. viii. p. 13. Bened.

†† Nestorius circa Verbum Dei, non quidem ut Paulus sentit, qui non substantivum, sed prolatitium potentiæ Dei efficax Verbum esse definit. Mar. Mercat. de discrim. Pauli et Nestorii. num. i. p. 17. Ed. Jo. Garner. Verbum autem Dei Patris, non substantivum, sed prolativum, vel imperativum sensit, atque pronuntiavit, [P. Samos.] non ut fides habet catholica, Verbum in substantia, vel essentia consubstantivum, id est, ομοουσιον Filium Dei Patris. Id. in Diss. de xii. Anathem. Nestorii, num xvi. Differentia itaque inter Samosatenum et Photinum ista sola est, quia Paulus Verbum Dei προφορικον, και πρακτικον λογον και ενεργητικον, id est, prolativum et potestatis effectivum Verbum sensit, non substantivum, quod Græci ουσιωδες dicunt. Id. ib. num. xix.

they

they will be more eaſily underſtood than they can be tranſlated by me. They ſeem, however, to amount to this: That by the Word, Paul underſtood the diſplayed, manifeſted, effective power of God, not a perſonal ſubſiſtence or real ſubſtance diſtinct from the Father.

I would likewiſe refer to * Damaſcenus, though his article contains nothing but the ** Synopſis of Epiphanius.

Theodoret's account of Paul and his ſentiments was tranſcribed above: nothing needs to be added here.

All theſe are manifeſtly the accounts of enemies, as it was before hinted they would be, no other being now remaining. Though therefore they may be, for the main, juſt and right; yet poſſibly ſome things may be expreſſed harſhly, if not improperly: nay, ſome of the accounts ſeem to differ; there muſt therefore be ſome miſtake or miſrepreſentation; or elſe the ſeemingly oppoſite expreſſions muſt be underſtood with ſome qualification on one ſide or the other, or reconciled by a diſtinction. Paul is ſaid to teach that Chriſt was a mere man, and nothing more than a man; and yet he is alſo allowed to have taught the indwelling of God in him, and that the Word came and dwelled in the man Jeſus. He is ſaid to have denied the pre-exiſtence of the Firſt-begotten, and of Chriſt; but yet he is ſaid to have taught, that the Word was always in God. It is ſaid he refuſed to acknowledge that the Son of God came down from heaven; and yet he acknowledgeth in him the powerful Word from heaven and Wiſdom. Theſe laſt expreſſions, ſeemingly contradictory, may be reconciled perhaps after this manner: Underſtand by the Word a diſtinct ſubſiſtence from God, he denied his coming down from heaven: but underſtand by the Word the [xx] Reaſon, the Wiſdom, the Power of God, he taught that the Word from heaven came and dwelled in the man Jeſus. This diſtinction may likewiſe be of ſome uſe elſewhere.

What became of Paul after his removal by Aurelian, in 272 or 273, is not known; but he had good opportunities for ſpreading his doctrine. His epiſcopate muſt have laſted twelve or thirteen years, nine years at leaſt before he was depoſed, and about three years afterwards, between the time of his depoſition and final removal. The fathers in the ſecond council [y] ſpeak of his having flatterers among the biſhops and preſbyters of the neighbouring

* Damaſc. Hær. 65. p. 296. ** Epiph. T. i. p. 605. [xx] Hic eſt virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic ſapientia ejus, et gloria. Hic in virginem illabitur, carnem, Spiritu Sancto cooperante, induitur. Cypr. de Idolor. Van. p. 15. Et ipſe a Patre exaltatus ſit, quia ſe in terris ſermo, et virtus, et ſapientia Dei Patris humiliavit. Id. De Unit. Ecc. p. 118. [y] οια και της θαπευοσης αυτον επισκοπες των ομορων αγρων τε και πολεων και πρεσβυτερυς. κ. λ. ap. Euſ. L. 7. cap. 30. p. 281. B.

neighbouring cities and villages about Antioch, and [z] of his being beloved and admired by others: though indeed they ascribe that respect for him to the presents he had made those persons. Since, then, Paul was of an active temper, and a man of popular gifts, as it seems, and his episcopate was chiefly under the mild governments of Odenatus, and his wife and successor Zenobia, it may be concluded, he had in that time made a considerable number of proselytes. And, very probably, he at first found some Christians in his diocese of the same sentiments.

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, affirms that [a] Lucian, who afterwards suffered martyrdom in 312, adhered to Paul, and separated from the church; or was held excommunicated from the church during the time of three bishops of Antioch. One might be almost apt to suspect, from Alexander's words, that he thought Lucian had succeeded Paul in the episcopal care and oversight of those who were in Paul's sentiments at Antioch.

The council at Nice, in one of their canons, [b] appoint, that the Paulianists should be rebaptized when they return to the catholic church. St. Augustine [c] has taken particular notice of that canon. And yet it appears from [cc] Athanasius, that the Paulians baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Paulians [d] are mentioned with others in an edict of Constantine against heretics. St. Chrysostom [e] often argues against the Paulians, and, I think, as then in being. Theodoret writes about 450, that [f] there were then no remains of them. And Pope Innocent the first, about 414, as [g] Tillemont observes, speaks of them as [h] if they subsisted no longer. However, St. Augustine, as we have seen, mentions them as if they were in being in his time, but the people of that sentiment were then oftener called Photinians than Paulians.

Neither Eusebius, nor the council of Antioch, nor Athanasius, that I remember, have any where charged Paul, directly or indirectly, with rejecting any books either of the Old or the New

[z] ἀλλὰ καὶ πλῆσιοι ἀπιφηνε· ἐφ' ᾧ τις τῶν τοιαῦτα ζηλευτῶν φιλεῖται καὶ θαυμάζεται, ibid. D. [a] . . παύλῳ τῷ σαμοσατέως συνοδῷ καὶ χρίσει τῶν ἀπανλαχοῦ ἐπισκόπων ἀποκηρυχθέντος τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὃν διαδεξάμενος λουκιανὸς ἀποσυναγώγος ἐμεινε τριῶν ἐπισκόπων πολυετεῖς χρόνους. apud Theodoret. H. E. L. i. cap. iv. p. 15. B.

[b] Can. 19. [c] Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in ecclesia catholica Nicæno concilio constitutum est. Aug. de Hær. ib.

[cc] οὔτε μανιχαῖοι, καὶ φρύγες, καὶ οἱ τοῦ σαμοσατέως μαθηταὶ, τὰ ὀνόματα λέγοντες, οὐκ ἧττον εἰσὶν αἱρετικοὶ. Ath. Orat. 2. contr. Arian. p. 510. E. [d] Euseb. de vit. constant. L. iii. cap. 64. [e] Vid. Chrysost. in Ps. viii. T. 3. p. 120. B. C. et Tom. v. Serm. 20. p. 300. Serm. 24. p. 347. Ed. Front. Duc. [f] Vid. Theod. H. Fab. l. 2. cap. xi. de Photino. [g] See Paul de Samosates. Art. vi. [h] Quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti minime baptizabant. Innocent. i. Ep. 22. 2p. Labb. Conc. T. ii. p. 1275. B.

Testament.

Teſtament. Epiphanius expreſsly ſays, that [i] Paul endeavoured to ſupport his doctrine by texts of ſcripture. Vincentius Lirinenſis ſpeaks of [k] this as a common method of heretics; and [l] ſays particularly of the works of Paul, and ſome others, that there was ſcarce a page without citations out of the Old or New Teſtament. Paul then, and the Paulians, uſed the ſame ſcriptures with other Chriſtians.

This is a ſummary account of what the ancients write of Paul and his followers. It ought to be obſerved, that I have made no uſe of [m] the epiſtle to Paul aſcribed to Dionyſius, nor of the queſtions and anſwers joined with that epiſtle. If my account therefore of Paul's opinions appears defective, when compared with that given by [n] Tillemont, or ſome other moderns, I had rather it ſhould do ſo, than run the hazard of deceiving my readers by borrowing from ſuſpected or manifeſtly ſpurious pieces, whoſe teſtimony is not to be relied upon.

There can be no queſtion but Paul was an author. It is very likely he would publiſh ſome vindications of himſelf and his opinions. Vincentius actually makes mention of his writings, as we obſerved juſt now. But, as I take the abovementioned queſtions to be ſpurious, I ſuppoſe none of his works to be now remaining.

As we have not now before us any of Paul's writings, and have his hiſtory from adverſaries only, we cannot propoſe to judge diſtinctly of his talents, nor draw his character at length: however, from the ſeveral particulars before put down, and collected from divers authors, ſome things may be concluded; and I apprehend that, laying aſide for the preſent the conſideration of his heterodoxy, we ſhall not miſtake much if we conceive of him after this manner: he had a great mind, with a mixture of haughtineſs, and too much affection for human applauſe. He was generally well reſpected in his dioceſe, and by the neighbouring biſhops; in eſteem with the great, and beloved by the common people. He preached frequently, and was a good ſpeaker. And from what is ſaid by (x) the fathers of the coun-

[i] Epiph. ib. p. 608. B. [k] Hic fortaſſe aliquis interroget, an et hæretici divinæ ſcripturæ teſtimoniis utantur? Utuntur plane, et vehementer quidem. Nam videas eos volare per ſingula quæque ſanctæ legis volumina. . . . Vincent. comm. cap. 35. p. 356. Ed. Baluz. Pariſ. 1669. [l] Lege Pauli Samoſateni opuſcula, Priſcilliani, Eunomii, Joviniani, reliquarumque peſtium: cernas infinitam exemplorum congeriem, prope nullam omitti paginam, quæ non novi aut veteris teſtamenti ſententiis fucata et colorata ſit. Id. ibid. [m] ap. Labbei Concil. T. i. p. 849. . . . 893. [n] Vid. Paul de Samoſates. Art. ii. Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 615, &c. (x) See before, p. 88.

cil,

cil, of (o) his rejecting or laying aſide ſome hymns, as modern, and compoſed by moderns, it may be argued, that he was a critic; which is a valuable accompliſhment at all times, eſpecially when uncommon*⁂*.

I have now given a ſufficient hiſtory of the controverſies of thoſe times, and of the part Dionyſius had in them.

IX. I need not enlarge in the account of Dionyſius's works, ſeveral learned men having already compoſed catalogues of them, ſo far as we are informed of their titles by ancient authors; as Cave in his Apoſtolici, or Lives of the Primitive Fathers, vol. i. and in his Hiſtoria Literaria; and Fabricius in his [o] Bibliotheca Græca; both dividing his works into treatiſes and epiſtles, and the latter diſpoſing his epiſtles in the alphabetical order of the names of the perſons or people to whom they are directed. Tillemont [p] likewiſe, as uſual, is exact and particular upon this head. Baſnage [q] digeſts our author's works in the order of time, which alſo is [r] Du Pin's method. And Pagi [s] has judicious obſervations relating to the time of ſome of Dionyſius's writings.

I have quoted ſeveral of his epiſtles, and mentioned ſome others, obſerving likewiſe ſometimes the moſt probable date of them. It is neceſſary, however, that I add here a few things.

1. Particularly I would tranſcribe a paſſage of Euſebius, following what was formerly taken from him concerning Diony-

(o) Poſſibly thoſe hymns were partly ancient, partly modern; having been altered and interpolated ſince their firſt original: and ſome of them might be entirely modern. Dionyſius ſpeaks of the many hymns [της πολλης ψαλμωδιας] compoſed by Nepos, with which many of the brethren were mightily pleaſed. Euſeb. l. vii. c. 24. Dionyſius does not expreſsly ſay that thoſe hymns were ſung in the public aſſemblies of Chriſtians; but it is very probable they were. And ſo Cave ſuppoſeth; for thus he writes, Hiſt. Lit. P. i. p. 86. de Nepote: Scripſit adhuc Nepos in eccleſiæ uſum pſalmos atque hymnos quam plurimos, pios admodum, et ab ipſo Dionyſio celebratos. And in his Apoſtolici, p. 194, in the Life of Dionyſius, he ſays of Nepos; 'That he was a man eminent for his ſkill in 'the holy ſcriptures, and for the many 'pſalms and hymns he had compoſed, which 'the brethren ſung in their public meet-'ings.' Conf. Valeſ. An. ad Euſ. l. vii. c. 24. p. 153. C. Such hymns as theſe, compoſed by private perſons, are the hymns which Paul rejected, or laid aſide, that is, would not allow to be uſed in public worſhip. And the 59th canon of the council of Laodicea forbids that any pſalms or hymns compoſed by private perſons ſhould be ſung in the church. So that what was reckoned in Paul to be a great fault, afterwards obtained general approbation.

⁂ A learned writer among the moderns, whom I did not think of when I drew the above character, confirms almoſt every part of it; for he allows Paul to have poſſeſſed the third ſee in the church, and to have had the patronage of a great princeſs, an appearance of piety, reputation for learning, flowing eloquence, and the favour of the multitude. Ex infimæ ſortis homine factus eſt Antiochenus epiſcopus, et tertium eccleſiæ thronum iiſdem artibus conſcendit, quibus hæretici ſolent, feminæ principis potentia, ſpecie pietatis, doctrinæ fama, dicendi facilitate, et multitudinis factioſæ gratia. J. Garner. Diſſ. i. de Hær. et Li. Neſtor. cap. iii. § iii. p. 307.

[o] T. v. p. 263. . . . 267. [p] Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. [q] Ann. P. E. 247. n. vii. [r] Nouv. Bib. T. i. p. 187, &c. [s] Vid. Pagi Crit. 257. n. iv.

ſius's

ſius's writings againſt Sabellius. Says Euſebius; 'And [t] beſide 'theſe he wrote many other epiſtles, ſtill extant, and [u] ſome 'large treatiſes in an epiſtolary form; as the books concerning 'Nature, inſcribed to his ſon Timothy, and the book of Temp-'tations, inſcribed to the forementioned Euphranor. Moreover, 'in a letter to Baſilides, biſhop of one of the churches of Penta-'polis, he mentions [w] a Commentary he had written upon the 'beginning of the book of Eccleſiaſtes. And there are many 'other letters of Dionyſius to the ſame Baſilides.'

From this paſſage it appears, that many of Dionyſius's letters were of a great length; indeed they were properly treatiſes inſcribed to friends, or others; and in ſome of them he diſplayed his copious learning without reſerve, though without oſtentation. His two books concerning the Promiſes, mentioned above, the fragments of which are to be tranſcribed hereafter, were [x] letters, or written in an epiſtolary form.

2. In Euſebius's Evangelical Preparation [y] are large and noble fragments of the books concerning Nature, which ſhew the author's excellent capacity, and his great learning, and intimate acquaintance with the Greek poets and philoſophers, as well as with the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament. If there were nothing elſe remaining, this fragment alone would be ſufficient to ſhew that Dionyſius was a fine writer.

3. St. Jerom confirms what Euſebius writes of the Commentary upon Eccleſiaſtes; for, enumerating this biſhop's works, he ſays, 'there [z] were many letters to Baſilides, in one of which he 'tells him, he had begun to write a Commentary upon the Ec-'cleſiaſtes.' In another place Jerom mentions Dionyſius, with ſeveral others, who, he ſays, had [a] largely explained the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians.

4. We ſtill have one letter to Baſilides, now generally called a Canonical epiſtle. It is ſuppoſed to have been written [b] about the year 262. Fleury [c] ſays; 'Of all the writings of St. Dio-'nyſius of Alexandria, the only one that remains entire and un-'queſtionable is the Canonical epiſtle to Baſilides the biſhop, who

[t] H. E. L. vii. c. 26. [u] Και δη και πλειστας λογων εν επιστολης χαρακτηρι γραφας· ως οι περι Φυσιως Τιμοθεω τω παιδι προσπεφωνηκεν. ib. B. 277. A. B.

[w] Φησιν εαυτον εις την αρχην εξηγησιν πεποιησθαι της Εκκλησιαστου. ib. B. [x] Conf. Euſeb. l. vii. cap. 26. in. et cap. 25. Vid. Valeſ. Annot. p. 154. B. [y] l. xiv. cap. 23. . . . 27. p. 772. . . . 784.

[z] Ad Baſilidem quoque multas epiſtolas: in quarum una ſe aſſerit etiam in Eccleſiaſten cœpiſſe ſcribere commentarios. De V. i. cap. 69. [a] Origenes, Dionyſius, Pierius, Euſebius Cæſarienſis, Didymus, Apollinaris, latiſſime hanc epiſtolam interpretati ſunt. Ep. 31. [al. 52.] p. 243. fin. Bened. [b] Vid. Baſn. a. 247. n. vii.

[c] Fleury's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſt. B. vii. ch. 56. Vol. i. p. 470. in the Engliſh edition.

'had

'had conſulted him upon ſeveral points of diſcipline.' But perhaps we may add to this the epiſtle to Novatus, which, as recorded in [d] Euſebius, ſeems to be entire. I ſhall make uſe of that epiſtle to Baſilides by and by, when I come to obſerve our author's teſtimony to the ſcriptures.

In the mean time, as the concluſion of it is too ſignal a proof of prevailing humility to be omitted, it ſhall be here tranſcribed. 'You [e] aſked thoſe queſtions, my dear ſon, not through ignorance, but only to do honour to us, and to cultivate our unanimity and friendſhip. And I, for my part, have declared my opinion, not as a teacher, but making uſe of that freedom with which it becomes us to ſpeak to each other. Do you judge according to the underſtanding that is in you; and write me word what is beſt in your opinion.' Dionyſius writes thus, ſays [f] Fleury, out of humility: for indeed his authority was very great, on account of the dignity of his ſee, his age, and the glory of his having been twice a confeſſor, as well as on account of his virtues and learning.

5. Euſebius has preſerved [g] large and valuable fragments of a letter of Dionyſius to or againſt one Germanus, a biſhop of thoſe times; who had calumniated Dionyſius, as if he had not taken due care of his people, or not ſhewn ſufficient courage in time of perſecution. This obliged Dionyſius, in defence of himſelf, to relate his own ſufferings at ſeveral times. This letter, according to Baſnage's [h] computation, was written in the year 259. I have made uſe of the fragments of it in the hiſtory I have given of Dionyſius.

I would here put down a paſſage of Euſebius not yet tranſcribed. 'Beſide [i] the forementioned letters, in that time [the perſecution under Valerian, and Dionyſius's exile] he wrote thoſe Paſchal epiſtles, which we ſtill have... Of theſe, one is written to Flavius, another to Domitius and Didymus, in [k] which alſo he publiſhed a canon [or cycle] of eight years; after having ſhewn that Eaſter ought not to be kept till after the vernal equinox.' I have put down this paſſage, as affording an argument of Dionyſius's ſkill in mathematical learning, and aſtronomical computations.

They who are deſirous of being informed of the nature of thoſe Paſchal epiſtles may conſult [l] Valeſius, [m] Du Pin, or [n] Tillemont.

[d] Euſ. l. vi. cap. 45. [e] ap. Labb. Conc. T. i. p. 836. D. E. [f] ib. Vol. i. p. 471. [g] Euſ. H. E. l. vi. cap. 40. l. vii. c. 1. [h] Dum exulem agit Dionyſius A. 259, ab Æmiliano pulſus, adverſus Germanum ſcripſit epiſtolam, quæ gravia paſſus eſt complectentem. Baſn. ibid. [i] Lib. vii. cap. 20. [k] ἐν ταῖς καινὰς ἐκδίδεται ὀκταετηρίδος. ib. 266. A. B. [l] Annot. in Euſ. p. 151. [m] Bib. des Ant. Ecc. Tom. i. p. 188. [n] Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 588, 589. Saint Den. d' Art. 13.

7. It

7. It has been disputed, whether Dionysius ever wrote against Origen. Cave [o] declares himself with some positiveness on the affirmative side of that question. Nevertheless, [p] at this time, learned men are for the most part clearly of opinion, that he did not. We [q] have formerly observed Dionysius's discourse of martyrdom, inscribed to Origen, supposed to have been written in the time of the Decian persecution, when our author had been bishop several years. And Stephen Gobar, in Photius [r] says, 'That 'Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, wrote to Origen, and com-'mended him after his death in a letter to Theoteenus, bishop 'of Cæsarea.' Dionysius therefore always retained a high respect for his master Origen.

8. There remains still one particular more to be considered in this place: whether Dionysius be author of [s] the Epistle to Paul of Samosata, containing likewise ten questions of Paul, with answers to them. That he wrote a letter relating to that affair a little before his death, is out of question. We saw the proofs of it formerly. The only dispute is, whether what we now have with the above-mentioned title be rightly ascribed to Dionysius. By [t] Cave it is called doubtful, or rather supposititious. By Valesius [u] it is rejected in a like manner. Du Pin [w] is of the same opinion, which he supports by the difference of style from Dionysius, and by other considerations: as does [x] Basnage likewise. Pagi [y] allows the Epistle not to have been written by Dionysius; but yet he thinks it might be written by some other bishop of that time: which supposition Basnage [z] endeavours to confute by arguments tending to shew it was written by some impostor a good while afterwards. Tillemont [a] doubts, whether the reasons of Valesius and Du Pin are of sufficient weight to induce us to reject that piece, as not written by Dionysius: and in a distinct note he treats of this point with a great deal of labour and learning, as well as modesty. Fabricius [b] is willing to allow the ge-

[o] Scripsisse Dionysium adversus Origenem exinde liquet, quod fragmentum profert Anastasius Sinaita quæst. 233. p. 266. Περι των κατα Ωριγενες, quo de situ paradisi agit. De hoc opere silent Eusebius et Hieronymus. Cav. H. L. P. ii. p. 51.

[p] Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 246. n. iii. v. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 267. in Tillemont, ib. p. 616. Du Pin, ibid. p. 190.

[q] See p. 67, 68.

[r] Cod. 232. p. 904.

[s] Ap. Concil. Labb. T. i. p. 849, &c.

[t] See Cave, as above-mentioned.

[u] Ann. in Euseb. l. vii. cap. 30.

[w] Bibl. p. 190.

[x] Ann. 247. n. xi.

[y] Crit. 264. n. iii.

[z] Ut supra.

[a] St. Denys d' Alex. Art. 17. p. 606. and note viii.

[b] Nec tamen suppositam [Vide Tillemontium nota viii. ad Vitam Dionysii Alex. et Stillingfleti Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity. p. 31.] illi videri, sed potius genuinam ejus esse Epistolam ad Paulum Samosatenum, et responsionem ad decem ejus propositiones; licet eam rejiciunt viri doctissimi Valesius ad Euseb. p. 155. seq. Elias Du Pin, Guil. Caveus, alliique etiam Harduinus ad Epistolam Chrysostomi ad Cæsarium. p. 9. qui Eutychiano alicui tribuit. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 263.

nuineneſs of that work, moved, as it ſeems, by Tillemont's arguments, and thoſe of biſhop Stillingfleet, to whom he refers. It is certain, however, that this epiſtle is now, and has been for a good while, (Q) generally rejected by learned men as ſpurious; though (R) biſhop Bull (good man!) was ſo happy as to know nothing of it; for which reaſon he ſecurely quotes this piece as the genuine and undoubted work of St. Dionyſius of Alexandria.

For my own part, I acquieſce in the reaſons of the learned men beforementioned, ſo far as to think it highly probable that the piece in queſtion is not the work of Dionyſius, nor of any of his contemporaries, but of a much later date. For which cauſe I ſhall make no uſe of it in what follows in this chapter, as I have hitherto omitted to take any thing out of it. Indeed, if the probability of its ſpuriouſneſs were ſomewhat leſs than it is, that might be a ſufficient reaſon for an entire omiſſion, or very ſlight notice of it in this work.

9. I need not ſtay to ſhew, that our Dionyſius of Alexandria did not write any notes or commentaries upon the pretended Dionyſius the Areopagite, (as ſome have thought) it having been already done by [c] others. And, as [d] Tillemont ſays, there are now ſcarce any perſons, of ever ſo little learning, who believe the works aſcribed to St. Dionyſius the Areopagite were compoſed ſo early as the third century.

(Q) This appears from the names abovementioned. See likewiſe note [b] what is there tranſcribed from Fabricius. I would add here ſome words of Dom. Bernard de Montfaucon: Haud leve item iſtud eſt ... judicium, quod mentitus ille Athanaſius Epiſtolam Dionyſii ad Paulum Samoſatenum mittat ad Perſas, quæ jam communi eruditorum calculo inter ſuppoſititia computatur. Vid. Monitum apud Athanaſ. Op. T. ii. p. 716. Ed. Bened. From which paſſage I alſo conclude, that Montfaucon himſelf likewiſe rejects this piece, as clearly ſuppoſititious. (R) Tillem. in his note before referred to p. 886. obſerves, 'That biſhop Bull often makes 'uſe of this as a certain and undoubted 'work of Dionyſius; and ſays, that Dionyſius there ſpeaks almoſt divinely of the 'divinity of Jeſus Chriſt. He likewiſe is 'very angry with Sandius, who rejects it.' This remark is too juſt; for biſhop Bull does quote that piece as Dionyſius's. Vid. Defenſ. Fid. Nic. § ii. cap. 11. § xi. p. 134. al. 148. And whereas Sandius had alleged an argument from Brockmand, a German writer, to prove it ſpurious; Bull anſwers that he does not know, nor care, who Brockmand is. ibid. § 12. p. 135. And at laſt ſays, that all writers, ancient and modern, except perhaps that forementioned Brockmand, did unanimouſly aſcribe it to Dionyſius. ... Epiſtolam contra Paulum Samoſatenum; quam revera ſcripſiſſe Dionyſium, auctores cuncti, tam veteres quam neoterici, (ſi unum fortaſſe Brockmandum illum excipias) unanimi conſenſu agnoſcunt. ibid. p. 135. Inſomuch that, in the late edition of biſhop Bull's works, Dr. J. E. Grabe thought himſelf obliged to add from Cave, by way of correction, the following note: Multis ſuſpecta eſt hæc Epiſtola, quod patres Antiocheni in Epiſtola Synodica apud Euſeb. l. 7. cap. 30. diſerte affirmant Dionyſium quidem ad univerſam Antiochenſium eccleſiam literas direxiſſe, Paulum vero ne ſalutatione dignatum. Vid. Cav. in Dion. Alex.

[c] Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 5, et 263.

[d] St. Den. d' A. art. 18. p. 610.

10. It

10. It has been obſerved, how few of Dionyſius's works, either tracts or epiſtles, have come down to us entire. Du Pin [e] ſays, the loſs of his works is one of the moſt conſiderable of this kind which we could ſuffer. We have, however, divers fragments, which are very valuable, and ſome of conſiderable length.

X. It may be now expected, that I ſhould attempt the character of Dionyſius, of whom ſo much has been ſaid. He has the title of Great given him by [f] Euſebius, [g] Baſil, [h] Gregory of Nyſſa, and [i] other ancient writers. I ſcarce need to ſay, that [k] Dionyſius is in Jerom's Letter to Magnus, among other Chriſtian writers; who, he ſays, were equally admirable for ſecular learning and the knowledge of the ſcriptures. In [l] another place he calls him the moſt eloquent biſhop of Alexandria. When Theodoret nameth the principal biſhops who were preſent at the firſt council againſt Paul, or invited to it, the character he gives Dionyſius is, that [m] he was a man illuſtrious for his learning: and certainly this part of his character is juſtified by the remaining fragments of his works, though, in all probability, his learning would be much more conſpicuous if his works were extant entire. The many epiſtles ſent by him to ſo many different perſons in ſeveral and remote parts of the world, upon the various points in queſtion at that time, aſſure us of the general repute and eſteem he was in. He was a perſon (s) of undiſſembled humility and modeſty, and of great (T) ſimplicity, to a degree uncommon in men of his extenſive learning, and long and wide experience. He had (v) a great deal of natural good humour, cultivated by the principles of religion; by which means he excelled in that moderation and charity, which the Chriſtian religion ſo earneſtly recommends. His undiſguiſed probity, or ſome vehemence of natural temper, rendered him liable to be ſometimes off his guard, inſomuch that in diſputes he was apt to go into extremes: for, as St. Baſil [n] ſays, a man who intends

[e] Bibl. ib. p. 190. [f] ὁ μεγας των Αλεξανδρειας επισκοπος Διονυσιος. Euſ. l. viii. in Procem. [g] τον μεγαν Διονυσιον. Baſ. p. 269. D. Ep. 188. [al. Canon. i.]

[h] Gr. Nyſſ. de Vit. S. Gr. Thaum. p. 556. D. [i] Vid. Valeſ. in notis ad Euſ. l. vii. in Pr. et Pagi Crit. An. 265. n. iv.

[k] Ep. 83. p. 656. [l] Vir eloquentiſſimus Dionyſius Alexandrinæ eccleſiæ pontifex. In. Iſ. l. xviii. pr. p. 478. [m] ανηρ επιφανης εν διδασκαλια γενομενος. Theod. Hær Fab l. ii. c. 8. (s) See before, p. 56, and other places. (T) For this I would refer to the hiſtory which Dionyſius gives of Serapion in a letter to Fabius. Euſ. l. vi. cap 44. and to another hiſtory in a letter to Xyſtus, biſhop of Rome, l. vii. cap. 9; and I ſuppoſe that this quality appears in ſome of the paſſages of Dionyſius which I tranſcribe at length.

(v) Dionyſius's good humour, moderation, and charity, are manifeſt in the fragments of the books concerning the promiſes, to be tranſcribed hereafter, as well as elſewhere. [n] Vid. Ep. 9. [al. 41.] p. 90. C. D.

to make a crooked plant ſtraight, ſometimes bends it too much the other way: ſo Dionyſius, in oppoſition to Sabellianiſm, aſſerted not only a diſtinction of ſubſiſtences, but a difference of eſſence, and an inequality of power and glory. And perhaps ſome may think they ſee another like inſtance in the argument to be hereafter produced concerning the revelation; where Dionyſius diſputeth the genuineneſs of that book, when it might have been ſufficient to confute the falſe interpretations which ſome had put upon it. We muſt not forget his generous zeal for truth, for the ſake of which he practiſed much ſelf denial, renouncing the honours and riches and grandeur of this world; thereby ſhewing true greatneſs of mind, and acquiring to himſelf glory and riches, preferable to all the advantages of a tranſitory life. He had a quick apprehenſion, and a lively fancy. His ſtyle is uſually florid, and he wrote with ſpirit to the laſt; which, after the fatigues of above thirty years public ſervice in the church, as catechiſt, or biſhop, and after two confeſſions before heathen magiſtrates, and the ſufferings that followed; beſide the malicious calumnies, or falſe and unfair inſinuations at leaſt of ſome of his brethren, and the unkind and unfriendly charges and accuſations of ſome other Chriſtians; may be reckoned the proof of a firmneſs of mind, which is very glorious: for it could be founded on nothing ſo much as the conſciouſneſs of his integrity, and other ſupports and conſolations of religion. To conclude, Dionyſius fulfilled the duties of his ſtation, and ſhined in his ſphere. Unqueſtionably he was one of the ornaments of that age; and he [o] may be eſteemed the chief glory of the ſee of Alexandria for three centuries, from the time of the firſt founder of that church, who, as is generally ſuppoſed, was St. Mark, or, if not, very probably ſome other eminent Chriſtian of the apoſtolic age; who, by the abundance of his ſpiritual gifts, which were common at that time, would have a diſtinction and pre-eminence above the greateſt of his ſucceſſors.

XI. Finally, we proceed to obſerve this writer's teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament.

I begin with the Letter to Baſilides, which we ſtill have entire. In anſwer to a queſtion ſent him by that biſhop, Dionyſius obſerves; 'By [p] what you write you ſhew that you well underſtand 'the divine evangeliſts, and that they have not preciſely re-'lated the hour when the Lord aroſe; for the evangeliſts have

[o] See Tillemont S. Den. d' Alex. art. 1. at the beginning.
[p] Labb. Con. Tom. i. p. 832. Can. i.

'expreſſed

'expreſſed themſelves differently concerning the time when 'thoſe perſons came to the ſepulchre, and all of them ſay that 'they found the Lord already riſen; *And in the end of the ſab-* 'bath, as Matthew ſays, chap. xxviii. 1. *And early when it was yet* 'dark, as John, chap. xx. 1. *And very early in the morning*, as 'Luke, chap. xxiv. 1. *And very early in the morning, at the riſing of* 'the ſun, as Mark, chap. xvi. 2. But when he aroſe, no one has 'expreſsly ſaid..... And let us not think [q] that the evangeliſts 'diſagree, or contradict each other, although there be ſome 'ſmall difference. Let us therefore honeſtly and faithfully en- 'deavour to reconcile them.' Then Dionyſius recites thoſe ſeveral places of the four evangeliſts more at large, with ſome remarks, and in the ſame order.

This paſſage is extremely valuable. It ſhews there were four evangeliſts, or ſacred authentic hiſtorians of the life and doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, received by Chriſtian people, and no more, and who they were. The order likewiſe in which they are quoted is obſervable; firſt, the two apoſtles, Matthew and John; then the two companions or fellow labourers of apoſtles, Luke and Mark. Very probably this was the order of many codes, or volumes, of the four goſpels.

In this Epiſtle [r] Dionyſius refers to the woman cured of her infirmity by touching the hem of Chriſt's garments, recorded by more than one of the evangeliſts.

Here [s] alſo is quoted Rom xiv. 23; and, laſtly, ſome [t] words of 1 Cor. vii. 5, expreſsly as Paul's.

XII. In the paſſages formerly tranſcribed from Dionyſius we ſaw divers texts of the Acts of the apoſtles, and St. Paul's epiſtles, expreſsly quoted, or clearly referred to. I might here obſerve ſome other like quotations, or references, to ſeveral of St. Paul's epiſtles in other remaining fragments of Dionyſius; but it is needleſs: and, beſides, ſome more inſtances will appear in a long paſſage, which muſt be neceſſarily produced hereafter. I would therefore only obſerve here, that Dionyſius received the Epiſtle to the Hebrews as the apoſtle Paul's. This appears evident, I think, from what he writes to Fabius, biſhop of Antioch, relating the early ſufferings of the Chriſtians at Alexandria before the publication of Decius's edict. Says he, 'The [u]

[q] Καὶ μηδὲ διαφωνειν, μηδε εγκαλεισθαι τοις ευαγγελισταις υπολαβωμεν· αλλ' ει και μικρολογιαν τις ειναι δοξει περι το ζητουμενον... αλλ' ημεις ευγνωμονως τα λεχθεντα και πιστως κριναι προθυμηθωμεν. ib. E. et p. 833. A.

[r] ib. Can. ii. p. 836. [s] ib. Can. iv. [t] Can. iii. [u] Εξηλθον δε και υπαρχωρουν οι αδελφοι· και την αρπαγην των υπαρχοντων, ομοιως εκεινοις οις και Παυλος εμαρτυρησε, μετα χαρας προσεδεξαντο. ap. Euſ. H. E. l. vi. c. 41. p. 237. B. C.

'brethren withdrew, saving themselves by flight; and *took joy-*
'*fully the spoiling of their goods*, like unto those whom Paul com-
'mends;' Heb. x. 34.

Here it should be observed again, that I do not make use of the forementioned epistle to Paul of Samosata with the questions and answers. There[w] is quoted Heb. x. 28, 29, as the apostle's, meaning Paul, and other texts of that epistle. But as we have very probable arguments to induce us to think that piece is a composition much later than the age of Dionysius, I take nothing out of it.

XIII. I do not recollect any thing in the genuine fragments of Dionysius, that shews his opinion about the controverted catholic epistles, except what we shall see presently in the passage concerning the book of the Revelation, where St. John's three epistles are expressly mentioned. However, in another passage cited by Athanasius, Dionysius observes, that[x] the apostle has the expression of *door of the law*; which expression is in Rom. ii. 13, and James iv. 11. And therefore both these texts are put in the margin by the Benedictine editor of St. Athanasius's works. But it is well known, that by the apostle in ancient ecclesiastical writers, is to be understood Paul; therefore it cannot be well doubted, but Dionysius intends the text in the epistle to the Romans: and if he had designed to refer also to the text of James, he would have signified it some way or other.

XIV. In the time of Dionysius's episcopate there were great numbers of Christians in the district of Arsinoe in Egypt, who were very fond of the millenary notion, expecting a kingdom of Christ here on earth, in which men should enjoy sensual pleasures. These persons were much confirmed in this opinion by a book of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, entitled A Confutation of the Allegorists. Dionysius had a disputation or conference with those Christians, of which he gave an account in one of his books, written upon that subject. In a fragment, which we have in Eusebius, he writes to this purpose: 'When,' says he,[y] 'I was in the province of Arsinoe, where you know this opi-'nion has for some time so far prevailed as to cause divisions and 'apostasies of whole churches; having called together the pres-'byters and teachers of the brethren in the villages, admitting 'likewise as many of the brethren as pleased to be present; I

[w] Conc. T. i. p. 868. A.

[x] Και ποιητης, ο αποστολος εντε νομε. ap. Athan. De Sent. Dionys. T. i. p. 257. E.

[y] ειδω, ως οιδας, περι πολλα τουτο επεπολαζε το δογμα, ως και σχισματα και αποστασιας ολων εκκλησιων γεγονεναι· συγκαλεσας τους πρεσβυτερους και διδασκαλους των κατα κωμας αδελφων, κ. τ. λ. ap. Eus. l. vii. c. 24. p. 272. A.

[z] advised

'advised that this opinion should be publicly examined into. 'And when they produced to me that book as a shield and im- 'pregnable bulwark, I sat with them three whole days suc- 'cessively, from morning till evening, discussing the contents of 'it.' He goes on, highly applauding the good order of the dis- pute, the moderation and candour of all present, their willing- ness to be convinced, and to retract their former opinions, if rea- son so required: 'With a good conscience,' says he, 'and un- 'feignedly, and with hearts open to the sight of God; em- 'bracing' whatever could be made out by good arguments from 'the holy scriptures. In the end, Coracio, the chief defender 'of that opinion, engaged and promised, in the presence of all 'the brethren, that he would no longer maintain, nor defend, 'nor teach, nor make mention of it, as being fully convinced 'by the arguments on the contrary side. And all the brethren 'who were present rejoiced for the conference, and their mutual 'reconciliation and agreement.'

This was the dispute. Of the books written by Dionysius upon this subject, Eusebius speaks after this manner, and gives us farther the following passages, which we are now to transcribe, and make the best use of we are able. 'Beside[a] all these [be- 'fore mentioned by Eusebius] there are two books of his Con- 'cerning the Promises. The occasion of them was Nepos, a 'bishop in Egypt; who taught, that the promises made to the 'saints in the divine scriptures were to be fulfilled in a Jewish 'sense; affirming, that there would be a certain thousand years 'of bodily pleasures upon this earth. He[b] thinking that he 'could support this opinion by John's Revelation, wrote a book 'upon this argument, with the title of A Confutation of the 'Allegorists. This book Dionysius answers in his books Con- 'cerning the Promises. In the first book he lays down his own 'opinion. In the second he discourseth of John's Revelation. 'And at the beginning of this book he speaks of Nepos to this 'purpose: "But because they produce a book of Nepos, on "which they mightily rely, as if he had beyond all contradic- "tion demonstrated, that there shall be a kingdom of Christ "upon this earth: on many other accounts truly I respect and "love Nepos; for his faith, and industry, and study[c] of the

[a] ... τα ταις αποδειξεσι και διδασκαλιαις τ.. αγιων γραφων συνταττομενα καταλεχο- μεν. ib. p. 272. B. C. [a] l. vii. c. ult. in. [b] Δοξας δε και ετος εκ της απεκα- λυψεως Ιωαννου τιμ ιδιαν κρατυνειν υπολαμβων, μεγαν αποδειξεως λογον τινα περι τουτ συνταξας επεγραψε· Προς ον ο Διονυσιος εν ταις περι επαγγελιων εισηγατα.. ib. p. 271. A. [c] Και της εν ταις γραφαις διαιρεσης, και της πολλης φιλομαθιας, ην μεγαν τον πολλου τιμ αξιαν εθεμεθα. ib. p. 271. B.

" ſcriptures, as well as for the many hymns compoſed by him,
" with which not a few of the brethren are ſtill much delighted.
" And I reverence him the more, becauſe he is dead. But
" truth is to be preferred and eſteemed above all things; and
" as we ought without envy to approve, and readily commend
" what is well ſaid, ſo have we alſo a right to examine and cen-
" ſure whatever appears otherwiſe. Since, then, the book is
" public, and by ſome thought to be plauſibly written, and [d]
" there are ſome teachers who look upon the law and the pro-
" phets to be of no value, and neglect to follow the goſpels, and
" deſpiſe the epiſtles of the apoſtles; whilſt at the ſame time
" they extol the doctrine of this book, as containing ſome great
" and hidden myſtery, and ſuffer not the weaker of our brethren
" to conceive any thing great and magnificent, either of the
" glorious and truly divine *appearance of our Saviour*, (Tit. ii. 13.)
" or of our reſurrection from the dead, and *our gathering to-*
" *gether*, (2 Theſſ. ii. 1.) and *likeneſs to him*, (1 John iii. 2.) but only
" to expect in the kingdom of God poor and mortal things,
" and ſuch as we now enjoy in the preſent ſtate; it is neceſſary
" that we enter into diſpute with our brother Nepos, as if he
" was preſent."

'Afterwards,' ſays [e] Euſebius, 'of the Revelation of John he
' writes thus: " Some [f] who were before us have utterly re-
" jected and confuted this book, criticiſing every chapter, [or
" paragraph] ſhewing it to be throughout unintelligible and
" inconſiſtent; adding, moreover, that the inſcription is falſe,
" foraſmuch as it is not John's: nor is it a revelation which is
" hidden under ſo obſcure and thick a veil of ignorance; and [g]
" that not only no apoſtle, but not ſo much as any holy or ec-
" cleſiaſtical man, was the author of this writing; but [h] that
" Cerinthus, founder of the hereſy called after him Cerinthian,
" the better to recommend his own forgery, prefixed to it an
" honourable name. For [i] this (they ſay) was one of his par-
" ticular notions, that the kingdom of Chriſt ſhould be earthly;
" conſiſting of thoſe things which he himſelf, a carnal and ſen-
" ſual man, moſt admired, the pleaſures of the belly, and of con-

[d] . . . και τινων διδασκαλων τον μεν νομον και τους προφητας το μηδεν ηγουμενων, και τοις ευαγγελιοις επεσθαι παρεντων· και τα, των αποστολων επιστολας εκφαυλισαντων. ib. C.

[e] ib. c. 25. in. [f] Τινες μεν και προ ημων ηθετησαι και ανεσκευασαι παντη το βιβλιον, κατ' εκαστον κεφαλαιον διευθυνοντες. ib. p. 272, D. 273, A. [g] και εχ οσιως των αποστολων τινα, αλλ' ουδ' ολως των αγιων η των απο της εκκλησιας τουτο γεγονεναι συντην τη γραμματος. Κηρινθον δε . . . αξιοπιστον επιφημαι θελησαι τω εαυτου πλασματι ονομα. ib. 273. A. [h] Conf. Euſ. l. iii. c. 28. p. 100. B. [i] Τουτο γαρ ειναι και της διδασκαλιας αυτου το δογμα, επιγειον εσεσθαι την του Χριστου βασιλειαν. 273. A.

" cupiſcence;

" cupiſcence; that is, eating, and drinking, and marriage; and,
" for the more decent procurement of theſe, feaſtings, and ſa-
" crifices, and ſlaughters of victims. But, [k] for my part, I dare
" not reject the book, ſince many of the brethren have it in high
" eſteem: but, allowing it to be above my underſtanding, I ſup-
" poſe it to contain throughout ſome latent and wonderful mean-
" ing; for though I do not underſtand it, I ſuſpect there muſt
" be ſome profound ſenſe in the words; not meaſuring and
" judging theſe things by my own reaſon, but aſcribing more to
" faith, I eſteem them too ſublime to be comprehended by me.
" Nor do I condemn what I have not been able to underſtand:
" but I admire the more, becauſe they are above my reach."
Then, examining the whole book of the Revelation, and ſhew-
ing it impoſſible it ſhould be underſtood in the obvious mean-
ing of the words, he goes on: " And having finiſhed in a
" manner his prophecy, the prophet pronounceth thoſe bleſſed
" that keep it, and alſo himſelf. For *bleſſed is every one*, ſays he,
" *that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book*; *and I John,*
" *who ſaw and heard theſe things*: Rev. xxii. 7, 8. I do not deny,
" then, that his name is John, and that this is John's book; for
" I acknowledge it to be the work of ſome holy and divinely in-
" ſpired perſon. [l] Nevertheleſs I cannot eaſily grant him to be
" the apoſtle, the ſon of Zebedee, brother of James, whoſe is the
" goſpel inſcribed according to John and the Catholic Epiſtle;
" for I conclude, from the manner of each, and the turn of ex-
" preſſion, and from the conduct [or diſpoſition] of the book, as
" we call it, that he is not the ſame perſon: for [m] the evangeliſt
" no where puts down his name, nor does he ſpeak of himſelf
" neither in the goſpel nor in the epiſtle." Then a little af-
ter he ſays again: " John no where ſpeaks as concerning him-
" ſelf, nor as concerning another. But he who wrote the Re-
" velation, immediately at the very beginning, prefixeth his
" name; *The revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him*
" *to ſhew unto his ſervants things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs. And*
" *he ſent and ſignified it by his angel unto his ſervant John, who bare*
" *record of the word of God, and his teſtimony, the things which he*
" *ſaw.* Rev. i. 1, 2. And then he writes an epiſtle: *John unto*
" *the ſeven churches in Aſia. Grace be unto you and peace*, v. 4.

[k] Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀθετῆσαι μὲν οὐκ ἂν τολμήσαιμι τὸ βιβλίον, πολλοὺς αὐτὸ διὰ σπουδῆς ἐχόντων ἀδελφοὺς. B. [l] ἅγιον μὲν γὰρ εἶναί τινος καὶ θεοπνεύστου συγχωρῶ· καὶ μὴν ῥᾳδίως ἂν συνθοίμην τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν ἀπόστολον, τὸν υἱὸν Ζεβεδαίου, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου· καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐπιγεγραμμένον, καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολική. p. 273. D. [m] ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ὄνομα παρεγγράφει· οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτόν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς. p. 274. A.

" But

" But [n] the evangelist has not prefixed his name, no not to his
" catholic epistle; but, without any circumlocution, begins with
" the mystery itself of the divine revelation: *That which was from*
" *the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our*
" *eyes*, 1 John, i. 1. And for the like revelation the Lord pro-
" nounced Peter blessed; saying, *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona,*
" *for flesh and blood has not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which*
" *is in heaven*, Matt. xvi. 17. Nor [o] yet in the second or third
" epistle ascribed to John, though indeed they are but short
" epistles, is the name of John prefixed; for without any name
" he is called the Elder. But this other person thought it not
" sufficient to name himself once and then proceed, but he
" repeats it again; *I John, who am your brother and companion in*
" *tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in*
" *the isle that was called Patmos for the testimony of Jesus*, Rev. i. 9.
" And at the end he says; *Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of*
" *the prophecy of this book; and I, John, who saw and heard these*
" *things*, chap. xxii. 7, 8. Therefore that it was John who wrote
" these things ought to be believed, because he says so. But
" who he was is uncertain; for he has not said, as in the gos-
" pel often, that he is *the disciple whom the Lord loved*; nor that
" he is he *who leaned on his breast*; nor the *brother of James*;
" nor that he is one of them who saw and heard the Lord:
" whereas he would have mentioned some of these things if he
" had intended plainly to discover himself. Of these things he
" says not a word: but he calls himself our *brother and compa-*
" *nion, and witness of Jesus*, and *blessed*, because he saw and heard
" those revelations. And I suppose there were many of the
" same name with John the apostle, who for the love they bore
" to him, and because they admired and emulated him, and were
" ambitious of being beloved of the Lord like him, were desirous
" of having the same name: even as many also of the children of
" the faithful are called by the name of Paul and Peter. More-
" over, [p] there is another John in the Acts of the apostles, sur-
" named Mark, whom Paul and Barnabas took for their com-
" panion: concerning whom it is again said; *And they had John*
" *for their minister*, Acts xiii. 5. But that he is the person who
" wrote this book, I do not affirm. Nor is it written that he
" came with them into Asia. But it is said; *Now when Paul*

[n] ὁ δὲ γε εὐαγγελιστης ὑδὲ της καθολικης ἐπιστολης προεγραψεν ἑαυτῳ το ὀνομα. B.

[o] Ἀλλ' ὐδὲ ἐν τη δευτερᾳ θεομενη Ἰωαννου τοῦ πρωτου, και τοι βραχειαις ὐσαις ἐπιστολαις, ὁ Ἰωαννης ὀνομαστι προκειται· ἀλλα ἀνωνυμως ὁ πρεσβυτερος γεγραπται. C.

[p] Ἐστι μεν και ἑτερος Ἰωαννης ἐν ταις πραξεσι των ἀποστολων, ὁ ἐπικληθεις Μαρκος. p. 273. A.

" But

" *and his company loosed from Paphos, they came to Perga in Pamphy-*
" *lia: and John, departing from them, returned unto Jerusalem:*
" v. 13. I [q] think, therefore, that he is another, one of them
" that dwelled in Asia; forasmuch as it is said, that there are
" two tombs at Ephesus, each of them called John's tomb. And
" from the sentiments, and words, and disposition of them, it is
" likely that he is different from him [who wrote the gospel
" and epistle.] For the gospel and epistle have a mutual agree-
" ment, and begin alike. That says; *In the beginning was the*
" *Word.* This, *That which was from the beginning.* That says;
" *And the word was made flesh, and dwelled among us. And we be-*
" *held his glory, the glory, as of the only begotten of the Father.* This
" has the same with little variation; *That which we have heard,*
" *which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and*
" *our hands have handled of the word of life. For the life was mani-*
" *fested.* These things he says by way of preface, pointing, as
" he afterwards shews, at those who asserted that the Lord was
" not come in the flesh. Therefore he also presently subjoins;
" *That which we have seen we testify, and declare unto you that eternal*
" *life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us. That*
" *which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.* He is uniform
" throughout, and wanders not in the least from the points he
" proposed to himself; but prosecutes them in the same sentences
" [literally, chapters] and words, some of which we shall briefly
" observe: for whoever reads with attention will often find in
" both, *life*; frequently, *light*; *avoiding of darkness*; oftentimes,
" *truth, grace, joy, the flesh and the blood of the Lord*; *judgment, for-*
" *giveness of sins, the love of God towards us, the commandment of love*
" *one toward another*; *the judgment of this world, of the devil, of anti-*
" *christ*; *the promise of the Holy Spirit*; *the adoption of the sons of*
" *God*; *the faith required of us in all things*; *the Father and the Son,*
" every where. And, in a word, throughout the gospel and
" epistle it is easy to observe one and the same character. But
" the Revelation is quite different and foreign from these, with-
" out any affinity or resemblance, not having so much as a sylla-
" ble in common with them. Nor does the epistle (for I do
" not here insist on the gospel) mention, or give any hint of the
" Revelation, nor the Revelation of the epistle. And [r] yet
" Paul in his epistles has made some mention of his revelations,
" though he never wrote them in a distinct book. Moreover, it
" is easy to observe the difference of the style of the gospel and
" the epistle from that of the Revelation; for they are not only

[q] Αλλον δε τινα ειναι των εν Ασια γεγονοτων. 275. B.

" written

" written correctly according to the propriety of the Greek " tongue, but with elegance of phraſe and argument, and the " whole contexture of the diſcourſe. So far are they from all " barbariſm and ſoleciſm, and even idiotiſm of language, that " nothing of that kind is to be found in them: for he, as it " ſeems, had each of thoſe [s] gifts; [or (x) words, 1 Cor. xii. " 8, 10.] the Lord having beſtowed upon him both theſe, know- " ledge and eloquence. As to the other, I do not deny that he " ſaw the Revelation, or that he had [the gift of] knowledge " and propheey. But I do not perceive in him an accurate ſkill " in the Greek tongue; on the contrary, I obſerve in him bar- " bariſms, and ſome ſoleciſms, which it is not neceſſary I ſhould " now ſhew particularly, for I do not write by way of ridicule; " let no one think ſo. I only intended to repreſent, after a cri- " tical manner, the difference of theſe pieces."

XV. I have now tranſcribed the whole of this argument, ſo far as it is preſerved by Euſebius: it may afford occaſion for many remarks; and I would hope for my reader's patient attention, whilſt I mention theſe following obſervations.

1. We have here a proof of the great reſpect ſhewn to the ſcriptures by all Chriſtians in general. Dionyſius, deſcribing the good temper of thoſe who entered into conference upon the millenary doctrine, ſays, they were diſpoſed to embrace whatever could be made out by good arguments from the holy ſcriptures. It was the temper of all parties; and Dionyſius himſelf approved of it, for he mentions it by way of commendation. Moreover, this is one thing he ſays in praiſe of Nepos, and for which he highly eſteemed him, that he was much addicted to the ſtudy of the ſcriptures.

2. We cannot but obſerve the general diviſion of thoſe ſcriptures, which were ſo greatly reſpected: The law and the prophets, for the Old Teſtament; goſpels and epiſtles of the apoſtles, for the New. This is very remarkable, and entirely agreeable to ſeveral (y) paſſages already alleged. It ſhews that no epiſtle, or treatiſe, or doctrinal work, was eſteemed by Chriſtians, as of authority, but what was ſuppoſed to be written by apoſtles. When Dionyſius cenſures ſome teachers, who had too great a regard for the doctrine contained in the book of biſhop

[s] Παυλω δια των επιστολων υποφηναντος τι και περι των αποκαλυψεων αυτου, ας αν ειτε γραψε καθ' αυτας. p. 276. B. [t] εκατερ γαρ ειχεν ως εοικε των λογων. C.

(x) Compare 1 Cor. xii. 8. *To one is given by the Spirit the word of wiſdom, to another the word of knowledge.* v. 10. . . . *to another prophecy.*

(y) See Vol. iii. p. and ſee hereafter in St. Cyprian, ch. 44. numb. 10.

Nepos,

Nepos, he blames them for undervaluing the law and the prophets, for neglecting the goſpels, and deſpiſing the epiſtles of the apoſtles. If there had been any other ſacred books among Chriſtians, which had been of authority, as a rule by which opinions were to be judged, tried and determined, he would have mentioned them alſo by their general title and character. This ſhews, that writings of prophets, or other inſpired perſons of low rank, in the time of the goſpel diſpenſation, were not canonical, or of authority; excepting only the hiſtorical writings of Mark and Luke, which undoubtedly were univerſally received, as has been ſhewn abundantly; and we have in particular ſeen that they were received by our great author.

3. In the paſſages juſt cited we have ſeen a very valuable teſtimony to divers parts, or books, of the New Teſtament; as, the goſpels of Matthew and John, particularly the beginning of this goſpel; the Acts of the apoſtles alſo diſtinctly cited by Dionyſius, and expreſs mention of St. Paul's epiſtles. He likewiſe aſſures us, that the firſt catholic epiſtle aſcribed to John was written by the apoſtle and evangeliſt. He ſo deſcribes the ſecond and third epiſtles aſcribed to John, as to ſatisfy us he meaneth the ſame we ſtill have. And he ſpeaks of theſe three epiſtles in ſuch a manner as to confirm the teſtimonies of other writers about this time; that they were all well known; the firſt univerſally acknowledged as the apoſtle John's; and the other two alſo aſcribed to him, but not altogether received without diſpute. Laſtly, with regard to the book of the Revelation, Dionyſius bears witneſs, not only that Nepos founded his doctrine upon it, but likewiſe that it was in high eſteem with many other of the brethren.

4. We have ſeen Dionyſius's obſervations upon the book of Revelation, which I think muſt be allowed to be a good critique for thoſe times. Dionyſius was a learned man; and perhaps he had ſome conſiderable aſſiſtance from more ancient writings of the ſame kind. He actually ſpeaks of ſome before him, who had criticiſed every period of this book. Whether he means Caius only, or ſome others likewiſe; I believe my readers may join with me in wiſhing, that we had them all before us, together with Nepos's book againſt the Allegoriſts, and Dionyſius's anſwer in his books of the Promiſes, entire. However, we ſhould be thankful for what we have, and duly improve it.

5. It may be queſtioned, whether this critique of Dionyſius, about the middle of the third century, or any other critique whatever, can be ſufficient to induce us to doubt of the genuineneſs

nuineneſs of the Revelation, which by many ancient authors is expreſsly aſcribed to John the apoſtle and evangeliſt. Beſides, Dionyſius's critique may be criticiſed, and perhaps the force of ſeveral of his obſervations may be abated. There are divers learned men, who have profeſſedly examined Dionyſius's argument, to whom [t] the reader is referred: though I intend to borrow ſome of their remarks, as well as add ſome of my own.

6. Here I deſire to begin with conſidering what Dionyſius alleges from others, which conſiſts of ſeveral particulars.

For, 1. he ſays, that ſome before him had utterly rejected this book, criticiſing every period, or ſection, and ſhewing it to be throughout unintelligible. Here I cannot but ſay it appears to be a defect in Dionyſius, that he has not named ſome of theſe critics, nor informed us of their character nor time: unleſs we could ſuppoſe that he had done this in ſome other part of his work not tranſcribed by Euſebius; or that there were ſome reaſons to think he might ſuppreſs their names out of tenderneſs, it being not very popular to write againſt the book of the Revelation; or thoſe authors having expreſſed themſelves in an offenſive manner, and taken too great liberties in oppoſing that book. Mill [u] thinks, that Caius only is intended, though Dionyſius ſpeaks in the plural number; and he flouriſhed not above forty years before our author: and indeed part of what Dionyſius allegeth afterwards from the writings before him ſuits what Euſebius has in another place tranſcribed from Caius; but as Dionyſius ſpeaks in the plural number, I think it reaſonable to underſtand him of more than one; for though we know not at this time of any one catholic writer by name, before Dionyſius, who had diſputed the genuineneſs of the Revelation, except Caius, it is not unlikely there might be more. It is not very eaſy to be ſuppoſed that Caius ſhould be altogether ſingular: if he was the firſt, ſo plauſible a writer would not be without followers. That there had been ſome controverſies about the book of the Revelation before the time of Dionyſius, may be argued from a work of Hippolytus, formerly (A) taken notice of, ſuppoſed to be written in defence of St. John's Goſpel and the Apocalypſe; or poſſibly to ſhew, that both theſe books came from that apoſtle, and that the Revelation was written by no other than him who

[t] See Mill. Proleg. n. clxii. . . . clxxx. The biſhop of London's third Paſtoral Letter, p. 58. . . . 60. Mr. Leonard Twells's Critical Examination of the late New Text and Verſion of the New Teſtament, Part iii. p. 105. . . . 121. Beauſobre et Lenfant, leur Preface ſur L' Apocalypſe. p. 606. . . . 608. Du Pin. Diſſ. Prelim. ſur la Bible Liv. ii. ch. ii. § 13. p. 68, 69. Fr. Ad. Lampe Prolegom. in Joann. l. i. cap. 7. n. xxvi. . . . xxviii. p. 126. . . . 130. [u] Caium intelligit, &c. Mill. Proleg. n. clxiii. vid. ibid. clxi.

(z) See before, ch. 32.

(A) See Vol. iii. ch. 35.

wrote

wrote the Gospel. It seems to me to be to very little purpose to say, that no catholic authors had written against the genuineness of the Revelation before Dionysius, except Caius only, because neither Eusebius nor Jerom has mentioned them; for Jerom had his chief dependence on Eusebius: and if they were not mentioned by him, we have no great reason to expect them in Jerom. It ought farther to be observed, that scarce any beside Eusebius have taken particular notice of that passage of Caius against the book of the Revelation; and that Eusebius, who here transcribes this passage of Dionysius, does not contradict him. Once more, it ought to be observed that Dionysius did not, so far as we know, mention Caius by name. As he omitted a particular mention of him a catholic writer, though probably he had some assistances from him, there may have been other writers of the church to whom he refers, though he has not named them.

2. They objected against the title, that it is improperly called a Revelation, which is so obscure; but I take this to be a trifling objection. The author, if he pleased, might call that a revelation, which had been communicated to him in an extraordinary manner, though he had received it, and was to represent it, in a figurative and emblematical style. Besides, it is often spoken of as a prophecy; see ch. i. 13. xxii. 7. 10. 18. 19. And it is no strange thing, that prophecies should be obscure when delivered, and for some time after. See 1 Pet. i. 10. 11. 12. and Luke xxiv. 25. 26. 27. 32. 44. 45. 46.

3. They said that the inscription is false, for the book was not written by John, [e] nor by any apostle, nor by any holy and ecclesiastical man, but by Cerinthus. But all or most of these assertions are without ground and reason. The author was certainly a holy man, and the book is a truly pious and religious book. I suppose I may appeal to every man of taste, if the book is not written in a high strain of piety; and therefore it follows, that the writer's name is John, as he calls himself; for so good a man could not be a downright liar and impostor. Consequently, likewise, Cerinthus could not be the author, unless he also was called John.

But there are other things, chiefly two, which are usually said by learned men in answer to that assertion, that Cerinthus was the author of the Revelation: first, that [w] the Revelation contradicts many of Cerinthus's opinions, and therefore could not be the work of Cerinthus. Irenæus [x] informs us that, among other

[e] Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. clxvii. Mr. Twells, as before, p. 109.
[x] Iren. lib. i. cap. 26. al. 25.

things,

things, Cerinthus denied that God made the world: whereas the writer of the Revelation often teaches the contrary; ſee Rev. iv. 11. x. 6. Another point of Cerinthus was, that Chriſt did not ſuffer, but Jeſus only. But the author of the Revelation calls Jeſus, Chriſt, not Jeſus alone, the firſt begotten of the dead; and adds, that the ſame Jeſus Chriſt waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood; Rev. i. 5. Again, v. 7. he ſays of the entire Jeſus Chriſt, that he was pierced. It is therefore improbable to the higheſt degree, that Cerinthus ſhould write the Revelation under the name of John; for had he meditated ſuch a fraud in favour of his millennium, he would have ſo contrived it as not to hurt his other equally favourite opinions. Secondly, it is ſaid, that the Revelation does not eſtabliſh Cerinthus's notions of the millennium, as it is deſcribed by the objectors, but directly contradicts and overthrows them; for [y] the author of the Apocalypſe expreſsly tells us, that fleſhly impurity ſhall keep men from entering into the new Jeruſalem; or, [z] in other words, St. John deſcribes his Jeruſalem as inhabited by none but pure and holy perſons; Rev. xxi. 27. xxii. 14. 15. whilſt Cerinthus's Jeruſalem was to be the reſidence of the earthly and the ſenſual. His citizens were to ſerve their paſſions and their pleaſures: whilſt the men of John's Jeruſalem were to ſerve God, and the Lamb, Rev. xxii. 3; or, as it is happily expreſſed by a great [a] author, 'His millenary ſtate was not the life of ſaints, as the Apoca-'lypſe repreſents it, but the life of libertines.'

As for the firſt of theſe reaſons, it appears to me not only juſt and ſolid, but alone ſufficient to overthrow the objection, and to ſhew that Cerinthus did not compoſe the Revelation. But with regard to the ſecond anſwer, with all due ſubmiſſion I would ſay, that I am not fully ſatisfied that it is juſt; for, allowing the character here given of Cerinthus by enemies to be in the main right and true, that he was a carnal man, and too fond of ſenſual enjoyments; ſtill there is nothing impure or vicious in their deſcription of his millenary ſtate. They do not ſay he taught that the kingdom of Chriſt ſhould conſiſt in riot and exceſs, and intemperance, adulteries, and all manner of uncleanneſs; but in eating and drinking, and nuptial entertainments, and other feſtivities; none of which are unlawful. It is true, this was low and mean: but ſuch was the notion of all the Chiliaſts at that time, ſo far as appears. Euſebius ſays, Nepos taught, that the promiſes made to the ſaints in the divine ſcriptures were to be fulfilled in a Jewiſh ſenſe; affirming that there would be a cer-

[y] Mr. Twells, as before, p. 110. [z] Mr. Twells, p. 101.
[a] My Lord of London in his Third Paſtoral Letter, p. 58.

tain

tain thouſand years of bodily pleaſures upon this earth: and he ſuppoſed he could defend that notion by the book of Revelation. Dionyſius likewiſe aſſures us, that they who admired Nepos's book ſuffered not the weaker of the brethren to conceive any thing great and magnificent, either of Chriſt's future glorious appearance, or of our gathering together and likeneſs to him; but only to expect in the kingdom of God poor and mortal things, and ſuch as we now enjoy in the preſent ſtate.

Here is a fair occaſion for me to conſider, what was the notion of the Chiliaſts, or Millenarians of that time, who in other reſpects were orthodox: and likewiſe, whether Cerinthus was a Chiliaſt, of which, though it is generally taken for granted, I have ſome doubt, becauſe Irenæus [b] ſays nothing of it. But though I defer a particular diſcuſſion of thoſe points, there are ſome things to be taken notice of here, and which I have reſerved for this place; otherwiſe I ſhould have obſerved them before, either in the hiſtory of the affair of Nepos, or in the account of Dionyſius's works.

For Theodoret expreſsly [c] ſays, that, beſide Caius and others, our Dionyſius likewiſe wrote againſt the heretic Cerinthus. But it is very probable, that Theodoret means only theſe two books of the Promiſes, or ſome part of them.

On the other hand, Jerom ſays, that Dionyſius wrote againſt Irenæus, who is among the moſt orthodox writers of the church; intending nevertheleſs, as is [e] ſuppoſed, the ſame books that Theodoret does, thoſe written againſt Nepos: for the two books againſt Nepos being againſt the Millenarians in general, as [f] Tillemont ſays, they were by conſequence againſt Irenæus, who was one of the moſt celebrated defenders of that opinion. And it is likewiſe eaſy to ſuppoſe, that he was here confuted by name.

Jerom's words in his Commentary upon the Prophecies of Iſaiah are ſo remarkable, and ſo much to our preſent purpoſe, that I ſhall venture to tranſcribe them. 'If [g] we underſtand the

[b] Vid. Iren. Con. Hær. l. i. cap. 26. [c] Eccl. Hiſt. lib. iii. cap. 31. init.

[d] Euſeb. lib. I. 2. cap. 2. [d] Vid. Iſidor. de Den. & Alex. art. 10.

[e] Vid. Pagi Crit. 263. n. 2. [f] Tillemont before. [g] . . . et quia ratione intelligenda ſit Apocalypſis Johannis, quam nos juxta literam accipimus, inducendum eſt; ſi ſpiritualiter, ut ſcripta ſunt, dicemus, multorum veterum videbimur opinionibus contraire, Latinorum, Tertulliani, Victorini, Lactantii; Græcorum, ut cæteros prætermittam, Irenæi tantum Lugdunenſis epiſcopi faciam mentionem: adverſus quem vir eloquentiſſimus Dionyſius, Alexandrinæ eccleſiæ pontifex, elegantem ſcribit librum, irridens mille annorum fabulam; et auream atque gemmatam in terris Jeruſalem; inſtaurationem templi; hoſtiarum ſanguinem; otium Sabbathi; circumciſionis injuriam, nuptias, partus, liberorum educationem, epularum delicias, et cunctarum gentium ſervitutem: rurſuſque bella, exercitus, ac triumphos,

'Revelation literally, we muſt Judaize; if ſpiritually [or figur-
'atively] as it is written, we ſhall ſeem to contradict many of
'the ancients, particularly Latins, Tertullian, Victorinus, Lac-
'tantius; and Greeks likewiſe, eſpecially Irenæus biſhop of
'Lyons, againſt whom Dionyſius biſhop of the church of Alex-
'andria, a man of uncommon eloquence, wrote a curious piece,
'deriding the fable of a thouſand years, and the terreſtrial Jeru-
'ſalem, adorned with gold and precious ſtones; rebuilding the
'temple, bloody (B) ſacrifices, ſabbatical reſt, circumciſion, mar-
'riages, lyings-in, nurſing of children, dainty feaſts, and ſervi-
'tude of the nations: and again, after this, wars, armies, tri-
'umphs, and ſlaughters of conquered enemies, and the death
'of the ſinner a hundred years old. Him Apollinarius anſwered
'in two volumes, whom not only the men of his own ſect, but
'moſt of our own people likewiſe follow in this point. So that
'it is no hard matter to foreſee, what a multitude of perſons I am
'like to diſpleaſe.' Thus writes Jerom.

And it muſt be owned, that the orthodox Chiliaſts, or Millenarians, do ſpeak of a thouſand [h] years reign of Chriſt before the general reſurrection; which good men, having been raiſed up from the dead, ſhould ſpend on this earth; when there ſhall be [i] an extraordinary plenty of the fruits of the earth; when alſo [k] they ſhall feaſt upon them; when [l] Jeruſalem ſhall be rebuilt; when likewiſe there will be marriages and bringing forth of children: but that they believed marriage and fruits of marriage to

et ſuperatorum neces, mortemque centenarii peccatoris. Cui duobus voluminibus reſpondit Apollinarius, quem non ſolum ſuæ ſectæ homines, ſed et noſtrorum in hac parte dumtaxat plurima ſequitur multitudo; ut præſaga mente jam cernam, quantorum in me rabies concitanda ſit. Hieron. in Eſ. l. 18. in Procem. p. 477, 478. Ed. Bened. (B) bloody ſacrifices.] Thoſe words deſerve to be taken notice of, as affording a remarkable inſtance of agreement between the millennium of the orthodox Chriſtians (of which Jerom here ſpeaks) and of Cerinthus, as above deſcribed. See p. 105. [h] Verum ille, cum deleverit iniuſtitiam, judicium-que maximum fecerit, ac juſtos, qui a principio fuerunt, ad vitam inſtauraverit, mille annis inter homines verſabitur, eoſque juſtiſſimo imperio reget. Lactant. l. vii. cap. 24. p. 722. Eodem tempore fiet ſecunda illa et publica omnium reſurrectio, in qua excitabuntur injuſti ad cruciatus ſempiternos. id. cap. 25. p. 728. f. Conf. Iren. l. v. cap. 31. et ſeqq.

[i] Sol autem ſepties tanto, quam nunc eſt, clarior fiet. Terra vero aperiet fecunditatem ſuam, et uberrimas fruges ſine ſponte generabit. Rupes montium mella ſudabunt: per rivos vina decurrent, et flumina lacte inundabunt. Lact. ib. cap. 24. p. 724. Conf. Iren. ib. cap. 33. n. 3.

[k] . . . non facient omne terrenum opus, ſed adjacentem habebunt paratam mensam a Deo paſcentem eos epulis omnibus. Iren. ib. n. 2. Tales itaque promiſſiones manifeſtiſſime in regno juſtorum iſtius creaturæ epulationem ſignificant. id. cap. 34. n. 3. Et hoc eſt triclinium, in quo recumbent ii, qui epulantur vocati ad nuptias. cap. 36. n. 2. Vivent itaque homines tranquilliſſimam vitam, et copioſiſſimam. Lact. ib. cap. 24. p. 726. in. [l] Hæc autem talia univerſa non in ſupercœleſtibus poſſunt intelligi: . . . ſed in regni temporibus revocata terra a Chriſto, et reædificata Hieruſalem, ſecundum characterem quæ ſurſum eſt Hieruſalem. Iren. ib. cap. 35. n. 2.

belong

belong to any of the raiſed ſaints, does not appear to me a clear point. Origen, [m] and [n] ſome others, ſpeak as if this was the expectation of the Chiliaſts, even of ſuch as were orthodox, as it ſeems, at leaſt of [o] ſome of them: which Origen therefore [p] mentions with great concern of mind, being apprehenſive that ſuch an opinion, if known by the heathens, might be a reproach upon the Chriſtian religion. And [q] St. Jerom, immediately after the words juſt cited from him, inſinuates the ſame thing of the orthodox Millenareans of his time: for which reaſon he reminds them of the ſaying of our Lord and Saviour, Matt. xxii. 29. 30. *Ye do err, not knowing the ſcriptures, nor the power of God. For in the reſurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage: but are as the angels of God.* Jerom [qq] writes to the ſame purpoſe in another place of his Commentaries upon the ſame prophet: but [r] Irenæus and [s] Lactantius, who were Millenarians, do not expreſs themſelves in that manner: what they ſay is, that at the time of the firſt reſurrection there will be found ſome good men living upon the earth, and that of them in the ſpace of a thouſand years ſhall be born a numerous race, a godly ſeed; over whom likewiſe the raiſed ſaints are to reign, and by whom they are to be ſerved. Pleaſing deluſion!

[m] Vid. Orig. de Princ. l. ii. cap. 11. n. 2. p. 104. Bened. et Comm. in Matth. p. 498. E. Huet. [n] ap. Phot. Cod. 232. p. 893. n. 10. [o] και μετα την αναστασιν. ... ισθιειν ημας μελλειν τα τοιαδε εδεσματα, και πινειν τινες δε και τεκνοποιειν. Philoc. cap. 26. p. 99. Cantabr. Select. in Pſal. p. 570. B. C. Bened. [p] ταυτα δε φθανει και εις τους απο των εθνων, μεγαλης ευνοιας δοξαι απτεσθαι ποιησει τον χριστιανισμον, πολλω θειλιονα δεγματα εχοντων των αλλοτριων της πιστεως. Orig. ib.

[q] Quibus non invideo, ſi tantum amant terrena, ut in regno Chriſti terrena deſiderent; et poſt ciborum abundantiam, gulæque ac ventris ingluviem, ea quæ ſub illo ſunt quærant. De quibus apoſtolus Paulus: *Eſca*, inquit, *ventri; et venter eſcis. Deus autem et hunc et illas deſtruet.* [1 Cor. vi. 13.] Et, *non eſt regnum Dei eſca et potus.* [Rom. xiv 17.] Et Dominus atque Salvator: *Erratis*, inquit, *nescientes ſcripturas, neque virtutem Dei. In reſurrectione enim neque nubent, neque nubentur: ſed erunt ſimiles angelorum.* Hieron. ibid. [qq] Nunc breviter perſtringendum eſt, quid plurimi de hoc loco ſentiant.... Judæi et noſtri Semijudæi, ſed auream atque gemmatam de cœlo expectant Jeruſalem, hæc in mille annorum regno futura contendunt: quando omnes gentes ſervituræ ſunt Iſrael.... et omnes oves Cedar congregentur; arietesque Nebaioth veniant, ut immolentur ſuper altare templi, quod fuerit extructum. De inſulis quoque, et maxime navibus Tharſis, volare filias illius et columbas, auri et argenti divitias conferentes.... Hæc illi dicunt, qui terrenas deſiderant voluptates, et uxorum quærunt pulchritudinem, ac numerum liberorum. Hieron. Comm. in Il. cap. 60 1, 2, 3, &c. p. 446, 447. [r] ... et illos quos Dominus in carne inveniet, exſpectantes eum de cœlis, et perpeſſos tribulationem, qui et effugerint iniqui manus: Ipſi ſunt, de quibus ait prophetа: *Et dereliqui multiplicabuntur in terra.* Et quotquot ex credentibus ad hoc præparavit Deus, ad derelictos multiplicandos in terra, et ſub regno ſanctorum fieri, et miniſtrare huic Jeruſalem, &c. Iren. l. v. cap. 35. ſub. init. [s] Tum qui erunt in corporibus vivi, non morientur; ſed per eoſdem mille annos infinitam multitudinem generabunt; et erit eorum ſoboles ſancta, et Deo cara. Qui autem ab inferis ſuſcitabuntur, ii præerunt viventibus, velut judices. Lact. ib. cap. 24. init. p. 722.

But I add no more at preſent relating to this matter. I ſhall only refer in the margin [t] to ſome ancient writers, beſide thoſe already cited, who may be conſulted by ſuch as have leiſure.

However, I would now mention a few obſervations relating to the paſſage of Dionyſius under conſideration.

1. I am now better ſatisfied than (c) formerly, that when Caius ſpoke of a book of Revelations, which he aſcribed to Cerinthus, he meant our Revelation written by John.

2. I take it for granted, that by ſome of the arguments above alleged, it has been fully ſhewn, that the ſuppoſition of the Revelation having been written by Cerinthus is without foundation.

3. The deſcriptions of the millennium of Cerinthus, and of the catholic Chriſtians, as given by thoſe who were not Millenarians, is much the ſame.

4. Therefore it is of no importance to ſhew, that the Revelation does not eſtabliſh Cerinthus's notion of the millennium; for neither does it, in the opinion of moſt learned men among the moderns, confirm the notions which ſome ancient catholics had of a millennium: though they certainly grounded their ſentiments upon the Revelation, and upon other books of the Old and New Teſtament, univerſally received.

5. It follows likewiſe, that there is not, as [u] Mr. Lampe thought, any good ground to conclude, that Cerinthus corrupted and interpolated the genuine Revelation of St. John, to ſupport his fond expectation of a thouſand years to be ſpent in nuptial feſtivities, and other ſuch like ſenſual enjoyments: for many catholic, or orthodox Chriſtians, had the ſame expectations, though they uſed our book of Revelation pure and uncorrupted. There might be likewiſe other arguments inſiſted on to ſhew, that this ſuppoſition is groundleſs and fictitious; as, that Cerinthus is not charged by the ancients with this crime of interpolating the Revelation; and, that if he had interpolated and altered this book to make it favourable to his notions about an expected millen-

[t] Vid. Juſt. M. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 307. et ſeq. Pariſ. Euſeb. H. E. l. iii. cap. 24. Gennad. de Ecc. Dogm. ap. Auguſt. in app. T. iii. cap. 55. Ed. Lovan. in app. T. viii. cap. 25. Ed. Bened. Tertullian. Contr. Marc. l. iii. cap. 24. Philaſtr. Hær. 59. De Chilionetitis, p. 119. Ed. Fabric.

(c) See Vol. ii. ch. 32.

[u] Hanc inter alia inde ſubnatum auguror, quod Cerinthus Hæreticus Apocalypſin Apoſtoli quibuſdam in locis, præſertim ubi ultima eccleſiæ fata proponuntur, corruperit, quam corruptam alii cum ipſa Joannis Apocalypſi confuderunt. Fr. Ad. Lampe Proleg. in Joann. l. i. cap. 7. n. 29. p. 129. Jam vero noſtra Apocalypſis nihil habet de regno Millenario Hieroſolymis erigendo, neque de voluptatibus corporis aut feſtis nuptialibus mille annorum ſpatio continuandis. . . . Neque tamen prorſus aliam, ſed certis tantum locis corruptam, atque ad Cerinthi mentem accommodatam fuiſſe colligo. ib. p. 130.

nium;

nium, he would alſo have made it agreeable to his other peculiar ſentiments, of which he was equally fond.

We have now conſidered the objections of ſome before Dionyſius, which he does not adopt.

7. We are in the next place to conſider Dionyſius's own objections, which ſeem to be more material.

The general deſign of Dionyſius's argument is, that the writer of the Revelation is not John the ſon of Zebedee, one of Chriſt's twelve apoſtles, writer of the Goſpel and the firſt Catholic epiſtle, becauſe the Revelation differs very much from thoſe other pieces in ſeveral reſpects.

1. The evangeliſt no where puts down his name, neither in the goſpel, nor in the epiſtle: but the writer of the Revelation mentions himſelf by name more than once. To this it is anſwered as follows:

1. Though St. John has not expreſsly named himſelf in his goſpel, he has there ſo [w] deſcribed himſelf, as that it is impoſſible not to know him: and, as for the epiſtles, they to whom they were ſent could not be ignorant from whom they came.

2. The other evangeliſts have forbore to mention their names, as well as John: nor is there any name prefixed to the epiſtle to the Hebrews.

3. The character of a prophet is different from that of an evangeliſt. The apoſtle might omit his name in his other writings, and yet put it here; where, indeed, he was obliged to put it in conformity to the ancient prophets, who had inſerted their names at the beginning, and in other parts of their prophecies: and above all, Daniel frequently mentions himſelf, whoſe manner the apocalyptic writer uſeth more than that of any other ancient prophet whatever.

But I queſtion whether this laſt obſervation can be allowed, as fully ſatisfactory; for if the apoſtle, who had omitted his name in his other works, mentioned it here in imitation of Daniel, and other ancient prophets, why did he not alſo ſpecify the time of his prophecies or viſions, by declaring the reign, and year of the reign, of the prince or emperor in whoſe time they were received, as is uſual with the ancient prophets, and [x] Daniel in particular?

2. Dionyſius objects, that though the writer of the Revelation calls himſelf John, yet he has not ſhewn us, that he is the

[w] See John xxi. 24. and other places.
[x] See Daniel ch. vii. 1, 2. viii. 1. ix. 12. x. 1. xi. 1.

apoſtle; for he does not ſay, as in the goſpel, that he is the diſciple whom the Lord loved, nor who leaned on his breaſt, nor the brother of James, nor that he is one of them that ſaw the Lord; whereas he would have mentioned ſome of theſe particulars, if he had intended to diſcover himſelf, and to have it thought that he was the apoſtle of that name. To this ſeveral things may be [y] replied.

1. The author of the Revelation calls himſelf John, without any farther diſtinction, and therefore he is likely to be the principal perſon of that name then living; that is, John the evangeliſt: for ſuch an one is ordinarily and ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed by his bare name, and needs no additions; but when a perſon inferior to others of the ſame name is mentioned, common perſpicuity requires an additional title to prevent miſtake. Since therefore, throughout the Apocalypſe, the perſon that ſaw the viſions, and committed them to writing, is barely ſtyled John it is obvious thence to imagine, that none but John the apoſtle an evangeliſt is meant by that name.

2. The [z] author of the Revelation was one who had *borne record of the word of God, and of the teſtimony of Jeſus, and of the things which he had ſeen*: Rev. i. 2. It is added, 'That [a] the 'concluding words of this verſe, *the things which he ſaw*, un-'doubtedly appropriate all that goes before to John the apoſtle; 'for had any John then living ſeen the tranſactions of the goſ-'pel, ſave John the apoſtle?'

So Mr. Twells. But all thoſe words may be very properly underſtood (*) of this book, the Revelation, or the things contained in it; for the book begins thus, chap. i. v. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him, to ſhew unto his ſervants things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs: and he ſent and ſignified it by his angel unto his ſervant John.* Then in the ſecond verſe the writer ſays, that he diſcharged his office in this book, having

[y] See, beſide Mill. Prolegomena, n. 374. Mr. Twells, as before, Part iii. p. 21, &c. [z] See Mr. Twells, as before, p. 22, 23. [a] Ibid. (*) The note of Mrs. de Beaufobre and Lenfant upon thoſe words is this; 'Who bare record of the 'Word of God and of the teſtimony of Jeſus 'Chriſt. See 1 John i. 1. and John xxi. '24. For though it is not certain that the 'goſpel of St. John was then written, it 'ſufficeth, that the apoſtle had by word 'of mouth preached the ſame things that 'are in his goſpel.' This place, ſays St. Ambroſe, "ſhews, that this book was "not written by any other John than he "who wrote the goſpel." Nevertheleſs 'theſe words may be alſo applied to the 'Apocalypſe itſelf. On peut pourtant auſſi 'rapporter ces paroles à l'Apocalyſe même.' It ought to be remarked, that the piece from whence that obſervation is taken, is not really St. Ambroſe's, though ſometimes aſcribed to him, but the work of ſome writer of the eighth century, or later, as thoſe commentators well knew; but for brevity ſake, I ſuppoſe, they quoted it by the name of St. Ambroſe. Vid. Ambroſii Opera, T. ii. p. 497, 498, 499. in App.

therein

therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jesus Christ, and all the visions he had seen, v. 2. *Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw.* This seems a very natural and obvious sense of these words; and that it is the real design and meaning of them, may be confirmed by comparing them with the beginnings of some of the books of the ancient Jewish prophets; as Is. i. 1. *The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he saw....* Ezek. i. 3. 4. *The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest,.... and I beheld....* In these words therefore the writer, after the manner of many other good writers, sets before his readers, in brief, the design and substance of the whole book.

3. 'The [b] Revelation is the work of that John who was in 'the isle of Patmos for the testimony of the gospel, which was 'then the peculiar case of John the apostle: which circumstance 'not only agrees with the history of John the evangelist, but is 'also peculiar to him, and marks him out as effectually as if he 'had been expressly so called; for [c] the ancients declare, 'that this John was banished in the latter end of Domitian's 'reign to that island; but we do not find, from ecclesiastical mo- 'numents, that any other named John was at that time banished 'into the isle of Patmos.'

I have been unwilling to omit this observation; but perhaps some will think it not very properly mentioned in this place. They may say, that this serves to shew that some ancient writers did own the Revelation was written by the apostle John; and it would be fitly enough insisted on in an account of their testimonies concerning it; but it ought not to be mentioned as a distinct consideration: for those writers, supposing this book to have been written by John the apostle, concluded thence that he was banished into the island of Patmos.

4. 'The [d] epistle of John to the seven churches of the Minor, 'or Proconsular Asia, and consequently the Revelation itself, 'was most probably written by that John who had the imme- 'diate and particular care of those churches; namely, John the 'apostle: for the presidence of our apostle is a fact attested by 'early antiquity. Eusebius [e] tells us from tradition, that upon 'the dispersion of the apostles, Asia fell to John's lot: and as

[b] Mr. Twells, as before, p. 24.
[c] See Clem. Alex. in his book, Quis Dives salvetur. cap. 42. p. 959. Tertul. de Præscr. Hær. c. 36. Euseb. Chron. Euseb. Domit. 14. and H. E. l. iii. c. 18. 20. Of the same mind were Epiphanius and Sulpitius Severus. and Jerom in Cat. V. I. and in l. i. contr. Jovin, c. 14.' So Mr. Twells in a note p. 24.
[d] Mr. Twells, p. 25. [e] Hist. Ec. l. iii. c. 1.

'Epheſus was the principal city of the province, there John 'chiefly reſided; viſiting and directing the neighbouring 'churches, as occaſion required.'

Theſe things therefore may be reckoned ſufficient to ſignify to every one who is the author of this book. He calls himſelf John; he is one who bore record of the word of God; he had been in the iſle of Patmos for the teſtimony of Jeſus; he writes to the ſeven churches of Aſia, where the apoſtle and evangeliſt is ſuppoſed to have preſided.

So it has been argued by learned men; and certainly theſe are particulars that deſerve conſideration, though they be not all of equal importance, as has been ſhewn in paſſing along. They are of uſe to weaken this objection of Dionyſius; but whether they confute and overthrow his argument, I cannot certainly ſay. It had been very eaſy, in my opinion, for the apoſtle to deſign, or deſcribe himſelf in a more peculiar and diſtinguiſhing manner, if indeed he was the author of this book: and ſince the writer of the Revelation, as Dionyſius obſerves, nameth himſelf more than once, and calleth himſelf our brother and companion, and ſays he was in Patmos for the teſtimony of Jeſus; why did he not ſomewhere ſay, that he was the diſciple whom Jeſus loved, or who leaned upon his breaſt; and that he was an eye-witneſs of the word, or of the ſufferings of Jeſus; or plainly call himſelf apoſtle? As the writer ſeems willing enough to characteriſe, and deſcribe himſelf, it may be thought ſomewhat ſtrange that he has not plainly expreſſed ſome ſuch characteriſtics as theſe, if they belonged to him.

3. Dionyſius objects, that the Revelation does not mention the catholic epiſtle, nor the epiſtle the Revelation.

But I think this obſervation to be of little moment: for, not to ſay any thing here about the exact time of writing any of theſe pieces, of the goſpel, or the fore-mentioned epiſtle of St. John, or the Revelation, nor which was firſt or which laſt written; it is not the cuſtom of the ſacred writers to quote themſelves, or refer to their own works. When they write more than one epiſtle to the ſame churches, or perſons, they make mention of their former epiſtle to thoſe churches or perſons; this is natural, and it is done by St. Paul: but in his epiſtle to the Romans, though he had then written ſeveral epiſtles, he does not there ſay any thing of thoſe former epiſtles.

4. Dionyſius argues, that there is a great likeneſs of ſentiment and expreſſion between the goſpel and catholic epiſtle of John; but that the Revelation is quite different, without any

affinity

affinity or reſemblance, not having ſo much as a ſyllable common to them. By way of reply to this, ſeveral things have been ſaid.

1. As, that [f] this argument, taken from the difference of ſtyle, is altogether inſignificant, and of no conſequence; for allowing it to be true, that there were as great a difference as Dionyſius aſſerts, every body knows, that the ſtyle of hiſtory is different from that of an epiſtle or a prophecy. The ſtyle of hiſtory is ſimple; of an epiſtle, familiar; and that of prophecy is grand and ſublime, as certainly is the ſtyle of the Revelation.

2. Another [g] part of the anſwer is, by denying the fact. The difference between the Revelation and the acknowledged writings of St. John is not ſo great as repreſented by Dionyſius. Nay, it is ſaid, 'there [h] is in many inſtances a conformity both 'of ſentiment and expreſſion between the Revelation and the 'unconteſted writings of John the apoſtle: and this agreement 'is ſo remarkable, as to be itſelf no bad argument, that they 'were all written by one hand; for how elſe could there be any 'tolerable reſemblance of this ſort in writings of ſo different a 'nature?' Divers ſuch coincidences have been obſerved by [i] learned men. 'In [k] the Revelation, (chap. xix. 13.) it is ſaid 'of Chriſt, that *his name is called the Word of God*; and in the 'goſpel of St. John he is ſtyled the Word, (ch. i. 1.) and in his 'his firſt epiſtle *the Word of life*: ch. i. 1. In the Revelation 'he is called the Lamb, (ch. v. 6. 12.) and in the goſpel of St. 'John, the *Lamb of God*; ch. i. 29. 36. In the Revelation the 'name of Chriſt is, *He that is true*: ch. iii. 7.... *he that is faith-*'*ful and true*; (xix. 11.) and in the goſpel of St. John, *he that is* '*true*.... *full of truth*, (ch. i. 14.) and the *truth*: xiv. 6. 1 John 'v. 20. In the Revelation, manna is applied to ſpiritual food; 'and ſo it is applied in the goſpel of St. John: Rev. ii. 7. John 'vi. 32. In the Revelation it is ſaid, *And every eye ſhall ſee him,* '*and they alſo which pierced him*; (Rev. i. 7.) and in the goſpel 'of St. John, from the prophet Zachary, *They ſhall look on him* '*whom they pierced*: John xix. 37. In the Revelation Chriſt 'ſaith, *If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in* '*to him, and ſup with him, and he with me*: Rev. iii. 20. In the 'goſpel of St. John, *If a man love me, he will keep my words; and* '*my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our* '*abode with him*: ch. xiv. 23.'

[f] Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. 176, 177.
[g] See Beauſobre and Lenfant Preface ſur l'Apocalypſe, p. 607. [h] Mr. Twells, as before. [i] Mr. Twells, as before. [k] See the biſhop of London's Third Paſtoral Letter. p. 59, 60.

These are instances of agreement between the Revelation and the confessed writings of St. John, which are commonly insisted on; but I own I have scruples with regard to divers of these instances. May I then be allowed to propose some difficulties upon this head, and go over again each of these particulars? When I have done so, I will add a few other.

1. 'In Rev. xix. 13. Christ is called the *Word of God.*' But there is no parallel to that expression that I know of in St. John's confessed writings. Indeed, at the beginning of his gospel, he speaks of the Word, and at the beginning of his first epistle of the Word of life: but still here is a difference. Mr. Twells [l] says, 'in Rev. xix. 13. Christ is termed *the Word of God*; and every one knows that he is more frequently so styled 'in the uncontested writings of St. John than elsewhere.' But though Mr. Twells says 'every one knows this,' I must entreat him to make an exception for me till somebody has shewn me the several texts of St. John's uncontested writings, where Christ is so called, for at present I do not know of one.

2. 'Then Christ is called the Lamb of God in the gospel of 'St. John, and the Lamb in the Revelation.' But here is no exact resemblance; for in the gospel Christ is called the Lamb of God; in the Revelation the Lamb. In the gospel Christ is but twice only called the Lamb of God, and that by John the baptist; but in the Revelation he is very frequently called the Lamb. And, besides, he is compared to a lamb in other books of the New Testament; as 1 Pet. i. 19. See likewise Acts viii. 32.

3. 'In Rev. iii. 7. 14. and again ch. xix. 11. Christ is [m] em-'phatically styled ὁ ἀληθινος, he that is true. And the very same 'character is given to him, 1 John v. 20. See also John i. 14. 'and xiv. 6. But such expressions occur no where else.' So argues Mr. Twells. And it may be owned that this is somewhat remarkable: but still, as Dionysius observed, the word Truth, so common in St. John's gospel and epistles, is wanting in the Revelation. And it may be said, that equivalent things are found in the writings of St. Paul, and other books of the New Testament; as when Paul says of Christ, (1 Tim. vi. 13.) that *before Pontius Pilate he witnessed a good confession*; and when the gospel is called the truth, or the word of truth, as it often is. And even insidious enemies were obliged to give our Lord the character of a sincere teacher of truth, as recorded Matt. xxii. 16. *Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth.* See also Mark xii. 14.

[l] As before, p. 28.

[m] See Mr. Twells, p. 28.

4. 'In

4. 'In Rev. ii. 17. are theſe words; *To him that overcometh, 'will I give to eat of the hidden manna.* And ſpiritual food is 'ſpoken of under the image of manna in John, vi.' But I cannot perceive theſe texts to be parallel: however, [n] Mr. Twells lays a good deal of ſtreſs upon this coincidence.

5. 'In Rev. i. 7. *Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye 'ſhall ſee him, and they alſo which pierced him: and all kindreds of the 'earth ſhall wail, becauſe of him.* In Zach. xii. 10. are theſe words; '*And they ſhall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they ſhall 'mourn for him....* And that text is cited John xix. 37. *And 'again, another ſcripture ſaith: They ſhall look on him whom they 'pierced*; but no [o] where elſe in the New Teſtament.' But I would obſerve, that in the Revelation there is no citation as in St. John's goſpel: and the text of the Revelation ſuits as well a text of St. Matthew's as of St. John's goſpel; *And then ſhall appear the ſign of the Son of man in heaven: and then ſhall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they ſhall ſee the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory:* Matt. xxiv. 30.

6. 'In Rev. iii. 20. our Lord promiſeth the obedient; *I 'will come unto him, and ſup with him, and he with me.* And ſo in 'the goſpel of St. John xiv. 23. *I and my Father will come unto 'him, and will make our abode with him.*' It muſt be allowed that here is ſome reſemblance: nevertheleſs, it would have been a great pleaſure to ſee in the Revelation the word abode, or abide, ſo common in St. John's goſpel and firſt epiſtle.

7. Farther, 'Rev. i. 5. *Unto him that hath loved us, and waſhed 'us from our ſins in his own blood.* So the apoſtle John, 1 John i. '7. *And the blood of Jeſus Chriſt his Son cleanſeth us from all ſin.*' But this coincidence appears to me to be of very ſmall moment; becauſe the love of Chriſt in waſhing, or cleanſing, or redeeming, or ſaving us from our ſins by his blood or death, is a ſubject inſiſted on in every book of the New Teſtament, and could not be omitted by any Chriſtian writer or ſpeaker in the early days of the goſpel.

To theſe coincidences, inſiſted on by others, Mr. Twells has added [p] ſeveral more. And, beſides, he proceeds ſtill farther, adding ſome propoſitions, and ſupporting them by various examples under each. His propoſitions are theſe: 'Firſt, the 'ſameneſs of conſtruction and acceptation of words in the Re-'velation, and the unqueſtionable writings of St. John, and 'which are leſs frequent with the other ſacred penmen, makes

[n] See him, p. 27, 28. [o] See Mr. Twells, p. 27. [p] As before, p. 30.

it

'it extremely probable that one perſon was the author of them 'all. Secondly, there [q] are many inſtances in the Revelation 'of conſtruction and acceptation of words altogether peculiar to 'John the evangeliſt, which demonſtrate he wrote that book.' So Mr. Twells. But I have not room for his particular inſtances; and he may be read not only in his own Engliſh, but likewiſe in Mr. Wolff's fourth [r] volume of Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ upon the New Teſtament; Mr. Wolff having tranſlated a large part of Mr. Twells's work into Latin entire, and the reſt of it in the way of a copious abridgment.

I ſhall, however, tranſcribe here a particular or two.

8. One of the coincidences obſerved by Mr. Twells, additional to thoſe above mentioned, is this: 'In Rev. iii. 21. Chriſt '[s] ſays, Εγω ενικησα, *I have overcome.* Juſt as he declares, Joh. xvi. 33. 'Εγω νενικηκα τον κοσμον, *I have overcome the world.* Again, Chriſ- 'tian firmneſs under trials is frequently called *overcoming* in the 'ſecond and third chapters of the Revelation, as it is alſo 1 Joh. 'ii. 13. 14. iv. 4. v. 5. language peculiar to St. John.'

I would add likewiſe two inſtances of conſtruction and acceptation of words, which [t] Mr. Twells reckons altogether peculiar to John the evangeliſt.

9. 'In Rev. ii. 26. *He* [u] *that keepeth my works unto the end.* 'Here [w] works, ſays Mr. Twells, is plainly put for [x] words: 'and ſo Grotius upon the place; but we no where find the like 'acceptation of this word, ſave in John xiv. 10. *The* [y] *words* 'which *I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of myſelf; but my Father that* 'dwelleth in me, he doth the works. Here is an oppoſition of ſenſe, 'which cannot be made out, unleſs we ſuppoſe, that ſpeaking 'words and doing works mean the ſame thing. The ſenſe 'therefore of the paſſage is this: The words which I ſpeak are 'not merely my own, but my Father which dwelleth in me, he 'is the joint author of them. And this ſenſe our Lord gives us 'in expreſs terms, v. 24. of this chapter: *The word, which ye* 'hear, *is not mine, but my Father's which ſent me.* And, again ch. 'viii. 28. *I do nothing of myſelf, but as my Father has taught me, ſo* 'I *ſpeak.*'

10. 'Keeping [z] *the word,* or *words,* is an expreſſion not uncom- 'mon in the Revelation; ſee ch. iii. 8. 10, xxii. 7. 9. But in 'no other book of the New Teſtament do we meet with it, ex-

[q] ib. p. 32. [r] p. 387, &c. [s] See Mr. Twells, p. 29. [t] ibid. p. 32. [u] τηρων αχρι τελους τα εργα μου. [w] εργα. [x] λογους. [y] Τα ρηματα α εγω λαλω εγω, απ' εμαυτου ε λαλω· ο δε πατηρ ο εν εμοι μενων αυτος ποιει τα εργα. [z] Τηρων λογον or λογους.

'cept

'cept in St. John's gospel and first epistle; see John viii. 51. '52. 55. xiv. 23. 24. xv. 20. xvii. 6. 1 Joh. ii. 5.' So [a] Mr. Twells. However, the phrase, *keeping the commandments*, is in Matt. xix. 17. St. Matthew has the same verb in other places, and particularly xxviii. 20. *Teaching them to observe* [or keep] *whatsoever I have commanded you*: that verb is also in other books of the New Testament; and *keeping Christ's commandments* is in John's gospel, as xiv. 15. 21. xv. 10. and often in his first epistle, and sometimes in the Revelation, as ch. xii. 17. xiv. 12. So that the verb Keep, τηρεω, is oftener used by St. John than any other writer of the New Testament, and the phrase *keeping Christ's word*, or *words* by him alone; but yet, perhaps, this peculiarity is not very remarkable.

3. I have now enlarged upon this part of the answer to Dionysius's argument, which consists in denying the fact, and in shewing that the difference between the Revelation and the acknowledged writings of St. John is not so great as he has represented it. Nevertheless it must be owned, as I apprehend, that this part of his critique is just and true in the main; for Dionysius observed, that there are certain words, or expressions, such as *light*, *life*, *truth*, and several others, very common in St. John's gospel and epistle, but not to be found at all, or very rarely, in the Revelation. Nor have any of our modern sharp-sighted critics been able to shew those expressions in this last mentioned book, nor with all their industry directly to confute and overthrow that observation.

And perhaps Dionysius's collection of this kind might be enlarged; for the verb μενω, *abide*, or *dwell*, is very common in St. John's gospel [b] and first epistle, but scarce occurs at all in the Revelation, except one place, ch. xvii. 10. which I suppose does not deserve particular notice here. Moreover, as Mr. Blackwall has, 'St. John often takes one thing two ways, both in the 'affirmative and negative; 1 Joh. v. 12. *He that hath the Son, 'hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life.*' This is the only example alleged by Mr. Blackwall; but he says St. John does so often; and it is certain there are several such instances in his [c] first and [d] second epistle, and others in his gospel. Thus of John the baptist he writes; (Joh. i. 20.) *And he confessed, and 'denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ.* And our Lord says to Thomas, (chap. xx. 27.) *And be not faithless, but believing*; but I cannot remember such forms of speaking in the Revelation.

It may be also said to the advantage of Dionysius, that his critique does not consist of minute particulars, but of such things

[a] Ib. p. 33. [b] See Sac. Classics, Vol. i. p. 353. [c] See 1 John i. 5, 6. iv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8. [d] 2 John, ver. 9.

as

as are very conſiderable, and muſt hold, I think, as proofs of a great agreement of ſentiments and expreſſions between St. John's goſpel and firſt epiſtle, and of a remarkable difference of the Revelation and the unqueſtioned writings of the evangeliſt.

Mr. Blackwall however ſays, 'The [e] Revelation is written 'much in the ſame ſtyle with St. John's goſpel and epiſtles.' On the contrary, Joachim Camerarius ſays, 'The [f] difference 'of the ſtyle of the Revelation from that of the goſpel and epiſtle 'is manifeſt, and may be eaſily perceived by any one who has 'attained to only a moderate knowledge of the Greek language.' And he [g] ſpeaks of theſe critical remarks of Dionyſius in terms of great reſpect.

Beza likewiſe, in his preface to the Revelation, having anſwered divers objections to the genuineneſs of this book, concludes; 'that [h] he cannot but think it moſt probable, that it was 'written by John the apoſtle: but that if a conjecture was to be 'made from the ſtyle, who elſe could be reckoned moſt likely to 'be the writer; he ſhould think of Mark, who was alſo called 'John, there being a great reſemblance in words, phraſes, and 'manner of writing, between this book and Mark's goſpel.'

And this I ſuppoſe to be the more general opinion of learned men, that there is a conſiderable difference of ſentiments and words and manner in the Revelation and the acknowledged pieces of the apoſtle John, whatever this difference is owing to; whether it be that theſe writings are not all the compoſitions of one and the ſame author; or that it is entirely owing to the diverſity of ſubject and deſign, which was mentioned (D) formerly, or to ſome other cauſe. I ſhall, however, mention another thing to be conſidered. If there were any reaſon to think that there was ſome conſiderable diſtance of time between the compoſing of any of theſe books, that might be one good way of accounting for differences of ſtyle; for it is not unlikely that one and the ſame perſon, writing upon different arguments, and at a great diſtance of time, eſpecially if he be one who does

[e] As before, p. 334.

[f] Sane orationem hujus diſſimilem eſſe ejus, qua conſcripta extat Evangelii expoſitio et Epiſtolæ compoſitio, evidens eſt, atque perſpicitur facile ab aliquo, qui non etiam peritiſſimus linguæ Græcæ, ſed illius mediocrem ſaltem notitiam conſecutus eſt ſtudio ſuo. Joach. Camer. ad Apoc.

[g] Sed nihil eſt opus noſtra diſputatione longiore, cum, ut opinor, ea, quæ debeant et poſſint dici de hoc libro, exſtent commemorata in libro vii. Hiſtoriæ Euſebii, excerpta ex quadam epiſtola Dionyſii Alexandrini. Id. ib.

[h] Quæ cum ita ſe habeant, quamvis non cenſuerim quidem ego pertinacius de ſcriptoris nomine inigandum, tamen Johanni apoſtolo potius quam cuiquam alii hunc librum tribuerim. . . Quod ſi quid aliud liceret ex ſtylo conjicere, nemini certe potius quam Marco tribuerim, qui et ipſe Johannes dictus eſt: adeo non in verbis tantum, ſed etiam in formulis dicendi plerisque ſimilis, ac pene idem eſt Evangelii Marci et hujus libri character. Bez. Pr. in Apoc.

(D) See p. 121.

ngt

not frequently exercise his style, or write in the intermediate space, should have a very different manner in his several performances.

Thus far then of the argument concerning difference of sentiment and expression.

3. Dionysius's last objection is founded upon the diction or language of the Revelation: for he says that the gospel and epistle of John are written correctly, and not only according to the propriety of the Greek tongue, but with elegance of phrase, argument, and composition; quite free from barbarism and solecism, and even idiotism of language: but the writer of the Revelation discovers no accurate skill in the Greek tongue; on the contrary, he has barbarisms, and some solecisms.

In answer to this, several things have been said by learned men of late times; for Mill [i] allows that there are solecisms in the Revelation. It is a thing, he says, too manifest to be denied; but then, as he adds, the other writers of the New Testament are not free from the like defects; no, not John the evangelist, the purity and elegance of whose language is so commended by Dionysius. Mr. Twells's [k] answer here is to the like purpose. 'We do not pretend,' he says, 'to assert that the language of 'the Revelation is pure Greek.' But he is persuaded that it is now much worse than when Dionysius passed his censure upon it: nay, he supposeth that there were not half the solecisms in the copies of Dionysius's times that now occur in the printed copies; and that our printed copies abound with solecisms. But then, as the Greek of the Revelation was always far from being pure, so Dionysius has beyond measure extolled that of St. John's gospel and canonical epistle, which has it's faults likewise.

So write those two learned men. But Mr. [l] Blackwall blames Dr. Mill for striking in so far with Dionysius as to allow there is false Greek and solecism in the Revelation; and he offers solutions of several constructions in that book which have been supposed ungrammatical: and Mr. Wolff, in a note [m] upon his Latin translation of this part of Mr. Twells's work, gives a caution against receiving that supposition, that there are solecisms in the Revelation.

Thus critics are divided upon points of this nature. I think, therefore, we may set aside this part of the argument until they are better agreed among themselves.

[i] Et certe Apocalypten subinde minus Græce scribere, etiam et σολοικίζειν, notius fit quam ut negari possit. Proleg. n. 179.

[k] As before, p. 113, 114, 115.

[l] See Sacred Classics, Vol. i. p. 140... 142.

[m] Cave, hoic Twelsii judicium probes. Omnem enim solœcismorum suspicionem ab illis, qui illorum postulantur, locis alienam esse infra ex notis apparebit. *Wolf. Cur. T. iv.* p. 417.

Before

Before that is done it ſeems needleſs to inquire after the reaſons of the imperfections of the language of the Revelation, or to examine thoſe reaſons which have been aſſigned. However, to obſerve ſomewhat briefly relating to this matter may not be amiſs. Mr. Twells [n] ſays, 'That if this book be found to have 'rather more of theſe imperfections than St. John's other writ-'ings, two cauſes may be aſſigned for it. Firſt, that being of 'the prophetical ſort, the Holy Ghoſt thought it moſt congru-'ous to uſe the ſame forms of ſpeech as the prophets of the Old 'Teſtament do, which occaſions more Hebraiſms in it. Se-'condly, as prophetic language is generally leaſt cultivated in 'point of beauty and perſpicuity, ſo we are not to wonder if 'the ſame negligence ſhould appear in the grammar of it. A 'writer big with the myſteries he relates, may well be ſuppoſed 'leſs attentive to diction, than when he draws up a hiſtory or 'an epiſtle.' So Mr. Twells. 'As for the language of the Re-'velation,' ſays [o] Tillemont, 'beſide other reaſons that might be 'alleged, may it not be ſaid, that, being baniſhed into Patmos, 'St. John had not by him the ſame perſons he had at Epheſus 'to aſſiſt him in the choice of terms and expreſſions? And poſ-'ſibly, too, the power of the Spirit of God conſtrained him to 'write quickly what he had ſeen, without concerning himſelf 'about purity and elegance of ſpeech, which are of no value 'in the ſight of God.'

I own I have no great opinion of theſe reaſons; but, as before obſerved, ſince learned men are not as yet agreed about the fact, there is no immediate neceſſity that we ſhould ſcrupulouſly examine the ſuppoſed cauſes of it. I therefore paſs on.

8. We are now to obſerve, after all, Dionyſius's own opinion of the author of this book.

In this critique upon the Revelation he ſays, he dares not reject it: and we find that he actually made uſe of it in his writings. Euſebius informs us, that in a letter to Hermammon, ſpeaking of Valerian and his perſecution, Dionyſius ſays: 'And [p] John 'had a revelation to this purpoſe: *And there was given unto him,* 'ſaith he, *a mouth, ſpeaking great things, and blaſphemies: and power* '*was given unto him to continue forty and two months.* Rev. xiii. 5. 'It is wonderful to ſee both theſe things in Valerian.' So Dionyſius. This paſſage is a proof that the Revelation was then well known, and in great reputation.

[n] As before, p. 115, 116.

[o] See Mem. Ec. T. i. P. iii. p. 1089. St. Jean l'Evangeliſte, note ix.

[p] και τω Ιωαννη δι ομοιως αποκαλυπτεται· Και εδοθη γαρ αυτω, φησι, στομα. . . . Αρφοτερα δε ιδειν εστι τη ουαλεριανω θαυμασαι. ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. 7. c. 10. init.

Among

Among theſe his critical obſervations he likewiſe acknowledgeth this book to be the work of ſome holy and divinely inſpired perſon; but, he thinks, not the work of John the apoſtle the ſon of Zebedee; but, rather, of ſome other John who had his chief reſidence in Aſia.

And certainly, Dionyſius is in the right to own, that the writer was a truly good and holy man. I think the book itſelf puts that out of queſtion.

Conſequently alſo, he was divinely inſpired; for he ſays, he *was in the Spirit*; Rev. i. 10. And the book is declared to be, or contain, (v. 1.) *the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him to ſhew unto his ſervants things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs; and he ſent and ſignified it by his angel unto his ſervant John.* It is added afterwards, (v. 19.) *Write the things which thou haſt ſeen.... and the things which ſhall be hereafter.* Again, (chap. iv. 1.) *I will ſhew thee things which muſt be hereafter.* It is alſo called (E) a *prophecy.* Now prophecy is not an human attainment, but the gift of God.

Nevertheleſs, Dionyſius thinks it not the writing of the apoſtle, but of ſome other John, whom he does not certainly know, but probably of that other John who is ſaid to have had his reſidence in Aſia, there being two tombs at Epheſus with that name.

Againſt this ſuppoſition ſhould be obſerved all the arguments above mentioned relating to the inſcription; that there are many ancient writers who receive the Revelation as the writing of John the apoſtle and evangeliſt; that we have no particular account of any John having been an exile in the iſle of Patmos about that time, except John the apoſtle; and the writer calling himſelf John without any particular characteriſtics gives ground to conclude he is the principal perſon of that name then living: and it may be judged very unlikely that the Spirit of God ſhould admoniſh and reprove the ſeven churches of Aſia by John the elder, (allowing that there was ſuch a perſon) whilſt John the apoſtle was living and preſided in thoſe parts.

XVI. I ſuppoſe I have now payed a due regard to this critique of Dionyſius: but before I proceed, I will take a brief review of it, and add two or three remarks.

This whole critique may be ſaid to conſiſt of three parts: objections of ſome before Dionyſius; then his own objections; and, laſtly, his own judgment or opinion.

(E) See Rev. ch. i. 3. xxii. 7. 10. 18. 19.

The objections of thoſe before Dionyſius I ſuppoſe to have been fully anſwered; and their opinion, that Cerinthus was the writer of the Revelation, confuted.

But Dionyſius's own objections are more material: they are five in number. Firſt, that the evangeliſt John has not named himſelf neither in his goſpel nor in his catholic epiſtle, but the writer of the Revelation nameth himſelf more than once. Secondly, that though the writer of the Revelation calls himſelf John, he has not ſhewn us that he is the apoſtle of that name. Thirdly, that the Revelation does not mention the catholic epiſtle, nor that epiſtle the Revelation. Fourthly, that there is a great agreement in ſentiment, expreſſion, and manner, between St. John's goſpel and epiſtle: but the Revelation is quite different in all theſe reſpects, without any reſemblance or ſimilitude. Fifthly, that the Greek of the goſpel and epiſtle is pure and correct, but that of the Revelation has barbariſms and ſoleciſms.

Theſe are Dionyſius's objections. The third we have ſuppoſed to be of little force. The fifth depending upon a matter of much niceneſs, about which very few are able to judge, and about which even the learned are not agreed, we have not much inſiſted upon it; nor did Dionyſius enlarge, or enter into, particulars here. As for the firſt, ſeveral things have been alleged by way of anſwer to it; but whether that anſwer be full and complete, may be queſtioned. As for the ſecond objection, ſeveral things alſo have been obſerved ſufficient to weaken, if not to confute and overthrow it. With regard to the fourth objection it has been obſerved, that the ſubject matter and deſign of the Revelation being very different from thoſe of the acknowledged pieces of the evangeliſt John, that muſt needs occaſion ſome conſiderable difference in ſentiment and expreſſion; but that the difference is not ſo great as repreſented by Dionyſius. Nevertheleſs, I am of opinion, that this difficulty has not been quite removed: and I muſt acknowledge, that the Revelation, when compared with the apoſtle's unqueſtioned writings, has an unlikeneſs not eaſy to be accounted for.

Dionyſius's own opinion is, that the Revelation was written by ſome holy and inſpired perſon named John; but who that John was he does not know: he might be John the elder, ſaid to have reſided for ſome time at Epheſus in Aſia; but the reaſons before mentioned ſatisfied Dionyſius he could not be John the apoſtle. Of this judgment of our author we have lately ſpoken; and have now nothing more to add, beſide the two following general remarks.

Firſt,

First, If the writer of the Revelation be ſuppoſed not an apoſtle, then this book is greatly degraded, it's authority is leſſened, and it can no longer be reputed canonical. Doubtleſs, Dionyſius knew what he was about: he did not take all theſe pains to ſhew that the Revelation was not written by an apoſtle for no end and purpoſe. If the book of the Revelation was not the writing of an apoſtle, but of ſome other John, who at the moſt was only an elder, or a prophet, it's authority would be diminiſhed; the Millenarians themſelves, if they could be perſuaded to come into this opinion, would not have retained the ſame value for it they had formerly, nor would they be quite ſo diligent in the ſtudy of it; nor would their adverſaries, the Allegoriſts, pay ſo great a regard to any arguments or particular opinions founded upon it. In one word, then, this book would be no longer a part of the rule of faith and practice to Chriſtian people.

Learned men therefore are in the right to produce every thing tending to juſtify and ſupport the common opinion concerning the writer of this book, and to obſerve all evidences internal and external of it's being the work of John the apoſtle.

Secondly, as (F) I ſaid before, It may be queſtioned whether this critique of Dionyſius, or any other critique whatever, can be ſufficient to create a doubt concerning the author of this book; which was owned for a writing of John the apoſtle and evangeliſt by many ancient writers before Dionyſius and before Caius, and, ſo far as we know, before the moſt early of thoſe who diſputed it's genuineneſs. This obſervation is agreeable to the judgments of ſeveral very eminent men, [q] Grotius, [r] Flacius Illyricus, and [s] Socinus; whoſe words, in part at leaſt, have

(F) See p. 109. [q] Apoſtoli Johannis ejus hunc librum credidere illi, quibus merito creditur, Juſtinus contra Tryphonem, Irenæus, Tertullianus adverſus Marcionem iv. et aliis multis in locis: quibus conſentiunt Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Cyprianus, et poſt eos alii multi. Grot. Annot. in Tit. Apocal. [r] Si iis habetur fides patribus, qui proprius ad hæc accederunt ſeculum, uti certe æquiſſimum eſt, quales ſunt Juſtinus, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Apollonius, Theophilus, Antiochenus.... affirmari poterit eam ut Johannis apoſtoli illo primo ſeculo habita. Cur enim tam certo Johannis apoſtolum eſſe confirmarent, ſi dubias de ea exſtitiſſe ſententias antecellorum cognoviſſent? Flac. Illyr. arg. in Apoc. [s] Non videtur propter parvam aliquam, aut etiam magnam diſſimilitudinem rationis ſcribendi in univerſum ac ſtyli ab aliis ejuſdem Johannis ſcriptis longe diverſi generis debere aut poſſe dubitari, quin ejus ſit opus, maxime cum ſimul adſint tot alia teſtimonia. Socin. Lect. Sacr. p. 306. Quocirca non videtur, propter parvam, aut etiam magnam diſſimilitudinem rationis ſcribendi in univerſum, ac ſtyli ab aliis ejuſdem Johannis ſcriptis longe diverſi generis, (quæ omnium fortaſſe rationum potiſſima eſt, quæ afferuntur ad probandum ſcriptum illud non eſſe ipſius) debere aut poſſe dubitari quin ejus ſit opus. Id. De Auct. Sacr. Scrip. cap. 1. n. ii. p. 269.

been alleged by [t] Mr. Simon in a like argument, and cannot be omitted in this work. It is likewiſe agreeable to the ſentiment of [u] Stephen Le Moyne, [w] Mill, and other learned men, whoſe words need not to be tranſcribed at preſent.

XVII. Dionyſius then received, as ſacred and divine ſcriptures, the four goſpels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the apoſtles, the epiſtles of Paul, and particularly the epiſtle to the Hebrews, as a writing of that apoſtle. Concerning the ſeven catholic epiſtles, we do not certainly know his judgment: but he has mentioned expreſsly and often the three epiſtles of the apoſtle John; the firſt as unqueſtionably genuine and received by all; the other two as well known. And it may be juſtly taken for granted that he received the firſt epiſtle of the apoſtle Peter, it having been all along univerſally received by catholic Chriſtians. As for the reſt we can ſay nothing poſitively of his opinion about them. The Revelation he allowed to be the work of John, a holy and divinely inſpired perſon; but he was not ſatisfied that it was written by John the ſon of Zebedee, apoſtle and evangeliſt. However, in his argument concerning that book, he lets us know that it was then generally received by Chriſtians as written by John the apoſtle. In Dionyſius we have ſeen likewiſe evidences of that peculiar reſpect ſhewed by Chriſtians to the ſacred ſcriptures; which they looked upon as the rule of judgment in things of religion, by which all points in controverſy were to be decided. And what thoſe ſcriptures were he ſhews by theſe general titles and diviſions of them; 'The Law and the Prophets, the Goſpels and Epiſtles of Apoſtles.' Nor have we perceived, in the remaining works and fragments of this great and learned biſhop of Alexandria, any marks of reſpect for any Chriſtian apocryphal writings.

[t] Hiſt. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 19.

[u] Quod mirum, cum revera aliter ſenſerint viri et antiquitate et meritis graviſſimi ante Dionyſium. Sic enim Juſtinus Martyr, exeunte ſeculo ſecundo. Sic labente et fere lapſo eodem ſeculo Theophilus Antiochenus, Clem. Alexandrinus, et Irenæus. Sic ineunte ſeculo tertio Origines. Sic adulto eodem ſeculo Melito Sardenſis epiſcopus. Qui omnes, Dionyſio Alexandrino priores, et ſuperiores, et ætati Johannis apoſtoli viciniores et propiores, illi apocalypſim conſtanter tribuerunt. Sic etiam Hippolytus noſter, qui annis etiam plurimis ætatem Dionyſii ſuperavit. Le Moyne Var. Sacr. T. ii. p. 1014.

[w] Mill. Prol. n. 227. . . . 229.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLIV.

CYPRIAN, bishop of Carthage.

I. *His history, and character, and testimonies to him.* II. *His works.* III. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament; and, first, of the four gospels.* IV. *Of the Acts of the apostles.* V. *Of St. Paul's thirteen epistles.* VI. *Of the epistle to the Hebrews.* VII. *Of the catholic epistles.* VIII. *Of the Revelation.* IX. *Respect for the scriptures.* X. *General titles and divisions of the scriptures.* XI. *Of Christian apocryphal writings.* XII. *Of Jewish apocryphal writings.* XIII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. THE account which St. Jerom has given of St. Cyprian, in his book of Illustrious Men, is but short. It is to this purpose: 'Cyprian [a] of Africa first taught rhetoric with great applause. Afterwards, being converted to Christianity by a presbyter named Cæcilius, whose name he also took, he gave all 'his estate to the poor; and after no long time he was made 'presbyter, and then bishop of Carthage. It is needless to give 'a catalogue of his works, which are brighter than the sun. He 'suffered under the emperor Valerian and Gallienus, in the eighth 'persecution, the same day that Cornelius died at Rome, but not 'in the same year.'

A more particular history of St. Cyprian may be collected from his life, written by his deacon Pontius, from his own works, the mention made of him by other ecclesiastical writers, and those Acts of his martyrdom, which are generally reckoned genuine, and are allowed by [b] Basnage to contain for the most part matters of fact truly related, though he thinks they have some interpolations. It is fit I should here give a short history of this celebrated bishop of the third century.

Beside the name of Cyprian, he had that of [c] Thascius; and

[a] Cyprianus Afer, primum glorioſe rhetoricam docuit: exinde ſuadente preſbytero Cæcilio, a quo et cognomentum ſortitus eſt, Chriſtianus factus, omnem ſubſtantiam ſuam pauperibus erogavit; ac poſt non multum temporis electus in preſbyterum, etiam epiſcopus Carthaginenſis conſtitutus eſt. Hujus ingenii ſuperfluum eſt indicem texere, cum ſola clariora ſint ejus opera. Paſſus eſt ſub Valeriano et Gallieno principibus, perſecutione octava, eodem die quo Romæ Cornelius, ſed non eodem anno. De V. I. cap. 67. [b] Non enim legitima omnino ſunt atque ſincera, quæ cum Cypriani operibus edita ſunt ex Vet. Cod. MS. Etſi multa in illis veriſſima contineri, faciles largiamur. Annal. Polit. Ecc. 257. num. 5. [c] Cyprianus qui et Thaſcius. . . . Pupieno S. Ep. Cyprian. 66, [al. 69.] Vid. et Paſſionis Act. p. 13.

bore likewiſe, as we have already ſeen, the name of Cæcilius, from the preſbyter by whom he was converted. His whole name therefore was Thaſcius Cæcilius Cyprianus. He was an African, as we have been aſſured by Jerom; but that he was born at Carthage is not certain. His converſion happened, according to [d] biſhop Pearſon, in the year 246: and therefore, ſince he ſuffered martyrdom in the year 258, the greateſt part of his life was ſpent in heatheniſm, and he might be born before the end of the ſecond century. Cæcilius [e] was not only a preſbyter by office, in the church of Carthage, but venerable likewiſe for his age, at the time of Cyprian's converſion.

Jerom ſays, that Cyprian, in the former part of his life, taught rhetoric with great applauſe. Lactantius [f] writes to the ſame purpoſe; and the like occurs [g] in Euſebius's Chronicle. Fabricius, [h] however, was of opinion, that Cyprian rather ſhewed his eloquence at the bar, than taught it in the ſchools; which, he thinks, may be concluded from what Cyprian [i] himſelf has intimated of his having lived in great plenty and ſplendour: but the words which that learned writer refers to, need not [k] to be underſtood as a deſcription of Cyprian's own circumſtances. Undoubtedly Cyprian had a good eſtate, which he ſold, and gave to the poor, ſoon after his converſion, as Jerom informs us; and ſtill more particularly [l] Pontius, who mentions this as one of the extraordinary actions of Cyprian before baptiſm, whilſt he was yet a catechumen: but Jerom, who was not ignorant, as it ſeems, of our biſhop's circumſtances, and has often mentioned him in his works, and [m] had a great opinion of his eloquence, never gives him the title or character of a pleader, or a magiſtrate; and in one [n] place, beſide that already quoted from his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, expreſsly ſays, that Cyprian

[d] Vid. Ann. Cypr. p. 6. [e] Erat ſane illi etiam de nobis contubernium viri juſti et laudibilis memoriæ Cæcilii, et ætate tunc et honore preſbyteri, qui eum ad agnitionem veræ divinitatis a ſeculari errore correxerat. Cypr. Vit. per Pont. pag. 3.

[f] Cyprianus magnam ſibi gloriam ex artis oratoriæ profeſſione quæſierat. Lact. Div. Inſt. Lib. v. cap. 1. [g] Cyprianus primum rhetor, deinde preſbyter, ad extremum Carthaginienſis epiſcopus martyrio coronatur. Euſ. Chr. p. 175.

[h] Non rhetoricam adeo in ſcholis docuiſſe, quam in foro exercuiſſe Cyprianus videtur. Conſer quæ ipſe de ſe Cyprianus libro ad Donatum, non longe ab initio. Fabric. annot. ad Hieron. de V. I. c. 67.

[i] ad Donat. p. 2 et 3. Oxon. 1682.

[k] Vid. Vit. S. Cyprian. a Benedictino adornat. num. 1. p. 39. Pariſ. 1726.

[l] Nondum ſecunda nativitas novum hominem ſplendore toto divinæ lucis coelaverat. . . . Diſtractis rebus ſuis ad indigentiam pauperum ſuſtentandam tota prædia pretio diſpenſans, . . . &c. Pont. p. 2. Oxon. [m] Beatus Cyprianus inſtar fontis puriſſimi, dulcis incedit et placidus. Hieron. Ep. 49. al. 13. ad Paulinum. p. 567. m. Ed. Bened. Cyprianus vir eloquentia pollens et martyrio. Id. ad Magn. Ep. 83. p. 655. [n] Proponamus nobis beatum Cyprianum, qui prius idololatriæ aſſertor fuit, et in tantam gloriam venit eloquentiæ, ut oratoriam quoque doceret Carthaginj. Id. Comm. in Jonæ cap. 3.

taught

taught rhetoric at Carthage. Not to add, that what he ſaid of Cyprian to the ſame purpoſe [o] in the Chronicle ought to be reckoned Jerom's rather than Euſebius's. And that Cyprian taught rhetoric in the ſchools is plainly ſaid [p] by St. Auguſtine, who muſt be reckoned a material evidence. But I do not perceive him, or any one elſe to ſay, that Cyprian ever pleaded, or exercised the office of a magiſtrate. And in that way he might come to have a good eſtate, and be greatly reſpected. The profeſſion of rhetoric could not but be very profitable [q] at that time, eſpecially if the profeſſor himſelf was a man of ability in his way, as Cyprian was. Poſſibly Cyprian had a ſtated salary: if not, the gratuities of his numerous ſcholars could not but be very conſiderable. His reputation being great, all the youth in general in thoſe parts, who were of any fortune, or who aimed to be magiſtrates and judges, or pleaders, would come to his ſchool. Beſides, Cyprian was not only maſter of the theory of his art, but of the practical part likewiſe. He not only underſtood the rules of rhetoric, and how to teach others eloquence, but he was alſo eloquent himſelf; and very probably compoſed for others arguments, or pleadings, or harangues, or panegyrics, and ſuch like diſcourſes, for [r] which he would be well recompenſed: and in theſe two things, teaching perſons rhetoric, or qualifying them for the bar, and perhaps ſometimes compoſing pleadings for his ſcholars, or others, I take to be comprehended the full meaning and intention of St. Auguſtine's [s] words, where he ſpeaks of Cyprian's promoting or improving forenſic diſputes and contentions.

Cyprian had a quick advancement to the higheſt offices in the church. This is intimated by Jerom, and more particularly related by [t] Pontius. Biſhop Pearſon [u] computes, that he was

[o] See before, note [g]. [p] Inter quos et Cyprianus.... Qui enim in ludo perverſitatem humanæ et ſuam et aliorum linguas regat loqui mendacium, ut quod ab adverſario obiicitur, aſtuta fallacia negare poſſit, non in alia ſchola didicerat confitendo vincere adverſarium. Auguſt. Serm. 312. Tom. v. Bened. [Al de diverſis 116.] [q] Quid ſi etiam figuras locutionis quæ Græcis traduntur, in iis ſaltem quæ de Græco eloquio commemoravi, oſtendere vellem;... Hæc omnia, quando a magiſtris diſcuntur, pro magno habentur, et commuantur pretio, magna jactatione venduntur. Aug. de Doct. Chriſt. l. iv. c. 7. n. 14. T. iii. P. i. [r] Nunc ſi quas tu ab ore noſtro laudes Cypriani deſidero,... Certe ſi adhuc in ſchola rhetorum verba diſcipulis venderem, prius ab eis mercedem ſumerem. Vendere tibi volo laudem pudicitiæ conjugis tuæ; prius mihi mercedem da, pudicitiam tuam. Aug. Ep. 259. n. 4. al. 125. [s] Et ut tantæ vocis tuba, quæ forenſium mendaciorum certamina ſolebat acuere, ad proſternendum pretioſis ſanctorum mortibus diabolum Chriſto militantes et in ipſo gloriantes devotos martyres excitaret. Auguſt. Serm. 312. al. de diverſis 116. [t] Preſbyterium et Sacerdotium ſtatim accepit. Pont. p. 2. Judicio Dei et plebis favore ad officium ſacerdotii et epiſcopatus gradum adhuc neophytus, et, ut putabatur, novellus, electus eſt. Id. p. 3. [u] Pearſon. Ann. Cypr. p. 8. 9.

made preſbyter in 247, and biſhop of Carthage near the end of the year 248. The learned Benedictine, who writes the life of St. Cyprian prefixed to Stephen Baluze's edition of this father, thinks, that [w] he might be baptiſed in the year 244 or 245, and made biſhop in 248 or 249, ſuppoſing it to be ſcarce poſſible to determine exactly and with certainty the year of either of thoſe events. Pagi likewiſe thought it to be doubtful, whether [x] Cyprian was advanced to the epiſcopate in the year 248 or 249.

Cyprian [y] was made biſhop againſt his own inclination, at the general and earneſt deſire of the people of Carthage. But his election [z] was oppoſed by ſeveral preſbyters of that church, five in number, who [a] afterwards gave him a great deal of uneaſineſs. It is no where expreſsly ſaid who was his immediate predeceſſor; but [b] it is, probably, concluded by learned men, that his name was Donatus.

The beginning of St. Cyprian's epiſcopate was peaceable, under the emperor Philip; but [c] near the end of the year 249, or early in the year 250, began the Decian perſecution. This biſhop of Carthage was extremely obnoxious to the heathen people; and they often demanded in a clamorous manner, in the theatre, and other public places, that he ſhould be thrown to the lions, as is related by [d] Pontius, and [e] by Cyprian himſelf. Hereupon he retired, (as Pearſon ſuppoſeth [f] in Jan. 250) judging it to be [g] for the good of his people, and agreeable to the doctrine of Chriſt in the goſpel, and [h] having alſo received a divine direction to that purpoſe. The government not being able to find him out, he was proſcribed, and proclamation was made at Carthage, That if any one had any goods of Cæcilius Cyprian,

w Vit. S. Cypr. (ut ſupra) § ii. p. 42. et § iv. p. 45. fin. x Vid. Pagi Crit. 248. n. 2. y Non præteribo etiam illud eximium, quem adhuc dum cum in dilectionem eius et honorem totus populus adſpirante domino proſiliret, humiliter ille receſſit, antiquioribus cedens, et indignum ſe titulo tanti honoris exiſtimans, ut dignus magis fieret. Pont. p. 3. z Quidam illi reſtiterunt, etiam ut vinceret. Pont. p. 3. Vid. etiam Cypr. Ep. 43. al. 40. a Vid. Pear. Ann. Cypr. 251. n. 3. b Vid. Pearſ. Ann. Cypr. 248 n. 3. et Benedic. Vit. St. Cypr. n. 4 p. 45. c Vid. Pagi Crit. 250. n. 4. d . . . maxime cum et ſuffragiis ſæpe repetitis ad leonem poſtularetur. Pont. p. 4. e Nec me in conſpectum publicum, et maxime eius loci, ubi toties flagitatus et quæſitus fuiſſem, temere committere. Cypr. Ep. 14. [al. 6.] p. 31. Orto ſtatim turbationis impetu primo, cum me clamore violento frequenter populus flagitaſſet, non tam meam ſalutem, quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans, interim receſſi. Ep. 20. [al. 15.] p. 42. Vid. et Ep. 59. [al. 55.] p. 130. f Ann. Cyp. p. 17. n. 2. Conf. Pagi 250. n. 5. g See note e. h Et audietis omnia, quando ad vos reducem me dominus fecerit, qui ut receſſerim juſſit. Ep. 16. [al. 10.] p. 38. Credidit ſe, ne domino latebram tunc jubenti parenti, etiam ipſa paſſione peccare. Pont. p. 5. in. i Statim denique pro talibus meritis etiam proſcriptionis gloriam conſecutus eſt. Pont. p. 4. Perſecutio enim veniens. . . . me proſcriptionis onere depreſſit, cum publice legeretur: ſi quis tenet vel poſſidet de bonis Cæcilii Cypriani epiſcopi Chriſtianorum. Ep. 66. [al. 69.] p. 166.

biſhop

biſhop of the Chriſtians, he ſhould diſcover them. Nor is the place where he abſconded known to this day. In this retirement, which laſted about fourteen months, he was not idle, nor unprofitable, as appears from the many epiſtles written by him during that time, a large part of which are ſtill extant. Cyprian ſeems to have taken with him from Carthage one of his deacons, named Victor, and ſome other friends. It is plain, he [k] had ſuch company with him at the beginning of his retirement. They may be ſuppoſed to have been of great uſe to him in taking copies of his letters ſent to Carthage, and other places: and to their diligent and faithful attendance on their biſhop, as well as perhaps to the kind aſſiſtance likewiſe of ſome others, who came to him afterwards, we ought to reckon ourſelves indebted for the letters above-mentioned, now in our hands.

The heat of the perſecution being abated, in the year 251, ſoon [l] after Eaſter, Cyprian came out of the place of his retirement, and returned to Carthage. In the [m] month of May, in the ſame year, he held a council for regulating ſome affairs of the church, particularly the treatment of ſuch as had lapſed in the perſecution: and in the year following [n] a ſecond council, in which the ſame affair was farther conſidered and regulated. There were, beſide theſe, ſeveral other councils held at Carthage in the time of this biſhop of that city; three of which were engaged about the queſtion of the baptiſm of heretics, in which Cyprian differed from Stephen biſhop of Rome, and ſome others. Cyprian was of opinion, that ** all baptiſm out of the catholic church was null and void, and that they who had received ſuch baptiſm only ought to be baptiſed when they came over from heretics to the church. What was Stephen's opinion is [o] diſputed; whether he held that baptiſm by all ſorts of heretics was valid, and that they who came from them needed not to be baptiſed; or, whether he maintained the validity of that baptiſm only which was performed in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. The moſt remarkable of theſe three coun-

[k] Sabotant vos Victor diaconus, et qui tecum ſunt. Ep. 5. [l] Vid. Ann. Cypr. p. 48. n 3. [m] Ann. Cypr. ib. p. 5. Conf. Pagi 251. n. 17, 18. 21.

[n] Ann. Cypr. p. 35. n. 6. 7. Vid. etiam Cypr. Ep. 59. al. 55. et Conf. Pagi 252. n. 3.

[*] . . . viſum eſt ei cum ferme collecta coepiſcopis ſuis Africanarum ecclefiarum, omnem hominem, qui extra ecclefiam catholicæ communionem baptizatus ſit, oportere ad eccleſiam venientem baptizari. Auguſt. de Bap. contr. Donat. l. i. cap. 18. p. 93, 94. T. ix. Bened. Ecce in unitate video Cyprianum et alios collegas ejus, qui facto concilio cenſuerunt omnes, qui extra eccleſiæ communionem fuerint baptizati, baptiſmum non habere; et ideo eis dandum eſſe, cum veniunt. ib. l. ii. c. 6. p. 100. D. Conf. Cypr. ad Jub. Ep. 73. et Conc. Carth.

[o] Vid. Tillemont Mem. Ecc. T. iv. St. Cyprien art. 42. et note xxxix. Du Pin Bibl. St. Cyprien Baſn. Ann. 256. n. 3, 4. Pagi Crit. in Bar. 256. n. 4, 5, 6.

cils

cils was the laſt, at which were (A) preſent eighty-five or eighty-ſeven biſhops, beſide preſbyters and others. It was held in 256, and the acts of it are ſtill in being. Of theſe councils I give no farther account, that I may have the more room to ſhew the excellent conduct of Cyprian in ſome other matters, which deſerve particular notice in this place.

About this time a peſtilential diſtemper waſted the Roman empire, raging in ſome part of it for ſeveral years. Some learned men think it begun in the reign of Decius, and increaſed very much under Gallus, about the year 252, in whoſe time it is placed by [p] Euſebius in his Chronicle, and [q] by Eutropius, and by [r] ſeveral other ancient writers. Pagi [s] is of opinion, that this peſtilence afflicted the Roman empire fifteen years, beginning under Gallus and Voluſian, in the year 252, and ceaſing in 267. In this affliction Carthage had its ſhare; and upon that occaſion Cyprian was not negligent in the duties of his epiſcopal function. His deacon Pontius informs us, that [t] he called together his people, and [u] diſcourſed to them of the obligation of compaſſion, ſhewing, out of the divine ſcriptures, how acceptable offices of kindneſs are unto God; adding, that it would be no extraordinary thing, if we ſhould take care of our own people: *He only is perfect, who does more than publicans and heathens*; Matt. v. 45, 46. We are to propoſe to ourſelves, ſaid Cyprian, the imitation of our heavenly Father, who cauſeth his ſun to riſe, and ſendeth rain upon all men; and thereby to ſhew, that we are not unworthy of our high birth. This diſcourſe had a good effect; and in the time of that calamity there were the moſt generous acts of goodneſs performed by the Chriſtians at Carthage, as [w] Pontius relates, and I ſometime may have an opportunity to ſhew more at large. Upon this occaſion, likewiſe, Cyprian wrote a treatiſe entitled, Of Mortality, or of the Plague; and, as is [w] computed, in the year 252.

(A) There were preſent eighty-five biſhops, one of which had two proxies, who at the ſame time he voted himſelf gave in alſo the votes of two abſent biſhops, according to the power they had given him. The number of votes therefore was in all eighty-ſeven.

[p] Sub hoc [Gallo] peſtilens morbus multas totius orbis provincias occupavit, maximeque Alexandriam et Ægyptum, ut ſcribit Dionyſius, et Cypriani de mortalitate teſtis eſt liber. Euſeb. Chron. p. 47.

[q] Sola peſtilentia et morbis atque ægritudinibus notus eorum [Galli et Voluſiani] principatus fuit. Eutr.

[r] Vid. Pagi Crit. 252. n. 25.

[s] Vid. Pagi ib. 252. n. 24. et ſeqq. 265. n. 5.

[t] Aggregatam primo in loco uno plebem de miſericordiæ bonis inſtituit, docens divinæ lectionis exemplis, quantum ad promerendum Deum proſint officia pietatis. Tunc deinde ſubjungit, non eſſe mirabile, ſi noſtros tantum debito caritatis obſequio faveremus; eum perfectum poſſe fieri qui plus aliquid publicano vel ethnico fecerit. . . . Et qui ſe Dei filium profitetur, cur non exemplum patris imitatur? Reſpondere, inquit, nos decet natalibus noſtris, et quos renatos per Deum conſtat, degeneres eſſe non congruit. Pont. p. 5.

[u] Id. p. 6.

[w] Vid. Pearſon. Ann. Cypr. p. 39. n. 77. et Baſn. 258. n. 14.

There

There was another occaſion, in which the virtue of Cyprian and the people under his care was very conſpicuous. Some barbarous people of Africa made inroads into Numidia, and carried off with them captives a great number of Chriſtians. The biſhops of Numidia gave Cyprian notice of that diſaſter. Hereupon he made a collection at Carthage for the redemption of thoſe who had been carried captive; and [x] the whole ſum contributed by Cyprian himſelf and his people, and ſome (B) biſhops and other Chriſtians then at Carthage, amounted to about ſeven hundred and eighty pounds; which Cyprian ſent to the biſhops of the province of Numidia, together with his own and his people's prayers, that no ſuch like diſaſter might befal them again; at the ſame time aſſuring them that, if there ſhould, the Chriſtians with him would be always ready to ſend relief to their brethren.

But the moſt glorious ſcene of Cyprian's life remains. The emperor Valerian, who for ſome time had been very favourable to the Chriſtians, became their perſecutor. Cyprian, having been brought before the proconſul, made a confeſſion of the Chriſtian faith, and was baniſhed to Curubis. So far we are informed by [y] Pontius, who [z] refers to the Acts for particulars; and by the Acts which we now have, we are informed that, [a] on the 30th day of Auguſt 257, Cyprian was brought before the proconſul Aſpaſius Paternus; and, being examined by him, owned himſelf to be a Chriſtian, and a biſhop; declaring, that he knew no other gods, beſide the one true God, who made the heaven,

[x] Miſimus autem ſeſtertia centum millia nummorum, . . . Et optamus quidem nihil tale de cætero fieri, . . . Si tamen ad explorandam noſtri animi caritatem, et comprobandum noſtri pectoris fidem, tale aliquid acciderit, nolite cunctari nunciare fratribus veſtris; pro certo habentes, eccleſiam noſtram et fraternitatem illic universam ac hæc ultra fiant precibus orare; facta fuerint, libenter, et largiter ſubſidia præſtare. Ep. 62. al. 60. (B) Mr. Marſhall, in a note upon this epiſtle of St. Cyprian, p. 177, ſays, 'that ſum was collected from his own church only, over and above the ſeveral ſums contributed by ſuch biſhops as happened to be at Carthage when this caſe was laid before the author.' And ſo Fleury underſtood it, in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, B. vii. n. 14. p. 420. But Tillemont takes it, as I have done above, that the contributions of Cyprian's church, and of ſome biſhops then at Carthage, all together amounted to that ſum. Tout cela enſemble fit une ſomme de vingt-cinq mille livres. Mem. Ec. St. Cypr. art. 37. p. 210. Which is righteſt I am not much concerned to determine. The thing is of no great importance.

[y] His tam bonis et tam piis actibus ſupervenit exilium. Pont. p. 6. Ut imminentis martyrii pleniore fiducia, non exulem tantummodo Curubis, ſed et martyrem poſſideret. ib. 7. [z] Et ut, quid ſacerdos Dei Proconſule interrogante reſponderet, taceam; ſunt Acta quæ referant. ib. p. 6. [a] Imperatore Valeriano quartum et Gallieno tertium Conſulibus, tertio Calendarum Septembrium, Carthagine in ſecretario Paternus proconſul Cypriano dixit: . . Exquiſivi ergo de nomine tuo? quid mihi reſpondes? Cyprianus epiſcopus dixit: Chriſtianus ſum, et epiſcopus. Nullos alios Deos novi, niſi unum et verum Deum, qui fecit cœlum et terram, mare, et quæ in eis ſunt omnia. . . . Poteris ergo ſecundum præceptum Valeriani et Gallieni exul ad urbem Cucubitanam proficiſci. Cypr. Paſſ. p. 11.

and

and the earth, the sea, and all things therein. Being stedfast in this profession, the proconsul banished him to Curubis. His deacon, [b] Pontius, accompanied him to the place of his exile, where he arrived the 13th or 14th of September. Cyprian had many fellow sufferers. Great numbers of Christians in the province of Numidia were apprehended, and sent to the mines. We have [c] a letter of Cyprian, written in his exile, which is inscribed to nine bishops by name, and beside them to others, presbyters, deacons, and the rest of the brethren in the mines, martyrs of God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ our Lord. And those confessors, who were not all in one and the same place, but in mines at some distance from each other, answer him again in three several letters, which are still extant in St. Cyprian's works.

Whilst [d] Cyprian continued at Curubis, Galerius Maximus succeeded Paternus as proconsul of Africa. He recalled Cyprian from his banishment, who then went to his gardens, or country house, near Carthage, by the orders, as it seems, of the proconsul. Those gardens had been sold by Cyprian, and the price of them given for the benefit of the poor, as was formerly observed: but, [e] by some favourable providence, they were again returned to the possession of our bishop.

Soon after his arrival there, Cyprian understood that there were orders given for bringing him before the proconsul, who was then at Utica, a city of Africa, about forty miles distant from Carthage; but, being desirous rather to die in the presence of his own people, he thought fit to go from his country seat, and conceal himself for a while. Of this he gives an account [f] in his last letter to his clergy and people. The proconsul being come from Utica to Carthage, Cyprian returned to his gardens, where many persons of the best rank in the city came to him, entreating him to retire, and offering him likewise a safe place

[b] Nam et me inter domesticos comites dignatio caritatis ejus delegerat exulem voluntarium Pont. p. 7. [c] Ep. 76. al 77.

[d] Cumque diu ibidem moraretur, successit Aspasio Paterno proconsul: Galerius Maximus, proconsul, qui sanctum Cyprianum episcopum ab exilio revocatum sibi jussit praesentari. Cumque Cyprianus sanctus martyr electus a Deo, de civitate Curubitana, in qua exilio praecepto Aspasii Paterni tunc proconsulis datus fuerat, regressus esset, ex sacro praecepto in hortis suis manebat. Act. Pass. p. 1.

[e] ad hortos, inquam, quos inter initia fidei suæ venditos, et Dei indulgentia restitutos, pro certo iterum in usus pauperum vendidisset, nisi invidiam de persecutione vitaret. Pont. p. 8. fin. [f] Cum perlatum ad nos fuisset, fratres carissimi, tribunarios esse missos, qui me Uticam perducerunt, et consilio carissimorum permissum esset, ut de hortis nostris interim secederemus, justa interveniente causa, consensi; eo quod episcopum in ea civitate, in qua ecclesiæ dominicæ praesit, illic dominum confiteri, et plebem universam praepositi praesentis confessione clarificari. Cypr. Ep. 81. [al. 83.] init. p. 238.

Of

of retreat: but he would by no means comply with thoſe propoſals. This is written [g] by his deacon Pontius.

On the 13th of September 258, an officer, with [h] ſoldiers, was ſent to Cyprian's gardens by the proconſul, to bring him before him. Cyprian then knew his end was near; and with a ready and conſtant mind, and a cheerful countenance, he went without delay to Sexti, a place about ſix miles from Carthage, where [i] the proconſul was for the ſake of his health. Cyprian's cauſe was deferred [k] for that day. He was therefore ordered to the houſe of an officer, where he was kept that night, but was well accommodated, and his friends had free acceſs to him. The news of this having been brought to Carthage, a great number of people of all ſorts, and the Chriſtians in general, flocked thence to Sexti; and Cyprian's people lay all night before the door of the officer, thus [l] keeping, as Pontius expreſſes it, the vigil of their biſhop's paſſion.

The next morning, the 14th of September, he was led to the proconſul's palace, ſurrounded [m] by a mixed multitude of people, and a ſtrong guard of ſoldiers. 'After [n] ſome time the proconſul came out into the hall; and Cyprian being ſet before him, he ſaid, "Art thou Thaſcius Cyprian?" Cyprian the biſhop anſwered, "I am." Galerius Maximus the proconſul ſaid, "The moſt ſacred emperors have commanded thee to ſacrifice." Cyprian the biſhop anſwered, "I do not ſacrifice." Galerius Maximus

[g] Conveniebant interim plures egregii et clariſſimi ordinis et ſanguinis, ſed et ſeculi nobilitate generoſi: qui propter amicitiam ejus antiquam, ſeceſſum ſubinde tenebant: et ne parum eſſet nuda ſuadere, etiam loca in quæ ſecederet offerebant. Ille vero jam mundum ſuſpenſa in cœlum mente neglexerat, nec ſuadelis blandientibus annuebat. Pont. p. 8. [h] Cum ecce Proconſulis juſſu ad hortos ejus . . . cum militibus ſuis princeps repente ſubitavit. id. ibid. [i] . . . et in Sexti perduxerat: ubi idem Galerius Maximus pro ſua bonæ valetudinis recuperandæ gratia ſeceſſerat. Act. Paſſ. p. 12. [k] Sed dilatus in craſtinum, ad domum principis a prætorio revertebatur. . . . Receptum eſt tamen et in domo principis conſtitutum una nocte continuit cuſtodia delicata: ita ut convivæ ejus, et cari in contubernio eſſemus fuerimus. Pont. p. 9. [l] Plebs interim tota ſollicita, ne per noctem aliquid ſine conſcientia ſui fieret, ante fores principis excubabat. Conceſſit ei divina tunc bonitas, vere digno, ut Dei populus circa ſacerdotis paſſionem vigilaret. id. ib.

[m] Egreſſus eſt domum principis, . . . et agminibus multitudinis mixtæ ex omni parte vallatus eſt. Sic autem comitatui ejus infinitus exercitus adhærebat, quaſi ad expugnandum mortem manu facta veniretur. ib. p. 9. [n] Cumque oblatus fuiſſet, Galerius Maximus proconſul Cypriano epiſcopo dixit: 'Tu es Thaſcius 'Cyprianus?' Cyprianus epiſcopus reſpondit, 'Ego:' Galerius Maximus dixit, 'Juſſerunt te ſacratiſſimi imperatores ce-'remoniari.' Cyprianus epiſcopus dixit, 'Non facio.' Galerius Maximus ait, 'Conſule tibi.' Cyprianus epiſcopus reſpondit, 'Fac quod tibi præceptum eſt: in 're tam juſta nulla eſt conſultatio.' Galerius Maximus collocutus cum conſilio, ſententiam vix ægre dixit verbis hujuſmodi: 'Diu ſacrilega mente vixiſti, et plu-'rimos nefariæ tibi conſpirationis homines 'aggregaſti. . . .' Et his dictis, decretum ex tabella recitavit, 'Thaſciuum Cyprianum gladio animadverti placet.' Cyprianus epiſcopus dixit, 'Deo gratias.' Act. Paſſ. p. 13.

ſaid,

ſaid, "Be well adviſed." Cyprian the biſhop anſwered, "Do as "thou art commanded: in ſo juſt a cauſe there needs no con- "ſultation." The proconſul having adviſed with his council, ſpoke to Cyprian in angry terms, as being an enemy to the gods, and a ſeducer of the people; and then read his ſentence out of a tablet: "It is decreed, that Thaſcius Cyprian be be- "headed." Cyprian the biſhop ſaid, "God be thanked." This is the account given in the Acts of St. Cyprian's paſſion; and Pontius writes to the like purpoſe.

Cyprian [p] was then led away to the field of Sexti, a [q] large level ſpot of ground, encompaſſed with trees, the boughs of which were then loaded with ſpectators; and, in the preſence of a great number of people, Cyprian was there beheaded, according to the ſentence pronounced upon him.

Lactantius, who himſelf [r] greatly commends the ſtyle of St. Cyprian's works, ſays they were deſpiſed by the learned heathens that had looked into them: and informs us, that [s] he had heard a perſon, a man of conſiderable eloquence, altering one of the letters of his name, call him Coprian; thereby intimating, that when he was a man of good parts, and qualified for great things, he had followed ſilly fables. But it ſeems to me reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that Cyprian, who was a man of bright natural parts, and no inconſiderable acquired abilities, had well informed himſelf, and had received ſome good evidence of thoſe principles, for the ſake of which he abandoned a reputable and profitable employment, if not an honourable and plentiful ſtation, without any worldly proſpects whatever; and in the ſervice of which he ſpent ten years, during his epiſcopate, in great labour and much oppoſition; and at length cheerfully reſigned his life, as a confirmation of the truth of them, and as an example of conſtance, by which his people, perſons whom he tenderly loved, might be induced to ſuffer any thing rather than deny them. The whole

[o] Pont. p. 9. f. 10. init. [p] Et ita idem Cyprianus in agrum Sexti productus eſt. Act. Paſſ. p. 13. [q] Ipſe autem locus æqualis eſt ubi pati contigit, ut arboribus ex omni parte denſatis ſublime ſpectaculum præbeat. Sed per enormitatem ſpatii longioris viſu denegato per confuſam nimis turbam, perſonæ faventes in ramos arborum repſerant. Pont. p. 10. [r] Unus igitur præcipuus, et clarus extitit Cyprianus, quoniam et magnam ſibi gloriam ex artis oratoriæ profeſſione quæſierat. . . . Erat enim ingenio facili, copioſo, ſuavi, et (quæ ſermonis maxima eſt virtus) aperto; ut diſcernere nequeas, utrumne ornatior in eloquendo, an facilior in explicando, an potentior in perſuadendo fuerit. Lact. Divin. Inſt. lib. v. cap. 1. ſub fin.

[s] Hic tamen placere ultra verba, ſacramentum ignorantibus non poteſt. . . . Denique a doctis hujus ſeculi, quibus forte ejus ſcripta innotuerunt, derideri ſolet. Audivi ego quendam hominem ſane diſertum, qui eum immutata una litera Coprianum vocaret; quaſi quod elegans ingenium, et melioribus rebus aptum, ad aniles fabulas contuliſſet. ib.

tenor

tenor of Cyprian's life after his converſion, peaceable, charitable, and beneficial to men of all characters in diſtreſs; the manner of his death, undaunted, willing, and ready, without ſeeking it, are a very valuable teſtimony in behalf of the truth and excellence of the principles of the Chriſtian religion.

I have no deſign to draw at length Cyprian's character. What has been ſaid juſt now may ſuffice. However, I cannot forbear obſerving, in the words of (c) Mr. Marſhall, for giving my readers ſome farther idea of our author, that he was the biſhop of a moſt flouriſhing church, the metropolis of a province; that he was a man made for buſineſs, had a diligent and active ſpirit, and talents equal to the charge wherewith he was entruſted; and I would add, that he was not only a man of great authority in his life-time, but likewiſe of great reputation afterwards. This has appeared in part from what has been taken from Jerom and Lactantius. They who are deſirous of knowing more of the praiſes that have been given Cyprian by ancient writers, may conſult [t] Ruinart and [u] Tillemont. I ſhall obſerve only a few things from St. Auguſtine. In his time the day of St. Cyprian's martyrdom was a feſtival not only at Carthage, but in other places of Africa, as appears from [w] five ſermons of Auguſtine, ſtill extant, delivered by him on that day at Hippo. It may be concluded from [x] what he ſays, as well as from ſome other ancient writers, that the anniverſary of Cyprian's martyrdom was then obſerved alſo in other parts out of Africa. Auguſtine [y] calls Cyprian a moſt agreeable writer, as well as a bleſſed martyr. He aſſures us, that [z] Cyprian was then generally well known in the world, partly for the conſtancy and fortitude of his ſufferings, partly for the charms of his moſt agreeable writings. A remark of Auguſtine [a] upon the difference of ſtyle in Cyprian's works may

(c) See Mr. Marſhall's preface, p. 14.

[t] Admonit. in Vit. et Act. S Cyprian. ſ. Act. Mart. Sin. et Sel. p. 198, 199.

[u] Tillem. St. Cyprien. art. 62, 63, 64.

[w] Serm. 309. . . . 313. T. v. Bened.

[x] Quis enim hodie, non dicam in hac nostra civitate, ſed plane per Africam totam, tranſmarinaſque regiones, non Chriſtianus ſolum, ſed Paganus aut Judæus, aut etiam Hæreticus, poſſit invenire, qui non nobiſcum dicat Natalem Martyris Cypriani? Aug. Serm. 310. al. de Diverſis. 113. in.

[y] Nonne adſpicimus, quanto auro et argento et veſte ornatus exierit de Ægypto Cyprianus doctor ſuaviſſimus et martyr beatiſſimus? quanto Lactantius, &c. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. lib. ii. cap. 40. n. 61.

[z] Verum quia non ſolum dixit quæ audirentur, ſed ſcripſit etiam quæ legerentur; . . . et innotuit regionibus multis, partim per famam fortiſſimæ paſſionis, partim per dulcedinem ſuaviſſimæ lectionis. Serm. 310. ſub. fin.

[a] Eſt tale aliquid in epiſtola beatiſſimi Cypriani. . . . Ait ergo quodam in loco: 'Petamus hanc ſedem: dant receſſum 'vicina ſecreta: ubi dum erratici palmitum lapſus pendulis nexibus per a-'rundines bajulas repunt, viteam porti-'cum frondea tecta fecerunt.' Non dicuntur iſta niſi mirabiliter affluentiſſima fecunditate facundiæ, ſed profuſione nimia gravitati diſplicent. Qui vero hæc amant, profecto eos qui non ita dicunt, ſed caſtigatius eloquuntur, non poſſe ita

be eſteemed a proof both of his own judgment, and of the judgment and abilities of our author in that way.

As my hiſtory of St. Cyprian is but ſhort, I would refer my readers to [b] Cave, and others, who have written his life more at large; and particularly to [c] Le Clerc, who has done the ſame, in the free way. I ſhould have been well pleaſed to inſiſt upon Cyprian's viſions and revelations; but it would require more room than I can ſpare here: beſides, though I have ſometimes taken notice of ſuch things, as in the hiſtories of Gregory of Neocæſarea, and Dionyſius of Alexandria, and perhaps occaſionally in ſome other chapters, that I might not leave this matter altogether untouched; there is another place in this work, where it may be proper to obſerve diſtinctly the continuance of miraculous powers, or extraordinary gifts of the ſpirit, in the church, after the time of the apoſtles; and for that place I reſerve the farther conſideration of Cyprian's claims to a ſhare in ſuch gifts.

II. St. Cyprian's works are diſtributed into two parts; Tracts, or Treatiſes; and Epiſtles. The tracts are upon a variety of ſubjects. Some are defences of the Chriſtian religion againſt Jews and Gentiles, ſome upon Chriſtian morality, others concerning the diſcipline of the church. His epiſtles were written partly in the time of his retirement under the Decian perſecution, partly afterwards. With them are joined divers epiſtles of others ſent to him; they are very uſeful and entertaining; I need not give a more particular account of *** them. However, it may not be amiſs to obſerve, that St. Jerom [d] does not reckon Cyprian to have written any commentaries upon ſcripture; though in a chain upon St. Luke's goſpel, mentioned by [e] Montfaucon, Cyprian is ſaid to be one of the ancient writers, from whom thoſe interpretations are taken. James le Long [ee] has put Cyprian among the commentators upon ſcripture; but it is only for the ſake of his treatiſe on the Lord's Prayer.

eloqui exiſtimant, non judicio illa evitare. Quapropter ille vir ſanctus et poſſe ſe oſtendit ſic dicere, et nolle, quoniam poſtmodum nunquam. Aug. De Doctr. Chr. lib. iv. cap. 13. n. 31.

[b] Cav. Hiſt. Lit. and Lives of the Primitive Fathers. Tillemont Mem. T. iv. Part i. Du Pin Bibl. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Sinc. et Sel. Vit. S. Cypr. a Benedictino adornat. Baſnag. Annal. Pagi Crit. Pearſon Ann. Cypr. Dodwell. Diſſ. Cypr. [c] Bibl. Univ. T. xii. p. 207, &c.

*** It is ſaid there are ſome letters of St. Cyprian at Venice, which have not been yet printed. Vid. Montfaucon, Diar. Ital. cap. 5. p. 75. [d] Beatus Cyprianus inſtar fontis puriſſimi, dulcis incedit et placidus; et quum totus ſit in exhortatione virtutum, occupatus perſecutionum anguſtiis, de ſcripturis civilibus nequaquam diſſeruit. Hieron. ad Paulin. Ep. 49. [al. 73.] p. 567. m. [e] Vid. Bibl. Coiſlin. p. 251. [ee] Vid. Le Long Bibl. Sa. T. ii. p. 693. Pariſ. 1723.

Though

Though I give no account of the ſeveral editions of St. Cyprian's works, I may be allowed to obſerve here, that (p) we have a beautiful edition of them in Engliſh, with uſeful and valuable notes, by the late Mr. Nathaniel Marſhall, publiſhed in the year 1717.

Some pieces have been aſcribed to St. Cyprian which are not his; but learned men are now ſo generally agreed what are his genuine works, what not, that I need not enlarge upon that point. As ſeveral of thoſe tracts which formerly had been reckoned his, and ſome others, are ſtill uſually bound up together with his works, and are uſeful, and written by good hands, I ſhall make ſome extracts out of them in a chapter apart, and there give a ſhort hiſtory or account of each of them.

All St. Cyprian's works, both tracts and epiſtles, abound with texts of the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament. But there is one tract, entitled Teſtimonies againſt the Jews, to Quirinus, in three books; which tract is little more than a collection of texts of ſcripture under ſeveral heads; for there is nothing in it properly Cyprian's, beſide two ſhort prefaces, and thoſe ſeveral heads, or the titles of the chapters of the work, and the names of the books of ſcripture, from which he takes his teſtimonies. The genuineneſs of this tract has been called

(p) I have made but little uſe of Mr. Marſhall's tranſlation. All my paſſages are out of Cyprian, except perhaps two or three, or four at moſt, were collected, tranſlated, and put in the order they are now in, before I was acquainted with it. However, I have made ſome improvements on Mr. Marſhall's performance, and have likewiſe taken care to make ſeveral references which, which I hope the attentive reader will approve. As I have not read over Mr. Marſhall's tranſlation, my teſtimony in favour of it is of no great value. But ſo far as I have had leiſure and opportunity to read and examine it, it appears to be, together with the notes, a work of much labour and care, and to deſerve great commendation. Nevertheleſs there is a particular or two which I muſt remark. Mr. Marſhall in his preface, p. 17, 18, expreſſeth himſelf in theſe very words. 'I know not whether it be worth while to take notice of a particular liberty which I have taken of prefixing the title of ſaint to the ſeveral apoſtles and evangeliſts, as they occur in our author, though he himſelf mentioned them ſimply and plainly, without any ſuch appellation.' And afterward he ſays: 'I have here and there alſo expreſſed my author's ſenſe in the language of holy ſcripture, where he himſelf did not mean to quote it. But then, in ſuch caſes, I never refer to the paſſage in the margin, as I always do where he particularly cites any verſe or chapter of the inſpired writers.' But it appears to me, that both theſe are unwarrantable and unjuſtifiable liberties, not proper to be taken in tranſlating ancient authors. With regard to the firſt, though of no very great importance; it ſeems to me to be rather better to keep primitive writers in their own original ſimplicity and plainneſs, as near as poſſible. With regard to the other liberty, which Mr. Marſhall ſays he has taken at ſome times, to me altogether unjuſtifiable. Ordinary readers will be liable to be miſled by that method: and I believe it muſt be attended with ſome bad conſequence, which good Mr. Marſhall was not aware of. Perhaps this remark will be illuſtrated and confirmed by ſomewhat to be taken notice of by and by, at numb. 6.

in question by some, particularly by [f] Rivet. Here books of scripture are expressly quoted by name, which is seldom done in Cyprian's other works. Here also texts of scripture are cited, according to different readings from those found in his other writings. Nevertheless, it is [g] generally thought by learned men, that these objections are of no great moment, this tract having been quoted as St. Cyprian's by several ancient writers. Bishop Pearson placeth these books in the year 248. The learned Benedictine [i] before mentioned supposeth likewise that they were written whilst Cyprian was presbyter, or soon after he was made bishop; and he offers some arguments that deserve consideration. Bishop Fell thinks this one of the first of St. Cyprian's tracts; and upon the ground of this opinion, concerning the early date of this work, is founded a solution of [k] the difficulty taken from the different citations of scripture, in this and other writings of this father. Mr. Simon, who dislikes Fell's solution, gives [l] another; but whether it be better than the bishop's I cannot say. Basnage, who [m] makes no doubt of the genuineness of this tract, and even thinks Pontius has referred to it, supposeth it written when Cyprian was bishop, and after the Decian persecution. Stephen Baluze maintains the genuineness of this work; but then at the same time he allows that it has been much interpolated. The words of one, who was well furnished with manuscripts of St. Cyprian's works, are so remarkable to this purpose, that the reader may expect to see them in the [n] margin.

[f] Si tamen libri illi [ad Quirinum] sunt Cypriani omnes. Aliquos enim ad Quirinum scripsisse, ex Hieronymo, et aliis, qui eorum mentionem faciunt, probavit Pamelius. Sed an sint ii ipsi libri, quos habemus, dubium reddunt citationes librorum, quas his formulis enuntiat, praeter Cypriani in aliis opusculis morem, κατα Lucam, κατα Marcum, &c. Rivet. Crit. Sacr. l. ii. cap. 15. p. 1097. [g] Vid. Notas Ed. Oxon. p. 17. Du Pin. Bibl. Tillemont. Tom. iv. St. Cyprien. art. 64. et note 54. [h] Ann. Cypr. p. 9. num. 1. [i] Vit. S. Cyprian. p. 44. num. 4. [k] . . . . varietatis istius. . . . . vix alia ratio reddi poterit, quam quod diversis temporibus scriberentur; et proinde dicendum tractatum hunc reliqua omnia quæ sequuntur præverisse. Edit. Ox. in not. p. 17. [l] Il [l Evêque d' Oxford] n'a pas pris garde, que cette ancienne traduction qui étoit entre les mains du peuple, et qu'on lisoit dans les eglises, n'empechoit point ceux qui savoient la langue Grecque de traduire le Grec des Septante, et celuy du Nouveau Testament, à leur maniere, quand ils le jugeoient à propos. C'est principalement à cela qu'il faut attribuer cette diversité de version des mêmes passages, qui est dans les differens livres de ce savant Eveque. R. Simon Critique des Comm. du N. T. chap. i. p. 15. [m] Ni a vero aberret conjectura, non ex titulo, quo Quirinus adscitus, sed ex verbis Pontii, librum ab episcopo Cypriano, sed extincta Decii persecutione, confectum fuisse censemus: "Quis emolumentum gratiæ proficientis ostenderit" quibus innuit libros ad Quirinum, quorum ad præfationem digitum Pontius intendisse videtur. Basn. An. 258. num. 12.

[n] Si qua sunt loca in operibus sancti Cypriani, de quibus pronuntiari non possit ea certe illius esse, id vero in primis asseri potest de libris Testimoniorum ad Quirinum. Plures enim codices plus habent quam vulgatæ editiones, alii minus. Itaque, quoniam impossibile est discernere.

And

And hence, if I miſtake not, ariſes the trueſt and beſt ſolution of the difficulty before mentioned. Biſhop Fell thought the different method of citing ſcriptures, and the different readings of texts, or paſſages, in this and the other works of Cyprian, to be owing to the diſtance of the times of writing them. This was one of Cyprian's firſt pieces; the reſt was written at different times afterwards.

Simon ſays, that though there was at that time a Latin verſion generally uſed by Latin Chriſtians, yet it was not uncommon for thoſe who had learning, and underſtood Greek, to tranſlate for themſelves from the original, when they ſaw fit. And to this principally, ſays he, we ought to aſcribe that diverſity of tranſlation of the ſame paſſages, which is found in the different books of this learned biſhop. Nor is it impoſſible but this method may have been uſed by ſome learned men at that time; Cyprian in particular. Maſſuet [o] indeed is pleaſed to make a doubt whether Cyprian underſtood Greek; but I think he is ſingular herein: others have a better opinion of our biſhop's learning; for it has been generally ſuppoſed, that Firmilian's letter, written in Greek, was tranſlated into Latin by him. I formerly referred (E) to ſeveral learned men of this ſentiment. To them I could now add [p] the learned Benedictine, author of St. Cyprian's Life: and it appears to me highly probable, that Cyprian, who in the former part of his life profeſſed rhetoric with reputation in the city of Carthage, was not unſkilled in the Greek tongue. And in his remaining writings we find mention of the Greek authors, particularly [q] Plato, and Hermes Triſmegiſtus, [r] Hippocrates, and Soranus: and he mentions them as if he was acquainted with their works, eſpecially thoſe of the two former.

But yet it ſeems to me that the forementioned reaſons are not

[o] Cyprianum autem Græce ſcivisse, nullo argumento ... Maſſuet. Diſſ. in Irenæ. ii. n. ... (E) See Vol. ii. ch. 39.

note [e]. [p] Hæc autem Firmiliani epiſtola, quæ Latine reddita exſtat inter Cyprianicas ſeptuageſima quinta, ſic Cyprianicum ſtilum redolet, ut non alium interpretem habuiſſe videatur. Vit. S. Cypr. n. 31. p. 118, init. [q] In quo et Plato pari ratione conſentit; et unum Deum ſervans, cæteros angelos, vel dæmonas dicit. Hermes quoque Triſmegiſtus unum Deum loquitur, eumque incomprehenſibilem atque inæſtimabilem confitetur. De Idol. Van. p. 14. [r] Non invenio unde hoc nomen aſſumant; niſi forte qui plura et lectitata legerunt apud Hippocratem et Soranum ... libros deprehenderunt. Ep. 69. al. 76. p. 186.

sufficient to account for the diversity we are speaking of: I rather think it to be chiefly owing to the additions and alterations that have been made in the books of Testimonies. Such a collection of texts of scripture is very liable to be altered. It is likely that some texts have been added in latter ages, according to the version or readings then in use: and other passages, which were in the work from the beginning, have been altered according to the readings in use in the age of the copier or transcriber. The account which Stephen Baluze gives of the manuscripts of these books appears to me to put this out of question. Such additions and alterations may have been made without any bad intention, barely with a view of rendering the work more useful and more generally acceptable; though they who are curious would be better pleased to see these books genuine and uncorrupted in their original size, however small, just as they came out of Cyprian's hands. And as I think such books as these, consisting chiefly of collections of texts of scripture, are more especially liable to alteration, both by interpolation or addition, and by changing the original readings for such as afterwards were in use and were more modern; so I likewise question whether we can be sure, that in St. Cyprian's other works we always have the passages in the Latin version made use of by him, and as they came from him. I think bishop Fell speaks in the same manner: I put his words at the bottom of the [t] page.

Upon the whole, there can be no doubt made but St. Cyprian published a work with this title; but it seems that the books of Testimonies which we now have, or at least some part of them, are liable to objections that have not been fully cleared up; for which reason it may be thought proper, that they should be quoted with some particular caution. Whenever therefore I take any thing out of the books of Testimonies, I intend to mention them expressly. There is another tract of St. Cyprian, which is written much in the same way with those books of Testimonies; it is entitled, An Exhortation to Martyrdom: but I do not know that such objections have been made against this as against the former.

[s] See before, note [n].

[t] Sperabam quidem ex largo hoc quod in tractatu isto habetur scripturarum spicilegio, ad versionis Latinæ, quæ Hieronymum præcessit, restitutionem, gradum aliquem præstrui potuisse. Et certe, si modo sibi ubique constaret Cypriani textus, loca ista quæ a lectione vulgata discrepare deprehendimus, pro antiquæ versionis reliquiis non immerito haberemus. Sed cum ea sit lectionum in Mss. codicibus varietas, ut plura simul occurrant, quæ a vulgata discrepent; et in his quid a Cypriano scriptum fuerit, codicibus sibi invicem non respondentibus, minime constet: porro, quas primorum seculorum patres in S. scripturis laudandis diversimode se habeant, veteram hanc ceu tantum non deperatam cognovimus. Annot. ad Testim. Libros, p. 77.

III. As

III. As I have already ſet before the eyes of my readers ſuch numerous paſſages of ſcripture in the Chriſtian writers, whoſe works we have peruſed, I might now perhaps begin to contract, and be more brief: however, I have determined to proceed in the method that has been hitherto taken, without much alteration, until we come below Euſebius of Cæſarea. And it is my deſign to omit nothing material, purely for the ſake of brevity. Let ſuch, therefore, as have not an opportunity of reading over the voluminous writings of the fathers, accept of the following account of the notice St. Cyprian has taken of the ſeveral books of the New Teſtament. I propoſe by this method to enable every one to judge in ſome meaſure of the difference between the books of Teſtimonies, as we now have them, and St. Cyprian's other pieces: and beſides, there are ſeveral citations in this writer's works that deſerve ſome remarks.

1. St. Cyprian ſpeaks expreſsly of [u] four goſpels, which he compares to the four rivers of paradiſe: theſe goſpels are received by the church, and are her property, within her circuit; by which ſhe is overflowed, and her plants are enabled to bear fruit. As (y) paradiſe had its four rivers, ſo the church has four goſpels.

2. In the ſecond book of Teſtimonies: 'Likewiſe [w] in the goſpel according to Matthew; *Now when Jeſus was born in Bethlehem of Judæa, in the days of Herod the king, behold there came wiſe men from the Eaſt to Jeruſalem*;' ch. ii. 1. 2. In this work is quoted the firſt chapter of this [x] goſpel. In other pieces this goſpel is cited thus: 'Likewiſe [y] the Lord has commanded us in his goſpel, *that we ſhould call no man our father upon earth, foraſmuch as one is our father who is in heaven*; ch. xxiii. 9. Again: in the goſpel [z] the Lord ſpeaks and ſays; *He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me*, and what follows.'

3. In the third book of Teſtimonies: 'Likewiſe [a] in the goſpel according to Mark; *And when ye ſtand praying forgive, if*

[u] Sede paradiſi inſtar exprimens, quatuor fluminibus intra muros ſuos intus irrigat, quibus quæ non facit fructum ſuum arbitrii, et in ignem mittitur. Ecclesia a quatuor fluminibus, id eſt evangeliis quatuor, quibus baptiſmi ſacramentum cœleſti inundatione largitur. Nam quid de eccleſiæ fontibus dicam, quo intus in eccleſia nemo eſt? p. 222. (y) See Mr. Nath. Marſh upon the place, p. 235. [w] In evangelio cata Matthæum: Cum natus eſſet in Bethlehem Judæ in diebus Herodis regis. . . . Teſtim. l. ii. cap. 29. p. 50. [x] Lib. ii. cap. 6. et 7. p. 36. [y] Item Dominus in evangelio ſuo præcepit, ne vocemus nobis patrem in terra. &c. De Orat. Dom. p. 142. [z] In evangelio Dominus loquitur et dicit: Qui diligit patrem aut matrem ſuper me, non eſt me dignus. De Exhorta. Mart. cap. 6. p. 173. [a] In evangelio, in prece quotidiana: Remitte nobis debita noſtra. . . . [Matth. vi. 12.] Item cata Marcum: Et cum ſteteritis ad orationem, remittite, &c. Teſt. lib. iii. cap. 22. p. 72.

'*ye have ought against any, that your Father also which is in heave*'*may forgive you your trespasses*;' ch. xi. 25, 26. So this gospel is several times quoted in this work: in other tracts after this manner; 'Whom [b] the Lord reproves and blames in his 'gospel, saying; *Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may* '*keep your own tradition*;' ch. vii. 9.

4. In the first book of Testimonies: 'Likewise [c] in the gos-'pel according to Luke; *And it came to pass, that when Elisabeth* '*heard the salutation of Mary the babe leaped in her womb, and Eli-*'*sabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost....*' Luke i. 41, 42, 43. In the tract on the Lord's Prayer; 'Which [d] the Lord teacheth in 'his gospel, saying; *Two men went up to the temple to pray, the one* '*a pharisee, the other a publican*,' to the end of the parable, ch. xviii. 10.... 14. Again: 'So [e] the widow Anna, as it is 'written in the gospel, *departed not from the temple, but served God* '*with fastings and prayers, night and day*; ch. ii. 37.

5. In the first book of Testimonies: 'Likewise [f] in the gos-'pel according to John; *He came to his own, and his own received* '*him not. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become* '*the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name*;' ch. i. 11, 12. In [g] the next book of Testimonies he quotes the first five verses of this gospel. In one of his epistles: 'Let [h] them imitate the 'Lord, who near the time of his passion was not more proud, 'but more humble; for then he washed his disciples feet, say-'ing; *If I your lord and master have washed your feet, ye also ought to* '*wash the feet of others; for I have given you an example, that ye* '*should do as I have done*;' John xiii. 14, 15.

IV. The book of the Acts of the apostles is frequently quoted by St. Cyprian by that title; but he has no where, that I remember, mentioned the name of the writer. 'According to [i] what 'Peter says to the Jews in the Acts of the apostles; (ch. ii. 38)

[b] Quos increpat Dominus et objurgat in evangelio suo dicens: Rejicitis mandatum Dei, ut traditionem vestram statuatis. De Unitate Eccl. p. 117. [c] Item in evangelio cata Lucam: Et factum est, ut audivit salutationem Mariæ Elisabet. Testim. l. i. cap. 8. p. 37. [d] Quæ Dominus in evangelio suo ponit et dicit: Homines duo ascenderunt in templum orare, unus pharisæus, et unus publicanus. De Orat. Dom. p. 141. [e] Sic Anna vidua, ... sicut in evangelio scriptum est, ib. p. 155. [f] Item in evangelio cata Joannem: In sua propria venit, et sui eum non receperunt. Testim. l. i. cap. 3. p. 21. [g] Lib. ii. cap. 3. p. 32. [h] Imitentur Dominum, qui sub ipso tempore passionis non superbior, sed humilior fuit. Tunc cum apostolorum [discipulorum, Baluz.] suorum pedes lavit, dicens: Si ego lavi pedes vestros magister et dominus, et vos debetis aliorum pedes lavare. Exemplum enim dedi vobis, ut sicut ego feci et vos faciatis. Ep. 14. [juxta Pamel. vi. Baluz. v.] p. 52. [i] Secundum quod in Actis apostolorum Petrus ad eos loquitur, et dicit: Pœnitemini, et baptizetur unusquisque vestrum in nomine Domini Jesu Christi.... Ep. 73. p. 205.

[3] Lib.

[c] *Repeti,*

'*Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus* '*Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the* '*Holy Ghost.*' Again: 'As [k] we read in the Acts of the apostle; (ch. iv. 32) *And the multitude of them that believed acted with* '*one heart and soul.*' The same text is expressly quoted in another place, as scripture: 'This [l] is evident from the divine scripture, which says; *The multitude of them that believed acted with* '*one heart and soul,*' that is, with great unanimity. Accordingly this book is cited by St. Cyprian for proof of what he asserts. Having quoted the book of Tobit, he adds: 'Nor [m] do we so 'allege these things, my brethren, as not to prove what the angel 'Raphael says [in Tobit] by the testimony of truth. In the 'Acts of the apostles the truth of this is shewed; and that souls 'are delivered by alms not only from the second, but likewise 'from the first death, is made manifest by fact and experience.' For this he alleges the history of Tabitha, Acts ix. 36... 41.

I must add one quotation more. In the third book of Testimonies: 'Likewise in [n] the Acts of the apostles, (ch. xv. 28, '29) *It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you* '*no other burden than these things, which are of necessity,* [or, these 'necessary things;] *that ye abstain from idolatries, and effusion of* 'blood, *and fornication. And whatever things ye would not should be* 'done *unto you, neither do ye unto others.*' This is a very extraordinary reading, and requires some remarks.

We ought here to recollect the substance of Stephen Baluze's note before referred to; That these books of Testimonies are very much interpolated, and that whereas he had one and twenty manuscript copies of them, five of those manuscripts wanted the third book. Moreover, in [o] his note upon the passage just transcribed, he mentions one copy, where this passage, and what follows to the end of the third book, is wanting: so that this passage was wanting in six copies of the one and twenty.

[k] Sicut legimus in Actis apostolorum: 'Multitudinum autem eorum qui crediderant, anima et mente una agebant. De Opere et Eleemos. p. 208. [l] Probat scripturarum divinarum quæ dicit: De Unit. Eccl. p. [m] 'Nec sic, fratres carissimi, ista 'proferimus, ut non quod Raphael angelus 'veritatis testimonio comprobemus. 'Actibus apostolorum facti fides posita 'est: quod eleemosynis non tantum a se-'cunda sed a prima morte animæ liberen-'tur, et impletæ fei probatione com-'pendium. Tabithæ operationibus justis et eleemosynis præstandis plurimum dedita, &c. De Opere et Eleem. p. 199.

[n] Item in Actibus apostolorum: Visum est Sancto Spiritui et nobis, nullam vobis imponere sarcinam, quam ista, quæ ex necessitate sunt; abstinere vos ab idololatriis, et sanguinis effusione, et fornicatione. Et quæcunque vobis fieri non vultis, aliis ne feceritis. Testim. l. iii. cap. 119.

[o] Ista et quæ deinceps sequuntur usque ad finem libri desunt in codice Gratianopolitano. Baluz. Not. p. 601.

I shall immediately observe a place in Irenæus, or rather in the Latin version of that father, where the texts of Acts xv. 20 and 29, are quoted very agreeably to the reading we have before us. In that place is recited Acts xv. from v. 7. to v. 29. There James in his speech says; 'Wherefore [p] my sentence is, that 'we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; 'but that we command them to abstain from the vanity of idols, and 'from fornication, and from blood: and that whatever things they 'would not have done unto them, neither should they do unto others.' And afterwards, reciting the epistle itself; 'For [q] it seemed good 'to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than 'these, which are necessary things: That ye abstain from things sacrificed 'to idols, and blood, and fornication: and that whatever things ye 'would not have done unto you, neither should ye do unto others: from 'which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well, walking in the Holy Ghost.'

This Latin version of Irenæus was not published, according to Mr. Dodwell's [r] computation, till some time after the year of Christ 385; though [s] Massuet thinks it more ancient by a great deal; and [t] Mill supposeth that it was made in Irenæus's life-time, or soon after his death, before the end of the second century: but I am apt to think that Dodwell's date of this translation is early enough; and possibly some readings of texts in this translation, as we now have it, were not in being till afterwards.

Here the principal differences from our present reading may be reckoned two; an omission, and an addition. The omission is of that particular, *things strangled*; the addition is of a precept, or prohibition rather, *not to do to others what they would not have to be done to themselves*. However, there are likewise some other variations that may require some notice as we go along.

