

THE  
W O R K S  
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.

---

V O L U M E VIII.

---

L O N D O N:  
PRINTED FOR J. JOHNSON, N<sup>o</sup> 72, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.  
M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

# C O N T E N T S

OF THE

## E I G H T H V O L U M E.

### TESTIMONIES OF ANCIENT HEATHENS.

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE
XVII.	A GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE EARLY ADVERSARIES OF THE CHRISTIANS WHO WROTE AGAINST THEM; CELSUS, PORPHYRY, HIEROCLES, JULIAN, FRONTO, AND SOME OTHERS - - - - -	...	I
XVIII.	CELSUS - - - - -	176	5
XIX.	LUCIAN, OF SAMOSATA - - - - -	176	69
XX.	ÆLIUS ARISTIDES THE SOPHIST, AND DION CHRYSOSTOM - - - - -	176	81
XXI.	GALEN - - - - -	180	90
XXII.	CONCLUSION OF THE SECOND CENTURY - - -	...	91
XXIII.	THE PERSECUTION OF SEVERUS, AND SPARTIAN'S TESTIMONY TO IT - - - - -	202	100
XXIV.	DIOGENES LAERTIUS - - - - -	210	110
XXV.	ALEXANDER SEVERUS - - - - -	222	120
XXVI.	ULPIAN - - - - -	222	124
XXVII.	DION CASSIUS - - - - -	230	128
XXVIII.	THE PERSECUTION OF MAXIMIN THE FIRST, OR THE THRACIAN - - - - -	235	137
XXIX.	THE EMPEROR PHILIP. THE QUESTION CONSIDERED, WHETHER HE WAS A CHRISTIAN - -	244.	138
XXX.	THE EMPEROR DECIUS - - - - -	249	145
XXXI.	THE EMPEROR GALLUS - - - - -	251	148
XXXII.	THE EMPERORS VALERIAN AND GALLIENUS - -	253	149
XXXIII.	AMELIUS - - - - -	263	160
XXXIV.	LONGINUS - - - - -	264	163
XXXV.	NUMENIUS - - - - -	...	168
XXXVI.	THE EMPEROR AURELIAN - - - - -	270	172
XXXVII.	PORPHYRY - - - - -	270	176
XXXVIII.	SIX WRITERS OF THE AUGUSTAN HISTORY - -	306	248

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE
XXXIX.	TWO AUTHORS WHO WROTE AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS IN THE TIME OF DIOCLESIAN'S PERSECUTION, ONE ANONYMOUS, THE OTHER SUPPOSED TO BE HIEROCLES - - - - -	303	251
	WHERE ALSO OF APOLLONIUS TYANÆS, AND THE TWO LIVES OF PYTHAGORAS, WRITTEN BY PORPHYRY, AND JAMBlichus - - - - -	...	282
	APPENDIX TO CHAP. XXXIX. - - - - -	...	286
XL.	DIOCLESIAN'S PERSECUTION OF THE CHRISTIANS 303...313	303	293
XLI.	A REVIEW OF THE FOREGOING PERIOD, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRD CENTURY TO THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE: WITH SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS UPON THE STATE OF CHRISTIANITY UNDER HEATHEN EMPERORS - ...	...	329
XLII.	CHALCIDIUS - - - - -	330	346
XLIII.	ALEXANDER OF LYCOPOLIS IN ÆGYPT - - - - -	350	349
XLIV.	PRAXAGORAS - - - - -	350	354
XLV.	BEMARCHIUS - - - - -	350	355
XLVI.	THE EMPEROR JULIAN - - - - -	361	355
XLVII.	HIMERIUS - - - - -	363	423
XLVIII.	THEMISTIUS - - - - -	364	426
XLIX.	LIBANIUS - - - - -	370	434
L.	EUTROPIUS - - - - -	370	460
LI.	AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS - - - - -	380	464
LII.	VEGETIUS - - - - -	390	478

## E R R A T A.

Page. line.	read.	Page.	read.
61 18 for Vienna	— Vienne		
423 4 for laid	— lay		
433 1 dele the first that			
467 and 473 in running title A. D. 380.			
			IN THE NOTES.
		48 col. 1. l. 2	dele ω
		168 col. 1. l. 4	—
		257 col. 2. from bottom	αποσπ- εχόμεν

A  
L A R G E C O L L E C T I O N  
O F A N C I E N T  
J E W I S H A N D H E A T H E N T E S T I M O N I E S,  
T O T H E  
T R U T H O F T H E C H R I S T I A N R E L I G I O N.

[ C O N T I N U A T I O N O F V O L . I I . ]

---

T E S T I M O N I E S O F A N C I E N T H E A T H E N S .

C H A P . X V I I .

*A general account of the early adversaries of the Christians, who wrote against them: CELSUS, PORPHYRY, HIEROCLES, JULIAN, FRONTO, and some others.*

THE next author to be quoted by me, is Celsus, who in the second century wrote professedly against the Christians. And I shall now give a general account of all our ancient adversaries, or such heathen authors, who designedly opposed the Christian religion.

Doubtless, all the heathen authors, hitherto quoted, were, in a sense, enemies to Christianity. For though they had heard of it, they did not embrace it, but rejected it: and usually they manifest ill-will and aversion, in their manner of speaking of Christians, and their principles. But now I intend such as on set purpose wrote against it, and endeavoured to confute it. In these it is reasonable to expect more particulars concerning Christianity, than in others, who only speak of it by the bye. We might at least expect this if their treatises were now entire; or if there remain some considerable fragments of them. We might expect to see there the best reasons which Heathens had to offer against it, and the arguments deduced at length, and the defects of the evidences of our religion, if indeed there are any. And if