1. To begin with the omission. Dr. Mill, [u] in his notes upon

[p] Propterea ego secundum me judico, non molestari eos, qui ex Gentibus convertuntur ad Deum; sed præcipiendum eis, uti abstineant a vanitatibus idolorum, et a fornicatione, et a sanguine: et quæcunque nolunt sibi fieri, aliis ne faciant. Iren. contr. Haer. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 199. Massuet. [q] Placuit enim Sancto Spiritui, et nobis, nullum amplius vobis pondus imponere, quam hæc, quæ sunt necessaria: ut abstineatis ab idolothytis, et sanguine, et fornicatione: et quæcunque non vultis fieri vobis, aliis ne faciatis: a quibus custodientes vos ipsos, bene agetis ambulantes in Spiritu Sancto. ibid. [r] Vid. Diss. Iren. v. num. 9, 10. [s] Massuet. Diss. in Iren. ii. num. 53, 54. [t] Mill. Prol. n. 608. [u] Και πνικτον.] Omittunt Cant. Iren. l. iii. c. 12. Tertull. de Pud. c. 12. Cyprian. l. iii. ad Quirin. Hieron. Com. in Galat. v. (qui tamen in nonnullis exemplaribus scriptum dicit, *et a suffocatis*.) Ambrosiast. in Galat. ii. (qui addendum vult a sophistis Græcorum quos vocat.) Augustin. et et Gaudentius ac Pacharius, quibus interpretamenti loco additum videtur το πνικτον. Per sanguinem enim et sanguinem suffocatum intelligi putant. Cæterum retinet Græca quæ quidem vidimus omnia, (excepto uno Cant.) Versiones omnes, etiam Vulgata Lat. Origen. viii. Contra Celsum, Patres et Theologi Græci universim; ut proinde rem non licentiandum arbitrer. Mill. in Act. Ap. 15.

Acts

Acts xv. 20, is by all means for retaining *and things ſtrangled* in the text, as the right reading: but in his Prolegomena [w] he expreſſeth himſelf as ſtrongly on the other ſide that this particular is an interpolation of the original text. But let us ſee whether we cannot hold that learned writer to his firſt opinion.

He owns that all the Greek manuſcripts of the Acts of the apoſtles have this article of the decree except one; and all verſions, and likewiſe all the Greek fathers and commentators in general: and it is very obſervable, that among thoſe Greek fathers there are two of great antiquity who have cited the decree as we now have it; I mean [x] Clement of Alexandria, who has ſo cited it in two places, and (c) Origen. After this, what good authority can there be for the omiſſion? Let us attend.

The main thing ſeems to be this, that as Dr. Mill ſuppoſeth the Italic verſion, as it is called, (that is the ancient Latin verſion, chiefly in uſe among the Latin Chriſtians before St. Jerom's time, and made, as [y] Mill thinks, about the end of the ſecond century) had only three particulars in the decree, omitting *things ſtrangled*. But allowing this, it would not prove that to be the right reading; for, that *things ſtrangled* were in ſome ancient Greek copies, and thoſe good copies, is apparent from Clement and Origen: therefore it is probable that the ancient Latin verſion, if it wanted that article, was corrupted in this place; as, it is not unlikely, it might be alſo in many other.

But I ſee no certain nor probable evidence that the moſt ancient Latin verſion, or any Latin verſion whatever, before the end of the ſecond century, wanted this particular. Indeed, Jerom informs us, that in his time ſome Latin copies had *things*

Και της πορνειας και του αιματος] Act. [illegible]. Cant. Irenæi interpres, Tertullian. Lucian. Ambr. Gaudentius, Eucherius, Fulgentius. Hieron. alii. Certe [illegible] πνικτου, ipſius Lucæ non [illegible] Chriſtianorum veterum, qui cum [illegible] epiſtola ſynodica omnem ſanguinis [illegible] interdictum vidiſſent; eoque [illegible] extendebant, ut etiam a mortuo [illegible] abſtinendum fuiſſe cenſuerint, quo modo ſcilicet ſanguine conſtringatur, vel inter viſcera ſepulto; ut [illegible] Petrolianus. Ex hac eccleſiæ [illegible] quiſpiam, haud dubito, [illegible], ad marginem codicis: [illegible] in præcepto de abſtinentia ſanguinis, includi etiam abſtinentiam [illegible] quolibet ſuffocato. [illegible] eſſe partem textus genuinam, [illegible] in corpus epiſtolæ hujuſmodi, jam ante tempora Clementis Alexandrini. Mill. Proleg. n. 441, 442. ed. Kuſter. vid. etiam n. 641.

[x] Εἰσὶν, ἰφασαν, τῳ πνευματι τῳ ἁγιῳ και ἡμιν, μηδεν πλεον ἐπιτιθεσθαι ὑμιν βαρος, πλην των ἐπαναγκες· ἀπεχεσθαι εἰδωλοθυτων, και αἱματος, και πνικτων, και της πορνειας· ἐξ ὡν διατηρουντες ἑαυτους εὐ πραξετε. Clem. Al. Pæd. l. ii. cap. 7. p. 172. B. C. Pariſ. Vid. etiam Strom. lib. iv. p. 512. D. 513. A. (c) See of this work Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. 28. [y] Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 377, &c. [z] In Actibus apoſtolorum narrat hiſtoria: . . . Seniores qui *Jeroſolymis* erant, et apoſtolos pariter congregatos, ſtatuiſſe per literas, ne ſuperponeretur eis aliquid legis, nec amplius obſervarent, niſi ut cuſtodirent ſe ab idolothytis, et ſanguine, et fornicatione: ſive ut in nonnullis exemplaribus ſcriptum eſt, *et a ſuffocatis*. Hieron. Comm. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. v. 2.

ſtrangled,

ſtrangled, others not: but he does not ſay that they which wanted that particular were the beſt or the moſt exact. It is highly probable that he preferred thoſe which had it; inſerting it [a] in the Latin New Teſtament [b] publiſhed by him, corrected by the Greek; as it is now alſo the reading of the Latin vulgate.

Having thus conſidered this paſſage of Jerom, which I take to be one of Mill's main authorities for his ſuppoſition that the ancient Italic verſion wanted this particular, I ſhall now take things in the order of time: but we have no occaſion to review the Greek writers, their ſentiment having been already ſufficiently owned. I would only juſt obſerve, that we have no way of knowing how Irenæus read this portion of ſcripture; his Greek being loſt, and his Latin interpreter not ſtrictly following his Greek original, but putting texts of ſcripture according to the Latin verſion in uſe in his time, as is fairly owned by [c] Mill himſelf; and poſſibly ſometimes altering and corrupting even that according to his own ſentiments, or the prevailing ſentiments of the time in which he lived.

As for Tertullian, one would be apt to conclude, from his [d] Apology, written about the year 200, that he read all four things; as we do. He then plainly underſtood the decree of the council at Jeruſalem, to prohibit *things ſtrangled:* and it is ſuppoſed that at that time, and for ſome while afterwards, all Chriſtians in general underſtood the decree to prohibit the eating the blood of brute animals. There are remaining [e] paſſages of ancient writings that ſeem to put this matter beyond all diſpute. Nevertheleſs, Tertullian, [f] in his treatiſe De Pudicitia, written after his Apology, though the time is not exactly known, quotes the de-

[a] Vid. Mill. Proleg. num. 849.

[b] Novum Teſtamentum Græcæ fidei reddidi. Hieron. De V. I. cap. 135.

[c] In Latinis autem, [Irenæi,] Interpreti id unum curæ erat, ut ſcripturæ teſtimonia, quæ in hoc opere occurrunt, exprimerentur verbis interpretationis, quæ Celtis ſuis, totique occidenti jam in uſu erat, Italicæ, ſive vulgatæ. Unde factum, ut paucis in locis, nec niſi ex contextu orationis, certo ſatis aſſequi poſſis, quænam futerit codicis Irenæani lectio. Mill. Pr. n. 368.

[d] Erubeſcat error veſter Chriſtianis, qui ne animalium quidem ſanguinem in epulis eiculentis habemus; qui propterea quoque ſuffocatis et morticinis abſtinemus, ne quo ſanguine contaminemur, vel intra viſcera ſepulto, &c. Apol. cap. 9. p. 10. D.

[e] πως αν παιδια φονευσει τεκουσα, εις μηδε αλογων ζωων αιμα φαγειν εξον; Epiſt. Eccleſ. Vienn. et Lugd. ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. v. cap. 1. p. 159. A. Vid. etiam Clem. Al. Pæd. lib. ii. cap. 7. p. 172. B. C. Strom. l. iv. p. 512, 513. A. et Pæd. l. iii. cap. 3. p. 228. B. C. Tertullian ut ſupra, Ap. cap. 9. Vid. etiam Originem ut laudatum ſupra p. 153. note c. Tantumque ab humano ſanguine cavemus, ut nec edulium pecorum in cibis ſanguinem noverimus. Minuc. Fel. cap. 30.

[f] Visum eſt, inquiunt, Spiritui Sancto et nobis, nullum amplius vobis adjicere pondus, quam eorum, a quibus neceſſe eſt abſtineri, a ſacrificiis, et a fornicationibus, et ſanguine, a quibus obſervando recte agitis, vectante vos Spiritu Sancto. Sufficit et hic ſervatum eſſe mœchiæ et fornicationis locum honoris ſui inter idololatriam et homicidium. Interdictum enim ſanguinis multo magis humani intelligemus. de Pud. c. 12.

decree,

cree, as if he read only three things: but then it is obſervable that he there ſeems diſpoſed to underſtand the prohibition of *blood* concerning murder or homicide; at leaſt, he would bring in this by way of conſequence. And beſides, there is too much reaſon to ſuſpect that this interpretation is given or hinted by him to ſerve a particular purpoſe, and increaſe the malignity and ſcandal of fornication.

The next author cited by Mill is St. Cyprian. I have tranſcribed the paſſage above [g] at length. It is the paſſage that gives occaſion to our preſent inquiry: but it has been ſhewn that we have no good reaſon to look upon it as Cyprian's. Indeed, it is highly probable that the reading we have now in this work is very late. In that paſſage every thing is to be underſtood as of a moral nature: inſtead of *blood* is put *effuſion of blood*, that it might be the more certainly underſtood of murder, or homicide: for that this is what we are here to underſtand by *effuſion of blood* I think cannot be queſtioned. I am ſure Dr. Hammond [h] took this paſſage, or this writer, whoever he is, in that ſenſe.

The next author is Ambroſiaſter, author of the Commentary upon St. Paul's thirteen epiſtles, placed by Cave as flouriſhing about the year 354, who ſuppoſeth [i] the real author to be Hilary, deacon of Rome, and that this work was written about the year 384. Richard Simon [k] is of the ſame opinion concerning the author of theſe Commentaries: but [l] the Benedictine editors of St. Ambroſe are not ſo clear upon this point. This writer, whoever he be, probably however of the fourth or fifth century, omits *things ſtrangled.* He even contends that that clauſe ought to be blotted out, and that it is an interpolation of the Greek writers, or Greek ſophiſts, as he calls them with much ſcorn and indignation. He [n] underſtands the prohibition *from blood*, of the blood of animals, not of homicide. We are obliged to him for nothing, the aſſurance he gives us that the Greek manuſcripts of his time univerſally agreed in the clauſe, *and from things ſtrangled.* If he had known of any Greek writers or Greek copies

[g] p. 151. [h] Vid. Hammond. in Act. xv. 29. [i] Hiſt. Lit. P. ii. 163. [k] Hiſt. Crit. des Commentateurs du Nouv. Teſtament, Ch. ix. p. 87. [l] Vid. Admonit. in Comment. in xiii. Ep. Beati Pauli. Ed. Bened.

[n] Denique tria haec mandata ab omnibus et Iudaeis et gentibus data reperiuntur, quae ſunt leges Romanae, id eſt, ut abſtinendum ab idololatria, et ſanguine, ſicut ſuffocatione. Quae ſophiſtae Graeci non intelligentes, ſcientes tamen a ſanguine abſtinendum, adulterarunt ſcripturam, quartum mandatum addentes, et a ſuffocato abſtinendum. Ambroſiaſt. in Gal. cap. 2. p. 215. Ed. Bened.

[n] Ergo haec illicita eſſe oſtenſa ſunt gentibus, quae putabant licere: ac per hoc non utique ab homicidio prohibiti ſunt, cum jubentur a ſanguine obſervare. Sed hoc acceperunt, quod Noe a Deo didicerat, ut obſervarent ſe a ſanguine edendo cum carne. Id. ibid. p. 214. F.

of

of the New Testament, that had favoured his omission, he would not have been quite so angry with the Greeks.

Pacian, bishop of Barcelona, about the year 370, is another writer who [o] omits *things strangled*. He understands *from blood* to mean homicide; and says, that the direction given by the council, to abstain from these three crimes; *things sacrificed to idols*, or idolatry; *from blood*, or from murder; and *from fornication*; is the sum and substance of the whole gospel, or Christian revelation.

The next writer alleged by Mill is Gaudentius, placed by Cave at the year 387. He [p] seems to have read only three things, and understands *blood* of the blood of animals; for he explains it to mean *things strangled:* or, as [q] Mill expresseth it, Gaudentius and Eucherius thought this clause added by way of interpretation.

St. Augustine likewise, placed by Cave at the year 396, is alleged upon this occasion by Dr. Mill: and, if the passage in the Speculum be his, he read only three prohibitions; *from things sacrificed to idols, from blood, and from fornication.* From this passage it appears, that by many at that time all these prohibitions were understood to be of a moral kind. Their explication of them is idolatry, murder, and fornication, which they therefore

[o] Visum est enim Sancto Spiritui, et nobis, nullum amplius imponi vobis pondus, præterquam hæc: Necesse est, ut abstineatis vos ab idolothytis, et sanguine, et fornicatione: a quibus observantes, bene agetis. Valete. Hæc est Novi Testamenti tota conclusio. Despectis in multis Spiritus Sanctus hæc nobis, capitalis periculi conditione, legavit. Reliqua peccata meliorum operum compensatione curantur. Hæc vero tria crimina, . . . ut veneni calix, ut lethalis arundo metuenda sunt. . . . Quid vero faciet contemptor Dei? Quid aget sanguinarius? Quod remedium capiet fornicator? Num quid aut placare Dominum desertor ipsius poterit? aut conservare sanguinem suum, qui fudit alienum? aut redintegrare Dei templum, qui illud fornicando violavit? Ista sunt capitalia, fratres, ista mortalia. Pacian Paræn. ad pœnit. T. iv. p. 315. H. Bibl. Patr.

[p] Et idcirco Beatus Jacobus cum cæteris apostolis decretum tale constituit in ecclesiis observandum: *ut abstineatis vos*, inquit, *ab immolatis, et a sanguine*, id est, *a suffocatis*. Prætermiserunt homicidium, adulterium, et veneficia: quoniam nec nominari ea in ecclesiis oporteret, quæ legibus etiam gentilium punirentur. Prætermiserunt quoque illas omnes minutias observationum legalium, et sola hæc quæ prædiximus custodienda sanxerunt; ne vel sacrificatis diabolo cibis profanemur immundis, vel ne mortuos [f. *mortuas*] pecorum viscera suffocatorum animalium sanguine polluamur, vel ne in immunditiis fornicationum corpora nostra, quæ templa Dei sunt, violemus. Gaudent. de Maccabæis. Tract. xv. Bibl. Patr. Max. Tom. v. p. 967. F. G. [q] ut et Gaudentius ac Eucherius, quibus interpretamenti loco additum videtur. Mill. ad Act xv. 20.

[r] Ubi videmus apostolos, eis qui ex gentibus crediderunt, nulla voluisse onera veteris legis imponere, quantum attinet ad corporalis abstinentiam voluptatis; *nisi observarent ab his tribus, id est, ab eis quæ idolis immolarentur, et a sanguine, et a fornicatione.* Unde nonnulli putant tria tantum crimina esse mortalia, idololatriam, et homicidium, et fornicationem; ubi utique et adulterium, et omnis præter uxorem concubitus intelligitur: quasi non sint mortifera crimina quæcunque alia sunt præter hæc tria, quæ a regno Dei separant, aut inaniter et fallaciter dictum sit: *Neque fures, neque avari, neque ebriosi, neque maledici, neque rapaces, regnum Dei possidebunt.* [1 Cor. vi. 10.] August. Specul. de Libro Act. Apost. Tom. iii. Bened.

thought

P. 793.

thought to be the only three mortal ſins. In [s] another place, Act. xxi. 25, is cited by Auguſtine, where *things ſtrangled* are wanting. There is [t] yet another place, where Auguſtine ſpeaks of this matter, and ſomewhat largely. Here again is mention made of the interpretation, which ſome gave of blood, meaning thereby murder; which ſenſe Auguſtine himſelf rejects here, as he did before. Thence we learn likewiſe, that in St. Auguſtine's time the decree of the council in its ancient ſenſe and interpretation was regarded [u] by very few Chriſtians among the Latins, who thought all wholeſome food, generally eaten by men, to be lawful; or, that they were under no obligation to obſerve a diſtinction of meats.

Beſide theſe writers, Mill refers alſo to Eucherius of the fifth, and Fulgentius of the ſixth century, as favouring the omiſſion of this particular in diſpute. But I do not think it needful to go any lower.

However, we ought not to paſs by the one ſingle manuſcript on this ſide the queſtion: it is the famous Cambridge manuſcript, which [w] Mill owns, with Simon, to have been written in the weſtern part of the world by a Latin ſcribe, and [x] to be interpolated and corrupted to a great degree. I put [y] in the margin the character which Mr. Wetſtein has lately given, in a few words, of this and ſome other manuſcripts, in his preface to the late edition of Curcellæus's New Teſtament with various readings. That character will have a good deal of weight with thoſe who are acquainted with the author's exact ſkill in this part of learning.

[s] De gentibus autem qui crediderunt, non statuimus, judicantes, nihil ejuſmodi eis esse faciendum illos, *niſi ut ſe obſervent ab idolothytis, et a ſanguine, et a ſuffocato, et a fornicatione*. Aug. Ep. 82. n. 9. Bened. al. 19. [t] Et in Actibus apoſtolorum lege præceptum ab apoſtolis, ut abſtineant gentes tantum *a fornicatione, et ab idolis, et a ſanguine*; id eſt, ne quidquam eſcarum edant, cujus ſanguis non effunditur. Quod alii non ſic intelligunt, quaſi a ſanguine præceptum eſſe abſtinendum, ne qui homicidio ſe contaminet. Ad Con. Fauſt. lib. xxxii. cap. 13.

... quis jam hoc Chriſtianus obſervat, quando vel minutiores aviculas non adhibuit quarum ſanguis effuſus eſt, aut ... non edat, ſi manu a cervice percuſſa nullo cruento vulnere occiſus eſt? Etenim forte pauci adhuc tangere iſta formidant, a cæteris irridentur: ita omnium animos in hac re tenuit illa ſententia veritatis. Non quod intrat in os veſtrum, vos coinquinat, ſed quod exit: nullam cibi naturam, quam ſocietas admittit humana, ſed quæ iniquitas committit, peccata condemnans. Id. ibid. [w] Certe textus ipſe Codicis, Græcus pariter ac Latinus, eſt Latini ſcribæ: quod oſtendit Simonius Hiſt. Text. Nov. Teſt. cap. 30. Miil. Proleg. n. 1271. [x] Et jam quidem ad ipſius Codicis partes accedimus: Latina tranſlationem Italicam exhibet, qualis tum temporis interpolata ferebatur, ante caſtigationem Hieronymi: Græca vero, textum mirifice corruptum, &c. Id. ib. num. 1272. [y] Inter Bodleianos codices ille qui Acta apoſtolorum continet, item Cantabrigienſis, et Claromontanus, ... a librario Latino ſcripti, et ad Verſionem Italicam corruptam tam inepte atque imperite deformati atque depravati ſunt, ut riſum moveant, qui illis locum dignitatemque genuinorum Codicum Græcorum conciliare ſtuduerunt. Præfat. in Nov. Teſt. Amſtel. 1735.

I think

I think it may not be amiſs for us now to collect the evidence we have had before us, in a few propoſitions.

(1.) All the Greek writers read this text as we now have it in our Greek copies; and ſome of thoſe Greek writers are very ancient, having flouriſhed in the ſecond century, or the beginning of the third.

(2.) All Chriſtians in general, all over the world, Greeks and Latins, in the ſecond century, and probably in the third likewiſe, underſtood the decree of the council at Jeruſalem to forbid the eating the blood of brute animals.

(3.) There is no clear proof, that in any Latin verſion, or any copies of the New Teſtament, of the ſecond or third century, the reading of this text was different from ours; for the paſſages in the verſion of Irenæus, and in the teſtimonies of Cyprian, are not to be relied upon as genuine. And Tertullian may be reckoned to afford as much evidence for the common reading as againſt it. Jerom bears witneſs only for the reading of ſome Latin copies in his time, without ſaying that they who wanted this particular were ancient; and the other writers alleged by Mill, who cite the text without *things ſtrangled*, are likewiſe of the fourth century, or later.

(4.) We ſee a probable riſe and occaſion of omitting *things ſtrangled* in ſome Latin copies about that time; I mean the fourth century, or toward the end of it: among the Chriſtians of the weſtern part of the Roman empire, where the Latin tongue chiefly obtained, the decree of the council of Jeruſalem ceaſed to be obſerved according to its original intent and meaning, and moſt ancient interpretation. As they no longer obſerved a diſtinction of meats, and often eat things ſtrangled without any ſcruple, ſome took an unwarrantable liberty with the text, and left that particular out of their copies; that their conduct might not ſeem to be expreſsly condemned by a command or advice given by apoſtles and elders in council aſſembled. Now alſo it became a common thing, though not univerſal, to interpret that particular, *from blood*, as a prohibition of homicide. Theſe two things at leaſt are extremely manifeſt; that at the end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth, many among the Latin Chriſtians neglected the diſtinction of meats, and likewiſe underſtood that prohibition in the ſenſe juſt mentioned. And I think it may be hence collected with probability, that this gave occaſion for leaving out *things ſtrangled* in ſome copies; for that clauſe appeared unſuitable to the general practice, and was a ſtrong objection to a common interpretation of another article in

ie the decree. In the paſſage, as it ſtands in the verſion of Irenæus, and in Cyprian's Teſtimonies, every thing in the proposal of James, and in the epiſtle of the council, is of a moral nature. This affords ground for ſuſpicion of an undue liberty taken with the text, to make it agree with the prevailing ſentiments and practices of ſome Chriſtians of later times. The paſſage in Cyprian's third book of Teſtimonies is abſolutely unexcuſable in two particulars; *from idolatries*, and *from effuſion of blood*; which are readings altogether unſupported by good authorities, and I ſuppoſe will not now be defended by any man of ſenſe.

(g.) As for the Cambridge manuſcript, it deſerves no farther notice here. One ſingle manuſcript, and that corrupted and interpolated, can never be equal to many, to all other; no more than one witneſs, and he a ſuſpected one, ought to be credited againſt forty others, and more.

(h.) I ſuppoſe it then to be highly probable, that our preſent common reading of this text is right; as I believe the firſt Chriſtians underſtood it right, when they took it to contain advice to abſtain from eating the blood of animals.

.. We are now to take into conſideration the addition to our common text; Acts xv. 20 and 29; which is, *And whatſoever ye would not ſhould be done unto you, neither do ye unto others.* Of this I have already taken ſome notice in (n) the chapter of Theophilus biſhop of Antioch, about the year 181, becauſe Dr. Mill had mentioned it as a conjecture of his, that that ancient father had referred to this reading in the Acts. But I then intimated, that I thought that conjecture to be entirely without foundation; and I gave ſome reaſons, which I ſuppoſed might be ſatisfactory. I am now more fully confirmed in the ſame opinion, and think there is not any the leaſt ground to ſuppoſe, that Theophilus referred to this additional reading in the Acts. For in fact, there is no reaſon to believe that this prohibition, or precept, call it what you pleaſe, was then in any copy of the Acts. This ſhall be ſhewn more diſtinctly by and by. Secondly, ſuppoſing this prohibition to have been then in the Acts, yet Theophilus did not refer to it, but rather to ſome text of the goſpels, where this equitable rule is ſpoken of as the doctrine of Chriſt himſelf; if indeed Theophilus referred at all to any part of the New Teſtament, and not ſolely to the writings of the Old. And, ſince the publication of the forecited volume, I have obſerved that the learned Mr. Wolff, [a] in his edition of

(n) [illegible] Vol. ii. chap. xx. [z] Vid. Mill. ad Act. xv. 20.
[a] Vid. Theoph. ad autol. l. ii. cap. 49. p. 228. Hamburg. 1724.

Theophilus,

Theophilus, (which I had not then ſeen) puts in the marginal note upon that paſſage of his author a reference to Luke vi. 31; which certainly is not improperly done; though I think it altogether as likely that Theophilus referred to Matt. vii. 12, or xxii. 40; if indeed he referred to any text of the New Teſtament. But, upon the whole, it appears to me ſomewhat probable, that Theophilus referred to the writings of the prophets themſelves, and to them only; and I ſhould think it muſt appear ſo to others likewiſe, who are pleaſed to read and conſider his context.

Though Mill had a conjecture that Theophilus referred to this additional reading in the Acts, yet, with his wonted critical ſkill, he ſuppoſed this reading not to be genuine, but an interpolation, however ancient; which opinion I ſhall endeavour to ſupport, except that I do not judge this interpolation to be very ancient, but very modern: nevertheleſs, that judicious critic has an obſervation upon this reading, as it ſtands in Acts xv. 29, which will not hold; for he ſays that this reading in that place diſturbs the ſenſe, and breaks the connection; which indeed it would do, if this rule were there delivered in a preceptive, poſitive form: but as they who had this reading put that equitable rule here in negative terms, in the form of a prohibition, the ſenſe is not diſturbed; and it might be added after this, as well as after the foregoing particulars; *from which if ye keep yourſelves, ye ſhall do well.*

The authorities for this additional reading are repreſented by Mill in his notes upon Acts xv. 20 and 29. They conſiſt of eight manuſcripts, five of which have this additional clauſe at v. 20; and three more at v. 29; one verſion, and three Chriſtian writers. All theſe authorities, eſpecially the manuſcripts, we ſhall obſerve particularly; and, as we examine their character and quality, we may poſſibly ſee reaſon to reduce their number.

The firſt manuſcript alleged for this reading is that called Stevens's ſecond manuſcript. According to Mill himſelf, this manuſcript [b] is very much interpolated, eſpecially in the Acts. He thinks this Greek manuſcript agrees ſo much with the Latin vulgate, that he cannot but conclude it to have been corrected, or formed upon that tranſlation, and even a corrupt and faulty copy of that tranſlation. This judgment of our Mill upon this manuſcript of Stephens is very obſervable; but Mr. Wetſtein [c] aſſerts, and proves it to be the ſame with that called Beza's manuſcript, or the manuſcript of Cambridge.

[b] ... quæ haud concordarent cum verſione vulgata, et quidem codice ejus corrupto, gloſſematibuſque, et ſubinde integris παραφραſεσι ſatis prolixis, in Actis præſertim apoſtolorum interpolato. Mill. Proleg. n. 1160.

[c] Vid. Proleg. ad Nov. Teſt. Gr. edit. accuratiſſimam. cap. 4. p. 22. ... 27.

The

The next is Stephens's tenth manuſcript, which [d] Mill ſays likewiſe agrees mightily with the Latin vulgate.

The third is the Cambridge manuſcript. We formerly ſhewed ſufficiently what is its character: and are here farther to' take notice, that it has been juſt now obſerved to be the ſame with Stephens's ſecond manuſcript. Mill therefore, though without knowing it, has twice mentioned one and the ſame manuſcript under different names.

The fourth is a Geneva manuſcript, of [e] which Mill gives a good character, though he thinks the ſcribe to have been careleſs and ignorant.

The fifth is that called Covel's fourth manuſcript, which Mill ſays is a [f] modern, or late manuſcript.

Theſe are all the manuſcripts, which are put by Mill in his notes upon Acts, xv. 20, as having this additional reading. At v. 29 ſome more are mentioned, as having it there.

The firſt of theſe, and the ſixth in our order, is that which Mill calls Stephens's firſt manuſcript; by which Mill means the Complutenſian edition, as [g] he has himſelf informed us. Therefore this is not a manuſcript, but a printed copy.

The next, or ſeventh, is Laud's ſecond. It agrees mightily with that in the Vatican, as [h] Mill ſays.

The laſt, and eighth, is the Seidelian manuſcript, mentioned by Kuſter, ſuppoſed to [i] be about ſeven hundred years old, or written in the tenth century.

Theſe are all the manuſcripts ſaid to have this additional clauſe. As placed in Mill's New Teſtament, they appear to be eight in number; but are really ſix only; Stephens's ſecond manuſcript being the ſame with that at Cambridge; and Stephens's firſt manuſcript, as it is called, being no manuſcript, but a printed copy.

The only verſion that has this reading is the Ethiopic, a very inaccurate verſion, as ſome think, and of little value; by ſome others, however, it is judged not to be contemptible: I may not ſtay to examine its merit particularly; I therefore refer [k] to divers learned writers upon this head, who may be conſulted by ſuch as have leiſure. I ſhall only obſerve, that it very ſeldom can be reaſonable to follow one ſingle verſion, where it differs

[c] Mill. Prol. n. 1171. [d] Ib. n. 1500. 1501. [e] Manu recenti. ib. n. 1487. [f] Ib. n. 1159. [g] Ibid: n. 1439. [h] Vid. Kuſteri Præf. in Mill. Nov. Teſt. p. 8. fin. [i] Vid. Scalig. de Emendat. Temp. l. 7. p. 682. Walton Proleg. xv. p. 57. &c. Ludolf Præf. in Lexicon Æthiop. p. 2. 3. et ejuſd. Hiſt. Æthiop. lib. iii. cap. 4. Ri. Simon. Hiſt. Crit. des Verſ. du. Nov. Teſt. Ch. xvii. p. 193, &c. Mill. Proleg. num. 1188. 1189. Beauſobre et Lenfant Pref. generale ſur le Nov. Teſt. page 213.

from all others; especially when that version has no evidences of early antiquity, neither internal nor external, but what are very doubtful and uncertain.

The Christian writers mentioned by Mill are, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, and Rabanus in the ninth century; for as for Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, Mill does not place him with these three. That learned critic mentioned it only as a conjecture, that possibly Theophilus might refer to this reading in the Acts. But I have already shewn that conjecture to be without foundation; because, even allowing this clause to have been then in the copies of the Acts of the apostles, there is no reason to think Theophilus referred to this text, but rather to some text in the gospels, if he refers to any place at all of the New Testament; and likewise because there is no reason to suppose that this clause was then in the Acts, as we have now shewn in part, and proceed to shew still farther.

The only Christian writers, then, who favour this reading are the three above mentioned: but by Irenæus we are to understand only his Latin interpreter, whose age we do not certainly know; and possibly that translation has been interpolated in some places since it was first made. Nor are we by St. Cyprian to understand St. Cyprian himself, but the interpolator of his third book of Testimonies, whose age we do not know, but possibly he lived as late as Rabanus, or since.

The very few, and those late quotations of this place in the Acts, according to this reading, shew it to be an interpolation, and that it never was in many copies of that book of scripture, and those only late copies.

Beside that we do not find this reading in the most ancient writers, nor in any one Greek writer whatever, there is positive evidence as to divers of the most ancient Christian writers, both Greek and Latin, that they had not this clause in their copies. This appears from their citations of the whole decree of the council at Jerusalem, together with the last farewell, or the concluding words of the decree of the apostles and elders, or from some remarks made by those writers upon the decree. I mean Clement of Alexandria, who has twice cited this text; Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, Pacian, Gaudentius, Augustine. I have above cited their passages very much at length, in considering that particular, *things strangled*, that every one might perceive as much. To those passages therefore, transcribed at the bottom of the page, I refer such as are pleased to examine them: and to those writers might be added Jerom. This shews, that in the fourth,

as

as well as more early centuries, this clauſe was wanting in moſt, and thoſe the beſt, if not in all copies.

There is one thing more, which may deſerve to be mentioned here: I do not perceive that this clauſe is found at Acts xxi. 25. in any manuſcript copy of that book, or in any verſion, or writer whatever. This is an argument, that neither was it originally in Acts xv. 20. and 29: for if it had been originally in both thoſe places, it would have appeared here likewiſe.

I think, then, that there is not any reaſon to ſuppoſe this precept, or prohibition, to have been originally put in their epiſtle by the apoſtles and elders aſſembled at Jeruſalem: but, on the other hand, there is very good evidence, that it is an interpolation, probably inſerted ſome time near the end of the fourth century, or afterwards, by ſome Latin Chriſtian, in order to render the whole decree of the council agreeable to the ſentiments and practices that prevailed in the age and place in which he lived; for the few manuſcripts that have this reading are of ſmall weight againſt the much greater number that want it. One verſion, corrupt too and inaccurate, as it ſeems, is of no authority againſt all others. The Chriſtian writers that have followed this reading are ſo few, that they ſcarce deſerve to be mentioned; eſpecially conſidering, that the only one of them whoſe name we know is Rabanus, of the ninth century; for who was Irenæus's interpreter, and when he lived, and who was the interpolator of Cyprian's Teſtimonies, and when he lived, are things altogether uncertain and unknown.

I conclude, then, that the preſent readings of Acts xv. 20. and 29. in our ordinary copies of the New Teſtament are the true and genuine original readings: or, to be a little more particular and diſtinct, in proportion to the evidence of things, I reckon it highly probable, that the clauſe, *and from things ſtrangled*, was originally in the decree; and certain that, according to the moſt ancient interpretation of the decree, it was underſtood by all Chriſtians in general to forbid eating the blood of brute animals. As for the additional article, which we have juſt now conſidered, it is plainly an interpolation; and, unleſs there be ſome other evidence for it, which I am unacquainted with, I do not ſee how it can be received as a part of the apoſtolical decree by any Chriſtian critic, who is duly concerned for the integrity and purity of the ſacred ſcriptures.

I have inſiſted thus long upon the reading of this portion of ſcripture, not only becauſe Mill himſelf had pronounced a wrong judgment upon it in his Prolegomena, as I conceive, but be-

cauſe there is an agreement to the like purpoſe in [l] Curcellæus, for leaving out the clauſe of *things ſtrangled*. And I am apprehenſive that, unleſs we retain the true reading of this place, for the main part at leaſt, we ſhall not rightly underſtand it; nor ſhall we, unleſs we have the true ſenſe and deſign of this decree, maintain, as we ought to do, the dignity of the apoſtolical character and commiſſion. Finally, the miſunderſtanding of this decree muſt be to the prejudice of the Chriſtian revelation itſelf, in the eſteem of many.

Having now, as I hope, ſettled the true reading of the determination of the apoſtles and elders upon the point in controverſy at that time, I wiſh I were likewiſe able to explain that determination to the ſatisfaction of the ſcrupulous and the judicious: but ſuch a performance, even ſuppoſing that ability, would require a longer digreſſion than could be allowed of in this place; for which reaſon that attempt muſt be deferred.

V. We are in the next place to conſider St. Cyprian's teſtimony to the epiſtles of the apoſtle Paul.

1. 'According [m] to what the bleſſed apoſtle Paul writes in his 'epiſtle to the Romans; *Every one ſhall give an account of himſelf: 'therefore let us not judge one another:*' ch. xiv. 12. 13.

2. He quotes the latter part of the firſt chapter of the epiſtle to the Romans very agreeably to the reading we ſaw formerly (1) in Clement of Rome, ver. 32. '*Who,*' ſays [n] he, *when they 'knew the righteouſneſs of God, did not conſider, that they who do ſuch 'things are worthy of death; nor only they who commit them, but they 'alſo who conſent to them that do them.*' The meaning of the text, according to this reading, is, that not only they who actually commit the ſins before-mentioned, are liable to puniſhment, but they alſo who approve of, and conſent to ſuch evil things. So it is ſaid of Paul, that [o] he was *conſenting to Stephen's death*, Acts viii. 1.

3. In the firſt book of Teſtimonies: 'In [p] the firſt epiſtle of 'Paul to the Corinthians; *Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye 'ſhould be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud.*

[l] Vid. Curcellæi Diatr. de Eſu ſanguinis inter Chriſtianos. cap. 11. [m] Secundum quod beatus apoſtolus Paulus in epiſtola ſua ad Romanos ſcribit et dicit: Unuſquiſque noſtrum pro ſe rationem dabit; non ergo nos invicem judicemus. Cypr. Ep. 69. al. 76. p. 188. (1) See Vol. i. p. 35. [n] Sed et hoc idem Paulus apoſtolus ſcribit et dicit: ... qui cum juſtitiam Dei cognoviſſent, non intellexerunt, quoniam qui talia agunt, morte ſunt digni, non tantum qui faciunt ea, ſed et qui conſentiunt eis qui hæc agunt. Ep. 67. al. 68. p. 175. [o] Σαυλος δε τη συνευδοκησει της αναιρεσεως αυτου. [p] In epiſtola Pauli ad Corinthios prima: Nolo enim vos ignorare, fratres, quia patres noſtri omnes ſub nube fuerunt. Item in epiſtola ad Corinthios ſecunda: Obtuſi ſunt ſenſus eorum, &c. Teſtim. lib. i. cap. 4. p. 22.

'Likewiſe

'Likewiſe in the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians; *Their minds 'are blinded unto this day:'* ſee 1 Cor. x. i. and 2 Cor. iii. 13. 14.

4. In one of his epiſtles, 'The [q] bleſſed apoſtle Paul alſo 'choſen and ſent of the Lord, and appointed preacher of the 'goſpel, ſays the ſame thing in his epiſtle; *The Lord Jeſus, the 'ſame night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and, giving thanks, 'broke it, and ſaid, This is my body, which will be given for you: this 'do in remembrance of me:'* 1 Cor. xi. 23. 24.

5. In one of his tracts: 'Likewiſe [r] the bleſſed apoſtle Paul, 'full of the inſpiration of the Lord; *Now he that miniſtereth,'* ſays he, *'ſeed to the ſower, will both miniſter bread for your food, and mul- 'tiply your ſeed ſown, and encreaſe the fruits of your righteouſneſs, that ye may be enriched in all things:'* 2 Cor. ix. 10. 11.

6. In the firſt book of Teſtimonies, 'Likewiſe [s] Paul to the 'Galations; *But when the fulneſs of time was come, God ſent forth 'his Son, made of a woman....'* Gal. iv. 4. In another work, 'The [t] apoſtle Paul, admoniſhing and ſaying, *Therefore, whilſt 'we have opportunity, let us do good to all men, eſpecially to them who 'are of the houſehold of faith. And let us not be weary in well doing; 'for in due ſeaſon we ſhall reap, if we faint not:'* ſo he tranſpoſeth the words of theſe two verſes, Gal. vi. 10. 9.

7. St. Cyprian expreſsly quotes the epiſtle to the Epheſians, not only in the third book of [u] Teſtimonies, but likewiſe in one of his epiſtles, after this manner: 'But [w] the apoſtle Paul, ſpeak- 'ing of the ſame thing more clearly and plainly, writes to the 'Epheſians and ſays; *Chriſt loved the church, and gave himſelf for 'it, that he might ſanctify and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water;'* Eph. v. 25. 26. The text cited in the Teſtimonies is, ch. iv. 30, *And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye were ſealed in the day of redemption:* which is a remarkable and uncommon reading. However, it is found again in [x] St. Auguſtine.

[q] Beatus quoque apoſtolus Paulus, a domino electus et miſſus, et prædicator veritatis evangelicæ conſtitutus, hæc eadem in epiſtola ſua ponit, dicens: Dominus Jeſus in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem, et gratias agens [egit et Baluz.] fregit, et dixit: hoc eſt corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, &c. Ep. 63. p. 152. [r] Item beatus apoſtolus Paulus dominicæ inſpirationis gratia plenus: Qui adminiſtrat, inquit, &c. De Op. et Eleem. [s] Item Paulus ad Galatas: at ubi advenit impletio temporis, miſit Deus filium ſuum natum de muliere. Teſtim. l. i. c. 8. p. 37. [t] Paulo apoſtolo admonente et dicente: Ergo dum tempus habemus, &c. De Op. et Eleem. p. 208.

[u] Paulus ad Epheſios: Nolite contriſtare Spiritum Sanctum Dei, in quo ſignati eſtis in die redemtionis. Teſt. l. iii. cap. 7. p. 64. [w] Sed et Paulus apoſtolus hoc idem adhuc apertius et clarius manifeſtans ad Epheſios ſcribit et dicit: Chriſtus dilexit eccleſiam. &c. Ep. 69. al. 76. p. 181. [x] Ex hoc locutionis modo arbitror dictum illud ab apoſtolo: Nolite contriſtare Spiritum Sanctum Dei, in quo ſignati eſtis in die redemtionis. Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. iv. n. 18. p. 166. B. Tom. iii. P. i. Bened.

8. In the third book of Testimonies, 'Likewise [y] Paul to 'the Philippians; *Who being appointed in the form of God, did not 'earnestly affect to be equal to God, but made himself of no reputation, 'taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man, and 'found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto 'death, even the death of the cross:*' Philip. ii. 6. 7. 8. The same passage is likewise found in the second book of Cyprian's [z] Testimonies, and plainly in the same sense. I have already quoted (k) this passage from some Greek writers, who interpret this text according to the translation just given. It is likewise found again, and plainly in the same sense, in [a] Novatus, or Novatian, as he is usually called, a Latin author, and contemporary with St. Cyprian. Mr. Marshall translates the first words of the passage above quoted from the third book of Cyprian's Testimonies in this manner: That though he was appointed to appear in the form of God, he did not boast of his equality with God, but emptied himself. And besides, Mr. Marshall has a long and judicious note upon this citation of our author: he says, 'he cannot 'acquiesce in our common construction of the words, *thought 'it no robbery*, &c. as if they intimated any thing like to his 'claiming an equality; because the apostle here is speaking of 'our Saviour's humility and condescension, and rather repre- 'sents him as receding from his just rights, than as insisting on 'them. Though he received so much honour from his Father, 'and was appointed to represent his person, yet when he came 'to suffer, he did not insist on his first pretensions; did not seem '(then) to think he had any claim to the divinity, or might as- 'sume it; boasted not (then) of his near alliance to the Deity; 'but, instead of it, emptied himself, behaved and acted like a 'person void of any such powers. Novatian, in his book De 'Trinitate, cap. 17. understands our apostle in this sense; which 'I must acknowledge, with Mr. Le Clerc, seems to me the most 'natural and easy. See Mr. Le Clerc upon the place in his Sup- 'plement to Dr. Hammond; and Dr. Whitby, who gives in- 'stances out of Heliodorus, wherein the words ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγεῖται, 'which we translate *thinking a robbery*, plainly signify catching at 'an opportunity, embracing any thing as extremely desirable.'

[y] Item Paulus ad Philippenses: Qui in figura Dei constitutus, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se æqualem Deo, sed se exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominis factus, et habitu inventus ut homo. Humiliavit se, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. Test. l. iii. c. 39. p. 76. [z] Test. l. ii. cap. 13. (k) See Vol. ii. ch. 16. n. 7. ch. 38. n. 28. [a] Qui cum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est æqualem se Deo esse; sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudine hominum factus, &c. Novat. de Reg. Fid. cap. 22. [al. 17.] p. 174. edit. Jo. Jacks.

So

So writes Mr. Marſhall. Mr. Wolff ** has diſcourſed largely of this matter, and deſerves to be conſulted.

9. That paſſage, as was obſerved, is in Cyprian's books of Teſtimonies. In another work, 'Mindful [b] of which the bleſ-'ſed apoſtle Paul ſays in his epiſtle [or in one of his epiſtles]: '*For me to live is Chriſt, and to die is gain:*' Philip. i. 21.

10. In the third book of Teſtimonies; 'In [c] the epiſtle of 'Paul to the Coloſſians; *Continue in prayer, watching in the ſame:* Coloſſ. iv. 2. In another work: 'Likewiſe [d] the bleſſed 'apoſtle Paul, full of the Holy Ghoſt, and ſent to call and con-'vert the Gentiles, warns and teaches; *Beware, leſt any man ſpoil 'you through philoſophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, af-'ter the rudiments of the world, and not after Chriſt: for in him dwelleth 'all the fulneſs of the Godhead:*' Col. ii. 8.

11. In the books of Teſtimonies the [e] firſt and [f] ſecond epiſtles of Paul to the Theſſalonians are expreſsly cited; and in [g] other works alſo paſſages of both theſe epiſtles are cited by Cyprian as words of the apoſtle Paul.

12. 'For [h] if the apoſtle Paul, writing to Timothy, ſaid, *Let 'no man deſpiſe thy youth*, how much more may it be ſaid to you 'by your colleagues, Let no man deſpiſe thy age:' 1 Tim. iv. 12.

13. 'Therefore [i] the apoſtle Paul writes to Timothy, and 'directs, That *a biſhop ſhould not ſtrive, but be gentle, and apt to 'teach*;' 2 Tim. ii. 24.

14. In the books of Teſtimonies [k] theſe two epiſtles are quoted by Cyprian diſtinctly, as the firſt and ſecond to Timothy.

15. In the third book of Teſtimonies: 'To [l] Titus, [that 'is, in the epiſtle to Titus, as appears from what there precedes:] '*A man that is an heretic, after the firſt and ſecond admonition, reject; 'knowing that ſuch an one is ſubverted, and ſinneth, being condemned of 'himſelf.*' Tit. iii. 10, 11. In a ſynodical epiſtle of Cyprian, and other biſhops in Africa, ſent to ſome of their brethren in Spain;

** Vid. Wolff. Curæ in Ep. ad Philip. cap. 2. 6. . . . 8.

[b] Cujus rei memor beatus apoſtolus Paulus in epiſtola ſua ponit et dicit: Mihi vivere Chriſtus, et mori lucrum. De mortal. p. 158.

[c] In epiſtola Pauli ad Coloſſenſes: Inſiſte orationi, vigilantes in ea. Teſt. l. iii. cap. 120

[d] Item beatus apoſtolus Paulus plenus Spiritu Sancto et vocandis formandiſque gentibus miſſus conteſtetur et inſtruat, dicens: videte ne quis vos deprædetur, . . . quia in ipſo habitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis. De bono Patient. p. 210.

[e] Teſt. l. iii. cap. 88.

[f] Teſt. l. iii. cap. 68.

[g] De mort p. 164. Ep. 14. [al. 5.] p. 32.

[h] Nam ſi apoſtolus Paulus, ad Timotheum ſcribens, dixit: Juventutem tuam nemo deſpiciat: &c. Ep. 3. [al. 65.] p. 6.

[i] Cui rei proſpiciens beatus Paulus apoſtolus ad Timotheum ſcribit et monet, epiſcopum non litigioſum, ſed mitem et docibilem eſſe debere. Ep. 74. p. 215.

[k] Teſtim. lib. iii. cap. 67. 76. 77. et paſſim.

[l] Ad Titum: Hæreticum hominem poſt unam aut ſecundam, &c. Teſt. l. iii. c. 78.

'Forasmuch [m] as the apostle directs, that *a bishop must be* '*blameless, as the steward of God.*' Tit. i. 7.

Mr. Hallett, in his [n] learned Discourse of Heresy and Schism, explaining the forecited difficult text to Titus, expresseth himself in this manner; 'What I take to be the true interpretation 'of the character, *self-condemned*, has been often published, and 'yet has been strangely overlooked of late years. The oldest 'writer that I have found it in is Jerom, who in his comment 'upon the place says; "A heretic is said to be condemned by "himself, because (while a fornicator, an adulterer, a murderer, "and other vicious persons, are cast out of the church by the "priests) heretics pass sentence upon themselves, and of their "own accord depart from the church; which departure is as "condemnation passed on them by their own consciences." And Mr. Hallett there shews that this has been the opinion of divers learned moderns, particularly of Estius, bishop Bullow, and Dr. Hammond.

I shall here add a passage from Cyprian, which may shew that interpretation to be older than Jerom; as Mr. Hallett likewise supposes, for he takes it to be the true meaning of the text. 'Which,' says [o] Cyprian, 'the apostle Paul confirms, when he 'teaches and requires that a heretic be rejected, as being subverted, a sinner, and condemned of himself: for the ruin of 'such an one must be laid to his own charge, who is not cast 'out by the bishop, but of his own accord forsakes the church, 'passing sentence upon himself by his heretical presumption.'

16. The epistle to Philemon is not found quoted in the remaining works of Cyprian. The shortness of it may be supposed to be the reason.

VI. The epistle to the Hebrews is no where expressly quoted by St. Cyprian; nor are there in his works any passages that contain allusions to it. He may have some texts of the Old Testament which are cited, or alluded to, in the epistle to the Hebrews; but he does not take them from that epistle, but from the original books themselves. This is so plain, that I suppose

[m] . . . quando et apostolus moneat ac dicat: Episcopum oportet esse sine crimine, quasi Dei dispensatorem. Ep. 67 [al. 68.] p. 173. [n] See Mr. Hallett's Sermons and Discourses, Vol. iii. p. 177, &c.

[o] Quisquis autem de collecta foris exierit, id est, si quis quamvis in ecclesia positus, receptus et ab ecclesia exierit, reum sibi futurum, id est, ipsum sibi qui perierit imputaturum. Quod et Paulus expiavit, docens et monens hæreticum vitandum esse, et naufragum, et peccatorem, et a semetipso damnatum. Hic enim reus sibi erit, qui non ab episcopo ejectus, sed sponte decedens et fugus et hæretica præsumptione semetipso damnatus. Ep. 69. [al. 72.] p. 122.

[o]

no one will conteſt it. Dr. Mill [p] allows that this epiſtle is no where cited by St. Cyprian; and his not quoting this epiſtle, which is ſo large, in any of his tracts or epiſtles, may be reckoned an argument that he was not acquainted with it, or that he did not eſteem it a part of holy ſcripture. Accordingly, Mr. Hallett, [q] in the introduction to his Paraphraſe and Notes on the three laſt chapters of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, admits it to be very likely that St. Cyprian was of the ſame opinion with ſome others of the Latin church at that time, who did not receive this as canonical epiſtle.

And indeed, that this Latin father did not reckon the epiſtle to the Hebrews to have been written by the apoſtle Paul, is farther evident from an obſervation twice mentioned by him, concerning the number of churches to which that apoſtle had written. In the firſt book of Teſtimonies, [r] 'Cyprian having quoted the words of Hannah, *the barren has born ſeven, and ſhe that has many ſons* [or children] *is waxed feeble*, (1 Sam. ii. 5.) goes on: The ſeven ſons are ſeven churches; for which reaſon Paul wrote to ſeven churches; and the Revelation has ſeven churches, that the number ſeven may be preſerved.' In another place, having mentioned the ſeven golden candleſticks in the Revelation, the ſeven pillars in Solomon's Proverbs, upon which Wiſdom built her houſe, and likewiſe the forementioned ſeven in the firſt book of Samuel, and the ſeven women in Iſ. iv. 1. he adds; 'And [s] the apoſtle Paul, who was mindful of this authoriſed and well-known number, writes to ſeven churches; and in the Revelation our Lord ſends his divine and heavenly inſtructions and commands to ſeven churches and their angels.' By the ſeven churches, to which Paul wrote, Cyprian unqueſtionably meaneth the churches of Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Epheſus, Philippi, Coloſſe, and Theſſalonica; as alſo obſerved by biſhop Fell [t] in a note upon this paſſage. Nevertheleſs, that learned writer adds there a remark which ſeems to me very particular: 'If it be aſked,' ſays he, 'in

[p] Illum nescio an secutus sit [illegible] quibus epistolam [illegible] nusquam citatam reperio. Proleg. 216. [q] See introd. p. [illegible] Prolegomenorum: *Stanks* [illegible] *that* [illegible] *that ſhe that ſhe* [illegible] Hebr. Paulum autem septem tantum [illegible] Unde et Paulus septem [illegible] et Apocalypsis ecclesias [illegible] et ideirco septenarius numerus [illegible] [r] Et apostolus [illegible] numeri legitimi et certi meminit, ad septem ecclesias scribit. Et in Apocalypsi Dominus mandata sua divina et præcepta ecclesiis ad septem ecclesias et earum angelos scribit. De exhort. Mart. cap. 11. p. 170. [s] Ad septem ecclesias scribat, [illegible] Corinthios, Galatas, Ephesios, Philippenses, Coloſſenſes, et Theſſalonicenſes. Si requiratur, quo in loco Paulus legitimi et certi numeri meminerit, hoc dicendum, hoc ab eo præditum. Hebr. xi. 30.

[t] what

'what place Paul has mentioned [so he understands the word 'meminit] this authorised and well-known number, perhaps 'it must be said, that it is done by him in Hebr. xi. 30. 'faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed 'seven days.' But I suppose it can scarce be doubted but Cyprian's meaning is, that as a regard had been had to the number seven by many persons upon various occasions; so likewise Paul had remembered, *was mindful of*, shewed his respect to that number by writing epistles to seven churches, and no more.

From these passages then it may be reckoned evident, that Cyprian supposed the apostle Paul had written to no more than seven churches, and that his other epistles were sent to particular persons. Cyprian therefore did not compute the epistle to the Hebrews among the works of the apostle Paul.

Since the writing what is above, relating to this epistle to the Hebrews, I have had an opportunity to consult Mr. Marshall's English translation of St. Cyprian. The passage of our author last cited is there rendered after this manner: 'Thus the 'apostle St. Paul, bearing in his mind this remarkable and distinguished number, hath written precisely to seven churches. 'And in the Revelation our blessed Lord directs his heavenly 'instructions to seven churches and their seven angels.' And in the notes upon this place, Mr. Marshall omits the above-mentioned remark of bishop Fell, which I have taken the liberty to censure, without translating it, or saying any thing about it. He likewise adds another remark of his own, which is much better in these very words; 'So that our author, (I observe) did not 'ascribe the Hebrews to St. Paul.'

Here therefore it will be very proper to take notice of Mr. Marshall's translation of a passage in St. Cyprian's works. It is in the Acts of the council at Carthage in the year 256, where our bishop presided. There a part of the thirty-third suffrage, that of Felix of Amaccora, is thus rendered; 'Wherefore to 'me it is manifest, that neither heretics nor schismatics are capable of the *heavenly gift*, who have been so presumptuous as 'to expect it from men who are sinners and aliens from the 'church.' Here that expression, *heavenly gift*, seems to be taken from Hebr. vi. 4. but there is no such expression in the original Latin. Felix says, that[x] heretics and schismatics are not capable of *any thing heavenly*; that is, spiritual or divine. The

[x] See Mr. N. Marshall's St. Cyprian. p. 179. [y] Et ideo manifestum est, nec hæreticos nec schismaticos aliquid celeste posse suscipere, qui a peccatoribus [illegible] nibus, et ab ecclesia extraneis [illegible] cipere. ap. Cypr. p. 236.

[illegible]

wrong verſion ſeems to be owing to the liberty which Mr. Marſhall gave himſelf, and which I obſerved (L) formerly. He ſays in his y preface, 'I have here and there alſo expreſſed my 'author's ſenſe in the language of holy ſcripture, where he him-'ſelf did not mean to quote it: but then, in ſuch caſes, I never 'refer to the paſſage, as I always do where he particularly cites 'any verſe or chapter of the inſpired writers.' But yet here Mr. Marſhall has not only expreſſed his author's ſenſe in the language of the epiſtle to the Hebrews, 'where he himſelf did 'not mean to quote it,' but he has alſo marked and diſtinguiſhed this expreſſion by putting it in the body of his tranſlation in Italic letters, and by referring in the margin to the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and alſo by putting this reference or quotation at the end of the volume in the table of the texts of ſcripture cited by St. Cyprian. To what ſhall we aſcribe this omiſſion of this matter thus: In tranſlating this ſuffrage, Mr. Marſhall put in practice the liberty we have noted: he did, at leaſt, write out that paſſage without any diſtinction of letters, and without any marginal reference to a book of holy ſcripture; but ſome good while after, when he came to review and read over his verſion, and no longer had the original before him, ſeeing this expreſſion, he thought it worthy of obſervation; and therefore preſently marked it with his pen for Italic, and put a reference in the margin, whence it came alſo into the table of texts at the end of the volume. This, I think, is a likely way of accounting for this matter: however, it may be eaſily accounted for another way; for the marking that expreſſion for Italic, the marginal reference, and it's place in the table of texts, may be all owing to ſome perſon employed by Mr. Marſhall. But ſtill the tranſlator is accountable for what enſued upon his wrong tranſlation: and if Mr. Marſhall himſelf was deceived and miſled by his own verſion, ſome one elſe whom he employed was impoſed upon; and in like manner muſt all others be deceived who read this paſſage in his tranſlation, and have no opportunity of conſulting the original.

'II. I ſhall now obſerve this writer's teſtimony to the catholic epiſtles.

1. We find no quotations or alluſions to the epiſtle of St. James in St. Cyprian's works.

2. The apoſtle Peter's firſt epiſtle is often quoted by St. Cyprian. 'Like wiſe [a] Peter, upon whom by the gracious vouch-

(L) See p. 145. Note (D)

[a] . . . Item Petrus, ſuper quem Domini dignatione fundata eſt, in epiſtola ſua ponit et dicit: Chriſtus paſſus eſt pro nobis, relinquens vobis exemplum, ut ſequamini veſtigia ejus: qui peccatum

faſcment,

'ſatement of the Lord the church is built, ſays in his epiſtle, '(1 Pet. ii. 21, 22, 23.) *Chriſt ſuffered for us, leaving you an ex-* 'ample, that ye ſhould follow his ſteps: who did no ſin, neither was 'guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not; 'when he ſuffered, he threatened not; but committed [or yielded] him-'ſelf to him that judged him unrighteouſly:' meaning Pontius Pilate. So Cyprian muſt have read this text, it being quoted by him after the ſame manner likewiſe in the [b] books of Teſtimonies. I may not ſtay to conſider which reading is preferable, whether this, or that now more commonly received, *to him that judgeth righteouſly*: I would therefore refer my readers, for farther ſatisfaction, to [c] Mr. Wolff's notes upon the place.

This epiſtle is ſeveral times quoted in the third book of Teſtimonies with this title, The [d] epiſtle of Peter to the people of Pontus: who are the perſons firſt named in the inſcription of the epiſtle.

In his other works, Cyprian quotes this as [e] the epiſtle of the apoſtle Peter, and [f] of Peter the apoſtle of Chriſt.

3. The ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter is not at all quoted by Cyprian. One may be well apt to think it was not received by him as a ſacred book; otherwiſe it could not have been omitted by a writer whoſe works ſo much abound with citations of ſcripture, and who had ſuch controverſies about the treatment of heretics. If this epiſtle had been a part of Cyprian's canon, it is likely he would have applied divers paſſages of it to the heretics and ſchiſmatics of his own time, as he does (M) the text of St. John's firſt epiſtle relating to antichriſt.

This may well bring to our mind the (N) paſſage formerly cited out of Firmilian's letter to our author, where we were willing to ſuppoſe that Firmilian had a reference to St. Peter's ſecond epiſtle. Nevertheleſs, perhaps Cyprian's entire ſilence about this epiſtle may induce ſome to doubt whether Firmilian did really refer to it. Farther, the entire ſilence of Cyprian, and the very ſmall notice taken of this epiſtle by (O) Origen, another acquaintance, and a very intimate friend of Firmilian, may oc-

non fecit, nec dolus inventus eſt in ore ejus; qui cum maledicerentur, non maledicebat; cum pateretur, non comminabatur, tradebat autem ſe judicanti injuſte. De Bono Pat. p. 213, 214. [b] tradebat autem ſe judicanti injuſte. Teſt. l. iii. cap. 59. [c] Vid. Joh. Chr. Wolff. Cur. Philolog. et Crit. Tom. v. p. 122, 123.

[d] De hoc ipſo in epiſtola Petri ad Ponticos. Teſt. l. iii. c. 36. vid. et c. 37. 39.

[e] Secundum quod Petrus apoſtolus in epiſtola ſua præmonet et docet, dicens: Sobrii eſtote, &c. De Zel et Livore p. 221.

[f] Petrus et ejus apoſtolus et ejus doctrina ideo perſecutiones fieri, ut probemur: ... poſuit enim in epiſtola ſua dicens: Ep. 57. al. 56. p. 121. (M) See below 4. 5. [k] and num. 10. (N) Vol. iii. ch. 22. num. 14. (O) See ch. 38. num. 12.

caſion

cation a doubt, whether this second epistle was received by Firmilian as an epistle of Peter.

I have no desire to set aside our second epistle of Peter, as not genuine; but I think it incumbent upon me to mention such observations as these when they offer: and I must still proceed to observe, that we have Firmilian's letter to Cyprian in a Latin translation only; nor do we certainly know by whom it was made. The expressions in the translation are very strong; that Peter and Paul in their epistles have cursed, or pronounced censures upon heretics, and admonished us to avoid them: but perhaps the words of the original were not so express. What we now have rendered *their epistles*, possibly might be only some general word denoting writings, or the scriptures: and in what Firmilian says of Peter, he might refer to that apostle's censure of Simon Magus, reputed an arch heretic, and recorded in [h] the Acts of the apostles; a book of holy scripture, and universally received. It is certain, that it is no uncommon thing for ancient Christian authors to quote Peter and Paul, meaning some words of theirs recorded in the Acts of the apostles, without naming that book, or hinting where the intended passage is to be found. We shall see in the *** next chapter a remarkable instance of this kind, where the apostle Paul is quoted. I place here †††† in the margin several such quotations of the apostle Peter in divers authors, one of which contains a part of his reproof of the forementioned Simon.

4. The first epistle of St. John is often expressly quoted by Cyprian: 'And [i] the apostle John, mindful of the command, writes in his epistle: *Hereby*, says he, *we perceive that we know him, if we keep his commandments: He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him:*' 1 John ii. 3.

5. I shall add one passage more [k] in the margin, where this epistle is quoted as written by the blessed apostle John.

[g] Vulgat. τας γραφας, τας γραμμασιν. Act. xxi. 20. . . . 23. [h] See below, p. 175. Numb. vii. 7.

[†] Et quidem Petrus de salvatore testificatus est: Hujus anima non derelicta est in inferno, nec caro ejus vidit corruptionem. [Vid. Act. ii. 27.] Philastr. de Hær. p. 6[illegible]. Ed. Fabric. Et Petrus Mago Simoni dixerat: Age Pœnitentiam quo modo dimittatur tibi quod [illegible]. [Act. viii. 22.] Philast. Hær. [illegible]. Adtende enim, quid Petrus Spiritu Sancto docente commonitus [illegible]. Et nunc ergo vos quid tentatis Deum, imponere jugum collo discentium, &c. [Act. xv. 10. 11.] P. Oros. de lib. arb. p. 620. Ed. Havercamp. 1738. Sicut Petrus ad Judæos exclamavit: Dextera Dei exaltatus, acceptum a Patre Spiritum effudit, &c. [Act. ii. 33.] Victorin. in Apocal. ap. Bib. Patr. T. iii. R. 415. D.

[i] Et Joannes apostolus mandati memor in epistola sua postmodum ponit: in hoc, inquit, intelligimus quia cognovimus eum, si præcepta ejus custodiamus. . . . . Ep. 28. [al. 25.] p. 54.

[k] Item beatus Joannes apostolus nec ipse ullam hæresin, aut schisma discrevit, aut

There

There are two paſſages, where Cyprian is ſuppoſed by ſome to quote or refer to the diſputed text, concerning the three witneſſes in heaven. The firſt is to this purpoſe: 'The [l] Lord ſays, '*I and the Father are one.* And again, of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit it is written: *And theſe three are one:*' 1 John v. 7. The other paſſage I ſhall not tranſlate. However, I put it [m] in the margin, for the ſake of thoſe who may chuſe to ſee it here. I do not enter into the merits of the queſtion, whether this clauſe be genuine, or whether it was quoted or referred to by St. Cyprian. The reader who is deſirous of information concerning this matter, may conſult the [n] authors who have treated of it largely; but in a (P) following chapter will be found an argument of no ſmall weight in favour of the ſuppoſition, that this clauſe was wanting in St. Cyprian's copies of St. John's epiſtle.

5. In a paſſage cited juſt now it is ſaid, John writes in his epiſtle, meaning our firſt epiſtle of St. John: and it muſt be owned, that St. Cyprian has no where quoted any other epiſtle of this apoſtle. But this may be accounted for by the brevity of the two other epiſtles. It is certain, that form of quotation is no proof of his knowing, or owning no other epiſtle of St. John, the like form being alſo often uſed by him in quoting an epiſtle of St. Paul. There are ſome inſtances of this to be found in the paſſages already cited. I ſhall add here one more: 'And [o] again 'the bleſſed apoſtle ſays in his epiſtle, (1 Cor. xii. 26.) *Whether* 'one member ſuffer, *all the members ſuffer with it; or one member re-* 'joice, *all the members rejoice with it.*' It is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the ſecond epiſtle of St. John was owned by Cyprian, becauſe it is expreſsly cited by one of the biſhops in the council of Carthage held in 256, of which Cyprian was a principal part. That biſhop there delivers his opinion upon the point in debate

aliquos ſpeciatim ſeparatos poſuit, ſed univerſos qui de eccleſia exiiſſent, quique contra eccleſiam facerent, antichriſtos appellavit, dicens: audiſtis quia antichriſtus veniit. Nunc autem antichriſti multi facti ſunt, &c. [1 Joh. ii. 18. 19.] Ep. 69. [al. 76] p. 180.

[l] Dicit Dominus: Ego et Pater unum ſumus. Et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto ſcriptum eſt: Et hi tres unum ſunt. *De Unitate Ec.* p. 109.

[m] Nam ſi baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remiſſam peccatorum conſequi potuit. Si peccatorum remiſſam conſecutus eſt, et ſanctificatus eſt, et templum Dei factus eſt, quæro cujus Dei? Si creatoris, non potuit qui in eum non credidit. Si Chriſti, nec hujus fieri potuit templum, qui negat Deum Chriſtum. Si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum ſint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus eſſe ei poteſt, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus eſt? ad Jubaianum Ep. 73. p. 203.

[n] There may be ſeen a large collection of ſuch authors in Mr. Wolff's Curæ Philog. &c. in loc. Tom. iv. p. 293. &c. I. therefore refer only to a very few. Vid. Mill. in loc. Emlyn's Tracts. Ri. Simon. Hiſt. Crit. du Texte du Nou. Teſt. ch. xvii. Le Clerc. Bib. Univ. T. xii. p. 450. . . . . 455, et paſſim. and Mr. David Caſley's Preface to the Catalogue of the manuſcripts of the king's library.

in

in this manner: 'The [p] apoſtle John writes in his epiſtle, [that 'is, in one of his epiſtles] *If there come any unto you, and bring not 'the doctrine of Chriſt, receive him not into your houſe; neither bid him, 'God ſpeed. For he that biddeth him, God ſpeed, is partaker of his 'evil deeds:*' 2 John, 10, 11. And St. John's third epiſtle likewiſe may have been owned by Cyprian.

6. There is no notice taken of the epiſtle of St. Jude in the works of this writer.

VIII. The book of the Revelation is frequently quoted by Cyprian; but he has no where ſaid that it was written by John the apoſtle, and but once mentioned the name of the writer. 'And, [q] in the Revelation, the angel, when John would have 'worſhipped him, refuſed it, and ſaid, *See thou do it not; for I am 'thy fellow-ſervant and of thy brethren: worſhip the Lord Jeſus.*' So it is in Cyprian. We have it, *Worſhip God*, Rev. xxii. 9.

The Revelation was eſteemed by him a book of authority, as is evident from the manner in which he quotes it. Recommending works of goodneſs, 'Hear, ſays [r] he, in the Revela-'tion the voice of thy Lord juſtly reproving ſuch men as theſe: '*Thou ſayeſt*, ſays he, *that I am rich and increaſed in goods, and have 'need of nothing: and knoweſt not that thou art wretched, and miſera-'ble, and poor, and blind, and naked:*' ch. iii. 17. 18. Again: 'So 'in the [s] holy ſcriptures, by which the Lord would have us 'to be inſtructed and warned, is the harlot city deſcribed.' He then cites Rev. xvii. 1. 2. 3. Once more: 'And [t] that waters 'ſignify people, the divine ſcripture ſhews in the Revelation:' ch. xvii. 15.

I may add here, that words of this book are cited together with other texts of the New Teſtament, in a letter of ſome preſbyters and deacons, and others, confeſſors of the church of Rome, to Cyprian, written in 250. 'And, *to [u] him that overcometh will 'I give to ſit upon my throne, even as I alſo overcame, and am ſat down 'upon my Father's throne:*' Rev. iii. 21.

(r) See below chap. XLV. numb. vi. 10. 11. 12. [o] Et iterum poſſuit [beatus apoſtolus] in epiſtola ſua dicens: Si patitur, membrum unum, &c. Ep. 17. [al. 12.] p. 39. [p] Joannes apoſtolus in epiſtola ſua poſuit dicens: ſi quis ad vos venit, et doctrinam Chriſti non habet, nolite eum admittere in domum veſtram, et ne illi ne dixeritis. Qui enim dixerit illi, ave, communicat factis ejus malis. Tract. p. 242. [q] Et in apocalypſi angelus Joanni volenti adorare ſe reſiſtit et dicit: Vide ne feceris, quia conſervus tuus ſum et fratrum tuorum. Jeſum Dominum adora. De Bono Pudicitiæ. p. 220. [r] Audi in apocalypſi Domini tui vocem, ejuſmodi homines juſtis objurgationibus increpantem: Dicis, inquit, dives ſum, et ditatus ſum, et nullius rei egeo. De Op. et Eleem. p. 202. [s] Sic in ſcripturis ſanctis, quibus nos inſtrui dominus voluit et moneri, deſcribitur civitas meretrix, compta pulchrius et ornata. De Habitu Virg. p. 97. [t] Aquas namque populos ſignificare, in apocalypſi ſcriptura divina declarat, dicens: Aquæ quas vidiſti, &c. Ep. 63. p. 153. [u] Ep. 31. 31. [al. 26.] p. 63.

IX. St.

IX. St. Cyprian's respect for the scriptures of the New Testament appears, in his very numerous quotations of them, in his appeals to them as decisive in matters of dispute and controversy, and in divers forms of citation, particularly such as these; *The* [w] *Lord says in the gospel*; or *in his gospel*, as in several of the passages cited above; *divine scriptures*, of the Acts; *sacred scriptures*, and *divine scriptures*, speaking of the Revelation; *the blessed apostle Paul, full of the grace of the inspiration of the Lord*; *the blessed apostle Paul, chosen and sent of the Lord*; *the blessed apostle Paul, full of the Holy Ghost, and sent to call and convert the Gentiles*; as we have seen already. Farther: 'The [x] Holy Spirit, foretelling and forewarning us by the apostle, *In the last days*,' says he, '*perilous times shall come*,' 2 Tim. iii. 1. Again; 'Paul, [y] in his epistles, in which he forms us to a holy course of life by his divine instructions, says, (1 Cor. vi. 19. 20.) *Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a great price: glorify and carry God in your body*.' So Cyprian, [z] and some other ancient writers, read that text. In another place, 'The [a] Holy Ghost forewarns by the apostle, and says, *There must be also heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you*,' 1 Cor. xi. 19. Again; 'And [b] therefore it is written; *Hold fast that which thou hast, that no other take not thy crown*,' Rev. iii. 11. One of the bishops at the council of Carthage, in the year 256, says; 'I [c] am of opinion that blasphemous and wicked heretics, who pervert the sound and adorable words of the scriptures, ought to be accursed.' Afterwards another bishop, in the same assembly, says; 'I [d] also, following the authority of the divine scriptures, am of opinion that heretics are to be baptised.' Cyprian [e] earnestly exhorts all in general, but especially Christian ministers, in all doubt-

[w] In evangelio Dominus loquitur, dicens: Qui confessus me fuerit coram hominibus, &c. De Lapsis. p. 130.

[x] Pronuntiante per apostolum nobis, et præmonente Spiritu Sancto: In novissimis, inquit, diebus aderunt tempora molesta. De Unit. Ec. p. 115. [y] Paulus in epistolis suis dicit, quibus nos ad curriculà vivendi per divina magisteria formavit; Non estis vestri; empti enim estis pretio magno. Glorificate [al. Clarificate] et portate Deum in corpore vestro. De Habit. Virg. p. 93. [z] Vid. Mill. in loc.

[a] Per apostolum prænonet Spiritus Sanctus, et dicit: Oportet et hæreses esse. De Unit. Ec. p. 111. [b] Et ideo scriptum est: Tene quod habes, ne alius accipiat coronam tuam. De Unit. Ec. p. 117.

[c] Hæreticos blasphemos et iniquos verbis varriis decerpentes sancta et adorabilia scripturarum verba execrandos esse. Ep. Num. 31. p. 236. [d] Et ipse secundum divinarum scripturarum auctoritatem baptizandos hæreticos esse censeo. ibid. num. 33. vid. et num. 37. p. 337. [e] Ne [illegible] ad divinæ traditionis caput et originem reveritamur, cessat error humanus... Si canalis aquam ducens, qui copiosus prius affluebat, subito deficiat, non ad fontem pergitur. . . . [illegible] Quod et nunc facere oportet Dei sacerdotes præcepta divina servantes, ut si in aliquo nebulam vacillaverit veritas; ad originem Dominicam et evangelicam, et apostolicam traditionem revertamur et inde surgat actus, unde traditio, unde et ordo et origo surrexit. Ep. 74. p. 215.

matter

matters to have recourſe to the goſpels, and the epiſtles of the apoſtles, as to the fountain where may be found the true original doctrine of Chriſt. He begins his diſcourſe on the Lord's prayer in this manner; 'The [f] precepts of the goſpel, my beloved brethren, are to be conſidered as the leſſons of God to us; as the foundations of our hope, and the ſupports of our faith; as ſpiritual conſolations to us, ſhewing us the paths of righteouſneſs, and ſetting us forward in the way of ſalvation: for, whilſt with teachable and willing minds we receive upon earth the inſtructions conveyed to us, we are led on inſenſibly to the kingdom of (q) heaven.'

The reſpect for the ſcriptures, particularly of the New Teſtament, appears in the public reading of them in the church. Cyprian, in two different letters, written in his retirement, gives his people an account of his having there ordained two perſons, Aurelius and Celerinus, who were before confeſſors, to be readers. In the former of thoſe two letters he relates the many ſufferings of Aurelius, and gives him a great character: and then adds; 'That [g] he had deſerved, though young, a higher degree in the clergy, but he thought it beſt that he ſhould begin with the office of a reader. Nothing,' ſays he, 'can be more fit than that he, who has made a glorious confeſſion of the Lord, ſhould read publicly in the church; that he who has ſhewn himſelf willing to die a martyr ſhould read the goſpel of Chriſt, by which martyrs are formed; and that he ſhould be advanced from the rack to the deſk.' Of Celerinus he writes in the following letter; 'That [h] it was very fit and becoming that he, who was already ſo illuſtrious in the world ſhould be placed upon the pulpit, that is, the tribunal of the church; that be-

[f] . . . lici præcepta, fratres dilectiſſimi, non aliud quam magiſteria divina, fundamenta ædificandæ ſpei, firmamenta roborandæ fidei, nutrimenta foventia cordis, gubernacula dirigendi itineris, ad obtinendæ ſalutis: quæ dum docilium mentes et credentium in terris inſtruunt, ad cælestia regna perducunt. De Bon. Pat. p. 139. (q) That paſſage ſtands thus, as tranſlated by Mr. [illegible]: 'Meretur talis clericatus ad ulteriores gradus et incrementa non de annis ſuis, ſed de moribus ſtruendus. Sed interim placuit, ut lectionis incipiat; quia et ministerium vocis, quæ Dominum omnibus lectionibus perſonare; et ſublimia, quæ Chriſti martyria conſecrant, evangelium Chriſti legere, unde martyres fiunt, ad pulpitum poſt cataſtam venire; illic fuiſſe conſpicuum gentilium multitudini, hic a fratribus conſpici; illic auditum eſſe cum miraculo circumſtantis populi, hic cum gaudio fraternitatis audiri. Hunc igitur, fratres dilectiſſimi, a me et a collegis qui præſentes aderant, ordinatum ſciatis. Ep. 38, [al. 33] p. 75. [h] . . . illuſtrem, quid aliud quam ſuper pulpitum, id eſt, ſuper tribunal eccleſiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celſitate ſubnixus, et plebi univerſæ pro honoris ſui claritate conſpicuus, legat præcepta et evangelium Domini, quæ fortiter et fideliter ſequitur? . . . Nihil eſt in quo magis confeſſor fratribus proſit, quam et dum evangelica lectio de ore ejus auditur, lectoris fidem quiſquis audierit, imitetur. Ep. 39, [al. 34] p. 77.

'ing conſpicuous to the people he may read the precepts and 'goſpel of the Lord, which he faithfully and courageouſly ob- 'ſerves and maintains:' and more there to the like purpoſe in behalf of his fitneſs, as a confeſſor, for the office to which Cyprian had ordained him.

We have not remaining any ſermons or homilies of our author: but it may be reckoned very likely that the ſcriptures, which were ſo much read in the church of Carthage by a perſon particularly appointed to that office, were alſo explained there by the biſhop, ſometimes at leaſt; and that, from the portions of ſcripture publicly read in the aſſemblies of the faithful, he gave them exhortations to the practice of virtue. And there is a paſſage in Cyprian's laſt letter to his clergy and people, which ſeems to put this matter out of queſtion. He is there giving them ſome directions for their conduct in that time of perſecution. 'As [i] for you, my deareſt brethren, I muſt charge 'you to be quiet and peaceable, according to the command- 'ments of the Lord, which I have frequently recommended to 'you, and upon which you have very often heard me preach- 'ing.'

X. I would now put down ſome general titles and diviſions of the books of the New Teſtament which we find in this ancient writer: we ſhall at the ſame time obſerve more tokens of high eſteem for them.

It is fit, however, that we ſhould firſt take notice of his general diviſion of all the ſcriptures received by Chriſtians, which is [k] that of Old and New. The ſtudy of both theſe Cyprian recommends as very beneficial for confirming our virtue and increaſing our knowledge; and he calls them the books of the Spirit, or inſpired writings, the divine fountains, and fountains of the divine fulneſs. So he writes in his preface to his firſt two books of Teſtimonies.

The general titles and diviſions of the New Scriptures are ſuch as theſe: Cyprian himſelf, delivering his own ſentiment in the forementioned council, ſays; 'My [l] opinion is, that here-

[i] Vos autem, fratres cariſſimi, pro diſciplina, quam de mandatis Dominicis a me ſemper accepiſtis, et ſecundum quod me tractante ſæpiſſime didiciſtis, quietem et tranquilitatem tenete, &c. Ep. 81, [al. 83] p. 259. [k] —quæ legenti tibi [al. legentibus] interim proſint ad prima fidei lineamenta formanda. Plus roboris [tibi] dabitur, et magis ac magis intellectus cordis operabitur ſcrutanti ſcripturas veteres ac novas plenius, et univerſa Dei rum ſpiritualium volumina perlegenti. Nam nos nunc de divinis fontibus imbavinus modicum, quod tibi interim ad teremus. Bibere et ſaturari copioſius poteris, ſi tu quoque ad eoſdem divinæ fœnitudinis fontes nobiſcum pariter potaturus acceſſeris. p. 18. [l] Hæreticos ſecundum evangelicam et apoſtolicam cotestationem adverſarios Chriſti et antichri-

'tics,

'ries, which by the evangelic and apoſtolic authority are de-'clared adverſaries of Chriſt, and antichriſts, when they come to 'the church, are to be baptized with the one only baptiſm of the 'church.' In another place [m] he obſerves what is written of obtaining remiſſion of ſins 'in the goſpels and the epiſtles of 'the apoſtles.' Again; 'Whence,' ſays [n] he, 'is that tradi-'tion? Does it deſcend from the authority of the Lord and the 'goſpels, or does it come from the commandments and epiſtles 'of the apoſtles? For thoſe things ought to be done which are 'written, as God taught Joſhua the ſon of Nun:' Joſh. i. 8. And ſoon after; 'If [o] therefore it is commanded in the goſpel, 'or is contained in epiſtles or Acts, that they who come over 'from any hereſy ſhould not be baptized, but only have impo-'ſition of hands in order to penance, let that ſacred and divine 'tradition be obſerved.' From this paſſage it may be argued, that the book of the Acts of the apoſtles was joined with the epiſtles, not with the goſpels. We ſee plainly that this general diviſion of the books of the New Teſtament very much obtained at that time: they were all contained in two codes, volumes, or general diviſions; one called the Goſpels, or ſcriptures of the Lord; the other the Apoſtle, or the epiſtles of the apoſtles; and in this later diviſion was uſually placed the book of the Acts of the apoſtles. I ſhall put [p] in the margin a few more examples of thoſe two general titles from our author. We likewiſe ſee very clearly that in theſe two codes were included all the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, which Chriſtians eſteemed divine, and received as the rule of faith and practice, to which all were bound to ſubmit, and whoſe ſacred and ſupreme authority was readily and cheerfully owned by all good Chriſtians.

Nor were there any Chriſtian books of authority beſide the four goſpels, the Acts, and epiſtles of apoſtles. It does hence

[m] ...ſtolos, quando ad eccleſiam vene-...ſo eccleſiæ baptiſmo baptizandos ... p. 245. [n] Quod enim in evan-... apoſtolorum epiſtolis Jeſu Chriſti ... fiat ad remiſſionem peccato-... ita eſt quaſi aut ſine Patre, aut ... ſum prodeſſe cuipiam ſolus Fi-... Ep. 73. p. 205. [n] Unde ... traditio? utrumne de Dominica et ... auctoritate deſcendens, an de ... mandatis atque epiſtolis veni-... Ea enim facienda eſſe quæ ſcripta ... Deus hortatur et proponit ad Jeſum ..., &c. Ep. 74, p. 211.

[o] Si ergo aut in evangelio præcipitur, aut in apoſtolorum epiſtolis aut Actibus continetur; . . . obſervetur divina hæc et ſancta traditio. ibid. [p] Scias nos ab evangelicis et apoſtolis traditionibus non recedere. Ep. 4, [al. 62] p. 7. Prænuntiata ſunt hæc futura in ſeculi fine; et Domini voce, atque apoſtolorum contestatione prædictum eſt: [Vid. Luc. xviii. 8. 2 Tim. iii. 1.] Ep. 67, [al. 68] p. 174. Nec epiſcopus computari potuit, qui evangelica et apoſtolica traditione contempta, nemini ſuccedens, a ſeipſo ortus eſt. Ep. 69, [al. 70] p. 181.

clearly appear that no epistles or other doctrinal writings of any person, who was of a rank below that of an apostle, were received by Christians as a part of their rule of faith. There are in Cyprian's works very numerous citations of the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, the thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul, (excepting only that to Philemon) the first epistle of the apostle Peter, the first epistle of the apostle John, and the Revelation, which it is highly probable he believed to be written by John the apostle: and all these are quoted as writings of authority. But in all the works of Cyprian there is not any one such citation of any other Christian book or author. It is therefore manifest that the writings or scriptures above-named were of authority, and that no writings of Christians, nor apostles, were esteemed to be so, except the historical writings of Mark and Luke. I inculcate this observation upon my readers: I think it is founded upon good evidence; and I believe it will appear to be of signal use and great importance.

XI. Nor have I observed in Cyprian any quotations of spurious apocryphal Christian writings. Mr. Jones [q] indeed, in his Alphabetical Table of apocryphal pieces not extant, mentions a book under the name of Paul. See Cypr. Ep. 23. But that book is really nothing but a note of Paul, a martyr of Cyprian's own time, containing a kind of absolution of some one or more persons who had lapsed in the Decian persecution, and so given by one Lucian, as appears from (*) Cyprian's complaints about that matter. Mr. Jones afterwards perceived this mistake, and acknowledged it somewhere, as I well remember, though the place does not now offer itself to me.

XII. Nevertheless, Cyprian often quotes apocryphal books of the Old Testament; such as Tobit, the book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, two books of Maccabees, and others, and in terms of high respect: for instance, quoting the book of Wisdom [r] he says, *the Holy Spirit therein teacheth us.* And [s] the book of Tobit is quoted by him as divine scripture: but yet I do not think those citations prove that Cyprian esteemed these books to be of authority. It is not difficult for the reader to recollect some

q See Mr. Jones's New and full method, &c. Vol. i. p. 148. (*) Nam frater noster Lucianus, et ipse unus de confessionibus, fide quidem calidus et virtute robustus, sed minus Dominica lectione fundatus, quasdam conatus est, imperiti ampridem et vulgi auctoritatem constituens, et manifestis scripturæ illius [Pauli] testimoniis nomine Pauli abutentes. Cypr. Ep. 23, [al. 23] p. 52. r Per Salomonem Spiritus Sanctus ostendit et præcinens: Et si coram hominibus tormenta patiuntur, si fiunt, spes eorum immortalitate plena est. [Sap. iii. 1.] Cypr. De Exhort. Martyr. cap. 12. p. 182. s Et ideo scripturæ divina instruit, dicens: bona est oratio cum jejunio et eleemosyna. [Tob. xii. 8.] De Or. Dom. p. 153.

things

things to this purpose already alleged from Greek writers, and our observations upon them: so Origen (R) often quotes the Shepherd of Hermas as an useful book, as scripture, and divinely inspired: but yet he did not suppose passages alleged thence to be decisive proofs, or evidences of any doctrine. There allowed to these writers some degree and measure of inspiration, but not that fulness of the Spirit, or that high degree of inspiration, which was afforded to the prophets of the Old Testament, and the apostles of the New. It seems very evident, from the catalogue of the books of the Old Testament left us (S) Melito, bishop of Sardis, about the year 170, that none of the books we now call apocryphal had a place in it. The (T) catalogue of the Jewish sacred books found in Origen's works is a great agreement with Melito's. It appears from what we have observed from (V) Africanus, and (X) Origen, that it was generally well known among Christians, of the eastern part of the world at least, that the scriptures of the Old Testament, or Jewish canon, were written in Hebrew; and that the books we now call apocryphal were not written in Hebrew, but in Greek; and that they were not received by the Jews as a part of their sacred scriptures. And that the Latin Christians, who lived in the western part of the Roman empire, had for the most part little knowledge and sentiments upon this point with those in the east, may be argued from Rufinus, and Jerom; not to insist upon any others. Rufinus, as (A) formerly cited, assures us that there were some books, not reckoned canonical, but called by the ancients ecclesiastical: and of this last sort he says were the books called the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees. He adds, that these were to be read in the churches, but no article of faith was to be taken from them: and he delivers this as the ancient belief of Christians. Jerom writes to the like purpose. He says that "the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, and the Mac-

(R) Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. xxiii.
(S) Vol. ii. p. 126, and Euseb. H. E. iv. 26.
(T) See Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. xxvi.
(V) Vol. ii. ch. 37. num. v.
(X) Vol. ii. ch. 38. num. xxv. (A) Ib. [illegible] quæ omnia [illegible] ecclesiæ voluerunt, non tamen ad auctoritatem ex his fidei [illegible]. Cæteras vero scripturas [illegible] dixerunt, quas in ecclesiis [illegible]. Hæc nobis a patribus, ut [illegible] opportunum visum est hoc in [illegible] ad institutionem eorum qui prima sibi ecclesiæ ac fidei elementa suscipiunt. Rufin. in Symb. " Hic prologus scripturarum, quasi galeatum principium omnibus libris, quos de Hebraeo vertimus in Latinum, convenire potest: ut scire valeamus quicquid extra hos est, inter apocryphas eos ponamus. Igitur Sapientia, quæ vulgo Salomonis inscribitur, et Jesu filii Syrach liber, Judith, et Tobias, et Pastor, non sunt in Canone. Prof. Hieron de omnib. lior. V. T. Seu Præf. in libr. Reg.

cabees, are not in the canon, but are to be reputed apocryphal. In [w] another place he ſays again expreſsly, that the church reads Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees, but does not receive them as canonical ſcriptures. Theſe, he adds, and the book of Wiſdom, and Eccleſiaſticus likewiſe, may be read for the edification of the people, but no doctrine of religion can be proved by their authority. So write theſe two learned authors of the fourth century. And that Cyprian was exactly of the ſame judgment upon this point, may be argued from a paſſage (B) cited above; where, having quoted the book of Tobit, he ſhews that he did not deſire the text alleged thence ſhould be taken as a deciſive proof of what he advanceth; and adds, that he ſhould confirm what was ſaid there by the teſtimony of truth, meaning the Acts of the apoſtles: which is enough to ſatisfy us that he really made a diſtinction, and that this diſtinction was well known, though it is not often expreſsly mentioned. Thoſe books therefore of the Old Teſtament, which we call apocryphal, were quoted by way of illuſtration, but not as of authority, or alone deciſive in any point of doctrine, unleſs confirmed by the inſpiration of prophets or apoſtles. Mr. Marſhall, in his notes upon St. Cyprian, has divers uſeful remarks (C) upon the citations of the apocryphal ſcriptures found in our author.

XIII. We have now ſeen in St. Cyprian a large canon of ſcripture; all the books of the New Teſtament commonly received by Chriſtians at this preſent time, except the epiſtle to Philemon, (which may have been omitted for no other reaſon but that he had no particular occaſion to quote it;) and the epiſtle to the Hebrews, and the epiſtle of St. James, and the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter, and the epiſtle of St. Jude. There is no particular citation of the third epiſtle of St. John; but, conſidering its ſhortneſs, and that the other two epiſtles of that apoſtle are expreſsly mentioned, there ſeems not to be any good reaſon for ſuppoſing it to have been rejected by this writer, or unknown to him. Excepting theſe few, all the other books of the New Teſtament have an ample teſtimony given them in the works of St. Cyprian; and they appear to have been eſteemed inſpired books, and writings of authority, the rule of faith and

[w] Sicut ergo Judith et Tobit, et Maccabæorum libros legit quidem eccleſia, ſed inter canonicas ſcripturas non recipit: ſic et hæc duo volumina legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem eccleſiaſticorum dogmatum confirmandam. Ejuſd. Præf. in Libr. Salom. ad Chrom. et Heliod. (B) See p. 151. (C) See the title of apocryphal writings, &c. in the Table of matters, at the end of Mr. Marſhall's St. Cyprian.

practice

practice to all Chriſtian people. Nor is there in this eminent and celebrated African biſhop of the third century one quotation of any Chriſtian ſpurious, or apocryphal ſcriptures.

CHAP XLV.

Writings aſcribed to St. CYPRIAN, or joined with his works.

I. *Pontius.* II. *An anonymous author concerning ſhews.* III. *Anonymous author concerning diſcipline and the benefit of chaſtity.* IV. *Anonymous author of the praiſe of martyrdom.* V. *Anonymous author againſt the Novatian heretic.* VI. *Anonymous author concerning rebaptizing; or, of the baptiſm of heretics.* VII. *Anonymous author of a computation of Eaſter.*

I. I HAVE ſeveral times quoted The Life of St. Cyprian, written by his deacon Pontius, which is now uſually prefixed to the works of that father. St. Jerom [a] calls it an excellent performance. Rigaltius [b] will ſcarce allow that it deſerves to be reckoned a hiſtory, it is ſo defective and ſo rhetorical; it is however uſeful: and if Pontius was not a fine writer, he was a good man. We have no reaſon to queſtion his being worthy of the confidence and friendſhip with which that eminent biſhop honoured him. He triumphed in [c] Cyprian's glorious martyrdom, though at the ſame time he was not a little grieved that he did not accompany him. He is ſaid to have died a martyr himſelf; but there is ſcarce any good authority for that ſuppoſition. St. Jerom ſays nothing of it; nor has he mentioned any work of his, beſide this one of Cyprian's Life and Paſſion, as he expreſsly calls it. This writer is placed by Cave at the year 251.

[a] Pontius, diaconus Cypriani, uſque ad finem paſſionis ejus cum ipſo exilium ſuſtinens, egregium volumen vitæ et paſſionis Cypriani reliquit. De V. I. cap. 68.

[b] Vita Cypriani quæ fertur ab ejus diacono Pontio perſcripta rhetoricæ dictionis gratiam magis quam narrationis hiſtoricæ diligentiam præfert. Rigalt. Not. ad Cypr. Ep. 81, [al. 83] ed. Oxon. p. 238.

[c] Inter gaudium paſſionis, et remanendi dolorem, in partes diviſus animus, et anguſtum nimis pectus affectus duplices onerant. Dolebo, quod non comes fuerim? Sed illius victoria triumphanda eſt. De victoria triumphabo? Sed doleo, quod comes non ſim? .... Multum, et nimis multum de gloria ejus exulto: plus tamen doleo, quod remanſi. Pont. in fine.

Trithemius ſays that [d] Pontius converted the two Philips, emperors of Rome, to the faith of Chriſt: but [e] it is thought that he confounds our Pontius, deacon of Cyprian and an African, with another of this name in Gaul, who is ſaid to have ſuffered martyrdom [f] in the time of Valerian and Gallienus; of whom there are [g] Acts of martyrdom ſtill extant, where that ſtory is related: but [h] Pagi has ſhewn that thoſe Acts are not to be relied upon in that matter, as being the forgery of a late writer. And Tillemont [i] has been at the pains to demonſtrate at large that they are good for nothing

Pontius, in his Life of Cyprian, has quoted the goſpels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, the [k] firſt chapter in particular, and St. John, and ſeveral of St. Paul's epiſtles, and the book of the Acts of the apoſtles [l] expreſsly by that title. There is no neceſſity to be more particular here, ſince it may be relied upon, and taken for granted, that this deacon's canon was the ſame with his biſhop's.

II. There are ſeveral treatiſes, which ſometimes have been aſcribed to St. Cyprian, but are now generally allowed by learned men not to be his. I ſhall here ſpeak of four of them: Of ſhews; Of diſcipline and the benefit of chaſtity; Of the praiſe of martyrdom; Againſt the heretic Novatian, or, Againſt the Novatian heretic. Of the firſt two, and the laſt, Du Pin [m] ſays, they are ancient and uſeful; that they appear to have been all three written by one and the ſame perſon, and that they might be reckoned pieces of St. Cyprian, if it were not for the difference of ſtyle; and that they are not aſcribed to him in the manuſcripts, but only in the printed editions. As I do not find any plain marks of theſe three pieces having one and the ſame author, I ſhall give a diſtinct account af all the four treatiſes juſt mentioned, according to the order they are placed in above, which is the ſame they have in the appendix to St. Cyprian's genuine works in the Oxford edition. Afterwards I ſhall make ſome extracts out of the book of an anonymous author, Concerning the rebaptizing of heretics: and laſtly, out of a ſmall piece,

[d] Hic Pontius ſua melliflua prædicatione et induſtria duos Philippos imperatores ad Chriſtum convertit, &c. Trithem. de Scr. Ec. cap. 42. p. 14. Ed. Fabr.

[e] Vid. Fabric. ib. n. t. m. [f] Vid. Baron. Ann. 246. n. 9. Tillem. Perſecution de l'egliſe ſous l'empereur Valerien. Art. 7. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. i. p. 26. 27. Acta S. S. per Bolland. &c. ad diem 14 Mai. Ruinart. Act. Mart. p. 215, not. 62. - Ap. Baluz. Marcell. l. ii. p. 124. &c. [h] Pagi Crit. in Bar. 244. n. 6.

[i] Not. 7. ſur la perſecution de Valerien. p. 336. .... 340. Mem. E. T. iv. P. i.

[k] Sane et in ſcripturis tale aliquid invenio. Nam Zacharias ſacerdos, poſtea ſibi per angelum filio, quia non credidit, obmutuit: [Luc. i. 20 et 64.] Pont. p. 1.

[l] Sed etſi in apoſtolorum Actis [m] nuſquam ille deſcribitur, quia toto non credidérat, a Philippo ſtatim tinctus, [m] eſt ſimilis comparatio. Ibid. p. 2.

[m] S. Cyprien. Bibl. des Aut. Ecc. T. i. p. 172.

entitled,

entitled, a Computation of Easter; all these being now usually joined in the volume of St. Cyprian's works.

1. I begin [h] with the piece, Of shews, which is called an epistle of an unknown author. It seems to have been written by a bishop, then [i] unwillingly separated from his people, and who had not frequent opportunities of writing to them. Tillemont [k] says that, whoever was the author, it is an excellent work: that [l] it was written in the times of heathenism, when [m] exorcisms were frequent in the church, and [n] whilst it was yet the custom to carry the eucharist home. That it was written in the time of heathenism, I think apparent from divers passages. This book is much commended by the [o] Benedictine, who writes the Life of St. Cyprian; but yet he does not allow it to be his: for though it has in it those marks of antiquity which have been observed by Tillemont, and though among the works ascribed to Cyprian; none resemble his style more than this, there is no notice at all taken of it by Pontius, and there is in it a difference of style, which may be perceived by all who are well acquainted with Cyprian's works.

2. In this book there are few texts of scripture quoted; which is different from Cyprian's ordinary method, whose works abound with them. However, the author informs us that [p] some at that time endeavoured to defend their practice of frequenting the theatre, by the apostle's allusions to the heathen games, referring particularly to 1 Cor. ix. 25, and Eph. vi. 12: he is likewise supposed to refer to [q] Matt. xxvii. 52. He calls the scriptures of the New Testament [r] sacred writings, and [s] divine scriptures, and [t] heavenly scriptures. He also shews his respect for these books by his indignation against those, who [u] pretended to jus-

[h] De Spectaculis. Epistola ignoti [illegible]. [i] Ut me satis contristat, et animum graviter affligit, cum nulla [illegible] ad vos porrigitur occasio, [illegible] (tantum enim est meum vobiscum [illegible] ita nihil mihi tantam lætitiam tempore restituit, quam cum [illegible] occasio. p. 2. ed. Ox.

[k] Mem. Ec. T. iv. St. Cyprien. art. 22. [l] Note xxviii. [m] Quod enim spectaculis [illegible] ad [illegible] quis ludus sine sacrificio [illegible] certamen non celebratum [illegible] vid. quæ sequuntur. [illegible] ejiciebat dæmonia exclamantes se [illegible] spectaculis [illegible]. [illegible] finans ad spectaculum, [illegible] ad hæc gerens secum, [illegible] circulum inter corpora obscæna meritricium tulit. p. 3. b. m.

[o] Vit. S. Cypr. § xxxv. [p] Apostolus quoque dimicans cestus et dimicationis nostræ adversus spiritalia nequitiæ proponit certamen. Curtius de his diis sumit exempla, coronæ quoque collocat præmia. Cur ergo homini Christiano fideli non liceat spectare quod licuit divinis literis scribere? p. 2 b in [illegible] [q] Considerabit et iam de sepulchris admirabile ipsorum consummatorum an vitæ corporum reda as: [consumtorum an ad vitam corporum (animas) reductas. Bunz. p. 343] p. 4 b. in. [r] Præscriba igitur mihi pudor, etiamsi non possunt sanctæ literæ. p. 2 b. f. [s] Vid. supra ?. [t] See the next note. [u] . . . tamen, quoniam non desunt vitiorum assertores blandi et indul-

• tify

tify their frequenting the public shews by the authority of the heavenly scriptures. And at the end of his book, or letter, he recommends to Christians, instead of attending the theatre, the study of the scriptures, after this manner; 'I [w] say then, that a 'good Christian ought to employ himself in diligent reading 'the sacred scriptures; there he will find more worthy objects 'for the entertainment of his faith and hope.'

3. So far of this book, which, though short, ought not to be reckoned unprofitable to us; and I hope it appears to deserve the account I have here given of it.

III. The second piece ascribed by some to Cyprian is entitled, Of [x] discipline and the benefit of chastity: in the Oxford and Benedictine editions it is called an epistle of an unknown author: the time of it too is uncertain: it is evident from the beginning of it that it was written by a bishop: I shall transcribe [y] the words by and by. The learned Benedictine beforementioned says this [z] piece is very ancient, and not unworthy of Cyprian himself; but the difference of style, and silence of Pontius about it, are good reasons why it ought not to be reckoned the work of that father. Whoever was the author, he has cited the words of divers books of the New Testament.

1. 'This,' says [a] he, 'our Lord taught, when he said, that 'a wife ought not to be divorced, *saving for the cause of adultery*' Matth. v. 32.

2. 'Hence he [the apostle] says [b] also, that *the members of* '*Christ ought not to be joined to the members of an harlot* . . . hence 'deservedly adulterers do not *inherit the kingdom of God*:' 1 Cor. vi. 15 and 9.

3. 'The [c] apostle declares the church to be the *spouse* of '*Christ*:' See 2 Cor. xi. 2.

4. 'Hence [d] also the apostle has observed that *the man is the* '*head of the woman*, [1 Cor. xi. 3; Eph. v. 23.] Nevertheless he

gentes patroni, qui præstant vitiis auctoritatem, et, quod est deterius, censuram scripturarum cœlestium in advocationem criminum convertunt, . . . Non pudet, non pudet, inquam, fideles homines et Christiani sibi nominis auctoritatem vindicantes, superstitiones vanas gentilium cum spectaculis mixtas de scripturis cœlestibus vindicare, et divinam auctoritatem idololatriæ conferre, . . . Hoc in loco non immerito dixerim, longe melius fuisse istis nullas literas nosse, quam sic literas legere. p. 2. a. b. ed. Ox. Conf. ed. Baluz. p. 339. [w] Scripturis, inquam, sacris incumbat Christianus fidelis, et ibi inveniet condigna fidei spectacula. . . . Quam hoc decorum spectaculum fratres, quam jucundum, quam necessarium! intueri super spem suam, et oculos aperire ad salutem suam. p. 4. b. fin. [x] De Disciplina et bono Pudicitiæ. [y] See below num. v. vi. [z] Ubi supra. § 35. p. 127. [a] Hanc sententiam Christus quando uxorem dimitti non nisi ob adulterium dixit. p. 6. a. [b] Hinc et illud dicit: Membra Christi membris meretricis non esse jungenda. . . . Hinc merito regnum coelorum non tenent adulteri. p. 6. a. [c] Nam si apostolus ecclesiam sponsam Christi pronunciat. p. 5. a. [d] Inde et apostolus caput mulieris pronuntiavit virum. . . .

'adds;

'adds; *He that loveth his wife, loveth himſelf. For no man hateth 'his own fleſh, but nouriſheth and cheriſheth it, even as Chriſt the 'church.*' Eph. v. 28, 29.

5. 'Hence [e] the apoſtle ſays; *This is the will of God, that ye 'ſhould abſtain from fornication.*' 1 Theſſ. iv. 3.

6. The reſpect which this biſhop had for the writings of the New Teſtament appears at the beginning of this tract, or epiſtle, ſent to his people. 'I reckon,' ſays [f] he, 'that I do not ne-'glect to diſcharge ſome part of my office whilſt I endeavour, 'eſpecially by daily tracts upon the goſpels, to make ſome im-'provements and increaſes of your faith and knowledge of the 'Lord: for what more uſeful ſervice is there in the church of 'the Lord? What is there more becoming the office of a biſhop 'than, by inſtructions from the divine words of the Lord him-'ſelf, to lead the faithful to the enjoyment of the promiſed king-'dom of heaven? This is my conſtant and daily labour and 'deſire, though abſent from you: and after my accuſtomed 'manner I endeavour to be preſent with you by the diſcourſes 'I ſend you, that, being built on the firm foundation of the goſ-'pel, ye may always *ſtand armed againſt all the wiles of the devil:*' Eph. vi. 11. And preſently afterwards; 'For this purpoſe we not 'only allege words from the ſacred fountains of the ſcriptures, 'but with the words themſelves we join our prayers to the 'Lord, that he will open both to us and you the treaſures of 'his myſteries, and enable us to act according to our knowledge: 'for great will be his miſery, *who knew the Lord's will, and ne-'glected to do it:*' Luke xii. 47.

7. He concludes with recommending the ſtudy of the ſcrip-tures; 'I have ſaid a few things only, becauſe it is not my de-

dilectionem et dicit: Quoniam qui uxorem ſuam diligit, ſeipſum diligit. Nemo enim carnem ſuam odio habet, ſed nutrit et fo-vet eam, ſicut et Chriſtus eccleſiam. p. 6. a.

[e] Hinc apoſtolus dicit: Hæc eſt voluntas Dei, ut abſtineatis vos a fornica-tione. p. 6. a.

[f] Aliquas officiorum meorum partes non æſtimo præteriſſe, dum ſolli-citor, vel maxime quotidianis evangeliorum tractatibus, aliquando vo-bis et ſcientiæ per Dominum incre-mentum tractare. Quid enim aliud in ec-clesia Domini utilius geri, quid accommo-datius officio epiſcopi poteſt inveniri: quam doctrina divinorum, per ipſum ſacra cellitaque verborum, poſſint cre-denti ad repromiſſum regnum pervenire viam? Hoc certe mei et operis et mu-neris, quotidianum votivum negotium, abſens licet obtinere connitor, et per literas præſentiam meam vobis reddere conor. Dum vos ſolito more allocutionibus miſſis in fide interpello, ideo convenio, ut evan-gelicæ radicis firmitate ſolidati, adverſus omnia diaboli prælia ſtetis ſemper armati. .... Non ſolum proferimus verba, quæ de ſcripturarum ſacris fontibus veniunt, ſed et cum ipſis verbis preces ad Dominum et vota ſociamus, ut tam nobis quam vobis, et ſacramentorum ſuorum thesauros aperi-at, et vires ad implendum quæ cognoſcimus tribuat. Periculum enim maius eſt voluntatem Domini cognoviſſe, et in Dei voluntatis opere ceſſaſſe. p. 5. a

[g] Ego pauca dictavi, quoniam non eſt propoſitum, volumen ſcribere, ſed allocu-

'ſign

'ſign to write a volume, but to ſend you a diſcourſe [or homily]. 'Do you look into the ſcriptures, and improve yourſelves by 'the precepts there delivered, relating to the virtue I have been 'recommending to you. My deareſt brethren, farewell.'

8. I think we may conſider this as an example of the homilies of the time in which this biſhop lived: but it would be an additional pleaſure to know more exactly the time itſelf, and the place of his ordinary reſidence.

IV. The third piece, ſometimes aſcribed to St. Cyprian, but now generally [h] diſcarded by learned men as unworthy of that great name, is entitled, Of [i] the praiſe of martyrdom. Biſhop Fell thinks this to be [k] only a declamation written by ſome one for the exerciſe of his ſtyle. Baſnage [l] and [m] Du Pin ſpeak of it in the like manner. But [n] the learned Benedictine has a more favourable opinion of it, though he does not take it to be a genuine work of St. Cyprian. It appears to me an oration in form, and there is a good deal of affectation in the ſtyle. It is allowed to be ancient, but the exact time of it is not eaſily determined. Conſidering the character of this book, a ſhort account of it will be ſufficient.

1. There are here cited paſſages of divers books of the New Teſtament, particularly of the four goſpels; [o] of Matthew, [p] Mark, [q] Luke, and [r] John.

2. He has in like manner quoted or referred to the following epiſtles of Paul; the epiſtle to the Romans, the firſt to the Corinthians, the epiſtles to the Galatians, the Philippians, the Coloſſians, and ſecond to Timothy.

3. He quotes 1 Cor. ix. 24, after this manner; 'It is [s] the 'voice of the moſt bleſſed Paul, ſaying; *Know ye not that they* 'which run in a race ſtrive many, *but one receiveth the prize? So run* 'ye ſo run that all may obtain.'

tionem tranſmittere. Vos ſcripturas aſpicite, exempla vobis de ipſis præceptis hujus rei majora conquirite. Fratres cariſſimi, bene valete. p. 8. b. [h] Vid. Pagi Crit in Baron. 251. n. xv. Baſnag Ann. 258. n. xv. [i] Liber De Laude Martyrii. [k] Exercendi ſtili gratia hæc videntur ſcripta, cum plenos theatri cuneos, et populi ſtrepitum ſibi repreſentet orator. Not. p. 8. ed Oxon. [l] Baſn. ut ſupra. [m] Nouv. Bibl. St. Cyprien. [n] Vit. St. Cyprian. n. xxxv. [o] Legis, ſcriptum eſſe, uſque ad quadrantem nos ultimum reddere. [Matt. v. 26.] p. 11. b.

[p] Quando repetas verba cœleſtia, nam et vox dicentis eſt Chriſti: Qui perdiderit animam ſuam pro nomine meo, recipiet in hoc ſeculo centuplum, et in futuro vitam æternam poſſidebit. [Marc. x. 30.] p. 11. b. [q] Sicut ſcriptum eſt: Qui me confeſſus fuerit in terris coram hominibus, et ego confitebor eum coram patre meo, et coram angelis ſuis. [Luc. xii. 8.] p. 11.

[r] Sed quoniam ita Dominus ſuo ore locutus eſt, eſſe habitacula penes patrem multa. [Johan. xiv. 2.] p. 14. b.

[s] Vox eſt beatiſſimi Pauli, dicentis: Nescitis, quoniam qui in agone currunt, multi certant, unus autem accipit palmam? Vos autem ſic currite, ut omnes comprehendatis, [comprehendatis, Baluz.] p. 15. a.

4. I ſhall

4. I ſhall put down a paſſage of this Latin writer, which may be thought to contain a reference to Hebr. xi. but I do not think it to be clear: however, it deſerves to be taken notice of for the ſake of the ſenſe as well as for the ſeeming reference. 'If,' ſays [t] he, 'you are a good man, and believe in God, why 'are you unwilling to lay down your life for him, who you 'know has ſo often ſuffered for you; who has been ſawn aſun-'der in Iſaiah, killed in Abel, offered up in Iſaac, ſold in Jo-'ſeph, crucified in the fleſh? I omit other things, which words 'cannot expreſs nor the mind conceive.'

5. Finally, perhaps he refers to ſome paſſages of the Revelation in ſome words which I intend [u] to put in the margin as an example of this author's oratorical flights. See Rev. xiii. 2; vi. 11; vii. 13, 14.

V. The fourth piece, aſcribed by ſome to Cyprian, is entitled, To or [w] Againſt the heretic Novatian; or, Againſt the Novatian ...tic; that hope of pardon ought not to be denied to thoſe ...o have lapſed. In the late editions it is called a tract of an unknown author. Du Pin calls it a homily. Tillemont, [x] who ...ſhows that the ſtyle of this work is different from Cyprian's, ...d that therefore it is not his, thinks however that it might ...e written ſoon after the perſecution of Decius, and then of Gallus, in the former part of the reign of Valerian, about the ... 254 or 255. He refers to [y] two paſſages of this work, ...hich compared together ſeem to render his opinion very pro...ble. The [z] Benedictine, author of St. Cyprian's Life, agrees ... Tillemont about the age of this piece. He ſays, it is cer...n the author was contemporary with Cyprian, and that it can...t be queſtioned but he lived near the beginning of the reign

... ...ubares, et Deo credis, quod pro eo ... ...m fundere metuis, quem pro te ... ...ium eſſe cognoſcis; in Eſaia ſec... ...Abel occiſus, in Iſaac immolatus, ...ſ venundatus, in homine crucifixus ... ...de ceteris quidem taceo, quæ nec ... ...poteſt dicere, nec animus ſuſtinere. ... ... O beati, et quibus vere di... ...ant peccata; ſi tamen qui Chriſti ... ...eſtis, aliquando peccaſtis. O ... ...qui a primordio mundi Domini ... ...meruit, et quos merito ſplendor ... ...ſ amictus induerit, et candor ſtolæ ... ...ornarit! p. 15. b. [w] Ad ... ...um hæreticum: Quod lapſis ſpes ... ...a eſt deneganda. [x] See Mem. ... I. Part i. St Cyprien. Art. 41. ... Cyprianus ergo ille qui ſub Noe fac... ...figuram perſecutionis quæ per to... tum orbem nunc nuper ſuper effuſa oſtendit.... Duplex ergo illa emiſſio [columbæ] duplicem nobis perſecutionis, tentationem oſtendit; prima in qua qui lapſi ſunt, victi ceciderunt; ſecunda in qua hi qui ceciderunt, victores extiterunt. Nulli enim noſtrum dubium vel incertum eſt, fratres dilectiſſimi, illos, qui prima acie, id eſt, Deciana perſecutione vulnerati fuerunt, hos poſtea, id eſt, ſecundo prælio ita fortiter perſeveraſſe, ut contemnentes edicta ſecularium principum [Galli et Voluſiani] hoc invictum haberent: quod non metuerunt exemplo boni paſtoris animam ſuam tradere, et ſanguinem fundere, nec ullam inſanientis tyranni ſævitiam recuſare. p. 17. b. [z] Vit. St. Cyprian. n. xxxv.

of

of Valerian, whilſt the church had peace. He ſuppoſes him likewiſe to have been an African, and a biſhop. Nevertheleſs, he does not allow this to be a work of Cyprian. And to the argument taken from the difference of the ſtyle he adds another, not inſiſted on by Tillemont.

1. This piece abounds with texts of ſcripture.

2. 'Whoſe [a] future ruin,' ſays he, 'the Lord repreſents in 'the goſpel, ſaying; *And he who hears my words, and does them* 'not, *I will liken him unto a fooliſh man, who built his houſe upon* 'the ſand.'... Matt. vii. 26, 27. This goſpel is quoted here in a like manner ſeveral times. I have not obſerved any thing taken from St. Mark.

3. 'Which [b] power the Lord gave to his diſciples, as he ſays 'in the goſpel; *Behold, I give unto you power to tread on all the* 'power *of the enemy, and upon ſerpents and ſcorpions, and they ſhall* 'not *hurt you:*' Luke x. 19. In this piece are many texts taken out of this goſpel.

4. 'Whom [c] the Lord Chriſt reckons thieves and robbers, as 'he himſelf declares in the goſpel, ſaying; *He that entereth not* 'by *the door into the ſheepfold, but gets down ſome other way, the ſame* 'is *a thief and a robber:*' John x. 1.

5. In this piece are alſo paſſages of divers epiſtles of St. Paul, particularly the epiſtle to the Romans, firſt to the Corinthians, the epiſtles to the Galatians, Epheſians, and Philippians; which paſſages are cited expreſsly as the apoſtle's, meaning Paul, though the churches to whom thoſe epiſtles were ſent are not named.

6. 'The [d] ſcripture ſaying; *Vengeance belongeth to me: I will* 'repay, *ſaith the Lord.*' In the margin of the Oxford edition here is a reference put to Heb. x. 30. But the quotation might be taken from Deut. xxxii. 35; or Rom. xii. 19; and very probably was taken from one or other of thoſe places.

7. 'Have [e] you not read, that *the Lord reſiſteth the proud, but* 'giveth *grace to the humble.*' Here too are placed in the ſame edition James iv. 6, and 1 Pet. v. 5. But the ſame thing is ſaid alſo Prov. iii. 34. However, if the writer intended any text of the New Teſtament, he may be ſuppoſed rather to refer to the firſt epiſtle of Peter, which was more univerſally received than

[a] Quorum Dominus ruinam in evangelio futuram his verbis ſignificaverat, dicens: qui audit verba mea, et non facit ea, &c. p. 17. b. [b] Quam poteſtatem tradidit Dominus diſcipulis ſuis, ſicut in evangelio ait:... p. 17. b. [c] Quos Dominus Chriſtus fures et latrones deſignat, ſicut ipſe in evangelio declarat, dicens:... P. 16. b. [d] Dicente ſcriptura: Mihi vindictam, et ego retribuam, dicit Dominus. p. 18. a. [e] Non legiſti: Quia Dominus ſuperbis reſiſtit, humilibus autem dat gratiam? p. 19. b.

that

that of James, whose authority, it is certain, was not then fully established. Besides, as [f] St. Augustine observes, there is scarce a page of the holy scriptures which does not teach us that *God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble.* There was no occasion therefore for that reference to the epistle of James. However, we have no good ground to say that this author rejected, or did not receive this epistle; for he may have owned it, though he has not quoted it in this work of his.

8. 'Have [g] you not read; *He that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness has blinded his eyes?*' 1 John ii. 11. In another place, 'Whom [h] John calls *antichrists*;' referring probably to 1 John ii. 18; or 2 John, 7.

9. 'As [i] it is written; *Behold he cometh with ten thousands of his angels, to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all ungodly men, and to convince all flesh of all the deeds of the ungodly, which they have ungodly committed, and of all the ungodly words which sinners have spoken of God:*' Jude, 14, 15.

10. The book of the Revelation is much quoted in this treatise. 'But [k] John speaks more plainly [than Daniel before quoted] both of the day of judgment, and of the end of the world, saying; *And when he had opened*, says he, *the sixth seal, behold there was a great earthquake*;' ... Rev. vi. 12... 17. Likewise in the same Revelation John says, this also was revealed unto him; *I saw*, says he, *a great throne....*' xx. 11, 12. Thus he has twice ascribed this book to John. He has twice more cited it by the name of Apocalypse or Revelation. In the first of those places thus; 'Hear [l] in the Revelation the voice of the Lord justly reproving thee, ch. iii. 17. *Thou sayest*, says he, *I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and blind, and poor, and naked.*' The other passage is Rev. xvii. 15. In two other places of this treatise it is quoted after this manner; 'And

[f] ... ut apostolica illa sententia ubique tenenda sit, qua ait, Quapropter qui videt stare videat ne cadat. Nulla enim fere pagina est sanctorum librorum, in qua non legatur, quod Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. lib. iv. cap. 23. [g] Non legisti: Quisquis odit fratrem in tenebris est? &c. p. 17. b. [h] Quos Joannes antichristos appellat p. 16. b. [i] Sicut scriptum est: Venit cum multis millibus nunciorum suorum, facere judicium de omnibus, et arguere omnes impios, et arguere omnem carnem de omnibus factis impiorum quæ fecerunt impie, et de omnibus verbis impiis, quæ de Deo locuti sunt peccatores. p. 20. b. [k] Joannes autem et de die judicii et consummatione mundi declarat, dicens: Et cum aperuisset, inquit, sigillum sextum.... Item in eadem Apocalypsi hoc quoque Joannes dicit sibi revelatum: Vidi, inquit, thronum magnum, et candidum sedentem super eum, &c. p. 21. a. b.

[l] Audi in Apocalypsi Dominicam vocem justis te objurgationibus increpantem. ... p. 16. a. Sicut Apocalypsis docet, dicens: Aquæ quas vidisti, populi sunt. [cap. xvii. 15.] p. 17. b.

'since

'[m] ſince it is written, that the dogs ſhall remain without:' xxii. 15. Laſtly, 'the [n] ſcripture proclaiming, and ſaying; *Remember 'from whence thou art fallen, and repent:*'... ii. 5. Thus he has quoted this book ſix times, beſide a reference or two more, which I do not inſiſt on: and he ſufficiently ſhews that he eſteemed it a book of authority; but he has no where called the writer apoſtle, or evangeliſt. However, it may be reckoned very probable that by John he means the apoſtle of that name; the ſame who wrote the goſpel and the epiſtle which he has quoted.

11. The paſſages that have been already taken from this treatiſe evidently ſhew that the ſcriptures the writer quotes were eſteemed by Chriſtians the rule of their faith and practice. Nevertheleſs, I ſhall add one or two more, containing ſome forms of citation, and marks of reſpect for theſe books.

12. Having largely quoted ſome books of ſcripture, particularly St. Luke's goſpel, he ſays; 'Let [o] us then, my beloved 'brethren, ſtir up ourſelves as much as poſſible; and, breaking 'off the ſleep of ſloth and ſecurity, let us be watchful to obſerve 'the commands of the Lord: let us ſeek with all our heart 'what we have loſt, that we may find; becauſe *to him that ſeeketh,* 'faith the ſcripture, *it ſhall be given, and to him that knocketh it 'ſhall be opened:*' Matt. vii. 7, 8. Let us cleanſe our houſe with 'a ſpiritual cleanſing, that all the ſecret and hidden parts of our 'breaſt, being illuminated by the light of the goſpel, may ſay, '*Againſt thee only have I ſinned:*' Pſ. li. 4.

13. 'We [p] read and adore, ſays he to the Novatians, and do 'not overlook the heavenly ſentence of the Lord, in which he 'ſays; *Him that denies him he alſo ſhall deny:*' Matt. x. 33. Again; 'hear [q] therefore, ye Novatians, with whom the heavenly ſcrip-'tures are rather read than underſtood: it is well if they are 'not interpolated.'

14. We have now taken ſo much from this writer, that it may be proper to ſum up his teſtimony. He has cited texts of all the four goſpels, except St. Mark's; and likewiſe the epiſ-

[m] Et cum ſcriptum ſit, Canes foris remanſuros. p. 16. a. [n] Clamante ſcriptura et dicente: Memento unde excideris, et age pœnitentiam. p. 19. b. [o] Excitemus nos quantum poſſumus, fratres dilectiſſimi, et abrupto inertiæ et ſecuritatis ſomno, ad obſervanda Domini præcepta vigilemus Quæramus tota mente quod perdidimus, ut invenire poſſimus: Quia quærenti, ait ſcriptura, dabitur, et pulſanti aperietur. Mundemus domum noſtram munditia ſpirituali, ut ſecreta quæque et abdita pectoris noſtri, vero evangelii lumine radiata, dicant: Tibi ſoli deliqui. ... p. 20. b. [p] Legimus et adoramus, nec prætermittimus cœleſtem Domini ſententiam, qua ait negaturum ſe neganten. p. 19. a. [q] Audite igitur, Novatiani, apud quos ſcripturæ cœleſtes leguntur potius, quam intelliguntur, parum ſi non interpolentur. p. 16. b.

tle

tle to the Romans, the firſt to the Corinthians, the epiſtles to the Galatians, the Epheſians and the Philippians, the firſt epiſtle of St. John, the epiſtle of St. Jude, and the book of the Revelation. Though he has not quoted all the books of the New Teſtament, becauſe, it is likely, he had not occaſion ſo to do in this one treatiſe, yet it may be well ſuppoſed his canon differed very little from ours, if at all. And he has given many proofs, in a ſhort compaſs, of his high reſpect for the books of the New Teſtament, and for the doctrine contained in them.

VI. In the late editions of St. Cyprian's works is a treatiſe [r] of ſome anonymous author, firſt publiſhed by Rigaltius, entitled, Of rebaptizing; or, Of the [s] baptiſm of heretics: that they ought not to be baptized again, who have been once baptized in the name of Jeſus Chriſt. This writer is placed by Cave at the year 253. Of this book Du Pin ſpeaks to this purpoſe: The [t] treatiſe of the baptiſm of heretics, publiſhed by Rigaltius, againſt the ſentiment of St. Cyprian, is the work of an ancient author, who lived before the time of St. Auguſtine, and probably at the ſame time with St. Cyprian. Of this piece Fleury [u] expreſſeth himſelf in this manner: The opinion of St. Stephen, and the greateſt part of the churches, was at that time defended by a certain author, whoſe treatiſe remains, but whoſe name we know not. He ſpeaks [x] as being a biſhop; and he, perhaps, was St. Stephen himſelf, or ſome one of his ſucceſſors. The Benedictine [y] before quoted delivers his judgment as follows: That the author of this piece was a biſhop; and that in the work itſelf are plain marks of his writing in the third century, and whilſt the controverſy about the baptiſm of heretics was on foot, and probably whilſt Cyprian was ſtill living. Cave not only admits the epiſcopal character of this author, and that he was contemporary with Cyprian, but is likewiſe [z] inclined to think him to have been of the ſame country.

1. This book is a good deal larger than any one of the four preceding pieces: it affords a very valuable teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament.

2. St. Matthew's goſpel is not expreſsly quoted in this book

[r] Anonymi liber de Rebaptiſmate. Non debere denuo baptizari qui ſemel in nomine Domini [noſtri] Jeſu Chriſti ſint tincti. [s] De baptiſmo hæreticorum.

[t] Nouv. Bib. des Auteurs Ec. St. Cyprien. p. 173. Amſt. [u] Fleury's Eccl. Hiſt. Book vii. ch. 31, p. 438: Engliſh tranſlation. [x] Et ideo cum ſalus noſtra in baptiſmate Spiritus, quod plerumque cum baptiſmate aquæ conjunctus, ſit conſtituta, ſiquidem per nos baptiſma tradetur, integre et ſolenniter et per omnia quæ ſcripta ſunt adſignetur, atque ſine ulla ullius rei ſeparatione tradatur: aut ſi a minore clero per neceſſitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut ſuppleatur a nobis, aut a Domino ſupplendum reſervetur. p. 26. b. ed. Ox. confer ibid. Rigaltii notas.

[y] Vit. S. Cyprian. § xxxv.

[z] Denique ſtilus, totaque ſcribendi ratio Tertulliani, vel Cypriani ætatem, quin et gentem ſatis aperte prodit. H. Lit. P. i. p. 93.

by name, though there are many references to it, and divers texts tranſcribed from it. The author ſays, that the diſciples did juſtly believe our Lord to be the Chriſt, for ſeveral reaſons he there mentions; and among others, becauſe [a] his ſtar was ſeen in the Eaſt, and he was diligently inquired of and worſhipped by the wiſe men, and honoured by them with rich and ſplendid gifts and offerings: Matt. ii. 2.... 11.

3. And, not to take notice of any other places, he quotes alſo ſome of the laſt words of this goſpel in this manner, 'Nor [b] imagine 'that to be contrary to this argument which the Lord ſaid; *Go, 'teach the nations, baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the 'Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*'

4. He expreſsly quotes St. Mark's and St. Luke's goſpels both together after this manner; 'In [c] the goſpel according to Luke 'he ſays to his diſciples: *I have another baptiſm to be baptized with.* 'Likewiſe [in the goſpel] according to Mark, he had ſaid to the 'like purpoſe to the ſons of Zebedee; *Are ye able to drink of the 'cup that I drink of, or to be baptized with the baptiſm that I am 'baptized with?*' See Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 38.

This paſſage ſeems to afford a probable argument that, in the code, or collection, or volume, of the four goſpels, St. Mark's goſpel was placed before St. Luke's. This I ſuppoſe to be the meaning of that expreſſion, quoting Mark after Luke; likewiſe he had ſaid; or, he had ſaid to the like purpoſe. But I do not mention this as a certain proof. He refers likewiſe to divers things in [d] the ſecond chapter of St. Luke's goſpel.

5. 'As [e] it is written in the goſpel according to John, *They 'alſo baptized others:*' ſee ch. iv. 2.

6. He has largely cited the book of the Acts of the apoſtles, and argues from divers things related in it. He has quoted it at leaſt five or ſix times expreſsly by that name: 'And [f] our 'Lord likewiſe confirming this ſame word of John, after his re- 'ſurrection, in the Acts of the apoſtles, commanded them [the 'diſciples], that they ſhould not depart from Jeruſalem, *but wait 'for that promiſe of the Father, which ye have heard of me: for John 'truly baptized with water, but ye ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt 'not many days hence:*' Acts i. 3, 4.

[a] .... quod in Oriente viſa ejus ſtella ſollicitiſſime fuiſſet a magis requiſitus et adoratus, et illuſtribus donis et inſignibus muneribus honoratus. p. 25. b. Oxon.

[b] Nec æſtimes huic tractatui contrarium eſſe quod Dominus dixit: Ite, docete gentes, tinguite eos nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. ibid. p. 25. a. [c] In evangelio ſecundum Lucam ad diſcipulos ſuos locutus eſt, dicens: Habeo aliud baptiſma baptizari: Item ſecundum Marcum ad filios Zebedæi, eadem ratione dixerit: Poteſtis bibere calicem quem ego bibo, aut baptiſmate quo ego baptizor baptizari? p. 28. b. [d] Vid. p. 25. b. [e] Et quod multo gravius eſt, ſicut in evangelio ſcriptum Joannem ſcriptum eſt, etiam alios baptizabant. p. 26. b. [f] Nam et Dominus

7. This

7. This author has quoted or referred to ſeveral of St. Paul's epiſtles, particularly the epiſtle to the Romans, the firſt to the Corinthians, the epiſtles to the Epheſians and the Philippians, and firſt to the Theſſalonians.

8. 'Becauſe [g] that being baptized in the name of Chriſt, they 'are *redeemed with the moſt precious blood* of the Lord:' 1 Pet. i. 19.

9. 'As [h] alſo the evangeliſt John ſays; *Every one that loveth* 'is born of God, and knoweth God, for God is love:' 1 John iv. 7, 8. The author therefore had no doubt but that this epiſtle was written by the ſame John who wrote the goſpel.

10. 'For [i] John teaching us ſays in his epiſtle, (1 John v. 6, '7, 8.) *This is he that came by water and blood, even Jeſus Chriſt: not* 'by water only, *but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that bear-* 'eth witneſs, *becauſe the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear* 'witneſs, *the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and theſe three* 'agree in one.'

11. 'I [k] think, likewiſe, that I have rightly repreſented the 'doctrine of the apoſtle John, who ſays; *For there are three that* 'bear witneſs; *the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and theſe three* 'in one.'

12. Theſe quotations ſhew that this biſhop, contemporary with St. Cyprian, had not in his copies of St. John's epiſtle the diſputed text concerning the witneſſes in heaven: and they afford likewiſe a ſtrong and cogent argument for the ſuppoſition, that neither had St. Cyprian that text in his copies.

13. There are ſome expreſſions made uſe of by this author, which may ſeem to imply that the books of the New Teſtament were divided into ſections or chapters.

'And therefore, ſays [l] he, we ſhall be obliged to bring to- 'gether the ſeveral paragraphs [literally ſhort chapters] of the 'ſacred ſcriptures, relating to this purpoſe.' Afterwards; 'For-

[g] Ipſe eandem vocem Joannis poſt ſuam reſurrectionem in Actis apoſtolorum continuo, præcepit eis, ab Hieroſolymis ne recederent, ſed expectare illam promiſſionem Patris, quam audiſtis; a me, quia Joannes quidem baptizavit aqua, vos autem baptizabimini Spiritu Sancto non poſt multos hos dies. p. 22. b. [h] Quia baptizati in nomine Chriſti redemti ſunt pretioſiſſimo ſanguine Domini. p. 20. a.

[i] Sicut et Joannes evangeliſta dicit: Et omnis qui diligit, ex Deo natus eſt, et cognoſcit Deum, quia Deus dilectio eſt. p. 28. b. [j] Ait enim Joannes de Domino noſtro in epiſtola ſua nos, docens: Hic eſt qui venit per aquam et ſanguinem Jeſus Chriſtus. Non in aqua tantum, ſed in aqua et ſanguine. Et Spiritus eſt, qui teſtimonium perhibet, quia Spiritus eſt veritas. Quia tres teſtimonium perhibent, Spiritus et aqua et ſanguis. Et iſti tres in unum ſunt. p. 29. a.

[k] Arbitror autem, et apoſtoli Joannes doctrinam nos non inepte diſpoſuiſſe, qui ait: Quia tres teſtimonium perhibent, Spiritus et aqua et ſanguis, et iſti tres unum ſunt. p. 30. b. 31. a. [l] Et ideo quæcunque ſanctarum ſcripturarum ad hanc partem pertinentia ſunt capitula, neceſſario in unum congeremus. p. 22. b.

'aſmuch [m] as it is manifeſtly declared by our Lord in that ſen-'tence, (Matt. x. 33) *Whoſoever ſhall deny me before men, him will I 'alſo deny before my Father which is in heaven.*' But the phraſes uſed in theſe places may denote no more than a text or paſſage, and do not certainly imply that the books themſelves, whence they are taken, were divided into larger or ſmaller ſections.

14. We are now, according to our uſual method, to obſerve a few forms of citation, and ſome tokens of reſpect for the ſcriptures.

'Nor [n] ſhall I omit,' ſays the author, 'what the goſpel de-'ſervedly relates; for our Lord ſaid to the man ſick of the 'palſy (Matt. ix. 2); *Son, be of good cheer, thy ſins be forgiven thee.*' Again; 'This [o] we find mentioned in the goſpel.' In another place; 'To [p] which things perhaps you will weakly anſwer, 'according to cuſtom, that the Lord hath ſaid in the goſpel '(John iii. 5); *Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can-'not enter the kingdom of God.*' To which he replies by an obſervation upon [q] the New Teſtament, as he expreſsly calls it. Farther; 'As [r] the holy ſcripture declares, out of which we ſhall bring plain proofs of what we aſſert.' He means particularly the New Teſtament. 'The [s] holy ſcripture foretold, that they 'who ſhould believe in Chriſt ſhould be baptized with the Spi-'rit:' as John vii. 39; Matt. iii. 11; and in other places. 'As [t] 'the ſcripture ſaith; *Out of his belly flowed rivers of living water:*' John vii. 38. He obſerves, that [u] the Jews received only the ancient ſcriptures. 'The ſcriptures of the New and the Old 'Teſtament,' he [x] ſays, 'clearly declare' what he there aſſerts. Again; of [y] this he 'has no advantage who has not the love 'of that God and Chriſt who is preached by the law and the 'prophets, and in the goſpel.' 'Becauſe [z] that both prophets 'and apoſtles have thus taught; for James ſays in the Acts of

[m] Per hujuſmodi clauſulam quia manifeſtiſſime a Domino dictum eſt: Quicunque me negaverit coram hominibus, negabo eum et ego coram patre meo qui eſt in cœlis. p. 28. a. [n] Sed nec illud omiſerim quod evangelium merito prædicat. Ait enim paralytico Dominus noſter, &c. p. 30. b. [o] Sicuti non ſolum Petrum hoc paſſum eſſe in evangelio deprehendimus. p. 25. a. [p] Ad quæ fortaſſe tu continuo impatienter reſpondeas, ut ſoles, dixiſſe in evangelio Dominum: &c. p. 23. a. [q] Sed in eodem Novo Teſtamento. p. 24. a. [r] Sicut declarant nobis ſanctæ ſcripturæ, quarum per ſingula quæque eorum quæ enarrabimus, adferemus perſpicuas probationes. p. 23. a. [s] Quoniam eos qui in Chriſtum crediturí eſſent ſcriptura ſancta prædixit, oportere in ſpiritu baptizari. p. 25. B. [t] Sicuti ſcriptura dicit: Flumina de ventre ejus currebant aquæ vivæ. p. 29. a. [u] Sicuti nec ſuper Judæos, qui veteres tantum ſcripturas recipiunt p. 27. b. [x] Quanquam ſcripturæ novi et veteris teſtamenti manifeſte prædicant. p. 28. b. [y] Quia hoc facto nihil proficit, qui non habet dilectionem ejus Dei et Chriſti, qui per legem et prophetas et in evangelio hoc modo prædicatur. p. 28. b. [z] Quia et prophetæ et apoſtoli ita prædicarunt. Ait enim Jacobus in Actis apoſtolorum. p. 27. b.

'the

'the apoſtles:' Acts x. 14. Finally, he complains of ſome who advanced things [a] contrary to the precept of the law and of all the ſcriptures.

Here are many marks of high reſpect for the books of the New Teſtament, which are equalled with, or reckoned ſuperior to, thoſe of the Old Teſtament; and together with them are eſteemed the rule of Chriſtian belief and practice. And the apoſtles are joined with the prophets.

15. There is ſtill a remarkable paſſage to be tranſcribed concerning an apocryphal writing, which paſſage farther confirms the authority of the ſacred ſcriptures of the New Teſtament.

He argues againſt ſome heretics who made uſe of fire, as well as water, in the adminiſtration of baptiſm. 'But,' ſays [b] he, 'the 'principal foundation (not to mention any other) of this falſe 'and pernicious baptiſm, is a book forged by thoſe ſame here-'tics for the ſake of this very error, which is called the Preach-'ing of Paul. [Some think it ſhould be Peter. It [c] might be 'called by both theſe names.] In which book, contrary to all 'the ſcriptures, you will find Chriſt, who alone never offended 'at all, both making confeſſion of his own ſin, and almoſt againſt 'his will compelled by his mother Mary to receive John's bap-'tiſm: likewiſe, that when he was baptized fire was ſeen upon 'the water; which is not written in any goſpel. And when a 'conſiderable time had paſſed, you will find alſo, that Peter 'and Paul, after they had had a conference together about the 'goſpel at Jeruſalem, and there had been ſome mutual difference 'between them, and an agreement had been entered into about 'the diſpoſition of things for time to come; after all theſe 'things, I ſay, you will find them meeting in the city [meaning 'Rome] as if they had never known each other before. And 'ſome other things of this kind there are abſurdly and ſhame-'fully forged: all which you may ſee heaped together in that 'book.'

16. There are then in this treatiſe many quotations of words of the goſpel of St. Matthew. The goſpels of St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, are expreſsly quoted by name; as is alſo the

[a] Contra præceptum legis et omnium ſcripturarum. p. 22. b. [b] Eſt autem adulterini hujus, immo internecini baptiſmatis, ſi quis alius auctor, tum etiam quidam ab eiſdem ipſis hæreticis propter hunc eundem errorem confictus liber, qui inſcribitur Pauli Prædicatio. In quo libro contra omnes ſcripturas, et de peccato proprio confitentem, qui ſolus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptiſma pene invitum a matre ſua eſſe compulſum. Item cum baptizaretur, ignem ſuper aquam eſſe viſum, quod in evangelio nullo eſt ſcriptum; et poſt tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, poſt conlationem evangelii in Hieruſalem et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum diſpoſitionem, poſtremo in urbe quaſi tunc primum invicem ſibi eſſe cognitos. Et quædam alia hujuſcemodi abſurde ac turpiter in illum librum invenies congeſta. p. 30.

[c] Vid. Baluz. Notas ad h. l.

book of the Acts of the apoſtles, very often; beſide other places where paſſages are taken out of it; but he has not mentioned the name of the writer of that book. Here are likewiſe quotations, or references, to ſeveral epiſtles of St. Paul; but the epiſtles themſelves, or the perſons to whom they were ſent, are not expreſsly named. It is likely, that one main reaſon of this method of citing was, that thoſe ſcriptures were ſo well known among Chriſtians, that almoſt every one would know whence the paſſages were taken, without citing the epiſtles by name expreſsly. Words of the firſt epiſtle of St. Peter are adopted by him. The firſt epiſtle of St. John is quoted, and aſcribed to John the apoſtle and evangeliſt: and we have obſerved ſeveral forms of citation, and alſo marks of the greateſt reſpect for the ſcriptures, and the New Teſtament in particular. Finally, he mentions an apocryphal ſpurious book, on which he has made divers juſt criticiſms, ſhewing it to be a forgery, and expreſſing the utmoſt indignation againſt it: but he affords no plain proofs that the books of the New Teſtament were then divided into any chapters or ſections.

VII. There is yet another piece, called, [d] A Computation of Eaſter; of which I ſhall here give an account, it being placed in the Oxford edition, in an appendix to St. Cyprian's works; and there being good reaſon to believe it was written about his time. Du Pin [e] and [f] Tillemont allow the antiquity of it; though they think the difference of ſtyle ſo manifeſt, as to ſhew plainly that it is not a work of Cyprian. Cave [g] ſays it is an ancient tract; and if not written by Cyprian, it is, however, the work of ſome contemporary. In the Oxford edition of St. Cyprian's works this piece is publiſhed as being probably genuine; and in his notes the learned editor delivers his judgment upon it to this purpoſe, in anſwer to Seneſchal, who had denied it to be written by Cyprian: 'That [h] he will not be poſitive it is the 'work of that father; but, if it be falſely aſcribed to him, yet it 'is not ſpurious, or ſuppoſititious, but manifeſtly ancient, and 'written about that time.' It is indeed, ſo far as I am able to judge, all over ancient; abating only the errors of the copies, which ſeem to be not a few.

There are in it divers marks of antiquity: the author [i] concludes his chronology at the fifth year of Gordian, and the con-

[d] De Paſcha Computus. [e] Nouv. Bibl. St. Cyprien. [f] Mem. Ec. T. iv. St. Cyprien. art. 65. [g] Hiſt Lit. P. i. p. 89. [h] Ego me vadem non ſpondeo. Sed ſi pſeudepigraphus ſit at ſpurius non eſt, et ſuppoſititius, ſed antiquum ille liquet; et Cypriani ætate ſcriptum, res ipſa docet. Not. p. 63.

[i] A quo tempore, id eſt, a paſſione, usque ad annum quintum Gordiani, Aviola et Papo conſulibus, ſuppleti ſunt anni ccxv. p. 70. b.

ſulſhip

ſulſhip of Arrianus and Papus, which is the year of our Lord 243. It is likely, therefore, that [k] he wrote not much after that time. Pagi [l] thinks this book was publiſhed in that very year. Farther, the author ſays, 'that [m] Chriſt, having been baptized 'in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, was crucified in the ſixteenth 'year of the ſame reign;' which opinion is ancient, and is more than once inſiſted on by him. I might add, that [n] the doxology at the concluſion of this work is ancient and unexceptionable.

If Pagi be in the right, that the fifth year of Gordian, mentioned in this piece, is the year of its publication, this is an additional argument, beſide the difference of ſtyle, that it is not Cyprian's; it being probable that he was not converted ſo ſoon.

1. Though I do not by any means ſuppoſe this to be a work of Cyprian, it deſerves to be taken notice of on account of its antiquity. And it is valuable for the teſtimonies it contains to ſome facts, as well as to the books of the New Teſtament, which I am now to obſerve.

2. This writer ſays, expreſsly, that [o] there are four goſpels; or, as another copy has it, evangeliſts; and twelve apoſtles; and that the goſpel is one divided into four parts.

3. He has not mentioned the names of the evangeliſts, but he has quoted words of the goſpels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John. I ſhall tranſcribe a few paſſages, chiefly to ſhew the author's method of citing, and his reſpect for the ſcriptures in general.

4. 'Theſe [p] are the days, of which the Lord ſays in the goſ-'pel; *And except thoſe days were ſhortened there ſhould be no fleſh 'ſaved:*' Matt. xxiv. 22.

5. 'Of whom [q] Simeon, a juſt man, holding him in his hands, 'ſaid to Mary, his mother; *Behold this* [child] *is ſet for the fall and*

[k] Vid. Not. ed. Ox. p. 70.

[l] Fallus V. C. in notis ad Compu-tum de Paſcha, cujus S. Cyprianum auctorem credit, quique perducitur uſque ad annum quintum Gordiani, obſervat, Chronicum Scriptores res perducere ad annum aliquem inſigniorem etiam paulo poſteriorem, adque in eo opere videri factum, nihilorum ad annum Gordiani Imp. quintum. Verum auctor non ad ultimum Gordiani annum, ſed ad ejus Quinquennium reſpexit, quibus ſcriptores de more opera ſua publicabant. Pagi Crit. in Bar. A. D. 243.

[m] Hi ſunt apoſtoli, quorum [illegible] edificati recognovimus Dominum noſtrum anno ſexto decimo imperii Tiberii Cæſaris paſſum, cum eſſet ipſe annorum xxxi. p. 69. b. . . . quibus ſuppletis Dominus Jeſus a nativitate ſua baptizatus eſt a Johanne anno quinto decimo imperii Tiberii Cæſaris; cujus anno ſexto decimo paſſus eſt et reſurrexit. p. 70. b.

[n] Ac propterea Deo Patri Omnipotenti, qui nos ad gratiam tantam vocavit, et divina ſacramenta manifeſtavit, per Jeſum Chriſtum filium ejus Dominum et Salvatorem noſtrum ſemper ſine ceſſatione gratias agamus. p. 70. b.

[o] Et ſic, per hanc multiformem trinitatem, et ipſe duodecim horæ evangelium unum in quatuor partes diviſum oſtenderunt, et tres menſes per quatuor tempora, id eſt, per quatuor evangelia, a Chriſto electos xii. apoſtolos nobis d monſtraverunt. p. 69. b.

[p] Ipſi ſunt dies, de quibus ait Dominus in evangelio, &c. p. 68. b.

[q] P. 69. a. b.

'*rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken* '*against*:' Luke ii. 28, 34.

6. 'And [r] rightly said our Lord and Master himself to the 'Jews; *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of* '*Abraham*:' John viii. 39.

7. He has a remarkable quotation of the Acts in this manner; '*From* [s] *Joshua the son of Nun to Samuel the judge, and priest of God,* '*according to the blessed apostle Paul, who was taught by the Spirit of* '*God, were fulfilled four hundred and fifty years*:' See Acts xiii. 20.

This seems to shew at once that the Acts was esteemed a book of the inspired scriptures, and that it was well known; otherwise, the author would have shewn more particularly where these words of the apostle Paul were to be found.

8. He [t] says, 'We are built upon the words of the apostles.' Perhaps he refers to Eph. ii. 20: but, whether he does or not, this observation is worthy of our notice.

9. 'Which make,' says [u] he, 'according to the Revelation, '*a thousand and two hundred and sixty days*; in which days that an- 'tichrist will make a great destruction; and therefore no Chris- 'tian will be able to offer sacrifice to God, because that most 'wicked one will begin to sit in the temple of God, and to say 'to the ignorant that he is God; whom our Lord and Saviour 'Jesus will kill [or consume] *with the breath of his mouth, and de-* '*stroy with the brightness of his coming*.' Here is a quotation of Rev. xii. 6; and a reference to 2 Thes. ii. 4, 8.

10. I forbear to insist on any other allusions to the books of the New Testament or any expressions, that [x] may seem to intend the whole collection of them. He speaks of [y] the holy and divine scriptures in words, which may more directly relate to the Old Testament; but it cannot be questioned, that he had an equal respect for the New; which contains the words of our Saviour, and of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and his apostles.

[r] Et merito Dominus et Magister noster dicebat Judæis, &c. p. 67. a. [s] ... a Jesu filio Nave usque ad Samuelem judicem, et Dei sacerdotem, secundum Pauli B. apostoli sermonem, qui Spiritu Dei edoctus retulit eos impleviſſe annos CCCL. p. 67. a. [t] See before note [m] [u] —qui fiunt dies, secundum Apocalypsin, mille CCLX. in quibus diebus ille antichristus magnam faciet vastationem: et ideo tunc nemo Christianorum poterit Deo sacrificium offerre, quoniam ipse nequissimus incipiet in templo Dei sedere, et ignorantibus se Deum affirmare: quem oportet Jesum Dominum et Salvatorem nostrum spiritu oris sui interficere, et præsentia adventus sui evacuare: p. 68. a. b. [x] ... in quibus oportet primo Enoch et Eliam venire, et per suam prophetiam magnæ multitudini evangelium, id est, Novum Testamentum confirmare: p. 68. a. [y] Multo quidem non modico tempore anxii fuimus et æstuantes, non in sæcularibus, sed in sanctis et divinis scripturis, quærentes invenire, quisnam, &c. p. 63. a.

THE

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;

PART II.

[VOL. V. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXLIV.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHEN I began this work, I declined writing the history of the heretics of the first two centuries, because of the difficulty of the subject, and for some other reasons; not intending to omit it entirely, but deferring it till another opportunity, if God permit: but when I came lower I did not discern those reasons any longer: accordingly, I placed near the beginning of the fourth volume a chapter, containing the history of Noetus and others called heretics, in the former part of the third century: and, in the chapter of Dionysius of Alexandria, I inserted an account of Sabellius, Paul of Samosata, and the controversies about the millennium, and the baptism of heretics. Following this method, the Manicheans, who appeared about the year 280, should have been in this volume, which carries down the history of catholic writers to the year of Christ 300: but, for want of room, I have been obliged to reserve their history for the next volume; which is in good forwardness, and I hope may be published next winter.

It is not unlikely, that some may begin to charge me with prolixity in this work, which is already increased to several volumes: but it should be considered that my volumes are small for a design of this nature, being in the octavo form only: and I believe that they who have read them, so far as we have proceeded, are convinced of the propriety of writing, when we can, the history of authors in the words of their contemporaries, or such as lived near their time; and, of the necessity of taking some particular notice of the works ascribed to them, for distinguishing their genuine writings from spurious, that we may admit of none but credible witnesses, liable to no suspicion: and some select passages may be of use, to shew the learning and piety of the primitive Christians, and their sentiments upon some points, which have been much controverted in late ages. Moreover, the particular design of this work, as formerly shewn, is to enable persons of ordinary capacities,

capacities, who have not an opportunity of reading many authors, to judge for themſelves concerning the external evidence of the facts related in the New Teſtament. I write chiefly for gentlemen, and ſuch others, as are not poſſeſſed of large libraries; and therefore I produce paſſages of ancient authors at length, and oftentimes tranſcribe alſo the original words at the bottom of the page, that this evidence may at once appear in a clear and ſatisfactory light. All which things take up a great deal of room: but, ſince they cannot be well omitted, I do not ſee any good reaſon to alter my method; and I preſume it will be ſtill approved by others. When we get below Euſebius of Cæſarea, it will not be needful to be ſo particular.

Feb. 14, 1743-4.

CHAP.

CHAP. XLVI.

St. CORNELIUS and St. LUCIUS, biſhops of Rome.

I. *St. Cornelius.* II. *St. Lucius.*

I. 'CORNELIUS,[a] biſhop of the city of Rome, to whom there 'are eight of Cyprian's letters ſtill extant, wrote an epiſtle to 'Fabius, biſhop of Antioch, concerning the ſynod at Rome, in 'Italy, and Africa; and another concerning Novatus, and of 'thoſe that had lapſed; a third concerning the acts of the ſy-'nod; a fourth to the ſame Fabius, which is very long, and con-'tains the riſe and condemnation of the Novatian hereſy. Hav-'ing been crowned with martyrdom for Chriſt, he was ſucceed-'ed by Lucius.' So writes St. Jerom in his Catalogue, or book of Illuſtrious men.

Fabian, who ſat in the ſee of Rome fourteen years, of whoſe ordination Euſebius [b] has given us a very remarkable hiſtory, ſuffered martyrdom [c] in the month of January 250. After his death there was a vacancy for about the ſpace of ſixteen months, upon account of [d] the troubles they were in, during which time the clergy of Rome governed the church. In the beginning of June 251, the heat of the perſecution being ſomewhat abated at Rome, even before the death of Decius, Cornelius was choſen biſhop and ſucceſſor of the above-named Fabian, with the gene-ral approbation [e] of the clergy and people of the church of Rome, and the concurrence [f] of ſixteen biſhops, then in the city, as St. Cyprian writes.

Cornelius Romanæ urbis epiſcopus, adhuc ſecto Cypriani exſtant epiſtolæ, una epiſtola ad Fabium, Antiochenæ civitatis epiſcopum, de ſynodo Romana, Italica, Africana; et aliam de Novatiano, et de his qui lapſi ſunt; tertiam de geſtis ſuis; quartam ad eundem Fabium valde prolixam, et Novatianæ hæreſeos cauſas et crimina continentem. Rexit eccleſiam annis duobus ſub Gallo et Voluſiano, cui ob Chriſtum martyrio coronato ſucceſſit Lucius. De V. I. cap. 66. [b] H. E. L. vi. cap. 29. [c] Vid. Pagi Crit. 250. n. vi. [d] ——quibus, poſt exceſſum notiſſimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum erat epiſcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates conſtitutus. Cleri Roman. Epiſt. ap. Cyprian. Ep. 30, [al. 31] p. 58. Oxon. [e] Factus eſt autem Cornelius epiſcopus de Dei et Chriſti ejus judicio, de clericorum pene omnium teſtimonio, de plebis quæ tum affuit ſuffragio, et de ſacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; cum nemo ante ſe factus eſſet, cum Fabiani locus—vacaret. Cypr. Ep. 55, p. 104.—qui epiſcopo Cornelio in catholica eccleſia de Dei judicio et cleri ac plebis ſuffragio ordinato, profanum altare erigere, — tentaverit. Id. Ep. 68. Pam. 67, p. 177. [f] Et factus eſt epiſcopus a plurimis collegis noſtris, qui tunc in urbe Roma erant, qui ad nos literas honorificas, et laudabiles, et teſtimonio ſuæ prædicationis illuſtres de ejus ordinatione miſerunt. Cypr. Ep. 55 [Pam. 52], p. 104. Epiſcopo in eccleſia a ſedecim coepiſcopis facto. Ibid. p. 112.

The

The election, however, was not unanimous. Some, both of the clergy and people of Rome, diſſented: by whom Novatus was choſen biſhop, who was ordained alſo by three Italian biſhops.

Both Cornelius and Novatus ſent abroad [g] letters and deputies to foreign biſhops and churches, notifying their election and ordination: but Cornelius's letters and deputies met with, generally, the moſt favourable reception: he therefore was approved of as rightful poſſeſſor of that ſee; and Novatus is eſteemed the firſt antipope, and the firſt author of ſchiſm at Rome.

In [h] October 251, Cornelius convened a numerous council at Rome, conſiſting [i] of ſixty biſhops, and a much larger number of preſbyters and deacons, who all confirmed his election, and condemned Novatus, and the rigid doctrine he now went into concerning the lapſed. Cornelius likewiſe took the ſentiments of other biſhops in Italy, who could not be preſent at the council held at Rome; which is, probably, what [k] Jerom means by the Italian ſynod. And the ſame things having been reſolved upon in a council at Carthage, we have at length the three ſynods mentioned by Jerom, and the ſenſe of [l] Euſebius, whom Jerom copied.

There is little certainly known of Cornelius's life, before he was advanced to this biſhopric; except that [m] Cyprian ſays he had paſſed through all the lower offices in the church, and behaved well therein.

St. Jerom in his Catalogue, as we have ſeen already, ſays that Cornelius was crowned with martyrdom. He ſpeaks to the like purpoſe [n] elſewhere. St. Cyprian [o] likewiſe calls Cornelius a martyr: but, though Jerom ſeems to ſay that Cornelius died at Rome, it is at preſent the general [p] opinion that he died at Circumcellæ, now Civita Vecchia, whither he had been baniſhed

[g] Vid. Cypr. Ep. 44. init. et Ep. 45, [42] p. 87. Oxon. [h] Vid. Pagi Crit. 251. n. xxvi. Baſn. 251, n. viii. [i] Vid. Euſeb. l. vi. cap. 43, p. 242. A.

[k] Vid. Pagi ibid. et Tillemont St. Corneille. Art. 8. p. 33, 34. Tom. iii. P. iii.

[l] Euſeb. l. vi. cap. 43, p. 242. B. Conf. eund. p. 245. D. [m] Nam quod ad Cornelium,—non iſte ad epiſcopatum ſubito pervenit, ſed per omnia eccleſiaſtica officia promotus, et in divinis adminiſtrationibus Dominum ſæpe promeritus, ad ſacerdotii ſublime faſtigium cunctis religionis gradibus aſcendit. Cypr. Ep. 55, [al. 52.] p. 103. [n] Sub Decio et Valeriano perſecutoribus, quo tempore Cornelius Romæ, Cyprianus Carthagine, felici cruore martyrium pertulerunt. —— De Vit. Paul. Erem. T. iv. P. ii. Edit. Bened.

[o] Unde illic repentina perſecutio nuper exorta ſit, unde contra eccleſiam Chriſti et epiſcopum Cornelium beatum martyrem, voſque omnes ſecularis poteſtas ſubito proruperit. Cypr. Ep. 61, [al. 58] p. 144. Si vero apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano epiſcopo legitima ordinatione ſucceſſit, et quem, præter ſacerdotii honorem, martyrio quoque Dominus glorificavit. Id. Ep. 69, [al. 76] p. 181. [p] Tillemont St. Corneille. Art. 16. Pearſon. Annal. Cypr. 252. n. xii. xiii. Pagi 252, n. xii. xiii. Baſn. 252, n. x.

by

p. 5.

by Gallus. Jerom having ſaid of Cyprian, that [q] he died on the ſame day of the month, though not in the ſame year, with Cornelius, it is concluded that Cornelius died on the 14th of September 252.

Jerom ſays that Cornelius governed the church two years, under Gallus and Voluſian. But thoſe two years muſt not be reckoned complete; for the moſt learned critics and chonologers compute that [r] his epiſcopate was not above one year, three months, and ten days; part under Decius, and part under Gallus: and yet Euſebius gives him [s] about three years. However, he may be ſuppoſed to allow him all the ſpace of time from the death of Fabian, including the vacancy of the ſee. But Du Pin [t] is greatly miſtaken in ſaying that he died near the end of the year 253, having been biſhop two years and ſome months.

Cornelius has a place in Jerom's Catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers, who mentions four of his letters ſent to Fabius; though it is [u] ſuppoſed now, by ſome learned men, that Euſebius [x] ſpeaks of but three epiſtles of Cornelius to that biſhop of Antioch. However, it cannot be queſtioned but Cornelius wrote other letters beſide thoſe mentioned by Jerom. Euſebius [y] ſpeaks of a letter of his to Dionyſius of Alexandria. He likewiſe wrote ſeveral letters [z] to Cyprian, two of which [a] we ſtill have. And Trithemius expreſsly ſays, that [b] Cornelius wrote many letters to Cyprian biſhop of Carthage, and other letters to others. The eight letters of Cyprian to Cornelius, mentioned by Jerom, ſtill remain.

I ſhall by and by make uſe of the long letter to Fabius, mentioned by Jerom, there being conſiderable fragments of it preſerved by Euſebius in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

There are not many texts of ſcripture quoted in the two remaining letters of Cornelius to Cyprian, or the juſt-mentioned fragments: but it may be well taken for granted, that he received the ſame books with Cyprian and other Chriſtians of that age.

I take no notice of the pieces which, without ground, have been aſcribed by ſome to this biſhop of Rome. Such as deſire

[q] Paſſus eſt, — eodem die quo Romæ Cornelius, ſed non eodem anno. D. V. I. cap. 67. [r] Vid. Pearſon. An. Cypr. 251, n. vi. Pagi 251, n. xix. Tillem. ut ſupra, Art. 16, p. 70, et note 14. [s] H. E. l. vii. cap. 2. [t] Nouv. Bibl. T. i. p. 180. Amſterd. [u] Vid. Baſnag. Ann. 252, n. xi. [x] H. E. L. vi. cap. 43. p. 242. B. C. D. [y] —και Κορνηλιῳ τῳ κατα Ρωμην γραφει, δεξαμενος αυτου την κατα τα Νοβατου επιστολην. H. E. l. vi. cap. 46, p. 247. D. [z] Vid. Baſnag. ibid. [a] Apud Cyprian. Ep. 49, 50. [juxta Pamelium. 46, 48.] [b] Ad Cyprianum Carthaginenſem epiſcopum plures ſcripſit epiſtolas, et alias ad alios. Trithem. de Script. Ec. cap. 40.

farther

farther information of these may consult [c] Basnage, [d] Tillemont, and others.

II. Cornelius, as St. Jerom says, was succeeded by Lucius. Herein he agrees with [e] Eusebius, who adds, that Lucius did not sit out full eight months. At present, the day of his ordination and the duration of his episcopate are reckoned [f] uncertain. However, bishop Pearson thought it probable that [g] Lucius was ordained on the 25th of September, and sat five whole months and ten days, dying on the 4th of March 253. Basnage [h] differs very little from him. Lucius was banished from Rome under Gallus; but he soon [i] returned. Of his speedy release there is no reason known, beside the divine goodness. We have a letter of St. Cyprian to Lucius, wherein he congratulates him [k] upon his return from his exile, as he says he had done before upon his ordination and confession. In another letter, written afterwards to pope Stephen, Cyprian [l] calls Lucius a martyr; but that word is not here to be understood strictly; for, properly speaking, Lucius was only a confessor.

We know of no writings of Lucius, but [m] such as are ascribed to him without ground.

CHAP. XLVII.

NOVATUS, otherwise called NOVATIAN.

I. *His history.* II. *His and his followers' peculiar opinions.* III. *The time of his taking up his particular sentiment.* IV. *History of his followers.* V. *His works.* VI. *His character.* VII. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.* VIII. *Scriptures received by the Novatians, his followers.*

ST. JEROM's chapter of (A) Novatus, next following that of Dionysius of Alexandria, being short, I shall transcribe it here

[c] Ann. 252, n. xii. [d] Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. Saint Corneille, Art. 17, p. 71, et Note xv. [e] Lib. vii. cap. 2.

[f] Pagi Crit. 252, n. 14.——17.

[g] Annal. Cyprian. 252. n. 15.

[h] Ann. 252, n. 13. [i] Pearson. ib. n. 18. [k] Et nuper quidem tibi, fratri carissime, gratulati sumus, cum te honore geminato in ecclesiæ suæ administratione confessorem pariter et sacerdotem constituit divina dignatio: Sed et nunc non minus tibi et comitibus tuis atque universæ fraternitati gratulamur, quod cum eadem gloria et laudibus vestris reduces vos denuo ad suos fecerit benigna Domini et larga protectio. Cypr. Ep. 61, [al. 58] init. [l] Servandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor glorioſus. ——Illi enim pleni Spiritu Dei et in glorioso martyrio constituti dandam esse lapsis pacem censuerunt. Ep. 68 [al. 67], p. 179. [m] Vid. Basnag. ibid. n. xiv. (A) of Novatus.] He is now generally called Novatian: but I hope to shew at the end of this chapter, that his true name is Novatus.

entire:

entire: 'Novatus, [a] preſbyter of the city of Rome, having endeavoured to invade the epiſcopal chair in oppoſition to Cornelius, formed the ſect of the Novatians, whom the Greeks call pure; not allowing apoſtates to be received, though they repent. The firſt author of this rigid principle was Novatus, Cyprian's preſbyter. His works are ſuch as theſe; Of Eaſter, Of the Sabbath, Of circumciſion, Of the (B) high-prieſt, Of prayer, Of Jewiſh meats, [another (C) piece, the title of which I do not underſtand], Concerning Attalus; and many other; and Of the trinity, a large volume, being a kind of epitome of a work of Tertullian. Many by miſtake conſider this as a work of Cyprian.'

There is another authentic account of Novatus in the fragments of the before-mentioned long letter of Cornelius to Fabius, biſhop of Antioch, which we have preſerved in Euſebius's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. As it is the uſual method of this work to take the hiſtory of writers, as often as we can, from contemporaries, it is fit we ſhould hear Cornelius.

In this letter, written after the council of Rome, where Novatus and his principles had been condemned, near the end of the year 251, or at the beginning of 252, Cornelius informs Fabius, that ſeveral of thoſe, who had ſided with Novatus, had now deſerted him. 'Maximus,' ſays [b] he, 'a preſbyter among us, and Urbanus, who have acquired great honour by the confeſſions they have made of our religion; and Sidonius, and Celerinus, a man who, through the divine mercy, has patiently endured all kinds of torments, and by the ſtrength of his faith, ſurmounting the weakneſs of his body, completely vanquiſhed the enemy; all theſe, he [c] ſays, having detected Novatus's ſubtilty, his lies, perjuries, unſociable and wolfiſh diſpoſition, were returned to the holy church, giving proofs of all theſe things in the preſence of divers biſhops and preſbyters, and a great number of the laity; lamenting and con-

[a] Novatianus Romanæ urbis preſbyter, adverſus Cornelium cathedram ſacerdotalem conatus invadere, Novatianorum, quod Græce dicitur καθαρῶν [al. καθαρόν] dogma conſtituit, nolens apoſtatas ſuſcipere pœnitentes. Hujus auctor Novatus, Cypriani preſbyter, fuit. Scripſit autem de Paſcha, de Sabbatho, de Circumciſione, de Sacerdote, de Oratione, de Cibis Judaicis, de Inſtantia, de Attalo, multaque alia, et de Trinitate grande volumen, quaſi ἐπίλογον operis Tertulliani faciens: quod plerique neſcientes Cypriani exiſtimant. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 70. (B) Of the high-prieſt.] In the Latin, de Sacerdote. But whether my tranſlation be right, I cannot ſay. Du Pin tranſlates, du Souverain Pontife; Tillemont, ſur le Pontife. (C) another piece, the title of which I do not underſtand.] In the Latin of Jerom, de Inſtantia: in the Greek verſion of Sophronius, περὶ τῶν ἐνστώτων: by Du Pin tranſlated, de la Fermeté; by Tillemont, ſur l'Inſtance. [b] Ap. Euſeb. H. E. l. vi. cap. 43, p. 242. D. [c] Ibid. p. 243. A.

'feſſing

'feſſing their fault, that, being ſeduced, they had for a time 'withdrawn themſelves from the church.' And ſoon after, as Euſebius ſays, Cornelius adds; 'This [d] wonderful man, this 'zealous defender of church diſcipline in all its ſtrictneſs, when 'he had determined to ſeize the epiſcopate, which was not 'aſſigned him by heaven, choſe out two of his aſſociates, men 'of an abandoned character: theſe he ſent into an obſcure cor-'ner of Italy, to fetch thence three biſhops, ſimple and illiterate 'men, whom they perſuaded to believe that, a difference having 'ariſen at Rome, they ought by all means to haſten thither to 'aſſiſt as mediators, together with other biſhops, in compoſing it. 'When they were come to Rome, they being, as I ſaid, per-'ſons of little experience, and unacquainted with the arts and 'ſubtilties of deſigning men, he ſhut them up in a private apart-'ment with ſome of his confidants; and when he had made 'them eat and drink to exceſs, at four of the clock in the after-'noon [e] he compelled them to ordain him biſhop, by a vain and 'ineffectual impoſition of their hands. Not long after one of 'thoſe biſhops came to the church, with tears lamenting and 'confeſſing his fault; whom we received to communion, as a 'layman, at the earneſt entreaties of the people. Having de-'poſed the other two, we appointed ſucceſſors in their room, 'whom we have ſent to take poſſeſſion of their ſees. Such di-'turbances and diviſions has this zealous defender of the goſpel 'cauſed in a church where he knows there are forty-ſix preſby-'ters, ſeven deacons, and as many ſub-deacons; forty-two aco-'lyths, exorciſts, readers, and porters, fifty-two; and above fifteen 'hundred widows and other indigent perſons; who are all main-'tained by the grace and bounty of the Lord. But no reſpect 'for all theſe, nor for the vaſt multitude of the people of this 'large and flouriſhing church, could reſtrain him from ſo des-'perate an attempt.' Then, ſays Euſebius, after ſome other things intervening he proceeds; 'And what was the ground 'of theſe aſpiring thoughts? upon what worthy deeds of his 'did he build his hopes of a biſhopric? was it, that [f] he had 'been always and from the beginning of the church; or had ſuſ-'tained many combats in its defence; or had been in many 'dangers for the ſake of religion? No: the [g] firſt occaſion of 'his faith was a dangerous diſtemper; and, when all hopes of 'life were gone, he received baptiſm by the pouring on of wa-'ter as he lay in his bed, if that may be called baptiſm. More-

[d] Ibid. C. D. et p. 244. [e] ἀριθμητικῶς, ib. p. 243. D. [f] ἀπὸ γε δὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀρχῆς; ib. p. 244. B. [g] Ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἐσχάτου ἡ γε ἀρχὴ τῆς πίστεως γέγονεν, —— κ. τ. λ. ib. C.

'Obſerv

'over, afterwards, through fear andfondneſs of life, in the time 'of perſecution he diſowned his being a preſbyter. For being 'deſired by the deacons to come out of his chamber, where he 'had ſhut himſelf up, and to comfort and encourage the brethren 'as became a preſbyter to do, he was ſo far from complying 'with their entreaties, that he put them off with ſcorn, ſaying 'he would be no longer a preſbyter, and that he was for another 'ſort of philoſophy.' And to paſs over ſome other things, ſays Euſebius, he obſerves; 'Thus [h] behaved this perſon, who had 'been made preſbyter by the ſpecial favour of the biſhop of that 'time, when all the clergy and moſt of the people oppoſed it; 'foraſmuch as it was not a regular thing, to admit a man into 'the number of the clergy, who had only been beſprinkled as 'he was in his bed under a diſtemper.' Cornelius ſays likewiſe, in his letter, that [i] Novatus had obliged his followers to take an oath upon the euchariſt, that they would never forſake him, to go over to his adverſary. Nevertheleſs, Cornelius ſoon after adds; 'He [k] is now left almoſt alone, the brethren deſerting him 'daily, and returning to the church. Whom alſo Moſes, a 'bleſſed martyr, who among us lately ſuffered a glorious mar-'tyrdom, perceiving the confidence and preſumption of the man, 'ſeparated from his communion, together with five preſbyters, 'who with him had ſchiſmatically forſaken the church.' To conclude; Euſebius [l] ſays, that at the end of this epiſtle Cornelius expreſsly mentions the names of the biſhops who had met in council at Rome, and there condemned Novatus, and the names of the churches they governed; as alſo the names of thoſe biſhops who could not be preſent at Rome, but by letters had ſignified their concurrence in the ſame reſolutions, and the names of the cities to which they belonged.

We have now ſeen the account which Cornelius gives of Novatus; and if there were remaining any letter of Novatus relating to Cornelius and his election, it is very likely we ſhould not be unwilling to produce it. However, having put down the hiſtories from Jerom and Cornelius, I ſhall endeavour to add in a few other particulars, and make ſome remarks.

Philoſorgius [m] ſays that Novatus was a Phrygian; but Photius, who relates this from him, adds, that he does not know whence he had it. Valeſius [n] indeed is inclined to give credit to Philoſorgius; but I think that [o] Mr. Jackſon has ſhewn it to be very improbable: nor does there appear to be any other

[h] Euſeb. H. E. L. vi. c. 43. p. 245. B. [i] Ib. C. [k] Ib. D. [l] Philoſt. H. E. L. viii. cap. 15. [m] Valeſ. ad Socrat. H. E. L. iv. c. 28. p. 57. [o] Val. Jackſon. Præf. p. viii.

ground for that ſuppoſition, but that the ſect of the Novatians was numerous in Phrygia.

It is probable, from the account which Cornelius gives of Novatus's ſickneſs and baptiſm, that he was not born of Chriſtian parents. It is generally thought that he was at firſt a ſtoic philoſopher. So [p] ſays Cave. And Mr. Jackſon [q] thinks this agreed on all hands. But I do not know of any ancient writers who call Novatus a ſtoic, though his philoſophy and eloquence be often mentioned by [r] them. Tillemont was aware of this, and ſays, ‘ that [s] the ancients have not expreſsly ſaid what was the ‘ philoſophy which he profeſſed: but we know that it was the ‘ ſtoic philoſophy which taught that rigour, and that parity of ‘ ſins, which Cyprian reproaches Novatus with. And [t] Du Pin is ſo cautious, as to ſay no more than that Novatus had been a philoſopher before he was a Chriſtian. After the ſame manner ſpeaks [u] Frederic Spanheim.

Novatus was preſbyter of the church of Rome; that is out of queſtion. But Cornelius does not inform us of the name of the biſhop by whom he was ordained: it is however very probable that it was Fabian, or one of his near predeceſſors.

St. Jerom ſays that Novatus, Cyprian's preſbyter, was the firſt author of the ſect which Novatus formed. St. Cyprian, who gives a very bad character of his preſbyter, confirms [x] that account; making him the principal cauſe of all the diſturbances that happened at Rome: and [y] Pacian, who was well acquainted with St. Cyprian's letters, writes to the ſame purpoſe. But the Greek writers take no notice of this: nor is there any mention of that African Novatus in the fragments of Cornelius's letter to Fabius, which I have largely tranſcribed.

[p] Novatianus, ex ſtoico philoſopho Chriſtianus. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. [q] Conſentiunt autem omnes, ex ſtoico philoſopho Chriſtiani nomen induiſſe Romæ. Jackſon. ibid. [r] Jactet ſe licet, et philoſophiam vel eloquentiam ſuam ſuperbis vocibus prædicet. Cypr. Ep. 55, [al. 52] p. 112. Quid ad hæc Novatianus?—— in perniciem fratrum lingua ſua perſtrepens, et facundiæ venenatæ jacula contorquens; magis durus ſecularis philoſophiæ pravitate, quam philoſophiæ dominicæ lenitate pacificus, &c. Id. Ep. 60, [Pam. 57] p. 142. Ignoſco tamen, frater, ſi quid et tu de tuo auctore præſumis, et Novatiani philoſophiam, per quam ille naufragium religionis incurrit, cum Heſiodi auctoritate coniungis. Pacian. ad Sympſon. Ep. 2. p. 308. C. ap. Bibl. Patr. T. iv. Ita tuus iſte philoſophus, ſapientiam ſuam quærens ſtatuere, &c. Id. Ibid. G. [s] Tillemont Saint Corneille, Art. iv. Mem: Ec. T. iii. P. iii. p. 15.

[t] Bib. des Aut. Ecc. Novatien.

[u] Novatianus ex philoſopho et clinico factus Romanæ eccleſiæ preſbyter, &c. Fr. Span. Hiſt. Ec. Sec. iii. p. 781.

[x] Idem eſt Novatus, qui apud nos primum diſcordiæ et ſchiſmatis incendium ſeminavit;—qui in ipſa perſecutione ad evertendas fratrum mentes alia quædam perſecutio noſtris fuit.—Plane, quoniam pro magnitudine ſua debeat Carthaginem Româ præcedere, illic majora et graviora commiſit. Qui iſtic adverſus eccleſiam diaconum fecerat, illic epiſcopum fecit. Cypr. Ep. 52, [al. 49] p. 97. [y] Ep. 3, p. 310. E. F. ap. Bibl. PP. T. iv.

Cornelius

Cornelius says, that in the time of the persecution Novatus refused to comfort the brethren, though desired by the deacons; and that he even disclaimed the character of a presbyter, and in effect renounced the Christian religion; saying that he was for another kind of philosophy. But it may be suspected that here is some mistake, or some misrepresentation. It is manifest, that during a large part of the Decian persecution, and for some good while after the martyrdom of Fabian, Novatus maintained his rank, and was in great repute with his brethren the clergy of Rome. For the letter sent to Cyprian in the name of the Roman clergy, and allowed [z] by all to have been drawn up by Novatus, was not written till about [a] the end of August 250: and the anonymous author of the tract against Novatus, joined with St. Cyprian's works, says, 'that [b] Novatus, so long as he was in 'the church, bewailed the faults of other men as his own, bore 'the burdens of the brethren, as the apostle directs, and by his 'exhortations strengthened such as were weak in the faith.' Possibly some retirement of Novatus is the foundation of this charge. But every slight or retreat, in time of persecution, is not really blameable; though such things rarely escape censure. There were other good and eminent men about that time who did the same; Cyprian in particular, who yet afterwards had a glorious martyrdom. And Novatus's treatise of Jewish meats was [c] actually written in some retired place: and, as it is a letter, it appears farther from it, that he was upon good terms with those to whom he writes, and that he had written to them more than

[z] Nam in epistola sua ita posuerunt.—Additum est etiam, Novatiano tunc scribente, et quod scripserat sua voce recitante, et presbytero Moyse, tunc adhuc confessore, nunc jam martyre, subscribente; ut lapsis infirmis, et in exitu constitutis, pax daretur. Quæ literæ per totum mundum missæ sunt, et in notitiam ecclesiis omnibus et universis fratribus perlatæ sunt. Cypr. ad Antonian. Ep. 55, [al. 52] p. 102. Vid. etiam. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 310. D. [a] Mense Augusto exeunte Clerus Romanus scribit ad Cyprianum literas, &c. Pearson. Ann. Cypr. A. 250. n. xvi. Conf. Pagi Crit. 250. n. xii.

[b] Unde igitur et tam sceleratus, et tam perditus, tam discordiæ furore vesanus, extiterit iste Novatianus, invenire non possum; qui semper in domo una, id est, Christi ecclesia, proximorum delicta ut propria fleverit, onera fratrum, sicut apostolus hortatur, sustinuerit, lubricos in fide cælesti allocutione corroboraverit. Anon. ad Novat. Hæret. p. 19. m. Oxon.

[c] Etsi mihi, fratres sanctissimi, exoptatissimus dies ille,—quo literas vestras et scripta suscipio, (quid enim me aliud nunc faciat liberiorem?) tamen non minus egregium diem et inter eximios arbitror computandum, quo similis vobis affectus debitæ caritatis remittens, et ego ad vos compari voto literas scribo. Nihil enim me, fratres sanctissimi, tantis constrictum vinculis tenet, — quam ne jacturam vobis quandam per absentiam meam putetis illatam, cui remedium connitor dare, dum elaboro vobis me præsentem frequentibus literis exhibere. Quamquam ergo et officium debitum et cura susceptа et ipsa ministerii imposita persona hanc a me literarum scribendarum exposcunt necessitatem. —Quam vero sint perversi Judæi et ab intellectu suæ legis alieni, duabus epistolis superioribus, ut arbitror, plene ostendi. De Cib. Jud. cap. 1. p. 255,—258. Ed. Jackson.

once, to comfort them, ſince his retreat; where alſo he had received divers affectionate letters from them, aſking his council and aſſiſtance. Mr. Jackſon [d] ſuppoſeth that this letter, or treatiſe, was ſent by Novatus from the place of his retreat under the Decian perſecution near the end of the year 250, to the people of the church of Rome, from whom he was then neceſſarily abſent. If this could be relied upon, it might entirely wipe off the blot which Cornelius has caſt upon Novatus: for then it might be reckoned that this retreat is the thing to which Cornelius refers, but gives it a wrong turn; whilſt from that letter it appears not to have given offence to any body at that time. But [e] ſome think that Novatus there writes in the character of a biſhop. Then this piece muſt be ſuppoſed to have been written after his ordination, and ſeparation from the church, to thoſe Chriſtians that adhered to him, and ſtood firm in the perſecution they endured, even when he was obliged to be abſent from them. If this ſhould be thought moſt probable, it ſhews, however, the good temper of Novatus at that time, his concern for the people under his care, his diligence in his charge, and the mutual affection between him and his people; and that both he and they were odious to heathens as well as to catholics: whereas Cyprian [f] intimates, that though Cornelius when biſhop was perſecuted, the Novatians lived at eaſe; which might be the caſe then, and yet at ſome other time the Novatians might have their full ſhare in the troubles brought upon Chriſtians. Cyprian himſelf was not inſenſible of this, though [g] he denies they could gain any honour by it; which I ſhall not diſpute with him at preſent. But whenever this letter was written, whether before or after his epiſcopal ordination, it does honour to Novatus. It is not the letter of a man who deſerted his charge, or apoſtatized from the goſpel, though he had retired. To all which I would

[d] Præfat. p. xi. [e] Il le qualifie du nom de lettre auſſi bien que les deux autres dont nous venons de parler; et il l'addreſſe, Au peuple qui demeure ferme dans l'evangile. [Plebi in evangelio perſtanti.] Il y parle en Evêque, et dit, que ceux à qui il ecrit, et dont la charge lui avoit été commiſe, gardoient l'evangile dans toute ſa pureté, ſans meſlange d'aucune doctrine fauſſe ou corrompue, et qu' ils l'enſeignoient de la même maniere aux autres avec courage et avec force. Par ou nous avons lieu de juger que c'eſtoit depuis ſon ſchiſme. Il eſtoit alors abſent de ſon peuple pretendu. Tillemont. Les Novatiens. Art. 3. p. 87, 88. [f] Quid ad hæc Novatianus?——Agnoſcitne jam, qui ſit ſacerdos Dei? quæ ſit eccleſia et domus Chriſti? Qui ſint Dei ſervi, quos diabolus infeſtet? Qui ſint Chriſtiani, quos antichriſtus impugnet? Neque enim quos illos, quos jam ſubegit; aut gaudet vastare, quos jam ſuos fecit. Inimicus et hoſtis eccleſiæ quos alienavit ab eccleſia et foras duxit, ut captivos et victos contemnit et præterit. Cypr. ad Cornel. Ep. 60, [57] p. 142. [g] Quanquam et aliquis ex talibus fuerit apprehenſus, non eſt quod ſibi quaſi in confeſſione noſtra blandiatur; cum conſtet, ſi occiſus fuerit extra eccleſiam fuerint, fidei coronam non eſſe, ſed pœnam potius eſſe perfidiæ. Ibid. p. 143. init.

add from Mr. Jackſon, who ſcruples not to call this ſtory of Cornelius [h] a calumny, that [i] Cyprian takes no notice of this fault among all his reproaches of Novatus.

Another thing to be obſerved of Cornelius's letter is, that it affords unexceptionable evidence of Novatus having been ordained biſhop by the hands of three biſhops.

Cornelius gives a ſad account of the ordination of Novatus, and of the perſons and methods by which it was procured: but it ought to be remembered that, in ſome of the paſſages above tranſcribed, he owns that Novatus had with him for a while five preſbyters and ſeveral confeſſors; ſome of whom were of great eminence, and had gained much honour by their confeſſions. Cornelius, in a letter to Cyprian, giving an account of the return of ſome of them to the church, writes, that [k] they owned they had concurred in the ordination of Novatus. From Pacian [l] it may be argued, that Novatus was ordained upon their particular recommendation: and St. Cyprian, in the letter he wrote to the ſame confeſſors, to congratulate them upon their return to the church, reminds them [m] 'of the great grief they 'had given him when they approved of the ſchiſm and hereſy 'of Novatus: ſo that it ſeemed,' he ſays, 'as if they had left all 'their glory behind them in the priſon.' Since then ſo large a part of the church of Rome, ſome of them men of eminence, and, in all other matters, of unblemiſhed virtue, approved of the ordination of Novatus; and at laſt came over to Cornelius, as may be ſuppoſed, chiefly for peace ſake, and in deference to the ſentiments of the majority of their brethren; it may be queſtioned whether that affair was altogether ſo ſcandalous as Cornelius has repreſented it; and it may be juſtly ſuſpected that he uſed ſtrong and aggravating expreſſions. Beſides, Novatus and his people made grievous complaints, and caſt foul reflec-

[h] Def. p. vi. [i] cujuſmodi criminis [illegible] inter omnia opprobria contra [illegible] aggeſtata, Ep. 57, non incuſavit. [illegible] [k] —— tantummodo circumſtantiæ commiſiſſe ſe quoque ſchiſmatis et hæreſis auctores fuiſſe, ut paterentur [illegible] quaſi in epiſcopum imponi. [illegible] ep. Cyprian. Ep. 49, [46] p. [illegible] Invenit [Novatus Carthaginenſis] [illegible] exercitum numero, qui tempeſtatem perſecutionis illius evaſerant; apud [illegible] Cyprianum de lapſis receptis Cornelium [illegible] Carthaginem. Dat eorum epiſtolas ad Novatianum. Ille ex auctoritate epiſtolarum, ſedente jam Romæ epiſcopo, adverſum fas ſacerdotii ſingularis, alterius epiſcopi ſibi nomen aſſumit. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 310. F. [m] Dolebam vehementer, et graviter angebar.——Poſteaquam vos de carcere prodeuntes ſchiſmaticus et hæreticus error excepit, ſic res erat, quaſi veſtra gloria in carcere remanſiſſet. Illic enim reſediſſe veſtri nominis dignitas videbatur, quando milites Chriſti non ad eccleſiam de carcere redirent, in quem prius cum eccleſiæ laude et gratulatione veniſſent. Cypr. Ep. 54, [Pam. 51] p. 99.

tions upon Cornelius; as [n] appears from one of Cornelius's own letters to Cyprian, and from divers of [o] Cyprian's letters ſtill remaining. Though therefore every thing ſaid by Novatus and his party might not be true, yet it is not impoſſible but Cornelius himſelf may have taken ſome ſteps which could not be fully juſtified. So much I think we may be allowed to ſay in behalf of Novatus, a man, whoſe faults ſtand in full light, recorded in the writings of his enemies; not without ſome aggravations and falſe colourings, as it ſeems; whilſt we have not remaining one line of his in defence of himſelf, or againſt his adverſaries.

What became of Novatus, after the conteſt about the biſhoprick of Rome, is not certainly known. Socrates [p] however ſays expreſsly, that he ſuffered martyrdom in the perſecution raiſed by the emperor Valerian. From Pacian, biſhop of Barcelona about the year 370, we know that the Novatians gloried in the founder of their ſect as a martyr. Sympronian, againſt whom Pacian writes, affirmed, that Cyprian had made mention of Novatus as a martyr, and having died before him: but [q] Pacian denies the truth of this, and ſays, that if Novatus did ſuffer ſomewhat from heathens, yet he was not put to death. Eulogius, archbiſhop of Alexandria near the end of the ſixth century, another writer againſt the Novatians, ſpeaks of a book [r] they had among them, called the Martyrdom of Novatus. But he treats it as a forgery, and ſhews it was falſe and fabulous.

[n] Qui [confeſſores] cum veniſſent, et a preſbyteris quæ geſſerant exigerentur, noviſſime quod per omnes eccleſias literæ calumniis et maledictis plenæ, eorum nomine frequentes miſſæ fuiſſent, et pene omnes eccleſias perturbaſſent; circumventos ſe eſſe affirmaverunt, nec quid in literis ineſſet ſciſſe. Cornel. ap. Cypr. Ep. 49, [al. 46] p. 92.

[o] ——quando literis ab utraque parte ſuſceptis tuas literas legimus, et epiſcopatus tui ordinationem ſingulorum auribus intimavimus. Honoris etiam communis memores, et gravitatis ſacerdotalis ac ſanctitatis reſpectum tenentes, ea quæ ex diverſo in literarum ad nos tranſmiſſum congeſta fuerant acerbationibus criminoſis reſpuimus, conſiderantes pariter et ponderantes quod in tanto fratrum numero, religioſoque conventu,—nec legi debeant, nec audiri. Neque enim facile promenda ſunt, et incaute ac temere publicanda, quæ diſcordioſo ſtilo ſcripta audientibus ſcandalum moveant, et fratres longe poſitos ac trans mare conſtitutos incerta opinione confundant. Cypr. Ep. 45, [al. 42] p. 87. Quod autem quædam de illo inhoneſta et maligna jactantur, nolo mireris.——Exploraſſe autem collegas noſtros ſcias, et veriſſime comperiſſe, nulla illum libelli, ut quidam jactant, labe maculatum eſſe; ſed neque cum epiſcopis qui ſacrificaverunt communicationem ſacrilegam niſcuiſſe.——Sed et quod paſſim communicare ſacrificatis Cornelium tibi nunciatum eſt, hoc etiam de apoſtatarum fictis rumoribus naſcitur. Cyprian. ad Antonian. Ep. 55, [al 52] p. 105, 106.

[p] Socrat. H. E. L. iv. cap. 28. p. 246. B.

[q] Nam quod, ante paſſum Novatianum, putas, et Cyprianum dixiſſe ſubjungis; Præceſſit me adverſarius meus; vide, quam manifeſte reſpondeam. Novatianus nunquam martyrium tulit, nec ex verbis beatiſſimi Cypriani auditum iſtud, aut lectum eſt.—Porro, etiamſi paſſus eſt aliquid Novatianus, non tamen etiam occiſus, non tamen coronatus. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 308. G. H.

[r] Eulog. Contr. Novat. Libr. vi. ap. Phot. Cod. 208. p. 530. et Cod. 280. p. 1621.

According

According to his account it was [s] a trifling thing, a little book of a few pages. It may be queſtioned then whether there be ſufficient evidence remaining to ſatisfy us that Novatus died a martyr: though it may be reckoned probable from the common opinion of his followers, and from the forecited paſſage of the treatiſe concerning Jewiſh meats, written in a place of retreat or baniſhment, that he was a confeſſor. Nor does Pacian deny this, but ſeems to grant as much.

II. Novatus is generally reckoned a ſchiſmatic and a heretic. Cornelius, in his letters to Cyprian, gives him [t] both theſe hard names: and Cyprian likewiſe ſpeaks [u] in the ſame manner. What was his ſchiſm we have ſeen; what was his hereſy is not quite ſo clear. St. Jerom, as before cited, ſays Novatus was againſt receiving apoſtates, though they repented. And undoubtedly that was his opinion, but perhaps not the whole of it; for, as this diſpute had it's riſe upon occaſion of the great numbers of perſons who had lapſed ſome way or other in the Decian perſecution, Novatus ſeems to have extended his ſevere doctrine to all ſuch; not only apoſtates, or thoſe who had actually ſacrificed, but to others alſo, who had been guilty of any ſlip or fault at that time.

Euſebius ſays that [x] Novatus excluded thoſe from all hopes of ſalvation who had lapſed in time of perſecution, though they gave ſigns of a ſincere converſion and repentance: but Socrates ſays, his [y] opinion was, that they who had ſacrificed in the perſecution ſhould not be received to communion: they ſhould be exhorted to repent; but their pardon ſhould be referred to God, who is able and has a right to forgive ſins. And this is the principle of the Novatians; which [z] Cyprian ridicules and expoſes, and Ambroſe [a] condemns, and ſhews [b] to be extremely abſurd and unreaſonable.

[s] ... Vid. ſupra not. [r] p. 213.

... Euſ. L. ... Socr. L. iv. cap. 28. p. 245. B.

[t] Ut ſcias quatenus ... ſchiſmaticus et ... ſemper junctos habeat. Cornel. Ep. 50, [al. 48] p. 129. p. 52.

[u] Poſſeda ... prodeuntes ſchiſmata ... error excepit. Cypr. ...

[x] ... ἀμαρτίας χαμαιτυπίας, ... τὰς ἐπιστροφὰς χαίρειν, καὶ ... ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλειν.

[y] Ἐκεῖνος τοὺς ἐπὶ ... ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποστεῖν, ... τὸ δὲ συγχωρεῖν ... ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἁμαρτήματα.

[z] Atque ô fruſtranda fraternitatis irriſor! ô miſerorum lamentantium caduca deceptio!——hortari ad ſatisfactoris pœnitentiam, et ſubtrahere de ſatisfactione medicinam; dicere fratribus noſtris, Plange, et lachrymas funde, et diebus et noctibus ingemiſce,—ſed extra eccleſiam noſtram omnia iſta moriere: quæcunque ad pacem pertinent, facies; ad nullam pacem, quam quæris, accipies. Cypr. Ep. 55, [Pam. 52] p. 114. in.

[a] Quid autem durius, quam ut indicant pœnitentiam, quam non relaxent; cum utique veniam negando, incentivum auferent pœnitentiæ? Ambr. de Pœn. l. i. cap. 1. n. iv. p. 390. Bened.

[b] Fruſtra enim dicitis, vos prædicare

This, most probably, is the true account: and perhaps Eusebius, and [c] some others, who speak much after the same manner with him, ought to be so understood likewise, though they seem to express themselves differently; for Ambrose too charges them with denying salvation to men. The meaning of those writers I suppose to be this, that the Novatians by their hard-hearted doctrine, and even letting them die out of the communion of the church, discouraged men's [e] repentance, and consequently obstructed their pardon and [f] salvation. Novatus then forbade the receiving to the communion of the church such as had fallen in time of persecution, whilst other Christians were for receiving them after tokens of repentance, suitable to the kind and degree of the offence; some after a shorter, others not till after a longer time of humiliation and penance; all however who desired it in [g] the near approach of death. In this way of conceiving of this matter we are confirmed by the accounts Eusebius has left us of the epistles of Dionysius of Alexandria to several, upon the doctrine of repentance, and the various degrees or kinds of offences.

But though the controversy upon this head was occasioned by the falls of some under persecution, it is not unlikely that Novatus himself, or his followers afterwards, carried this rigour and severity to other sins, sometimes called mortal, and reckoned more heinous than others; such as adultery, fornication, and the like; withholding the communion of the church from all who were surprised into any of these. So say [h] Pacian, and [i] Socrates, and the [k] author of the Questions out of the Old and New Testament, and [l] St. Ambrose, that the Novatians did

pœnitentiam, qui tollitis fructum pœnitentiæ. Homines enim ad aliquod studium aut præmiis aut fructibus incitantur. Id. ib. cap. 16. p. 413. Conf. cap. 11. p. 404. [c] —adimendo spem salutis, denegando misericordiam patris, repuendo pœnitentiam fratris. Anonym. ad Novatian. Hæret. apud Cyprian p. 16. a. Oxon. Et tu iam, Novatiane, Judicas, et nullam spem pacis ac misericordiæ habere lapsos prædicas. Id p. 19. infr. m. [d] Sed quid mirum, si salutem negatis aliis, qui vestram recusatis? Ambr. ib. l. ii. c. 4, [al. 5] p. 422. [e] Hinc ergo apparet, Novatianum cum dolo dicere agendam pœnitentiam. Ut quid enim pœniteret, si delictum aboleri negatur? Ex Vet. et Nov. Test. Qu. cii. ap. August. T. iii. in App. [f] En, qui salutis viam fratribus inexorabili religione præcludat! Pacian. Ep. 2. p. 309. A. [g] Ut lapsis infirmis et in exitu constitutis pax daretur. ap. Cypr. Ep. 55, [al. 52] p. 102. [h] Transeo omnis Novatianorum, quem ad me conferetis undique propositionibus deatus, Symproniane frater, hoc continet: quod post baptismum pœnitere non liceat: quod mortale peccatum ecclesia donare non possit; imo quod ipsa pereat recipiendo pœnitentes. Pacian. Ep. 3. init. [i] Καταμαθεῖν τῆς Καππαδοκίας τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βαπτισμα ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐξωθεῖσι τῆς κοινωνίας οἱ Νοβατιανοί. Socrat. L. v. c. 22. p. 288 B. [k] Novatianus, majora, inquit, crimini nominatim remitti prohibebat, id est, idololatria et fornicatio post lavacrum. Qu. cii. August. T. iii. [l] Sed aiunt se, exceptis gravioribus criminibus, relaxare veniam levioribus. Non hoc quidem auctor vestri erroris Novatianus, qui nemini pœnitentiam dandam putavit. Ambr. de Pœnit. l. iii. c. 3. p. 393. B.

not

not allow the church a right to pardon mortal ſins, or greater ſins, committed after baptiſm. And St. Ambroſe will have it that [m] Novatus was more rigid than his followers, refuſing pardon to all ſins, ſmall as well as great. Theodoret therefore ſays, that [n] among the Novatians repentance is not to be mentioned: and Cyprian in [o] very ſtrong terms calls Novatus not only a deſerter of the church, but an enemy of mercy, a murderer of repentance, a teacher of pride, a corrupter of truth, and a deſtroyer of charity.

This then was the hereſy of Novatus; the principle by which he and his people were diſtinguiſhed from other Chriſtians: for which they arrogated to themſelves (as [p] Euſebius, and [q] Auguſtine, and [r] Ambroſe, and [s] other writers intimate), or received from their adverſaries, by way of deriſion, the denomination of Cathari, or puritans.

Nor does it appear that Novatus went into any other error of moment; for Cyprian is not unwilling to allow that [t] he agreed with catholic Chriſtians upon the doctrine of the trinity. Socrates, the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, ſays this [u] was the only innovation made by the founder of the Novatian ſect, not to receive penitents to communion: and he adds, that [x] they celebrated Eaſter at the ſame time with the Romans. Nevertheleſs, afterwards there aroſe a diſpute among them upon this point, which divided the ſect; as is related by [y] Socrates and [z] Sozomen.

I took notice juſt now, that Cyprian was not unwilling to allow that Novatus thought rightly about the trinity; but whether he was really orthodox, or held the Nicene faith, is another queſtion, and a point not ſo eaſily decided. From [a] Jerom and

[m] Nec Novatianus probatur, qui vetuerit ſemel omnibus. Ambroſ. ib. [n] Ἐπιτιμίας τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. συλλόγων. ἐξορίζουσι. Theod. H. F. l. iii. cap. 5. [o] Hoſtis ecclesiæ, miſericordiæ hoſtis, doctor penitentiæ, doctor ſuperbiæ, corruptor, perditor caritatis. Cypr. Ep. 60, [al. 57] p. 142. [p] Κατὰ τὰς ἀποφάσεις. l. vi. cap. 43. [q] Cathari, qui ſeipſos illo nomine ſuperbiſſimo, propter mundiciam ſuperbiſſimæ ſuperbiſſime nominant. Auguſtin. [r] Ut ſunt doctores Novatianorum, qui mundos ſe appellant. Ambr. [s] Eulog. ap. Phot. cod. 280. p. 1620. v. 50. [t] Idem Deum eundem quam et nos Deum confitetur, eundem Filium, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, noſſe dicuntur, nec hoc adjuvare tales poteſt. Ep. 69, [al. 76] p. 183.

[u] Νοβατος μεν γαρ, ος αρχηγος εγενετο της αιρεσεως, της μεταμελειας επι τοις αμαρτημασιν εις κοινωνιαν ουκ προσιετο, και τουτο μονον εκαινοτομει. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 24. p. 670. A. [x] Ibid. [y] Socr. l. v. cap. 21. p. 282. [z] Soz. l. vi. cap. 24. l. vii. cap. 18. [a] Tranſit ad inclytum martyrem Cyprianum, et dicit, Tertulliani librum, cui titulus eſt de Trinitate, ſub nomine ejus Conſtantinopoli a Macedoniane partis hæreticis lectitari. In quo crimine mentitur duo. Nam nec Tertulliani liber eſt, nec Cypriani dicitur, ſed Novatiani, cujus et inſcribitur titulo: et auctoris eloquium, ſtyli proprietas demonſtrat. Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 415. T. iv. Bened.

Rufinus

[b] Rufinus we learn, that the people of the Macedonian sect at Constantinople were fond of the book which Novatus wrote upon the trinity, supposing it favourable to their notion about the Spirit. And among the moderns Frederic Spanheim says, that [c] though Novatus maintained a trinity of persons in one Godhead, against Sabellius, and asserted Christ's divinity, yet he speaks in a most dangerous manner of the Spirit, as less than Christ, and a creature. Tillemont [d] says, that, in the 22d and 24th chapters of his book upon the trinity, he teaches the Son to be less than the Father, and the Spirit to be less than the Son; and that there are in him other things tending to Arianism. Du Pin [e] and [f] bishop Bull are better satisfied with the treatise upon the trinity. But enough of that matter.

The Novatians are said by several ancient writers to have condemned second marriages as unlawful and sinful, insomuch that they would not receive those to communion who married a second time. So [g] Epiphanius, and [h] Augustine in his book of Heresies: and in another work, entitled, Of the advantage of widowhood, if it be his, he [i] joins them with the Cataphrygians, as agreeing with them in this respect: and Rufinus [k] upon the Creed says roundly, that Novatus, meaning I suppose his sect, forbade second marriages absolutely, and in all cases. Theodoret says this [l] was an additional doctrine of the Novatians. Socrates [m] asserts, that the Novatians were not all of one mind upon this head: the Novatians in Phrygia, he says, condemned second marriages; they of Constantinople had no positive rule concerning this matter; but the Novatians in the West received bigamists to communion without scruple. This is likely to be the truth: some had this rigid sentiment, but not all; for it being not a doctrine of Novatus himself, but added afterwards, as Theodoret assures us, all the sect was not agreed in this point. However, here we see another sin, beside apostacy, that excluded

[b] Vid. Ruf. de adult. Libr. Orig. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 253. [c] Ac quamquam in una deitate personarum trinitatem distinguit, contra Sabellium, adstruatque Christi divinitatem; tamen de Sp. S. ut minore Christo, et creatura, locutus admodum periculose est. Spanh. Hist. Ec. Sec. iii. p. 782. [d] See Tillemont. Les Novatiens, art. 3. [e] Du Pin. Bibl. des Aut. Eccl. [f] Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. x. [g] Οὗτοι δὲ ὁ βούλονται δίγαμοις ἐπικοινωνεῖν· εἰ γάρ τις μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα συναφθεὶη γυναικὶ δευτέρᾳ, παρὰ τούτοις οὐκ εἰσδέχθησεται ἔτι. Epiph. Hær. 59. n. iii. p. 495. [h] Secundas nuptias non admittunt. Hær. 38. [i] Aug. de Bono. Vid. cap. 4. T. vi. Bened. [k] Et quod Novatus sollicitavit, lapsis pœnitentiam denegando, et secundas nuptias, cum forte iniri eas necessitas exegerit, condemnando. Rufin. in Symb. Ap. cap. 39. p. 226. ap. Cyprian. Op. edit. Baluz. p. 27. Oxon. ap. Hieron. Oper. p. 142. f. T. v. Benedict. [l] Οἱ δὲ τοῦτο διαδοχὴ καὶ ἑτέρα τῷ δόγματι προσέθεικαν· τοὺς γὰρ δευτέρους γάμους ὡμίλησοτας τῶν ὑφ' ἑαυτοῖς μυστηρίων. Hær. Fab. l. iii. c. v. p. 229. D. [m] Socr. l. v. cap. 22 p. 288. B. C.

men

men from communion; for the Novatians, that condemned second marriages, esteemed such as married a second time after baptism to be unworthy of that privilege.

And perhaps it may be allowed not to be an improbable conjecture, that this principle was borrowed from the Montanists, and therefore prevailed most among the Novatians of Phrygia; though, possibly, some few in other places also approved of the same rigid doctrine. Pacian expressly says, that [n] the Novatians made great use of Tertullian; meaning, I suppose, those works of his which were written after he had imbibed the Cataphrygian doctrine. Pacian says likewise, that [o] when Sympronian first wrote to him he did not well know what to think of him; whether he ought to take him for a follower of Montanus, or of Novatus.

It is scarce needful to observe, that they baptized afresh all who came over to them from other sects; because it seems to be a necessary consequence of their refusing communion with other Christians, as not sufficiently pure. This was the doctrine of Novatus himself, as Cyprian allows [p] plainly. He says that herein Novatus aped the catholic church.

I shall add here but one thing more. Eulogius [q] says that the Novatians at Alexandria did not pay due reverence to the martyrs, nor [r] allow that there was any virtue in their reliques. He does not say that this was the common opinion of the Novatians; but it seems to me, that their rigid principles would generally lead them to deny those who suffered in the catholic church to be true martyrs. Nay, [s] the catholics would not allow the Novatians to have any martyrs: how then could the Novatians suppose there were martyrs among their adversaries? especially [t] since they thought the church quite corrupted, ruined and destroyed, by receiving great sinners upon repentance, and communicating with them. They might likewise think

[n] Tertullianus post hæresim suam: (nam multa inde sumpsistis.) Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 314. E. [o] Cum primum scripseras, Cataphrygem putabam. Id. ib. p. 308. A. [p] Nec nos movet, frater carissime, quod in literis tuis complexus es; Novatienses rebaptizare eos, quos a nobis sollicitant:——Nam Novatianus, simiarum more, quæ cum homines non sint, homines tamen imitantur, vult ecclesiæ catholicæ auctoritatem sibi et veritatem vindicare, quando ipse in ecclesia non sit.——Sciens enim unum esse baptisma, hoc unum sibi vindicat, ut apud se esse ecclesiam dicat, et nos hæreticos faciat. Cyprian. ad Jubaian. Ep. 73. p. 198. [q] —φησι και τους εν Αλεξανδρειᾳ Ναυατιανους κατα των μαρτυρων του Χριστου κενολογουντας. Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1617. fin. [r] Ib. p. 1620. in. [s] See before, p. 212. Note g. [t] Nulline apud nos confessores, martyres nulli, nulli immaculati atque integri sacerdotes, quos catenæ, quos ignes, quos gladii probaverunt? Fuere, inquies, sed negatores recipiendo perierunt.—Interim cui persuadere poteris, quod lapsis receptis ecclesia tota conciderit? quod admissis pœnitentibus, admittentium populus negator effectus sit? Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 309. G.

themselves

themselves obliged to ape the catholics in this, as well as in some other matters: and, besides, the allowing this would be giving an advantage [u] to some arguments brought by the catholics against their relentless unforgiving doctrine; which would be in effect yielding up their cause, and the main ground of dissension and separation.

This is said, supposing Eulogius by martyrs to mean martyrs in the catholic church, since the separation of the Novatians. If he means all martyrs in general, and such as were allowed that character by the Novatians themselves, as having suffered in communion with them, or in the pure times of the church, before the rise of this controversy; then it will be thought by some, that what Eulogius complains of may be esteemed rather a proof of the judgment and good sense of the Novatians, that they had not that excessive veneration for martyrs, which was then become fashionable among Christians.

III. When Novatus embraced the rigid principle above described, is disputed. Some think it was taken up only as acceptable to some people, and as a method of throwing hatred upon Cornelius, who had obtained the see of Rome, and was for allowing the peace of the church to such as had fallen in time of persecution, and gave proofs of repentance. So [x] Pacian seems to say. And [y] Tillemont argues, that Novatus did not make any schism in the church till after the election of Cornelius. But Pearson [z] and [a] some others have thought the schism commenced at the very beginning of 251; which is argued from some words of Cornelius in the letter formerly abridged by us; where he says that [b] Moses the martyr, who [c] is supposed to have died early in the year 251, had withdrawn himself from Novatus, and five other presbyters. The learned Benedictine, who writes the life of St. Cyprian, takes [d] a middle way, as he

[u] Plurimos comperimus se demum reformasse post lapsum, et pro nomine Dei passos. Num possumus his martyrum consortia negare, quibus Dominus Jesus non negavit? Audemus igitur dicere, non esse his vitam redditam, quibus Christus coronam reddidit? Ambr. de Pœn. l. i. cap. 9, [al. 10] p. 401. Et Conf. Anonym. adversus Novatian. ap. Cypr. p. 17. fin. p. 18. init. Oxon. [x] Audite quæso, et totum ordinem vestri erroris advertite. Cornelius jam Romæ episcopus a sexdecim episcopis factus locum cathedræ vacantis acceperat.—Tum forte quidam presbyter Novatus ex Africa.—Romam venit.—Nec multo post, Novatianum istum episcopatu Cornelii anxium, (nam sibi sperverat;) cum aliquantis, ut in tali re fieri, ex sua parte fautoribus nutantem imperitum dubitantem fovet, ut magnum aliquid operet, hortatur. Invenit aliquos ex eorum numero qui tempestatem persecutionis Cornelius evaserunt: apud quos, hanc ipsam de lapsis receptis Cornelio confiaret invidiam. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 310. E. F.

[y] See Tillem. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. S. Corneille art. 3. et note iii. [z] Vid. Pearson. Ann. Cyprian. 251. num. i.

[a] Vales. Annot. in Euse. l. vi. c. 43. p. 137. a. [b] Euseb. l. vi. c. 43. p. 245. C. D. [c] Vid. Pearson. ib. et Pagi Crit. 251. n. xiv. [d] Sic mediam inter utrosque

says,

ſays, between theſe two ſentiments: he thinks the ſchiſm did not break out till after the election of Cornelius, but that, for ſome good while before, the foundation of it was laid, and divers ſteps taken; which I apprehend muſt be granted: what Cornelius ſays of Moſes ſeems a good proof of it. Another argument of this may be, that the ordination of Novatus very ſpeedily followed that of Cornelius, ſo that the deputies from Novatus arrived in Africa about the ſame time with thoſe from Cornelius, as appears from [e] St. Cyprian, and is allowed by Tillemont [f].

Whenever Novatus firſt approved the rigid maxims upon which his ſect was formed, it is now the [g] common opinion of learned moderns that Novatus, preſbyter of Carthage, under Cyprian, was the firſt author of theſe meaſures; agreeably to the paſſages of Jerom, Cyprian, and Pacian, which we took notice of ſome while ago [h].

In January 251, ſay [i] Pearſon and [k] Pagi, Novatus came from Africa to Rome, and there drew Novatus, preſbyter of that city, into his meaſures; or, as they expreſs it, ſeparated him from the church. Moſes, who before was intimate with Novatus, hereupon ſhews his diſlike of him, and of five other preſbyters, of the ſame ſentiments and meaſures. Moſes dies ſoon after. When the perſecution abated, the diſturbance broke out, upon account of the election of a biſhop at Rome.

But here, in my opinion, ariſes a very conſiderable difficulty. Moſes is ſuppoſed to have died at Rome in January, or February, 251, and before his death to have ſhewn a diſlike of Novatus, and five other preſbyters of Rome, on account of meaſures they had been led into by Novatus, preſbyter of Carthage, lately arrived there. But [l] Tillemont ſhews it to be very probable that Novatus, Cyprian's preſbyter, was yet in Africa in

[e] ...viam iniho, ut ex utraque ſententia quid aſſumam, aliquid etiam reſecturus. Etſi enim ſchiſma ante Cornelii ordinationem erupiſſe non credam, ... tamen multo ante occultis motibus informatam et praeparatam. Cyprian. ap. Cypr. Bened. p. 84. ... p. 85, 86. [f] Vid. Cypr. Ep. ... Ep. 45. [al. 42.] [f] Il paroît que ces deux lettres furent apportées en même temps. Et c'eſt ce qui ... de dire, que la faction de Novat commence à ſe former des deſolation de S. Corneille, et qu'elle ... que l'on parla de l'elire. ... St. Corneille art. 7. p. 26. ... de Corneille——fût neanmoins bientôt ſuivi preſque auſſitoſt par un ſchiſme tres dangereux, dont Novat fût l'auteur, et Novatien l'executeur et le miniſtre. Tillemont. Saint Corneille, art. 3. p. 10.

[h] See before, p. 206, 210. [i] Ann. Cypr. 251. n. i. [k] Sub initio itaque Januarii Novatus, relicto in Africa Feliciſſimo, Romam venit, et ſeparavit ab eccleſia Novatianum. Quare Novatianum, antea ſibi maxime familiarem, Moyſes preſbyter et confeſſor illuſtris, adhuc ſuperſtes, ſed paulo ante mortem, a communione ſua ſeparavit, ut habet Cornelius epiſtola ad Fabium Antiochenſem epiſcopum, apud Euſebium. lib. vi. cap. 43. Moyſes autem paulo poſt moritur in carcere, hoc ipſo menſe exeunte. Pagi Crit. 251. n. xiv. [l] See Tillem. Mem. Ec. Corneille Art. 3. note iii.

February,

February, if not alſo in March, the ſame year. And I own it ſeems to me moſt probable that he muſt have been at Carthage in the month of March: how then is it poſſible that he ſhould have miſled thoſe preſbyters at Rome before the death of Moſes?

I beg leave therefore to mention a thought, to be conſidered and examined by the curious: it ſeems to me that too much regard is paid to what Cyprian writes of his preſbyter Novatus, as if he had been the chief author of all the diſturbances at Rome. For the Greek writers, who appear to be well acquainted with the Novatian ſect, ſay nothing of this African Novatus; nor does Cornelius in the fragments of his letter to Fabian of Antioch, preſerved in Euſebius, take any notice of him. Indeed Cornelius, in a [m] letter to Cyprian, mentions this perſon among other legates in the ſecond deputation ſent by his rival from Rome to Africa; but he does not lay any thing particularly to his charge: and he there [n] actually calls another perſon author of the ſchiſm. It is apparent, from Cyprian's anſwer to that letter, that [o] Cornelius had never ſent him any account of the conduct of the African Novatus. But Cyprian, upon the bare mention of the name of his preſbyter, being full of reſentment, goes into a kind of declamation; and, beſide what that Novatus had done at Carthage, he tells Cornelius a ſtory of what he ſuppoſed he had done at Rome: and he ſeems to think he knew this better than Cornelius himſelf; at the ſame time, what he ſays appears to have no other foundation but ſuſpicion and conjecture.

I would therefore diſpoſe things at Rome about this time in the following order: Moſes died in January, or the beginning of February, 251: before his death he obſerved caballing, and intereſt-making for the chair of Rome; which occaſioned his ſhewing a diſlike of Novatus, and five other preſbyters of that city. Perhaps likewiſe ſome ſchemes were now propoſed relating to the treatment of the lapſed, which he did not approve of. After his death, and before the election of Cornelius, which happened in June 251, Novatus of Carthage came to Rome, and joined the party of the Roman preſbyter of that name: and I ſuppoſe he continued to favour that intereſt; and he may be allowed to have fomented the diſſenſions at Rome. But, ſo far as

[m] Puto Nicoſtratum, et Novatum, et Euariſtum, et Primum, Et Dionyſium illo jam perveniſſe. Invigiletur ergo, &c. Corn. ad Cyprian. ap. Cypr. Ep. 50, [al. 48] [n] Euariſtum vero auctorem ſchiſmatis fuiſſe, &c. Ib. [o] Nam de Novato nihil inde ad nos fuerat nuntiandum, cum magis per nos vobis debeat Novatus oſtendi, rerum novarum ſemper cupidus, &c. Cyprian. Ep. 52, [al. 49] p. 96.

I can

I can perceive, there is no ground for thinking the African Novatus the first author of the Novatian rigid principle, and the Novatian sect, but the conjectural story of Cyprian, and the authority of those few other writers, who have taken things upon trust from him, without any nice inquiry or examination.

As for the exact time when our Novatus took up his rigid scheme of church discipline; whether before or after the ordination of Cornelius, and the particular occasion of it, and whether it was the result of his own serious thoughts, or whether he was led into it by views of private interest, or by the management of some designing and artful adviser; these are matters very much in the dark. I know of no remaining evidence sufficient to afford satisfaction in these points; nor do I see how they can ever be fully cleared up, unless some more of our author's own writings, or of his followers, should be brought to light, which we have no reason to expect.

IV. When Novatus was ordained he and his people were not idle or unactive, but supported his election to the utmost of their power. His deputies, as was observed before, arrived at Carthage about the same time with those from Cornelius. It is now [r] the general opinion of learned men, that Cornelius was ordained on the 4th day of June 251; and those learned men suppose that the deputies of Novatus might come to Carthage with an account of his ordination likewise in the month of July the same year. There [q] matters were held in suspense for a while, till they should receive a clearer account of Cornelius's election.

Novatus sent abroad letters and deputies to many other churches, as is apparent from the epistles of [r] Cornelius and [s] Cyprian, authentic witnesses in this case. And though the churches were generally restored to peace and tranquillity in the space of a few years, as [t] appears from what Dionysius of Alexandria writes in a letter to pope Stephen, it is nevertheless certain that they had been greatly disturbed by this affair. The many epistles or treatises, written by the same Dionysius upon this occasion, are a proof that many relished the rigid doctrine of this sect. Fabius, bishop of Antioch, in particular, had been their

[p] Vid. Pearson. Ann. Cypr. 251, n. vi. vii. viii. ix. Pagi Crit. 251, n. xix. et seqq. Tillem. S. Corneille Art. ii. [q] Sed cum statuissemus collegæ complures, qui in unum conveneramus, ut legatis ad vos tegpiscopis nostris Caldonio et Fortunato missis, omnia integra suspenderentur, donec ad nos iidem collegæ nostri rebus illic aut ad pacem redactis, aut pro veritate amplius, redirent. Cypr. ad Corn. Ep. 48 [al. 45] p. 90, 91, Conf. Ep. 44 [al. 41] p. 85. [r] —noviſſime, quod per omnes eccleſias literæ calumniis et maledictis plenæ, eorum nomine frequentes miſſæ fuiſſent, et pene omnes eccleſias perturbaſſent. Cornel. ap. Cypr. Ep. 49, [al. 46,] p. 22. [s] —et per plurimas civitates novos apoſtolos ſuos mittat.—Cypr. Ep. 55, p. 112. [t] Vid. Euſeb. l. vii. cap 4. et Pagi Crit. 256, n. xiv, xv.

friend

friend and favourer. Marciani, bishop of Arles, was firm in the same principle and cause in the time of pope [u] Stephen: nor is it known that [x] he ever deserted them.

Besides, for keeping up their interest, there were new bishops ordained, and set over those who any where separated from the catholic church upon the ground of this principle. Of this also there is authentic evidence from [y] Cyprian himself. There [z] seems to have been a new bishop, by name Maximus, appointed for the Novatian party at Carthage, Cyprian's own diocese.

Though therefore Novatus and his principles had been condemned and rejected by most Christian bishops, and by the majority of the clergy and people of their several churches, at the time of Dionysius's writing the forementioned letter to Stephen, Novatus still continued to have a numerous party in many places, separated from the catholic church. However, we find no farther mention made of them in the third century, though that has been distinguished by Cave with the name and title of the Novatian age.

One of the canons [a] of the council of Nice, in 325, relates to them. Socrates [b] says, 'that Constantine, solicitous for peace, 'and desirous to secure the concord and harmony of the churches, 'invited Acesius, bishop of the Novatian sect, to come to that 'council. When the creed had been composed and subscribed 'by the synod, the emperor asked Acesius, whether he also 'assented to that creed, and to the determination concerning the 'feast of Easter? He answered the emperor, that there was 'nothing new in what the synod had determined; for it was the 'same that had been delivered to him as from the beginning, 'and from the times of the apostles; both with regard to the 'form of faith, and the time of keeping Easter. Whereupon 'the emperor inquiring, What then was the occasion of his se- 'paration from the communion of the church? he related what 'had happened under Decius in the time of the persecution, 'and gave him an account of the strictness of their severe rule 'of discipline; which was, that they who after baptism com- 'mitted any such sin, as the divine scriptures call mortal, should 'not be admitted to a participation of the divine mysteries:

[u] Vid. Cypr. Ep. 68, [al. 67.] [x] See Tillem. St. Cyprien. Art. 39. [y] —et per plurimas civitates novos apostolos suos mittat,—cumque jampridem per omnes provincias et per urbes singulas ordinati sint episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persecutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios pseudoepiscopos audeat. Cypr. Ep. 55. p. 113. [z] Nam et pars Novatiani maximum presbyterum, nuper ad nos a Novatiano legatum missum, atque a nostra communione rejectum, nunc istic sibi facit pseudoepiscopum dicitur. Id. Ep. 59. p. 132. [a] Can. viii. [b] Socrat. lib. i. cap. 10.

'they ſhould be exhorted to repentance, but pardon ought not 'to be expected from the prieſts, but from God, who is able 'and has authority to forgive ſins. When Acefius had ſaid this, 'the emperor replied; Set a "ladder, then, Acefius, and go up 'to heaven alone."

The ſame ſtory is told by [c] Sozomen, poſſibly taken from Socrates. It ought however to be obſerved, that [d] Valeſius diſputes the truth of this relation: on the other hand, Baſnage defends it againſt the objections of that learned writer.

Thoſe ancient eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians have not particularly informed us of the place where Acefius was then biſhop. Tillemont, ſpeaking of this matter, ſays, Acefius [e] was biſhop in thoſe parts; that is, ſomewhere not very far off from Nice. Baſnage [f] argues, that he was then biſhop of the Novatians at Byzantium. It is certain he [h] was afterwards biſhop of that people in that city, then called Conſtantinople.

In [i] 326, Conſtantine made a law ſomewhat favourable to them, giving them their churches and cemiteries, provided they had never belonged to the catholics. But [k] in the ſevere edict of 331, or thereabout, the Novatians are joined with the Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, and Caraphrygians, and other ſects: their places of worſhip are to be taken from them; they are forbidden to aſſemble in public or private; and their books are to be ſought for and deſtroyed. But [m] it is the opinion of ſome learned men, that this edict had but little effect with regard to the Novatians. Sozomen's reflections upon this edict are ſuch as theſe: 'By [n] means of this law other ſects have 'been in a manner buried in oblivion: for in the times of the 'preceding emperors [o] all the followers of Chriſt, though they 'had different opinions, were conſidered by the Gentiles as all 'one, and ſuffered all alike. Nor could they diſturb each other, 'because of the common calamities; for which reaſon, they all 'held their aſſemblies without much difficulty: and as they frequently met together, though they were few in number, they 'were not quite broken, but kept up their ſeveral intereſts.

[c] Sozom. l. ii. c. 32. [d] Valeſ. Annot. p. 53. [e] Tillem. Ann. 325, num. xxxiii. [f] Baſn. Ann. tom. i. Pagi Crit. 326, n. ix. [h] Vid. Soz. p. 433. D. [i] Vid. Baſn. ib. Tillem. as before [k] Sozom. l. ii. c. 32. [m] Vid. Baſnag. ib. Tillem. as before p. 95. [n] Before, p. 95. [o] Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν πρὸ ἐκείνου βασιλέων, ὅσοι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐσέβοντο, εἰ καὶ τὰς δόξας διέφερον, πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἱ αὐτοὶ ἐνομίζοντο, καὶ κοινὰς συμφορὰς ἔπασχον· ὅθεν οὐκ ἐμάχοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους διὰ τὰς κοινὰς συμφορὰς καὶ τὰς συνόδους ἐποιοῦντο· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ πολλοὶ ὄντες ἐκ τοῦ παραχρῆμα ἐξέλιπον, ἀλλὰ διέμενον ἕκαστος ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἐκκλησιάζοντες. Ibid. p. 493. B.

'But [p] after the publication of this edict they could not ... publicly, it being prohibited; nor privately, the bish... clergy of every city narrowly observing them. From that time great numbers of them were induced out of fear to join themselves to the catholic church. And they who persisted in their particular sentiments not leaving successors, their sects died away: forasmuch as they were not allowed to assemble together, nor could they without danger teach their principles privately to any. And indeed the other sects from the beginning had but few followers, either because of the absurdity of their opinions, or the unskilfulness of their teachers: but the Novatians having good leaders, and being of the same mind with the catholic church upon the doctrine of the Deity, were numerous from the beginning, and have continued to be so, without suffering much by this law: and the emperor himself, as may be supposed, softened it of his own accord with regard to them, designing rather to frighten than hurt his subjects. And moreover Acesius, then bishop of that sect at Constantinople, being esteemed by the emperor for the sanctity of his life, it is likely, spoke a good word for the church under his care. As for the Cataphrygians, in other parts of the empire they declined, as most others did, excepting only in Phrygia, and the neighbouring countries; where from the time of Montanus they have been numerous, and still continue so to be.'

The Novatians suffered together with the catholics in the Arian persecution under Constantius, about [q] the year 356. Agelius, then bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, [r] saved himself by flight: but many of his people, eminent for piety, suffered greatly at that time. 'The Arians,' as Socrates [s] says, 'demolished many churches in divers cities, by orders of Macedonius, their bishop at Constantinople. The emperor's edict, and the violence of Macedonius, threatened likewise a church of the Novatians at Constantinople. It's ruin was near, and the persons were at hand, to whom the execution was committed: but the Novatians prevented them after a sort; for, gathering together in a great multitude, and being assisted likewise by a good number of well-meaning catholics, they pulled down

[p] μετα δε τουτον τον νομον, ουτε δημοσια εκκλησιαζειν εξεστιν καλουμενοις, ουτε λαθρα, των κατα πολιν επισκοπων και κληρικων τηρουντων. v. λ. ib. C. [q] See Tillemont, Mem. Tom. vi. P. ii. Les Ariens Art. 63. [r] Vid. Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 38, p. 142. B. C. [s] καθ-ους μεν ουν εν πολλαις πολεσι κατα διαφορους τοπους εκκλησιαι κατεσκαφησαν, μαλιστα υπο Μακεδονιου επισκοπου Κωνσταντινουπολεως. Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 38. p. 143. A. [t] L. iv. cap. 20. p. 172. C. D.

'the

'the church, and conveyed all the materials to another place 'without the city.' So writes Socrates. And Sozomen [t] confirms his account. About the same time the church [u] of the Novatians at Cyzicum was quite demolished by Eleusius, the Arian bishop of that city, an intimate friend of the forementioned Macedonius.

The Novatians however had honourable satisfaction made them afterwards. With the leave [x] of the emperor Julian they rebuilt their church at Constantinople in a splendid manner, calling it now Anastasia. As for their church that had been pulled down at Cyzicum, Julian sent [y] orders to Eleusius to rebuild it in two months time at his own expense, upon the pain of a very heavy forfeiture.

Under [z] Valens again the Novatians, as well as others who held the consubstantial doctrine, were forbidden to worship at Constantinople. The churches of the Novatians were shut up, and their bishop Agelius was banished: but the emperor's displeasure against the Novatians [a] was moderated by Marcian, a pious and learned man, who formerly had a military post in the imperial palace, but was now presbyter in the church of the Novatians, and had been appointed preceptor in polite literature to the emperor's daughters, Anastasia and Carosa. In regard to him therefore the churches of the Novatians, which for some while had been shut up, were opened again. Nevertheless, even after this the [b] Novatians were not quite void of disturbance from the Arians. So writes Socrates: and to the same purpose Sozomen, who [c] adds, that Agelius was soon recalled from his banishment, and officiated in the churches as before.

In the year [d] 383, Theodosius had a synod, or conference, at Constantinople, for putting an end to those dissensions which there were in the empire by reason of different sects of religion. And [e] Socrates says that the emperor was so well pleased with the orthodoxy of the Novatians, in holding the doctrine of the consubstantiality, that he gave them leave to assemble for divine worship in cities; and appointed that their churches should enjoy the same privileges with those of his own sentiments.

Tillemont [f] observes that the Novatians are never named in the laws of Theodosius against heretics, though they were put

[t] Socrat. l. ii. cap. 38, p. 144. A, B. [u] Socr. ib. p. 143, D. 144, A. [x] Socrat. l. iii. cap. 11. Sozom. l. v. cap. 5. (or 4.) [y] Vid. Socrat. l. iv. cap. 9. Socr. ib. et l. v. cap. 21. [z] Socrat. ib. p. 218, B, C. [a] Sozom. l. vi. cap. 9, p. 649, C. [b] Vid. Basn. 283, n. vi. et Tillemont Les Novatiens, Art. 5, p. 98, 99. [c] Vid. Socrat. l. 5, cap. 10, p. 269, B. C. cap. 22, p. 280, B. et Conf. Sozom. l. viii. cap. 1. p. 754. D. [d] Tillem. Les Novatiens p. 99.

in that rank in 381, by an œcumenical council. He [g] adds that [h] Socrates, to prove the affection which Theodoſius had for this people, ſays, that emperor pardoned Symmachus at the requeſt of Leontius, biſhop of the church of the Novatians at Rome, about the year 388.

Socrates [i] ſpeaks of their ſees at Conſtantinople, Nice, Nicomedia, and Cotiæus in Phrygia, as the chief ſees of that ſect in the fourth century; in the Eaſt at leaſt, for he ſuppoſeth them to be beſides very numerous in [k] the Weſt.

What were their numbers in theſe cities does not appear. Socrates [l] ſeems to ſay they had three churches within Conſtantinople, beſide that which was deſtroyed: but perhaps he means no more than that they had three in all.

The pieces written againſt them by [m] St. Ambroſe, [n] Pacian, the [o] anonymous author of the Queſtions out of the Old and New Teſtament; the notice taken of them by [p] Baſil, [q] Gregory Nazianzen; the accounts given of them by Socrates and Sozomen in their eccleſiaſtical hiſtories; are proofs of their being numerous, and in moſt parts of the world, in the fourth and fifth centuries. Not to inſiſt now particularly on [r] Philaſter, [s] Epiphanius, [t] Auguſtine, [u] Theodoret, who have written profeſſedly of heretics and their opinions. St. Jerom likewiſe frequently confutes the Novatians in his commentaries, and in his epiſtles. Among the epiſtles of Iſidore of Peluſium, who flouriſhed about the year 412, there [x] are two againſt the Novatians. And that they ſubſiſted in ſome parts after this, appears from the books [y] of Eulogius biſhop of Alexandria, written againſt them not long before the end of the ſixth century.

The vaſt extent of this ſect is manifeſt from the names of the authors who have mentioned them, or written againſt them, and from the ſeveral parts of the Roman empire in which they were found. And [z] Socrates mentions one Mark, biſhop of the Novatians in Scythia, who was preſent at Conſtantinople with Paul in his laſt ſickneſs, who died in the year 439.

The Novatians had among them ſome men of note and eminence. Not to ſay any thing more of Aceſius, already mentioned,

[g] Ibid. [h] Socrat. l. v. cap. 14, p. 273, C. [i] Socrat. l. iv. cap. 28, p. 246, Conf. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 24. [k] l. vii. cap. 11. Conf. cap. 9. [l] εἰς δὲ τὰς ἄλλας τρεῖς, τοσαύτας γὰρ ἐντὸς τῆς πόλεως ἔχουσιν οἱ τῶν καθαρῶν ἐκκλησίας, συνέρχονται ἀλλήλοις σπανίως. Socr. l. ii. cap. 38, p. 144, A. [m] Ambr. de Pœnit. libri duo. [n] Pacian. ad Sympron. Epiſt. tres. [o] Qu. cii. ap. Aguſtin. Tom. iii. in app. Bened. [p] Baſil. ad Amphil. Can. i. Ep. 188, p. 268, A. Bened. [q] Gr. Naz. Orat. 39, p. 635, 636. [r] Philaſt. Hær. 82. [s] Epiph. Hær. 59, p. 493, &c. [t] Aug. de Hær. c. 38. [u] Theod. Hær. Fab. l. iii. cap. 5. [x] Iſid. l. i. Ep. 338, 339. [y] Ap. Phot. cod. 208, p. 528, cod. 280, p. 1597. [z] Socrat. l. vii. cap. 46, p. 390.

tioned, [a] Socrates and [b] Sozomen have celebrated Eutychian as a worker of miracles; a man of this sect in the time of Constantine, who lived a solitary life upon the mountain Olympus in Bithynia.

Agelius succeeded Acesius as bishop of the Novatian people at Constantinople: he enjoyed that honour, as [c] it seems, near fifty years, dying in the sixth year of the reign of Theodosius, that is, the year of Christ 384. Socrates says of him, 'that [d] 'he lived an apostolical life: he went bare-foot, and wore but 'one coat, according to the precept in the gospel.' Sozomen [e] writes of this bishop exactly to the same purpose, only in different words: as before shewn, he saved himself by flight in the Arian persecution under Constantius: he was banished by Valens, but obtained a speedy release at the intercession of Marcian. Though Agelius, as both these ecclesiastical historians assure us, was a very pious person, he [f] was not a man of great abilities; however, he had under him Sisinnius, a man of fine parts and learning: he was of use to his bishop in the forementioned conference at Constantinople in 383, though he was then only reader.

When Agelius died, Sisinnius was presbyter in the church of the Novatians; and Agelius nominated him to [g] be his successor: but his people rather desired Marcian, who had been so serviceable in the persecution under Valens. Agelius complied with them, provided that Sisinnius should succeed Marcian, as he did in 395.

Socrates [h] enlarges in the character of Sisinnius. He was educated, together with the emperor Julian, under Maximus the philosopher: he was skilled in all parts of philosophy, especially in logic: he was an excellent disputant; insomuch that Eunomius was shy of entering into an argument with him, and often avoided him: he had great understanding in the scriptures: was eloquent; and had a good knowledge of the world: was moreover a man of ready wit. Socrates, to [i] whom the life is referred, has recorded some of his remarkable sayings. He was in great reputation for his learning, and upon that account was respected by all his successors: he was likewise honoured with the esteem and affection of many of senatorian rank: he published a good number of books: but he ap-

[a] Socrat. l. i. cap. 13. [b] Sozom. l. i. cap. 14. [c] Vid. Socrat. l. v. cap. 12, 21. [d] Socr. l. iv. cap. 9. [e] Sozom. l. vi. cap. 9. [f] σισιννιος δε ουτος ουκ ισχυσε, αλλ' ευφυης τα μαλιστα και λογιος ανηρ, και ικανος προς το διαλεγεσθαι, προεκαλλετο. Socr. l. v. cap. 10. p. 267, C. [g] Lib. v. cap. 21, p. 290, C. D. [h] Lib. v. cap. 21. et. l. vi. cap. 22. [i] Ib. l. vi. cap. 22.

'peared too nice in his language, and affected poetical phrases: 'he was therefore more admired as a speaker than a writer; 'for indeed there was a certain gracefulness in his person, in 'his speech, his garb, his aspect, and every motion of his body. 'In a word, he was beloved by men of all sects, especially by 'the bishop Atticus.' So writes Socrates.

Sisinnius died [k] in 407, and [l] was succeeded by Chrysanthus, son of Marcian, immediate successor of Agelius. Chrysanthus in his younger years had a military post in the palace. In the reign of Theodosius the first he was governor in Italy, and after that vicar of the British islands; in both which charges he behaved with great reputation. Being advanced in years, he returned to Constantinople, and put up for præfect of that city: but, instead of that, he was against his own will compelled to accept of a bishoprick: for Sisinnius, when near his end, having mentioned him as a fit person to succeed him, and his people looking upon what Sisinnius said as a law, earnestly entreated him to accept the episcopal office. Whereupon Chrysanthus fled. But the people, having found him in Bithynia, at length prevailed upon him by their importunity. 'He was,' as Socrates says, 'a man of signal prudence and modesty: and by his 'means the churches of the Novatians were not only upheld, 'but increased. He was liberal to the poor out of his own 'estate; but [m] received nothing from the churches under his 'care, beside two loaves of the sacred bread every Lord's day. 'Such was his concern to promote the interest of his people, that 'he took Ablabius, the best rhetorician of that time, out of the 'school of the sophist Troilus, and ordained him presbyter.' Socrates says, that his polite and ingenious sermons were extant in his time. He adds, that Ablabius was afterwards bishop of the Novatians at Nice, at the same time teaching rhetoric.

By all these things we see plainly, that under good catholic princes the Novatians enjoyed great liberty of worship, and were admitted to places of trust and honour.

Chrysanthus was succeeded by [n] Paul, who had been a teacher of the Latin tongue; but, laying aside that employment, he betook himself to an ascetic life. Whilst he was bishop he was almost universally beloved at Constantinople. He died in 439. Socrates says, that [o] at his funeral he in a manner united all sects of religion into one church; for they all accompanied his body

[k] Socr. l. vii. cap. 6, p. 343, C.

[l] Ib. cap. 12.

[m] και σχεντος παις πλειχοις οικοθεν χρυσιον διεπεμπετ' απο τε των εκκλησιων ηδεν εδεξατο, πλην κατα κυριακην δυο αρτους των ευλογιων ελαμβανεν. Ib. p. 348, D.

[n] Socrat. l. vii. cap. 17. init.

[o] Ib. cap. 46.

to

to the grave, ſinging pſalms, he having been greatly eſteemed for the ſimplicity and integrity of his manners.

Caſſiodorus, who wrote about the middle of the ſixth century, makes mention of [p] a learned Novatian, whom he knew, named Euſebius; who, like Didymus of Alexandria, was blind from his childhood: he was exceedingly well acquainted with authors and books, as well as things, and ſhewed a wonderful ſtrength of memory: he uſually reſided in Aſia. Caſſiodorus does not ſay any thing of his quality. Poſſibly the loſs of eyeſight diſcouraged his accepting any offices, civil or eccleſiaſtical. However, he made a good improvement of his leiſure: he ſtored his mind with uſeful knowledge, and was communicative in converſation as he had opportunity.

I do not here reckon Socrates and Sozomen among the great men that have done honour to this ſect; becauſe, though they ſometimes ſpeak favourably of them, and therefore by ſome have been taken for Novatians, there is [q] good reaſon to think they were catholics.

However, from the ſeveral inſtances that have been mentioned, it may be inferred, that this people had among them not a few men of polite learning and fine accompliſhments.

Though there were Novatians in ſome places at the latter end of the ſixth century, or afterwards, as we have ſeen, yet it is probable that they declined after the middle of the fifth century, if not ſooner.

Socrates, having given an account of the ordination of Cyril, who ſucceeded Theophilus at Alexandria in 412, ſays; 'From [r] 'that time the biſhoprick of Alexandria exceeded the bounds 'of the prieſthood, and exerciſed a kind of princely authority 'and government; for Cyril immediately ſhut up the churches 'of the Novatians, and took away all their ſacred veſſels and

[p] ——niſi de partibus Aſiæ quemdam ad nos venire Euſebium nomine contigiſſet, qui ſe infantem quinque annorum ſic cæcatum eſſe narrabat,——Hic tantos auctores, tantos libros in memoriæ ſuæ bibliotheca condiderat, ut legentes probabiliter admoneret, in qua parte codicis quod prædixerat, invenirent. Diſciplinas omnes et animo retinebat, et expoſitione planiſſima lucidabat.——Hoc etiam Joſephum, Origenem, et Hieronymum commemoraſſe in ſuis opuſculis aſſerebat.---- Cujus inſtructione commonitus, multos codices antiquos reperi, qui apud me habebantur incogniti. Quem tamen adhuc Novatianæ pravitatis errore detentum, miſericordia Domini ſuffragante, rectæ fidei credimus illuminatione complendum. Caſſiod. Inſtit. l. v. p. 512.

[q] Vid. Valeſ. de Vita et Scriptis Socratis atque Sozomeni; et Baſnag. Ann. 439, num. v. et Tillem. Les Novatiens, Art. vii. Tom. iii. P. iii. p. 110.

[r] Και γαρ εξ εκεινου, η επισκοπη αλεξανδρειας παρα της ιερατικης ταξεως καταδυναστευειν των πραγματων ελαβε την αρχην· ευθεως ουν κυριλλος τας εν αλεξανδρεια ναυατιανων εκκλησιας αποκλεισας, παντα μεν αυτων τα ιερα κειμηλια ελαβεν· τον δε επισκοπον αυτων θεοπεμπτον παντων ων ειχεν αφειλετο. Socr. l. vii. cap. 7.

'ornaments: and as for their biſhop Theopemptus, he de-
'prived him of all he had.'

The ſame eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, having mentioned the names of ſeveral biſhops of Rome, as Damaſus, Siricius, Anaſtaſius, adds: 'After Anaſtaſius ſucceeded Innocent, who was the firſt 'that perſecuted the Novatians at Rome, taking away from them 'many churches.' This pope Innocent [t] was ordained in 401, and died in 417.

Afterwards Socrates writes to this purpoſe: 'After [u] Inno-
'cent, Zoſimus governed the church of Rome for the ſpace of 'two years: and after him Boniface preſided in that church three 'years, who was ſucceeded by Celeſtinus. This [x] Celeſtinus 'alſo [as innocent had begun to do] deprived the Novatians at 'Rome of their churches, and forced their biſhop Ruſticula to 'aſſemble them in private houſes in ſome obſcure place. For 'until that time the Novatians had flouriſhed mightily at Rome, 'having a great number of churches, and large congregations; 'but envy laid hold of them alſo; the biſhoprick of Rome, like 'that of Alexandria, having long ſince ſurpaſſed the ſacerdotal 'dignity, and aſſumed ſecular power and authority: for which 'reaſon thoſe biſhops would not allow theſe perſons to meet to-
'gether freely, though they were of the ſame opinion with 'themſelves: they commended them indeed for their found-
'neſs in the faith, but took away from them every thing they 'had. The biſhops of Conſtantinople acted in a different man-
'ner; treating the Novatians with abundance of affection and 'mildneſs, and permitting them to aſſemble within the walls of 'the city, as has been ſhewn.'

Celeſtinus is ſuppoſed to have poſſeſſed the ſee of Rome from the year 422 to 432.

I conclude my hiſtory of the Novatians with theſe paſſages of Socrates, which are recommended to the reader's obſervation.

V. We ſaw formerly a catalogue of the works of Novatus in Jerom, but not complete: for Jerom ſays, there were many other beſide thoſe expreſsly named by him. Trithemius likewiſe, having mentioned the ſame books that Jerom does, adds; 'that [y] Novatus wrote many letters to divers perſons; and that,

[s] μετα δε αναστασιον διαδεχεται, ος σχεδον τας εν ρωμη καυστιανιστας εκκλησιας ηφανισε, πολλας τε αυτων εκκλησιας αφειλετο. Ib. cap. 9.

[t] Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar. 402, xix. 417, iv. et ſeqq. [u] Ib. cap. 11.

[x] Και ουτος ο κελεστινος τας εν ρωμη καταστασιανων εκκλησιας αφειλετο, και τον επισκοπον αυτων ρουφικλαν κατ' οικιας εν παραδειγ συναγειν ηναγκασεν· αχρι γας τουτε και επι αιων μεγαλως επι της ρωμης ηυξησαι, πολυανθρωπους εχοντες, και γαρ και πλουσιους αφορμας. κ. λ. ibid.

[y] Epiſtolas ſcripſiſſe dicitur, quæ ad notitiam meam non venerunt. Trithem. de Script. Ec. cap. 44.

'beſides,

'besides, he is said to have written some other pieces, but he 'was not acquainted with them.'

1. A very few only of those works have come down to us. We have however a small piece, entitled, Of Jewish meats, which is supposed to be the same that Jerom mentions. Mr. Jackson, whose edition of Novatus, or Novatian (as he calls him), I make use of, thinks this [z] treatise, or epistle, was written in the year 250, before the end of the Decian persecution: but of this, I think, we cannot be positive: for, as [a] before observed, it may be questioned whether this treatise was not written by Novatus after his episcopal ordination, and after his separation from the church; consequently, after the middle of the year 251. I allow it was written in some time of trouble, and in a place of retreat or banishment; but what was that time does not appear; whether the persecution of Decius, or Gallus, or Valerian: therefore the date of it must be left uncertain. Du Pin [b] says, it appears probable to him that this piece was written after that Novatus was become the head of a party, during the persecution of Gallus and Volusian.

2. There is also still extant the treatise, Of the trinity, or, Of the rule of faith, which Jerom calls a large volume. I think this [c] book is now generally allowed by learned men to be the work of our Novatus: and it is the largest piece of his now remaining. Concerning the time of writing it Mr. Jackson [d] mentions two opinions; the first, Pamelius's and his own, that it was written before the schism, which began in 251; the other, that of Dr. Cave; who supposed that this work was composed after the schism, not before the year 257; here being notice taken of the heresy of Sabellius, which appeared about that time. Mr. Jackson might have mentioned a third opinion, that of [e] Baronius; who thought this book was not published by Novatus till about the year 270, as supposing him not only to argue against Sabellius, whom he mentions by name, but also against Paul of Samosata, whom he does not name. And [f] Tillemont thinks this opinion not improbable, though not certain.

[z] [a]de Cibis Judaicis] scripsit [illegible] Romana, cum sub persecutione Decii (quæ exorta est Romæ [illegible] creatus, et post annum decimum anno 251) secessisset; quod [illegible] in primo epistolæ capite: [illegible] temporetur anno 250, forte [illegible]. Jackson. Præf. p. xi.

[illegible], p. 212. [b] Bibl. des [illegible] Nov. p. 182. [c] See Du [illegible] Novatien. Baron. Ann. 272, [illegible]. Le Novatiens, Art. 3.

[d] Statuendum restat (quantum possumus) quo tempore conscripsit Novatianus librum de Trinitate. Et cum Pamelio omnino arbitror ego illum hoc opus composuisse, antequam in schisma incideret, quod fuit inceptum 251. Aliter quidem judicat doctiss. Cavius, hac ductus ratione, quod hæreseos Sabellianæ meminit, quæ (ut dicit Cavius) circa annum 257, exorta est. Jackson. Præf. p. xii, xiii.

[e] Baron. Ann. 272, n. xv. [f] See Tillem. Les Novatiens, Art. iii. p. 89.

Let

Let us consider Mr. Jackson's arguments. In the first place he asks; How [g] will Cave prove that Sabellius was not known in the world for his heresy before 257? But to this there is an obvious answer at hand, that Cave is not singular in this supposition. It is the opinion of very many learned men, that Sabellius did not publish his particular sentiments till 254 or 255, or thereabout, as I have observed in another [h] place. And secondly, it is very easily proved that Sabellianism was not known long before the year 257: for in that year Dionysius of Alexandria sent pope Xystus or Sixtus the second an account of what he had said and written in that controversy, which had its rise in Ptolemais in Egypt; and therefore probably had not been on foot above a year or two, or three at the most. Therefore Sabellianism was not known in the West before the year 255, or 256, or 257. This argument needs not to be enlarged upon. I should think that any man may perceive from the history of the third century, particularly from what we have written concerning Novatianism, that, supposing Sabellianism to have appeared before 250, and allowing it likewise to have been at all different from the common and prevailing sentiment of Christians at that time, such was the vigilance of the bishops of the church, Dionysius would have sent an account of it to Rome long before 257. What a noise did Novatianism make? how many deputies were there sent to and fro? what a number of letters and treatises was there written upon that subject in the space of a very few years? I think then that Dionysius's account of the rise of Sabellianism is an invincible argument that it did not appear in Egypt before 254, or 255, or 256. Therefore this book of Novatus could not be written before 256, or 257. It is not very unlikely that, soon after the first intelligence of this doctrine came to Italy from Dionysius, or from some other person, Novatus, much disliking it, composed this treatise of the Trinity; and possibly he was as well qualified to treat the subject as any man in the West.

If this argument needed any farther enlargement, it might be added, that the catholics of Pentapolis, who disliked some expressions of Dionysius in his writings against Sabellius, laid their charges against him before his namesake of Rome, whose episcopate begun in 259: therefore Dionysius had but lately written in this controversy. If his work had been published long ago, these offended catholics would not have deferred their ac-

[g] Sed quomodo probaverit Cavius Sabellium propter hæresin non esse notum ante an. 257? Hæc est mera viri docti conjectura, &c. Ib. p. 13. [h] See before, p. 72.

cusations

cuſations till 259, or 260, nor have choſen to bring them to Dionyſius of Rome, the ancient and honoured friend and correſpondent of him of Alexandria.

Nevertheleſs, Mr. Jackſon thinks that [i] the hereſy of Sabellius began about 220, that is, 30 years before the ſchiſm at Rome; conſequently Cave is miſtaken no leſs than thirty and ſeven years concerning the time of Sabellius.

Mr. Jackſon would ſupport his opinion by the chronicles of [k] Iſidore of Seville, and [l] Ado, which place Sabellius about the year 220: but chronicles written, one in Spain in the ſeventh, the other in Gaul in the ninth century, are of little authority againſt Dionyſius, a contemporary upon the ſpot. It is likely thoſe chroniclers mean Noetus; who might appear, or be famous, about that time: they might confound theſe two perſons, their opinions agreeing in the main, as is ſuppoſed; and Sabellius being more known than Noetus, as we are informed by the learned [m] Auguſtine, who is certainly a good witneſs in this matter, and aſſures us that even in his time Noetus was known to very few, and that theſe two hereſies were reckoned one and the ſame. It is an additional argument that theſe chroniclers mean Noetus, or confound him and Sabellius, in that they make no diſtinct mention of the former. There is the more reaſon to think Ado means Noetus when he ſpeaks of Sabellius, becauſe he joins Hippolytus with him: and it is generally ſuppoſed that Hippolytus wrote againſt Noetus in his book againſt all hereſies, and that this was the laſt hereſy in that work. In ſhort, Noetianiſm and Sabellianiſm were confounded, and reckoned one and the ſame hereſy, by the Latins in the time of Auguſtine and afterwards: and the beſt uſe that can be made of theſe two chroniclers is to confirm the common ſuppoſition, that Noetus either appeared, or was condemned, about the year 220, or ſoon after.

[i] Et tandem exhinc apparet, triginta circiter eſſe annos inter ſchiſma Novatiani et incœptam hæreſin Sabellii; et Cavius ratione temporis erravit fere triginta et ſeptem annos. Ib. p. 18.

[k] —— hoc diſerto teſtimonio confirmat Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis, qui in chronico ad annum a mundo condito 5419, ſive anno Domini 221, ſub imperio Aurelii Antonini Heliogabali ſcribit ortum fuiſſe Sabellium hæreſiarchum. Ib. p. 18.

[l] Huic vero convenit Ado Viennenſis, quo auctore, Sabellius erat hæreſiarches anno circiter 220, imperante Aurelio Heliogabalo, ſub cujus imperio ſimul cum Hippolyto vixiſſe tradit Ado. Verba illius ſunt in chronico ab. an. 220, ad an. 224. 'Sabellius hæreſiarches oritur. Hippolytus epiſcopus multorum conditor opuſculorum temporum canonem conſcripſit, et huc uſque perduxit.' Id. ibid.

[m] Sabelliani ab illo Noeto, quem ſupra memoravimus, defluxiſſe dicuntur.—— Sed qua cauſa duas hæreſes eas Epiphanius computet, neſcio: cum fieri potuiſſe videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iſte famoſior, et ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæreſis nomen acceperit. Noetiani enim difficile ab aliquo ſciuntur: Sabelliani autem ſunt in ore multorum. Auguſt. Hær. cap. 41.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, Mr. Jackſon ſays, it is [n] not likely that Novatus ſhould write ſo good a book, in all things conformable to the catholic doctrine, after he had fallen into his deteſtable ſchiſm, and an opinion ſo contrary to the divine goodneſs and mercy.

How deteſtable his ſchiſm was I cannot ſay, though I do not juſtify his conduct: for, whatever pretenſions he might have to the chair of Rome, on account of his eminent learning, or uncommon ſervices, or the expectations given him, poſſibly by a large number of the clergy and people of that church; yet, when another was choſen, as [o] Cyprian obſerves, it might be his duty to acquieſce. Nor is it unlikely that as good books as this of Novatus upon the trinity have been written by men who have had falſe apprehenſions of the divine goodneſs and mercy in ſome reſpects. Finally, I wonder why Mr. Jackſon ſhould make a queſtion of Novatus writing, at any time, a book upon the catholic principles about the trinity, when there appear not any traces of a difference upon this point between him and his followers and the catholics of that time. It is not unlikely that Novatus was from the beginning, and always continued to be, as orthodox in that, and moſt other matters, as Chriſtians generally were in that age.

Upon the whole, I believe there are very few but muſt be of opinion that this treatiſe, the principal remaining work of Mr. Jackſon's author, was not written till ſome while after his deteſtable ſchiſm, as Mr. Jackſon calls it.

I cannot forbear obſerving here, though it is not neceſſary, that ſeveral of the ancient writers concerning hereſies confirm the more common opinion of the time of Sabellianiſm, particularly Epiphanius and Auguſtine: their order is this; Noetians, Valeſians, Novatians, Angelics, Apoſtolics, Sabellians. They ſuppoſed therefore that Novatianiſm ſprang up in the ſpace of time between Noetus and Sabellius.

From what has been ſaid, the concluſion is ver evident; that the earlieſt probable date of this work is that aſſigned by Cave, which is the year 257, ſeveral years after the author's epiſcopal ordination.

[n] Nec, quantum cogito, veriſimile eſt illum condidiſſe tam egregium librum in omnibus catholicæ doctrinæ et pietati primævæ eccleſiæ apprime conſonum, poſtquam in ſchiſma deteſtandum et ſententiam bonitati et miſericordiæ divinæ adverſantem ſe demerſiſſet. Ibid.

[o] Factus eſt autem Cornelius epiſcopus de Dei et Chriſti ejus judicio, de clericorum pene omnium teſtimonio, de plebis quæ tum aſſuit ſuffragio,——cum nemo ante ſe factus eſſet, cum Fabiani locus—— vacaret.——Quiſquis jam epiſcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat neceſſe eſt; nec habeat eccleſiaſticam ordinationem qui eccleſiæ non tenet unitatem; quiſquis ille fuerit, multum de ſe licet jactans, et ſibi plurimum vindicans. Cypr. Ep. 55 [al. 52] p. 104.

3. Beſide

3. Beſide theſe two treatiſes, which we ſuppoſe to be the ſame that are mentioned by Jerom, there is extant a letter of the Roman clergy to Cyprian, written during the vacancy of the ſee, after the death of Fabian, in Auguſt 250. It is allowed that [p] Novatus drew up this epiſtle, and [q] it is much commended.

4. There is ſtill another letter, written before the end of the ſame year to Cyprian. Theſe two letters are among [r] Cyprian's. But it is not ſo certain that Novatus had the chief hand in penning this, as the former. Mr. Jackſon, however, has done well in publiſhing it together with the other things aſcribed to Novatus.

5. In theſe pieces there is not, that I remember, any thing concerning the particular ſentiment which Novatus is ſuppoſed to have maintained after his epiſcopal ordination; or relating to the differences between him and ſome other Chriſtians: yet ſurely there muſt have been ſuch things. It may be argued from [s] Cyprian's letters: and [t] Jerom ſpeaks of epiſtles of Novatus that were ſchiſmatical.

6. St. Jerom, in his Catalogue, among other works of Novatus, mentions two with theſe titles, Of Eaſter, Of circumciſion. And, in the appendix to St. Jerom's works, there are two treatiſes, or epiſtles, without the name of the author; one entitled, Of the celebration of Eaſter; the other, Of the true circumciſion. The former of theſe is now allowed to be [u] St. Auguſtine's, and is publiſhed [x] among his letters: as for the other, it is generally allowed to be the work of ſome later author than Novatus, foraſmuch as here is expreſs mention made of the Manicheans and Arians: nor is there [y] any good reaſon to take it for a work of St. Jerom: it muſt therefore be looked upon as the compoſition of ſome anonymous writer, whoſe time is uncertain. I ſhall take notice of a few things obſervable in it.

[p] Additum eſt etiam, Novatiano tunc ſcribente, et quod ſcripſerat ſua voce recitante, &c. Cypr. ad Antonian. Ep. 55 [al. 52] p. 102. [q] Menſe Auguſto exeunte clerus Romanus ſcribit ad Cyprianum.——Sunt autem hæc cleri Romani literæ præclare ſcriptæ, et literis ipſius Cypriani pene æquandæ: ex quibus de ingenio et eloquentia Novatiani judicium ferri poteſt. Ille enim hanc epiſtolam exaravit. Pearſon. Ann. Cypr. 250. n. xvi. Conf. Pagi Crit. 230, n. xii.

[r] Ap Cypr. Ep. 30, 36, [al. 30, 31.]

[s] Sed enim ſupervenerunt poſtmodum aliæ literæ tuæ,——in quibus animadverti animum tuum Novatiani literis motum mutare cœpiſſe, &c. Cypr. ad ant. Ep. 55 [al. 52] p. 101. et paſſim.

[t] —— ſimulque epiſtolas Novatiani, ut dum ſchiſmatici hominis venena cognoſcimus, libentius ſancti martyris Cypriani bibamus antidotum. Hieron. ad Paul. Concord. Ep. 10. [al. 21] p. 17, in Ed. Bened. Ego Origenem propter eruditionem ſic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, Apollinarium; &c. Id. ad Tranquill. Ep. 56 [al. 76], 589. f. [u] Vid. Martian. Annotat. ap. Hieronym. T. v. p. 175. [x] Auguſtin. Ep. lib. 2. Ep. 55. Bened. [al. 119. T. ii.] [y] Vid. Cenſuram epiſtolæ de vera circumciſione, apud Hieron. T. v. p. 150.

1. Here

1. Here are many quotations of the books of the Old and New Testament, or references to them.

2. The author several times quotes the first [z] chapter of St. Matthew's gospel.

3. He takes notice of the [a] enrolment of Cyrenius, or Cyrinus, as he calls him, in Luke ii. 1—5.

4. He also expressly quotes [b] the beginning of St. John's gospel.

5. He cites Rom. ix. 4, 5, very remarkably in this [c] manner: *To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises; of whom also is Christ according to the flesh, who is blessed for ever.*

6. In this piece is likewise cited [d] the beginning of St. John's first epistle; and there are passages out of many other books of scripture, as before observed: but I do not think it needful to take any farther notice of particular citations in this work.

VI. I do not draw the character of Novatus: I am not satisfied to make such an attempt upon the ground of those few writings of his that remain, when there were so many more, and the history we have of him is so imperfect. I find, however, that [e] learned moderns do allow him wit, or good natural parts; learning and eloquence, or a fine pen: and Jerom of old, who was better qualified to judge than we are, in several respects, especially because he had more of this writer's works than we have, in a letter to pope [f] Damasus, speaking of Tertullian and Novatus, calls them very eloquent men.

The sentiment of Novatus upon church discipline is often spoken of by ancients and moderns, as contrary to the divine

[z] Foris scriptus est, cum evangelista ait: Liber generationis Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham. De Vera Circumcisione, ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 153, m. Foris scribitur per Matthaeum: Christi autem generatio sic erat: Cum esset desponsata mater ejus Maria Joseph. Ib. infra. med. pag.

[a] Rogo hic, ubi sub Cyrino census investigatio? ubi edictum Cæsaris? ubi necessitas profitendi? Ib. p. 162. in.

[b] Intus scribitur, cum per Joannem dicitur: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum. Ib. p. 153. infr. m.

[c] Quorum adoptio est filiorum, et gloria, et testamentum, et legislatio, et obsequium, et promissa: ex quibus etiam est Christus secundum carnem, qui est benedictus in secula. Ib. p. 151. in.

[d] Cum beatus Joannes invisibilem et visibilem, Deum et hominem, brevi quasi charactere significarit. Sic enim ait: Quod fuit ab initio, etc. tres, quod audivimus. Ecce libri illius interiorem partem. Quod sequitur: Et manus nostræ palpaverunt de verbo vitæ. Ecce libri pars exterior, &c. p. 154. init.

[e] Novatianus Stoicorum philosophorum scita professebatur, homo acerrimi ingenii, multæ jugæ doctrinæ, nec facundiæ vulgaris. Admon. in Ambros. libr. de Penit. T. v. p. 385. ed. Bened.

[f] Non quod non potuerim et ad illas aliquid respondere, sed quod ab eloquentissimis viris, Tertulliano nostro scilicet et Novatiano, Latino sermone sint editæ. Hieron. Ep. 125. T. ii. p. 563. Bened.

goodness

...s and mercy. Upon this account he has been called ...on of a moſt cruel diſpoſition, and has been ſaid to charge God himſelf with cruelty. Nevertheleſs, in his book of the Trinity he appears to have had honourable ſentiments of the Deity, ...ing [h] that God excels all other beings in benevolence, good-...s, juſtice and mercy. Nor did he deny the power or will ...f God to pardon great ſins after baptiſm; though he would not ...w ſuch a power in the church, or to be lodged with the ordinary miniſters of the goſpel.

I would add, that he may be thought to have one advantage, in that all his litigious and controverſial writings, if there were any ſuch, are loſt: for, next to the happineſs of eſcaping diſputes and controverſies, may be reckoned the having them buried in oblivion: but though this may be eſteemed an advantage to him, I cannot tell whether it be ſo to us. It is not unlikely that, if more of his works were in being, we, as well as [i] Jerom, ſhould be willing to read them. Since he is upon record, as author of a ſect that ſubſiſted for ſeveral ages, it might be deſireable to know from himſelf the grounds he went upon. The writings of catholic authors, it is to be hoped, would afford a ſufficient preſervative againſt infection: and, together with the venom of his pernicious doctrine, there might have been conveyed to us ſomething healing and nouriſhing.

I have given above the true reaſon why I decline drawing the character of Novatus. As Du Pin ſaw no occaſion to be ſo ſcrupulous, it is by no means fit my readers ſhould be deprived of the commendation he has given the founder of the Novatian ſect. 'This author,' ſays [k] he, 'had abundance of wit, learning, and eloquence: his ſtyle is pure, neat, and polite: his expreſſions are choſen, his thoughts natural, and his reaſonings juſt: he is full of citations of texts of ſcripture, that are much to the purpoſe: moreover, there is a great deal of method and order in thoſe treatiſes of his which we have: and he always expreſſeth himſelf with mildneſs and moderation.' What a better character could be deſired by a catholic writer!

VII. Though the pieces of Novatus, and eſpecially the treatiſe of the Trinity, or the Rule of faith, abound with texts of the Old and New Teſtament, there are not many books of either cited expreſsly and by name.

[h] ...ante crudeliſſimum Novatianum ...m] dixit, eo quod malit mori ...is quam ut revertatur et vivat? ...Lat. Comm. p. 335. Pariſ. 1669.
—— et omnibus divitiis ditior, omni ...prudentior, et omni benignitate benignior, omni bonitate melior, omni juſtitia juſtior, omni clementia clementior. De Reg. Fid. cap. 2. p. 24. Jackſon.

[i] See before, note [t], p. 237.

[k] Biblioth. p. 182.

1. A great

1. A great number of paſſages are quoted out of St. Matthew's goſpel. 'Him,' ſays [l] he, 'the ancient prophecies, as well as 'the goſpels, teſtify to be the ſon of Abraham, and the ſon of 'David.' Here is probably a reference to the firſt chapter of St. Matthew's goſpel. The words of Matt. i. 23, are [m] quoted by him in another place. Once more: 'So [n] Chriſt himſelf ſays; '*Lo I am with you unto the end of the world:*' chap. xxviii. 20.

2. To St. Mark's goſpel there are very few, if any, references. However, we may take a paſſage or two to be conſidered. 'If '[o] it belong to God only to forgive ſins, Chriſt forgiveth ſins:' ſee Mark ii. 5, 6, 7. 'God [p] is not worſhipped by the belly, 'nor with meats, which the Lord ſays periſh, and are purged in 'the draught, according to the courſe of nature:' ſee Mark vii. 19.

3. 'They [q] alſo urge and inſiſt upon what is ſaid in the goſ- 'pel of Luke: *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power* '*of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee; therefore that holy thing which* '*ſhall be born of thee ſhall be called the Son of God:*' chap. i. 35.

4. 'For, [r] *And the word,* ſays John, *was made fleſh, and dwelled* '*among us:*' John i. 14. This [s] goſpel is expreſsly quoted as John's ſeveral times by this writer.

5. The book of the Acts of the apoſtles is no where expreſsly quoted, or very plainly referred to, in the remaing pieces of Novatus: but it may be reckoned probable that he has an eye to the hiſtory contained in the firſt chapters of that book when he ſays; 'The [t] Holy Spirit, the comforter, whom Chriſt had pro- 'miſed to the diſciples, is he who explained to them the evangelic 'myſteries, and illuminated them with the knowledge of divine 'things; by whom being confirmed, they endured bonds and 'impriſonments for the name of the Lord, and triumphed over 'the powers of the world, and over all torments.' I place in

[l] Hunc enim Abrahæ filium, hunc David, hunc non minus et vetera prædicta et evangelia teſtantur. De Regula Fidei, cap. 9, p. 58. [m] Et vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod eſt interpretatum, Nobiſcum Deus. Ib. cap. 24 [al. 19], p. 186. [n] Sic Chriſtus ipſe dicit, Ecce ego vobiſcum ſum uſque ad conſummationem ſeculi. cap. 12, p. 87. [o] Quod ſi, cum nullius ſit niſi Dei, peccata dimittere, idem Chriſtus peccata dimittit. De Reg. Fid. c. 13. p. 97, 98. [p] Deus ventre non colitur, nec cibis, quos Dominus dicit perire, et en feceſſu naturali lege purgari. De Cib. Jud. cap. 5, p. 275. [q] Proponunt enim atque illa prætendunt, quæ in evangelio Lucæ relata ſunt, —— Spiritus Sanctus veniet in te.— De Reg. Fid. cap. 24 [al. 19], p. 186. [r] Nam et Verbum, inquit Joannes, caro factum eſt, et inhabitavit in nobis. Ib. c. 10. p. 74. [s] Ac ſic Joannes nativitatem Chriſti deſcribens. De Reg. Fid. cap. 13. init. Si enim Joannes dicit, Omnia per ipſum facta ſunt. cap. 17 [al. 25], init. et paſſim. [t] Hic eſt enim —— qui evangelica ſacramenta diſtinxit, qui in ipſis inluminator rerum divinarum fuit, quo confirmati pro nomine Domini nec carceres nec vincula timuerunt; quinimo ipſas ſeculi poteſtates et tormenta calcaverunt. Ib. c. 29, p. 220.

the

the margin [u] another paſſage, in which he quotes the words of Joel; which are alſo alleged by St. Peter, Acts ii. 16, 17. See Joel ii. 28.

6. I proceed to St. Paul's epiſtles.

1. The epiſtle to the Romans is often quoted as St. Paul's by this preſbyter of the church of Rome, who was alſo afterwards choſen biſhop by a part of the ſame church. 'The [x] apoſtle 'Paul writes in his epiſtle: *Whoſe*, ſays he, *are the fathers, of 'whom is Chriſt according to the fleſh, who is over all God bleſſed for 'ever.*' Rom. ix. 5. In the epiſtle penned by Novatus, ſent to Cyprian by the preſbyters and deacons of the church of Rome in 250, it is ſaid: 'Otherwiſe [y] the apoſtle had not ſo com- 'mended us, ſaying: *That your faith is ſpoken of throughout the 'whole world.*' Rom. i. 8.

2. 'Laſtly, [z] the apoſtle Paul knew this harmony and unity, 'with a diſtinction of perſons; for, writing to the Corinthians, *I*, 'ſays he, *have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increaſe:*' intending 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7, 8.

3. 'Laſtly [a] the apoſtle Paul: *Having*, ſays he, *the ſame ſpirit, 'as it is written, I believed, therefore have I ſpoken: we alſo believe, 'and therefore ſpeak.*' 2 Cor. iv. 13.

4. 'And [b] in another place [the apoſtle Paul:] *Now a me- 'diator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.*' Gal. iii. 20. Words of this epiſtle are ſeveral times cited by this writer as the apoſtle Paul's.

5. 'Of [c] whom the apoſtle Paul: *He that deſcended is the ſame 'that aſcended above all heavens, that he might fill all things.*' Eph. iv. 10.

6. 'But [d] why ſhould we paſs by that place in the apoſtle? '*Who being in the form of God, did not earneſtly ſeek to be like God;*'

[u] Eſt enim per Joelem prophetam repromiſſus, ſed per Chriſtum redditus: In noviſſimis, inquit, diebus effundam de Spiritu meo ſuper ſervos et ancillas meas. Ib. p. 218. [x] Quod ſi et apoſtolus Paulus; Quorum, inquit, patres, et ex quibus Chriſtus ſecundum carnem, qui eſt ſuper omnia Deus benedictus in ſecula, in ſuis literis ſcribit. cap 13. p. 99.

[y] Quoniam nec tantas de nobis laudes apoſtolus protuliſſet dicendo: Quia fides veſtra prædicatur in toto mundo. p. 289.

[z] Denique novit hanc concordiæ unitatem, cum perſonarum tamen diſtinctione. Nam cum ad Corinthios ſcriberet; Ego, inquit, plantavi, &c. de Reg. Fid. cap. 27 [al. 22.]

[a] Denique apoſtolus Paulus: Habentes, inquit, eundem ſpiritum. cap. 29. p. 219.

[b] Et alio in loco: Mediator autem unius non eſt, Deus autem unus eſt. cap. 30. p. 230.

[c] De quo apoſtolus Paulus: Qui deſcendit, ipſe eſt qui aſcendit ſuper omnes cœlos. cap. 17, [al. 25] p. 134.

[d] Cur autem —— illum prætereamus apud apoſtolum locum? Qui cum in forma Dei eſſet, non rapinam arbitratus eſt æqualem ſe Deo eſſe. De Reg. Fid. cap. 22, [al. 17] p. 173, 174, 175. Hic ergo quamvis eſſet in forma Dei, non eſt rapinam arbitratus æqualem ſe Deo eſſe. p. 176. vid. etiam quæ ibidem ſequuntur, et p. 177, 178.

or, *to be equal with God.* Philip. ii. 6—12. That Novatus underſtood this text after that manner, was ſhewn [e] formerly.

7. 'For *whether*, ſays [f] the apoſtle, *they be thrones, or dominions,* 'or *principalities, or powers, things viſible and inviſible, by him all* 'things *conſiſt.*' Col. i. 16, 17.

8. There are not in Novatus any paſſages taken out of the firſt or ſecond epiſtle to the Theſſalonians.

9. 'The [g] apoſtle Paul alſo: *Who only,* ſays he, *hath immor-* 'tality, *and dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto.*' 1 Tim. vi. 16.

10. 'And [h] Chriſt is ſaid to be *one maſter:* (Matt. xxiii. 8, 10.) 'but yet we read that the apoſtle Paul alſo is a *maſter,*' or teacher. 2 Tim. i. 11.

11. 'Under [i] whom [Chriſt] it is now rightly ſaid: *To the* 'pure *all things are pure,*—' Titus i. 15.

12. The epiſtle to Philemon is no where quoted, or referred to, in the remaining works of Novatus.

13. With regard to the epiſtle to the Hebrews, I ſhall take what may deſerve any notice in this writer. He obſerves, 'It 'is [k] aſſured of Chriſt, both by prophets and apoſtles, that he 'ſitteth at the right hand of the Father.' See Heb. i. 3. But this is ſo often ſpoken of in the New Teſtament, in the goſpels, Acts, and epiſtles, that it cannot afford any argument for the epiſtle to the Hebrews. Again, he ſays, 'that [l] Chriſt is found 'to be greater and better not than one angel only, but than all 'the angels.' See Heb. i. 4. *Being made ſo much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.* But this too is often ſaid in the New Teſtament, as Eph. i. 21; Philip. ii. 10; Col. i. 16,—18: and therefore here is no proof of a reference to the epiſtle to the Hebrews. Mr. Hallett, having allowed that St. Cyprian and our Novatus had not quoted this epiſtle, adds: 'There [m] are many paſſages in the epiſtle to 'the Hebrews very pertinent to the purpoſe of their writings: 'upon which account it looks very likely that they were of the 'ſame opinion with ſome others of the Latin church at that

[e] See p. 166. [f] Sive enim, inquit apoſtolus, throni, ſive dominationes, ſive virtutes, ſive poteſtates, viſibilia et inviſibilia, omnia per ipſum conſtant. cap. 13. p. 94. [g] Apoſtolus quoque Paulus: Qui ſolus, inquit, habet, immortalitatem, &c. cap. 30. p. 230. [h] Et magiſter unus Chriſtus eſt dictus; at enim legimus, quod magiſter ſit etiam apoſtolus Paulus. ib. p. 233. [i] Sub quo merito jam dicitur: Omnia munda mundis. De Cib. Jud. cap. 5. p. 273. [k] Aut cum ſedere ad dextram patris et a prophetis et ab apoſtolis approbatur. De Reg. Fid. cap. 26. p. 201. [l] Qui non uno, ſed omnibus angelis et major et melior invenitur. ib. cap. 20, [al. 25] p. 162.

[m] See his Introduction to his Paraphraſe and notes upon the epiſtle to the Hebrews, p. 18.

'time,

'time, who did not, as [n] Jerom tells us, receive this as a ca-'nonical epiſtle.'

I infer then, that the epiſtle to the Hebrews was not received by Novatus as an epiſtle of the apoſtle Paul. Indeed [o] Epiphanius and [p] Jerom ſeem to ſay that the paſſage in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, chap. vi. 4—8, was the main text by which the Novatians, and even Novatus himſelf, had been miſled. But, however it may have been with the Novatians in after times, I think there can be no reaſon to ſuppoſe that Novatus himſelf inſiſted upon this paſſage: his remaining works afford a deciſive argument that he did not receive the epiſtle to the Hebrews: nor does the anonymous author of the piece, Againſt the Novatian heretic, uſually joined with St. Cyprian's works, take any notice of this text. We know likewiſe, from the ſeveral authors who wrote againſt the Novatians, that there were other texts of ſcripture alleged by them in ſupport of their peculiar notion: they argued from [q] the words of Chriſt in Matt. x. 33: *Whoſoever ſhall deny me before men, him alſo will I deny before my Father which is in heaven:* from [r] Matt. xii. 32: from [s] Acts viii. 22; and from [t] 1 John v. 16: not to mention any other texts.

What has been juſt now ſaid is of uſe to ſhew the miſtake of ſome moderns, who have ſuppoſed that many catholic Chriſtians among the Latins were induced to ſet aſide the epiſtle to the Hebrews, becauſe the Novatians perverted a paſſage in the ſixth chapter of it. Much to our purpoſe are the obſervations of Beauſobre and Lenfant: 'For [u] it is falſe,' ſay they, 'that the 'church of Rome did not acknowledge the epiſtle to the He-'brews, becauſe the Novatians abuſed the words of chap. vi. 4, '5, 6, to exclude from the benefit of repentance and from the 'peace of the church thoſe who, after baptiſm, had fallen into 'idolatry or other crimes. There is no likelihood that the 'church of Rome would reject a book which had been held for 'canonical, becauſe ſome new heretics endeavoured to make an 'advantage of it for the ſupport of their errors: beſides, it is

[n] Hieron ad Dardan. Ep. 129.

[o] Σφαλλει δε αυτας το ρητον της αποστολικης γραφης (Heb. vi. 4—8.) Epiph. Hær. 59. n. ii. p. 494. A. B. [p] Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic rideant, qui contendunt non poſſe renovari per pœnitentiam eos qui crucifixerunt ſibimet Filium Dei, et oſtentui habuerunt, conſequenter hunc errorem ſolvit, et ait. Hieron. adv. Jovin. l. 2. p. 195. Bened. [q] Ad Novatian. Hæret. p. 18. a. ap. Cyprian.

[r] Vid. Q. cii. ex Vet. et Nov. Teſt.

[s] Sed ſoles alio dolo fraudem hanc velle contegere, dicens eodem ſenſu etiam Petrum apoſtolum dixiſſe Simoni: Age pœnitentiam ab hac malitia tua, ſi forte remittatur tibi. ib. [t] Unde nec illa quæſtio veſtra quidquam poterit adferre ponderis, quam ſumitis de epiſtola Johannis dicentis: Qui ſcit fratrem ſuum peccare peccatum non ad mortem, petat. &c. Ambr. de Pœnit. l. i. cap. 10. Conf. Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 312. G. [u] Car il eſt faux, que l'egliſe de Rome n'ait pas reconnu l'epitre aux Hebreux, &c. Pref. ſur l'Ep. aux Hebr. n. ii. p. 413, 414.

'certain that at Rome they counted but thirteen epistles of St 'Paul before the rise of the sect of the Novatians; as appears 'from the testimony of Caius, presbyter of Rome, who wrote at 'the beginning of the third century: whereas [x] the heresy of 'Novatus, likewise presbyter of Rome, did not begin to appear 'till after the middle of that age.' So those learned writers: and I think their argument conclusive.

But yet it must be owned that Philaster, who flourished about the year 380, says, 'in his time it [y] was customary in some 'places to omit the public reading of the epistle to the Hebrews; 'and that one reason of that practice was the advantage which 'the Novatians endeavoured to make of it.' Nevertheless this does not alter my opinion of the forementioned argument of those commentators. Philaster only informs us what was the practice of some churches in his time, near the end of the fourth century: as for the sentiments of the Latin Christians in the former part of the third century, and downward till below the middle of it, we need no information from him; being already sufficiently informed about them by Tertullian, Caius, the works of Cyprian, and Novatus himself, not to mention now any other writers.

7. Our next article will take in the seven catholic epistles, and the book of Revelation.

1. There are no references in this author to the epistle of St. James, nor to the first or second epistle of St. Peter. However, we shall observe, with regard to the last mentioned epistle, that he says: 'The [z] several parts of the world are so firmly connected 'together as not to be dissolved by any power, till he alone who 'made it shall command it to be dissolved for affording a better 'state for us.' See 2 Pet. iii. 11, 12, 13. Again, he speaks of the [a] world's hastening to the fiery day of judgment: see 2 Pet. iii. 7. But this was so common an expectation, that the present world should be sometime destroyed by fire, that these expressions, in my opinion, are not sufficient to determine a particular reference to this epistle. Mr. Jackson, [b] in a note upon the

[x] Or l'heresie de Novat, aussi prêtre de Rome, ne commença qu' apres le milieu de ce siecle là. ib. p. 414. [y] —— Et quia addiderunt in ea quædam non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia, etsi legitur a quibusdam; non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredicim epistolæ ipsius, et ad Hebræos interdum. Et quia et factum Christum dicit in ea, inde non legitur. De pœnitentia autem propter Novatianos æque. Philast. Hær. 41. [z] —— ut ex disparibus elementis ita sit unus rum ista ista coagmentata conspiratione solidatus, ut nulla vi dissolvi possit, nisi quum illum solus ipse qui fecit, ad majora alia præstanda nobis, solvi jusserit. de Reg. Fid. cap. 2. p. 19. [a] Sive quoniam ad ignium diem judicii mundus iste festinat. ib. cap. 8. p. 56. [b] Stoici contra (prope cum Christianis) igne dissolutum iri statuebant. Not. ii. p. 19.

fig.

firſt cited paſſage, owns that this was an expectation of the ſtoics.

2. 'For [c] John alſo ſays: *No man hath ſeen God at any time.*' 1 John iv. 12. Again: 'We [d] find it written, that God is 'called love, and that he is called light:' ſee 1 John iv. 8, and i. 5.

3. I remember not any thing in this writer relating to the other two epiſtles aſcribed to St. John.

4. There is nothing in Novatus taken out of the epiſtle of St. Jude.

5. 'But [e] there is a woe appointed to thoſe who add, and to 'thoſe who take away.' See Rev. xxii. 18, 19. But whether this will be reckoned material I cannot ſay.

6. We are next to obſerve ſome forms of citation and general diviſions of the ſcriptures, and afterwards ſome marks of reſpect for them.

1. 'Of [f] *two ſparrows*, ſaith the Lord, *one does not fall without* '*the will of your Father*:' ſee Matt. x. 29, 30. 'Although [g] we 'haſten to other things, yet that I think ought not to be omitted 'which the Lord ſaith in the goſpel for repreſenting his majeſty: '*Deſtroy this temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up again.*' John ii. 19. 'Laſtly [h] in the goſpel; *the hour cometh*, ſaith the Lord, '*neither in this mountain, nor at Jeruſalem, ſhall ye worſhip the* 'Father.' John iv. 21. And in like manner in other places, as may be ſeen in part in what has been tranſcribed. He alſo calls the New Teſtament in general [i] the evangelic ſcripture.

2. 'This [k] ſame Jeſus, the Son of God, we read to be promiſed 'in the Old Teſtament, and obſerve exhibited in the New Teſ- 'tament.' 'Him the ancient prophecies, as well as the goſpels, 'teſtify to be the ſon of Abraham:' ſee before Numb. vii. 1. 'Juſtly [l] do we believe and hold, according to the doctrine of 'the Old and New Teſtament, that Chriſt Jeſus is God and man.' The phraſe of Old and New Teſtament is frequent in this writer.

3. He calls the ſcriptures ſacred and divine, and at the ſame

[c] Nam et Johannes: Deum nemo, inquit, vidit unquam. cap. 18. [al. 26.] p. 136.

[d] Scimus enim ſcriptum eſſe, quod Deus caritas dictus ſit,—— et quod Deus lux dicatur. cap. 7. in. [e] Sed vae adjicientibus quomodo licet detrahentibus. cap. 16. [al. 24.] p. 123.

[f] Duobus, inquit Dominus, paſſeribus non cadet ſine Patris voluntate. cap. 23. p. 153. [g] Illud non arbitror [illegible] quod in evangelio Dominus [illegible] cum templi ſui ſe excidium [illegible] cap. 23. [al. 16.] init.

[h] Denique in evangelio, Veniet hora, inquit Dominus, &c. cap. 6. p. 42.

[i] Præſertim cum animadvertat ſcripturam evangelicam,——— cap. 13. p. 96.

[k] Hunc enim Jeſum Chriſtum,——et in veteri teſtamento legimus eſſe repromiſſum, et in novo teſtamento animadvertimus exhibitum. cap. 9. in.

[l] Merito ſecundum inſtitutionem veteris et novi teſtamenti, et Deum et hominem Chriſtum Jeſum et credimus et cognovimus. cap. 17. [al. 25.] p. 128.

time ſhews their uſe and authority for confirming the truth of doctrines, or for confuting errors. 'That [m] Chriſt is not only 'man, but God alſo, is proved by the ſacred authority of the 'divine writings.' 'The [n] divine ſcripture eaſily detects 'and confutes the frauds of heretics.' Again: 'The [o] divine 'ſcripture of the Old and New Teſtament.' And [p] ſacred ſcriptures, [q] heavenly ſcriptures: this laſt is a common expreſſion in our author. He [r] affirms the ſcriptures are infallible; he [s] ſays it is one and the ſame ſpirit that ſpoke in the prophets and the apoſtles: but he gives the advantage to theſe. Among the offices of the Holy Spirit he mentions this as one, that [t] he guards the goſpels.

9. We are now to ſum up the teſtimony of this writer. We have not ſeen in him paſſages of all the books of the New Teſtament commonly received at that time: but there is no reaſon to think he differed upon this head from other Chriſtians; there not having been any accuſations brought againſt him upon that account. Every one knows now what are the books I mean: the four goſpels, the Acts, thirteen epiſtles of St. Paul, the firſt epiſtle of St. Peter, and the firſt epiſtle of St. John: moſt of theſe we have ſeen quoted by him; and it may be taken for granted that the reſt alſo were a part of his canon. He likewiſe received the book of the Revelation: we ſaw a paſſage in him which may be ſuppoſed to refer to it. Beſides, we know it was received by St. Cyprian of Africa, with whom the church of Rome held a friendly correſpondence. It was alſo received by the anonymous writer [u] againſt the Novatian heretic, ſuppoſed contemporary with Novatus. This book is much quoted in that piece; which is an argument that it was a book of authority with thoſe againſt whom he wrote. We perceive farther, from the writings of Novatus, that he did not receive the epiſtle to the Hebrews as a part of ſacred ſcripture, for he never quotes it; though there are in it many texts, which he would certainly have reckoned to be to his purpoſe, if the epiſtle had

[m] Quia Chriſtus non homo tantum, ſed et Deus divinarum ſit rerum ſacris auctoritatibus approbatur. cap. 20, [al. 21] in.

[n] Sed enim ſcriptura divina hæreticorum et fraudes et furta facile convincit et detegit. cap. 24, [al. 19] p. 187.

[o] Quandoquidem non tam veteris quam etiam novi teſtamenti ſcriptura divina. cap. 26, [al. 29] p. 201. [p] Scripturæ ſanctæ. cap. 30, p. 229. [q] Et poterum quidem omnium ſcripturarum cœleſtium eventilare tractatus. cap. 21, [al. 16] init. Sed quo modo hoc tenemus et legimus et credimus, ſic ſcripturarum cœleſtium nullam partem præterire debemus. cap. 33, p. 230. [r] Non utique ex ſcripturarum cœleſtium vitio, quæ nunquam fallunt. cap. 30, p. 232. [s] Unus ergo et idem ſpiritus qui in prophetis et apoſtolis ... quoniam ibi ad momentum, hic ſemper. cap. 29, p. 219. [t] ——evangelia cuſtodit. cap. 29, p. 223. [u] See below p. 192.

been

been of authority with him. As for the diſputed catholic epiſtles, that of James, the ſecond epiſtle of St. Peter, the ſecond and third of St. John, and that of St. Jude, we have no clear evidences what was his opinion of them. He had a great regard for the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament commonly received. We have ſeen in him many undeniable proofs of that peculiar reſpect which was ſhewn the ſcriptures by all Chriſtians in general, as eſteeming them books of authority, by which all diſputes and controverſies were to be decided. Finally, it ought to be obſerved, that there is not in this learned Latin writer of the third century any the leaſt notice taken of ſpurious apocryphal Chriſtian writings.

VIII. It remains only that we obſerve the ſentiments of the Novatians concerning ſacred ſcripture. Having before carried down their hiſtory a good way below the time of their founder and firſt leader, it may be thought requiſite to make a diſtinct article of their teſtimony: but a ſhort one will ſuffice.

1. For, as we meet not with any complaints againſt them relating to this matter, it may be concluded that they had all along the ſame canon with the catholic Chriſtians of the ſeveral countries where they lived.

2. Philaſter [x] expreſsly ſays that the Novatians agreed with the catholic church in receiving the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament; which is not contradicted by Epiphanius, Theodoret, or Auguſtine, who alſo have written profeſſedly of heretics and their opinions. Socrates, giving an account of the difference between the catholics and Novatians, aſſures us, that each ſide endeavoured to ſupport itſelf by the authority of the divine ſcriptures.

3. This account is confirmed by the arguments of thoſe writers who deſignedly confute the Novatians: for, in their arguments, they quote to them as books of authority all the books commonly received by Chriſtians; particularly [z] the Acts of the Apoſtles.

4. It is probable, likewiſe, that they kept pace with the catholics in admitting the epiſtle to the Hebrews. That ſome of them

[x] Novatiani ſurrexerunt poſt perſecutionem poſtremam a Novato quodam, qui, [illegible] catholica credebant antea, Teſtamentum et novum accipientes. Philaſt. Her. 82. [y] ὅτω δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν [illegible] καὶ ἐκ τῶν θείων [illegible] ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἔλεγεν. Socrat. l. iv. c. [illegible] p. 245, D. [z] The Acts are quoted by ſeveral writers in their arguments againſt the Novatians, as Ephiphan. Hær. 59, n. viii. p. 500, & Ambroſ. de Pœnit. l. i. cap. 8. p. 399, E. cap. 10, p. 401, B C. Quid Paulus apoſtolus? erubeſcit, cum Athenienſem illum verum et dixit et comprobat? Nam in Actis apoſtolorum ita ponit, &c Pacian. Ep. 3. p. 308. B. C. Vid. etiam Qu. ex V. et N. T. Qu. cii.

in some places received this epistle, may be inferred from the passages of Epiphanius and Jerom before quoted: and St. Ambrose, in his books upon this controversy, considers [a] the objection taken from Hebr. vi. 4,—8, as does [b] Eulogius of Alexandria; who likewise says that [c] they argued from Hebr. x. 26, 27: but I do not observe that Pacian, or the anonymous author of the Questions out of the Old and New Testament, in writing against this sect, take any notice of the objection founded upon the passage in the sixth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. It is therefore my opinion, that, whilst the catholics were not agreed in receiving this epistle, so long there were also different sentiments about it among the Novatians.

5. I can say little concerning the opinion which these people had about the disputed catholic epistles.

6. As for the book of the Revelation, it was certainly received by them: it is quoted by most, if not all, the authors who write against them.

[a] Cum igitur tam evidenti et ipsius apostoli, et scriptorum ejus exemplo refutarguantur, tamen adhuc obniti volunt, et auctoritatem sibi sufragari sententiæ, allegantes scriptum ad Hebræos: Impossibile enim, &c. Ambr. de Pœnit. l. ii. cap. 2. p. 417. C. D. [b] Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1604. [c] Ib. p. 1609. in.

A NOTE UPON CHAP. XLVII.

It is commonly said, by learned moderns, that the Greek writers of the church have mistaken the name of Cornelius's rival, calling him Novatus *, and confounding this presbyter of Rome with the presbyter of Carthage: whereas his name, they say, was Novatianus, or Novatian. So Cave and Ruinart, and Petavius, not to mention any more. Hodie duos nominum similitudine decepti perpetuo fere confundunt scriptores Græci. *Cav. H. L. in Novatian.* Quin et ad ipsum Novatianum, quem Eusebius Novatum vocat, Græcorum more, qui Novati et Novatiani nomina sæpius confundunt. *Ruin. Act. M. Sinc. et Sel. de S. Dionys. Alex. n. xii. p.* 180. Græci enim Novatum et Novatianum inter se contuderunt, similitudine nominum decepti. Quo in errore fuit Eusebius noster. *Vales. Annot. in Euseb. l. vi. c.* 45.

1. My first argument therefore in support of the present assertion is, that this presbyter of Rome is generally called Novatus by the Greek writers; by Eusebius, and Socrates, and Sozomen, and divers others: and I know of no reason why they should be deceived herein. Eusebius had before him the letter of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, and the letter of Dionysius of Alexandria to this presbyter, and divers other letters of the same Dionysius, upon the controversy about receiving the lapsed: and the two last mentioned ecclesiastical historians were well acquainted with the Novatians at Constantinople,

* See note A, page 266.

who

who may be ſuppoſed to have known the name of the founder of their ſect. Let me add here, to all the Greek writers already mentioned, Athanaſius; who expreſsly ſays, that the Novatians were ſo called from Novatus: απο νοβατε νοβατιανοι *Orat. i. contr. Ar. p.* 407. B.

2. There are ſtill remaining in Latin authors traces of their agreement with the Greek writers upon this head. For this I allege the words of J. A. Fabricius: Euſebii et Rufini editiones νοβατω, Novato vi. 45. Sed Novatiano utique fuit illi nomen, non Novato, qui epiſcopum Romanum ſe contra Cornelium ordinari paſſus eſt anno 251, quo has ad eum literas Dionyſius Alexandrinus exaravit. *Fabric. not.* (*f*) *ad Hieron. de V. I. cap.* 69. Rufinus therefore, in his tranſlation of Euſebius, at the place referred to, has Novatus, as Fabricius owns. I ſhall next allege a paſſage taken from the notes of the Benedictine editors of St. Ambroſe's works: Romana editio ubique Novatum fecit e Novatiano: qua mutatione inductus in errorem Petavius Ambroſium noſtrum iis patribus a quibus ambo hæretiarchæ inter ſe confunduntur, accenſuit. Verum doctiſſimus vir ſecus ſenſiſſet, ſi quam aliam editionem, aut quemlibet manu exaratum codicem conſuluiſſet. *Not. in Ambroſ. de Pœnit. l. i. cap.* 3, *p.* 393. Hence then I learn, that in the Roman edition of St. Ambroſe's works is Novatus, where in other editions we now have Novatianus. Indeed the Benedictine editors of Ambroſe ſay, that all the manuſcripts have Novatianus. But, in anſwer to this, two things may be ſaid: 1. That it is likely the Roman editor did not put Novatus without ſome reaſon. 2. It is very likely that in ſome manuſcripts of divers Latin authors the name of the preſbyter of Rome may be found written Novatus: and what is to be farther offered will confirm this ſuppoſition. I therefore proceed in the ſecond argument. The Benedictines themſelves have ſo printed his name in their edition of St. Hilary of Poictiers: Nam in urbe Roma a Novato et Sabellio et Valentino hæreticis factum concilium, ab Orientalibus confirmatum eſt. *Hilar. ex. op. hiſt. Fragm. iii. p.* 1320. *F. Et vid. ibidem annotata.* Farther, I find his name frequently printed Novatus in the edition of St. Jerom's works by Martianay, a Benedictine likewiſe, of the congregation of St. Maur. Quid reſpondebit Novatus negans pœnitentiam, &c.? *Hieron. Comm. in Joel. cap.* 2. *p.* 1358. *in Tom. iii.* Hæc diximus, non quo juxta Novatum tollamus ipſam pœnitentiæ. *Id. in Amos, cap.* 5. *p.* 1407. *m.* Faceſſat itaque Novatus errantibus manus non porrigens.—— *Id in Ep.* 38, [*al.* 61] *T. iv. p.* 307. Ego Originem propter eruditionem ſic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, &c. *Ep.* 56, [*al.* 76] *p.* 589. *ib.* Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic riccant, &c. *adv. Jovin. l.* 2. *p.* 195. *m.* Non eſt loci hujus, ut pœnitentiam prædicem, et quaſi contra Montanum Novatumque ſcribens, clamem, &c. *ad Occan. Ep.* 84. [*al.* 30] *p.* 659. Montanus et qui Novati ſchisma ſectantur, nomen ſibi munditiæ præſumſere. *In Ep. ad Tit. cap.* 1. *p.* 414. *f.* I have put down all theſe paſſages out of Martianay's edition of Jerom's works, hoping I may rely upon him for the right readings. I obſerve, indeed, that, in the index of matters at the end of St. Jerom's fourth tome, Martianay diſtinguiſhes between Novatian, and Novatus the preſbyter of Carthage: ſuppoſing that where Jerom mentions Novatus he intends this laſt perſon,

and

Catholicus de humilitate et obedientia. *Vit. Montf. Bib. Mſs. T. i. p.* 46, 67, 1373*. This conſideration alone is ſufficient to render it probable that the perſon of whom we are ſpeaking was called Novatus: for it is not likely he ſhould have a name by which no other man was ever called.

5. Some learned moderns ſeem to have ſuppoſed that the name of this perſon was Novatus. I gueſs that Beauſobre and Lenfant were of this opinion, becauſe they write his name in French Novat: as may be ſeen in a paſſage formerly quoted, p. 244, note *. In Du Freſne's Latin tranſlation of the Paſchal Chronicle, the name Novatus is preſerved. p. 271, D. 272. A Pariſ. 1688. And I am apt to think it will be found, (though this ſingle inſtance only now offers itſelf to me,) that ſeveral learned moderns have kept the name Novatus in their Latin tranſlations of Greek writers.

Obj. I can think of but one objection of moment, which is, that this perſon's name is always written Novatian by St. Cyprian: and it muſt be owned that this is a conſiderable difficulty: nevertheleſs, I think it ought not to prevail againſt ſo much evidence as we have ſeen on the other ſide. The caſe ſeems to me to be this; Cyprian would have it that his preſbyter Novatus was the principal author of the diſturbances at Rome, [See before, p. 222.] And therefore he called the preſbyter of Rome Novatian, as if he had been only a follower of Novatus of Carthage: and, having once given him that name, he uſed it ever after. Moreover, having occaſion, or being of himſelf mightily diſpoſed, frequently to mention theſe two preſbyters together, no ſhorter way of diſtinguiſhing them could be thought of, than to call one Novatus, the other Novatianus: and St. Cyprian having often called him of Rome Novatian, I ſuppoſe he was without ſcruple followed by many Latin writers; though, I think, not univerſally; far from it: for we have ſeen above ſufficient evidence that, notwithſtanding Cyprian's way of writing, there were not a few ancient Latin authors, who always, or generally, called the preſbyter of Rome, and Cornelius's rival, Novatus.

It will be thought by ſome that I have dwelt too long upon ſo trifling a thing as a man's name: but, having long ago had doubts about it, I have choſen to put down here the collections I had made upon the point. Let others make what uſe of them they think fit.

* So I wrote in the firſt edition: but the book is eaſy enough to be found. It is in *Bib. PP. Maxima*, T. v. p. 1082, 1083, where it makes little more than one folio page. It is alſo in *Bib. PP. Morell.* Paris, 1644, T. ii. p. 75, &c.

CHAP

CHAP. XLVIII.

DIONYSIUS, bishop of Rome.

I. *His history and works.* II. *His character.* III. *His testimony to the scriptures.*

I. DIONYSIUS of Rome has been already mentioned by us in the history of his contemporary and namesake of Alexandria. He [a] was first presbyter, afterwards bishop of Rome. His predecessor Xystus, or Sixtus the second, suffered martyrdom [b] under the emperors Valerian and Gallienus, on the sixth day of August, in the year of Christ 258. It is now the general opinion [c] of learned men that, after the death of Xystus, the see of Rome was vacant almost a whole year, that Dionysius was ordained bishop of that city on the 22d day of July 259, and died the 26th of December 269.

In the time of his episcopate, probably near the beginning of the sole reign of Gallienus, not long after the defeat of Valerian by the Persians, and therefore about the year of our Lord 260 or 261, the Christians at Cæsarea in Cappadocia were in great distress; occasioned, as it seems, by the inroads of some barbarous people: for St. Basil [d] in one of his epistles says, 'that 'Dionysius wrote to the church of Cæsarea, and by his letters 'comforted them when under affliction, and likewise sent some 'persons to redeem those of the brethren that had been taken 'captive.' The memory of this benefit, St. Basil says, was preserved at Cæsarea, not only by the tradition of their ancestors, but also by the letter of that good bishop in their possession.

He was appealed to in the affair of Sabellianism, and probably in the beginning of his episcopate, in [e] the year 260, or soon

[a] Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 7. p. 254, A.

[b] Xystum autem in cœmeterio animadversum sciatis octavo iduum Augustarum die. Cypr. Ep. 80, [al. 82] p. 238. Jam de Xysto bono et pacifico sacerdote, ac propterea beatissimo martyre, ab urbe nuntius venerat. Pont. de Vit. Cyprian. p. 8. m. Sixti martyris, et Romanæ ecclesiæ episcopi. Hieron. ad Ctesiph. Ep. 43, p. 476, fin. Bened.

[c] Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Pagi Crit. in Baron. 258, n. vii. 271, n. x. Basnag. Ann. 259, n. viii. Tillem. Mem. T. iv. St. Denys Pape.

[d] Οιδαμεν γαρ, μνημης ακολουθια, παρα των πατερων ημων αιτηθεντων, και απο γραμματων των ετι και νυν φυλαγμενων παρ' ημιν, διδασκομενοι, Διονυσιον εκεινον, τον μακαριωτατον επισκοπον, —— επισκεπτομενον δια γραμματων την ημετεραν εκκλησιαν των Καισαρεων, και παρακαλουντα τους πατερας ημων δια γραμματων, και πεμπειν τους απολυτρουμενους εκ της αιχμαλωσιας την αδελφοτητα. Basil. Ep. 70, [al. 220] T. iii. p. 164, B. C. Bened.

[e] Vid. Basnag. Ann. 259, n. viii.

after.

after. 'Some catholics of Pentapolis,' as Athanasius [f] writes, 'dissatisfied with some expressions used by Dionysius of Alexandria in his writings upon that argument, went to Rome, and 'accused him there to his namesake Dionysius, bishop of Rome: 'and he, having heard them, wrote at once against the followers 'of Sabellius, and against those opinions for which Arius has 'been expelled the church; declaring, that the opinions of Sa- 'bellius, and of those who say the Word of God is a creature, 'a workmanship, and made, though directly opposite to each 'other, were equally impious. He also wrote to Dionysius, to 'inform him of the things laid to his charge; who immediately 'replied to entitling his books, A confutation and apology.' So writes Athanasius in his epistle concerning the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria. In another work he says; 'When [g] some 'brought accusations to the bishop of Rome against the bishop 'of Alexandria, as if he had said the Son was a creature, and 'not consubstantial to the Father, the synod at Rome was offend- 'ed, and the bishop of Rome sent the judgment of them all to 'his namesake. He afterwards vindicated himself, entitling 'his book, A confutation and apology: and thus he writes to 'him;' that is, to Dionysius of Rome.

There was therefore a synod at Rome, which had some concern in this business: but, whether it was convened upon occasion of the accusations brought against Dionysius of Alexandria, or whether his accusers found it assembled, and laid their charges against him before Dionysius of Rome, and the whole synod, is not clear. Hence also we perceive that Dionysius of Rome wrote in that controversy; but whether one piece only, or a treatise, and an epistle besides to Dionysius of Alexandria, is not certain. A large fragment of what he wrote upon this point remains cited in a work of Athanasius. I shall transcribe a part of it presently.

It should be observed, that Dionysius, whilst presbyter only, [h] wrote to his namesake of Alexandria upon the question of the baptism of heretics. And now, I think, we have mentioned all

[f] ——απηλθον εις την Ρωμην, και κατειπον αυτου παρα τω ομωνυμω αυτου Διονυσιω τω επισκοπω Ρωμης· ο δε, ακουσας, εγραψεν ομου κατα τε των τα σαβελλιου δοξαζοντων, και κατα των φρονουντων ταυτα απερ και αρειος λεγων εξεβληθη της εκκλησιας·—— επεστειλε δε και Διονυσιω δηλωσαι, περι ων εσιγησαν κατ' αυτου· και αντεγραψε, ειθυς αυτος, και επεγραψε τα βιβλια ελεγχου και απολογιας. Athan. de Sent. Dionys. T. i. p. 252.

[g] ——παρα τω επισκοπω Ρωμης του της Αλεξανδρειας επισκοπου, ως λεγοντα ποιημα, και κτισμα τον υιον του πατρος, η μεν κατα Ρωμην συνοδος ηγανακτησεν, ο δε της Ρωμης επισκοπος την παλαι γνωμην γραφει προς τον ομωνυμον εαυτου. χρονοις λειπει απ' αλληλων μηνες το μεν βιβλιον επιγραφει ελεγχου και απολογιας, γραφει δε ταυτα προς εκεινον. Athan. de Synodis, p. 757, F.

[h] Vid. Eus. lib. vii. cap. 5, p. 258, C.

the

the works of this bishop of Rome, of which we have any certain notice: I mean the letter just named, the letter to the Cæsareans mentioned by Basil, and what he wrote in the Sabellian controversy: for Jerom has not allotted him any distinct article in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers: and as for decretal, or other epistles ascribed to him, they are allowed [i] by learned men to be spurious: nor does there remain any thing of his genuine writings, beside the fragment just mentioned.

To this Dionysius was sent one of the letters about baptism, written by Dionysius of Alexandria, as [k] shewn formerly; as also another letter by the same person concerning one [l] Lucian. To him likewise were [m] addressed the four books concerning Sabellianism, written by the same Dionysius of Alexandria, as we are assured by Eusebius; with whom Athanasius agrees when he says, the vindication which that bishop made of himself, entitled, A confutation and apology, was inscribed to Dionysius of Rome. And lastly, to him, and Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, by name, as well as to all other bishops and clergy, and the universal church, was directed [n] the Synodical epistle of the council of Antioch, which condemned Paul of Samosata: but Dionysius dying before the end of the year 269, he never saw it: and possibly he was dead at the time of writing it, though the fathers of the council had not received any account of his death.

II. We are not without proofs of the eminence and distinction of this bishop for his personal merit, as well as the dignity of his see. His epistolary correspondence and friendship, whilst yet presbyter only, with the great Dionysius of Alexandria, is an argument he was a man of more than common accomplishments. Eusebius, who read the fourth letter of the Alexandrian bishop upon baptism, which we have not, observes, that from the testimony there given him it may be perceived that [o] Dionysius of Rome was a very learned and admirable man. Basil, in the place before quoted, styles him [p] 'a most blessed bishop, illustrious for the orthodoxy of his faith, and every other virtue:' and himself here mentions him together with Irenæus, Clement of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria, and other ancient eccle-

[i] Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. 269. n. iii. Basnag. in Baron. 259. n. ix. Tillem. Mem. St. Denys p. 701, 702.

[k] See before, ch. xxi. p. 70.

[l] See the same, numb. vii. p. 72.

[m] See the same, numb. vii. p. 73. Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 30. init.

[n] Ἐξ ὧν γραφαὶ πᾶσιν, ὅπως καὶ αὐτὸς ἔφησε τι καὶ ξαυτοῦ πρὸς τὸν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν Διονύσιον μεμαρτύρηται. Euseb. l. vii. c. 7. fin.

[o] Διονύσιος ἀνὴρ, τὸν μακαριτὴν ἐπίσκοπον, παρ' οὗ καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν πίστιν, καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν ἀρετὴν διαπρέψαντα. Basil. ut supra.

[p] Ἐγνωκαμεν ἀνὴρ, καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Ῥωμαίος,

siastical writers of chief note. I need not insist any farther upon the regard which Athanasius has shewn him.

III. However, I am now to transcribe from Athanasius a part of the fragment of this bishop of Rome, which he has preserved: It will represent to us his respectful manner of speaking of the scriptures in general: and it contains quotations out of some books of the New Testament.

'The true disciples of Christ,' says [r] Dionysius, 'know very 'well that a trinity is taught by the divine scriptures; but that 'neither the Old nor the New Testament teach three Gods.' Afterwards: 'But [s] the Son always was, if he *is in the Father*, as 'he himself says: (John xiv. 11.) and if Christ be his word 'and wisdom and power, as ye know the divine scriptures say, 'Christ is.' He argues: 'Was [t] he made, who is *the first-* 'begotton of every creature?' Col. i. 15. 'He observes, that [u] in 'many places the divine oracles say Christ was begotten; no- 'where that he was made.' Finally, at the conclusion of the fragment: 'For [x] *I*,' says he, '*and the Father are one.*' And, '*I in the Father, and the Father in me.*' John x. 30. xiv. 10, 11.

This is all I have to produce from Dionysius: though it be little, it suffices to shew the concurrence of this bishop of Rome with other Christians of that time in acknowledging the divine scriptures, and divine oracles, to be the rule of faith by which all doctrines were to be tried. He likewise, as well as others, teaches us where these oracles are to be found; namely, in the Old and New Testament, which contain all the scriptures that were in the strictest sense sacred and divine.

και Διονυσιος ο Ρωμαιος, κ. λ. Id. de Sp. S. cap. 29, p. 60, Bened. [r] Ουτοι γαρ τριαδα μεν κηρυττομενην υπο της θειας γραφης σαφως επιστανται, τρεις δε Θεους ουτε παλαια ουτε καινη διαθηκη κηρυττουσαν. ap Ath. de Decret. Nicen. Syn. T. i. p. 231, F. Bened,

[s] αει δε ην, ει γε εν τω πατρι εστι, ως αυτος φησι· και ει λογος και σοφια και δυναμις ο Χριστος· ταυτα γαρ ειναι τον Χριστον αι θειαι λεγουσι γραφαι, ωσπερ επιστασθε. ib. p. 232, A. [t] Ποιημα ο πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως——; ib. D. [u] και πολλαχε δε των θειων λογιων γεγενησθαι,—λεγομενον—κ. λ. ibid.

[x] Εγω γαρ, φησι, και ο πατηρ εν εσμεν· και εγω εν τω πατρι, και ο πατηρ εν εμοι· ibid. E.

CHAP.

CHAP XLIX.

COMMODIAN.

I. *His history and work.* II. *Select passages.* III. *His testimony to the scriptures.*

I. COMMODIAN, a Latin author, formerly supposed by some to have lived in the time of Constantine, near the beginning of the fourth century, now [a] with more reason reckoned contemporary with St. Cyprian, or to have lived soon after him, is not at all mentioned by St. Jerom. As Gennadius, who wrote near the end of the fifth century, has given Commodian a place in his book of Ecclesiastical writers, I place [b] the whole article entire at the bottom of the page.

He speaks loosely [c] of its being then two hundred years from Christ to his own time. It is likely, therefore, that [d] it was not quite three hundred years since Christ when he wrote: nor are there any expressions throughout the work that should induce us to think he lived after the alteration of the state of things made by the conversion of Constantine. Cave therefore seems to have rightly concluded that he wrote about the year 270.

It is no improbable conjecture, that Commodian was a native of Africa: it is certain he [e] was originally a heathen: it appears from his acknowledgments in many places.

It may be argued that he was not an illiterate person; for, as

[a] They who desire to know more of Commodian, and his time, and the editions of his work, will do well to consult Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 136, &c. and Fabr. De Verit. Rel. Christ. p. 227, &c. I make use of Davies's edition at the end of Minucius Felix. Cantabr. 1712.

[b] Commodianus, dum inter seculares literas etiam nostras legit, occasionem accepit fidei. Factus itaque Christianus, et volens aliquid studiorum suorum muneris offerre Christo, suæ salutis auctori, scripsit mediocri sermone, quasi versu, librum adversum Paganos. Et quia parum nostrarum attigerat literarum, magis illorum destruere potuit dogmata, quam nostra firmare. Unde et de divinis repromissionibus adversum illos vili satis et crasso, ut ita dixerim, sensu disseruit, illis stuporem et nobis desperationem incutiens, Tertullianum, et Lactantium, et Papiam auctores secutus. Moralem sane doctrinam, et maxime voluntariæ paupertatis amorem optime prosecutus, studentibus inculcavit. Gennad. De V. I. cap. 15.

[c] ——Cur annis ducentis
fuistis infantes?—— Instr. vi. p. 202.

[d] Vid. Davis. not.

[e] Ego similiter erravi tempore multo,
Fana prosequendo, parentibus insciis ipsis.
Instr. i. p. 199.
Gens et ego fui perversa mente moratus.
Instr. xxvi. p. 221.
Et ego qui moneo idem fui, nescius errans.
Ib. xxxiii. p. 226
——de cloaca levatus.——ib. lxiii. p. 253.

he himself says, he [f] was converted by reading the law; that is, as [g] Rigaltius understands him, the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Gennadius plainly supposeth him to have been acquainted with secular authors before he read the sacred scriptures.

The only work of this author, mentioned by Gennadius, is still in being; consisting of eighty sections, or instructions, all acrostics, in a style between verse and prose.

Gennadius calls it a little book against the Pagans: but no one can suppose that to have been the title originally: it is more likely that [h] it was in general entitled instructions. Nor is it against heathens only; Christians likewise are here instructed and admonished as [i] Rigaltius clearly perceived.

In the former part of the work Commodian derides and exposes the heathen deities and their worship: this was an easy thing: herein, for certain, the Christians triumphed; and Commodian's thoughts are both just and acute. He likewise instructs the [k] Jews; and not content with this he also instructs Christians. This was yet a greater and more difficult attempt. To confute error by reason and argument is a laudable performance; but it may be soon done, and without much labour: to persuade men to act as Christians and friends of truth, requires more time and pains. Commodian aimed at this difficult work: and accordingly he instructs [l] catechumens, the [m] faithful, [n] Christian women, the [o] inferior clergy, [p] the pastors or bishops of the church, [q] and the aged; not to mention any other particulars.

Commodian [r] had no office in the church; but he endeavoured to be useful by propounding good instructions: and, if he was not a fine writer, he was an honest man and a zealous Christian.

II. Having given this history of Commodian, and his work, I shall make some extracts out of him, for shewing the sentiments of Christians at that time.

1. He often says that [s] the heathen people were deceived and imposed upon by their priests.

[f] Abstuli me tandem inde, legendo de lege. Instr. i. p. 199.

[g] Legem hic et alibi passim appellat libros utriusque Testamenti. Rigalt.

[h] Ob ea perdoctus ignaros instruo verum. Instr. i. p. 199.

[i] Libello suo Commodianus titulum fecit Institutiones, scilicet ad paganos, ut ab idolorum cultu ad verum Christianæ legis philosophiam convertantur: quinetiam Christianos ipsos, ne obliti Christianorum ad secularia redeant. Rigalt. in Præf. Davis. p. 197. [k] Instr. xxxvii. xxxviii. xxxix. lx. [l] ib n. xlvi. [m] n. xlvii. xlviii. et passim. [n] n. lix. lx.

[o] Mysterium Christi, zacones, exercite estse.
Ideirco ministri facite præcepta magistri. Instr. n. lxviii.

[p] Pastor, si confessus fuerit, geminavit agonem. &c. n. lxix. [q] ibid.

[r] Non sum ego doctor, sed ipse docet ipsa elementa. num. lxiii. p. 256.

[s] Vos autem seducunt sacerdotes pauci. Instr. viii. p. 205.

2. Commodian

2. Commodian believed that [t] men have free-will; that they are born reasonable beings, not brutes; and that, with the help of those means which God affords them, they are able to convert themselves from error and sin, if they will but use their natural powers, and exercise thought and consideration.

3. He shews what [u] was the common opinion of Christians at that time concerning the fall of the angels.

4. Commodian [x] heartily embraced the doctrine of the expected millennium. He deserves to be added to authors [y] formerly mentioned.

5. He mentions [z] the Lord's day: and, as [a] Rigaltius understands it, the passage shews that Christians had love-feasts upon that day.

6. What he says [b] of antichrist may deserve the notice of the curious.

III. Nothing remains but that we observe the scriptures cited by him.

1. Commodian quotes several books of the Old Testament; and in one place [c] Tobit.

2. He expressly speaks of the [d] Old Testament, which prophe-

Deludunt vos pauci scelerati vates inanes,
Extricare tuam dum quærunt vitam.
Subornant aliis esse sub mysteria falsum,
Inde simulantes concuti numine quodam,
Mentitaque canunt, et se sub figura fatigant, &c. num. xvii. p. 212.

[t] Quis, homo, tu frater, noli pecus esse ferinum,
Erue te tandem, et tecum ipse retracta.
Non utique pecus, nec bestia es, sed homo natus.
Tu te ipse doma sapiens, et iura sub arma. num. xxxiv. p. 227.

[u] Cum Deus Omnipotens exornaret mundi naturam,
Visitari voluit terram ab angelis istam.

— — — —

Tanta fuit forma feminarum, quæ flecteret illos,
Ut eo inquinati non possent cœlo redire. num. iii.

[x] Reddere decrevit nos ipsos in aureo sæclo. n. xxix. p. 224. Conf. n. xxxiv. p. 228.
De cœlo descendet civitas in anastasi prima.

— — — —

Rumgemus illi qui fulmen Ali devoti.

— — — —

Recipiuntque bona, quoniam mala passi fuere.
Degenerant ipsi per annos mille nubentes.
Computantur sibi tota vestigia terræ, &c. n. xliv. p. 237, 238. vid. et n. lxxx.

[y] See p. 116.

[z] Et die Dominica quid dicis? Si non ante locavit,
Tolle de turba pauperem, quem ad prandium ducas. num. lxi. p. 254.

[a] Hic vero locus indicat, olim Commodiani in ecclesia diebus Dominicis agapas in usu fuisse. Rigalt. [b] Vid. num. xli.

[c] Prandia ab eo prospice Tobia, qui semper
Omnibus omnino diebus cum paupere sumpsit. num. lxi. p. 254.

[d] Et Deus lex prima fundamentum posteræ legis.

— — — —

Novum testamentum vetus de illo proclamat. Instr. xxv. p. 220.

fied of Christ: therefore there was another which was called the New Testament: he likewise in the same place speaks of the old and new law.

3. He quotes or alludes to divers things [c] in the gospels.

4. He refers to the history of St. Stephen [f] in the Acts of the apostles.

5. He quotes divers of St. Paul's epistles; as [g] the first to the Corinthians, the [h] epistle to the Philippians, the [i] epistles to Timothy and Titus.

6. I cannot well tell whether [k] he refers to the epistle of St. James.

7. He plainly refers [l] to 1 John ii. 15.

8. He very frequently transcribes or refers to the [m] book of the Revelation, and once [n] expressly quotes it.

9. Commodian's respect for the scriptures appears many ways, in frequently adapting the words of it, and in the manner of quoting it.

10. He quotes [o] the writings of the blessed Paul as of authority: in one place, [p] Paul, or rather God by him, says. He refers [q] all men to the law, that is, the scriptures, in order to their understanding religion.

11. It is pleasing to observe this high respect for scripture running through the writings of all early Christians in general.

[c] Idcirco cæcus cæcum in fossam deducit. num. xxvii, p. 220.
Unde Deus clamat, stulte hac nocte vocaris. n. lxiv. p. 256. Vid. Luc. xii. 20.
Vid. n. lv. p. 247, et alibi passim.
In talibus spes *est* vestra de Christo refecto. n. lxi. vid. Matth. xxv.

[f] Rectam qui diligit Stephanus sibi vitam in iter. n. lxii. p. 254.

[g] Crux autem stultitia facta est adulteræ genti. n. xxxvi. p. 229.

[h] Vobis autem Deus est venter, et præmia jura.
Suggerit hoc Paulus apostolus; non ego duplex. n. xxxi, p. 225. vid. ad Philip. cap. iii.

[i] Apostolus autem tales jubet esse magistros.
Sit patiens rector, &c. n. lxix. p. 260.

[k] Maledicti retine linguam, unde Dominum adoras. n. lxiii. p. 255. Vid. Jac. iii. 5.

[l] Nolite diligere mundum, neque ambitum ejus. n. lvii. p. 249.

[m] Vid. Instr. xli. xlii. xliii. lxxx. et passim.

[n] —— ut ferunt operta Joannis. n. xliii. p. 237

[o] Audi vocem, quæ vis Christiana manere,
Beatus Paulus qualiter te ornari præcipit. n. lx. in.

[p] Apostolus Paulus clamat, immo Deus per ipsum. n. lviii. p. 250.

[q] Omnipotentis enim in lege quærite cuncti.

Lex docet, in medio ciet, consulite pro vobis. n. xxii. p. 217.

CHAP.

CHAP. L.

MALCHION.

I. His history, and testimonies to him. II. Remarks, and his testimony to the scriptures.

I. SAYS Jerom in his [a] Catalogue: 'Malchion, a most elo-
'quent presbyter of the church of Antioch, who had taught
'rhetoric in the same city with great applause, held a disputation
'with Paul of Samosata, bishop of the church of Antioch,
'who had revived the opinion of Artemon: which disputation
'was taken down by short-hand writers, and is still extant.
'There is also another large epistle written by him in the name
'of the synod, and directed to Dionysius and Maximus, bishops
'of Rome and Alexandria: He flourished under Claudius and
'Aurelian.'

So Jerom in the above-mentioned work. Malchion [b] is again mentioned by him in his letter to Magnus among other ancient Christian authors.

Eusebius, in his account of the last council of Antioch, in the affair of Paul, speaks of Malchion after this manner in his ecclesiastical history: 'But [c] the person who especially convicted and
'confuted him, when he endeavoured to conceal himself, was
'Malchion, an eloquent man, and a sophist, president of the
'school of Greek literature at Antioch; who for his uncommon
'soundness in the faith of Christ had the honour to be made a
'presbyter in that church. Being the only person of all present
'that was able to detect that subtile and deceitful man, he en-
'tered into dispute with him: which disputation was taken
'down by short-hand writers, and we know it to be still extant.'

[a] Malchion disertissimus Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, quippe qui in eadem urbe rhetoricam florentissime docuerat, adversum Paulum Samosatenum, qui Antiochenæ ecclesiæ episcopus dogma Artemonis instaurarat, excipientibus notariis disputavit, qui dialogus usque hodie exstat. Sed et alia grandis epistola ex persona synodi, ab eo scripta, ad Dionysium et Maximum, Romanæ et Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ episcopos, dirigitur. Floruit sub Claudio et Aureliano. De V. I. cap. 71.

[b] Necnon presbyterorum Pamphili, Pierii, Luciani, Malchionis. ad Mag. Orat. ep. 83, [al. 84] p. 656, m.

[c] μαλιστα δ' αυτον ευθυνας επιχειρησομενον διηλεγξε Μαλχιων· ανηρ τα τε αλλα λογιος, και σοφιστης των επ' αντιοχειας ελληνικων παιδευσεων διδασκαλος· ος μην αλλα και οι υπερβαλλουσαν της εις χριστον πιστεως γνησιοτητα προσδοκηθεντα της αυτου παροικιας αξιωμενος, θειος γραφαι επισημοτατων ταχυγραφων, ζητησιν προς αυτον εισπεσαμενος, ην και εις δευρο φερομενην ισμεν, μονος ισχυσε των αλλων κρυψινουν εχθρα και απαλλον φωραται τον ανθρωπον. Euf. l. vii. c. 29.

Theodoret calls this perſon Malachion: he [d] ſays that he was formerly a ſophiſt, afterwards ordained preſbyter; that he diſputed with Paul, and convicted him of holding the opinion he was charged with.

Theſe are the principal remaining accounts of Malchion, and teſtimonies to him; for I think it ſcarce worth obſerving, what is ſaid by ſo late a [e] writer as Trithemius, that Malchion taught rhetoric at Antioch with applauſe many years: and yet perhaps he concluded as much from an expreſſion of [f] Theodoret. Indeed we do not find much notice taken of Malchion in ancient writers. The Greek Chriſtians however have put him into their calendar for the ſervice he did in oppoſing Paul of Samoſata, as has been obſerved by Valeſius [g] and others.

II. Having put down theſe teſtimonies to this author, I propoſe to mention ſome obſervations.

1. It is probable that Malchion was originally a heathen: Jerom does not expreſsly ſay ſo; but he ſays he taught rhetoric at Antioch with reputation; which is near the ſame with what [h] he ſays of Cyprian, who certainly was at firſt a heathen. Nor does Euſebius expreſsly ſay it: but that he taught Greek literature, as I have tranſlated him; or profane learning, as Du Pin renders the ſame phraſe. And Theodoret, as well as Euſebius, ſays, that Malchion was at firſt a ſophiſt. I preſume theſe teſtimonies therefore may afford a probable argument that Malchion was originally a heathen; but whether they are ſufficient to put the point beyond diſpute I cannot ſay.

2. Malchion was an author, or a Chriſtian writer. The Diſputation or conference, mentioned by Euſebius and Jerom, muſt be reckoned his. It was, as we may well ſuppoſe, publiſhed by him, and not by Paul; and both Euſebius and Jerom ſpeak of it as extant in their times: but it appears to me ſomewhat probable that Euſebius had never read it: he ſays we know it to be ſtill extant: if he had ſeen it I ſuppoſe he would have expreſſed himſelf differently.

Jerom aſcribes likewiſe to Malchion the epiſtle of the laſt council of Antioch, of which we have large fragments in Euſebius's Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory: indeed Cave [k] makes a doubt of

[d] Μαλχιωνος δε τινος πρότερον μεν σοφιστευσαντος, ὕστερον δε τῳ πρεσβυτερίῳ τιμηθεντος χειροτονίᾳ, τον περι τον παυλον ποιησαμενου διαλεξιν, εξεταζει τον γενομενον αιρεσιαρχην λογον, &c. Theod. Haret. Fab. L. ii. c. 8, p. 223, B. [e] ——quippe qui rhetoricam in eadem civitate multis annis florentiſſime docuit. Trithem. de ſcript. Eccl. cap. 45. [f] ——υστερον δε πρεσβυτερικῆς τιμηθεντος χειροτονίας. vid. not. [d]. [g] Valeſ. Annot. in Euſ. l. vii. cap. 29. Vid. et Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. Not. de Samoſates, art. 5, p. 268. [h] Vid. de V. I. cap. 67. [i] —les ſciences profanes. Du Pin. Bibl. p. 193. [k] Cav. Hiſt. Lit. in Malchion.

this:

this: he ſuſpects that Jerom ſaid it of his own head, without any good authority: but moſt other [l] learned moderns, whom I have conſulted, allow that epiſtle to have been compoſed by Malchion: I mean particularly Fabricius, Tillemont, and Fleury. Du Pin does not declare his opinion: he only obſerves that Jerom ſays Malchion was alſo the author of the letter written in the name of the ſynod againſt Paul of Samoſata. I ſee no good reaſon to diſpute Jerom's account; and the piece ſhews its author: Malchion was a ſophiſt, and the epiſtle is a common place of accuſation.

We have no certain account of any other works of Malchion, beſide the diſputation and epiſtle juſt mentioned. Jerom mentions theſe two only, without ſo much as hinting there were any other. Trithemius indeed ſays that [m] Malchion compoſed ſeveral excellent works of great uſe againſt heretics; but that is a mere flouriſh: he mentions none by name but the two we have taken notice of already.

3. There is nothing now remaining of Malchion that can be depended on as genuine, beſide the fragments of the ſynodical epiſtle in Euſebius, of which I gave a large account [n] formerly. It has been obſerved by [o] ſeveral learned men, that Leontius of Byzantium, who lived near the end of the ſixth century, has cited two [p] paſſages of the Diſputation or conference with Paul: for Du Pin ſays it [q] is not altogether certain that they are genuine. Tillemont [r] obſerves likewiſe, that there is a paſſage out of it in the letter of Peter the deacon to Fulgentius, and other African biſhops: which Peter flouriſhed in the ſame ſixth century, but earlier than Leontius above-named: it is only a part of what is cited by Leontius. I have not made any uſe of theſe fragments in my hiſtory of Paul [s] formerly given: nor do I intend now to take any thing out of them.

Trithemius expreſſeth himſelf as [t] if that Diſputation was in being in his time: but [u] Fabricius well obſerves, in a note upon him, that thoſe words mean no more than that it was extant in the time of Jerom, not of Trithemius. The ſame obſervation,

[l] Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. l. vi. c. 4. Tom. V. p. 54. Cette lettre fut compoſée par Malchion. Tillem. ut ſupra, p. 630. See likewiſe Fleury's Eccl. Hiſt. B. 8, ch. 29. [m] Edidit nonnulla præclara volumina, quæ ſuo tempore ad fidei Chriſtianæ defenſionem contra hæreticos multum profuiſſe videbantur. Trithem. de Script. Eccl. cap. 45. [n] p. 80, 81. [o] Fabric. ut ſupra. Valeſ. ut ſupr. Tillem. ib. p. 630. [p] Vid. Baluz. Concil. p. 19.—22. [q] Mais il n'eſt pas entierement certain, qu'ils ſoient veritables. Du Pin in Malchion, above, p. 193. [r] Tillem. ub. ſupr. p. 629. [s] p. 78, 79. [t] —— De quibus exſtat opus inſigne dialogorum contra Paulum Samoſatenum. Trithem. ut ſupr. Extabat Hieronymi tempore, non Trithemii. Fabric.

I suppose, ought to be applied to [x] Bede in the eighth, and [y] Freculph in the ninth, century; who likewise speak of this piece as extant in their times: but they only transcribe Jerom: and it is he, in all these places, who is to be understood to say it was then extant; that is, in his time.

If the citations of Leontius and Peter the deacon are not to be relied upon, then we have not any certain notice of this work after Eusebius and Jerom: what has been the occasion of so great neglect of this piece I cannot say; but, methinks, it is pity it is not still extant.

4. I would observe, in the fourth place, that Malchion was the principal director of the last council of Antioch concerned about Paul of Samosata. In the first council moderate principles prevailed: in the last [z] council, when Firmilian was dead, and several other eminent bishops absented for some reason or other, very different measures were taken: these, as I formerly [a] intimated, may be chiefly ascribed to Malchion. We have now seen farther proof of that supposition: Eusebius assures us that Malchion only, and no other, was able to detect or confute Paul: and Jerom, besides, informs us that the large epistle written in the name of that council was composed by Malchion: what better evidence can be desired of this matter? Nor is this my thought only. Du Pin, speaking of Malchion, says: 'he [b] had a famous dispute with Paul of Samosata in the second 'council of Antioch, held in 270; and, after having detected 'the errors which that heretic endeavoured to conceal, he [c] 'caused him to be condemned by the council.'

5. I observe, in the fifth place, what was Malchion's opinion concerning the doctrine of the trinity does not clearly appear. Eusebius speaks of Malchion as a man of uncommon soundness in the faith of Christ: but if Eusebius was an Arian, as some think, and if that character relates to the doctrine of the trinity, this testimony, instead of assuring us of Malchion's orthodoxy upon that head, may rather occasion a suspicion that he Arianised. There is another thing, which may occasion a doubt whether Malchion held the Nicene faith. The council of Nice established the homousian, or consubstantial doctrine: but it is said that the council of Antioch (in which, as has been shewn, Malchion directed and governed) rejected the word consubstantial as improper. This has been taken notice of by several ancient

[x] Vid. Bed. Chr. p. 22, Cantabr. 1722. [y] Freculph. Chr. T. iii. l. iii. c. 11. ap. Bib. Patr. Tom. xiv. p. 1166, D. [z] See p. 80, 85. [a] p. 85. [b] Du Pin, as before, p. 193. [c] ——il le fit condamner par le Concile, ib.

writers

writers of the fourth century; [d] Athanasius, [e] Hilary of Poictiers, and [f] Basil. This therefore, if the council of Nice be the standard of orthodoxy, casts a suspicion upon that of Antioch; and [g] there is no small difficulty in reconciling these councils: but I may not stay to inquire exactly into that matter: it is sufficient for me at present to give these hints, and refer to those ancient writers above-named, and some [h] learned moderns of great note, who have endeavoured to reconcile this contradiction, real or apparent; and to shew that, notwithstanding the different sentiments and conduct of these two councils with regard to this word, yet they both held the same doctrine.

6. With regard to Malchion's canon of scripture: as we have nothing of him remaining besides the above-mentioned fragments in Eusebius, and I have formerly [i] observed the notice taken of scripture in the synodical epistle of the council of Antioch, I have nothing farther to add here upon this head, but only to say, That it ought to be taken for granted that Malchion owned and respected those scriptures which were generally received at that time among Christians: but what was his opinion concerning the books of the New Testament, then doubted of by some, cannot be certainly known.

CHAP. LI.

ANATOLIUS, and three others, bishops of Laodicea.

I. *Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, his history and works.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures.* III. *Eusebius, likewise bishop of Laodicea.* IV. *Stephen,* V. *Theodotus, bishops of the same city.*

I. SAYS Jerom: 'Anatolius, [a] a native of Alexandria, bishop 'of Laodicea in Syria, flourished under the emperors Probus

[d] Δια τυτ' εικοτως ειλαβηθεισες το τυτου σοφισμα τυ σαμοσατεως, ειρηκασι, μη ειναι τον χριστον ομοουσιον. Ath. de Synod. p. 759, B.

[e] Male homousion Samosatenus confessus est: sed numquid melius Arii negaverunt? Octoginta episcopi olim respuerunt; sed trecenti et decem octo nuper recepe-runt, &c. Hil. de Syn. n. lxxxvi, p. 1200, Conf. Facund. l. x. c. 6. [f] Και γαρ τω αυτω, οι επι παυλω τω σαμοσατει συνελθοντες, ειπαλου την λεξιν ως ουκ ευσημον. Basil. Ep. 52 [al. 300] p. 145, B. [g] De hac synodorum αντιλογια laborarunt theologi, qua veteres, qua neoterici. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 29, a. m. [h] Petav. de Trin. l. iv. c. 5. num. ii iii. Bull Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 1. num. ix. x. xi. Basnag. Ann. 269, num. vi. Tillem. ut supr. Paul de Samos. art. 5, p. 631, 632. [i] See p. 87. [a] Anatolius Alexandrinus, Laodiceæ Syriæ episcopus, sub Probo et Caro imperatoribus floruit. Miræ doctrinæ vir fuit in arithmetica, geometria, astronomia, grammatica, rhetorica, dialectica. Cujus ingenii magnitudinem

'and

'and Carus. He was exceedingly well skilled in arithmetic, 'geometry, astronomy, grammar, rhetoric, logic. The greatness 'of his capacity may be perceived from his work concerning Eas-'ter, and from his ten books of institutions of (A) arithmetic.'

Probus reigned from 276 to August 282; Carus the remainder of that year, and all 283. Nevertheless, Cave has placed Anatolius as flourishing about the year 270, and not much amiss; Eusebius, whom he succeeded, having died, as is [b] supposed, in 269 or 270; though some [c] think not before 272.

Anatolius is placed in Jerom's Chronicle at the third year of Probus, the year of Christ 278, after this manner: 'Anatolius, [d] bi-'shop of Laodicea, well acquainted with all the principles of the 'philosophers, is now much celebrated.'

Nor did Jerom forget Anatolius [e] in his letter to Magnus.

Jerom undoubtedly was indebted to Eusebius for what he knew of this person. Now therefore we will see what Eusebius himself writes of him in his Ecclesiastical history.

He says 'that [f] Anatolius was an Alexandrian, and bishop 'of Laodicea after Eusebius; and that for eloquence, and no-'skill in philosophy and the Greek literature, he was the most 'eminent person of his time; being a complete master of arith-'metic, geometry, and likewise of logic, natural philosophy, and 'rhetoric: for the sake of which qualifications, as is said, he was 'desired by the people of Alexandria to set up a school for the 'Aristotelian philosophy.'

When that request was made we cannot say exactly; but, if ever, undoubtedly before he left Alexandria, and was advanced to the episcopal office. Nor is there any certain information given us of his complying with that request: though Fabricius in [g] one place scruples not to say, without hesitation, that he set up such a school at Alexandria.

Anatolius and his friend Eusebius performed signal services for the people of Alexandria, both Christians and others; when

de volumine, quod super Pascha composuit, et decem libris de arithmetica institutione, malligore possumus. Hier. de V. I. c. 73. (A) They who desire to see what learned moderns say of Anatolius may consult Cav. H. L. T. I. i. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 637.——643. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. ii. p. 274, &c. T. v. p. 177. [b] See Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 641. Euseb. Ann. 269, n. ix. [c] Pagi. Anon. 269. n. ix. [d] Anatolius Laodicenus episcopus philosophorum disciplinis eruditus plurimo sermone celebratur. Chr. p. 177. [e] Ep. 83, [al. 84].

[f] Γενος μεν και αυτος αλεξανδρευς, λογων δε ευ εχει, και παιδειας της ελληνικης, φιλοσοφιας τε, και τα πρωτα των μαλιστα και κατα τα μαθηματων απειργασμενος, ατε αριθμητικης ειδικως εις ακρον. ων ενεκα και της αλεξανδρεων πολιτειας αριστοτελης διαδοχης την σχολην, λογος εχει προς των της πολεως συνεστασθαι αιτων αξιωθηναι. Eus. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 284, D. 285. A. [g] Anatolius Alexandriæ scholam Aristotelicam constituit, fœtus deinde episcopus in Syria Laodicenus circa A. Chr. 270. Bib. Gr. T. ii. p. 274.

Brochius;

Bruchium, or Pyruchium, one of the quarters of that city, in which too was the citadel, ſuffered under the extremities of a ſiege. Anatolius was ſhut up in Bruchium; Euſebius was without among the Romans, the beſiegers. One of thoſe ſervices is particularly related by [h] our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, to whom I refer. Anatolius had the better opportunity to be uſeful to the public by means of the high eſteem he was in: for Euſebius ſays, that [i] with univerſal conſent he had preeminence above all the magiſtrates or ſenators of Alexandria, that were in Bruchium.

Learned men [k] find no ſmall difficulty in ſettling the time of this ſiege. Tillemont thought it [l] to be in the reign of Gallienus in 263 or 264; Baſnage [m] in 262 or 263; whoſe opinions ſeem to me more probable than their's who place it later.

Soon after that ſiege was over Anatolius [n] left Alexandria.

Our hiſtorian tells us 'that [o] Theotecnus, biſhop of Cæſarea 'in Paleſtine, ordained Anatolius biſhop, intending that he 'ſhould ſucceed him: and it is certain that for a ſhort time they 'both preſided together in that church: but Anatolius, [p] going 'to Antioch to be preſent at the council called upon the occaſion 'of Paul of Samoſata, as he was paſſing through Laodicea, was 'detained there by the brethren, Euſebius being dead.'

It is reaſonable to think that our hiſtorian muſt mean the laſt ſynod in the affair of Paul, which was held in 269. After this he ſays nothing farther of Anatolius. But here he died; for, as the hiſtorian adds, he [q] was ſucceeded by Stephen, the laſt biſhop of Laodicea, before the perſecution of Diocletian began.

'Anatolius,' ſays [r] Euſebius, 'did not write many books; 'however, from thoſe which have come down to us may be per-'ceived both his eloquence and his extenſive knowledge and 'learning, particularly from his work concerning Eaſter.'—'The [s] ſame Anatolius left alſo the Principles of arithmetic in 'ten books, and likewiſe ſome other works, monuments of his

L. vii. c. 32, p. 285 et 286, A.

Μεγας, φησι, και παρ' ἑτερων αρισταις ... ἐλαμπρυνετο τῃ πολιτικῃ πολει, ἱκανος ... ἀστε των εν τελει προεστωτας ... τῃς κατ' αὐτον ἐξουσιας ... ib. p. 285, A. [k] Vid. Pagi in Baron. Ann. 269, ... xi. [l] See his Hiſt des Emp. ... Gallien, art. 12. T. iii P. iii. p 974, ... p. 1175. [m] Baſn. Ann. 262, n. ... [n] Euſ. ib. p. 286, B. [o] Τουτῳ ... χειρας εις επισκοπην επι- ... ib. p. 288, A. [p] Euſ. ib. A. B. ... τον Ανατολιον δ. τον θειον ανταλλα- ξαιτο, της εκεισε παρεπιδημουσης τοις προ ... διαγειν κεκριται στεφανος. ib. p. 288, B.

[q] Ων ... τοσαυτα ... συγγραμματα· τοσαυτα ... ἀστε ... λογικε, και φιλοσοφους ... περι τῃ παλαιᾳ εορτῃ ... ib. p. 286, B. C. [r] Και ... ὁ αυτος ... γραφας, και ... της ... ib. p. 287, D. 288, A.

'diligence

'diligence in ſtudying the divine ſcriptures, and of his under-'ſtanding therein.'

Euſebius has inſerted in his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory [t] a long paſſage of Anatolius's book upon Eaſter, or his Paſchal canons, as he there calls it: and Ægidius Bucherius has publiſhed the ſame work in an ancient Latin verſion ſaid to be Rufinus's; which is generally allowed to be, for the main at leaſt, the genuine work of Anatolius. It is thought by ſome, that there are remaining fragments of his other work, the Inſtitutions of arithmetic. Fabricius [u] has publiſhed ſome fragments in Greek, which he ſuppoſed to be of Anatolius.

There were others of this name, which ought to be diſtinguiſhed from our Anatolius. Fabricius [x] has mentioned ſeveral. Cave [y] alſo well argues, that our Anatolius is different from him whom [z] Eunapius ſpeaks of as maſter of Jamblichus: though [a] Valeſius confounded them; and [b] Baſnage is pleaſed to ſignify his approbation of Valeſius's opinion.

Anatolius, in the paſſage [c] cited by Euſebius from his Paſchal canons, mentions ſeveral Jewiſh writers; Philo, Joſephus, Moſæus, and others more ancient; two of the name Agathobulus, called rabbins, or maſters; and Ariſtobulus, one of the ſeventy tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, or part of it. He likewiſe [d] mentions ſome book of Enoch: and in that part of his work, which we have in Latin only, very honourable mention is made of [e] Origen.

II. As there remains but a ſmall part of the work of Anatolius, except what is the Latin tranſlation, a brief account of his teſtimony to the ſcriptures will ſuffice.

1. He quotes 'as from the goſpel [f] theſe words: Now the firſt 'day of the feaſt of unleavened bread, the diſciples came to 'Jeſus, ſaying unto him; *Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee* 'to eat the paſſover?' Matth. xxvi. 17. And ſee Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7.

2. He quotes alſo thoſe [g] words of the Lord; 'My ſoul is ex-

[t] ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοῦ πάσχα κανονίων. H. E. p. 286, C. D. et p. 287.

[u] Bib. Gr. l. iii. c. xi. T. ii. p. 275—278. [x] Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 277. Vid. et T. ii. p. 275. [y] Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 136.

[z] Eunap. Vit. Jambl. init. [a] Ann. in Euſeb. p. 158. [b] Ann. 209, n. ix.

[c] Euſ. p. 287. [d] Περὶ προφητείας καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἐνὼχ βιβλίῳ. ib. p. 287, D.

[e] Sed et Origenes omnium doctiſſimus, et calculi componendi perſpicacliſſimus (quippe qui et χαλκέντερος vocatus,) libellum de Paſchate luculentiſſime edidit. Anatol. ap Bucher. p. 439. [f] Contra evangelii dictum, dicentis: Prima autem die azymorum acceſſerunt diſcipuli ad Jeſum. Quin dubium non eſt, quin ante diem fit in quo diſcipuli Dominum interrogaverunt, ſecundum morem antiquo ſuo conſtitutum: Ubi vis paremus tibi comedere Paſcha? p. 443, ſub. fin.

[g] Aliud enim eſt ſecundum quod Apoſtolo, imo a Domino præceptum eſt, ſpiritu contriſtato contriſtari [Rom. xii. 15.

[g] Hinc

'*exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.*' Matth. xxvi. 38. And in the same manner, and in the same place, the words of Luke xv. 6.

3. He [h] expressly mentions John the evangelist, the same that leaned on the Lord's breast.

4. He quotes [i] very respectfully the direction of the apostle in Rom. xii. 15, intimating that it ought to be attended to as spoken by the Lord himself.

5. In the passage of the Paschal canons, preserved by Eusebius, there is a manifest reference to the latter part of the third chapter of St. Paul's second epistle to the Corinthians: 'But,' says he, 'all these proofs are not necessary for those from whom 'the veil of the law of Moses is taken off; who may with *open* 'face always *behold as in a glass Christ*, and the things of Christ, 'both his doctrine and his sufferings:' see 2 Cor. iii. 14—18: and in the Latin translation of this work we find the words of [l] 2 Cor. vi. 14.

6. He speaks [m] with respect of the Old as well as the New Testament.

7. He says of some, that [n] they can by no means prove their point by the authority of the divine scripture.

8. Though this be little, here is sufficient to shew that this learned Alexandrian concurred with other Christians in a high respect for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament: and it is likely that his canon was much the same with that of Origen.

III. It may be proper to take notice here of Eusebius, not only because he was predecessor of Anatolius in the see of Laodicea, but also because he was of Alexandria, and they were intimate friends whilst they lived in their native city.

Though Eusebius was not an author, and therefore is wanting in Jerom's Catalogue, and in many other histories of ecclesiastical

cum cruce passo compati, ipso dicente: Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem: et cum victore inimicum antiquum triumphante, ac summo triumpho devicto [illegible] lætante collætari, ipsomet præ[illegible] congratulamini mihi, quia invenistis quam perdideram. Anatol. ib. p. 445. [h] Quorum exemplum sequentes [illegible] hodie omnes Asiæ episcopi (quippe [illegible] et ipse ab auctore irreprehensibili, Jo[illegible] Christ evangelista, et pectoris Domini incubatore, doctrinarum sine dubio [illegible] baptismalium potatore;) regulam susceperunt. ib. p. 44. [i] See before, note 9

[illegible] ἡμᾶς οὐ τὰς τοιαύτας τῶν ἀποδείξεων [illegible] ἀναγκαίας, ἀλλ' περιγράφειν μὲν τὸ ἐπὶ τὰ μωσέως νοημα καλυμμα· ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ δὲ τῷ προσώπῳ λείποι μὴ χρῆσθαι καὶ τὰ χριστοῦ ἀεὶ κἀλοπτρίζεσθαι, μαθήματα τε καὶ παθήματα. Eus. ib. p. 287, D. [l] Quia solemnitas Dominicæ resurrectionis lux est. Et non est communicatio luci cum tenebris. Anat, ap. Bucher. p. 443. [m] Quod in veteri quidem testamento non potest probabiliter inveniri, Domino per Moysen præcipiente: Septem diebus commedetis azyma, &c. ib. p. 443. [n] Nam qui ac ætate lunæ Pascha definiunt posse celebrari, non solummodo illud auctoritate divinæ scripturæ affirmare non possunt, sed et——animarum periculum incurrunt. ibid.

writers,

writers, he was a man of no small consideration, and is mentioned as [o] an eminent person in Eusebius's or Jerom's Chronicle.

It is likely my readers may remember that this Eusebius has been already mentioned with honour in this work, in our history of Dionysius of Alexandria. Eusebius was then a deacon in that church. The words of Dionysius, speaking of the state of affairs there in the persecutions of Decius and Valerian, and which were [p] formerly cited, are these: 'the deacons that survive after those that have died of the plague are Faustus, Eusebius, Chæremon: Eusebius, I say, whom God qualified from 'the beginning [referring here, it is likely, to his conduct in 'the Decian persecution], and furnished with great resolution 'and ability for fulfilling the office of ministering to the confessors in prison, and for burying the bodies of the perfect 'and blessed martyrs, not without the utmost peril.'

Our historian, having finished his quotation of that letter of Dionysius, adds: 'It [q] ought to be observed that Eusebius, 'whom Dionysius calls deacon, was afterwards bishop of the 'church of Laodicea in Syria.'

Eusebius, still deacon, accompanied Dionysius when he made his confession before Emilian the præfect of Egypt in 257, as [r] formerly shewn.

His settlement in Laodicea is related by his namesake, the ecclesiastical historian, in this manner: 'Socrates [s] was succeeded in the care of the church of Laodicea by Eusebius, a 'native of the city of Alexandria. The occasion of his removal was the affair of Paul. Passing through Syria upon that 'account, he was seized by those who were concerned for the 'interest of religion in those parts, who would by no means let 'him return home. He was succeeded by Anatolius; one good 'man coming after another, as the saying is.'

It may be well supposed that the time of Eusebius's going into Syria was the year 264, or thereabout, when the first council was held at Antioch upon the case of Paul of Samosata: then Eusebius entered upon this see, and was succeeded by Anatolius about the year 270.

IV. 'After [t] the death of Anatolius,' as we are informed by our historian, 'Stephen was advanced to the presidentship of 'that church, and was the last bishop there before the persecu-

[o] Eusebius Laodicenus insignis habetur. Chron. p. 177, init. & Eus. H. E. l. vii. c. xi. p. 261, B.

[p] p. 65,

[q] See before, p. 65, & Eus. 261, C.

[r] See p. 61.

[s] Eus. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 284, D. p. 288, A. B.

[t] Eus.

'tion:

'tion: he was admired by many for his eloquence, and phi-'losophy, and Greek learning. However, when the perſecution 'broke out he did not behave like a philoſopher; but ſhewed 'himſelf rather to be a diſſembler, and mean ſpirited.' What was his fault is not certainly known: we may be diſpoſed to think that he apoſtatized, and renounced the Chriſtian religion; though Euſebius does not expreſsly ſay it: thereby, as I apprehend, ſhewing both his ſincerity as an hiſtorian, and his tenderneſs for the reputation of a brother, and a fellow-creature, overcome by temptation.

V. Euſebius proceeds: 'Nevertheleſs [u] that church did not 'fall to ruin: it was reſtored to it's wonted ſplendour by Theo-'dotus, who was deſigned biſhop of that church by God him-'ſelf, the Saviour of all men. He by his actions ſhewed himſelf 'to be what his name ſignified [a man given of God], and a 'true biſhop. He was an excellent phyſician for the body; but 'for the cure of ſouls he had not his equal: ſuch were his hu-'manity, his integrity, his compaſſion for the afflicted, and his 'diligence in relieving thoſe who needed his aſſiſtance: with [x] 'which was joined uncommon ſkill in the divine ſcriptures, or 'the things of religion.'

To this perſon Euſebius inſcribed his Evangelical preparation; there [y] ſtyling him 'beloved of God, and an ornament to the epiſ-copal office.'

What Euſebius ſays of his being an excellent phyſician for the body has induced [z] Fabricius to put Theodotus into his Ca-talogue of ancient phyſicians.

This biſhop of Laodicea, ſo much commended by our Euſe-bius, is reputed an Arian by ſeveral learned moderns, to whom I ſhall refer in the margin; as [a] Vigerus, editor of Euſebius's Preparation, [b] Pagi, and [c] Tillemont.

And there is more than a little ground for that ſuppoſition; for Arius in his letter to Euſebius of Nicomedia [d] names Theo-dotus among others his favourers: Theodoret [e] intimates that the ſame perſons defended the Arian doctrine at the council of Nice. In another place [f] he mentions Theodotus among thoſe who had imbibed the Arian principle, and were it's principal

[u] p. 295. B. C. [x] πολλὰ δὲ τῇ ... καὶ θείᾳ μαθηματα συνε-... p. 288. C. [y] —τιμὴν ... χριστοῦ, θεοῦ δῶρα ... καὶ θεοῦ, ἐπὶ ἐπισκοπικὴν ἐπιφανείαν. ... cap. 1. init. [z] Vid. Bib. ... p. 423. [a] Hunc ego non ... quam Laodicenum epiſco-... —Stephano in epiſcopatu ſuc-ceſſit, Arianæ impietatis fautorem acerri-mum. Viger. in Præf. ad fin.

[b] Ann. 318, n. xvii. et xviii. [c] See his hiſtory of the Arians, art. 4, and note 2, and elſewhere. Mem. E. vi.

[d] ap. Thdrt. l. i. cap. 5, p. 21. A. et Epiph. H. 69, n. vi. [e] Thdrt. l. i. c. 7, p. 26. A. [f] Id. l. 5. c. 7.

patrons;

patrons: he likewiſe ſays that [g] he came to Antioch with Euſebius of Nicomedia in 331, to depoſe Euſtathius. Athanaſius [h] affirms that Theodotus, and others whom he names, had written the like things with Arius before the council of Nice: not to inſiſt upon the letter of Conſtantine [i] in Gelaſius Cyzicenus, written to him after the council of Nice.

When Theodotus entered upon the epiſcopate is not certainly known: Vigerus, in the preface before cited, ſays he ſucceeded Stephen about the third year of Conſtantine, or the year of Chriſt 308; which is not altogether improbable, it being evident from Euſebius that Stephen was biſhop before the perſecution, and for ſome time after it began: but the exact time of Stephen's death or removal, and of the acceſſion of Theodotus, I think cannot be determined. However, Pagi [k] well obſerves that Theodotus died before the council of Jeruſalem in 336, becauſe Sozomen mentions George, then biſhop of Laodicea, as preſent at it.

Theodotus is wanting in Cave and Du Pin, not being generally reckoned an author: but perhaps he might be juſtly ſo eſteemed, conſidering what is ſaid of him by Athanaſius. It is true, Athanaſius does not quote Theodotus as he does ſome others; but the reaſon was, that [l] the letters were not at hand, as he ſays; which he mentions by way of excuſe for ſending no more out of them: for which cauſe he omitted to cite ſeveral, whom by name he charges with having written the like things with Arius.

This chapter began with Anatolius, whoſe hiſtory was the principal deſign of it: however, we have been led to take notice of ſeveral others mentioned by Euſebius; and I preſume it may not be unacceptable to any, as it ſerves to repreſent the ſtate of Chriſtianity at that time.

[g] l. i. c. 21, p. 52. B.

[h] Πρὸ δὲ τῦ γενέσθαι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνοδον, ἐγραψαν καὶ οἱ περὶ Εὐσέβιον,——καὶ Θεόδοτον, κ. λ. Ath. de Synodis, n. xvii. T. i. p. 730. D.

[i] ap. Labb. Conc. T. ii. p. 285.

[k] Ann. 318, n. xviii.

[l] Καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτῶν δὲ ἐσχον ἐν ἑτοίμῳ, ἵνα τὰς ἀποστείλαι. Athan. ib. p. 731. D.

CHAP.

CHAP. LII.

THEOGNOSTUS.

I. *His history.* II. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I. THEOGNOSTUS, [a] an ancient writer, no where mentioned by Eusebius or Jerom, flourished, as * Cave thinks, about the year 282; and, though we have not now any certain proofs of his exact age, that computation cannot be very erroneous; as may appear from what we shall observe presently.

Theognostus is mentioned by Athanasius, Philip Sidetes, Stephen Gobar, and Photius.

Athanasius has spoken of him in two of his works: in the first he quotes him against the Arians, to shew [b] that the fathers of the Nicene council did not first begin to use the expression, 'Of 'the substance,' it having been before used in the same subject by Theognostus; whom Athanasius here calls [c] a learned or an eloquent man. In the other [d] work Athanasius mentions Theognostus together with Origen: he gives Theognostus the character of an admirable man, and worthy of esteem: he speaks of them both in an honourable manner, and as ancient men. In that same work he afterwards alleges a passage from Theognostus, which I intend to make use of by and by.

Stephen Gobar [e] says that Athanasius had often mentioned Origen and Theognostus in an honourable manner: whether he means only these two places, or whether there were still some more in which Theognostus was mentioned by Athanasius, we cannot say positively.

In the Fragment of Philip Sidetes, published by Mr. Dodwell, it is said that Theognostus was president of the Christian or catechetical school at Alexandria. The order of those presidents,

[a] Concerning this writer may be seen Cav. Hist. Lit. Du Pin. Bib. des Aut. Ecc. Tom. i. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 12, §. vii. Dodwell. Diss. Iren. in Append. p. 511. Fabric. Bib. Gr. lib. v. cap. 1, p. 2-6. Tillemont, Origene, art. 3. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. 3, p. 269, 270, and some other authors to be hereafter mentioned in this chapter. * Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 146, 147. Oxon.

[b] Πρὸς τουτο, ω χριτομαχοι Αρειανοι, οτι Θεογνωστος, αιτης λογιος, ω παρεληφαμεν το εκ της ουσιας ειπειν. Ath. de Decret. Nic. Syn. p. 230. B.

[c] Παλαιοι μεν ην ανδρες Ωριγενης ο πολυμαθης και φιλοπονος, και Θεογνωστος ο Σαιραπιος και σπουδαιος. Id. Ep. 4. ad Serap. p. 702. C.

[d] ib. p. 703. B. C. D.

[e] Οτι Ωριγενην και Θεογνωστον αμφω ο, τε μεγας Αθαναστος ο Αλεξανδρειας εν πολλοις απεδεξατο λογοις. ap. Phot. Cod. 232, p. 904.

according to that writer, is this: Origen [f] was the fourth; after Origen, Heraclas; after him Dionysius; after him Pierius; after Pierius, Theognostus. What regard ought to be had to Philip, I [g] cannot certainly say; but as we are not able to disprove what he writes, so I think likewise that it is not safe to depend entirely upon him.

From Photius we learn that [h] Theognostus published a work called Hypotupoſes, or Institutions, in seven books or discourses. The title of the work in Photius's copy was this: 'The Institutions of the blessed Theognostus, an Alexandrian, and Exegetus;' which last word I find rendered by some learned men commentator and interpreter of the sacred books: but that meaning appears to me at least doubtful; nor can I assign any other with which I am fully satisfied. Mr. Dodwell, in his notes [i] upon the forecited passage of Philip, says that the title of the work was borrowed from Clement, and that the title given the author denotes his public office of teaching in the school at Alexandria.

Photius says, 'that [k] in the first book Theognostus discourseth 'of the Father, and endeavours to prove him creator, even 'against those who supposed matter coeternal with God.' One may be apt to think that this part of our author's work was very curious and philosophical. Afterwards Photius expresseth his dislike of the doctrine of the first six books of the Institutions in several respects, saying that the author [l] speaks of the Son as a creature; that he too closely followed Origen in some of his peculiarities, which may be found in his books of Principles; and that with him he supposeth angels and dæmons to have certain fine bodies. With the seventh or last book Photius appears well enough satisfied. He gives an agreeable character of this writer's style: it is, he says, full and expressive, and yet has nothing redundant: he has the Attic purity and elegance without affectation; and in the greatest plainness and perspicuity there is nothing mean and vulgar.

If we had had Photius's extract entire, we should not have been at a loss about the exact age of Theognostus; for he put

[f] τεταρτος προεστη της χριστιανικης διδασκαλειας Ωριγενης· Μετα Ωριγενην——μετα Πιεριον Θεογνωστος. Fragm. Ph. Sid. ap. Dodw. Diss. Iren. p. 488. [g] See before, chap. 18. vol. ii. p. 180.

[h] Ανεγνωσθησαν Θεογνωστου αλεξανδρεως λογοι επτα· ων η επιγραφη, του μακαριου Θεογνωστου αλεξανδρεως και εξηγητου υποτυπωσεις. Phot. Cod. cv. 280. in. [i] Ipsum Philippi operis titulum a Clemente sumptum fuisse, hoc est catecheticæ magistralem dignitatem, deinde munus publicum vox illa significat. Dodwell. ut supr. p. 512.

[k] εν μεν ουν τω πρωτω λογω διαγραφει περι του πατρος, και οτι εστι δημιουργος των ολων δεικνυσι, και κατα των ετεροδοξων αγωνιζεται, ειλη της Θεογ. Phot. ib. p. 280. [l] ποιημα δε λεγων, κτισμα αυτον αποφαινει. ib.

down

down the time when he flouriſhed: but the laſt words of the extract are wanting.

We may however conclude, from what we have ſeen, that Theognoſtus was an Alexandrian, and that he flouriſhed ſome time after Origen, before the end of the third century.

Euſebius's ſilence about this writer has occaſioned divers ſurmiſes and ſpeculations. Baronius [m] cannot help thinking it happened, not without a malicious and fraudulent deſign, to bury in oblivion the name and writings of a ſtrenuous aſſerter of the conſubſtantial doctrine: Huet [n] is almoſt of the ſame mind, and ſuſpects that theſe Inſtitutions had been interpolated by the Arians in the ſpace of time between Athanaſius and Photius: but [o]Tillemont is not convinced by their reaſonings. Indeed, he who carefully compares Athanaſius and Photius will perceive that they both read exactly one and the ſame work; and that the Inſtitutions were as uncorrupted in the time of the latter, as of the former. Athanaſius found in them ſomewhat to his purpoſe; but there were other things he did not like. He [p] ſays that, in what he alleges out of the ſecond book of the Inſtitutions, Theognoſtus ſpeaks his own ſentiments; but there were other things propoſed only in the way of argument and diſputation. In like manner, [q]Photius is not poſitive that the things he condemns were the real ſentiments of the author of the Inſtitutions; at leaſt he is aware of this apology for him: but he diſallows it, and ſays ſuch things ought not to be publiſhed to the world in writing at any rate. Mr. Dodwell [r] aſcribes Euſebius's ſilence to nothing but negligence, and ſuppoſeth him leſs accurate in matters near his own time than elſewhere. Certainly Euſebius did not know every thing; nor had he a fair opportunity, or ſufficient leiſure,

[m] Et ut omittamus de aliis dicere, nonne dolo malo Theognosti theologorum celebri nomen atque ſcripta ſilentio obvoluere? quid conſubſtantialis nominis hoſtibus? At is non praeterit Athanaſius. Baron. Ann. 109. lix.

[n] Vir ſane ſtudioſiſſimum virum, et diſertum, et admirandum eum: ſed fuit Athanaſius atque ideireo praeter rationem ab Euſebii ſententiam illius probabile eſt, quod ab hujus partibus fuerit alienus. Quaſi vero corruptus ejus Hypotypoſes ab hujus ſectatoribus, quemadmodum et Clementis hoc eodem titulo inſcriptum, non dubito Andreas Schottus conjectat. Huet. Origen. lib. i. ſect. i. num. 3.

[o] Nous voyons S. Athanaſe marque aſſez, que de ſon temps il y avoit des choſes diffamées dans cet auteur ſur la divinité de Jeſus-Chriſt. Mais il dit, que ce n'étoit que comme pour diſcuter la verité, et qu'il exprimoit enſuite ſon vray ſentiment. Tillem. ib. 269.

[p] Ἀφ' ὧν μὲν ὁ Θεόγνωστος τὰ πρότερα ὡς ἐν γυμνασίᾳ ἐξετάσεως, ἕτερα τὰ ταύτῃ δόξαν τίθεις, οὐτὰ χαράττει. Ath. de Decret. Nic. Syn. p. 229. C.

[q] Εἰτε (ὡς καὶ τις εἶπε) σκεπτικώτερον τὴν τῶν λόγων ἀπολογίαν, εἴτε καὶ ἀληθῆ ταῦτα καὶ ἐδόξαζε τὰ πρότερα——ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδὲν ἂν καινὸν προσθείην τοῖς εἰρημένοις ὑπὲρ τούτων, εἰ τὸ τῆς ἀπολογίας τοῦ προσώπου ἐπὶ ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπιζητεῖν ἀπολογίαν, εἰς ἀσέβειαν κατέβαινε συγγραφῆς. Phot. ib. p. 280.

[r] —— quamquam cui nullius meminit Euſebius, in rebus ſui temporis minus profecto, quam in reliquis, accuratus. Dodw. ib. p. 512.

to bring every thing he knew into his writings. It muſt be reckoned very probable that Jerom was unacquainted with this writer's works, though they have been ſo expreſsly cited by Athanaſius.

There is yet another way of accounting for the ſeeming inconſiſtence between the commendations Theognoſtus had received from Athanaſius, and the cenſure paſſed on him by Photius: it is that taken [s] by Du Pin, who ſuppoſeth that in ſeveral ages there have been differences of expreſſion about the ſame doctrine: he therefore ſays that Photius is to blame for accuſing Theognoſtus of error upon the divinity of the Son, purely becauſe of ſome ways of ſpeaking that did not entirely agree with thoſe of his own age; not conſidering that, though the ancients have expreſſed themſelves differently, the doctrine was always the ſame at the bottom; and that it would be unjuſt to expect of them that they ſhould ſpeak as exactly, and with as much precaution, as they who came after the riſe and condemnation of hereſies.

As the Inſtitutions of Theognoſtus have been ſo little taken notice of by the ſeveral ſects of Chriſtians in paſt ages, it may be thought that this work of our author was not neceſſary; however, it might be uſeful: and the curious and judicious, I believe, would read it with ſatisfaction and improvement if it were now in being.

II. We are obliged to Athanaſius for the paſſages he has cited: I am now to obſerve one of them. Athanaſius is treating of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt: he firſt quotes Origen and then Theognoſtus; he informs us, 'that [t] Theognoſtus, in confirmation of what had been before aſſerted by him, alleges thoſe 'words of our Saviour ſpoken to the diſciples: *I have yet many 'things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: howbeit, when 'Holy Ghoſt is come he will teach you:* John xvi. 12, 13. Then he adds: 'as our Saviour ſpeaks to ſuch as are not yet able to receive thoſe 'things that are perfect, he condeſcends to their weakneſs: but 'the [u] Spirit is given to thoſe that are perfect. No man therefore ought to ſay, that the teaching of the Spirit excels the doctrine of the Son: but whereas the Son condeſcends to the imperfect, the Spirit is the ſeal of thoſe who are perfected. Wherefore it is not becauſe of any ſuperior excellence of the Spirit above the Son, that the blaſphemy againſt the Spirit is inexpiable and unpardonable; but becauſe, by thoſe who are imperfect,

[s] Du Pin. ib. p. 192. [t] Ath. Ep. 4, ad Serap. p. 703. B. C. [u] τὰ δὲ τελειωμένοις συγχωρεῖται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ οὐδεὶς τῆς μὲν χάριτος μὴ χάριν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ φάσκειν διδασκαλίαν ὑπερβάλλειν τῶν τοιούτων ἕνεκεν. ibid. C.

pardon

'pardon may be obtained: for [x] thoſe *who have taſted of the* 'heavenly gift, (Hebr. vi. 4.) and have been made perfect, there 'remains no excuſe, or any means of eſcape.'

From that expreſſion, *taſting the heavenly gift*, I would infer, that our author received the epiſtle to the Hebrews. This may be further argued from what precedes in Athanaſius: for, proceeding to the teſtimonies of Origen and Theognoſtus concerning the ſubject he was upon, he thus expreſſeth himſelf: 'They [y] both write of this matter, ſaying that this is the blaſ- 'phemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt; when they who have been fa- 'voured with the gift of the Holy Ghoſt in baptiſm return to 'ſin: therefore, ſay they, ſuch receive no remiſſion, according 'to what Paul alſo ſays in the epiſtle to the Hebrews: *For it is* 'impoſſible for thoſe who were once enlightened, and have taſted of the 'heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt, and have 'taſted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if 'they fall away, to renew them again unto repentance: ch. vi. 4, 5, 6. 'This they both [z] ſay.' Then he alleges their paſſages in order.

And this recompence then we have of the labour of our inquiry into the life and writings of Theognoſtus; that we have found [a] another learned Alexandrian, of the third century, who received the epiſtle to the Hebrews.

CHAP. LIII.

THEONAS, biſhop of Alexandria.

I. *His hiſtory.* II. *An epiſtle aſcribed to him.* III. *His teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament.*

I. THEONAS, as [a] Jerom ſays in his Chronicle, was the fifteenth biſhop of Alexandria. He held that ſee, as we are informed by [b] Euſebius, nineteen years; who in the ſame place ſpeaks of Pierius and Achillas, as flouriſhing among the preſbyters in that epiſcopate, and obſerves the ſucceſſion of the biſhops of Alexandria about that time: after Dionyſius was Maximus; then

[x] τοις γευσαμενοις της εφαπαξ [al. απαξ] δωρεας και γενηθεισι, κ. λ. Ibid. p. 702. C. D. [y] ταυτα δε λεγουσι, και περι δευτερας μετανοιας [al. μετανοιαν]. ib. E. [z] See before on Origen, Vol. 2, ch. xxxviii, num. x, and in this vol. Dionyſius of Alexandria, p. 101, 102.

[a] Alexandrinæ eccleſiæ quintuſdecimus epiſcopus præfuit Theonas ann. xix. Hieron. Chr. p. 177. f. [b] H. E. l. 7. c. 32, p. 289, C, D.

Theonas, about the year of Christ 282, who was succeeded by Peter, of whom we shall write hereafter.

II. There is extant a [c] letter from Theonas to Lucian, chief chamberlain to the emperor, which emperor [d] was not a Christian. But learned men are not fully satisfied who this Theonas is: the editor makes a scruple of [e] ascribing it to the bishop of Alexandria; though he thinks it ought to be received as a genuine monument of antiquity, composed in the beginning of the fourth century: and indeed, according to the tenor of the epistle itself, Christianity was not yet fully established; though [f] it had made great progress in the world, even under persecutions.

Cave allows that [g] Theonas, author of this letter, was a bishop; but whether of Alexandria, or some other place, he cannot determine: the letter he thinks [h] to have been written about the year 305; but he delivers this opinion as conjectural only upon a point that cannot be clearly decided.

Tillemont is much disposed to think [i] it a genuine epistle of Theonas, bishop of Alexandria, written [k] about the year 290. Lucian he supposeth to have been chief chamberlain to the emperor Diocletian, and a faithful servant of Jesus Christ.

I am inclined to assent to Tillemont concerning the author of the epistle and the time of writing it.

The letter was undoubtedly written in Greek; we have only a translation in but indifferent Latin.

III. As the several learned critics above quoted admit the antiquity of this piece, I shall observe the author's testimony to the scriptures.

The author often delivers his Christian counsels to Lucian, and by him to other Christians in the imperial palace, in words of the New Testament, or in expressions allusive to them: but without quoting any particular books, which might not be judged proper in an epistle.

[c] Theonas episcopus Luciano Præposito Cubiculariorum invictissimi principis nostri. Theon. ap. Luc. Acher. Spic. T. xii. p. 545. Sed quia, ut sentio, diversis officiis cæis adscriptus, et carnium tu, Luciane, præpositus dicaris. Id. ib. p. 547.

[d] Nam quanto magis princeps ipse nondum Christiana religioni adscriptus.—— ib. p. 546. [e] Vid. Pref. p. 21, 22.

[f] Gratias ago Omnipotenti Deo, et Domino nostro Jesu Christo, qui fidem suam per universum orbem in salutis nostræ unicum remedium manifestare, ac etiam in tyrannorum persecutionibus ampliare non destitit. &c. Theon. ib. p. 545.

[g] Theonas —— dignitate episcopus: cujusnam vero loci, haud facile est divinare. H. L. T. i. p. 172. [h] Ætatem si quæras, circa annum 305; clarissimo adjutor, nempe isto Constantio Chloro, cui Cæsar creatus est anno 292.——Augustus renunciatus est ann. 305; obiit —an. 306. Cav. ib. [i] La lettre de l'evêque Theonas a Lucien —— est selon toutes les apparences un fruit de la piet. de notre saint. Lucien estoit le chef des chambellans de l'empereur Diocletien, et un fidele serviteur de J. Ch. Tillem. Saint Theonas. M. E. T. iv. P. 3, p. 1218. [k] Id. ib. p. 1223.

He

He [l] mentions the goſpel and apoſtle, as the divine oracles of Chriſtians.

He [m] recommends the daily reading of the ſacred ſcriptures, and meditating upon them, as the beſt means of improving the mind in every virtue, and as the moſt uſeful helps for enabling Lucian, and the other Chriſtians with him, to diſcharge their ſeveral offices with reputation, as became the followers of Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. LIV.

PIERIUS, preſbyter of Alexandria.

'PIERIUS, ſays [a] Jerom in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical 'writers, preſbyter of the church of Alexandria, taught the 'people with great reputation in the time of the emperors Carus 'and Diocleſian, when Theonas was biſhop of that church: 'ſuch was the elegance of his diſcourſes and treatiſes, which are 'ſtill extant, that he was called the younger Origen. It is cer-'tain that he was a great aſcetic, and an admirer of voluntary 'poverty, and that he was well ſkilled in logic and rhetoric, and 'that after the perſecution he ſpent the reſt of his days at Rome. 'There is a very prolix homily of his upon the prophet Hoſea, 'which was pronounced on Eaſter-eve, as the diſcourſe itſelf 'ſhews.' That is St. Jerom's ſummary account of this writer.

Carus reigned in 282 and 283. Diocleſian reigned from 284 to 305. 'And,' as Euſebius [b] informs us, 'Maximus, immediate

[l] Interdum et divinas ſcripturas laudare conabitur, quas mira diligentia et largiſſimo impendio Ptolomæus Philadelphus in linguam noſtram traduci curavit: laudabitur et interim evangelium, apoſtoluſque, pro divinis oraculis. Theon. ib. 548.

[m] Non prætereat dies, quin opportuno tempore dato aliquid ſacrarum lectionum legatis, aliquid contemplemini, nec ſacræ ſcripturæ literaturam abjiciatis. Nihil adeo animam paſcit, et mentem impinguat, ſicut ſacræ faciunt lectiones. Sed ex illis hunc maxime capite fructum, ut patientia veſtra juſte et pie, hoc eſt, in charitate Chriſti, veſtra officia exequamini, et tranſitoria omnia ob ejus promiſſiones æternas contemnatis. ib. p. 550. [a] Pierius, Alexandrinæ eccleſiæ preſbyter, ſub Caro et Diocletiano principibus, eo tempore quo eam eccleſiam Theonas epiſcopus regebat, florentiſſime docuit populos, et in tantam ſermonis diverſorumque tractatuum, qui uſque hodie exſtant, venit elegantiam, ut Origenes junior vocaretur. 'Conſtat hunc miræ ασκησεως, et appetitorem voluntariæ paupertatis, ſcientiſſimumque dialecticæ et rhetoricæ artis, et poſt perſecutionem omne vitæ ſuæ tempus Romæ fuiſſe verſatum. Huius eſt longiſſimus tractatus de propheta Oſee, quem in vigilia Paſchæ habitum, ipſe ſermo demonſtrat. Hieron De V. I. cap. 76. [b] Και επ' αλεξανδρειας δε μαξιμον οκλωκαιδεκα ετεσι μετα την διανοσιε τελευτην επισκοπευσανθα, θεωνας διαδεχεται· καθ' ον επι της αλεξανδρειας επι ταυτον τω πιερίω πρεσβυτερια τιμωμενος αχνλας εγνωρι-

'succeſſor of Dionyſius, governed the church of Alexandria 'eighteen years, and was then ſucceeded by Theonas: under him 'Achillas, made preſbyter at the ſame time with Pierius, was 'famous. He was intruſted with the care of the catechetical 'ſchool, and was an excellent example of a truly philoſophical 'and Chriſtian converſation. Theonas, having borne the epiſco-'pal office nineteen years, was ſucceeded by Peter, who obtained 'great honour during his epiſcopate, which he held twelve years. 'He governed the church three years before the perſecution: 'the reſt of his time he paſſed in a more ſtrict and mortified 'courſe of life, but ſtill without neglecting the common good of 'the churches; for which reaſon, in the ninth year of the per-'ſecution, he was honoured with the crown of martyrdom, be-'ing beheaded.' So writes Euſebius.

Maximus therefore, having ſucceeded Dionyſius in 264 or 265, was himſelf ſucceeded by Theonas in 282; he by Peter in 300, who died a martyr in the year 311 or 312, as is computed. Achillas, juſt mentioned by Euſebius as catechiſt, was biſhop [c] of Alexandria after Peter; but for a ſhort time [d] only, as it ſeems: indeed, ſince Achillas was ordained preſbyter about the ſame time with Pierius, and had the care of the ſchool under Theonas, it may be argued that he muſt have been ſomewhat advanced in years in 311, when he came to be biſhop: he was ſucceeded by Alexander in 312 or 313. I have here put down theſe ſeveral ſucceſſions at Alexandria; I believe it will not be diſagreeable to my readers.

Farther, Euſebius, ſpeaking of the moſt eminent men of his own time, or near it, ſays, 'One [e] of theſe was Pierius, preſby-'ter at Alexandria, celebrated for his ſtrict courſe of life and 'philoſophical learning: he was likewiſe admired for his dili-'gence in the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, and his expoſitions of 'them, and his public diſcourſes to the people.'

In Jerom's letter to Magnus, Pierius is placed among other learned Chriſtian writers next after Pamphilus.

In another place he mentions Pierius's [f] interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 7; and reckons him among ſeveral others, who, as he ſays,

ξίλο, τῆς ἱερᾶς πίστεως τὸ διδασκαλεῖον ἐνεχείρισεν. Euſeb. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 289, 290. [c] Vid. Euſeb. Chron. p. 181. Socrat. l. i. cap. 5. [d] Ἀχιλλᾶς μὲν ὀλίγον χρόνον πρεσβύτερος, καὶ τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστατήσας. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀλέξανδρος, κ. λ. Theodoret. H. E. l. i. c. 2.

[e] Euſeb. ib. p. 289. A. [f] Origenes, Dionyſius, Pierius, Euſebius, Cæſarienſis, Didymus, Apollinaris, latiſſime hanc epiſtolam interpretati ſunt: quorum Pierii, quum ſenſum apoſtoli ventilaret atque differet, et propoſuiſſet illud exponere, Volo autem omnes eſſe ſicut meipſum, adjecit: τοσοῦτον λείπω τοῦτο ἀσθενῶ τε καὶ κωλύομαι. Hieron. Ep. 31, [al. 52], p. 263.

had largely explained that epiſtle. Cave [g] underſtands Jerom to mean ſome commentary; but I do not think it neceſſary to take him in that ſenſe: ſeveral of the writers there mentioned may have largely explained that text in their homilies, or letters, or treatiſes, without making a commentary upon the epiſtle.

In his prologue to his Commentary upon Hoſea, [h] Jerom again mentions the long diſcourſe of our author upon that prophet, which he ſpoke of in his Catalogue: he calls it an extemporary and eloquent diſcourſe.

It has been obſerved by ſeveral learned men [i] of late times that there were copies of the bible, or however of ſome parts of it, called Pierius's, which were in great eſteem: that obſervation is founded upon a paſſage of St. Jerom in his commentary upon Matt. xxiv. 36. *But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels in heaven, but my Father only.* Jerom ſays, 'that [k] in 'ſome Latin copies of his time was added, *nor the Son*; whereas 'in the Greek copies, particularly the copies of Origen and Pierius, that clauſe was wanting.'

Theſe things concerning Pierius I have collected from Euſebius and Jerom, authors of the beſt credit. Philip Sidetes [l] ſays, 'that Pierius was catechiſt at Alexandria after Dionyſius: the 'next after him,' he ſays, 'was Theognoſtus, then Serapion, then 'the great Peter, who ſuffered martyrdom.' And Photius informs us that [m] in his time it was ſaid that Pierius was preſident of the ſchool of that city: accordingly it is now generally taken for granted, by learned men, that he had ſome while that charge; but I think without good foundation, ſince it is no where mentioned by Euſebius or Jerom: and why they ſhould omit this, when they ſo particularly mention his fame for popular diſcourſes, I cannot tell. Euſebius mentions Pierius and Achillas together: he expreſsly ſays of this laſt that he was catechiſt: why did he not ſay the like of Pierius, if true? Philip ſays that Pierius was catechiſt after Dionyſius. When did he ſucceed his predeceſſor in that chair—when he was made biſhop, or after his death?

[g] Scripſit commentarios in primam ad Corinthios: quos quidam autor eſt Hieronymus. Cave. Hiſt. Lit. Pierio. [h] Pierii quoque de adventu longiſſimum, quem in exordio hujus prophetæ die vigiliarum Dominicæ nativitatis extemporali et diſerto ſermone dictavit. Hieron. Pr. in Oſee. p. [illegible] Origenis ejuſdem, Adamantii [illegible] cognominati, ut etiam Petri [illegible] Alexandrini, exemplaria [illegible] Teſtamenti in magno pretio [illegible] quam omnium puriſſima. [illegible] reperio apud Hieronymum ad Matth. xxiv. Hody de Bibl. Text. l. iv. c. 2, p. 622. Conf. Mill. ad Matth. loc. et in Prolegam. n. dccxxvii.

[k] In quibuſdam Latinis codicibus additum eſt, neque filius: quum in Græcis, et maxime Adamantii et Pierii exemplaribus hoc non habeatur adſcriptum. Sed quia in nonnullis legitur, differendum videtur. Hieron. in Matth. p. 118. [l] μετα τουτον πιεριος. μετα πιεριον θεωνας τος. κ. λ. Philip. Sid. [m] Vid. Phot. Cod. 118, 119.

Dionyſius

Dionyſius was choſen biſhop in 247, or 248, and died in the year 264 or 265. At which of thoſe ſeaſons did Pierius take upon him the catechetical office? Is either of them conſiſtent with what Jerom ſays of Pierius, that he flouriſhed under Carus and Diocleſian, and ſurvived the perſecution? Tillemont [n] is much of my mind: and Cave, though at the beginning of his article of Pierius he roundly calls him maſter of the ſchool at Alexandria, afterwards propoſes divers difficulties affecting Philip's account.

Photius ſays that Pierius was a martyr; and that a brother of his, named Iſidore, ſuffered at the ſame time: but the ſilence of Euſebius muſt needs render this doubtful: and Jerom is poſitive that Pierius outlived the perſecution under Diocleſian, as before ſeen: nor does Tillemont receive this account.

But though we have no good reaſon to think that Pierius was a martyr, he appears to have been in great eſteem. Epiphanius [o] ſpeaks of a church at Alexandria called by his name: and Photius [p] intimates that there were temples and churches built by the faithful in honour of him and his brother.

There is ſtill ſomewhat farther to be taken from Photius, who read a work of [q] Pierius in twelve books or diſcourſes: Photius does not mention any other title. His character of it is this: 'His ſtyle is clear and perſpicuous, eaſy and familiar, like that 'of extemporary diſcourſe. He expreſſeth himſelf after the man-'ner of the ancients, very differently from what now obtains in 'the church. Of the Father and the Son he ſpeaks rightly 'enough, except that he makes two ſubſtances and two natures: 'nevertheleſs, as appears from what precedes and follows the 'place I refer to, by ſubſtance and nature he may mean only 'ſubſiſtence, and not in the ſenſe of the Arians. But of the Spirit 'he ſpeaks dangerouſly and impiouſly, for he makes him inferior 'in glory to the Father and the Son.——And, with Origen, he 'ſeems to hold the preexiſtence of ſouls.'

Photius here alſo mentions Pierius's writing upon Hoſea and Eaſter, and therein treating of the Cherubim and Jacob's ſtone pillar; and ſomething written by him [r] upon St. Luke; which words of Photius are not very clear: but it ſeems as if the title of one of the twelve books abovementioned was to this purpoſe: Upon Luke, or Obſervations upon Luke's goſpel.

[n] Mem. Ecc. T. iv. Saint Theonas. p. 583. Ed. de Paris. T. iv. P. 3. p. 1225. a Bruxelles.

[o] Hær. 69, c. 2, p. 728. Ω

[p] οἱ ὡς φασι, καὶ πῶς καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκ τῶν ἐυσεβείων ἱδρύθησαν. Cod. 118, p. 300. A.

[q] Λοῦς δὲ τε βιβλου περιειχε δωδεκα. Cod. 119, p. 300.

[r] Ἐχει δὲ χρησιν εἰς τον λογον, ᾧ ἡ ἐπιγραφη, Εἰς τον κατα Λουκαν, κ. λ. ib. p. 300. m.

This

This is what we know of Pierius: from which it is eaſy to conclude, that in his time he adorned the Chriſtian profeſſion by his piety, learning, and public labours. As we have none of his works, we cannot particularly judge of his ſentiments: but from the teſtimonies which we have collected it appears that a great part of his time and labour was employed in ſtudying and interpreting the ſcriptures; and it may be ſuppoſed that his canon was the ſame as that of Origen, or very little different.

Pierius is placed by Cave at the year 283: ſome may be apt to think he ſhould have been put lower; but it is likely that learned writer ſuppoſed Pierius was made preſbyter in the beginning of the epiſcopate of Theonas. Moreover, Jerom ſpoke of Pierius as flouriſhing in the reign of Carus.

CHAP. LV.

I. *Dorotheus, preſbyter of Antioch.* II. *Dorotheus, author of the Synopſis of the life of the prophets, and of the apoſtles and diſciples of Chriſt.*

I. SAYS Euſebius, in his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, 'About this 'time Timæus ſucceeded Domnus in the epiſcopate of the 'church of Antioch, whom Cyril ſucceeded within our memory. 'In [a] his time was Dorotheus, preſbyter of the church of An- 'tioch, a learned man whom we knew. He was very ſtudious 'in the ſacred ſcriptures, and acquainted himſelf ſo far with 'Hebrew, as to be able to read the ancient ſcriptures in their 'own language with underſtanding: he was a man of a liberal 'mind, [or was extremely well educated, or perhaps was a 'man of high birth,] and was not unſkilled in Greek literature: 'but he was an eunuch from his birth: this being an extraor- 'dinary thing, the emperor took notice of him, and made him 'overſeer of the purple dye-houſe at Tyre. We [b] have heard 'this perſon expound the ſcriptures indifferently well. Cyril 'was ſucceeded in the epiſcopate of Antioch by Tyrannus.'

[a] Καθ' ον δωροθεον πρεσβειυ τυ καλα επιχειλι ηξιωμενον τηνικαδε λογιον ανδρα ηγνωμεν· φιλοκαλος δ' ουλος περι τα θεια γενομενος, και της εβραιων επεμεληθη γλωτλης· ως και αυλαις ταις εβραικαις γραφαις επιστημονως ενλυγχανειν. ην δ' ουτος των μαλιστα ελευθερων, προπαιδειας τε της καθ' ελληνας ουκ αμοιρος, κ. λ. Euſ. l. vii. cap. 32, in. p. 284, B.C.

[b] Τουτυ μεζονως τας γραφας επι της εκκλησιας δηγυμενυ καληκυσαμεν, ib. C.

'I have

I have transcribed this passage after this manner with the connection, that we might the better perceive the time of Dorotheus. Cyril [c] is supposed to have been bishop of Antioch from about the year 280, to the year 300, or longer. We may therefore reckon that Dorotheus flourished about 290, and afterwards. Who is the emperor meant by Eusebius is not certainly known; but it seems to me not improbable to be Diocletian, in the early part of his reign.

It ought to be supposed that Dorotheus first served in civil offices, and after that became presbyter in the church of Antioch.

This Dorotheus [d] ought to be distinguished from one of the same name, elsewhere mentioned by [e] Eusebius, who was one of the eunuchs of Diocletian's palace, and suffered martyrdom; and from another Dorotheus, author of the Synopsis, or short history of Christ's apostles and seventy disciples. Fabricius [f] indeed supposeth, that this presbyter of Antioch, and the martyr of the same name, were one and the same person, and that there is not sufficient reason to distinguish them: but I think he is almost singular in that opinion.

Dorotheus, presbyter of Antioch, not being a writer, is not in Jerom's Catalogue: and for the same reason there is no distinct article allotted him in Cave, or other modern authors of ecclesiastical libraries, or such like works: nevertheless I have thought it proper to insert his history here distinctly, though it be short, as a proof that there were men of learning and quality among Christians in those early ages; and that Christianity did not discourage any branch of useful knowledge: though, as we have here and often elsewhere occasion to observe, the scriptures were their principal study.

II. I take this opportunity to give an account of the supposed author of 'The Synopsis of the life and death of the prophets, 'and also of the apostles and disciples of Jesus Christ.'

It has been thought by some that [g] he was bishop or presbyter of Tyre at the beginning of the fourth century, in the year 303, about which time he underwent many sufferings in the per-

[c] See Tillem. in St. Lucien d' Antioche. Mem. T. v. P. iii. p. 149, et note (4) p. 406, et Pagi Ann. 283, n. viii. Basnag. Ann. 283, n. ix. [d] Vid. Cav in Dorotheo Tyr. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 163, et Pagi Ann. 283, n. viii. Basn. Ann. 283, n. ix. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. v. P. ii. p. 9, et note (8) p. 342. [e] H. E. l. viii. c. 1. p. 292, A. et cap. vi. [f] Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 145, in notis. [g] Dorotheus, Tyriorum urbis, ut volunt, episcopus. Presbyterum quidem cum martyrologio Romano faciunt recentiores. Quod non unde profluxisse videtur, quam quod hunc cum Dorotheo Antiocheno male confuderunt. Cav. H. L. [ad ann. 303] T. i. p. 163, a.

secution

secution begun by Diocletian, and afterwards died a martyr under Julian in the year 363, when he was 107 years of age.

Cave [h] has divers just observations upon this piece and it's author: he thinks the Synopsis to be the work of an anonymous author in the sixth century. Frederic Spanheim computed the author to have lived in the same age. Cave was of opinion, that they who called this Dorotheus presbyter, instead of bishop of Tyre, confounded him with Dorotheus presbyter of Antioch. And may I not rather say, (if I too may propose a conjecture) that possibly this Dorotheus is a mere fictitious person, called bishop of the church of Tyre for no other reason but because Dorotheus, of whom we spoke before, is said by Eusebius [k] to have been overseer of the purple dye-house at Tyre?

Tillemont argues, that [l] there could be no bishop of Tyre at the beginning of the fourth century named Dorotheus: if there had he would have been mentioned by Eusebius or Jerom.

Fabricius [m] may be consulted for the editions of this work.

As for the work itself, though it has been too often quoted, it is now generally allowed by learned men to be fabulous, and of little or no value. For preventing such quotations of it for time to come, and that my readers may be the better satisfied about it's real character, I shall place divers censures upon it in the margin. One is that [n] of the author of the Collection of the Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, which I make use of; another is taken [o] out of Bellarmine's book of Ecclesiastical writers; and the third from [p] the Annals of Baronius.

[g] 1. Ex hoc fragmento perspicere licet, hanc Dorothei, ut præ se fert, exscriptorem non scripsisse Probo et Philoxeno Coss. anno Christi 525.——2. Admodum probabile est, hunc anonymum fuisse ipsam Synopsis Dorotheanæ conditorem. Cave, p. 170. [h] Quod vero habet Epiphanius, Hær. li. quæ est Alogorum, eadem Pseudo-Dorotheus in Synopsi de hæresibus, sæculi minimum vi. scriptor, ut Nicephorus, et alii, fuisse Marcionitarum ex iis qui a Christo adlecti fuerunt, magis dubium, imo falsum. Simon. De Hist. Evang. Scriptor. cap. 12, Op. T. ii. p. 275. [k] ——και τιμηται της κατα τυρον αλουργου βαφης. Lib. H. E. p. 284, C. [l] Mais il est encore plus difficile de s'imaginer, que s'il avoit été en ce temps là un Dorothée tel que le depeint Theophane, Eusebe n'en eut rien écrit, ni S. Jerome même, qui le donne pour comme un pere l'eglise, et comme un martyr, &c. Tillem. Not. 8, sur S. Dorothée. ib. p. 342. [m] Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 145, 146. [n] Dorotheus ——Exstat hic sub ejus nomine Synopsis, ——sed plane fabulosa, nulliusque apud eruditos auctoritatis. Vid. Ind. Alphabet. in Bib. P. P. Max. [o] At hujus Dorothei nullam mentionem inveni apud Eusebium, S. Hieron. vel Gennadium, aut etiam Joan. Trithemium, qui scripserunt de viris illustribus. Ipsa vero Synopsis plena est fabulis. Consulat lector quæ iste auctor scribit in vita Isaiæ, Hieremiæ, Elisæi.——Præterea consulat quæ scribit in vita Jacobi Alphæi, et Clementis, et in summa sciat, ab isto numerari inter 72, discipulos Christi omnes, qui ab apostolo Paulo numerantur, etiamsi ethnici fuerint vel feminæ; et illos omnes non solum discipulos Domini, sed etiam episcopos facere. Non meminissem libri tam fabulosi, nisi vidissem a multis citari, et non minimum fieri. Ex Bellarmino de Scrip. Ecc. ap. Bib. P. P. Max. T. iii. p. 421, H. [p] Nomina autem discipulorum, qui a Domino fuerunt electi, dum singula ex-

This

This Synopsis might be compared with some like books ascribed to Hippolytus, of which [q] I spoke formerly, and [r] with some articles in Ephiphanius, and with the last chapter of the second book of the Apostolical constitutions, and Cotelerius's notes upon it.

I shall take notice of but very few things in this Synopsis.

Among Christ's seventy disciples the first here named is James, the brother of the Lord: of whom he says, that [s] he was stoned by the Jews, and was buried in the temple at Jerusalem, near the altar.

Here likewise are absurdly numbered among Christ's seventy disciples the seven deacons, and others, mentioned in the Acts, and Clement, and Timothy, and Titus, and almost all others, mentioned by name in St. Paul's epistles.

CHAP. LVI.

VICTORINUS, bishop of Pettaw.

I. *His history.* II. *Others of the same name.* III. *His works, and extracts out of a poem against the Marcionites, ascribed to him.* IV. *Testimonies to him.* V. *His opinions.* VI. *His testimony to the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.*

I. VICTORINUS, bishop of Pettaw, or Petaw upon the Drave in Germany, flourished according to [a] Cave about the year 290; according to [b] Sixtus Senensis about the year 270. He had the honour to die a martyr for Christ under the persecution of Diocletian; and, as is [c] supposed, in the year 303.

St. Jerom's account of him in his book of Illustrious men is to this purpose: [c] Victorinus, [d] bishop of Pettaw, understood Greek [c] better than Latin: hence his works are excellent for the sense,

primere conati sunt, omnes fere, quorum invenerunt in epistolis Pauli fieri mentionem,——inter discipulos Domini adnumerarunt.——Primus post Hippolytum (quod invenerimus,) ejus rei auctor fuit Dorotheus, qui falso cognomine Tyri episcopus inscribitur,——Hic inquam Dorotheus Cæsarem quendam unum fuisse dicit ex discipulis Domini, &c. Baron. Ann. 33, n. 40. [q] Vol. ii. chap. 35. [r] Vid. Epiph. H. 20, n. iv. et H. 51, n. vi. p. 428. [s] Jacobus frater Domini secundum carnem, qui et Justus vocatur, et primus Hierosolymorum episcopus constitutus est. Lapidibus ibi a Judæis adobrutus occubuit, atque in templo prope altare sepultus est. ap. B. P. P. ib. p. 427, G.

[a] Cav. H. L. T. i. [b] Sixt. Sen. Bib. S. lib. iv. p. 308. [c] Cav. ib. Vid. et Pagi Ann. 303, ix. Basnag. 303, n. xvi.

[d] Victorinus, Petavionensis episcopus, non æque Latine ut Græce novit. Unde

[c] but

'but mean as to the ſtyle. They are ſuch as theſe: Commen-
'taries upon Geneſis, Exodus, Leviticus, Iſaiah, Ezekiel, Ha-
'bacuc, Eccleſiaſtes, the Song of Songs, and the Revelation of
'John, Againſt all hereſies, and many other works. At laſt he
'was crowned with martyrdom.'

Cave[e] thinks that Victorinus was a Greek by birth, or elſe born in the confines of Greece. I ſuppoſe that learned man concludes this from what Jerom ſays concerning Victorinus's ſtyle in this and ſome other places, which will be taken notice of hereafter. Cave likewiſe ſuppoſeth that Victorinus profeſſed rhetoric, or oratory, before he was a biſhop. And ſo [f] Caſſiodorus ſays more than once.

Tillemont thinks it probable that [g] Caſſiodorus confounded our Victorinus with Victorinus of Africa (of whom we ſhall ſpeak preſently), becauſe what Jerom ſays of our biſhop's ſtyle does not agree to one who had been a profeſſor of rhetoric: but I think that cannot eaſily admitted: for Caſſiodorus appears [h] to have known both theſe authors, and ſpeaks of them diſtinctly. It is not likely therefore that he ſhould confound their characters. And, notwithſtanding what Jerom ſays, Victorinus might be a man of good learning, and able to write elegantly in Greek, as he himſelf ſeems to allow. Victorinus's diſadvantage, therefore, probably was this: that whilſt he was well ſkilled in Greek he wrote chiefly in the Latin tongue, which was in uſe in the country where he lived, though he was not completely maſter of the propriety and elegance of that language. I might add, that [i] the ſtyle of Victorinus the African is not admired, though he gained ſo much reputation in his profeſſorſhip.

opera ejus grandia ſenſibus, viliora videntur compoſitione verborum. Sunt autem hæc: Commentarii in Geneſim, in Exodum, in Leviticum, in Iſaiam, in Ezechiel, in Abacuc, in Eccleſiaſten, in Cantica Canticorum, in Apocalypſin Johannis, adverſum omnes hæreſes, et multa alia. Ad extremum martyrio coronatus eſt. De V. I. cap. 74. [e] ——ſi non origine Græcus, in Græciæ ſaltem confinio natus videtur, ex oratore epiſcopus, ut non uno loco nos docet Caſſiodorus. Cav. ib.

[f] De quo libro [Eccleſiaſte] et Victorinus de oratore epiſcopus nonnulla diſſeruit. Caſſiod. Inſt. Div. Lit. c. 5, T. ii. p. 512. De quo [Matthæo] et Victorinus de oratore epiſcopus nonnulla diſſeruit. Ib. c. 7. p. 513. [g] See Saint Victorin de Pettau, in Tillem. Mem. T. v. P. ii. p. 215. [h] What Caſſiodorus writes of our Victorinus may be ſeen before at note [f], or hereafter at [e g h] under numb. iii. He likewiſe mentions Victorinus the rhetorician ſeveral times. Quorum Commenta a Mario Victorino compoſita, in Bibliotheca mea vobis reliquiſſe cognoſcor. Caſſ. de Rhetorica. T. ii. p. 535, b. in. Præterea ſecundum Victorinum Enthymematis altera eſt definitio. Ib. p. 536, m. Modum autem hypotheticorum ſyllogiſmorum ſi quis plenius noſſe deſiderat, legat librum Marii Victorini, qui inſcribitur de ſyllogiſmis hypotheticis. Id. de Dialectica, p. 539, Conf. ejuſdem Chron. T. i. p. 365, infr. m. [i] Stilus Victorino parum felix, præſertim in dogmaticis perplexus et ingratus, et qui vix ulla adeo decantatæ eloquentiæ veſtigia retinet. Cav. H. L. in Fab. M. Victorino.——Scripſit adverſus Arium libros more dialectico valde obſcuros. Hieron. De V. I. cap. 101.

We

We muſt content ourſelves with this ſhort hiſtory of our Victorinus, unleſs ſome more particulars ſhould offer themſelves to us when we come to obſerve his works, and the teſtimonies given to him.

II. But it is fit that we firſt take notice of ſome other ancient writers of this name.

Our Victorinus had been long ſuppoſed biſhop of Poictiers in France, until John Launoy [k] in the laſt century publiſhed his Diſſertation concerning him: and he was ſo fortunate as to prove his point, and ſatisfy the learned in general, that Victorinus, biſhop and martyr, of whom Jerom ſpeaks in the forecited chapter of his Catalogue, and often elſewhere, ought not to be numbered among Gallican biſhops, but was biſhop of Petabion, or Petabium in upper Pannonia: or, according to the modern diviſion of that country of Pettaw, in the dukedom of Stiria, and circle of Auſtria.

At the end of that Diſſertation, Launoy added an appendix concerning five illuſtrious perſons of this name; that is, four beſide our biſhop.

The firſt of which is Victorinus, who [l] wrote in defence of Praxeas, and is mentioned by Tertullian.

The ſecond is our Victorinus, biſhop and martyr.

The third is Victorinus, an African, who, after he had long taught rhetoric at Rome with great applauſe, embraced the Chriſtian religion: he is mentioned by [m] Auguſtine, [n] Jerom, and [o] Caſſiodorus. According to [p] Cave, he flouriſhed about the year 362, and died in 370, or ſoon after.

The fourth is [q] Victorinus of Marſeilles, likewiſe profeſſor of rhetoric. He flouriſhed [r] about 434.

The fifth is Victorinus Lampadius, of Antioch, who publiſhed a piece entitled Conſular and imperial orations, mentioned by [s] Photius.

There is another author ſometimes [t] called Victorinus; but it is now [u] generally thought that his name is more properly Victorius, of Aquitain. He flouriſhed about [x] 457.

[k] Joann. Launoii Conſtantienſis, Pariſ. Theologi, de Victorino Epiſc. et Mart. Diſſertatio. Ed. Secund. Pariſ. 1664.

[l] Sed poſt hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam hæreſim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Tertull. de Pr. Hær. cap. 53, p. 255, A. [m] Confeſſ. l. viii. cap. 2. [n] Victorinus, natione Afer, Romæ ſub Conſtantio principe rhetoricam docuit, et in extrema ſenectute, Chriſti ſe tradens fidei ſcripſit,——Hier. de V. I. cap. 101, Vid. eiuſd. Procem. in Ep. ad Gal. Vid. et adv. Ruf. l. i. T. iv. p. 3[illegible] in. [o] See before, note [h], p. 287.

[p] H. L. [q] Victorinus rheter Maſſilienſis, &c. Gennad. de V. I. cap. 62. Conf. Sidon. Ep. l. v. ep. 21. [r] Cav. ubi ſupra. [s] Cod. ci. p. 276. [t] Vid. Gennad. de V. I, cap. 88. [u] Vid. Laun. ut ſupra, p. 44 et 45. [x] Cav. ib.

beſide

Beſide theſe, it is ſuppoſed that there were many others of the ſame name, who bore a glorious teſtimony to Chriſt in times of perſecution: but it is by no means neceſſary that I ſhould give any particular account of them at preſent.

III. We ſaw juſt now, in Jerom, a catalogue of this writer's works. Trithemius [b] makes no additions: he only names the ſame pieces in a little different order. We muſt now take ſome farther notice of them.

1. The firſt work of our author, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers, is a Commentary upon Geneſis. In [c] another place Jerom quotes Victorinus, as having commented upon the hiſtory of Iſaac's bleſſing of Jacob, which is recorded in Geneſis, ch. xxvii. The Fragment, concerning the creation of the world, publiſhed [a] by Cave from the library of the archbiſhop of Canterbury at Lambeth, may be a part of this Commentary.

2. Of the Commentaries upon Exodus, Leviticus, Ezekiel, Habacuc, the Canticles, we have nothing remaining: nor is there any farther notice taken of them, except in ſuch catalogues of his works as have been already mentioned.

3. The Commentary upon Iſaiah is again mentioned by Jerom [b] in the preface to his own expoſition of that book: he ſpeaks there of Victorinus as the only Latin who had written upon that prophet; or, at leaſt, who had explained any large part of him, though ſeveral Greek writers had beſtowed a great deal of labour that way. In [c] another place he mentions a myſtical explication, which Victorinus gives of a paſſage in Iſaiah, ch. vi. 2.

4. In his Commentary upon the book of Eccleſiaſtes, Jerom obſerves Victorinus's [d] explication of Eccl. iv. 13, in which he

[a] V. Trithem. cap. 46. [b] Quo-[illegible] poſcitis ſumus, et de eo quid [illegible] in figura adjungere, Hippolyti [illegible] verba ponimus, a quo et Victo-[illegible] non plurimum diſcrepat: [illegible] plenius executus ſit, ſed [illegible] occaſionem præbere lectori ad [illegible] Victorini. Hieron. ad Dam. [illegible] in T. ii. Bened. al. Ep. [illegible] Exſtat quidem penes me Vic-[illegible] —de Fabrica Mundi.—— [illegible] Filio illo ἀπαραλλάκτως quod-[illegible] Commentariis vel in Geneſin, [illegible] deceptum; quod [illegible] propter venerandam anti-[illegible] propter celeberrimi mar-[illegible] hic subjungam. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. in Victorin. T. i. p. 147, 148.

[b] Me nimiæ laboris et operis eſt, omnem Iſaiæ librum velle ediſſere, in quo majorum noſtrorum ingenia ſudaverunt, Græcorum dico. Cæterum apud Latinos grande ſilentium eſt, præter ſanctæ memoriæ martyrem Victorinum, qui cum apoſtolo dicere poterat: Licet imperitus ſermone, non tamen ſcientia. Hier. Pr. in II. p. 3. [c] Sex alas unus, et ſex alas alteri.' Victorinus noſter duodecim apoſtolos interpretatus eſt. Hieron. ad Dam. T. iii. p. 518, Bened. al. Ep. 142.

[d] Origenes et Victorinus non multum inter ſe diverſa ſenſerunt. Poſt generalem illam ſententiam, quæ omnibus patet: quod melior ſit adoleſcentulus pauper et

agreed with Origen. I have put part of Jerom's paſſage in the margin, as of ſome uſe, to ſhew our author's manner in his Commentaries: and I would likewiſe refer my readers to what there follows. This Commentary upon Eccleſiaſtes is expreſsly mentioned by [c] Caſſiodorus: it ſeems by him that Victorinus had explained ſome parts or paſſages only of this book.

5. In his Catalogue, Jerom ſays nothing of Victorinus's having written upon St. Matthew: but, in the preface to his own Commentary upon that evangeliſt, he mentions [f] Victorinus with other Latin commentators. Caſſiodorus too mentions [g] Victorinus's explication of that goſpel. The expreſſions uſed both by Jerom and Caſſiodorus ſeem to imply, that Victorinus's performance was no large work; but contained either ſhort notes upon the whole, or elſe explications of ſome paſſages only.

6. The Commentary upon the Revelation is alſo mentioned by Caſſiodorus as well as Jerom. Says Caſſiodorus: 'Victorinus [h] the biſhop, already mentioned by us more than once, explained briefly the moſt difficult places in this book.'

There is ſtill extant [i] a Commentary upon the Revelation, which is aſcribed to Victorinus: but its genuineneſs is not unqueſtioned. Cave [k] ſays, 'it either is not his, or has been greatly interpolated: for Jerom informs us, that Victorinus held the millenarian opinion, which the author of this work diſlikes.' Baſnage [l] rejected this Commentary. Lampe [m] thought the more probable opinion to be that it is not his. Du Pin, after having obſerved the arguments for and againſt the genuineneſs of this work, concludes: 'We [n] cannot therefore be poſitive that this Commentary is not a work of Victorinus: on the contrary, there is ſome probability that it is his.' Tillemont [p] has treated this queſtion modeſtly, and carefully, as uſual. He owns that [q] there are ſome reaſons to doubt of it: but it ſeems that there

ſapiens, quam rex ſenex et inſipiens: et, quod frequenter evenit, ut ille per ſapientiam ſuam de carcere regis egrediens, imperet pro dominatore perverſo; et rex inſipiens perdat imperium, quod tenebat: ſuper Chriſto et diabolo hunc locum interpretati ſunt, quod puerum pauperem et ſapientem, Chriſtum velint, &c. Hier. in Ecc. T. ii p. 741, fin.

[c] De quo libro [Eccleſiaſte] et Victorinus——nonnulla diſſeruit. Inſt. Div. Lit. cap. 5. [f] Legiſſe me fateor——et Latinorum, Hilarii, Victorini, Fortunatiani opuſcula. Hier. Pr. in Matth. p. 3, f.

[g] De quo [Matthæo] et Victorinus ex oratore epiſcopus nonnulla diſſeruit. Caſſiod. ib. c. vii. [h] De quo libro [Apocalypſi] et Victorinus ſæpe dictus epiſcopus difficillima quædam loca breviter explicavit. Id. ib. c. ix. [i] Ap. Bib. P. P. T. iii. p. 414. &c. [k] Cav. ubi ſupr.

[l] A Victorino tamen abjudicandum eſſe exiſtimamus. Baſnag. Ann. 303, n. xv.

[m] Quod eo minus congruum, cum librum hunc falſo adſcribi Victorino Petavienſi, ſeu, ut aliis potius videtur, Pictabionenſi, qui ſub fine ſeculi tertii floruit, valde ſit probabile. Lampe Proleg. in Joh. l. i. c. 4, n. xii. p. 66. [n] Du Pin Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. i. p. 194. [o] Au contraire il y a quelque apparence qu'il eſt de lui. ibid. [p] See St. Victorin de Petau, Mem. Ec. T. v. P. ii. p. 218, et note 2. [q] Ib. p. 218.

are yet more to believe it a genuine remain of the many works of this holy martyr; only it must be allowed that what he had written in favour of the millenarian opinion has been altered: and he [r] offers some reasons for thinking that what is now found in this Commentary upon that point is an interpolation, or addition. That passage is at the end of the piece, and it appears to be of a different style from the rest of the work. Moreover, there [s] is some reason to suspect that alterations have been made in divers ancient writers who held that opinion: and what may more especially increase the suspicion here, is, that in this very Commentary there still seem to be some traces of that sentiment; where [t] it is said that all the saints shall be assembled together in Judea to worship Christ. Whether it be Victorinus's or not, it is supposed to have in it divers marks of antiquity. Tillemont [u] understands the author to speak of the senate of Rome, as still employing it's name and authority for persecuting the church. What he says of Nero, that [x] he is to be raised up to be antichrist, is a more common notion of the first than of the later ages. The author, [y] reckoning up the epistles of Paul, says nothing of the epistle to the Hebrews: and in the time of our bishop it was common in the West not to consider that as an epistle of St. Paul. It may be also observed that, [z] speaking of the prophet who is to come with Elias, he says nothing of Enoch; but informs us that some suppose him to be Moses, others Elisha: as for the author himself, he thinks it must be Jeremiah, whose death is not related in the scriptures: these may be reckoned marks of antiquity: and the style of the work answers very well to the character which Jerom gives of Victorinus's, as low and mean. So Tillemont: who nevertheless says, the [a] safest way is not to be positive who is the author; and I assent to him. Though therefore I intend to make extracts out of this work, I desire it may be remembered that I do not quote it as certainly, but only probably, Victorinus's. I am willing to allow that in some places it has been interpolated and altered; but I am inclined to think it genuine in the main.

[r] Ib. note ii. p. 444, et 445. [s] See Les Milenaires in Mem. Ec. T. ii. P. ii. p. 691. [t] ——in Judæa, ubi omnes sancti conventuri sunt, et Dominum suum visuri. Victorin. ap. Bib. Patr. T. iii. p. 415. D. [u] Et vidi, inquit, mulierem ebrium de sanguine sanctorum, de-sidio senatus illius consummatæ nequitiæ, et furorem contra fidei prædicationem latum indulgentiam ipse dedit decreto in universis gentibus. Id. ib. p. 420. H. [x] Unum autem de capitibus occisum in morte, et plaga mortis ejus curata est, Neronem dicit. Constat enim, dum insequeretur eum equitatus missus a senatu, ipsum sibi gulam succidisse. Hunc ergo suscitatum Deus mittet regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerunt Judæi. ib. p. 420, D. [y] Id. ib. p. 415, E. [z] Multi putant eum Eliam esse, aut Elizæum, aut Moysen. Sed utrique mortui sunt. Hieremiæ autem mors non invenitur, quia omnes veteres nostri tradiderunt illum esse Hieremiam. p. 418. D. [a] Ubi supra, p. 446.

To this Commentary, as we now have it, is uſually prefixed a prologue aſcribed to St. Jerom: but there is ſo little reaſon to think it his, that no one, ſo far as I know, believes it to be authentic.

7. Beſide theſe Commentaries Jerom ſays that Victorinus wrote againſt all hereſies. This book, [c] or theſe books, if they were ſeveral, ſeem to be referred to by Optatus in Africa, who flouriſhed not long before the year 370.

8. Jerom concludes in this manner: Victorinus wrote many other things. But we have no certain knowledge of any more than thoſe named by him.

9. Cave [d] mentions two poems which have been publiſhed as his; but he thinks altogether without ground.

10. Tillemont ſays, 'that [e] many manuſcripts aſcribe to St. 'Victorinus of Pettau a hymn upon the croſs, or upon Eaſter, or 'baptiſm; which [f] is among St. Cyprian's works. It has been 'obſerved that [g] Bede cites it as Victorinus's. It is a fine 'poem, and perhaps too fine for him. We thence perceive that 'many perſons pretended to embrace the Chriſtian religion, 'who did not perſevere until baptiſm.' This is but a ſhort poem: I do not intend to quote any thing out of it.

11. Tillemont adds, 'that [h] the poem againſt the Marcionites, among the works of Tertullian, may be aſcribed to Victorinus: and this piece anſwers well enough to what Jerom ſays 'of Victorinus's ſmall ſkill in the Latin tongue. This piece is of 'ſome conſiderable length.'

Indeed what Jerom ſays of our author might diſpoſe us not to expect from him any Latin poetry: however, Bede has actually quoted ſome verſes as his. And, ſince it is allowed that Victorinus did once teach rhetoric, poſſibly he might think fit ſometimes to exerciſe his pen in verſe as well as proſe: but, when he writes Latin verſe, we are not to expect that his ſtyle ſhould appear very beautiful.

This poem is joined with Tertullian's works, but fully ſhewn by [i] Rigaltius in his preface to it, not to be his: it ſtands there [k]

[b] Ap. Bib. P. P. ib. p. 414.

[c] Marcion, Praxeas, Sabellius, Valentinus, et cæteri, uſque ad Cataphrygas, temporibus ſuis a Victorino Petavionenſi, et Zephirino Urbico, et a Tertulliano Carthaginenſi, et ab aliis aſſertoribus eccleſiæ catholicæ ſuperati ſunt. Optat. l. i. cap. 9. [d] Tribuuntur autem ei carmina duo, quæ habentur in ſacrorum poetarum collectione Fabriciana. De Jeſu Chriſto Deo et homine, unum. Alteri titulus eſt, Lignum Vitæ. Sed conjectura plane incerta, et, ut mihi videtur, falſa. Cav. in Victor. H. L. T. i. p. 147, Oxon. [e] Mem. E. T. v. P. ii. p. 218, 219, S. Victorin.

[f] De Cruce Domini. p. 4, App. Cypr. Oxon. 1682. [g] Qua ductus opinione Victorinus Pictavienſis antiſtes eccleſiæ, de Golgotha ſcribens ita incipiat, &c. Bed. de loci. ſanct. c. 2. p. 317, Cantabr. 1722.

[h] Tillem. ib p. 219. [i] Apud Tertullian. p. 796. Paril. 1634. [k] Incerti auctoris adverſus Marcionem Libri quinque. Ib. p. 797.

with

with this title, Five books of an uncertain author againſt Marcion. Pearſon [l] quotes it as a piece whoſe age is unknown; but yet, as it ſeems, not reckoning it to have been written till after the middle of the fifth century. From [m] Cave we underſtand that Allix ſuppoſed this work was not publiſhed till after the time of Jerom. Bull [n] aſſerted it to be a genuine work of Tertullian; which induced Tillemont to ſay, 'that [o] by many 'inſtances it may be ſhewn, a critical ſkill in authors was not 'Bull's talent.'

I certainly do not think that this poem was written by Tertullian; nor do I perceive that we have ſufficient evidence to aſcribe it to our Victorinus: but as it is of ſome conſiderable length, and I do not now think of a better place for it, I ſhall here make ſome extracts, and take notice of ſeveral things in it.

1. This writer has a catalogue of the early [p] biſhops of Rome, among whom is Clement; who, he ſays, was acquainted with the apoſtles, or apoſtolical men.

2. He mentions [q] Hermas, author of the Shepherd, whom he placeth in the time of pope Pius.

3. He takes notice of divers ancient [r] heretics.

4. Speaking of Iſaiah and Jeremiah, he ſays that [s] the former was ſawn aſunder, and that the latter never died.

[l] Primus inter Latinos qui Pium ſuo loco poſuit, erat Proſper in Chronicô a Labbeano. Quem ſecutus eſt Catalogus tertius Pſeudo-Tertullianus, cujus ætas ignoratur. lib. iii. Pearſ. Opp. Poſt. p. 266, 267. [m] Doctiſſimus Allix libros adversùs Marcionem poſt Hieronymi ævum natos arbitratur. Cav. in Tertulliano. Hiſt. L. T. i. p. 93. f. [n] Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. iii. cap. 10, n. xix. p. 217.

[o] On pourroit montrer par divers exemples, que la critique des ouvrages n'eſt pas le fort de Bullus. Mem. Ec. T. iii. P. i. p. 564.

[p] Nempe Roma Linum, primum conſidere juſſit.
Post quem Cletus et ipſe gregem ſuſcepit ovilis.
Hunc Anacletus ſucceſſor ſorte locatus.
Quem ſequitur Clemens: is apoſtolicis bene notus. Adv. Marcion. l. iii. p. 803.

[q] Post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germine frater. Sup. Tertullian.
Angelicus pastor, quia tradita verba locutus. ib. p. 803.

[r] Hæc vobis per Marcionem, Cerdone magiſtro.

——— ——— ——— ———

Atque Valentino Deus eſt infamis.

——— ——— ——— ———

Hæreſis eſſe deos Baſilidem credere juſſit,
Quos annus et dies annum habet.
Sidera per numeros argumentatus acute. l. i. p. 798.
Adversùs Romam Cerdo —— l. iii. p. 803.
Nempe [Marcion] Marcion hic veniens, nova pontica peſtis. ibid.
Hunc, locupletes vates, ——

——— ——— ——— ———

Quem populus lectum ligno, sine labe repertum,
Improbum, demens crudeli morte peremit.
Sanctus Hieremias, quem gentibus esse prophetam
Divina virtus fulsit ———

——— ——— ——— ———

Alla morte virum conflat, neque cade peremtum. l. iii. p. 802.

[s] His

5. His canon of the Old Teſtament [t] ſeems to have been much the ſame with that of the Jews and proteſtants.

6. He often ſpeaks [u] of the Old and New Teſtament, and of their entire agreement together; and that the law and the prophets and the apoſtles of Chriſt ſay one and the ſame thing.

7. He diſtinctly mentions the four [x] evangeliſts, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

8. He ſpeaks of the ſages that [y] came to Jeruſalem after our Saviour's birth; and of the ſtar that conducted them, as recorded in Matt. ii; and he ſeems to have thought that they were prieſts.

9. He [z] ſpeaks of John the baptiſt, our Lord's forerunner, and calls him apoſtle.

10. He [a] enumerates many of our Lord's miracles. I omit other references to the goſpels, for the ſake of brevity.

11. This author in his poem expreſsly, and by name, quotes ſeveral of St. Paul's epiſtles, and plainly refers to divers others.

12. He alſo often [b] refers to the epiſtle to the Hebrews; and probably eſteemed it an epiſtle of St. Paul.

13. He likewiſe [c] frequently quotes the book of the Revela-

t Oſea, Amos, et Michæas, Joel, Abdias, Jonas,
Atque Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggæuſque,
Zacharias vim paſſus, et angelus ipſe Malachiim, &c. ib. et p. 803. in.

u Adverſum ſeſe duo Teſtamenta ſonare,
Contra prophetarum Domini committere verba. l. ii. in. p. 799.
Sic igitur lex, et miri cecinêre prophetæ

Sic et apoſtolicæ voces teſtantur ubique.
Nec quidquam veteris non eſt novo denique junctum. l. iv. p. 804. a. f.

x Cujus facta, ſimul dicta conjuncta, fideles
Illi, Matthæus, Marcus, Lucaſque, Joannes,
Conſcripſere, mera, non extera verba locuti,
Spiritu ſancta Dei, tanto præſente magiſtro. l. ii. p. 799. b.

y Templa ſacerdotes linquunt, ſtellæ quoque ductu
Mirantur Dominum, tantum ſe cernere partum. l. i. p. 797. a.

z Quem viſum Joannes baptiſmi primus apertor,
Et vatum ſocius, necnon et apoſtolus ingens, &c. l. ii. p. 800. a. in.

a In vinum vertuntur aquæ, memorabile viſu.
Lumina redduntur cæcis, juſſuque trementes
Dæmones expulſi clamant, Chriſtumque fatentur.
Omnia ſanantur verbo jam tabida membra.
Jam graditur claudus, ſurdus ſpem protinus audit.
Dat dextram mancus, loquitur magnalia mutus.
Fit mare tranquillum juſſu, ventique quieſcunt. l. i. p. 797. b.

b Sanguine nam vituli populum, ſimul omnia vaſa,
Atque ſacerdotes, et ſcripta volumina legis
Sparſit aqua mixto. ——— l. i. p. 804, a. Conf. Hebr. ix. 19.
Hoc Dominus noſter, qui nos ſua morte redemit,
Extra caſtra, volens, populi vim paſſus iniqui. ib. Conf. Hebr. xiii. 12. et paſſim.

c Fœderis hinc etiam novi inenarrabilis auctor
Diſcipulus Joannes animas pro nomine paſſas
Teſtatur tali ſeſe vidiſſe ſub ara.
Clamantes Dei vindictam pro cæde potentis. l. iv. p. 804, b. Conf. Apoc. cap. vi. 9.
Sic quoque Joannes, ſic pandit Spiritus illi,
Tot numero ſolio ſenioribus inſuper albis, ib. p. 805, a. Conf. Apoc. cap. iv. 4.

tion)

tion, and calls it John's, and John's the diſciple or apoſtle of Chriſt.

14. I need not take any thing more from this unknown author of the five books againſt Marcion: from what has been tranſcribed, it may be reckoned undoubted that he received all the books of the New Teſtament, generally received by Chriſtians, and eſteemed by them of authority: nor does there appear any ſign of his receiving any other Chriſtian writings in that manner.

IV. We return to Victorinus himſelf; to whom I intend to produce ſome more teſtimonies chiefly taken from Jerom: my readers will not be diſpleaſed to ſee them, as they will help them to ſome knowledge of this good man's character; which otherwiſe we could never be acquainted with, ſince the loſs of the greateſt part of his works.

We ſaw in the paſſage tranſcribed from Jerom's Catalogue, at the beginning of this chapter, he ſaid that 'Victorinus underſtood 'Greek better than Latin; and that his works, though valuable 'for the ſenſe, were mean as to the ſtyle.' In another place he ſays, 'that [f] Victorinus, who was crowned with a glorious martyr-'dom, was not able to expreſs his thoughts.' In that place Jerom paſſeth his judgment upon ſeveral other Latin writers of the church; ſuch as Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Arnobius, and Hilary. In his letter to Magnus he ſays, 'that [g] though 'the writings of the martyr Victorinus are not learned, they ſhew 'a good will to learning.' In another [h] place he calls Victorinus a martyr of bleſſed memory, who could ſay with the apoſtle: *though I be rude in ſpeech, yet not in knowledge*: 2 Cor. xi. 6. He alſo informs us that [i] Victorinus, as well as many others, made great uſe of Origen's Commentaries upon the ſcriptures: he ſpeaks of [k] this again; at the ſame time giving Victorinus the character of a man of renowned integrity. Once more, Victorinus [l] is mention-

[f] Inclyto Victorinus martyrio coronatus, quod intelligit, eloqui non poteſt. Ad Pamm. Ep. 49, [al. 13], T. iv. P. ii. p. 61, in. [g] Victorino martyri in libris ſuis deſit eruditio, tamen non deeſt traditionis voluntas. Ep. 83, [al. 84], ib. p. 636, f. [h] Caeterum apud Latinos grande ſilentium eſt, praeter ſanctae memoriae martyrem Victorinum, qui cum apoſtolo dicere poterat: etſi imperitus ſermone, ſed tamen ſcientia. In Il. Pr. p. 3, f. [i] Facio de Victorino Pictabionenſi, et ceteris, qui Origenem in explanatione ſcripturarum ſequuti ſunt, et exſcripſerunt. Ad Vigilant. Ep. 36, [al. 75], p. 279, ſub. fin. [k] Nec diſertiores ſumus Hilario, nec fideliores Victorino, qui eius [Origenis] tractatus, non ut interpretes, ſed ut auctores proprii operis tranſtulerunt. Ad. Pamm. et Ocean. Ep. 41, [al. 65], p. 346, in. [l] Si auctoritatem ſuo operi praſtruebat,—— habuit in promptu Hilarium Confeſſorem, —— habuit Ambroſium, cuius pene omnes libri huius ſermonibus pleni ſunt: et martyrem Victorinum, qui ſimplicitatem ſuam in eo probat, dum nulli molitur inſidias. De his omnibus tacet, et quaſi columnis eccleſiæ praetermiſſis, me ſolum pulicem et nihili hominem conſectatur. Adv. Ruf. L. i. p. 351.

ed with divers others, who are repreſented as very eminent perſons, or pillars of the church: where the martyr Victorinus is again diſtinguiſhed for his uncommon ſimplicity.

V. I ſhall make another ſhort article of this writer's opinions.

1. He was a millenarian; as Jerom ſays, in his [m] chapter concerning Papias, and in [n] his Commentary upon Ezekiel.

2. It was formerly obſerved that [o] the author of the Commentary upon the Revelation ſuppoſed that Nero ſhould be raiſed up from the dead to be antichriſt. Since, therefore, this expected antichriſt would [p] be the Meſſiah and king of the Jews, we may conclude that this writer did not ſuppoſe the famous antichriſt would be an erroneous, or heretical and imperious, domineering Chriſtian; but a man of another religion, particularly the Jewiſh religion. Conſequently, ſince the author likewiſe [q] underſtood the man of ſin, and ſon of perdition, in 2 Theſſ. ii. 3, to be the ſame as antichriſt, he muſt have ſuppoſed the apoſtle there to ſpeak of a man who is a Jew by religion at leaſt.

Mr. La Roche publiſhed, in his New Memoirs of Literature [r], a curious diſſertation upon antichriſt; where the author argues that the Jewiſh people were antichriſt; and largely explains 2 Theſſ. ii. 1,—12. And there are in St. Cyril of Alexandria [s] many paſſages favouring that ſuppoſition.

I ſhall here inſert in the [t] margin, for the ſake of inquiſitive

[m] Hic dicitur mille annorum Judaicam edidiſſe *de regno*, quam ſequuti ſunt Irenæus,—et ceteri qui poſt reſurrectionem aiunt in carne cum ſanctis Dominum regnaturum. Tertullianus quoque in libro de ſpe fidelium, et Victorinus Petabionenſis, et Lactantius, hac opinione ducuntur. De V. I. cap. 18. [n] Quod et multi noſtrorum, et præcipue Tertulliani liber, qui inſcribitur de ſpe fidelium, et Lactantii inſtitutionum volumen ſeptimum pollicetur, et Victorini Petabionenſis epiſcopi crebræ expoſitiones. Hier. in Ezech. cap. 36, T. iii. p. 952. in. [o] See p. 291.

[p] Et beſtia quam vidiſti, inquit, de ſeptem eſt: quoniam ante illos reges Nero regnavit,——Hunc ergo ſuſcitatum Deus mittet regem dignum dignis, et Chriſtum qualem meruerunt Judæi. Et quoniam aliud nomen allaturus eſt, aliam etiam vitam inſtituturus, ut ſic eum tanquam Chriſtum excipiant Judæi. Denique et Lanceas non ad idola colenda revocaturus eſt, ſed ad circumciſionem colendam. Victorin. ap. B. P. P. T. iii. p. 420. D.

[q] Et Paulus contra antichriſtum ad Theſſalonicenſes ait: Quem Dominus interficiet ſpiritu oris ſui. Id. ib. p. 415. C.

[r] Vol. iv. p. 179,—200. [s] Vid. Cyril. A. Comm. in Zach. T. iii. p. [illegible] C. D. p. 770. C. D. p. 773. D. [illegible] in Joann. T. iv. p. 262. A. B. Vid. et I. v. p. 370. E. Et Conf. Dodw. Diſſ. [illegible] Iren. n. xiii. [t] Unde illam quæ [illegible] deliri credunt eſſe tranſlatam ac vivum ſervatum, Sibylla dicente, Mariæ profugum a finibus eſſe venturum, [illegible] primus perſecutus eſt, noviſſimus pe[illegible] tur, et antichriſti præcedat adve[illegible] Lactant. vel Cæcil. de Mort. Pe[illegible] 2. Cæterum ait nobis, —— Ne[illegible] Occidentalii plaga regibus ſubactis de[illegible] imperaturum.——Ab antichriſto ve[illegible] ricatale imperium eſſe capiendum: [illegible] quidem ſedem et caput regni Hiero[illegible] mam eſſe habiturus: ab illo urbem et templum eſſe reparandum. Illum [illegible] perſecutionem futuram eſſe, ut Chri[illegible] Dominum cogat negari, ſe potius C[illegible] um eſſe confirmans: omneſque [illegible] dum legem circumcidi jubeat. Sul[illegible] Sever. Dial. 2. cap. ult. Vid. et [illegible] Sacr. Hiſt. l. ii. c. 28, et 29. Unde [illegible] multi noſtrorum putant ob ſuſpi[illegible] tarpitudinis magnitudinem Neronem [illegible] chriſtum fore. Hieron. in Dan. xi. [illegible] Opp. T. iii. p. 1129. Con. Aug. de [illegible] Dei, l. xx, c. 19. et Comm. Inſtr. n. [illegible]

reader;

readers, paſſages of ſome other ancient Chriſtians beſide Victorinus, who ſpeak of Nero's appearing as antichriſt, or his forerunner; for they expreſs themſelves differently. The author of the Computation of Eaſter, of [u] whom I gave an account formerly, did not ſuppoſe that [x] antichriſt would be a Chriſtian.

2. Helvidius [y] alleged Victorinus as favouring his opinion, that Mary had children by Joſeph after the birth of Jeſus: but Jerom affirms that Victorinus did not underſtand by the Lord's brethren, mentioned in the goſpels, ſons of Mary, but in general relations or kindred.

VI. We are now to obſerve Victorinus's teſtimony to the ſcriptures, chiefly to the books of the New Teſtament: and the two pieces I ſhall make uſe of are the Commentary upon the Revelation, and the Fragment publiſhed by Cave, between both which there is a remarkable agreement.

1. In the Fragment, diſcourſing on the fourth day's work, he obſerves, beſide other things, that [z] 'there are four living creatures before the throne of God, four goſpels, four rivers in paradiſe. St. John's goſpel is here quoted in this manner: 'The 'evangeliſt John thus ſpeaks: *In the beginning was the Word, 'and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*'

2. In the Commentary upon the Revelation he ſpeaks of the goſpels in this manner: 'The [a] four living creatures (ſee Rev.

[u] See p. 168—200.

[x] In quibus diebus ille antichriſtus [illegible] vaſtationem. Et ideo tunc [illegible] Chriſtianum potuit Deo ſacrificare. De Pacha Comput. ap. [illegible] App. p. 68. Ed. Oxon.

[y] Sed quamquam —— Tertullianum in [illegible] vocat, et Victorini Petabionenſis epiſcopi ſcripta proponit: Et de Jeroquidem nihil amplius dico, quam [illegible] locutum non fuiſſe. De Victorino autem hoc, quod et de evangeliſtis, [illegible] Domini, non filios [illegible] fratres autem eo ſenſu, quem ſuperius [illegible] propinquitate, non natura. Helvid. T. iv. p. 141.

[z] Hæc quatuor animalia ante thronum [illegible] quatuor evangelia, quatuor flumina [illegible] Victorin. de Fabrica Mundi. Cav. H. L. ſ. i. p. 148, a.

[illegible] evangeliſta ſic dicit: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud [illegible] et Deus erat Verbum, &c. ib. p. [illegible]

[a] Quatuor animalia, quatuor [illegible] Primum itaque dixit, ſimile [illegible] ſecundum ſimile vitulo, tertium ſimile [illegible] quartum ſimile aquilæ volanti. —— Animalia igitur quod differentia vultibus ſunt, hanc habet rationem. Simile leoni animal, Evangelium ſecundum Marcum, in quo vox leonis in eremo rugientis auditur: Vox clamantis in deſerto, Parate viam Domini. Hominis autem figura Matthæus enititur enunciare nobis genus Mariæ, unde carnem accepit Chriſtus. Ergo dum enumerat ab Abraham usque ad David, et usque ad Joſeph, tanquam de homine locutus eſt. Ideo prædicatio ejus hominis effigiem oſtendit. Lucas ſacerdotium Zachariæ offerentis hoſtiam pro populo, et apparentem ſibi angelum dum cantat, propter ſacerdotium, et hoſtiæ contemplationem, vituli imaginationem tenet. Joannes evangeliſta aquilæ ſimilis, aſſumti pennis ad altiora feſtinans, de verbo Dei diſputat. Marcus evangeliſta ſic incipit: Initium evangelii Jeſu Chriſti, ſicut ſcriptum eſt in Iſaia prophetа, Vox clamantis in deſerto. Hæc eſt leonis effigies. Matthæus: Liber generationis Jeſu Chriſti, filii David, filii Abraham. Hæc eſt facies hominis. Lucas autem dicit: Fuit ſacerdos nomine Zacharias, de vice Abia, et mulier ei de filiabus Aaron. Hæc eſt imago vituli. Joannes ſic incipit: In principio erat Verbum, hoc erat in

'iv. 6, 7) are the four goſpels: *The firſt*, ſays he, *was like a lion,* 'the ſecond was like a calf, the third like a man, and the fourth like 'a flying eagle. Theſe living creatures have different faces, which 'have a meaning: for the living creature like a lion denotes 'Mark, in whom the voice of a lion roaring in the wilderneſs is 'heard: *A voice crying in the wilderneſs, Prepare the way of the* 'Lord. Matthew, who has the reſemblance of a man, ſhews the 'family of Mary, from whom Chriſt took fleſh; and, while he 'computes his genealogy from Abraham to David and Joſeph, 'he ſpeaks of him as a man; therefore his preaching is repre-'ſented by the face of a man. Luke, who relates the prieſt-'hood of Zacharias offering ſacrifice for the people, and the an-'gel that appeared to him, becauſe of the prieſthood and the 'mention of the ſacrifice, has the reſemblance of a calf. The 'evangeliſt John, like an eagle with ſtretched-out wings mount-'ing on high, ſpeaks of the Word of God. The evangeliſt 'Mark commences thus: *The beginning of the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt,* 'as it is written in Iſaiah the prophet; the voice of one crying in the 'wilderneſs: this is the face of a lion. Matthew ſays: *The book* 'of the generation of Jeſus Chriſt, the ſon of David, the ſon of Abra-'ham: this is the face of a man. But Luke ſays: *There was a* 'prieſt, named Zacharias, of the courſe of Abia; and his wife was of 'the daughters of Aaron: this is the form of a calf. John begins 'thus: *In the beginning was the Word, the ſame was in the beginning* 'with God: this is the ſimilitude of a flying eagle.'

Thus in this paſſage we have the four evangeliſts, and the beginnings of their ſeveral goſpels, or at leaſt what is near the beginning of each of them. This paſſage, therefore, if it be really Victorinus's, as I ſee no reaſon to doubt, is very valuable.

3. He ſpeaks of the time and of the occaſion of St. John's writing his goſpel: it was written after he had been confined in Patmos, and to confute and overthrow hereſies then ſprung up. 'By [c] the reed like unto a rod, which was given to him, '(ſee Rev. xi. 1), that he might meaſure the temple of God 'and the altar, and them that worſhip therein, is ſignified the 'power, which when ſet at liberty he exhibited to the churches; 'for he afterwards wrote his goſpel. When Valentinus, and Cerin-'thus, and Ebion, and others of the ſchool of Satan, were ſpread

principio apud Deum. Hæc eſt ſimilitudo aquilæ volantis. Victorin. Comm. in Apoc. ap. Bib. P. P. T. iii. p. 416. F. G. H. [c] Noviſſimam arundinem ſimilem virgæ, ut metiretur Dei templum, et aram, et adorantes in ea, poteſtatem dicit, quam dimiſſus poſtea exhibuit eccleſiis. Nam et evangelium poſtea ſcripſit. Cum eſſent Valentinus, et Cerinthus, et Ebion, et cæteri ſcholæ Satanæ diffuſi per orbem, convenerunt, ad illum de finitimis provinciis omnes, et compulerunt, ut illi teſtimonium conſcriberet. In Apoc. p. 418. C.

'abroad

'abroad over the world, all men [or all the churches] from the 'the neighbouring provinces came to him, and earneſtly en- 'treated him to put down his teſtimony in writing.'

4. 'And [d] we read in the Acts of the apoſtles, how, when he 'was diſcourſing with his diſciples, he was taken up into heaven.' See Acts i. 9,—11. Words of the Acts are [e] elſewhere quoted without naming the book.

5. In the Fragment publiſhed by Cave, in his obſervations upon the ſeventh day, when God reſted from all his labours, among other remarkable inſtances of that remarkable number he mentions this: 'And [f] ſeven churches in Paul.' Cave ſays, 'Per- 'haps it ſhould be in the Apocalypſe:' but the author means the ſeven churches which have epiſtles ſent to them in the collection of St. Paul's epiſtles. This will be apparent to all from a paſſage in the Commentary upon the Revelation; where, ſpeaking of the ſeven churches mentioned in that book, to which likewiſe John ſent epiſtles, he ſays: 'That [g] in the whole world are ſeven 'churches; and that thoſe churches called ſeven are one catholic 'church, Paul has taught: and that he might keep to it, he did 'not exceed the number of ſeven churches; but wrote to the 'Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephe- 'ſians, to the Philippians, to the Coloſſians, to the Theſſalonians. 'Afterwards he wrote to particular perſons, that he might not 'exceed the meaſure of ſeven churches: and, contracting his 'doctrine into a little compaſs, he ſays to Timothy: *That thou 'mayſt know how thou oughteſt to behave thyſelf in the church of the 'living God.*'

The reader cannot but recollect here what we formerly ſaw of the like kind in St. [h] Cyprian.

Here we have a very valuable teſtimony to St. Paul's epiſtles, like to that which we ſaw before to the goſpels. It may be hence juſtly concluded that he received thirteen epiſtles of the apoſtle Paul; that is, the ſecond, as well as the firſt, to the Co-

[d] Et nos legimus in Actis apoſtolorum, eum ſimilimodum loquens cum diſcipulis ſuis raptus eſt in cœlos. ib. p. 419. A.

[e] Sicut Petrus ad Judæos exclamavit: Dextera Dei exaltatus acceptum a Patre Spiritum effudit, hunc quem videtis. (Act. ii. 33.) ib. p. 415. D. [f] Septem candelabra aurea, —— ſeptem mulieres apud Iſaiam, ſeptem eccleſiæ apud Johannem. de Fabr. Mund. ap. Cav. H. L. p. 249, a. [g] In toto orbe ſeptem eccleſias omnes eſſe, et ſeptem nominatas unam eſſe catholicam, Paulus docuit primo: Quod ut ſervaret ipſe, et ipſum ſeptem eccleſiarum non exceſſit numerum. Sed ſcripſit ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Epheſios, ad Philippenſes, ad Coloſſenſes, ad Theſſalonicenſes. Poſtea ſingularibus perſonis ſcripſit, ut excederet modum ſeptem eccleſiarum. Et in brevi contrahens prædicationem ſuam, ad Timotheum ait: Ut ſcias, qualiter debeas converſari in eccleſia Dei vivi. In Apoc. p. 415. D, E. [h] See p. 169.

rinthians,

rinthians, and to the [i] Theſſalonians, and all his epiſtles to particular perſons; the firſt and ſecond to Timothy, the epiſtles to Titus and Philemon.

6. But Victorinus makes no mention of the epiſtle to the Hebrews: and in what he ſays of the reſt ſeems entirely to exclude it from the number of St. Paul's epiſtles. Nevertheleſs, there are in the Commentary upon the Revelation ſome paſſages which ſeem to contain alluſions to this epiſtle: I think they deſerve to be taken notice of.

1. 'For [k] our prayers aſcend to heaven. As therefore heaven 'is denoted by the golden altar, which was the innermoſt, (for 'even the prieſts, who had the anointing, entered only once in 'the year to the golden altar, the Holy Ghoſt this ſignifying, 'that Chriſt ſhould do this once for all:) in like manner, &c.' Compare Hebr. ix. 7, 8, 12.

2. Again: 'For [l] Moſes himſelf taking moiſt wool, and the 'blood of a calf, and water, ſprinkled all the people, ſaying: 'This is the blood of the teſtament, which God has enjoined 'unto you.' See Hebr. ix. 19, 20; and compare Exod. xxiv. 8, 9.

I have tranſlated the former part of this paſſage nearly according to the Latin original; but I ſuppoſe that to be corrupted: perhaps it ſhould be ſcarlet, inſtead of moiſt or wet, wool; and ſome other emendations might be thought of.

3. Preſently after the author ſays: 'No [m] law is called a teſ- 'tament: nor is any thing elſe called a teſtament, but what 'men make who are about to die: and whatever is within a 'teſtament is concealed until the day of death:' ſee Hebr. ix. 16, 17.

Whether theſe will be allowed to be alluſions to the epiſtle to the Hebrews; and, if they are, whether they can be ſufficient, conſidering what he ſaid before, to afford an argument that it was of authority with this writer; I cannot ſay. We proceed.

[i] He has more than once quoted the ſecond epiſtle to the Theſſalonians. Et Paulus contra antichriſtum ad Theſſalonicenſes ait: Quem Dominus interficiet ſpiritu oris ſui. [2 Theſſ. ii. 8.] in Apoc. p. 415. C. Et Paulus apoſtolus conteſtatur. Ait enim ad Theſſalonicenſes: Qui nunc tenet teneat, &c. [2 Theſſ. ii. 7] ib. p. 418, F. [k] Utique ad cœlum aſcendunt orationes. Sicut igitur cœlum intelligitur ara aurea, quæ erat interior; (nam et ſacerdotes ſemel in anno introibant, qui habebant chriſma, ad aram aureum, ſignificante Spiritu Sancto Chriſtum hoc ſemel facturum;) ſic et,——Victor. in Ap. ib. p. 418, B. [l] Nam et ipſe tunc legis de populo, accepta lana [forte coccinea,] et ſanguine vituli et aqua, aſperſit populum univerſum, dicens: Hic ſanguis teſtamenti eius, quod mandavit ad vos. ib. p. 417, E. [m] Nullum teſtamentum vocatur. Nec teſtari aliud dicitur, niſi quod faciunt morituri. Et quodcunque intra ſecus teſtamenti ſui ſignatum eſt, uſque ad diem mortis. ib. p. 417, E. F.

7. I have not observed in the remains of this author any quotations of the epistle of St. James.

8. Upon those words [n] of Rev. i. 6: 'And hath made us kings 'and priests: that is,' says he, 'the whole church of the faithful, as the apostle Peter says: [Ye are] *a holy nation, a royal priesthood:*' 1 Pet. ii. 9.

9. I do not perceive any references to the second epistle of St. Peter, nor to any of the epistles of St. John, nor to that of St. Jude.

10. The Fragment in Cave concludes in this manner: 'These 'are they, who sit before the throne of God, who in the Re-'velation of John, the apostle and evangelist, are called elders.' And in the Commentary upon the Revelation he several times ascribes that book to John. 'The [p] opened book,' says he, 'is 'the Revelation which John saw.' Afterwards [q] he calls him apostle: and soon after he informs us when John saw and wrote the Revelation. 'And [r] he said unto me: *Thou must prophesy again* 'before peoples, *and* tongues, *and* nations: (Rev. x. 11.) that is, because 'when John saw this he was in the isle of Patmos, having been 'condemned to the mines by the emperor Domitian: there he 'saw the Revelation. And when, being now old, he expected to 'be received up [to heaven] through his sufferings, Domitian 'was killed, and all his acts disannulled, and John was set at 'liberty from the mines. Then afterwards he wrote the same 'Revelation, which he had received from the Lord. This is 'the meaning of those words: *Thou must prophesy again.*' In another he says: 'When [s] the scripture of the Revelation was pub-'lished, Domitian was emperor.'

11. We have already seen some forms of citation: a particular one may be added. 'The [t] other three horses,' says he, 'signify the wars, famines, and pestilences, more plainly spoken

[n] Fecit nos regnum et sacerdotes: id est, ecclesiam fidelium ecclesiam, sicut Petrus dicit: Gens sancta, regale sacerdotium. Cav. Ital. Lit. T. Rom. p. 414, H. [o] ——quos Apocalypsi Joannis apostoli et evangelistæ, ut scripsit, vocat. Ap. Cav. H. Lit. T. [p] Liber apertus Apocalypsis quam Johannes vidit, ubi supra, p. [q] Sed quia dicit, se scripturum Joannes quanta locuta fuissent tonitrua, quæcunque in veteri testamento sunt obscura et prædicata, vetatur [illegible] sed relinquere ea signata, qui erat [illegible] nec oportebat gratiam sequentis [illegible] primo collocari. ib. F. [r] ——Hoc est, quoniam quando hoc vidit Joannes, erat in insula Patmos, in metallum damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare. Ibi ergo vidit apocalypsin. Et cum senior jam putaret se per passionem accepturum receptionem, interfecto Domitiano, omnia judicia ejus soluta sunt, et Joannes de metallo dimissus. Sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Domino apocalypsin. Hoc est, Oportet te iterum prophetare. ib. G. [s] Intelligi oportet tempus, quo scriptura apocalypsis edita est, quoniam tunc erat Cæsar Domitianus—unus exstat, sub quo scribitur apocalypsis, Domitianus scilicet. p. 420, C.

[t] Cæteri tres equi bella, fames, pestes in evangelio a Domino prædicata manifestius significant. p. 417. H.

'of by the Lord in the gospel.' 'For [u] the Lord says: *This 'gospel shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto the nations, 'and then shall the end come:* Matt. xxiv. 14. Presently afterwards: 'As [x] we read in the gospel: *Nation shall rise against na-'tion, and kingdom against kingdom:*' ver. 7. 'And [y] so the Lord 'says in the gospel: *Then let them which are in Judea flee to the 'mountains:*' ver. 16. And in like manner often. 'And [z] the 'Jews saying, *Forty and six years has this temple been building,* the 'evangelist says: *He spake of the temple of his body:*' John ii. 20, 21. Having quoted Matth. xiii. 52. *Therefore every scribe instructed to the kingdom of God is like unto an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old,* he says: 'The [a] new 'things are the words of the gospel; the old those of the law 'and the prophets.' By *the words of the gospel,* or *evangelic words,* meaning, as it seems, the whole New Testament. After his long account of the four gospels, and their symbolical representations before transcribed, he observes: 'All [b] these, though 'four, are one, because they proceed from one mouth.' Explaining some words in the Revelation, he says: 'They [c] con-'fute those who say that one spake in the prophets, and ano-'ther in the gospel.' Again, 'The [d] doctrine of the Old Testa-'ment is connected with the New.' He [e] often speaks of the Old and New Testament.

12. We have seen then in Victorinus very valuable testimonies to the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, and some expressions which may be thought allusive to the epistle to the Hebrews, as also a plain quotation of the first epistle of St. Peter, beside his express testimony to the author of the book of the Revelation, and his Commentary upon it. And there might be other books received by him, as of authority, though not expressly mentioned in his few remaining works. Unquestionably he received all those scriptures of the New Testament, which were generally received by Christians in all times, and all over the world. We have also observed him to speak distinctly of a collection of sacred writings, called the gospel, and the New Testament. Finally, we should not forget

[u] Ait enim Dominus: Prædicabitur, &c. ib. H. [x] Ut legimus in evangelio: Surget enim gens, &c. ib. [y] Sic et Dominus in evangelio ait: Tunc qui in Judæa sunt, &c. p. 419. H. [z] Evangelista inquit: Ille dicebat de templo corporis sui. p. 418. G. [a] Nova evangelica verba: vetera legis et prophetarum. ib. p. 415. B. [b] Hæ prædicationis, quamvis quatuor sunt, una est tamen, quia de uno ore processit. p. 416. A.

[c] Arguit qui alium in prophetis, alium in evangelio dicunt esse locutum. p. 416. D. [d] Conjuncta veteris testamenti prædicatio cum novo. p. 417. F.

[e] Sic nec prædicatio novi testamenti fidem habet, nisi habeat veteris testamenti prænunciata testimonia. p. 417. A.

here

here the evidences we saw at the beginning of this chapter of Victorinus's writing Commentaries upon several books of the Old Testament, and some of the New; proofs of his application and industry, and of his unfeigned affection and ardent zeal for the holy scriptures, and for the Christian religion: which he recommended not only by the labours of his life, but also by the patience and fortitude of a violent, but willing, death for it's sake.

CHAP. LVII.

METHODIUS, bishop of Olympus in Lycia.

I. *His history.* II. *His works.* III. *Testimonies to him.* IV. *Select passages of Methodius.* V. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament: and first, of the four gospels:* VI. *Of the Acts of the apostles:* VII. *Of St. Paul's epistles:* VIII. *Of the epistle to the Hebrews:* IX. *Of the catholic epistles:* X. *Of the Revelation.* XI. *Forms of quoting, general divisions, and respect for the scriptures.* XII. *Texts explained.* XIII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. 'METHODIUS, [a] bishop of Olympus in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre, a man of a neat and correct style, composed a 'work against Porphyry in several books. He also wrote a 'Banquet of ten virgins; Concerning the Resurrection, against 'Origen, an excellent book; and against him likewise Of the 'Pythoness; and Of liberty, [or free will;] Commentaries also 'upon Genesis and the Canticles; and many other works, which 'are in the hands of every body. He obtained the crown of 'martyrdom at Chalcis in Greece, at the end of the last persecu-'tion; or, as some say, under Decius and Valerian.'

So writes Jerom in his book of Illustrious men. Eusebius makes no mention of Methodius in his Ecclesiastical history. The reason of it has been supposed by many learned men to be, that Methodius had written against Origen, whom Eusebius greatly admired. Nay, Valesius says, moreover, it [b] was out of

[a] Methodius Olympi Lyciæ, et postea Tyri episcopus, nitidi compositique sermonis, adversus Porphyrium confecit libros, et Symposium decem virginum, de resurrectione opus egregium contra Origenem, et adversus eundem de Pythonissa, et de autexusio. In Genesim quoque, et in Cantica Canticorum commentarios; et multa alia, quæ vulgo lectitantur. Et ad extremum novissimæ persecutionis, sive, ut alii affirmant, sub Decio et Valeriano, in Chalcide Græciæ, martyrio coronatus est. De V. I. cap. 83. [b] Nam cum omnes ecclesiasticos scriptores in hoc opere

envy

envy and hatred of Methodius, that Eusebius wrote after him against Porphyry. But this last supposition appears to me uncharitable: however, we are informed by Jerom that [c] Eusebius, in his Apology for Origen, complained of Methodius for writing against Origen, after he had more than once spoken of his sentiments without any censure or dislike. And from the accounts we have of the works of Methodius, and some remaining extracts out of them, it appears, that not only several of his pieces were written against Origen, but likewise that he sometimes treated that great man not very civilly.

Socrates [d] writes, that Methodius, after he had long opposed Origen, as if he recanted what he had said, commended him in a dialogue, called Zeno. Tillemont [e] thinks Socrates is not to be credited herein: and [f] Baronius long ago charged that ecclesiastical historian with being guilty of a manifest falsehood in this account: for he says the quite contrary is the truth, as we learn from Eusebius himself: Methodius first approved of Origen, and afterwards wrote against him. Besides, how should Socrates become acquainted with this recantation of Methodius, which is unknown to every body else; which Eusebius, Rufinus, and other defenders of Origen, say nothing of? Whereas, says Baronius, if they had known it they would have transcribed it in letters of gold, and shewn it every where. On the other hand [g] Valesius, [h] Huet, and [i] Pagi, maintain the truth of the relation in Socrates. But it seems to me not impossible that Socrates mistook the time of writing that dialogue, which might be written before Methodius had taken a disgust against Origen. Or, if indeed it was written afterwards, as Socrates supposed, I think it reasonable to conclude the commendation there given Origen was a small matter of no great moment, and far short of a recantation. Baronius's reasoning appears solid: if Methodius had recanted what he had written against Origen, it would have been mentioned by his apologists. I suppose the meaning of

accurare commemoraverit, Methodium tamen de industria prætermisit, eo quod Origenem, quem ipse præcipue mirabatur, impugnavisset. Hinc etiam est, quod contra Porphyrii libros, post eundem Methodium scripsit: quasi æmulatione quadam et odio adversus Methodium incitatus. Vales. Ann. in Eus. l. vi. c. 33, p. 128, B.

[c] Eusebius Cæsariensis episcopus, cujus supra memini, in sexto libro ἀπολογίας Origenis hoc idem objicit Methodio episcopo et martyri, quod tu in meis laudibus criminaris, et dicit: quomodo ausus est Methodius nunc contra Origenem scribere, qui hæc et hæc de Origenis loquutus est dogmatibus? Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruf. l. 1, p. 359, Bened. [d] Μεθόδιος πολλὰ καταδραμὼν τῶν Ὠριγένους, ὕστερον ἐν παλινῳδίας σχήματι τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπῄνεσε λόγῳ, ὃν ἐπιγράψας Ζήνωνα. H. E. l. vi. cap. 13. p. 320, A. [e] Tillem. St. Methodius Mem. Eccl. T. v. P. iii. p. 139. 145.

[f] Baron. Ann. 402, n. xvii. [g] Vales. ad Socr. l. vi. c. 13. [h] Huet Origeniana. l. ii. c. iv. num. ii. [i] Pagi Crit. 402, n. iii.

Eusebius's

Eusebius's words above cited by Jerom to be this: That Methodius in his own writings, in several places, had treated of several sentiments that were disliked in Origen; and that Methodius in those more early pieces appeared to be much of the same opinion with Origen: but afterwards he wrote against him with a good deal of bitterness; of this conduct Eusebius complained. And it has been observed by [k] Tillemont, that in the Banquet of the ten Virgins, probably [l] one of the first books published by our author, there are several sentiments very near resembling those called Origen's. Methodius, says that learned writer, in one place [m] very nearly follows the opinion of Origen upon the preexistence of souls, which are at length sent from heaven into bodies. He [n] seems also to say, (as Origen was accused,) that in the glory of heaven men shall be changed into the nature of angels. These things, not to insist now on any other, are found in that Banquet.

Upon the whole, as Eusebius was not unacquainted with Methodius, and has been careful to mention a great number of ecclesiastical writers in his history, his silence about this bishop may be very probably ascribed to the cause above-mentioned, his displeasure against him for writing against Origen, and treating him roughly: that silence must also be reckoned an argument, that Methodius did never retract: for that would have been much for Origen's honour; it would have reconciled his admirers to Methodius, and they would have spoken of it frequently, and Eusebius would not have failed to give him an honourable place in his Ecclesiastical History.

There [o] are considerable difficulties about the place of which Methodius was bishop. Jerom said above, that he was at first bishop of Olympus. Socrates too says expressly, and at length, that he [p] was bishop of a city in Lycia, called Olympus. He [q] is now very commonly called bishop of Patara, and at other times of Tyre. Suidas [r] says, Methodius was bishop of Olympus in Lycia, or of Patara, and afterwards of Tyre: in which words there is supposed to be an ambiguity: for they may mean, that Olympus was sometimes called Patara; or, that it is doubtful which of those two places he was bishop of: but, that Pata-

[k] As before, p. 138. [l] Ib. p. 136.

[m] ——τρόπον τινὰ σπείρεται εἰς τὰ σώματα ἐκπεσοῦσα καὶ καταπεσοῦσα τοῦ ὄφεως. Method. Conv. ap. Combef. Auct. Nov. p. 74, C. [n] ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν χιλιονταετηρίδα καὶ ἀποδεδυσάμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ σχήματος τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τῆς ζώης, ὡς ἀγγέλοις ὁμοιωθησόμεθα. Ib. p. 429, A.

[o] Tillem. as before, p. 132, & sur St. Methode Note 1. [p] ——Μεθόδιος, τῆς ἐν Λυκίᾳ τινὸς πόλεως Ὀλύμπου ἐπίσκοπος. Socr. l. vi. c. 13. [q] See Till. as before, note [o]. [r] Μεθόδιος, ὁλυμπίτης λυκίας, εἶτα πατάρων, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τύρου ἐπίσκοπος. Suid.

ra and Olympus were two different places might be shewn. They [s] are expressly named by Strabo, as two of the six large cities of Lycia: and how he should be bishop of both is not easy to conceive.

Jerom says that Methodius was afterwards bishop of Tyre; and so likewise Suidas from him, or from his Greek interpreter Sophronius: which yet is not easy to be accounted for, nor very probable; such removals or translations of bishops not being then very common. Tillemont [t] thinks that if Methodius was bishop of Tyre, he must have succeeded Tyrannio, a worthy pastor of that church, particularly mentioned by [u] Eusebius, as one of the illustrious martyrs of Diocletian's persecution, who was drowned in the sea near Antioch.

It is, however, very likely that Methodius was for some time, if not to the end of his life, bishop of Olympus in Lycia: since Socrates gives him that title, as well as Jerom. Besides, in one of his works, he [x] informs us of a wonderful thing he had seen upon Olympus, a mountain of Lycia; which, according to [y] Strabo, adjoined to the city of the same name.

In Jerom's days there were two different opinions about the time of this person's death; for some thought he suffered under Decius or Valerian: but this opinion is inconsistent with his writing against Porphyry, who did not publish his books against the Christians till about the year 270. The other is Jerom's own opinion, that Methodius had the honour of martyrdom at the end of the last, or Diocletian's persecution: therefore in the year 311 or 312, as [z] Tillemont shews; not in the year 302, or 303, as Du Pin [a] says, if his numbers are rightly printed in my edition. Methodius is placed by Cave as flourishing about the year 290, against which I have no exceptions to make: for it is not unlikely that he was ordained bishop about that time.

But though the above-mentioned opinion of Jerom concerning the time of the death of Methodius may be reckoned very probable, yet what he says about the place of it is not very easy to be [b] received.

In this uncertainty are we about several material things relating to Methodius: which may be imputed partly to his own modesty, who had said little of himself in his works; and partly, and chiefly, to the neglect, or the resentment and ill-will of Euse-

[s] Strab. l. 14, p. 665, A. [t] As before, p. 133. [u] Euf. l. viii. cap. 13, p. 307, 308. [x] Vid. Excerpt. ex libr. de Resurr. ap. Comb. p. 501, ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924. [y] Ubi supra, p. 666. [z] See Till. as before, p. 133, and notes. [a] Du Pin Bibl. des Aut. Ecc. T. i. p. 195, à Amst. [b] Till. as above, p. 133, and note 3.

bius:

bius: who, it is likely, could have left us good memoirs of him, if he had pleaſed.

Thus much we may rely upon, that he was biſhop, and probably of Olympus in Lycia, as was before ſhewn; and that the ſame biſhop ſuffered death for the Chriſtian religion, probably in the perſecution begun under Dioclefian: and, beſide what we have already ſeen from Jerom and others, it may be obſerved here, that he is called biſhop and martyr by [c] Photius, and by [d] Theodoret. Hereafter I may add ſome more paſſages confirming theſe particulars.

I ſhall conclude the brief hiſtory of this perſon with one obſervation: it is an obvious thought, and a conjecture likely to ariſe in the minds of not a few, that, ſince Methodius is ſaid to have been biſhop of ſo many places, and there were in Jerom's time two very different opinions concerning the time of his death, poſſibly there were two of this name in the third century, both biſhops and martyrs; one ſomewhat obſcure, the other well known, for his writings at leaſt.

II. Of theſe we have a pretty good account left us: and I muſt take ſome notice of them before I proceed to make extracts.

1. The firſt mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue is the work or books againſt Porphyry, which in another place he ſays [e] amounted to ten thouſand lines. St. Jerom has ſpoken of this work more than once in his Commentary [f] upon the book of Daniel, and [g] elſewhere. Of this work there is now nothing remaining, except [h] a few fragments, which are but of ſmall conſequence. The three chief writers againſt Porphyry were Methodius, Euſebius, and Apollinarius: and [i] Philoſtorgius, as we are informed by Photius, gave the preference to Apollinarius above the other two.

2. The next piece mentioned by Jerom, as above, is the Banquet of ten Virgins, or Of Chaſtity. Out of this work, which is a dialogue, there are large extracts in [k] Photius: and we ſtill have it [l] entire, anſwerable to the quotations made by the ancients. Photius indeed cenſures this work: he ſays there are in it Arian and other erroneous opinions, and [m] therefore ſuſpects it to have been interpolated: but that ſuſpicion is now judged groundleſs by moſt of the learned [n] moderns.

[c] Cod. 235, p. 932. [d] Dialog. i. p. 37. [e] Methodius uſque ad decem millia procedit verſuum. Hieron. Ep. 83, [al. 84.] [f] In Dan. Pr. et cap. xii. v. ult. [g] Adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 433, in. T. iv. P. ii. et l. p. 30, [al. 50] p. 776, in ib. [h] ap. Combefis. p. 442, &c. [i] ὅτι, φησὶν ἀτελείας κατὰ πορφυρίου γράψας ἐν τῷ κρατεῖν τῶν πλανήσεων εὐσεβῶς πρὸ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν μεθοδίου κατὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποθέσεως σπουδασμάτων. Philoſt. H. E. l. viii. c. 14. [k] Cod. 237, p. 949, &c. [l] ap. Combef. Auct. p. 64, &c. [m] ——νενοθευμένος ἐστιν· εὑρήσεις γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ παραδόλτμειας καὶ ἀρειανικὰς δοξοκοπίας, καὶ ἕτερα τῶν παλαιῶν μυθολογήματα. ib. p. 964, f. [n] Du Pin Bibl. T. i. p. 198, Ill. as before, p. 138, Baſnag. Ann. 300, n. ix.

3. The book of the Resurrection, written against Origen, is called by Jerom an excellent work: this too was a dialogue: there are large extracts out of it in [o] Photius: and Epiphanius [p] transcribed a good part of it into his work against heresies.

4. Of the next work mentioned by Jerom, Of the Pythoness, or the cunning woman, whom Saul consulted, likewise against Origen, nothing now remains.

5. Nor have we any thing of his Commentaries upon Genesis, or the Canticles, that is considerable, and that can be relied upon.

6. There are large extracts in Photius out of the treatise [q] Of Free-will; or, Of the Origin of Evil. Tillemont [r] observes, that Jerom seems to say, this work also was written against Origen: but this does not appear by what Combefis has given. He adds, it is a dialogue, in which an orthodox person confutes two Valentinians. Fabricius [s] however says, this treatise was written against the Valentinians and Origen.

7. Photius [t] has also extracts out of another work of Methodius, entitled, Of the Creatures, not mentioned by Jerom. This book was plainly written against Origen, whom [u] he here more than once calls centaur; as [x] if he had been some compound creature, partly heathen, partly Christian; or, as Fabricius expresseth it, because [y] he mixed things sacred and prophane, Christian and heathen principles all together.

8. We now plainly perceive that there were at least three or four pieces of Methodius written against Origen, and that he sometimes treated that great man in an offensive manner: and, if the homily or tract, to be hereafter mentioned, concerning Simeon and Anna be his, we have another instance of his ill-will to Origen. This is one of the arguments of Combefis for the genuineness of that [z] work, that the author opposeth Origen: but, supposing this not to be written by Methodius, we have nevertheless a good deal of evidence of his aversion to that eminent person: and I think this must be allowed to make a kind of apology for Eusebius; though I heartily wish he had not carried his resentment so far as he seems to have done. He had good reason, we will suppose, to be displeased with Methodius,

[o] Cod. 234, p. 908, &c. [p] Epiph. Hær. 64, a pag. 534, ad 590. et ap. Combef. Bib. Patr. p. 283, &c. [q] ap. Phot. Cod. 236, p. 940, et Combef. Bib. p. 347, &c. [r] Ib. p. 142. [s] Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 256. [t] Cod. 235. [u] ὅτι ὁ Ὠριγένης, ὁν κενταύρου καλεῖ, κ. λ. Cod. 235, p. 933, ver. 28. Ἡλίου δὲ ὄν, ὦ κενταῦρε. ib. p. 936, ver. 52.

[x] Christianam denique fidem Hippocentaurum facite, nec equum perfectum, nec hominem. Faust. Manich. l. 15. ap. Aug. T. viii. p. 571, F. [y] Quod nempe sacra profanis atque Christiana Ethnicis miscuisset dogmata. Fabr. ib. p. 256.

[z] Vid. Method. Combefis. p. 427, 469, 473, not. 42.

and

and he might well cenſure and blame him for treating Origen as he did: nevertheleſs, he ſhould have given Methodius a place among other ancient worthies in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

9. Theodoret [a] has quoted a paſſage of Methodius out of a piece entitled, A Diſcourſe of Martyrs; of which there is nothing elſe remaining. I ſhall take notice of that paſſage hereafter.

10. Nor have we any thing of the dialogue called Xeno, which we before obſerved to be taken notice of by Socrates.

11. I think I have now put down the titles of all the works of Methodius, expreſsly mentioned by the ancients: however, it is not improbable that he wrote more; for Jerom ſays there were many other beſide thoſe mentioned by him. Euſebius's paſſage above cited from Jerom ſeems to imply, that Methodius had written ſome good number of books before he became an enemy to Origen: and he might afterwards alſo write ſome other, which we are not acquainted with.

12. And there are actually ſeveral other [b] things now extant which are aſcribed to him: ſuch as, a Homily concerning Simeon and Anna; another Homily upon our Saviour's entrance into Jeruſalem; and Revelations, and a Chronicle.

Theſe two laſt I think are generally rejected as not genuine.

The ſecond likewiſe I ſuppoſe is defended by very few.

But the firſt homily, concerning Simeon and Anna, has more patrons. Not only [c] Combefis, and ſome others, but [d] Fabricius likewiſe pleads it's genuineneſs. On the other hand, Tillemont [e] allows, there is no good reaſon to take it for a work of our Methodius. Oudin [f] ſtrenuouſly oppoſeth it, and thinks it the compoſition of ſome other Methodius, later than ours by ſeveral centuries; as does [g] Cave. Du Pin [h] ſays that 'it is 'not cited by the ancients, nor abridged by Photius. The au-'thor ſpeaks ſo clearly of the myſteries of the trinity, of the 'incarnation, and the divinity of the Word, who he more than 'once ſays is conſubſtantial with the Father; of the hymn called 'Triſagion, of the virginity of Mary, even after her delivery; 'and of original ſin; that there is room to doubt whether ſome-'what has not been added to this homily: beſide that the ſtyle 'is more verboſe, and fuller of epithets than that of Methodius.' So that learned writer. And in my opinion theſe particulars are ſufficient to aſſure us, that either this homily is not genuine,

[a] Vid. Theodoret. Dial. i. p. 37.

[b] See Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. v. P. iii. before, p. 222. et notes 6 & 7, ſur. St. Methode. Vid. etiam Fabric. ut ſupra, p. 257, 258.

[c] Vid. Combef. in Method. p. 469.

[d] Fabr, ut ſupra, p. 257.

[e] Tillem. as before, p. 136, & 144, & note vi.

[f] De Script. Ecc. T. i. p. 303, &c.

[g] Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 152.

[h] Du Pin, as before, p. 200.

(which I rather think), or elſe it has been ſo interpolated as to be very little worth. Of this, and ſome other things aſcribed to Methodius, Grabe [i] honeſtly ſays, they are either ſuppoſititious, or interpolated. I ſhall therefore make no uſe of this piece; or, if I do, I ſhall give notice of it particularly.

III. I ſhall now put down a few teſtimonies to Methodius, beſide thoſe already obſerved in the hiſtory of him, and in the account of his works: there is the more need of this becauſe of Euſebius's ſilence. Epiphanius, who inſerted a large part of the dialogue concerning the reſurrection into his work, Againſt Hereſies, calls [k] Methodius a bleſſed man; and [l] afterwards gives him the character of a learned or eloquent man, and a zealous defender of truth. Jerom has given Methodius a place in his [m] letter to Magnus among other ancient Chriſtian writers of note; and when he cites him, in his Commentary upon Daniel, he calls him [n] the moſt eloquent martyr Methodius. Andrew of Cæſarea, about the year 500, in his Commentary upon the book of the Revelation, often cites this writer, and more than once calls him [o] the great Methodius; a title which he gives likewiſe to Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, and ſome other ancient writers. He alſo calls Methodius [p] a bleſſed man: quoting him and Hippolytus, he calls them [q] ſaints, or holy men. More teſtimonies to our author may be ſeen in [r] Leo Allatius, who is a great admirer of Methodius, and [s] prefers him to Origen: but ſurely that judgment is owing to partiality and prejudice. Methodius had wit and learning as well as piety: ſo much ought to be owned: but why he ſhould be equalled, and even preferred to Origen, I cannot ſee. Doubtleſs Socrates would allow the four writers, whom he mentions, as enemies of Origen, (of whom Methodius is the firſt) a good ſhare of learning. Nevertheleſs, ſenſible of their inferiority to that eminent perſon, and offended at the manner in

[i] Cæterum proſtat quidem unus inſuper et alter Methodii tractatus, e quibus plura, eaque luculentiſſima, pro —— catholica trinitatis profeſſione teſtimonia allegari poſſent. Sed ab iis abſtineo, quod tractatus iſti aut ſuppoſititii, aut interpolati eſſe videantur. Grab. Annot. ap. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 13, in fin.

[k] ὑπο τȣ μακαριτȣ Μεθοδιȣ. Epiph. Hær. 64. c. 11, p. 534. C. [l] Μεθοδιῳ ανδρι λογιῳ ὀντι, και σοφοδρα περι της αληθειας αγωνισαμενῳ. id. ib. c. 63, p. 591. A.

[m] Ep. 83, [al. 84]. [n] Et ex parte diſertiſſimus vir martyr Methodius, in Dan. cap. xii. verſ. ult. [o] Ὁ δε μεγας Μεθοδιος. Andr. in Apoc. p. 63. A. Vid. et p. 66. B. 124. B. [p] ib. p. 64. E.

[q] τοις δε αγιοις, Μεθοδιῳ και Ιππολυτῳ, κ. λ. p. 70. E.

[r] Vid. Leon. Allat. de Method. Scripſis Diatriba. ap. Hippolyt. Ed. Fabric. P. ii. p. 76, &c. [s] Fuit ingenium, et doctrina maxima Origenis. Eam ſi cum Methodiana conferas, habet quod laudari poteſt, et debeat; tamen vileſcere videtur, et diſſoluta viribus fluere. Contra, Methodiana eſt, quæ ſemper vigens, florens, purgens, concitans, auditorem vellicat et rapit. Mortua eſt Origeniana loquacitas, ſi cum Methodiana brevitate conferatur. Una Methodii pagina et luminibus oratoriis et ſententiis, et pietate, et eruditione firma et integra centum Origenis paginas exæquat. Leon. Allat. ib. num. xvi. p. 83.

which

which they had treated him, he applies to them this obſervation: 'That [t] mean and obſcure people, who are unable to ſhine by 'their own merit, endeavour to make themſelves conſiderable by 'detracting from others. The firſt,' ſays he, 'who was ſeized 'with this diſtemper, was Methodius, biſhop of a city in Lycia, 'named Olympus.' The other three mentioned by Socrates are Euſtathius, Apollinarius, and Theophilus of Alexandria.

IV. Before I proceed to this author's teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament, I ſhall tranſcribe a few ſelect paſſages: they will be agreeable to ſome of my readers; and may be of uſe to give ſome idea of the ſtate of theology in thoſe days.

1. In his book Of the Creatures, as we are informed by Photius, he ſaid that [u] the book of Job was written by Moſes.

2. In his remaining fragments he twice [x] quotes the book of Wiſdom as Solomon's.

3. He ſays that [y] God having made the world appointed angels as governors and preſidents under himſelf. 'But [z] the devil 'fell, through envy of us, and afterwards many other angels ad-'mitted fleſhly deſires, and fell in love with the daughters of 'men:' which opinion doubtleſs is founded upon a wrong interpretation of the ſixth chapter of Geneſis. Du Pin, through haſte, or ſome other cauſe, has [a] ſtrangely miſrepreſented this paſſage of Methodius; ſuppoſing him to aſcribe the fall of the devil, as well as the other angels, to this laſt temptation.

4. Methodius [b] had a notion that the divine Word was incarnate in Adam: he builds this doctrine upon what St. Paul writes in Eph. v. 31, 32, and ſays, that '[c] Adam was not only a type 'and figure, but Chriſt, foraſmuch as the Word, who was before 'all ages, dwelled in him; for it was fit and reaſonable, that the 'firſt-begotten of God, and the firſt and only begotten, even 'Wiſdom, joining itſelf to man, ſhould be incarnate [or, be-'come man,] in the firſt-made and firſt and firſt-born of men.' This Methodius will have to be orthodox, or the right interpre-

[t] Socrat. H. E. l. vi. c. 13, in.

[u] Οτι το Ιωβ βιβλιον, Μωσεως εστι ο αγιος φησι. Cod. 235, p. 937, f. ap. Combef. p. 345. A.

[x] —— καθαπερ και η σοφια Σολομωνος μαρτυρει. ap. Epiphan. Hær. 64. n. xix. p. 543. A. Vid. ib. n. xxxvi.

[y] ap. Epiphan. ib. n. xxi. in. et ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 908, fin.

[z] Ο δε διεβαλε, και φθονερος περι των μετα ταυτα γεγενητο την διοικησιν, φθονον εγκισσας καθ' ημων· ωσπερ και οι μετα ταυτα αλλοι πολλοι εραστευτες, κ. λ. ib. ap. Epiphan. p. 544. B.

[a] —— que le peché a eſté cauſé par l'envie du diable, et que le diable même, qui avoit eſté creé dans la juſtice ſemblable aux autres anges eſt tombé par le peché d'envie, et par l'amour déreglé, qu'il a eu pour les filles. Du Pin. Bib. T. i. p. 198.

[b] Concerning this matter ſee Beauſobre, Hiſt. de Manichée, &c. T. ii. p. 317, 318.

[c] Φερε γαρ ημεις επισκεψωμεθα πως ορθοδοξης αινιγμα τον Αδαμ εις τον Χριστον, ὁ μοιον τυπον αυτον ηγημενος ειναι και εικονα, αλλα και αυτο τουτο Χριστον και αυτος γεγονεναι, δια το των προ αιωνων εις αυτον εγκατασκηψαι λογον. Ηρμοζε γαρ το πρωτογονον του Θεου και πρωτον και μονογενες, την σοφιαν, τω πρωτοπλαστω και πρωτω και πρωτογονω των ανθρωπων ανθρωπω νεφασθηναι επιθρωπησαι. Method. Conv. p.

tation of St. Paul: but [d] Combefis, in oppoſition to a learned modern who would juſtify this paſſage, argues, that it cannot be reconciled to ſound doctrine. I ſhall preſently tranſcribe from Methodius what follows in the ſame place.

5. Some while ago we ſaw the cenſure which Photius paſſed upon the writings of Methodius; that they had in them the Arian doctrine, and therefore were interpolated as he ſuſpected: but learned moderns, not perceiving any marks of interpolation, have thought themſelves obliged to admit that Methodius Arianiſed. Biſhop Bull [e] indeed, and [f] Grabe after him, maintain the orthodoxy of this biſhop and martyr. Du Pin [g] likewiſe thinks that Methodius may be very well defended from the accuſation of erring about the trinity: but [h] Tillemont ſays it is very difficult to put a good ſenſe upon ſome of his expreſſions concerning the Word, and concerning the proceſſion of the divine perſons: Baſnage [i] and [k] Beauſobre ſpeak to the like purpoſe. And [l] Methodius is one of thoſe many ancient writers, whom Huet ſuppoſeth to have thought falſely and abſurdly about the trinity, and yet are not reckoned heretics, but are counted amongſt the orthodox writers of the church.

Let me take a paſſage or two of our author, that the reader may the better judge for himſelf. In the work Concerning the Creatures, he ſays: 'There [m] are two creative powers: one, who 'by his pure will, without any difficulty, creates what he pleaſeth 'out of nothing; this is the Father: the other diſpoſeth into 'order, and poliſheth things already made, in imitation of the 'former; [or, according to the model given by the former;] 'this is the Son, the all-powerful and ſtrong hand of the Fa'ther, by which he adorns and finiſhes the matter firſt made by 'him out of nothing.'

79. A. B. ap. Combef. Auct. Noviſſ.

[d] Non videntur hæc ſane dicta. Poſſinii explicatio pia eſt, ſed violenta. Plane enim diſtinguit Methodius primum Adamum et ſecundum, vultque utrumque ipſum reipſa Chriſtum extitiſſe, inceſſente Verbo ac illabente, &c. Combef. Annot. ib. 146. B.

[e] Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 14, n. ix. x. p. 147, &c. [f] Grabe in Annotatis, ib. p. 150. [g] Du Pin, as before, p. 198. [h] Tillem. as above, p. 138.

[i] Diſſimulari tamen vix poteſt, multa in Methodio reperiri duriſſima, quæque Ariana veſtigia non obſcure exhibeant, &c. Baſnag. Ann. 300, n. ix. Vid. quæ ibidem ſequuntur, et num. vii. [k] Hiſt. de Manichee, &c. l. vi. ch. iii. n. viii. T. ii. p. 317, note 7. [l] Nam ut alios hic-vitatis cauſa prætermittam, quot recenſere poſſumus, nulla ha reſeos ſuſpicione aſperſos, et de trinitate tamen falſa et abſurda commentos? Venient in hunc ordinem Juſtinus Martyr, —— Clemens Romanus, —— Methodius, —— Huet. Origen. l. ii. c. 3. n. vi. [m] Ὅτι φασὶν οἱ αγιοι, ὁτι ὁ μὲν δυναμεις εν τοις προειμενολογημενοις ἐξαμεν ειναι ποιητικας. την ἐξ ουκ ὀντων γενεσιν τῳ θελήματι, χωρις μελισμου, [al. αὐλησεως,] ψιλῳ τῳ θελησαι. αὐτουργησαι ὁ θελειται τουτ' τεχναζεται δὲ ὁ πατηρ· θατερα δὲ καταστησασαι και ποικιλλσαι κατα μιμησιν της προτερας τα ηδη γεγονοτα· εστι δὲ ὁ υἱος ἡ παντοδυναμις και κραταια χειρ τ πατρος, ἡ μετα το ποιησαι την ὑλην ἐξ ουκ ὀντων κατασκευη. Method. de creat. ap. Phot. Cod. 235, p. 917, fin. et ap. Combef. p. 344.

This

This paſſage is cenſured by [n] Petavius. I ſee that [o] biſhop Bull endeavours to juſtify it: but [p] Beauſobre ſays that this paſſage 'favours of Platoniſm, according to which it was thought 'improper that [q] the ſupreme God ſhould meddle with matter, 'or make any thing that is periſhable.' He ſays, moreover, that ſome of the ancient fathers 'divided the creation between 'the Father and the Son. The celebrated Methodius ſuppoſed 'that the Father's part lay in bringing matter out of nothing, 'and that of the Son in forming the world after the plan which 'the Father had ſhewn him.'

Let us in the next place take the ſequel of the paſſage above tranſcribed, relating to the firſt man: 'For,' ſays [r] Methodius, 'that is Chriſt, even man filled with pure and perfect deity, and 'God contained in man: for it was highly becoming that the 'moſt ancient of æons, and the chief of archangels, ſince he was 'to live with men, ſhould inhabit the moſt ancient and firſt of 'men, that is, Adam.'

Theſe laſt words of our author Baſnage [s] is much offended with: the moſt ancient of æons he thinks more becoming the mouth of a Valentinian than a catholic Chriſtian. Grabe [t] thought proper to allege the firſt part of this paſſage as a proof that Methodius believed Chriſt's true deity: but then he omitted the latter part of the paſſage, being, I ſuppoſe, too much in haſte to tranſcribe it all: nevertheleſs, if the latter part of the paſſage ſhould be underſtood to be explanatory of the former part of it (as poſſibly it may), then Grabe's argument would be of little weight.

I ſhall tranſcribe no more paſſages relating to this matter, but only refer to ſome places [u] in the margin, to be conſulted by thoſe who are curious, and have leiſure; and particularly to [x] Beauſobre's remarks upon the forecited paſſages of Methodius: nor do I venture to ſay what was this writer's real opinion concerning the trinity; for this appears to me a point not eaſily decided: and I think it would require a nice and careful diſquiſi-

[n] Petav. de Trinit. l. i. c. iv. n. xii.
[o] Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii.
[p] Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. ii. cap. 13, n. x.
[q] Beauſobre, as before, l. vi. ch. 6. n. 7. T. ii. p. 360. [q] —— dans le-quel on ne permettoit pas au Dieu ſuprême de mettre la main à l'œuvre, de toucher à la matiere, ni de former rien de périſſable.
[r] Ἦτο γαρ ειναι τον Χριστον, ανθρωπον πληρη θεοτητι και τελια περιλαμβανομενον, και θεον ανθρωπῳ κεχωρημενον. ην γαρ πρεπωδες, τον πρεσβυτατον των αιωνων και αρχαγγελων, ανθρωποις μελλοντα συνομιλειν, εις τον παλαιοτατον και πρωτον των ανθρωπων εισοικισθηναι, τον Αδαμ. Conviv, p. 79. B. [s] Mirum ſane Chriſti titulum, antiquiſſimum æonum et ſola Valentini ſchola dignum. Baſn. Ann. 300, n. vii. [t] Grab. Annot. ad Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 150. [u] Vid. Excerpt. ex libr. de Creatis ap. Phot. Cod. 235, p. 940. Conviv. Decem Virg. ap. Combef. Auct. Nov. p. 75. C. p. 80. A. B. p. 81. C. D. p. 82. B. C. 101. D. 113. D.
[x] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 118, 119.

tion

tion to determine, upon good ground, what was his ſentiment upon that head.

6. Methodius is likewiſe called a millenarian. Du Pin having made his extracts out of the Banquet ſays: 'I [y] ſtay not to 'obſerve that he has taught in this treatiſe the opinion of the 'millenarians.' Tillemont [z] too ſays that Methodius here clearly admits the opinion of the millenarians, and a reign of the ſaints upon the earth for the ſpace of a thouſand years after the reſurrection: and [a] it muſt be owned that in the Banquet he expreſſeth himſelf after that manner: but in the Fragments of the diſcourſe, Of the Reſurrection, he affirms that the earth is not to be annihilated, but changed and renewed. 'Since therefore,' ſays [b] he, 'the earth will exiſt ſtill, doubtleſs it will have inhabitants, 'ſuch as never die any more, nor marry, nor bring forth chil-'dren, but are as the angels, unchangeable and uncorruptible, 'enjoying perpetual felicity.' This paſſage is ſomewhat difficult to be reconciled with that in the Banquet. Petavius underſtood [c] our author to ſpeak here of everlaſting happineſs upon this earth. And afterwards, in that diſcourſe or dialogue Concerning the Reſurrection, he ſays: 'So [d] far we are to be like 'unto the angels, that as the angels in heaven, ſo alſo we in pa-'radiſe, ſhall no more marry or feaſt, but ſhall be employed in 'ſeeing God, and in improving ourſelves under the government 'and conduct of Chriſt: for he ſaid not, they ſhall be angels, 'but *as the angels.*' Huet [e] refers to theſe paſſages as a proof that Methodius himſelf, who propoſed to correct Origen, did not always expreſs himſelf juſtly concerning the reſurrection.

7. According to Methodius, human ſouls [f] are corporeal. This he argues from the parable of the rich man and Lazarus in Luke xvi. foraſmuch as in hell, the ſeparate ſtate of exiſtence, they

[y] Du Pin, as before, p. 198.

[z] Tillem. as before, p. 138.

[a] Con. p. 129. A. B. and ſee above, p. 305, note [n].

[b] —— εσομενης γαρ και μετα τουτον τον αιωνα γης, αναγκη πασα εσεσθαι και οικησοντας, ουκετι τεθνηξομενους, η γαμησοντας και γεννησομενους, αλλ' ως αγγελους αμεταπτωτως εν αφθαρσια τα αρισα πραξοντας. ap. Epiph. H. 64. n. xxxii. p. 555. D.

[c] Hic perſpicue poſt judicium homines terram habitaturos aſſerit: non ut Chiliaſtæ ad aliquot duntaxat ſæcula, ſic ut interim ſuprema illa felicitate, hoc eſt, aſpectu Dei carerent: verum ut et perpetuo in hac terra degerent, et ſumma nihilominus illic ac perfecta beatitate fruerentur. Petav. animad. in Epiph. p. 261.

[d] —— ινα ωσπερ οι αγγελοι εν τω ουρανω, ουτως και ημεις εν τω παραδεισω, μητε γαμοις η ευλαβειαις ετι σχολαζοντες, αλλα τω βλεπειν τον θεον, και γεωργειν την ζωην, πρατευοντος ημιν τα Χριστου. ap. Epiph. Hær. 64. n. xxxv. p. 558. A.

[e] Under the ſame Origenis caſtigator Methodius ſine ceſpitatione hoc argumentum tractavit, homines fingens poſt reſurrectionem habitaturos in terra jam inſtaurata, et per aerem temperatiſſimum ambientem in melius mutata, et in paradiſi deliciis beatum ævum acturos: angelis autem cœleſtes orbes deſtinatum eſſe domicilium. Huet. Orig. l. ii. c. 2, Qu. 9. n. vi. p. 132.

[f] αι δε ψυχαι απο του δημιουργου και παντων των ολων, σωματα νοερα υπαρχουσαι, κ. τ. λ. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 932.

are ſpoken of as having a tongue, a finger, and other members. He [g] is alſo reckoned among thoſe fathers who ſuppoſed angels to be corporeal.

8. I have one obſervation to make here upon occaſion of the ſeveral errors imputed to Methodius: this good man, who not long after Origen's death bore hard upon him, calling him centaur, as if he had been a monſter, partly heathen, partly Chriſtian, is himſelf liable to the charge or ſuſpicion of hereſy, in thoſe latter times of greater orthodoxy.

9. In [h] one place of the Banquet are mentioned theſe following heretics all together: Sabellius, Artemas, and the Ebionites, Marcion, Valentinus, and the Helceſaites. What he ſays of them may be taken into conſideration at ſome other time.

I ſhall put down no more paſſages of this ſort from our author, but proceed to what remains.

V. I am now to obſerve this writer's teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament.

Methodius ſays expreſsly, 'There [i] have been four goſpels 'delivered to us:' I need not therefore put down particular quotations of each goſpel: indeed he has not mentioned the writers by name: however, no one can make any doubt or queſtion but he meaned our goſpels, and aſcribed them to the ſame evangelifts that we, and all Chriſtians in general, have always done.

VI. He ſpeaks of the baptiſm of Paul by Ananias, and particularly refers to the hiſtory of it [k] in the Acts.

VII. It cannot be needful that I ſhould tranſcribe particular paſſages of all the epiſtles of St. Paul cited by this author. It may ſuffice to obſerve, that he has quoted or alluded to theſe following epiſtles of that apoſtle; the epiſtle to the Romans, the firſt and ſecond to the Corinthians, the epiſtles to the Galatians, the Epheſians, the Philippians, the Coloſſians, the firſt to the Theſſalonians, and the firſt to Timothy: words of moſt of theſe are cited more than once, either as the apoſtle's or as Paul's. I have obſerved no clear references to the [l] ſecond to the Theſſalonians, the ſecond to Timothy, or to Titus, or Philemon, in thoſe extracts or treatiſes which I make uſe of as unqueſtionably

[g] Vid. Huet. Origen. l. ii. c. 2, Qu. 5. 2. viii. p. 71.

[h] Conv. p. 113. D.

[i] — διὰ τοῦτο καὶ εὐαγγέλια τέσσαρα παραδέδοται, τετραχῆ εὐαγγελισαμένου τοῦ [illegible] ἀληθοποιοῦντος, καὶ παιδαγωγήσαντος [illegible] χ. λ. Conv. Dec. Virg. p. 131. B. Combef. Auct. Nov. P. i.

[k] εὐαγγελιζόμενος καὶ ἀνακαινίζοντος αὐτὸν [illegible] τῷ βαπτίσματι, καθὼς ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τέτρωται. ib. p. 83. A.

[l] Though I do not now recollect any clear indiſputable references to the ſecond epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, in the remaining works of Methodius; yet I ſuppoſe him to refer to 2 Theſſ. i. 5: *that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God*, when he ſays of ſome ancient worthies, τῆς βασιλείας καταξιωθέντες. Conv. p. 105. A.

genuine:

genuine: nevertheleſs it cannot be doubted but he received all theſe epiſtles; as Origen and other Chriſtians did about his time.

VIII. He ſeems to have ſeveral paſſages out of the epiſtle to the Hebrews. He ſays: 'We [m] reſtrain evil thoughts, *leſt any 'root of bitterneſs ſpringing up ſhould trouble us:*' ſee Hebr. xii. 15. This is taken from the fragments of the treatiſe Of the Reſurrection. In the Banquet he appears to allude to it ſeveral times. He ſays: 'The [n] law was not ſo beautiful as the goſpel; for that 'was a kind of type and ſhadow of things to come: this is the 'truth and the grace of life.' And a little before he had ſaid: 'For [o] the law is the type and ſhadow of the image, that is, of 'the goſpel; but the goſpel is the image of the truth itſelf.' This is very agreeable to what is ſaid Hebr. x. 1. *For the law having a ſhadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with thoſe ſacrifices make the comers thereunto perfect.* He ſays likewiſe: 'For [p] after the reſurrection the truth ſhall be 'clearly manifeſted to us, when we *ſhall ſee face to face,* and not 'through *a glaſs darkly* and *in part,* the holy tabernacle, the city in 'the heavens, *whoſe builder and maker is God:*' here he joins together words of 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and Hebr. xi. 10, which laſt place is thus: *For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whoſe builder and maker is God.* He ſpeaks [q] of *Jeſus having paſſed into the heavens;* the very ſame expreſſions which we have in Heb. iv. 14. Having made honourable mention of Seth, Enos, Enoch, Methuſelah, and Noah, he adds: 'Theſe [r] were the firſt lovers of righteouſ-'neſs, and the firſt of the *firſt-born* children, *which are written in 'heaven:*' ſee Hebr. xii. 23. Theſe alluſions, and theſe expreſſions, borrowed, as it ſeems, from the epiſtle to the Hebrews, afford a probable argument of his uſing it, and of his reſpect for it.

Let us now ſee whether Methodius has not aſcribed this epiſtle to St. Paul: 'Since,' ſays [s] he, 'the law, according to 'the apoſtle, is ſpiritual, containing images of good things to 'come.' The firſt part of the obſervation ſeems to be taken from

[m] τους μεν ενταυθα τας βλαφας αυτης, οιον τας ενθυμησεις τας πονηρας, συσελλομεν, μη τις ριζα πικριας ανω φυουσα ενοχληση. De Reſurr. ap. Epiph. Hær. 64, n. xxv. p. 548. D. ap. Combef. p. 286.

[n] —— ο νομος· αλλ' ουχ' ουτως ην ωραιος ως το ευαγγελιον· εκεινος γαρ τυπος τις ην και σκια των μελλοντων πραγματων· τουτο δε αληθεια και ζωης χαρις. Conviv. p. 127. A. ap. Combef. Auct. Nov.

[o] ο μεν γαρ νομος της εικονος εστι τυπος και σκια, τουτεστι του ευαγγελιου· ο δε λογος, το ευαγγελιον αυτης της αληθειας. Conviv. p. 225. C.

[p] το γαρ αληθες μετ' αισθησιν δηλουται, οποτε προσωπον κατα προσωπον την αγιαν σκηνην, την πολιν την εν ουρανοις ης τεχνιτης και δημιουργος Θεος, αλλ' ουκ αινιγματων και εκ μερους εποπτευσομεν. Conv. p. 96. C.

[q] —— τω διεληλυθοτι τους ουρανους Ιησου. Conv. p. 129. A.

[r] —— πρωτοι δικαιοσυνης γεγονοτες ημεις, και πρωτοι πρωτοτοκων τεκνων απογεγραμμενων εν ουρανοις. Conv. p. 105. A.

[s] Ει ο νομος εστι, κατα τον αποστολον, της εικονας εμπεριεχων των μελλοντων. ib. p. 96. A. B.

Rom

Rom. vii. 14, where it is said, that *the law is spiritual*; and the second from Hebr. x. 1. Indeed the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews there says, that the *law had not the very image of the things*: whereas Methodius here speaks of the law containing images of good things: but he useth the word image loosely: he means no more than what he had expressed in the words before cited from him, that the *law was a type and shadow* of things to come, and as such contained, or obscurely hinted and represented, the images of them. That he intends not to say any thing more in this place, than in the former, is evident from several things that follow here; to which the reader is referred, if he has any doubt: in particular he says presently afterwards, 'that [t] the Jews had only a shadow of the image, at the third 'remove from the truth.'

Lastly, there is in the Banquet an exhortation to stedfastness in virtue, notwithstanding the greatest opposition from the enemy. 'For [u] ye will obtain unspeakable renown, if ye shall over-'come, and seize the seven crowns, for the sake of which the *race* 'and combat *is set before us*, according to the master Paul.' There may be in this passage, and in what precedes, a reference to the twelfth, and some other verses of the sixth, chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians: but the latter part of the passage, *the race set before us*, seems to be taken from Hebr. xii. 1; and for that it is more particularly that he alleges Paul's authority.

By these several passages I am induced to think it probable, that Methodius received the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's.

I formerly shewed the reasons why I do not esteem the homily concerning Simeon and Anna to be genuine. I am therefore far from alleging any thing out of it as a proof of the sentiments of our Methodius: but if that piece had been genuine, I suppose it might afford an undeniable testimony to this epistle; for there it is said, that '[x] God *took on him* [or laid hold of] *the* 'seed of Abraham, according to the most divine Paul, and through 'him of the whole human kind:' see Hebr. ii. 16.

IX. There is very little notice taken of the seven catholic epistles in the remaining pieces of this writer.

1. He speaks of Christ as [y] the *chief shepherd*: perhaps he borrows that character from 1 Pet. v. 4.

[t] Ὡς Ἰουδαίοις μὲν τὴν σκιὰν τῆς εἰκόνος, τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας, κατηγγέλκασιν· κ. τ. λ. p. 96. C.

[u] Μυρίων γὰρ ἐξεστι σοι καὶ ἀῤῥήτων ἐπιτυχεῖν εὐφροσυνῶν, ἐὰν ἀγωνίσῃ καὶ κρατήσῃς τῶν ἑπτὰ στεφάνων, ὑπὲρ ὧν ὁ ἀγὼν προκειται καὶ ὁ πὸλεμος, κατὰ τὸν θεῖον διδάσκαλον Παῦλον. ib. p. 116. B.

[x] —— ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαβόμενος κατὰ τὸν θειότατον Παῦλον, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ παντὸς τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου φύλου. De Sim. et A. p. 427. D. Combefis.

[y] ἀρχιποίμην. Conv. p. 70. C.

2. In

2. In the place referred to a little while ago Methodius says of the Ebionites, that 'z they assert the prophets spoke of their 'own motion.' Possibly our author has here an eye to 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. *Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is a of any private interpretation: for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God b spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* He says: 'The c Jews look for a sensible [or 'earthly] kingdom, and place their hopes in this strange land, 'which the divine word says shall pass away.' In 2 Pet. iii. 10. it is said *the heavens shall pass away d with a great noise:* perhaps Methodius refers to this text, perhaps to some others. In another place he says, 'the e whole world shall be consumed [or 'overflowed] with fire;' though according to his opinion it will not then utterly perish, but will be renewed and restored: possibly Methodius here refers to 2 Pet. iii. 6, 7, where it is said: *the world that then was, being f overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now,——are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment.*

3. He observes, that 'g *the world lieth in wickedness:*' the same thing that is said in the same words in 1 John v. 20.

4. I transcribe nothing more here relating to these epistles. Undoubtedly Methodius received the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John; for they were admitted as genuine, without controversy, by all catholic Christians. But what was our author's opinion concerning the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the epiſte of Jude, does not clearly appear from his remaining works.

X. The Revelation is very often quoted by Methodius as the writing of John: 'And h that the Word who became man is the 'chief virgin, [or prince of virgins,] as well as the chief shep-'herd, and chief prophet of the church, John, inspired by Christ, 'has shewn us in the book of the Revelation: *And I looked, and 'lo, a lamb stood on the mount Sion.——These are they which are not 'defiled with women, for they are virgins: these are they which follow 'the lamb whithersoever he goes:*' Rev. xiv. 1—4. This passage

z —— ως εθνικοι, εξ ιδιας κινησεως τους προφητας λελαληκεναι φιλονεικουντες. Conv. p. 113. D. a ιδιας επιλυσεως ου γινεται.

b αλλ' υπο πνευματος αγιου φερομενοι ελαλησαν οι αγιοι θεου ανθρωποι.

c βασιλειαν αισθητην προσδοκωντες, και επι γης ταυτης της αλλοτριας, ην παρελευσεσθαι λογος, τιθεμενοι τας ελπιδας. Conv. p. 90. A. d εν η οι ερανοι ροιζηδον παρελευσονται. e απας ο κοσμος κατακλυζομενος πυρι. ap. Epiph. Hær. 64. n. xxxi. p. 553. D. f —— ενδατι κατακλυσθεις. g του τον κοσμον εν τω πονηρω κεισθαι. De Resur. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 321, et ap. Combef. Bibl. p. 522. B. h Οτι δε και αρχιπαρθενος, ουτως και αρχιποιμην και αρχιπροφητης γεγονως λογος ανθρωπησας, της εκκλησιας, και ο χρισοληπτος ημιν παρεστησεν εν βιβλω της αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννης, λεγων· Και ειδον, κ.τ.λ. Conv. p. 70. C. D.

is in the Banquet; and in the same work: 'As [i] also John 'shews, saying, that the *incense in the vials of the four and twenty 'elders are the prayers of saints:*' see Rev. v. 8. Again, 'John [k] 'relating the revelation says: *And there appeared a great wonder in 'heaven,*' and what follows: where Methodius quotes Rev. xii. 1—6. In the same work the [l] Revelation is quoted as scripture, and a book of authority. In the extracts out of the treatise of the Resurrection, made by Photius, he quotes this book as written [m] by the blessed John. In the same extracts are these words: 'How [n] then is Christ celebrated by the prophets and the apostles 'as the *first-begotten of the dead?*' This is often said of Christ in the New Testament, as Acts xxvi. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 20; and twice almost in the very expression of Methodius, Col. i. 18, and Rev. i. 5. If we could be certain that Methodius referred to this place in the Revelation, then we should be assured that he supposed the writer of this book to be the apostle John. Finally, Methodius is mentioned by [o] Andrew of Cæsarea with Irenæus and others, who had bore testimony to the divine inspiration of this book. I think it is plain from what has been here collected, that Methodius received the Revelation as a book of authority; and very probable that he esteemed it a writing of John the apostle and evangelist.

XI. His forms of quotation, or general terms made use of in speaking of these books, and marks of respect for them, are such as these; [p] scriptures, [q] holy, or sacred scriptures, [r] divine scriptures. He speaks of [s] the Old Testament, which implies an acknowledgment of another that is new; both which are indeed quoted very largely by him, and as books of authority. In a passage quoted some while ago he speaks of prophets and apostles, thereby expressing the two general divisions of the scriptures before and after the coming of Christ: he [t] quotes these books by way of proof of what he says. He [u] affirms, that 'there is 'no contradiction or absurdity in the divine words.' The gospels are cited by him after this manner: 'The [x] Lord declares

[i] καθως και Ιωαννης εμηνυσε, κ. λ. ib. p. 57. A.

[k] —— την αποκαλυψιν ο Ιωαννης εξηγευεται λεγει. ib. p. 109. D.

[l] —— γινεται κατα ιδιαν της γραφης, οποτε και αποκαλυψις αρσενα την εκκλησιαν διαρρηδην γενεσθαι. ib. p. 111. C.

[m] ο μακαριος Ιωαννης. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924, ap. Combef. p. 326. B.

[n] πως δε, ει και ο Χριστος πρωτοτοκος ειναι των νεκρων υπο των προφητων και των αποστολων κηρυττεται; ap. Phot. ib. p. 925, et ap. Combef. p. 328.

[o] Vid. Andr. Prolog. in Apoc. p. 3. B. C.

[p] Vid. Method. Conv. p. 125. A. et passim.

[q] ταις αγιαις γραφαις. ib. p. 66. D.

[r] αι θειαι γραφαι. p. 89. A.

[s] εκ παλαιας υμιν χαρτου παρεξομαι διαθηκης εγγραφον προφητειαν. ib. p. 130. C.

[t] ουδε γαρ αναρτυρος ο λογος γραφων. ap. Epiph. p. 548. D. Vid. ib. n. xvii. p. 539. C.

[u] οτι μηδεμια επεισαγεται στασις η ατοπια εν τοις θειοις λογοις. ap. Epiphan. ib. Hær. 64, p. 555. B.

[x] και ο κυριος —— εν ευαγγελιοις παρεγγυα. Conv. p. 66. D.

'in

'in the goſpels.' Again: 'As [y] alſo our Lord Jeſus Chriſt di-'rects and commands in the goſpels: *Let your lights ſhine, and* '*your loins be girded about, and be ye yourſelves like men that wait for* '*their lord:*' Luke xii. 35—38. 'For [z] *ye are the ſalt of the* '*earth*, ſaid the Lord to the apoſtles:' ſee Matt. v. 13. 'Where, '[a] according to the true oracles of the Lord, they neither marry 'nor are given in marriage:' ſee Matth. xxii. 30. He quotes St. Paul after this manner: ſays [b] the bleſſed Paul; [c] the moſt wiſe Paul; [d] Paul, a wiſe man, and moſt ſpiritual, or full of the Holy Ghoſt. He [e] recommends the ſtudy and meditation of the ſcriptures.

XII. In the remains of Methodius there are many interpretations of texts of ſcripture; but, in my opinion, for the moſt part, ſuch as do little honour to the author's judgment: I ſhall put down two or three, which are ſomewhat remarkable.

1. He underſtands [f] the words of Chriſt in John v. 39, to be a command to *ſearch the ſcriptures*; not a declaration what was then the practice of the Jews: accordingly, he makes uſe of this text as an argument to ſearch even the moſt abſtruſe and difficult parts of ſcripture, and as an encouragement to explain them ſo far as we are able.

2. St. Paul writes: *I knew a man in Chriſt,——ſuch an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew ſuch a man,——how that he was caught up into paradiſe:* 2 Cor. xii. 2—4. Methodius [g] is clearly of opinion that the apoſtle here ſpeaks of two remarkable revelations, and two different raptures, one into the third heaven, the other into paradiſe: and he thinks that they who carefully attend to the expreſſions of the apoſtle will perceive, that he does not ſpeak of paradiſe and the third heaven as one and the ſame place, or ſuppoſe paradiſe to be in the third heaven.

3. Theodoret has quoted this paſſage of Methodius out of his diſcourſe Concerning Martyrs: 'For,' ſays [h] he, 'martyrdom

[y] καθ' ον τροπον και ο κυριος ημων εν ευαγγελιοις Ιησους Χριστος, ωδε νομοθετων. Conv. p. 92. B. C. [z] υμεις γαρ εστε το αλας της γης, ο κυριος εφη τοις αποστολοις. ib. p. 67. D. [a] ενθα ουτε γαμουσιν, ουτε γαμισκονται, κατα τας αψευδεις του κυριου χρησμους. ib. p. 76. C. [b] —— φησιν ο μακαριος Παυλος. Conv. p. 67. D.

[c] καθαπερ και ο σοφωτατος Παυλος δηλοι. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924, f.

[d] ως αν ο πνευματικωτατος και σοφος ανηρ, τον Παυλον λεγω. Conv. p. 77. A.

[e] πρωτον τον περι αυτην την πιστιν κτησασθω καρπον. ειτα τα καλλυνθρα, την ασκησιν και μελετην των γραφων. ib. p. 127. C.

[f] περι δε του την επιλυσιν αυτων απειρηται και ειπειν, μειζον η καθ' ημας· ουκ ολιγοι τολμητιαι, πιστευσασαν τω κελευσαντι τας ζητησεις ερευναν. Conv. p. 110. A. [g] Οτι δε αποκαλυψεις φησι γεγονεναι τω αγιω Παυλω λεγει γαρ, αλλ' ουδε ο αποστολος επιτρεπεται ειναι τοις παραδεισον εν τω τριτω ουρανω τοις λειπειν ακουσασθαι λογων επισαμενοις —— ει δε αποκαλυψεις μεγαλας εωρακεναι μηνυει τα αναλειφθεισης ενεργειας. κ. λ. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 910. ap. Combef. Bib p. 303.

[h] Ουτω γαρ θαυμαστον και περιπτον εστι το μαρτυριον, οτι αυτος ο κυριος Ιησους Χριστος ο υιος του θεου, τιμων αυτο εμαρτυρησεν ουκ αξιαγαστον ηγησαμενος το ειναι και

'is

'is so admirable and desirable that the Lord Jesus Christ himself, 'the Son of God, was pleased to be a martyr, not esteeming it a 'thing to be earnestly sought, to be like God, that he might bless 'man, to whom he had descended, with this gift also:' see Philip. ii. 6. This is the entire passage as given us by Theodoret. Bishop Bull [i] understood the expression of St. Paul here made use of in the sense of our English version, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God:* and he refers to a place of Petavius, where he also is supposed to be of the same opinion. Nevertheless, it seems to me that, in this passage of Methodius, the expression can admit of no other meaning than that in the translation I have made, and that it must denote a voluntary humiliation of Jesus Christ. There is likewise a passage in the Banquet where Methodius refers to Philip. ii. 6, 7; I put it in the [k] margin: I suppose it does not weaken but confirm the interpretation I have given of the expression in the sixth verse; which sense, it is certain, appears frequently in the Christian writers of the third century.

5. St. Paul writes: *And the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive:* 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. By *the dead,* [l] Methodius understood our bodies: *we which are alive,* are our souls, which receive *the dead,* that is our bodies, out of the earth: then we, soul and body, *are to be caught up together to meet the Lord.* This may be allowed to be a difficult text: but I am apt to think that many will consider this paraphrase as an example of the wrong and injudicious interpretations of our author, which I spoke of formerly; nor do I intend to add any more.

XIII. We perceive from the remains of Methodius that he received the four gospels, the Acts of the apostles, St. Paul's epistles, and the epistle to the Hebrews as one of them. We have no plain evidence how many of the seven catholic epistles he received: undoubtedly he owned the first of St. Peter and the first of St. John, there never having been any doubt concerning the genuineness of these. His opinion about the rest we are not acquainted with. He likewise quotes the Revelation frequently as a book of sacred scripture, written by John; whom it is likely

[i] ... ap. Theodoret. Dial. i. ... p. 27. [k] In libro de Martyribus ... Filium Dei ... Christum nominat Dominum et Filium Dei, qui non rapinam existimavit, esse aequalem Deo. Quae, Petavii sententia iudice, non nisi in Deum ... dici possunt. Bull. Def. Fid Nic. ... 13, n. 9. Vid. Petav. Praefat. ... Ioann. c. 1, n. 5. [l] Διο και αναστησεται τα των ανθρωπων σωματα, ουκ αλλα τινα παρα ταυτα, αλλ' αυτα ταυτα τα νυν ... πολυ γαρ και των μερων του ολου σωματος της θειοτητος εις τον βιον εκλελυθοτος. Και δειν γαρ και τα μερη του ολου παραλαβειν, εις την εαυτου τελειοτητα παλιν αποπληρωθηναι. κ. λ. Conv. p. 115. A. B.

[l] —— τουτ' εστιν, αυτα τουτων ταυτα τα σωματα· πως γαρ οι ζωντες, αι ψυχαι εσμεν, ο. απλα καθαιρετα εγερθεντες [al. εγερθεντας] εκ της γης ιστανται κ. λ. ap. Phot. Cod. 234, p. 924, in. et ap. Combef. p. 325.

he ſuppoſed to be John the apoſtle and evangeliſt. We have ſeen in him clear proofs that the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, generally received by Chriſtians, were well known, much uſed, and highly eſteemed: being books of authority, and appealed to in all points of diſpute and controverſy. I have not obſerved in this Greek writer, of the third century, any quotations of Chriſtian apocryphal writings: nor do the works of this author afford any the leaſt ground to ſuppoſe that there were any writings of ancient Chriſtian authors that were eſteemed ſacred and of authority, beſide thoſe which are now generally received as ſuch by us; namely, the writings of apoſtles and evangeliſts.

CHAP. LVIII.

LUCIAN, preſbyter of Antioch; and HESYCHIUS, biſhop in Egypt.

I. *Lucian, his hiſtory, and teſtimonies to him.* II. *His edition of the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament.* III. *Heſychius, his hiſtory, and his edition of the Old and New Teſtament.* IV. *Lucian's works.* V. *His ſentiment upon the doctrine of the trinity.* VI. *Concluding remarks.*

I. SAYS [a] Jerom in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers: 'Lucian, a moſt eloquent man, preſbyter of the church of Antioch, was ſo laborious in the ſtudy of the ſcriptures, that to this day ſome copies of the ſcriptures are called Lucian's. There are extant ſome diſcourſes [or ſmall treatiſes] of his concerning the faith, and ſome ſhort epiſtles to ſeveral. He ſuffered at Nicomedia for confeſſing the name of Chriſt, in the reign of Maximin, and was buried at Helenopolis in Bithynia.'

Cave ſays that [b] Lucian was contemporary with Paul of Samoſata, and flouriſhed chiefly about the year 290. He ſuffered

[a] Lucianus, vir diſertiſſimus, Antiochenæ eccleſiæ preſbyter, tantum in ſcripturarum ſtudio laboravit, ut uſque nunc quædam exemplaria ſcripturarum Lucianea nuncupentur. Feruntur ejus de Fide libelli, et breves ad nonnullos epiſtolæ. Paſſus eſt Nicomediæ ob confeſſionem Chriſti ſub perſecutione Maximini ſepultuſque eſt Helenopoli Bithyniæ. Hier de V. I. cap. 77. [b] Noſter hic Paul Samoſateno erat ætate ſuppar, præcipue vero claruit circa an. 290. Cav. Hiſt. L. in Luciano.

martyrdom

martyrdom in [c] 311, or rather [d] in 312, and on the seventh day of January in that year.

It is now commonly said by [e] learned moderns, that (A) Lucian was born at Samosata: but it is said, I think, upon the credit only of [f] the Acts of Lucian, and [g] of Suidas, who [h] copied those Acts; which is no authority at all. Tillemont himself says, that [i] 'those Acts are certainly a work of Metaphrastes, and that 'they are mixed with fables, and have divers faults contrary to 'the truth of history; which,' says he, 'may excuse our not paying any regard to them, when they differ from other authors; 'and allows us to take little notice of them in other points.' Bollandus likewise observes upon those Acts, that [k] the Menologium makes Lucian a native of Antioch.

It seems to me that the author of the Acts, who had little regard to truth, and was not much concerned to be rightly informed, confounds upon this occasion Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, with Lucian the famous heathen dialogist, who lived in the second century, and was of Samosata.

This may be thought a trifle not worth taking notice of: but really it gives one offence to see learned men deliver for history what has no good authority, and supply their accounts of this eminent person out of a piece which is good for nothing: nor is this particular altogether trifling; for when those learned writers come to consider a difficult question, concerning Lucian's opinion about the doctrine of the trinity, this circumstance of Lucian's being a native of the same city with Paul, bishop of Antioch, is almost always [l] taken in as a thing of some moment.

I must add that it is to the honour of Theodoric Ruinart, that

[c] Baron. Ann. 311. n. iii. iv. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 279. [d] Ruin. Act. Mart. p. 504. Pagi Ann. 311, n. x. et xx. Basnag. 312, n. iv. Tillem. S. Lucien. Mem. T. v. P. iii. p. 150, 151, et note v.

[e] Lucianus, nobili prosapia ortus, patriam habuit Samosata, urbem Syriæ non incelebrem, ejusdem et urbis et nominis cum famoso illo Christianæ religionis derisore, qui Trajani tempore vixit. Cav. ubi supr. Conf. Basn. an. 312, n. 23. Tillem. ubi supr. p. 146, et passim. (A) In the preceding note I have placed Tillemont among those who say Lucian was born at Samosata: for such are his words: Il nâquit à Samosates dans la Syrie appellée Euphratesienne. ubi supr. p. 146. And yet he was aware that this is destitute of foundation; as appears from what he says in another place. Il estoit, à ce qu' on prétend, de mesme pays que Paul de Samosates. ib. p. 398, not. 1, sur S. Lucien.

[f] Vid. Bolland. Act. Sanctor. T. i. p. 359. [g] Vid. Suid. V. Λουκιανος. et Hodius de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. iv. c. iii. p. 626, et l. iii. P. i. c. 5. p. 303.

[h] Vid. Kuster. ad Suid. ib. not. 5.

[i] See Mem. Ec. T. v. P. iii. p. 345, 346. [k] Menologium habet ex Antiochia Syriæ ortum fuisse Lucianum. Act. Sanct. ib. p. 359. [l] Illum autem familiarem fuisse Pauli Samosateni, credibile est. Fuit enim ipse oriundus ex urbe Samosatensi, ut legitur in ejus vita. Et cum Paulus ex ea urbe ad Antiochensem episcopatum evectus est, Lucianus quoque ecclesiæ Antiochenæ presbyter fuit. Pagi Ann. 311, n. xii. Conf. Vales. Annot. in Thdrt. H. E. l. i. c. iv. Ex urbe Pauli erat hæretici; a Paulo ad presbyteratum in nobilissima ecclesia Antiochena promotus fuerat: cujus et errorem cum imbibisset, &c. Basnag. Ann. 312, n. 13.

he has not inserted those Acts in his collection of Genuine and Select Acts of Martyrs: nor do I observe that in his account of Lucian he has borrowed any one article from them.

Of this person, in his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius writes after this manner, speaking of those who suffered in the persecution begun by Diocletian: 'Among the presidents of the 'churches in great cities, who suffered at that time, the first to 'be recorded in the monuments of the pious is Anthimus, bi'shop of Nicomedia, a witness of the kingdom of Christ, who 'was beheaded: and [m] of Antioch, Lucian, a presbyter of the 'church, a man of an unblemished character throughout his 'whole life; he also suffered at Nicomedia, where, in the 'presence of the emperor, he first apologized for the heavenly 'kingdom of Christ in words, and afterwards farther recommended it by deeds.'

Again, in another place, the same ecclesiastical historian, having related the death of Peter of Alexandria by order of Maximinus, adds: 'And with him suffered many other bishops of 'Egypt in like manner; as did also [n] Lucian, presbyter of the 'church of Antioch, an excellent man in all respects, celebrated 'for his piety and his knowledge of the scriptures: he was 'carried from Antioch to Nicomedia, where the emperor then 'was; and, having made an apology before the governor for the 'doctrine he professed, he was sent to prison, and there put to 'death.'

At this place Rufinus, in his Latin translation of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, makes a little alteration; and also inserts a speech of considerable length, said to be [o] the same apology which Lucian made to the Roman governor. Whereupon, as [p] Rufinus says, 'the audience being much moved, and almost per'suaded, Lucian was commanded away to prison, there to be 'put to death, as if they feared a tumult of the people.' Of this apology I intend to take some farther notice by and by.

There is still extant a panegyrical [q] oration or homily of St. Chrysostom, pronounced on the seventh day of January 387, in

[m] Τὸν δ' ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας μαρτυρήσαντα τῷ πάντα ἄριστος πρεσβύτερος τῆς αὐτοῦ παροικίας. Λουκιανὸς ἐν τῇ Νικομηδείᾳ καὶ αὐτὸς βασιλέως ἐπιταγῇ τοῦ μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας λόγου πρώτην ἀπολογίαν, εἶτα δὲ καὶ τῷ μαρτυρίῳ. Eus. H. E. l. viii. c. xiii. in.

[n] Λουκιανὸν τὸν ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ἄριστον, ὃς τὴν ἐξ ἔργων, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν παθῶν εὐσέβειαν ἐπιδεδειγμένος, τῆς κατ' Ἀντιόχειαν παροικίας πρεσβύτης, ἀχθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν Νικομήδειαν πόλιν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐπουρανίου βασιλείας διαπρεσβεύσατο τῷ κρατοῦντι, παραχρῆμα τε ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ ἔργῳ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν πρώτων διδασκαλιῶν ἀπελογήσατο. ib. l. ix. c. vi.

[o] Tum ille, data sibi facultate dicendi, huiusmodi orationem de fide nostra ille dicitur. Rufin. H. E. l. ix. c. vi.

[p] Et cum pene iam his verbis auditorum fuisset, arripi iubetur ad carcerem, ibique quasi absque tumultu populi necari. ib.

[q] T. ii. p. 524—526.

hone-

honour of this martyr: but it is so oratorical, that though St. Chrysostom enlargeth upon the sufferings and fortitude of Lucian, and upon the manner of his death, it is very difficult to say how he would have us to suppose that the martyrdom of this presbyter, one of his predecessors in the church of Antioch, was performed: whether [t] by famine, or by torture, or [s] by both; and whether in prison, or abroad.

Sozomen, having occasion to speak of Lucian, who, he says, suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, gives him this great character, that [u] 'he was likewise on other accounts very eminent, and 'in a signal manner skilful in the sacred scriptures.'

Honorius of Autun says, that [w] Lucian was first presbyter of Antioch, and afterwards bishop of Nicomedia: but this is not said by Eusebius, or Jerom; and therefore, probably, it is without foundation. The error may have arisen from the place of Lucian's martyrdom, or from the near mention made of Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History. Eusebius does not suppose Lucian to have been bishop of Nicomedia, nor to have had any office in that church; for he reckons Lucian among the martyrs of the church of Antioch.

Jerom assured us that Lucian was buried at Helenopolis in Bithynia; but why he was buried there does not certainly appear from any good authority. In his Chronicle, at the 21st year of Constantine's reign, Jerom says: 'Constantine [x] repairing Drepanum, a city in Bithynia, in honour of the martyr 'Lucian, who was there buried, called it Helenopolis from his 'mother.' The same [y] is in the Paschal Chronicle, with this addition, that Constantine enacted that all the lands in view of the city should be exempted from tribute: which privilege, the author says, was enjoyed to his time. Philostorgius, the credulous Arian historian, says, that [z] the empress Helena's fondness for that city was owing to this only, that the body of Lucian was brought thither after his martyrdom by a dolphin.

[t] Vid. Tillem. sur S. Lucien, notes 6 et 7. Il y a bien de la difficulté pour le genre de mort de S. Lucien. Id. ib. p. 410.

Martyrium vero S. Luciani presbyteri Antiocheni, qui fame et cruciatibus multatus, ut ait Chrysostomus, Christi nomen fortiter confessus est, accidit anno 311, Maio 12. Montfaucon. ad Hom. in S. Lucian. t. 2. p. 523.

[s] ——Λουκιανὸς, τὰ εἰς Νικομηδέα διατρίψας, ἄλλως τε τὰ ἄλλα εὐδόκιμος, καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς γραφὰς ἐπ' ἄκρον ἐκμεμαθηκώς. Sozom. l. iii. c. v. p. 503, A.

[u] Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, postmodum Nicomediæ episcopus. Honor. de Scriptor. Ec. c. 78.

[x] Drepanum Bithyniæ civitatem in honorem martyris Luciani ibi conditi Constantinus instauravit ex vocabulo matris suæ Helenopolim nuncupavit. Hier. Chr. l. 2. p. 181.

[y] ——Chron. Pasc. p. 283.

[z] ——ἀσπάσασθαι δὲ τὸ χωρίον κατ' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν, ὅτι δὲ Λουκιανὸς ὁ μάρτυς ἐνταῦθα τυχὸν μετὰ τὸν μαρτύριον δελφῖνος ἐπομισθεὶς. Philost. l. ii. c. xii. p. 474.

In a church of this city, which was near Nicomedia, Constantine, a little before his death, prepared himself for [a] baptism.

Jerom has not only allotted Lucian a place in his book of Illustrious men, and mentioned him in his Chronicle, as already seen, but has likewise named him in his [b] letter to Magnus, among other Christian writers, eminent for polite learning, as well as for knowledge in the divine scriptures. And there are some other passages of his to be taken notice of.

II. Jerom said, in the place before cited from his Catalogue, that some copies of scripture were called Lucian's: he elsewhere speaks of that matter more largely, where he says, that 'the 'churches of Egypt made use of that edition of the Septuagint, 'which was put out by Hesychius. From Constantinople to 'Antioch Lucian's edition was used; but the countries lying in 'the midst read the version of the Seventy, as published by Pam-'philus and Eusebius from Origen's copy.'

There is another passage of Jerom concerning Lucian's edition of the Seventy, which [d] I transcribe at the bottom of the page.

And in his preface to the four gospels he [e] speaks of an edition of the New, as well as of the Old, Testament, made by Lucian and Hesychius; but he does not commend their copies; for, as he says, they were interpolated; that is, there were some things inserted in them without good authority, they being wanting in more ancient copies.

Jerom is now commonly understood to say in the first of these passages, that Lucian's edition of the version of the Seventy was generally used by the churches from Constantinople to Antioch, and Hesychius's by the churches in Egypt: but [f] Martianay denies

[a] Vid. Euseb. de Vit. Const. l. iv. c. 61. p. 557.

[b] ——nec non presbyterorum Pamphili, Pierii, Malchionis, &c. Ep. 83. p. 656.

[c] Alexandria et Ægyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediæ inter has provinciæ Palæstinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt. Totusque orbis ac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat. Hier. Præf. in Paralip. Opp. T. i. p. 1023. Eadem repetuntur in libr. ii. adv. Ruf. T. iv. p. 425.

[d] In quo illud breviter admoneo, ut sciatis aliam esse editionem, quam Origenes, et Cæsariensis Eusebius, omnesque Græciæ tractatores Κοινὴν, id est, Communem appellant, atque vulgatam, et a pluribusque Ἀκριβῆ dicitur; aliam Septuaginta Interpretum, quæ in Ἑξαπλοῖς codicibus reperitur, et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est, et Jerosolymæ atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur. Ep. ad Sun. et Fret. [al. Ep. 135] T. ii. p. 627. [e] Prætermitto codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum asserit perversa confutatio, quibus utique nec in Veteri Testamento post Septuaginta Interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendasse quum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat falso esse quæ addita sunt. Præf. in Quat. Evang.

[f] Hunc locum male intelligunt, qui putant in omnibus Christi ecclesiis ita adoptatas fuisse editiones Græcas LXX interpretum

nies this. He says that the editions made by Lucian and Hesychius were used in those countries by a few only, and those men of mistaken judgment; and that the edition made from Origen's Hexapla generally prevailed every where: and it must be owned, that in the last cited passage Jerom not only censures the interpolations of those two critics in the New Testament, but likewise their emendations of the Old: and, in the passage which I have put in the margin, he depreciates Lucian's edition of the Seventy, in comparison of Origen's, which last he himself followed in his translation of the Old Testament from the Greek.

Humphrey Hody doubted whether [g] Lucian and Hesychius had ever seen Origen's edition of the version of the Seventy: nor indeed have we any certain information upon that head, very little being said of their editions in the remaining pieces of ancient authors: but as Origen's performance was much celebrated, and his Tetrapla and Hexapla had been formed a good while before Lucian and Hesychius undertook any thing of that kind, it may be thought probable that those learned men were acquainted with Origen's Seventy; though perhaps they had not seen that correct edition which was published by Pamphilus and Eusebius.

The author of the Synopsis Scripturæ Sacræ, or of an addition to it, calls [h] the seventh and last Greek version of the Old Testament Lucian's; and says that his version was made from the Hebrew; and was found in the time of Constantine the Great at Nicomedia, privately hid in the hands of some Jews: which is in the main agreeable to what [i] is said in the Acts of Metaphrastes, before censured: but this account is all false and mistaken. The seventh Greek version, as it is called, was in Origen's Hexapla, and was of a part only of the Old Testament: whereas Lucian's edition contained the whole Old Testament,

rum, ut in Alexandrinorum et Ægyptiorum conventibus publice populo Christiano legerentur falsi codices juxta emendationem Hesychii; in ecclesiis autem Constantinopolitanis usque ad Antiochiam juxta Luciani martyris recognitionem. Contrarium docet Hieronymus multis in locis, ac primum in præfatione in quatuor evangelia ad Damasum expresse testatus, duas editiones paucis ante ipsum annis fuisse emendatas, &c. Vides igitur, lector, intra provincias jam dictas a paucis, qui etiam perverse contenderent, non suscepta Hesychii et Luciani exemplaria scripturarum. Non idem sentiendum de codicibus elaboratis ab Origene. ——Illa namque editio celebris adeo fuit apud omnes, ut publice usurparetur in cunctis Christianorum ecclesiis, &c. Martian. Annot. ad Præf. Hieron. in Paralip. T. i. p. 1023. [g] Et dubito quidem ego, utrum Lucianus et Hesychius editionem Origenianam unquam oculis usurparint, necne: quandoquidem eam a Pamphilo primum et Eusebio in lucem fuisse emissam verisimilius videtur. Hod. de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. iv. c. iii. p. 628.

[h] Εβδομη παλιν και τελευταια ερμηνια η του αγιου Λουκιανου——. Ap. Syn. S. S. ap. Athan. T. ii. p. 205. [i] Vid. Hod. p. 626, 627.

as has been observed by [k] Hody, and [l] Montfaucon, men well skilled in this matter: nor is there any good reason to think that Lucian understood Hebrew: and the finding the copy among the Jews at Nicomedia appears to be altogether fabulous, or mistaken; for it is likely that [n] Lucian took care to publish copies of his work without delay. Yea the author of the Synopsis himself says, that [o] Lucian having finished his exact version delivered it to his Christian brethren; and yet he presently afterwards adds, that after his martyrdom it was [p] found in the hands of some Jews, where it had been lodged for safety; which, in my opinion, has not the appearance of probability: for the Jews of those times were always enemies to the Christians, and no more to be confided in than heathens, especially in times of persecution.

The late Jeremiah Jones thought that [q] the editions of the New Testament made by Lucian and Hesychius, and mentioned by Jerom, as above, are [r] the apocryphal gospels of Lucian and Hesychius, which are censured in the decree of Pope Gelasius; and that Gelasius means not any distinct gospels, but their interpolated editions of our canonical gospels. Hody [s] and Mill [t] speak to the like purpose.

III. As Hesychius has been now named, and I see no need to allot him a distinct chapter, I shall here observe that [u] he is generally supposed to be the same Hesychius, whom [x] Eusebius mentions with other bishops in Egypt, who obtained the crown of martyrdom in Diocletian's persecution; but the time is not

[k] Ut errant hi scriptores, cum editionem Luciani appellant translationem; sic rursus falluntur, cum Septimam dicunt: nescientis nimirum, extitisse Septimam quandam in Hexaplis Origenis. Hod. ib. p. 627.

[l] Sic ille [auctor Synopseos,] decantatum illam Luciani martyris editionem cum Septima Hexaplari confudit, exque duabus unam fecit. Quod commentum Eusebii atque Hieronymi testimoniis explodituri, quorum prior, Luciano martyri æqualis, in ipso autographo vidit Septimam ab Origene ante annos plus quinquaginta in Hexaplis positam. Ad hæc vero auctoris Synopseos narratio respuitur ex ipsis Septimæ fragmentis, quæ, ut testificantur Eusebius et Hieronymus, in paucis scripturæ libris aderat: contra vero Luciani editio totam scripturam complectebatur, nihilque aliud erat quam interpretatio τῶν O plurimis in locis ab eodem sancto martyre emendata, quæ multis post conflata Hexapla annis prodierat. Hinc vero corrigendus Waltonus, qui ab auctore Synopseos deceptus, opinatur Septimam eandem esse, quam Luciani martyris editionem. Proleg. ix. num. xx. Montf. Prælim. in Hex. Orig. cap. 8, §. ii. p. 58, 59. [m] See Tillem. St. Lucien. not. ii. p. 404, Mem. T. v. P. iii. [n] See Tillem. again, p. 405, who says, it is probable, that Lucian published many copies of his edition, and made it common.

[o] καὶ διορθωσάμενος ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι τοῖς ἐξέδοτο τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. Synopf. ubi supr. p. 204, A. [p] —παῖς Ἰουδαίοις.—ib. [q] See his Canon of Scripture, vol. i. p. 281, 311. [r] Evangelia, quæ falsavit Lucianus, apocrypha. Evangelia, quæ falsavit Hesychius, apocrypha. Gelas. ap. Labb. T. iv. p. 1264.

[s] Hod. ubi supr. p. 629. [t] Mill. Proleg. n. 728. [u] Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillem. St. Pierre d'Alexandrie. Art. 10, Mem. T. v. P. iii. p. 124. et Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 279. [x] φιλίας τε, καὶ Ἡσυχίου, καὶ Παχυμίου, καὶ Θεοδώρου, τῶν ἀμφὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκόπων. Hist. Ec. l. viii. cap. 13, p. 308, C.

exactly

exactly known. Cave says, that Hesychius flourished near the end of the third century, about the year 296, and placeth his martyrdom in 311; Basnage [y] in 311 or 312. Tillemont speaks of him as suffering with others, whose martyrdom he placeth [z] in 310.

It is observable that there is no distinct article for Hesychius in Jerom's Catalogue: nor is his name among other eminent Christian writers in Jerom's letter to Magnus.

Hody [a] supposeth Jerom to refer to this person's edition of the Seventy in another place, beside those formerly taken notice of by me.

But it is not fit I should stay to enlarge farther on these matters: I therefore refer to Grabe, and others, who have published editions of the Seventy, or written prolegomena, or dissertations upon that version; and to Fabricius, who [b] has a short article, with many good hints relating to the labours both of Lucian and Hesychius.

However, it should be here remembered, that Hesychius put out an edition of the New as well as of the Old Testament. The evidences of this we saw just now in * Jerom.

IV. There is little if any thing of Lucian remaining.

1. In the Paschal Chronicle, the author, having shewn the fierceness of the persecution at Nicomedia, adds: 'Of [c] this innumerable multitude of martyrs the presbyter Lucian writing 'to the Antiochians speaks in these words: "the whole choir of "martyrs together salutes you. I take this opportunity to certify you, that Anthimus the bishop has finished the course of "his martyrdom."

If this be genuine, we have here a part of one of those short epistles intended by St. Jerom. However, it is now the constant opinion of learned men that Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, suffered at the beginning of Diocletian's persecution in 303, and that Lucian did not die before the year 311 or 312. If therefore this letter be his, he must have been at Nicomedia, and in communion with that church, and the martyrs there, when Anthimus suffered.

2. Eusebius assures us, that before Lucian suffered he apologized for the heavenly kingdom in words: and, as before shewn,

[y] Basn. Ann. 312, n. 18. [z] See Tillem. as referred to before, note [u].

[a] Citatur alibi editio Hesychiana ab Hieronymo sub titulo Exemplarium Alexandrinorum. Hod. ib. p. 628, f. Conf. Hieron. in. Is. lviii. 11, p. 433.

[b] Vid. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 278, 279, Conf. eund. ib. T. ii. p. 358, 359. * See before, p. 326, note [e].

[c] Περι τουτου του απειρου πληθους των μαρτυρησαντων Λουκιανος πρεσβυτερος Αντιοχευσι γραφων εδηλω· Ασπαζεται υμας χορος απας ομου μαρτυρων. Συναγγελιζομαι δε υμας, ως Ανθιμος ο πασπας τω του μαρτυριου δρομω ετελειωθη. Chr. Pasch. p. 277, C.

Rufinus

Rufinus has inſerted a ſpeech, as delivered by him; which I ſee [d] Huit quotes as Lucian's: and [e] Fabricius thinks it might be taken by Rufinus from the Acts of his martyrdom: but [f] Tillemont is of opinion that it is a ſpeech of Rufinus's own making.

Whether it be Lucian's, or Rufinus's, or in part only the apology of our martyr, with ſome additions of the hiſtorian, I cannot forbear taking ſome notice of it here, it repreſenting in ſome meaſure the juſt ſentiments of thoſe ancient Chriſtians who conſidered their religion as a divine inſtitution of virtue.

'It is no ſecret,' ſays he, 'that the God whom we Chriſtians 'worſhip, is the one God declared to us by Chriſt, and by the 'Holy Ghoſt inſpired in our hearts.'

'I [g] own, that we alſo once truſted in gods of our own making. '——But Almighty God, commiſerating the errors of man-'kind, ſent his wiſdom into this world, clothed in fleſh, to teach 'us the knowledge of God, who made the heavens and the 'earth, who is eternal and inviſible. He moreover gave us a 'rule of life, and delivered to us the precepts of righteouſneſs: 'he taught us to practiſe ſobriety, to rejoice in poverty, to be 'very meek, to be willing to ſuffer, to preſerve the purity of our 'minds, and to be patient at all times. He likewiſe foretold 'the things which have ſince happened to us; that we ſhould 'be brought before kings and rulers, and be ſlaughtered as 'victims: for which cauſe alſo, though he was immortal, as 'being the Word and Wiſdom of God, he yielded himſelf to 'death, that whilſt he was in the body he might ſet us an example 'of patience. Nor did he deceive us by dying, but on the third 'day roſe again:—being innocent, and unſpotted, and under-'going death only that he might overcome it by riſing again.

[d] Huet Dem. Ev. Prop. iii. §. viii. p. 30. [e] Apologiam ad Præſidem ante martyrium A. C. 311. Nicomediæ dictam, cujus meminit Euſebius ix. 6. Rufinus in Latina ſua verſione ex Actis, ut videtur, martyrii ejus,——excerptam exhibet. Fabr. B. G. T. v. p. 279.

[f] See Tillem. as before, p. 145, 146.

[g] ——Fateor, erravimus etiam nos aliquando, et ſimulachra quæ finximus, deos cœli ac terræ putabamus auctores.—— Verum omnipotens Deus—errores miſeratus humanos Sapientiam ſuam miſit in hunc mundum carne veſtitam, quæ nos doceret Deum, qui cœlum fecit et terram, non in manufactis, ſed in æternis atque inviſibilibus requirendum. Vitæ enim nobis leges, ac diſciplinæ præcepta conſtituit; ſervare parſimoniam, paupertate gaudere, manſuetudinem colere, ſtudere pati, puritatem cordis complecti, patientiam cuſtodire. Sed et omnia hæc quæ nunc adverſum nos geritis, ventura nobis eſſe prædixit; educendos nos ad reges, et ante tribunalia judicum ſtatuendos, ac velut victimam jugulandos. Inde eſt denique, quod et ipſe qui erat immortalis, utpote Verbum et Sapientia Dei, mortem præbuit, quo nobis in corpore poſitus patientiæ præberet exemplum. Sed nec nos ſua morte decepit, quibus poſt tertium diem reſurrexit: non ut iſta quæ nunc fabio conſcribuntur continent Acta Pilati: ſed innocens, immaculatus et purus, ad hoc ſolum mortem ſuſcepit, ut eam vinceret reſurgendo. Quæ autem dico, non ſunt in obſcuro geſta loco, nec teſtibus indigent. Pars pene jam mundi major huic veritati adſtipulatur, urbes integræ. Euſ. H. E. Verſ. Ruf. l. ix. c. 6. p. 202.

'Theſe

'These things are well attested, and a large part of the world 'now acknowledgeth the truth of them.'

3. There is likewise a Creed, or Formulary of Faith, concerning the trinity, which is sometimes called Lucian's. Fabricius reckoning up our martyr's works speaks of this among the rest. I shall put his words in the [h] margin: but I am by no means of opinion that this is one of Lucian's little books, or discourses concerning the Faith, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue: I rather think that Jerom intends Lucian's Apology, made a little before his martyrdom, or some other short treatises in defence of the Christian religion. Rufinus, a contemporary, useth the same word with Jerom, when he introduceth [i] the speech, or apology, which Lucian made before the president at Nicomedia, calling it, A Discourse concerning the Faith; which was not a formulary of the doctrine of the trinity, but an apology for the Christian religion in general.

Bishop Bull [k] readily allowed this Formulary to be Lucian's: but let us consider the testimony of antiquity. Sozomen informs us, that [l] 'the Eusebians in a synod at Antioch pub-'lished a Formulary, which they said was Lucian's the martyr.' But Sozomen adds, 'he did not know whether they spake truth, 'or whether they endeavoured to recommend their own compo-'sition under the authority of the martyr:' whereas it seems to me, that if there had been extant any such piece of Lucian, Sozomen must have known it. Moreover, the Creed, which Sozomen is supposed to refer to, is at length in [m] Athanasius, [n] Hilary, and [o] Socrates: but they none of them call it Lucian's; nor do they say that it was published as his. In one of the five Dialogues concerning the Holy Trinity, the age of which is not certainly known, except that they could not be written much before the end of the fourth century, the Macedonian asks the Orthodox, if he believed as the blessed Lucian did? to which the Orthodox answers, he believes as did all the martyrs and apostles. The Macedonian asks again, whether he would subscribe Lucian's Formulary; or, whether there was in it any thing which he condemned? the Orthodox then tells him, that

[h] Præterea, brevis fidei formula—— exstat apud Athanasium de Synodis——T. i. p. 892, et Socratem ii. 10. quamque Synodi Antiochenæ. (A. C. 341) patres, Luciani esse affirmant apud Sozomenum iii. 5. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 279.

[i] Tum ille, data sibi facultate dicendi, hujusmodi orationem de fide nostra habuisse dicitur. Rufin. ubi supr. [k] Def. Fid. Nic. cap. 3. Sect. ii. n. 6. [l] Ἔλεγον δὲ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν ὁλόγραφον εὑρηκέναι Λουκιανοῦ,—πότερον δὲ ἀληθῶς ταῦτα ἔφασαν, ἢ τὴν ἰδίαν γραφὴν σεμνότερον θέντες τῷ ἀξιώματι τοῦ μάρτυρος, λέγειν οὐκ ἔχω. Sozom. l. iii, c. 5. p. 503, A. [m] De Synod. T. i. p. 735, 736. [n] Hilar. de Synod. p. 1168, 1169, Conf. ib. not. f. p. 1168, Ed. Bened. [o] Socrat. l. ii, c. 10.

he

he [p] diſlikes the addition which his friends had made, and that he could prove it to be an addition of theirs. There does not then appear to be ſufficient reaſon to conſider that Formulary as Lucian's.

V. This brings us at length to a difficult queſtion, which cannot well be omitted, relating to Lucian's belief in the trinity. We have ſeen divers teſtimonies very favourable to him in Euſebius, Chryſoſtom, Jerom, Rufinus, Sozomen. His edition of the Seventy was eſteemed by many. His memory was honoured by Conſtantine and others; nor is there in Jerom or Athanaſius any cenſure paſſed upon his faith. Who could have thought that there ſhould be any reaſon to doubt whether Lucian was orthodox? and yet it is queſtioned: for Arius concludes his letter [q] to Euſebius, biſhop of Nicomedia, calling him Collucianiſt: the reaſon of which ſeems to be what is ſaid by Epiphanius, that [r] Lucian and Euſebius had lived together in Nicomedia: and Arius I think muſt have ſuppoſed them of one opinion, and of the ſame opinion with himſelf. Epiphanius in his Anchoret ſays, that [s] Lucian and all the Lucianiſts denied that the Son of God took a ſoul, and taught that he took fleſh only. Again, in the ſame work, he ſpeaks [t] of the Lucianiſts and Arians as one ſect: and in his Panarium, in his article of the old Lucianiſts, he diſtinguiſheth [u] between the ancient Lucian, follower of Marcion, and Lucian who lived, he ſays, in the time of Conſtantine, whom the Arians call a martyr, and who was inclined to the Arian hereſy. According to [x] Philoſtorgius, Euſebius of Nicomedia, and others of the chief of the Arians, were diſciples of Lucian; Maris of Chalcedon, Theognis of Nice, Leontius of Antioch, Aſterius the ſophiſt, and others; which induced Du Pin to ſay that all the heads of that party were Lucian's diſciples: and, not to add any thing more, Alexander in his letter to his nameſake of Conſtantinople ſays, that '[y] Lucian, ſucceeding [or following] Paul of Samoſata, remained for a long time, 'during three biſhops, excommunicated,' or ſeparated from the

[p] Κατεγνω της προθεσεως, ως προσεθηκατε· και εχω δειξαι, οτι προσεθηκατε εκεινα αυτης. De S. Trin. Dial. iii. ap. Athan. T. ii. p. 507. B. Ed. Bened.

[q] συλλελειπται, αλληλως Ευσεβει. ap. Epiph. H. 69. p. 732. A.

[r] —— αμα Λουκιανω εν Νικομηδεια συμβιουντος. Epiph. ib. p. 730. B. [s] Λουκιανος γαρ, και παντες Λουκιανισται αρνουνται τον υιον του Θεου ψυχην ειληφεναι· σαρκα μονον φασιν εσχηκεναι. κ. λ. Epiph. Ancor. n. xxxiii. T. ii. p. 38. C. [t] ib. n. xxxv. p. 40. D. [u] Λουκιανος τις αρχαιος, ου ο νυν επι χρονοις Κωνσταντινου γενομενος, ον δηθεν οι αρειανοι εν μαρτυσιν επιγραφουσιν· ην γαρ και ουτος ο Λουκιανος, φησι, προσκειμενος τη των αρειανων αιρεσει. Epiph. H. 43. n. i. p. 378. [x] Ουτω τα μαρτυρος πολλας μεν και αλλας συνθεσεις αναγραφει, ως και Ευσεβιου του Νικομηδειας, και Μαριν του Χαλκηδονος, κ. λ. Philoſt. l. ii. c. xiv. p. 475. A. Vid. ib. c. 12, 13, p. 474, et c. 3, p. 470.

[y] Ο διαδεξαμενος Λουκιανος αποστασιαν εσχεν επι τριων επισκοπων πολιτευσας χρονον. Alex. ap. Thdrt. H. E. l. i. c. 4. p. 15. B.

church:

church: thoſe three biſhops are ſuppoſed to be [z] Domnus, Timæus, and Cyril; which laſt was ſucceeded by [a] Tyrannus.

Learned men are not agreed in their interpreration of thoſe words; ſome ſuppoſing them to mean that [b] Lucian, following the ſentiments of Paul of Samoſata, biſhop of Antioch, ſeparated himſelf from the communion of the church: others, that [c] he was by three ſucceſſive biſhops excluded from communion. It is, however, the general opinion of learned moderns, that Lucian did not always continue ſeparated, or excommunicated: they agree in ſuppoſing that [d] thoſe words of Alexander afford reaſon to conclude that Lucian returned, or was reſtored, to the catholic communion before his death; and probably, in the beginning of the epiſcopate of Tyrannus, who [e] ſucceeded Cyril about the year 297, near the end of the third century, or however before Dioclefian's perſecution, which began in February 303.

That paſſage of Alexander would lead us to think that Lucian was in the ſentiments, or at leaſt in the intereſts, of Paul of Samoſata; and [f] that for ſome reaſons he greatly diſliked the act of the council which depoſed Paul. And there are other things which may be reckoned of ſome moment: for in the former part of the Creed aſcribed to Lucian there are ſome expreſſions which ſeem over-orthodox; inſomuch that biſhop Bull [g] could not forbear to ſay, they are ſtronger than any uſed by the council of Nice: and, if ſo, others may be apt to conclude they muſt be Sabellian; though in the latter part of the ſame Creed [h] are ex-

[z] Vid. Hieron. Chr. p. 176, 177. Antiochiæ decimus nonus conſtituitur epiſcopus Tyrannus. ib. p. 179.

[a] Causa itaque ſchiſmatis Luciani fuit doctrina Pauli Samoſateni, quam defendebat; cujus gratia diu ſeparavit ſe a ſuis epiſcopis Antiochenis, Domno ſcilicet Timæo ac Cyrillo, qui ſibi invicem ſucceſſere. Pagi Ann. 311. n. xi. Caterum Latinus verbi ἀποστατάγος ἐφανε, v. λ. ſenſum intellexere interpretes, quos ſecutus Baronius ſcribit, Lucianum a tribus ſibi quæ ſibi continue ſuccedentibus, ecclæſiæ rerum fuiſſe. Atqui hoc non dicit Alexander, ſed tantum ait, Lucianum ſibimet fecille in Antiochenſi eccleſia, et ſuorum epiſcopis ſibi continue ſuccedentium Collectas ſeorſum celebraſſe. Id enim ſignificat vox ἀποστατάγος. Id. ib. n. xii. Primo Samoſateno ſuccedens Lucianus ſeparata ſocietate trium epiſcoporum ſuorum plurimus annis permanſit.—Hæc Alexandri eſſe mentem nobis perſuaſimus.—— Ἀποστατάγος ἐφανε, non actiua hominis ſe ſeparantis, ſed paſſivam pelli ejectionem ſignificat, &c. Baſnag. Ann. 312. n. xxiii. Conf. Tillem. S. Lucien, Not. 3, p. 405.

[b] Tandem vero ad unitatem eccleſiæ reverſus eſt Lucianus, ut ex Alexandro colligitur. Pagi. Ann. 311, n. xii. Extra dubium igitur eſt, Lucianum in errorem incidiſſe, ex quo tamen Deo favente tandem emerſiſſe putamus. Baſn. ubi ſupra.

[c] See Tillem. in St. Lucien, p. 149, and note 4, Mem. T. v. P. iii.

[d] See before, p. 92.

[e] Imo pene auſim affirmare, abſolutam Filii divinitatem aliquatenus in Lucianæo Symbolo efficacius et ſignificantius exprimi, quam in ipſo Nicæno. Quippe verba illa, Deum ex Deo, totum ex toto, perfectum ex perfecto, quæ confeſſionis Lucianææ ſunt, perfectam Filii divinitatem, et æqualem paternæ naturam, diſertius annunciant, quam iſta Nicæni Symboli, &c. Def. Fid. Nic. p. 146.

[f] τὰ σημαινόμενα ἐκ ἁπλῶς, οὐδὲ ἀργὰν χειμένα, ἀλλὰ σημαίνεται ἀκριβῶς τὴν ἰδίαν ἑκάστε ταὐτοσιμαζόμενα ὑπόστασιν τε καὶ δόξαν καὶ τάξιν· ἃς ἅπαν τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, τὴν δὲ συμφωνίαν μίαν. Ep. Socr. l. ii. c. 10. p. 88. A.

preſſions

preſſions favourable to Arianiſm; which may be what the Orthodox Chriſtian, in the Dialogue before referred to, calls an addition, and ſays is contrary to Lucian's Creed: meaning, perhaps, the former part (B) of it. Moreover, it may be thought by ſome that Lucian, in the ſpeech preſerved by Rufinus, ſpeaks not of the Word, or Logos, as a diſtinct perſon, but only as the Wiſdom of God.

But how ſhall we reconcile this with the high eſteem paid to Lucian by the Arians of the fourth century? For certainly Paulianiſm, or Sabellianiſm, and Arianiſm, are very different: it would likewiſe be hard to conceive how Euſebius, who was exceedingly averſe to the Sabellian ſcheme, ſhould ſay that Lucian was an excellent man in all reſpects.

Upon the whole, it is very difficult to reconcile the accounts concerning Lucian, or to determine where his fault lay, if he was guilty of any. As the Arians in general, and many catholics of the fourth century, ſhewed a great regard to the name of Lucian, ſome may be apt to infer there muſt have been two perſons of that name; but that is an opinion which does not ſeem to be at all countenanced by antiquity; and we are, I think, obliged to ſuppoſe one and the ſame perſon to be intended all along.

VI. Whether Lucian's opinion concerning the trinity, particularly concerning the Word, was the ſame with that which is now reckoned orthodox, or not, which is a point not eaſily decided; we have ſeen other accounts of him which are unqueſtioned: and all muſt be ſatisfied that he was a pious, learned and diligent man; that he believed Jeſus to be a divine teacher and the Chriſt. Lucian made out an edition both of the Old and the New Teſtament: Jerom indeed does not commend this laſt, Lucian having admitted into his copies ſome readings and paſſages which he did not reckon genuine: as this is the only fault found by Jerom, it may be concluded that the work was unexceptionable in other reſpects; or at leaſt that Lucian's canon of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament was much the ſame with that of other Chriſtians.

And every ſerious reader, I preſume, has with joy obſerved this additional teſtimony to the truth of the Chriſtian religion, which this preſbyter of Antioch aſſerted and adorned by the virtues and literary labours of his life, and by a death worthy of praiſe.

(B) Though I have argued as above, I certainly do not take any part of the Creed aſcribed to Lucian to be his.

CHAP.

CHAP. LIX.

PAMPHILUS, preſbyter of Cæſarea.

I. *His hiſtory, and teſtimonies to him.* II. *An account of ſome others who ſuffered martyrdom about the ſame time with Pamphilus.* III. *Of the library erected by Pamphilus at Cæſarea.* IV. *An edition of the Seventy by him and Euſebius from Origen's Hexapla.* V. *Books tranſcribed from others in that library, ſtill remaining.* VI. *A ſchool ſaid to be ſet up by him at Cæſarea.* VII. *His Apology for Origen.* VIII. *Contents of the Acts of the apoſtles, compoſed by Pamphilus, or Euthalius.* IX. *His character.* X. *Critical remarks upon pretended acts of his paſſion.*

I. 'PAMPHILUS [a] a preſbyter, friend of Euſebius biſhop of 'Cæſarea, had ſuch an affection for the (A) divine library [or had

[a] Pamphilus preſbyter, Euſebii Cæſarienſis epiſcopi neceſſarius, tanto bibliothecæ divinæ amore flagravit, ut maximam partem Origenis voluminum ſua manu deſcripſerit, quæ uſque hodie in Cæſarienſi bibliotheca habentur. Sed et in duodecim prophetas viginti quinque ἐξηγησεων volumina manu ejus exarata repperi, quæ tanto amplector et ſervo gaudio, ut Crœſi opes habere me credam. Si enim lætitia eſt unam epiſtolam habere martyris, quanto magis tot millia verſuum, quæ mihi videtur ſui ſanguinis ſignaſſe veſtigiis? Scripſit, antequam Euſebius ſcriberet, Apologeticum pro Origene, et paſſus eſt Cæſareæ Palæſtinæ ſub perſecutione Maximini. Hier. de V. I. c. 75.

(A) —— had ſuch an affection for the divine library.] That is a literal tranſlation, but the meaning is not very obvious. The phraſe occurs again in the chapter of Euſebius, who, as Jerom there ſays, was very ſtudious in the ſcriptures, and with Pamphilus a diligent ſearcher of the divine library: in ſcripturis ſtudioſiſſimus, et bibliothecæ divinæ, cum Pamphilo martyre diligentiſſimus perveſtigator. Upon both thoſe places Fabricius ſays, that thereby is to be underſtood the ſacred ſcriptures, and refers to Martianay's Prolegomena to the firſt tome of St. Jerom's works. Cave underſtood the phraſe in the ſame manner; for ſpeaking of Pamphilus he ſays: Tanto erga divinas literas ſtudio exarſit, ut bibliothecam Cæſareæ exſtruxerit. Hiſt. Lit. And Trithemius de Scr. Ec. c. 47. Pamphilus —— tantos eo tempore apud Cæſaream libros amore Scripturarum congregavit, ut in omni tempore nulla bibliotheca celebrior extiterit. Honorius, c. 76, et 82, copies Jerom exactly, and therefore is of no ſervice to us. Sophronius tranſlates literally, θειας βιβλιοθηκης. Martianay, to whom Fabricius refers, ſays: Apud veteres bibliothecæ divinæ nomen obtinebant ſacra volumina, quæ nunc temporis Biblia vocamus. Proleg. i. n. 1. But his proofs are not ſufficient; his examples are not very numerous; one of them is that above concerning Euſebius. I here take notice of another of them: Eodem ſenſu Hieronymus Ep. 89. ad Auguſtinum, vetus inſtrumentum, ſeu volumina ejuſdem vocat eccleſiarum bibliothecas. Vis, inquit, amator eſſe verus ſeptuaginta interpretum? Non legas ea quæ ſub aſteriſcis ſunt, imo rade de voluminibus, ut veterum te fautorem probes. Quod ſi feceris, omnes eccleſiarum bibliothecas damnare cogeris: vix enim unus aut alter liber invenitur, qui iſta non habeat. But I think the phraſe ought there to be underſtood in it's own natural ſenſe, to denote the libraries of the churches, containing copies of the Old and New Teſtament. All churches had copies of the ſcriptures, and the repoſitories in which they were lodged might be called libraries: beſides, ſome churches had large collections of books, and many copies of the ſcriptures; as the churches at Jeruſalem and Cæſarea: which laſt library, as Jerom expreſsly ſays in a paſſage to be cited by and by, was dedicated to that church by

'had ſuch a deſire to form a well-furniſhed eccleſiaſtical library] 'that he wrote out with his own hand the greateſt part of Ori- 'gen's works, which are ſtill in the library of Cæſarea; and be- 'ſides, I have met with five-and-twenty volumes of Origen's 'Commentaries upon the twelve prophets in his hand-writing; 'which I value and keep as if I had the treaſures of Crœſus. 'For if it be a pleaſure to poſſeſs one ſingle epiſtle of a martyr, 'how much more muſt it be to have ſo many thouſand lines, 'which he ſeems to me to have marked with the traces of his 'blood? He wrote before Euſebius of Cæſarea an Apology for 'Origen, and ſuffered at Cæſarea in Paleſtine in the perſecution 'of Maximin.'

So writes Jerom in his Catalogue of eccleſiaſtical writers. I have placed this at the beginning as a ſummary of the life of this excellent perſon: I ſhall add more from him, as well as from other ancient writers, preſently.

Pamphilus flouriſhed, according to Cave, about the year 294; he was put into priſon in the year 307, and accompliſhed his martyrdom [b] in 309. Euſebius, ſpeaking of Pamphilus, and ſome others, ſays they ſuffered after they had been impriſoned [c]

by Pamphilus. Such a library there was likewiſe at Hippo in Africa in Auguſtine's time: Eccleſiæ bibliothecam, omneſque codices diligenter poſteris cuſtodiendos ſemper jubebat. Poſſid. in Vit. Aug. c. 31. And the word is uſed of the repoſitory of a church which could not have in it many books. Poſteaquam perventum eſt in bibliothecam, inventa ſunt ibi armaria inania. Act. Purgat. Cæcil. ap. Du Pin. Optat. p. 168, a. f. There is another paſſage of Jerom, where, as I think, the phraſe ought to be interpreted in the ſame manner: Revolve omnium quos ſupra memoravi commentaries, et eccleſiarum bibliothecis fruere, et magis concitato gradu ad optata cœptaque pervenies. Ad Pamm. ep. 31, [al. 52], p. 244, in. Farther, if by the divine library we underſtand the ſacred ſcriptures, we ſhall charge Jerom with a trifling tautology in his chapter of Euſebius: and it is obſervable that Jerom, commending ancient Chriſtian writers, often mentions their diligence in ſtudying the ſcriptures, or their ſkill in them, and always ſpeaks plainly; but never uſeth this phraſe, except in the chapters of Pamphilus and Euſebius: probably therefore he refers to their care in furniſhing the library at Cæſarea, which conſiſted of copies of the ſcriptures, and commentaries upon them, and other works of Chriſtian writers, as well as works of profane authors. A paſſage of Jerom in a letter to Marcella, ſpeaking of that library, leads us directly to this ſenſe. Beatus Pamphilus, quum Demetrium——in ſacræ bibliothecæ ſtudio vellet æquare,——tunc vel maxime Origenis libros impenſius proſequutus, Cæſarienſi eccleſiæ dedicavit. Ad Marcell. T. ii. col. 711. In my edition of Moreri's Dictionary, which is called the tenth, printed in 1717, the article of Pamphilus begins in this manner: S. Pamphile—— avoit tant d'amour pour les livres, qu'il recueillit un tres-belle bibliotheque. St. Pamphilus was ſo great a lover of books, that he collected a very handſome library; which, in ſhort, I think, is what Jerom intends to ſay; that 'Pamphilus was ſo am- 'bitious of making a numerous collection 'of authors, and eſpecially of having a 'large and well furniſhed library of Chriſ- 'tian eccleſiaſtical writings, that he ſpared 'no coſt or pains to obtain his end, and 'even wrote out with his own hand many 'copies of ſuch books.' Therefore, finally, the connection confirms my interpretation.

[b] Vid. Cav. H. L. in Pamphil. Ruinart Acta Mart. p. 323, 324, 325.

[c] Τουτοις επι της ειρκτης ετυν δεκα χρονον κατατριψασιν. Euſ. de Mart. Pal. c. 11, p. 337. A.

two

two whole years; but it is ſuppoſed by learned moderns that [d] Pamphilus lay in priſon only a year and ſome months, from the latter end of the year 307 to the 16th of February 309.

In the Acts of Pamphilus, in Simeon Metaphraſtes, which [e] Valeſius ſuppoſed to be taken from Euſebius, and Tillemont [f] allows to be in the main right, it is ſaid that [g] Pamphilus was a native of Berytus, and there received the firſt rudiments of learning: and in Photius he is ſaid to have been educated by [h] Pierius. For my own part, I think that neither of theſe accounts is to be relied upon: but, admitting the truth of them, it muſt be ſuppoſed, I think, that Pamphilus having firſt made ſome progreſs in learning at Berytus, his native city, afterwards completed his ſtudies at Alexandria, and then ſettled at Cæſarea, where he certainly reſided a great part of his life.

From this perſon Euſebius received [i] the ſurname of Pamphilus, or Pamphili. In the chapter before cited Jerom calls Pamphilus Euſebius's friend; he mentions this again in [k] the chapter of Euſebius himſelf: and in another place he ſays that [l] theſe two perſons ſeemed to have but one ſoul.

Euſebius, the ſurvivor, has given many teſtimonies of ſincere reſpect for the memory of his friend: and, as he was to the laſt an admirer of his virtues, we may reaſonably think him an imitator of them: he appears to have eſteemed that friendſhip the chief happineſs of his life; it is likely he improved by it. Indeed there are in Euſebius's remaining works divers moſt agreeable and affecting paſſages concerning this holy man; which therefore I intend to tranſcribe largely, and ſometimes with the connection.

The thirty-ſecond chapter of the ſeventh book of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is entitled, 'Of ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Men as have 'flouriſhed in our time, and who of them lived to the demolition 'of the churches;' meaning the beginning of Dioclefian's perſecution. After the mention of ſeveral, he ſays: 'At [m] Cæſarea 'in Paleſtine, after Theotecnus ſucceeded Agapius, who, as we

[d] See Tillem. Mem. T. v. P. iii. S. Pamphile, p. 68, et note iii. [e] Vid. Valeſ. Ann. in Euſ. p. 179, 180.

[f] Tillem. ib. p. 55. [g] Atque ortus quidem erat ex Berytenſium civitate, ubi in prima ætate educatus fuit in illis quæ illic erant ſtudiis literariis. Ex Sim. Met. ap. Valeſ. ib. p. 180. Conf. Fabric. Hippol. T. ii. p. 220, m. [h] Vid. Phot. Cod. 118, f. et 119, in. p. 300.

[i] ὁ τε ἱερὸς παμφίλος, καὶ ὁ ἐξ αὐτου χρηματίσας εὐσεβείας. Socr. l. iii. c. 7, p. 175. B. Γεγονε δὲ καὶ τῆς παμφίλε τε ἱερομαρτυρος ἀρετῆς διαπυρος ἐραστης· ὃθ' ἣν αἰτιαν φασι τινες αὐτον καὶ τῆς τε παμφίλε ἐπωνυμίας μετεσχηκεναι. Phot. Cod. 13, p. 12, m.

[k] Ob amicitiam Pamphili martyris ab eo cognomentum ſortitus eſt. De V. I. c. 81. [l] Euſebius et Pamphilus tantam inter ſe habuere concordiam, ut unius animæ homines putes, et ab uno alter nomen acceperit. Hier. de Err. Orig. ad Pamm. et Ocean. Ep. 41, [al. 65] T. iv. p. 347, f.

[m] H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 288, C. D.

'well know, was extremely laborious, and very solicitous for the 'welfare of his people, and bountiful to the poor. In his time 'was Pamphilus, a (B) man of good understanding, a philoso- 'pher in word and deed, presbyter of that church, with whom 'we had the honour to be acquainted: but to write of him is a 'copious subject; and we have already in a distinct work related 'the whole history of his life and conversation, [or, and [n] of the 'school erected by him,] and of his fortitude in several confes- 'sions during the persecution, and lastly the martyrdom with 'which he was crowned: indeed, Pamphilus was the most ad- 'mirable person in that church.'

In another chapter and book of the same work, speaking of the most illustrious martyrs in several countries in the time of the forementioned persecution: 'Among [o] these must not be 'omitted the great glory of the church of Cæsarea, the presby- 'ter Pamphilus, the most admirable person of our time, whose 'glorious magnanimity and patience we have represented in an- 'other place.'

In his book of the History of the Martyrs of Palestine, relating many cruel torments inflicted on the Christians by the Roman president at Cæsarea, in the year of Christ 307: 'And others,' says [p] Eusebius, 'he thrust into prison, after he had tormented 'them in the most shameful manner: of this number was Pam- 'philus, my dearest friend, on account of his eminent virtue the 'most renowned martyr of our age. Urbanus, having first made 'trial of his knowledge by divers questions of rhetoric and phi- 'losophy and polite literature, required him to sacrifice; when 'he saw that Pamphilus refused to obey his orders, and despised 'all his threatenings, he commanded that he should be tortured 'in the severest manner: when he had again and again raked his 'sides with his torturing irons, the cruel wretch, being as it were 'satiated with his flesh, though he had gained nothing but vex- 'ation and dishonour, ordered him to be had away to the rest of 'the confessors in prison.'

And afterwards: 'But [q] it is time to give an account of the most 'glorious spectacle of those who were perfected by martyrdom 'together with Pamphilus, whose memory must always be pre- 'cious to me: they were in all twelve, and were honoured with 'a resemblance of the prophets, or rather the apostles, both in

(B) or, a most eloquent man; λογιωτατον. Virum disertissimum. Vales. Vers.

[n] τινα δε τα κατ' αυτον ειη και της συστασης διατριβης. Singula quæ ad illius vitam et ad scholam ab eodem constitutam pertinent. Vales. Vers.

[o] l. viii. c. 13, p. 308. B.

[p] De Martyr. Palæst. c. 7. p. 329. A. B.

[q] ib. cap. xi. p. 336. A. B. C.

'grace

'grace and number; the chief of whom was Pamphilus, and 'the only one who had the honour of the preſbyter's office at 'Cæſarea; a man, who, throughout his whole life, excelled in 'every virtue; in contempt and renunciation of this world, in 'liberality to the indigent, in diſregard of all earthly honours 'and preferments to which he might have aſpired, and in an 'abſtemious philoſophical courſe of life: but he was eſpe- 'cially eminent and remarkable above all men of our time for 'an unfeigned zeal for the holy ſcriptures, and for unwearied 'application in whatever he undertook; whether it were kind 'offices to his friends, or to others who ſought his aid: but a 'fuller account of theſe, and his other virtues and ſervices, has 'been already given by us in a diſtinct work of three books, 'compriſing the hiſtory of his life. At preſent we go on with 'our narration concerning the martyrs.'

That work to our great grief is loſt: but there is a paſſage of it in Jerom, which I ſhall here tranſcribe: 'Euſebius, [s] the friend 'and admirer and conſtant companion of Pamphilus, wrote three 'excellent books containing the life of Pamphilus; in which, as 'he greatly commends him on other accounts, ſo he particularly 'extols his humility: and in the third of thoſe books he writes 'after this manner: What ſtudious perſon was not a friend of 'Pamphilus? If he ſaw any in ſtraits, he gave bountifully as he 'was able. He not only lent out copies of the ſacred ſcriptures 'to be read, but cheerfully gave them to be kept; and that not 'only to men, but to women likewiſe, whom he found diſpoſed 'to read. For which reaſon he took care to have by him many 'copies of the ſcriptures, that, when there ſhould be occaſion, he 'might furniſh thoſe who were willing to make uſe of them: 'but of his own he wrote nothing, except letters to friends; ſo 'great was his humility: but he diligently read the works of 'ancient authors, and was continually meditating upon them.'

II. I ſhall here inſert a paſſage or two concerning ſome other perſons who ſuffered with Pamphilus, or ſoon after, and re-

[r] τησιν τα θεια λογια γνησιοτατη σπουδη. [s] Ipſe enim Euſebius amator ejus et comes et contubernalis Pamphili tres libros ſcripſit elegantiſſimos, vitam Pamphili continentes: in quibus quum cætera miris laudibus prædicaret, humilitatem ejus ferret in cœlum, etiam hoc in tertio libro addidit: Quis ſtudioſorum amicus non fuit Pamphili? Si quos videbat ad victum neceſſariis indigere, præbebat large quæ poterat. Scripturas quoque ſanctas non ad legendum tantum, ſed ad habendum tribuebat promptiſſime: Nec ſolum viris, ſed et feminis, quas vidiſſet lectioni deditas. Unde et multos codices præparabat, ut quum neceſſitas poposciſſet, volentibus largiretur. Et ipſe quidem proprii operis nihil omnino ſcripſit, exceptis epiſtolis, quas ad amicos forte mittebat: in tantum ſe humilitate dejecerat. Veterum autem tractatus ſcriptorum legebat ſtudioſiſſime, et in eorum meditatione jugiter verſabatur. Hieron. adv. Ruf. col. 357, 359, T. iv. Ed. Bened.

ſembled him in a high regard for the ſacred ſcriptures: our narration is thereby ſomewhat interrupted, but it will be eaſily excuſed.

The firſt of thoſe paſſages immediately follows that above cited, which concluded with thoſe [t] words: 'At preſent we go 'on with our relation concerning the martyrs.'

'The [u] ſecond perſon,' ſays Euſebius, 'and next after Pam- 'philus, who entered the combat, was Valens, a deacon of (c) 'Ælia, an old man of gray hairs and venerable aſpect, exceed- 'ingly [x] well ſkilled in the divine ſcriptures: and they were ſo 'fixed in his memory that there was no diſcernible difference 'between his reading and reciting them by heart, though it 'were whole pages together.'

That perſon ſuffered with Pamphilus. The other paſſage which I would allege relates to a martyr in 310, who ſuffered in company with Silvanus, biſhop of Gaza, who [y] in the year 307 had the ſinews of his feet ſeared with hot irons at Cæſarea, and was then, with nine-and-thirty others, ſent [z] to work in the copper mines at a place in Paleſtine called Phæno; where he continued till he was beheaded. Their martyrdom, in 310, is related by Euſebius in this manner: 'The [a] firſt of theſe was Sil- 'vanus, a truly religious man, and a complete model of Chriſ- 'tianity; of whom it may be ſaid, that, having from the firſt 'day of the perſecution ſignalized himſelf in various and almoſt 'continual confeſſions and combats, he was reſerved to this 'time to be as it were the ſeal of the [b] comb at in Paleſtine. With 'him there were many others from Egypt; and among them was 'John, who in ſtrength of memory ſurpaſſed all men of our 'time: he had before loſt his eyeſight; nevertheleſs, in the con- 'feſſions he had made, when the flexures of one of his feet were 'ſeared, as (d) thoſe of others were, his eyes likewiſe, though 'already

[t] See before, p. 339. [u] De Mart. Pal. c. 11, p. 336. C. D. (c) *Ælia*; that is, Jeruſalem; or the city juſt by it, ſo called by Adrian. And the name of Jeruſalem was now ſo loſt and forgotten, that when one of theſe martyrs, being examined by the preſident of Paleſtine concerning his native place, anſwered, that his city was Jeruſalem, meaning the heavenly Jeruſalem: the preſident, not knowing any ſuch place, was thrown into ſurpriſe, and very ſolicitouſly ſought to know where it lay; thinking it to be ſome city where Chriſtians were numerous, and might be formidable. See Euſ. p. 337, 338.

[x] των θειων γραφων ει και τις αλλος επιστημων. [y] —— επι της αυτης πολεως τους αμφι σιλβανον —— τοις εις το αυτο χαλκω μεταλλον ποσοις ο αυτος εκκριτως κατηρτισμενοις των ποδων τας αγκυλας αυτοις σφυραξας. De M. P. cap. 7, p. 328. C.

[z] —— των δε επι παλαιστινης μαρτυρων, σιλβανος επισκοπος των αμφι την γαζαιων κλησιων, κατα τα εν φαινοι χαλκω μεταλλα στειρεις εις δεσμον τον αριθμον τεσσαρακοντα, την κεφαλην αποτεμνεται. H. E. l. viii. c. 13, p. 308. B. [a] —— πλειστης τι χρημα και γνησιον υποδειγμα χριστιανισμου φερων. κ. λ. De Mar. Pal. c. 13, p. 343. D. 344. [b] ως αν υστατον γενοιτο σημειον των κατα παλαιστινην αγωνων επισφραγισμα. ib. p. 343. D. (d) That ſeverity of ſearing the ſinews of the left foot, or leg, and ſearing the right eye, was practiſed

'already deprived of ſight, were burned with the ſearing irons: 'ſuch was the cruelty and inhumanity of thoſe executioners! It 'is needleſs to enlarge upon his virtue and philoſophical courſe 'of life. What was moſt remarkable in him was the ſtrength of 'his memory: he had [c] whole books of the divine ſcriptures, 'not written in tables of ſtone, as the apoſtle's expreſſion is, nor 'on parchments and papers, which are devoured by moths and 'time, but on the fleſhly living tables of his heart, even his pure 'and enlightened mind: inſomuch, that whenever he pleaſed he 'brought out, as from a treaſury of knowledge, ſometimes the 'books of Moſes, at other times thoſe of the prophets, or ſome 'ſacred hiſtory, ſometimes the goſpels, ſometimes the epiſtles of 'apoſtles. I muſt own,' ſays Euſebius, 'that I was much ſur-'priſed the firſt time I ſaw him: he was in the midſt of a large 'congregation, reciting a portion of ſcripture; whilſt I only 'heard his voice, I thought he was reading, as is common in 'our aſſemblies; but when I came near, and ſaw this perſon, 'who had no other light but that of the mind, inſtructing like 'a prophet thoſe whoſe bodily eyes were clear and perfect, I 'could not forbear to praiſe and glorify God.'

III. Pamphilus erected a library at Cæſarea: Euſebius mentions it in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. He is ſpeaking of the time of ſeveral of Origen's works, and of the places where they were compoſed: 'But,' ſays [d] he, 'what need I attempt to give here 'an exact catalogue of the works of that great man, when it has 'been already done in the life we have written of the bleſſed 'martyr Pamphilus? Where, [e] ſhewing the zeal of Pamphilus 'for the intereſt of religion [or [f] for the ſacred ſcriptures,] we 'gave liſts of the works of Origen, and of other eccleſiaſtical 'writers collected by him, and placed in his library.'

Jerom inſinuates that [g] in the third book of that work Euſebius inſerted a catalogue of all Origen's works; whereas Euſebius's own words juſt cited ſeem not to imply a complete catalogue, but ſuch works only of Origen as were in the library at (E) Cæſarea.

tified upon great numbers of confeſſors by Firmilian, preſident of Cæſarea, ſucceſſor of Urbanus, who put Pamphilus into priſon. Vid. Euſ. de Mart. Pal. c. 8, p. 330. B. C. [c] —— ολας βιβλους των θειων γραφων. ib. p. 344. A. [d] Euſ. l. vi. c. 32, p. 231. A. B. [e] —— εν η την περι τα θεια σπουδην του μακαριλου οποση τις ην, παριστωντες, της συναχθεισης αυτω και περι αυτον εκκλησιαστικων συγγραφων βιβλιοθηκης τους τιτακας παρεθεμην. ib. p. 231. B. [f] So Valeſius tranſlates: Ubi cum probare vellemus, quantum Pamphili ſtudium erga divinas literas fuiſſet,—— [g] Numera indices librorum ejus, qui in tertio volumine Euſebii, in quo ſcripſit vitam Pamphili, continentur: et non dico ſex millia, ſed tertiam partem non invenies. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. p. 419. in. (E) Compare this with what is ſaid in the chapter of Origen, Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. numb. .

Jerom has several times mentioned that library: he seems to me to refer to it [h] in the two chapters of Pamphilus himself and Eusebius, when he speaks of the divine library. But not now to insist on those passages, in his article of St. Matthew he says [i] that his Hebrew gospel was still in the library at Cæsarea, which Pamphilus had collected with great care. In another place he speaks of the gospel according to the Hebrews, as [k] being in that library: in the same work, (his book Of Illustrious Men,) in the article of Euzoïus, bishop of Cæsarea, about 366, he says, 'that 'Euzoius had with abundance of pains repaired the library of 'Origen and Pamphilus, which was fallen to decay.' In a letter to Marcella, Jerom [m] commends this design of Pamphilus, and compares his library with the more ancient celebrated libraries of Demetrius Phalereus and Pisistratus. He there speaks again of the care of Euzoius; and likewise of Acacius, the immediate successor of Eusebius in the see of Cæsarea, in repairing this library: and he says that Pamphilus dedicated the books of Origen, which he had collected at great expense, to the church of Cæsarea; whence perhaps it may be inferred that this was a public library: and indeed we know, from Jerom himself, that [n] he had the use of some books lodged in it.

IV. There was a joint labour of Pamphilus and Eusebius in publishing a correct edition of the Greek version of the Seventy from Origen's Hexapla, which I have already taken notice of in

[h] See before, p. 335, note (A).

[i] Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. De V. I. c. 3. [k] In Evangelio juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthæum; quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca. Adv. Pelag. l. iii. T. iv. col. 533, m. [l] —— plurimo labore corruptam bibliothecam Origenis et Pamphili in membranis instaurare conatus est. De V. I. c. 113. [m] Beatus Pamphilus martyr, cujus vitam Eusebius Cæsariensis tribus fermè voluminibus explicavit, quum Demetrium Phalereum et Pisistratum in sacræ bibliothecæ studio vellet æquare, imagineque ingeniorum, quæ vera sunt et æterna monumenta, toto orbe perquireret, tunc vel maxime Origenis libros impensius prosequutus, Cæsariensi ecclesiæ dedicavit: quam ex parte corruptam Acacius, dehinc et Euzoius, ejusdem ecclesiæ sacerdotes, in membranis instaurare conati sunt. Ad Marcell. inter Ep. Crit. T. ii. p. 711, in. [al. Ep. 141] Conf. Ruf. ap. Hieron. T. iv. col. 426, f. 428, in. [n] Præterea quintam et sextam et septimam editionem, quas etiam nos de ejus bibliotheca habemus, miro labore reperit, et cum cæteris editionibus comparavit. De V. I. c. 54. Unde et nobis curæ fuit omnes veteris Legis libros, quos vir doctus Adamantius in Hexapla digesserat, de Cæsariensi bibliotheca descriptos ex ipsis authenticis emendare. Id. in Ep. ad Tit. cap. iii. T. iv. P. i. col. 437. Id quod secundo dicitur, non sic, in Hebræis voluminibus non habetur: sed nec in ipsis quidem LXX. interpretibus. Nam in exemplis Origenis in Cæsariensi bibliotheca legens, semel tantum scriptum inveni. In Ps. prim. T. ii. P. ii. col. 123, in. Postea vero per interpretationem tuam, quæstione contra Origenem toto orbe commota, in quærendis exemplaribus diligentior fui; et in Cæsariensi bibliotheca Eusebii sex volumina reperi Απολογιας υπερ ωριγενους, Adv. Ruf. T. iv. col. 443, f.

the

the chapter of [o] Lucian. Huet is of opinion, that [p] before this there was no ſeparate edition of the Seventy according to Origen's emendations. Undoubtedly, this was a ſignal ſervice for the church of Chriſt; the benefit of Origen's immenſe labour was rendered more extenſive; and, if their edition was not the firſt, it was the moſt exact.

V. There are ſtill extant in the curious collections of Europe memorials of this library of Pamphilus, and traces of his and Euſebius's labour in tranſcribing or correcting copies of the ſcriptures, or other books.

In the Jeſuits' college at Paris [q] is a beautiful manuſcript of the prophets, ſuppoſed [r] to have been written in the eighth century. In that manuſcript, as Montfaucon aſſures us, there is before the book of Ezekiel a note to this purpoſe: 'This [s] was 'taken from a copy in ſuch a place, in which copy was written: "Tranſcribed from the Hexapla containing the tranſlations; "and corrected by Origen's own Tetrapla, which alſo had emen- "dations and ſcholia in his own hand-writing. I Euſebius added "ſcholia; Pamphilus and Euſebius corrected."

Huet, ſpeaking of this ſame manuſcript, in one place [t] ſays, that note is at the end of Jeremiah; in [u] another, before Ezechiel. I have put his words at the bottom of the page.

[o] See p. 326. [p] Apud multos hanc opinionem percrebuiſſe video, Origenem, quo parabilior eſſet emendata a ſe editio ſeptuaginta, edidiſſe eam ſeorſum, et ex ingenti Hexaplorum mole exemiſſe.——Probabilior mihi videtur ſententia I. B. Morini,——editionem illam των ο ex Origenianis Hexaplis deſcriptam ab Euſebio et Pamphilo, et primum evulgatam arbitrantis, juxta illud Hieronymi in Præf. ad Paralip. ad Chromatium:—— Mediæ inter has provinciæ Paleſtinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Euſebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt. Nam cum frequenter exſcriberentur exempla in eccleſiarum, doctorumque hominum uſum, noris in dies deformabantur ſordium inquinamentis. Degenerante ergo magis magisque hac editione, reſtituere eam conati ſunt Euſebius et Pamphilus, ex ipſo αυτογραφῳ, quod erat in Cæſarienſi Bibliotheca: reſtitutam vero et ſeorſum magna diligentia deſcriptam publicaverunt. Atque ea editio Palæſtina dicta eſt. Huet. Orig. l. iii. c. 2, p. 261. [q] Vetuſtiſſimum, pulcherrimumque codicem Prophetarum. ——Montf. Præf. in Hex. Orig. p. 4. [r] Hæc porro omnia diſcimus ex Notis manu ſcriptis Marchaliani, nunc R. R. P. P. Jeſuitarum Collegii Ludovici Magni, quas adtulimus ſupra p. 14. Ille vero Codex ſæculo circiter viii. ut ex characteris forma exiſtimatur, ad fidem exemplaris Apollinarii exſcriptus eſt. Montf. Præliim. in Hex. Orig. cap. 11, §. iv. [s] Deinde vero ante Ezechielem hæc nota legitur:

'Deſumptus eſt [Ezechiel] ab Exem- 'plari Abbatis Apollinarii, Cœnobiarchæ, 'in quo hæc ſubjiciuntur: Exſcriptus eſt 'ab Hexaplis editionem complectentibus: 'et correctus eſt ad fidem Tetraplorum 'Origenis, quæ etiam manu ejus emen- 'data et ſcholiis illuſtrata erant. Ego Eu- 'ſebius ſcholia adjeci. Pamphilus et Eu- 'ſebius correxerunt.'

—— Μετελήφθη απο των κατα τας εκδοσεις εξαπλων, και διωρθωθη απο των ωριγενους αυτου τετραπλων, ατινα και αυτα χειρι διωρθωτο, και εσχολιογραφειτο ο ευσεβιος εγω σχολια παρεθηκα. Παμφιλος και ευσεβιος διωρθωσαντο. Montf. in Orig. Hex. c. 1, §. v. p. 14.

[t] Hujus editionis et emendationis lucu- 'lentum extat monumentum in Codice Re- 'nati Marchali, jam ſæpe laudato, in quo 'poſt Jeremiæ librum adnotatum eſt, deſ- 'criptum eum eſſe ex Origenis Hexaplis, et emendatum ex Tetraplis manu ipſius exaratis, idque opera Pamphili et Euſebii. Huet Orig. l. iii. c. 2. p. 262, in.

[u] Editioni των ο, quæ erat in Tetraplis, ſcholia

In the French king's library, as we are informed by Montfaucon, is [x] a very ancient manuscript, written in the fifth or sixth century, containing part of St. Paul's epistles. It seems, he says, to have been written in Palestine, or Syria: for the transcriber says, in a note at the end, that he had compared his copy with another in the library of Cæsarea, in the hand-writing of Pamphilus: which therefore must have been done before that library was quite destroyed, as it was before the middle of the seventh century. In that Mss. the epistle to the Hebrews appears as St. Paul's. 'The order is [y] this: To the Romans, 'the first and second to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to 'the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, first and 'second to the Thessalonians, to the Hebrews, first and second 'to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon.' That learned writer has given us that curious note of the transcriber beforementioned in the ancient letters of the manuscript. I place it at the bottom of the page in the letters now commonly used: 'This [z] book was 'compared with the copy in the library at Cæsarea, in the hand-'writing of saint Pamphilus.'

VI. It is thought by divers learned men, as [b] Cave, [c] Valesius, and [d] Tillemont, though Du Pin takes no notice of it, that Pamphilus not only erected a library, but a school likewise, or academy, at Cæsarea. This supposition is chiefly built upon a passage of Eusebius, which [e] I have cited already. Tillemont however brings in [f] other passages in support of it. I must leave this point undecided. I dare not contest the thing. But the evidence is not clear, because the passage of Eusebius, where

scholia ad limbum aliqua adjecisse Origenem discimus ex memorato Codice Marchali, quem habent Claromontani Patres Societatis Jesu. Adnotatum enim est ante Ezechielem, librum hunc ex Hexaplis descriptum esse, correctum vero ad Tetraplorum fidem. Postmodum subest: ατινα και τα αυτα χειρι διωρθωτο, και εσχολιογραφητε, οὗν ευσεβιος εγω τα σχολια παρεβηκα. Παμφιλος και ευσεβιος διωρθωσαντο. Ib. p. 261, m. [x] Codex ccii. membranaceus, continens foliis 14, complectens partem Epistolarum Pauli, inter antiquissimos Europæ numerandus, sæculi nempe v. vel. vi.——Scriptus esse videtur in Palæstina vel Syria, eo circiter quo diximus ævo. Nam Cailigraphus, qui notam infra edendam in fine posuit, hoc exemplar se contuliisse significat cum Codice ipsius Pamphili manu exarato: antequam videlicet Cæsarea funditus diueretur, quod contigit ante medium sæculi vii. Mont. Bib. Coislin. p. 251, 252.

[y] Ordo Epistolarum Pauli in Codice xxix. supra, ad Rom. ad Corinth. 1, 2, ad Galat. ad Ephes. ad Philippens. ad Colossens. ad Thessalonicens. 1, 2, ad Hebr. ad Timoth. 1, 2, ad Titum, ad Philemonem. Ib. p. 255, m. [z] Αντεβλήθη δε η βιβλος προς το εν καισαρεια αντιγραφεν της βιβλιοθηκης του αγιου παμφιλου χειρι γεγραμμενον. Ap. Bib. Coisl. ib. p. 262.

[b] Pamphili vitam tribus libris amplexus est——Eusebius, quibus integrum vitæ ejus curriculum, quæque ad scholam ab eo institutam pertinent,——accuratissime depinxit. Cav. H. L. de Pamphilo ad fin.

[c] Vales. Annot. in Euseb. p. 160, B.

[d] Saint Pamphile, ubi supra, p. 58.

[e] See p. 338. [f] Vid. Euseb. de M. P. c. iv. p. 323, C. 324, A. B.

the

he is ſuppoſed to mention the ſchool, is [g] obſcure; and becauſe there is no notice taken of this ſchool, that I remember, in Jerom, nor any other ancient writer of credit.

VII. In the article above-cited at length Jerom ſays, that 'Pamphilus wrote an Apology for Origen before Euſebius:' and in the chapter of that biſhop of Cæſarea he aſcribes [h] to him an Apology for Origen in ſix volumes. It ſeems, therefore, that Jerom then ſuppoſed that Pamphilus had written ſome Apology for Origen, diſtinct from the ſix books of Euſebius; and upon that account gave Pamphilus a place in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, compoſed in 392; and alſo in his letter [i] to Magnus, written about the year 400. He ſeems ſo [k] to explain himſelf in the diſpute which he afterwards had with Rufinus: when having found, as he ſays, that the book he had taken for Pamphilus's was the firſt of the ſix volumes of what he eſteemed Euſebius's Apology for Origen, he denied that Pamphilus ever wrote any thing beſides epiſtles to friends; and [l] often charged Rufinus with a fraud in publiſhing the firſt book of that Apology in a Latin tranſlation, as a work of Pamphilus.

Nevertheleſs, whatever Jerom might think fit to ſay after his difference with Rufinus, the truth ſeems to be this: five

[g] I ſhall here put down Euſebius's words, and divers Latin verſions: ικανα δε τα κατ' αυτον φησι, και τις συνεγραψατο διατριβης. l. vii. c. 32, p. 288, D. Verum nos ſingula quæ ad illius vitam et ad ſcholam ab eodem inſtitutam pertinent,——peculiari opere complexi ſumus. Valeſ. Omnem eius vitam inſtitutionemque a puero. Ruf. Verum ſingula vitæ illius, et in qua ſchola inſtitutus fuerit. W. Muſculus. Qua ratione inſtitutus. Chriſtophorſon. Et Conf. Valeſ. Annot. p. 160, B. And any one that pleaſeth, may ſee how I have tranſlated the paſſage, at p. 338.

[h] Ἀπολογιας pro Origene ſex libros. De V. I. c. 81. [i] Nec non preſbyterorum, Pamphili, Pierii,—Ep. 83, T. iv. p. 656.

[k] Nunc——ſufficiat, breviter prudentem inſtruxiſſe lectorem, me iſtum librum, qui ſub nomine Pamphili ferebatur, vidiſſe Adrianum in codice tuo. Et quia mihi non erat curæ quid pro hæretico diceretur, ſic tenere habuiſſe, quaſi diverſum eſſet opus Pamphili et Euſebii: poſtea vero quæſtionem tuam——perſpicueque deprehendiſſe, quod primus liber ſex voluminum Euſebii eſſet, qui unus ſub nomine Pamphili martyris editus eſt.——Unde etiam ante annos circiter decem, quum Dexter amicus meus——me rogaſſet, ut auctorem noſtræ religionis ei indicem texerem; inter cæteros tractatores poſui et hunc librum a Pamphilo editum, ita putans eſſe, ut a te et tuis diſcipulis fuerat divulgatum. Sed quum ipſe dicat Euſebius, Pamphilum nihil ſcripſiſſe, exceptis brevibus epiſtolis ad amicos: et primus liber ſex voluminum illius eadem et eiſdem verbis continent, quæ ſub nomine Pamphili a te ficta ſunt; perſpicuum eſt te idcirco hunc librum diſſeminare voluiſſe, ut ſub perſona martyris hæreſim introduceres. Quumque de hoc ipſo libro, quem Pamphili ſimulas, multa perverteris, &c. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. T. 4. p. 419. [l] Referens enim de apologia Pamphili martyris, quam nos Euſebii Arianorum principis probavimus. Adv. Ruf. col. 407, in. Euſebius——per ſex volumina nihil aliud agit, niſi ut Origenem ſuæ oſtendat fidei, id eſt, Arianæ perfidiæ. ib. f. Conf. eund. p. 357, 359, 405; et Ep. ad Pamm. et Ocean. p. 347. Fecerat hoc et in ſancti Pamphili martyris nomine, ut librum primum ſex librorum defenſionis Origenis, Euſebii Cæſarienſis, quem fuiſſe Arianum nemo eſt qui neſciat, nomine Pamphili martyris prænotaret. Ep. 43, ad Cteſiph. p. 477, in. Conf. eund. in libr. vi. in Ezech. c. xviii. T. iii. col. 821; et Prol. Dialog. adv. Pelag. T. iv. p. 484.

books

books of the Apology for Origen were compoſed jointly by Pamphilus and Euſebius: the ſixth and laſt was written by Euſebius alone after the martyrdom of Pamphilus: for Euſebius in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory does expreſsly and openly refer his readers for a farther account of Origen to [m] the Apology compoſed by himſelf and Pamphilus. He ſoon after refers to the [n] ſixth book of that Apology as his own. Socrates [o] ſpeaks of their common labour in it as an allowed thing, and commends the work: yea, he quotes it in another place as [p] Pamphilus's, without mentioning Euſebius. Photius, though he is far from commending the performance, ſays, that [q] the firſt five books were written jointly by Pamphilus and Euſebius in priſon, and the ſixth by Euſebius alone afterwards. It is needleſs to allege any other [r] teſtimonies. Pamphilus, as well as Euſebius, was remarkable for the regard he had for Origen. St. Jerom knew that very well, and owns it ſometimes: nor is it at all ſtrange that they ſhould have a high eſteem for Origen, who continually had before them, in their library, the originals of thoſe amazing works, his Tetrapla and Hexapla, and many other volumes of his writings, monuments of a moſt capacious mind and unexampled induſtry.

This work, againſt which [s] Jerom threatened to write, according to [t] his own acknowledgment, was laboured and copious. Indeed, it muſt have been a large work, as may be inferred from the length of (F) the firſt book, which [u] we ſtill have in Rufinus's Latin tranſlation; from [x] Euſebius's divers references to it for farther particulars concerning Origen; and from the accounts given [y] by ſome ancient authors of the contents of it.

Here I might make ſome extracts out of that firſt book which remains, to ſhew what books of ſcripture are referred to by the

[m] ταυτα και εκ της υπερ αυτε απολογιας ημιν τε και του καθ' ημας υπερ μαρτυρι παμφιλω απολογιας, εφεξης διαλεξομαι. l. vi. c. 33, p. 232. [n] ——εν εκτω της γραφεισης ημιν περι τε αυτος απολογιας. ib. c. 36, p. 233.

[o] τουτων αξιουσι, οτι παμφιλος και—— ευσεβιος· αμφω γαρ κοινη——ενδοξοις βιβλοις απολογιαν υπερ αυτε συνεθεντο, κ. λ. Socr. l. iii. cap. 7, p. 175, B.

[p] Id. l. iv. c. 27, p. 244, D.

[q] ——ων οι μεν πεντε, παμφιλω το θειο-τατω μαρτυρι συνοντι, συμπαροντος και ευσεβιου, επεπονησαν· κ. λ. Phot. cod. 118, col. 296. vid. et col. 297, f.

[r] Vid. Prædeſtinat. Haer. 43.

[s] Adverſus quæ volumina, (ſi Dominus vitæ hujus dederit ſpatium) alias reſpondere conabor. Adv. Ruf. l. ii. p. 419.

[t] Sex libros Euſebius Cæſarienſis epiſcopus, Arianæ quondam ſignifer factionis, pro Origene ſcripſit, latiſſimum et elaboratum opus. Adv. Ruf. l. i. p. 357.

(F) Rufinus tranſlated the firſt book, and that only, ſo far as we know. Horum tu primum librum vertis ſub nomine martyris——Si totum opus Pamphili eſt, cur reliquos libros non tranſfers? ib. l. i. p. 357 [u] Ap. Hieron. Opp. T. v. p. 219, &c. Ed. Bened.

[x] H. E. l. vi. c. 23, et 33, et 36.

[y] Vid. Socr. l. iii. c. 7. l. iv. c. 27. Phot. cod. 117, 118. Conf. Tillem. Saint Pamphile. T. v. P. iii. p. 60, 61.

compoſers,

compoſers, and by Origen, in the paſſages quoted from him: but it is needleſs. Conſidering Pamphilus's reſpect for Origen, and his intimacy with Euſebius, it may be taken for granted, that his canon of ſcripture was the ſame, or much the ſame, as theirs. And what theirs was, has been or will be ſhewn largely in this work.

VIII. Montfauçon has publiſhed Contents [z] of the Acts of the apoſtles, which he thinks to have been compoſed and drawn up by Pamphilus. As [a] the work is aſcribed to Pamphilus in the manuſcript, which [b] is ſuppoſed to be of the tenth century, ſo for that, and ſome other reaſons, he makes no ſcruple to conſider him as the author. The ſame thing has been put out again [c] by Fabricius as a work of Pamphilus. But thoſe Contents [d] had been often publiſhed before without the name of the author: and the only thing uncommon is [e] the ſhort preface to thoſe Contents; which too, with the Contents themſelves, had been publiſhed [f] by Zacagni, as written by Euthalius, who [g] flouriſhed about the year 458.

And indeed it ſeems to me more likely that Euthalius ſhould be the author than Pamphilus. It is obſervable that Euthalius publiſhed the Acts of the apoſtles, the Catholic epiſtles, and St. Paul's epiſtles. At the end of his edition of the Catholic epiſtles, which follow that of the Acts of the apoſtles, is this note: 'The [h] book of the Acts of the apoſtles, and of the Catholic 'epiſtles, was collated with the exact copies of the library of Eu-'ſebius Pamphilus in Cæſarea.' Mr. Wetſtein, to whom I refer my readers, has divers curious remarks concerning Euthalius. He is of opinion, that [i] this note has been an occaſion of aſcribing to Pamphilus, as author, what was really done by Euthalius, who made uſe of his library. However, we have here another proof of the uſefulneſs of that library at Cæſarea.

[z] Præmittitur Expoſitio Capitum Actuum auctore Pamphilo, ἐκθεσις κεφαλαιων των πραξεων του παμφιλου· quam integram edimus infra. Mont. Bib. Coiſlin. p. 76.

[a] Codex xxv. al. cxxi. membranaceus, decimi ſæculi, complectitur Acta apoſtolorum et epiſtolas catholicas.—Ib. p. 75.

[b] Hanc opellam eſſe vere Pamphili martyris, non eſt quod dubitemus. ib. p. 78. in. [c] Vid. Fabr. Spic. Patr. ſeu Hippolyti Opera. P. ii. p. 205, &c.

[d] Exſtat eadem ἐκθεσις ſine nomine auctoris ante Commentarios Oecumenii in Acta, atque inde in melioribus Novi Teſtamenti editionibus; Rob. Stephani, Joh. Beecleri, et Joh. Millii: necnon in Dan. Heinſii ad Nov. Teſt. Exercitationibus. Fabr. ib. p. 209. [e] Ap. Bibl. Coiſlin. p. 78. [f] Ap. Laurent. Zacagn. Collectanea, p. 428.

[g] Vid. Zacagn. Præf. p. 61, 62. et Cave H. Lit. T. i. p. 446. Oxon. 1740.

[h] Ἀντεβλήθη δὲ τῶν πράξεων καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν τὸ βιβλίον πρὸς τὰ ἀκριβῆ ἀντιγραφα τῆς ἐν καισαρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκης συστᾶσιν τοῦ παμφίλου. ap Zacagn. ib. p. 513.

[i] Quod præcipuum eſt, editionem ſuam cum exemplari Pamphili martyris, in Bibliotheca Cæſarienſi aſſervato, contulit.—Inde error librariorum ortus eſt, qui cum legerent, ab Euthalio Codicem Pamphili conſultum eſſe, totum laborem Euthalii Pamphilo, tamquam potiori, adſcripſerunt. Wetſt. Proleg. p. 76.

IX. It

IX. It is now time that we reflect upon what we have met with concerning this martyr for the Chriſtian religion. There can be no queſtion but Pamphilus was an underſtanding and truly pious man. He was not diſtinguiſhed only by the laſt ſcene of his life, the magnanimity, fortitude, and patience of his confeſſions and martyrdom; but his whole life was a ſhining example of virtue. He muſt have been a perſon of a good family, and a large eſtate: but he deſpiſed the world, and renounced all earthly expectations. He was a zealous Chriſtian, and greatly delighted himſelf in the ſcriptures: he was liberal to the poor, kind to his acquaintance, and to all men who ſought to him: he had an earneſt deſire to promote learning and knowledge, eſpecially the knowledge of the holy ſcriptures, in men of every condition: and his diligence in all laudable undertakings was extraordinary. The teſtimonies to his virtue, which we have ſeen, are very agreeable: but if the large hiſtory of his life, written by Euſebius, were ſtill in being, very probably it would be more entertaining, and inform us of many things of an edifying nature. It is one of thoſe works of Euſebius, the loſs of which is much lamented by learned men.

Where can ſuch a man as this be found in the heathen world? how rare were ſuch examples under the Moſaic inſtitution, of men who employed their whole time in improving their own minds, and ſerving others, without noiſe and oſtentation, and without worldly views, and at laſt quietly reſigned their lives rather than diſown the principles by which they had been hitherto conducted and ſupported!

Nor was Pamphilus alone, though diſtinguiſhed. There were twelve in all, who at one and the ſame time bore the moſt ſignal teſtimony to truth. One [k] of whom was a ſervant of Pamphilus, by name Porphyry; who, though he was burned at a ſtake, bore that painful death, and all the preceding tortures appointed by the cruel governor, with wonderful fortitude and reſignation, ſerenity and patience. Not to inſiſt now on the many others in Paleſtine, Egypt, and other places, who about this time ſignalized themſelves by divers confeſſions, and at laſt by dying for their religion. Certainly theſe men, if they were not the beſt ſpeakers, were the beſt livers that ever the world ſaw: and in their death they are without rivals. Theſe holy and uſeful men, theſe confeſſors and martyrs, undaunted by all the evils which an unkind and miſtaken world ſometimes brings upon thoſe who are its greateſt bleſſings and beſt bene-

[k] Vid. Euſeb. de Mart. Pal. c. xi. p. 338, 339.

factors,

factors, were formed by the Chriſtian [l] religion when the evidences of it were near, and, if not true, their weakneſs might have been perceived. They were advanced by it to this eminence, when it was conſidered as an inſtitution of virtue, not an abſtruſe and ſpeculative ſcience; a doctrine from heaven, not a creature of the ſtate: and when Jeſus, their Lord and Maſter, was not only admired as a divine teacher, but was alſo eſteemed an example both in his life and in his death.

One thing, which frequently occurs in the authentic hiſtories of theſe primitive Chriſtians of note and diſtinction, deſerves eſpecial regard: I mean their affection and zeal for the holy ſcriptures. For their own ſake, for the ſake of others, and among them for our good, they were mightily taken up in reading, ſtudying, explaining, and commenting upon the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament; or in tranſcribing them, or correcting copies of them, and procuring exact editions, for the uſe of all ſorts of perſons. This is for our imitation, and for our ſatisfaction. It is what ought to be imitated by us: and it likewiſe affords us good reaſon to think that the books of holy ſcripture, which contain the revelations of the divine will to mankind, and are the rule of our faith, have been tranſmitted to us in great purity, without any remarkable alterations or deviations from the original writing.

X. Fabricius has publiſhed what he calls [m] Acts of the Paſſion of St. Pamphilus, taken out of his Life written by Euſebius of Cæſarea; from which I might have ſelected ſome things, and thereby poſſibly made my account of Pamphilus more agreeable to ſome: but I cannot perſuade myſelf to make any uſe of that piece, not being ſatisfied of it's genuineneſs.

Here it is not only ſaid that he was of a noble family, which is very likely, but alſo that [n] he had honourably diſcharged civil offices in his country: which, I think, cannot be eaſily reconciled with Euſebius's genuine account; who ſays that [o] Pamphilus re-

[l] Triumphus Dei eſt paſſio martyrum, et pro Chriſti nomine cruoris effuſio, et inter tormenta lætitia. Quum enim quis viderit tanta perſeverantia ſtare martyres atque torqueri, et in ſuis cruciatibus gloriari, odor notitiæ Dei diſſeminatur in Gentes, et ſubit tacita cogitatio, quod niſi verum eſſet evangelium, numquam ſanguine defenderetur. Neque enim delicata, et divitiis ſtudens ac ſecura confeſſio eſt; ſed in carceribus, in plagis, in perſecutionibus, in fame, in nuditate et ſiti. Hic triumphus Dei eſt, apoſtolorumque victoria. Hieron. ad Hedib. n. xi. T. iv. P. i. p. 184.

[m] Acta Paſſionis S. Pamphili martyris ex libris Euſebii Cæſarienſis de illius Vita, juxta MS. Medicæum Regis Chriſtianiſſimi. Ap. Fabr. Spic. Patr. ſeu Hippolyti Opp. T. ii. p. 217, &c. Conf. ejuſd. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 277, 278.

[n] ——επισημως τε ταις κατα την πατριδα πολιτειαις διαπρεψαντος. Act. Paſſ. ap. Fabr. p. 218, m. ——fuiſſet autem inſignis in republica gerenda in patria ſua. Certamen Pamphili ex Metaphr. ap. Valeſ. Ann. in Euſ. p. 179, b. in.

[o] ——κοσμικων ελπιδων ολιγωρια. Euſ. de Mart. P. c. xi. p. 336, B.

nounced

nounced all worldly expectations;' or, as Valesius translates the words, 'despised [p] all secular honours, to which he might have aspired.' Eusebius does actually say of Phileas, bishop of Thmuis, that [q] he had with reputation enjoyed all civil offices and employments in his country. Why did he not expressly say the same of Pamphilus, if true, when he spoke of his contempt of this world?

Again, it is said in these Acts that [r] Pamphilus renounced, or gave away all his paternal estate to the poor, and that he himself lived a philosophical kind of life, having nothing of his own: but Eusebius in his genuine account only says that [s] Pamphilus was very bountiful to the indigent, or gave liberally out of his substance for the relief of such persons. That particular appears to me contrary to all the ancient authentic accounts which we have of Pamphilus. If he had renounced, or given away all his estate, how should he have erected a library? How could he have transcribed numerous copies of the books of scripture, and Commentaries upon them? How should he and Eusebius put out a correct edition of the Seventy from Origen's Hexapla? In all these works Pamphilus must have been assisted by some rich Christian, as Origen was by Ambrose, if he had nothing of his own: but nothing of that kind is any where said by Eusebius or Jerom. On the contrary, it is all along supposed that he lived upon his own, and that from time to time he cheerfully laid out what he had, as occasions offered, in good works and useful designs of various kinds, as before seen.

So far as I can perceive, these Acts of Fabricius are much the same with those in Surius, Valesius, and others, as taken from Simeon Metaphrastes, which [t] were mentioned before: and therefore what I have said, or may say concerning either, ought to be understood as relating to both.

Fabricius supposeth these Acts to have been taken out of the books of Eusebius containing the life of Pamphilus. Valesius [u] thinks that those Acts in Metaphrastes were taken from Eusebius's book of the Martyrs of Palestine: which book, as we now have it in the common copies, is imperfect, as he says, and may be made more complete by these Acts in Metaphrastes.

[p] ——seu sæcularium honorum ad quos adspirare poterat despicientiam. Vales.

[q] ——διαπρεψας απ' ταις κατα την πατριδα πολιτειαις και λειτουργιαις. H. E. l. viii. p. 301, D. [r] ——αποδομενος ητοι τα εις κτησιν απο προγονων κτηματα γυμνοις, πτωχοις και πενησιν απασιν, αυτος εν ακτημοσι δικην ξενου——κ. λ. Fabr. ib. p. 220. m. Renuntians quidem iis quæ ad ipsum redibant a majoribus, nudis, mancis, et pauperibus distribuit. Ipse autem degebat in vita quæ nihil possidebat. Ex Metaphrast. ap. Vales. ib. p. 180, b. in.

[s] ——τη της ουσιας εις ενδειαν κεκτημενος. De Mart. Pal. c. xi. p. 336, B.

[t] See p. 337. [u] Vid. Vales. Ann. p. 180.

I rather

I rather think these Acts to be the invention of some idle impostor, who, according to his own fancy, enlarged and flourished upon Eusebius's genuine account of the martyrdom of Pamphilus and his companions, which we have in the eleventh chapter of his book concerning the Martyrs of Palestine. The whole of this piece, compared with that chapter of Eusebius, has such an appearance: Eusebius says of that company of martyrs, that 'x they resembled the prophets and apostles.' This writer[a] adds, 'and the patriarchs.' Eusebius, speaking of their last combat, says, 'it[b] was a most glorious spectacle;' as indeed it was. Whereupon this oratorical author says, 'there[c] might be seen 'in it at once persons of every age of the human life, and of 'every rank in the church, (meaning[d] faithful, catechumens, 'presbyters and deacons,) and of every condition and employment, and likewise a great variety of sufferings, and consequently different crowns for the victors.' This plan the author proposes at the beginning, and afterwards fills up as he sees good.

I think these considerations, added to the foregoing, may be sufficient to shew that this piece is a forgery.

The length of these critical remarks, I hope, will be excused. If we are not upon our guard, we shall have nothing but fable instead of history.

CHAP. LX.

PHILEAS, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt; and PHILOROMUS, receiver-general at Alexandria.

'PHILEAS, says[a] Jerom, of a city in Egypt called Thmuis, 'of a noble family, and large estate, accepted an episcopal 'charge. He wrote an excellent book in praise of the martyrs. 'After a long debate with the judge, who commanded him to 'sacrifice, he was beheaded for Christ under the same persecutor, 'by whose orders Lucian suffered at Nicomedia.'

x De M. Pal. c. xi p. 336, B.

a Ap. Fab. ib. p. 219, m. ap. Valef. Ann. p. 179, C. b Ubi supr. p. 336, A.

c ἀφρως εν αυτῳ παν ειδος ηλικιων τε σωματος, και ψυχων αγωγης, βιου τε και διαιτης διαφορα περιειληφοτα, βασανων τε ποικιλας ειδεσι, κ. λ. ap. Fabr. p. 217, ap. Valef. 179, C, d Ap. Fabr. p. 219, in. ap. Valef. p. 180, A.

e Phileas de urbe Ægypti, quæ vocatur Thmuis, nobili genere, et non parvis opibus, susceptο episcopatu elegantissimum librum de martyrum laude composuit. Et disputatione actorum habita adversus judicem, qui eum sacrificare cogebat, pro Christo capite truncatur, eodem in Ægypto persecutionis auctore, quo Lucianus Nicomediæ. De V. I. c. 78.

Jerom

Jerom means the emperor Maximin. But learned men are not agreed about the year of this good man's martyrdom. By Cave [b] it is placed in 311, by [c] Basnage in 311 or 312, by [d] Tillemont after 306, and before the edict in 311 or 312. The place of his martyrdom is now, I think, generally allowed to be [dd] Alexandria, though [e] Valesius once inclined to Thebais.

Phileas flourished, as Cave computes, near the end of the third century, about the year 296. It is likely that Thmuis was the place both of his nativity and his episcopate.

Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History has a long passage of a letter of Phileas to the Christians at Thmuis; which is generally reckoned to be the same that Jerom calls a book in Praise of the Martyrs.

Eusebius at the same time gives an account of the martyrdom of Philoromus. And there are still extant [f] Acts of the martyrdoms of these two persons, which are esteemed genuine and sincere by [g] Tillemont and [h] Ruinart: and indeed they are in the main agreeable to Eusebius: but yet it seems to me that they are interpolated: at least, I am of opinion that they are not to be relied upon as sincere and uncorrupt; for which reason I shall not make any use of them. But I shall immediately transcribe Eusebius's history of the death both of Phileas and Philoromus, with a part of the just-mentioned passage of the letter written by the former.

Our ecclesiastical historian then, having mentioned divers other instances of heroic courage and firmness of mind in the cause of truth, adds: 'And [i] these are indeed admirable: but 'yet more admirable are they who, distinguished by their wealth, 'high birth, honours, learning and eloquence, preferred before 'all other things true religion and faith in Jesus Christ. Among 'these was Philoromus, who bore no ordinary office, but was 'the emperor's receiver-general at Alexandria; and, as became 'his high station in the Roman government, daily heard causes, 'attended by a guard of soldiers. Phileas, likewise, bishop of 'the church at Thmuis, who had with reputation discharged all 'public offices in his own country, and was eminent for his 'philosophical learning, (when many of their kindred and 'other honourable friends, and some of the magistrates, and

[b] H. L. in Philea. [c] Ann. 312, n. 18. [d] Mem. Ecc. S. Phileas, &c. T. v. P. iii. p. 173, et note 5.

[dd] Vid. Basn. ib. n. 19. et Ruinart. Act. Mart. p. 494. [e] Annot. in Euseb. l. viii. c. 9. [f] Ap. Ruin. Act. M. p. 494—496. [g] As before, p. 163, &c.

[h] Ubi supra, p. 493, 494.

[i] Θαυμασιοι μεν ουν και ουτοι· εξαιρετοι δε εκεινοι θαυμασιωτεροι, οι πλουτῳ μεν και γενεσει, και δοξῃ, λογῳ τε και φιλοσοφιᾳ διαπρεψαντες, κ. λ. Eus. l. viii. c. 9. p. 301, C, D. 302.

'even

'even the judge himself advised them to take pity upon themselves, and to consider their wives and children, would not by all their entreaties be induced, out of a regard to their own life, to transgress the divine laws concerning denying and confessing our Saviour; but with a manly and courageous and philosophic mind, or rather with a religious heart truly devoted to God, having withstood all the threatenings and abuses of the judge, they were both beheaded.

'But, [k] forasmuch as we said that Phileas was eminent for learning, let him be produced as his own witness. At the same time he shews what he himself was, he will relate the martyrdoms that happened in his time at Alexandria much more exactly than we can do. Thus then he writes in his epistle to the people at Thmuis:' "All [l] these ensamples and "patterns and excellent admonitions being set before us in the "divine and sacred scriptures, the blessed martyrs among us, "without hesitation fixing the eye of their soul upon God over "all, and willingly embracing death for the sake of religion, "stedfastly adhered to their calling: knowing that [m] our Lord "Jesus Christ became man for our sake, that he might destroy "all sin, and afford us helps for obtaining eternal life: *For he "did not earnestly desire to appear like God, but made himself of no re-"putation, taking the form of a servant: and being found in fashion "as a man, he humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross:*" Philip. ii. 6, 7. "Wherefore [n] also these martyrs, full of Christ, "*earnestly desiring* (A) *the greatest gifts*, (1 Cor. xii. 31,) endured, "not once only, but some of them often, all kinds of pains and "tortures that can be invented; and, though the officers did "their utmost by words and deeds to terrify them, they were "not disheartened, *because perfect love casteth out fear:*" 1 John iv. 18.

I omit the rest which may be seen in Eusebius himself, who, having finished his extracts, adds: 'These [o] are the words of a 'true philosopher, and a martyr filled with the love of God: 'which, when in prison, before the final sentence of the judge, 'he sent to the people under his care; partly informing them

[k] Ib. cap. 10, p. 332, B. &c.

[l] Τουτων απαντων υποδειγματων ημιν και επιγραμμων, και καλων γνωρισματων εν ταις θειαις και ιεραις γραφαις, κ. λ. ib. C.

[m] ——τον μεν κυριον ημων ιησουν χριστον ειρηται ενανθρωπησαντα δι' ημας, ινα πασαν μεν αμαρτιαν εκκοψη, εφοδια δε της εις την αιωνιον ζωην εισοδου ημιν καταβηται· ου γαρ αρπαγμον ηγησατο το ειναι ισα θεω· αλλ' εαυτον εκενωσε μορφην δουλου λαβων. Ib. p. 302, C. D.

[n] Διο και ζηλωσαντες τα μειζονα χαρισματα οι χριστοφοροι μαρτυρες: ib. D.

(A) St. Paul there says, the best gifts, τα χαρισματα τα κρειττονα. But afterwards ch. xiii. 13, he says, The greatest of these is charity, μειζων δε τουτων η αγαπη.

[o] Ib. p. 304, B.

what were his own circumſtances, partly exhorting them to 'hold faſt the faith of Chriſt, even after his death, which was 'then near at hand.'

Here are, I think, three references to books of the New Teſtament; the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, and the epiſtle to the Philippians, and the firſt of St. John. We ſee by this ſhort paſſage, what great regard the Chriſtians of thoſe times had for the holy ſcriptures; and how apt they were to clothe their own thoughts in expreſſions borrowed from them.

I ſuppoſe likewiſe, that none will diſpute my interpretation of that phraſe, which in our Engliſh tranſlation is rendered, 'thought 'it not robbery to be equal with God;' for it is here evidently uſed and underſtood by Phileas, as expreſſive of our Lord's humility, not of his dignity and greatneſs. In the like manner have we already obſerved that expreſſion underſtood by ſeveral (B) ancient Chriſtian writers.

I would juſt obſerve that, at the end of the paſſage cited by Euſebius, Phileas quotes ſome precepts of the Old Teſtament, as [p] ſacred ſcripture.

Phileas is elſewhere mentioned by [q] Euſebius among other biſhops of Egypt, who ſuffered martyrdom in Diocleſian's perſecution.

CHAP. LXI.

PETER, biſhop of Alexandria, and the MELETIANS.

I. *Peter, his hiſtory and works, and teſtimony to the ſcriptures.* II. *The Meletians, their hiſtory and time.*

I. IN the year of our Lord 300, Peter ſucceeded Theonas at Alexandria. In St. Jerom's Chronicle [a] he is called the ſixteenth biſhop of that church, and is ſaid to have had a glorious martyrdom in the ninth year of the perſecution: but St. Jerom has not given this biſhop of Alexandria a place in his Catalogue among other eminent writers of the church. Nor do I remember that

(B) See Vol. ii. chap. xxxviii. num. xxviii. 12. and in this Vol. p. 166, 241, 242, 321.

[p] πείσεται γὰρ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἡμῖν παραγγελλόμενα. ib. p. 304, B.

[q] l. viii. c. 13, p. 308, C. [a] Alexandrinæ eccleſiæ ſextusdecimus poſt Theonam epiſcopus ordinatus Petrus, qui poſtea nono perſecutionis anno glorioſe martyrium perpetravit. Hieron. Chr. p. 179.

his

he has any where quoted him. However Peter is now generally reckoned an author. Several things are aſcribed to him.

Penitential [b] Canons, ſuppoſed to [c] have been drawn up by him in the fourth year of the perſecution under Dioclesian, in the year of Chriſt 306, for the ſake of ſuch as had ſome way lapſed under the ſeverities they had endured, or through fear of ſuffering.

A work, entitled [d] De Divinitate, quoted in the councils of Epheſus and Chalcedon.

A Diſcourſe [e] of Eaſter, which is not [f] allowed by all to be his.

Peter is ſeveral times mentioned by Euſebius in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. It appears to me worth the while to tranſcribe all his paſſages; though ſome notice has been already taken of them at the beginning of the articles of Theonas and Pierius.

'Theonas, [g] having borne the epiſcopal office nineteen years, 'was ſucceeded by Peter, who obtained great [h] honour during 'his epiſcopate, which he held twelve years. He governed the 'church three years before the perſecution. The reſt of his 'time he paſſed in a more ſtrict and mortified courſe of life, but 'ſtill without neglecting the common good of the churches; 'for which reaſon, in the ninth year of the perſecution, he was 'beheaded, and obtained the crown of martyrdom.'

In another place, giving an account of thoſe preſidents of the churches, who had demonſtrated the ſincerity of their faith by laying down their lives in the late perſecution, he ſays: 'But [i] 'of thoſe, who in Alexandria, and throughout Egypt and The-'bais, glorioufly finiſhed their courſe, none more fit to be firſt 'mentioned than Peter, biſhop of Alexandria, a [k] moſt excel-'lent teacher of the Chriſtian doctrine: and, among his preſby-'ters, Fauſtus, Dius, and Ammonius, were perfect martyrs of 'Chriſt; as were alſo Phileas, Heſychius, Pachymius and The-'odorus, biſhops of divers churches in Egypt.'

Once more: 'About [l] the ſame time alſo Peter, who with ſo

[b] Vid. Labbei Concil. T. i. p. 955—968. [c] Scripſit quarto perſecutionis Diocletianeæ anno, Chriſti 306, eorum cauſa, qui in prædicta perſecutione lapſi eſſent, librum de Pœnitentia: ex quo ſuperſunt hodie canones 15, variis pœnitentium caſibus accommodati. Cav. H. L. in Petro. [d] Alium item librum de Divinitate. Cav. ib. Vid. Labb. Concil. Tom. iv. p. 286, C. D. E. [e] Scripſit etiam tractatum de Paſchate. Teſtantur id, quæ habemus hodie hujus operis fragmenta. Cav. ib. p. 160. [f] Vid. Cav. ut ſupra, Baſnag. Ann. 306, n. xiii. f.

[g] Euſ. H. E. l. vii. c. 32, p. 289, 290.

[h] ——ει τοις μαλιστα και αυτος διαπρεψας εφ' ολοις δυοκαιδεκα ετεσιν. Ib. p. 289, D.

[i] Ib. l. viii. c. 13, p. 308, B. C.

[k] Θειον τι χρημα διδασκαλων της εν χριστω θεοσεβειας. ibid. [l] Ib. l. ix. c. 6.

'much reputation presided over the church at Alexandria, an [m] 'ornament to the episcopal character, both for the holiness of 'his life and his laborious application in studying and explain- 'ing the sacred scriptures, without any crime of any kind laid 'to his charge, beyond all expectation, on a sudden, for no 'other reason but the will of Maximin, was taken up and be- 'headed.'

Our bishop is several times mentioned and called martyr by [n] St. Athanasius. I shall take notice of two places. In one of them he observes: 'Peter [o] was bishop here before the perse- 'cution, and in the persecution was also a martyr.' In the other he intimates, that Peter suffered at the end of the persecution, or even after it was over, as his manner of writing may be thought to imply. Which too seems to be agreeable to what Eusebius said just now of Peter's having been arrested and beheaded on a sudden, and beyond all expectation. The words of Athanasius are these: 'But [p] when the persecution had ceased, 'and the blessed bishop Peter had suffered martyrdom, Antony 'removed, and returned to his monastery.'

Sozomen says that [q] Peter fled in the time of the persecution: I suppose he must mean some retirement, which was free from blame. Sozomen himself does not pass any censure upon it: and Eusebius has represented Peter's episcopate as so illustrious, and every way worthy of commendation, that it is not easy to admit the suspicion of any improper conduct. However, that expression of Sozomen, and what Eusebius says of Peter's strict course of life, though without at all neglecting the care of the churches, may lead us to think that, for a large part of the persecution, he lived in some private place unknown to the instruments of the persecution; where however Christian people had access to him, and received his advices and instructions.

Theodoret styles Peter [r] a most excellent person, and a victorious combatant, who in the time of wicked tyrants obtained the crown of martyrdom. Again, he calls him [s] divine Peter.

I do not intend to make any long extracts out of Peter's book of Canons, or Canonical Epistle, the only piece of his that remains, if indeed it be his. I would however observe, that he

[m] Θειον επισκοπων χρημα, βιω αριστης τε επεκα, και της των ιερων λογων συνεσκησεως, κ. λ. ib. p. 351, C.

[n] Apol. contr. Arian. n. xi. p. 133, D. Ep. ad Episc. Æg. et Lib. n. 23.

[o] Apol. contr. Arian. n. 59.

[p] Επειδη δε λοιπον ο διωγμος επαυσατο, και μεμαρτυρηκει ο μακαριτης επισκοπος Πετρος, απεδημησεν, κ. λ. Vit. S. Anton. n. 47.

[q] ——φευγοντος δια τον τοτε διωγμον. Soz. l. i. c. 24.

[r] ——μετα πετρον εκεινον τον νικηφορον αγωνιστην, ος επι των δυσσεβων εκεινων τυραννων τω μαρτυριω στεφανον απεδησατο. Thdrt. l. i. c. 2, p. 7.

[s] τω θειοτατω πετρω, κ. λ. Id. l. i. c. 9, in.

resolves

reſolves all his caſes by the authority of the holy ſcriptures: and that here are cited the goſpels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; the Acts of the apoſtles, very largely; ſeveral epiſtles of Paul, particularly that to the Hebrews, as [t] the apoſtle's, intending Paul; and the firſt epiſtle of John. In the fragment of his book De Divinitate are cited [u] the beginning of John's goſpel, ſeveral epiſtles of Paul, and the firſt of Peter.

II. In the time of Peter aroſe the Meletian controverſy, or ſchiſm, as it is uſually called; which, as [x] Tillemont obſerves, ſubſiſted for the ſpace of an hundred and fifty years, not being extinct in the time of Theodoret and Socrates.

I do not reckon myſelf obliged to give a particular hiſtory of that affair; but I beg liberty to ſay that I cannot eaſily aſſent to Athanaſius's account of the riſe and occaſion of it, which is to this purpoſe: 'Peter [y] in a full ſynod of biſhops depoſed Mele-'tius, an Egyptian biſhop; who was convicted of ſeveral crimes, 'and particularly of having ſacrificed. Meletius neither ap-'pealed to another ſynod, nor took any pains to vindicate him-'ſelf, but preſently made a ſchiſm. And to this day [z] his fol-'lowers, inſtead of Chriſtians, are called Meletians. From that 'time Meletius took great liberties in calumniating Peter, and 'then Achillas.'

There are ſeveral conſiderations tending to weaken the credit of this account: 1. Athanaſius is a prejudiced perſon. After the council of Nice, if not before, the Meletians [a] joined intereſts with the Arians; and certainly they were always enemies to the biſhop of Alexandria. 2. Athanaſius writes with paſſion. Meletius, he ſays, was convicted of many crimes; but he does not name them: he only mentions ſacrificing. Nor is it likely that the Meletians quitted the name of Chriſtians. They were often called Meletians by others, and ſometimes poſſibly by themſelves: but to ſay that inſtead of Chriſtians they were called Meletians is invidious. How unreaſonable is this in Athanaſius, when Meletius and his followers at firſt, and for a good while, if not all along, agreed with him in every point of doctrine! Epiphanius [b], to whom [c] others aſſent, expreſsly

[t] —— ειμη, ως λεγει αποστολος, επιλιποι ε' αν ημας διηγουμενος ο χρονος. [Hebr. xi. 32] Can ix. ap. Labb. T. i. p. 962.

[u] Ap. Labb. Conc. T. iv. p. 468, C. D. E. [x] St. Pierre d'Alexandrie. art. 8. Mem. Ec. T. v. P. iii. p. 111.

[y] Ουτος Μελιτιος, απο της αιγυπτου λεγομενης επισκοπης, επι πολλαις ελεγχθεις παρανομιαις, και θυσια, εν κοινη συνοδω των επισκοπων καθειλεν, κ.λ. Athan. ap. contr. Arian. n. 97, T. i. p. 177.

[z] Και αντι χριστιανων, μελιτιανοι μεχρι νυν οι της εκεινου μεριδος ονομαζονται. ibid.

[a] Vid. Socrat. H. E. l. i. c. 6, p. 14, Sozom. l. ii. c. 21. [b] Σχισμα εποιησε, ειμην μεταλλαγμενος την πιστιν γεγενηται. Epiph. H. 68, n. i. Vid. ib. reliqua.

[c] Αλλα ταυτα μεν τη εκκλησια ζητουσι. Theodoret.

preſsly ſays that Meletius made a ſchiſm, but attempted not any innovation in the faith. Nor does (A) Athanaſius differ from them. 3. If Meletius had been convicted of apoſtaſy, or of ſacrificing to idols in time of perſecution, the ſentence paſſed upon him and his adherents in the council of Nice would have been different. What it was may be ſeen in ſeveral [d] ancient writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. 4. Meletius [e] always complained of injuſtice. 5. And moreover [f] he had a numerous party on his ſide, no leſs than [g] eight-and-twenty biſhops, and many good men: which could not have been, if he had been known to have fallen ſo greatly in the time of the perſecution. 6. There are other accounts, and Athanaſius is almoſt ſingular. Socrates [h] indeed ſpeaks to the like purpoſe, becauſe he tranſcribes Athanaſius: but, according to Epiphanius, Meletius [i] was a confeſſor: and the controverſy between the biſhop of Lycopolis in Thebais and the biſhop of Alexandria was owing to their different ſentiments concerning the manner of receiving ſuch as had lapſed in the perſecution, Peter [k] being more mild and merciful than Meletius. Sozomen makes the fault of Meletius to have been this; that, [l] when Peter had fled, Meletius uſurped a power of ordaining where he had no right: nor is there any thing laid to his charge by the council of Nice, as the ground and reaſon of their ſentence, but [m] the raſhneſs and preſumption of his ordinations, and the obſtinacy and contumacy of him and his adherents in maintaining them. Theodoret indeed does in one place ſay, following Athanaſius, it is likely that [n] Meletius was convicted of ſome crimes: but he does not ſeem to know what they were, nor to have any good aſſurance of the facts. And, in another place, ſpeaking of Meletius, all he lays to his charge is ambition, or love of dominion, [o] in ordaining biſhops

Theodoret. H. F. l. iv. c. 7. p. 239. Αλλ' ετερως μεν εδοξε των της ευσεβειας δογματων εκτετυπωται. Id. ib. p. 240.

(A) This appears, in that Athanaſius calls the Arians heretics, the Meletians ſchiſmatics only, and thus diſtinguiſheth their ſeveral crimes. Αλλ' οι μεν προ ολιγου καινοτομησαντες και αρτι εταν σχισματικοι γεγονασιν· ε. δε προ τριακοντα και εξ ετων αποδειχθεντες αιρετικοι, κ. λ. Ep. ad Epiſc. Æg. et Lib. n. 22, T. i. p. 293.

[d] Vid. Socrat. l. i. c. 9. Sozom. l. i. c. 24. Thdrt. H. F. l. iv. c. 7.

[e] κεκλησθαι μεν ελεγεν εαυτον, κ. λ. Socrat. l. i. c. 6, p. 14, C. Conf. Thdrt. l. i. c. 9, in.

[f] Vid. Epiph. H. 68, n. 2, 3, et 5.

[g] Vid. Athan. ap. contr. Arian. n. 71, p. 187.

[h] Socr. ubi ſupr. p. 14, B. Vid. not. c.

[i] Epiph. ib. n. 1, 2.

[k] Ο δε αγιωτατος πετρος ευσπλαγχνος ων, κ. λ. Epiph. ib. n. 3, in.

[l] ——πετρου——φευγοντος δια τον διωγμον, τας διαφερουσας αυτω χειροτονιας υφηρπασε. Sozom. l. i. c. 24.

[m] Ελειπετο δε το κατα την προπετειαν μελιτιου, και των υπ' αυτου χειροτονηθεντων. ap. Socr. l. i. c. 9, p. 28. —— λογιζομενη το προπετες και ετοιμον εις χειροτονιας μελιτιε, και των τα αυτα φρονησαντων. Sozom. ubi ſupra. Vid. et Thdrt. l. i. cap. 9.

[n] ——επι τισι παρανομιαις διελεγχθεις, κ. λ. Thdrt. l. i. c. 9, in.

[o] Μελετιος της εκκλησιας κατα της αλεξανδρεως τον μεγαλα φρονησασας πεμπεται; πολλαις πολεσι και επισκοπας εχειροτονησε, και πρεσβυτερους, και —καινης αιρεσεως προσεπενοει, αλλα ταυτα μεν τη εκκλησια φρενων. το δε της φιλαρχιας εστιν εξαμετρος παθος. Id. H. Fab. l. iv. c. 7.

and

and other clergy out of his own province, where he had no juriſdiction.

Upon the whole, I think there is not ſufficient ground to admit the truth of what Athanaſius ſays of Meletius's ſacrificing. It is more likely that it is a ſtory forged by ſome angry people with a view to diſcredit the Meletian cauſe; which ſtory Athanaſius too readily received.

Samuel Baſnage, of Flottemanville, in his Exercitations publiſhed in 1692, diſputes [p] the truth of that account: but in his annals, publiſhed in 1706, he writes [q] as if he had quite forgot what he had once ſaid; which needs not, however, to be reckoned very ſtrange in an author who writes a great deal.

In compoſing the argument here offered, I have had no regard to that in Baſnage's Exercitations, which I did not obſerve till afterwards. Theſe thoughts aroſe in my mind in reading Athanaſius, and comparing him with other ancient writers.

It is diſputed among learned men when this ſchiſm began. Baronius [r] placeth it in 306: Baſnage [s] in his Annals, before cited, contends for the ſame date: Pagi is altogether [t] for 301, or 302: Tillemont [u] carefully examines the merits of each opinion without determining the point.

It ſeems to me, that all the accounts and teſtimonies above cited, which ſpeak of this controverſy, as ariſing in the time of Peter, and after the beginning of the perſecution, ſhould lead us to pitch upon the year 306, or thereabout: when Peter, as is ſuppoſed, put out his Canons, and, as is likely, began to live more retired than he had done; then, probably, Meletius began to ordain biſhops, and other clergy, where he ſhould not.

The only thing that leads to the year 300, or 301, or 302, is a paſſage of Athanaſius in a piece ſuppoſed to have been written in [x] 356; where he ſays that [y] the Meletians had been ſchiſmatics above five-and-fifty years. Upon which I would obſerve, that poſſibly the numbers in Athanaſius have been altered; or he

[p] Hoc affirmat Athanaſius,——tantique teſtis auctoritas apud me plurimum valet. ——Verumtamen nonnullas de Meletii idololatria dubitandi cauſas ſuggerunt Theodoretus, Epiphanius, Nicæna Synodus.——Hæc ſunt quæ de Meletiana idololatria ſuſpenſum detinent.——Baſn. Exercit. p. 307, 308. Ultraj. 1692.

[q] Vera prædicaſſe Socratem, teſtis eſt omni exceptione major Athanaſius.—— At falſo contaminari Epiphanii narrationem extra dubium eſt. Cum enim Epiphanio antiquior, et rerum Ægypti, ubi ſchiſma Meletianum exortum eſt, longe peritior Athanaſius ſcriptum reliquit, Meletium idolis ſacrificaſſe, fide quoque dignior eſt. Baſn. Ann. Pol. Ec. A. 206, n. 14. Roterod. 1706.

[r] Baron. Ann. 306, n. 44.

[s] Baſn. Ann. 306, n. 15.

[t] Ann. 306, n. 29, 30.

[u] Mem. Ec. S. Pierre d'A. art. 8, et not. 8, T. v. P, iii. p. 111, et 301.

[x] Vid. Athanaſ. Opp. Ed. Bened. T. i. p. 177, not. c. et p. 269.

[y] ὁ γαρ ολιγος ἐστιν ὁ χρονος· αλλ' οἱ μεν πρὸ πεντηκοντα και πεντε ἐτων σχισματικοι γεγονασιν· οἱ δὲ πρὸ τριακοντα και ἑξ ἐτων ἀπεδειχθησαν αἱρετικοι, και της ἐκκλησιας ἀπεβλιθησαν ἐκ χειροτωσιας της οικουμενικης συνοδου. Ep. ad Epiſc. Æg. et Lib. n. 22, p. 293.

might write in haſte, and miſtake through forgetfulneſs: or, finally, it is not impoſſible that, for ſome reaſon or other affecting his mind at that time, he might chuſe to aſcribe a very early date to that ſchiſm. I add, that in the ſame place Athanaſius ſays, 'It [7] was ſix-and-thirty years ſince the Arians were 'declared heretics, and caſt out of the church by the judgment 'of an œcumenical council.' Which might induce us to think that piece muſt have been written in the year 361 or 362, that is, ſix-and-thirty years after the council of Nice, when the Arians were condemned; if there were not ſome cogent reaſon ſhewing that epiſtle to have been written in 356: and, [8] notwithſtanding what the Benedictine editors ſay, it is more reaſonable to carry on the number, thirty-ſix, through the whole ſentence, than to confine it to the firſt part of it, *declared heretics*, and to underſtand thereby ſome declaration, different from that of the council there ſpoken of. I do not therefore ſee any good reaſon why this paſſage of Athanaſius ſhould oblige us to think the Meletian controverſy aroſe before the year 306.

[7] See note 7. [8] Verum hunc locum par eſt ita diſtinguere, ut verbum, ἀπεδείχθησαν, ſunt declarati, ad Alexandrum Alexandrinum referantur, qui nimirum in Synodo Alexandrina Arium hæreticum primus declaravit; cætera autem quæ ſequuntur, Niceno attribuantur Synodo. Ubi ſupr. p. 269, n. 4.

An ANSWER to Mr. Jackson's Remarks upon the fifth volume of the firſt edition of this work.

See the Belief of a future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews, p. 120, &c.

I. *The time of Sabellianiſm.* II. *The name of the preſbyter of Rome, rival of Cornelius: whether Novatus or Novatianus.*

I. Mr. Jackson is not a little diſpleaſed at my placing the riſe of Sabellianiſm ſo late as only two or three years before A. D. 257, when Dionyſius of Alexandria wrote to pope Xyſtus upon that ſubject: though I am not therein ſingular, but only maintain the general opinion of learned men about it, as I ſhewed p. 72. To authors there mentioned I ſhall add one or two more: Hæreſis Sabelliana erupit circa A. C. 257. *J. A. Fabr. Annot. ad Philaſt. cap. liv. de Sabellio.* Sabellius, Euſebio teſte lib. 7. Hiſtor. cap. vi. errores Ptolemaide in urbe Pentapoleos circiter annum 257, ſpargere cœpit. *Benedictin. not. ad Ambroſ. Tom. ii. p. 445.* Scribit Euſebius libr. Ecc. Hiſt. 7. Sabellii hæreſim ſub tempora Decii ——audiri cœpiſſe, cum Romanæ ſedi præeſſet Stephanus, aut Sixtus: hoc eſt, circa annum Chriſti ccl vii. &c. *Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii. l. i. c. 6, §. iii.*

Ide

I do not think myself obliged to say a great deal more here in vindication of that date: I can rely upon my argument from Dionysius, exhibited p. 234, 235; and I persuade myself that they, who will read it and carefully attend to it, will not think that Mr. Jackson has weakened it by what he has said, but has left it still in full force.

Mr. Jackson says, p. 121, that 'Dionysius, in his letter to Xystus, gives no account of the rise of Sabellianism, but only of it's being greatly spread.' But my argument does not depend upon that, but rather upon Dionysius's not having sooner sent an account of that affair to his correspondents at Rome; which he would have done if the controversy had been on foot a good while before: nevertheless, it happens that there are expressions in that letter of Dionysius which imply that it was then but newly moved, advanced, or agitated. Περι γαρ του λογου ητησατο εν τη πολεμικη της ανεπαρκειας δογματος. *Ap. Eusch. H. E. l.* vii. c. 6.

Besides, what avails it for Mr. Jackson to insist so much upon it, that Dionysius gives Xystus an account of the *increase*, not of the *rise* of Sabellianism, when the increase supposes the rise? And it is the spreading of a doctrine that induces men to take notice of it, and send accounts of it to their friends. If Sabellianism had not spread in the country near him, Dionysius would not have thought it needful to make any mention of it in a letter to one at a distance: this therefore was what he was naturally lead to speak of in his letter to Xystus.

Farther, Mr. Jackson says, p. 122, 123, 'Sabellius himself was undoubtedly noted many years before; and, upon the death of his master Noetus, about A. D. 220, spread his doctrine in several parts of Libya.' p. 24. Sabellius was the most noted——the most famous disciple of Noetus.'

These things are said with a good deal of positiveness: but upon what grounds? where is the evidence? *Tillemont Mem. Ec. T. iv. Les Sabellien*, observes: 'Philaster and Augustine say that Sabellius was a disciple of Noetus, which is not impossible, though the Greeks say nothing of it.' Philaster's words are: Sabellius post illum [Noetum] in Libya discipulus ejus similitudinem sui doctoris itidem secutus est errorem. Augustine's words are: Sabelliani ab illo Noeto, quem ipsi memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur. Nam et discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium: so that he speaks doubtfully about it. One might call Sabellius a disciple of Noetus, as he came not very long after him, and because of the resemblance of their opinions: but if it was a thing well known that Sabellius was a scholar of Noetus, why should the Greeks omit to mention it? And if they write nothing about it, how should the Latins know it? The silence of Greek authors is of much more importance than the sayings and reports of a few Latin writers. Had not Epiphanius and Theodoret, who write of heresies, and particularly of Noetianism and Sabellianism, an opportunity to know where Sabellius learned his doctrine if they knew it? Theodoret *H. F. l. iii. c. 3*, mentions some predecessors of Noetus, and says that Callistus upheld his opinion after him: Τουτοις μετα τουτον υπερεσπισε Καλλιστος. But says nothing here or elsewhere, that I remember, of Sabellius being a disciple of Noetus. Epiphanius, *H. 62. n. 1*, says that Sabellius's doctrine was the same with that of the Noetians, except-

'ing

'ing only a few things.' Why does he not add that Sabellius learned his doctrine from Noetus, if he knew that also to be true?

Mr. Jackson says, p. 121, 'There is no evidence that Sabellianism 'had it's rise in Ptolemais in Egypt.' Where then had it it's rise? It is generally concluded by learned men, from Eusebius's account of Dionysius's letter to Xystus, that it had it's rise in Ptolemais. Sabellius himself is continually spoken of by the ancients, who give an account of him and his doctrine as a Libyan or African: so Philaster before cited: and so Theodoret, *H. F. l. ii. c.* 9. Σαβελλιος δε ο λιβυς ο πενταπολιτης. If Sabellianism had it's rise in Asia Minor, at Ephesus, or Smyrna, or thereabout, why have we no account of any writers of that country opposing it? Athanasius says that in the time of Dionysius some of the bishops of Pentapolis held the doctrine of Sabellius, which occasioned his looking into the matter. Εν πενταπολει της απω λιβυης τινες αυτα των των επισκοπων εφρονησαν τα σαβελλιου. *De Sent. Dionys. n.* 5, *p.* 246. And Theodoret, in his article of Sabellius, takes particular notice that Dionysius of Alexandria wrote against him. If this principle had been first taught by Sabellius in some other parts before it was known in Egypt, why does not Dionysius himself; why did not Eusebius, nor Athanasius, nor Epiphanius, nor Theodoret, give any hint of it?

Mr. Jackson, p. 125, still insists upon 'the authority of two ancient 'chronologers, Isidore Hispalensis, and Ado Viennensis, who in their 'chronicles agree to place Sabellius about A. D. 220.' And indeed he had need to call them *ancient*. Nevertheless Mr. Jackson does not deny the truth of what I said, p. 235, that they are Latin authors; 'and that they wrote, one of them in Spain in the seventh, the other 'in Gaul, in the ninth century:' that is, the earliest of them several hundred years after the supposed time of Sabellius. The authority of such chroniclers undoubtedly is very great. I likewise argued from several considerations, to which the reader is referred, that they confounded Noetus and Sabellius.

But Mr. Jackson's strongest argument seems to be, that his author could not write his *excellent* book on the Trinity, p. 126, his *incomparable and invaluable* book, p. 132, after his schism; which yet he must have done if Sabellianism had not it's rise till after 251. Nec, quantum cogito, verisimile est, illum condidisse tam egregium librum,—postquam in schisma detestandum se demersisset. *Præf.* p. 18. But the force of this argument depends upon a degree of uncharitableness in a man's mind, for which I can see no ground: a heretic, or schismatic, we may suppose, cannot write a good book in favour of his errors, or wrong conduct: but if he hold any truths in common with other men, I do not see why he may not be able to write well in defence of them: and I readily assent to Nicephorus in what he says of Eusebius, the famous bishop of Cæsarea; that he left many writings useful for the church, though he often favours Arianism. Και αλλα διαφορα συγγραμματα καλλιστα, ωφελιμα τη εκκλησια εισφερεται· ωστε τοιουτος ων· εν τοσοις φαινεται τα αριστα φρονησων. *Nic. H. E. l. vi. c.* 37, *p.* 446, *c.*

I have here added thus much concerning the time of Sabellius, to please Mr. Jackson; though I am of opinion that what I said formerly was sufficient.

II. I must take some notice of what Mr. Jackson says concerning the name of Novatus, otherwise called Novatianus.

I offered five arguments; the first of which was, that 'this presbyter of Rome is generally called Novatus by the Greek writers.' This argument I did not much labour, because I supposed it to be allowed by learned moderns, that the Greek authors do generally so write his name. However, Mr. Jackson affirms, p. 131, that 'my opinion is 'contrary to the testimony of the most ancient Greek, as well as Latin writers.' Let us then see how Mr. Jackson shews this.

He allows, p. 126, that 'Eusebius generally calls him Novatus; and the historian Socrates likewise after Eusebius.' But why does he say *after Eusebius?* Doubtless Socrates had read Eusebius: but was he not also well acquainted with many of the Novatians at Constantinople? And had they not there divers learned men, who could inform him in the history of their founder?

At p. 126, Mr. Jackson says that 'though Eusebius himself calls 'him Novatus, he has preserved his true name in the seventh book of 'his Ecclesiastical History, and eighth chapter; where he is called No-'vatian in the letter which his contemporary, Dionysius bishop of 'Alexandria, wrote concerning his schism to his namesake of Rome.' But I should think that Mr. Jackson might be reasonably led to conclude that must be a wrong reading, even though it should be allowed to be ancient. For the title of that chapter is, 'Of the Heresy of 'Novatus:' and at the end of the preceding chapter Eusebius, introducing that letter to Dionysius of Rome, says that 'in it Dionysius of 'Alexandria writes concerning Novatus after this manner.' Γραφει δε εν μεν ετερα, των καθ' ὁτον νοβατον μνημονευων εν τουτοις. And in the 43d chapter of the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History, giving an account of the affair at Rome, both Eusebius and Cornelius himself, in his letter to Fabius, often mention the Roman presbyter by the name *Novatus:* it must therefore be probable that in one place an error has crept in contrary to the original reading: accordingly, in the Latin translation of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, printed at Basil in 1611, or 1612, is *Novatus*; the translator, I suppose, taking it for granted that the other was a wrong reading: Novato quidem merito succensemus. Moreover, in the 45th chapter of the same sixth book of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, is a letter of Dionysius to the presbyter of Rome himself, where he calls him *Novatus:* Διονυσιος νοβατω τω αδελφω χαιρειν. Indeed as that letter is given by Niceph. l. vi. c. 4, it has Novatianus: but surely Eusebius's authority is better than that of so late a writer, if indeed we have his authority for it: but probably that reading did not come from Nicephorus himself; for he too, as well as other Greek authors, writes his name Novatus. *Vid. Niceph. l. vi. c. 3, T. i. p. 397. d. cap. 5, p. 394, c. 6, p. 395, et 396, c. 7, p. 397, B, &c. c. 35, p. 436, G.* Και σωκρατης ο εκ ταυατη. —— And, even introducing Dionysius's letter to Novatus, where we now have *Novatian*, Nicephorus says, 'that letter was written to Novatus.' Οπερια δε και αυτω εκειτω νοβατω την επιστολην διασαλευσαι γεγραφε, παραθεσθαι δικαιον, *L. 6. c. 4. p. 393. D.* Insomuch that, though in the Greek copies of Nicephorus it is νοβατιανω, the Latin translator, sensible it must be a wrong reading, puts

puts *Novatus*: Dionysius Novato fratri salutem: and so it is likewise in Rufinus's ancient Latin translation of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, as was shewn formerly: see p. 249.

I hope I have now at once shewn that Dionysius of Alexandria, and Nicephorus, as well as Eusebius, write the name of the presbyter of Rome, *Novatus*.

Still Mr. Jackson says, p. 127, that 'in the Chronography of 'Georgius Syncellus, p. 374, Dionysius calls the Roman presbyter 'whom he wrote Novatian.' But then in the margin is put Νοβατος as a various reading, or a correction of the text, as supposed to be corrupt, and with good reason; for elsewhere very often, perhaps forty or fifty times, that author writes *Novatus*.

Mr. Jackson says, p. 127, 'And Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History, *l. iii. c.* 8. calls the Roman presbyter Novatian, and so is expressly against Mr. L——, though he has alleged him on his side.' But let any attentive person judge whether Mr. Jackson has reason: what he says here: in that place indeed Sozomen has Novatian: but in another *Novatus*. Μαλιστα μεν γαρ, μαθησεως της παλαιας ειδως τα ταυτης φρονουντα, *l. iv. c.* 21, *p.* 571, *D*. And in another place he expressly says that the name of the leader of the sect was Novatus. Ναυατος μεν γαρ, ην ερ πρεσβυτερος της αιρεσεως. κ. λ. *l. vi. c.* 24, *p.* 670. *A*. It is likely therefore that, in the place referred to by Mr. Jackson, we have a wrong reading; for it is not reasonable to think that in that one place Sozomen intended to contradict himself, or that he used a different writing of the name from Eusebius and Socrates: but, however that be, should not the other places have been taken notice of by Mr. Jackson? Was Mr. Jackson in the right to conceal them from his readers? And was not I in the right to reckon Sozomen on my side, when he has left at least two places to one for me?

At p. 249, I mentioned Athanasius among other Greek authors writing *Novatus*. And certainly he is an *ancient* author: nor does Mr. Jackson attempt to weaken his testimony: I referred to but one passage in Athanasius; but I might have referred to others; and he is a good witness, having lived some while in the west: and that he means the presbyter of Rome is apparent. *Vid. Ap. cont. Arian. n.* 25, *p.* 122. *E. F. Vid. et Ep. iv. ad Serap. n.* 13 *p.* 704. *E*. The author of the Paschal Chronicle, giving the history of Dionysius of Alexandria and the Roman presbyter, calls him Novatus several times. Επι τας αφεσεις ελθοντες ναυατος της ρωμαιων εκκλησιας πρεσβυτερος ελεγεν. κ. λ. *p.* 271, *C. vid. ib. D*. 272. *A*. Theodoret expressly makes Novatus presbyter of Rome and head of the sect. Ο δε ναυατος ρωμαιων της εκκλησιας πρεσβυτερος ην. *H. Fab. l. iv. cap.* 5. and I might allege Philostorgius, Epiphanius, Zonaras, and other Greek authors, writing the name after the same manner: but I forbear. If I have set Mr. Jackson's readers right as to Dionysius of Alexandria, and Sozomen, I have performed all that was needful for repairing my first argument.

My second argument, p. 249, 250, was, 'that there are still remaining 'in Latin authors traces of their agreement with the Greek writers 'upon this head.' I allow that some ancient writers did, though corruptly, write the Roman presbyter's name Novatian: but I think that

many others write it Novatus; of which we ſtill have traces in the works of divers of them: but I am of opinion that in ſeveral paſſages the right reading has been altered; which has been owing to a notion, prevailing of late among moderns, that his name was Novatian.

Under that argument I produced paſſages of divers ancient Latin authors: one of thoſe paſſages is from Hilary, at p. 249. which Mr. Jackſon does not conteſt, becauſe, as I ſuppoſe, he is ſenſible the Roman preſbyter muſt be meant: other paſſages are from Jerom, Philaſter, Auguſtine: theſe Mr. Jackſon diſputes; for he ſays thoſe writers do not mean the preſbyter of Rome, but the preſbyter of Carthage. I argued that by Novatus Jerom muſt mean the Roman preſbyter in ſeveral places of his works, becauſe he ſpeaks of him as an author; whereas Novatus of Carthage never was reckoned an author. In anſwer to this Mr. Jackſon ſays, p. 129, that 'Jerom certainly meant 'Novatus of Carthage in all the places referred to by me; and that 'this Novatus he ſuppoſes to have been a writer in his 56th epiſtle to 'Tranquilinus, p. 589.' But I am apt to think that moſt readers, who look upon thoſe paſſages of Jerom, will be of a different mind, and think that probably Jerom means the Roman preſbyter. Mr. Jackſon has no reaſon for ſaying that he 'certainly meant the preſbyter of 'Carthage:' nor can I ſee that Jerom, in the epiſtle referred to by Mr. Jackſon, ſuppoſes Novatus to have been an author: I think he means the Roman preſbyter, Mr. Jackſon's author. The words are: Ego Origenem propter eruditionem ſic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium.——But who ever heard of the writings or the learning of Novatus of Carthage?

Some may make a doubt whether Philaſter and Auguſtine, when they ſay the Novatians were ſo called from Novatus, mean the preſbyter of Carthage or him of Rome: but it ſeems to me moſt likely that they mean the latter, who was by much the more famous man: nor can there be any good reaſon aſſigned why they ſhould not there mean the ſame perſon, even the preſbyter of Rome, to whom their brethren, the Greek writers continually aſcribe the unmerciful doctrine of rejecting penitents; to whom likewiſe the Latins themſelves aſcribe it very frequently: and I ſuppoſe it to be a common opinion, among learned and judicious moderns, that the party was not denominated from the preſbyter of Carthage, but from the preſbyter of Rome. Nefandæ ſeditioni tamen Novatianus, non Novatus nomen impoſuit. *Baſnag. An.* 251. *n. vi.* Indeed Jerom ſays: Hujus auctor Novatus Cypriani preſbyter fuit: which I have tranſlated: 'The firſt author of this rigid 'principle was Novatus, Cyprian's preſbyter,' p. 207. And Mr. Jackſon, p. 128, tranſlates it after this manner: 'The author of this ſect 'was Novatus, one of Cyprian's preſbyter's.' But I think that we have neither of us tranſlated very happily; for that ſenſe does not agree with the preceding words, where Jerom expreſsly ſays that Novatian, or Novatus of Rome, formed or conſtituted the ſect of the Novatians. Novatianus Romanæ urbis preſbyter, adverſus Cornelium cathedram ſacerdotalem conatus invadere Novatianum——dogma conſtituit, nolens apoſtatas ſuſcipere pœnitentes. Hujus auctor Novatus Cypriani preſbyter fuit. It ſeems to me therefore that in theſe laſt words Jerom

rom intends to say, 'his adviser was Novatus, one of Cyprian's presbyters:' for, having before said that 'the presbyter of Rome formed 'the sect of the Novatians,' he cannot be supposed to say, presently afterwards, that Novatus of Carthage was the author of the same sect. The most, I think, that he can mean is, that the presbyter of Carthage helped and concurred with him at Rome: and this too it is likely is said by him upon the authority of St. Cyprian only. Moreover, it is observable that Novatus, the presbyter of Carthage, so long at least as he was in Africa, was of a quite contrary principle from that which distinguished the Novatian sect: he was for receiving those who had lapsed upon very easy terms; and though he may afterwards have embraced the rigid principle of that sect, yet it is not likely that he should have been the first author and propoſer of it. I shall represent this in the words of some others, that it may not be suspected I state the case wrong. Secundum Baronii argumentum pariter infirmum, quod nempe cum duæ essent inter se contrariæ sectæ schismaticorum, Felicissimus ille sententiæ Novati adversarius erat, quod diceret, lapsos omnes absque pœnitentiæ mora recipiendos. Nam hæc nihil probant. Quippe Novatus, quamdiu in Africa fuit, semper se ejusdem cum Felicissimo sententiæ de lapsis recipiendis professus est. Cum autem Romam venisset, et se Novatiano adjunxisset, ut Romanum schisma promoveret, illius sententiam amplexus esse videbatur, sive serio, sive ficte, ut et ipse Novatianus sententiam suam jam mutaverat, ut Cornelio fortius contradicet. *Pagi in Baron. A. D.* 250, *n. xiv. Vid. et Basnag. Ann. P. E.* 371. *n. v.* Qua quidem in re a nonnullis in duo peccatum est extrema. Nam, Carthagine, Felicissimus, cui Novatus se adjunxit, lapsos omnes absque ulla mora recipiendos dixit. Contra, Romæ, Novatianus, ad quem et postea Novatus, mutatis partibus, accessit, lapsos nunquam recipi voluit. *Turretin. Hist. Ec. Compend, p.* 23. Novatus Carthagine, absente Cypriano, cum lapsis communicaverat——Paullo post Romam veniens Novatus simile inter Cornelium episcopum et Novatianum dissidium invenit, ex nimia Cornelii in lapsos indulgentia natum, et eousque excrescens, ut Novatianus a factiosis episcopus crearetur. Hic Novatum in aliud extremum pertraxit, suisque partibus junxit, quæ Catharorum, seu purorum superbivere nomine. *Lampe Synops. Hist. Ec. p.* 120. And here I think it would not be amiss for my readers to recollect what I said formerly, p. 222, 223, shewing that Cyprian beyond measure magnified the influence of his presbyter Novatus in the disturbances at Rome, and that Cyprian has been too much relied on by some.

My third argument was, 'The common appellation of this people 'shews that the name of their leader was Novatus, not Novatianus.' For they are generally called Novatians. If the name of their leader had been Novatianus, they would have been called *Novatianenses*, or somewhat like it; whereas there is but one instance of this, which is in Cyprian, and is cited from him by Augustine. I took notice of it, p. 250; nor has Mr. Jackson produced any other instance: he has therefore left this argument in it's full force.

The fourth argument was, 'that there never was, that we know 'of, any one, in any age, called Novatian, unless the person in dispute

'was

'was ſo named.' This argument Mr. Jackſon has not touched, having no inſtance to allege; whilſt Novatus is no uncommon name as I ſhewed. This argument muſt be of conſiderable weight in a point of this kind; for it is not likely that this famous preſbyter of Rome ſhould be called by a name which no other man ever had, neither before him nor after him. Indeed this argument alone appears to me deciſive, unleſs there is ſome clear evidence of another kind againſt it, which there is not.

In the fifth place I obſerved that ſome 'learned moderns ſeem to 'have ſuppoſed the name of this perſon to be Novatus.' And I referred to ſome, p. 252; to them ought to be added the author of the Roman edition of St. Ambroſe's works, ſpoken of p. 249. The learned lawyer, Fr. Balduinus, likewiſe was of the ſame opinion: Eccleſiæ Romanæ preſbyter Novatus, et Antiochenæ epiſcopus Paulus Samoſatenus, magnas paulo ante turbas dederant. *De Leg. C. M. l. i. p.* 48. *Fid. et ib. p.* 65, *m.*

I accounted for Cyprian's manner of writing this perſon's name, p. 252, and ſhall add nothing more here.

Upon the whole it ſtill appears to me highly probable that *Novatus* was the name of the preſbyter of Rome, Cornelius's rival, and that *Novatianus*, or *Novatian*, is the denomination of his followers.

I am ſorry to have ſpent ſo much time upon this point: and if, for the ſake of brevity, I have omitted to take particular notice of any difficulty in Mr. Jackſon, I hope the reader will find it obviated in the note upon chap. xlvii. p. 248—252.

THE

THE

CREDIBILITY

OF THE

GOSPEL HISTORY;

PART II.

[VOL. VI. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCXLV.]

CHAP. LXII.

ARCHELAUS, bishop in Mesopotamia.

I. *The history and antiquity of a work ascribed to Archelaus.* II. *Extracts out of it, and the author's testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I. SAYS Jerom: 'Archelaus [a], a bishop of Mesopotamia, 'wrote in the Syriac language a book of his Conference [or Dis-'pute] with Manichee at his coming out of Persia, which has 'been translated into Greek. He flourished under the emperor 'Probus, who succeeded Aurelian and Tacitus.'

This piece, as we now have it, contains two conferences with Mani, one at Caschar, or Carchar, a city in the Roman part of Mesopotamia, and another at Diodoris, a village, or a small town, in the same country: with an historical account of the life and death of Mani, and some other things.

The greatest part of it is now only in a Latin translation, not made from the supposed Syriac original, but from [b] Greek. When this Latin translation was made is not certain. Zacagni, the editor, supposeth that [c] it was not in being in Jerom's time, but that however it was made before the seventh century. Ano-

[a] Archelaus episcopus Mesopotamiæ libŕum disputationis suæ, quam habuit adversum Manichæum, exeuntem ex Persida, Syro sermone composuit, qui translatus in Græcum habetur a multis. Claruit sub Imperatore Probo, qui Aureliano et Tacito successerat. De V. I. c. 72.

[b] Porro Græcam versionem, non vero Syriacum textum præ manibus Latinum interpretem habuisse——satis superque demonstratur. Zacagn. Præf. §. v. in.

[c] ib. n. iv. f.

ther

ther learned writer argues, that [d] this translation was not made sooner than the sixth, or the latter part of the fifth, century; because the conference itself was unknown to Augustine, and likewise to pope Leo, who died in 461.

It is thought that [e] this piece is not now entire and complete.

Archelaus is placed by Cave, and many others, as flourishing about the year 278. Beausobre's opinion of this book, entitled 'The Acts of the Disputation of Archelaus with Mani, or Manichee,' is, 'that [f] it is, in general, a romance, published by some 'Greek, about the year of our Lord 330, fifty or sixty years 'after Mani's death.' 'There are in it,' he [g] says, 'some truths, 'but not many; and those disguised, and mixed with manifest 'falsehoods.' Again: 'It [h] is a fiction of some Greek, who, 'having got some memoirs concerning the life and opinions of 'Mani, resolved to write a history of him, and confute his 'errors.'

I fear that account of this book is too just, and that a large part of it is fiction; of which I may say more in the next (A) chapter. At present I would chiefly consider the author, and the time of this work.

As for the author of the book, Jerom supposed it to have been written in Syriac by Archelaus himself, and then translated into Greek: but he does not name the translator. Epiphanius [i] likewise, and [k] Cyril of Jerusalem, and [l] Socrates, ascribe the book to Archelaus: but by Photius we are informed that [m] Heraclean, bishop of Chalcedon, in his book against the Manichees, said, Hegemonius wrote the Dispute of Archelaus. This has induced [n] Cave, and others, to look upon Hegemonius as the

[d] See Beausobr. Hist. de Manich. T. i. Diss. Prelim. p. 6. [e] Illud tamen dissimulare non possum, Acta ista disputationis Archelai cum Manete, quæ ex Vaticano Casinensis codicis apographo primi edimus, integra nequaquam videri, sed pluribus in locis a librario mutilata. Zac. ib. n. 14. in. [f] En general toute cette piece, qu'on nomme les Actes de la Dispute d'Archelaus, n'est qu'un roman fabriqué par un Grec et publié depuis l'an 330, soixante ans, ou environ, aprés la mort de Manichée. Beauf. ib. p. 6.

[g] Il y a quelques veritez, mais en petit nombre, et le peu qu'il y en a est alteré, tronqué, mêlé de fables manifestes.——id. ib. [h] Dés que j'eus lû cette piece, que feu M. Zacagni, bibliothecaire du Vatican, publia le premier toute entiere, j'eus un grand soupçon, que la Dispute de Cascar, n'étoit qu' une fiction de quelque Grec, qui ayant eu des mémoires touchant la vie et les dogmes de Manichée, voulut écrire son histoire, et refuter ses erreurs. L'examen changea mes soupçons en certitude. Id. in Preface. T. i. p. vi.

(A) See the first section in the next chapter, numb. i. 2. [i] απο τε αρχελαυ βιβλιε. Epiph. H. 66, n. 32, in. Vid. et n. 21. [k] Cat. 6, n. 27, p. 104.

[l] H. E. l. i. c. 22, p. 56, D.

[m] Ηγεμονιον τε τον [τας] αρχελαυ προς αυτον αντιλογιας αναγραψαντα. Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204. [n] Unde conceptis pene verbis jurare ausim, non alium hujusce versionis auctorem fuisse quam Hegemonium nostrum, nec aliam eam, quam quæ Cyrillus, Epiphanius, aliique olim usi sunt. Cav. De Hegemonio, in Diss. de Scriptor. incert. æt.

tranſlator. Zacagni ſays that [o] Hegemonius not only tranſlated the Syriac, but made additions of his own. To the like purpoſe [p] Aſſeman. Both which laſt writers aſcribe ſuch additions and alterations to Hegemonius, an author whoſe age is unknown, as muſt greatly leſſen the authority of this work; more, perhaps, than they imagined.

But Beauſobre ſays that this piece was originally written in Greek, and that Hegemonius was the author, and that it was not written before the year 330. He argues in this [q] manner: 'Euſebius publiſhed his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory about fifty years 'after the death of Mani. He there ſpeaks of this hereſiarch, 'and his hereſy: but he ſays not one word of his excurſion in- 'to the Roman Meſopotamia, nor of his diſputes with Archelaus. 'Since Euſebius ſays nothing of theſe matters, it may be con- 'cluded that he was entirely ignorant of them: but it is not to 'be ſuppoſed that he ſhould be ignorant of ſo public an event, 'that had happened half a century before: nor that he ſhould 'omit to relate ſo memorable a thing if he knew it.' Beauſobre thinks that Archelaus muſt have been entirely unknown to Euſebius: and therefore he concludes that theſe Acts of Archelaus did not appear until after Euſebius had publiſhed his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; that is, in the ſpace of time between the year 326 or 330, and the year 348 or 350, when Cyril of Jeruſalem wrote his Catechetical Diſcourſes, who is the firſt author that has quoted this piece. Nor does it appear that [r] St. Ephrem, who was of Meſopotamia, and died in 373, has any where taken notice of this Diſputation, though he often ſpeaks of Mani. Moreover there is a particular in the book itſelf, which leads him to conclude it was compoſed between the years 330 and 340. This time, ſays Beauſobre, is diſtinctly marked in ſome words, which the writer puts into the mouth of Archelaus, for convincing Mani that he could not be the promiſed Paraclete. 'When [s] you ſay you are the Paraclete, perhaps you little think 'that you charge Chriſt with falſehood: who, though he pro- 'miſed to ſend him ſoon after his reſurrection, has not ſent him

[o] ——Hegemonium vero, quæ ab Archelao jam edita fuerant, meliori non ſolum ordine digeſſiſſe, verum etiam exordio, epilogo, aliiſque nonnullis locupletaſſe, ut omnibus numeris abſoluta, celeberrimæ illius diſputationis acta ad poſteros tranſmitterentur. Zac. Præf. cap. 4, p. iv.

[p] Quæ quum ita ſint, ab eodem Hegemonio videntur quædam ex illis Actis mutilata, quædam etiam addita. Aſſem. Bib. or. T. 3. P. 2 p. 47, in. Vid. quæ ibidem præeunt et ſequuntur.

[q] B. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 3, 6, p. 145, 146. [r] Ib. p. 146.

[s] ——dicens ſe eſſe paracletum, qui ab Jeſu præſignatus eſt mitti, in quo mendacem ignorans fortaſſe aſſeret Jeſum: qui enim dixerat ſe non multo poſt miſſurum eſſe paracletum, invenitur poſt trecentos, et eo amplius annos miſiſſe hunc. Arch. c. 27, p. 46.

'till

'till above three hundred years afterwards.' These three hundred years come out in the year of our Lord 333 or 334. Zacagni says this [t] dropped from Archelaus in the heat of dispute: because from the death of Christ, to the conference at Caschar, there were not more than 249 years: but, says [u] Beausobre, I think otherwise. Nothing is more common than for impostors, who make another speak, not to remember every thing that is agreeable to the character they have introduced, and to thrust in themselves without thinking of it. Hegemonius, who in fact lived more than three hundred years after our Saviour's resurrection, thought of the time when he himself lived, not that of Archelaus, who was speaking. So that learned author.

I must be here indulged the liberty of making some remarks. I readily own I am inclined to think with Beausobre that this work was originally written in Greek, not in Syriac.

The argument from the silence of Eusebius is specious; and yet, possibly, not conclusive. It is indeed strange that he should never mention the name of Archelaus. Nor do I pretend to confute this argument of Beausobre; for it is almost inconceivable, that Eusebius should be ignorant of Archelaus, if these disputes were real. However, I would not omit any thoughts which offer, and may tend to bring truth to light; and therefore I observe, that though Archelaus and these conferences in Mesopotamia are never mentioned by Eusebius, some may suspect that he had seen this book called The Acts of Archelaus: for in his Ecclesiastical History, when he speaks of Mani, and so particularly insists [x] upon the barbarism of his language and manners, he may be thought to refer to passages in the Acts, which [y] resemble his account. And in his [z] Chronicle the appearance of Mani is placed in the reign of Probus, agreeably to these [a] Acts. Indeed I do not lay much stress upon this last particular, because I think the article concerning Mani, in the Chronicle, may be entirely Jerom's, and not Eusebius's: but with Beausobre it should have some weight, because he allows that [b] whole paragraph to be Eusebius's.

[t] Contentionis æstu actus videtur hic dixisse Archelaus, post trecentos et amplius annos a Christi morte Manetem emersisse: nam a Christe morte usque ad habitæ cum Manete disputationis tempus, anni circiter 249, intercedunt. Zacag. in not. ad Arch. p. 46. [u] Beaus. ubi supr. p. 153. [x] βαρβαρος ὀντα τον βιον αυτω λογω και τροπω.——H. E. l. 7. c. 31.

[y] Persa barbare, non Græcorum linguæ, non Ægyptiorum, non Romanorum, non ullius alterius linguæ scientiam habere potuisti, sed Chaldæorum solum, quæ ne in numerum quidem aliquem ducitur: Act. Arch. c. 36, p. 63. Et Confer. c. 12, p. 23.

[z] Secundo anno Probi——insana Manichæorum hæresis in commune humani generis malum exorta. Eus. Chr. p. 177. [a] c. 27, p. 46. [b] B. ib. p. 122.

As for the ſpace of three hundred years, mentioned in the Acts, it deſerves little conſideration. Arguments from numbers are oftentimes of ſmall moment. Some miſtakes are made by tranſcribers. Writers themſelves are not ſeldom miſtaken in their computations. St. Chryſoſtom [c] reckoned it to have been five hundred years from the deſtruction of Jeruſalem to his own time, though it was not much above three hundred years. It was to the purpoſe of the perſon, who managed the ſuppoſed diſpute againſt Mani, to enhance the time. Moreover people delight in round numbers. And juſt before the time is ſaid to be [d] almoſt three hundred years. It is the leſs likely that the writer ſhould forget himſelf, and put his own time inſtead of that of the ſpeaker's, becauſe he preſently afterwards mentions the reign of [e] Probus.

Having given theſe ſentiments of others, and made remarks upon them, I now proceed to obſerve, that the antiquity of this piece is manifeſt from the uſe made of it by Cyril and Epiphanius in the fourth century, and from the notice taken of it by Jerom in his Catalogue, before the end of the ſame century.

There are other arguments of it's early age: I ſhall mention ſeveral things, though not all of equal importance.

Archelaus, or whoever is the writer, naming ſeveral heretics, mentions none below [f] Sabellius: nor do there any where appear in this book any traces of that remarkable period in the church, the council of Nice. Moreover, the author allots but [g] one year to Chriſt's miniſtry, or at leaſt to the moſt public part of it, after he had called his diſciples to attend him. He allows that [h] men might attain to virtue by the light of nature, though a few only. He does not extol affected voluntary poverty, as ſome have done; but [i] allows him, who well uſeth a good eſtate, to be equally virtuous with him who gives away all he has. Tillemont ſays: 'In this [k] work we meet with ſome opinions 'more common in the primitive times, than they have been ſince 'the hiſtory and the doctrine of the church have been cleared

[c] Πεντακοσιοστον γαρ λειπει εξ ενεινε εστι των μαχρις τωδε. Chryſ. adv. Jud. Hom. 6. T. 1. p. 651, B. [d] ——eum qui poſt trecentos fere annos venerit. Arch. n. 27. p. 45. [e] ——ſub Probo demum Romano imperatori miſiſti. ib. p. 46.

[f] Vid. cap. 37. et 38. [g] Nec in aliquo remoratus Dominus noſter Jeſus intra unius anni ſpatium languentium multitudines reddidit ſanitati, mortuos luci. ib. c. 34, p. 58. Cum diſcipuli ejus per annum integrum manſerunt cum eo. ib. c. 50, p. 93, m. [h] Verum quia pauci per hunc modum poterant ad juſtitiæ culmen adſcendere, id eſt, per parentum traditiones, nulla in literis lege conſcripta. c. 28, p. 48. [i] Bonum, inquam, his qui poſſunt: ſed abuti divitiis ad opus juſtitiæ atque miſericordiæ parem gratiam tribuit, [Jeſus,] ac ſi univerſis pariter renuntietur. c. 42, p. 75.

[k] Mem. Ec. T. 4. P. 2. Les Manichéens. Art. 12. p. 796.

up,

'up. The author seems not to understand the union of the two 'natures in Christ.' Beausobre has an observation of the like kind, and says, that '[l] the author speaks more like an unitarian 'than a catholic.' I add, that he seems to have condemned all war as unlawful; for, [m] relating that some Roman soldiers, charmed with the piety and generosity of Marcellus, were induced to embrace the Christian religion, he says that they immediately forsook the profession of arms.

These particulars may be reckoned evidences of great antiquity: but when the book was composed, I cannot certainly say; whether near the end of the third or at the beginning of the fourth century: nor am I able to determine who is the author.

II. My extracts out of it will contain chiefly the author's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

1. But I would just observe that [n] he speaks of divers of our Lord's miracles, and other historical facts, recorded in the gospels.

2. We do not find all the books of the New Testament quoted in this piece: it is likely that there was no particular occasion for it.

3. He mentions [o] the New Testament, the gospels, and the apostle Paul's epistles: for which not only he, but Mani likewise, had a great regard.

4. Quoting St. Matthew's gospel, he calls him [p] an evangelist of the Spirit.

5. A passage of St. Mark's gospel is cited [q] as the word of God.

6. Quoting John i. 16, he calls [r] him 'Saint John the great-'est of the evangelists;' if that is not the style of the Latin translator.

7. Here is mention made of [s] the book of the gospels.

[l] Beauf. ib. p. 116. [m] At illi [milites] admirati, et amplexi tam immensum viri pietatem, munificentiamque,—commoventur, ut plurimi ex ipsis adderentur ad fidem domini nostri Jesu Christi, derelicto militiæ cingulo. Arch. cap. 1. p. 2. Vid. ib. Zacagn. not. [3.] et conf. Beauf. Hist. Manich. T. 2. p. 797. [n] Vid. cap. 34, p. 58, c. 36, p. 63.

[o] Sunt etiam alia multa, quæ dici possent et de apostolo Paulo, et de Evangeliis, ex quibus ostendere possumus, veterem legem non esse alterius, quam Domini, cujus est novum Testamentum. Arch. c. 45. p. 82. Vid. etiam cap. 40, p. 69, m.

[p] Sed et Spiritus Evangelista Matthæus [cap. xxiv] diligenter significavit Domini nostri Jesu Christi sermonem. Act. Arch. c. 35, p. 61. [q] Quid enim ait sermo divinus? Quis enim potest introire in domum fortis, et diripere vasa ejus, nisi illo sit fortior? [Mar. iii. 27] ib. c. 16, p. 30.

[r] Sed et sanctus Joannes maximus Evangelistarum ait, gratiam gratia præstare, &c. ib. c. 45, p. 82. [s] ——sicut scriptum est in Evangeliorum libro. c. 13, p. 24.

8. The book of the Acts is quoted and called [t] ſcripture.

9. Divers of St. Paul's epiſtles are expreſsly quoted. That to the Romans is called [u] his firſt epiſtle, becauſe, as I ſuppoſe, it was placed firſt in the collection.

10. There ſeems to be an expreſſion, borrowed from the epiſtle to the Hebrews, in Mani's [x] letter to Marcellus, inſerted in theſe Acts: and there appears to be a reference to Hebr. iii. 3, 5, 6, in ſome words of [y] Archelaus.

11. I do not ſee any of the Catholic epiſtles quoted, except the firſt epiſtle of St. John. Mani himſelf is here brought in arguing from [z] 1 John v. 19: *The whole world lies in wickedneſs*, or in the wicked one, as he underſtands it.

12. Antichriſt is here often [a] ſpoken of: but there is ſcarce any clear reference to the book of the Revelation. However, it ſhould be obſerved by us, that in the Revelation, ch. xii. 9, Satan is repreſented by the character of the *great dragon*. And in this diſpute he is ſpoken of [b] as 'the dragon, our perpetual 'enemy.'

13. The writer's reſpect for the ſcriptures now commonly received, is manifeſt from his very numerous and frequent quotations of them as deciſive, and of authority in all diſputed points of religion.

CHAP. LXIII.

MANI, and his followers.

SECT. I. A general hiſtory of the MANICHEES.

I. *Paſſages of ancient writers concerning them.* 1. *Euſebius of Cæſarea*; 2. *Socrates*; 3. *Libanius.* II. *Authors who wrote againſt them*; 1. *Heraclean*; 2. *Alexander of Lycopolis*; 3. *Auguſtine*; 4. *Serapion*;

[t] Quid enim dicit ſcriptura? Quia unuſquiſque propria ſua lingua audiebat, per Paracletum ſpiritum loquentes apoſtolos? ib. c. 36, p. 63. Vid. et cap. 34, p. 59.

[u] Ipſe quoque in prima epiſtola ſua poſuit, dicens. ib. c. 34, p. 59.

[x] Ἀρχὴν γὰρ, καὶ τέλος, καὶ τὸν τούτων πατέρα τῶν κακῶν. εἰς τὸ θεοῦ διαφέρουσιν, εἰς τὸ τέλος κατάρας ἔγγυς. ib. c. 5, p. 7. Vid. Hebr. vi 8.

[y] Ita et ſi Dominus meus Jeſus Chriſtus præcellit in gloria Moyſen, tanquam Dominus famulum, non propterea reſpuenda eſt gloria Moyſi. Arch. c. 43, p. 77.

[z] Malum vero eſſe tam mundum hunc, quam omnia quæ in eo ſunt,——ſicut ait Joannes, Totus mundus in maligno eſt poſitus, et non in Deo. cap. 14, p. 26.

[a] Vid. c. 36, p. 62, 63.

[b] Credo, quod habeat adjutorem draconem illum, qui nobis ſemper inimicus eſt. c. 40, p. 69.

5. *Titus*

5. Titus of Boſtra; 6. Didymus; 7. Authors omitted by Fabricius; 8. Syrian authors againſt them. III. *Though they were in many places, they were no where numerous.* IV. *Eminent men among the Manichees; 1. Alexander of Lycopolis; 2. Auguſtine; 3. Adimantus; 4. Agapius; 5. Apthonius; 6. Fauſtus; 7. Hierax; 8. Sebaſtian; 9. Secundinus.* V. *Their eccleſiaſtical conſtitution.* VI. *Their manners vindicated from Aſperſions.* VII. *A brief account of the perſecutions which they ſuffered.*

I CHUSE to begin this chapter with a general hiſtory of Mani, and the ſect called after his name.

I. In the firſt place I would allege ſome paſſages of ancient writers who have mentioned them.

1. Euſebius's article concerning them in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is to this purpoſe: 'About [a] the ſame time that madman, 'juſtly named Manes, formed the wild hereſy called after his name, 'being ſet up for the ruin of many by Satan the adverſary of God. 'This perſon [b] was a barbarian in every reſpect, both in his 'ſpeech, and in his manners. As for his (A) diſpoſition, it was dia-'bolical and furious; for he made an appearance of being Chriſt 'himſelf. Sometimes he gave out that he was the Comforter, 'and the Holy Ghoſt himſelf. To madneſs he added exceſſive 'pride; and, as if he had been Chriſt, he choſe twelve to be com-'panions with him in his innovation. His ſcheme was patched 'up of many falſe and impious hereſies, long ſince extinct. 'This venomous principle was brought into our world, the Ro-'man empire, from Perſia. From that time the impious doc-'trine of the Manichees has infected many. Such was the 'riſe of that ſcience falſely ſo called.'

In this place Euſebius appears much out of humour: he is ſcarce maſter of himſelf: whether his expreſſions are juſt may perhaps be conſidered hereafter.

In [c] his, or Jerom's Chronicle, the riſe of this ſect is with much particularity diſtinctly fixed at the ſecond year of the emperor Probus, which is the year of Chriſt 277.

[a] Εν τουτῳ και ο μανεις τας φρενας, επωνυμος τις της δαιμονιωδους αιρεσεως.——Euſ. H. E. l. 7, c. 31. [b] Βαρβαρος ὁητα τον βιον αυτε λογῳ και τροπῳ, την τε φυσιν δαιμονιωδης τις ων και μανιωδης. Ακολουθα τουτοις εγχειρησι χριστον αυτον μορφαζεσθαι επειρατο, τοτε μεν τον παρακλητον, και αυτο το πνευμα το αγιον αυτος εαυτον ανακηρυττων. κ. λ. ib.

(A) Beauſobre thinks that here Euſebius has done wrong to Mani, and that his picture of Mani has little reſemblance. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 108.

[c] Secundo anno Probi, juxta Antiochenos cccxxv. anno juxta Tyrios ccccii. ——inſana Manichæorum hæreſis in commune humani generis malum exorta. Euſeb. Chron. p. 177.

This would be a proper place for me to consider the time of the rise of Manichæism: but being unwilling to render this article, the general history of Manichæism, too prolix, I shall defer it until I come to give a succinct history of Mani himself.

However I would here observe, that I do not remember the Manichees to be any where else mentioned by Eusebius; which may be reckoned somewhat strange, if in his time they were numerous in any parts of the Roman empire: in his Commentaries upon the Psalms and Isaiah, and elsewhere, he might have had frequent occasions to confute them. A great number of heresies of various kinds, some [d] resembling the Manichæan principle, are censured in the Apology for Origen, written jointly by Pamphilus and Eusebius. If the Manichees had been well known in the Roman empire, at the beginning of the fourth century, we might have expected to see them there particularly named, which they are not.

Since writing this, I have observed these words in Tillemont, whom nothing escapes. The article concerning the Manichees in the Chronicle he considers as Jerom's: it is only the passage in the History which he reckons Eusebius's; whereupon he [e] says: 'Eusebius, who speaks little of this heresy, does not pre-'cisely mark the time of it: he seems willing however to have 'it thought that [f] it began in the time of pope Felix, who go-'verned the church, according to him, from 276 to 281.'

2. In the next place I intend to transcribe a long passage of Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, who flourished about the year of Christ 440.

'But [g] it is an usual thing for cockle to grow up among good 'grain. It is agreeable to envy to lay snares for the righteous. 'Not long before the reign of Constantine there sprang up a kind 'of heathenish Christianity, which mingled itself with the true 'Christian religion: as heretofore false prophets arose together 'with the prophets, and false apostles with the apostles. For in 'those days the doctrine of Empedocles, a heathen philosopher, 'was clandestinely introduced into Christianity: of this Euse-'bius Pamphilus has made mention in the seventh book of his 'Ecclesiastical History, but without any particularity; for which 'reason I have judged it not improper to supply his omissions; 'thereby it may be known who this Manichee was, and whence

[d] ——vel secundum eos, qui Deum quidem fatentur, non tamen hominem assumsisse, id est, animam corpusque terrenum, qui sub specie quasi amplioris gloriæ Jesu Domino deferendæ, omnia quæ ab eo gesta sunt phantastice magis quam vere gesta esse testantur. Pro Orig. Ap. ap. Hieron. Opp. T. 5, p. 226, m.

[e] Note v. sur les Manich. T. iv. P. 2, p. 956.

[f] Vid. Eus. l. 7, cap. 30, 31, p. 283, C.

[g] Socrat. H. E. l. i. c. 22, 55——57.

'he

'he came, who made this audacious attempt. One Scythian, a 'Saracen, married a captive woman, native of the Upper The-'bais; upon her account he lived in Egypt. Having been in-'ſtructed in the learning of the Egyptians, he introduced the 'doctrine of Empedocles and Pythagoras into Chriſtianity; aſ-'ſerting [h] two natures, one good, the other evil, as Empedocles 'did; and calling the evil nature Diſcord, the good nature Friend-'ſhip. Buddas, formerly named Terebinthus, became a diſciple of 'that Scythian: he travelled into the country of Babylonia, which 'is inhabited by the Perſians, where he told a great many ſtrange 'ſtories of himſelf; as that he was born of a virgin, and brought 'up in the mountains: afterwards he wrote four books, one of 'which was entitled, Of Myſteries, another The Goſpel, a third 'The Treaſure, and the fourth Heads, [or Chapters.] While 'he was performing ſome of his pretended ſacred rites he was 'thrown down by a ſpirit and died. The woman at whoſe houſe 'he dwelled buried him: ſhe, coming to the poſſeſſion of his mo-'ney, bought a boy ſeven years of age, named (B) Cubricus; 'this boy ſhe made free and gave him a good education. Some 'time after this (c) ſhe died, leaving the boy all the eſtate ſhe 'had by Terebinthus, and the books he had written, according to 'the inſtructions received from Scythian. Cubricus now free, 'and thus enriched, went into Perſia; where he changed his name, 'calling himſelf Manes: there he diſtributed among his ſeduced 'followers the books of Buddas, or Terebinthus, as his own. The 'contents of theſe books are in expreſſion Chriſtian, in ſentiment 'heatheniſh; for the impious Manichee directs the worſhip of 'many gods, and teaches that the ſun ought to be adored: he 'likewiſe introduces [i] fate, and deſtroys man's free-will. He 'openly teaches tranſmigration; following herein the ſentiment

[h] Δυο φυσεις ειπων, αγαθην τε και πονηραν, ως και εμπεδοκλης νεικος ονομαζων την πονηραν, φιλιαν δε την αγαθην. ib. p. 55, C.

(B) Named Cubricus.] He is generally ſo called. Cyril and Epiphanius write the name Κυβρικος, as well as Socrates. But in the Acts of Archelaus his name is written Corbicius. Quæ cum ſola eſſet, habere aliquem ad miniſterium voluit, et comparavit ſibi puerum annorum ferme ſeptem, Corbicium nomine, quem ſtatim manumiſit, ac literis erudivit. Act. Arch. c. 53, p. 97. In the Hiſtoria Hæreſeos Manichæorum, publiſhed by Pfaff, at the end of Lactantii Epitome, p. 183, the name is a little different.——Puerum ſibi pro hæreditatis ſolatio comparavit, nomine Curbitius, quem et literis non mediocribus erudivit. In former editions of Auguſtine, Mani's firſt name is ſaid to have been Urbicus. But in the Benedictine edition that paragraph, at the beginning of Auguſtine's article of the Manichees, [De Hær. c. 46] is left out upon the authority of manuſcripts. Beauſobre ſays, none of theſe names have an Oriental air. And he ſuſpects, that the right name is Carcubius. See Beauſ. T. i. p. 67.

(c) When that widow died, Cubricus is ſaid to have been twelve years of age. Quique cum duodecim annorum eſſet effectus, anus illa diem obiit, &c. ap. Arch. c. 53, p. 97. [i] Και ειμαρμενην εισαγει, και το εφ' ημιν αναιρει. Socr. ib. p. 56, A.

'of

'of Empedocles, Pythagoras, and the Egyptians. He denies 'that [k] Christ had real flesh, making him a mere phantom. He 'rejects the law and the prophets, and calls himself the Para- 'clete: all which things are contrary to the sense of the ortho- 'dox church. Moreover, in [l] his epistles he had the presump- 'to style himself apostle: at length he met with the deserved 'punishment of such an impostor upon this occasion. The son 'of the king of Persia happened to fall sick; the father, as the 'saying is, left no stone unturned, being extremely desirous to 'save his son's life: having heard of Manichee, and [m], supposing 'the strange things he had heard of him to be true, he sends for 'him as an apostle, hoping that by him he might save his son: 'when he was come he pretended to undertake the cure of the 'king's son. But when the king saw that his son died in his 'hands, he shut him up in prison, intending to put him to death; 'but he made his escape and came into Mesopotamia. The king 'of Persia hearing that he was in those parts sent after him, got 'him apprehended, and flayed him alive: after which his skin 'was filled with chaff and hung up at the gate of the city. This 'account is no forgery of ours; it is collected out of the book 'of Archelaus, bishop of Caschar, a city in Mesopotamia, which 'we have met with and read: for Archelaus himself says he had 'disputed with him in person; and he there relates the several 'particulars which I have just written concerning him.'

Thus I have given the history of Mani and his principles in the words of this ancient writer, which will serve for a text to be commented upon. Once I was somewhat desirous to set before my readers in this place St. Augustine's article of the Manichees in his book Of Heresies; but it is too abstruse and dogmatical; therefore I thought this historical account preferable. There is another reason which discouraged the design of translating Augustine, and may be soon perceived by those who look into him: but though I do not here, nor any where else, translate that article of Augustine entire, I shall make good use of it, and frequently quote it.

In this passage of Socrates we see a proof of the truth of Beausobre's observation, that [n] from the book called The Acts of Archelaus,

[k] Και τον χριστον εν σαρκι γεγονεναι ου βελεται, φαντασμα αυτον λεγων ειναι· και νομον και προφητας αθετει· και εαυτον παρακλητον. ib. p. 56, B.

[l] Εν δε ταις επιστολαις και αποστολον εαυτον φαντασζειν ετολμησεν. ibid.

[m] μαθων τε περι του μανιχαιου, και τας τερατειας αυτου ψευσας ειναι αληθεις, ως αποστολον μεταπεμπεται, πιστευσας δ' αυτον σωθησεσθαι τον υιον· ο δε παραγενομενος μετα του επιπλαστου σχηματος εγχειριζεται του τα βασιλεως υιου· ο δε βασιλευς εωρακως οτι ο παις εν ταις χερσιν ετεθνηκει, κ.λ. ib. p. 56, C.

[n] Beauf. Hist. de Manich. p. 6. T. I.

chelaus,

chelaus, the ancient Chriſtian writers took the hiſtory of Mani and of the origin of Manichæiſm, which they have given us. Cyril of Jeruſalem, Epiphanius, Socrates, the Greeks in general, have all drawn from this ſource; as is acknowledged too by [o] Petavius and [p] Tillemont.

We have ſeen the account which Socrates gives of the death of Mani, taken from the forementioned book: but Socrates flouriſhes when he ſays that 'the king of Perſia, having heard 'of the ſtrange things ſaid to be done by Mani, and believing 'them to be true, ſent for him as an apoſtle.' There is nothing like this in Archelaus, whoſe [q] words I tranſcribe at the bottom of the page.

That Mani was put to death needs not to be conteſted. It is mentioned by [r] Alexander of Lycopolis: the memory of it was celebrated [s] by his followers in an annual feſtivity, obſerved by them with a good deal of pomp and ſplendour: and, as [t] Beauſobre ſays, 'it is not impoſſible but the death of the young 'prince may have brought upon him the diſpleaſure of the king: 'but it is certain that the eaſtern writers do aſcribe this diſ-'grace to his opinions in religion; and, if I may ſay it, to his 'Chriſtianity, which ſeems to be better proved.'

Indeed the author of the diſpute ſeems himſelf to have been aware of ſomething of this kind; for he ſays that [u] Mani, whilſt in priſon, ſent out his diſciples to ſpread abroad his opinions. The king, being informed of this, ſends orders for putting him to death: but, as he ſays, Mani bribing his keepers with a large ſum of money, got out of priſon, and thus eſcaped for the preſent.

Beauſobre has a large number of exceptions to the hiſtory of

[o] Ex hac Archelai relatione cæteri deinceps hauſerunt omnes, qui hæretici iſtius hiſtoriam et dogmata ſcriptis tradiderunt. Petav. Animadv. ad. Epiph. p. 289.

[p] Les petites differences, qui ſe rencontrent entre eux, (ſavoir Epiphane, Cyrille, Socrate;) n'empêchent pas qu' on ne voye, qu' ils ont tous puiſé dans la même ſource. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. 4, P. 2, Art. 12, p. 794.

[q] Cum ergo illi eſſent profecti, regis filius ægritudine quadam arreptus eſt, quem rex curari deſiderans, edictum propoſuit in vita, [f. invitans;] ſi quis eum curare poſſit, accipere præmium, multo propoſito. Tum iſte——præſentiam ſuam Manes exhibet, dicens ſe eſſe puerum curaturum, quæ cum audiſſet rex, ſuſcepit eum cum obſequio, ac libenter habuit. Verum——mortuus eſt puer in manibus ejus, vel potius extinctus. Arch, c. 53, p. 98.

[r] ——συγρατεῖσαι τε σαπωρῳ τῳ περσῃ· προσκρουσαντα δε τι τουτῳ απωλωλεναι. Alex. Lyc. p. 4. in.

[s] ——cum veſtrum bema, id eſt, diem quo Manichæus occiſus eſt, quinque gradibus inſtructo tribunali et pretioſis linteis adornato,——magnis honoribus proſequamini. Aug. contr. Ep. Fund. c. 8.

[t] B. ib. p. 82, 85, 86.

[u] His ergo tam ſcelerate compoſitis, mittit et diſcipulos ſuos prædicaturos intrepide fictos ſimulatoſque errores, et novas, falſaſque voces annuntiaturos per loca ſingula. Quod cum rex Perſarum cognoviſſet, dignis eum ſuppliciis ſubdere parat. Quo Manes agnito, admonitus in ſomnis, elapſus de carcere, in fugam verſus eſt, auro plurimo cuſtodibus corruptis, et manſit in caſtello Arabionis. Arch. c. 59, p. 69.

'Mani,

Mani in the Acts of Archelaus's Diſpute, to whom I refer the reader. I ſhall put down here ſome obſervations which I have myſelf made in reading thoſe Acts.

Mani was a Perſian: but the writer of the Diſpute ſeems little acquainted with Perſian affairs. He ſuppoſeth that Probus was the Roman emperor at the time in which he placeth the conference; but the king of Perſia, ſo often mentioned by that title, is never named. Some may be apt to ſuſpect he did not certainly know who was king of Perſia when Probus was emperor, and therefore feared to put down any name, leſt it would be a miſtake, which might afterwards be detected and expoſed: then the hiſtory of Mani is here related, as if the whole courſe of his affairs happened under one prince only; whereas learned moderns are now clearly of opinion that [x] thoſe tranſactions were in the time of three or four reigns of ſeveral kings of Perſia. Moreover, this writer ſuppoſeth, that Mani, or his teachers and predeceſſors, learned the doctrine of two natures, or two principles, from Empedocles, and other Greeks; whereas it is much more likely that he had it from the [y] Perſians.

There are many improbabilities in the hiſtorical part of that diſpute. Mani is ſaid to have been impriſoned; but, if the king of Perſia had been diſpleaſed with him on account of the death of his ſon, I think he would not have ſent him to priſon, but would have put him to death preſently.

Suppoſing Mani to have been impriſoned by the king of Perſia, it is not eaſy to conceive how he could eſcape, and get to Caſchar, or Carchar, ſaid to be a city in the Roman Meſopotamia.

The writer of the Diſpute ſays, in that city lived a Chriſtian, of great note for wealth and liberality: Mani in Perſia heard of his fame, and was very deſirous, as [z] is related, to make a convert of him, hoping he might by him gain the whole province; but not chuſing to come to him without ſome previous notice, he

x Shariſtani in libro de Religionibus Orientis de eo refert: Mani apparuit tempore Shabur filii Ardeſhir, et occidit eum Behram filius Hormuz, Filii Shabur. Hyde de Relig. V. Perſ. cap. 21, p. 282, Conf. Herbelot Bib. Orient. V. Mani.

Mais voici une ignorance, une erreur, qu'on ne ſauroit excuſer. C'eſt d'avoir mis ſous un même regne le cours entier d'une affaire, qui commença ſous l'ayeul, ou le biſayeul, et qui ne s'acheva que ſous le petit-fils, ou l'arrier-petit-fils. Beauſ. T. 1. p. 128.

Car Sapor, qui regnoit depuis 240, ou 241, mourut vers 271. Hormiſdas ſon fils en 272, et Vararane fils d'Hormiſdas en 276. Ainſi ce ſera Vararane II. fils de celuici, qui aura fait mourir Manichée en 277, ou 278. Till. Mem. Ec. Les Manichéens Art. vii. in fin. y Græcis Budda Empedoclis opinionem amplexus dicitur, duo rerum pugnantia inter ſe principia ſtatuentis.——Verum rectius a Perſarum magis accepiſſe videtur. Hyde ib. p. 285.——Verum rectius a Perſis, ſeu Perſarum magis id accepiſſe videtur, qui αγαθον δαιμονα, και κακον δαιμονα——ſtatuebant, ut eſt apud Laertium in Proœmio, &c. Toll. Inſign. Ital. p. 126, in not. z Arch. c. 4, p. 5.

deputes

deputes one of his diſciples, by name Turbo, whom he ſends with a letter to that eminent Chriſtian: this letter is fully inſcribed: 'Manichee [a] to Marcellus.' But could that be ſafely or prudently done by a man eſcaped out of priſon, and every where ſought by his ſovereign?

The [b] meſſenger, who carries back an anſwer from Marcellus, finds Mani in a caſtle named (D) Arabion, a Perſian fortreſs, as it ſeems, and upon the frontier: Mani thereupon comes in great haſte to Marcellus at Caſchar; and he [c] has in his company two-and-twenty, or, as in another copy, twelve young men and virgins; that is, ſo [d] many men who profeſſed virginal chaſtity; and he is himſelf dreſſed very politely after the Perſian manner. How can it be thought that a perſon under his prince's diſpleaſure ſhould travel with ſuch attendants?

Moreover, when the diſputations in the Roman part of Meſopotamia were over, and he was diſagreeable to the people of Caſchar and Diodoris, where the conferences were held, he [e] returns to Arabion, where he is taken up by the king's ſoldiers: but would any man of common ſenſe act in this manner, who was liable to capital puniſhment for ſuch an offence as is here ſuppoſed?

It is alſo remarkable that Mani's letter to Marcellus, brought by Turbo, begins in this manner: 'Manichee [f] apoſtle of Jeſus 'Chriſt, and all the ſaints and virgins with me, ſend peace to 'Marcellus.'

Upon all which therefore I again obſerve, that Mani is ſaid to have been impriſoned on account of the death of the king of Perſia's ſon: but all the following particulars of his hiſtory repreſent him not a priſoner, but at full liberty; for [g] his three

[a] Arch. p. 6, cap. 5. [b] Marcellus vero, accito uno ex pueris ſuis, Calliſto nomine, præcipit proficiſci, qui nihil moratus, illico proficiſcitur; et poſt triduum pervenit ad Manem, quem in caſtello quodam Arabionis reperit, atque epiſtolam tradidit. Arch. c. 6, p. 9.

(D) Concerning Arabion ſee Tillem. as before, art. 8, at the end.

[c] Eadem autem ipſa die adventavit Manes, adducens ſecum juvenes, et virgines electos ad viginti duo ſimul——et primo——ad Marcellum ingreditur ſalutandum. Quo ille viſo admiratus eſt primo habitus indumenta. Habebat enim calciamenti genus, quod quadriſole vulgo appellari ſolet; pallium autem varium, tanquam ærina ſpecie; in manu vero validiſſimum baculum tenebat ex ligno ebeleno. Babylonium vero librum portabat ſub ſiniſtra ala. Crura etiam braccis obtexerat colore diverſo, quarum una ruſa, alia velut praſini coloris erat. Vultus vero ut ſenis Perſæ artificis, et bellorum ducis videbatur. Arch. c. 12, p. 23.

[d] M. de Tillemont a pris ces vierges pour des filles.——Je ne ſai ſi ceux de ſes diſciples, qui l'accompagnoient, étoient de jeunes hommes; mais je ſuis bien aſſuré qu'il n'y avoit de jeunes filles avec eux.——Ces *vierges* et ces *ſaints* ſont les mémes perſonnes. Auſſi trouve-t-on dans un endroit de la verſion Latine *virgines Electos*, ce qui marque que ce ſont des hommes. Beauſ. T. 1. p. 93.

[e] Sed ille vias, quibus venerat, repetens, tranſito fluvio ad Arabionis caſtellum rediit, ubi poſtea comprehenſus, oblatus eſt regi. Arch. c. 45, p. 100.

[f] Ap. Arch. c. 5, p. 6.

chief

chief disciples, who had been sent out into several parts, return to him, and find him in prison, as is pretended: from thence he sends them out again, and they return: after which they are again sent abroad by him to propagate his principles. Soon after this he sends the beforementioned letter to Marcellus by Turbo; which was, as already observed, fully inscribed; and divers people, his followers, called saints, join with him in the wish of peace: to this letter he receives an answer from Marcellus, whose messenger has no directions of privacy, nor apprehensions of danger from carrying and delivering a letter to Mani: soon after this he comes to Marcellus with a numerous attendance, and is himself properly and richly habited like a Persian high priest or bishop. Was this man a prisoner? Are these things marks of chains and confinement? Finally, when the disputes in Mesopotamia are over, Mani returns to Arabion, a Persian fortress: that is, he makes the best of his way back again to Persia; which shews that before he made the excursion into Mesopotamia (if ever he made any) he was at full liberty: for he leaves the angry and offended Christians in Roman Mesopotamia, and returns to Persia, his own country, as a place of safety. Since, therefore, we are well assured that Mani was put to death, we may reckon it probable that in some short time after his return home he fell under his prince's displeasure, and was condemned by him for some cause or other: nor does any cause of offence appear more likely than his zeal in propagating some speculative opinions.

The history of Turbo is likewise improbable: this man was a disciple of Mani, and had been [h] instructed by Addas, one of Mani's chief disciples: nor is it reasonable to think that a man should be employed in such an affair, who might not be confided in: but, having delivered his master's letter into the hands of Marcellus, when he is desired to go back with an answer, he excuseth himself; and a servant of Marcellus having been dispatched with the answer, Turbo presently [i] gives Marcellus and Archelaus, bishop of the city, an odious, and perhaps false account, of Mani's doctrine.

Archelaus likewise, at the end of the disputes, appears to have with him one [k] Sisinnius, who is supposed to give him particular information concerning Mani: but Sisinnius, according to Photius,

[g] For the several following particulars see Arch. c. 53, 54. [h] Accitum unum ex discipulis, Turbonem nomine, qui per Addam fuerat instructus, tradita epistola, abire jubet, ac perferre Marcello. Arch. c. 4. p. 5. [i] Vid. Arch. c. 6, 7, et seqq. p. 9, &c. [k] Sed nunc pauciſſime dicere volentem deprecor, ut cum silentio audiatis, ut agnoscatis, qui sit, et unde, et qualis sit iste, qui advenit; sicut Sisinnius quidam, unus ex comitibus ejus indicavit mihi, quem etiam ad testimonium eorum, quæ a me dicentur, si placet, vocare paratus sum. Sed ne ipse quidem dicere recusavit

Photius, and [m] Peter of Sicily, was a chief disciple of Mani, and sat in his chair after him as his successor. However, whether those authors are to be relied upon as to that particular or not, it is not reasonable to think that Archelaus, a catholic bishop of the Roman Mesopotamia, should have with him at one and the same time two disciples and intimates of Mani, and both deserters.

Sisinnius is a Greek name: I should be glad to know more of him, if ever there was a Manichee of this name; it might perhaps afford some light for clearing up the time of this piece which we have been examining.

3. Valesius, in his notes upon Socrates, transcribes a passage out of a letter of Libanius to Priscian, president of Palestine; which letter he supposeth to relate to the Manichees in that province, though they are not named: 'These [n] men worship the 'sun, but without bloody sacrifices, and honour him as a deity 'in a secondary sense only. They pinch their belly to a great 'degree, and look upon the day of their death as the day of their 'deliverance. They are in many places of the world, but every 'where a few only: they injure no man, but some there are 'who give them trouble.'

II. That suits the Manichees; they were in many places, but no where numerous. That they were in many parts of the world may be concluded from the many books published against them. Fabricius [o] has a catalogue of ancient authors who have mentioned the Manichees, or written against them, amounting to more than forty in number; and yet that catalogue might be greatly enlarged.

Epiphanius, in his article of the Manichees, written about the year 376, speaking of authors who had written against them, nameth [p] Eusebius of Cæsarea, Eusebius of Emesa, Serapion of Thmuis, Athanasius of Alexandria, George of Laodicea, Apollinarius of the same place, and Titus of Bostra; and he says there were other authors besides these who had written against them.

1. Photius, giving an account of Heraclean, bishop of Chalcedon, whose work he much commends, (whose time however is not now certainly known) says, that, speaking of others who

cusavit eadem quæ nos dicimus, præsente Mane. Credidit enim doctrinæ nostræ supradictus, sicut et apud me alius Turbo nomine. Arch. c. 51, p. 94.

[l] σισιννιος, ο και το αξιωμα αυτω της εκεινων διδασκαλιας αναδεξαμενος. Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 14, p. 59.

[m] Sisinnius, qui Manetî successit. Pet. Sic. Hist. Manich. ap. B. Patr. T. 6, p. 758. A.

[n] Οι τον ηλιον μονοι θεραπευοντες ανευ αιματος, και τιμωντες θεον προσηγορια δευτερα, και την γαστερα κολαζοντες, και εν χερσι ποιουμενοι την της τελευτης ημεραν. Πολλαχου μεν εισι της γης, πανταχου δε ολιγοι· και αδικουσι μεν ουδενα, λυπουνται δε υπ' εκεινων. Annot. in Socr. l. i. c. 22, p. 53.

[o] Bib. Gr. T. V. p. 289—293.

[p] Hær. 66, n. 21, p. 638.

had

had opposed the same sect before him, he names [q] Hegemonius, who wrote the disputations of Archelaus with Mani; Titus, George of Laodicea, Serapion of Thmuis, and Diodorus, whose work against the Manichees consisted of five-and-twenty books: this work of Diodorus of Tarsus is in Ebedjesu's [r] Catalogue, and therefore must have been translated into Syriac. And Photius in his own work against the Manichees, or Paulicians, mentions [s] Cyril bishop of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Titus of Bostra, Serapion of Thmuis, Alexander of Lycopolis, the twenty books of Heracleon bishop of Chalcedon, upon whom he again bestows great commendations: but we have now nothing of that work remaining beside the extracts made by Photius.

2. The piece of Alexander, just mentioned, written in Greek, who was of Lycus, a city of Thebais in Egypt, is still in [t] being. Fabricius supposeth that [u] he was at first a heathen and Manichee, afterwards a catholic Christian. Cave [x] thinks he was orginally a heathen, next a Manichee, in the end a catholic: he says that he is a very ancient writer, probably of the fourth century. Photius, as before cited, calls him [y] archbishop of Cyropolis: but Beausobre argues that [z] he was a mere heathen or pagan philosopher, as he calls him. Tillemont likewise says, that 'by [a] his book he 'appears to have been a pagan philosopher, who, observing that 'some of his fellow disciples embraced the opinion of the Ma- 'nichees, wrote this piece to confute it by natural and philoso- 'phical reasons. He speaks with some respect of Jesus Christ, and 'prefers the doctrine of the churches [they are his own words] 'to that of Mani: but it may be perceived by those very places 'that he is by no means a Christian.' I do not chuse to enter at present into any debate about the character of this writer: the reader, if he pleaseth, may consult the work itself, and the modern authors to whom I have referred: I shall only say that the Manichees were Christians. If ever Alexander was a Manichee he must have been a Christian at that time; what he was afterwards, when he wrote against them, is another question.

3. I do not think it needful to say any thing here particularly of Augustine, whose books however against the Manichees are numerous and still extant, and will be of great use to us, as will ap-

[q] Cod. 85, p. 204. [r] Vid. Assem. Bib. Or. T. 3, P. i. p. 29. [s] Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. cap. xi. [t] Ap. Combefis. Auct. Nov. [u] Alexandri Lycopolitæ ex Ethnico Manichæi, atque inde ad ecclesiam reducti liber.——Videtur scripsisse sæculo quarto. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 290. [x] Erat quidem primum cultu Gentilis, deinde ad Manichæos in Egyptum recens delatos se contulit. Tandem ejurata hæresi, ad Catholicorum castra transiit. Cav. Diss. de scriptor. incertæ ætatis. [y] Phot. contr. Manich. ubi supra. [z] Beaus. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 236. [a] Tillem. T. iv. Les Manichéens Art. 16. fin.

pear

pear hereafter. Caſſiodorus commends Auguſtine's writings [b] againſt the Manichees, as if they were ſuperior to what he had written againſt other heretics.

4. But there are two catholic writers againſt the Manichees, Serapion and Titus, of whom I ſhall here give a diſtinct account. Their books againſt the Manichees being their only remaining works, I ſhall write their hiſtory in this place, and obſerve their teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament.

Serapion, mentioned by [c] Epiphanius and [d] Heraclean among authors who before them had written againſt the Manichees, is placed by Jerom in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers; where he ſpeaks of him to this purpoſe: 'Serapion [e], biſhop of Thmuis, 'who for his great capacity was called Scholaſticus, and was much 'eſteemed by the monk Antonius, publiſhed an excellent book 'againſt the Manichees, another upon the Titles of the Pſalms, 'and uſeful epiſtles to divers perſons; and under the emperor 'Conſtantius he was famous as a confeſſor.'

Cave [f] ſpeaks of Serapion at the year 347, about which time he is ſuppoſed to have been made biſhop of Thmuis by Athanaſius. Baſnage, editor of Serapion's [g] book againſt the Manichees, placeth him at 340; Cave ſays he died about the year 358; Valeſius [h] ſays he died before the year 359; but Tillemont, who thinks [i] he was made biſhop about 349, makes a queſtion whether [h] he was not alive in the year 369; Socrates [l] ſays that about the year 373 Athanaſius ſent five biſhops, and among them Serapion of Thmuis, to wait upon the emperor Conſtantius in the weſt.

It has been obſerved by learned men that Thmuis in the Egyptian language ſignifies a goat: the city was ſo called becauſe that animal was the great object of it's worſhip; Jerom ſays as much [m] in his Commentary upon the forty-ſixth chapter of Iſaiah.

It is commonly ſaid that Serapion was a great aſcetic, and for a good while lived a mortified courſe of life in the deſerts of Thebais. Cave [n] goes into this ſuppoſition; but Tillemont diſ-

[b] Contra quos ita fervore pietatis incanduit, ut diligentius atque vivacius adverſus eos dixerit, quam contra hæreſes alias diſſeruit. Caſſ. de Inſtitu. D. L. c. i. p. 510, T. 2. [c] H. 66. c. 21.

[c] Ap. Phot. cod. 85, p. 204.

[e] Serapion Thmueos epiſcopus, qui ob elegantiam ingenii cognomen Scholaſtici meruit, charus Antonii monachi, edidit adverſus Manichæum egregium librum, et de Pſalmorum titulis alium, et ad diverſos utiles epiſtolas. Et ſub Conſtantio principe etiam in confeſſione inclytus fuit. De V. I. cap. 99. [f] Cav. H. L. [g] Ap. Caniſ. Antiq. Lect. T. i. [h] Annot. in libr. iv. c. 23. Socr. p. 54, b.

[i] Saint Athanaſ. Art. 66. Mem. Ec. T. 8. P. i. p. 241. [k] Ib. p. 243.

[l] Socrat. H. E. l. 4, c. 9, p. 547, C.

[m] Θμουις lingua Ægyptia ab hirco. In. Iſ. T. 3, p. 343, m. [n] Vitæ inſtituto ασκητης, inter arctioris diſciplinæ cultores diu deſerta Thebaidos habitavit. Cav. ubi ſupr.

putes it: for he says that [o] the attainments of learning and eloquence, ascribed to Serapion by Jerom and Sozomen, are not the things for which hermits are wont to be commended; nor do those writers any where say that he ever lived such a course of life, though they have mentioned him several times.

Antonius's respect for this bishop of Thmuis is taken notice of by [p] Athanasius, who also himself had a great regard for him, and addressed [q] several of his works to him in epistles.

In Sozomen, Serapion has the character [r] of a man of admirable piety and eloquence; and his name is in [s] Jerom's letter to Magnus. Socrates has preserved a memorable saying of our author, taken from from Euagrius of Pontus: 'The [t] angel of the 'church of Thmuis said: "the soul that has drunk in spiritual "knowledge is completely cleansed; the parts of the soul fretted "with anger are cured by love, and other evil affections are cor-"rected by temperance."

No work of Serapion remains beside his book against the Manichees, which is not very large.

As for his testimony to the books of the New Testament, I observe briefly, that he has quoted the gospels, the [u] Acts of the apostles, and divers of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that [x] to the Hebrews, as his; he quotes the epistle to the Romans [y] as an oracle, and [z] in like manner other parts of scripture.

The reader may perhaps here recollect that [a] we formerly saw the history of another bishop of this place named Phileas, who suffered martyrdom in the persecution begun by Diocletian.

5. I shall be obliged to cite Titus of Bostra several times; I therefore here write likewise his history: says Jerom, 'Titus [b], 'bishop of Bostra, in the time of Julian and Jovian, wrote with 'great strength of argument against the Manichees, and some 'other volumes: he died under Valens.' This last mentioned emperor reigned from 364 to 378: Titus is remembered again by Jerom in his letter to Magnus.

According to Cave, Titus flourished about 362, and died about 371; in Basnage's edition he is placed as writing about the

[o] Note 70, Sur. S. Athan. ubi supr. T. 8, p. 1179, [p] De Vit. S. Anton. p. 856, n. 82, p. 864, n. 91. [q] Vid. Athan. Opp. p. 340, &c. p. 647, &c. [r] ——περὶ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα τὸν βίον διεπίσιος, καὶ λέγειν δεινός. Sozom. l. 4, c. 9, p. 547.

[s] ——et Serapionis confessoris. Hier. Ep. 83. [t] ——ὅτι ὁ μὲν πεπωκὼς πνευματικὴν γνῶσιν τελείως καθαίρεται· ἀγαπᾷ δὲ τὰ φλεγμαίνοντα μόρια τῆς ψυχῆς διορθοῦται, πυκνὰς δὲ ἐπιθυμίας ἐπιτίμησας ἴσως ἐγκρατεῖς. ap. Socr. l. 4, c. 23, p. 237, C. [u] Serap. contr. Manich. p. 47, f. [x] ὅταν λέγῃ παῦλος· Πίστει μᾶλλον ἡ πορνὴ ὁ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι. p. 46, m. [y] τὰ δὲ λόγια βοῶντα καὶ λέγοντα. p. 47, supr. m. [z] καὶ βοῶσιν οἱ λόγοι. p. 47, infr. m. [a] See p. 352.

[b] Titus Bostrenus episcopus sub Juliano et Joviano principibus fortes adversum Manichæos scripsit libros, et nonnulla volumina alia. Moritur autem sub Valente. De V. I. c. 102.

year

year 360: Tillemont thinks that [c] he publiſhed his books againſt the Manichees in the reign of Valens.

Titus fell under the diſpleaſure of Julian, of which Sozomen has left the following account: 'Julian [d] ordered the people of 'Boſtra to expel the biſhop of that church by a public decree, 'and threatened them, that if any diſturbance happened there 'he ſhould impute it to the biſhop and clergy. Titus thereupon 'ſent a letter to the emperor, aſſuring him that the Chriſtians 'were equal in number to the Greeks [or Gentiles]; that they 'were very quiet; and that, paying a regard to his admonitions, 'they had no thought of making any diſturbance. From thoſe 'words Julian took occaſion to write a letter to the people of Boſ-'tra, in order to incenſe them againſt Titus, as having accuſed 'them, ſaying: "It was not owing to their own good temper, "but to his exhortations, that they were kept from ſedition." The letter, or reſcript of Julian, ſtill [e] extant, confirms Sozomen's account.

The books of Titus againſt the Manichees are taken notice of by many ancient authors; as [f] Epiphanius, [g] Theodoret, [h] Heraclean, [i] Stephen Gobar, [k] Photius; as alſo by [l] Trithemius; beſide Jerom above tranſcribed.

We ſtill have three of thoſe books, with the contents of all four; but the fourth and laſt ſeems to be irrecoverably loſt: and there may be reaſon to think that the three books which we have are not complete, or that ſome parts of them are out of place. It ſeems to me that ſome words of [m] Baſnage, to whom we are indebted for the publication of Titus in Greek, afford ground for ſuch a ſuſpicion, though he has taken laudable pains to ſet all right.

Some aſcribe to Titus a Commentary upon St. Luke, though it is not diſtinctly mentioned among his works by any ancient author; learned men therefore are divided in their ſentiments about it. Baſnage thinks that [n] Titus wrote ſuch a commentary,

[c] Perſecution de Julien, Art. 25, Mem. T. 7, p. 669.

[d] Sozom. l. 5, c. 15, p. 616, B. C. D.

[e] Vid. Julian. Opp. T. i. p. 435, Ep. 52. [f] Hær. 66, c. 21.

[g] Hær. Fab. l. i. c. 26, ſub. fin.

[h] Ap. Phot. cod. 85. [i] Ap. eund. cod. 232, p. 896. [k] Contr. Manich. l. i. cap. xi. [l] De Script. Ec. cap. 72.

[m] Quinimo plurima inverſo ordine turbata intricatiſſima invenimus. Prima fronte periiſſe librum tertium autumabam. ——Sed perlegendo Græca, apparuit nobis ille liber tertius integer, quem primo libro inſeruerat amanuenſis. Deinde truncatus multis in locis videbatur primus liber. Sed diſcerpta reſarcire, et in genuinum ordinem reſtituere conati ſumus, non modo argumentorum ſeriem ſecuti, ſed etiam propoſito Serapionis ſcopo, quem ipſe delineaverat, ſequentes. Baſnag. Animadv. ap. Caniſ. Lect. T. i. p. 58. [n] Obſervandum eſt igitur, periiſſe Commentarios Titi in Lucam, ſed fragmenta tantum, ſive Catenam Græcorum Patrum ſub ejus nomine protrudi. Baſn. ib. p. 57.

and that there are fragments of it remaining: Fabricius is of opinion, that [o] the Commentary upon St. Luke is the work of ſome other Titus, of the ſixth century, or later: Tillemont, beſide other material things, obſerves that [p] no ancient author makes particular mention of any work of Titus, but that againſt the Manichees; and that the Commentary upon St. Luke, which bears his name, has divers marks of a late age.

I ſhall add here ſome cenſures of learned moderns upon Titus; particularly upon that work of his which we have, and is univerſally received as genuine. Thoſe cenſures may be of uſe to aſſiſt my readers in forming a right judgment of ancient Chriſtian writers.

Says [q] Tillemont: 'He ſeems to have followed the dangerous error aſcribed to Origen, that the pains of the damned, and even thoſe of the dæmons themſelves, will not be eternal.'

Du Pin [r] ſays: 'It is ſurpriſing that Titus had not recourſe to original ſin for explaining all the difficulties of the Manichees: it might have ſerved him for a general ſolution of almoſt all their objections: for there is no longer any difficulty to comprehend, why man is carried to evil, why he ſuffers, why he is ſubject to hunger, pain, diſeaſes, death, when once original ſin is admitted: nevertheleſs, he has made no uſe of this doctrine to explain theſe queſtions, but examines them like a philoſopher. He has not ſo much as mentioned the grace of Jeſus Chriſt, and he ſeems to have ſuppoſed that man can of himſelf do good as well as evil.'

James Baſnage, the firſt editor of Titus in Greek and Latin, ſpeaks [s] to the like purpoſe. And indeed it is commonly ſaid that [t] Auguſtine himſelf, in his books againſt the Manichees, ſpoke of man's free-will juſt as Titus and Didymus, and other Greeks did.

I ought now briefly to obſerve this writer's teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament. He frequently quotes the goſpels, and the epiſtles of St. Paul, particularly that to the Hebrews: he

[o] Commentarius in Lucan ſub Titi nomine editus——non eſt hujus Titi, ſed ſcriptoris Cyrillo Alexandrino, ac fortaſſe ſæculo ſexto junioris, &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 8, p. 413. [p] Vid Tillem, ubi ſupra, p. 670. [q] Tillem. ubi ſupr. p. 671.

[r] Du Pin Bibl. des Aut. Ec. T. 2, p. 122, a Amſterdam. [s] Non modo ſiluit de peccato originali, quo facile neceſſitatem et æquitatem pœnarum firmare poterat; ſed virtutem a rationis exercitatione hominiſque electione pendere abſque ulla Chriſti gratia affirmabat. Baſn. ap. Caniſ. Lect. T. i. p. 57. [t] Libertatem arbitrii tam ad bonum quam ad malum homini lapſo tribuit [Didymus]: nec mirum, omnes enim adverſus Manichæos diſputantes, ne Auguſtino quidem excepto, hanc ſententiam propugnaverunt. Id. ib. p. 199.

quote

quotes [u] the first words of the epistle, and afterwards, in another place, a [x] large part of the first chapter, expressly as Paul's.

In one [y] short paragraph he quotes the beginning of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's gospels, and the sixth and seventh verses of the first chapter of St. John, and cites all those several evangelists by name.

Titus likewise quotes [z] the Acts of the apostles. I shall have occasion to take particular notice of the passage hereafter.

He has little or nothing out of the catholic epistles, or the Apocalypse.

I have observed in this author these general divisions of scripture; 'the [a] law and the prophets:' 'the [b] law, the gospel, and 'Paul:' and presently afterwards, 'the [c] law, our Saviour, and 'the apostle:' often, 'law [d] and gospel' for Old and New Testament.

His respect for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament is manifest; I need not allege particular passages. At the beginning of his work he says: 'We [e] learn the way of truth from 'the holy scriptures and the common principles of reason.'

6. This is not a proper time or place for me to give a distinct account of Didymus of Alexandria, who flourished about the year 370, though we still have [f] a tract against the Manichees, and in it's original Greek language, which is generally allowed to be [g] his.

I shall only say that here are no hard names. Didymus must have been naturally of a mild temper; or the principles of reason and religion had softened him, and produced in him gentleness and long-suffering: upon this account, as well as others, this piece deserves to be commended. This character belongs to so few writings in the Manichæan controversy, that one cannot forbear taking notice of it. Most other authors with their arguments have mingled bitter invectives, and the harshest expressions that can be thought of. In such kind of language none have exceeded that polite and orthodox writer Photius, patriarch of Constantinople: and honest Serapion, at the beginning of his work, naming Valentinus and Marcion, and some other ancient here-

[u] Και ο παυλος οιδε—γραφων μεν εξαιοις ειτως λεγει· Πολυμερως και πολυτροπως, κ. λ. Tit. contr. Manich. l. 3. ap. Canis. Lect. T. i. p. 142. [x] Ib. p. 153.

[y] Ib. p. 141. [z] Ib. p. 155.

[a] Τοσαυτην γαρ επιμελειαν τω νομω και τοις προφηταις πεποιηται ο σωτηρ, κ. λ. l. 3, p. 140. [b] Ειπεν ο νομος——ειπε το ευαγγελιον——εβοησεν ο παυλος.——ib. p. 153, in. [c] Και μανθανεται—εκ νομου, και σωτηρος, και αποστολου. ib. p. 153.

[d] Vid. ib. p. 154. in. [e] Αλλ' αυτην της αληθειας την οδον, εκτε των αγιων γραφων, και των κοινων εννοιων εχοντες. l. i. p. 60.

[f] ap. Basnag. Canis. Lect. p. 204, &c.

[g] Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. in Didymo. Basnag. ap. Canis. lect. p. 203. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. x. Didyme, Art. iv. in fin. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 8, p. 353.

tics, affirms that 'the [h] Manichæan wickedneſs and abſurdity 'had ſo far outgone all other things of the kind, as to make 'them appear almoſt innocent.' Ephiphanius [i] calls this the moſt venomous of all hereſies; and to the like purpoſe ſpeaks [k] Cyril. However, it muſt be owned that hard names have been given to all ſorts of heretics; nor is it eaſy to ſay which is the worſt hereſy: perhaps men are apt to think that ſo which they are oppoſing. Athanaſius [l] repreſents Arianiſm as the moſt impious of all hereſies, not excepting the Manichees; for they, and the Valentinians, are expreſsly named by him juſt before.

7. All theſe beforementioned writers and others are in Fabricius. But I think it not amiſs to take notice here of ſome authors omitted in his Catalogue.

1. The anonymous author of A Hiſtory of the Hereſy of the Manichees; a ſmall piece publiſhed by Mr. Pfaff with the Epitome of Lactantius.

2. The anonymous author De Vera Circumciſione, in the appendix to St. Jerom's works, more than once oppoſeth the Manichees [m]. A diſtinct account of this piece was given [n] formerly.

3. Arius deſerved a place in that Catalogue, if upon no other account, for the ſake of the early mention of the Manichæan doctrine concerning [o] the Son, in a letter written before the council of Nice.

4. Nor has Fabricius got Chryſoſtom, though that great orator often touches upon this point. Montfauçon thought it ſomewhat remarkable that he did ſo frequently oppoſe this error; and therefore takes particular notice of it in [p] his prefaces to ſeveral of the volumes of St. Chryſoſtom's works.

5. St. Jerom likewiſe frequently mentions and argues againſt the Manichees. I ſhall often quote him in writing their hiſtory.

6. Pelagius, in his Commentaries upon St. Paul's epiſtles, confutes them ſeveral [q] times.

[h] Τελευταιον δε εκτρωμα της πονηριας, πασας τας αλλας πονηριας δευτερας αποδειξασα, η τα μανιχαια τρελλε μανια. κ. λ. Serap. contr. Manich. p. 44, m. [i] Μετα την μοχθηραν ταυτην, και ουδεν υπερ πασαν αιρεσιν κακιαν εφευρουσαν τα μανι,——Epiſcopalia.——H. 97, n. i. [k] Vid. Cyr. Cat. 16, n. 9, p. 247. [l] Οι δε αρειανοι των μεν αλλων αιρετικων εισι τολμηροτεροι, και μιαροτητας εχοντας αδελφας απειληφασιν εκεινας, ολεθρου ουτω ασεβεστερας. Ath. Hiſt. Arian. ad Mon. T. i. p. 384, A.

[m] ——quam [vitam] Manichæi non videntes in carne, Ariani non intelligentes in ſpiritu.——ap. Hieron. opp. T. v. p. 152, et paſſim. [n] See p. 237, 238.

[o] ——εξ ης μανιχαιος μερος εμφασεως τε πατερος το γενημα εισηγησατο. Ap. Epiph. H. 69, c. 7. [p] Anomœorum impietatem ſæpe oppugnat et infectatur Chryſoſtomus. ——Sed, quod fortaſſe miretur quiſpiam, ſæpius in Manichæos invehitur.——Licet enim hæc hæreſis non tantas turbas daret, quantas haud ita pridem dederant Anomœi, attamen magno illi numero erant, malumque ſerpebat in dies latius. Præf. ad Chryſ. T. 7, n. iii. [q] Verum totus hic locus contra Manichæos facit, ubi dicit, quod evangelium ante ſit promiſſum ——et quod Chriſtus ſecundum carnem ex David ſtirpe. Pelag. in Ep. ad Rom. c. i. ver. 1, 2, ap. Hieron. opp. T. v. p. 926. Vid. et p. 928, et 951.

7. Rufinus

7. Rufinus, upon the Creed, diſtinctly cenſures the Manichees, together with divers others called heretics.

8. To all theſe and others might be added, from Aſſeman, divers Syrian authors.

1. The [r] Edeſſen Chronicle.

2. Ephrem, placed by Cave at the year 370, who in his work againſt all hereſies [s] particularly attacked the Manichees.

3. Aſſeman mentions ſeveral others, whoſe [t] names are in the margin.

III. All theſe names of eminent writers upon this point are ſufficient to aſſure us that there were Manichees in many parts of the world; but it does not appear that they were any where numerous: this may be perceived from St. Auguſtine, who had occaſion to be well acquainted with them. He ſays to them: 'You [u] are a very few, and almoſt none at all:' and adds, that though good men were ſcarce, there were vaſtly more truly good men among the catholics than all the Manichees, whether good or bad. They ſometimes argued that they were the few whom our Lord ſpeaks of as walking in the narrow way that leads to life: but Auguſtine cautions them [x] againſt being deceived by ſuch an argument, however ſpecious it might appear. In another place he magnifies [y] the number of the catholics above the ſmall number of their ſect. He ſays that [z] Fortunatus, a Manichæan preſbyter, ſeduced people enow at Hippo to induce him to live there a good while; which, however, I think, does not lead us to ſuppoſe that the number of his converts was very great. I need not inſiſt on any more paſſages of Auguſtine where [a] he ſpeaks of their ſmall number.

IV. Fabricius has likewiſe a catalogue [b] of the names of Ma-

[r] Ap. Aſſeman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 393.

[s] Refellit S. Doctor omnes generatim hæreſes; ſpeciatim autem Bardeſanis, Marcionis, et Manichæi. Aſſem. ib. p. 118, Conf. T. 3, P. i. p. 63.

[t] Hinc adverſus eam ſectam, præter Græcos et Latinos patres, Syri complures ſcripſere; Ephraem, Paulonas, Daniel Rheſinæ, Natanael, et Bud Periodeutes, de quibus Sobenſis in hoc catalogo. Ib. T. 3, P. i. p. 220.

[u] Quid autem inter vos, in tam exiguo et pene nullo numero veſtro, nonne plerique ſunt tales———? Quæ tamen paucitas ſanctorum et fidelium——per ſe ipſam tantam maſſam frumenti facit, ut omnes probos et reprobos veſtros, quos pariter veritas reprobat, incomparabili multitudine ſuperet. Contr. Fauſt. l. 20, c. 23.

[x] Fuge iſta, obſecro, non te decipiat ſpecies paucitatis, quoniam ipſe Dominus dixit, anguſtam viam eſſe paucorum. Contr. Secundin. cap. 26.

[y] ——velitiſque intelligi in tanta veſtra paucitate latere neſcio quos, qui ſua præcepta cuſtodiunt, et in tanta catholicæ multitudine non velitis? De Mor. Manich. cap. ult. fin.

[z] Eodem tempore preſbyterii mei, contra Fortunatum quemdam Manichæorum preſbyterum diſputavi, qui plurimum temporis apud Hipponem vixerat, ſeduxeratque tam multos, ut propter illos ibi eum delectaret habitare. Retr. l. 2, c. 14.

[a] Cum in iſta paucitate magnas patiamini anguſtias, dum a vobis exigitur vel unus ex iis quos electos vocatis, qui præcepta illa cuſtodiat. De Mor. Ec. Cath. c. 34.

[b] Ap. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 287—289.

nichees mentioned by ancient writers. I ſhall take notice of a few only.

1. Here again occurs Alexander of Lycopolis; of whom I need not ſay any thing more than I have done.

2. Auguſtine, a wit of the firſt order, and a principal glory of the country of Africa, who was entangled in this opinion, and for about nine years was among the auditors of the Manichees, from the nineteenth to the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year of his age; at which time ſuſpicions concerning the truth of their doctrine aroſe in his mind, and increaſed, until he quite forſook them. Afterwards he wrote againſt them at ſeveral times with great applauſe and ſucceſs.

I have expreſſed myſelf with no greater exactneſs concerning the time of Auguſtine's being in the Manichæan ſcheme, becauſe he himſelf ſpeaks differently: ſometimes his expreſſion is that he was with them [c] almoſt nine years, at another time [d] full nine years: ſometimes he ſays that when the difficulties of their ſcheme perplexed him, he was [e] in the twenty-eighth, at other times [f] in the twenty-ninth, year of his age; nay he ſpeaks of his being [g] in the thirtieth year of his age, or almoſt thirty years old, before his eyes were opened.

The reaſon of this different way of ſpeaking ſeems to be that his change was gradual: for the ſpace of nine years, or very near it, from the nineteenth year of his life, he was entirely [h] theirs; in the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year of his age doubts aroſe in his mind; about the end of which laſt year [i] he ſeems to have determined to be no longer a Manichee: in the next year, the thirtieth of his life, when his mother came to him at Milan,

[c] Nam novem ferme anni ſecuti ſunt, quibus ego in illo limo profundi ac tenebris falſitatis,——volutatus ſum. Confeſſ. l. 3, c. xi. n. 20. Et per annos ferme novem, quibus eos animo vagabundus audivi, nimis extento deſiderio expectabam iſtum Fauſtum. ib. l. 5, c. vi. n. 10. Quid enim me aliud cogebat, annos fere novem, ——homines illos ſequi ac diligenter audire——? De Util. Cred. cap. i. n. 2.

[d] Novem annos totos magna cura et diligentia vos audivi. De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 68. [e] Per idem tempus annorum novem, ab undeviceſimo anno ætatis meæ, uſque ad duodetriceſſimum ſeducebamur et ſeducebamus. Confeſſ. l. 4, c. i.

[f] Proloquar in conſpectu Dei mei annum illum unde trigeſimum ætatis meæ. Jam venerat Carthaginem quidam Manichæorum epiſcopus Fauſtus nomine, &c. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. 3. [g] Et ecce jam tricenariam ætatem gerebam, in eodem luto hæſitans,——dum dico, Cras inveniam. Ecce manifeſtum apparebit, et tenebo. Ecce Fauſtus veniet, et exponet omnia. Confeſſ. l. 6, c. xi. n. 18. [h] Audite doctos eccleſiæ catholicæ viros tanta pace animi, et eo voto quo ego vos audivi: nihil opus erit novem annis, quibus me ludificaſtis. Longe omnino, longe breviore tempore, quid interſit inter veritatem vanitatemque cernetis. De M. E. C. cap. 18, n. 34. [i] Dubitans de omnibus, atque inter omnia fluctuans, Manichæos quidem relinquendos eſſe decrevi: non arbitrans eo tempore dubitationis meæ in illa ſecta mihi permanendum eſſe.—Statui ergo tamdiu eſſe catechumenus in catholica eccleſia, mihi a parentibus commendata, donec aliquid certi eluceret, quo curſum dirigerem. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. ult. n. 25.

he

he was only [k] not a Manichee; nay, in his thirty-first year he had not yet [l] a clear notion of the origin of natural and moral evil; and it was not till the thirty-third year of his age that he was baptized.

Whilst Auguſtine was among the Manichees he promoted their intereſt conſiderably, and [m] brought over divers to the ſame opinion; men of good condition, and bright parts, and ſome of them addicted to a ſtudious courſe of life: as [n] Alypius, [o] Romanianus, and [p] Honoratus.

3. Adimantus, ſaid to have been a diſciple of Mani, wrote [q] a book againſt the law and the prophets, endeavouring to ſhew that the goſpels and epiſtles were contrary to them; or, in other words, the diſagreement between the Old and New Teſtament, and that conſequently the former could not be of God. This book Auguſtine confuted in a diſtinct piece, ſtill extant; and he [r] elſewhere occaſionally confutes this writer's objections againſt the Old Teſtament.

In another place he ſays that [s] Adimantus was that diſciple of Manichee who was alſo called Addas. Beauſobre [t] thinks this a miſtake of Auguſtine, becauſe the Greek writers diſtinguiſh between Addas and Adimantus: but perhaps Auguſtine had good reaſon for what he ſaid. Toutée, the Benedictine editor of St. Cyril, aſſents [u] to Auguſtine; as does [x] Tillemont, without heſitation. Cave ſuppoſed [y] Addas and Adimantus to have been

[k] Et invenit me periclitantem quidem graviter deſperatione indagandæ veritatis. Sed tamen cum ei indicaſſem, non me quidem jam eſſe Manichæum, ſed neque catholicum Chriſtianum.——Ib. l. 6, c. i. n. 1. [l] Et intendebam ut cernerem quod audiebam, liberum voluntatis arbitrium cauſam eſſe ut male faceremus, et rectum judicium tuum ut pateremur, et eam liquide cernere non valebam. ib. l. 7, c. 3. n. 5. [m] ——ſeducebamur et ſeducebamus——et ſectabar iſta atque faciebam cum amicis meis, per me ac mecum deceptis. Confeſſ. l. 4, cap. i. Vid. ib. cap. 4. n. 7. [n] Et audire me rurſus incipiens, illa mecum ſuperſtitione involutus ei, amans in Manichæis oſtentationem continentiæ, quam veram et germanam putabat. Conf. l. 6, c. 7, n. 12, vid. ib. l. 11. [o] Ipſa me penitus ab illa ſuperſtitione, in quam te mecum præcipitem dederam, liberavit. Contr. Academicos, ad Roman. l. 1. c. i. n. 3.

[p] Tu nondum Chriſtianus, qui hortatu meo, cum eos vehementer exſecrareris, vix adductus es, ut audiendi tibi atque explorandi viderentur.——De Util. Cred. cap. i. n. 2. [q] Eodem tempore venerunt in manus meas quædam diſputationes Adimanti, qui fuerat Manichæi diſcipulus, quas conſcripſit adverſus legem et prophetas, velut contraria eis evangelica et apoſtolica ſcripta demonſtrare conatus. Huic ego reſpondi. Aug. Retract. l. i. c. 22. [r] Vid. Aug. in Pſalm. Serm. 12, cap. i. [s] Jam illud aliud quod in eodem codice ſcribi cœperat, Adimanti opus eſt, illius diſcipuli Manichæi, qui prænomine Addas dictus eſt: ubi de utroque Teſtamento velut inter ſe contraria teſtimonia proferuntur verſipelli doloſitate.——Aug. Contr. Adv. Leg. et Proph. l. 2, cap. ult. n. 41.

[t] Beauſ. ib. T. i. p. 432, not. (6.)

[u] Vid. Cyril. Cat. vi. c. 13, not. (e)

[x] Mem. T. iv. Les Manich. Art. 14, in.

[y] Diverſus ab Adda noſtro erat Adimantus ille, cujus toties apud Auguſtinum occurrit mentio, quemque ipſe peculiari opere refutavit. In catalogo enim diſcipulorum Manetis, tum apud Petrum Siculum, tum apud formulæ Cotelerianæ et Tollianæ auctorem diſtincte recenſentur, etſi in alia ſententia me olim fuiſſe fateor, et mecum ipſe Auguſtinus. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 145,

two

two different perſons: I put his words at the bottom of the page. I ſhall hereafter take ſome farther notice of the names of thoſe who are ſaid to have been diſciples of Mani.

Adimantus is much admired by [a] Fauſtus; he is next in his eſteem to Mani himſelf, which Auguſtine [a] fails not to obſerve: Beauſobre therefore concludes that [b] Adimantus was the apoſtle of Mani, who planted Manichæiſm in Africa: but to me this appears a conjecture without foundation. Auguſtine has [c] often mentioned this man, but ſays nothing of that kind of him. He ſays he [d] was a diſciple of Mani, and much extolled, as having been an eminent teacher of that ſect; and [e] that it was commonly ſaid he was a follower of Mani in his lifetime: but he no where intimates that they gave out that Africa was indebted to Adimantus for his preſence or perſonal inſtructions.

If Adimantus and Addas be two names of one and the ſame perſon, as Auguſtine ſuppoſed, it may be reckoned very probable that he was a diſciple of Mani in his lifetime, or however one of the moſt early abettors of his principles afterwards: for according to the Diſpute aſcribed to Archelaus, the three chief diſciples of Mani were [f] Thomas, Addas and Hermas: in Cyril [g] their names are Thomas, Baddas, and Hermas; in Epiphanius [h] Thomas, Hermias, Addas; in Theodoret [i] Aldas, (by miſtake of tranſcribers probably for Addas,) Thomas and Hermas. I need not add any more authors.

Whether Adimantus be the ſame perſon as Addas or not, it is fit I ſhould take notice of what Photius writes in his extracts out of Heraclean. 'That [k] author ſaid that Diodorus of Tarſus, in 'his firſt ſeven books, really argued againſt a work of Addas, 'called Modion, whilſt he thought he had been overthrowing 'the living goſpel of Manichee himſelf.' That title is ſuppoſed to have been taken from Mark iv. 21.

Here then is a book of Addas; was it the ſame with that of Adimantus, confuted by Auguſtine? We cannot be abſolutely

[a] —— a doctiſſimo ſcilicet et ſolo nobis poſt beatum patrem noſtrum Manichæum ſtudendo [al. ſtupendo] Adimanto. Fauſt. l. i. c. 2, ap. Auguſt. T. 8.

[a] Fauſtus ſic miratur Adimantum, ut ei ſolum præferat Manichæum. Contr. Fauſt. l. 6, c. 6. [b] Beaut. ib. T. i. p. 433.

[c] Contr. Adimant. c. 12, n. 2. c. 13, n. 1, et 4, et paſſim. [d] Quid quod etiam inſidiare auſus eſt populo Iſrael Adimantus unus ex diſcipulis Manichæi, quem magnum doctorem illius ſectæ fuiſſe commemorant. Contr. Adim. c. 12, n. 2.

[e] Si autem recenſeatis quæ contra Fauſtum Manichæum ſcripſimus, et contra Adimantum, qui Manichæi ſectator cum ille viveret fuiſſe jactatur. —— Contr. Adv. Leg. et Pr. c. 12. [f] Acquiſti etiam diſcipulos tres, quorum nomina ſunt hæc, Thomas, Addas, et Hermas. Act. Diſp. c. 53. p. 98. [g] Cat. vi. c. 31. p. 101. [h] Hær. 66, c. 1. et xii.

[i] Hær. Fab. l. i. c. 26, p. 214, C.

[k] ὁ δὲ τὰς πρώτας ἑπτὰ βίβλους τῶν [illegible] ἀγγελίου κατὰ τοῦτο [illegible] ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ [illegible] Cod. 85, p. 214.

certain;

certain; but possibly it was. The book used in Africa might be a Latin translation of the Greek original; and Addas might be more generally called Adimantus by the Latins, as Mani himself, who for the most part is called Manes by the Greeks, is generally called Manichæus by the Latins. We saw before that Adimantus and his book were much esteemed by the Manichees in Africa. If what Heraclean says of Diodorus of Tarsus be true, we have also proof of the great regard paid to the book of Addas in Asia; it must have been common there and in high esteem; otherwise Diodorus had not allotted his first seven books to the confutation of it, and that upon the supposition of it's being Mani's gospel.

Heraclean ascribes a like mistake to [l] Titus of Bostra. I rather think that Titus was not mistaken: he knew well enough whom he argued against; but he reckoned it to be one and the same thing to confute the master or a chief disciple. The objections he answered were sometimes taken from Mani himself, sometimes from Addas; but he did not judge it needful expressly to distinguish his authors. Titus has himself more than once intimated, that [m] he argued against somebody beside Mani himself, though he does not name the author. However here is another proof of the commonness of the book of Addas, and of the esteem it was in.

Possibly this book was not always fully titled, or inscribed, exactly in the same manner: and Augustine, a Latin in Africa, might mean, and have before him, the same book that was used by Diodorus and Titus; though he does not call it the Modion of Addas, but Dissertations of Adimantus.

Upon the whole, I think it probable that Addas and Adimantus are only two names of one and the same person; and that the book of Adimantus, which (as appears from Faustus and Augustine) was famous in Africa, is the same with that of Addas, which was used by the Manichees in Asia. In short, this book was every where considered by that sect as one of the best books they had; and I wish we had it too.

4. We are indebted to Photius for the knowledge of another Manichæan writer named Agapius; but his age is uncertain. Photius says that [n] Agapius seems to oppose the error of Eunomius, who flourished about the year 360. But those words need not be understood to mean any more than [o] that his sentiments were different from those of Eunomius, insomuch that he seemed to oppose them: as indeed it is allowed that the Manichæan

[l] Phot. Cod. 85. [m] —— ως γε τα τω μανητος συγγραφων φησιν,—— Tit. contr. Manich. l. i. p. 71, infr. m. —— Φησι δε τις λεξις εκεινος, η ετερος τις των απ' εκεινου, συγγραψας το κεφαλαιον περι της ανθρωπινης πρωτοπλαστιας. Ib. l. 3, p. 137.

[n] Μαχεσθαι δε δοκει προς την ευνομιου κακοδοξιαν. Cod. 179, p. 405. [o] Vid. Cav. Diss. de Scriptor. incert. æt. et Beaus. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 434.

doctrine

doctrine concerning the trinity was different from that of the Arians.

However, what Photius says [p] of this writer's confessing a consubstantial trinity, and agreeing mightily in expression with the orthodox Christians, may be an argument for his having lived and written after the Nicene council; forasmuch as it is very common with Photius to find in ecclesiastical authors, who lived before that council, many forms of expression different from those in use afterwards.

Photius speaks of a piece, or, as he is generally understood, of two pieces of [q] Agapius; one a work of three-and-twenty books, another consisting of a hundred-and-two chapters, inscribed to a woman of the same sect named Urania: but perhaps that is a fictitious name and character. If those books were extant they would be very curious. It may be collected from the account which Photius gives of them, that they would have furnished us with a good knowledge of the Manichæan scheme; for most, if not all their principles, seem to have been there treated.

In another work Photius, reckoning up the twelve disciples of Mani, mentions [r] Agapius, author of the Heptalogus, as does likewise [s] Peter of Sicily: this book is also in the [t] Anathemas against the Manichees, or Form of abjuring Manichæism. Timothy, presbyter of Constantinople, mentions, perhaps by mistake, the [u] Heptalogus of Alogius: it is generally supposed that [x] this is another book of the same Agapius, who wrote the other two beforementioned: if so, Agapius wrote three books in defence of the Manichæan principles. Whether this computation be right I cannot tell; but I can by no means allow that the placing Agapius among the twelve disciples of Mani affords any help for settling this age; because I do not admit the authority of the Catalogues in Photius and Peter, and the Anathemas just quoted; the reasons will be assigned hereafter.

5. Philostorgius tells a story of [y] Apthonius at Alexandria, whom he speaks of as a bishop of the Manichees, and a man in great reputation for knowledge and eloquence. Ætius, he says, had a public disputation with Apthonius, and so entirely over-

[p] Και τριαδα δε ομοουσιον ο καταρατος λεγει μεν ομολογειν. Cod. 179, p. 404, in. τας μεν των ευσεβων λεξεις συνομολογων ib. infr. p. m. [q] ——αγαπιε βιβλιοι, λογοδεκα περιεχοι τρια και εικοσι, και ετερα κεφαλαια εκατον δυο και εκατον. Cod. 179, p. 401.

[r] ——και αγαπιος, ο την επταλογον καλουμενην συνταξας. Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 14. [s] Pet. Sic. de Manich. ap. B. P. P. T. 16, p. 758, B. [t] Ap. Fabr. Hippolyt. T. 2, p. 203, et Cotel. not. ad Recogn. Clem. l. 4. c. 27, et Toll. Insign. Ital. p. 142. [u] Vid. Timoth. in Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. T. i. p. 138, 139, et Meursii Var. Divin. p. 117. [x] Vid. Cav. et Beauf. ubi supra. [y] Αφθονιος τις της μανιχαιων λυσσης προεστως, και μεγαλη παρα πολλοις επι σοφια και δεινοτητι λογων φερων την δοξαν. Philost. l. 3, c. 15, p. 487, 488.

came

came him that he died of grief ſeven days after. In the Catalogues of Photius and Peter of Sicily, and likewiſe in the Form of abjuring Manichæiſm, before referred to, is the name of Apthonius; and he is ſpoken of as one of Mani's commentators.

6. Fauſtus of Milevi [z], in Africa, publiſhed a volume in defence of Manichæiſm, which St. Auguſtine anſwered [a] in a large work of three-and-thirty books, always prefixing at the beginning of each book a paſſage or ſection of Fauſtus himſelf. Beauſobre [b] commends this author's manner of writing, and ſuppoſeth that we have his work entire in Auguſtine; ſo does [c] Cave: but I do not perceive that clearly: we have the [d] introduction, but I do not ſee any concluſion. Auguſtine did not conſider every thing in the book of Adimantus, but left a part of it near the end unanſwered, as he acknowledges [e] in a work written long afterwards. Auguſtine wrote a book againſt Mani's epiſtle of the Foundation; but he therein confuted only the beginning of that epiſtle, as he informs us in his [f] Retractations. In like manner he may have been obliged, by the multitude of affairs upon his hands, to break off his anſwer to Fauſtus before he had confuted the whole of his book. It ſeems to me that Auguſtine, having followed Fauſtus ſtep by ſtep a great way, until he had produced and confuted * his furious paſſages concerning the goſpels, ſuppoſed he might then put an end to his labours: I think that at the concluſion Auguſtine intimates he had conſidered ſome chapters only of [g] Fauſtus.

Of this writer Beauſobre ſpeaks farther to this purpoſe: 'We [h] 'might expect in this work of Fauſtus pure and genuine Mani-'chæiſm: but beſide that the African ſect was one of the moſt 'abſurd and heretical among them, Fauſtus treats but a ſmall 'number of queſtions.' But, as before ſaid, perhaps we have not his piece entire: and here again our deſires may be raiſed for the works of Agapius, which ſeem to have been more full and

[z] Fauſtus quidam fuit, gente Afer, civitate Milevitanus, eloquio ſuavis, ingenio callidus, ſecta Manichæus, ac per hoc nefando errore perverſus. Noveram ipſe hominem. — Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. i. c. 1.

[a] Contra Fauſtum Manichæum—ſcripſi grande opus, verbis ejus propoſitis reddens reſponſiones meas. Triginta et tres diputationes ſunt, quas etiam libros cur non dixerim? Retract. l. 2, c. 7.

[b] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 224.

[c] In quibus Fauſtum κατα ποδας ſequitur, integrumque ejus librum in ſuum opus tranſcripſit. Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 344, Oxon.

[d] Vid. Fauſt. lib. i. ap. Aug. T. 8.

[e] Quamvis quædam ſint perpauca in fine ipſius operis Adimanti, quibus non reſpondi; neſcio quibus enim, ut fieri ſolet, incurrentibus, quæ magis videbantur urgere, illa interrupta ſic remanſerunt. Contr. Adv. Leg. et Pr. l. 2. c. 12, n. 41, fin.

[f] Liber contra epiſtolam Manichæi, quam vocant fundamenti, principia ejus ſola redarguit. Retr. l. 2, c. 2.

* Vid. Fauſt. l. 32, et 33, ap. Aug.

[g] Quapropter poſt omnes Fauſti calumnias refutatas, dumtaxat horum ejus capitulorum, quibus hoc opere quantum Dominus adjuvare dignatus eſt, ſufficienter, ut arbitror, prolixeque reſpondi, &c. Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 33, c. 9.

[h] Ib. p. 224.

copious.

copious. However, I ſhall be able to make good uſe of the work of Fauſtus, for ſhewing the Manichæan ſentiments concerning the ſcriptures, and other matters.

Auguſtine inſinuates that [i] Fauſtus was at firſt very poor, but that he lived well, and ſomewhat delicately, among the Manichees; notwithſtanding the ſtrict rules by which all the elect are bound to govern themſelves. Auguſtine calls him [k] biſhop: he ſpeaks of the great eſteem which Fauſtus was in among that people; but ſays that [l], excepting his eloquence, there was little in him extraordinary; and that he was no more able than their other teachers, to remove the difficulties in the Manichæan ſcheme, which he then began to be ſenſible of. However, Auguſtine [m] has often commended Fauſtus's manner of ſpeaking; and [n] owns that he was well qualified to make converts, and that he ſeduced many. He muſt have excelled in the art of ſpeaking, or Auguſtine [o] had not given him the preference in that reſpect to Ambroſe, the famous biſhop of Milan, who had more learning, and was a good ſpeaker likewiſe. Fauſtus and other Manichees [p] were baniſhed into ſome iſland by the Roman proconſul; but it was not long before they were releaſed. Tillemont [q] ſuppoſeth this to have happened in the year 386.

I cannot tell how it came to paſs that in Fabricius it is ſaid [r] Auguſtine heard Fauſtus nine years; when Auguſtine, in the place referred to, and elſewhere, aſſures us, that it was not till the ninth year of his being in the Manichæan ſentiments that Fauſtus came to Carthage.

Fauſtus is ſpoken of by [s] Cave as flouriſhing at the year 400; but that is placing him too late. Auguſtine forſook the Manichees before he was quite thirty years of age; he became acquainted

[i] Et quia in mattis dormiunt, mattarii appellantur: a quorum ſtratis longe diſſimiles fuerunt plumæ Fauſti, et caprinæ lodices; qua deliciarum affluentia non ſolum mattarios faſtidiebat, ſed etiam domum patris ſui hominis pauperis Milevitani. Contr. Fauſt. l. v. c. 5.

[k] Jam venerat Carthaginem quidam Manichæorum epiſcopus Fauſtus nomine, magnus laqueus diaboli, et multi implicabantur in eo per illecebram ſuaviloquentiæ, quam ego tametſi laudabam, &c. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. 3, n. 3. [l] ——quæ mihi cunctatio in dies major oboriebatur, ex quo illum hominem, cujus nobis adventus, ut noſti, ad explicanda omnia, quæ nos movebant, quaſi de cœlo promittebatur, audivi, eumque excepta quadam eloquentia talem qualem cæteros cognovi. De Util. Cred. c. 8, n. 20.

[m] Ergo ubi venit, expertus ſum hominem gratum et jucundum verbis, et ea quæ illi ſolent dicere multo ſuavius garrientem. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. 6. n. 10.

[n] Vid. ſupr. not. [k]. [o] Et delectabar ſuavitate ſermonis, quamquam eruditionis, minus tamen hilareſcentis atque mulcentis quam Fauſti erat, quod adtinet ad dicendi modum: cæterum rerum ipſarum nulla comparatio. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. 13, n. 23. [p] Fauſtus autem convictus vel confeſſus quod Manichæus eſſet cum aliis nonnullis ſecum ad judicium proconſulare perductis, —— in inſulam relegatus eſt. Contr. Fauſt. l. 5, c. 8. [q] St. Auguſtin. Art. 18, Mem. T. 13, p. 43.

[r] ——et novem annos a ſe auditum teſtatur. Conf. l. 5, c. 6. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 288. [s] Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 344.

with

with Fauſtus in his twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year: at which time he ſpeaks of Fauſtus as a biſhop, and very famous in his party. If Auguſtine was born in 354, Fauſtus muſt have come to Carthage, and their acquaintance muſt have begun, in 382 or 383. Auguſtine's book againſt Fauſtus ſeems not to have been written till about the year 400; but the book of Fauſtus might be written a good while before, and he himſelf dead; as indeed I ſuſpect he was from Auguſtine's manner of writing [u] at the beginning of his work and elſewhere. However, I willingly place Fauſtus at the year 384; though, according to the preceding argument, that is rather too late.

7. Hierax is reckoned among Manichæan writers by [x] Fabricius and Beauſobre. This laſt writer ſpeaks of him in this manner: 'he [y] was an Egyptian, a native of Leontopolis, well ſkilled 'in the learning of the Greeks and Egyptians: he was not one of 'thoſe extravagant Manichees that reviled the law and the pro'phets;' and a great deal more, which I need not tranſcribe.

But, with ſubmiſſion, I ſee no reaſon to call Hierax, or Hieracas, a Manichee: that ſuppoſition depends upon the authority [z] of Photius, and Peter of Sicily, and the Anathemas, or Form of abjuring Manichæiſm, before taken notice of; where Hierax is named among the diſciples and commentators of Mani. But they are all ſo late, that their teſtimony is of no weight againſt other evidence; for Photius and Peter are writers of the ninth century; and in their writings againſt the Manichees they ſo agree that it is [a] reckoned one copied the other; but which is the original is hard to ſay; and the Anathemas, as given us by Cotelerius and Tollius, plainly appear not to be of an earlier age. The compoſer of that form was acquainted with the Paulicians, and muſt have borrowed from Photius, or Peter, or both: in Tollius it is entitled 'A [b] Form of receiving thoſe who are converted 'from the hereſy of the Manichees and Paulicians to the true 'faith.' Beauſobre himſelf has ſomewhere well obſerved, upon another occaſion, that things are not to be received upon the credit of pieces of ſo late age.

[t] Nam annum ætatis viceſimum nonum egit Carthagine cum Fauſto. Libro enim 6 Confeſſionum cap. xi. ſcribit: Et ecce jam tricenariam ætatem gerebam.——Erat hunc annus Chriſti tricenteſimus octogeſimus tertius. Pagi in Baron. Ann. 377, n. iii. [u] Fauſtus quidem fuit gente Afer. ——Noveram ipſe hominem, quemadmodum eum commemoravi in libris Confeſſionum mearum. Contr. Fauſt. l. i. c. 1.

[x] Bib. Gr. T. 5, p. 288. [y] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 430, 431.

[z] See Beauſ. p. 430, not. (6.)

[a] Quæ dum memoro, non poſſum non ſignificare dubitationem, quam in notis profeſſus ſum, et in qua me adhuc hærere fateor, uter ſcilicet horum alterum in ſcribendo imitatus videatur. Wolf. Præf. ad Phot. contr. Manich. p. 6. [b] Ap. Toll. Inſign. Ital. p. 126.

Hierax

Hierax has a great character in [c] Epiphanius for learning and piety: nevertheless he had, it seems, some errors which induced Epiphanius to consider him as an heretic; but he does not call him a follower of Mani: he makes a distinct heresy of his opinions: and in like manner [d] Augustine, [e] John Damascenus, and [f] Prædestinatus: nor do any of them insinuate that he borrowed any thing from Mani: and all of them, except Augustine (who has entirely omitted their sentiments concerning the scriptures) expressly say that the Hieracites received the Old and New Testament; particularly Epiphanius, briefly in his [g] Synopsis, and more largely in his [h] Panarium. The only ancient author, that I know of, who says the Hieracites rejected the Old Testament, is the anonymous author [i] against all heresies, among the works of Athanasius: nor are they any where charged with holding two principles. Philaster and Theodoret have nothing about them.

Hierax, it is true, is said to have denied the resurrection of the body, and [k] to have expected only a spiritual resurrection: but it does not appear that he took that opinion from Mani. Epiphanius expressly says he supposeth that Hierax learned it of Origen, or formed it out of his own (L) head.

In the letter of Arius to Alexander, as we have it in [l] Epiphanius, and [m] Athanasius in Greek, and in [n] Hilary in Latin, divers opinions concerning the Son are represented; that of Mani, Sabellius, and Hierax, all as different from each other.

If Hierax had been a Manichee, it would be very strange that [o] great numbers of the Egyptian monks, or ascetics, should admire and follow him, as Epiphanius says they did.

[c] Hær. 67, n. 1. [d] De Hær. c. 47. [e] γραφαις δε παλαιαις και καινοις χρωνται. Dam. de Hæres. n. 67, ap. Cot. Monum. Gr. T. i. p. 297. [f] Prædest. i, n. 47.

[g] Vid. Epiph. T. i. p. 605, T. ii. p. 147. [h] Hær. 67, n. 1. [i] Ap. Athan. T. 2. p. 233, D. Ed. Bened.

[k] ——τελευταν . . . και ταις σαρξιν φασκει. &c. Epiph. H. 67, n. 1.

(L) Beausobre is pained to say, (T. i. p. 431) 'What we know of his sentiments is, that he denied the resurrection of the body; that he did not believe, that Jesus had a true human body; and that he admitted three principles of all things, God, Matter, and Malice.' But these things are not in Epiphanius. Beausobre here builds upon a passage of a writer of the seventh or eighth century: De Hieracites locus insignis Joannis Carpathi episcopi, ex MS. opere de Anachoretis, productus a Cangio in Appendice ad Glossarium Græcum: —— οτιες λεγουσι, μη σαρκωθεντα σωμα αναληφθηναι αυτον, μητε εγηγερθαι τα νεκρα· σωμα πνευματικον εσεσθαι· και οτι τρεις εισιν αρχαι και υλη και κακια. ap. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 8, p. 333. I need to say no more, than that this is not an authentic account of the principles of Hierax the Egyptian mentioned by Epiphanius, and other ancient writers. If there ever were persons called Hieracites, who held these notions, there is no reason to think they borrowed them from him.

[l] Hær. 69, n. 7, p. 732, D. [m] Athan. de Synod. T. i. p. 729, E.

[n] —nec sicut Manichæus partem ullam substantiæ Patris natum exponit: nec sicut Sabellius,——nec sicut Hieracas de lucerna de lucerna, vel lampadem in duas partes. Hilar. de Trin. l. 4, p. 833. Vid. et l. 6, p. 881, et p. 885, D. E.

[o] κατα πολλα των αγιων των ασκητων των αυτω συναπηχθησαν. Hær. 67, c. 3. p. 710, A.

Finally,

Finally, there is no notice taken of Hierax as a disciple of Mani, in the Disputation of Archelaus, nor in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, no more than in Epiphanius.

I conclude, therefore, there is no reason to think that Hierax, whose opinions make a distinct heresy in Epiphanius, was a Manichee. If Photius, or Peter of Sicily, knew any one of that name who was a Manichee, he must have been different from him mentioned by Epiphanius, and other ancient writers; and probably he was no very early or ancient follower of Mani: but I rather think that they knew not any such person, but have mistaken the character of Hierax, of whom Epiphanius writes.

Let it not be thought to no purpose that I have said so much to shew that Hierax was not a Manichee. Beausobre in several parts of his work has divers arguments, built upon the supposition that Hierax was in the Manichæan scheme; all which reasonings therefore now fall to the ground: nor can we in any case judge of the Manichæan sentiments by those of Hierax, for he was not of that sect, nor had he any concern with it.

Hierax is placed by [p] Cave at 302, who takes his account from Epiphanius, and says nothing of his being a Manichee. Tillemont [q] has written A History of the Hieracites. He says that this sect arose after that of the Manichees, about the year 290 or 300; but he does not charge the author of it with holding the Manichæan doctrine.

According to Epiphanius, Hierax, notwithstanding his errors, was a very extraordinary person: he was skilful [r] in medicine, was a man of [s] great acuteness, and [t] of a strict and unblemished life, for which he was much respected. He [u] had the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament by heart, and wrote commentaries upon them; in particular, A [x] Dissertation upon the Creation of the World in six Days: he likewise composed [y] hymns: he was acquainted with the Greek and Egyptian learning, and [z] wrote both languages. He lived to a great age, being, as [a] some say, upwards of ninety years old when he died: he retained his eye-

[p] Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 161.

[q] Mem. T. iv. P. 2, p. 817, &c.

[r] ——ιατροσοφιστικη τε και τοις αλλοις. Hær. 67, cap. i. [s] ——οξυς τα τοιαυτα τροπος. ib. p. 709, D. —— ο δε αιρ εκπληκτος τη αυτε αστ[ε]ια. ib. p. 710, A. —— ο δε ιερακας αυ[τ]ος τε τολλην ειχε την ασκησιν. ib. [p]. 711, C. [u] ουτος μεν γαρ παν[τ]α καινην διαθηκην σαφως ειπειν [κ]αι εις αυτα εξηγησαμενος. ib. [p]. 709, D. [x] Συνεγραψατο δε ελ-

ληνικως τε και αιγυπτιακως εξηγησαμενος, και συνταξας της εξαημερε κτισεως πλασαμενος. κ. λ. ib. n. 3, p. 712. B.

[y] ψαλμους τε τολλους ιαμβικως επλασατο. ib. [z] τοις των αιγυπτιων και ελληνων μαθημασιν ανριβως επιστας. ib. n. 1. p. 709, C. Vid. et B. [a] Vid. supra not. [v].

[b] φασι δε τινες περι αυτε, οτι υπερ εννενηκοντα ετη βιωσας, εως της ηλικιας της στελεχουσα ελαλλιγραφει· καλλιγραφος γαρ ην· εμενε γαρ αυτε σφοδρως ο οφθαλμος. Hær. 67, c. 3, p. 712, C.

ſight to the laſt, uſing no amanuenſis, but writing out his own works, and tranſcribing likewiſe the works of others in a fair hand.

Such a character of this Egyptian Chriſtian may well induce us to form a wiſh for ſome of his works; though, as may be collected from Epiphanius, his [c] interpretations of ſcripture were ſomewhat allegorical.

As all ancient writers in general, who make mention of Hierax, ſay he received the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, it may be concluded that his canon was much the ſame with that of other Chriſtians in the place where he lived: in particular, we plainly perceive from Epiphanius that [d] he received the epiſtle to the Hebrews as the apoſtle Paul's: and, if Epiphanius be not miſtaken, he [e] likewiſe made uſe of a book entitled The Anabaticon, or Aſcenſion of Iſaias.

8. Sebaſtian, a Manichee, then a young man, was general in Egypt in the reign of Conſtantius, about the year 356, and afterwards was in high offices under ſeveral emperors. Athanaſius [f] complains of him more than once: he is mentioned ſeveral times by [g] Zoſimus, and [h] Ammianus Marcellinus. A note [i] of Valeſius upon the laſt mentioned writer contains a brief hiſtory and character of Sebaſtian, and ſhews particularly his acquaintance with Libanius.

9. Secundinus, an [k] auditor among the Manichees, wrote a letter to Auguſtine, which we ſtill have in that ancient writer's works, together with his own anſwer.

Cave placeth Secundinus at the year 390: he [l] conjectures that he was of Africa, and ſpeaks of his being an old friend and

[c] Και συνταξας της εξαημερε μυθους τινας πλασαμενος, και κομπωδεις αλληγοριας. ib. B. [d] Vid. Epiph. ib. n. 2, 3, 6, 7.

[e] Ib. n. 3, p. 712, A. [f] ——παροξυνει τον στρατηλατην σεβαστιανον, μανιχαιον οντα, κ. λ. Ath. Ap. pro fuga ſua. n. 6, p. 323, C. Εχοντες δε υπηργες εις την ποιησιαν του δεκα σεβαστιανου, μανιχαιου οντα, και ασελγη βιωτευειν. Id. in Hiſtor. Arian. ad Monach. p. 379, f. Vid. eund. ib. p. 381, C. 387, A. B. C. [g] Zoſim. Hiſt. l. 3, p. 714, l. 4, 749. [h] ——triginta millia——commiſit Procopio, junctо ad parilem poteſtatem Sabaſtiano comite ex duce Ægypti. Amm. Marcell. l. 23, c. 3, p. 385. Vid. eund. l. 31, c. 13, f. et paſſim. [i] Is eſt igitur Sebaſtianus dux Ægypti, ſecta Manichæus.——Erat autem filius Antiphili, a quo in diſciplinam traditus Libanio, mox relicto eloquentiæ ſtudio ad militiam ſe contulit, tametſi excellenti ingenio præditus: ut docet Libanius in epiſtolis duabus ad Antiphilum, quibus et aliam ſubjungit ad Sebaſtianum, exhortans ut redeat. Exſtant in editione Cracovienſi Lat. Libanius 308, 340, 494, epiſtolas ad eum ſcribit. Valeſ. not. [h]. p. 385. [k] Secundinus quidam, non ex eis quos Manichæi electos, ſed ex eis quos auditores vocant, quem nec facie quidem noveram, ſcripſit ad me velut amicus, honorifice objurgans, quod oppugnarem literis illam hæreſim, et admonens ne facerem. Aug. Retr. l. 2, c. x.

[l] Secundinus natione, ni fallor, Afer, ſecta Manichæus, claruit circa ann. 390, certe poſt Auguſtini ad eccleſiam reditum. ——Magna illi cum Auguſtino interceſſerat familiaritas, dum uterque in hæreſi Manichaica verſaretur.——Objicit Punicæ gentis perfidiam. Cav. Hiſt. Lit. T. i. p. 286.

intimate

intimate acquaintance of Auguſtine. But herein that learned and laborious writer has made ſeveral miſtakes; for Secundinus was a perfect ſtranger. Auguſtine [m] had not any perſonal knowledge of him; nor was Secundinus an African, but [n] a Roman, as he himſelf plainly intimates. If he had been an African he would not have reproached Auguſtine [o] with the faithleſſneſs of that country in deſerting the Manichees. Tillemont [p] mentions divers other reaſons for thinking that Secundinus lived at Rome, or ſomewhere in Italy. Nor was this letter written ſo ſoon as the year 390; it is probable that Auguſtine would not long delay to anſwer it; but in his Retractations he ſpeaks of his anſwer after his books againſt Fauſtus, and after the diſputes held with Felix in the year 404, and after another book againſt the Manichees, entitled De Natura Boni. The character too which Auguſtine himſelf gives of his anſwer, as [q] the beſt of all his books againſt the Manichees, leads us to ſuppoſe it was one of his laſt works written in that controverſy. In a word, the order in which this book is placed, and the manner in which Auguſtine ſpeaks of it, may induce us to think it was not written before 405 or 406.

V. 'The [r] Manichæan ſect, or church, as Auguſtine's phraſe is, 'conſiſted of two parts, elect and auditors.' He afterwards ſays: 'As [s] Mani had twelve diſciples, in imitation of the twelve apoſ-'tles, that number is ſtill reſpected by the Manichees: for there 'are twelve of their elect, whom they call maſters; and there is 'a thirteenth who is their preſident: they have ſeventy-two bi-'ſhops ordained by the maſters, and preſbyters ordained by bi-'ſhops. Their biſhops likewiſe have deacons: the reſt are called 'elect only: but when they are judged fit, they alſo are ſent 'abroad, either for upholding and ſpreading their error where it 'is already, or for planting it where it is not.'

That we may the better judge of this diviſion of the Mani-

[m] Vid. not. [k]. [n] Legit enim aliquanta exile meum et qualecunque Romani hominis ingenium, reverendæ tuæ dignationis ſcripta, in quibus ſic iraſceris veritati, ut philoſophiæ Hortenſius. Secund. ad Aug. n. 3. [o] Muta quæſo ſententiam, depone Punicæ gentis perfidiam, &c. ib n. 2. [p] St. Auguſtin Art. 168, Mem. T. 13, p. 450, a Paris.

[q] Huius autem mei voluminis titulus eſt, Contra Secundinum Manichæum: quod, mea ſententia, omnibus quæ adverſus illam peſtem ſcribere potui, facile præpono. Retr. l. 2, cap. x. [r] Nam in his duabus profeſſionibus, hoc eſt, Electorum et Auditorum, eccleſiam ſuam conſtare voluerunt. Aug. de Hær. cap. 46.

[s] Propter quod etiam ipſe Manichæus duodecim diſcipulos habuit, ad inſtar apoſtolici numeri, quem numerum Manichæi etiam hodie cuſtodiunt. Nam ex electis ſuis habent duodecim, quos appellant magiſtros, et tertium-decimum principem eorum: epiſcopos autem ſeptuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magiſtris; et preſbyteros, qui ordinantur ab epiſcopis. Habent etiam epiſcopi diaconos. Jam cæteri tantummodo Electi vocantur: ſed mittuntur etiam ipſi qui videntur idonei ad hunc errorem vel ubi eſt ſuſtentandum et augendum, vel ubi non eſt etiam ſeminandum. Id. ibid.

chees into elect and auditors, it is needful to take notice of some passages of divers authors.

Epiphanius calls their auditors [t] catechumens; and in The Acts of Archelaus the second order of the Manichees is [u] twice spoken of by the name of catechumens.

Faustus expresseth himself as if [x] by elect were meant clergy, and by auditors seculars, or the laity: Augustine [y] in his argument takes notice of this without directly allowing it, that I perceive.

By the Manichæan rule a very different course of life was prescribed to the elect from that of the auditors. These last [z] might eat flesh, drink wine, bathe, marry, traffick, possess estates, bear magistracy, and the like; all which things were forbidden the elect, as appears from divers passages of Augustine. The elect might eat grapes, but they were not to drink wine, though ever so new: the elect also ate [b] apples, pears, melons, and all sorts of fruit and herbage, and [c] common bread; but forbore, as it seems, not [d] only flesh, but also eggs, and milk, and [e] fish. In this respect, as Augustine says, the [f] elect and auditors looked like men of two different religions. He elsewhere speaks of the elect as [g] persons

[t] Παρακελεύονται δὲ τοῖς αὐτῶν κατηχουμένοις τρέφειν αὐτοὺς ἀφειδῶς· οἱ δὲ ὧν ὅτιδὴν αἰτήσωσιν ἀναγκαῖον προσφέρειν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς ἑαυτῶν. Epiph. H. 66, c. 53, p. 665, B.

[u] —— μετοιμάσαντες εἰς κατηχουμένους σώματα. Arch. c. 9, p. 16, m. λέγει τοὺς κατηχουμένους. ib. p. 17. [x] Idcircoque Christo iam credere non poterant, [Judæi], indifferentiam docenti ciborum, et a suis quidem discipulis omnia penitus removenti, secularibus vero vulgo concedenti omnia quæ possent edi. Faust. l. 16, c. 6. Neque enim justa hæc nunc vestra sententia est, ut nos quidem, qui solum in plebe sacerdotale hominum genus censeamus a carnibus abstinere debere, dæmoniorum doctrinæ videamur vobis affectatores. Id. l. 30. cap. 1. [y] Auditoribus autem vestris, quos tamquam distinctos a genere sacerdotum dixisti, secundum veniam hæc edenda conceditis. Contr. Faust. l. 30, c. 5.

[z] Auditores autem qui appellantur apud eos, et carnibus vescuntur, et agros colunt, et si voluerint, uxores habent, quorum nihil faciunt qui vocantur Electi. Aug. ad Deuter. Ep. 236, al. 74. Nisi forte quod non vescimini carnibus, et vinum non bibitis. De Mor. Manich. c. 13, n. 27. Quandoquidem auditores vestri, quorum apud vos secundus gradus est, ducere atque habere uxores non prohibeantur. ib. c. 18, n. 65. [a] Nam et vinum non bibunt, dicentes fel esse tenebrarum, cum vescantur uvis: nec merum aliquid, vel recentissimi, sorbent. De Hær. c. 46. Jam vero quæ tanta perversio est, vinum putare fel principum tenebrarum, et uvis comedendis non parcere? De Mor. Manich. c. xvi. n. 44. [b] Vid. de M. Manich. cap. xiii. et xiv. [c] Sicut enim in ipso errore vestro, cum eo pane vescimini quo cæteri homines, et fructibus vivatis et fontibus, lana et lino similiter vestiamini, &c. Contr. Faust. l. 20, c. 23. [d] Nec vescuntur saltem carnibus —— Nec ova saltem sumunt, —— sed reliquis alimentis lactis utuntur. —— De Hær. c. 46. [e] —— cur ita cum vos noxiis prædicatis, ut si alia esca non occurrat, prius fame consumamini, quam pisce vescamini. Contr. Faust. l. 16, c. 9.

[f] —— non intuentes, non considerantes in eisdem habendis agendisque rebus tantum ad diversum vitam valere, si diversa sit fides, ut cum auditores vestri et uxores habeant, et filios quamvis inviti suscipiant, eisque patrimonia congerant vel custodiant, carne vescantur, vinum bibant, lavent, nutant, vindemient, negotientur, honores publicos administrent, vobiscum eos tamen non cum gentibus computetis, cum facta eorum gentibus videantur filiis meliora quam vobis. Contr. Faust. l. 20, c. 23. [g] —— quam purgare putant [illegible]

sons who pretended to greater perfection, and were supposed to be in the highest rank for virtue, and more holy than others: and he sometimes pleasantly calls the elect [h] their grandees or quality; unless he is to be understood to mean only some of the chief even of them.

For what reasons the elect were required to forbear flesh and wine, is not clear. The catholic Christians often say that * Paul prophesied of them in 1 Tim. iv. 1—4. And Augustine charges them with ‡ thinking such meats to be evil in their own nature; † Faustus himself says that, ‡‡ in his opinion, all flesh is impure; possibly, however, for no other reason, but because flesh is supposed to be a great fuel of concupiscence, which therefore the elect, who were obliged to continence, ought to avoid: somewhat of this kind is intimated in The Acts of ‡‡‡ Archelaus. If so, the Manichæan elect forbore those things for the like reasons that the catholics, as Augustine says, practised ‖ certain abstinences, to humble the body and strengthen the mind ‖‖. But that this was the only reason and foundation of this forbearance, I do not affirm.

The auditors [i] were obliged to maintain the elect. They [k] kneeled down to the elect to ask their blessing. This ceremony was

[g] ... is eo genere vitæ, quam vivunt ... Manichæorum, velut sanctius et ex... Auditoribus suis. De Hær. cap. ... flatres,——quasi ullos emi... in se tenentes primum gradum ..., Electos vocari apud Manichæos. ... Pet. 140. n. 10. [h] Nam etiam ... quidam dicente, nullam substantiam ... esse, unus de primatibus hujus ... quem familiarius crebriusque au... ors, dicebat. De M. Manich. cap. ... 11.——cum ad ipsos primates detu...——ib. c. 19, n. 70. * Ve... ra quod apostolus Paulus—— ... prævideris in talibus, qualis Ma... ni sunt, quales et estis vos.——... autem manifeste dicit, quia in no... temporibus quidam recedent a ...——prohibentes nubere, abstinere a ... Deus creavit, &c. Act. cum ... i. c. 7. ‡ Vos autem ipsam ... cum negatis bonam, et immundam ... quod carnes diabolus operetur ... materia mali.——Hoc ani... voluntate, hac opinione ab escis ... temperatis, quod non significi... naturam malæ et immundæ sint. ... Faust. l. 30. c. 5. † Ego qui... quis eorum carnem immundam ex... Faust. l. 6, c. 1. ‡‡ Cum quis vestrûm carnalibus, aliisque cibis fuerit satiatus, tunc ei concupiscentiæ oboritur incentatio.——Manes ap. Arch. cap. 14, p. 17. ‖ Et Christiani, non hæretici, sed catholici, edomandi corporis causa, propter animam in orationibus amplius humiliandum, non quod illa immunda esse credant, non solum a carnibus, verum etiam a quibusdam terræ fructibus abstinent. Contr. F. l. 30, c. 5. ‖‖ See Beaus. V. 2, p. 767, &c.

[i] Suisque Auditoribus ideo hæc arbitrantur ignosci, quia præbent inde alimenta Electis suis.——Itaque ipsi Electi, nihil in agris operantes, nec pomis carpentes, nec saltem folia ulla vellentes, expectant hæc auferri usibus suis ab Auditoribus suis.——Aug. de Hær. cap. 46. Illæ autem purgare non ab istis ordinibus expetentes, cum ei qui appellarentur electi et sancti, auferemus escas.——Confess. l. 4. c. 1. in. Vid. et Epiph. H. 66, c. 53, p. 665, B. supra citat. not. [t] p. 88. [k] Sed ipsi Auditores ante Electos genua figunt, ut eis manus supplicibus imponantur: non a Patre presbytero, vel episcopis aut diaconibus eorum, sed a quibuslibet electis. Aug. ad Deut. Ep. 236, al. 74, n. 2.

performed by the auditors before all the elect, and not only before biſhops, preſbyters and deacons.

From all theſe paſſages we may be able to form ſome judgment concerning this diſtinction in the Manichæan ſect. Archelaus and Epiphanius denoting the ſecond order by the name of catechumens, we might have been induced to think that elect and auditors, among the Manichees, anſwered to faithful and catechumens among the catholics. But when we conſider what Fauſtus ſaid, and that the elect, when qualified, were employed in ſpreading their principles, and that the auditors maintained the elect, and aſked a bleſſing from them upon their knees, we are rather led to another notion.

Beauſobre gives this account of the matter: 'The [l] elect were 'their doctors, their biſhops, their preſbyters, their eccleſiaſtical 'miniſters: but this title does not properly denote the epiſcopate, 'or any other office; it denotes a particular kind of life, or the ob- 'ſervation of ſome counſels, called evangelic; ſuch rules as Mani 'had preſcribed to thoſe who aimed at perfection, and particu- 'larly to the miniſters of his ſect. Thus the Manichæan elect 'were the miniſters of their church, and in general all who 'made profeſſion of celibacy, virginity, poverty, and practiſed 'certain abſtinences and auſterities, which were judged proper 'for them; for which reaſon they are called [m] the perfect by 'Theodoret.' Beauſobre farther obſerves that, [n] among the catholics, catechumens were ſuch as had not been initiated by baptiſm; whereas among the Manichæan auditors there were many who had been baptized, though perhaps not all.

According to this account, as the ſame learned writer expreſſeth himſelf in another [o] place, 'the elect were eccleſiaſtics, and in 'general all ſuch as made profeſſion of obſerving certain coun- 'ſels, called evangelic; as if we ſhould ſay the clergy and the 'monks. The auditors were laity.'

Whether this account be quite right I cannot certainly ſay; for Auguſtine ſeems to intimate that [p] the reaſon why he was not preſent at their euchariſt was, that he was only an auditor.

But, however that be, I would obſerve that the word elect, denoting the higher order ſo often found in Auguſtine, is alſo uſed in the like manner [q] by Gregory Nazianzen; and that [r] ſome Manichees,

[l] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2, p. 763, 764. See likewiſe T. 1 p. 17, n. 8.

[m] οἱ κεκλημένοι τελειοι παρ' αὐτοις. H. Fab. l. 1, c. 26, p. 214, A. [n] Ib. p. 763.

[o] Ib. T. 1. p. 17, note 8. [p] Quid autem inter vos agatis, qui Electi eſtis, ego ſcire non poſſum. Nam et euchariſtiam audivi a vobis ſæpe quod accipiatis: tempus autem accipiendi cum me latere, quid accipiatis, unde noſſe potui? Diſput. contr. Fort. i. n. 2. [q] —— τοις καθηγεμασι, τοις ἐκλεκτοις λεγομενοις, οἱς τοτε ἐξεστι καθαρτηριους. Greg. N. Or. 22, p. 746, C. [r] Nam Quidam veſter au-

ditor,

nichees, who were only in the rank of auditors, appear to have practiſed much ſtrictneſs and abſtemiouſneſs, reſembling that required of their elect.

Beauſobre thinks that [s] the auditors were ſo called becauſe they heard in the church whilſt others taught and inſtructed.

I do not remember to have ſeen in him, or any one elſe, a reaſon aſſigned for the uſe of the word elect, denoting all thoſe of the ſect which were not auditors: but perhaps they borrowed it from thoſe texts of the goſpels and epiſtles where the word is uſed for Chriſtians, or God's peculiar people; as Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Luke xviii. 7; Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12; and other places: Auguſtine [t] has a paſſage which may lead us to this thought.

Photius, in his firſt book againſt the Paulicians, uſually reckoned a branch of the Manichees, relates a ſingularity of theirs: they [u] reduced all their ſect, or the profeſſors of their principles, to ſix churches: the firſt was called Macedonia, the ſecond Achaia, the third was called the church of the Philippians, the fourth that of the Laodiceans, the fifth that of the Epheſians, the ſixth that of the Coloſſians; themſelves [x] they called Chriſtians; the catholics they named Romans, as [y] if they had been mere heathens. This fancy of reducing their ſect to ſix churches is alſo taken notice of by [z] Peter of Sicily, and the author of The Form of abjuring Manichæiſm, as it is in [a] Cotelerius, and [b] Tollius.

Moreover, it was a common thing among them, their leaders eſpecially, to change the name by which they were firſt called for that of ſome apoſtolical man. Photius [c] produces ſeveral inſtances: Simeon, who changed his name to Titus; Joſeph, who, leaving his own name, took that of Epaphroditus; Gegneſius, who altered his name to Timothy; and Sergius, who called himſelf Tychicus: inſomuch that Mr. Wolff, the learned editor of Photius, could not forbear remarking that [d] theſe people mightily affected apoſtolical things.

[s] in illa memorabili abſtinentia nihilo [illegible] cedens. De M. Manich. c. 20, n. [illegible]. [t] T. 2, p. 763.

Electi quidem Dei ſunt omnes ſancti, et habemus hoc in ſcripturis? ſed uſurpaverunt ſibi illud nomen, et quaſi familiariter ſibi applicaverunt, ut tanquam proprium Electi appellentur. Enarr. in Pſ. 102, n. 10. [u] Εξ δε αυτων ομολογουσιν [illegible] ως την μεν μακεδονιαν καλουσι. κ. τ. λ. Phot. l. i. cap. v. in. [x] Και τους μεν αφ' ημων ονομαζουσι χριστιανους οι τρισαθλιοι ομοφυλους· εαυτους δε τη αληθεια, ως [illegible] παιδελως καθεστηκασι, των χριστιανων επωνυμιαν. Phot. ib. l. i. cap. 6.

[y] Seipſos —— Chriſtianos nuncupant; nos autem——Romanos, Ethnico nomine proprium permutare conati, appellant. Pet. Sic. ap. Bib. Patr. T. 16, p. 756, B.

[z] Vid. ſupr. not. y. [a] Ap. Recognit. Clem. l. 4, c. 27. [b] Inſign. Ital. p. 144.

[c] Phot. ib. l. i. c. iv. [d] Adeo in omnibus apoſtolici ævi ſpecium affectarunt, ut, quemadmodum virorum apoſtolicorum, ita et eccleſiarum veteris memoriæ nomine adoptarent, ad exemplum factionis illius, quæ apoſtolicorum nomine apud veteres nominatur. Ap. Phot. p. 15.

VI. The Manichees are ſometimes ſpoken of as an impious, diſſolute ſort of people: their euchariſt particularly is repreſented as an abominable rite, not fit to be deſcribed; as may be ſeen in [c] Cyril of Jeruſalem, and [f] Auguſtine. Beauſobre [g] ſpeaks largely to this infamous ſtory of their euchariſt, to whom I refer: however I ſhall here mention ſome of his arguments and obſervations.

The thing is altogether incredible, eſpecially when related [h] of people who by profeſſion were Chriſtians; who believed that Jeſus Chriſt was a perfect model of all virtues; who acknowledged the reaſonableneſs and excellence of the precepts of the goſpel, and that the eſſence of religion lies in obeying them.

The Manichees always denied their practiſing the abominable rites laid to their charge: ſo [i] Auguſtine himſelf ſays. And in the year 392, when he had been ſeveral years a catholic, and was now preſbyter, he had a public conference with Fortunatus, a Manichæan preſbyter. Before they enter into diſpute upon matters of belief, Fortunatus openly calls upon Auguſtine, who for ſeveral years was one of them, to tell [k] if he knew any of the crimes with which they were reproached. This confidence of Fortunatus, ſays [l] Beauſobre, is a ſtrong preſumption of the innocence of the ſect. Auguſtine [m] puts by that queſtion. When he is ſtill preſſed by Fortunatus, who inſiſts upon an anſwer, Auguſtine is not able to produce any thing material againſt them of his own knowledge; but excuſeth [n] himſelf becauſe he was not one of the elect, but only an auditor.

In the year 391 or 392, Auguſtine wrote a book for the ſake of his friend Honoratus, whom [o] of a heathen he had perſuaded to become a Manichee; who alſo ſtill adhered to that ſect when

[c] Cat. vi. cap. 33. [f] Qua occaſione, vel potius exſecrabilis ſuperſtitionis quadam neceſſitate, coguntur Electi eorum velut euchariſtium conſperſam cum ſemine humano ſumere.—Sed hoc ſe facere negant, et alios neſcio quos ſub nomine Manichæorum id facere affirmant. Detecti tamen ſunt in eccleſia, ſicut ſcis, apud Carthaginem,——ubi puella nomine Margarita iſtam nefariam turpitudinem prodidit, quæ cum eſſet annorum nondum duodecim, propter hoc ſcelestum myſterium ſe dicebat eſſe vitiatam. Tunc Euſebiam quamdam Manichæam cuaſi ſanctimonialem, idipſum propter hoc ipſum paſſam, vix compulit confiteri——quæ totum illud turpiſſimum ſcelus, ubi ad excipiendum et commiſcendum concumbentium ſemen farina ſubſtituitur,——ſimiliter indicavit. Aug. de Hæreſ. cap. 46.

[g] Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. l. 9, ch. 7, § 9. T. 2. p. 720, &c. [h] Beauſ. ib. p. 732. [i] Sed hoc ſe facere negant. Vid. ſupr. not. f. [k] Ex te ergo præſent. audiant boni viri, utrum ſint vera ſu quibus criminamur et appetimur, an falſa.——Purgare me prius volo p conſcientiam veſtram——ſi ea qu tantur vidit in nobis, vel conſcentus Act. contr. Fortunat. in. [l] Ibid. p. 737, m. [m] Interfui. Sed alia queſ eſt de fide, alia de moribus: ego de propoſui. Act. Fortun. n. 2.

[n] Noſtis autem me non Electum veſtrum, ſed Auditorem fuiſſe.——Qu autem inter vos agatis, qui electi eſtis, e ſcire non poſſum, et reliqua. ib. n. 3.

[o] Tu nondum Chriſtianus, qui hortu meo, cum eos vehementer exſecraris, &c. De Util. Cred. c. 1. n. 2.

he

by himself had left it. Auguſtine is allowed to argue here for the moſt part very well: but, ſays [p] Beauſobre, why does he not in this book, for the ſake of his dear and illuſtrious friend, make uſe of that deciſive argument, their abominable myſteries? No good reaſon, he thinks, can be aſſigned for this omiſſion; but that there was no ground for the accuſation.

The general ſilence of ancient authors is another argument of the falſehood of this ſtory. Cyril of Jeruſalem publiſhed his Catechetical Diſcourſes about the year 347, ſeventy years, as is ſuppoſed, after the death of Mani: but, as [q] Beauſobre ſays, he is the firſt who has ſpoken of this matter: and [r] from Cyril to Auguſtine he does not find any author, Chriſtian or heathen, who has reproached the Manichees with theſe obſcene myſteries. There [s] is no mention made of them in The Diſpute of Archelaus; Serapion, biſhop of Thmuis, contemporary with Cyril, ſays not a word of them; nor has he perceived this accuſation in any works of Ephrem; Theodoret, Titus of Boſtra, and Abulpharagius, in his Dynaſties, are alſo ſilent upon this head. And, as Beauſobre goes on, if to theſe fathers we add the two pagan philoſophers, Alexander of Dicopolis, and Simplicius, who both wrote againſt theſe people, and are profoundly ſilent about the crimes they are reproached with, the number of witneſſes to their innocence in this reſpect will greatly ſurpaſs that of their accuſers.

I ſhall ſay nothing more concerning that point: but as [t] Suidas, without any particular regard to their euchariſt, upbraids the Manichees with nocturnal aſſemblies and obſcene mixtures, and others (F) often ſpeak of them as an impious ſet of men, I ſhall add ſome things which perhaps may be of uſe to ſet the character of this people in a proper light.

About the year 388, ſome time after he was returned to the catholics, Auguſtine wrote two books; one entitled Of the Manners of the Catholic Church, the other Of the Manners of the Manichees; and they were occaſioned by the Manichees [u] boaſting of their own ſtrict courſe of life, and [x] by their cenſures of the looſe behaviour of the catholics.

At

[p] Ib. p. 741. [q] ——p. 725.
[r] ——p. 728. Ib. p. 734, 735.
[s] Ἐκ τῶν ἀθεσμοτάτων τινὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τελετὰς, καὶ ἀφροσύνας μιξείας, κ. λ. Suid. V. Μάν. (F) In Moreri's article of Manes are theſe words: 'He condemned marriage, ſtill allowing his followers to plunge themſelves in all manner of ſenſuality ——' et condamnoit le mariage, permettant pourtant à ſes diſciples de ſe plonger dans toutes ſortes de volupté brutales. Docens, . . . illicitas eſſe nuptias, licitos concubitus promiſcuos. Lamp. Synopſ. H. E. l. 2. c. 2. p. 125. How could any man believe that!

[u] Jam baptizatus autem cum Romæ eſſem, nec forte tacitus poſtem Manichæorum jactantiam de falſa et falſaci continentia et abſtinentia,——ſcripſi duos libros, unum de Moribus Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, alterum de Moribus Manichæorum. Retr. l. 1. c. 7. [x] Nolite conſectari

At the beginning of the firſt of thoſe two books Auguſtine owns that [y] the Manichees enſnared many by the ſpecious appearance of chaſtity and temperance. This was the very thing that [z] brought his friend Alypius into their nets.

Auguſtine himſelf ſeems to have acquitted them. Whilſt he was among them he lived a ſenſual courſe of life, and his head was filled with ambitious ſchemes: but he owns that [a] this was not owing to their doctrine; for they earneſtly exhorted men, he ſays, to mind better things. So he writes at the beginning of his book addreſſed to his friend Honoratus: and at the end of it he ſpeaks of the pale countenances of theſe [b] men.

It is a ſaying of Ephrem the Syrian, that [c] the devil gave Mani a pale complexion, the better to deceive the ſimple and unwary.

St. Chryſoſtom obſerves of the Manichees, that [d] they had an appearance of modeſty, but they hid the wolf under ſheep's clothing.

It appears, from divers things ſaid by St. Jerom, that the [e] Manichees were great faſters, and that they had among them many virgins, perſons who profeſſed to live a chaſte and ſingle life. The gay ladies of his time endeavoured many ways to put a good face upon their luxurious courſe of life: ſometimes they [f] ſaid: *To the pure all things are pure.* And if at any time they met a woman who looked pale and ſad, they would ſay: 'Ah child, 'thou art a nun, or a miſerable Manichee, I ſuppoſe.'

Jerom, commenting upon Amos iii. 15, *And I will ſmite the winter-houſe with the ſummer-houſe*, ſays, that 'by the [g] winter-'houſe

[t] ari turbas imperitorum, qui vel in ipſa vera religione ſuperſtitioſi ſunt, vel ita libidinibus dediti, ut obliti ſint quid promiſerint Deo. De Mor. Ec. Cath. c. 34, n. 75. [y] Sed quoniam duæ maxime ſunt illecebræ Manichæorum, quibus decipiuntur incauti,——altera, cum vitæ caſtæ et memorabilis continentiæ imaginem præferunt. De Mor. Ec. Ca. cap. i, n. 2. [z] ——amans in Manichæis oſtentationem continentiæ, quam veram et germanam putabat. Confeſſ. l. 6, c. 7, n. 12. [a] ——cum vitæ hujus mundi eram implicatus, tenebroſam ſpem gerens, de pulcritudine uxoris, de pompa divitiarum, de inanitate honorum, cæteriſque noxiis et perniciosis voluptatibus. Hæc enim omnia, quod te non latet, cum ſtudioſe illos audirem, cupere et ſperare non deſinebam. Neque hoc eorum doctrinæ tribuo. Fateor enim et illos ſedulo monere, ut inde caveantur. De Util. Cred. ad Honorat. c. i. n. 3. [b] ——quo illi homines exſangues corporibus, ſed craſſis mentibus adſpirare non poſſunt. ib. cap. ult.

[c] Quare ſic interpretor: Pallore Manetem diabolus tinxit, ut incautos falleret. Aſſem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 119. [d] Και γαρ οι μανιχαιοι——το σχημα μεν επιδικνυνται επιεικειας,——και καταπετασει την δερμα των προβατων λυκον. In Gen. Serm. 7, p. 680, B. ed. Bened.

[e] Atque utinam omni tempore jejunare poſſimus,——Nec tamen Manichææ hæreſeos accuſandi ſunt, quum carnalis cibus præferri non debuerit ſpirituali. Ad Lucin. Ep. 52, al. 28, T. 4, p. 579.

[f] Iſtæ ſunt, quæ ſolent dicere: Omnia munda mundis.——Et quam viderint pallentem atque triſtem, Miſeram, Monacham, et Manichæam vocant. De Cuſtod. Virg. Ep. 18, al. 22, p. 32, f.

[g] Et percutiet domum hyemalem; eos hæreticos, qui laborant continentia et jejuniis xerophagiis, chamæcuniis, e quibus Tatianus

'houſe may be underſtood thoſe heretics that mortified themſelves with faſting and abſtinence, who fared hard and lodged hard, ſuch as Tatian, and Mani, and their followers: the ſummer-houſe may denote the Nicolaitans and other heretics, who indulged their appetites, and lived in all manner of exceſs.' And upon Joel i. 14, *Sanctify ye a faſt*, he has theſe words: 'Mani and Tatian, and many other heretics, faſt, but their faſting is worſe than gluttony and drunkenneſs.' Once more the ſame ancient and learned writer declares: 'Virgins, ſuch [i] as are ſaid to be among divers heretics, and even among the impure Manichees, are to be eſteemed whores, not virgins.' Such is the unhappineſs of hereſy which turns virtues into vices! It is true however, that the Manichees faſted and lived chaſtely; but their great abſtinence and virginal chaſtity were of no value.

Chryſoſtom expreſſeth himſelf in the like manner. He ſays he dares not call the virgins of heretics virgins; and affirms that the ſobriety of heretics is worſe than the greateſt diſſoluteneſs.

I ſuppoſe the reaſon of theſe hard ſentences may be, what is ſomewhere obſerved by Auguſtine, that [m] actions are qualified by the views and ends with which they are performed.

I preſume that all theſe paſſages of ancient writers may be ſufficient to render it probable that the Manichees had no doctrines which countenanced a licentious courſe of life. Some of their ſect, it is likely, failed [n] in obſerving the ſtrict rules by which they were bound; but ſo it was with the catholics: there were bad livers likewiſe among them; ſome [o] who pretended to much ſanctity and devotion were guilty of great enormities. Auguſtine's complaint of the Manichees is verified in all parties; men [p] ſay, and do not; they commend and teach what they do not perform.

VII. The

Tatianus et Manichæus. Et domum cavam, ut Nicolaitas,——qui propter ventris ingluviem, omnem recipiunt voluptatem. In Amos l. i. T. 3, p. 1396. in.

[k] Jejunat Manichæus et multi hæretici, maximeque Encratitæ, quorum princeps Tatianus. Sed hoc jejunium fœtiditate vanitate deterius eſt. In Joel. cap. i. T. 3, p. 1345, f.

[l] Cæterum virgines, quales apud diverſas hæreſes, et maxime apud impuriſſimum Manichæum reperiuntur, ſcorta ſunt æſtimanda, non virgines. De Cuſtod. Virg. Ep. 18, T. 4, p. 47. [k] Τας γαρ τας αιρεσεσι εν αις πολλη πορνειας εστι. Chr. de Virgin. T. i. p. 268, B. [l] Και γαρ ασελγειας πολλης και των αιρεσεων σωφροσυνη χειρων εστι. ib. p. 271. E. Vid. et. A. B. C. ib.

[m] Niſi forte quod non veſcimini carnibus, et vinum non bibitis,——Quod quæro vobis, quo fine faciatis? Finis enim quo referuntur ea quæ facimus,——ſi non ſolum inculpabilis, ſed etiam laudabilis fuerit, tunc demum etiam facta noſtra laude aliqua digna ſunt. De Mor. Manich. l. 2, cap. 13, n. 27.——Sed tamen ſignificantes, vanam eſſe continentiam iſtam, niſi ad aliquem rectiſſimum finem, certa ratione feratur. ib. n. 28. Si ergo parcimoniæ gratia et coercendæ libidinis, qua eſcis talibus et potu delectamur et capimur, audio et probo. Sed non ita eſt. ibid. Vid. et cund. contr. Fauſt. l. v. c. 5.

[n] Vid. Aug. de Mor. Manich. cap. 18, 19, 20. [o] Novi multos eſſe ſepulchrorum et picturarum adoratores. Novi multos eſſe, qui luxurioſiſſime ſuper mortuos bibant, et epulas cadaveribus exhibentes, ſuper ſepultos ſe ipſos ſepeliant, et voracitates, ebrietatesque ſuas deputent religioni, &c. De Mor. Ec. Ca. c. 34, n. 74.

[p] Cum autem laudatis et docetis iſta, nec

VII. The Manichees ſeldom had the protection of the Roman laws. Tillemont, in his hiſtory of this people, has an entire article concerning the laws of the emperors againſt them. In Auguſtine's works againſt the Manichees we find frequent notice of the difficulties they lay under. Fauſtus [q] glories in the perſecutions they endured, as a proof of their being good Chriſtians: this was a common ſubject of boaſting among them: and they argued that [r] they were not of the world, and muſt needs be ſincere lovers of truth, becauſe the world hated them, and they were always under perſecution.

It appears by Auguſtine's ſecond day's conference with Felix, at Hippo, in the year 404, that the Manichæan books, or papers of Felix, had been taken from him, and were in the cuſtody of a public officer. Felix [s] deſired to have them reſtored to him for his aſſiſtance in the debate: Auguſtine at length allows that any thing he pointed to might be recited out of thoſe writings. Among them was a letter of Mani, called The Epiſtle of the Foundation. And, in the firſt day's conference, Felix ſeveral times intimates [t] the difficulty he lay under in diſputing againſt the imperial laws.

When Auguſtine [u] ſpeaks of the baniſhment of Fauſtus and others into an iſland, I think he intimates that by law they might have been puniſhed more ſeverely: for he ſays that moderate ſentence was obtained by the interceſſion of thoſe very Chriſtians who proſecuted Fauſtus and his Manichæan friends in the proconſul's court. And, in the ſame context, a little before, he ſpeaks of the [x] advantage the Manichees had from the mildneſs of

nec facitis, quid vobis fallacius——dici aut inveniri poteſt? De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 68. [q] Vides pauperem.——eſurientem, ſitientem, perſecutiones et odia ſuſtinentem propter juſtitiam. Et dubitas, utrum accipiam evangelium? Fauſt. l. 5, c. 1. [r] Ubi eſt ergo quod perpetuam ſibi perſecutionem in hoc mundo futuram prædicant, eoque ſe commendatiores haberi volunt, hinc interpretantes, quod hic mundus eos oderit. De M. Manich. c. 19, n. 69.——aut definite vos inde jactare, quod multis deteſtabiles ſitis. Contr. Fauſt. l. 6, c. 8. [s] Et quia nullam ſcripturam inter manus habui, quia non mihi ſunt redditæ, unde me inſtruere poſſem. Nullus enim ad certamen exit, niſi prius munitus fuerit: et nullas litigator poteſt ſine ſuis chartis litigare. Similiter et ego ſine mea ſcriptura reſpondere non poſſum.——Modo peto, codices reddantur mihi.——Aug. dixit: Sed quia codices tuos repetis, qui ſub ſigillo publico cuſtodiuntur.——Tolle autem codices tuos, et dic quid inde velis proferri.——Felix dixit: Omnes ſcripturas, quæ mihi ſublatæ ſunt. Iſta enim Epiſtola Fundamenti eſt, &c. Act. cum Fel. l. 2. c. [t] Non tantum ego poſſum contra tuam virtutem, deinde contra leges Imperatorum.——Act. cum. Fel. l. 1. c. 12. Vid. ib. infra, et cap. 6. [u] Fauſtus autem convictus vel confeſſus, quod Manichæus eſſet, cum aliis nonnullis ſecum ad judicium proconſulare perductis, ejusdem Chriſtianis a quibus perducti ſunt intercedentibus, leviſſima pœna, ſi tamen ulla pœna dicenda eſt, in inſulam relegatus eſt: quod ſua ſponte quotidie ſervi Dei faciunt, ſe a turbulento ſtrepitu populorum removere cupientes;——Denique non multo poſt inde omnes eadem ſolemni ſorte dimiſſi ſunt. Contr. Fauſt. l. 6, c. 8. [x] Pro qua impia perverſitate, propter Chriſtianorum temporum manſuetudinem,

of the catholics, which was such that their sufferings were few, and almost none at all. But then it should be observed that [y] Augustine computes banishment into a desert island to be a mere title, and little more than retirement, which gives men an opportunity for meditation: moreover, as he assures us, the banishment of the Manichees beforementioned was of short duration; they were all soon released by public authority.

And it may be collected from some things said by Augustine, upon another occasion, that [z] though their assemblies were prohibited by law at Carthage, they [a] found opportunities to meet together for divine worship: such was the zeal of these unhappy people, or such was the moderation of those who were intrusted with the execution of the laws against them.

Not long after the year 440, pope Leo [b] made strict inquiry after the Manichees at Rome and in other places, and destroyed great numbers of their books; so writes Prosper: and from Leo himself, in a letter to the bishops of Italy, we learn that [c] he detected many of this people at Rome: some he converted; the rest, who were unmoved by his arguments, were condemned to perpetual banishment as the laws directed.

Photius says that [d], though many emperors had punished those profanes even with death, the progress of their impiety had not been stopped.

They who are desirous of knowing more of this matter may consult the Codes [e] of Justinian, and [f] Theodosius; where are divers laws against these men, which cannot be denied to have an appearance of much severity.

In Baronius [g] may be seen such a rescript of Diocletian and Maximian, said to be given at Alexandria in the year 290, occasioned by an account received from Julian, proconsul of Africa,

[y] ...m, quam parva et prope nulla pa... an, cur non cogitatis? ib.

Vid. not. [a]. [z] ——quod eo tempore, quo conventicula eorum lege publica prohiberentur. De Mor. Man. c. 19, p. 60. [a] Non erant hi [Electi] ex una ... sed diverse prorsus habitantes, ex ... conventus omnium factus erat, ... forte descenderant. ib. n. 68.

Hoc tempore plurimos Manichæos ... Urbem latere diligentiæ Papæ Leo... nuntiavit, qui eos de secretis suis erutos, ... totius ecclesiæ publicatos, omnes ... fui turpitudines et damnare fe... prodere, incensis eorum codicibus, ... magnæ moles erant interceptæ, ... Prosper. Chr. Integr. ap. Canis. et ... Lection. T. i. p. 304.

[b] Plurimos impietatis Manichææ sequaces et doctores in Urbe investigatio nostra reperit.——Aliquanti vero, qui ita se demerserant, ut nullum his auxiliantis posset remedium subvenire, subditi legibus, secundum Christianorum principum constituta, ne sanctum gregem sua contagione polluerent, per publicos judices perpetuo sunt exilio relegati. Leo. Ep. 2. ad omn. Ep. Ital. [d] ——πολλοι δε ευσεβων βασιλεων ξιφει την δικην τες απιστατας επεπραττοντο, και μηδ' ουτως ασεβες φορας ισταντο. Phot. Contr. Man. l. i. c. 16, p. 61. [e] Just. cod. l. i. Tit. v. De Hæreticis, et Manichæis, et Samaritis.

[f] Cod. Theod. l. 16. Tit. v. De Hæreticis. [g] Baron. Ann. 287, n. i. ii. &c. Vid. et Cotelr. Mon. Gr. T. i. p. 778, 779.

of

of the great diſturbances occaſioned by the Manichees in that country. This reſcript is, I think, generally allowed to be [h] genuine: but Samuel Baſnage [i] offers divers weighty arguments againſt that ſuppoſition: one of them is, that there is no mention of this law in Euſebius, Cyril, or Auguſtine: he has many other reaſons which are very conſiderable, and may be ſeen in his own work.

Indeed it ſeems to me altogether unlikely that Manichæiſm ſhould ſo ſoon have gained footing, and made ſuch progreſs in Africa, as is here ſuppoſed, ſo as to cauſe diſturbances to divers people and [k] cities, and [l] be received by men of high rank as well as others.

It appears to me alſo very probable that, if Diocleſian had made ſuch a law as this, the Manichees would have been expreſsly named in Conſtantine's edicts againſt heretics; whereas, it does not appear from Euſebius that [m] they were ſo named in any ſuch laws of that Chriſtian emperor.

It muſt be owned Ammianus Marcellinus ſays that 'Conſtantine [n], deſirous to get exact information concerning the opinions 'of divers ſects, the Manichees and the like, employed Strategius for that purpoſe; who acquitted himſelf ſo well in the office aſſigned him, that the emperor ordered he ſhould for the 'future be called Muſonianus.' But perhaps Ammianus accommodates his way of ſpeaking to the ſtate of things in his own time, when the Manichees were well known as well as greatly diſliked. Ammianus mentions no other ſect diſtinctly beſide the Manichees, as if they were the principal ſubject of inquiry; which can hardly be allowed when we perceive from our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians that there were other ſects at that time which made much more noiſe in the Roman empire: however, the inquiry here ſpoken of is no proof that the Manichees were named in any of Conſtantine's laws againſt heretics.

Beauſobre [o] admits the genuineneſs of this law: but then he ſays Diocleſian [p] and his miniſters muſt have been very little ac-

[h] Vid. Tillem. Les Manicheens Art. 17. et Diocletien. § 14. [i] Baſn. Ann. 287, n. iv. [k] ——et multa facinora ibi committere: populos namque quietos perturbare, nec non civitatibus maxima detrimenta inferre. ap. Baron. ib. n. 3. [l] Si qui ſane etiam honorati, aut cujuſlibet dignitatis, vel majoris perſonæ, ad hanc inauditam, turpemque ſectam,——ſe tranſtulerunt. ib. n. 4. [m] Vid. Euſ. de Vit. Conſtant. l. 3, cap. 63, 64.

[n] Conſtantinus enim cum limatius ſuperſtitionum quæreret ſectas, Manichæorum et ſimilium, nec interpres inveniretur idoneus, hunc ſibi commendatum ut ſufficientem elegit: quem officio functum perite, Muſonianum voluit appellari, ante Strategium dictitatum. Amm. M. l. 15, c. 13. [o] See B. Hiſt. de Man. T. i. p. 183. T. 2, p. 799.

[p] Diocletien et ſes miniſtres connoiſſoient fort mal ces heretiques, s'ils les croyoient capables d'approuver les inceſtes, eux qui toleroient à peine le mariage. ib. T. i. p. 284.

quainted

quainted with the true principles of the Manichees; which I think ſhould have led him to ſuſpect the reputed original of this reſcript, and aſcribe it rather to ſome ignorant and deſigning impoſtor.

Before I conclude the remarks upon this reſcript, I ſhould acknowledge that it is mentioned in [q] the Commentaries upon St. Paul's thirteen epiſtles, uſually joined with the works of St. Ambroſe: but, as the Benedictine editors ſay, thoſe [r] Commentaries have been interpolated in many places; and they may have been ſo here. However, the age of that work is not certainly known: I formerly [s] took ſome notice of it.

SECT. II. The Hiſtory of MANI.

I. *His name, country, parents, qualifications.* II. *The time of the riſe of Manichæiſm.*

I. MANI, always [a] ſo called by the Perſians and Arabians, uſually called Manes, or Manichee, by the Greeks and Romans, was [b] a Perſian, or at leaſt lived in the territories of the king of Perſia; as is allowed [c] by all authors who ſpeak of him.

Beauſobre [d] ſays it is certain he was a Perſian, if thereby be meant that he was a native ſubject of the kings of Perſia: but if thereby be meant that he was of the province of Fars, or Perſia, it is doubtful. Ephrem ſays [e] he was a Babylonian; that is, of the province of Babylon, or elſe of Chaldæa, which [f] is often confounded with that of Babylon: this ſeems to be confirmed by The Acts of Archelaus, where [g] that biſhop reproaches Mani

[q] Quippe cum Diocletianus imperator conſtitutione ſua deſignet, dicens: Sordidam hanc et impuram hæreſim, quæ nuper, inquit, egreſſa eſt de Perſide. Ambroſiaſt. in 2 Tim. c. iii. p. 310, C.

[r] Illud inſuper adjiciendum eſt, eoſdem librarios magna licentia ſaltem in tres priores epiſtolas abuſos eſſe: quandoquidem ab eis non raro longa fragmenta ibidem inſerta fuiſſe probabile eſt, quæ in vetuſtioribus manuſcriptis non inveniuntur, &c. Admon. p. 21, f. [s] See before, p. 155.

[a] Manes Perſa, in eorum libris dictus Mani pictor, nam talis fuit profeſſione ſua. —Cum itaque in omnibus Arabum et Perſarum libris conſtanter vocetur Mani, hoc verum ejus nomen Perſicum fuiſſe tuto credamus. Hinc Græcis et aliis vulgo audit Μανης. Hyde de Relig. Vet. Perſ. c. 21, p. 280, 281. Vid. et Moſhem. de Reb. Chriſtian. ante Conſtantin. m. p. 734.

[b] Μανης δε ουτος απο της των περσων εφματο γης. Epiph. Hær. 66, n. 1.

Manichæi a quodam Perſa extiterunt, qui vocabatur Manes. Auguſtin. de Hær. c. 46, in.

Perſa, quem accuſaſti, non adderit. Secundin. Ep. ad Aug. c. 3.

[c] Manetem genere Perſam omnes veteres faciunt. Aſſem. B. Or. T. i. p. 122.

[d] T. i. p. 66. [e] Babylonium fuiſſe docet [Ephræm] infra hymno xiv. Aſſem. ib. [f] Vid. Cellar. Orb. Ant. T. 2, p. 755. [g] Perſa barbare, non Græcorum linguæ,——non ullius alterius linguæ ſcientiam habere potuiſti, ſed Chaldæorum ſolum, &c. Arch. n. 36, p. 63.

with

with underſtanding no language but his Chaldee; which implies that he was a Chaldean.

It is not a little diſagreeable to obſerve the poor thoughts of divers ancient Greek writers, occaſioned by the name of this man. The thing is taken notice of by ſeveral moderns: I quote two of them in the margin, [h] Cave and [i] Tollius.

They ſpeak as if his name had been derived from the Greek noun mania, ſignifying madneſs, or from the verb mainomai; and as if his name were the ſame as maneis, that is, mad or furious; whereas the name is certainly Perſic or Chaldaic. Euſebius, formerly quoted, is pleaſed to allude to this imaginary ſignification of the word. Cyril of Jeruſalem ſays, 'he [k] changed 'his name from Cubricus to Manes, thinking thereby to gain 'honour among the Perſians; but divine providence ſo ordered 'it that he thereby affixed to himſelf among the Greeks the cha-'racter of madneſs.' Epiphanius [l] has ſomewhat to the like purpoſe. Titus of Boſtra, who writes the name Maneis, inſtead of Manes, has alſo condeſcended [m] to adopt this ſlight thing; for ſo I muſt call it, though it is alſo found in ſo fine a writer as [n] Photius.

The poor people were ſo often teazed with this ſilly fancy, that, as Auguſtine ſays, for that reaſon they [o] prolonged the name, and called their maſter Manichee, to avoid the reproach of that odious derivation: and ſome of them pretended that the true way of writing the name was Mannichee, denoting one that poured down the heavenly bread manna. I have tranſcribed at the bottom of the page two paſſages of Auguſtine, where he ſpeaks

[h] Græci vero, quo aptiorem irridendi occaſionem arriperent, illud a μανια deducere ſolent. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 140, f. Oxon. [i] Quia vero, Græcis, aut Græca intelligentibus adverſariis, vox illa Μανης uberiorem irridendi anſam præbebat, quaſi a Græco μανια, inſania, ſeu μαινομαι, inſanio, derivata eſſet, et ſic nomen et omen inſaniæ Maneti obtigiſſet; tum quod et eadem vox Μανης ſtupidum ſignificaret, ut apud Ariſtophanem, Μεγαλως θ' ο Μανης. Manichæi Manichæos ſe vocari volebant, quaſo derivato nomine a manahath requies. Nec apud Judæos iidem contumelia caruerunt, qui omnes impios Manetes appellarunt, &c. Toll. not. ap. inſign. Ital. p. 126.

[k] η δε τε θεε οικονομια και αγνοια αιτιαν εαυτω καλλιγορον εποιει γενεσθαι· ινα εν περσαις νομισας εαυτον τιμαι, παρ' ελλησι μανιας επωνυμον εαυτον καλαγγελλη. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24. [l] Hær. 66, n. 1, p. 617, C. D.

[m] ο δε μανης εκ βαρβαρων, και της μανιας αιτιας επωνυμος. κ. λ. Titus contr. Manich. l. i. in. p. 60. [n] Vid. Phot. contr. Man. l. i. c. 12, p. 45, 46, 47.

[o] Manichæi a quodam Perſa exſtiterunt, qui vocabatur Manes: quamvis et ipſe, cum ejus inſana doctrina cœpiſſet in Græcia prædicari, Manichæum diſcipuli ejus appellare maluerunt, devitantes nomen inſaniæ. Unde quidam eorum quaſi dotiores, et eo ipſo mendaciores, geminata n litera, Mannichæum vocant, quaſi manna fundentem. Aug. de Hær. c. 46, in.

Et per dominum veſtrum Manichæum, qui manes lingua patria vocabatur. Sed vos, ut apud Græcos nomen inſaniæ vitaretis, velut declinato et prolongato nomine, quaſi fuſionem addiditis, ubi amplius laberemini. Sic enim mihi quidam veſtrum expoſuit, cur appellatus ſit Manichæus, ut ſcilicet in Græca lingua tamquam manna fundere videretur, quia Grace fundi χεειν dicitur, &c. Contr. Fauſt. l. 19, c. 22.

of

of this matter. James Baſnage, in his notes upon Titus [p], has judiciouſly cenſured both ſides for theſe trifles. One might be apt to think that [q] Mani, or Mane, or Manes, ſhould be the name of the man, and [r] Manichæus denote a follower of him. But the Greeks and Latins do often uſe [s] this laſt for himſelf, as well as the former. I put in the margin [t] a few other obſervations, though of no great importance, concerning the different ways of writing this name in ſeveral authors. I hope I need not make any apology for generally writing his name Mani [u] after the people of the eaſt, where he lived: and Epiphanius ſays that [x] Mane was the name he took inſtead of Cubricus.

It is not among the Greeks that we muſt ſeek for the original of this name; for Archelaus himſelf ſays that [y] Corbicius changed his name after the death of the widow, his patroneſs, at the

[p] ——Ut averterent omen Manetis diſcipuli apud Græcos Manichæum illum appellabant, eumque velut angelum e cœlis μαννα χειτλα, panem cœleſtem, mannam ſcilicet, effundentem referebant. Sic ab utraque parte ludebatur circa nominis etymologiam. Sed futiles admodum ſunt illæ obſervationes, quas quiſque ad ſuæ partis gloriam trahere conatur. Baſn. ad Tit. B. p. 60. [q] Manichæi poſt hos de Perſide a Mane homine——ita dicto ſurrexerunt.——Philaſt. de H. c. 61, in.

[r] ——Notabis Manichæum dici a Leone, quem Manem potius vocare debebat. Μανης eſt hæreſiarcha ipſe, Μανιχαιος, qui ejus ſectæ eſt, et Μανιχαιον δογμα. Tamen nunquam aliter a veteribus patribus vocatur, quam Manichæus, ut Hieronymo, et aliis primæ notæ ſcriptoribus: quod perinde eſt, ac ſi Marcioniſta pro Marcione diceretur, Valentinianus pro Valentino, Photinianus pro Photino. Neque Semel Μανιχαιος et Μανης pro eodem apud Epiphanium. Joſ. Scal. Animadv. in Euſ. Chron. p. 240, f.

[s] Even in the Acts of Archelaus Mani's name is written both ways, that is, ſometimes he is called Manes, at other times Manichæus. I ſhall refer to ſome examples: et poſt triduo venit ad Manem. Arch. c. 6, p. 9. Nullum ex nobis, ô Manes, Galatam facies: ib. c. 36, p. 62. His auditis, turbæ volebant comprehendere Manem. c. 55, p. 100. Dic mihi illud etiam, ô Manichæe. c. 49, p. 90. His letter to Marcellus is there thus inſcribed: Μανιχαιος, κ. λ. c. 5. p. 6. In like manner Epiphanius uſeth both ways of writing Mani's name.

[t] Suidas ſays: Μανης, ονομα Περσου—— ὑπηλθε Μανεντος. Which might almoſt induce one to ſuppoſe, that he wrote the name Μανεις, for Μανης: the proper name of a ſlave, is, I think, generally declined Μανη. In Titus this name is always written Μανεις, and he declines as Suidas directs: οι χαλεπως φερος τη Μανεντος πλανη μενοι. Tit. B. contr. Man. l. i. p. 64, m. The ſame way of declining is uſed in the Form of abjuring Manichæiſm. Αναθεματιζω τον πρωτον Μανεντος μυθον. ap. Toll. p. 130. Αναθεματιζω τον πατερα Μανεντος Παλεκιον. ib. p. 144. Epiphanius declines otherwiſe: εκ Μανητιος. H. 66, n. i. p. 617, C. εως τη Μανη. ib. c. 20, p. 637, D. μαθητη ουτι τη Μανη. ib. c. 12, p. 629, B. I add ſome other examples from other authors.——εις τον Μανητα. Thdrt. H. F. l. i. c. 26, p. 213, D. Cyril of Jeruſalem always writes Manes, never Manichee. And he declines, as Epiphanius——ανθ' ὡν τον κυβρικον Μανην εαυτον επωνομασεν. Cat. 6, n. 24. καθεπαλαισε τον Μανην ο Αρχελαος. ib. n. 30.——αλλ' ενος των κακων τριων τη Μανη μαθητων. ib. n. 31. How Philaſter declined Manes, appears from the beginning of his article. See note [q]. In The Acts of Archelaus, where the name is written Manes, in the nominative, and not Manichæus, it is not prolonged in the genitive: et quomodo de Perſide venientem Manem.——Arch. n. 35, p. 61. His auditis, turbæ volebant Manem comprehenſum tradere.——c. 55, p. 100.——non ex Mane originem mali hujus manaſſe. ib. p. 101. And ſee before note [s].

[u] Les Perſans et les Arabes appellent nôtre hereſiarque Mani.——Beauſ. Hiſt. Manich. T. i. p. 73, m. and ſee note [a]. p. 116. [x] Κυβρικος μεν το πρωτον καλουμενος, επωνομασας δε εαυτω Μανη' ονομα, H. 66, n. i. in.

court of Perſia; and all the Greek writers in general ſay that in taking the name Manes he intended to ſecure himſelf honour among the Perſians.

But though the name Mani be Perſic or Chaldaic, learned moderns, ſkilled in the oriental languages, are not agreed about the original of it. However, it may be obſerved that Cyril of Jeruſalem ſays, Manes [z] in the Perſian language ſignifies diſcourſe or eloquence; and that he changed his name from Cubricus to Manes, partly to obliterate the memory of his ſervitude, partly for the ſake of gaining the reputation of a good ſpeaker: this is taken up by [a] Photius and others. Epiphanius ſays that [b] Mane, in the Babylonian language, ſignifies veſſel or inſtrument: Ephrem the Syrian [c] ſeems to refer to this notion of the word; which is alſo approved by Aſſeman; and it may be ſuppoſed to be alluded to in [d] The Acts of Archelaus; nor does Hyde deny that [e] Mân, or Mana, in Aſſyrian and Chaldee, ſignifies veſſel.

I ſhall not concern myſelf about other derivations or ſignifications of this name; but only refer to ſome [f] authors, where they may be ſeen by thoſe who are curious.

Whatever was the meaning of the name, as [g] Beauſobre obſerves, it certainly was very honourable; and, if it ſignified any thing, there is reaſon to think it denoted ſome advantageous quality; for [h] divers kings of Edeſſa were named Manes or Maanes; and Aſſeman ſays that [i] it was a common name of the princes of Syria and Arabia.

It is ſaid that Mani's father's name was Patitius or Patecius, and his mother's name Caroſſa: their names are in The [k] Form of

[z] Tunc ergo Corbicius, ſepulta Domina, bonis ſibi derelictis omnibus uti cœpit, et migravit ad medium civitatis locum, in quo manebat Rex Perſarum, et commutato ſibi nomine Manem ſemetipſum pro Corbicio appellavit. Arch. n. 53, p. 98.

[a] Εἶτα, ἵνα μὴ τὸ τῆς δουλείας ὄνομα ἐποτειδίστον ᾖ, αὖθι τῷ χωρίῳ Μάνην ἑαυτὸν ἐπωνόμασεν, ὅπερ καλὰ τὴν Περσῶν διάλεκτον τὴν ὁμιλίαν δηλοῖ· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ διαλεκτικὸς δόξαι τις εἶναι, Μάνην ἑαυτὸν ἐπωνόμασεν, οἰόμενος ὁμιλητήν τινα ἀριστον. κ. λ. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24. [a] Δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο σαφῶς ἡ γλῶσσα, τὸν οἱονεὶ ὁμιλητὴν, καὶ πρὸς διάλεξιν ἀγαπητόν. Ph. contr. Man. l. i. c. 12, p. 45.

[b] Τὸ γὰρ Μάνη ἀπὸ τῆς βαβυλωνίας εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα μεταφερόμενον σαφῶς ἀποφαίνει τ' ὄνομα. H. 66, n. i. p. 617. C. D.

[c] Manes, Chaldaicum nomen, vas, veſtem, inſtrumentum quodlibet ſignificat. Huc ſpectat quod S. Ephraem hoc loco ſcribit: Manetem diabolus tamquam propria induit veſte, ut eo, velut inſtrumento ſuo abuteretur, ſuaque per ipſum promeret oracula. Aſſem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 119.

[d] Vas es Antichriſti, et neque bonum vas, ſed ſordidum et indignum. Arch. c. 36. p. 62. [e] Verum quidem eſt, quod in lingua Aſſyriaca et Chaldaica Mân ſeu Manâ ſit Vas. De Rel. V. Perſ. p. 281, in.

[f] Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 281. 282. Hyde de Rel. Vet. Perſ. p. 281. Le Moyne Var Sacr. p. 634. Joſeph. Scal. Animadv. in Euſ. Chron. p. 240, 241, Touttée ad Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24. Beauſobr. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 70—74. Jac. Baſn. ad Tit. Boſtr. l. i. p. 60.

[g] T. i. p. 73. [h] Vid. Chron. Edeſſ. ap. Aſſeman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 418, 419, &c. [i] Maanus, nomen tum Syris tum Arabibus principibus familiare. Aſſem. ib. p. 418. [k] ἀναθεματίζω τὸν πατέρα Μανέντος θαλάσιον, καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ μητέρα Καρόσσαν. ap. Toll. Inſign. p. 144.

abjuring

ching Manichæiſm, and in [l] Hyde. Cave [m] has Patricius, by miſtake probably; but the thing is of no importance.

The Greek writers continually repreſent Mani as a ſlave, purchaſed by a widow, and afterwards ſet at liberty. This we have already ſeen in Socrates, with whom others agree. This is one thing with [n] which Cyril upbraids him; though he at the ſame time owns that it is no real ſcandal. If he was once poor and a ſlave, he obtained his liberty, and came to the poſſeſſion of a great eſtate by that time he was twelve years of age. According to [o] Archelaus, and [p] Cyril, the widow that purchaſed him for a ſlave ſoon ſet him at liberty, adopted him for her ſon, gave him a good education, and in the end made him her heir.

But I think it may be queſtioned whether Mani ever was a ſlave; for there is no notice taken of it in the eaſtern writers; and even the Greek authors ſpeak of him as rich, learned, educated among philoſophers, and at the court of Perſia in his early age. Manes among the Greeks was a common name for [q] ſlaves: and one may be almoſt apt to think that this gave occaſion for the common opinion of the Greek writers concerning Mani's ſervitude.

The eaſtern authors, cited by [r] Hyde and [s] Herbelot, ſay that Mani was a painter and engraver by profeſſion: what uſe he is ſaid to have made of his ſkill in painting will be ſeen hereafter.

It is ſaid by the ſame writers, quoted both by [t] Hyde and [u] Herbelot, that he had ſo fine a hand as to draw lines and make circles without rule or compaſs: and he made a terreſtrial globe with all it's circles and diviſions.

[l] Ille——apud Shahriſtanium vocatur Manes ſon Phaten doctus ſeu Philoſophus. At pro Phaten legendum Phatec. Mater fuit Πατεκιος, et mater Καρρεας. Hyde ib. p. 280. [m] ——patre Patricio, matre Caroſſa natus. H. L. T. p. 140. b. [n] ——τα περι αυτου παιδικα κακα, μειωσιν φερουσι τω βλασφημουντι, ει δουλειαν ψηγονται αισχυνη ουκ εστιν, κ. λ. Cat. 6, n. 26.

[o] ——comparavit ſibi puerum annorum ſex ſeptem, Corbicium nomine, qui poſtea manumiſit, ac literis eruditum. Qui cum duodecim annorum eſſet effectus, annis illis diem obiit, ipſique unigenito bona ſua tradidit. Arch. n. 53. p. [p] Και τουτον εις ευθετειαν λαβουσα, και ως εκ των περσων μαθηματων ως ενι——ευφυης ων παις εικοτως εις μεσον φιλοσοφων ηγαγε, και τελειωσασης της χηρας ηβης και τα βιβλια και τα χρηματα. n. 24. [q] Μανης γαρ εστι κοινον. Suid. Av. ver. 1329. et paſſim. Ἐστι δε ὁ Μανης μεν χωρις Διογενους ζωγραφος και ἀνηρ Περσης. Μανης δε ὁ χωρις Διογενους ἀνηρ Περσης. Diog. Laert. l. 6, n. 55. Vid. Menag. in locum, et in l. 5 n. 55. Conf. Senec. de Tranq. Anim. c. 8. Vid. et Suid. V. Μανης, cum Kuſteri notis, et Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 281, 282. [r] Manes Perſa. in eorum libris dictus Mani pictor. Nam tali fuit profeſſione functus. Hyde ubi ſupra, c. 21, p. 280. [s] Mani. Manes——étoit peintre et graveur de ſa profeſſion. Herbelot Bib. Orient. [t] Orientales narrant, quod ex pictoria arte qua excellebat ſuperbia elatus ſe prophetam vendicaverit. Ferunt eum potuiſſe a duo ulnarum longitudinem ducere lineam, in qua applicando normam nullam curvitas deprehendi potuit. Hyde ib. p. 282, m.

[u] Ce Manes ſavoit faire quelques ſortes de figures, et avoit tant de facilité qu'il faiſoit des lignes, et decrivoit des cercles ſans regle et ſans compas. Il fit auſſi un globe terreſtre avec tous ſes cercles et ſes diviſions. Herbelot. ib.

It may be argued that Mani was ſkilful in the ſcience of aſtronomy, becauſe Epiphanius ſays he [x] wrote a book of aſtrology, and that his followers boaſted of their underſtanding in aſtronomy.

Auguſtine too ſays, that [y] the Manichæan writings were filled with a fabulous philoſophy about the heavens and the ſtars, and the ſun and moon. Fauſtus, however, the Manichæan biſhop, did not concern himſelf with thoſe ſpeculations; which, I think, is to his honour, and ſeems to ſhew that as among other ſects, ſo among them likewiſe, there were doctrines maintained by ſome, which the wiſer and more underſtanding did not conſider as eſſential parts of their ſcheme, or at all belonging to it.

Beauſobre [z] has ſhewn it to be probable that Mani believed our earth to have two hemiſpheres, an upper and a lower, both inhabited; and conſequently that there are antipodes. He collects as much from ſome things ſaid in The [a] Acts of Archelaus; and he refers to a paſſage of Coſmas Indicopleuſtes, who ſays that [b] the Manichees are of much the ſame opinion with the Greeks, and believe as they do that the heaven is ſpherical.

Shariſtani, an Arabian author in Hyde, calls Mani [c] a learned man, and a philoſopher; and another author of the ſame country ſays [d] that Mani wrote a ſyſtem of philoſophy, and invented a muſical inſtrument, called by the Arabians Oud.

Beauſobre argues that [e] Mani was ſkilled in medicine; but he has no direct evidence: it is not expreſsly ſaid by the Greek or eaſtern writers. And Beauſobre does not give credit to the ſtory of his attempt to cure the king of Perſia's ſon. I therefore leave that a doubtful point.

But Mani was learned. This appears from all the particulars juſt mentioned, and from what is ſaid by the Greek writers of the literary and philoſophical [f] education beſtowed upon him by the

[x] ——αλλην δε τινα περι αστρολογιας· ου γαρ απολελυται της ταιαυτης στερησεως, αλλα μαλλον αυτοις εν προχειρῳ κατεχρηματος προκειται αστρονομια. Haer. 66, n. 13, p. 629, D. [y] Libri quoque eorum pleni ſunt longiſſimis fabulis, de cœlo et ſideribus et ſole et luna:——quæ tamen ubi conſideranda et diſcutienda protuli, modeſte ſane ille nec auſus eſt fiducie ipſam farcinam. Noverat enim ſe iſta non noſſe, nec eum puduit confiteri. Non erat de talibus, quales multos loquaces paſſus eram, conantes eam docere, et dicentes nihil. Ille vero cor habebat, etſi non rectum ad te, nec tamen nimis incautum ad ſcitum. Conf. l. 5. c. 7, n. 12. [z] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2, p. 374—376.

[a] Και παλιν εισιν στεροι κοσμοι τινες, τ... φυσικων διδασκει απο τουτου τον κοσμον, εξ... αιωρ... λεγει. Arch. c. 9. p. 17. Και ο... ὑμισφαιρια εχειν ριζας εχοντα, κατω στειλουσας τ... ib. c. 8, p. 14. Conf. Lact... Inſtit. l. 3. c. 24.

[b] Μανιχαιοι παραπλησια τοις Ελλησι φ... τες, τα τε αστρα και αυτον ουρανον σφαιροει... ριζοντες, κ. λ. Coſm. l. 6, p. 271. B.

[c] Apud Shahariſtanium——Mares... Phaten doctus, ſeu philoſophus. Hyde... 280. [d] Ibn Shahna dicit Man... ſcripſiſſe philoſophiam, quam vertit... linguam Perſicam: eumque extitiſſe... tum inſtrumenti muſici dicti Arab... Oud, id eſt, Teſtudo, Chelys. ib. p. 2... T. i. p. 81, 82. [f] ——παι... φιλοσοφ... σχολης. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 24.

good

good widow, into whose hands he came. And in The Acts of Archelaus he is spoken of as [g] if he was equal to the most knowing among the Persians, or was the first man of his time among them for learning.

I shall now translate a long article in Herbelot, taken from eastern authors, who say that 'Mani [h], having gained some esteem, began to gather together a number of people, in the character of disciples, who opposed the worship and ceremonies 'of the religion of Zoroaster, which the Persians professed at 'that time. This novelty having occasioned some disturbances, 'Saphor would have had him punished; but Mani, perceiving 'that he was sought for, fled and retired into Turkestan: here 'he had full scope to spread his notions among an ignorant sort 'of people, and make himself pass among them for a wonderful 'man, or even a god. Having found a cave where was a fine 'spring, he got some provisions, sufficient for a year, to be lodged 'there: and then he told his disciples that he was about to take 'a journey to heaven, and that they would be a whole year without seeing him; after which time he would come down again 'from heaven, and appear in a certain cave which he told 'them of.

'At the end of the year they failed not to look for him, and 'found him at the appointed place. Then he shewed them that 'wonderful book, filled with uncommon images and figures, 'and called Ergenk and Eftenk, which he said he had brought 'from heaven. This new imposture greatly increased the number of his followers, who all went from Turkestan into Persia 'upon the death of Sapor.

'Hormisdas, having succeeded his father Sapor, used Mani 'very kindly: he even embraced his sect, and built him a castle 'for his security.

'Baharam, or Varanes, succeeding his father Hormisdas, appeared in the beginning of his reign to favour Mani: but, 'having got him out of his castle under a pretence of disputing 'with the doctors of the Zoroastrian sect, he soon after flayed him 'alive, filled his skin with chaff, and had it hung up in a conspicuous place to terrify those of his sect: whereupon the greatest part of his followers fled into India, and some even to China. All that staid in Persia lost their liberty, and were reduced to servitude.'

The same story is told in [i] Hyde from the same historian

[g] ——eruditus secundum doctrinam, [illegible] in locis illis est, et pene dixerim super [illegible]am hominem. Arch. n. 53, p. 98.

[h] Vid. Herbelot. Bib. Or. v. Mani.

[i] Persarum historicus Chondemir narrat, quod Manes, Seduceus, fuit egregius

Condemir, or Khondemir, with only ſome few variations. As Hyde's book is not very common, I have tranſcribed his words at the bottom of the page.

I think it may be beſt to make here a few remarks, omitting others, which might be mentioned, and poſſibly may be remembered at another time.

1. The eaſtern authors, quoted in Hyde's and Herbelot's collections, are not ancient, but rather modern: for they are either Mahometans, or Chriſtians of late times.

2. The eaſtern writers declare Mani to have been a Chriſtian. It ſeems to be implied in Khondemir's account, as it ſtands in Herbelot: but it is plainly intimated at the beginning of his article in Hyde: and Shariſtani, cited by Hyde, ſays that [k] Mani received the prophecy or religion of Jeſus, but not that of Moſes.

3. The eaſtern writers agree with the Greeks in repreſenting Mani as an impoſtor, or one that pretended to prophecy and inſpiration.

4. If theſe writers are to be relied upon, Mani improved his ſkill in painting for gaining, or ſupporting the reputation of his being a prophet, or ſome extraordinary perſon. This is more than once taken notice of [l] by Hyde, who likewiſe ſpeaks particularly [m] of the painted, finely-figured book of his Revelations, called Ertengh.

5. According to the eaſtern, as well as the Greek writers, Mani was put to death by a king of Perſia; ſo Khondemir, before

gius pictor et ſculptor: qui poſtquam audierat quod Jeſus ſe miſſurum paracletum declaraſſet, diabolus lapideæ cordis eius tabulæ inſculpſit ſuggeſtionem, ipſum eſſe dictum paracletum. Quod tempore Shabur filii Ardeſhar Babecam prophetiam jactabat: cumque Shabar eum interficere quæreret, aufugit in Turkiſtan, ubi multos ſeduxit. Poſtea ibi invenitas ſpeluncam, ubi optimæ aquæ fons erat, ibi clanculum repoſuit annonam ad unius anni ſpatium duraturam, et aſſeclis ſuis prætendebat, ſe ad cœlum aſcenſurum, et poſt unius anni ſpatium ſe rurſus ad eos deſcenſurum. Quocirca ſeipſum ab eis ſubducens, in dictam ſpeluncam abiit, ibique ad præſtitutum tempus permanſit. Et deinde rurſus comparens, produxit tabulas egregie pictas, quas Ertengh-Mani vocant, affirmans ſe eas a cœlo accepiſſe: unde plurimi ei fidem adhibuere. Deinde in Perſidem feſtinans Regem Behram ad ſuam religionem invitavit. Et quidem Rex fuit ex primis qui ejus dictis fidem adhibuit. Et cum aſſeclæ ejus multi evaderent, Magorum doctoribus præcepit, ut cum eo disputarent. At tandem omnes qui ſervati ejus addicti erant, Regis Behram juſſu cæſi ſunt, et fervor ejus ignis hoc modo extinctus. Hyde de Rel. V. Perſ. cap. 21, p. 282, 283.

[k] ——Ille amplexus eſt religionem inter Magiſmum et Chriſtianiſmum, aſſerens prophetiam Chriſti, ſed non aſſerens prophetiam Moſis. Apud Hyde, p. 282.

[l] Orientales aiunt, quod ex pictoriæ artis, qua excellebat ſuperbia elatus, ſe prophetam venditavit. ib. p. 282.

[m] Utcunque tamen fuerit, impius iſte Mani, cum eſſet profeſſione pictor, impiorum ſuorum dogmatum librum, ut ſpecioſior appareret oculis, et eo nomine multo gratior eſſet, elegantur qua potuit pinxit, et varii generis picturis ornavit et decoravit, et Perſice illum vocavit Ertengh, vel abbreviate Teugh—— ibi intelligendum eſt Manetis Evangelium pictum, ſeu Ertengh ſc. picturarum liber, in quo dogmata ſua et revelationes ſcripſit. ib. p. 281, 282.

tranſcribed;

transcribed; and [n] so likewise Shariſtani: but the Perſian and Arabian authors make Mani's death owing to his zeal for religious principles, or the diſturbances occaſioned thereby. Thus Khondemir, as we have ſeen. And Hyde ſays it [o] is certain that Varanes put to death the dualiſts, or thoſe who maintained two principles, and hung up Mani at the gate of the city. Theſe writers ſay nothing of Mani's having occaſioned the death of the king of Perſia's ſon: they ſeem not to have had any the leaſt knowledge of that matter.

6. I muſt take notice of a miſtake of theſe writers; for according to them the place of Mani's retirement was China; where likewiſe they ſay he had ſeveral churches finely painted. But [p] Hyde ſays they muſt or ſhould mean Turkeſtan: for Mani never was in China. This we ſhould not have been able to perceive from Herbelot, who ſeems to have concealed and diſguiſed this miſtake of his authors. He declares indeed that they ſpeak of Mani's followers going into India and China after his death; but as for the place of his retirement, when he fled from Sapor, one would have thought that they had called it Turkeſtan, whereas it ſeems they name China. This may be collected from Hyde, and muſt leſſen the credit and authority of thoſe writers.

Perhaps ſome may ſuſpect that by China thoſe writers mean what we call Turkeſtan. To which I anſwer; if ſo this remark is of no value: but I am confirmed in the perſuaſion of it's ſolidity by a paſſage of Abulpharagius, who ſays that Mani [q] ſent his twelve diſciples into all the countries of the eaſt, even as far as India and China: where by China he muſt, I think, mean the ſame country that we call by that name; but if he does, very probably it is a miſtake.

Turkeſtan [r] is ſaid to be a country containing ſeveral provinces, or ſmall kingdoms: it is ſituated on the eaſt of the Caſpian ſea, and borders upon Sogdiana.

[n] Shahriſtani in libro de Religionibus Orientis de eo refert: Mani apparuit tempore Shabur filii Ardeſhir, et occidit eum Behram filius Hormuz filii Shabur. Hyde p. 282.

[o] Sed ille; nam Rex Behram interfecit Dualiſtas, et Manetem in porta urbis crucifixit. p. 283. [p] Apud Ruſtemi epiſtolam legitur.——Tchigil eſt picturam domus Chinenſis, ſcil. illud decretum, quod in regno China Manes pictor pinxit. Quod autem dicunt de China, intelligendum eſt de Turkiſtan, ubi Manes commoratus eſt. Et ibidem eſt alia eccleſia dicta Ghalbila, quam Manes picturis ornavit. Et ibi eſt urbs Tchigil. Ille enim nunquam fuit in China. Hyde p. 281. [q] Deinde a fide deficiſſens, ſeipſum Meſſiam nominavit, et duodecim diſcipulos ſibi adſcitos in omnes Orientis regiones, Indiam uſque et Sinam miſit, qui in ipſis doctrinam Thanawiorum ſeminarent; ſc. duos eſſe in mundo deos.——Abulph. Dynaſt. p. 82.

[r] See Beaufobre T. i. p. 187. See likewiſe the article of Turkeſtan in Herbelot's Bibliotheque Orientale.

II. I now proceed to what I formerly proposed to do in this place; which is to settle the time of the rise of the Manichæan sect; or, if that cannot be done, to shew at least the sentiments of ancients and moderns about it.

We have already seen the sentiments of two learned ancients. Eusebius, [s] or Jerom, said that Manichæism rose in the second year of Probus, the year of Christ 277; Socrates [t] not long before the reign of Constantine. I shall now shew the sentiments of divers others.

Jerom elsewhere says it [u] is certain that the Manichees appeared before the council of Nice.

Augustine, that [x] this sect did not arise until after Tertullian, and even after Cyprian. In another place he says that [y] Cyprian obtained the crown of martyrdom before Manichæism was at all known in the Roman empire. It is likely that Augustine thought he spoke within compass. However, if we should not be able to be more exact than this with full certainty, it is of importance to be assured, that as this sect evidently appeared in the Roman empire before the council of Nice, so it did not arise in the world until after Cyprian, who was ordained bishop about the year of Christ 248, and obtained the crown of martyrdom in 258.

In The Acts of Archelaus [z] the reign of Probus is several times mentioned as the time of Mani's appearing, or the time of the dispute with him; soon after which he was put to death.

Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote his Catechetical Lectures about the year 347, observes that [a] the Manichæan heresy arose not very long ago, about seventy years, and that there were then men living who had seen Mani. In another place he speaks [b] of Mani's not appearing till the apostles had been dead two hundred years. Toutée supposes Cyril to mean the year of Christ 277, which was the second of Probus; and that he computed the apostolic age to have ended about the year of Christ 77. It may

[s] p. 375. [t] p. 376. [u] Alioqui hoc argumento,——nec Marcion, nec Catophryges, nec Manichæus damnari debent: quia Synodus Nicena eos non nominat: quos certe ante Synodum fuisse non dubium est. Hieron. ad Pamm. et Ocean. Ep. 41 al. 65. p. 344, in.

[x] Nam constat, non solum post Tertullianum, verum etiam post Cyprianum, hanc hæresim exortam. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 12, c. 4. in. Ecce prædicatissimus tractator divinorum eloquiorum [Cyprianus] antequam terras nostras vel tenuissimus odor Manichææ pestilentiæ tetigisset. Id. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag. l. 4, c. 8, n. 24.

[y] ——numquid et gloriosissimæ coronæ Cyprianus dicetur ab aliquo, non solum fuisse, sed vel esse potuisse Manichæus, cum prius iste sit passus, quam illa in orbe Romano pestis apparuit? De Nupt. et Concup. l. 2, c. 29, n. 51.

[z] ——sub Probo demum Romano imperatore.——Arch. n. 27, p. 46. Vid. n. 28, init. [a] ——τοι πρωην επ τ ἐδ ξαντ ως αξιφνιδιον· πρ γαρ ολιγ εδητ πω επ, ἡ πλειω· και εστι μεχρι τ νυ αυτ τ οφθαλμοις διαφανεστατ ενι. Cat. 6, n. 20. [b] κα ο τελειτησαντ τ αποστολ απο διακοσιω επ εξεδεχοντ μαν——Cat. 16, n. 9.

be

is alſo ſuppoſed that Cyril took his date of Manichæiſm from The Acts of Archelaus, where Mani's coming is placed under the emperor Probus.

Epiphanius is not conſiſtent with himſelf, placing Mani earlier at one time than another. In one of his works he ſays that [c] Mani came from Perſia, and diſputed with Archelaus in the ſixth of Valerian and Gallienus; that is, in the year of our Lord 261 or 262; which date is alſo in [d] Photius. But, in his work Againſt Hereſies, Epiphanius ſometimes mentions [e] the fourth of Aurelian; that is, the year 273 or 274; at other times [f] the reigns of Aurelian and Probus; that is, about the year 276. Moreover, Epiphanius, who wrote about the year 376, ſays he [g] converſed with perſons who were acquainted with Hermias, diſciple of Mani.

Pope Leo [h] placeth the riſe of Manichæiſm in the conſulate of Probus and Paulinus, or the year 277.

In the Edeſſen Chronicle [i], publiſhed by Aſſeman, Mani's birth is placed at the year of our Lord 240, a thing not mentioned, that we know of, any where [k] elſe.

Alexander of Lycopolis mentions it as a common report that Mani lived in the time of the emperor Valerian, who was taken captive by the Perſians in [m] the year 259; that he went into the wars with Sapor king of Perſia; and, having by ſome means diſpleaſed the king, was put to death by him.

Having put down ſo many accounts from ancient authors, I will now mention the opinions of moderns.

The general opinion, as Aſſeman owns, is, that [n] Mani diſputed with Archelaus in the year 277, and died in 278. To the like purpoſe [o] Tillemont, and [p] Baſnage, and others. And Zacagni

[c] ——τὴν ἐπιδημίαν ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης βασιλείας τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῆς Περσίδος, κ. λ. Ancor. et Pond. c. 20, p. 176, A.

[d] Cod. Munich. I. 1, c. 15, in.

[e] ἐπὶ τῆς τετάρτης τῶν αὐτῶν [αὐρηλιανοῦ] βασιλείας. Har. 66, c. 1. in.

[f] ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν προδιλαβόντων αὐρηλιανοῦ καὶ Πρόβου, ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ ὁ Μανὴς ἐφανερώθη, κ. λ. ib. c. 19, f. Vid. et n. 20, p. 1. D. Ἡμεῖς δὲ κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιρὸν ἐγενήθημεν, καὶ αὐρηλιανὸς ὁ τῶν αὐτῶν, ὅτε ἐγὼ ἐγεννήθην. ib. n. 77, in.

[g] ἐπὶ γὰρ αὐρηλιανοῦ καὶ Πρόβου ἐγένετο ἡ αἵρεσις. καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκείνων χρόνων ἕως τοῦ νῦν ἐτῶν, ἤτοι τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς διηγούμενοι. II. 66, n. 12.

[h] Manichæus ——generalitatis diabolicæ, et confuſionis obſcuræ, eo tempore Probo Imperante innotuit. ——Probo Imperatore Paulinoque Conſulibus. Leo Hom. 2. de Pentec. cap. 7.

[i] Anno quingenteſimo quinquageſimo primo natus eſt Manes. Chr. Ed. ap. Aſſem. Bib. Orient. T. i. p. 393.

[k] ——natus enim fuit juxta Chronicon noſtrum anno Græcorum 551, Chriſti 240, quod nemini hactenus de ejus natali obſervatum. Aſſem. ib. in notis.

[l] αὐτὸς ἐπὶ οὐαλεριανοῦ μὲν γεγενῆσθαι λέγεται, στρατεῦσαι δὲ σὺν τῷ περσῶν βασιλεῖ πρὸς ἀρμενίαν δέ τι τοῦ στρατεύματος. Alex. Lyc. p. 4, A.

[m] Vid. Pagi Crit. in Bar. 259, n. 7, et ſeqq. Baſnag. Ann. 259, n. 3.

[n] Deinde communior fert ſcriptorum opinio, eam diſputationem anno Chriſti 277, Manetis interitum anno 278, accidiſſe. Bib. Or. T. 3. P. 2. p. 45.

[o] Mem. Ec. T. 4, Les Manichéens, art. 7, et note v.

[p] Ann. 277, n. 3, etc. Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 262, 281.

obſerves

obſerves that [q] whereas Epiphanius, in the work firſt quoted above, placed the diſpute of Archelaus and Mani in the ninth of Valerian and Gallienus, he afterwards followed a later date in his work Againſt all Hereſies, having then obtained better information. But Aſſeman [r] prefers the firſt account of Epiphanius, followed by Photius and others; though then, if Mani was born in 240, he muſt have finiſhed his courſe when he was little more than twenty years of age; which, ſurely, muſt appear improbable to moſt perſons.

Tillemont never ſaw the Edeſſen Chronicle: but having taken notice of what Alexander ſays of Mani's living in the time of Valerian, he adds, that [s] in order to reconcile him with Jerom's Chronicle, we may ſuppoſe Mani to have been in an advanced age in 277, when he was put to death; and then he may eaſily have gained reputation in Perſia before the year 260.

Beauſobre does not diſallow it to be probable that [t] Manichæiſm began to be known in the Roman empire about the year 277, the time fixed in Jerom's Chronicle; but it may have ariſen [u] eight or ten years ſooner in Perſia. Nor is it, he ſays, very improbable that [x] Mani might be author of a new ſect by that time he was thirty years of age: for more he could not be, admitting the authority of the Edeſſen Chronicle concerning the time of his birth, as Beauſobre does: nay, he ſuppoſeth that [y] Mani might make a figure in 267.

Touttée obſerves that, [z] ſince Cyril ſays in his time there were perſons

[q] Dicendum itaque eſt, Epiphanium in libro de Menſuris et ponderibus erraſſe, et multo certiora de Manichæorum hæreſis exortu in libris adverſus hæreſes nobis tradidiſſe, licet in eiſdem quoque libris iterum ſibi non conſtare deprehendatur. Zacagn. Pr. n. 8, p. 9.

[r] Hujus hæreſeos initium accurate deſcribitur a S. Epiphanio lib. de Menſuris et Ponderibus. Aſſem. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 393, not. 2. Atqui ex Epiphanio, Photio, et Petro Siculo, Manes ex Perſarum carceribus in Meſopotamiam anno Gallieni nono, id eſt Chriſti 261, aufugit. Anno igitur ſequenti, vel ad ſummum anno 263, dignis impietatis ſuæ pœnas perſolvit; idque anno ætatis ſuæ circiter vigeſimo tertio, ſi auctori Chronici Edeſſeni credendum, qui illum, ut ſupra dixi, natum ſcribit anno Chriſti 240. Aſſem. ib. T. 3, P. 2, p. 45. [s] Les Manicheens, Note v. ſur. [t] See Beauſ. Vol. i. p. 121, 122.

[u] J'explique tous ces paſſages, non du tems de la naiſſance du Manicheiſme, qui avoit commencé en Perſe environ dix ans auparavant, mais du tems, ou cette hereſie commença de faire du bruit dans l'Empire. Beauſ. T. i. p. 123.

[x] Je ne voi point de raiſon aſſez forte, pour rejetter le temoignage de la Chronique d'Edeſſe, ſur le tems de la naiſſance de Manes.——Or ce prince [Sapor] étant mort en l'année 271 ou en 272, il ne pouvoit avoir alors que trentedeux, ou trente trois ans. Il eſt vrai encore, que l'on peut être ſurpris que Manes ſoit devenu chef de ſecte, étant encore ſi jeune. Mais ces raiſons ne ſauroient balancer le temoignage d'un auteur Syrien, ou Meſopotamien, qui paroit bien inſtruit des faits, qui ſe ſont paſſez en Orient. Beauſ. T. i. p. 65. [y] J'en ai marqué le tems a l'année deux cens ſoixante ſept, en quoi j'ai ſuivi Apulpharage, qui temoigne, qu'elle parût ſous Aurelien. Ib. p. 186, in.

[z] Is eſt annus 277, a Chriſti nativitate. Non eſſe in anteriora tempora retrahendum Manetis exortum argumento eſt id quod Cyrillus ſubjicit, fuiſſe adhuc ſuo tempore ſuperſtites, qui Manetem ipſe ſuis oc-

perſons living who had ſeen Mani, we cannot reaſonably place the diſpute with him before the year 277, at which time his hereſy was firſt brought into the Roman empire, and in the following year he was put to death: which, I think, cannot be denied by thoſe who have any regard for The Acts of [a] Archelaus.

Cave therefore is ſomewhat ſingular when he ſays that [b] Mani began to ſpread his notions in 277, and [c] lived to near the end of that century; and yet he may be thought to have ſome reaſon for that ſuppoſition, when it is recollected that in Cyril's time there were ſome who had ſeen Mani; in Epiphanius's, ſome who had converſed with his diſciple Hermias; provided thoſe authors may be depended upon.

Pagi approves [d] of the date in Jerom's Chronicle, but ſays that, according to the ſucceſs and progreſs of this doctrine in ſeveral places, authors have ſpoken differently concerning the time of it.

For my own part, I think it very difficult to determine exactly the time of the riſe of Manichæiſm in Perſia, or of it's firſt appearance in the Roman empire: and I am apt to think that moſt conſiderate perſons may be in ſuſpenſe here. It is evident from the letter of Arius, and the teſtimonies of Jerom and Auguſtine, that Manichæiſm was known in the Roman empire before the council of Nice, and not till after the time of Cyprian. As for the edict of Dioclefian, I am not ſatisfied about it's genuineneſs. What ground Euſebius, or rather Jerom, in the Chronicle, had for fixing Manichæiſm at the ſecond year of Probus, we cannot now certainly ſay; excepting only the authority of The Acts of Archelaus, which there is not much reaſon to think that Euſebius was acquainted with. It appears to me remarkable that Alexander of Lycopolis, who, as is ſaid, once was a Manichee, and afterwards wrote againſt them, ſpeaks not with aſſurance about Mani's time. The little notice taken of Manichæiſm by Euſebius is another thing that deſerves obſervation; as do likewiſe

conſpexiſſent. Quod autem ſub Probo innotuit Manes, intelligendum de Perſia, Mesopotamiam et Romanorum imperium adventu, qui uno tantum anno ... interceſſit. Toutt. ad Cyr. Cat. ... 13, not. 3.

[a] Vid. Arch. n. 55, p. 100.

[b] Hæreſin ſuam diſſeminare cœpit circa ... Probi imperatoris anno ſecundo. H. L. T. i. p. 139, in Manete.

[c] Jam vero ſuæ virus non ante annum ... propinare cœpit Manes, et plures ... annos in vivis erat, ac proinde ad exitum vergente hoc ſæculo Agapium ſibi diſcipulum adſcivit. Cav. Diſſ. de Script. incert. æt. ſub. in.

[d] In Annalibus origo hæreſeos Manichæorum anno præcedenti conſignatur, ſed eam ad præſentem retrahendam eſſe evincit Eutebius in Chronico. Pagi Ann. 277, n. vi. Verum eſt, varias ſub idem fere tempus eruptiones monſtri illius fuiſſe, et inſignibus alicunde facinoris notis celebratas. Quæ cauſa fuit, cur non iiſdem Imperatoribus hæreſis iſtius origo mandata fuerit. Ib. n. vii.

the

the words of Cyril and Epiphanius, where they ſpeak of Mani or Hermias having been perſonally known to ſome of their times: inſomuch that, upon the whole, I am doubtful whether Manichæiſm was known in the Roman empire before the very end of the third century, or the beginning of the fourth. If it was known there ſooner, I think it's progreſs muſt have been very inconſiderable.

Sect. III. Mani's predeceſſors and works.

I. *His predeceſſors*; 1. *Scythian*; 2. *Terebinthus*. II. *His works.*

It will be proper, in the next place, to give an account of Mani's works.

1. But it is requiſite that I beforehand take notice of two perſons ſpoken of as Mani's predeceſſors, and [a] ſometimes called his maſters, Scythian and Terebinthus; both expreſsly named in the long paſſage of Socrates, tranſcribed at the beginning of this chapter.

1. It has been the prevailing opinion of learned men that Scythian lived in the apoſtolic age, or near it. Epiphanius [b] placeth him near the times of the apoſtles; which [c] Cave thinks may be underſtood with ſo great latitude as to leave room to ſuppoſe that Scythian lived to near the end of the ſecond century.

In The Acts of Archelaus, Scythian is ſaid [d] to have lived in the time of the apoſtles: but that ſeems not very conſiſtent with what follows, where [e] it is ſaid that Terebinthus was a diſciple of Scythian, and intimate with him: and Mani, who appeared not in the world till after the middle of the third century, is ſaid to have been the ſlave and adopted ſon of the woman at whoſe houſe Terebinthus died.

Indeed there is reaſon to believe that Scythian was contempo-

[a] ——τῆς μανέντος διδασκάλης. Vid. Anathem. ap. Coteler. Clem. Recogn. l. 4, c. 27, in. [b] ——περὶ τῆς χρόνος τῶν ἀποστόλων. H. 66, n. 3, p. 620, A.

[c] Tradit Epiphanius ipſum Hieroſolyma profectum περὶ τῆς χρόνος τῶν ἀποστόλων. [H. 66, n. 3, p. 620, A.] Quod laxiore quidem ſenſu de ſæculo avum apoſtolicum proxime ſecuto intelligendum eſt; adeo ut vergente ad exitum ſæculo ſecundo diem fatalem obiiſſe cenſeri poteſt. Cav. H. l. T. i. p. 140. Oxon. 1740.

[d] Scythianus nomine apoſtolorum tempore fuit ſectæ hujus auctor et princeps. ——Arch. n. 51, p. 95.

[e] Diſcipulum habuit quendam nomine Terebinthum. Arch. n. 52, p. 96.—— quia ergo aliquantulum temporis ſecum illi ambo decreverunt ſoli habitare;—— Ille vero diſcipulus, qui cum eo fuerat converſatus,——ib.

rary

gary with Mani, as [f] ſome learned men have perceived; for [g] in Photius is expreſs mention made of a * letter of Mani to Scythian.

Archelaus in one place ſays that [h] Scythian was of the country of Scythia: but afterwards he ſays he [i] was a Saracen or Arabian; which is alſo ſaid by [k] Cyril and [l] Epiphanius. Photius too ſays, not very differently from [m] Archelaus, that Scythian [n] was deſcended from the Saracens, but choſe to live in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria.

2. Terebinthus, reckoned another predeceſſor of Mani, is ſaid by [o] Epiphanius to have been a learned man as well as Scythian. The common account of this man in [p] Archelaus, [q] Cyril, [r] Epiphanius, and others, is, that after the death of his maſter Scythian he went into Perſia, or the country of Babylon, where he changed his name from Terebinthus to Buddas; and gave out that he was born of a virgin, and brought up by an angel in the mountains; and that at laſt he was thrown off the top of a houſe by [s] an angel, or ſome other ſpirit, where he had gone up very early one morning to perform ſome ſacred rites.

As for his changing his name, in all probability there was no bad deſign in that, Buddas [t] being in the Babylonian language equivalent to Terebinthus, which in Greek ſignifies a certain tree.

What is ſaid of his pretending to have been born of a virgin, and educated in the mountains, muſt needs be a fiction; becauſe, as [u] Beauſobre obſerves, the Manichees univerſally denied the

[f] Hunc Scythianum Manetis adhuc certa vixiſſe non dubito, licet ætate ac [illegible] cum præceſſit.——Certe ex Manetis epiſtola ad Scythianum fragmentum quæ infra afferetur. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 280. Vid. et Beauſobre Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 26, et 63.

[g] Και περι και ο μανιχαιος προς σκυθιανον επιστολης.——ap. Phot. in Eulogio cod. [illegible] p. 849. * See a French tranſlation of the fragment of that letter in B. [illegible] p. 45. [h] ——quidam ex Scythia Scythianus nomine. Arch. n. 51, p. [illegible]. [i] Quique Scythianus ipſe ex genere Saracenorum fuit, et captivam quandam accepit uxorem de ſuperiore Thebaide, quæ cum ſimul habitare in Ægypto [illegible] quam in deſertis. ib. n. 52, p. [illegible]. [k] ——σαρακηνης το γενος. Cat. [illegible]. n. 22. [l] ——απο της σαρακηνικης [illegible]. H. 66, n. 1.

See before note [i]. [n] Σκυθιανης τις [illegible] πατριδα αιγυπτιος, το δε εξ αιθιοπων [illegible] σαρακηνης την αλεξανδρειαν ωκει. Ph. [illegible] Manich. l. 1. c. 12, in.

[o] ——και ετος ει γραμματων επιμελησατα πεπαιδευμενος. H. 66, n. 3, p. 620, D. [p] ——et Babyloniam petiit, quæ nunc provincia habetur a Perſis,—quo cum venuſſet, talem de ſe famam pervulgavit ipſe Terebinthus, dicens——ſe ——vocari non jam Terebinthum, ſed alium Buddam nomine,——ex quadam autem virgine natum ſe eſſe, ſimul et ab angelo in montibus enutritum.——Tunc deinde mane primo aſcendit ſolarium quoddam excelſum, ubi nomina quædam cœpit invocare.——Hæc eo cogitante juſtiſſimus Deus ſub terr. [illegible] cum detrudi per ſpiritum juſſit, et continuo de ſummo dejectus, exanime corpus deorſum præcipitatum eſt, quod anus illa miſerta collectum locis ſolitis ſepeliit. Arch. c. 52, p. 97 [q] Cyr. Cat. vi. n. 23.

[r] Hær. 66, n. 3. [s] ——υπο αγγελου καταχθεις κατεπεσε. Epiph. ib. p. 621, A. [t] Qui in Perſum concedens, ut melius eclaretur, tranſtulit nomen ſuum in Buddam, (rectius Butm, ſeu Budm,) Terebinthum ſignificans. Hyde, p. 280, Conf. Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 53, 54, 55. [u] T. i. p. 56.

poſſibility

poſſibility of ſuch a birth, and always ſuppoſed that [x] Mani himſelf was born in the ordinary way.

As for the manner of his death, there is no reaſon to receive the account of it as true, from thoſe who have ſuffered themſelves to be impoſed upon in ſo many particulars: but it is not improbable that Terebinthus often went to the upper part of the houſe to perform his devotions there; the Manichees being frequent in prayer, and the top of the houſe [y] being a place much uſed for that purpoſe by the eaſtern people. Whether Terebinthus died ſuddenly in ſuch a place I do not know.

Finally, whereas it is ſaid that Terebinthus outlived Scythian, and that having died himſelf at the houſe of a widow, who, coming to the poſſeſſion of his eſtate, purchaſed the boy Cubricus, or Mani, then ſeven years of age, it muſt be all without foundation; for Scythian himſelf was contemporary with Mani, and alive after that Mani had publiſhed his peculiar opinions, as has been ſhewn. Moreover, Terebinthus, or Buddas, or Addas, was a diſciple of Mani: his name is in all catalogues of the firſt diſciples of that Perſian maſter, and he wrote in defence of his ſcheme. And by Scythian may then be meant Mani, who, as [z] Theodoret ſays, was ſometimes ſo called; poſſibly, becauſe he was a while in that country.

Let this ſuffice for ſhewing that the common accounts concerning theſe two predeceſſors of Mani are not to be relied upon, but are really idle fictions.

I have already ſeveral times quoted Beauſobre. I here again refer to his Hiſtory of the Manichees.

II. We come now to Mani's works, of which I ſhall give the beſt account I can.

Socrates, in the paſſage formerly cited, ſpeaks of four books written by Terebinthus or Buddas, entitled Myſteries, The Goſpel, The Treaſure, and Chapters. By [b] Cyril, and [c] Epiphanius, and [d] Photius, they are aſcribed to Scythian, as they are alſo in The [e] Acts of Archelaus. But there being an ambiguity in one place of that work [f] where they are mentioned, it is likely that

[x] ——cur hominem ſuſceptum a Spiritu Sancto Manichæum, non putatis turpe, natum ex utroque ſexu prædicare? Aug. contr. Ep. Fund. c. 7, n. 8. Cum enim vos non timeatis viſcera et ſanguinem Manichæi de humano concubitu venientem,——id. ib. Vid. et Alex. Lyc. p. 14, D. [y] See Beauſobre, T. i. p. 60. [z] σκυθιανος δε δηλειων προσηγορευετο. Hær. Fab. l. i. c. 26, in.

[a] T. i. p. 53——64. [b] Cat. 6. n. 22. [c] Hær. 66, n. 2. [d] Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 12. [e] ——eſt in quatuor illos libellos, quos Scythianus ſcripſerat, non multorum verſuum ſingulos. Arch. n. 53, p. 97. [f] Diſcipulum autem habuit [Scythianus] quendam nomine Terebinthum, qui ſcripſit ei quatuor libros, ex quibus unum quidem appellavit Myſteriorum, alium vero Capitulorum, tertium autem Evangelium, et noviſſimum omnium Theſaurum appellavit. Arch. n. 52, p. 96.

thereby

thereby Socrates was induced to call them Terebinthus's, as has been hinted by [g] ſome learned men.

Socrates ſays that Mani, coming to the poſſeſſion of thoſe books, diſtributed them among his followers as his own. Archelaus [h] ſpeaks to the like purpoſe; only he ſays that Mani firſt made additions to them. It ſeems to me probable that they are really Mani's; and I ſhall conſider them as ſuch. Beauſobre does the ſame.

The four books, mentioned by Socrates, are differently placed by the authors juſt cited. I chuſe to ſpeak of them in the order in which they are named by Archelaus and Epiphanius: Myſteries, Chapters, Goſpel, Treaſury. Afterwards I ſhall put down the titles of other things aſcribed to him.

1. The firſt is The Myſteries. 'It appears,' ſays [i] Beauſobre, 'by comparing Titus of Boſtra and Epiphanius, that it began 'with theſe words: "God [k] and matter exiſted, light and darkneſs, good and evil: they were entirely ſeparate and contrary "to each other." This book was divided into [l] two-and-twenty 'ſections, according to the number of the letters of the Syriac 'alphabet. As for the ſubject of the book, Photius [m] ſays the 'author there blaſphemed the law and the prophets. But that 'was not the principal deſign of this pernicious work: it is the 'doctrine of two principles that Mani there endeavoured to 'prove by a demonſtration a poſteriori: I mean from the mixture of good and evil which there is in the world. All his reaſoning is founded upon this maxim, that if there were one ſole 'cauſe, who is moſt ſimple, moſt perfect, moſt good, all effects 'would be anſwerable to the nature and will of that cauſe; the 'whole would ſhew his ſimplicity, his perfection, his goodneſs; 'and every thing would be immortal, holy, happy, like himſelf. 'We may with aſſurance conclude what were the contents of this 'book, The Myſteries, from the confutation of it by Titus of 'Boſtra; who follows his adverſary very cloſely, though he does 'not concern himſelf minutely with every [n] thing.'

Some learned men, as [o] Cave, and [p] Fabricius, thought that Mani wrote a book Concerning the Faith. They ſuppoſe it to

[g] Scythianus——diſcipulum habuit Terebinthum, qui alio nomine Buddam ſe vocavit, ſcripſitque ei (hoc eſt ab eo dictos) quatuor libros. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 280. Vid. et Touttée in Cyr. not. p. 101. et confer. Beauſ. T. i. p. 46, m.

[h] Tunc aſſumit illos libellos, et transfert ſibi ita ut multa alia a ſemetipſo inſereret——nomen vero libellis proprium dedit, prioris nomine deleto, tanquam ſi eos ſolus ex ſemetipſo conſcripſerit. Arch. n. 53, p. 98.

[i] B. T. i. p. 46, 47.

[k] Η. Θεος και ὑλη ἐφυ, φως και σκοτος· ἀγαθα, και κακα· ἐν τοις πασιν ἀ χωρις ἀλλ. Tit. contr. Manich. l. i. p. 63, in. et ap. Epiph. H. 66, n. 14, in.

[l] Epiph. H. 66, n. 13, p. 629, C. D.

[m] Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 12, p. 40.

[n] What Beauſobre ſays farther of this book may be ſeen T. i. p. 427.

be

be quoted by Epiphanius. But Beauſobre well argues that [q] the paſſage in Epiphanius is taken out of the book of The Myſteries, as appears by comparing him with Titus of Boſtra. I think Epiphanius does not intend a book different from others there named, but ſays that in the books mentioned by him, particularly that of The Myſteries, Mani ſhews what was his faith or doctrine.

I therefore ſhall not ſpeak of this as a diſtinct book of Mani, as ſome have done.

2. The ſecond book is that called Chapters or Heads; ſummarily repreſenting, it is likely, the fundamental principal articles of the Manichæan doctrine. Beauſobre [r] puts the queſtion, whether this be not The Epiſtle of the Foundation. As I ſee no reaſon for ſuch a ſuppoſition, I ſhall ſpeak of that afterwards among Mani's epiſtles.

3. The third book was entitled The Goſpel; which, as Cyril ſays, did [s] not contain the hiſtory of the life of Chriſt, but reſembled the goſpels in name only. We might be apt to conclude from thoſe words of Cyril that he had ſeen the book; but perhaps he ſpeaks only by way of conjecture; as [t] Photius ſeems to have done when he ſays that [u] therein were related things derogatory to the honour of Chriſt our Saviour. I ſuppoſe this to be the ſame book which is ſometimes called [x] The Living Goſpel. Beauſobre ſays [y] it was a collection of Mani's meditations and pretended revelations. But I cannot ſee how he ſhould know this, when he adds that it was written in Perſic, and probably was never tranſlated into Greek: and in another place he ſays that [z] he has not obſerved any fragments of it in the authors that have confuted Mani. I ſuppoſe that conjectural concluſion is built upon the ſtory of Mani's journey to heaven, ſpoken of by eaſtern authors, for which I ſee no good foundation. For my own part I cannot ſay what was in the book; I know nothing of it beſide the title.

4. The fourth is called The Treaſure, and [a] Treaſure of Life, and [b] The Treaſures in the plural number, as if there were more than one: a greater, perhaps, and a leſs. Epiphanius ſpeaks of a book called The little Treaſury, as diſtinct from that called The Treaſure:

[q] H. l. T. i. p. 139.
[r] Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 282.
[s] T. i. p. 426, 427. [t] ib. p. 48, in. [u] ——εὐαγγελιον, ὃ χριστε πλαξεις περιεχεσθαι, αλλ' ατλως μοιον την προσηγοριαν. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 22.
[t] Vit. Toutée not. [b] in Cyr. p. 101.
[u] Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 12, p. 40.
[x] το των μανιχαιων ζων ευαγγελιον. ap. Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204, f. Conſ. Timoth. Conſt. ap. Meurſ. Varia Divina p. 117. et Form. Recip. Manich. ap. Toll. p. 142. et Cotel. Clem. Recogn. l. 4, c. 27.
[y] T. i. p. 48. [z] Ib. p. 426, not. 2.
[a] Θησαυρος ζωης. ap. Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. p. 40. Θησαυρος της ζωης. ap. Meurſ. Var. Div. p. 117. et Toll. p. 142. et Cotel. ubi ſupra. [b] και τους θησαυρους καταλειψει. Phot. Cod. 85, p. 204.
[c] Ετερα δε θησαυρος· και αλλας δη βιβ-

Treaſure:

Treasure: perhaps it was an abridgment of the former; but we cannot be certain. The Treasure was one of the books which were confuted by [d] Heraclean. Beausobre thinks that [e] the pompous title of The Treasure, or Treasure of Life, might be an allusion to some words of Christ, where he compares his doctrine to a treasure hid in a field: See Matth. xiii. 44. Augustine [f] and the author [g] De Fide, joined with Augustine's works, allege a passage as taken out of The Treasure: but [h] Beausobre says it is not genuine, and offers very weighty arguments against it. As I do not intend to examine all the notions of the Manichees, I shall have no occasion to consider that passage.

5. By Epiphanius, Mani is said to have written [i] a book about astrology: it is likely he means astronomy.

6. In Photius is a book entitled [k] The Gigantic Book: it is one of the three books of Mani which were confuted by Heraclean: the other two are The Gospel and The Treasures. Timothy of Constantinople mentions a Manichæan book, entitled [l] The Giant's Enterprize: very probably he means the same with that just taken notice of.

7. Mani's epistles: of which there was a [m] book or [n] collection made by somebody.

8. The first to be observed by us is The Epistle of the Foundation: this was confuted by Augustine, who transcribed the beginning of it into his own [o] works. There is a large fragment of it in another book of [p] Augustine: there are fragments of it also in the [q] treatise De Fide, joined with Augustine's works. It was publicly read by the Manichees in their [r] assemblies. Possibly it was a long epistle; for Augustine [s] calls it a book, and says it contained almost their whole scheme.

There is an epistle to Patricius, cited by [t] Julian the Pelagian, and Opus Imperfectum of Augustine. Tillemont [u] considers

[d] ... ἀναιρεῖται, τὸν μικρὸν δὲ ... καλεμένου. Epiph. H. 66, n. 620, D. [e] Phot. Cod. 85. [f] Aug. de Nat. Boni. cap. 44. Vid. et Act. cum Fel. c. 7, et Contr. Faust. l. 20, c. 6. [g] cap. 14, &c. [h] Vid. Hist. de Man. l. i. p. 49, 426 T. ii. p. 387, &c. [i] ... περὶ ἀστρολογίας. H. 66, n. 619, D. [k] Διατρεπει δὲ τὸ παρὰ ... ὀνομαζομένου εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τοῦ ... βιβλου, καὶ τοῦ Θησαυροῦ. [l] Cod. 85. p. 204. ... τοῦ γιγαντιαίου στρατεύματος. ap. Cotel. Mon. Vet. Div. p. 117. [m] καὶ τὸ τῶν ... βιβλιον. ap. Coteler. ubi supra. Tom. i. p. 142. [n] ἡ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ... ap. Mosheim. ib. p. 117.

[o] Vid. Aug. contr. Ep. Manichæi. [p] Vid. De Natura Boni. cap. 46, T. 8. [q] De Fide. cap. v. xi. xxvii. [r] Ipsa enim nobis illo tempore miseris quando lecta est, illuminati dicebamur a vobis. Aug. contr. Ep. Man. cap. v. n. 6. [s] Et potissimum illum consideremus librum, quem Fundamenti epistolam dicitis, ubi totum pene quod creditis continetur.——Aug. ibid. [t] Sic etiam in illa ad Patritium epistola ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 186.——Dixit hoc idem et Manichæus in epistola ad Patritium. Dixit et in epistola, quam scripsit ad filiam Menoch. ib. l. 2, c. 109. [u] Mem. Ec. T. iv. Les Manichéens, Art. 13.

this as different from The Epiſtle of the Foundation, though he allows that alſo to have been ſent to ſome particular perſon. But to me it ſeems probable that they are one and the ſame epiſtle; for, according to the reading [x] in the Benedictine edition of Auguſtine's Anſwer, The Epiſtle of the Foundation appears to be ſent to Patticius. Which is the right reading, that in the Opus Imperfectum of Auguſtine, or that in his Anſwer to The Epiſtle of the Foundation, I do not determine: but it ſeems likely that hereby is meant the ſame name with that of Mani's father: and if Patec, or Phatec, was the name of his father, and of his friend, or diſciple, to whom The Epiſtle of the Foundation was ſent, it may afford ground to think that this was a common name among the Perſians or Chaldeans.

8. A letter to [y] Menoch, a Manichæan woman, found at Conſtantinople, and [z] often quoted by Julian the Pelagian. I think the genuineneſs of this letter is not diſputed; but [b] Auguſtine did not know any thing of it till it was quoted againſt him by Julian.

9. A letter to Marcellus, found in The [c] Acts of Archelaus, and in [d] Epiphanius. Beauſobre [e] allows this letter to be genuine: but I think that if thoſe Acts are fictitious, and the hiſtory of Mani there recorded is for the moſt part improbable, and without ground, it will be difficult to maintain this letter. Again, if genuine, it muſt have been written in Greek, as Beauſobre grants. That learned writer has indeed ſome arguments to prove that Mani underſtood Greek; but perhaps they are of no great moment: the contents of the letter may increaſe the ſuſpicion of it's genuineneſs. It may be doubted whether in writing to a ſtranger Mani would take upon him his apoſtolical character, as he here does, unleſs indeed he means nothing extraordinary by it; and whether he would call one who was not of his opinion his [f] dear ſon. It ſeems to me likewiſe improbable that Mani ſhould reveal his ſentiments ſo clearly to one, who as yet had no knowledge of him; for he declares openly the doctrine of two principles, and his opinion concerning the birth of Chriſt.

[x] De eo igitur, frater dilectiſſime Patticii, de quo ſignificaſti, &c. ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. 12, n. 14, *ubi ſubjicitur in ima pagina hoc monitum.* Editi, *dilectiſſime, audiſti.* Vetus codex Corbeienſis ante mille annos ſcriptus loco *audiſti*, habet *Patticî*: forte nomen illius, cui epiſtolam dedit Manichæus.

[y] See before, note [t].

[z] Sed quia poſt editionem illorum,—— apud Conſtantinopolim Manichæi epiſtola inventa eſt, atque ad has directa partes; opera eſt aliqua ejus inſerere. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 166. [a] Ap. Auguſtin. ib. c. 172, 174, 175, 176, 181, et paſſim. [b] Si dicam tibi, iſtam Manichæi epiſtolam me omnino neſcire; quamvis verum dicam, non credes. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 172. [c] Arch. c. v. p. 67.

[d] H. 66, c. 6. [e] T. i. p. 94, 95.

[f] ——τεκνον αγαπητον. ap. Arch. p. 67.

and

and, in ſpeaking of this laſt, he [g] uſeth broad and offenſive expreſſions. I might add other obſervations; but I forbear.

4. A letter to Scythian, cited by Eulogius in [h] Photius. The paſſage may be likewiſe ſeen among ſome other fragments of Mani's writings in [i] Fabricius.

5. An epiſtle to Zebenna, of which there are two fragments in [k] Fabricius.

6. A letter to Cudarus, of which Fabricius has alſo a [l] fragment.

7. A letter to Odas [or perhaps Addas, or Buddas]: Fabricius [m] has likewiſe obliged us with a fragment of this epiſtle.

8. Auguſtine [n] ſpeaks of an epiſtle of Mani, containing the beſt rules by which the elect ought to govern themſelves. By the manner of ſpeaking it appears to have been well known at Rome and in Africa. Whether it was The Epiſtle of the Foundation, or ſome other, I cannot ſay; but I ſuppoſe it was not improper juſt to mention here this particular.

8. In ſome late writers mention is made of a book entitled [o] Memoirs, or Memorable Sayings and Actions, of Mani; the loſs of which is much regretted by [p] Beauſobre.

9. Alexander of Lycopolis mentions [q] a book of Mani concerning our Saviour's crucifixion. But it may be queſtioned whether he means a diſtinct book, or only that in ſome book Mani had treated of that ſubject.

10. An eaſtern author, cited by Hyde, ſpeaks of a [r] book of philoſophy written by Mani.

11. In [s] Photius is quoted a paſſage as Mani's; it is to this purpoſe: 'I am not ſo unmerciful as Chriſt, who declared, *He that denies me before men, him alſo will I deny.* As for me, 'I ſay on the other hand: "him that denies me before men, and "by lying ſecures himſelf, I will receive with joy as if he had "not denied me; and his lie and apoſtacy I will conſider as a ſer"vice to my intereſt." This ſaying, with ſome difference, and [t] quite ſo abſurd and impudent, is in The Form of abjuring Manichæiſm, as we have it in [t] Cotelerius, and [u] Tollius. I think [x] Beauſobre is in the right to diſpute the genuineneſs of this paſſage, found only in late authors, without naming the work

[f] ... παρας τους γνησιους ελεγον ειναι ... σαρκος και της αλλης δυσ... γνησιων γεγενησθαι. ib. p. 8.

[g] Cod. 280, p. 849, m. [h] Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 274. [i] Ibid.

[k] P. 285. [l] Ibid. [m] Propoſita ... di regula de Manichæi epiſtola.

[n] De Mor. Manich. c. 20, n. 74.

[o] ... τ' των απομνημονευματων. (five dictorum factorumque memorabilium Commentarium.) ap. Tollii Inſign. p. 142, et Cotel. ubi ſupra.

[p] T. i. p. 430. [q] ... παντες μαθησαις διατεταττεται λεγω περι τουτου ... Alex. Lyc. p. 19, B.

[r] Ibn Shahna dicit Manetem ſcripſiſſe Philoſophiam, quam vertit in linguam Perſicam. Hyde, p. 285. [s] Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 3. [t] ubi ſupra.

[u] Toll. ubi ſupr. p. 148.

[x] T. 2, p. 796.

whence it is taken. I am ſure it is contrary to the noble ſaying of Mani, to be alleged by and by [y] from The Acts of Archelaus, where he profeſſes willingneſs to ſuffer, and to fear God more than men: it is alſo contrary to the practice of his followers, who were generally in ſuffering circumſtances for their principles, and yet perſevered, and ſhewed as much conſtancy as the men of any other ſect. Beauſobre [z] has quoted a paſſage of [a] Secundinus, ſhewing that the Manichees did not approve of diſſimulation, nor of denying the Lord Jeſus. Auguſtine aſſures us, that [b] the Manichees alleged as genuine words of Chriſt what is recorded Luke xviii. 29, 30. *There is no man that has left houſe, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's ſake, who ſhall not receive manifold.*

Perhaps this impudent ſaying was in The Memoirs, or Memorable Acts and Sayings, of Mani: if ſo, Beauſobre had no reaſon to ſet any great value upon that piece. Indeed I ſuſpect the collection with that name to have been a late thing; and I apprehend it not unlikely to have been made by Mani's enemies, and to have been injurious to him in ſome reſpects, though there may have been in it ſome of his genuine ſayings and obſervations.

12. Titus of Boſtra intimates that [c] Mani's books, at leaſt the book he anſwered, was written in Syriac. Auguſtine however ſuppoſeth that [d] they had books written in Perſic.

13. From Auguſtine we learn that the [e] Manichees had many and large books, adorned at great expenſe. Perhaps the bulk of the volumes was owing to the largeneſs of the letters in which [f] they were written throughout; ſuch as were otherwiſe generally uſed only at the beginnings of books or chapters.

14. I have now finiſhed my account of Mani's works: I wiſh we

[y] See the next ſection, near the beginning. [z] Ib. p. 796, 797.

[a] Ipſe enim non ignoras, quam peſſimus ſit, quamque malignus, quique etiam tanta calliditate adverſus fideles et ſummos viros militat, ut et Petrum coegerit ſub una nocte tertio Dominum negare. Secundin. ad Auguſt. c. 4.

[b] ——quid ſi alius dicat illud eſſe immiſſum, et falſum, quod ipſi proferunt dicente Domino: Omnis qui reliquerit domum, aut uxorem, aut parentes, aut filios propter regnum cœlorum, &c. Aug. contr. Adimant. c. 3, n. 2.

[c] Ὅτε μὲν εἰ ἑτέρα, γραὸς δίκην μυθολογεῖ καὶ γραφεῖ τῇ συρίᾳ φωνῇ χρώμενος. Tit. l. i. p. 69, in. [d] Itane Perſicis libris me jubes credere, qui Hebræis me dixiſti non credere? Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 13, c. 17.

[e] ——conſpuuntur [al. conſpiciuntur] tam multi et tam grandes et tam pretioſi codices veſtri: et multum dolentur labores antiquariorum, et ſacelli miſerorum, et panis deceptorum. Contr. Fauſt. l. 13, c. 6. Incendite omnes illas membranas, elegantesque tecturas decoris pellibus exquiſitas, ut nec res ſuperflua vos oneret. ib. cap. 18.——cum te illi ſonarent mihi frequenter et multipliciter voce ſola, et libris multis et ingentibus. Confeſſ. l. 3, c. 6, n. 10. Vid. et c. 12.

[f] Habeant qui volunt veteres libros, vel in membranis purpureis auro argentoque deſcriptos, vel initialibus, ut vulgo aiunt, literis, onera magis exarata, quam codices: dummodo mihi, meiſque permittant pauperes habere ſchedulas, et non tam pulchros codices quam emendatos. Hier. Pr. in Job, T. i. p. 798.

had

had more of them, or at leaſt The Epiſtle of the Foundation entire, that we might judge for ourſelves. Perhaps it might pleaſe the curious if ſome learned man would publiſh a collection of all Mani's fragments.

SECT. IV. The ſentiments of the Manichees concerning divers points.

I. *Mani was a Chriſtian.* II. *Divers particulars in which the Manichees agreed with other Chriſtians.* III. *Whether Mani was an impoſtor? The queſtion propoſed, and the opinions of ſeveral about it.* IV. *Reaſons for thinking he was an impoſtor, with an examination of thoſe reaſons.* V. *Additional obſervations.* VI. *The Manichæan ſentiments concerning the divine perfections. Whether they believed two gods? They believed God creator, and a trinity. Whether they worſhipped the ſun?* VII. *They held two eternal principles.* VIII. *Their account of the creation of the world.* IX. *Of the formation of man.* X. *That man has two ſouls.* XI. *Of the fall of man.* XII. *Of marriage.* XIII. *Of free will.* XIV. *Of fate.* XV. *Of the lawfulneſs of war.* XVI. *They held the tranſmigration of ſouls.* XVII. *They denied the reſurrection of the body.* XVIII. *Of the future judgment, and the eternity of hell torments.* XIX. *Of the end of the world.* XX. *The grounds and reaſons of their faith in Chriſt.* XXI. *They believed Chriſt to be God, but not man.* XXII. *Their opinion of Chriſt's crucifixion, death, and reſurrection.* XXIII. *Whether they thought the death of Chriſt to be a propitiatory ſacrifice?*

I. THE firſt thing I obſerve for ſhewing Mani's ſentiments is, that he was a Chriſtian.

Entering into the debate with Archelaus, he is made to ſay: 'I, brethren, am [a] a diſciple and an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt.' His letter to Marcellus, inſerted in the work aſcribed to Archelaus, is thus inſcribed: 'Mani, an [b] apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, and 'all the ſaints with me, unto Marcellus my dear ſon, grace, 'mercy and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Je-'ſus Chriſt.' In that letter he complains that 'ſome [c], even 'Chriſtians, did not believe the things ſaid in the goſpels by our

[a] Ego, viri fratres, Chriſti quidem ſum diſcipulus, apoſtolus vero Jeſu. Arch. n. 13, p. 24, in.

[b] Μανιχαιος αποστολος ιησυ χριστυ——χαρις, ελεος, ειρηνη απο θεου πατρος και κυριυ ημων ιησυ χριστυ. κ. λ. n. 5, p. 6.

[c] Ουτε γαρ τοις ειρημενοις εν ευαγγελιοις παρ αυτυ τυ σωτηρος ημων και κυριυ ιησυ χριστυ πιστευουσιν. ib. p. 7.

'Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.' At the village Diodoris, Mani is repreſented ſpeaking to Archelaus in this honeſt, and reſolute, and truly Chriſtian manner: 'If [d] you have a mind to perſe-'cute me, I ſubmit: if you would inflict puniſhments upon me, 'I do not decline them: if you would kill me, I am not afraid. 'For we ought to fear him alone, who is able to deſtroy both 'ſoul and body in hell:' ſee Matt. x. 28.

Fauſtus in his book uſually propoſeth difficulties and objections againſt their ſcheme in the way of queſtion: 'Do [e] you re-'ceive the goſpel? Yes certainly.' Afterwards: 'Do [f] you re-'ceive the goſpel; and do you aſk me whether I receive the 'goſpel, when in fact it appears that I receive it by doing what 'it commands?' which he there proceeds to ſhew in a variety of particulars. He [g] ſpeaks 'of the wholeſome, or ſaving 'words of the Lord, and his divine diſcourſes.' And, according to him, Chriſt [h] is light and truth itſelf, and [i] a teacher and model of all virtue.

Fauſtus readily profeſſeth himſelf and the reſt of the Manichees [k] to be diſciples of Chriſt and his apoſtles: nor [l] will they be prevailed upon by any to forſake Jeſus, the ſon of God, their maſter. Our [m] Lord, and our Saviour, are characters and titles by which they continually ſpeak of Jeſus Chriſt.

Titus of Boſtra owns that [n] they honoured the name of Chriſt. Auguſtine obſerves, that [o] they would not ſay the doctrine of the apoſtles of Chriſt was in any reſpect falſe and miſtaken.

By all which we may perceive how much the late ingenious Stephen Nye was miſtaken, when he ſaid that [p] the Manichees never were accounted a ſect of Chriſtians.

I ſhall add but little more here.

Fortunatus,

[d] Si perſequi volueris, paratus ſum: et ſi inferre ſupplicia, non refugiam. Si etiam interficere me vis, non reformido. &c. Arch. n. 47, p. 84. [e] Accipis evangelium? Et maxime? Fauſt. l. 2, c. 1.

[f] Accipis evangelium? Tu me interrogas, utrum accipiam evangelium, in quo id ipſum accipere apparet, quia quæ jubet obſervo——? Ego patrem dimiſi——, et interrogas, utrum accipiam evangelium? Niſi adhuc neſcis, quid ſit quod evangelium nuncupatur. l. 5, c. 1.

[g] —— credimus,——tum præcepta ſalutaria ejus, tum parabolas, cunctumque ſermonem deificum. Id. l. 32, c. 7.

[h] —— Chriſtum lumen, ſanctimonium, divina omnia poſcentem. l. 14. c. 1. f. —— veritatis auctori. l. 16, c. 2.

[i] Quid vero et de magiſtro ipſo dicemus ac ſanctimonii totius auctore Jeſu——? l. 30, c. 4. [k] ——ut fere Chriſto placeat et ejus apoſtolis, et nobis profecto. l. 2, c. 1. med.—— neque id temere aut præſumtive, ſed a Chriſto diſcentes et ejus apoſtolis, &c. eod. cap. ad fin.

[l] Nos vero quamvis de hac ſententia nemo prorſus deficiat, ex Deo accepimus filium Dei. l. 23, c. 3, in. [m] Et merito dixiſſe Dominum noſtrum. Fortunat. Diſp. 1. c. 14. Evaſimus igitur, qua ſpiritalem ſecuti ſumus ſalvatorem. Nam illius tantum erupit audacia, ut ſi non ſit Dominus carnalis foret, omnis noſtra fuerat ſpes amputata. Secundin. ad Aug. c. 4.

[n] —— ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τετιμήκασι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—— Tit. l. 3, in. p. 139.

[o] Nam illa vox altera Paganorum eſt, qui dicunt, Apoſtolos Chriſti non recta docuiſſe.

Fortunatus, the Manichæan preſbyter, in the diſpute with Auguſtine, ſays, the [q] ſoul cannot be reconciled to God but by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt: that [r] Chriſt our Saviour has taught us what good we ought to do, and what evil we ought to avoid, in order to pleaſe God: that [s] the doctrine of Chriſt is ſound doctrine, by which the ſoul may be purified from it's defilements, and brought back to the kingdom of God.

II. Mani then and his followers were Chriſtians. It will appear farther from great numbers of things to be taken notice of as we go along. However, I would here add a few paſſages ſhewing, in ſome meaſure, what opinions they held in common with other Chriſtians.

They believed a God and a trinity, and that God made the world; ſo Auguſtine [t] ſays, Nevertheleſs we may hereafter obſerve ſome differences between them and other Chriſtians upon theſe heads.

They required and encouraged repentance, as Auguſtine likewiſe aſſures [u] us.

And he obſerves that [x] he and the Manichees agree in ſaying that we ought to love God and our neighbour. But they denied that this was taught in the Old Teſtament.

Let me here add the confeſſion of faith made by Fortunatus at the beginning of the diſpute with Auguſtine in the year 392; though ſome expreſſions there uſed are not altogether agreeable to the catholic doctrine.

'Our belief,' ſays [y] Fortunatus, 'is this, that God is incor-'ruptible, glorious, inacceſſible, incomprehenſible, impaſſible,

deceiſſe. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 16. n. [p] Nye's Def. of the Canon of the New Teſt. p. 87, &c. [q] ——et animam aliter non poſſe reconciliari Deo, niſi per mediatorem, qui eſt Jeſus Chriſtus. Aug. et Fortu. Diſp. i. n. 17.

[r] ——auctore Salvatore noſtro, qui nos docet et bona exercere, et mala fugere. Diſp. 2, n. 20, f. [s] ——ſi poſt admonitionem Salvatoris noſtri, et ſanam doctrinam ejus, a contraria et inimica ſui natura ſe ſegregaverit anima; —— Unde poſſit recte eſſe pœnitentiam datum poſt evangelium Salvatoris, et poſt hanc ſcientiam rerum, qua poſſit anima, acſi divino fonte lota, de ſordibus et vitiis tam mundi hujus, quam corporum in quibus eadem anima verſatur, regno Dei, unde progreſſa eſt, repræſentari. Fort. Diſp. 2, c. 21.

[t] Numquid propterea dicere non debemus, quod bonus Deus fecerit mundum; quia hoc dicit etiam Manichæus?—Item ſi interrogemur, utrum ſit Deus? et nos et Manichæi reſpondemus; Eſt Deus.—De ipſa quoque Trinitate interrogati, utrique dicimus, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum ejuſdem eſſe naturæ. Aug. Op. Imp. l. v. c. 30. [u] Nam ut inter omnes ſanos conſtat, et quod ipſi Manichæi non ſolum fatentur, ſed et præcipiunt, utile eſt pœnitere peccati. Aug. de duab. Anim. c. 14, n. 22, in.

[x] Atque in his duobus convenit mihi cum Manichæis id eſt, ut Deum et proximum diligamus: ſed hoc veteri teſtamento negant contineri. De Mor. Ec. Cath. c. 28, n. 57. [y] Et noſtra profeſſio ipſa eſt, quod incorruptibilis ſit Deus, quod lucidus, quod madibilis, quod intenibilis, impaſſibilis, æternam lucem et propriam inhabitet: quod nihil ex ſeſe corruptibile proferat, nec tenebras, nec dæmones, nec Satanam, nec aliquid adverſum in regno ejus reperiri poſſit: Sui autem ſimilem Salvatorem

'dwelling in his own eternal light: that he produceth nothing 'from himself that is corruptible, not darkness, not da- 'mons, not Satan: that he has sent a Saviour like himself, the 'Word, born before the foundation of the world; who, after the 'world was made, came among men to save the souls worthy of 'his holy favour, sanctified by his heavenly precepts, through 'faith and reason endowed with the knowledge of heavenly 'things: and that under his conduct those souls shall again re- 'turn to the kingdom of God, according to his holy promise, 'who said: *I am the way, the truth, and the door: and no man 'cometh unto the Father but by me:* John xiv. 6. These things we 'believe, forasmuch as souls cannot otherwise, that is, through 'any other mediator, return to the kingdom of God: for he him- 'self says: *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also:* ver. 9. 'and, *He that believeth on me shall not taste death, but passeth from 'death to life, and cometh not into condemnation:* chap. v. 24. These 'things we believe, and this is the ground of our faith; as also, 'that with all the powers of our mind we are to obey his holy 'commandments, holding the doctrine of the trinity, the Father, 'the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'

Thus Fortunatus; who likewise just before had professed his belief and expectation [z] of the future judgment of the just judge Jesus Christ: and Secundinus, in his letter to Augustine, reminds [a] him of the just tribunal of the Great Judge; and asks him if it be not true which Paul says, *that every one must give an account of his works?* Rom. xiv. 12.

III. Before we proceed to a more particular examination of Mani's principles, it may be proper to consider what were his pretensions, or upon what grounds he recommended his peculiar doctrines; whether upon the foot of reason only or of a peculiar revelation.

We have already seen how Eusebius and some other catholic

Salvatorem direxisse, Verbum natum a constitutione mundi, cum mundum fabricaret, post mundi fabricam inter homines venisse, dignas sibi animas elegisse sanctæ suæ voluntati, mandatis suis cœlestibus sanctificatas, fide ac ratione imbutas cœlestium rerum; ipso ductore hinc iterum easdem animas ad regnum Dei reversuras esse, secundum sanctam ipsius pollicitationem, qui dixit: Ego sum via, veritas, et janua; et nemo potest ad Patrem pervenire, nisi per me. His rebus nos credimus, quia alias animæ, id est, alio mediante non poterunt ad regnum Dei reverti, nisi ipsum repererint, viam, veritatem et januam. Ipse enim dixit: qui me vidit, vidit et patrem meum; et, qui in me crediderit, mortem non gustabit in æternum, sed transitum facit de morte ad vitam, et in judicium non venit. His rebus credimus, et hæc est ratio fidei nostræ, et pro virili no animi nostri mandatis eius obtemperare, unam fidem sectantes hujus trinitatis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Fortunat. Disp. i. n. 3. [z] ——et in futura justi judicis Christi examinatione.—ib. n. 3.

[a] Quis igitur tibi patronus erit ante justum tribunal judicis, cum et de sermone et opere cœperis te teste convinci. Secund. ad Aug. n. 3. [b] An falsum in Paulo est, quod operam singuli suorum non erunt reddituri rationem? ib.

writers

writers expreſs themſelves. Euſebius in particular ſays, 'he [a] 'made an appearance of being Chriſt, and ſometimes ſaid he was 'the Comforter, and the Holy Ghoſt himſelf; and that like 'Chriſt he choſe himſelf twelve apoſtles.' Epiphanius ſays that [c] he preſumed ſometimes to ſay he was the Holy Ghoſt, and at other times that he was an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt. According to Cyril, Mani [d] ſaid he was the Comforter, and the defender of truth: and in another place that [e] he ſaid he was the Holy Spirit.

In The Acts of Archelaus, at the beginning of the conference at Caſchar, he is made to ſay: 'I, [f] brethren, am a diſciple and 'apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt. I am the Comforter, promiſed to be 'ſent by Jeſus, *to convince the world of ſin, and of righteouſneſs:* 'John xvi. 8. as alſo Paul ſent before me ſaid: *We know in part,* 'and *prophecy in part*; 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10; reſerving to me that 'which is perfect, that I might *do away that which is in part:* re-'ceive therefore this third teſtimony by me, and own me as a 'choſen apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt. If you will receive my words, 'you will obtain ſalvation: if not, you will be conſumed by 'everlaſting fire.'

Theodoret ſays that [g] Mani gave out he was the Chriſt, and called himſelf the Holy Ghoſt.

And, as Jerom expreſſeth it, ſome [h] pretended that Mani was the Comforter himſelf. And to the like purpoſe [i] Ruſinus.

It is not eaſy to conceive how any man ſhould ſay all theſe things of himſelf; that he is the Chriſt, and an apoſtle of Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt himſelf. However, to reconcile theſe accounts, if poſſible, it may be obſerved, that perhaps ſome of theſe writers uſe words in a different ſenſe from that in which they are now generally underſtood by us: and when it is ſaid that Mani pretended to be Chriſt, the meaning may be that he acted like

[a] See before, p. 375.

[b] Λεγε δε εαυτον ο μανης ειναι το παρακλητον, και ποτε μεν αποστολον φασκει ειναι Χριστου, ποτε δε πνευμα παρακλητον. Epiph. H. 66, n. 12, p. 629, B. Conf. n. 13, p. 635, C. [c] ——εγας λεγει εαυτον ειναι παρακλητον, και της αληθειας αγωνιστην. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 26.

[d] Λεγει εαυτον ειναι το πνευμα το αγιον. Cat. 16, n. x, p. 248, D. [f] Ego, viri fratres, Chriſti quidem ſum diſcipulus, ſed hoc vero Jeſu.——Sum quidem ego Paracletus, qui ab Jeſu miſſi prædictus ad arguendum mundum de peccato, et de justitia, ſicut et qui ante me miſſus est Paulus, ex parte ſcire, et ex parte prophetare se dixit; mihi reſervans quod perfectum eſt, ut hoc quod ex parte eſt deſtruam. Tertium ergo teſtimonium accipite, apoſtolum me eſſe Chriſti electum. Et ſi vultis mea verba accipere, invenietis ſalutem; nolentes autem, vos æternus ignis abſumere habet. Arch. n. 13, p. 24.

[g] ——εστολμησεν εαυτον ο παραπονηρος και χριστον προσαγορευσαι, και πνευμα αγιον ονομασαι. Theodrt. H. F. l. 1, c. 26, p. 224.

[h] Sicut aliæ hæreſes Paracletum in Montanum veniſſe contendunt, et Manichæum ipſum dicunt eſſe Paracletum. ad Vigilant. T. 4, P. 2, p. 285, in.

[i] Conſilium namque vanitatis eſt quod docet Manichæus: primo, quod ſeipſum Paracletum nominavit. Ruf. in Symb. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 142.

Chriſt

Chriſt in chuſing for himſelf twelve companions; or, by Chriſt may be meant the Holy Ghoſt, with whom Chriſt was anointed, and whom Mani pretended to have received. So the word Chriſt is uſed in ſome ancient [k] writings, particularly in [l] The Acts of Archelaus.

As for his calling himſelf the Comforter, or the Holy Ghoſt, and an apoſtle of Chriſt, poſſibly the meaning is, that he ſaid he had received the Holy Ghoſt, and was an apoſtle of Chriſt, eminently furniſhed with ſpiritual gifts.

That muſt be the higheſt pretenſion he made. This is Auguſtine's ſummary account of the matter in his book Of Hereſies. 'They [m] ſay that our Lord's promiſe of ſending the Comforter, 'the Holy Ghoſt, has been fulfilled in their maſter Mani: and 'in his epiſtles he ſtyles himſelf apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, foraſ-'much as Chriſt had promiſed him, and in him had ſent the 'Holy Ghoſt. Accordingly he had himſelf twelve diſciples, in 'imitation of the number of the apoſtles, which number is ſtill 'kept up by the Manichees.' Again, Auguſtine ſays, 'the [n] Manichees pretended that 'Chriſt's promiſe of ſending the Holy 'Ghoſt had been fulfilled in their leader.' And in another place, 'they ſaid that [o] the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Lord had promiſed 'to ſend to his diſciples, had come to them by him.' Once more Auguſtine ſays, that 'Mani [p] endeavoured to perſuade 'men, that the Holy Ghoſt did perſonally dwell in him with 'full authority.'

That this is all which Mani can be ſuppoſed to have pretended to, is evident from the arguments made uſe of in confuting him. The ancient writers, in their anſwers, ſhew that the promiſe of ſending the Holy Ghoſt had been fulfilled in the apoſtles ſoon after our Lord's aſcenſion: whereas Mani did not appear until long after the death of all the apoſtles, in the time of Probus, or Aurelian. This is largely argued by [q] Archelaus, [r] Epipha-

[k] See Beauſ. T. i. p. 115, and 255.

[l] Hic eſt Chriſtus Dei, qui deſcendit ſuper eum, qui ex Maria eſt. Arch. n. 50, p. 93, in. Vid. ib. n. 34, p. 59, 60.

[m] Promiſſionem domini Jeſu Chriſti de Paracleto Spiritu Sancto in ſuo hæreſiarcha Manichæo dicunt eſſe completam. Unde ſe in ſuis literis Jeſu Chriſti apoſtolum dicit, eo quod Jeſus Chriſtus ſe miſſurum eſſe promiſerit, atque in illo miſerit Spiritum Sanctum. Propter quod etiam ipſe Manichæus diſcipulos habuit, ad inſtar apoſtolici numeri, quem numerum Manichæi hodieque cuſtodiunt. Aug. de Hær. c. 46. [n] ——Mira cæcitate aſſerentes eamdem Domini promiſſionem in ſuo hæreſiarcha Manichæo eſſe completam. Aug. ad. Ceret. Ep. 237, [al. 243] n. 2. [o] Noſti enim quod auctoris ſui Manichæi perſonam in apoſtolorum numerum inducere molientes, dicunt Spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus ſe miſſurum eſſe promiſit, per ipſum ad nos veniſſe. De Util. Cred. c. 3, n. 7.

[p] Non enim parvi exiſtimari ſe voluit, ſed ſpiritum ſanctum conſolatorem et dilatorem fidelium tuorum, auctoritate plenaria perſonaliter in ſe eſſe perſuadere conatus eſt. Confeſſ. l. 5, cap. 5, n. 8.

[q] Vid. Arch. n. 27, 28. [r] Ep. H. 66, n. 20, 21.

nius,

nius, and others. And in the diſpute itſelf Mani is repreſented explaining his claim in this manner, 'that [s] the Spirit came 'upon him.' And Archelaus argues, that [t] the Holy Ghoſt was to deſcend upon and dwell in none but Chriſt, and Paul, and the other apoſtles; that is, in the moſt eminent and extraordinary manner.

All therefore that Mani could ſay is, that he was an apoſtle of Chriſt, and had the ſpirit as an apoſtle.

But whether he ſaid ſo much may be queſtioned. Godfrey [u] Arnold, a learned German, who wrote a hiſtory of hereſies in his own language, denies that Mani took upon him any extraordinary character: but Beauſobre, though a man of great candour, thinks Arnold was miſtaken herein. 'Arnold [x] was 'in the right to ſay that Mani never pretended to be the Com-'forter; but he was in the wrong to deny that he aimed to paſs 'for the prophet of the Comforter; or a man extraordinarily 'ſent to reveal to the Chriſtian church ſome truths which Jeſus 'Chriſt had not made known to his diſciples. The Manichees 'themſelves had this opinion of their patriarch.' So Beauſobre.

I beg leave to conſider this point diſtinctly. I have not had the advantage of ſeeing Arnold's work. I can only repreſent the caſe as it appears to me.

IV. In the firſt place I ſhall mention divers reaſons and arguments for thinking that Mani was an impoſtor, and examine them. After which I ſhall mention ſome additional obſervations.

The reaſons and arguments are ſuch as theſe: 1. The ancient Greek and Roman Chriſtian authors repreſent his pretenſions as very extraordinary; 2. As do likewiſe the eaſtern writers. 3. Mani imitated Chriſt in chuſing and ſending out twelve apoſtles. 4. He called himſelf apoſtle. 5. Divers other of his expreſſions ſhew him to have pretended to a divine commiſſion. 6. His followers conceived of him as an apoſtle, or an inſpired teacher. 7. They rejected the book of the Acts, becauſe of the evidence it afforded, that the promiſe of ſending the Spirit had been fulfilled in the apoſtles, and therefore could not belong to Mani.

[s] Spiritum enim veniſſe ſuper te dixiſti, quem promiſerat Jeſus eſſe miſſurum. Arch. n. 52, p. 92, m. [t] Et ſicut non in omnes homines ſpiritus habitare poterat, niſi ſuper eum qui de Maria natus erat, et in nullum alium Spiritus Paracletus venire poterat, niſi ſuper apoſtolos, et ſuper beatum Paulum. Arch. n. 34, p. 59, m. [u] Germanice illam epiſtolam [Fundamenti,] exhibet Gothofredus Arnoldus in Hiſtoria ſive Apologia Hæreſium. T. iv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 283. [x] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 239, 240.

1. The

1. The ancient Greek and Roman Chriſtian writers repreſent Mani's pretenſions as very extrordinary.

I anſwer, that we have ſhewn them to be miſtaken in ſeveral things. In particular, divers of them ſay that Mani called himſelf the Comforter, which is not true. We muſt therefore look for ſome other evidence of his impoſture beſide their word. Mani publiſhed ſeveral new notions as doctrines of religion: ſome might therefore ſay: 'A man that does this had need to 'be inſpired.' And thence ſome might be led to conclude, that he actually pretended to be inſpired in an extraordinary manner, and ſent by Chriſt to reveal new truths. Some might ſpeak of him to this purpoſe; and others might take up this account without much examination.

2. The eaſtern writers, whether Perſians or Arabians, whoſe account was formerly [y] taken, ſpeak of him in the like manner.

I anſwer, that thoſe writers are not very ancient. Their account of Mani's impoſture, particularly his journey to heaven, is taken from the hiſtory of Mahomet, who is much later than the perſon whoſe affairs we are examining. Therefore probably that ſtory is a fiction, without any real foundation. I formerly [z] obſerved a miſtake of theſe writers (ſome of them at leaſt) concerning the place of Mani's retirement. It is alſo very improbable, which is ſaid by the eaſtern hiſtorians, as quoted by Herbelot, that numerous followers having been gained in China, or Turkeſtan, they all went into Perſia upon the death of Sapor. Nor did Mani attempt to paſs for a god. Once more, the eaſtern writers are not agreed about the time in which Mani lived, ſome [a] placing him much later than others. The teſtimony of theſe authors therefore is not to be relied upon.

3. The third agument is, that Mani imitated Chriſt in chuſing and ſending out twelve diſciples.

In anſwer to which I would ſay: ſuppoſing that he had twelve diſciples, and ſent them abroad to propagate his principles, it does not follow that he was an impoſtor; for we have been informed by [b] Auguſtine, that this was the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution of the Manichæan ſect. There were twelve of the elect called maſters, and a thirteenth, who was their chief or principal. If this was an inſtitution of Mani himſelf, and put in practice in his own time, he muſt have been the principal; and perhaps only by way of an innocent, or at the worſt an affected, imitation of the ſtate of things at the firſt riſe of the Chriſtian religion in the time

[y] See p. 422. [z] See p. 423. [a] L'auteur du Tarikh Khozidek le fait plus modern, &c. See Herbelot Bib. Orient. in Mani. [b] See before, p. 403.

of

of Chriſt and his apoſtles: which, I ſuppoſe, is all that can be thought of their keeping up the ſame form in Auguſtine's time.

But it may be queſtioned whether Mani had twelve diſciples diſtinguiſhed from the reſt. It is true Euſebius intimates as much: but what ground he had for it we cannot ſay. However, Auguſtine [c] ſays it expreſsly, as does [d] Theodoret, about the year 420. But this is not to be found in more ancient authors, excepting Euſebius only, who has been juſt named; and there are two reaſons to doubt of it. Firſt, ſeveral ancient writers are ſilent about this particular, who would have mentioned it if true. In [e] The Acts of the Diſpute with Archelaus there are but three of Mani's diſciples named, whom likewiſe he is there ſaid to have ſent abroad to ſpread his opinions; one into the eaſt, another into Syria, and the third into Egypt; Thomas, Addas, and Hermas: the ſame three that are mentioned by [f] Cyril and [g] Epiphanius. Secondly, if Mani had twelve diſciples, whom he called apoſtles, or employed as ſuch, it is likely that their names would have been tranſmitted to us by ſome ancient authors: but there is no ſuch catalogue any where to be found, except in the forementioned authors, Photius, Peter, and The Form of abjuring Manichæiſm: all which are too late to be of any authority, as was obſerved formerly. That catalogue too is itſelf liable to ſeveral exceptions. In [h] Photius their names ſtand thus: Siſinnius, ſaid to have ſucceeded Mani in his [i] chair; Thomas, Budas, Hermas, Adamantus, and Adimantus; Hierax, Hieraclides and Apthonius, called [k] commentators upon Mani; Agapius author of the Heptalogus, Zarvas and Gaurialius: and to the like purpoſe in the two other [l] writers. But it is plain that this catalogue is of no value. In The Acts of Archelaus, [m] Siſinnius is ſaid to have defended Mani, and to have been a convert to the catholic church. Then there are two or three different names, which are but one and the ſame perſon; Budas, Adamantus, and Adimantus; that

[c] Propter quod etiam ipſe Manichæus duodecim diſcipulos habuit, ad inſtar duodecim numeri. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

[d] Ὅτι δωδεκα μαθητας κατα τον τῶν ἀποστολων τυπον. Hær. Fab. l. i. p. 214, C. [e] Ταυτην δὲ πασαι τὴν οἰκουμενην ἀλλαι πεμψουσι τοις τρισιν αὐτου μαθηταις, ἑκαστοι εἰς κλιματα ὡρισεν. Act. Arch. c. xi. p. 22. Acquiſivit etiam apoſtolos tres, quorum nomina ſunt hæc, Thomas, Addas et Hermas. ib. c. 53, p. [f] Τουτου μαθηται τρεις γεγονασι, Θωμας, Βουδας, και ερμας. Cyr. Cat. vi. [g] Epiph. H. 66, n. v. et xii. [h] Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. n. 14. [i] Διαδοχος δε και το ἀξιωμα αὐτου της διδασκαλιας ἀναδεξαμενος. ib. [k] ἐξηγηται, οἱ αὐτου και οἱον τρομηματισται. ib. [l] Porro diſcipuli Manetis antichriſto fuere duodecim: Siſinnius, qui Manetis ſucceſſit: Thomas, qui Evangelium Manichæi novum condidit: Buddas, et Hermas, Adamantus et Adimantus, quem in diverſas orbis partes orbis prædicatorem amandavit. Manetis interpretes et explanatores erant Hierax, et Hieraclides, atque Apthonius. Adimanti hi et alii terni hujus ſectatores, Agapius, qui Heptalogum commentus eſt, Zarvas et Gabrialius. Pet. Sic. de Man. ap. Bib. P. P. T. 16, p. 758, A. [m] Arch. n. 51, p. 94.

is,

is, Addas, otherwiſe called alſo Buddas and Baddas. Apthonius lived in the fourth century, as was [n] formerly ſhewn. Hierax was no [o] Manichee. Touttée has a good note upon Cyril relating to this matter, which might be conſulted. I put down a ſmall part of [p] it.

4. The fourth argument is that Mani called himſelf an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt. Auguſtine aſſures us that [q] all his letters began in that manner; particularly, that [r] called The Epiſtle of the Foundation: 'Mani, apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt by the providence of God 'the Father:' in like manner [s] The Epiſtle to Marcellus, in The Acts of Archelaus; and The [t] Epiſtle to Menoch, cited by Julian the Pelagian.

Anſwer: if this title muſt be here underſtood in the higheſt and ſtrongeſt ſenſe, of a perſon commiſſioned by Chriſt, and inſpired as an apoſtle, the argument is complete and unanſwerable. But poſſibly Mani meaned no more than a diſciple of Chriſt, and a teacher of his religion. This may be argued from the paſſage already cited from Auguſtine, where he ſpeaks of the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution of the ſect. The word may be ſuppoſed to be ſo uſed in The Diſpute of Archelaus. That biſhop having given hard words, Mani tells him that [u] apoſtles are patient and long-ſuffering: thereby, perhaps, intending to ſhew what Archelaus ſhould be, as well as what he himſelf was, according to his own profeſſion. Turbo, when aſked who he was, anſwered, that [x] he came from Perſia, and was ſent by Mani, a maſter of the Chriſtians; the very title, which, as Auguſtine informs us, was [y] given to twelve of the Manichæan elect in his own time, who yet, I preſume, were not reckoned inſpired apoſtles: and maſters is a word made uſe of in [z] The Acts of Archelaus to denote miniſters of the catholic church. I might add that the eaſtern people are very

[n] See p. 396. [o] See before, p. 399, &c. [p] Quod quamvis antiqua ſit illa de duodecim Manetis diſcipulis opinio, ab auguſtino in libro de Hæreſibus, et Theodoreto commemorata, non tamen apud antiquiores legatur. Non id refert Archelaus, non Epiphanius. In Cyril. Cat. p. 107. [q] Omnes tamen ejus epiſtolæ ſic exordiuntur: Manichæus apoſtolus Jeſu Chriſti. Contr. Fauſt. l. 13, c. 4.

[r] Certe ſic incipit: Manichæus apoſtolus Jeſu Chriſti, providentia Dei Patris. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 5, n. 6.

[s] Arch. cap. v. [t] Manes apoſtolus Jeſu Chriſti filiæ Menoch. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c, 172. Sed niſi Menoch filiam, et Manichæum, qui ſe Chriſti apoſtolum nominat, titulus indicaret, te omnium ſuum pollicerentur auctorem. Julian. ib. c. 187. [u] Tu quoque, Archelae, bene me de Deo ſentientem, dignamque opinionem de Chriſto retinentem, verbis maledicentiſſimis obtundis, licet tale ſit apoſtolorum genus, patiens et ferens omnia, etiam ſi eos convitiis quis, aut maledictis obtrectet. Arch. c. 47, in. [x] De Perſide autem venio, a Manichæo magiſtro Chriſtianorum miſſus. ib. c. 4. [y] Nam ex electis ſuis habent duodecim, quos appellant magiſtros. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

[z] Cui enim oportet credi? magiſtris illis veſtris, qui carnibus veſcuntur, et affluentiſſimis deliciis perfruuntur—? Manes ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 24.

apt

apt to uſe a lofty ſtyle. They give and take high titles without incurring the ſuſpicion or charge of blaſphemy.

5. It is argued that Mani's impoſture may be proved by other high expreſſions made uſe of by him beſide that of apoſtle. In The Epiſtle to Marcellus he not only ſtyles himſelf apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt, but ſays alſo that [a] he was ſent for the amendment and reformation of men. Several paſſages have been already cited [b] from The Diſpute of Archelaus, containing high pretenſions, which ſhould be recollected here; particularly that paſſage where he ſays: 'If you receive my words, you will obtain ſalvation: if 'not, you will be conſumed with everlaſting fire.' But then it ſhould be remembered likewiſe, that in that piece are many miſrepreſentations of things.

There are alſo ſtrong expreſſions at the beginning of The Epiſtle of the Foundation. After having called himſelf apoſtle he adds: 'That [c] the words he is going to deliver are wholeſome 'words, proceeding from the living fountain. He that hears 'and believes and keeps them ſhall never die, but ſhall obtain a 'glorious and eternal life.' Theſe expreſſions ought to be conſidered. If they relate to any doctrines not founded on ſcripture, they contain a bold claim: but if he intends to recommend only ſcriptural doctrines, the interpretation may be ſoftened. And it is obſervable that Auguſtine, having cited thoſe words, does not, in his remarks upon them, cenſure them as wicked, or antichriſtian, or the like; but only ſays that [d] here is indeed a promiſe of teaching the truth, but without good aſſurance: and that any body might ſay as much to draw in ſimple people. Auguſtine then cites the words next following in that epiſtle: 'The [e] peace 'of the inviſible God, and the knowledge of the truth, be with the 'dear and holy brethren, who both believe and keep the heavenly 'commands:' which Auguſtine does not blame at all, but ſays he readily joins in the ſame wiſh: and if Mani never ſpoke otherwiſe he might be read and followed by every body. Nay, he

[a] Ὅτι πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν τῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέσταλμαι. Ap. Arch. c. 5.

[b] See before, p. 441.

[c] Hæc ſunt, inquit, ſalubria verba ex fonte vivi ac vivo fonte, quæ qui audierit, et ſibi primum crediderit, deinde quæ inſinuat cuſtodierit, numquam erit morti obnoxius, verum æterna et glorioſa vita fruetur. ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. xi. n. 12. [d] Et hæc, ut videtis, pollicitatio eſt, nondum exhibitio veritatis: et vos quoque animadvertere facillime poſſitis, iſto velamine quoſlibet errores fucari poſſe, ut imperitorum animis per ornatam ianuam latenter irrepant. Auguſt. ibid. [e] Pax, inquit, Dei inviſibilis, et veritatis notitia ſit cum fratribus ſanctis et cariſſimis, qui mandatis cœleſtibus credunt pariter atque deſerviunt. Ita ſit, ut dicit. Nam et iſta benigna et acceptiſſima optatio eſt. Tantum meminerimus hæc et a bonis doctoribus et a deceptoribus dici poſſe. Itaque ſi nulla niſi talia diceret, omnibus legendum et amplectendum eſſe concederem. ibid. n. 13.

ſeems

ſeems to declare himſelf well ſatisfied [f] with every thing at the beginning of that epiſtle.

6. Still it is urged that his followers conceived of him as an inſpired apoſtle and meſſenger of Chriſt, and honoured him accordingly. Some of their expreſſions have been mentioned already, to which others may be now added.

Fauſtus, conſidering that text, Matt. v. 17: *I came not to deſtroy the law, but to fulfil*, ſays: 'He [g] muſt be for ever thankful to his 'maſter,' meaning Mani, 'for helping him here: for otherwiſe, 'he had been a Jew, not a Chriſtian.' However, he might ſpeak thus of Mani, though he conſidered him only as a good interpreter, and no inſpired prophet or apoſtle. In another place Mani is called [h] their divine. What can be inferred from this I do not know; I do not perceive any uncommon honour to be here given. Fauſtus alſo calls Mani [i] their bleſſed father. But perhaps no more is meant thereby than what the catholics often ſaid of ſaints and martyrs. Fauſtus in another place ſpeaks [k] as if by the Spirit, whom they had received, they were enabled to diſcern what texts of the New Teſtament are genuine, what not. But afterwards [l] he retracts in ſome meaſure thoſe bold expreſſions.

Farther, the Manichees celebrated the day of their maſter's death: but ſo did the catholics that of many martyrs. Mani's Epiſtle of the Foundation was read in the aſſemblies of his followers: and ſo likewiſe were ſome writings publicly read among the catholics, which they never eſteemed canonical ſcripture, or a part of the rule of their faith. Nay, I do not know but here may offer a thought, which may afford a good argument that the Manichees did not eſteem their leader an apoſtle: for if they had ſo done they would have had more of his writings, and have publicly read them: whereas it ſeems that the Manichees in Africa had few of them. Auguſtine, who was nine years among them, and afterwards wrote many volumes in the controverſy, has quoted very few, and does not ſpeak of any other book, or letter of his, being read in their aſſemblies, but the epiſtle above-named.

And upon all theſe things, beſide what has been already hinted, I obſerve in general, that ſome, or all of theſe honours were paid by catholics to men who had not the character of apoſtles:

[f] Et omnino, quicquid in hujus epiſtolæ initio ſcriptum eſt, donec veniatur ad cauſſam, nolo reprehendere. ibid.

[g] Quare indeficientes ego præceptori meo refero gratias, qui me ſimiliter labentem retinuit, ut eſſem hodie Chriſtianus. Fauſt. l. 19, c. 5. [h] Sic enim mali principium ac naturam theologus noſter appellat. Fauſt. l. 20, c. 3.

[i] —— a doctiſſimo ſcilicet, et ſolo nobis poſt beatum patrem noſtrum Manichæum ſtapendo Adimanto. Fauſt. l. 1. c. 2.

[k] Et nobis Paracletus ex novo teſtamento promiſſus perinde docet, quid accipere ex eodem debeamus, et quid repudiare. Id. l. 32, c. 6. [l] Ib. c. 7.

that

that it is no uncommon thing for honours to be given to men after their death, by ſome people, which they never expected or deſired; and that we ſhould interpret expreſſions as they are intended to be underſtood. The catholic Chriſtians often ſpeak [m] of men's receiving the Holy Ghoſt in baptiſm. In The Diſpute of Archelaus it is ſpoken of as an inconteſtable thing that [n] the Spirit was ſtill given to men. And Epiphanius ſays that [o] God, according to his promiſe, beſtowed gifts of the Spirit largely upon a preſbyter at Diodoris, to enable him to confute Mani: quoting alſo Matt. x. 19. But yet no one thinks that apoſtolical inſpiration is here intended.

7. In the ſeventh place it is argued that they rejected the Acts of the apoſtles, becauſe of the evidence it afforded, that the promiſe of ſending the Spirit had been fulfilled in the apoſtles of Chriſt, and therefore could not belong to Mani. Auguſtine [p] ſays much.

I anſwer, firſt, whether the Manichees always and univerſally rejected the book of the Acts will be diſtinctly conſidered hereafter. Secondly, they were not obliged to reject the Acts for the reaſon here ſuppoſed. They might give the higheſt character to Mani, under Chriſt, and yet receive that book. The Montaniſts, as Auguſtine obſerves, ſpoke of Montanus, as theſe people did of Mani: yet [q] they readily received the Acts of the apoſtles. The Manichees could not deny that the Holy Ghoſt was poured out upon Chriſt's apoſtles. It is evident from St. Paul's epiſtles, ſuch they received. Beſides, we know, that [r] they acknowledged

[m] Καὶ γὰρ σὺ θείας ἀπολαύσας χάριτος ἐν ὕδατι, καὶ πνεύματος μετασχὼν, εἰς ... τὰ σπήλαια πέπτωκας. Chryſ. De Lazaro, ad Dem. l. i. T. i. p. 136. D. Ed. Bened. [n] Spiritus enim ſecundum rationem habitat in homine, ... cundit, et permanet, et competenter ... rictum eſt, et fit ſemper, ſicut tu te... ante hoc tempus profitebaris eſſe ... tum Dei. Arch. c. 50, p. 92, m. ... γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἐπ' αὐτοῖ ἐλπίζουσιν ... τας τὴν πίστιν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπι... ος, ὡς καὶ ἐπηγγείλατο, ἀφιεὶς ... ii. 66. n. xi. [p] Noſti autem, quod ... ſe Manichæi perſonam in apoſto... numerum inducere molientes, dicunt ... Sanctum, quem Dominus diſcipu... miſſurum eſſe promiſit per ipſum ad ... nire. Itaque ſi illos Actus Apoſ... n acciperent, in quibus ad ventus ... ſpiritus prædicatur, non invenirent, ... lo id immiſſum eſſe dicerent. De ... Cred. c. 2. n. 7. [q] Nam quidam Manichæi canonicum librum, cujus titulus eſt, Actus Apoſtolorum, repudiant. Timent enim evidentiſſimam veritatem, ubi apparet Sanctus Spiritus, minus, qui eſt a Domino Jeſu Chriſto in evangelica veritate promiſſus. Sub ejus quippe Spiritus nomine, a quo penitus alieni ſunt, indocta hominum corda decipiunt, mira cacitate aſſerentes eamdem Domini promiſſionem in ſuo hæreſiarcha Manichæo eſſe completam. Quod et illi hæretici faciunt, qui vocantur Cataphryges, dicentes, per neſcio quos inſanos, Montanum ſcilicet et Priſcillam, quos et proprios ſuos prophetas habent, veniſſe Spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus miſſurum ſe eſſe promiſit. Aug. Ep. 237, [al. 253], n. 2.

[r] See Tertullian in this work, V. ii. p. 261, 262. [r] Et nos de Teſtamento novo ſola accipientes ea, quæ in honorem et laudem Filii majeſtatis vel ab ipſo dicta comperimus, vel ab ejus apoſtolis, ſed jam perfectis et fidelibus. Faust. l. 32. c. 7.

the divine illumination of the apoſtles, and admitted their authority in every thing ſaid by them, when ſo illuminated. 'This,' ſays [s] Fauſtus, 'is the doctrine of Chriſt and his apoſtles, and for 'certain ours likewiſe.' Again, ſays Fauſtus, 'This [t] we believe 'not without ground, but upon the authority of Chriſt and his 'apoſtles, who firſt taught this doctrine.' They did not deny that the Holy Ghoſt was given to the apoſtles: all that they could be led to ſay is, that ſome farther diſcoveries were made by Mani. But I diſpute their ſaying ſo much as that. Thirdly, they might have other reaſons for rejecting the Acts, different from that aſſigned by Auguſtine. According to their notions, they could not approve of the death of Ananias and Sapphira, nor the blindneſs of Elymas. They could not like any text where Jeſus is called a man, as Acts ii. 22. And they diſliked all references therein to the books of the Old Teſtament. Finally, they never told Auguſtine that they rejected the Acts for the reaſon mentioned by him. It does not appear that he had any hint of it from them; but it is a conjectural reaſon of his own invention, after he had left them, as is evident [u] from what precedes the paſſage above [x] quoted: and therefore he entreats Honoratus candidly to weigh and examine the reaſon propoſed by him, and judge whether it is not right. For he ſays he had often wondered at their conduct in rejecting that book, without being able to find out what ground they went upon in ſo doing.

V. I have now conſidered the moſt material reaſons and arguments for thinking that Mani was an impoſtor, and pretended to apoſtolical inſpiration. I beg leave to add ſome farther obſervations.

1. It is not a pleaſing thing, unleſs there be very cogent reaſons, to fix the charge of impoſture on a Chriſtian, and a man of great knowledge and underſtanding, as Mani was. All muſt be ſenſible that he is treated roughly enough in The Acts of Archelaus. Yet even there he is ſometimes repreſented ſpeaking honeſtly, and like a good Chriſtian, and with a due regard to the authority of Jeſus Chriſt. Moreover, we ſuppoſe that he ſuffered a violent death, which was commemorated by his followers in a ſolemn manner: and there is reaſon to believe that the occaſion of it

[s] —— ut *fere* Chriſto placet, et eius apoſtolis, et nobis profecto.—— Fauſt. l. 24. c. 1.

[t] Neque id temere aut præſumtive, ſed a Chriſto diſcentes et eius apoſtolis, qui primi eadem in mundo docuiſſe probantur. Id. l. 24, c. 1. fin.

[u] Hoc enim de illo libro fecerunt, qui Actus Apoſtolorum inſcribitur. Quod eorum conſilium, cum mecum ipſe pertracto, nequeo ſatis mirari.—— Sed mirum illud eſt quod mihi videtur, quod peto placidiſſimo et ſereniſſimo judicio mecum conſideres. Noſti enim quod auctoritati ſui, &c. De Util. Cred. c. 2, n. 7.

[x] See note [p].

was

was innocent, if not honourable. If he attempted to cure the king's ſon and did not ſucceed, no reaſonable perſon can think he failed deſignedly. But there is a great deal of reaſon to ſuppoſe that all that ſtory is fictitious. It is more probable that he died a martyr to ſome principles, philoſophical or religious, or both.

2. The accounts of his pretenſion to inſpiration are not eaſily reconciled with other accounts, given by the ſame writers, of his borrowing his peculiar principles from other men; from Scythian, and Terebinthus, and Pythagoras, and Empedocles, and I know not how many more. Euſebius, and others, ſay his ſyſtem was patched up out of ancient hereſies. Archelaus, or whoever compoſed the Diſpute under his name, particularly deſires the by-ſtanders and hearers to take notice that [y] the doctrine taught by Mani was not his own invention. Cyril ſays that [z] he collected every thing bad in former hereſies; and for that reaſon he calls him a [a] thief, appropriating to himſelf what were other men's things, though they were very bad. Auguſtine expreſsly affirms that, [b] in the doctrine about two principles and natures, Mani followed more ancient heretics. The ancients therefore were ſenſible that Mani's doctrine was not new. Learned moderns are of the ſame opinion, and allow that in the main his principles had been taught before by divers heathen philoſophers and Chriſtian ſects. Mr. Wolf of Hamburgh wrote a learned work, entitled [c] Manichæiſm before Mani, where this is largely ſhewn. And Beauſobre likewiſe [d] deſerves to be conſulted upon this point.

3. Though Mani, at the beginning of his epiſtles, called himſelf apoſtle of Chriſt, we do not plainly perceive, from any remaining fragments of his works, that he profeſſed to teach in the name of Chriſt, and by ſpecial authority under him, or to deliver dictates of the Holy Ghoſt.

4. If Auguſtine had found ſuch expreſſions in any of Mani's works, which he met with, where he pretends to ſpeak by inſpiration, it is likely that he would not have inſiſted ſo much as he does upon [e] that ſingle appellation of apoſtle of Chriſt. Moreover, Auguſtine having cited a part of The Epiſtle of the Foundation,

[y] Addidit etiam hoc Archelaus dicens, Videte fratres, ne quis veſtrum incredulus ſit his quæ a me dicta ſunt, id eſt, quod non ſit primus auctor ſcelerati hujus dogmatis exſtiterit Manes; ſed tantum, quod per eum aliquibus terræ partibus manifeſtatus ſit. Arch. n. 55. p. 100.

[z] ——δυσσεβέστατος μανης, ὁ τα των αιρεσεων πασων κακα συνειληφως —— τα πασι συλλεξας ομου των αιρετικων. Cat. 16. n. 4. p. 247 D.

[a] Κλεπτης γαρ εστιν αλλοτριων κακων, ἐξιδιοποιουμενος τα κακα. id. Cat. 6, n. 21, p. 100.

[b] Ille duo principia inter ſe diverſa,——duasque naturas atque ſubſtantias,——ſequens alios hæreticos, opinatus eſt. De Hær. c. 46, in.

[c] Manichæiſmus ante Manichæos, et in Chriſtianiſmo redivivus. Hamb. 1707.

[d] See him T. i. p. 29——41.

[e] Vid. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. cap. vi. vii. viii.

where Mani delivers ſome of his notions about two principles, he adds: 'How [f] will he prove theſe things to me? how came he to 'know them himſelf?' If Mani had any where declared that theſe things had been communicated to him by ſpecial revelation, Auguſtine would have taken notice of it here. Nay, it ſeems to me that [g] from the following words of Auguſtine it may be ſtrongly argued, and even concluded, that Mani did not make uſe of ſuch expreſſions, to recommend his uncertain diſputed doctrines, or to aſſure the truth of them, and that it was not his manner of teaching.

5. The leading principles of Mani's ſcheme, wherein he differed from other Chriſtians, are of a philoſophical nature. Such principles may be recommended without pretending to inſpiration. Felix, in the diſpute with Auguſtine, boaſts that 'Mani '[h] had taught them the beginning, middle, and end; who made 'the world, why, and out of what; the courſe of the ſun and 'moon, and other things.' Auguſtine [i] anſwers, that Chriſt promiſed to ſend the Spirit, to teach us all truth, meaning religious truth: not to make us mathematicians and philoſophers, but Chriſtians.

6. Mani and his followers were great reaſoners. So he is repreſented in many places [k] of The Acts of Archelaus. Such an one was Fauſtus: he openly profeſſeth that [l] the doctrine of Mani taught him not to receive every thing recommended, as ſaid by our Saviour, but firſt to examine and conſider whether it be true, ſound, right, genuine: whilſt the catholics, he ſays, ſwallowed every thing, and acted as if they deſpiſed the benefit of human

[f] Hæc mihi unde probaturus eſt, aut hæc ipſe unde cognovit? ib. c. 13. n. 17.

[g] Et quoniam quæſivi unde ipſe probet, nunc quæro unde ipſe cognoverit? Si dicit ſibi eſſe revelatum a Spiritu Sancto, ſuamque mentem divinitus illuſtratam, ut ea quæ dicit, certa et manifeſta cognoſceret; ipſe ſignificat, quid interſit inter cognoſcere et credere.——Debuit ergo non nobis polliceri ſcientiam, neque manifeſtam cognitionem;——ſed dicere potius ſibi iſta eſſe monſtrata, illos autem quibus narrantur credere ſibi debere quæ neſciunt. ib. n. 18. [h] Et quia venit Manichæus, et per ſuam prædicationem docuit nos initium, medium et finem: docuit nos de fabrica mundi, quare facta eſt, et unde facta eſt, et qui fecerunt: docuit nos, quare dies, et quare nox: docuit nos de curſu ſolis et lunæ. Act. cum. Fel. l. i. c. 9.

[i] Non legitur in Evangelio Dominum dixiſſe, Mitto vobis Paracletum, qui vos doceat de curſu ſolis et lunæ. Chriſtianos enim facere volebat, non mathematicos. Aug. ib. c. 10. [k] Pro nimia autem humanitate Marcelli adeſſe feſtinavi, ut qualiter obſervare modum divinæ religionis eum edoceam: ne ſicut muta animalia, quæ intellectu carent, nec quid agunt advertunt, ita etiam Marcellus, —— ap Arch. n. 13, p. 24. Vid. ib. p. 7, 8, 25, et paſſim. [l] Et tamen me quidem adverſus capituli huius neceſſitudinem Manichæa fides reddidit tutum, quæ principio mihi non cunctis quæ ex Salvatoris nomine ſcripta leguntur paſſim credere perſuaſit, ſed probare, ſi ſint eadem vera, ſi ſana, ſi incorrupta.——Tu vero qui temere credis, qui naturæ beneficium rationem ex hominibus damnas, cui inter verum falſumque iudicare religio eſt, cuique homini [illegible] ſeparare, non minus formidini eſt, quam infantibus maniæ, &c. Faust. l. 15, c. 3.

reaſon,

reaſon, and were afraid to examine and diſtinguiſh between truth and falſehood. He inſinuates elſewhere that [m] the catholics eſteemed that a faith not worth naming, which depended upon reaſons. The Chriſtian religion, they ſaid, is a plain and ſimple thing, and curious inquiries are needleſs and inſignificant. I put in the margin [n] another like reflection of his. They were not pretentions to inſpiration, but ſpecious and alluring promiſes of rational diſcoveries, by which Auguſtine was deluded, as he [o] particularly ſays in his letter to his friend Honoratus. His words are ſtrong and remarkable; and therefore I tranſcribe them largely at the bottom of the page. Auguſtine almoſt continually repreſents this as the characteriſtic of the ſect, and the main pretence by which they ſeduced [p] men. They [q] ridiculed the frightful authority of the church: they [r] bantered the catholic credulity, and [s] promiſed men ſcience and demonſtration. Upon this [t] point turns Auguſtine's book to his friend Honoratus, ſtill a Manichee, which alſo is entitled Of the Uſefulneſs of believing. In another place Auguſtine complains of them, that they [u] ſet up reaſon above authority or ſcripture.

7. Mani made no pretenſions to miraculous powers: this is

[m] Sed tamen hoc enervis fidei confeſſio eſt, in Chriſtum ſine teſte et argumento non credere. Nempe ipſi vos docere ſoletis, ideireo nihil eſſe curioſius exquirendum, quia ſimplex ſit et abſoluta Chriſtiana credulitas. Id l. 12, c. 1. in.

[n] At, inquis, beatiores appellat, qui non viderunt et crediderunt. Hoc ſi ideo dictum putas, ut ſine ratione et judicio quidquid credamus; eſto tu beatior ſine ſenſu, ego mihi contentus ero cum ratione beatus eſſe. Id. l. 16, c. 8. fin.

[o] Noſti enim, Honorate, non aliam ob cauſam nos in tales homines incidiſſe, niſi quod ſe dicebant terribili auctoritate ſeparata, mera et ſimplici ratione eos qui ſe illuc vellent introducturos in Deum, et omni liberaturos. Quid enim me aliud cogebat, annos fere novem, ſpreta religione quæ mihi puerulo a parentibus inſita erat, homines illos ſequi ac diligenter audire, niſi quod nos ſuperſtitione teneri, et fidem nobis ante rationem imperari dicebant, ſe autem nullum premere ad fidem, niſi prius diſcuſſa et enodata veritate?—— Tu,——qua quæſo, alia re delectatus es, recordare obſecro te, niſi magna quadam promiſſione ac pollicitatione rationum? De Util. Cred. c. 1. n. 2. [p] Non nulli autem hæretici, quia non decipiunt, niſi cum ſcientiam, quam non exhibent, promittunt,—— De Diverſis Quæſt. 83. q. 68, n. 1. T. 6. [q] See juſt before, note [o]. [r] Eſt igitur mihi propoſitum, ut probem tibi, ſi poſſim, quod Manichæi ſacrilege ac temere invehantur in eos, qui catholicæ fidei auctoritatem ſequentes, ante quam illud verum quod pura mente conſpicitur intueri queant, credendo præmuniuntur. De Ut. Cred. n. 2. in. vid. et not. [o]. Vos cum noſtis, temere credentibus quam vehementer inſultare ſoleatis. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 13, n. 17. [s] Quid infelicius illa ſuperſtitione inveniri poteſt, quæ non modo non exhibet ſcientiam quam promittit et veritatem, ſed ea dicit quæ vehementer ſunt ſcientiæ veritatique contraria? Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 15. n. 16. Ipſum vero —— ſcripſi librum de utilitate credendi, ad amicum meum, quem deceptum a Manichæis adhuc eo errore noveram detineri, et irridere in catholicæ fidei diſciplina quod juberentur homines credere, non autem quid eſſet verum certiſſima ratione docerentur. Retr. l. 1. c. 14. [u] Unde igitur exordiar? ab auctoritate, an a ratione? Naturæ quidem ordo ita ſe habet, ut cum aliquid diſcimus, rationem præcedat auctoritas.—— Sed quoniam cum iis nobis res eſt, qui omnia contra ordinem et ſentiunt, et loquuntur, et gerunt, nihilque aliud maxime dicunt, niſi rationem prius eſſe reddendam, morem illis geram. De Mor. E. C. c. 2. n. 3.

particularly insisted upon in [x] The Acts of Archelaus. If it should be here said, that his attempt to cure the king of Persia's son was pretending to do a miracle, I might answer, that story is not credibly related. But, setting aside that consideration for the present, I think that what is said in the forementioned Acts, about his doing no miracles, ought to induce us to suppose Mani did not pretend to a miraculous cure. Nor do the Acts, in the relation of that attempt, say so: but that he [y] took upon him to cure the king's son, and killed him: which leads us to think he made use of some external means that proved hurtful. Epiphanius says he [z] had recourse to medicines, but his hopes of cure failed him: Cyril, that [a] he promised to cure the young prince by prayer. Nor was it, I think, unbecoming a pious man, and a teacher of religion, if called in upon occasion of sickness, to make use of prayer. However, it must be owned that [b] Cyril likewise speaks of Mani's killing the king's son; which, as already observed, seems to imply some external applications that were prejudicial; provided there is any foundation at all for this story.

8. I do not recollect that Mani or his followers were ever famous for visions and revelations, as some others have been. It is indeed said, in The Acts of Archelaus, that [c] Mani was admonished in a dream of the king's design to put him to death. But surely every one perceives that to be ridiculous. Does a man, imprisoned by order of his prince, need a revelation to let him know he had best escape if he can? It may also, perhaps, be worth while to observe here, that Mani's deliverance is not ascribed to magic, or any such like thing, but to [d] a large sum of money, by which he bribed his keepers. As for the journey to heaven, mentioned by some eastern writers, I suppose that no one can think it worthy of any regard. In a word, the Manichees, as it seems, were rather a sect of reasoners and philosophers, than visionaries and enthusiasts.

It is observable, that Gregory Nazianzen, mentioning altoge-

[x] Et post ista omnia mandata, iste nec signum quidem aliquod, aut prodigium ullum ostendens. Arch. c. 35, p. 61. f. Et hæc quidem non inexplorata proloquor; sed ex eo quod nullum te video facere virtutem, ita de te sentio. &c. ib. c. 36, p. 63. [y] ——præsentiam suam Manes exhibet apud regem, dicens se esse puerum curaturum.——Verum ne multa narrando quæ gessit, tædium auditoribus inferam, mortuus est puer in manibus ejus, vel potius extinctus. ib. c. 53, p. 98. [z] ——τινα εἰδὴ φαρμακευτικῆς προσηγαγε τῳ νοσηλευομενῳ παιδὶ τῳ βασιλεως. H. 66, n. 4. [a] ἀλλ' ὁ μανης επηγγειλατο διὰ προσευχης σωσειν εὐσεβης κατορθωσειν. Cat. 6, n. 25. [b] ——τῳ παιδος τοῦ βασ... Ib. n. 26. [c] Quod cum rex Persarum cognovisset, dignis eum supplicis subdere parat. Quo Manes agnito, admonitus in somniis, elapsus de carcere, in fugam versus est, auro plurimo custodibus corruptis. Arch. c. 54, p. 99. [d] See the preceding note [c].

ther

ther the [c] Montaniſts, Manichees, Novatians and Sabellians, diſtinguiſhes the firſt by their pretence of inſpiration, without imputing any ſuch thing to any of the reſt. And in like manner in another [f] place, where, beſide the forenamed, are alſo mentioned Valentinus, Marcion, and ſome others.

Not that the Manichees were ſilent about the Spirit. No, for certain they, as well as other Chriſtians, claimed an intereſt in the promiſe of the Spirit made by Chriſt: but, whereas Auguſtine ſays they [g] pretended that the Spirit came to us by Mani, I am not fully ſatisfied about the juſtneſs of his expreſſion. One might be rather apt to conclude from [h] words of Fauſtus, and even from thoſe words of Auguſtine juſt cited, *came to us*, that they conſidered the gift of the Spirit as a bleſſing common to believers under the goſpel diſpenſation.

If they had gone upon the ground of a particular inſpiration in Mani, it might be expected that the traces of that high notion concerning their maſter ſhould appear more diſtinctly than they do, in the diſcourſes of the Manichees, with whom Auguſtine diſputed. Fortunatus ſeems to uſe ſtrong expreſſions to the contrary, when he ſays: 'He [i] knows that he cannot by 'any means ſhew his faith to be right, unleſs he proves it by 'the authority of the ſcriptures.'

Upon the whole, I do not chuſe to deny that Mani was an impoſtor; but I do not diſcern evident proofs of it. I plainly ſee that he was an arrogant philoſopher, and a great ſchemiſt: but whether he was an impoſtor, I cannot certainly ſay. He was abundantly too fond of philoſophical notions, which he endeavoured to bring into religion: for this he is to be blamed. But every bold dogmatizer is not an impoſtor.

I put down Beauſobre's judgment upon this point, when I entered upon the conſideration of this queſtion. I muſt here take notice of ſeveral other of his places, where he delivers his opinion concerning this matter. I do it for the ſake of my readers, as well as myſelf, that none, who are deſirous of information and judging rightly, may be deſtitute of any helps that can be obtained for theſe purpoſes.

[c] Μοντανὸς δὲ τὸ παρὰκλητον πνευμα, καὶ τὰς μετ' αὐτὸν προφήτιδας, κ. λ. Greg. Or. 23, p. 414, C. [f] Μανιχαῖος τὸ παράκλητον πνευμα, καὶ ἑαυτὸν φησὶν εἶναι· Μανιχαῖος τὴν ὑλὴν μετὰ τὰς σκοτείας· Ναζαραῖος τὴν ἀλαζονείαν, κ. λ. Or. 25, p. 441, B. [g] ——dicunt Spiritum Sanctum, quem Dominus diſcipulis ſe miſſurum eſſe promiſit, per ipſum [Manichæum,] ad nos veniſſe. De Util. Cred. c. 3. n. 7. [h] ——et nobis Paracletus ex Novo Teſtamento promiſſus perinde docet——de quo ultro Jeſus, cum eum promitteret, dicit in Evangelio, Ipſe vos inducet in omnem veritatem, et ipſe vobis annuntiabit omnia, et commemorabit omnia. Fauſt. ap. Aug. l. 32, cap. 6.

[i] Et quia nullo genere recte me credere oſtendere poſſum, niſi eamdem fidem ſcripturarum auctoritate firmaverim. Diſp. Fortun. l. 2, n. 20.

He ſays, in the preface to his work, that 'Mani[k] took the 'character of an apoſtle of Chriſt, and a prophet immediately 'inſpired by the Paraclete, to reveal to the world truths, in which 'our Lord thought not proper to inſtruct his firſt diſciples. This 'was his impoſture or fanaticiſm. For whatever the ancients 'may ſay, there are no evident proofs that he ever endeavoured 'to paſs for the Paraclete, or the Spirit.' He elſewhere ſpeaks of Mani's pretending[l] to a divine vocation. However, he likewiſe expreſſeth himſelf after this manner, ſpeaking at the ſame time both of Mani, and ſome others called heretics: 'In[m] what 'then conſiſted their error? Theſe heretics were philoſophers, 'who, having formed certain ſyſtems, accommodated revelation 'to them; which was the ſervant of their reaſon, not the miſ-'treſs. Mani, in particular, boaſted of having a perfect know-'ledge of all things, of having baniſhed myſteries, and given a 'true account of every thing; which the Manichees called the 'knowledge of the beginning, middle and end of all things. 'St. Auguſtine confeſſeth, that what ſeduced him in his youth 'was the hope of underſtanding every thing by demonſtration, 'and of knowing God by the ſole light of reaſon, without the 'help of faith.' Again, ſays the ſame learned author: 'As[n] 'for his hereſy in general, it was, properly ſpeaking, a philoſo-'phical ſyſtem, the grounds of which he found in the philoſophy 'of the magi, and which he accommodated, as well as he could, 'to the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt. Herein he did nothing but 'what had been done before by many Greeks, and both Greeks 'and Latins have been doing almoſt ever ſince. In all times 'have been ſeen philoſophers, whoſe minds were filled with the 'ideas and notions of Plato and Ariſtotle; which, under ſlight 'pretexts, they have mingled with Chriſtian truths, and erected 'into articles of faith.'

So Beauſobre[o]. I readily aſſent to him in what he ſays of the philoſophical nature of Mani's ſyſtem. Whether he pretended to divine inſpiration, I cannot ſay. However, I leave every one to judge as he ſees good. But I own I had rather vindicate a Chriſtian from the charge of impoſture, than pronounce him guilty, unleſs the evidence againſt him be clear and full.

We now proceed to a more diſtinct examination of the Manichæan principles.

VI. Mani had honourable ſentiments of the Deity, as ſelf-exiſtent, eternal, completely happy, and perfect in goodneſs. So

[k] T. i. Pr. p. x. xi. [l] T. i. p. 179, 180. [m] B. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 52.
[n] Ib. p. 109. [o] See him alſo, T. i. p. 426, note 4, and T. 2, p. 253.

much

much is evident from the paſſage of Fortunatus above quoted, and from a paſſage of Mani himſelf, to be taken notice of preſently.

They owned God to be Almighty: both [p] Fortunatus and [q] Fauſtus aſcribe to God that attribute. Indeed they did not believe this world of ours to be made out of nothing. However, perhaps that was not from a ſuppoſition of the want of ſuch power in God, but becauſe they imagined [r] things would have been better than they are, perfectly good, without any mixture of evil, if the matter of which they conſiſted had been of divine original.

But Mani and his followers did not believe the divine immenſity, or that, as to his nature, he was in all places. For part of ſpace, according to them, was occupied by Hyle, the evil principle, matter. But though they limited the divine eſſence in point of ſpace, they did not limit God in point [t] of power and knowledge. This appears from Auguſtine, who owns the [u] Manichees taught that God had prepared an eternal priſon for the nation of darkneſs. Therefore God's dominion muſt be over all.

Upon account of their doctrine of two principles, to be taken notice of hereafter, the Manichees are often charged with believing two gods. So Turbo, in The Acts of Archelaus, expreſsly ſays of Mani: 'He [x] worſhips two gods, ſelf-exiſtent, eternal, 'oppoſite to each other, one good, the other bad.' And Socrates ſaid, that [y] Mani taught his diſciples to worſhip many gods.

Fauſtus particularly conſiders this point. 'Is [z] there one God; 'or are there two gods? For certain, one. Why then do you 'ſay there are two gods? That is no doctrine of ours. Why do 'you ſuſpect it to be ſo? Becauſe you believe two principles, one

[p] ——a Deo omnipotente. Fortun. ap. Aug. Diſp. i. n. 17. [q] ——quia et omnipotentem Deum colam. Faust. l. 20, c. 2. [r] ——Quomodo autem et conditor potuit creaturas, non ſubſiſtente materia? Si enim de non extantibus, conſequitur has viſibles creaturas meliores eſſe, et omnibus virtutibus plenas. Manes ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 27. [s] Ego duas naturas eſſe dico, unam bonam, et alteram malam, et eam quidem, quæ bona eſt, in quibuſdam partibus habitare.——Si enim dicimus monarchiam unius naturæ, et omnia Deum replere, et nullum eſſe extra ſummum locum, quis erit creaturæ ſuſceptor? ubi gehenna ignis? ubi tenebræ exteriores? ubi fletus? Manes ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 29. [t] See Beaus. T. i. p. 505, 506. [u] Ipſi enim dicunt, Deum genti tenebrarum æternum carcerem præparare, quam dicunt eſſe inimicam Deo. Contr. Adim. c. 7, n. 1. [x] Οὗτος δύο θεοὺς θεοποιεῖται, αὐτοφυεῖς, ἀϊδίους, ἐναντίους ἀλλήλοις, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἀγαθὸν, τὸν δὲ πονηρὸν εἰσηγεῖται. ap. Arch. n. 7, p. 9.

[y] πολλοὺς δὲ θεοὺς σέβεσθαι ὁ Μανιχαῖος παραδέδωκεν. Soer. l. i. c. 22. [z] Una Deus eſt, an duo? Plane unus. Quomodo ergo vos duos aſſeritis: nusquam in noſtris quidem aſſertionibus duorum deorum auditum eſt nomen. Sed tu unde hoc ſuſpicaris, cupio ſcire. Quia bonorum et malorum duo principia traditis. Eſt quidem quod duo principia confitemur, ſed unum ex his Deum vocamus, alterum Hylen: aut ut communiter, et uſitate dixerim, dæmonem. Faust. l. 21, in.

'good,

'good, the other bad. It is true, we believe two principles: 'but one of these we call God, the other Hyle; or sometimes, 'in common discourse, the devil.' However, he adds afterwards: 'I own that [a] we sometimes call the adverse nature god: 'not that it is so esteemed by us, but by those who worship it: 'even as the apostle speaks of the *god of this world blinding the* 'eyes of them that believe not.' See 2 Cor. iv. 4.

They likewise considered God as the creator of the heavens and the earth, and all things that are therein, as [b] Augustine assures us; which is very different from what is said of them by [c] Athanasius and [d] Rufinus. Forasmuch therefore as some writers deny that the Manichees ascribed the creation of the world to the good principle, and some other heretics also are said to have disowned God as creator, I shall put down a passage or two more from [e] Augustine, and [f] the author De Fide, where they allow that the Manichees spoke of God as the maker of the world. And Titus of Bostra, giving an account of their notion upon this head, says that [g] the universe, according to them, consisted indeed of a mixture of good and bad, but was formed by the good principle, that is, God. For the evil principle knew nothing beforehand of the formation of the world. Besides, I remember that I alleged a passage to this purpose [h] before, when I shewed their agreement with other Christians. And Beausobre [i] might be consulted upon this head.

The Manichees believed a consubstantial trinity, or three persons of the same substance. I [k] have already taken some notice

[a] Nan nec diffiteor, etiam interdum nos adversam naturam nuncupare deum, sed non hoc secundum nostram fidem, verum juxta præsumtum jam in eam nomen a cultoribus suis, qui eam imprudenter existimant deum, &c. ib. ad fin.

[b] Vos autem fatemini universum istum mundum, qui nomine cœli et terræ significatur, habere auctorem et fabricatorem Deum, et Deum bonum. De Mor. Manich. c. x. n. 16. [c] Και γαρ κακεινοι [μανιχαιοι] μονον αρχης ομοιως αγαθον θεον ομολογουσι, και εργον μεν αυτω ουτε βλεπομενον ουτε ασωματον δεικνυειν δυνανται· τον δε κληθεντα και ουτω ουτα θεον, τον ποιησαντα ουρανον και γης, και παντων των ασωματων αριθμουσι, παιδικως εισι μυθολογοι. Ath. Ep. Enc. ad. Ep. Æg. et Lib. n. 16, T. i. p. 285, E.

[d] Tum deinde quod mundum a malo factum dicit, Deum creatorem negat. Ruf. in Symb. ap. Hieron. Opp. T. 5, p. 142. [e] Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc est a natura Dei factum constentur quidem, sed de commixtione boni et mali, quæ facta est, quando inter se utraque natura pugnavit. Aug. de Hær. cap. 46.

Iste autem, cujus nomen in eodem libro non comperi, detestatur Deum mundi fabricatorem: cum Manichæi, quamquam librum Geneseos non accipiant, atque blasphement, Deum tamen bonum fabricasse mundum, etsi ex aliena natura atque materia, confiteantur. Contr. adv. Leg. et Proph. l. i. c. i. [f] Manichæus enim duas dicit esse naturas, unam bonam, et alteram malam; bonam quæ fecit mundum, malam de qua factus est mundus. De Fid. c. 49, in. [g] Γεγονε τοινυν μιξις και κρασις, τουτον φησι τον τροπον της τε κατα πρόθεσης δυναμεως του αγαθου, και της καταπιεσης υλης· και ουτως εξ αμφοιν εδημιουργηθη το παν, υπο του αγαθου δηλαδη· η γαρ αι προεισησει η κακια κοσμου γενεσεως. Tit. l. i. p. 68, m.

of

of this. I obſerve here a few more particulars as proofs of this, though I do not deſign to examine their opinion nicely.

Auguſtine ſays the [l] Manichees never dared to deny that the Father and the Son are conſubſtantial.

Secundinus begins his letter to Auguſtine in this manner: 'I [m] give thanks to the ineffable and moſt ſacred Majeſty, and 'to Jeſus Chriſt, his firſt-begotten, king of all lights. I alſo 'humbly give thanks to the Holy Spirit.'

Fauſtus has a remarkable paſſage where he ſays: 'We [n] 'worſhip one deity of God the Father Almighty, and Chriſt his 'Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, under a three-fold appellation. But 'the Father we believe to inhabit the ſupreme and moſt ſublime 'light, which Paul calls inacceſſible. [1 Tim. vi. 16.] The Son 'we think dwells by his power in the ſun, by his wiſdom in the 'moon: the Holy Spirit, the third Majeſty, has the air for his 'reſidence.'

Here therefore I obſerve that the Manichees are ſaid to worſhip the ſun. So [o] Socrates expreſsly. Libanius too owned that [p] they worſhipped the ſun in a ſecondary ſenſe: and it is very likely that they paid ſome reſpect both to the ſun and the moon on [q] account of the reſidence of the Son of God therein, as juſt mentioned by Fauſtus.

However, let us likewiſe ſee what others ſay. We find Auguſtine himſelf charging them with [r] the worſhip of the ſun and the moon. But in the diſpute with Fortunatus, when called upon to declare if he had ſeen any thing criminal in their worſhip, he owned that [s] he had obſerved nothing amiſs in the prayers, at which he was preſent, except that they turned themſelves to-

[l] See before, p. 439, note [t]. [m] See B. T. 2, p. 360, 361. [n] See p. 439, &c.

[l] ——Quia et numquam dicere auſi ſunt, Patrem et Filium niſi unius eſſe ſubſtantiæ. Aug. Serm. 12, in PS. cap. x. n. vi. [m] Habeo et ago gratias ineffabili et ſanctiſſimæ Majeſtati, ejuſque primogenito omnium luminum regi Jeſu Chriſto. Habeo gratias et ſupplex ſancto refero Spiritui. Secund. ad Aug. Ep. in.

[n] Igitur nos Patris quidem Dei omnipotentis, et Chriſti filii ejus, et Spiritus Sancti unum idemque ſub triplici appellatione colimus numen: ſed Patrem quidem ipſum lucem incolere credimus ſummam ac principalem, quam Paulus alias inacceſſibilem vocat: Filium vero in hac ſecunda ac viſibili luce conſiſtere; qui quoniam ſit et ipſe geminus, ut eum Apoſtolus novit, Chriſtum dicens eſſe Dei virtutem et Dei ſapientiam; virtutem quidem ejus in ſole habitare credimus, ſapientiam vero in luna: nec non et Spiritus Sancti, qui eſt majeſtas tertia, aeris hunc omnem ambitum ſedem fatemur ac diverſorium. Fauſt. l. 20, c. 2.

[o] ——καὶ τὸν ἥλιον προσκυνεῖν διδάσκει. Socr. l. i. c. 22, p. 56, A. [p] See before, p. 383. [q] ——quod vel tu, vel quilibet alius rogatus, ubinam Deum ſuum credat habitare, reſpondere non dubitabit, in lumine: ex quo cultus hic meus omnium pene teſtimonio confirmatur. Fauſt. ib. l. 20, c. 2, f. [r] Solem etiam et lunam cum eis adorant et orant. Aug. T. 2. Ep. 236, al. 74. [s] Ego autem in oratione qua interfui nihil turpe fieri vidi. ſed ſolum contra fidem animadverti——quod contra ſolem facitis orationem. Adv. Fortun. Diſp. i. n. 3.

ward

ward the sun. In another place he informs us, that [t] when they prayed they looked toward the sun in the day time, and toward the moon in the night. In another place he speaks of [u] their kneeling to the sun, or toward it. Alexander of Lycopolis says they [x] honour the sun and moon above all things, not as gods, but as the way by which we are to go to God. Titus of Bostra ascribes their respect to the sun to their supposition that [y] it was composed of parts of light entirely pure, and unsullied with a mixture of evil. And [z] Augustine seems to speak to the like purpose, or at least that they esteemed it a portion of light which God inhabits. Simplicius says they [a] thought the sun and moon to consist of parts of the good substance, and therefore honoured them.

Upon the whole, I believe we need not surmise any great harm in the respect they shewed the sun, considering that Faustus assures us they believed one God only under a threefold appellation, and considering what Augustine says of the prayers at which he was present. But it seems that when they prayed to God, for some reason or other they turned their faces toward the sun or the moon.

VII. 'The Manichees,' to use Augustine's [b] words, 'held 'two principles, different and opposite, eternal and coeternal: 'and two natures and substances, one good, the other evil, fol- 'lowing herein other ancient heretics.'

In this [c] notion, as the same learned father says, they triumphed to a great degree, supposing it to afford the best account of the origin of evil.

And Epiphanius says that [d] by this scheme Mani endeavoured to free God from the charge of being the author of evil.

To

[t] Orationes faciunt ad solem per diem, quaquaversum circuit; ad lunam per noctem, si apparet; si autem non apparet, ad aquilonium partem, qua sol cum occiderit ad orientem revertitur, stant orantes. De Hær. c. 46.

[u] Sol ille, cui genu flectitis, &c. De Mor. Manich. cap. 8, n. 13.

[x] Τιμωσι δε μαλιστα ηλιον και σεληνην, ουχ ως θεους, αλλ' ως οδον δι' ης εστι πορος θεον αφικεσθαι. Alex. L. p. 5, D. [y] Επειδη δε ηλιον σημειον και σκηνην ειναι, ως υπειληφε, του καλου δοξαζουσι. Tit. contr. Manich. l. 2, p. 128, in. [z] Et ideo istum solem ——— isti sic colunt ut particulam dicant esse lucis illius in qua habitat Deus. De Gen. contr. Man. l. i. c. 3, n. 6.

[a] Ποιον δε και το περι τουτο αλλοκοτον, το μεν σωματων και το των αγιων μοιρας των δυο φωτηρας τιμαν, της δε αγαθης μοιρας λεγειν ειναι τας αυτας. κ. λ. In Epictet. c. 34, p. 167.

[b] Iste duo principia inter se diversa et adversa, eademque æterna et coæterna, hoc est, semper fuisse, composuit: duasque naturas atque substantias, boni scilicet et mali, sequens alios antiquos hæreticos, opinatus est. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

[c] Hic fortasse quis dicat, Unde ipsa peccata, et omnino unde malum? Si ab homine, unde homo? Si ab angelo, unde angelus? Quos ex Deo esse cum dicitur, quamvis recte vereque dicatur, videntur tamen imperitis et minus valentibus acriter res abditas intueri, quasi per quamdam catenam ad Deum mala et peccata connecti. Hac quæstione regnare se putant. De Duab. Anim. c. 8, n. 10.

[d] Μανης βουλομενος κακιαν υπεξαιρειν του θεου.

To the like purpoſe ſpeaks[e] Jerom, and[f] Titus of Boſtra, and[g] Simplicius.

Indeed this difficult queſtion, of the origin of evil, was the ruin of theſe men, and of many others. They perplexed and confounded themſelves, and they endeavoured to puzzle and confound all other people. Auguſtine[h] intimates as much.

Theodoret's account is to this purpoſe: 'Mani[i] taught two 'eternal beings, God and matter. God he called light, matter 'darkneſs: and the light good, matter evil. He called them 'alſo by other names. Light is a good tree, full of good 'fruits: matter an evil tree, bearing fruits agreeable to it's root.'

Photius, obſerving the contents of a work of Agapius, a Manichæan writer, ſays: 'He[k] advanceth a bad principle, ſelf-'exiſtent and oppoſite to God; which he ſometimes calls nature, 'ſometimes matter, ſometimes Satan, and the devil, and the 'prince and god of this world, and the like.'

Their opinion is laid down by[l] Fortunatus at the beginning of his ſecond diſpute with Auguſtine.

Jerom[m] often takes notice of this doctrine of the Manichees.

This doctrine Máni teaches in his letter to Marcellus. He[n] wonders how any Chriſtians can think that God made Satan and other evil things. This notion, and the conſequences of it, are much diſcourſed of in The Diſpute of[o] Archelaus.

After all this, it may be ſtill proper to put down, in the margin at leaſt, the words of Mani himſelf, near the beginning of his Epiſtle of the Foundation, which was ſo much admired by his followers, and is largely cited by Auguſtine. 'There[p] 'were,'

θεου. κ. λ. Epiph. H. 66, n. 16, p. 632. Vid. et n. 15, in. [e] Inde Manichæus, ut Deum a conditione malorum liberet, alterum mali inducit auctorem. Hier. in Naum. cap. 3, T. 3, p. 1588, in.

[f] Κακιας γαρ αιτιον αποδειξαι τον θεον βελομενος, κ. λ. Tit. contr. Manich. l. i. p. 60, in. ap. Baſnag. et Caniſ. Lect. Ant. T. i.

[g] ——και το θαυμαστον, οτι τριτα ταυτα ανεπλασαν, δια θεοσεβη δηθεν ευλαβειαν· μη βουλομενοι γαρ αιτιον τε κακε τον θεον ειπειν, αρχην υποτησαντο ιδιαν τε κακε, κ. λ. Simpl. in. Epict. Enchir. c. 34, p. 168.

[h] Qui dum nimis quærunt, unde ſit malum, nihil reperiunt niſi malum. De Ut. Cred. c. 18, n. 36.

[i] Ουτος δυο αγεννητους και αιδιους εφησεν ειναι, θεον και υλην· και προσηγορευσε τον μεν θεον φως, την δε υλην σκοτος. κ. λ. Thdrt. H. F. l. i. c. 26. p. 212. B. C.

[k] Αρχην πονηραν αυθυποστατον αντιτιθησιν εξ αιδιε τω θεω, ην ποτε μεν φυσιν, αλλοτε υλην, και αλλοτε δε σατανταν, και διαβολον, και αρχοντα τε κοσμε, και θεον τε αιωνος τουτε. κ. λ. Ph. cod. 179, p. 404, in.

[l] Diſp. 2, ſub in. [m] Ut non juxta Manichæum, et cæteras hæreſes, (quæ factorem et materiam ponunt,) aliquid unde creaturæ factæ ſint, anteceſſerit creaturas, ſed omnia ex nihilo ſubſtiterint. Hier. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. i. T. 4. P. i. p. 435, in. Vid. eund. ad Cteſ. Ep. 43. T. 4. P. 2, p. 480, infr. m. et Prol. Dial. adv. Pelag. ib. p. 485, in.

[n] Και πως τον θεον τε σαταναν, και των κακων αυτε πραγματων λεγειν τολμωσι ποιητην και δημιεργον, θαυμαζειν μοι επερχεται. ap. Arch. c. 5, p. 7, f.

[o] Ego duas naturas eſſe dico, unam bonam et alteram malam. ib. c. 14, p. 26.

[p] Hæc quidem in exordio fuerunt, duæ ſubſtantiæ a ſeſe diviſæ. Et luminis quidem imperium tenebat Deus Pater, in ſua ſancta ſtirpe perpetuus, in virtute magnificus,

'were,' ſays he, 'in the beginning, two ſubſtances, divided 'from each other. The kingdom of light is held by God the 'Father, unchangeable, all-powerful, true in his nature, eternal, 'having in himſelf wiſdom and vital powers.—His moſt ſplendid 'kingdom is founded upon light and bleſſed land, not to be 'ſhaken or moved by any.' But however, as he goes on, 'On [q] one ſide of his illuſtrious and holy territories was the land 'of darkneſs, deep and wide, where dwelt fiery bodies, and all 'ſorts of peſtiferous things: beyond which are muddy waters, 'boiſterous winds, dark ſmoke; and at the centre the dreadful 'prince and univerſal governor, having with him innumerable 'princes, of which he is the ſoul and ſource. And theſe are 'the five natures [or elements] of the peſtiferous country.'

Theſe five elements, as Auguſtine obſerves in plainer words, are [r] darkneſs, water, wind, fire, ſmoke. Darkneſs is the outmoſt, within that water, within that wind, next fire, and the inmoſt ſmoke; all which regions have their ſeveral inhabitants. In another place [s] Auguſtine mentions again theſe five elements, but in a different order.

There were as many elements in the [t] kingdom of light; air, light, fire, water, wind: which, at the formation of the world, were mixed with the bad elements.

Hence it appears that [u] Mani aſcribed to matter, the evil ſubſtance, the land of darkneſs, not only eternal exiſtence, but likewiſe motion and life, animal paſſions, and, as one would

magnificus, natura ipſa verus, æternitate propria ſemper exſultans, continens apud ſe ſapientiam et ſenſus vitales.—Ita autem fundata ſunt ejuſdema ſplendidiſſim regna ſuper lucidam et beatam terram, ut a nullo unquam aut moveri aut concuti poſſint. Ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich. c. 13, n. 16.

[q] Juxta unam vero partem ac latus illuſtris illius ac ſanctæ terræ erat tenebrarum terra profunda et immenſa magnitudine, in qua habitabant ignea corpora, genera ſcilicet peſtifera. Hic infinitæ tenebræ, ex eadem manantes natura inæſtimabiles cum propriis fœtibus: ultra quas erant aquæ cœnoſæ ac turbidæ cum ſuis inhabitatoribus, quarum interius venti horribiles ac vehementes cum ſuo principe et genitoribus. Rurſus regio ignea et corruptibilis cum ſuis ducibus et nationibus. Pari modo introrſum gens caliginis ac fumi plena, in qua morabatur immanis princeps omnium et dux, habens circa ſe innumerabiles principes, quorum omnium ipſe erat mens et origo. Hæcque fuerunt naturæ quinque terræ peſtiferæ. ap. Aug. ib. c. 14, n. 19.

[r] Animadvertimus quinque naturas quaſi partes unius naturæ, quam vocat terram peſtiferam. Hæ ſunt autem, tenebræ, aquæ, venti, ignis, fumus; quas quinque naturas ſic ordinat, ut exteriores cæteris ſint tenebræ, a quibus numerare incipit. Intra tenebras aquas conſtituit, intra aquas ventos, intra ventos ignem, intra ignem fumum. Et habebant iſtæ quinque naturæ ſua quæque genera inhabitatorum. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 28, n. 31.

[s] ——eaque elementa his nominibus nuncupant, fumum, tenebras, ignem, aquam, ventum. Aug. De. Hær. c. 46.

[t] His quinque elementis malis debellandis alia quinque elementa de regno et ſubſtantia Dei miſſa eſſe, et in illa pugna fuiſſe permixta; fumo aera, tenebris lucem, igni malo ignem bonum, aquæ malæ aquam bonam, vento malo ventum bonum. Id ibid.

[u] ἀφ' ὗ ἑκατέρου τῶν παρὰ τὸ μανιστὶ νομιζομένων ἑκατίων, ὕσια ζῶσα τε καὶ ἀγίνητος ὀνομάζεται. Tit. l. i. p. 65.

think,

think, reaſon or intelligence. If the inhabitants of thoſe regions had not reaſon originally, they ſeem to have gained it afterwards.

Upon this point I ſhall mention a thought[x] of Beauſobre, which is to this purpoſe. 'Titus of Boſtra obſerves this abſurdity in the Manichæan ſcheme, that[y] they aſcribe an unreaſonable life only to dæmons: and yet thoſe dæmons are repreſented ſhewing great art and ſkill. But,' ſays Beauſobre, 'Titus did not conſider that the Manichees do not aſcribe ſuch ability to the dæmons till after they had ſeized on the parts of light which were devoured by them, and became incorporated with them.' Whether this be right I cannot ſay: I ſhall mention an obſervation concerning this matter by and by.

'As for the devil,' to take the words of[z] Beauſobre, 'Mani did not believe him to be properly eternal, foraſmuch as he gave him a father: which ſuppoſition he built upon the words of our Saviour in John viii. 44. According to him the father of the devil was matter agitated in a violent, irregular, and tumultuous manner.'

That learned writer does not refer to the proper vouchers for proof of this account. I ſhall therefore add a few references in the margin, taken from The Diſpute of Archelaus, where[a] Mani is repreſented quoting that text of St. John's goſpel in this manner, that 'the father of the devil is a liar and a murderer:' where likewiſe he ſpeaks[b] of the devil as having no former or creator but his own malice, whence he ſprang.

This notion of the origin of Satan may ſeem ſtrange: and yet perhaps it is not much ſtranger than the opinion of thoſe who thought that[c] plants grew up where no ſeeds had been ſown: and that animals in water and on the land, having ſexes, ſprung

[x] See Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2, p. 410, 411. [y] οθεν πιθανως προσομολογειν αυτη λογισμον τε και γνωσιν. Tit. l. i. p. 70, ſub in. [z] B. T. i. p. 179, and ſee him again T. 2. p. 263.

[a] Et alio in loco, patrem diaboli mendacem et homicidam eſſe confirmat [Salvator Chriſtus]. Manes ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 24.——Cum loquitur mendacium de ſuis propriis loquitur, quoniam mendax eſt, ſicut et pater ejus. ib. n. 29, p. 48. Conf. Beauſ. T. 2, p. 263. [b] Si vero conſideretis, quomodo generentur filii hominum, invenietis non eſſe Dominum hominis creatorem, ſed alium, qui et ipſe ingenitæ eſt naturæ, cujus conditor nullus, nec creator, nec factor eſt, ſed ſola malitia ſua talem eum protulit. ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 27. [c] ——quia niſi talis aliqua vis eſſet in iſtis elementis, non plerumque naſcerentur ex terra quæ ibi ſeminata non eſſent: nec animalia tam multa, nulla marium feminarumque commixtione præcedente, ſive in terra, ſive in aqua, quæ tamen creſcunt, et coeundo alia pariunt, cum illa nullis coeuntibus parentibus orta ſint. Aug. De. Trin. l. 3. cap. 8, n. 13. Quod ſi animalia quædam vento et aura concipere ſolere, omnibus notum eſt.—Lact. Inſt. l. 4, c. 12, ſub in. Nec tamen commoveat aliquem, quod animalia quædam de terra naſci videntur. Hæc enim non terra per ſe gignit, ſed ſpiritus Dei, ſine quo nihil gignitur. l. 2, c. 8, p. 183. Vid. Id. ib. l. i. c. 8, p. 43.

up

up out of the genial virtue of the elements alone, deſcended from no parents. There is this difference only, that theſe perſons, it is likely, aſcribed that genial virtue of the elements to an intelligent and powerful cauſe, even ‡ God.

Here, therefore, I inſert the obſervation deferred before, which is this: ſince Beauſobre allows that, according to the Manichees, the devil, who was not properly eternal, was formed by the violent and irregular motion of eternal matter; and ſince Auguſtine expreſsly ſays, that the elements in the kingdom of darkneſs begot their ſeveral princes; in like manner, perhaps, the land of darkneſs, once irrational, gained reaſon, or cunning and ſkill, by ſome violent and tumultuous agitations. Or, poſſibly, they never aſcribed reaſon to dæmons, though they allowed them to have a great deal of cunning.

I beg leave to obſerve farther, that [e] Auguſtine often ſpeaks of mind in matter, according to the Manichæan ſcheme: as does [f] Mani himſelf in his Epiſtle of the Foundation. And Auguſtine thinks he has a great advantage, in his argument with them, when he obſerves [g] how many good things they placed in the evil nature; ſuch as life, power, memory, intellect, proportion and order.

Their doctrine of two principles the Manichees endeavoured to ſupport by texts of the New Teſtament. They often argued from [h] thoſe words of our Saviour, Matt. vii. 18. *A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit:* and * from the ſeventh chapter of the epiſtle to the

‡ Beauſobre has exactly the like thought, though I was not aware of it when I wrote what is above. However I here tranſcribe his words. Il ne faut pourtant pas s'imaginer, qu' il crût le Demon éternel. Sans doute il le faiſoit naitre du mouvement deréglé de la Matiere, comme d'anciens philoſophes croyoient, que les animaux étoient nez de la corruption de la terre. C' étoit le ſentiment des Manichéens, qu'on attribue auſſi aux Priſcillianiſtes. Nec natura ejus [Diaboli] opificium Dei ſit, ſed eum ex chao et tenebris emerſiſſe. Leo Ep. xv. N°. 5, p. 452. Beauſ. T. i. p. 388. [d] Quinque enim elementa, quæ genuerunt principes proprios, genti tribuunt tenebrarum. De Hær. cap. 46. ſub in. [e] Hinc enim et mali ſubſtantiam quamdam credebam eſſe talem, et habere ſuam molem terram, et deformem, ſive craſſam, quam terram, et deformem, ſive tenuem et ſubtilem, ſicut eſt aeris corpus, quam malignam mentem per illam terram repentem imaginantur. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. x n. 20. Hæc dixi, ut, ſi fieri poteſt, tandem dicere deſinatis, malum eſſe terram per immenſum profundam et longam; malum eſſe mentem per terram vagantem; malum eſſe quinque antra elementorum—malum eſſe animalia in illis nata elementis. De M. Manich. c. 9. n. 14. [f] —— in qua morabatur immanis princeps omnium et dux, habens circa ſe innumerabiles principes, quorum omnium ipſe erat mens atque origio. ap. Aug. contr. Epiſt. Manich. c. 15, n. 19. [g] —— ita errantes, ita delirantes, —— ut non videant, et in eo quod dicunt naturam ſummi mali, ponere ſe tanta bona, ubi ponunt vitam, potentiam,—memoriam, intellectum, temperiem—menſuras, numeros, —ordinem. De Nat. Boni. cap. 41. [h] Cui enim oportet credi? magiſtris veſtris iſtis,—aut Salvatori Chriſto dicenti, ſicut ſcriptum eſt in Evangeliorum libro, Non poteſt arbor bona malos fructus facere ——? ap. Arch. n. 13, p. 24. Vid. et n. 5, p. 7.

* See Beauſobre T. 2, p. 253.

Romans,

Romans, where the apoſtle ſpeaks of two laws, or two powers; one the underſtanding or reaſon, the other the fleſh or the members of the fleſhly body, which are in perpetual oppoſition: and from [i] 1 John v. 19. *The whole world lies in wickedneſs*, or the evil one; and from other texts which need not to be particularly mentioned.

VIII. According to the Manichees the formation of this world was occaſional, owing to an attempt of the kingdom of darkneſs upon the kingdom of light. Auguſtine expreſſeth himſelf briefly in his ſummary account of Manichæiſm: 'They [k] own, 'indeed, that the world was made by the good nature, that is, 'the nature of God, but out of a mixture of good and evil, 'which happened when the two natures fought together.'

There is ſomewhat about this fight in [l] the fragments of Mani's letter Of the Foundation. But there muſt have been more ſaid of it in that part of the letter which Auguſtine did not anſwer, and therefore did not quote. For want of which I ſhall be obliged to take the account of this matter from other authors.

Theodoret ſays, 'There [m] being a prodigious tumult and 'inteſtine war in the kingdom of Hyle, as they contended and 'fought with each other, they exceeded the bounds of their 'own territories, and came to the confines of light: at the ſight 'of which they were greatly ſurpriſed and delighted, and did 'all they could to lay hold of and mix the light with themſelves.'

Titus of Boſtra ſays, that '[n] matter having made the inroad 'beforementioned, the good being ſent out a power or ſpirit, 'to which the Manichees give what name they pleaſe, to reduce 'matter to better order, which was in ſome meaſure effected; 'for matter was greatly delighted at the ſight of that power, and 'devoured it, and thereby was rendered more tame.'

In The Acts of Archelaus this affair is related after this manner: 'Darkneſs, [o] exceeding it's limits, fought with light.

[i] Ego duas naturas eſſe dico, unam bonam, alteram malam,—ſicut ait Joannes: Totus mundus in maligno poſitus eſt, non in Deo. ap. Arch. n. 14, p. 26.

[k] Proinde mundum a natura boni, hoc eſt, a natura Dei factum, confitentur quidem, ſed de commixtione boni et mali, quæ facta eſt, quando inter ſe utraque natura pugnavit. De Hær. c. 46.

[l] Unde ſi tibi videtur, inquit, auſculta prius quæ fuerint ante conſtitutionem mundi, et quo pacto prœlium ſit agitatum, ut poſſis luminis ſejungere naturam ac tenebrarum. ap. Aug. contra Ep. Manich. c. 12, n. 15. Vid. et libr. De Fid. contr. Manich. cap. xi.

[m] —— αιωσι δε πολλοις υστερον διαστασιασαι προς εαυτην την υλην και τας ταυτης καρπας προς αλληλας· τε δε πολεμε συγαντος, και των μεν οικοντων, των δε οικνομενων, μεχρι των ορων τε φωτος αυτες αφικεσθαι· ειτα το φως θεασαμενες, ηδυηναι τε επ' αυτω, και θαυμασαι και βεληθηναι παντοδι κατ' αυτε γρατευσαι, και αρπασαι, και κερασαι τω φωτι το ιδιον σκοτος Thdrt. T. iv. p. 212. C.

[n] Tit. contr. Manich. l. 2, p. 68.

[o] ——— Γνοντα δε τον αγαθον πατερα το σκοτος εν τη γη αυτε επιδεδημηκος, προσαλλειν εξ αυτε δυναμιν, λεγομενην μητερα της ζωης, και αυτην προσεβλησειαι τον πρωτον ανθρωπον, κ. λ. ap. Arch. n. 7, p. 10.

'When the good Father [that is God] perceived that darkneſs was come into his country, he detached from him a power called the Mother of Life. This power formed the firſt man, and inveſted him with the five elements, wind, light, water, fire, air. Thus equipped he went down to fight with darkneſs: but [p] the princes of darkneſs fighting againſt him devoured a part of his armour, which is the ſoul.' 'The firſt man,' as it follows in thoſe Acts, 'being overpowered looked up to God, who taking pity on him ſent to his [q] relief another power called the Living Spirit; who deſcending reached out his hand to him and reſcued him: but he left the ſoul below.—Then the Living Spirit created the world. He created the lights out of the ſouls that remained, and appointed the firmament to revolve. At length he created the earth.'

Who is meant by the Living Spirit is not certain; whether the Word, or the Holy Spirit, or ſome other intelligent being: but it ſeems to be rather more probable, that [r] hereby is meant ſome ſpirit inferior to the divine perſons; and that Mani was of the ſame opinion with divers others in former times, who, judging the creation of this viſible world unworthy of God, aſcribed that work to ſome inferior intelligence.

'And,' as Beauſobre ſays, 'if [t] we reduce to ſimple ideas all which is ſaid concerning the firſt man, his deſcent, his armour, his combats, a part of his armour taken from him, and devoured by the princes of darkneſs, the meaning may amount to this: that the ſoul is a celeſtial ſubſtance, which God has thought fit to mix with matter for making the world; and that this was occaſioned by an enterpriſe of matter, which God foreſaw, but did not think fit to hinder.' Or, as he expreſſeth it in another place: 'They [u] ſuppoſed that the firſt man deſcended from heaven to combat the powers of darkneſs: and that he was armed with five celeſtial elements, air, wind, water, fire and light. Matter devoured a part of his armour, which is the ſoul. In general God permitted that the celeſtial ſubſtance ſhould be mingled with the terreſtrial, or bad ſubſtance, which occaſioned the creation of the world.'

The ſame learned and judicious author has ſome other obſervations [x] relating to this matter, taken from the obſcure and

p οι δε του σκοτους αρχοντες αντιπολεμουντες αυτω εφαγον εκ της παναπλιας αυτου, ο εστιν η ψυχη. ib. q —— και επεστειλεν ετεραν δυναμιν προβεβλημενην υπ' αυτου, λεγομενην ζων πνευμα —— εκτοτε ου κατελειψε κατω την ψυχην. —— Τοτε ζων πνευμα εκτισε τον κοσμον; —— Τοτε παλιν το ζων πνευμα εκτισε τους φωτηρας, α εστι της ψυχης λειψανα, και ουτως επηξε το στερεωμα κυκλευσαι· και παλιν εκτισε την γην. ib. p. 10, 11.

r See Beauſ. T. 2, p. 359.

t ib. T. 2, p. 390. u ib. p. 555.

x as before, p. 390, 391, 392.

figurative

figurative ſtyle of the eaſtern people, and the language in which Mani's works were written, which might not be well underſtood by the Greeks and Romans.

And I ſhall add here a paſſage of Fortunatus, who, diſputing with Auguſtine, ſays: 'Hence [y] evidently appears our ancient 'original, that before the formation of the world ſouls were 'ſent againſt the contrary nature to ſubdue it by their virtue 'and patience, that the victory and glory might be given to 'God. For, as the apoſtle ſays: (Eph. vi. 12.) *We wreſtle not 'only againſt fleſh and blood, but alſo againſt principalities and powers, 'againſt ſpiritual wickedneſſes, and the rulers of darkneſs.*'

To proceed: The [z] firſt work of the creator was to ſeparate the parts of the celeſtial ſubſtance, which, though mingled with matter, had preſerved their purity, and to make of them the ſun and the moon; which is agreeable to the words of Auguſtine: The [a] Manichees ſay, that 'thoſe veſſels, the ſun and moon, were 'made of the pure ſubſtance of God; or of that ſubſtance of 'God which had preſerved it's purity.' He preſently afterwards explains what is meant by the ſubſtance of God, ſaying, that 'the moon was made of the good water, the ſun of the good 'fire;' that is, according to the Manichæan ſentiment.

But it ſhould be obſerved, that whereas Auguſtine here and elſewhere often uſeth the phraſe, *the ſubſtance of God*, it ſeems likely, that [b] thereby the Manichees (if they alſo uſed the ſame phraſe) did not mean the divine ſubſtance, or nature, which they always reckoned incorruptible, inviolable, immutable, but only the ſubſtance from God, the celeſtial ſubſtance, the [c] ſubſtance of his kingdom or empire. I ſuppoſe that every one will perceive as much from what will be hereafter ſaid of their denying the humanity of Chriſt, and the incarnation of the Word, and all union of the divine nature with the human. And it might be collected from what has been already produced concerning their ſentiments of the divine perfections.

In a word, not to be too minute, the [d] Creator formed the ſun and moon out of thoſe parts of light which had preſerved their original purity. The viſible or inferior heavens (for now we

[y] Hinc ergo apparet antiquitas temporum noſtrorum, quam repetimus, et annorum noſtrorum, ante mundi conſtitutionem hoc more miſſas eſſe animas contra contrariam naturam, ut eamdem ſua paſſione ſubjicientes, victoria Deo redderetur. Nam dixit idem apoſtolus, &c. Fortun. Diſp. 2, n. 22, fin. ap. Aug. T. 8. [z] See B. T. 2, p. 361, 362. [a] Quas itidem naves de ſubſtantia Dei pura perhibent fabricatas.—Naves autem illas, id eſt, duo cœli luminaria, ita diſtinguunt, ut lunam dicant factam ex bona aqua, ſolem vero ex igne bono. Aug. De H. c. 46.

[b] Beauſobre has ſpoken largely to this point. See him T. 1. p. 227.——234. p. 592, 593, 529, &c. and T. 2, p. 339, &c.

[c] His quinque elementis debellandis alia quinque elementa de regno et ſubſtantia Dei miſſa eſſe, et in illa pugna fuiſſe permixta. Aug. de Hær. cap. 46.

[d] See B. ib. p. 364.

do not speak of the supreme heaven), and the rest of the planets, were formed of those parts of light which were but little corrupted by matter. The rest he left in our world, which are no other than those parts of light which had suffered most by the contagion of matter.

The [e] Creator formed not the earth, until after he had made the heavens and the stars. This appears from the account before taken out of The Acts of Archelaus.

And that we may the better conceive of all this, we may observe and rectify a wrong account of Augustine. 'Mani,' says [f] he, 'teaches not only that man, but that the whole world was formed by the mixture of two coeternal natures, one good the other bad, in such a manner however as to ascribe the formation of the world to the good God.' This, says [g] Beausobre, is not just. Do not the sun and moon, which were made out of the pure celestial substance, belong to the world? It is our earth properly, with it's atmosphere, and it's heavens, which were composed of two substances: which is the occasion that life and death, good and evil, reign here. The Manichees, certainly, as that learned writer goes on, were not orthodox upon the article of the creation of the world: but, setting aside their particular error, they had noble ideas of the manner in which God made the world. The disorders that are in the world, says [h] Fortunatus, sufficiently shew that it was made out of two substances; at the same time things have not come into that form and proportion which constitutes the world, but by the authority and command of one only. So my author.

IX. The Manichæan notion of the creation of man may be seen in [i] Beausobre, taken from Mani himself, Archelaus, Augustine, Titus of Bostra, Theodoret and others.

A succinct account of what he says at large is to this purpose: The [k] dæmons, foreseeing that God would insensibly withdraw the light, or the reasonable soul, which he had sent into matter, and leave them to themselves, or punish them for their late attempt, thought of a method to detain it. They had seen the first man, who came to fight them; and they still discerned his form in the sun, or the heavens. Upon this model they formed the human body, thereby to attract souls; who, not perceiving

[e] Ib. p. 367. [f] Manichæus ex commixtione duarum naturarum coæternarum, boni scilicet et mali, non solum hominem sed universum mundum condidisse dicit, et ad eum omnia pertinentia. ita tamen, ut ipsam fabricam mundi, quamvis ex commixtione boni et mali, Deo bono et artifici tribuat. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 186.

[g] as before, p. 367, 368. [h] Fatentur commoventur, sed quia inconvenientia sibi fiunt, ex per hoc ergo constat non esse unam nihil antiam, licet ex unius iussione eadem ad compositionem mundi huius et faciem venerint. Fortunat. Disp. i. n. 13.

[i] Hist. de Manich. T. 2, p. 399.—418.

[k] Ib. p. 410.

the

the ſnare which the devil had laid for them, entered the body, and were touched with the pleaſure afforded by the organs of the ſenſes, and eſpecially that of concupiſcence. Pleaſure ſeduces and tranſports them, and they become delighted with their new habitation. Hereby they are led to propagate, and thus they forge their own chains and build their own priſons.

Some paſſages of Mani's Epiſtle of the Foundation, concerning the formation of man, may be ſeen in [l] Auguſtine.

I think it is paſt diſpute that Mani did aſcribe the formation of the human body to matter, or the devil, or the evil principle. I refer for this purpoſe to ſome paſſages in The Acts [m] of Archelaus and [n] Epiphanius; and ſhall tranſcribe in the margin ſome paſſages of Mani [o] in his letter to Menoch, where he ſpeaks of Satan being the author of bodies, as God is of ſouls. Auguſtine's article upon this point in [p] his ſummary account of Manichæiſm, as likewiſe what he ſays [q] elſewhere, deſerves our attention.

Alexander of Lycopolis ſpeaks to this purpoſe: 'Matter ' [or Hyle] perceiving in the ſun a human form, became ambitious to make a man out of his own ſubſtance. For this purpoſe he placed in him the utmoſt of his own powers, together with as much ſoul as he could obtain. By which means man became ſuperior to all animals, who are mortal like him, and partook largely of the divine power; for he is an image of the divine power.'

What I have here tranſcribed from Alexander may be compared with [s] The Acts of Archelaus, and [t] Epiphanius.

[l] —— dicens, noſſe te cupere cujuſmodi ſit divitas Adæ et Evæ, utrum verbo ſint ſeminati prolati, an primogeniti ex corpore. Ita ap. Aug. contr. Ep. Manich c. 12. [m] 14. Vid. et Aug. de Natura Boni. cap. 25. [n] Vid. Arch. n. 10, p. 19, 20. [o] 14, p. 27. [p] II. 66, n. 30. [q] Sicut ergo auctor animarum Deus eſt, ſic corporum auctor per concupiſcentiam carnis eſt, &c. ap. Aug. op. Imp. l. 3. c. 174. vid. et. c. 175, 176.

Adam et Evam ex parentibus principes tenebrarum aſſerunt natos, cum pater eorum [Archon] Sacla ſociorum ſuorum fetus omnes devoraſſet, et quicquid inde compactum divinæ ſubſtantiæ ceperat, cum ſuo concumbens in carne prolis tam-[quam] tenaciſſimo vinculo colligaſſet. De [Hær.] c. 46. [o] —— ita ſane, ut [Deum] fabricam mundi, quamvis ex commixtione boni et mali, Deo bono et artifici tribuat; an malia vero, et cuncta quæ [in] ipſa terra, et ipſum hominem, operata dicat malignæ mentis, quam genti adhibuit tenebrarum. Hinc eſt, quod *animam primam* dicit *a Deo luctis manuſſe, et accepſſe illam fabricam corporis, ut eam frenoſſo reperet.* Non enim hoc de homine, ſed de anima bona dicit, quam Dei partem atque naturam univerſo mundo, et omnibusque in eo ſunt, opinatur eſſe permixtam, in homine autem per concupiſcentiam decipi. Quam concupiſcentiam, quod ſæpe inculcandum eſt, non vitium ſubſtantiæ bonæ, ſed malam vult eſſe ſubſtantiam. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, cap. 186.

[p] Και ὅτι μὲν ἐξ ἀνθρώπου μορφὴν ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἐμφερομένην ἐθεάσατο ἡ ὕλη, καὶ ἐπεθύμησεν ἐξ ἰδίας οὐσίας ἄνθρωπον ποιῆσαι, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἰδίων δυνάμεων ἐνέθηκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅσην ἐδύνατο ψυχὴν ἐνέβαλεν, ἵνα τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ζώων τῶν θνητῶν μείζων ᾖ, ἔχοντα καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ τῆς ἀθανασίας, καὶ τὸ θεῖον μετέχοντα, εἰκὼν γὰρ τοῦ θείου ἐστίν. Alex. p. 5. B. C. [s] ap. Arch. n. 7, p. 12. [t] II. 66, n. 26, et 30.

And Mani, in a passage of his Letter of the Foundation, preserved [u] in Augustine, speaks of man as being a whole little world, uniting in himself the image of all powers, both celestial and terrestrial. Moreover, the Manichees, as Augustine says, believed that in [x] Adam was a large portion of light, that is, of the heavenly substance.

Some passages of Faustus likewise may confirm the supposition of the Manichees not ascribing the formation of the human body to God. 'It is true,' says [y] he, 'God is not the author of 'that birth which brings us into the world, men and women, 'males and females.' Again, says [z] Faustus, 'there are two 'times of our nativity; one, when nature brings us into this 'world under the chains of carnal affections; the other, when 'we are born again, and are converted from error to truth, of 'which Christ speaks in the gospel, in his conference with Nicodemus, saying, *Unless a man be born again he cannot see the 'kingdom of God.*' Which doctrine Faustus endeavours to support by long quotations from several of St. Paul's epistles.

As Beausobre says, they [a] pretended it was impossible that a holy and good God should join a pure and celestial soul with a terrestrial, sensitive, animal soul, whose affections resist reason, and carry the man to actions he disapproves. And they argued, that the ordinary way in which men come into the world shewed it was not God who formed them at first. This argument of theirs is largely represented in The [b] Acts of Archelaus.

X. Moreover, the Manichees supposed that there were in man two souls. Augustine wrote [c] a book on purpose against this opinion: but it was a necessary consequence of their sentiment about two principles. There are, according [d] to them, two eternal natures, both living and animated: and both enter

[u] In eadem enim construebantur et contexebantur omnium imagines, coelestium ac terrenarum virtutum; ut pleni videlicet orbis, id quod formabatur, similitudinem obtineret. Man. ap. Aug. de Nat. Bon. c. 46. [x] Malâ non vacuum fuisse dicit Adam, sed ejus minus habuisse, multoque plus lucis. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 186. [y] Magis ac magis ostendit, nativitatem hanc, quæ nos mares facit ac feminas,——non eam esse in qua Deus operatur, cum hominem format. Faust. l. 24, sub fin. [z] Quoniam quidem et nativitatis nostræ tempora duo sunt, unum illud, quo nos irretitos carnalibus vinculis in lucem hanc naturæ produxit, alterum vero, cum veritas nos ex errore conversos ad se regeneravit initiatos ad fidem. Quod tempus secundæ nativitatis in Evangelio Jesus significans dixit, &c. Faust. l. 24, sub in. [a] T. 2, p. 416.

[b] Si vero consideretis, quomodo generentur filii hominum, invenietis, non esse Dominum hominis creatorem, sed alium. ——Est igitur vobis hominibus commixtio cum uxoribus vestris de hujusmodi occasione descendens. Cum quis vestrum carnalibus aliisque cibis fuerit satiatus, tunc ei concupiscentiæ oboritur incitatio. &c. ap. Arch. c. 14, p. 27.

[c] *De duabus Animabus contra Manichæos.* Opp. T. 8. [d] See Beaus. T. 2, p. 420.

into

into the compoſition of man. I place in the margin [e] a paſſage of Auguſtine of ſome conſiderable length, taken from his ſummary account of Manichæiſm in his book Of Hereſies.

This was in ancient times a common opinion of many people, and was held by the Manichees. They [f] ſuppoſed that it was evidently taught by St. Paul in all thoſe places where he oppoſes the fleſh and the ſpirit, the old man and the new man, the law of the mind and the law of the members. Theſe two men, theſe two laws, theſe two principles, are in man: and they are always contrary to each other: the ſpirit oppoſeth the deſires of the fleſh, and the fleſh thoſe of the ſpirit: but contrary deſires and wills cannot proceed from one and the ſame cauſe purely ſpiritual. There are therefore two ſouls in man, two active principles; one the ſource and cauſe of vicious paſſions, deriving it's origin from matter, the other the cauſe of the ideas of juſt and right, and of inclinations to follow thoſe ideas, deriving it's original from God.

XI. Though the Manichees did not receive the Old Teſtament, nor admit the Moſaic account of the creation, they ſuppoſed the world to have had a beginning, as we have ſeen already; and Adam and Eve to have been the firſt pair, and the parents of mankind. This appears from the very beginning [g] of the famous Epiſtle of the Foundation.

The Manichees, as Auguſtine ſays, believed that in Adam was a large portion of light; that is, of the celeſtial ſubſtance. Again, we learn from him, that [i] 'they ſaid Adam and Eve 'were made by the princes of darkneſs; but Adam had in him 'a great abundance of the particles of light, with but few par-'ticles of darkneſs: for that reaſon he lived holily a good while. 'At length the adverſe part in him prevailed, and he knew

[e] Carnalem concupiſcentiam, qua caro concupiſcit adverſus ſpiritum, non ex vita in primo homine natura nobis ineſſe ſuſpicatur; ſed ſubſtantiam volunt eſſe contrariam, ſic nobis adhærentem, ut quando liberamur atque purgamur, ſeparetur a nobis, et in ſua natura etiam ipſa immortaliter vivat: eaſque duas animas, vel duas mentes, unam bonam, alteram malam, in uno homine inter ſe habere contrariam, quando caro concupiſcit adverſus ſpiritum, et ſpiritus adverſus carnem. De Hær. c. 46. ſub fin. [f] See Beauſ. T. 2, p. 421. [g] De eo igitur,—— de quo mihi ſignificati, dicens, noſſe te cupere, cujuſmodi ſit nativitas Adæ et Evæ, &c. ap. Aug. Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 12, n. 14. [i] Falſa eſt namque apud vos opinio de Adamo et Eva. Longa fabula eſt, ſed ex ea adhibeam quod in præſentia ſatis eſt. Adam dicitis ſic a parentibus ſuis genitum, ubi orti ſunt illis principibus tenebrarum, ut maximam partem lucis haberet in anima, et paucissimam gentis adverſæ. Qui cum lente viveret propter exuperantem copiam boni, commotam tamen in eo fuiſſe adversam illam partem, ut ad concubitum declinaretur; ita eum lapſum eſſe et peccaſſe, ſed vixiſſe poſtea ſanctiorem. De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 73.

'Eve.' So then conjugal commerce was the first sin of these parents of mankind.

And, in The Acts of Archelaus it is said that [k] the princes, having made Adam after the form of the first man whom they had seen, made Eve likewise, giving her some of their own concupiscence, that she might deceive Adam.

XII. Hence we may be led to conclude that the Manichees must condemn marriage; and indeed those words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 3. are often applied to them. Mani himself says that [l] *concupiscence is the root of all evil*, quoting in that sense 1 Tim. vi. 10. It may be thought that [m] their condemning all manner of concupiscence, however regulated, appears in some words of Faustus, which I put in the margin: where he speaks of the first or natural birth, and of the second or spiritual birth.

This notion is handsomely confuted by [n] Titus of Bostra, in a passage which may be seen translated by [o] Beausobre: but I presume I need not transcribe it here.

Faustus has particularly considered the charge brought against them, of teaching what the apostle calls *doctrines of devils*, 1 Tim. iv. 1. And, if Faustus may be relied upon, their doctrine upon [p] the article of marriage and virginity was much the same with that of the catholics, or orthodox Christians of that time. The churches of the catholics, he says, had in them almost as many professed virgins as married women. If the [q] catholics made virgins, without being liable to the charge of forbidding to marry, the same was true of them: they did not compel, they only exhorted. And he boldly says, that text of St. Paul is no more against them than against the catholics. This defence of Faustus is the fuller, if by their elect, who alone were forbidden to marry,

[k] Την δε γυναικα ποιησαι, λεγει, αυτος εκ της επιθυμιας αυτων, προς το εξαπατησαι τον Αδαμ. ap. Arch. n. 10, p. 20.

[l] Tolle denique maligna hujus filiis radicem, et fratrem tecum spiritalem contemplaris. Radix enim, ait Scriptura, omnium malorum concupiscentia. Ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3, c. 175. Vid. et c. 176, 186, 187. [m] Modus quoque nascendi duplex est, unus ille furoris et intemperantiæ propriis, quæ fumus a generatoribus rumpitur et per libidinem fati: alius vero honestatis et sanctimoniæ, quo in Christo Jesu per Spiritum Sanctum sub bonorum doctrinis disciplinati renatus ad fidem, &c. Faust. l. 24, c. 1.

[n] Tit. contr Manich. l. 2, p. 130, 131. [o] T. 2, p. 468, 469. [p] —— ut videtis hinc, et virgines vestras dæmoniorum doctrina captas noveri, et vos esse antistites dæmoniorum, qui certatim simul ad hæreses incitetis professionem in turbonibus vestris, ut pene jam major in ecclesiis omnibus virginum apud vos quam nuptarum numerositas habeatur. Faust. l. 30, c. 4. [q] Non ergo est interdictum, quod vos existimetis solis hortamentis virgines facere, et non prohibitione nubendi. Nobis enim quoque hoc insitum est.—— Quapropter et nos hortamur quidem volentes ut permaneant, non tamen cogimus invitas ut accedant. —— Si igitur hoc modo virgines facere sine crimine est, extra culpam sumus et nos: sin quoquo genere virgines facere crimen est, rei estis et vos. Jam qua mente aut consilio hoc adversum nos capitulum proferatis, ego non video. ibid.

and

and were required to forbear eating fleſh and drinking wine, be underſtood prieſts or eccleſiaſtics, as [r] Fauſtus intimates.

More may be ſeen concerning this point in (*) the author, to whom I have already often referred.

Upon the whole, conſidering what has been obſerved above concerning the origin of mankind, it may be reckoned more probable, that they rather tolerated marriage as an imperfect ſtate, in regard to human weakneſs, than approved it. Perhaps we may apply to this caſe what [s] Auguſtine ſays of the Manichæan auditors eating fleſh. They were indulged it, but yet it was a fault, he ſays, and to be forgiven only becauſe they maintained the elect.

And I queſtion whether Fauſtus be ſincere, and may be relied upon in what he ſays of this matter. My doubts are owing to the very diſadvantageous expreſſions he makes uſe of in ſpeaking of the natural birth, in the twenty-fourth book of his work: ſeveral of which paſſages I have tranſcribed, or referred to; and to a paſſage in his thirtieth book, where he is profeſſedly treating on the point of marriage. For, having ſaid, as before ſhewn, that they did not compel, but only commended and exhorted to virginity, as the the catholics, he adds: 'And [t] indeed it 'would be no leſs than madneſs, for private perſons to forbid 'what is allowed by public authority.' It ſeems therefore that, following their doctrine, they might have been diſpoſed to prohibit marriage, if it had been in their power.

It is ſaid that [u] the Manichees were ſeverely treated by a king of Perſia for diſcouraging marriage.

I may mention another thought relating to this point, when I come to ſpeak of their notion concerning the tranſmigration of ſouls.

If the Manichees did not approve of marriage, they muſt have condemned fornication, and all ſuch like irregularities. This

[r] Neque enim juſta hæc nunc veſtra ſententia eſt, ut nos quidem, qui ſolum in hoc ſacerdotale hominum genus cenſeremus a carnibus abſtinere debere, de moribus doctrinæ videamur vobis affectibus. ib. c. 1. [*] See Beauſ. T. 2, p. 470, &c. [s] Auditoribus autem veſtris ——— ſecundum veniam concedenda conceditis. ——— Neque enim conceditur ſecundum veniam, niſi peccatum. Hoc vos de omni carnium cibo dicitis, hoc et ipſi ——— veſtros auditores docetis: ſed illis quod ſit ignoscendum, propter quod vobis neceſſaria miniſtrent, ut dixi, concedentes, non dicentes tale peccatum, ſed peccantibus veniam largientes. Aug. contr. Faud. l. 30, c. 5. [t] Et demens profecto ille, non tantum ſtultus putandus eſt, qui id exiſtimet lege privata prohiberi poſſe, quod ſit publica conceſſum: dico autem hoc ipſum nubere. ib. c. 4. [u] Rex vero Perſarum, cum videret tam Catholicos et epiſcopos, quam Manichæos Manetis ſectarios, a nuptiis abſtinere; in Manichæos quidem ſententiam morti dedit. Ad Chriſtianos vero idem edictum mutavit. ——— Quum igitur Chriſtiani ad regem confugiſſent, jutſit ille diſcrimen, quale inter utroſque eſſet, ſibi exponi. ap. Aſſem. Bib. Or. T. 3, p. 220.

is evident from The Acts of Archelaus, where Mani himſelf is made to ſay that [x] adultery, fornication, covetouſneſs, and other things, are fruits of the evil root. Nor is marriage here mentioned among evil things.

Auguſtine indeed charges them with allowing wicked ſenſual gratifications rather than marriage. But then, as [y] Beauſobre obſerves, he preſently adds: 'I [z] doubt not but you, at hearing 'this, will exclaim againſt it as injuſtice and calumny. You 'will ſay that you praiſe and recommend perfect chaſtity, but 'you do not forbid marriage; foraſmuch as you do not hinder 'your auditors, the ſecond order among you, from marrying and 'having wives.' It is not eaſy to conceive that [a] they, who ſeverely cenſured the polygamy of the patriarchs, ſhould approve of worſe things in Chriſtians.

XIII. It is a difficult queſtion whether the Manichees believed free-will. It is generally denied; but Beauſobre does not concur in that ſentence. He has diſcourſed largely upon this point, and I refer to [b] him. I ſhall however cite a part of what he ſays.

'If [c] by free-will be meant a power of doing good, and re-'ſiſting evil, it is certain that the Manichees aſcribed it to the 'ſoul, which was ſent into matter. For, firſt, when we ſhewed 'the opinion of theſe men concerning the creation of the world; 'we ſaw that, among the ſouls which God ſent to combat mat-'ter, there were ſome that preſerved their purity entire; others 'that were but little affected with the contagion of matter; and 'others that were ſo corrupted, that they were left in this lower 'ſtage of the world. The Creator placed them according to 'their merits. Secondly, when Auguſtine aſks Fortunatus why 'God ſent ſouls into matter, that Manichee anſwers, to [d] tame 'it, and reduce it to order. They muſt therefore have had the 'power of ſo doing. Finally, what ſuffers me not to doubt that 'Mani acknowledged the ſoul's liberty in it's ſtate of innocence,

[x] —— fructus autem fornicationes, adulteria, homicidia, avaritia, et omnes mali actus malæ iſtius radicis. ap. Arch. c. 17, p. 30. [y] T. 2, p. 473.

[z] Non enim concubitum, ſed ut longe ante ab apoſtolo dictum eſt, vere nuptiis prohibetis, quæ talis operis una eſt defenſio. Hic non dubito vos eſſe clamaturos, invidiamque facturos dicendo, caſtitatem perfectam vos vehementer commendare atque laudare, non tamen nuptias prohibere: quandoquidem auditores veſtri, quorum apud vos ſecundus eſt gradus, ducere atque habere non prohibentur uxores. De Mor. Manich. c. 18, n. 65. [a] Nec quod Jacob filius eius inter Rachel et Liam duas germanas ſorores, earumque ſingulas famulas, quatuor uxorum maritus, tamquam hircus erraverit: ut eſſet quotidie, inter quatuor ſcorta certamen, quarum eum venientem de agro prior ad concubitum raperet. Fauſt. l. 22, cap. 5. [b] T. 2, p. 433——448.

[c] Ib. p. 438. [d] —— et in contraria natura eſſe animam diximus, ideo ut contrariæ naturæ modum imponeret: modo impoſito contrariæ naturæ, ſumit eamdem Deus. Fort. Diſp. 2, n. 33. vid. et n. 34.

'is

'is a paſſage in his letter to Menoch; "the [e] firſt ſoul that came "from the God of light received the machine of the body to go-"vern it with a rein."

And, after a long diſcuſſion, that learned writer ſums up all in theſe three [f] propoſitions: '1. The Manichees allowed the ſoul 'to be free in it's origin, and its ſtate of innocence. For it had 'power to reſiſt evil, and to overcome it. 2. After it's fall it 'had not abſolutely loſt that power, but it had loſt the uſe, be-'cauſe it was ignorant of it's nature, and its origin, and it's true 'intereſts; and becauſe concupiſcence, which has it's ſeat in the 'fleſh, carries it away by an invincible force to do or allow that 'which it condemns; [or, in other words, the [g] ſoul has not loſt 'it's liberty, but ignorance on the one hand, and violence of 'paſſion on the other, hinder it from making uſe of it's power.] '3. The goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt delivers the ſoul from that ſer-'vitude, and gives it ſufficient power to ſubdue ſin, and to obey 'the law of God, provided it make uſe of the helps therein af-'forded.

After all which, Beauſobre makes divers obſervations upon the controverſy with the Manichees, as managed by ancient Chriſtian authors, and then concludes in this manner: Finally, 'I [h] 'allow that thoſe ancient writers in general ſay the Manichees 'denied free-will. The reaſon is, that the fathers believed and 'maintained againſt the Marcionites and Manichees, that what-'ever ſtate man is in he has the command over his own actions, 'and has equally power to do good and evil. Auguſtine him-'ſelf reaſoned upon this principle, as well as other catholics his 'predeceſſors, ſo long as he had to do with the Manichees. 'But when he came to diſpute with the Pelagians he changed 'his ſyſtem. Then he denied that kind of freedom which be-'fore he had defended: and, ſo far as I am able to judge, his 'ſentiment no longer differed from theirs concerning the ſervi-'tude of the will. He aſcribed that ſervitude to the corruption 'which original ſin brought into our nature: whereas the Mani-'chees aſcribed it to an evil quality, eternally inherent in [i] 'matter.'

XIV. Socrates ſaid that [k] the Manichees held the doctrine of Fate. Whether, and how far, they did ſo may be ſeen in [l] Beauſobre; for I do not chuſe to ſtay upon this point.

[e] Operæ, *inquit*, pretium eſt advertere, cuia prima anima, quæ a Deo luminis manavit, accepit fabricam iſtam corporis, ut eam freno ſuo regeret. Man. ap. Aug. Op. Imp. l. 3. c. 186.

[f] Ib. p. 447. [g] See p. 448.

[h] The ſame. [i] More obſervations upon Auguſtine may be ſeen in the ſame author, p. 435—438. [k] See before, 377. [l] T. 2. p. 424—432.

XV. It

XV. It is thought by ſome that [m] the Manichees denied the lawfulneſs of war.

XVI. Socrates informed us, that [n] the Manichees held the tranſmigration of ſouls; which is very true. It is taken notice of in [o] The Acts of Archelaus, [p] in Epiphanius, [q] Theodoret, and other authors.

Agapius, as abridged by Photius, ſays that '[r] ſouls, which 'have arrived at the perfection of virtue, return to God: they 'that have been very wicked are aſſigned to fire and darkneſs; 'but others of a middle rank, which have behaved but indif-'ferently, and are neither very good nor very bad, paſs into 'other bodies.' That is only a ſummary account: if we had Agapius himſelf we ſhould ſee more particulars.

A paſſage of Auguſtine may induce us to think it was their opinion, that [s] their elect needed no purification after this life: and likewiſe that their auditors in general, who were allowed to marry, trade, bear offices, and the like, paſſed into other bodies for purification, and farther trial.

The paſſage I have referred to is in Auguſtine's ſummary account of the Manichæan ſect. There is another like paſſage [t] in his work againſt Fauſtus, which I alſo put into the margin.

And perhaps this may afford an argument, that marriage, and other things, practiſed by the auditors, were rather tolerated than approved in the Manichæan ſcheme: for which reaſon they who lived in that ſtate would uſually need to be purified, and to be put upon another trial in ſome other body.

XVII. It is eaſy to conclude, from what has been already ſaid, that the Manichees did not believe the reſurrection of the body. As Theodoret ſays, 'they [u] derided the reſurrection of 'bodies. No part of matter, they ſaid, could be worthy of 'ſalvation.'

[m] See Beauſ. T. 2, p. 797, and the authors quoted by him. [n] See p. 377.

[o] Arch. c. 9, p. 15. [p] H. 66, n. 28.

[q] H. Fab. l. 1, c. 26, p. 214. A.

[r] Κρατεῖσι δὲ καὶ τῶν αἱρετικῶν τούτων, τὰς μὲν εἰς ἀκρότητα ἀρετῆς ἐλθούσας, εἰς θεὸν ἀναλύειν· τὰς δὲ εἰς ἄκρον κακίας πῦρ δίκας καὶ σκότος· τὰς δὲ μέσας πως φαύλως σπουδάσας πάλιν εἰς σώματα ἄγει. Phot. cod. 179, p. 105.

[s] Animas auditorum ſuorum in electos revolvi arbitrantur, aut feliciore compendio in eſcas electorum ſuorum, ut iam inde purgatæ in nulla corpora revertantur. Cæteras autem animas et in pecora redire putant, et in omnia quæ radicibus fixa ſunt, atque aluntur in terra. De H. c. 46.

[t] Quid autem fallitis auditores veſtros, qui cum ſuis uxoribus, et filiis, et familiis, et domibus, et agris vobis ſerviunt, ſi quiſquis illa omnia non dimiſerit, non accipit evangelium? ſed quia eis non reſurrectionem, ſed revolutionem ad iſtam mortalitatem promittitis, ut rurſus naſcantur, et vita electorum veſtrorum vivant,——aut ſi meliores meriti ſunt, in melones et cucumeres, vel in alios aliquos cibos veniant, quos vos manducaturi eſtis, ut veſtris metatibus cito purgentur, &c. Contr. Faut. l. 5, c. x.

[u] Τὴν δὲ σωμάτων ἀνάστασιν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλουσιν· ἀνάξιόν φασι τῆς θείας μοίρας εἶναι σωτηρίας. Theod. H. F. l. i. cap. ult. p. 214, A.

According

According to them, Chriſt came to ſave ſouls. So their opinion is repreſented [x] in The Acts of Archelaus. Auguſtine's account in his book Of Hereſies is, 'they [y] ſay that Chriſt came 'to ſave ſouls, not bodies.' Says Fortunatus, 'We [z] believe 'that Chriſt came to deliver the ſoul from death, and bring it 'back to eternal glory, and reſtore it to the Father.' Again, ſays the ſame Manichee, 'we [a] believe that our Saviour Chriſt 'came from heaven to fulfil the will of the Father: whoſe will 'is, that he ſhould deliver our ſouls from the enmity by ſlay-'ing it.'

Their notion about matter led them into this opinion: and they argued from [b] ſeveral texts of ſcripture, particularly from 1 Cor. xv. 50. *Fleſh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.*

They allowed a reſurrection of the ſoul now; when, [c] being enlightened by the doctrine of the goſpel, it purified itſelf from carnal affections. And they might ſpeak of the reſurrection or aſcent of the ſoul, when it ſhould return to God; but they abſolutely denied the reſurrection of bodies.

Souls, when they have finiſhed their purification here, return to the world of light, whence they came. But, which is ſomewhat ſtrange, they paſs by the way of the moon and the ſun; which [e] by the Manichees were conſidered as ſhips or veſſels of paſſage, by which ſouls return, and are conveyed to heaven.

According to them, the increaſe of the moon is cauſed by ſouls, or parts of light, aſcending thither from the earth; and it's decreaſe by the departure of ſouls, which are thence tranſmitted to the ſun. This appears abſurd, and might be incredible, if it was not affirmed by [f] Auguſtine, [g] Archelaus, [h] Titus of Boſtra, and [i] others.

[x] Επειδὴ τοίνυν αὐτὸς τὸν τῆς ἀπωλείας εἰς σώματα ἔλυσε. Ap. Arch. n. 8. p. 12.

[y] ——eumque Chriſtum noviſſimis temporibus veniſſe ad animas, non ad corpora liberanda. Aug. de H. c. 46.

[z] ——ut eamdem de morte liberaret, et perduceret eam ad æternam gloriam, et reformaret patri. Fortunat. Diſp. i. n. 11.

[a] Quemadmodum et ſalvatorem Chriſtum credimus de cœlo veniſſe, voluntatem Patris complere. Qua voluntas Patris hæc erat, animas nobiſcum de eadem inimicitia liberare, interfecta eadem inimicitia. Fortun. Diſp. i. n. 17. Vid. et Diſp. 2. n. 3.

[b] Vid. Epiph. Har. 6, c. 86, 87. Aug. contr. Adim. c. 12, n. 4. Contr. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 3.

[c] —— qui fictitiis tuis non niſi reſurrectionem tantummodo animarum, per prædicationem veritatis: corporum autem, quam prædicaverunt apoſtoli, naturam negetis. Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 1. c. 2.

[d] Vid. Fortunat. Diſp. i. n. 7, ii. n. 33.

[e] Quicquid vero undique purgatur luminis, per quaſdam naves, quas eſſe lunam et ſolem volunt, regno Dei, tanquam propriis ſedibus redditur. Aug. de Hær. c. 46, sub in. ——quod delira imperitia Manichæi opinantes, repleri eam dicunt, ſicut repletur navis, ex fugitiva Dei parte.——Hinc ergo impleri lunam dicunt, cum eadem pars Dei magnis laboribus ab inquinamento purgatur, de toto mundo——fugiens, redditur Deo ——repleri vero per menſem dimidium, et alio dimidio in ſolem refundi, velut in aliam navem. Aug. Epiſt. 55, [al. 119] cap. 4. n. 7.

[f] See the preceding note.

[g] Ἐρεῖς γάρ, ὅτι σκάφη εἰσὶ λέγοντες δεῖ φωτὸς· εἶτα ἐκ γεωσεβῶν καὶ ἀθέων, μετατίθεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου κόσμου. Ap. Arch. n. 8. p. 13.

[h] Tit. l. i. p. 69. in.

[i] Epiph. H. 66, n. 9, p. 626, B. C. Thdrt. T. 4. p. 213, C.

XVIII.

XVIII. The Manichees expected a future judgment, as [k] before ſhewn; and more paſſages might be alleged: Mani [l] profeſſeth it in The Acts of Archelaus.

But it is doubtful whether they believed the eternity of hell torments.

Mani, in the diſpute with Archelaus, ſays that [c] all [m] ſorts [c] of ſouls will be ſaved, and the loſt ſheep will be brought back [c] to the fold.' A paſſage of the Epiſtle of the Foundation, preſerved by the author De Fide, ſeems to ſpeak [n] of ſome ſouls as loſt, which ſhall be for ever excluded from the holy land, and the regions of light and happineſs. They are ſuch as have been enemies to the light, and have perſecuted the church, and the elect therein.

Auguſtine ſeems to have ſuppoſed it to be their opinion that [o] ſome ſouls would finally periſh. And, in his arguments with them, he often inſiſts upon it as an undeniable thing, that [p] all the light that was mixed with darkneſs, or all the good or celeſtial ſubſtance that was ſent into matter at the formation of the world, would never be again entirely ſeparated from it; which he conſiders as a great objection againſt their ſcheme.

Simplicius likewiſe argues with them upon the ſuppoſition that [q] ſome parts of the good ſubſtance, or ſome ſouls, are for ever loſt, and never again ſeparated from the evil ſubſtance.

In

[k] See p. 440. [l] Dicat tamen ipſe, ſi eſt judicium piorum et impiorum. *Manes dixit:* Eſt judicium. Ap. Arch. n. 32, p. 54. [m] Et ſalvabitur omne animarum genus, ac reſtituetur quod perierat proprio ſuo gregi. Ap. Arch. c. 25, p. 41, 42. [n] Item in epiſtola fundamenti ſic dicit de illis animabus, quæ mundi amore errare ſe a priore lucida ſua natura paſſæ ſunt,——infeſta etiam perſecutione ſua ſanctam eccleſiam atque electos in eadem conſtitutos cœleſtium præceptorum obſervatores afflixerunt, a beatitudine et gloria ſanctæ terræ arcentur. Et quia a malo ſe ſuperari paſſæ ſunt, in eadem mala ſtirpe perſeverabunt, pacifica illa terra et regionibus immortalibus ſibimet interdictis. De Fide cap. 5. ap. Aug. T. 8.

[o] Ipſi enim dicunt, Deum genti tenebrarum æternum carcerem præparare, quam dicunt eſſe inimicam Deo. Et parum eſt, ſed etiam ſua membra ſimul cum ipſa gente puniturum eſſe non dubitant dicere. Contr. Adim. c. vii. n. 1. Dicunt enim etiam nonnullas animas, quas volunt eſſe de ſubſtantia Dei, et quidem omnino naturæ, quæ non ſponte peccaverunt, ſed a gente tenebrarum, quam mali naturam dicunt, ad quam debellandam non ultro, ſed Patris imperio deſcenderant, ſuperatæ et oppreſſæ ſint, affigi in æternum globo horribili tenebrarum. De Nat. Boni. c. 42. [p] Quarum inter ſe pugnam et commixtionem, et boni a malo purgationem, et boni quod purgari non poterit in æternum damnationem, ſecundum ſua dogmata aſſeverantes, &c. Aug. de Hær. c. 46, ſub in. Deum denique bonum et verum dicunt cum tenebrarum gente pugnaſſe, et partem ſuam tenebrarum principibus miſcuiſſe, eamque toto mundo inquinatam et ligatam per cibos Electorum ſuorum, ac per ſolem et lunam purgari aſſeverant. Et quod purgari de ipſa parte Dei non poterit, in fine ſæculi æterno ac penali vinculo colligari. —— Aug. Ep. 236, [al. 74.] Natura vero Dei cautior ducta eſt, iniqua facta eſt, nec potuit tota purgari, cogitur in fine damnari. Contr. Secund. c. 20, ſub fin. Nunc vero miſeri audent adhuc dicere, nec totam poſſe purgari, et ipſam partem, quæ purgari non potuerit, proficere ad vinculum.—— et affigetur in æternum carcere tenebrarum. De Agon. Chriſtian. cap. iv. Opp. T. 6. [q] Αὐτοὶ δὲ τὸ ἐπιγεῖον, τὸ ἁγιον

In his ſummary account, Auguſtine repreſents it to be their opinion, that [r] the dæmons ſhall in the end be buried alive in the hideous maſs of darkneſs, and that ſome ſouls will be appointed to keep them faſt ſhut up, and watch them as guards, and cover the kingdom of light from all attempts of the princes of darkneſs. He ſpeaks to the like purpoſe [s] elſewhere. Nor is this diſagreeable to a paſſage of Mani's Epiſtle of the Foundation, as [t] cited by the author De Fide.

All which however, as Beauſobre ſays, means no more than a privation of happineſs, or a labour and taſk, rather than a puniſhment. Indeed, it is reaſonable to think the [x] Manichees ſhould allow but very few, if any ſouls, to be loſt and periſh for ever. That could not be reckoned honourable to the Deity, conſidering how ſouls were ſent into matter. The doctrine of tranſmigration may have been contrived for this purpoſe. The Manichees were very generous in this reſpect; they allowed ſouls no leſs than five [y] bodies for trial.

XIX. The Manichees believed that after a certain period this [z] viſible world would be conſumed by fire. But, as [a] Turbo ſays in The Acts of Archelaus, he had not been informed how long it would be before that happened. However, Ebed-Jeſu, quoted by [b] Beauſobre, ſays, that [c] according to the Manichees

ὁσιοι, εἰς το ἀγαθον, ἀλλα μενουσι τῳ κακῳ εἰς ἀναλλοιωσιαν. In Epiſt. c. 34, p. 165. — κατα τινας, ὡς περιτειχισμενοι, ψυχας ἀναγκη περι αὐτους ἐν τῳ καιρῳ τοῦ λοιπου τον ἀτειχον αἰωνα. Ib. p. 166.

[r] Sed a nobis ſeiunctam atque ſecluſam in ſuam naturam illam mali, et finito illo ſeculo per conflagrationem mundi in globo quodam, tamquam in carcere ſempiterno, eſſe victuram. Cui globo affirmant acceſſuram ſemper et adhæſurum quaſi cooperto rium atque tectorium ex animabus, natura quidem bonis, ſed tamen quæ non potuerint a naturæ malæ contagione mundari. De Hær. c. 46, in fin. [s] Dicat quod vult, includat in globo tamquam in carcere gentem tenebrarum, et forinſecus affliget naturam lucis,——ecce pejor eſt pœna lucis quam tenebrarum, pejor eſt pœna divinæ naturæ quam gentis adverſæ. Illa quippe, etſi in tenebris intus eſt, ad naturam ſuam pertinet in tenebris habitare. Animæ autem quæ hoc ſunt quod Deus,——a vita ac libertate ſanctæ lucis alienantur, et conſigentur in prædicto horribili globo. De Nat. Bon. c. 42, ſub fin. ——naturamque naturam bonam malo coercendo ſuperandoque miſcuiſſe, quam turpiſſime pollutam——labore magno vix tandem ac liberet, non totam tamen: ſed quod ejus non potuerit ab illa inquinatione purgari, tegmen ac vinculum futurum hoſtis victi et incluſi. De Civ. Dei l. xi. c. 22. [t] Non igitur poterunt recipi in regna pacifica, ſed configentur in prædicto horribili globo, cui etiam neceſſe eſt cuſtodiæ adhiberi. Ap. libr. de Fide, c. 5. Conf. Aug. contr. Faust. l. 21, c. 16. et de Nat. Boni. cap. 42.

[u] Ainſi la peine de ces ames n'eſt proprement qu'une privation de felicité, et un travail plutôt qu' une ſupplice. Beauſ. T. 2, p. 574. [x] C' eſt un fait conſtant. Les Manicheens n'ont point cru la perte éternelle d'aucune ame. Ib. p. 572, in.

[y] Ἐξ ὑλης και τουτο, παρ' ἡμιν παγγιζεται ἡ ψυχης στεγη σωματα. Ap. Arch. n. 9, in. Vid. et Epiph. H. 66, c. 28, in.

[z] Vid. ſupr. not. [r].

[a] —— ἀχρις αν το τοις κατω κοσμοις ὁλοι, ἐν πυρι ποτε ἐσται, ἐκκαυθω τον ποσοτητα Ap. Arch. c. 11. p. 22.

[b] T. 2, p. 580. [c] Manichæi reſurrectionem abnegantes contra Chriſtianos jejunium luctumque in die dominico faciunt, aientes, in ipſo die fore ut hoc ſeculum ſubeat interitum diſſolutionemque omnem poſt circulum novem millium annorum. Ap. Aſſem. Bib. Or. Gr. T. 3, P. 2, p. 561.

the

the world would come to an end when it had ſubſiſted nine thouſand years.

XX. The Manichees were Chriſtians, as was particularly ſhewn above. But they rejected the Old Teſtament, and pretended they [c] could there ſee no prophecies about Chriſt, neither in Moſes, nor in the other prophets. They therefore wanted that argument of faith in Jeſus. As [f] Fauſtus ſays, 'being Gentiles by nature, and not Jews, they came directly to Chriſt, excited by the fame of his virtues and wiſdom.' He farther ſays, that 'they [g] were induced to believe in Jeſus for the ſake of the voice of God, not ſpeaking by a prophet or interpreter, but ſaying himſelf, when he ſent his Son from heaven: *This is my beloved Son, hear him.*' 'We [h] alſo believe his own word, who ſaid: *I came forth from the Father, and came into the world:* and much more to the like purpoſe.' 'Moreover [i] he appeals to his works: *If ye believe not me, believe the works:* (Joh. x. 38.) He does not ſay, believe the prophets.' For ſuch reaſons then they believed in Jeſus Chriſt, and received him as the Son of God, and their Lord and Saviour.

XXI. The Manichees believed Jeſus Chriſt to be God, but not man. They believed him to be God truly, man in appearance only.

Turbo, once diſciple of Mani, in The Acts of Archelaus, repreſents his maſter's opinion upon that head in this manner: 'The [k] Son of God came and took the form of a man. He appeared to men as a man, though he was not a man, and they took him for a man born.'

In the ſame work Mani is brought in ſaying, that '[l] Jeſus appeared indeed in the form of a man, but yet was not a man.'

[d] See p. 437. [e] Alioquin nihil eos de Chriſto prophetaſſe abunde jam parentum libris oſtenſum eſt. Fauſt. l. 12. Conf. l. 13, in.

Quia omnem, ut dixi, Moyſcos ſcripturam ſcrutatus, nullas ibi de Chriſto prophetias inveni. Id. l. 16, c. 3.

[f] Quomodo Chriſtum colitis, prophetas repudiantes, quorum ex præſagiis accipitur fuiſſe venturum?——Porro autem nos natura Gentiles ſumus——non anti effecti Judæi, ut merito Hebræorum ſequeremur fidem, euntes ad Chriſtianiſmum; ſed ſola exciti fama, et virtutum opinione, atque ſuſpentia liberatoris noſtri Chriſti Jeſu. Id. l. 13. [g] ——quis fidelior vobis eſſe teſtis debet, quam Deus ipſe de Filio ſuo, qui non per vatem, nec per interpretem, ſed ultro cœlitus erupta voce, cum eum mitteret ad terram dixit: Hic eſt Filius meus dilectiſſimus: Credite illi. Id. l. 12.

[h] Nec non et ipſe de ſe: A Patre meo proceſſi, et veni in hunc mundum; atque multa alia hujuſmodi. Ib.

[i] Ad hæc et opera ipſa ſua ſibi in teſtimonium vocat: Si mihi non creditis, dicens, operibus credite. Non dixit, ſi mihi non creditis, prophetis credite. ibid.

[k] Και ελθων ο υιος μετεσχηματισεν εαυτον εις ανθρωπον, και εφανη τοις ανθρωποις ως ανθρωπος, μη ων ανθρωπος, και οι ανθρωποι υπελαβον αυτον γεγεννησθαι. Ap. Arch. c. 8, p. 12. [l] Sicut vos Jeſus oſtendit, ejus qui apparuit quidem in hominis ſpecie, nec tamen fuit homo. Ap. Arch. c. 47, p. 85.

Ancient

Ancient catholic authors often take notice of this opinion of theirs, and repreſent it after this manner.

Auguſtine in his ſummary account of their principles ſays, 'they [m] deny the real fleſh of Chriſt, and affirm that he had only 'the appearance of fleſh: and that neither his death nor his 'reſurrection was real.' In another place, that 'they [n] believed 'not a real, but only a ſeeming imaginary death of Chriſt, and 'no nativity at all, not ſo much as in appearance.'

In another place Auguſtine ſays, 'they [o] do not deny our Lord 'Jeſus Chriſt to be God, but they pretend that he appeared to 'men without taking the human nature.'

Theodoret's account is, 'they [r] ſay that Chriſt took neither 'ſoul nor body, but appeared as a man, though he had nothing 'human; and that his croſs, paſſion, and death, were in appear-'ance only.'

Athanaſius ſays the [q] Manichees deny that the Word was made fleſh. Again, they [r] do not believe our Lord's incarnation and humanity.

Ambroſe ſays they [s] did not believe that Chriſt came in the fleſh.

Jerom ſpeaks of [t] their allowing the ſalvation of the ſoul only, and ſaying that both the birth and the reſurrection of Chriſt were in appearance only: and therefore we cannot form an argument for the reſurrection of our bodies from his reſurrection, becauſe he roſe in appearance only.

So ſay the catholics. Let us now obſerve the Manichees themſelves, that we may judge whether they have been miſrepreſented.

It is plain that, according to them, Jeſus was pure deity. The

[m] Nec fuiſſe in carne vera, ſed ſimulatam ſpeciem carnis ludificandis humanis ſenſibus præbuiſſe, ubi non ſolum mortem, ſed etiam reſurrectionem ſimiliter mentiatur. De H. c. 46. [n] Cur ipſi mortem non veram, ſed imaginariam Chriſti ſentiant; nativitatem autem non ſaltem veram, ſed prorſus nullam delegerunt? Cont. Fauſt. l. 29, c. 3.

——cum ipſi dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum Deum eſſe non negent, et aſſumtione humani corporis cum hominibus apparuiſſe confingant. Aug. de Gen. 12. [al. de diverſis 16.] cap. 8.

[o] Τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἀρνοῦνται ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν θεὸν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ φαίνεσθαι μὲν ἀνθρώποις, ἀνθρωπίνην δὲ οὐκ ἔχειν τὴν φύσιν. Haer. F. T. 4, p. 213, 214.

[q] ——ἀρνεῖται τὸν λόγον σὰρξ γενέσθαι. Ath. Or. i. contr. Arian. p. 455, D.

[r] Οὕτω δὲ μανιχαῖος ἀπιστήσας τὴν σάρκωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τοῦ κυρίου. Contr. Apoll. l. i. p. 939, D. [s] ——Cum Manichæus adoraverit, quem in carne veniſſe non credidit. Ambr. de Fid. l. 5, c. 14, T. 2, p. 583, E.

[t] Hæreticos vero, in quorum parte ſunt Marcion, Apelles, Valentinus, Manes, nomen inſaniæ, penitus et carnis et corporis reſurrectionem negare, et ſalutem tantum tribuere animæ; nuſquamque nos dicere ad exemplum Domini reſurrecturos, quum ipſe quoque Dominus in phantaſmate reſurrexerit; et non ſolum reſurrectio eius, ſed et ipſa nativitas τῷ δοκεῖν, id eſt, putative vita magis ſit quam fuerit. Hier. ad Pamm. Ep. 38, [al. 61.] T. 4, p. 320, m.

catholics argued that Christ had been foretold in the books of Moses, particularly in Deut. xviii. 18. *I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee: him shall ye hear.* How does Faustus answer that argument? It is in this manner: 'That [u] this does not belong to Christ, any one may see: for 'Christ is not a prophet, nor a prophet like unto Moses. Moses 'was a man, Christ is God. He was a sinner, Christ holy. He 'was born in the ordinary way; Christ, according to you was 'born of a virgin, according to me not at all.——How then can 'he be a prophet like unto Moses?'

Faustus often denies Christ's [x] nativity: and again and again insists upon the impropriety that [y] God, and the God of the Christians too, should be born.

They pretended that it was dishonourable for Christ to be born of a woman. This argument is taken notice of in The Acts of [z] Archelaus.

It is easy to suppose that the catholic Christians put these people in mind of those texts of the New Testament, where Jesus is said to be the son of David, of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and the like: to which, however, they gave answers, such as they are.

The Manichees argued from the first chapter of St. John's gospel, ver. 5. *And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.* The light is the Word, or the divine nature: the darkness, according to them, is the flesh, or matter, the evil substance. The light shined in the darkness, but the darkness could not touch, seize, lay hold of the light: nor indeed would the light touch the darkness, or suffer itself to be touched by it. This thought is in a fragment of one of Mani's [b] letters.

[u] —— Sed hæc quidem ad Christum minime spectare, nec Judæum latet, nec nobis sic credere conducit ipsi est: quia non propheta Christus, nec Moysi similis propheta: siquidem ille fuit homo, hic Deus; ille peccator, hic sanctus; ille ex coitu natus, hic secundum te ex virgine, secundum me vero nec ex virgine. Faust. l. 16. c. 4. [x] Accipis evangelium? Et maxime. Proinde ergo et natum accipis Christum? Non ita est. Neque enim sequitur, ut si evangelium accipis, ideo nec et natum accipiam Christum. Faust. l. 5, in.

[y] Accipis ergo generationem? Equidem conatus diu sum hoc ipsum quodcumque est persuadere mihi, quia sit natus Deus. ——Quamvis nec sic quidem dignum erit ex utero natum credere Deum, et Deum Christianorum. Id. l. 3 in. et fin.

Sed non, inquit, accipere evangelium hoc solum est, si quod præcipit facias: sed ut etiam credas omnibus quæ in eo scripta sunt, quorum primum est illud, quia sit natus Deus. Id. l. 5, c. 2.

[z] Ergo non putas, cum ex Maria virgine esse? *Manes dixit:* Absit, ut Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum per naturalia pudenda mulieris descendisse confitear. ap. Arch. c. 47, p. 85. Vid. et cap. 5. p. 8. [a] Apostolum accipis? Et maxime. Cur ergo non credis Filium Dei, ex semine David, natum secundum carnem? —— Faust. l. xi. in.

[b] Μικ τε φωτος εστιν απλη και αληθης φυσις, και για αυτε η ειρηνη· το φως γας εν τη σκοτια φαινει, και η σκοτια αυτο ε καλυπτει· η γας εσια ηψατο σαρκος, αλλ' ουδ' ολως· ουτε σωματι σαρκος εσκιασθη, ουτε δια της σαρκος, και παλιν, και φθαρτον, τοτε ουν ειρηνη φθειρεσης αυτο τ. Manet. Ep. Zebin. ap. Lardner, B. Gr. T. v. p. 284.

And

And this leads us to think that this notion was chiefly owing to their doctrine of two principles. Believing matter, of which the body is formed, to be evil in itself, they could not allow a divine person to be united to the human nature; and [c] therefore they pretended that our Lord had only the appearance of flesh without the reality.

They said that [d] Christ came directly from heaven. They argued this from all those texts where [e] our Lord speaks of his coming from the Father, being sent by the Father, and the like.

They argued likewise that our Lord was not born of a woman, because [f] when some weak people, as they call them, told him his mother and his brethren stood without, he answered, *Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?* Matth. xii. 47, 48. This text was often insisted on by them; and their argument is handsomely answered by [g] Jerom. Indeed, any men, not under the biass of some prejudice, might perceive that our Lord does not here disown any earthly relations; but, preserving a due affection for them, he declares that he considered every truly good man and woman as his mother, his brother, and sister; that is, all such were dear to him. And he teaches us not to suffer ourselves to be diverted from any important service by the unseasonable importunities of earthly friends and relatives. Augustine observes they [h] might as well argue that the disciples had no earthly fathers, because Christ says to them: *Call no man your father upon earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven:* Matt. xxiii. 9.

As they were greatly pressed by the catholic argument from the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, they endeavoured to evade it many ways. Sometimes they disputed [i] the genuineness

[c] See Beauf. T. i. p. 378.

[d] Mihi enim pium videtur dicere, quod nihil eguerit filius Dei, in eo quod adventus ejus procuratur ad terras, neque opus habuerit columba, neque baptismate, neque matre, neque fratribus, fortasse neque patre, qui ei secundum te fuit Josephus; sed totus ille ipse descendens, &c. Manes ap. Arch. c. 50. p. 91. [e] Ipse enim testimonium dat, quia de finibus Patris descendit. Et. *qui me recipit, recepit eum qui me misit.* Et, *non veni facere voluntatem meam, sed ejus qui misit me.* Et, *non sum missus nisi ad oves perditas Israel.* Sunt et alia innumera testimonia hujusce modi, quæ indicant eum venisse, non natum esse. ap. Arch. c. 47, p. 85.

[f] Manes dixit: Similis tui quidam, cum ei aliquando dixisset, *Maria mater tua*, et fratres tui foris *stant*, non libenter accipiens, eum qui dixerat, increpavit, dicens: Quæ est mater mea, aut qui sunt fratres mei? et ostendit eos, qui facerent voluntatem suam, et matres sibi esse et fratres. ap. Arch. ib. p. 85. [g] Non ergo juxta Marcionem et Manichæum matrem negavit, ut natus de phantasmate putaretur; sed apostolos cognationi prætulit, ut et nos in comparatione dilectionis carni spiritum præferamus. In Matt. T. 4, p. 52, f. [h] Cujus rei exemplum præbuit prior ipse dicendo: Quæ mihi mater, aut qui fratres? Unde volunt quidam pernicio sissimi hæretici asserere, non eum habuisse matrem. Nec vident esse consequens, si hæc verba attendant, ut nec discipuli ejus patres habuerint: quia sicut ipse dixit, quæ mihi mater est; sic illos docuit, cum ait: Nolite vobis dicere patrem in terris. Enarr. in Ps. ix. n. 31. T. 4.

[i] Vid. Faust. l. 2, et 7.

of thoſe genealogies, and [k] they inſiſted upon the differences and ſeeming contrarieties in them, as recorded by thoſe two evangeliſts. They likewiſe argued that [l] they were contrary to all thoſe declarations of Chriſt, where he diſowned all earthly kindred, and ſaid he came from heaven, and was not of this world.

They argued from Chriſt's eſcape from the Jews, when they would have ſtoned him: ſee John viii. 59. This argument is in Mani himſelf: 'By [m] that eſcape,' he ſays, 'Chriſt ſhewed his 'eſſence, and that he was the Son of the true light: he went 'away from them without being ſeen. The immaterial form 'was not viſible, nor tangible, though there was the appearance 'of fleſh. For what is material can have no communion 'with an immaterial ſubſtance, though this appear in the form 'of fleſh.' It is likely that [n] here is a reference to thoſe words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 14: *What communion hath light with darkneſs?*

They argued from our Lord's transfiguration. Mani himſelf in a fragment ſays: 'The [o] Son of the eternal light manifeſted 'his nature on the mount.'

In another fragment [p] Mani banters the Galileans, as he calls them, for believing two natures in Chriſt, not conſidering that the nature of light cannot be mixed with matter: 'For it is ſim-'ple and uncompounded, and cannot be joined to matter. The 'ſupreme light, being among material things, ſhewed a body, 'whilſt ſtill it was one nature only.'

Theſe, and ſuch like arguments, had great influence upon Auguſtine's mind for a long time, as [q] he humbly owns.

Farther, we find Fauſtus arguing from [r] our Saviour's eſcape

[k] Vid. eund. l. 3. [l] Quare non credis in genealogiam Jeſu? Multæ quidem ſunt cauſſæ. Sed palmaris illa, quia nec ipſe ore ſuo uſquam ſe fatetur patrem habere, aut genus in terra, ſed e contra, quia non ſit de hoc mundo, quia a Patre Deo proceſſerit, quia deſcenderit de cælo, quia non ſibi ſint mater et fratres, niſi qui fecerint voluntatem Patris ſui qui *in* cœlis eſt. Fauſt. l. 7. [m] Ιουδαιοι βουλομενοι ποτε λιθασαι τον χριστον,——ειδεξε σαφως την αυτου θειαν ουσιαν ο του αληθινου φως υιος, και μετ' αυτων διελθων ουκ ωφθη· η γαρ αυλος ουδ' ευσχηματισμενη το ειδος της σαρκος ωρατο ην δε, ειδητ εξιστο δε αδηλος, δια το μηδεμιαν εχειν κοινωνιαν την υλην προς το αυλον, ει και σαρκος ωρατο μορφη. Man. Ep. ad. Cudar. ap. Fabr. ib. p. 285.

[n] See Beauſ. T. 2, p. 530.

[o] ο δε του αιδιου φως υιος την ιδιαν φυσιν εν τω ορει εφηνε φυσει. ap. Fabr. B. Gr. l. 5. p. 285. [p] Των γαλιλαιων δυο φυσεις συνημαζοντων εχειν τον χριστον, πλατυς αυτων εχομεν γελωτα——το δε αμιγατον φως των εαυτω συνεπιμιγεν ειδεξεν εαυτο εν τοις υλικοις σωμασι σωμα, μια ων αυτος φυσις το παν. ap. Fabr. ib.

[q] Ipſum quoque ſalvatorem noſtrum unigenitum tuum, tamquam de maſſa luciditſimæ molis tuæ porrectum ad noſtram ſalutem, ita putabam.——Talem itaque naturam ejus naſci non poſſe de Maria virgine arbitrabar, niſi carni concerneretur. Concerni enim et non inquinari non videbam, quod mihi tale figurabam. Metuebam itaque credere in carne natum, ne credere cogerer ex carne inquinatum. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. x. n. 20.

[r] Legitur id quoque, quod de ſupercilio montis jactatus aliquando a Judæis, illæſus abierit. &c. Fauſt. l. 26, c. 2.

at Nazareth, when the people would have caſt him down from the brow of the hill; or, as he ſays, when they did ſo, and yet he eſcaped.

And to prove that Jeſus was man in appearance only, they [s] referred to thoſe words in Philip. ii. 8. *And was found in faſhion as a man.*

Whereas it was objected to them that [t] if Jeſus had not been born, and had not an human body, he could not have been ſeen or heard by men: they anſwered that angels had been ſeen, and had converſed with men, though they had not human bodies.

XXII. As the Manichees did not believe that Chriſt was born, or had true body, ſo neither did they believe that he was really crucified, or that he died. They did not deny [u] that he was apprehended by the Jews, and, ſo far as in them lay, faſtened to the croſs, and that he ſeemed to die: but they did not allow that he really died.

So Fauſtus ſays without any heſitation or ambiguity: 'We [x] 'own that he ſuffered in appearance, but he did not really die.' Again: 'It [y] is our opinion that Jeſus did not die.' He likewiſe ſays: 'As [z] from the beginning, having taken the likeneſs of 'man, he appeared to have all the infirmities of the human ſtate; 'ſo, at the concluſion of his tranſaction here, it was not improper 'that he ſhould ſeem to die.'

Mani himſelf in his fragment ſays: 'A [b] ſimple nature does 'not die, nor is an appearance of fleſh crucified.' And [c] more to the like purpoſe.

Auguſtine [d] paſſeth a juſt cenſure upon their notion of a ſeeming death, and an imaginary, deceitful reſurrection.

Nevertheleſs they often ſpeak [e] of Chriſt's being made ſubject

[s] Sed totus ille ipſe deſcendens ſemetipſum in quocumque voluit transformavit in hominem, eo pacto quo Paulus dicit, habitu repertus eſt ut homo. ap. Arch. n. 50, p. 91. [t] Nam illud quidem quod ſæpe affirmare ſoletis, neceſſario eum eſſe natum, quia alias hominibus videri aut loqui non poſſet, ridiculum eſt: cum multoties, ut jam probatum a noſtris eſt, angeli, et viſi hominibus et locuti eſſe narrentur. Fauſt. l. 29, c. 1. f.

See Beauſ. T. i. p. 228, 229.

[u] Denique nos ſpecie tenus paſſum confitemur, nec vere mortuum. Fauſt. l. 29 c. 1. [x] Alioquin nobis nec Jeſus mortuus eſt, qui eſt immortalis Elias. Id. l. 26, c. 2. f. [y] Ut enim ab initio tantæ hominis [illegible] tantæ humanæ conditioni [illegible] ſubjecta, ne ab ea non erat, ſi in fine quoque conſignandæ œconomiæ gratia fuiſſet viſus et mori. Id. l. 26, c. 1. f.

[b] Απλη φυσις ου αποθνησκει, και σκια σαρκος ε σταυρεται. Manes ap. Fabr. T. 5, p. 284. [c] Πως ει παθε, μητε της καθ' ημας κρατουσης. μητε της επιφανους αυτη σκοτιζουσης; Id. ibid. [d] Sed illud eſt quod magiæ ſimile dicimini aſſerere, quod paſſionem mortemque ejus ſpecie tenus factam, et fallaciter dicitis adumbratam, ut mori videretur, qui non moriebatur. Ex quo fit, ut ejus quoque reſurrectionem umbraticam, imaginariam, falſamque dicatis: neque enim ejus, qui non vere mortuus eſt, vera reſurrectio eſſe poteſt. Ita fit, ut et electrices diſcipulis dubitantibus falſas oſtenderit. &c. Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 29, c. 2. [e] Hoc ergo ſentimus de nobis quod et de Chriſto, qui cum in forma

to death, buried, and raiſed from the dead by the power of the Father. They believed that [f] for our ſalvation Chriſt hung upon the croſs. And therefore Fauſtus pretends to be exceſſively angry with Moſes for that ſaying: *Curſed is every one that hangeth on a tree:* Deut. xxi. 23. They likewiſe ſpeak [g] of our Lord's ſhewing the marks of his wounds for curing the unbelief of Thomas.

As the Manichees did not believe Chriſt to have been born, nor to have a real body, they denied his baptiſm, and ſome other facts related in the goſpels. For proof of this, and likewiſe for farther ſhewing their opinion concerning our Lord's crucifixion, I ſhall here produce part of a paſſage of Fauſtus, which muſt be alleged hereafter upon another account more at large.

'We [h] reject divers other things which have been ſince added 'to the hiſtory of Chriſt; as that he was born of a woman, circumciſed like a Jew, that he ſacrificed like a heathen, that he 'debaſed himſelf ſo unworthily as to be baptized, and was then 'carried into the wilderneſs, and miſerably tempted of the devil. 'Excepting theſe things, and the quotations of the Old Teſtament, which have been clandeſtinely inſerted, we believe all the 'reſt, and eſpecially his myſtic crucifixion, by which he diſcovers to us the wounds of our ſoul.'

Theſe things need no anſwer. It would be waſte of time to ſtay to confute what any one may preſently perceive to be weak and abſurd. I ſhall however add a word or two by way of explication.

In what is ſaid of Chriſt's ſacrificing, perhaps he refers to our Lord's keeping the paſſover, and to the offering made by Mary for her purification: ſee Luke ii. 24.

As they paid no regard to the inſtitutions of Moſes, and denied our Lord to be born, or to have real fleſh, it is no wonder that they excepted againſt the things juſt mentioned, and to his circumciſion.

forma Dei eſſet conſtitutus, factus eſt ſubditus uſque ad mortem, ut ſimilitudinem animarum noſtrarum offenderet. Et quemadmodum in ſe mortis ſimilitudinem oſtendit, et ſe a Patre eſſe de medio mortuorum reſuſcitatum: eo modo ſentimus et de animis noſtris futurum, quod per ipſum noverimus ab hac morte liberari. Fortun. Diſp. i. n. 7. [f] Quapropter et nos Moyſen, —— plus tamen hinc exſecramur, quod Chriſtum filium Dei, qui noſtræ ſalutis cauſa pependit in ligno diro devotionis contumelia laceſſivit.——Ait enim maledictum eſſe omnem qui pendet in ligno. Fauſt. l. 14. c. 1. in. [g] —— cum Chriſtus Thomam apoſtolum dubitantem de reſurrectione non ſit, ſed quo animi eius vulneribus mederetur, corporis ſui cicatrices oſtendit. Fauſt. l. 16, c. 8.

[h] Dico autem hoc ipſum natum ex femina turpiter, circumciſum judaice, ſacrificaſſe gentiliter, baptizatum humiliter, circumductum a diabolo per deſerta, et ibi tentatum quam miſerrime. His igitur exceptis, et —— credimus cætera, præcipue crucis eius myſticam fixionem, quæ noſtræ animæ paſſionis monſtrantur vulnera. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 7.

In

In The Acts of Archelaus, Mani is repreſented [i] excepting againſt the account of Chriſt's baptiſm, becauſe that ordinance ſignified remiſſion of ſins, whereas Jeſus was free from ſin. But there is no juſt ground for that exception in the hiſtory of our Lord's baptiſm, as recorded by the evangeliſts.

As for their denying Chriſt's temptation, undoubtedly that is a conſequence of their ſuppoſition that Chriſt was God and not man.

As for the myſtic, figurative crucifixion, it is likely that the paſſages above tranſcribed may be of uſe to enable the reader to form ſome notion of their meaning. I likewiſe refer [k] to Beauſobre.

Fauſtus does elſewhere ſpeak of a [l] paſſible Jeſus. And [m] Secundinus has ſomewhat to the like purpoſe: but the meaning is not obvious. I apprehend that if we had Agapius, or more of Mani's works, we might underſtand this, and ſome other things, better than we do.

Before I quit this article, I chuſe to put down ſome obſervations of Beauſobre which may afford uſeful illuſtrations.

'The grace of the Saviour,' ſays [n] he briefly, 'conſiſts in enabling the ſoul to underſtand it's nature, it's origin, it's duties, it's hopes, and in giving it neceſſary aſſiſtances for breaking the chains of carnal paſſions.' In other places more largely: 'The [o] grace of Jeſus Chriſt has ſeveral branches: but the principal is the giving the ſoul the knowledge of it's nature and origin, which it had in a manner loſt ſince it's union with matter. Another branch is diſcovering to the ſoul the ſnares of the devil, the means of eſcaping them, and of returning to it's heavenly country. This is what Fortunatus ſays to Auguſtine: "As [p] we ſin unwillingly, and are compelled by the ſubſtance which is adverſe and contrary to us, we endeavour to gain the knowledge

[i] Manes dixit: Ergo baptiſma propter remiſſionem peccatorum datur? Archelaus dixit: Etiam. Manes dixit: Ergo peccavit Chriſtus, quia baptizatus eſt; Archelaus dixit: Abſit. Hyp. Arch. c. 50, p. 94.

[k] See him T. 2, p. 546.

Necnon et Spiritus Sancti,——aeris hunc omnem ambitum ſedem fatemur ac diverſorium: cujus ex viribus ac ſpirituali profuſione, terram quoque concipientem, ligneo patibilem Jeſum, qui eſt vita ac lux hominum, omni ſuſpenſus ex ligno. Fauſt. l. 20, c. 2. [m] —— noli eſſe ferris lancea, qua latus percutitur Salvatoris. Video enim illum et in omni mundo et in omni anima crucifixum, quæ anima ſanctam habuit ſuccendi naturam. Secundin. ad Aug. n. 3. [n] Beauſ. T. 1. p. 569, in. [o] T. 2. p. 548, 549. See alſo p. 546, 547.

[p] Nam quia inviti peccamus, et cogimur a contraria et inimica nobis ſubſtantia, idcirco ſequimur ſcientiam rerum. Qua ſcientia admonita anima, et memoriæ priſtinæ reddita, recognoſcit ex quo originem trahat, in quo modo verſetur, quibus bonis iterum emendans quod nolens peccavit, poſſit per emendationem delictorum ſuorum, bonorum operum gratia, meritum ſibi reconciliationis apud Deum collocare, auctore Salvatore noſtro, qui nos docet et bona operari, et mala fugere. Fortunat. Diſp. 2, n. 22.

" of things. By this knowledge the ſoul, recovering it's firſt " ideas, comes to underſtand it's original, and it's preſent miſery. " Then correcting it's paſt faults, and practiſing good works, it " obtains reconciliation with God, under the conduct of our Sa- " viour, who teaches both what good things we ſhould do, and " what evil things we ſhould avoid." ' And, as Fortunatus after- ' wards adds: " It [q] is clear therefore, that repentance is given " the ſoul ſince the coming of the Saviour, and ſince this know- " ledge of things; by which, being waſhed, as in a divine foun- " tain, and purified from the vices and defilements of the world, " which it had contracted in the body, it may be reſtored to the " kingdom of God whence it came."

XXIII. And now, ſince the Manichees denied that Chriſt really ſuffered, we are led to obſerve ſtill more diſtinctly whether they thought his death to have the nature of a ſacrifice, or what ends and uſes his ſeeming death anſwered. Beauſobre, who has written their hiſtory with great care, and nicely examined their opinions, ſpeaks to this point more than once; and his words are very remarkable.

' The Manichees,' ſays [r] he, ' had no temples, for they had ' no idols.——Nor had they any altars, becauſe they had no ſa- ' crifice, no not that which the ancient church called the ſacrifice ' of commemoration. For they did not believe that Jeſus Chriſt ' really ſuffered, nor conſequently that his death was a true ſacri- ' fice. The euchariſt with them was only a ceremony of thankſ- ' giving in memory of the myſtic crucifixion of our Saviour. ' That crucifixion, according to them, had only moral views.'

Again: ' The [s] Manichees, as they aſcribed little to faith, ' aſcribed a great deal to good works, which they conſidered as ' an eſſential and abſolutely neceſſary condition of ſalvation. ' They had not the ſame notion of the death of Chriſt that we ' have. According to us, it is an offering made to God for the ' expiation of the ſins of men: according to them, it is only an ' act of ſublime virtue, the end of [t] which is, on the one hand, ' to teach men not to fear death, and to crucify the fleſh; and on ' the other hand to aſſure them of the immortality, of which ' Chriſt has given them a pattern in his reſurrection.'

And, after quoting the paſſages of Fortunatus tranſcribed

[q] Unde patet recte eſſe pœnitentiam datam poſt adventum ſalvatoris, et poſt hanc ſcientiam rerum, qua poſſit anima, acſi divino fonte lota, de ſordibus et vitiis tam mundi totius, quam corporum in quibus eadem anima verſatur, regno Dei, unde progreſſa eſt, repræſentari. ib. n. 21.

[r] T. 2, p. 703, 704.

[s] ibid. p. 794, m.

[t] See more to the ſame purpoſe, ib. p. 546.

above,

above [u], the ſame learned author ſays: 'It [x] hence appears 'that the Manichees aſcribed the ſalvation of the ſoul to the 'doctrine of the Saviour. They could not aſcribe it in any 'manner to the virtue of his blood, or of his ſacrifice; foraſmuch 'as they did not believe that he had blood, or that he made 'himſelf a ſacrifice. All the efficacy of the miniſtry of Chriſt 'conſiſted in the power of his doctrine, ſupported by his mira-'cles.' He then adds, 'he cannot certainly ſay how they ex-'plained thoſe texts of ſcripture which ſpeak of our being re-'deemed by the blood of Chriſt: but perhaps they thereby 'meant his doctrine, an explication which he has met with in ſo 'ancient and venerable a writer as [y] Clement of Alexandria.'

SECT. V. Their worſhip.

I. *It's ſimplicity.* II. *Their public worſhip; prayers, reading the ſcriptures, with diſcourſes.* III. *Their baptiſm, and euchariſt.* IV. *They obſerved the Lord's-day:* V. *And Eaſter, and Pentecoſt, and the anniverſary of Mani's martyrdom.* VI. *Their diſcipline.*

I. IT is now proper to take ſome notice of their worſhip.

Here a fine paſſage of Fauſtus offers itſelf. He is ſhewing the difference between his ſect and heathens: 'They [a] think that God 'is to be worſhipped with altars, victims, chapels, images, in-'cenſe. I, if I might be worthy, would eſteem myſelf a reaſon-'able temple of God. Chriſt, his ſon, I receive as a living 'image of the living God. His altar is my mind, cultivated 'with care, and endowed with knowledge and juſt ſentiments. 'The honours and ſacrifices which I preſent to the Deity, are 'prayers, and thoſe pure and ſimple.'

So Fauſtus. And Beauſobre ſuppoſeth that [b] their worſhip was generally ſimple and plain, like that of a ſect that aroſe and

[u] See notes P and 9. [x] Beauſ. T. 2, p. 549. [y] *Et ſanguis filii ejus mundat nos.*] Doctrina quippe Domini, quæ valde fortis eſt, ſanguis ejus appellata eſt. Clem. Adumbr. in Ep. i. Joan. p. 1009. ed. Pott. Αγοραζει δε ημας κυριος τιμιῳ αιματι, δεσποτων παλαι των ποικων απαλλαξασων αμαρτιων, δι' ας τα πνευματικα της πομπιας εκυριευσεν ημων. Id. in Ecl. p. 994, n. 20.

[a] Item Pagani aris, delubris, ſimulachris, victimis, atque incenſo Deum colendum putant. Ego ab his in hoc quoque multum diverſus incedo, qui ipſum me, ſi modo ſim dignus, rationabile Dei templum puto. Vivum vivæ majeſtatis ſimulachrum Chriſtum Filium ejus accipio: aram, mentem bonis artibus et diſciplinis imbutam. Honores quoque divinos ac ſacrificia in ſolis orationibus, et ipſis puris ac ſimplicibus, pono. Fauſt. l. 20, c. 3.

[b] A l'egard de la pompe, je ne ſuis point ſurpris, qu' il n'y en eût pas dans la fête d' une ſecte, ſeparée de l'egliſe dès le iii. ſiécle, lorſque le culte étoit encore aſſez ſimple, et qui étoit perſecutée par-tout. T. 2, p. 711, in. See him alſo, p. 700—705.

ſeparated

ſeparated from the catholics in the third century, and was always perſecuted.

II. They had public worſhip where [c] prayers were performed, at which all were preſent, auditors as well as elect: for Auguſtine, who never entered into the higher order, was preſent at them.

Prayer was a religious exerciſe in which they were often engaged, either publicly or privately, both by night and by day. This may be argued from what Auguſtine [d] ſaid of the different points of the heavens, to which they turned themſelves in praying, whether in the day time or night ſeaſon: not now to mention any other proofs of this.

They read the ſcriptures in their public aſſemblies. I ſuppoſe this may be inferred from a paſſage of Auguſtine, where [e] he ſpeaks of their admiring and reading the epiſtles of the apoſtles: and from another place, where [f] he ſpeaks of their reading, commending and reſpecting the epiſtles of the apoſtle Paul; of which they gave wrong interpretations, and thereby deceived many.

Mani's Epiſtle of the Foundation [g] was read in their aſſemblies, as [h] divers pieces, beſide canonical ſcripture, were often read among other ancient Chriſtians.

It is likely that they alſo had diſcourſes, explaining the principles of religion, and exhorting to the practice of virtue. For whilſt Auguſtine was among them, he obſerved that [i] they earneſtly warned men againſt ſenſuality, ambition, and ſuch other faults.

III. They obſerved the Chriſtian appointments of baptiſm and the euchariſt. Felix, in his diſpute with Auguſtine, mentions [k] both theſe ordinances, as uſual among them.

They practiſed infant baptiſm. This appears both from [l] Fauſtus and [m] Mani himſelf. They both ſpeak of it as common among Chriſtians; and they ſhew their approbation of it.

They

[c] Noſti autem me non Electum veſtrum, ſed Auditorem fuiſſe. Itaque quamvis et orationi veſtræ interfuerim, ut interrogaſtis, &c. Diſp. contr. Fortun. i. n. 3.

[d] See before, p. 460. [e] Et tamen epiſtolas apoſtolorum, quibus hæc omnia conteſtantur, tenetis, legitis, prædicatis. Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 12. c. 24.

[f] Certe et ipſi Manichæi legunt apoſtolum Paulum, et laudant et honorant, et ejus epiſtolas male interpretando multos decipiunt. Id. de Geneſi l. i. c. 21, n. 3.

[g] Ipſa enim nobis illo tempore [illegible] quando lecta eſt, illuminati dicere [illegible] vobis. Contr. Ep. Fund. c. v. n. 6.

[h] See Vol. ii. of this work, p. 26, 27, 52.

[i] Neque hoc eorum doctrinæ tribuo: fateor enim et illos ſedulo monere, ut res caveantur. De Ut. Cred. c. i. n. 3.

[k] Si adverſarius nullus contra Deum eſt, ut quid baptizati ſumus? ut quid euchariſtia? ut quid Chriſtianitas, ſi contra Deum nihil eſt? Act. cum Fel. c. 19. ap. Aug. T. 8. [l] Unde etiam omnis [illegible] legio, et maxime Chriſtiana, ad ſacramentum [illegible] appellat. Fauſt. l. 22. c. [illegible]

[m] Quo [illegible] interrogandi? Si omni [illegible] actuale eſt, antequam [illegible]

They baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, as we learn from [n] Athanaſius.

Jerom [o] ſpeaks of the Manichæan baptiſm.

I only add, Auguſtine ſays that [p] the Manichees, in that reſpect differing from the Pelagians, ſay infants have need of a Saviour on account of the corruption which the ſin of the firſt man tranſmits unto them.

They had the euchariſt frequently, as [q] Auguſtine knew very well, though he never was preſent at it.

They communicated in both kinds. As much may be inferred from the infamous ſtory of their euchariſt, formerly taken notice of. But, as the elect might not drink wine, it [r] is doubtful what liquor they made uſe of; whether pure water, or water with raiſins, or ſomewhat elſe, ſteeped in it. Beauſobre is inclined to think that [s] they made uſe of pure water; therein following the example of ſome other ſects more ancient than themſelves. So it may be; I do not deny it. But I almoſt wonder that Beauſobre did not here recollect what Auguſtine writes of the diet of the elect, which he himſelf alſo has given a diſtinct account of [t] elſewhere. For, if Auguſtine may be relied upon, and has been guilty of no miſrepreſentation, the [u] elect, though forbidden the uſe of wine, did ſometimes drink beer, cyder, and a ſort of boiled wine, or liquor reſembling wine.

In the time of pope Leo, called the great, the people of this ſect at Rome, the better to conceal themſelves and avoid the ſeverity of the laws, communicated with the catholics. They [x] received the bread, but they avoided the cup as much as poſſible; becauſe, as I ſuppoſe, they ſcrupled to taſte wine.

IV. The

lum quiſpiam agat, quare accipit purificationem aquæ, cum nullum malum egerit per ſe? Aut ſi nec dum egit, et purificandus eſt, licet [al. liquet,] eos naturaliter malæ ſtirpis pullulationem oſtendere. Manet. Ep. ap. Aug. op. Imp. l. 3, c. 187.

[n] Ουτω μανιχαιοι, και φρυγες, και οι τα σαμοσατεως μαθηται, τα ονοματα λεγοντες, ειδεν ητττον εισιν αιρετικοι. Or. 2, contr. Ar. n. 43, p. 510. E. [o] Diaconus eras, ——— et a Manichæis baptizatos recipiebas. Hier. contr. Lucifer. T. 4. P. 2, p. 305, m. [p] ——— quod non vult Manichæus; ut tamen propter vitium, quod in eos per peccatum primi hominis pertranſiit, fateatur et parvulis neceſſarium ſalvatorem, quod non vult Pelagius. Contr. duas Ep. Pelag. c. 4, n. 3. T. 10.

[q] Nam et euchariſtiam audivi a vobis ſæpe quod accipiatis. Tempus autem cum me lateret, quid accipiatis, unde noſſe potui? Contr. Fort. Diſp. i. n. 3.

[r] B. T. 2. p. 721. [s] ib. p. 723.

[t] ib. 774, 775. [u] ——— bibat autem mulſum, carœnum paſſum, et nonnullorum pomorum expreſſos ſuccos, vini ſpeciem ſatis imitantes.—de Mor. Manich. c. 13, n. 29. Hordei quidam ſucco vinum imitantur, quod movendo fit optimum. Sane, quod minime prætereundum eſt, hoc genus potus citiſſime inebriat. Nec tamen unquam ſuccum hordei fel principum eſſe dixiſtis. id. cap. 16, n. 46. ——— et carœnum quod bibitis, nihil aliud quam coctum vinum eſſe videamus. ib. n. 47. Conf. c. 13, n. 30. [x] Cumque ad tegendam infidelitatem ſuam noſtris audent intereſſe myſteriis, ita in ſacramentorum communione ſe temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant. Ore indigno corpus Chriſti accipiunt,

IV. The Manichees observed the Lord's day, but fasted upon it, auditors as well as elect. This is taken notice of by [y] Augustine, [z] Ambrose, [a] Leo, just quoted. Ebedjesu, cited by Asseman, gives this reason of that practice: 'They [b] expected the coming 'of Christ on that day.' Which leads Beausobre to say, they 'then meditated upon the last coming of Christ, at the end of this inferior world which we inhabit. Supposing that the conflagration and dissolution of our earth would happen on a Lord's-day, and not knowing which, they ever passed that day in fasting and prayer, that the Lord, when he came, might find them in the exercise of humiliation and repentance.

V. The Manichees, or however those of Africa, kept Easter, as we learn from [d] Augustine; who only blames them that they did not keep it with sufficient solemnity.

Beausobre supposes that [c] there is no good reason to doubt of their keeping the feast of Pentecost.

In the [f] month of March, and therefore usually about the time of Easter, they celebrated the anniversary of the martyrdom of Mani, which was called Bema, or the master's chair.

VI. Their ecclesiastical constitution we saw [g] formerly, in the passage of Augustine concerning their elect and auditors.

It is likely they had also some ecclesiastical discipline, and that censures of their church were pronounced upon bad livers. This is supposed in a story told by Augustine of an indecency committed by some of the elect, whilst he was of that sect. He says, that [h] he and others were offended, and expected that the men should have been excommunicated, or at least sharply reproved; but,

piunt, sanguinem autem redemtionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Leo. Serm. 4. de Quadragesima. [y] Die autem Dominico jejunare scandalum est magnum, maxime posteaquam innotuit detestabilis ——hæresis Manichæorum, qui suis auditoribus ad jejunandum istum tamquam constituerunt legitimam diem. Augustin. Ep. ad Casulan. 36, [al. 86], n. 27. Vid. ib. n. 29. Die quoque Dominico cum illis jejunant, *auditores scilicet*. Ep. 236, [al. 74], n. 2. [z] Dominica autem jejunare non possumus, quia Manichæos etiam ob istius diei jejunium damnamus. Ambr. Ep. 23. T. 2, p. 883, n. xi. [a] Vid. Leo. Serm. iv. de Quadrag. et passim.

[b] Manichæi resurrectionem abnegantes contra Christianos jejunium luctumque in die dominico faciunt, aientes, in isto die fore ut hoc sæculum subeat interitum dissolutionemque omnem post circulum novem millium annorum. ap. Assem. Bib. Or. T. 4. p. 361. [c] B. T. 2, p. 709.

[d] Cum sæpe a vobis quærerem illo tempore quo vos audiebam, quæ causa esset, quod Pascha Domini plerumque nulla, interdum a paucis tepidissima festivitate frequentaretur, —— cum vestrum Bema, id est, diem quo Manichæus occisus est, quinque gradibus instructo tribunali, et pretiosis linteis adornato,——magnis honoribus prosequamini? Contr. Ep. Manich. c. 8. n. 9. [e] See T. 2. p. 711, n. xi.

[f] Illo enim mense (Martio) Bema vestrum cum magna festivitate celebratis. Contr. Faust. l. 18, c. 5. Vid. not. [d].

[g] See before, p. 403, 404.

[h] ——vidimus ergo in quadrivio Carthaginis,——non unum, sed plures quam tres electos simul post transeuntes nescio quas feminas tam petulanti gestu adhinnire. —— Nos autem graviter commoti, graviter etiam questi sumus. Quis tandem hoc vindicandum, non dicam seperatione ab ecclesia, sed pro magnitudine flagitii vehementi saltem objurgatione arbitratus

but, as it ſeems, little notice was taken of the matter. The excuſe they made was, that their aſſemblies were then prohibited by the laws, and therefore ſome inconvenience might happen, if their principal men were diſobliged. He argues with them, as[1] if an elect would be degraded for eating the ſmalleſt bit of fleſh.

SECT. VI. The Manichæan Doctrine concerning the Scriptures.

I. *A ſummary account of their ſcheme.* II. *They rejected the Old Teſtament.* III. *Their notion of John Baptiſt.* IV. *What books of the New Teſtament they received.* 1. *They received the New Teſtament in general, or the goſpels, and the epiſtles of St. Paul.* 2. *What they ſaid of St. Matthew's goſpel.* 3. *Whether they received the Acts of the apoſtles?* 4. *They received St. Paul's epiſtles:* 5. *Particularly that to the Hebrews.* 6. *Of their receiving an epiſtle to the Laodiceans.* 7. *Whether they received the catholic epiſtles?* 8. *And the Revelation?* 9. *Probably, they received all the canonical ſcriptures of the New Teſtament.* V. *Proofs of their reſpect for the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament.* VI. *Of their pretence that the books of the New Teſtament had been corrupted and interpolated.* 1. *Paſſages of ancient catholic authors concerning that matter.* 2. *Paſſages of Fauſtus concerning the ſame.* VII. *Remarks upon the paſſages of Fauſtus.* VIII. *The Manichees vindicated from the charges of forging and interpolating ſcripture.* 1. *They did not forge a letter aſcribed to Chriſt.* 2. *That they did not interpolate the books of the New Teſtament.* IX. *Of the apocryphal books uſed by them.* 1. *Auguſtine's definition of ſuch books.* 2. *Proofs of their uſing apocryphal ſcriptures, and what.* 3. *An account of Leucius, a great writer of apocryphal books.* [1]. *His works.* [2]. *His opinions.* [3]. *His time.* 4. *Remarks upon the works of Leucius, and the apocryphal books uſed by the Manichees.*

WE are now come to the principal point, and perhaps as difficult as any, to ſhew what books of ſcripture the Manichees received, and what regard they had for them.

I. Auguſtine's general account is to this effect: 'They[2] ſay

bitratus eſt? Et hæc erat omnis excuſatio impunitatis illorum, quod eo tempore quo conventicula eorum lege prohiberentur, ne quid læſi proderent, metuebatur. De Mor. Manich. c. 19, n. 68, 69.

[1] Quæ ergo ratio eſt, vel potius amentia, de numero Electorum hominem pellere, qui forte carnem valetudinis cauſſa, nulla cupiditate guſtaverit——? Ita fit ut in Electis veſtris eſſe non poſſit, qui proditus fuerit, non concupiſcendo, ſed medendo partem aliquam cœnaſſe gallinæ. De Mor. Manich. cap. 16, n. 51.

[2] Deum, qui legem per Moyſen dedit, et in Hebræis prophetis locutus eſt, non eſſe verum Deum, ſed unum ex principibus tenebrarum. Ipſiuſque Teſtamenti Novi ſcripturas tamquam infalſatas ita legunt, ut quod volunt ipſi accipiant, quod nolunt rejiciant, eiſque tamquam totum verum habentes nonnullas apocryphas anteponunt. Aug. de Hær. c. 46.

'that

'that the God who delivered the law by Moſes, and ſpake in the 'Hebrew prophets, is not the true God, but one of the princes 'of darkneſs. The ſcriptures of the New Teſtament they receive, 'but ſay they are interpolated, taking what they like, and reject-'ing the reſt, and preferring to them ſome apocryphal ſcriptures 'as containing the whole truth.'

Here are therefore four things to be obſerved by us,—their rejecting the Old Teſtament; what books of the New Teſtament they received; then in what manner they received them, or what regard they had for them; and laſtly, what apocryphal books they made uſe of.

II. Concerning the Old Teſtament.

That the Manichees univerſally, and all along, rejected the books of the Old Teſtament, or the Jewiſh ſcriptures, is evident from the teſtimonies of almoſt all writers, who have taken any notice of this people.

It is intimated by [b] Serapion.

The deſign of the [c] third book of Titus of Boſtra was to vindicate the Old Teſtament againſt their objections.

In The Acts of Archelaus it is repreſented as one article of Mani's doctrine that [d] the Jewiſh prophets were deceived by the princes of darkneſs: that [e] the princes of darkneſs ſpake with Moſes, and the Jewiſh prieſts and prophets. Mani [f] himſelf is there made to ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe, and to ſay that there are ſome things true and right inſerted in the Jewiſh ſcriptures, that the wrong might be received, but that nothing before John the Baptiſt ought to be admitted as of authority.

Fauſtus, we may be ſure, does [g] not ſpeak with greater reverence of the God of the Jews, than other Manichees.

He ſays moreover, that [h] the moral precepts of the law of Moſes were not revealed by him; for they are as old as the world, and are of perpetual obligation. They [i] were taught Enoch,

[b] ——μητε τοις ιουδαιοις τιμωντες. Serap. ap. Caniſ. Ant. Lect. T. i. p. 47, f. Conf. p. 54, ſub fin. [c] ο τριτος ειτερ των ιουδαικων και των προφητων πεποιηται λογος, ως προς την θειαν πασης της παλαιας διαθηκης δοξησης. Tit. p. 59. ap. Caniſ. [d] Περι δε των παρ ημιν προφητων φησι λεγει· πεπλανησθαι αυτους, ητοι αιρεσιας, ητοι διαιρεσιας των σκοτους, κ. λ. Ap. Arch. c. 10, p. 18. [e] Τοις δε λαλησασιτα μετα μωσεως, και των ιουδαιων, και των ιερεων, τοις αρχουσι λεγει ειναι τα σκοτους. Ib. cap. xi. p. 20. [f] Sed et ea quæ in prophetis et in lege ſcripta ſunt ipſi [Satanæ,] adſcribenda ſunt. Ipſe eſt enim qui in prophetis tunc locutus eſt—— et ſcribere pauca quædem vera, ut per hæc etiam cætera quæ ſunt falſa crederentur. Unde bonum nobis eſt ex omnibus quæ uſque ad Joannem ſcripta ſunt, nihil omnino ſuſcipere. Ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 25. Vid et p. 26. [g] Placet ad ingluviem Judæorum dæmonis, (neque enim Dei,) nunc taurus, nunc arietes, cultris ſternere? Faud. l. 18, c. 2. [h] ——diffamatæ in gentibus, id eſt, ex quo mundi hujus creatura exiſtit. Id. l. 22, c. 2.

[i] Hæc autem erant antiquitus in naticnibus, ut eſt in promtu probare, olim promulgata per Enoch, et Seth, et cæteros eorum ſimiles juſtos, quibus eadem illuſtres tradiderint angeli temperandæ in hominibus gratia feritatis. Id. l. 19, c. 3.

Seth,

Seth, and the other ancient patriarchs by angels, for the good government of the world. Theſe laws Moſes inſerted in his two tables.

Epiphanius in his Synopſis briefly ſays, they [k] blaſpheme the Old Teſtament, and the God that ſpeaks therein. And in his long argument with them he often takes notice of [l] their diſadvantageous notion of the Old Teſtament.

Hilary [m] ſpeaks of their enmity to the law and the prophets.

Cyril of Jeruſalem [n] takes notice of the ſame thing.

In Jerom, [o] Mani is frequently joined with Marcion, and others, who rejected the Old Teſtament.

Auguſtine had frequent occaſion to ſpeak of this matter, and ſometimes ſays they [p] preſumed to affirm that 'the law given 'by Moſes was not from God, but from one of the princes of 'darkneſs.' And he informs us that [q] this was one of thoſe arguments in which they triumphed; and that they had too much ſucceſs in deceiving weak people by the objections they brought againſt the Old Teſtament. Archelaus too intimates that Mani argued upon this point with much confidence, and in a ſpecious manner, when he ſays he [r] thought the devil helped him. Indeed it is thought by ſome that [s] the ancient Chriſtians were not able to defend the Old Teſtament ſo well as we have done in late times.

It would be tedious to mention all the Manichæan objections; I ſhall however take notice of ſome of them.

They pretended to take offence at the repreſentations [t] given of God in the Old Teſtament, as if he had bodily parts and human paſſions; as if he was ignorant of ſome things, and envious, and cruel, and paſſionate.

Their

[k] Παλαιαν διαθηκην βλασφημουντες, και . . . ατα τα λαλησαντα θεον. Epiph. T. i. 625. [l] Id. Hær. 66, c. 43, p. 656. c. 70, p. 691, et paſſim.

[m] Manicheus enim abrupti in improbanda lege et prophetis furoris. Hil. de Trin. l. 6, n. 10, p. 884. [n] Cat. 6, c. 27, p. 102. [o] Et contrario hæretici, Marcion et Manichæus, et omnes qui veterem legem rabido ore dilaniant. Hieron. in Ecc. T. 2, p. 778, in. Non quo legem juxta Manichæum et Marcionem deſtruamus. Id. ad Aug. Ep. 74, [al. 89.] p. 624. m. Audiant Marcion et Manichæus, et cæteri hæretici, qui vetus laniant inſtrumentum. Id. in Matt. c. x. T. 4, P. i. p. 33, m. Audi Marcion, audi Manichæe, bonæ margaritæ ſunt lex et prophetæ, et notitia veteris teſtamenti. Id. in. Matt. c. 13, p. 59, f. Aliud eſt damnare legem, quod Manichæus facit, aliud legi præferre evangelium, quæ apoſtolica doctrina eſt. Id in Dial. i. adv. Pelag. T. 4, p. 503, in.

[p] Patriarchas prophetaſque blaſphemant. Legem per famulum Dei Moyſen datam, non a vero Deo dicunt, ſed a principe tenebrarum. Aug. Ep. 236. al. 74.

[q] Nam bene noſti, quod reprehendentes Manichæi catholicam fidem, et maxime vetus teſtamentum diſcerpentes et dilaniantes, commoveant imperitos. Id De Util. Cred. c. 2. n. 4, T. 8. [r] Deinde cœpit dicere plurima ex Lege, multa etiam de Evangelio, et Apoſtolo Paulo, quæ ſibi videntur eſſe contraria; quæ etiam cum fiducia dicens, nihil pertimeſcit. Credo, quod habeat adjutorem draconem illum, qui nobis ſemper inimicus eſt. Arch. cap. 40, p. 69. [s] See Beauſ. T. i. p. 283, &c. [t] ——nunc ignarum futuri,—— nunc ut improvidum——nunc ut invidum et timentem, ne ſi gustaret homo ſuus

de

Their objections againſt the firſt three chapters of the book of Geneſis may be ſeen in [u] Fauſtus, and in a work of [x] Auguſtine, purpoſely written in defence of the beginning of that book.

Fauſtus argues, that [y] they were not Jews, but Gentiles: that they came directly to Chriſt, and not by the way of Judaiſm. If therefore there had been, as poſſibly there were, Gentile prophets, they would be more profitable to them than the Jewiſh.

They ſaid that, [z] whilſt they were Gentiles and before they believed, the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament were uſeleſs, becauſe they could then be of no authority with them; and when the goſpel was embraced, they were altogether needleſs.

They ſaid they [a] were ſatisfied with the New Teſtament, which the Jews rejected, and that very much, out of too great a regard for the Old.

They found fault with [b] the Iſraelites ſpoiling the Egyptians by the order of Moſes.

The appointment of ſacrifices, ſuch as thoſe in the law of Moſes, they pretended was unworthy of God, and therefore was not from him, but from ſome evil beings. This way of arguing is aſcribed to Mani [c] in The Acts of Archelaus, and is alſo made uſe of by [d] Fauſtus.

It is eaſy to think they [e] did not fail to expoſe the ordinance of circumciſion, as much as they were able.

They

de ligno vitæ in æternum viveret; nunc alias et appetentem ſanguinis atque adipis ex omni genere ſacrificiorum —— nunc iraſcentem in alienos, nunc in ſuos, nunc perimentem millia hominum ob levia quidem aut nulla commiſſa; nunc etiam comminantem, venturum ſe fore cum gladio, et parciturum nemini, non juſto non peccatori. Fauſt. l. 22, c. 4.

[u] ibid. [x] Aug. de Geneſi contra Manichæos. libr. iii. Tom. i.

[y] Porro autem nos natura Gentiles ſumus,——ſub alia nati lege,——non ante effecti Judæi, ut merito Hebraicorum ſequeremur fidem, euntes ad Chriſtianiſmum.——Ita nihil, ut dixi eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ Hebræorum teſtimonia conferunt, quæ magis conſtet ex Gentibus quam ex Judæis. Sane ſi ſunt aliqua, ut fama eſt, Sibyllæ de Chriſto prætagia, aut Hermetis, quem dicunt Triſmegiſtum, aut Orphei, aliorumque in Gentilitate vatum; hæc nos aliquanto ad fidem juvare potuerunt, qui ex Gentibus efficimur Chriſtiani. &c. Fauſt. l. 13, c. i. [z] Hebræorum vero teſtimonia nobis, etiam ſi ſint vera, ante fidem inutilia ſunt, poſt fidem ſupervacua; quia ante fidem eis credere non poteramus, nec vero ex ſuperfluo credimus. Fauſt. l. 12, c. i. [a] Quare non accipis Teſtamentum vetus? Quia et omne vas plenum ſuperfuſa non recipit, ſed effundit,—— Proinde et Judæi ex præoccupatione Moyſeos Teſtamento veteri ſatiati, reſpuerunt novum. Id. l. 15, cap. i. in.

[b] Ibi vero Moſes argentum et aurum ab Ægyptiis ſumens, cum populus fugiſſet ex Ægypto. Jeſus autem nihil proximi deſiderandum præcepit. Ap. Arch. c. 40, p. 69. [c] Ipſe [Satanas] eſt enim, qui in prophetis tunc locutus eſt, plurimis de Deo ignorantias ſuggerens, et tentationes, et concupiſcentias. Sed et devoratorem eum ſanguinis et carnis offendunt. Quæ omnia ad eum pertinent Satanam, et ad prophetas ejus. Ap. Arch. c. 13, p. 25. [d] Placet ad ingluviem Judæorum dæmonis——nunc tauros, nunc arietes, nunc etiam hircos, ut non et homines dicam, cultris ſternere: ac propter quod idola ſumus exoſi, id nunc exercere crudelius ſub prophetis ac lege? Fauſt. l. 18, c. 2. Vid. ſupr. not. [t].

[e] Nam peritomen ego ut pudendum deſpui, ac, ſi non fallor, et tu. Id. l. 6, c. i. Placet circumcidi, id eſt, pudendis inſignire

They pretended that [f] the law and the goſpel were contrary to each other, and therefore they were not both from one and the ſame being. In the Old Teſtament men are encouraged by the hopes of riches, and other temporal bleſſings. But Jeſus Chriſt bleſſeth the poor, and declareth that no man can be his diſciple who forſaketh not all that he hath. This argument is put into the mouth of [g] Mani in The Acts of Archelaus: and it is with the utmoſt diſdain that [h] Fauſtus ſpeaks of the bleſſings promiſed in the Old Teſtament; ſuch as riches, plenty, long life, a numerous progeny, a land flowing with milk and honey. He is fully ſatisfied with the ſpiritual bleſſings of the goſpel. Nor would he accept of ſuch good things as the law promiſeth, if offered him. Again, ſays Fauſtus: 'Our [i] church is poor indeed, but 'ſhe is married to Chriſt, who is rich: and ſhe is contented with 'the eſtate of her huſband: nor will ſhe hold any ſtrange cor-'reſpondence, or receive either preſents or letters from another.'

The Manichees [k] took great liberties in reviling the patriarchs and the kings of Iſrael for the practice of polygamy: and they unmercifully aggravated the faults, which ſome good men of the Old Teſtament were ſurpriſed into, and miſrepreſented ſome other things. Fauſtus is very copious in his declamations upon theſe points.

ſignire pudenda, et Deum credere ſacramentis talibus delectari? Id. l. 18, c. 2.

[f] Legem Moyſi, ut breviter dicam, dicebat hic non eſſe Dei boni, ſed maligni principis, nec habere eam quicquam cognationis ad novam legem Chriſti; ſed eſſe contrariam et inimicam, alteram alteri obſtantem. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

[g] Dicebat ergo, quod ibi dixerit Deus, Ego divitem et pauperem facio. Hic vero Jeſus beatos diceret pauperes. Addebat etiam, quod nemo poſſit ejus eſſe diſcipulus, niſi renunciaret omnibus quæ haberet. Id. ib. [h] Cur non accipis Teſtamentum vetus? Quia et ab ipſo hoc, et ex novo didicimus, aliena non concupiſcere. ——Divitias promittit, et ventris ſaturitatem, et filios et nepotes, vitamque longam, et Chananitidis regnum.——Judæis bona ſua habere, libens volenſque permiſi, ſolo ſcilicet evangelio, et regni cœlorum ſplendida hæreditate contentus. Fauſt. l. 22, c. 1. Secunda vero cauſa eſt, quod non etiam miſera eius, et corporalis, ac ſæculo ab animæ commodis hæreditas eſt, ut poſt beatam illam novi Teſtamenti poſſeſſionem, quæ cœlorum mihi regnum, et vitam perpetuam repromittit, etiam ſi gratis eam mihi teſtator ſuus ingereret, faſtidirem. Id. l. 4, c. 1. [i] Et quia eccleſia noſtra, ſponſa Chriſti, pauperior quidem ei nupta, ſed diviti, contenta ſit bonis mariti ſui, humilium amatorum dedignatur opes. Sordent ei Teſtamenti veteris et ejus auctoris munera, famæque ſuæ cuſtos diligentiſſima, niſi ſponſi ſui non accipit literas. Fauſt. l. 15, c. 1.

[k] ——ſoceros dormire cum nuribus, tamquam Judas; patres cum filiabus, tamquam Loth; prophetas cum fornicatricibus, tamquam Oſee; maritos uxorum ſuarum noctes amatoribus vendere, tamquam Abraham; duabus germanis ſororibus unum miſceri maritum, tamquam Jacob; rectores populi, et quos maxime entheos credas, millenis et centenis volutari cum ſcortis, tamquam David et Salomon. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 4. Vid. et l. 22, c. 3, 5. l. 12, c. 1. [l] ——ac per hoc et Judæorum patres, Abraham ſcilicet et Iſaac et Jacob——quamquam fuerunt ipſi flagitioſiſſimi; ut fere Moſes indicat eorum pronepos, ſive quis alius hiſtoriæ ejus conditor eſt, quæ dicitur Geneſeos, qui eorum vitas nobis odio omni faſtidioque digniſſimas ſcripſit. Fauſt. l. 33, c. 1.

And Auguſtine tells us that [m] when he was young they would come to him, and aſk, 'if he thought they were righte-'ous men who had more than one wife at a time?'

Jerom informs us that [n] they alleged thoſe words of our Lord in John x. 8: *All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers.* And in fact the Manichæan biſhop and author, ſo often quoted already, fails not to inſiſt upon [o] this text, and to apply it particularly to Moſes.

Jerom repreſents the Manichees arguing that [p] it was allowed the law of Moſes was aboliſhed, and therefore we ought to receive the New Teſtament only.

The catholic Chriſtians maintained the authority of the Old Teſtament, and put the Manichees in mind of divers things contained in the New; as thoſe words of our Lord himſelf, Matth. v. 17: *I came not to deſtroy the law, but to fulfil.*

This is in The [q] Acts of Archelaus, where Mani by way of anſwer ſays: 'Chriſt never ſpake thoſe words, for it is not true 'that he fulfilled the law, but that he deſtroyed it.'

Fauſtus in his work likewiſe propoſes this catholic objection, to which he gives a variety of anſwers, weak and trifling.

They are ſuch as theſe: 'This [r] is related by Matthew only, 'and as ſpoken by Chriſt in his ſermon on the mount: when he 'was not preſent, but only the firſt four diſciples, who attended 'on him before Matthew was called. Of thoſe diſciples who 'were preſent at that ſermon none have written a goſpel but 'John, who ſays nothing of this matter. It may therefore be

[m] —— cum a me quærerent,—— et utrum juſti exiſtimandi eſſent, qui haberent uxores multas ſimul. Confeſſ. l. 3, c. 7, n. 12. [n] —— detrahens prophetis ejus, quaſi auctoritate teſtimonii evangelici, in quo ſalvator ait: Omnes qui venerunt ante me fures fuerunt et latrones. Hier. in Iſ. T. 3, p. 171. [o] Quippe cum et ipſum dicentem audirem, fures fuiſſe et latrones omnes qui venerunt ante ſe. Qua ſententia primum omnium video feriri Moyſen. Fauſt. l. 16, c. 2.

[p] Manichæus nobis conſurgit repente, qui legem dicit abolitam, et ſolos novi Teſtamenti legendos libros. Adv. Pelag. l. 2, T. 4, p. 510, m. [q] Ego audiens, dicebam eis ſermonem evangelicum, quomodo dixit Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus, Non veni ſolvere legem, ſed adimplere. Ille vero ait, nequaquam eum hunc dixiſſe ſermonem: Cum enim ipſam invenianus eum reſolviſſe legem, neceſſe eſt nos hoc potius intelligere quod fecit. Arch. c. 40, p. 69. [r] Cur Legem non accipitis et Prophetas, cum Chriſtus eos non ſe veniſſe ſolvere dixerit, ſed adimplere? quis hoc teſtatur dixiſſe Jeſum? Matthæus. Ubi dixiſſe? In monte. Quibus præſentibus? Petro, Andrea, Jacobo et Joanne, quatuor his tantum: cæteros enim necdum elegerat, nec ipſum Matthæum. Ex his ergo quatuor unus, id eſt, Joannes, Evangelium ſcripſit? Ita. Alicubi hoc ipſe commemorat? Nuſquam. Quomodo ergo quod Joannes non teſtatur, qui fuit in monte, Matthæus hoc ſcripſit, qui longo intervallo, poſtquam Jeſus de monte deſcendit, ſecutus eſt eum? Ac per hoc de hoc ipſo primo ambigitur, utrum Jeſus tale aliquid dixerit, quia teſtis idoneus tacet, loquitur autem minus idoneus: ut interim permiſerimus nobis injuriam feciſſe Matthæum, donec et ipſum probemus hæc non ſcripſiſſe.—— Fauſt. l. 17, c. 1.

'queſtioned

'queſtioned whether Jeſus ever ſpoke theſe words.' He alſo ſays that Matthew himſelf did not write this, which will be conſidered another time.

Then he adds, that [s] all in general are agreed that Chriſt came not to fulfil the law, but to deſtroy it.

After which [t] he comes again to the Manichæan principle, of examining and judging what is right, what not, in the ſcriptures, and rejecting what does not appear agreeable to truth. And he pretends that [u] if the catholics will maintain the genuineneſs of this text, they ought to obey all the laws of Moſes, and be no longer Chriſtians, but Jews.

Finally, he ſays, let [x] us conſider what law is here ſpoken of, for there are ſeveral laws. There is the law of Moſes, the law of nature, and of truth. Which laſt he ſays is ſpoken of by the apoſtle, Rom. viii. 2, calling it *the law of the ſpirit of life.* And [y] there are other prophets, beſide thoſe of the Jews: and that [z] our Saviour does not here ſpeak of their law, appears from the things he diſcourſeth of; which are not the peculiar ordinances of the Moſaic law, but thoſe precepts which are of eternal obligation.

The catholics put them in mind likewiſe of John v. 46: *Had ye believed Moſes, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me.*

To which Fauſtus makes divers anſwers: as [a] that, upon ſearching the writings of Moſes, he could not find any prophecies concerning Chriſt. Therefore our Lord never ſpoke in this manner, for all his words are true. And he himſelf elſewhere declares, *All who were before him were thieves and robbers*, particularly ſtriking at Moſes. Moreover, upon divers occaſions, when he might have referred the Jews to Moſes and the prophets, he

[s] Uterque enim noſtrum ſub hac notione Chriſtianus eſt, quia Chriſtum in deſtructionem legis et prophetarum veniſſe putavimus. l. 18, c. 1. [t] Et tamen me quidem jam adverſus capituli hujus neceſſitudinem Manichæa fides reddidit tutum, ——Ib. c. 3, in. [u] Nempe cogeris aut vanæ ſuperſtitioni ſuccumbere, aut capitulum profiteri falſum, aut te Chriſti negare diſcipulum. l. 18, c. 3, f.

[x] Ecce jam conſentio dictum.——Sunt autem legum genera tria: unum quidem Hebræorum, quod peccati et mortis Paulus appellat: aliud vero Gentium, quod naturale vocat. Tertium vero genus legis eſt veritas, quod perinde ſignificans apoſtolus dicit, Lex enim ſpiritus vitæ in Chriſto Jeſu liberavit me a lege peccati et mortis. Id. l. 19, c. 1, 2. [y] Item Prophetæ, alii ſunt Judæorum, alii Gentium, alii veritatis. Ib. c. 2.

[z] Lege ergo tripartita, et tripartitis Prophetis, de quonam eorum Jeſus dixerit, non ſatis liquet. Eſt tamen conjicere ex conſequentibus. &c. ib. c. 3.

[a] Quare Moyſen non accipitis, cum Chriſtus dicat: Moyſes de me ſcripſit, et ſi crederetis Moyſi, crederetis mihi—? Nam ego quidem ſcripturas ejus perſcrutatus,—nullas ibidem de Chriſto prophetias inveni. —Unde in ingenti poſitus æſtu, ratione cogebar in alterum e duobus; ut aut falſum pronuntiarem capitulum hoc, aut mendacem Jeſum. Sed id quidem alienum pietatis erat, Deum exiſtimare mentitum. Rectius ergo viſum eſt, ſcriptoribus adſcribere falſitatem, quam veritatis auctori mendacium, &c. Id. l. 16, c. 1. ii.

only directs them to conſider his miracles, and the teſtimony given to him from heaven by God the Father.

For all which reaſons he pretends he may conclude that this paragraph is not genuine, but has been inſerted by the corrupters of ſcripture, who have here ſaid what is not true.

This may ſuffice for ſhewing the opinion and the arguments of the Manichees concerning the Old Teſtament.

III. I ſhall only add a word or two for ſhewing what they thought of John the Baptiſt.

Didymus of Alexandria intimates that [b] they did not admit his authority, reckoning him one of the Old Teſtament. And Photius ſays of Agapius, the Manichee, that [c] he reviled not only Moſes and the prophets, but the forerunner likewiſe. But, in The Acts of Archelaus, Mani is ſaid [d] to have ſpoken of John the Baptiſt as a preacher of the kingdom of heaven. Beauſobre therefore concludes that [e] the Manichees received John's teſtimony to the divine miſſion of our Saviour. And indeed Didymus himſelf intimates, in the place before referred to, that [f] they were willing to argue from ſome things ſaid by John the Baptiſt. Perhaps they were not all of the ſame opinion about him. Nor is it any great wonder that men ſhould differ upon the queſtion, whether John the Baptiſt belonged to the Old Teſtament or to the New.

IV. In the next place we are to conſider what books of the New Teſtament were received by the Manichees. I ſhall obſerve the teſtimonies of divers authors.

1. Serapion, having ſaid he would not inſiſt upon matters in the Old Teſtament, adds: 'Since [g] they reſpect the goſpels, my 'proofs ſhall be taken from them.' What books of the New Teſtament he quoted in his work againſt the Manichees was ſhewn [h] formerly.

Titus of Boſtra expreſsly ſays, 'they [i] receive the goſpel.' Several of his paſſages will be more particularly cited hereafter, when we come to obſerve what they ſaid of the interpolation of the ſcriptures. But when Titus here ſays, 'they received the

[b] Ὃ γαρ δεχονται τον βαπτιστην ιωαννην, τυγχανοντα ενα της παλαιας γραφης. Didym. contr. Manich. p. 214. [c] Την δε παλαιαν γραφην κωμωδει, μωσεα και αυτον, και τους προφητας, και τον προδρομον. Phot. cod. 179, p. 404.

[d] Aiebat autem, Joannem regnum cœlorum prædicare; nam et per abſciſſionem capitis ejus hoc eſſe indicatum, quod omnibus prioribus et ſuperioribus ejus abſciſſis, poſteriora ſola ſervanda ſint. Arch. cap. 40, p. 70. Vid. ib. c. 13, p. 25, 26.

[e] Beauſ. T. i. p. 289. [f] Ει δε κατ' κεινο προφεροιτο, το λεχθεν υπο του βαπτιστου ιωαννου——ακουετωσαν, οτι ου δυναται προφερειν αφ ων μη παραδεχονται. Did. ib. p. 213, 214. [g] Επειδη γαρ τα ευαγγελια μεμελετηται αυτοις, εκ των ευαγγελιων προσαχθησεται ο ελεγχος. Serap. ap. Caniſ. T. i. p. 54, infr. m. [h] See p. 386.

[i] Τα ευαγγελια προσδεχομενοι και τουτοις παραδεχονται. Tit. l. 3, p. 140, f.

'goſpel,'

'goſpel,' he means, I think, the New Teſtament in general, becauſe the goſpel is there oppoſed to the law and the prophets.

Epiphanius ſays they [k] pretended that the two teſtaments were contrary to each other. He likewiſe ſays that 'when [l] they reject the Old Teſtament, many things may be alleged from the goſpels and from the apoſtles to confute them.' They acknowledged the New Teſtament therefore, both the goſpels and the epiſtles of the apoſtles, as of authority.

St. Jerom's account, in the place above referred to, is, they [m] ſay the law is aboliſhed, and that the books of the New Teſtament only are to be attended to by us.

Fauſtus often ſays that [n] he receives the goſpel; meaning thereby the doctrine taught by Jeſus Chriſt.

He ſays that [o] he, as well as the catholics, own Jeſus to be the author of the New Teſtament or covenant.

He mentions [p] the four evangeliſts, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, without hinting that there were any other authentic hiſtorians of Jeſus Chriſt.

He ſeems to allow that John wrote the goſpel under his name. For, [q] mentioning Peter and Andrew, James and John, as the firſt and moſt early diſciples of Jeſus, he ſays: 'of all theſe four 'John only wrote a goſpel.'

In The Acts of Archelaus it is expreſsly ſaid that 'Mani [r] 'argued from the goſpel, and the apoſtle Paul;' that is, from the goſpels, and from the epiſtles of that apoſtle.

Photius, in his extracts from Agapius, ſays that 'he [s] quoted 'many paſſages of the divine goſpel, and the epiſtles of the di-'vine Paul.'

[k] Φασκει γαρ τας δυο διαθηκας εναντιας προς αλληλας. Hær. 66, c. 42, in.

[l] Και ποτε εστιν ειπειν δια των ευαγγελιων, και των αποστολων εις ελεγχον της του μανη μαιας——του σωτηρος ομολογουντες την παλαιαν διαθηκην, ου μονον, αλλα και αυτοι αποστολοι. κ. λ. Id. H. 66, c. 43, m.

[m] ——— Manichæus nobis conſurgit repente, qui legem dicit abolitam, et ſolos Novi Teſtamenti legendos libros. Adv. Pelag. l. 2. T. 4, p. 510.

[n] Accipis Evangelium? Et maxime. Fauſt. l. 2, c. 1. Accipis Evangelium? Tu me interrogas, utrum accipiam, in quo idipſum apparet, quia quæ jubet obſervo. ——— Niſi adhuc neſcis, quid ſit quod Evangelium nuncupatur. Eſt enim nihil aliud, quam prædicatio et mandatum Chriſti. Id. l. 5, c. 1.

[o] ——— quod Novum Teſtamentum Jeſum condidiſſe utrique fatemur. Id. l. 18, c. 1.

[p] Sed offenſus duorum Evangeliſtarum maxime diſſenſione, qui genealogiam ejus ſcribunt, Lucæ et Matthæi, hæſi incertus quemnam potiſſimum ſequerer. ——— Infinita ergo eorum prætermiſſa lite, ——— ad Joannem Marcumque me contuli: nec impariter a duobus ad duos, et ab Evangeliſtis ad ejuſdem nominis profeſſores. Fauſt. l. 3, c. 1.

[q] Quibus præſentibus? Petro, Andrea, Jacobo et Joanne. ——— Ex his quatuor unus, id eſt, Joannes Evangelium ſcripſit? Ita. Fauſt. l. 17, c. 1.

[r] Deinde cœpit dicere plurima ex Lege, multa etiam de Evangelio, et Apoſtolo Paulo, quæ ſibi videntur eſſe contraria. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

[s] ——— απεσταφασσων δε ρητα τινα του θειου ευαγγελιου, και επιστολων του θειου παυλου, πειρατα τρεπων αυτα, και προς την αιρεσιν διαστελλων. Ph. Cod. 179, p. 405.

Auguſtine ſpeaks of [t] their uſing the four goſpels, and the epiſtles of Paul; and frequently of their [u] approving or [x] admitting the authority of the goſpel and the apoſtle.

2. With regard to St. Matthew's goſpel, Fauſtus has diſputed it's genuineneſs. He is anſwering the catholic argument for the authority of the Old Teſtament, taken from the words of our Lord in Matt. v. 17: and, among other things, he ſays that [y] Matthew did not write this: and that he is not the author of the goſpel under his name may be concluded from what is ſaid Matt. ix. 9. *And as Jeſus paſſed forth from thence he ſaw a man named Matthew, ſitting at the receipt of cuſtom; and he ſaith unto him, Follow me. And he aroſe and followed him.* Fauſtus argues, that if Matthew were the writer he would have ſaid: 'Jeſus ſaw me, 'and called me, and I aroſe and followed him.' But certainly this argument is unworthy of a man of learning and conſideration. The weakneſs of it is evident from many texts of the goſpels not diſputed by the Manichees. In John iii. 16, our Lord himſelf ſays: *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth on him might not periſh.* John the evangeliſt ſpeaks of himſelf in the third perſon ſeveral times: ſee John xix. 26. xx. 2. xxi. 7, 20. It is a common thing for Joſephus, the Jewiſh hiſtorian, to [z] ſpeak of himſelf after the like manner. And does not every one perceive that Matthew out of modeſty might decline to ſpeak of himſelf in the firſt perſon upon that occaſion? Auguſtine has fully anſwered [a] this objection: and I have tranſcribed a part of what he ſays in the margin, for the ſatisfaction of inquiſitive readers.

Not to add, what is alſo well obſerved by Auguſtine elſewhere, that [b] it is a vain imagination to think by ſuch trifling objections to

[t] ——— Aut ſi talis oratio impudens eſt, ſicuti eſt, cur in Pauli Epiſtolis, cur in quatuor Evangelii libris ea valere aliquid putant ——? De Util. Cred. cap. 3, n. 7.

[u] Nam quæro ab eis, utrum bonum ſit delectari lectione Apoſtoli, —— et utrum bonum ſit Evangelium diſſerere? Reſpondebunt ad ſingula: Bonum eſt. Conf. l. 8, c. x, p. 24. [x] Videamus, quemadmodum ipſe Dominus in Evangelio nobis præceperit eſſe vivendum: quomodo etiam Paulus Apoſtolus. Has enim ſcripturas illi condemnare non audent. De M. E. C. c. 7, n. 13, in. [y] ——— ut interim permiſerimus nobis injuriam feciſſe Matthæum, donec et ipſum probemus hæc non ſcripſiſſe, ſed alium neſcio quem ſub nomine ejus: quod docet et ipſa lectionis ejuſdem Matthæi obliqua narratio. Quid enim dicit? Et cum tranſiret Jeſus, vidit hominem ſedentem ad telonium, nomine Matthæum, et vocavit eum. At ille confeſtim ſurgens, ſecutus eſt eum. Et quis ergo de ſe ipſo ſcribens, dicat, Vidit hominem, et vocavit eum, et ſecutus eſt eum: ac non potius dicat, Vidit me, et vocavit me, et ſecutus ſum: niſi quin conſtat hæc Matthæum non ſcripſiſſe, ſed alium neſcio quem ſub ejus nomine? &c. Id. l. 17, c. 1.

[z] Vid. Joſeph. de B. J. l. 2, c. 20, n. 4, 5. et paſſim. [a] Sed non uſque adeo inperitum putaverim, ut nec legerit, nec audierit, ſolere ſcriptores rerum geſtarum, cum in ſuam perſonam venerint, ita ſe contexere tamquam de alio narrant, quod de ſe narrant. Contr. Fauſt. l. 17, c. 4.

[b] ——— qui etiam de Evangelico [al. Evangelio,] tantæ auctoritatis culmine omnibus

to overthrow the authority of a goſpel ſo fully eſtabliſhed as that of St. Matthew.

3. Auguſtine often intimates that the Manichees rejected the Acts of the apoſtles. He ſometimes ſpeaks as if their averſion to that book was very great, and they could ſcarce endure the mention of it. I have already cited ſeveral of his paſſages relating to this matter. To them * the reader is referred, and I entreat him to caſt an eye upon them, though I add here [c] one or two more.

In one place he may be underſtood to ſay that [d] ſome of the Manichees reject this book. Perhaps others may interpret the place differently. But I have accidentally obſerved that [e] the compoſer of the general index in the Benedictine edition of Auguſtine's works did not underſtand him to ſay 'certain peo-'ple called Manichees,' but 'ſome of the Manichees.'

And indeed I queſtion whether the Manichees did all, and always, reject the book of the Acts as they did the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament.

For firſt, I do not ſee any reaſon they had to reject the Acts any more than the goſpels, or other books of the New Teſtament. Auguſtine himſelf ſays that [f] in other books of the New Teſtament there are like things to thoſe in the Acts: and that as they pretended other books of the New Teſtament were interpolated, they might have ſaid the ſame of this likewiſe. That indeed, as he obſerves, would have been a groundleſs and impudent aſſertion: but if that had been what they choſe to ſay of

omnibus noto, mentiri ſic audet, ut non Matthæum, ne apoſtolici nominis pondere comprimatur, ſed neſcio quem alium ſub Matthæi nomine velit putari ſcripſiſſe de Chriſto, quod non vult credere, et quod calumnioſa verſutia refutare conatur. Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 23, c. 6.

* See before, p. 449, 450.

[c] Qua poteſtate Petrus apoſtolus uſus eſt in eo libro quem iſti non accipiunt, quoniam manifeſte continet Paracleti adventum, id eſt, conſolatoris Sancti Spiritus. —— Contr. Adim, c. 17, n. 5. Quod non ſolum in Actibus Apoſtolorum canonicis, quos iſti non accipiunt, ne de adventu veri Paracleti, quem promiſit Dominus, convincantur, evidenter apparet. Contr. Fauſt. l. 19, c. 31. Deinde Paracletum ſicut promiſſum legimus in iis libris, quorum non omnia vultis accipere; ita et miſſum legimus in eo libro, quem nominare etiam formidatis. In Actibus quippe Apoſtolorum —— apertiſſime legitur nullus die Pentecoſtes Spiritus Sanctus. ib. l. 32, c. 15. [d] Nam quidem Manichæi canonicum librum, cujus titulus eſt Actus Apoſtolorum, repudiant. Aug. ad Ceret. Ep. 237, [al. 253], n. 7. Vid. ſupra. 449, note q. [e] See the general Index in the word Manichæi —— ex eis quidam Actus Apoſtolorum repudiant. 2. Tom. Ep. 237. [f] Hoc enim de illo libro fecerunt, qui Actus Apoſtolorum inſcribitur. Quod eorum conſilium, cum mecum ipſe pertracto, nequeo ſatis mirari. ——Tanta enim liber iſte habet, quæ ſimilia ſunt his quæ accipiunt, ut magnæ ſtultitiæ mihi videatur, non et hunc accipere, et, ſi quid ibi eos offendit, falſum atque immiſſum dicere. Aut ſi talis oratio impudens eſt, ſicuti eſt, cur in Pauli Epiſtolis, cur in quatuor Evangelii libris ea valere aliquid putant, in quibus haud ſcio an multo plura ſint proportione, quam in illo libro eſſe potuerunt, quæ a corruptoribus interjecta credi volunt? De Ut. Cred. c, 3, n. 7.

this book, it would have been no more unreaſonable than their ſaying it of the reſt; for there were not here more things contrary to their opinions, than in the other books which they did receive.

Secondly, I have obſerved that ſeveral Greek writers of the fourth century, or thereabouts, in their diſputes with the Manichees, cite this book as if it was received by them.

The Acts are quoted in The Diſpute of [g] Archelaus.

Serapion having alleged the hiſtory in 2 Kings xiii. 21, adds: 'But [h] if they pay no regard to theſe things, and deſpiſe the 'law, let them however hearken to what is ſaid of ſick people 'being healed by the very ſhadow of Peter's body, and let that 'fill them with confuſion:' where he plainly refers to Acts v. 15.

Titus of Boſtra argues with them out of the Acts. The Manichees pretended that the diſpenſation of the law was cruel and unmerciful. They excepted againſt Eliſha's curſing the children, which preſently afterwards were devoured by two bears: and againſt Elijah's calling for fire from heaven to conſume the captains with their men, ſent to him from the king of Iſrael. Whereupon Titus anſwers: 'If [i] they condemn theſe actions as evil, 'what will they ſay of Paul, when obſerving that Barjeſus, who 'was with the proconſul Sergius Paulus, ſtrove to turn him from 'the truth, he deprived him of eyeſight, and ſaid: *O full of all 'ſubtilty?*' and what follows: Acts xiii. 10. He likewiſe adds: 'And [k] what will they ſay of Peter, who, when Ananias and 'Sapphira brought a part only of the price of what they had 'ſold, and he had convicted them of lying, ſtruck Ananias 'dead, and afterwards delivered Sapphira to the ſame grave?' Upon theſe inſtances Titus proceeds to argue a great deal, without any ſuſpicion of their conteſting the credit and authority of the book whence they are taken.

Epiphanius [l], in his argument with the Manichees, quotes the Acts of the apoſtles ſeveral times.

Didymus of Alexandria likewiſe, in his ſhort tract againſt them, expreſsly quotes [m] the ſame book for a part of the hiſtory of St. Stephen.

[g] Vid. Arch. c. 34. p. 59, c. 36, p. 63.

[h] ——— και ει μηδενος τουτων φροντιζουσι, και το λεγειν διαφευγουσι· μηδε των νεκρων τιμωσιν, αγ. εκ του παραλληλου διανοηθησεται, πως η σκια Πετρου την ψυχην ημων ωφελησεν; Serap. p. 47, f.

[i] Και τινα τουτων αιτια, και τι ταυτα; επιθυμιας ει τον ειδεναι και γνωναι τι βουλεται, η ειπερ απλως ουκ εστιν ουτε των λεγομενων εμφησαι τον μαγον, ——— επιτιμησε, φησιν των οφθαλμων εσκοτασε. Tit. contr. Manich. l. 3, p. 155.

[k] Τι δε ερουσι περι του Πετρου ——— τον μεν αυτοις ψευδη συνορκιζοντα, την δε σαπφειραν τω ανδρι συμφωνησασαν αποκτειναντος; Id. ib.

[l] Vid. H. 66. c. 61, p. 674. B. c. 62, p. 675. E. et C.

[m] ——— ωσπερ και επι του αγιου Στεφανου, κ.λ. Didym. contr. Manich. p. 208.

All

All this ſeems ſufficient to render it probable that the Manichees did not always, and every where, reject the Acts of the apoſtles: if they had ſo done, Archelaus, or Serapion, or Titus, or Epiphanius, or Didymus, muſt have known it, and would have taken ſome notice of it.

We have therefore Auguſtine's ſingle teſtimony alone againſt them upon this head; which can affect only the Manichees of his time in Africa, if it be valid ſo far.

I do not recollect that Fauſtus has any thing which can afford us much light. He has quoted [n] the tenth of the Acts: but it is not in ſuch a manner as to decide the queſtion. He may be ſuppoſed likewiſe to refer to [o] the fifteenth chapter.

Upon the whole, I ſomewhat doubt whether the Manichees were ſo much offended at this book as Auguſtine inſinuates.

If the reader thinks it may be of any uſe for finding out the Manichæan ſentiment concerning the book of the Acts, he may obſerve the teſtimony of the Paulicians to the New Teſtament, which will be taken notice of hereafter. They are commonly reckoned a branch of this ſect; and it is ſaid that ſome of them did not receive the Acts.

Beauſobre, conſidering this matter, ſays: 'Nevertheleſs, [p] Auguſtine has well obſerved that [q] the Manichees might have received the book of the Acts, and yet avoid the difficulties they would then have been urged with, by only making the like exceptions, which they did to evade the teſtimony of the goſpels. Which,' as that learned author adds, 'has made me think that the true reaſon why the Manichees excluded the hiſtory of the apoſtles from their canon, was, that it had not in the eaſtern churches, from the beginning, the ſame authority with the goſpels and epiſtles.' After which he refers to a well known paſſage of St. Chryſoſtom.

But I am rather of opinion that this book was not always rejected by the Manichees: and I rely upon the reaſons juſt aſſigned, without adding any thing farther.

Nor can I allow that the Acts of the apoſtles was not of authority from the beginning in the eaſtern churches: for it was received by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Dionyſius of Alexandria, and other Chriſtians in the eaſt, as has been already ſhewn in this work.

[n] —— quemadmodum et illud, quod de Petro ſoletis adferre, tamquam idem viderit aliquando de cœlo demiſſum vas, in quo eſſent omnia genera animalium et ſerpentes. Fauſt. l. 31, c. 3.

[o] De mandato vero abſtinendi a cibis communibus, viſum vobis eſt et vehementer creditum, morticina quidem et immolata eſſe ſine immunda. l. 32, c. 3.

[p] B. T. i. p. 293. [q] De Util. Cred. cap. 3.

4. I next obſerve what epiſtles of apoſtles they admitted.

Auguſtine ſpeaks of it as an undoubted and well known thing, that the [r] Manichees read, admired and commended St. Paul's epiſtles.

In another place he ſpeaks [s] of their having, reading, and commending, or commenting upon, the epiſtles of the apoſtles.

He alſo ſpeaks [t] of their receiving the goſpel, and the canonical epiſtles: meaning by this laſt expreſſion, as I apprehend, the epiſtles commonly received by other Chriſtians as a part of their canon; not thoſe ſometimes called catholic, as [u] Beauſobre thought. The firſt ſenſe is agreeable to Auguſtine's uſe of the word in other [x] places.

I ſuppoſe there is no doubt but they received thirteen epiſtles of the apoſtle Paul.

Photius, ſpeaking of Agapius, in the [y] paſſage above cited, ſays, he quotes paſſages of the divine goſpel, and of the epiſtles of the divine Paul.

Fauſtus [z] readily ſays, 'he receives the apoſtle;' thereby meaning Paul, or the epiſtles of that apoſtle. And in his yet remaining work he quotes expreſsly, and by name, many of them: as well as frequently without naming them: as [a] the epiſtle to the Romans, the [b] firſt and [c] ſecond to the Corinthians, to [d] the Galatians, to [e] the Epheſians, to [f] the Coloſſians, to [g] Titus.

5. Let us now conſider whether the Manichees received the epiſtle to the Hebrews. There is ſome reaſon to think they did: for there are references to it in [h] The Acts of Archelaus. Serapion, in his book [i] Againſt the Manichees, quotes this epiſtle, as does [k] Titus of Boſtra, and [l] Didymus of Alexandria. Epiphanius, in his argument with theſe people, quotes this epiſtle [m] ſeveral

[r] Certe et ipſi Manichæi legunt apoſtolum Paulum, et laudant et honorant, et eius epiſtolas male interpretando multos decipiunt. De Gen. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 2, n. 3. [s] Et tamen epiſtolas apoſtolorum, quibus hæc omnia conſtantur, tenetis, legitis, prædicatis. Contr. Faust. l. 12, c. 24. [t] —— ut quidquid eſt in evangeliis vel epiſtolis canonicis, quo adjuvari hæreſim ſuam putent, id eſſe a Chriſto et Apoſtolis dictum teneant atque ſuadeant. Contr. Faust. l. 22, c. 15.

[u] T. i. p. 291. [x] Qui etiam in Scripturis canonicis Teſtamenti Novi, hoc eſt in veris evangelicis et apoſtolicis literis, non accipiant omnia. —— ad Cerct. Ep. 237, [al. 253,] et paſſim.

[y] See p. 501, note [s]. [z] Apoſtolum accipis? Et maxime. Faust. l. xi. c. 1.

[a] Aut ſi vobis ſecundum quod ad Romanos ſcribit, credere cordi eſt. l. xi. c. 1.

[b] [c] *propter idem rurſum* Apoſtolus ad Corinthios dicit. —— l. 24, c. 1, fin.

[c] Scribenſque ad Corinthios. l. xi. c. 1, et paſſim. [d] Quippe Paulus inde Galatas arguit. l. 8, c. 1. Et ad Galatas de ſemetipſo. l. 24, c. 1. [e] Dicit ad Epheſios. Id. l. 24, c. 1. [f] Necnon et ad ipſos Coloſſenſes idipſum denuo dicit. ibid. [g] De Gentium [lege] vero ſi quis ambigit, audiat Paulum, qui ſcribens ad Titum de Cretenſibus, dicit. Id. l. 19, c. 2. [h] Arch. c. 5, p. 7. c. 43, p. 77.

[i] Serap. p. 40, 41. and ſee before, p. 386.

[k] Tit. l. 3, p. 142, 153. See before, p. 386. [l] Did. p. 209.

[m] Epiph. H. 66, c. 63, in. fin. c. 74, p. 695. B. c. 75, p. 701, D.

times.

times. Auguſtine, in his book againſt Adimantus, quotes it [n] together with the epiſtle to the Romans. He alſo quotes it [o] in his anſwer to Fauſtus.

6. Timothy of Conſtantinople ſays the [p] Manichees received an epiſtle to the Laodiceans: but poſſibly he means the Paulicians. However, I think this [q] teſtimony can be of but little value here.

7. As for the Catholic Epiſtles, we cannot ſay any thing very particularly about them.

However Epiphanius, in his confutation of them, has quoted, beſide moſt other books of the New Teſtament, the [r] firſt and [s] ſecond epiſtles of Peter. Auguſtine, in his books againſt Fauſtus, again and again [t] quotes the firſt epiſtle of Peter, as received by them. In another work againſt the Manichees he openly quotes the ſecond epiſtle of Peter. And in his anſwer to Fauſtus he cites [x] the firſt epiſtle of John, which is alſo quoted by Manichæus himſelf [y] in The Acts of Archelaus.

8. Auguſtine, in his work againſt Fauſtus, quotes [z] words of the Revelation with others of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, as if they received the former as well as the latter: which may lead us to think that the Manichees, thoſe in Africa at leaſt, did not reject the book of the Revelation.

9. In a word, Auguſtine, Epiphanius, and other ancient catholic authors, who wrote againſt the Manichees, do ſo quote all the books of the New Teſtament, that one is induced to think they received all the evangelical ſcriptures which other Chriſtians did; for if they had not thoſe authors would have taken notice of it. They inform us diſtinctly, that the Manichees did not receive the Old Teſtament. If they had rejected any books of the New Teſtament, generally received, they would have mentioned it. Auguſtine indeed ſays, they did not receive the book of the Acts: but as he does not ſpeak of their entirely diſ-

[n] Interpretatus Apoſtolus ſabbatum ad Hebræos, cum dicit, *remanet ergo ſabbatismus populo Dei.*——Apoſtolicam itaque interpretationem ſpiritaliter teneo. Contr. Adim. cap. 16. n. 3.

[o] Contr. Fauſt. l. 6, c. 9.

[p] Τὰ τοῦ Παύλου ἐπιστολὴ. Tim. ap. Meurſ. Var. Div. p. 117.

[q] Le témoignage du Prêtre Timothée, d'heureux, qu'ont interpolé ſon ouvrage, n'eſt d'aucun poids. Beauſ. T. i. p. 366. Le Decret de Gelaſe, et le Formule de Hormiſdas, ont été fort interpolez. Id. p. 366, 367, not. 4.

[r] Hær. 66, c. 73, p. 693. D.

[s] Ib. c. 64, p. 678, E. et C.

[t] Contr. F. l. 22, c. 14, et 22.

[u] Quia vero et ipſi mali angeli non a Deo mali ſunt conditi, ſed peccando facti ſunt mali, ſic Petrus in epiſtola ſua dicit: Si enim Deus angelis peccantibus non pepercit,——[2 Pet. ii. 4.] De Nat. Boni. cap. 33. [x] Quod etiam Joannes dicit: Filii Dei ſumus, et nondum apparuit, quid erimus. [1 John iii. 2.] Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 18. [y] Ap. Arch. c. 14, p. 26. Vid. loc. citat. ſupra, p. 15.

[z] Non ſolum enim in vetere Teſtamento ſcriptum eſt, *Quem enim diligit Deus, corripit*——ſed etiam in novo, *Ego quem amo, arguo et caſtigo.* Apoc. iii. 19. Contr. F. l. 22, c. 14.

liking

liking any of the reſt, it may be hence inferred, that in other reſpects their canon of the New Teſtament was much the ſame with that of the catholics.

Auguſtine once [a] ſpeaks of their not only rejecting ſome paſſages of the New Teſtament, but alſo of their chuſing what books they pleaſed; but the only inſtance he produceth is that of the Acts: which confirms what has been juſt now ſaid, that the Manichees did not reject any book of the New Teſtament, received by other Chriſtians, except the book of the Acts, if indeed they rejected that. Auguſtine, who ſo often ſpeaks of their not liking the Acts of the apoſtles, muſt ſome time have joined with it other books, if there had been any other diſowned by them.

V. We have therefore now ſeen what books of the New Teſtament were generally received by the Manichees. Under the next particular we ſhall obſerve what they ſaid of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament being interpolated; where, it is likely, we ſhall more diſtinctly perceive what regard they had for them. Nevertheleſs I would add here ſome things for ſhewing the credit and authority which theſe ſcriptures had with them.

And it ſeems evident that they aſcribed a good degree of authority to the books of the New Teſtament before mentioned. This appears from paſſages of Serapion, and others above cited, and from the conſtant method of arguing with them by Serapion, Titus, Epiphanius, and all authors in general who wrote againſt them. To add here only one inſtance from Serapion, who ſuppoſeth that he fully confutes and overthrows a ſentiment of theirs by arguing from the New Teſtament in this manner: 'The [b] 'goſpel ſays, publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of hea-'ven before you. And Paul ſays, that Raab the harlot periſhed 'not with them that believed not.'

Auguſtine, at the beginning of one of his books againſt theſe men, ſays: 'I [c] will obſerve this method, to quote no texts but 'ſuch as they cannot except againſt; that is, out of the New 'Teſtament only; and out of that too none of thoſe texts which

[a] Qui non accipiunt omnia, ſed quod volunt, et libros eligunt quos accipiant, aliis improbatis. Sed in ſingulis quibuſque libris loca diſtinguunt, quæ putant ſuis erroribus convenire. Cætera in eis pro falſis habent. Nam quidam Manichæi canonicum librum, cujus titulus eſt Actus Apoſtolorum, repudiant. Aug. Ep. 237, [al. 253,] T. 2.

[b] Οταν δε λεγη το ευαγγελιον——οταν λεγη παυλος.—Serap. p. 46, infr. m.

[c] Et ea de ſcripturis aſſumam teſtimonia, quibus eos neceſſe eſt credere, de Novo ſcilicet Teſtamento. De quo tamen nihil proferam eorum quæ ſolent immiſta eſſe dicere, cum magnis auguſtiis coartantur; ſed ea dicam, quæ et approbare et laudare coguntur. De M. Ec. Cath. c. 11. n. 2.

'they,

'they, when hardly preſſed, are wont to call interpolations: but 'I ſhall allege ſuch things only as they both approve and com-'mend.'

Every one, I preſume, has obſerved in the hiſtory which has been given of their opinions, that they endeavoured to juſtify their doctrine of two principles, their notion of the perſon of Chriſt, and all their peculiar ſentiments, by texts of the New Teſtament. Particularly, when they reject the Old Teſtament, one of their ſtrongeſt arguments is taken from it's contrariety to the New. Therefore this laſt was received, and was of authority with them. The [d] deſign of the book written by Adimantus, the old diſciple of Mani, as Auguſtine informs us, was to overthrow the Old Teſtament, by ſhewing it to be contrary to the evangelical and apoſtolical ſcriptures.

Mani, in his letter to Marcellus, [e] complains 'that men, even 'Chriſtians, did not believe the goſpels.' And in that ſame ſhort letter he has words of the goſpels of Matthew and John, of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, and of the epiſtle to the Hebrews. And in the [f] diſpute with Archelaus he quoted and argued from many paſſages of the goſpels and Paul's epiſtles. And there are large and numerous quotations of the books of the New Teſtament in his letter to [g] Menoch, if it be genuine.

Fortunatus, the Manichæan preſbyter, in his diſpute with Auguſtine, quotes Philip. ii. 5, in this manner: 'We [h] think,' as the apoſtle directs: and ſays, 'he [i] knows very well, that he 'cannot prove his faith to be right, unleſs he ſhews it to be 'agreeable to the ſcriptures.'

Secundinus, in his letter to Auguſtine, though of no great length, quotes the goſpels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the epiſtles to the Romans, the Epheſians, and firſt to Timothy. And in a ſhort compaſs he owns [k] a great number of facts recorded in the goſpels; as Peter's thrice denying his

[d] Eodem tempore venerunt in manus meas quædam diſputationes Adimanti, ——quas conſcripſit contra Legem et prophetas, velut contraria eis Evangelica et Apoſtolica ſcripta demonſtrare conatus. Aug. Retr. l. i. c. 22, in.

[e] Ap. Arch. cap. v. p. 6, 7, 8.

[f] Ib. c. 13, p. 24, 25, et paſſim.

[g] Ap. Auguſtin. Op. Imperf. l. 3, c. 177, 180, 185, 186.

[h] Hoc ſentimus, quod nos inſtruit beatus Paulus, qui dixit: Fortunat. Diſp. i. n. 7. [i] Et quia nullo genere recte me credere oſtendere poſſum, niſi eamdem fidem Scripturarum auctoritate firmaverim. Id. in Diſp. ii. n. 20.

[k] ——ut et Petrum coegerit ſub una nocte tertio Dominum negare, et eidem reſurgenti Thomam non permiſerit credere——et tanto paſtori Iſcariotem rapuerit; et ut ad ultimum crucis ſupplicium veniretur, in perniciem ipſius Scribas Phariſæoſque accenderit, ut Barrabbam dimitti clamarent, et Jeſum crucifigi.—— Et tamen ne ipſo quidem crucis opprobrio potuit ſatiari. Quin immo inſaniens hinc coegit ſpinis coronari, illinc aceto potari: hinc militum lancea percuti, illinc ſiniſtri latronis ore blaſphemari, &c. Secundin. ad Aug. cap. 4.

Lord;

Lord; the final apoſtaſy of Judas; the unbelief of Thomas after our Lord's reſurrection; Chriſt's crucifixion; the Jews preferring Barabbas to Jeſus at the inſtigation of the ſcribes and phariſees; that Jeſus was crowned with thorns, and had vinegar given him to drink; that his ſide was pierced, and that he was crucified between two thieves, by one of whom he was reviled. He refers alſo to Hymeneus and Alexander, and other things ſpoken of by Paul, 1 Tim. i.

Indeed a large part of the New Teſtament may be found quoted by Fauſtus, and other Manichees with whom Auguſtine was concerned, and according to our copies.

Notwithſtanding what is ſaid of their charging the catholic Chriſtians with having interpolated the goſpels, which will be conſidered hereafter, Fauſtus readily ſays, 'They [l] believe 'Chriſt's myſtic crucifixion, his ſaving or wholeſome precepts, 'his parables, and his divine diſcourſes, as related in the goſpels.'

And in Fauſtus alone we find theſe following, and many other things; our [m] Lord's gathering diſciples gradually, and not completing at once the number of his apoſtles; [n] his conference with Nicodemus; the [o] impriſonment of John the Baptiſt, his [p] meſſage to Jeſus, and the anſwer ſent back to him; Peter's [q] confeſſion, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, the Son of God; that [r] unclean ſpirits crying out owned Jeſus to be the Son of God; many [s] miracles of our Lord, his curing a man blind from his birth, raiſing the dead, the woman healed upon touching Chriſt's garment; the [t] hiſtory of the centurion, whoſe ſervant Chriſt healed; the [u] eſcape of Barabbas at the petition of the Jews; and the penitent thief, and Chriſt's acceptance of him; Thomas's [x] unbelief, and Chriſt's ſhewing him the marks of his wounds; and many other things.

[l] His igitur exceptis, —— credimus cætera, præcipue crucis eius myſticam fixionem,—tum præcepta ſalutaria eius, tum parabolas, cunctumque ſermonem deificum. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 7.

[m] Quis hoc teſtatur dixiſſe Jeſum? Matthæus. Ubi dixiſſe? In monte. Quibus præſentibus? Petro, Andrea, Jacobo et Joanne, quatuor his tantum. Cæteros enim necdum elegerat, nec ipſum Matthæum. Id. l. 17, cap. i. [n] l. 24, c. i.

[o] Nam et in ipſo Matthæo poſt inclauſum Joannem in carcere, tunc legitur Jeſum cœpiſſe prædicare evangelium regni Dei. l. 2, c. i. [p] l. 5, c. i.

[q] l. 5, c. 3. [r] ——quia nec ſpiritibus immundis, cum iidem Jeſum eſſe filium Dei exſerte indiſſimulanterque confiterentur, profuit.—— l. 16, c. 1.

[s] Nam et cæcum a nativitate lumen videre natura non ſinit, quod tamen Jeſus potenter operatus videtur erga hujus generis cæcos——? manum aridam ſanaſſe, vocem ac verbum privatis his per naturam redonaſſe; mortuis et in tabem jam reſolutis corporibus compage reddita vitalem reſtaurare ſpiritum, quem non ad ſuperos adducat——? Quæ tamen omnia nos communiter facta ab eodem credimus Chriſtiani. l. 26, c. 2. [t] l. 33, c. 2.

[u] An Barabbas latro ille inſignis, qui non ſolum in ligno ſuſpenſus minime eſt, ſed etiam Judæorum rogatu emiſſus e carcere, magis fuit benedictus, quam ille qui cum Chriſto Jeſu cruce adſcendit in cœlum? l. 14, c. 1. [x] l. 16, c. 8.

Auguſtine

Auguſtine having quoted the hiſtories of the dæmoniacs at the tombs, and of the barren figtree, which withered at Chriſt's word, particularly obſerves, that [y] theſe were things which they had never pretended to be interpolations.

Fauſtus, quoting the goſpel, calls it [z] ſcripture.

I ſhall here [a] in the margin put down a number of paſſages, ſhewing the reſpect which the Manichees had for the apoſtles of Jeſus, though I have before taken notice of ſome of them. That [b] the apoſtle Paul ſhould contradict himſelf, or teach different doctrine at one time, or in one epiſtle, from what he had taught in another, is a thought which Fauſtus rejects with indignation.

VI. What comes to be conſidered by us in the next place, is, their pretence that the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament were corrupted, having been interpolated by the catholics: and therefore, as Auguſtine ſaid in his ſummary account, 'they took what 'they liked, and rejected the reſt.' What has been already ſaid may be of ſome uſe to help us in underſtanding this notion of theirs. Nevertheleſs divers paſſages of ancient authors ſhould be obſerved by us, that we may the more diſtinctly perceive how far they carried this principle.

1. Some might complain if I did not largely tranſcribe ſo ancient a writer in this controverſy as Titus of Boſtra, who, I think, has uſed the ſtrongeſt expreſſions of any of their adverſaries in ſpeaking of this matter. They are ſuch as theſe:

'Mani, and his followers,' he ſays, 'for [c] ſupporting their doc-'trines, quote ſome texts of ſcripture, and wreſt them from their 'right meaning.'

The [d] Old Teſtament, even the law and the prophets, he aſcribes to what he calls the evil principle. 'The goſpels, and

[y] Sed quoniam privilegio quodam vos tuemini, ut de ſcripturis opprimi nequeatis, dicendo eas eſſe falſatas: quamquam et quæ commemoravi de arbore, et de grege porcorum, numquam a corruptoribus immiſſa eſſe dixiſtis. De Mor. Manich. c. 17, n. 55. [z] ——ut ſcriptura teſtatur. Nam pannum, inquit, novum nemo aſſuit veſtimento veteri, &c. l. 8. c. 1.

[a] Ut fere Chriſto placet, et ejus Apoſtolis, et nobis profecto. Fauſt. l. 24, cap. 1.

Neque id temere aut præſumtive, ſed a Chriſto diſcentes, et ejus Apoſtolis. ibid. in fin.

Sed quærendum potius eſt, quid ipſe de ſe, quidve apoſtoli ſui de eodem prædicarint. Id. l. 19, c. 1.

Ecce quid Apoſtolus dixit, ecce quid Evangeliſta. Fel. Act. l. 2, c. 2, ap. Aug. t. 8. [b] Non equidem crediderim apoſtolum Dei contraria ſibi ſcribere potuiſſe, et modo hanc, modo illam de Domino noſtro habuiſſe ſententiam.——Alioquin, abſit apoſtolum Dei, quod ædificavit umquam deſtruere. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 1.

[c] χρησεις τινας των αγιων γραφων ενδιαζομενος προς τινα αιτιαν ψευδολογιας Tit. l. 3, p. 135. f. [d] Των δε γραφων τας μεν παλαιοτερας αιτιαται τη τοις αιτιοις λεγομενη κακιφ, νομ. τε και προφητας· τα δε ευαγγελια, και τα λοιπα της καινης διαθηκης μαθηματα, παρα μεν του αγαθου, ως οιεται, δεδοσθαι, φησιν· ουδε ταυτα μεντοι ο της βλασφημιας εκφυγειν δυνηθεις διισχυριζεται ολα καθαρευειν του, ως φησιν, παντος θειου· ευπαρχειν δε και τουτοις, ασπις κατα τινα μιξιν, πολλα της υπ' αιτου καταγνωσεως ολης· και χρηται ταυτα, περιελοντα ουκ ολιγα καθ' εαυτα, καταλιπειν α τη του αγαθου μεριδι. ib. p. 136.

'other

'other parts of the New Teſtament,' he ſays, 'are from the 'good principle; but they are not uncorrupt: for many things 'of Hyle, or the bad principle, are mixed with them. For which 'reaſon we are to make a diſtinction, and are to follow, and 'make uſe of, thoſe parts only which belong to what he calls 'the good principle.' He adds, 'that [e] Mani pretends to cor- 'rect the holy ſcriptures, and, acting here the aſſumed character 'of the Paraclete, he takes away a large part of the New Teſ- 'tament, and leaves in it a few things only, ſo ſpoiling all it's 'harmony.'

Titus ſays farther: 'Becauſe [f] they honour the name of Chriſt, 'they pretend to honour alſo the goſpels. But if they did really 'honour the goſpels they would neither take away from them, 'nor add to them.——Whereas they have added to the goſpels 'what they pleaſed, and have taken away from them what they 'thought fit: ſtill calling it the goſpel however, when it is not; 'for they have not the body [or ſubſtance] of the goſpel.'

Preſently afterwards he ſays that 'they [g] had treated the 'ſcriptures worſe than the heathens: for they only rejected them, 'whereas theſe men, pretending to receive the goſpels, have 'abuſed, perverted and adulterated them.'

More to the like purpoſe may be ſeen in [h] Titus. But I ſuppoſe I have tranſcribed enough to ſatisfy every one concerning the nature of the charge which he brings againſt this people.

And there is reaſon to think that he aggravates and exaggerates beyond the truth. Therefore Mill [i] ſays judiciouſly, 'they 'did not alter the goſpels; they only ſaid of thoſe paſſages, 'which they did not like, that they were additions, made long 'ago by ſome corrupters of the ſcriptures.' And Beauſobre [k] has ſhewn largely that Titus has in part miſrepreſented the caſe.

[e] Ουτω των αγιων γραφων την διορθωσιν, ως φησεται, καθ' εαυτον μεταχειριζομενος, και δια τουτο μαλιστα τολμων παρακλητος ειναι δοκειν, τα μεν πλειονα περιγραφει, βραχεα δε καταλιπων, και της καινης διαθηκης πολυστα των συγγενων λογων την συμφωνιαν· ib. p. 136.

[f] Αλλ' επειδη τετιμηται το ονομα ιησυ, προσποιουνται· ειδει γαρ αυτους, ειγε τα ευαγγελια ετιμων, μη περιτεμειν τα ευαγγελια, μη μερη των ευαγγελιων εξυφελειν, μη ετερα πεποιηθηναι——προσγεγραφηκασι γαρ οσα βεβουληνται, και εξυφειλαιτο οσα κεκρικασι· και λοιπον ονοματι——καλουσι το ευαγγελιον, μη τετηρηκοτες το σωμα. Tit. l. 3, p. 139.

[g] ——οι δε ειληφεναι δοκουντες, ειτεβατευσαι, ενεχαρευσαι, ενεκαπηλευσαν τοις γραμμασι· ib. p. 139.

[h] Id. ib. p. 140, 141.

[i] Non quidem palam rejectis iſtis capitulis, ſed diſſimulatis, ſeu ita apud animum repudiatis; ut nihilominus cum ab eis premerentur, haud neceſſe haberent, cum Marcionitis reformare codices ſuos, ſive ex ipſis tollere quæ ſibi minus probata fuerint; ſed ſufficeret dixiſſe, loca illa jam olim a corruptoribus S. textus fuiſſe inſerta.——Mill. Proleg. n. 726. Gemina iſtis, ipſiuſque textus depravationem objicit Manichæis Titus. Dicit eos circumcidiſſe Evangelia.——Verum criminatio hæc quouſque valeat, et quomodo interpretanda ſit, ex ſupra dictis liquet——non mutilantes quidem Scripturas, textumve ipſum quovis modo mutantes. Id. n. 761.

[k] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 302.—309.

Jerom

Jerom intimates either [l] that the Manichees curtailed the copies of the New Teſtament, or did not receive and admit the authority of every thing found in the copies generally uſed by the catholics.

What Photius ſays of Agapius was obſerved [m] formerly. He does not expreſsly charge Agapius with pretending that the books of the New Teſtament were interpolated.

Auguſtine often ſpeaks of this matter. Divers of his paſſages muſt be produced.

The general account which he gives in his Retractations of what he wrote againſt Fauſtus, is this: 'I [n] wrote a large work againſt 'Fauſtus, blaſpheming the law and the prophets, and their God, 'and the incarnation of Chriſt, and ſaying that the ſcriptures of 'the New Teſtament, by which he is confuted, are interpolated.'

He frequently ſpeaks to this purpoſe: 'When [o] any text is al-'leged againſt them from the goſpels which they cannot an-'ſwer, they ſay it is interpolated.' Again, 'When [p] they are 'greatly preſſed with the authority of the ſcriptures, they cry 'out: "That paſſage was inſerted in the goſpel by the corrupters "of ſcripture." 'When [q] the words of ſcripture are clearly 'againſt them, ſo that they can find no way to pervert them, 'they betake themſelves to their common anſwer, and ſay the 'paſſage is an interpolation.'

In an epiſtle to Ceretius, having repreſented their opinion concerning the Old Teſtament, he adds: 'And [r] in the canoni-'cal ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, that is, the genuine evan-'gelical and apoſtolical writings, they do not receive all, but 'what they like.——In every book they mark the places, taking 'ſuch as they think favourable to their errors, and ſetting aſide 'the reſt as interpolations.'

[l] Marcion et Manichæus hunc locum, in quo dicit apoſtolus, *Quæ quidam ſunt allegorica*, et cætera quæ ſequuntur, [Gal. iv. 24.] de codice ſuo tollere noluerunt, putantes adverſum nos relinqui. Hier. in Gal. T. 4, p. 281, f.

[m] See before, p. 501. [n] Contra Fauſtum Manichæum, blaſphemantem Legem et Prophetas, et eorum Deum, et incarnationem Chriſti; ſcripturas autem Novi Teſtamenti, quibus convincitur, falſatas eſſe dicentem, ſcripſi grande opus. Retr. l. 2, c. 7. [o] Quod ſi dicunt, hoc capitulum falſum eſſe, et a corruptoribus ſcripturarum eſſe additum; (nam hoc ſolent, quando non inveniunt quid reſpondeant, dicere:) Contr. Adim. cap. 3, n. 2.

[p] An forte dictum ſunt, ſicut ſolent dicere, cum ſcripturarum eos vincit auctoritas, hoc capitulum a corruptoribus ſcripturarum inſertum eſſe Evangelio? Contr. Adim. c. 15, n. 1, m. [q] Hoc eſt quod paulo ante dixi, quia ubi ſe manifeſta veritate illi premuntur, ut obtendant diluendis verbis ſanctarum ſcripturarum, contra in eis fallaciæ ſuæ reperire non poſſunt, id teſtimonium quod prolatum eſt, falſum eſſe reſpondent. Contr. Faust. l. xi. c. 2.

[r] Qui etiam in ſcripturis canonicis teſtamenti novi, hoc eſt, in veris Evangelicis et Apoſtolicis libris, non accipiunt omnia, ſed quod volunt.——Sed et in ſinguli quibuſque libris ſecernunt quæ putant ſibi errores ſuos confirmare, cætera in ea pro fidei habent. Ad. t. 2. Ep. 237, al. 253.

He ſomewhere calls this [s] a certain privilege of theirs, by which they endeavoured to defend themſelves againſt arguments brought from a text of ſcripture.

In another place he ſays: 'This [t] is their principle—Whatever is found in the goſpels, or in the epiſtles, by which they imagine their error may be ſupported, that they allow and maintain to have been ſaid by Chriſt and his apoſtles: whatever appears contrary to them in the ſame books they make no ſcruple to ſay, without ſhame, has been inſerted by ſome corrupters of ſcripture. By which diabolical privilege of theirs they think themſelves ſecure againſt every thing that can be alleged from ſcripture.'

Hence we learn that, according to them, the apoſtolical epiſtles, as well as the goſpels, had been corrupted.

He elſewhere ſays that 'they [u] receive and approve ſome things in the books of the New Teſtament: and that when aſked, why they rejected and found fault with other things in the ſame books, they anſwered, becauſe thoſe paſſages had been inſerted by corrupters of the ſcripture.'

Auguſtine intimates that [x] this principle was taught by Mani himſelf, 'to accept whatever favoured him in the New Teſtament, and reject what did not.'

It is found in The Acts of Archelaus. That [y] biſhop argued in favour of the Old Teſtament from thoſe words of Chriſt, Matt. v. 17: *I came not to deſtroy, but to fulfil.* To which Mani anſwers, that 'Chriſt never ſpoke thoſe words. For ſince in fact he deſtroyed the law, we ought to conclude his diſcourſes agreed therewith.'

[s] Sed quoniam privilegio quodam vos tuemini, ut de ſcripturis opprimi nequeatis, dicendo eas eſſe falſatas. De M. Manich. c. 17, n. 55. [t] An forte, quæ de Novo Teſtamento protulimus, ipſa quoque audent dicere falſa eſſe atque perverſa, privilegio ſuo diabolico, ut quicquid eſt in Evangelio vel Epiſtolis canonicis, quo adjuvari hæreſim ſuam putent, id eſſe a Chriſto et apoſtolis dictum teneant atque ſuadeant, quicquid autem ex iiſdem codicibus adverſus eos ſonuerit, immiſſum ab infalſatoribus, ore impudenti ac ſacrilego non dubitent dicere? Cui furori eorum, auctoritatem omnium librorum exſtinguere atque abolere conanti, jam ſupra —— non pauca reſpondi. Centr. Fauſt. l. 22, c. 15.

[u] Vos ſcripturas Novi Teſtamenti tamquam falſatas corruptaſque pulſatis. —— Vos autem omnia quæ in libris Novi Teſtamenti non accipitis omnino reprehenditis, nec a Chriſto, nec ab apoſtolis ejus dicta vel conſcripta aſſeveratis. ——— Cum itaque a vobis quæritur, quare non omnia in libris Novi Teſtamenti accipitis, ſed in eis libris, in quibus approbatis aliqua, multa reſpuitis, reprehenditis, accuſatis, a corruptoribus inſerta eſſe contenditis. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 8.

[x] Nam ſicut te Manichæus impiam docuit perverſitatem, ut ex evangelio quod hæreſim tuam non impedit accipias, quod autem non impedit, non accipias. Contr. Fauſt. l. 18, c. 7. [y] Ego audiens dicebam eis ſermonem evangelicum, quomodo dixit Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus, *Non veni ſolvere legem, ſed implere.* Ille vero ait, nequaquam eum hoc dixiſſe ſermonem. Cum enim ipſam inveniamus eum reſolviſſe legem, neceſſe eſt nos hoc potius intelligere quod fecit. Arch. c. 40, p. 69.

The

The ſame thing is implied in ſome charges [z] of Archelaus againſt Mani.

And Fauſtus ſpeaks of it [a] as the common Manichæan doctrine, and [b] taught them by their maſter.

2. There is a long paragraph of Fauſtus upon this point, which I ſhall tranſcribe largely. I need not inſert it all here, becauſe there are in it many tautologies: but I ſhall endeavour to repreſent the whole of his argument in his own words.

Says this Manichæan biſhop: 'If [c] you receive the goſpel, 'you ought to receive all things written therein. And do you, 'who receive alſo the Old Teſtament, believe every thing writ-'ten therein? Excepting the prophecies concerning the king 'of the Jews, who was to come, whom you take to be Jeſus, 'and ſome moral precepts, you no more value it than Paul 'does, who conſiders it as dung. Why then may not I do the 'like with the New Teſtament—take what is right and condu-'cive to my ſalvation, and reject thoſe things which have been 'fraudulently foiſted in by your anceſtors, and diſfigure it, and 'ſpoil it's beauty and excellence?

'And [d] how much more allowable is it for us to take this me-'thod, ſince it is certain that the New Teſtament was not written 'by Chriſt himſelf, nor by his apoſtles, but a long while after

[z] —— et in noſtris libris, ſicut etiam adverſus me diſputans fecit, aſſertionem ſuam proferre, quædam in his accuſans, quædam permutans, ſolo Chriſti nomine adjecto. Arch. cap. 54, p. 99.

[a] Et tamen me quidem jam adverſus capituli hujus neceſſitudinem Manichæa fides reddidit tutum, quæ principio mihi non cuncta quæ ex ſalvatoris nomine ſcripta leguntur, paſſim credere perſuaſit. Faust. l. 18, c. 3. [b] Quare indeficientes ego præceptori meo refero gratias, qui me ſimiliter labentem retinuit. &c. Id. l. 19, c. 5, in.

[c] Si accipis evangelium, credere omnia debes, quæ in eodem ſcripta ſunt. Quid enim tu, quia vetus accipis teſtamentum, idcircone credis omnia paſſim, quæ in eodem ſcripta ſunt? Nempe ſolas indidem excerpentes prophetias, quæ regem Judæis venturum ſignificabant, quia ipſum putetis eſſe Jeſum; et pauca quædam diſciplinæ civilis præcepta communia, ut eſt, non occides, non mœchaberis, cætera prætermittitis, et arbitramini, eſſe non minus atque eadem quæ Paulus putavit ſtercora. Quid ergo peregrinum hoc, aut quid mirum eſt, ſi ego de teſtamento novo puriſſima quæque legens et meæ ſaluti convenientia, prætermitto quæ a veſtris majoribus inducta fallaciter, et majeſtatem ipſius et gratiam decolorant? Faust. l. 32, cap. i.

[d] —— præſertim quod nec ab ipſo ſcriptum conſtat, nec ab ejus apoſtolis, ſed longo poſt tempore a quibuſdam incerti nominis viris, qui ne ſibi non haberetur fides, ſcribentibus quæ neſcirent, partim apoſtolorum, partim eorum qui apoſtolos ſecuti viderentur, ſcriptorum ſuorum frontibus indiderunt, aſſeverantes ſecundum eos ſe ſcripſiſſe quæ ſcripſerunt. Quo magis mihi videntur injuria gravi affeciſſe diſcipulos Chriſti: quia quæ diſſona iidem et repugnantia ſibi ſcriberent, ea referrent ad ipſos, et ſecundum eos hæc ſcribere ſe profitentur evangelia, quæ tantis ſint referta erroribus, tantis contrarietatibus narrationum ſimul ac ſententiarum, ut nec ſibi prorſus, nec inter ſe ipſa conveniant. Quid ergo aliud eſt, quam calumniari bonos, et Chriſti diſcipulorum concordem cœtum in crimen devocare diſcordiæ? Quæ quia nos legentes animadvertimus, cordis obtutu ſaniſſimo æquiſſimum judicavimus, utilibus acceptis ex iiſdem, id eſt. iis quæ et fidem noſtram ædificent, et Chriſti Domini atque ejus Patris omnipotentis Dei propagent gloriam, cætera repudiare, quæ nec ipſorum majeſtati, nec fidei noſtræ conveniant, ib. c. 2.

'their time by ſome unknown perſons; who, leſt they ſhould not 'be credited when they wrote of affairs they were little ac- 'quainted with, affixed to their works the names of apoſtles, or 'of ſuch as were ſuppoſed to have been their companions, and 'ſaying they were written by them? Whereby, in my opinion, 'they have greatly injured the diſciples of Chriſt, making them 'the authors of books in which there are many errors and con- 'tradictions. For is not this to abuſe the diſciples of Jeſus, 'who certainly agreed, and were all of one mind? We, perceiv- 'ing this, have taken the only reaſonable method; which is to ex- 'amine every thing according to the rules of ſound reaſon and 'judgment, accepting thoſe things which are uſeful for eſtabliſh- 'ing our faith, and are honourable to the Lord Jeſus Chriſt and 'Almighty God his Father, and rejecting all other things which 'are not for his honour nor our benefit.'

'Whether [e] the prophets propheſied of Jeſus will be conſi- 'dered hereafter. In the mean time I ſay, if Jeſus, foretold in 'the Old Teſtament, teaches that ſome things in it are to be re- 'ceived, and many others rejected, in like manner the Com- 'forter, promiſed in the New Teſtament, teaches us what of it 'we ought to receive and what to reject. Of whom Jeſus, when 'he promiſed him, ſays in the goſpel: *He ſhall lead you into all 'truth, and teach you all things, and bring all things to your remem- 'brance:* John xvi. 13. Why therefore may not we do the ſame 'with the New Teſtament, through the Comforter, that you do 'with the Old by Jeſus?——eſpecially, ſince, as before ſaid, it 'was not written by Chriſt, nor by his apoſtles.'

'To [f] conclude therefore, as you in the Old take only the 'prophecies

[e] —— Sed an prophetæ Jeſum præſagiverint, poſtea videbimus. Interim ad hæc me reſpondere oportet, quia ſi Jeſus, per teſtamentum vetus annunciatus, nunc dijudicat et carminat, docetque pauca ejus accipienda eſſe, repudianda vero quam plurima; et nobis Paracletus ex Novo Teſtamento promiſſus perinde docet, quid accipere ex eodem debeamus, et quid repudiare: de quo ultro Jeſus, cum eum promitteret, dicit in Evangelio. Ipſe vos inducet in omnem veritatem, et ipſe vobis annuntiabit omnia, et commonebit vos. Quapropter liceat tantum et nobis in Teſtamento Novo per Paracletum, quantum vobis in vetere licere oſtenditis per Jeſum: ——præſertim quod nec Chriſtus ipſe ullum conſtat, ut diximus, nec [illegible] apoſtolis. ib. c. 6.

[f] Quapropter tu quoque ex vetere teſtamento [illegible] prophetias, et illa quæ ſuperius diximus civilia atque ad diſciplinam vitæ communis pertinentia præcepta; ſuperſediſtis vero peritomen, et ſacrificia, et ſabbathum et obſervationem eius, et azyma: quid abeſt, ſi et nos de Teſtamento Novo ſola accipientes ea, quæ in honorem et laudem filii manifeſtatis vel ab ipſo dicta comperimus, vel ab eius apoſtolis, ſed jam perfectis ac fidelibus, diſſimulavimus cætera, quæ aut imprudentes tunc et ignoranter a rudibus dicta, aut oblique et maligne ab inimicis objecta, aut impudenter a ſcriptoribus affirmata, et poſteris tradita: dico autem hoc [illegible] ex femina turpiter, circumciſum [illegible], ſicuti ab gentilibus, baptizatum [illegible], circumdictum a diabolo [illegible] et ab eo tentatum quam miſerum. His igitur exceptis, et ſi quid ei a ſcriptoribus ex teſtamento vetere falſa ſub

'prophecies and moral precepts; and have rejected circumcision, 'and sacrifices, and the sabbath, and it's rest, and unleavened 'bread; what absurdity is there, if we also receive in the New 'those things only which we find to the honour of the Son, and 'said by himself or his apostles, but perfect and fully instructed; 'and reject other things said by them [that is, the apostles] in 'their ignorance, or falsely and impudently ascribed to them, 'and since handed about as theirs? I mean that Jesus was born 'of a woman, circumcised like a Jew; that he sacrificed like a 'heathen, was meanly baptized, led about in the wilderness, and 'miserably tempted by the devil. Excepting these, and the 'quotations of the Old Testament, fraudulently inserted by those 'writers, we receive all the rest; especially his mystical crucifixion, in which are manifested the wounds of our own souls; 'as also his salutary precepts, and his parables, and all his divine 'discourses, teaching the difference of two natures, of which 'there can be no doubt but they are his.'

I put in the margin[3] another passage of Faustus, without translating it exactly, where he pretends that 'there are many differences and contrarieties in the gospels; and that the ancestors 'of the catholics had inserted many things, mingling their own 'words with the oracles of the Lord, which did not agree with 'the doctrine taught by him; and that the gospels were not 'written by Christ, nor his apostles, but a long while after them 'by some unknown men, half-Jews, who were not well informed, but put down any uncertain traditions which they met 'with; and then affixed to their own erroneous accounts the 'names of Christ's apostles or their companions.' From all which he concludes, that 'men ought never to hear or read the gospels 'without caution, trying all things by their own reason and 'judgment, and admitting nothing but what, after strict examination, is found to be right.'

Such is the substance of a paragraph in the thirty-third and

[3] Nec immerito nos ad hujusmodi scripturas tam inconsonantes et varias, nunquam sane sine judicio ac ratione aures accommodamus: sed contemplantes omnia, et cum aliis alia conferentes, perpendimus etiam eorum, quidquid a Christo Deo proditum erit necne. Mutata enim a meis vestris eloquiis Domini nostri inserta verba sunt, quæ nomine signata ipsius cum ejus fide non congruant: præsertim, quia, ut jam sæpe probatum a nobis est, nec ab ipso hæc sunt, nec ab ejus apostolis scripta; sed multo post eorum assumptionem a nescio quibus et ipsis inter se non concordantibus semi-judicis per fabulas opiniones que comperta sunt, qui tamen omnia eadem in apostolorum Domini conferentes nomina, vel eorum qui recenti apostolos viderentur, errores sic mendacia sua secundum eos se scripsisse mentiti sunt. Id. l. 33, c. 3.

laſt book of the work of Fauſtus, ſo far at leaſt as it is given us by Auguſtine.

I refer likewiſe [h] in the margin to a place or two more, where he ſpeaks ſomewhat diſtinctly of this matter.

VII. It is fit we ſhould now make ſome remarks upon theſe paſſages.

1. It appears hence, that Auguſtine's account upon this head is juſt and right. The Manichees, or however thoſe of Africa, took what they liked in the New Teſtament, and rejected what did not ſuit them. So Fauſtus evidently.

2. As for what Fauſtus ſays of the catholics not receiving every thing in the Old Teſtament, Auguſtine well anſwers, that [i] they received every thing therein as of divine original and appointment; and allowed all things to be right for the time; thoſe which they did not now follow, as well as the laws of true and real righteouſneſs, by which they were ſtill obliged. I have tranſcribed ſeveral paſſages of Auguſtine at the bottom of the page, ſuppoſing that they will not be diſagreeable to the reader.

3. The Manichees, or however Fauſtus and his friends, denied that the goſpels were written by the apoſtles and evangeliſts whoſe names they bear. Mr. Nye [k] gives a different account of the ſentiment of our Manichæan author. But it is manifeſt that Fauſtus ſpeaks of the books of the New Teſtament commonly received by catholic Chriſtians, or at leaſt of the goſpels. Beauſobre [l] is ſenſible of it, and ſpeaking of this ſubject ſays, 'they denied the goſpels to have been written by the ſacred au-'thors whoſe names they bear; and denied it with ſurpriſing 'raſhneſs and aſſurance.'

4. Hence we perceive what in the goſpels the Manichees received, and what not. They received our Lord's diſcourſes and

[h] Vid. Fauſt. l. 18, c. 3, l. 19, c. 5.

[i] Nos Veteris Teſtamenti ſcripturas omnes, ut dignum eſt, veras divinaſque laudamus. —— Nos ea quæ nunc de libris Teſtamenti Veteris non obſervamus, congruenter tamen illo tempore atque illi populo fuiſſe præcepta —— oſtendimus et docemus. Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 8, in.

Quæcunque ſcripta ſunt in illis libris Veteris Teſtamenti omnia veriſſime atque utiliſſime pro æterna vita ſcripta eſſe laudamus, accipimus, approbamus: Sed quæ in his mandata corporali operatione non obſervamus, et rectiſſime tunc mandata intelligimus, et umbras futurorum eſſe didicimus, et nunc impleri cognoſcimus. Id. ib. c. 14.

Hoc enim aliqua veri-ſimili ratione diceretur, ſi eſſet aliquid in Veteris Teſtamenti libris, quod nos diceremus non rectè dictum, non divinitus juſſum, non veraciter ſcriptum. Nihil horum dicimus, ſed accipimus omnia, ſive quæ obſervamus, ut rectè vivamus; ſive quæ non obſervamus, ut tamen et ipſa tunc in prophetia juſſa et obſervata nunc jam compleri videamus. Id. ib. cap. 15.

[k] See Steph. Nye's Defence of the Canon of the New Teſtament. p. 94——100.

[l] Nos heretiques ayant ſuppoſé, que les Evangiles n' avoient été écrits par des Apôtres, ni par de diſciples des Apôtres, mais par des inconnus à demi-juifs, &c. Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 299. See alſo p. 296.

parables;

parables; the hiſtory of his preaching, miracles, crucifixion, and every thing elſe, excepting ſome few things moſt evidently contrary to their notions; as our Lord's nativity, circumciſion, and the quotations from the Old Teſtament. Some might be apt to think they muſt have ſet aſide a very large part of the New Teſtament, as interpolated: but from this paſſage of Fauſtus himſelf, and from many things already alleged, it may be perceived [m] that would be a wrong concluſion.

5. We ſee the ground and occaſion of the liberty they took in cenſuring the New Teſtament, particularly the goſpels. They had certain philoſophical principles of which they were too fond; and therefore they would rather ſay any thing than give them up. They would not give up their particular notions. Nor did they dare to deny the authority of Chriſt or his apoſtles. The only refuge left them therefore was to ſay that the books of the New Teſtament were not written by apoſtles, or that they were interpolated. Perhaps it might have been ſufficient to ſay this laſt: poſſibly that is all that was ſaid by ſome of the ſect. But Fauſtus is pleaſed to ſay both, rather than preſume to contradict Chriſt or his apoſtles, or inſinuate that their doctrine was in any thing wrong. Auguſtine has a [n] remark to the ſame purpoſe handſomely expreſſed.

6. The Manichæan ſcheme, as here repreſented by Fauſtus, is inconſiſtent and overthrows itſelf. The goſpels in ſome things are good authority, in others not. The goſpels, he ſays, were not written by Chriſt, nor his apoſtles, nor apoſtolical men: but by ſome unknown people a good while after their times. Nor were thoſe writers well acquainted with the affairs of which they have written. And yet they are, it ſeems, good witneſſes to Chriſt's miracles, parables, divine diſcourſes, and myſtical crucifixion. Fauſtus too claims an intereſt in the promiſe of the Spirit, made by Chriſt; though he knows nothing of that promiſe but from the goſpels. Auguſtine has well ſhewn the inconſiſtency of this ſcheme. 'If [o] the books of the New Teſtament 'are genuine and right,' ſays he, 'your doctrine is overthrown: 'and if they are not ſo, but ſpurious and fallacious, your princi-

[m] His autem exceptis, et teſtimoniis ex Veteri Teſtamento, quæ illis inſerta ſunt literis, cætera vos, ſecundum id quod Fauſtus loquitur, fatemini accipere. Aug. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 19.

[n] Vos ergo jam dicite, quare non accipiatis omnia ex libris Novi Teſtamenti? utrum quia non ſunt apoſtolorum Chriſti, an quia pravi aliquid docuerunt Apoſtoli Chriſti? Reſpondebunt, quia non ſunt apoſtolorum Chriſti. Nam illa vox altera Paganorum eſt, qui dicunt apoſtolos Chriſti non recta docuiſſe. Contr. Fauſt. l 32, c. 16, in. [o] Ita ergo aut cogimini veraces illos codices confiteri, et continuo evertent hæreſim veſtram: aut ſi fallaces eos dixeritis, eadem auctoritate Paracletum non poteritis aſſerere, et vos evertitis hæreſim veſtram. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 16, in.

'ple is in like manner overthrown. For you have no other au-'thority to go upon.'

Some may think their principle led them to pay little regard to ſcripture. And they may be apprehenſive that there was nothing in the New Teſtament they relied upon as certainly genuine and ſaid by Chriſt, or written by his apoſtles. But if that be the conſequence of their principle, they did not ſee it. We muſt rather ſay, therefore, that they were abſurd and inconſiſtent. For that the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament were in eſteem and authority with them, muſt be apparent to all who have read the preceding part of this hiſtory. And it is as evident that they were well ſatisfied of the genuineneſs of ſome parts of the New Teſtament, though they affirmed other things to be interpolations. Otherwiſe thoſe books could have been of no uſe. Moreover we juſt now obſerved Fauſtus to ſay of our Lord's divine diſcourſes and parables: 'There can be no doubt but they 'are his.' They received therefore many things in the New Teſtament, yea the main part of it, as unqueſtionably genuine. Theſe are words of Secundinus to Auguſtine: 'And [p] is that ſay-'ing blotted out of the goſpel, *Broad is the way that leads to de-'ſtruction?* or is not that text in Paul genuine, *that every one muſt 'give an account of himſelf?*'

And Auguſtine ſuppoſes that he argues very cogently when he reminds them that, [q] ſo far as they weaken the credit of the ſcriptures, they weaken the proofs of their own particular principles, built thereon. They [r] likewiſe hazarded even their Chriſtianity. They weaken, he tells them, and in a manner overthrow the grounds and evidences upon which they believe in Jeſus, or would perſuade others to believe in him: ſuch as the hiſtory of his words and works, and the divine appearances in his favour, recorded in the goſpels.

7. The arguments they make uſe of for ſhewing that the goſpels were not written by apoſtles, or are interpolated, are inſufficient.

[p] An emendatum in Evangelio eſt, quod ſpatioſa via non ducat in interitum? An falſum in Paulo eſt, quod operum ſinguli ſuorum erunt rationem reddituri? Secundin. ad Aug. c. 3. [q] Unde aſſeritis perſonam veluti auctoris, vel potius deceptoris? Reſpondetis. Ex Evangelio vos probare. Ex quo Evangelio? quod non totum accipitis, quod fallatum eſſe vos dicitis. Quis ergo teſtem ſuum prius ipſe dirat falſitate eſſe corruptum, et tunc prodiret ad teſtimonium? Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 16. Vid. ib. l. 13, c. 4, 5.

[r] Vocem Patris de cœlo non audiſtis, opera Chriſti, quibus de ſeipſo teſtificabatur, non vidiſtis, codices in quibus hæc ſcripta ſunt, ut ſpecie Chriſtiana fallatis, velut accipitis; ne tamen contra vos legantur, infalſatos dicitis. ib. l. 13, c. 5. Sed tamen ſi Paganus in Novo Teſtamento talia reprehenderet, qualia illi reprehendunt in vetere, nonne et ipſi ea defendenda ſuſciperent? &c. ib. l. 22, c. 14.

They

They are ſuch as theſe: That there are in the goſpels many things which are abſurd and contrary to reaſon. But that is falſe: every thing in the goſpels is right and reaſonable.

Again they ſay that the evangeliſts diſagree, and that there are contrarieties in the accounts of things contained in the goſpels: which too is falſe, as Auguſtine well obſerves. If [s] they cannot reconcile theſe ſeveral accounts, it is for want of ſkill and attention, or it is owing to prejudice. Again, ſays Auguſtine: Let [t] them ſtudy the goſpels more, and let them come with a pious diſpoſition, and judge with the candour required in reading and comparing other hiſtorians, who have ſeverally written of like matters, and all will be eaſy.

As for any pretenſions to the Spirit, they gave no proofs of their having a greater intereſt in him than other Chriſtians had. Therefore, if their reaſon and judgment failed them, as they evidently did in this matter, their whole argument is deſperate, and of no value. Auguſtine has ſpoken [u] to this particular likewiſe.

8. Their principle was arbitrary. They ſaid the ſcriptures uſed by the catholics were corrupted. They [x] ſhould then, as Auguſtine well obſerves, produce other copies more correct, where were the things they allowed and contended for as right; whilſt the other things, inſiſted on by the catholics in arguing againſt them, were wanting. But they produced no ſuch copies, nor ever pretended to have any different from thoſe commonly uſed.

Auguſtine has very agreeably and thoroughly expoſed them

[s] Vos ergo quid dicitis? Unde oſtenditis ſcripturas illas non ab apoſtolis miniſtratas? Reſpondetis, quia multa ſunt in eis et inter ſe et ſibi contraria. Omnino falſiſſimum eſt, vos non intelligitis.——Quis enim ferat lectorem, vel auditorem, ſcripturam tantæ auctoritatis facilius quam vitium ſuæ tarditatis audere culpare? Contr. Fauſt. l. 32. c. 16.

[t] Sed contraria, inquit, inter ſe ſcripta eorum reperiuntur. Maligni malo ſtudio legitis, ſtulti non intelligitis, cæci non videtis. Quid enim magnum erat iſta diligenter inſpicere, et eorumdem ſcriptorum magnam et ſalubrem invenire congruentiam, ſi vos contentio non perverteret, et ſi pietas adjuvaret! Quis enim unquam duos hiſtoricos legens de una re ſcribentes, utrumque vel utrumlibet eorum aut falſum aut falli arbitratus eſt, ſi unus eorum dixit quod alius prætermiſit; aut ſi alter aliquid brevius complexus eſt, &c.? Contr. Fauſt. l. 33, c. 7.

[u] An hoc dicitis vos Paracletum docuiſſe, Scripturas illas Apoſtolorum non eſſe, ſed ſub eorum nominibus ab aliis eſſe conſcriptas? Hoc ſaltem docete, ipſum Paracletum eſſe, a quo didiciſtis hæc apoſtolorum non eſſe. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 16.

[x] Proferendus eſt namque tibi alius codex eadem continens, et tamen incorruptus et verior, ubi ſola deſint ea quæ hic immiſta eſſe criminaris. Ut ſi, verbi cauſa, Pauli epiſtolam, quæ ad Romanos eſt, corruptam eſſe contendi, alam proferas incorruptam, vel alium codicem potius, in quo eiuſdem Apoſtoli eadem epiſtola ſincera et incorrupta ſit. Non faciam, inquis, ne ipſe corrupiſſe credar. Hoc enim ſoletis, dicere,. Et verum dicitis, &c. De Mor. Ec. Cath. cap. 29, n. 61.

upon

upon this head in a [y] paſſage which I tranſcribe in his own words at the bottom of the page.

9. That the ſeveral books of the New Teſtament were written by apoſtles, or apoſtolical men, that is, by the perſons whoſe names they bear, is evident from the teſtimony of all Chriſtians in general, who lived before the time of Fauſtus and Mani.

10. The charge againſt the catholics is falſe and groundleſs. Neither they, nor their anceſtors, had corrupted and interpolated the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament. Some faults may have crept into them: and leſſer differences there will be in copies of books often tranſcribed: but no conſiderable alterations could be made in writings ſo much valued, ſo well known, in the hands of ſo many perſons, preſerved in their original language, and tranſlated likewiſe into many other languages.

On theſe two laſt obſervations, which contain the main anſwer to all the Manichæan pretences and objections relating to the books of the New Teſtament, Auguſtine has inſiſted largely, and admirably, in his confutations of the Manichees, and elſewhere. I am ſure my readers will be pleaſed to ſee what he has ſaid; and therefore I intend to tranſcribe ſeveral of his paſſages.

1. In a letter to Jerom, Auguſtine writes to this purpoſe: 'The [z] Manichees pretend that many paſſages of the divine 'ſcriptures, by which their impious opinions are clearly con-'futed, and which therefore they cannot wreſt to their purpoſe, are 'not right: which wrong things however they do not aſcribe to 'the apoſtles, but to ſome unknown corrupters of the ſame 'ſcriptures. But ſince they cannot juſtify themſelves by the 'more numerous, nor more ancient copies, nor by the authority 'of the original language, from which the Latin copies have been 'tranſlated, their fooliſh aſſertion is eaſily confuted.'

2. In his book to his friend Honoratus, Auguſtine obſerves:

[y] Aliud eſt ergo auctoritate aliquorum vel librorum vel hominum non teneri, et aliud eſt dicere, Iſte quidem vir ſanctus omnia vera ſcripſit, et ita epiſtola ipſius eſt, ſed in ea ipſa hoc ejus eſt, hoc non eſt ejus. Ubi cum ex adverſo audieris, Proba; non confugies ad exempla veriora, vel plurium codicum, vel antiquorum, vel linguæ præcedentis, unde hoc in aliam linguam interpretatum eſt: ſed dicas, Inde probo hoc illius eſſe, illud non eſſe, quia hoc pro me ſonat, illud contra me. Tu es ergo regula veritatis? &c. Contr. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 2.

[z] Manichæi plurima divinarum ſcripturarum, quibus eorum nefarius error clariſſima ſententiarum perſpicuitate convincitur, quia in alium ſenſum detorquere non poſſunt, falſa eſſe contendunt: ita tamen ut eam falſitatem non ſcribentibus apoſtolis tribuant, ſed neſcio quibus codicum corruptoribus. Quod tamen quia nec pluribus, nec antiquioribus exemplaribus, nec præcedentis linguæ auctoritate, unde Latini libri interpretati ſunt, probare aliquando potuerunt, notiſſima omnibus veritate ſuperati confuſique diſcedunt. Aug. Ep. 82, [al. 19] n. 6.

'Their

'Their [a] opinion is, that ſome unknown men, who were 'deſirous to mix the law with the goſpel, had interpolated the 'ſcriptures of the New Teſtament before the time of Mani. 'But,' ſays he 'this opinion of theirs always appeared to me 'extremely abſurd and unreaſonable. It appeared ſo to me 'when I was among them; and not to me only but to you, and 'to others alſo who had any good degree of underſtanding. 'But I am now ſtill more perſuaded of the egregious folly of 'ſuch an opinion, ſince they cannot make it out by the difference 'of the copies of ſcripture.'

3. In another place Auguſtine ſays, 'the [b] books of ſcrip-'ture could not be corrupted. If ſuch an attempt had been 'made by any one, his deſign would have been prevented and 'defeated. His alterations would have been immediately de-'tected by many and more ancient copies. The difficulty of 'ſucceeding in ſuch an attempt is apparent hence, that the ſcrip-'tures were early tranſlated into divers languages, and copies of 'them were numerous. The alterations, which any one attempt-'ed to make, would have been ſoon perceived: juſt even as now,' ſays he 'in fact, leſſer faults in ſome copies are amended by 'comparing ancient copies, or thoſe of the original language.'

4. And ſoon afterwards he ſays: 'According [c] to your way 'of proceeding, the authority of ſcripture is quite deſtroyed; 'and every one's fancy is to determine what in the ſcriptures 'ought to be received, what not. He does not admit it becauſe 'it is found in writings of ſo great credit and authority; but it is 'rightly written becauſe it is agreeable to his judgment. Into

[a] Volunt enim neſcio quos corruptores divinorum librorum ante ipſius Manichæi tempora fuiſſe: corrupiſſe autem illos, qui Judæorum legem evangelio miſcere cupiebant. De Ut. Cred. c. 3, n. 7, ſub f. Quæ vox mihi ſemper quidem, etiam cum eos audirem, invalidiſſima viſa eſt: nec mihi ſoli, ſed etiam tibi, (nam bene memini,) et nobis omnibus, qui paulo majorem diligentiam in judicando habere conabamur, quam turba credentium. Nunc vero—— nihil mihi videtur ab eis impudentius dici, vel ut mitius loquar, incuriosius et imbecillius, quam ſcripturas divinas eſſe corruptas: cum id nullis in tam recenti memoria exſtantibus exemplaribus poſſint convincere. ib. n. 7, init.

[b] —— quid faceretis, dicite mihi, niſi clamaretis, nullo modo vos potuiſſe falſare codices, qui jam in manibus eſſent omnium Chriſtianorum? quia mox ut facere cœpiſſetis, vetuſtiorum exemplarium veritate convinceremini. Qua igitur cauſa a vobis corrumpi non poſſent, hac cauſa a nemine potuerunt. Quiſquis enim hoc primitus auſus eſſet, multorum codicum vetuſtiorum collatione confutaretur: maxime, quia non una lingua ſed multis eadem ſcriptura contineretur. Nam etiamnum no mullæ codicum mendoſitates vel de antiquioribus, vel de lingua præcedente emendantur. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 16, f.

[c] Videtis ergo id vos agere, ut omnis de medio Scripturarum auferatur auctoritas, et ſuus cuique animus auctor ſit, quid in quaque Scriptura probet, quid improbet, id eſt, ut non auctoritati Scripturarum ſubiiciatur ad fidem, ſed ſibi Scripturas ipſe ſubiiciat: non ut ideo illi placeat aliquid, quia hoc in ſublimi auctoritate ſcriptum legitur; ſed ideo recte ſcriptum videatur, quia hoc illi placuit. Quo te committis, anima miſera——? Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 19.

'What

'what confusion and uncertainty must men be brought by such 'a principle!'

5. In a passage, which [d] I place at the bottom of the page, Augustine shews admirably that by their way of reasoning the credit of all sorts of writings, the most authentic, the best attested, the most generally received, is weakened, and even reduced to nothing.

6. Again: 'If,' says [e] he, 'you receive abundance of fabulous 'things upon the authority of Mani, because found in his writings, 'though there is no demonstration of the truth, and his autho- 'rity is very obscure; is it not much more reasonable to believe 'the things contained in the scriptures of the New Testament, 'which are so well known, and have been transmitted down from 'the time of the apostles with an universal, uninterrupted tra- 'dition? And if the things therein delivered are contrary to your 'sentiments, you should conclude your sentiments to be wrong, 'and should correct them by the scriptures.'

7. Augustine argues likewise in this manner: 'If [f] you here 'ask us, how we know these to be the writings of the apos- 'tles; in brief we answer, in the same way that you know the 'epistles, or any other writings of Mani, to be his: for if any 'one should be pleased to dispute with you, and offer to deny

[d] Quid hoc loco potest dicere impudentissima pertinacia? Non hoc Christum dixisse? At in Evangelio verba ejus ita conscripta sunt. Falsum esse scriptum? Quod hoc sacrilegio magis impium reperiri potest? quid ista voce impudentius? quid audacius? quid sceleratius? Simulachrorum cultores, qui Christi etiam nomen oderunt, numquam hoc adversus Scripturas illas ausi sunt dicere. Consequetur namque omnium literarum summa perversio, et omnium qui memoriæ mandati sunt librorum abolitio; si quod tanta populorum religione roboratum est, tanta hominum et temporum consensione firmatum, in hanc dubitationem inducitur, ut ne historia quidem vulgaris fidem possit gravitatemque obtinere. De Mor. Ecc. Cath. c. 29. n. 60.

[e] Plane, inquis, Manichæus me docuit. Sed infelix, credidisti, neque enim vidisti. Si ergo ad millia fabulosorum phantasmatum, quibus turpiter gravidatus es, te auctoritati ignotissimæ——sub ludisti, ut ideo hæc omnia crederes, quia in illis conscripta sunt libris, quibus miserabili errore credendum esse censuisti, cum tibi nulla demonstrentur: cur non potius Evangelicæ auctoritati, tam fundatæ, tam stabilitæ, tanta gloria diffamatæ, atque ab Apostolorum temporibus usque ad nostra tempora per successiones certissimas commendatæ; non te subdis, ut credas, ut videas, ut discas etiam omnia quæ te offendunt, ex vana et perversa opinione te offendere. Contr. Faust. l. 32, c. 19.

[f] Hic jam si quæratis a nobis, nos unde sciamus Apostolorum esse istas literas: breviter vobis respondemus, inde nos scire, unde et vos scitis illas literas esse Manichæi, quas miserabiliter huic auctoritati præponitis. Si enim et hinc vobis aliquis moveat quæstionem, et scrupulum contradictionis impingat, dicens, libros quos profertis Manichæi, non esse Manichæi, quid facturi estis? Nonne potius ejus deliramenta ridebitis, qui contra rem tanta connexionis et successionis serie confirmatam, impudentiam hujus vocis emittat? Sicut ergo certum est, illos libros esse Manichæi, et omnino ridendus est, qui ex transverso veniens tanto post natus litem vobis hujus contradictionis intenderit; ita certum est, Manichæum, vel Manichæos esse ridendos, aut etiam dolendos, qui tam fundatæ auctoritati, a temporibus Apostolorum usque ad hæc tempora certis successionibus custoditæ atque perductæ, audeant tale aliquid dicere. Ib. cap. 21.

'the

'the epiſtles aſcribed to Mani to be his, what would you do? 'Would you not laugh at the aſſurance of the man who denied 'the genuineneſs of writings generally allowed? As therefore 'it is certain thoſe books are Mani's, and he would be ridicu- 'lous who ſhould now diſpute it; ſo certain is it that the Mani- 'chees deſerve to be laughed at, or rather ought to be pitied, 'who diſpute the truth and genuineneſs of thoſe writings of the 'apoſtles, which have been handed down as theirs from their 'time to this through an uninterrupted ſucceſſion of well known 'witneſſes.'

S. Auguſtine ſays farther that, 'following [s] their principle, 'there muſt be an end to all authority and certainty in all writ- 'ings whatever. For no writings ever had a better teſtimony 'afforded them than thoſe of the apoſtles and evangeliſts. Nor 'does it weaken the credit and authority of books, received by 'the church of Chriſt from the beginning, that ſome other writ- 'ings have been without ground, and falſely aſcribed to the 'apoſtles. For the like has happened, for inſtance, to Hippo- 'crates; but yet his genuine works are diſtinguiſhed from others 'which have been publiſhed under his name. We know the 'writings of the apoſtles as we know the works of Plato, Ariſto- 'tle, Cicero, Varro, and others, to be theirs, and as we know

[s] Infelices inimici animæ veſtræ, quæ unquam literæ ullum habebunt pondus auctoritatis, ſi Evangelicæ, ſi Apoſtolicæ non habebunt? De quo libro certum erit cujus ſit, ſi literæ quas Apoſtolorum dicit et tenet eccleſia ab ipſis Apoſtolis propagata et per omnes gentes tanta eminentia declarata, utrum Apoſtolorum ſint, incertum eſt——? Quaſi vero et in literis ſæcularibus non fuerunt certiſſimi auctores, ſub quorum nominibus poſtea multa prolata ſunt, et ideo repudiata, quia vel his quæ ipſorum eſſe conſtaret minime congruerunt, vel eo tempore quo illi ſcripſerunt, nequaquam innotefcere, et per ipſos vel familiariſſimos eorum in poſteros prodi commendarique meruerunt.——Hos autem libros, quibus illi qui de tranſverſo proferuntur comparati reſpuuntur, unde conſtat eſſe Hippocratis?——niſi quia ſe eos ab ipſo Hippocratis tempore utque ad hoc tempus et deinceps ſucceſſionis ſeries commendavit, ut hinc dubitare dementis ſit? Platonis, Ariſtotelis, Ciceronis, Varronis, aliorumque ejuſmodi auctorum libros, unde noverunt homines, quid ipſorum ſint, niſi eadem temporum ſuccedentium conteſtatione continua? Multi multa de literis eccleſiaſticis conſcripſerunt, non quidem auctoritate canonica, ſed aliquo adjuvandi ſtudio, ſive diſcendi. Unde conſtat quid cujus ſit, niſi quia his temporibus quibus ea quiſque ſcripſit, quibus potuit innotuerit atque edidit, et inde in alios atque alios continuata notitia latiuſque firmata ad poſteros, etiam uſque ad noſtra tempora pervenerunt, ita ut interrogati cujus quiſque liber ſit, non hæſitemus quid reſpondere debeamus? Sed quid pergam in longe præſenta? Ecce illas literas quas habemus in manibus, ſi poſt aliquantum temporis vitæ hujus noſtræ, vel illas quiſquam Paulli eſſe, vel has neget eſſe meas, unde convincitur, niſi quia illi qui nunc illa noverunt, notitiam ſuam ad longe etiam poſt futuros continuatis poſterorum ſucceſſionibus tranſiciunt? Quæ cum ita ſint, quis tandem tanto furore cæcatur,——qui dicat hoc meruiſſe non potuiſſe Apoſtolorum eccleſiam, tam fidem, tam numeroſam fratrum concordiam, ut eorum ſcripta fideliter ad poſteros tranſicerent, cum eorum cathedras uſque ad præſentes epiſcopos certiſſima ſucceſſione ſervaverint; cum hoc qualumcumque hominum ſcriptis, ſive extra eccleſiam, ſive in ipſa eccleſia, tanta facilitate proveniat? Contr. Faust. l. 33, cap 6.

'the

'the writings of divers eccleſiaſtical authors; foraſmuch as they 'have the teſtimony of contemporaries, and of thoſe who have 'lived in ſucceeding times. I might moreover, by way of il-'luſtration, produce for examples theſe now in hand. Suppoſe 'ſome one in time to come ſhould deny thoſe to be the works of 'Fauſtus, or theſe to be mine; how ſhould he be ſatisfied but 'by the teſtimony of thoſe of this time who knew both, and 'have tranſmitted their accounts to others? And ſhall not, then, 'the teſtimony of the churches, and Chriſtian brethren, be valid 'here; eſpecially when they are ſo numerous, and ſo harmoni-'ous, and the tradition is with ſo much eaſe and certainty traced 'down from the apoſtles to our time? I ſay, ſhall any be ſo 'fooliſh and unreaſonable as to deny or diſpute the credibility 'of ſuch a teſtimony to the ſcriptures, which would be allowed 'in behalf of any writings whatever, whether heathen or eccle-'ſiaſtical?'

So writes Auguſtine, with reſpect both to the genuineneſs and the integrity of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, in his thirty-third and laſt book againſt Fauſtus.

9. I ſhall only add one ſhort paſſage concerning this laſt particular, the integrity of the text, from another book of the ſame work.

Auguſtine, arguing for our Lord's humanity from theſe words, Rom. i. 3. *Of the ſeed of David according to the fleſh*, ſays, 'the [h] 'clauſe is in all copies ancient and modern. All churches and 'languages agree with one conſent in owning it.'

10. By all which we perceive how ſolidly and rationally Auguſtine defended the authority of the ſcriptures; and how weak are all the objections which the Manichees brought againſt the antiquity, genuineneſs, or purity, of the books of the New Teſtament.

VIII. Auguſtine, in the paſſage of his Summary above cited, ſaid that 'the Manichees made uſe of apocryphal books.' We ſhall have full proof of it preſently.

But let us firſt of all examine a charge or two brought againſt theſe people.

1. There is a paſſage in [i] Auguſtine, which might lead ſome

[h] Hoc autem quod adverſus impietatem veſtram ex apoſtoli Pauli epiſtola profertur, Filium Dei ex ſemine David eſſe ſecundum carnem, omnes codices, et novi et veteres habent, omnes eccleſiæ legunt, omnes linguæ conſentiunt. Contr. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 3.

[i] Si enim prolatæ fuerint aliquæ literæ, quæ nullo alio narrante ipſius proprie Chriſti eſſe dicantur; unde fieri poterat, ut ſi vere ipſius eſſent, non legerentur, non acciperentur, non præcipuo culmine auctoritatis eminerent in ejus eccleſia——? Quis ergo tam demens, qui hodie credat eſſe epiſtolam Chriſti, quam protulerit Manichæus, et non credat facta, vel dicta eſſe Chriſti, quæ ſcripſit Matthæus? Aug. Contr. F. l. 28, c. 4.

perſons

perſons to ſuſpect that the Manichees pretended to have ſome letter of Chriſt. Mr. Jones, [k] in his table of apocryphal pieces, not extant, reckons this as one: 'An Epiſtle of Chriſt produced by the Manichees.' 'But,' ſays [l] Beauſobre, 'no ancient author 'having ever accuſed them of forging ſuch a letter, and no man 'having ever ſeen this pretended letter, it is reaſonable to con-'ſider what Auguſtine ſays only as a ſuppoſition, which makes a 'part of an argument, otherwiſe alſo perplexed enough.' Fabricius [m] ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. Moreover Fauſtus acknowledgeth that [n] Chriſt did not write the New Teſtament. If the ſect had any letter aſcribed to our Saviour, Fauſtus would have mentioned it: and Auguſtine in his anſwer would not only have made a ſuppoſition of ſuch a thing, but would have taken particular notice of it.

2. The Manichees are ſometimes charged with interpolating, or endeavouring to interpolate and alter the books of the New Teſtament, in order to render the words of it agreeable to their ſentiments.

The paſſages of Titus above cited imply as much. Pope Leo [o] ſeems to ſay it expreſsly.

But they may be acquitted here likewiſe. I have formerly [*] ſaid what is ſufficient for anſwering Titus. And Fabricius [p] has helped us to a good ſolution for Leo. 'All that is to be under-'ſtood by his complaint againſt the Manichees, is, that they 'made uſe of ſome apocryphal books, in which Chriſt was 'brought in ſpeaking what he never ſaid: but they did not make 'any alterations in the words of the goſpels of Matthew, Mark, 'Luke, or John, or any other of the canonical books of the New 'Teſtament received by them, but only endeavoured to pervert 'them by falſe interpretations.'

[k] Jones's Can. of the N. T. Vol. i. p. 145, 146. [l] Hiſt. Manich. T. i. p. 338, 339. [m] Ex hoc loco non ſatis firmiter probatur, Manichæos revera Epiſtolam quamdam ſingularem ſub nomine Chriſti jactaſſe. &c. Fabr. Cod. Pſ. N. T. T. i. p. 306, not. [f]. [n] Præſertim quod nec ab ipſo ſcriptum conſtat. Fauſt. l. 32, cap. 2. [o] Ipſaſque Evangelicas et Apoſtolicas paginas, quædam auferendo, et quædam inſerendo violaverunt: confingentes ſibi ſub Apoſtolorum nominibus, et ſub verbis ipſis Salvatoris multa volumina falſitatis, quibus erroris ſui commenta munirent, et decipiendorum mentibus mortiferum virus effunderent. Leo. Serm. 4, in Epiph. cap. 4.

[*] See p. 512. [p] Hæc Leonis verba accipienda ſunt de libris apocryphis a neſcio quibus ſutoribus fabularum ſub Apoſtolorum nomine ſcriptis, quos a Manichæis lectos notat Auguſtinus, l. 22, c. 79. Contra Fauſtum, et Timotheus preſbyter in loco ſupra, p. 178, et ſeq. adducto. In his Salvator ſubinde loquens inducebatur. Cæterum in Evangeliis Matthæi, Marci, Lucæ, et Joannis, atque in Epiſtolis Pauli, ——nihil vel inſerendo vel auferendo violaſſe hæreticos iſtos, ſed tantum parva interpretatione ſcripta illa divina pervertiſſe, teſtatur Photius MS. contr. Manichæos lib. i. Fabr. ib. p. 306, 337.

That

That they really did not make any ſuch alterations may be well argued from the teſtimony given by Photius to the Paulicians of his time, whom he always conſiders as Manichees. He ſays, 'they [q] do not make any material alterations in the ſcriptures, as Marcion and Valentinus did.' And preſently afterwards he ſays, 'they do not corrupt the goſpel by any inſertions or additions.'

Mr. Wolff, in his notes upon that paſſage of Photius, ſays he does not ſee how this can be reconciled with the accounts given by Titus and Archelaus. As for Titus, what was formerly ſaid may ſuffice. Nor is there, perhaps, any greater difficulty in the words of Archelaus. We have indeed ſeen that [r] Mani pretended the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament had been altered by others. And in the place referred to by Mr. Wolff, Archelaus ſays that 'when [s] Mani had our ſcriptures he endeavoured to 'find in them his doctrine of the two principles: and that when 'he diſputed with him, he ſtrove to ſupport his opinions by the 'ſame; cenſuring ſome things, and changing others:' that is, I think, perverting them. In a word, Mani perverted ſome texts of ſcripture; and ſome others, that were too hard for him, he cenſured, as additions, but did not alter the text of the New Teſtament himſelf.

Auguſtine may be reckoned a good witneſs for them here: 'For,' ſays [t] he, 'if any one ſhould charge you with having interpolated ſome texts alleged by you, as favourable to your cauſe, 'what would you ſay? Would you not immediately anſwer that 'it is impoſſible for you to do ſuch a thing in books read by all 'Chriſtians? And that if any ſuch attempt had been made by 'you, it would have been preſently diſcerned and defeated by 'comparing the ancient copies? Well then,' ſays Auguſtine, 'for 'the ſame reaſon that the ſcriptures cannot be corrupted by you, 'neither could they be corrupted by any other people.'

q ——τοις ῥημασι μεν γαι σιωμασιν εδεν μεγα παραλλαττωι, εδε καταλειπει τω λογω το σχημα——και τα μεν ξητα——διδασι κατεχειν τω τε ευαγγελιω, μητε παρεινθηναις μητε προσθηκαις αισχυνομενοις. Ph. contr. Manich. l. 1, p. 9, 10.

r See before, p. 513, 514.

s Et ut ne multa dicam, comparant univerſos libros Scripturarum noſtrarum,—quibus ille acceptis, homo aſtutus cœpit in noſtris libris occaſiones inquirere dualitatis ſuæ——et in noſtris libris, ſicut etiam adverſus me diſputans fecit, aſſertionem ſuam proferre, quædam in his accuſans, quædam permutans.——Arch. cap. 54, p. 99.

t Tamen cum ea de iis codicibus proferretis, quos dicitis falſatos, hoc ipſum illic immiſſum eſſe diceremus, quod illic de Manichæo ſic dictum legeretur, ut de alio intelligere non poſſemus: quid faceretis, dicite mihi, niſi clamaretis, nullo modo vos potuiſſe falſare codices, qui iam in manibus eſſent omnium Chriſtianorum? quia mox ut facere cœpiſſetis, vetuſtiorum exemplarium veritate convinceremini. Qua igitur cauſa a vobis corrumpi non poſſent, hac cauſa a nemine potuerunt. Aug. contr. F. l. 32, c. 16. Vid. et ſupra, p. 373. not. b.

The

The ſcriptures therefore were not corrupted; for it was impoſſible: nor had the Manichees attempted it.

Nor has Auguſtine, that I remember, any where charged them with ſuch an attempt: though, if there had been reaſon for it, there were many occaſions to mention it. He often ſpeaks of their charge againſt the catholics. Certainly therefore he would have returned it, if there had been any ground for it.

Moreover, it is evident from Auguſtine that the Manichees had no copies of the books of the New Teſtament, different from thoſe uſed by the catholics: they often ſaid, that the catholic copies were corrupted: but [u] when called upon to produce others, more ſincere and uncorrupt, they always declined it.

It is alſo very remarkable, which Auguſtine ſays, that when he was with them, and [x] in their private diſcourſes they inſinuated that the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament had been corrupted by ſome men, who were deſirous to mix Judaiſm with Chriſtianity, they produced not any copies different from thoſe commonly received.

Beauſobre has vindicated the Manichees from [y] the charge or ſuſpicion of being the authors of ſeveral paſſages found in ſome copies of the New Teſtament. I refer to him: but I do not think it needful for me now to enter into particulars of that kind; I have ſaid what is ſufficient to render men eaſy upon this head.

IX. Auguſtine, in his Summary, ſaid 'that the Manichees 'made uſe of apocryphal books, which they prefer to the canoni-'cal ſcriptures.' That they uſed ſuch books is unqueſtionable: but what regard they had for them is not eaſily perceived by us now.

1. As we are now entering into this inquiry, and are to obſerve the proofs of the Manichees uſing apocryphal writings, and what they were, it may not be improper to take notice here of Auguſtine's definition of ſuch books. 'Apocryphal books,' he [z] ſays, 'are not ſuch as are of authority [or received by the 'church,]

[u] Proferendus eſt namque tibi alius codex eadem continens, ſed tamen incorruptus et verior, ubi ſola deſint ea quæ hic immiſſa eſſe criminaris. Ut ſi, verbi cauſa, Pauli epiſtolam, quæ ad Romanos ſcripta eſt, corruptam eſſe contendis, aliam proferas incorruptam, vel alium codicem potius, in quo ejuſdem Apoſtoli eadem epiſtola ſincera et incorrupta conſcripta ſit. Non faciam, inquis, ne ipſe corrupiſſe credar, hoc enim ſoletis dicere. De Mor. Ec. Cath. cap. 29, n. 61.

[x] Quam [reſponſionem] quidem non facile palam promebant, ſed nobis ſecretius, cum dicerent ſcripturas novi Teſtamenti falſatas fuiſſe a neſcio quibus, qui Judæorum legem inſerere Chriſtianæ fidei voluerunt, atque ipſi incorrupta exemplaria nulla proferrent. Confeſſ. l. 5, c. xi. n. 21.

[y] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 342——344.

[z] Aliud eſt ipſos libros non accipere, et nullo vinculo detineri, quod Pagani de omnibus libris noſtris, quod Judæi de novo

'church,] and are kept ſecret: but they are books whoſe origi-
'nal is obſcure, and which are deſtitute of proper teſtimonials;
'their authors being unknown, and their character either here-
'tical, or ſuſpected.' That paſſage is taken out of Auguſtine's anſwer to Fauſtus. A like deſcription of ſuch books may be ſeen [a] in his work, entitled Of the City of God.

2. Let us now obſerve ſome farther proofs of the Manichees uſing apocryphal ſcriptures: at the ſame time we ſhall perceive, in good meaſure, what they were.

Photius ſays of Agapius, a celebrated Manichæan writer, that [b] he makes uſe of the Acts of the twelve apoſtles, eſpecially thoſe of Andrew.

Philaſter ſays that [c] the Manichees, and divers other heretics, make uſe of apocryphal ſcriptures. He ſays particularly, that they have Acts of Andrew, John and Peter.

St. Cyril of Jeruſalem, having named the three diſciples of Mani, Thomas, Buddas, and Hermas, adds: 'Let [d] no man 'read the goſpel according to Thomas: for it is not a work of 'one of the twelve apoſtles of Chriſt, but of one of the three 'naughty diſciples of Mani.' And in another place he ſays, 'The [e] Manichees have written a goſpel, entitled according to 'Thomas, by which the minds of the ſimple are corrupted.'

Fauſtus ſpeaks as if he had ſome writings or hiſtories of the apoſtles Peter, and Andrew, and Thomas, and John, which were not in the catholic canon.

He

novo Teſtamento faciunt, quod denique nos ipſi de veſtris et aliorum hæreticorum, ſi quos ſuos et proprios habent, vel de iis qui appellantur apocryphi: non quod habendi ſint in aliqua auctoritate ſecreta, ſed quia nulla teſtificationis luce declarati, de neſcio quo ſecreto, neſcio quorum præſumtione prolati ſunt. Contr. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 2.

[a] Omittamus igitur earum ſcripturarum fabulas, quæ apocryphæ nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus uſque ad nos auctoritas veracium Scripturarum certiſſima et notiſſima ſucceſſione pervenit. In his autem apocryphis etſi invenitur aliqua veritas, tamen propter multa falſa nulla eſt canonica auctoritas. De Civ. Dei l. 15, c. 23, n. 4.

[b] Και ταις λεγομεναις δε πραξεσι των δωδεκα αποστολων, και μαλιστα ανδρεε, ο μεσον εντιθεται, αλλα νοηθεν εχει το ψευδος τρισι. Phot. Cod. 179, p. 405.

[c] —— e quibus ſunt maxime Manichæi, Gnoſtici, Nicolaitæ, Valentiniani, et alii quam plurimi, qui apocrypha Prophetarum et Apoſtolorum, id eſt Actus ſeparatos habentes, Canonicas legere Scripturas contemnunt. —— Nam Manichæi apocrypha beati Andreæ Apoſtoli, id eſt, Actus, quos fecit veniens de Ponto in Græciam, quos conſcripſerunt tunc diſcipuli ſequentes Apoſtolum. Unde et habent Manichæi et alii tales Andreæ beati, et Joannis Actus Evangeliſtæ beati, et Petri ſimiliter Apoſtoli; in quibus quia ſigna fecerunt magna et prodigia, ut pecudes et canes et beſtiæ loquerentur, &c. Philaſt. Hær. 88.

[d] Μηδεις αναγινωσκετω το κατα θωμαν ευαγγελιον· ουχ εστι εις των δωδεκα αποστολων, αλλ' εις των καινων τριων των μαθητων. Cyr. Cat. 6, n. 31.

[e] Εγραψαν και μανιχαιοι κατα θωμαν ευαγγελιον, οπερ ευρισκα τας ευαγγελικας παραδοσεις επισχρατρευον, διαφθειρει τας ψυχας των απλουστερων. Id. Cat. 4, n. 36.

[f] Mitto enim cæteros ejuſdem Domini noſtri apoſtolos, Petrum et Andream, Thomam,

He certainly quotes [g] The Acts of Paul and Thecla with a good deal of reſpect, as if he thought it a true hiſtory. Of this book I have ſaid ſomething [h] already.

Fauſtus ſays, 'The [i] Virgin Mary was not of the tribe of 'Judah, but of Levi: foraſmuch as her father was a prieſt, named 'Joachim.' Auguſtine, [k] in his anſwer, calls the book, whence that particular was taken, an apocryphal piece of no authority. Beauſobre makes no doubt but [l] that it was ſome book of Leucius.

Auguſtine often ſpeaks of the Manichees uſing apocryphal ſcriptures. In his book againſt Adimantus he quotes one of thoſe books, containing [m] a hiſtory of the apoſtle Thomas. In the ſame work he relates [n] another hiſtory of the apoſtle Peter, taken from their apocryphal ſcriptures, and probably from the ſame work where was the forecited hiſtory concerning Thomas: and in the twenty-ſecond book of his work againſt Fauſtus he relates the [o] ſame account of Thomas from the apocryphal ſcrip-

Thomam, et illum inexpertem Veneris inter cæteros beatum Joannem, qui per diverſa profeſſionem [al. poſſeſſionem] boni iitius inter virgines ac pueros divino præconio cecinerunt, formam nobis atque adeo vobis ipſis faciendarum virginum relinquentes. Sed hos quidem, ut dixi, prætereo; quia eos excluſiſtis de canone: &c. Fauſt. l. 30, c. 4. [g] Si vero favere huic quoque propoſito et non reluctari volenti, id quoque doctrinam putatis eſſe dæmoniorum, taceo nunc veſtrum periculum, ipſi jam timeo Apoſtolo, ne dæmoniorum doctrinam intuliſſe Iconium videatur, cum Theclam oppigneratam jam thalamo, in amorem ſermone ſuo perpetuæ virginitatis incendit.——Num igitur et de Chriſto eadem dicere poteritis, aut de apoſtolo Paulo, quem ſimiliter ubique conſtat, et verbo ſemper prætuliſſe nuptis innuptas, et id opere quoque oſtendiſſe erga ſanctiſſimam Theclam. Quod ſi hæc dæmoniorum doctrina non fuit, quam et Theclæ Paulus, et cæteri cæteris annuntiaverunt Apoſtoli.—Fauſt. l. 30, c. 4. [h] See the ſecond Part of this work, Vol. ii. p. 286. and p 311—313. and Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 423. [i] —— ſed ex tribu Levi, unde ſacerdotes: quod ipſum palam eſt, quia eadem patrem habuit ſacerdotem quemdam nomine Joachim, cujus tamen in hac generatione nulla uſquam habita mentio eſt. Faust l. 23, c. 4.

[k] Ac per hoc illud quod de generatione Mariæ Fauſtus poſuit,——quia canonicum non eſt, me non conſtringit.—— Hoc ergo potius, vel tale aliquid crederem, ſi illius apocryphæ ſcripturæ, ubi Joachim pater Mariæ legitur, auctoritate detinerer. Aug. Contr. Fauſt. l. 23, n. 9.

[l] Cela ſe trouvoit, ſans doute, avec d'autres erreurs, dans le livre de Seleucus, qui avoit écrit l'hiſtoire de la Vierge. Beauſ. T. i. p. 354.

[m] Ipſi autem legunt ſcripturas apocryphas, quas etiam incorruptiſſimas dicunt, ubi ſcriptum eſt, apoſtolum Thomam maledixiſſe homini, a quo per imprudentiam palma percuſſus eſt, ignorante quis eſſet, maledictumque illud continuo veniſſe ad effectum. Nam cum ille homo, quoniam miniſter convivii erat, ut apportaret aquam, exiſſet ad fontem, a leone occiſus et dilaniatus eſt. —— Sic etenim in illa ſcriptura legitur, quod deprecatus fuerit apoſtolus pro illo in quem temporaliter vindicatum eſt, ut ei parceretur in futuro judicio. Aug. contr. Adim. c. 17, n. 2, T. 8. [n] In illo ergo libro,——legimus ad ſententiam Petri cecidiſſe homines, et mortuos eſſe virum et uxorem.——Quod iſti magna cæcitate vituperant, cum in apocryphis pro magno legant, et illud quod de apoſtolo Thoma commemoravi, et ipſius Petri filiam paralyticam factam precibus patris, et hortulani filiam ad precem ipſius Petri eſſe mortuam. ib. c. 17, n. 5.

[o] Legunt ſcripturas apocryphas Manichæi, a neſcio quibus futoribus fabularum ſub apoſtolorum nominibus ſcriptas.——

Ibi

tures uſed by the Manichees, which, he there ſays, were compoſed by ſome unknown fabulous authors under the names of apoſtles.

In his anſwer to an anonymous author, whom he ſtyles an adverſary of the law and the prophets, he obſerves, that [p] auther alleged paſſages out of apocryphal writings under the names of the apoſtles Andrew and John: which, he ſays, if they were really theirs, would have been received by the church, which has ſubſiſted with an uninterruped ſucceſſion of biſhops, from the times of the apoſtles to our own.

In the diſputes with Felix the Manichee, Auguſtine puts him in mind [q] of a paſſage of The Acts of Leucius, called Acts of the Apoſtles, one of the apocryphal ſcriptures, not received by the catholic church, but much eſteemed by the Manichees, as he ſays.

The ſame paſſage is alſo quoted, as from Leutius or Leucius, by [r] the author De Fide againſt the Manichees: who alſo afterwards quotes the [s] ſame book of Leucius, entitled, Acts of the Apoſtles, and relates thence a ſtory concerning the apoſtle Andrew.

3. As we have now had ſufficient proofs of the Manichees uſing apocryphal ſcriptures, and Leucius has been named, I ſhall next give ſome account of this man, who is uſually eſteemed a great forger of ſuch books.

Ibi tamen legunt apoſtolum Thomam, cum eſſet in quodam nuptiarum convivio peregrinus et prorſus incognitus, a quodam miniſtro palma percuſſum, imprecatum fuiſſe homini continuam ſævamque vindictam. Nam cum egreſſus eſſet ad fontem, unde aquam convivantibus miniſtraret, cum leo irruens interemit; manumque eius, qua caput Apoſtoli levi ictu percuſſerat, a corpore avulſam, ſecundum verbum ejuſdem Apoſtoli id optantis atque imprecantis, canis intulit menſis, in quibus ipſe diſcumbebat Apoſtolus.——— Utrum illa vera ſit aut conficta narratio, nihil mea nunc intereſt. Certe enim Manichæi, a quibus illæ ſcripturæ, quas canon eccleſiaſticus reſpuit, tamquam veræ ac ſinceræ acceptantur, ſaltem hinc coguntur fateri, &c. Contr. Fauſt. l. 22, c. 79. [p] Sane de apocryphis iſte poſuit teſtimonia, quæ ſub nominibus apoſtolorum Andreæ Joanniſque conſcripta ſunt. Quæ ſi illorum eſſent, recepta eſſent ab eccleſia, quæ ab illorum temporibus per epiſcoporum ſucceſſiones certiſſimas, uſque ad noſtra et deinceps tempora perſeverat. Contr. Adv. L. et P. l. i. c. 20. in. [q] Habetis etiam hoc in ſcripturis apocryphis, quas canon quidem catholicus non admittit; vobis autem tanto graviores ſunt, quanto a catholico carone ſecluduntur. Aliquid etiam inde commemorem, cujus ego auctoritate non tenear, ſed tu convinceris. In Actibus ſcriptis a Leutio, quos tamquam Actus Apoſtolorum ſcribit, habes ita poſitum: Etenim ſpecioſa figmenta, &c. Act. cum Fel. l. 2, c. 6. [r] In Actibus etiam conſcriptis a Leucio, quos ipſi accipiunt, ſic ſcriptum eſt; Etenim ſpecioſa figmenta, &c. De Fid. c. 5, ap. Aug. T. 8, in App. [s] Attendite in Actibus Leucii, quos ſub nomine Apoſtolorum ſcribit, qualia ſint quæ accipitis de Maximilla uxore Egetis:———Ibi etiam ſcriptum eſt, quod cum eadem Maximilla et Iphidamia ſimul eſſent ad audiendum apoſtolum Andream, puerulus quidam ſpecioſus, quem vult Leucius vel Deum, vel certe angelum intelligi, commendaverit eos Andreæ apoſtolo. De Fid. cap. 38.

In

In the firſt place I ſhall take notice of his works, and the ancient authors who have mentioned him; ſecondly, his opinions; thirdly, his time: after which I intend to add ſome remarks upon the apocryphal ſcriptures made uſe of by the Manichees.

1. I would give ſome account of the books aſcribed to Leucius, and ſhew the places of ancient authors who have mentioned him: but I muſt be allowed to be brief. They who are deſirous of fuller ſatisfaction may look into [t] Fabricius, [u] Jones, [x] Beauſobre, and others: and poſſibly I may ſome time have another opportunity to take farther notice of him.

Leucius is expreſsly named in [y] two or three paſſages juſt cited from Auguſtine, and the author De Fide: and poſſibly he is the author of all the other apocryphal pieces before taken notice of from Fauſtus and Auguſtine, though he is not there named.

Photius [z] gives an account of a book entitled 'The Travels 'of the Apoſtles: in which are contained Acts of Peter, John, 'Andrew, Thomas, Paul. The author is Leucius Charinus, as 'the book itſelf ſhews.'

He is mentioned by name in the Decree of [a] Gelaſius. All his books are declared to be apocryphal.

He is mentioned in like manner by [b] pope Innocent the firſt, in one of his epiſtles.

A large fragment of his Travels of the Apoſtles is cited [c] in the ſecond council of Nice.

He is mentioned [d] in the ſuppoſititious letter of Jerom to Chromatius and Heliodorus, and called Seleucus.

2. In the next place I ſhall ſpeak a word or two of the opinions of Leucius. The account which Photius gives of them, who had read his work abovementioned, is this: 'He [e] teaches

[t] Cod. Apocr. N. T. [u] Of the Canon of Scripture, vol. i. [x] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 348, &c. [y] Act. cum Fel. l. 2, c. 6. De Fide c. 5, et 38.

[z] Διηγησεῖς βιβλίου, αἱ λέγονται τῶν ἀποστόλων περίοδοι· ἐν αἷς περιεῖχετο πράξεις τε Πέτρου, Ἰωάννου, Ἀνδρέου, Θωμᾶ, Παύλου. Γράφει δὲ Λεύκιος, ὃς δηλοῖ τὸ αὐτὸ βιβλίον, λεύκιος χαρῖνος. Phot. Cod. 114, p. 292.

[a] Libri omnes, quos fecit Leucius diſcipulus diaboli, apocryphi. Gelaſ. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 4, p. 1264.

[b] Cætera autem, quæ vel ſub nomine Matthiæ, ſive Jacobi minoris, vel ſub nomine Petri et Joannis, quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt, vel ſub nomine Andreæ, quæ a Henocharide et Leonida philoſophis; vel ſub nomine Thomæ, et ſi qua ſunt alia, non ſolum repudianda, verum etiam noveris eſſe damnanda. Inn. ad Exup. Ep. 3, ap. Conc. ib. T. 2, p. 1256. [c] ἐκ τῶν ἀποκρύφων περιόδων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 7, p. 357, &c. and ſee Beauſ. Hiſt. de Man. T. i. p. 388, 389, &c.

[d] Sed factum eſt, ut a Manichæi diſcipulo nomine Seleuco, qui etiam Apoſtolorum geſta falſo ſermone conſcripſit, hic liber editus, &c. Ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 245.

[e] φασὶ γὰρ ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν τῶν ἰουδαίων θεὸν καὶ πατέρα ——— ἄλλον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν, ὃν φασὶν ἀγαθὸν ——— καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸν καὶ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν λέγει σε μὴ ἐναλλάττεσθαι ἀληθῶς, ἀλλὰ δόξαι καὶ πάλλα πάλλαι; φαντασίαν τοὺς παθητὰς, νῦν μὲν πρεσβύτην πάλαι, καὶ πάλιν παῖδα, καὶ μειράκια καὶ ἐλαττόνα,

'that the God of the Jews is evil; that the God preached by 'Jeſus Chriſt is good. He ſpeaks of God by the names of Fa- 'ther and Son: he ſays that Chriſt was not really man, though 'he appeared to be ſo; that he appeared to the diſciples dif- 'ferently, ſometimes young, ſometimes old, and leſs at one time 'than another, and ſometimes ſo high as to touch the heavens 'with his head: he ſays that Chriſt was not crucified, but ano- 'ther in his room; that marriage is evil in itſelf, and of the evil 'one; that God is not the creator of dæmons. In the Acts of 'John he ſeems to argue againſt images.'

From this account, though poſſibly Photius is not exact, and may have miſrepreſented ſome things, it may be concluded that [f] Leucius agreed in divers reſpects with the Manichees, or rather they with him. For we may hence argue that, as he ſaid the God of the Jews was evil, he did not receive the books of the Old Teſtament. We likewiſe perceive that he was one of them who are called Docetæ, and that he did not believe Chriſt to be man really, but in appearance only: he likewiſe had a diſadvantageous opinion of marriage, and highly extolled perpetual virginity: he denied that dæmons were made by God, and condemned the uſe of pictures and images. Beauſobre [g] has carefully examined the forecited extract of Photius, and made juſt remarks upon it, for diſcovering the real ſentiments of Leucius.

3. I am to conſider the time of Leucius. Mr. Jones was poſitive that [h] Leucius was a Manichee, and that he did not live before the latter part of the third, or the beginning of the fourth, century after Chriſt: and many others undoubtedly are of the ſame opinion. But Grabe placeth him in the ſecond century, as does [k] Mill; who ſuppoſeth that he flouriſhed about the year of Chriſt 140, and has a great many juſt obſervations upon this man and his works, to whom I refer the reader; not judging it needful to tranſcribe a modern author who is, or ought to be, in every body's hands. Beauſobre is exactly of the ſame mind with the two laſt mentioned writers: and ſays that, [l] unleſs by a Manichee be meant one who held the ſame or like opinions with them, it is certain that Leucius was not a Manichee, he having

πλαττοντα, και κεκριφεν, ωσε τον χορεύειν δοκειν επ' ὀτε μεχρις σρυτε——και τον χριστον μη σωματικον, αλλ' ετερον αυτ' αυτου.—— Γαμους δε κρινουσι αθετει, και φασαν γενεσιν ποιηρας τε και της ποιητρος· και πλασιν των ειδωλων αλλοι εκκλησεις——δοκει δε κατ' εικοσιν τους ειδωλολατρεις εν ταις ιωαννε πραξεσι διγματιζειν. Phot Cod. 114, p. 292.

[f] Concerning the opinions of Leucius ſee Beauſ. T. i. p. 384—390.

[g] ib. p. 384——390.

[h] as before, V. i. p. 303, &c.

[i] —— figmentum Leucii hæretici, ſeculo ſecundo plura ejuſmodi cudentis, Grabe Spic. T. i. p. 58. —— Leucius, ſive Lucius, Marcionis ſucceſſor. Sec. ii. ib. p. 78. ——quæ Lucium ſeculi ii. hæreticum auctorem habere videntur. ib. p. 324.

[k] Proleg. n. 333—340.

[l] Hiſt. de Man. T. i. p. 349, 350.

lived

lived more than a hundred years before Mani was born. He then proceeds to mention [m] divers arguments for that ſuppoſition, which appears to me very conſiderable: but I may not now ſtay to tranſcribe or abridge them.

4. Laſtly, I am to mention ſome obſervations upon the works of Leucius, and the apocryphal writings made uſe of by the Manichees.

1. It ſeems to me not improbable that all the preceding quotations of apocryphal books in Auguſtine are taken out of one and the ſame book, called Acts or Travels of the Apoſtles, and compoſed by Leucius.

2. So much I ſaid formerly. I now add: It ſeems to me that the Apocryphal Acts of Andrew, Thomas, Peter, John, and even Paul, were not diſtinct books, but parts of one and the ſame work called Acts of the Apoſtles. Photius, as before quoted, calls the work of Leucius, Travels of the Apoſtles. That very title might lead us to ſuppoſe there was ſomewhat in that piece concerning all, or moſt of the apoſtles. In his article of Agapius he ſays, 'that Manichæan author makes uſe of The Acts of 'the twelve Apoſtles, eſpecially thoſe of Andrew.' It does not follow that The Acts of Andrew or Thomas, or the like, were diſtinct works becauſe they are ſometimes quoted ſeverally and alone. We have a proof of this in the article of Leucius, juſt now tranſcribed from Photius, where at the end he mentions The Acts of John diſtinctly: whilſt yet, unqueſtionably, they were a part only of the work before deſcribed by the general title of The Travels of the Apoſtles: which alſo he expreſsly ſaid contained The Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, Paul. Mill likewiſe [n] allows it to be one work which contained Acts of ſeveral apoſtles.

3. Another obſervation to be mentioned here is, that there is no good reaſon to think, as ſome have done, that the apocryphal ſcriptures, made uſe of by the Manichees, were forged by them. No, they had no occaſion to forge books of that ſort: for they found moſt of their ſentiments encouraged by apocryphal books, compoſed by authors of earlier antiquity. Thoſe [o] books favoured their ſentiments concerning the ſeeming humanity of Jeſus, the merit of virginity or celibacy, and the imperfection of the marriage-ſtate. They therefore took the advantage of thoſe writings, and ſometimes quoted or appealed to them.

[m] ib. p. 350, 351. [n] Confarcinati quoque erant ab eodem Charino, ille, qui librum ipſum diligenter perluſtrarat, Photio, Ἱστορίαι Apoſtolorum. ——— Complectebatur autem iſtud volumen 1. Acta Petri. ——— 2. Acta Joannis. ——— 3. Acta Andreæ. ——— 4. Acta Thomæ. ——— Mill. Proleg. n. 337, 338. [o] Beauſ. T. i. p. 424.

Cyril, above quoted, says the gospel of Thomas was written by a disciple of Mani, so called. But [p] Beausobre well argues that this gospel was not forged by the Manichees; forasmuch as it was in being before the rise of Manichæism; and is mentioned among spurious writings, not only by [q] Eusebius, but also by [r] Origen, in the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke's Gospel. He adds, that the gospel of Thomas is placed among apocryphal books in the Synopsis, which is in [s] the works of Athanasius, without imputing it to the Manichees. Gelasius likewise contents himself with saying of this gospel, that [t] it was used by the Manichees, without adding that it was forged by them.

The same may be shewn to be probable with regard to other books made use of by the Manichees.

Eusebius, among spurious books written by heretics, reckons [u] Acts of Andrew, John, and other apostles. Epiphanius says that [x] The Acts of Andrew, John, and Thomas, were used by the Encratites: The [y] Acts of Andrew and Thomas by the apostolics: The [z] Acts of Andrew and other apostles by the Origenists: all three sects, which are supposed to be older than the [a] Manichees.

Augustine particularly observes of [b] a hymn used by the Priscillianists, that it was among the apocryphal scriptures: and then adds, 'Not that these apocryphal scriptures are peculiarly theirs; 'for there are several sects of very different opinions from each 'other, who delight in those books, as fetching thence some sup-'port for some of their notions.'

4. I add but one observation more, which is, that these apocryphal books confirm the history of the genuine and authentic scriptures of the New Testament. They do not directly contradict them; they indirectly confirm and establish them. For they are composed and written in the names of such as our authentic scriptures say were apostles, or companions of apostles. They all suppose the dignity of our Lord's person, and the power of working miracles, together with a high degree of authority, to have been conveyed by him to his apostles.

[p] ib. p. 345.

[q] Hist. Ec l. 3, c. 25, p. 97. D.

[r] The passage of Origen, with remarks upon it may be seen in the second Vol. of this work, p. 501, &c.

[s] Athan. T. 2, p. 202. [t] Evangelium nomine Thomæ, quo utuntur Manichæi, apocryphus. Gelas. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 4, p. 1264.

[u] H. E. l. 3, c. 25, p. 97. D.

[x] Epiph. H. 47, n. 2.

[y] H. 61, n. 1.

[z] H. 63, n. 2.

[a] See before ch. xli. p. 22, &c.

[b] Hymnus sane, quem dicunt esse Domini nostri Jesu Christi,——in scripturis solet apocryphis inveniri. Quæ non proprie Priscillianistarum sunt, sed alii quoque hæretici eis nonnullarum sectarum impietate vanitatis utuntur, inter se quidem diversa sentientes, unde suas quisque varias hæreses sunt secuti. Sed scripturas istas habent in sua diversitate communes, easque illi præcipue frequentare assolent, qui legem veterem et prophetas canonicos non accipiunt. Ep. 237, al. 253, n. 2.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

Various readings, and ſelect paſſages, in Fauſtus the Manichee.

I SHALL here take ſome notice of various readings in the New Teſtament, or the texts of ſcripture made uſe of by the Manichees, and likewiſe ſome ſelect paſſages, or obſervations, in Fauſtus the Manichee.

1. The catholics, as [a] Fauſtus obſerves, aſſerted the integrity of the books of the New Teſtament, and could not endure the ſuppoſition that they had been corrupted and interpolated.

2. Fauſtus ſays that [b] the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt is nothing but the preaching, or the doctrine and commandments, of Chriſt. Beauſobre aſſents [c] to this explication as right, and prefers it to Auguſtine's: though that great writer did not forget to allege [d] 2 Tim. ii. 8.

3. We evidently perceive, from the work of Fauſtus, that [e] both the catholic and the Manichæan copies of the New Teſtament had the two genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

4. It looks as if [f] Fauſtus underſtood the beatitude, Matt. v. 3, of worldly poverty, and the mourning in ver. 4, of afflictions in this life; and ver. 6, of bodily hunger and thirſt for the ſake of righteouſneſs: though, as it ſeems, this laſt mentioned text,

[a] Sed quia vobis ita placet, qui nunquam ſine ſtomacho auditis aliquid eſſe in Apoſtolo cauponatum, ne hoc quidem nobis ſciatis eſſe contrarium. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 1. [b] —— et interrogas, utrum accipiam Evangelium? niſi adhuc neſcis, quid ſit quod Evangelium nuncupatur. Eſt enim nihil aliud, quam prædicatio et mandatum Chriſti. Fauſt. l. 5, c. 1. Vides in me Chriſti beatitudines illas, quæ Evangelium faciunt, et interrogas, utrum accipiam? ibid. ——Quia evangelium quidem a prædicatione Chriſti et eſſe cœpit et nominari. —— Id. l. 2, c. 1. Scias me, ut dixi, accipere Evangelium, id eſt, prædicationem Chriſti. ib.

[c] Cependant je dois rendre juſtice à Fauſte. Il n'explique pas mal, et ſi je l'oſe dire, il explique mieux que S. Auguſtin, ce que veut dire le mot d' Evangile. Il entend par là, non l' hiſtoire de la naiſſance, et des actions de J. Chriſt, mais le doctrine, que Jeſus Chriſt a preché.—— Et quoique S. Auguſtin eût raiſon dans le fond, il n'en avoit pas neanmoins de ſoutenir, comme il faſoit, que l'hiſtoire de la naiſſance de J. Chriſt eſt compriſe dans l'idée de ces mots, *Evangile de J. Chriſt*, qui ne ſignifioit autre choſe, que la doctrine prechée par Jeſus Chriſt. Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 298, 299.

[d] —— hanc ſcilicet cauſam ſubjiciens, quia generatio Chriſti non pertinet ad Evangelium. Quid ergo reſpondebis Apoſtolo dicenti, Memor eſto Chriſtum Jeſum reſurrexiſſe a mortuis, ex ſemine David ſecundum Evangelium meum? Aug. contr. Fauſt. l. 2, c. 2. [e] Quid enim ſcripſit? Liber generationis Jeſu Chriſti filii David, &c. Fauſt. l. 2, c. 1. Sed offenſus duorum maxime Evangeliſtarum diſſenſione, qui genealogiam ejus ſcribunt, Lucæ et Matthæi, hæſi. &c. l. 3, c. 1. Vid. et l. 7, c. 1, et l. 23, c. 1, 2.

[f] Vides pauperem, vides mitem, —— lugentem, eſurientem, ſitientem, perſecutiones et odia ſuſtinentem propter juſtitiam. l. 5. c. 1. —— beati qui lugent, beati qui eſuriunt, beati qui perſecutionem patiuntur propter juſtitiam. ib. c. 3.

which

which we render *hunger and thirſt after righteouſneſs*, was read [g] as it is now in our preſent copies.

5. Fauſtus had Matt. xxviii. 19, in his [h] copies.

6. He likewiſe quotes [i] the beginning of St. Mark's and St. John's goſpels.

7. There is ſome reaſon to think that Fauſtus read Luke xxiii. 43, as [k] Origen did: 'This [l] day ſhalt thou be with me in 'the paradiſe of God,' or 'of my Father.'

8. Fauſtus [m] has the hiſtory of the woman taken in adultery, which is at the beginning of the eighth chapter of St. John's goſpel.

9. Mani, in The Diſpute with Archelaus, underſtands our Lord to ſay [n] in John viii. 44, that 'the devil is a liar, as is alſo 'his father.' Upon this text the curious may conſult [o] Mill, and [p] Beauſobre.

10. Auguſtine, in his work againſt Fauſtus, ſays, that in ſome Latin [q] copies they had, Rom. i. 3, 'Which was *born* of the ſeed 'of David;' inſtead of *made*, which is in the Greek.

11. Fauſtus [r] and [s] Secundinus quote St. Paul's epiſtle to the Epheſians by that title.

12. I put in the margin the definitions which [t] Fauſtus gives of ſchiſm and hereſy.

[g] —— quomodo eſurientem et ſitientem juſtitiam, quam Fauſtus in ſcriptis ſuis non addidit. Aug. Contr. Fauſt. l. 5, c. 7.

[h] Et alibi ad diſcipulos: Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti,——F. l. 5, c. 3.

[i] At denique Marcus,—— vide quam ſit competenter exorſus: Evangelium, inquit, Jeſu Chriſti, Filii Dei. Fauſt. l. 2, c. 1. Sed Joannes quidem in principio fuiſſe Verbum dicit, et Verbum fuiſſe apud Deum, et Deum fuiſſe Verbum. Marcus vero, Evangelium, inquit, Jeſu Chriſti, Filii Dei. l. 3, c. 1. Cur ergo credunt Joanni dicenti, In principio erat Verbum? Aug. C. Fauſt. l. 7, c. 2.

[k] See before V. ii. p. 528.

[l] —— Cum latronem Chriſtus de ligno ſecum introduxerit in paradiſum Patris ſui. Fauſt. l. 14, c. 1. —— et ipſo eodem die ſecum futurum dixit eum in paradiſo Patris ſui. Id. l. 33, c. 1.

[m] In injuſtitia namque et in adulterio deprehenſam mulierem quamdam Judæis arcuſantibus abſolvit, ipſe præcipiens ei ut jam peccare deſineret. Fauſt. l. 33, c. 1.

[n] —— cum loquitur mendacium, de ſuis propriis loquitur; quoniam mendax eſt, ſicut et pater ejus. ap. Arch. c. 29, p. 48. Conf. c. 33, p. 56, et c. 13, p. 24, f.

[o] Ad Joh. viii. 44, et Proleg. 793.

[p] Hiſt. de Manich. T. i. p. 105, 388. T. 2, p. 263.

[q] Etſi enim in quibuſdam Latinis exemplaribus non legitur *factus*, ſed, *natus ex ſemine David*, cum Græca factus habeant, &c. Contr. Fauſt. l. xi. c. 4.

[r] Dicit ad Epheſios. Fauſt. l. 24, c. 1.

[s] Contra quos ſe Apoſtolus in Epheſiorum epiſtola certamen ſubiiſſe fatetur. Secundin. ad Aug. c. 1.

[t] Schiſma, niſi fallor, eſt eodem opinantem atque eodem ritu colentem quo cæteri, ſolo congregationis delectari diſcidio. Secta vero eſt longe alia opinantem quam cæteri, alio etiam ſibi ac longe diſſimuli ritu divinitatis inſtituiſſe cultum am. Fauſt. l. 20, c. 3. Porro autem ſectas ſi quæras, non plus erunt quam duæ, id eſt, Gentium et noſtra, qui eis longe diverſa ſentimus. ib, c. 4, in fin.

SECT.

SECT. VIII. The concluſion of the hiſtory of the Manichees.

IN compoſing this chapter I have made much uſe of Beauſobre's Hiſtory of Manichee and Manichæiſm; and I have often quoted him as I have gone along. Nevertheleſs it was fit to make this renewed and final acknowledgment of my obligations. Sometimes, however, I have differed from him; whether with reaſon or not, others have a right to judge. That work of Beauſobre contains not only a laboured hiſtory of the Manichees, but likewiſe ſeveral entertaining and uſeful digreſſions concerning the opinions of the heathen philoſophers, and the moſt early Chriſtian ſects. I wiſh ſome learned man might have ſufficient leiſure and encouragement to give us a handſome edition of it in (G) Engliſh.

It may be thought by ſome that, in writing the hiſtory of this people, I have taken a great deal of liberty with the ancient writers of the Chriſtian church. Nevertheleſs, I know that I have not deſigned to diſparage them: and I humbly hope that I have not leſſened their juſt credit and authority. No men are infallible. In controverſial writings, eſpecially where the difference of opinion is very great, it is difficult for the beſt of men to keep themſelves entirely free from the influence of prejudice and paſſion. Moreover, Manichæiſm is in itſelf an abſtruſe and intricate ſubject; and had it's riſe in Perſia, a country remote from moſt of thoſe eccleſiaſtical writers who have come down to us; which makes a good apology for them, though they ſhould be ſuppoſed to have made ſome miſtakes, and to have been guilty of ſome miſrepreſentations. It is acknowledged by ſuch as have looked into this matter, [a] that the hiſtory of Mani and his followers has long lain in great obſcurity and uncertainty. This may be allowed to be a good reaſon why I ſhould take ſome

(G) What is to be expected of Beauſobre, may be concluded from what he ſays of himſelf, when he enters upon the examination of the ſcandalous ſtory of the Manichæan euchariſt: 'As for me,' ſays he, 'whom heaven has preſerved from the 'ſpirit of the church, who know no greater 'good than freedom of thought, nor any 'more delightful employment than the 'ſearch of truth, nor greater pleaſure than 'that of finding and ſpeaking it, I have 'ſtudied eccleſiaſtical hiſtory with as little 'prejudice as poſſible.' Pour moi, que le ciel a preſervé de l'eſprit de l'egliſe, qui ne connois point de plus grand bien que la liberté de penſer, de plus douce occupation que la recherche de la verité, ni de plus grand plaiſir que celui de la trover et de la dire, &c. Hiſt. de Manichée et du Manicheiſme. T. 2, p. 730.

[a] Hæc hos compendio, et pro more noſtro, de Manete, ejuſque ſcriptis. Cum vero Manetis hiſtoriam mire turbaverint tum veterum, tum recentiorum plures, neque ea adhuc ſatis dilucide expoſita ſit, non abs re erit illam paullo accuratius et explicatius enarrare. Cav. H. L. in Manete. T. i. p. 140. Oxon.

more

more than ordinary pains about it, and endeavour to avoid and correct the errors which others ſeem to have fallen into.

It may be eaſily ſuppoſed that for ſeveral reaſons I could wiſh this hiſtory had been ſhorter. However I preſume it will be found upon trial that the length of it is not altogether unprofitable. And I perſuade myſelf it will afford my readers divers uſeful and agreeable reflections. I propoſe to mention ſome, not doubting but that others of taſte and judgment will think of more.

1. The riſe of Manichæiſm in Perſia is a proof of the early plantingthe goſpel in that country. If Chriſtianity had not been there before, Mani could not have formed a new ſect of Chriſtians. 'Hereſies and ſchiſms,' as [b] Auguſtine ſays, 'break 'the goſpel-nets. Some in one place, ſome in another: the 'Donatiſts in Africa, the Arians in Egypt,——the Manichees in 'Perſia.' According to Abulpharagius, Mani [c] was at firſt a Chriſtian prieſt, and he preached and explained the ſcriptures, and diſputed againſt the Jews, the Magi, and the heathens. Beauſobre [d] has an article on purpoſe concerning the planting the goſpel in Perſia.

2. We cannot avoid recollecting, in the next place, the juſt obſervation of Socrates, taken notice of by us at our entrance into this field: 'It is no unuſual thing for cockle to grow up amongſt 'good grain.' It is no other than what our Lord foreſaw, and likewiſe forewarned the diſciples of, that they might not be too much ſurpriſed at the event. *The kingdom of heaven*, he ſaid, *is likened unto a man which ſowed good ſeed in his field: but while men ſlept his enemy came, and ſowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.*——Matt. xiii. 24,—30. Again: *The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was caſt into the ſea, and gathered of every kind:* ver. 47. *Then ſaid he unto the diſciples, It is impoſſible but offences will come; but woe unto him by whom they come:* Luke xvii. 1. And St. Paul ſays to the Corinthians: *There muſt be alſo hereſies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifeſt among you:* 1 Cor. xi. 19. Indeed, before the apoſtles left this world they ſaw divers corruptions getting into the churches, or actually brought into them.

[b] Diſruptis retibus, hæreſes et ſchiſmata facta ſunt. Retia quidem omnes concludunt. Sed impatientes piſces,——ubi poſſunt, impingunt ſe, et rumpunt, et exeunt. ——Et retia quidem illa per totum expanduntur. Qui rumpunt autem, per loca rumpunt. Donatiſtæ ruperunt in Africa, Ariani ruperunt in Ægypto, Photiniani ruperunt in Pannonia, Cataphryges ruperunt in Phrygia, Manichæi ruperunt in Perſide. Aug. Serm. 252, n. 4. T. v. al. in Dieb. Paſch. Serm. 23.

[c] Hic primo Chriſtianiſmum præ ſe tulit, et ſacerdos factus eſt Ehwazi, docuitque et interpretatus eſt libros, [ſacros,] et cum Judæis, Magis, et Ethnicis diſputavit. Gregor. Abulph. Dynaſt. p. 82.

[d] T. i. p. 180—196.

3. There

3. There were early two very different opinions concerning Chriſt. 'Some,' as [c] Auguſtine obſerves, 'believed Chriſt to be 'God, and denied him to be man. Others believed he was a 'man, and denied him to be God.' Of this opinion [f] was Auguſtine for a while, at his firſt getting out of Manichæiſm, as he ſays, till [g] he became acquainted with ſome Platonic writings. And it has been thought by ſome that this laſt was likewiſe the notion which (H) the Jews of old had of their expected Meſſiah. Therefore Athanaſius ſays that 'the [h] apoſtles of Chriſt, well 'knowing the Jewiſh prejudices upon this head, with great wiſ-'dom firſt inſtructed them in our Saviour's humanity.' The former was the opinion of the Manichees, and of many others

[c] Sic enim quidam Deum credendo Chriſtum, et hominem negando erraverunt. Et rurſus quidam hominem putando, et Deum negando, aut contemſerunt, aut in homine ſpem ſuam ponentes, in illud maledictum inciderunt. Contr. Fauſt. l. 13, c. 8. Ait enim, Chriſtus Deus eſt tantum, omnino hominis nihil habens. Hoc Manichæi dicunt. Photiniani, homo tantum; Manichæi, Deus tantum. Illi nihil divinum in Domino confitentur; iſti quaſi totum divinum.—— Serm. 37, c. 12.

[f] Ego vero aliud putabam, tantumque ſentiebam de Domino Chriſto meo, quantum de excellentis ſapientiæ viro, cui nullus poſſet æquari: præſertim quia mirabiliter natus ex virgine, ad exemplum contemnendorum temporalium pro adipiſcenda immortalitate, divina pro nobis cura tantam auctoritatem magiſterii meruiſſe videbatur. Quid autem ſacramenti haberet, Verbum caro factum eſt, nec ſuſpicari quidem poteram. Confeſſ. l. 7, c. 19, n. 25. [g] Et primo volens oſtendere mihi, —— quod Verbum tuum caro factum eſt, et habitavit inter homines, procuraſti mihi per quemdam hominem —— Platonicorum libros ex Græca lingua in Latinam verſos. Et ibi legi, non quidem his verbis, ſed hoc idem omnino multis et multiplicibus ſuaderi rationibus, quod in principio erat Verbum, &c. Confeſſ. l. 7, c. 9, n. 13, et 14. Vid. ib. l. 8, c. 2, n. 3.

(H) Beauſobre's account of that matter is to this purpoſe: 'At the beginning of 'Chriſtianity, there aroſe two oppoſite errors concerning the perſon of our Saviour. The firſt obtained among the 'Chriſtians that came out of Judaiſm. 'Many perſuaded themſelves that the Chriſt 'was but a mere man, diſtinguiſhed from 'others by the abundance of divine gifts 'conferred upon him, and by his incomparable virtues. "In the time of the "apoſtles," ſays Athanaſius, "the Jews "were in this error, and drew the Gentiles "into it: that the Chriſt is only a mere "man, that he is not God, and that the "Word was not made fleſh." De Sent. 'Dionyſ. p. m. 432. Theſe Jews were 'not the unbelieving Jews, but ſuch as 'made profeſſion of Chriſtianity. But 'though they agreed ſo far, they were not 'all of the ſame mind concerning the na-'tivity of our Saviour. Some believed 'that he was the Son of Joſeph and Mary. '—— Others acknowledged that he was 'born of a virgin, and conceived by the 'ſole operation of the Holy Spirit. Neither 'the one nor the other refuſed him the title 'of the Son of God: but they imagined 'that it was given him on account of the 'eminence of his office, the excellence of 'his gifts, his glorious reſurrection, the 'ſovereign authority and dominion to 'which he was advanced by the Father: 'to all which, theſe laſt added his miracu-'lous nativity. Theſe kept the name of 'Nazarenes which had been given to the 'firſt believers. The others were called 'Ebionites. Theſe two are the moſt an-'cient hereſies of Chriſtianity. Antiquiſ-'ſima hæreſis iſta fuit, et ab ipſo religionis 'Chriſtianæ exordio graſſari cœpit. Petav. 'Dogm. Th. T. v. De Incarn. l. 1, 2. § 3. 'In a ſhort time aroſe another quite op-'poſite, but not leſs pernicious than the 'former.' Hiſt. Manich. T. 2, p. 517.

[h] Επειδη γαρ οι τοτε ιουδαιοι —— ενομιζον τον χριστον ψιλον ανθρωπον μονον, εκ σπερματος ἐκεῖθεν ἐρχεσθαι —— τοτε ειπεν μετα πολλης της συνεσεως οι μακαριοι αποστολοι τα αιβρωτικα της σαρκος πρωτον εξηγειτο τοις ιουδαιοις. Athan. de Sent. Dion. T. i. p. 248. C.

before

before them. Jerom ſays, that 'whilſt [i] the apoſtles were ſtill 'living, and when the blood of Chriſt was ſcarce cold in Judea, 'there were men who taught that his body was no more than 'a phantom.' This opinion is more than once cenſured by [k] Ignatius in his epiſtles, written ſoon after the beginning of the ſecond century; which, as [l] Cotelerius obſerves, plainly ſhews the early riſe of this falſe doctrine.

4. We may now diſcern the true character of the Manichees. I formerly ſaid they were rather a ſect of reaſoners and philoſophers than enthuſiaſts. But they were very indifferent critics; otherwiſe they would not have treated the New Teſtament as they did; nor have pretended that thoſe books were falſely inſcribed, and greatly interpolated, which had ſuch evidences of genuineneſs and integrity. Fauſtus, ſo celebrated a teacher among them, does not appear to have been a man of much reading. He had a plauſible way of ſpeaking, and an agreeable manner of ſetting off his opinions; and that is all. Though the Manichees made high pretenſions to [m] truth, reaſon, ſcience, they did not eſcape ſuperſtition. With all their boaſtings of that kind, and the contempt they expreſſed for the credulity of the catholics and their numerous rites, there was not a ſect that rendered themſelves more miſerable by affected auſterities than the Manichees. The reſtraints laid on all the higher order, the elect, with regard to marriage, diet, and ſecular buſineſs, muſt, I think, have more than equalled all the ſuperſtitious uſages of the catholics at that time. And when it is conſidered what [n] difficulty the Manichæan auditors muſt have had to maintain their elect, and with how little hopes of getting to heaven at laſt; I mean directly, without the fatigue of I know not how many tranſmigrations, as it might happen; this people muſt appear ridiculous and contemptible.

5. The ſubſiſtence of the Chriſtian religion to our time, notwithſtanding the many dangers it has been expoſed to, affords us reaſon to hope it ſhall maintain itſelf, and be upheld to the

[i] Apoſtolis adhuc in ſeculo ſuperſtitibus, adhuc apud Judæam Chriſti ſanguine recenti, phantaſma Domini corpus aſſerebatur. Hier. adv. Lucif. T. 4, p. 304, in.

[k] Εἰ δε ωσπερ τινες αθεοι ὀντες, τουτεστιν απιστοι, λεγουσιν, το δοκειν πεπονθεναι αυτον, κ. λ. Ign. ad Trall. c. x. et paſſim.

[l] Solem negaret meridie lucere, qui Docetas ſeu phantaſiaſtas hæreticos temporibus apoſtolorum inficiaretur erupiſſe. Cotel. ad. Ign. Ep. ad. Trall. c. x.

[m] Incidi in homines ſuperbe delirantes. —Et dicebant, Veritas, et veritas. Et multum eam dicebant mihi. Aug. Conf. l. 3, cap. 6, ſub in.——ut a vobis, magnis omnino pollicitatoribus rationis atque veritatis, quæram.——De M. Manich. c. 17, n. 55.

[n] Quid autem fallitis Auditores veſtros, qui cum ſuis uxoribus, et filiis, et familiis, et domibus, et agris vobis ſerviunt,——eis non reſurrectionem, ſed revolutionem ad iſtam mortalitatem promittitis, ut rurſus naſcantur,——Contr. Fauſt. l. 5, cap. x. Vid. ſupra. p. 476, not. [s].

end

end of time, whatever oppoſitions may be yet made againſt it. It cannot encounter worſe enemies than it has already experienced and withſtood: nor can there ariſe more abſurd, or more different opinions in the church, and among Chriſtians, than there were in former times. Some there have been who have handed down to us, in the main, the genuine principles of the Chriſtian religion. And by the events of paſt ages we are encouraged to truſt in Providence, and do our beſt to ſerve the cauſe and intereſts of truth and liberty.

6. It is not unlikely that differences of opinion, and the diſputes they occaſion, are ſome way of uſe for advancing the intereſt of truth. The great Auguſtine was plainly of this opinion. He ſays that [o] objections againſt ſcripture, and falſe interpretations, excite our zeal and induſtry, and induce to ſtudy, until we have learned the right ſenſe. Auguſtine has upon ſeveral occaſions ſpoken [p] of the advantage which the catholic intereſt receives from hereſies.

7. The Manichees have not weakened but confirmed the evidence of the Chriſtian religion. They agree with other Chriſtians in acknowledging the dignity of Chriſt's perſon, his high authority, and the authority of his apoſtles, and other things which were formerly inſiſted on by us, and need not to be repeated here. And they received all, or well nigh all, the ſame books of the New Teſtament which were received by other Chriſtians. They ſaid, indeed, that thoſe ſcriptures had been interpolated in ſome time paſt: but they never corrupted or interpolated them, nor attempted it. Nor could they, or any others, corrupt them

[o] Sed ideo divina providentia multos diverſi erroris hæreticos eſſe permittit, ut cum inſultant nobis, et interrogant nos ea quæ neſcimus, vel ſic excutiamus pigritiam, et divinas ſcripturas noſſe cupiamus. Propterea et Apoſtolus dicit: Oportet hæreſes eſſe, ut probati manifeſti fiant inter vos. Illi enim Deo probati ſunt, qui bene poſſunt docere. Sed manifeſti hominibus eſſe non poſſunt, niſi eum docent: docere autem nolunt, niſi eos qui doceri quærunt. Sed multi ad quærendum pigri ſunt, niſi per moleſtias et inſultationes hæreticorum quaſi de ſomno excitentur, et de illa imperitia ſua periclitari ſe ſentiant. Qui omines, ſi bonæ ſint fidei, non cedunt hæreticis, ſed quid eis reſpondeant diligentius inquirunt. Nec eos deſerit Deus, ut petentes accipiant, et quærentes inveniant, et pulſantibus aperiatur. Aug. de Geneſi contr. Manich, l. i. c. i. n. 2. Didicimus enim, ſingulas quaſque hæreſes intuliſſe eccleſiæ proprias quæſtiones, contra quas diligentius defenderetur ſcriptura divina, quam ſi nulla neceſſitas cogeret. Id. de Dono Perſever. c. 20, n. 53. Tom. 10.

[p] Utitur enim [Eccleſia Catholica] gentibus ad materiam operationis ſuæ, hæreticis ad probationem doctrinæ ſuæ. De Vera Relig. cap. 6, n. 10. Tom. i. Sed quoniam veriſſime dictum eſt, oportet multas hæreſes eſſe,——utamur etiam iſto divinæ providentiæ beneficio. Ex his enim hominibus hæretici ſunt, qui etiamſi eſſent in eccleſia, nihilominus errarent. Cum autem foris ſunt, plurimum proſunt, non verum docendo, quod neſciunt, ſed ad verum quærendum carnales, et ad verum aperiendum ſpiritales Catholicos excitando.——Quapropter multi, ut diem Dei videant et gaudeant, per hæreticos de ſomno excitantur. ib. cap. 8, n. 18.

if they would, as [q] Auguſtine obſerves. And the controverſy with them has occaſioned the writing of many books, containing numerous quotations of the ſcriptures, and excellent vindications of their genuineneſs and integrity.

8. We are very much indebted to Auguſtine, and many other learned Chriſtians of former times, who aſſerted and maintained the authority of the Old, and the genuineneſs and integrity of the New, Teſtament; and gave a better account of the creation of the world, of [r] human liberty, and [s] the nature and origin of evil, than was taught by theſe people.

9. We may hence learn to exerciſe moderation toward men of different ſentiments, and to keep our temper in diſputing with them. In all probability we ſhall never meet with any men, Chriſtians at leaſt, who differ more from us than the Manichees did from the catholics. Thoſe unreaſonable men rejected all the ſcriptures of the Old Teſtament in the lump. They aſſerted that the books of the New Teſtament had been long ago interpolated, and that they were not all written by thoſe whoſe names they bear. They held two eternal principles, and denied the humanity of Chriſt and the reſurrection of the body. And yet Auguſtine profeſſeth much mildneſs and moderation toward them. And, entering into an argument with them, he offers to God a fervent prayer that [u] he may be enabled to govern his paſſions, and ſeek their converſion, not their deſtruction. Poſſibly he did not always fully obſerve the rules, which in the time of ſedate judgment he preſcribed to himſelf as juſt and reaſonable. But the paſſage, which I chiefly refer to, is ſo beautiful and empha-

[q] Qua igitur cauſſa a vobis corrumpi non poſſent, hac de cauſſa a nemine potuerunt. Contr. Fauſt. l. 32, c. 16.

[r] Εγω μεν ουν η κακια αιτιος, και ανυποστατος· πραξις μαλλον η ουσια ουσα, και πραξις εκ προαιρεσεως συμβαινουσα. κ. λ. Serap. contr. Manich. p. 44, fin.

[s] Peccatorum originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis, ſed ſubſtantiæ tribuunt gentis adverſæ: quam dogmatizantes eſſe hominibus mixtam, omnem carnem non Dei, ſed malæ mentis perhibent eſſe opificium, quæ a contrario principio Deo coæterna eſt. &c. De Hær. cap. 46, ſub fin.

Quam concupiſcentiam, quod ſæpe inculcandum eſt, non vitium ſubſtantiæ bonæ, ſed malam vult eſſe ſubſtantiam. Op. Imp. l. 3. c. 106.

Vos autem aſſeritis quamdam naturam atque ſubſtantiam malum eſſe. De M. Manich. cap. 2, n. 2.

Veritas autem dicit, omnia iſta quæ videmus, et quæ non videmus, quæ naturaliter ſubſiſtunt, a Deo facta eſſe: in quibus rationalem creaturam, etiam ipſam factam, ſive in angelis ſive in hominibus, accipiſſe liberum arbitrium: quo libero arbitrio ſi Deo ſervire vellet, ſecundum voluntatem ac legem Dei, haberet apud eum æternam felicitatem.——Ecce autem liberum arbitrium, atque inde peccare quemque ſi velit, non peccare ſi nolit, &c. Aug. ap. Act. cum Felic. l. 2. c. 3.

[u] Unum verum Deum omnipotentem—et rogavi, et rogo, ut in refellenda et revincenda hæreſi veſtra, Manichæi, cui et vos fortaſſe imprudentius quam malitioſius adhæſiſtis, det mihi mentem pacatam atque tranquillam, et magis de veſtra correctione, quam de ſubverſione cogitantem. Contr. Ep. Fund. cap. i. in.

tical,

tical, that I have tranſcribed it largely at the bottom of the [x] page. And I would tranſlate it too, but that I am not able to reach the energy of his expreſſions. In the general he ſays: 'Let them be ſevere againſt you, who know not with what labour truth is diſcovered, and how difficultly error is avoided. 'Let them be ſevere againſt you, who know not how hardly the 'diſeaſes of the mind are cured, and the eye of the underſtanding 'ſtrengthened to bear the light. Let them be ſevere againſt you, 'who are inſenſible how little we can know of God after our 'beſt endeavours to underſtand his perfections. Let them treat 'you with rigour, who never were entangled in a like error. 'As for me, I can by no means treat you in that manner; but 'muſt exerciſe toward you that patience and long-ſuffering 'which I once wanted, and which my friends ſhewed me, when 'with a blind and furious zeal I not only maintained, but propa-'gated to the utmoſt of my power, the principle in which you 'are ſtill engaged.'

It will be one good uſe of all this long hiſtory, if we learn to form charitable ſentiments of other men, and to practiſe moderation toward them; no longer debating with thoſe who differ from us, as if we were infallible, but as inquirers after truth, even as we deſire they ſhould do: which [y] alſo is particularly recommended by the ſame renowned writer.

SECT. IX. The PAULICIANS.

I. *Their hiſtory.* II. *Their teſtimony to the ſcriptures.*

I. I TAKE this opportunity to give a brief account of the Paulicians, who were mentioned [a] before, and are uſually reck-

[x] Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neſciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quam difficile caveantur errores. Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neciunt quam rarum et arduum ſit carnalia phantaſmata piæ mentis ſerenitate ſuperare. Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neſciunt cum quanta difficultate ſanetur oculus interioris hominis.——Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neſciunt quibus ſuſpiriis et gemitibus fiat, ut ex quantulacunque parte poſſit intelligi Deus. Poſtremo in vos ſæviant, qui nunquam tali errore decepti ſunt, quali vos deceptos vident. Ego autem, qui diu multumque jactatus, tandem reſpicere potui,——qui denique illa figmenta, quæ vos diuturna conſuetudine implicatos et conſtrictos tenent, et quæſivi curioſe, et adtente audivi, et temere credidi, et inſtanter quibus potui perſuaſi,—ſævire in vos non poſſum, quos ſicut me ipſum illo tempore, ita nunc debeo ſuſtinere, et tanta patientia vobiſcum agere, quanta mecum egere proximi mei, cum in veſtro dogmate rabioſus et cæcus errarem. ibid. cap. 2. n. 2, 3. [y] ——illud quovis judice impetrare me a vobis oportet, ut in utraque parte omnis arrogantia deponatur. Nemo noſtrum dicat, ſe jam inveniſſe veritatem. Sic eam quæramus, quaſi ab utriſque neſciatur, Ita enim diligenter et concorditer quæri poterit, ſi nulla temeraria præſumtione inventa et cognita eſſe credatur. Id. ib. n. 4.

[a] See p. 407.

oned a branch of the Manichees. But Beauſobre ſays that [b] though they are ſometimes confounded with the Manichees, they agreed but little with them. And indeed Peter of Sicily intimates that [c] they did not own themſelves to be Manichees.

They are generally ſuppoſed to have firſt appeared in the ſeventh century, in the country of Armenia, and to have been ſo called from [d] Paul, ſon of Callinice, a Manichæan woman, who had another ſon named John, who alſo was a zealous preacher of this doctrine, called revived Manichæiſm.

Photius ſays they [e] hold two principles, as the Manicheees do; he [f] calls Mani their maſter: he continually conſiders their ſect as a [g] branch of Manichæiſm.

I formerly [h] mentioned a particularity of theirs. Photius likewiſe ſays that [i] they did not chuſe to have their miniſters called prieſts, but ſcribes or ſecretaries, or *companions in travel*, the word uſed in Acts xix. 29, and 2 Cor. viii. 19.

II. I now proceed to obſerve their teſtimony to the ſcriptures.

1. Photius ſays they [k] reject the holy prophets and all the Old Teſtament, and the ancient ſaints in general, calling them thieves and robbers.

2. 'As for the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament,' Photius ſays, 'they [l] receive the goſpel, and the apoſtle [meaning the goſ-'pels and the epiſtles of the apoſtle Paul at leaſt,] which the 'Chriſtian church receives and honours, and has delivered to 'them. Theſe they receive without altering or corrupting them 'in any material things, as Valentinus and ſome others have done. 'But they pervert them from their true meaning to ſupport their 'apoſtaſy.'

3. Afterwards, having quoted 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16, and having applied to them what St. Peter ſays of ſome who wreſted the

[b] B. T. 2, p. 765. [c] Qui tametſi ſe a Manichæorum impuritatibus alienos dictitant, ſunt tamen dogmatum ipſorum vigilantiſſimi cuſtodes et propugnatores. Pet. Sic. ap. Bib. P. P. Max. T. 16, p. 754, B. [d] Εν ταυτη γυνη τις ονοματι καλλινικη——δυο τικτει παιδας,——Εκ θατερου τουτων των ειρημενων, οτω παυλος ηνοιγμα——παυλικιανων κλησιν οι της αποστασιας εραται μετελλαξαντο. Ph. contr. Manich. l. i. c. 2, p. 4, 5. Vid. et Petr. Sic. ib. p. 759, A.

[e] Δυο μεν αρχας ομολογουσιν, ως οι μανιχαιοι· Phot. ib. l. i. c. 6, in.

[f] Και πιγε τω διδασκαλω αυτων μανεντος, &c. ib. c. 8. p. 24. [g] οι του μανεντος παραφυαδες· ib. l. 4. c. 1. in. et paſſim.

[h] See p. 407. [i] Τους μεντοι παρ' αυτοις ιερεων ταξιν επεχοντας ουκ ιερεις, αλλα συνεκδημους και ιοταριους ονομαζουσι. l. i. c. 9, p. 31. Conf. c. 25, p. 134, et Wolf. not. in. loc. [k] Αλλα γαρ και τους ιερους προφητας, και πασαν την παλαιαν γραφην, και τους αλλους αποστρεφονται αγιους, ληστας και κλεπτας αποκαλουντες. ib. l. i. c. 8, p. 23. [l] Το μεντοι ευαγγελιον, και τον αποστολον, α και το θειον των χριστιανων περιστυσεται και τιμα συνταγμα, εγγραφως τουτοις παρεθετο, τοις ρημασι μεν και ονοματιν ουδεν μεγα παραλλαττων του λογου το σχημα, &c. l. 1, c. 3, p. 9. Vid. et p. 10, 11.

ſcriptures

ſcriptures to their own deſtruction, he ſays: 'As [m] for the ora-'cles of the Lord and the apoſtles, and the other ſcriptures, (by 'which laſt I mean the Acts of the apoſtles, and the epiſtles 'called catholic,) excepting thoſe of the chief apoſtle, they re-'ceive them: for thoſe aſcribed to him they do not receive at 'all. And concerning the Acts of the apoſtles, and the catholic 'epiſtles, they are not all of the ſame opinion: for ſome reject 'them, whilſt others join them with the other ſcriptures received 'by all.'

4. Photius does alſo elſewhere expreſsly ſay they [n] rejected Peter, becauſe he denied his Lord and Maſter. Mr. Wolff therefore ſays, that [o] perhaps theſe are the only Chriſtians that ever rejected both of St. Peter's epiſtles.

5. In another place, 'they [p] admit, as the rule of their faith, 'the oracles of the Lord, and the epiſtles of the great apoſtle 'Paul, and ſome of them the Acts of the apoſtles, and the catho-'lic epiſtles, except thoſe of the chief apoſtle.'

6. Again, 'they [q] endeavour to confirm their doctrines by the 'ſcriptures of the goſpel, and the divine apoſtle Paul.'

7. He quotes to them [r] the divine Luke in the Acts, though, as he adds, many of the ſect do not receive that book.

8. He quotes to them expreſsly [s] Paul's epiſtle to the Hebrews, or Jews, as his word is.

2. What regard the Paulicians had for the book of the Revelation I cannot particularly ſay; Photius not quoting it in his argument with them.

10. I add one thing more. Theſe [t] people greatly reſpected the

[m] Οι αυτα τε τα κυριακα λογια, και τα αποστολικα, και τας αλλας γραφας, φημι δη τας τε πραξεις των αποστολων, και τας καθολικας λεγομενας, πλην των αναφερομενων εις τον κορυφαιον, εκεινας γαρ ουδε τοις ρημασιν παραδεχονται. ——— Και τας πραξεις δε των αποστολων, και τας καθολικας ου παντες αυτων συναρμοζουσι τοις αλλοις, εισι δε οι και συνταττουσι. Id. l. i. c. 8, p. 27. [n] ——— μαλιστα δε τον κορυφαιον των αποστολων πετρον ουσφημουσι, επι γεγονεναι εξαρνος, φασι, της εις τον διδασκαλον και χριστον πιστεως. ib. c. 8, p. 24.

[o] Hi igitur forte ſoli ex omni Chriſtianorum antiquitate utramque Petri epiſtolam adverſati ſunt, cum Euſebius lib. iii. c. 3. H. E. teſtetur priorem ab omnibus, poſteriorem ab antiquioribus non receptam fuiſſe. At hi quidem id fecerunt, oborta, an Petri ea ſit, dubitatione; illi vero, ex temerario quodam in Petrum odio. Wolff. ib. p. 27.

[p] οις τατε κυριακα διαγεγραπται λογια, και τε μεγαλε αποστολε παυλε αι επιστολαι, και παρ' ενιοις των αποστολων αι πραξεις, και των καθολικων οσαι παρα τας τε κορυφαιε τυγχανουσι. ib. l. i. c. 13, p. 56, 57.

[q] οις τε τας ευαγγελικας γραφας τιμαν ισχυριζονται, και οις τοι αποστολοι και θεοφορε παυλος τε οικειε φρονηματος δογματιζει και διατασσεται καταψευδονται. l. 4, c. 6, p. 133. [r] Τα ισα δε και ταις πραξεσιν ο θειος λουκας, ει και τα πλειστοι της αποστασιας αι των ταυτης φωνας ου προσιενται. l. 2. c. 6, p. 187.

[s] Τω σωτηρι γαρ ενι ο παυλος προς ιουδαιους γραφων, της πατριου προσεχει φωνη, κ. λ. l. 2. c. x. p. 185. [t] Η προειρημενη μανιχαικη γενη, ενια τε πρωτα εις ομιλιαν αυτης κατεστη, ινα τι φησι, μητε μοι, τα θεια ων αναγινωσκεις ευαγγελια; Ο δε ——— εξειπαι φησας την των λαικων πλειστοι ταξιν ανεδην ετυς την των φρικτων λογιων πουεισθαι αναγνωσιν, ασεβειαι γαρ τουτο ειρησθαι το εργον. l. i. c. 20, p. 100.

ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, and approved that all people, the laity, and even women, ſhould read, ſtudy, and underſtand them. This appears from a ſtory told by Photius of a converſation between a Manichæan woman and Sergius, who afterwards became a zealous promoter of the ſect.

11. I have almoſt entirely confined myſelf to Photius, not thinking it needful to be more particular at preſent, or to copy much from Peter, or any other author, concerning ſo late a ſect. However I ſhall briefly obſerve, that Peter of Sicily in the main agrees with Photius, often ſaying that the Paulicians rejected the Old Teſtament, and uſed only the goſpels and the apoſtle. In particular, he ſays: 'They [u] receive the four goſpels, and the 'fourteen epiſtles of Paul, and the catholic epiſtle of James, and 'the three epiſtles of John, and the catholic epiſtle of Jude, and 'the Acts of the apoſtles, without making any alterations in 'them. But they admit not the two epiſtles of the chief of the 'apoſtles.'

12. Upon the whole, the Paulicians, according to theſe accounts, received the books of the New Teſtament as they were received by other Chriſtians, excepting the two epiſtles of Peter, which they entirely rejected, if theſe authors ſay right. But what was their ſentiment concerning the Revelation we cannot ſay.

[u] Quod veteris inſtrumenti tabulas non admittant, prophetaſque planos et latrones appellent,——aut ſola duntaxat ſacra quatuor evangelia, et S. Pauli Apoſtoli denas quaternat epiſtolas recipiant, Jacobi item Catholicam, ternas Joanni, Catholicam Judæ, cum Actis Apoſtolorum, iiſdem quibus apud nos ſunt verbis.—— Binas Catholicas magni et immobilis eccleſiæ fundamenti,——principis apoſtolorum, non admittunt. Petr. ubi ſupr. p. 756, E.

REMARKS

REMARKS

UPON

MR. BOWER's ACCOUNT OF THE MANICHEES,

IN THE SECOND VOLUME OF HIS HISTORY OF THE POPES.

[FIRST PUBLISHED AT THE END OF VOL. IX.]

NONE of my learned friends, who have read Mr. Bower's Hiſtory of the Popes, (and I ſuppoſe they have all read it,) could forbear obſerving the difference between his account of the Manichees, and that given in the ſixth volume of the firſt edition of this work. And ſome of them have intimated that I could not decline taking public notice of it, unleſs I would be underſtood to allow that the account given by me of the ſame people was wrong; for which I ſee no reaſon. Indeed I cannot but wiſh that Mr. Bower had read that volume, or the late Mr. Beauſobre's Hiſtory of the Manichees, from which I received a great deal of light; I think he would then have expreſſed himſelf very differently from what he has done: as it is, I think myſelf obliged to make a few remarks.

In the hiſtory of Manes, or Mani (as the Perſians his country-men call him,) which is at the beginning of note (D) p. 19, 20, of Mr. Bower's ſecond volume, there are, in my opinion, ſeveral miſtakes: as may appear from the account given of Mani, and his works, and predeceſſors, in the forementioned volume: to which they are referred who are pleaſed to look into it.

In the latter part of the ſame note, p. 21, 22, Mr. Bower proceeds to the tenets of this ſect, which I conſidered formerly, ſo far as I judged needful. I therefore take notice of a very few things only in Mr. Bower upon this article.

In that note, p. 21, ſays Mr. Bower: 'Thus was gluttony with them 'a cardinal virtue, and eating to exceſs *highly* meritorious.' I do not conceive how that can be truly ſaid of the Manichees, when their elect, the moſt diſtinguiſhed part of them, comprehending their eccleſiaſtics, and ſome others, were obliged to abſtain from meat, and wine, and eggs, and fiſh. And Mr. Bower ſays, p. 23, that 'their auditors, as well as 'their elect, kept two faſts in the week, the one on Sunday, the other on 'Monday.' That the Manichees were great faſters was ſhewn p. 410, 411: that they were by principle, and frequent practice, a temperate, abſtemious ſort of people, appears, I think, from a paſſage which I have not yet alleged at all. It is near the concluſion of a work generally aſcribed to Marius Victorinus Afer, in the fourth century; which is a letter to Juſtin, a Manichee, a learned man, and the author's friend. 'In [a]

[a] Et caſſum nunc uſque jugi inedia, inimica, ut ais, carnis membra tenuaſti, conſtans ipſe animæ officere meritis, ac naturali corporis ſuccos, ac pinguedinis diſtente graſſamina atque ipſorum abdominum mole pragravari: ſi poſt hunc jejuniorum laborem ad creatorem tuum, quem ais, aut diabolum, aut exteriores tenebras reverteris. T. M. Victorin. adv. Manich. Ap. B. PP. Lugd. T. 4, p. 292, D. E.

'vain,' says he, 'do you now macerate your body, and mortify it with 'continual fasting and watching; if, after all, it has no other lot than to 'return to the devil, who, you say, is it's creator.'

But, undoubtedly, Mr. Bower has some reason for saying what he does, which therefore ought to be considered. 'The particles of the good na-'ture were, according to them, in all beings of this universe, mixed with, 'and chained to, the particles of the evil nature. Such, however, as 'happened to be in the food which they used, were, in being used by 'them, delivered for ever from so painful a bondage. Thus was glut-'tony with them a cardinal virtue, and eating to excess highly meri-'torious:' p. 21, note (D). This therefore is only a consequence deduced from the just mentioned supposed principle of theirs. But it does not appear that they discerned this consequence; for, so far as we can find, they did not, by principle, eat to excess: but were, and upon principle, great fasters and very abstemious. Augustine imputes to them the same principle, whether justly or not I do not now inquire. Nevertheless he does not upon that account charge them with excess in eating; because I suppose he knew they were not guilty of it. But he ridicules their fasting: 'Your [b] fasting,' says he, 'is cruel; you ought to be always 'eating; whilst you cease to eat, you forbear to deliver the particles of 'the good nature from their chains.'

Farther, p. 21: 'They rejected the Old Testament, and some parts of 'the New, especially the Acts of the apostles.' That the Manichees rejected the Old Testament is undoubted; whether they rejected any books of the New Testament, and particularly the Acts of the apostles, has been carefully examined p. 500—508.

In the latter part of that note, p. 23, Mr. Bower gives a shocking account of their eucharist, taken from ancient ecclesiastical writers. And afterwards, at p. 25, he tells the same, or like story from pope Leo, commonly called the great: this was also examined. See particularly my reference to Beausobre, with his arguments and observations, p. 408; in which, if I am not mistaken, there is a sufficient vindication of the Manichees from the charge of lewd and abominable rites and mysteries.

Nevertheless, as I did not then distinctly speak of Pope Leo, upon whom Mr. Bower chiefly insists, I shall now consider what is alleged from him. 'He spared no pains,' says Mr. B. p. 25, 'to find them 'out; and being informed by some, whom they had attempted to seduce, 'where they assembled, he caused great numbers of them to be seized, in 'virtue of the imperial edicts, and among the rest their bishop, and some 'of their teachers. Having them thus in his power, his first care was to 'learn of them their true tenets, and the secret practices of their sect; 'which he had no sooner done, than he assembled the neighbouring bi-'shops, and those who happened to be then at Rome, with a great num-'ber of presbyters; inviting to the assembly even the laymen of any rank,

[b] Nec ipsa jejunia vobis competunt. Non enim oportet vacare fornacem, in qua spiritale aurum de stercoris commixtione purgatur, et a miserandis nexibus divina membra solvuntur. Quapropter ille est misericordior inter vos, qui se potuerit ita exercere, ut nihil ejus valetudini obsit, sæpe crudos cibos sumere, et multa consumere. Vos autem..... a membrorum divinorum purgatione cessando crudeliter jejunatis. Contr. Faust. l. 6, c. 4, T. 8.

'the

'the great officers of the empire, and the ſenate.....Being all met, and 'in great expectation, Leo ordered the elect of the Manichees, that is 'their teachers and chief men among them, to be brought forth. Great 'was their confuſion when they appeared before ſo grand an aſſembly; 'but being encouraged by Leo, they firſt owned their impious tenets, and 'their ſuperſtitious practices, and diſcovered a crime, which modeſty,' ſays pope Leo, 'would not allow him to name: but it was ſo fully proved,' adds he 'that the moſt incredulous were thoroughly ſatisfied it was true, 'for all thoſe who were concerned in that abominable act were preſent: 'viz. a girl of twelve years old, the two women who had brought her up, 'and prepared her for the crime, the youth who had debauched her, and 'the biſhop who preſided at that deteſtable ceremony, and had directed 'it.....It appeared from the confeſſion which their biſhop made openly, 'and gave in writing, that they committed theſe abominations chiefly on 'their feſtivals.' I think it may be worth our while to ſee pope Leo's own words; which therefore I tranſcribe [c] below.

With regard then to pope Leo I would obſerve, firſt, that we have not remaining any copy of the proceedings againſt theſe people to which Leo refers. Secondly, though the confeſſions mentioned by Leo ſeem a ſpecious argument for the truth of theſe charges, yet I apprehend that, when duly weighed, they are of little value. By menaces, and promiſes, and good management, an artful and powerful eccleſiaſtic, like Leo, is able to obtain ſuch confeſſions as he wants, whenever there are any people, who have fallen under his diſpleaſure, and he has determined to haraſs them with fines, or impriſonment, or baniſhment. Says Athenagoras, in his Apology for the Chriſtians of his time, 'that [d] our enemies may 'ſeem not to hate us without reaſon, they accuſe us of abominable feaſts, 'and inceſtuous mixtures in our aſſemblies.' It has been the way of all perſecutors in general. They will make thoſe appear criminal whom they intend to deſtroy, and will do their utmoſt to expoſe them to general ſcorn and averſion. Thirdly, after all theſe examinations and confeſſions, Leo did not know when this abominable rite, with which he charged them, was performed. Firſt he ſays, 'in their worſhip: de ſacris tamen eorum,' &c. then 'in their feſtivals: de feſtivitatum eorum conſuetudine.' In

[c] De ſacris tamen eorum, quæ apud illos tam obſcena ſunt, quam nefanda, quod inquiſitioni noſtræ Dominus manifeſtare voluit non tacemus, ne quiſquam putet nos de hac re dubia fama et incertis opinionibus credidiſſe. Reſidentibus itaque mecum Epiſcopis et Preſbyteris, ac in eundem conſeſſum Chriſtianis viris ac nobilibus congregatis, Electos et Electas eorum ſublimus præſentari. Qui cum et perverſitate dogmatis sui, et de feſtivitatum illarum conſuetudine multa referarent, illud quoque ſcelus, quod eloqui verecundum eſt, prodiderunt: quod tanta diligentia investigatum eſt, ut nihil minus credulis, nihil obtrectatoribus, relinqueretur ambiguum. Adſunt enim omnes personæ, per quos infandum facinus fuerat perpetratum, puerula ſcilicet ut multum decennis, et duæ mulieres, quæ ipsam nutrierant, et huic ſcelori præparaverant. Præſto erat etiam sedulus corruptor virginis, et epiſcopus ipsorum detestandi criminis ordinator. Omnium una fuit horum et una confeſſio, et patefactum eſt execratum, quod tantus noſtræ vix ferre potuerunt. Dum enim ea singulis loquentes, cætus omnes horruit auditus, geſtorum documenta ſunt lecta .... Leon. Serm. 15. c. 4, p. 64. edit. Lugd. 1700. Conf. Ep. 15, al. 93. c. 16, p. 228, 231. et Ep. 8. al. 2.

[d] Ἵνα δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν ἀφορμὴν ἀλογίστου μισανθρωπίας ἀφέλωμεν, ἐπιβάλλει καὶ περὶ τούτων λέγειν. v. A. Legat. pro Chr. p. 34, D.

another place [e] it is 'in their myſteries.' Once more, 'in [f] the princi-'pal feaſt of their ſect.' If good evidence of this fact had been produced, he would have expreſſed himſelf more clearly and uniformly. As pope Leo ſays that this was done 'in the principal feaſt of their 'ſect,' Beauſobre [g] underſtood him to mean their Bema, an annual feſtival, celebrated in honour of Mani with great * ſolemnity. 'Which,' he ſays, 'affords a manifeſt proof of the falſehood of the depoſition 'of the witneſſes before Leo: for that feaſt was not profaned with any 'ſacrifices of unchaſtity. Auguſtine, who, when a Manichee, was 'preſent at it, has deſcribed it, and diſcerned nothing impure in it.' Fourthly, it appears from pope Leo that the Manichees celebrated the euchariſt in the like manner with other Chriſtians: for he has informed us that 'the [h] better to conceal themſelves, and avoid the ſufferings 'which by law they were expoſed to, they would come to church and 'communicate with the catholics; when they partook of the bread, but 'refuſed the cup.' The reaſon is manifeſt: according to the Manichæan rule, the elect, who alone had a right to communicate at the Lord's table, were forbidden wine, which was uſed by the catholics. If, inſtead of wine, water had been propoſed to them, or ſome other liquor not prohibited, they would have received it. I think that what Leo ſays teaches us two things. The firſt of which is, that the Manichees obſerved the euchariſt in the ſame manner with the catholics, except that they uſed ſome other liquor inſtead of wine. And certainly the teſtimony of Leo in this point is very remarkable. The other thing which we learn from hence is, that the Manichees were ſcrupulous and conſcientious men. Who can believe that they, who refuſed to taſte wine, though it were to ſecure themſelves from heavy ſufferings, admitted into their religious rites abominable filthineſs, which no reaſonable creature can bear to think of? Fifthly, the Manichees at Rome, in the time of pope Leo, were a ſober and modeſt people. For he found himſelf obliged frequently to caution his own people and hearers againſt being [i] ſeduced 'by their faſtings, 'abſtinence from certain meats, mean dreſs, pale countenances,' and other marks of a ſober and abſtemious courſe of life. Which is agreeable to Auguſtine, who ſays, that 'by [k] an appearance of chaſtity and tem-'perance they enſnared many people.' Sixthly, pope Leo's abuſive manner of ſpeaking of the Manichees invalidates all his accuſations

[e] In exercrabilibus autem myſteriis eorum. Ep. 15, al. 23, c. 16, p. 250.

[f] —— in ipſo præcipuo obſervantiæ ſuæ feſto, ſicut proxima confeſſione patefactum eſt, ut animi, ita et corporis pollutione lætantur. Serm. 23, c. 4. p. 76, al. Serm. 4, De Nativitate Domini.

[g] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2, p. 754.

A brief account of that feſtival may be ſeen p. 379, and 402.

[h] Quæque ad tegendam infelicitatem ſuam noctis audent intra ſua myſteria, ita ſe ſacramentorum communione temperant, ut interdum, ne penitus latere non poſſint, ore indigno Chriſti corpus accipiant, ſanguinem autem redemptionis noſtræ haurire omnino declinent. Serm. 41, c. 5, p. 106. al. De Quadrageſſima. iv.

[i] Neminem fallant diſcretionibus ciborum, ſordibus veſtium, vultuumque pallore. Non ſunt caſta jejunia, quæ non de ratione veniunt continentiæ, ſed de arte fallaciæ. Serm. 33, c. v. p. 93.

Non vos ſeducant deceptoriis artibus facta et ſimulata jejunia, quæ non ad purificationem proficiunt animarum. Speciem quidem ſibi pietatis et caſtitatis aſſumunt, ſed hoc dolo actuum ſuorum obſcura circumtegunt. &c. Serm. 23. c. 6. p. 76. [k] Duæ maxime ſunt illecebræ Manichæorum, quibus decipiuntur incauti —— altera, cum vitæ caſtæ, et mirabilis continentiæ, imaginem præferunt. De Mor. Cath. Ec. l. 1, c. 1, T. 1.

againſt

againſt them. For he ſays, 'they [1] were the worſt of all heretics, who 'had nothing in them that was tolerable: whoſe law is a lie, whoſe religion is the devil, and whoſe ſacrifice is filthineſs, and the like.' Is any regard to be had to a man who talks at that rate? He who ſhould take his notion of the Manichæan worſhip from pope Leo, I believe, would ſuffer himſelf to be groſsly impoſed upon. It might be better to take it from Fauſtus, one of their own biſhops, as cited in †† Auguſtine, and alſo in this volume at p. 489.

I muſt now return to the note before cited at p. 23. 'The great and 'chief myſtery of their ſect was the euchariſt. And it was in celebrating 'the euchariſt that they committed the abominations with which the fa- 'thers have reproached them. We might indeed ſuſpect the teſtimony of 'the fathers, it being well known that in declaiming againſt heretics they 'are apt to exaggerate, and did not always ſcrupulouſly adhere to truth. 'But that the Manichees abandoned themſelves, in the celebration of their 'euchariſt, to the moſt impure and infamous practices, is not only atteſted 'by them, but has been often proved by unexceptionable witneſſes, nay 'and owned by themſelves, before the civil magiſtrates, in Italy, in Gaul, 'in Paphlagonia, and Africa.'

But is not that a new charge? Is not this different from what we have been conſidering? 'The Manichees abandoned themſelves, in the cele- 'bration of the euchariſt, to the moſt impure and infamous practices.' Thoſe expreſſions ſeem to me to imply promiſcuous lewdneſs, or the general practice of impurity at their euchariſt. But pope Leo, as we have ſeen, ſpeaks only of 'one girl debauched by a youth,' for a certain purpoſe. And in a like manner Auguſt de Hær. cap. 46. T. 8.

But Mr. Bower has ſome other evidence beſide that of the fathers, and ſays 'it has been proved by unexceptionable witneſſes, and has been 'owned by themſelves.' I ſuppoſe Mr. B. may have an eye to a paſſage in Auguſtine, which is to this purpoſe: 'It [a] is ſaid that ſome of them 'have confeſſed it before magiſtrates, not only in Paphlagonia, but like- 'wiſe in Gaul. This I heard at Rome from a catholic Chriſtian.' Upon which I would obſerve, firſt, that Auguſtine does not there ſpeak of 'the Manichees abandoning themſelves to impure practices,' but of a particular fact, like to that mentioned by Leo. Secondly, Mr. B——'s expreſſions are too ſtrong and poſitive. Auguſtine only ſays that he had heard ſuch a thing from a catholic at Rome. Thirdly, this fact, or theſe facts are laid at remote places. If Auguſtine had had proofs of them at home, or near at hand, he needed not to have gone ſo far as Paphlagonia and Gaul in queſt of them. Fourthly, Mr. B. ſpeaks of it's being 'proved and owned by themſelves before civil magiſtrates in Italy and

[1] —— quibus pleniſſime docetur, nullam in hac ſecta pudicitiam, nullam honeſtatem, nullam penitus reperiri caſtitatem: in qua lex eſt mendacium, diabolus religio, ſacrificium turpitudo. Serm. 15. c. 4, p. 64.

Aliæ hæreſes, dilectiſſimi, licet merito omnes in ſua perverſitate damnandæ ſint, habent tamen ſingulæ in aliqua ſui parte quod verum eſt.—— In Manichæorum autem ſceleſtiſſimo dogmate prorſus nihil eſt, quod ex ulla parte poſſit tolerabile judicari. Serm. 23. c. 5, p. 76. al. De Nativitate Domini. iv.

†† Contr. Faut. l. 20, c. 3. T. 8.

[a] Hoc ſe facere quidam confeſſi eſſe in publico judicio perhibentur, non tantum in Paphlagonia, ſed etiam in Gallia, ſicut a quodam Romæ Chriſtiano catholico audivi. De Natura Boni. c. 47. T. 8.

'Africa.'

'Africa.' Which I do not ſee in Auguſtine, but only Gaul and Paphlagonia; unleſs ſome other paſſage be alſo referred to.

Mr. B. concludes the note, upon which I have made theſe animadverſions, ſaying: 'The Waldenſes, who ſprung up in the twelfth century, 'were ſtigmatized by their enemies with the odious name of Manichees. 'But that their doctrine was different from that of the Manichees, nay 'that it was altogether orthodox, I will ſhew in a more proper place.'

When Mr. B. comes to that part of his work, I ſuppoſe he will have the taſk of ſhewing, not only that the Waldenſes were unjuſtly ſtigmatized with the Manichæan doctrine, but likewiſe, that they were not guilty of the impure and infamous practices generally imputed to the Manichees. And perhaps he may alſo diſcern at length, that thoſe crimes were unjuſtly charged upon the real Manichees, or ſuch as owned themſelves diſciples of Mani. But however that may be, I have taken the liberty to make theſe remarks for ſupporting what I had ſaid formerly, and which I ſtill think to be right: not with a deſign to detract from the merit of Mr. Bower's laborious and uſeful work, which I heartily wiſh he may carry on with continued and increaſing acceptance and eſteem.

THE END OF THE THIRD VOLUME.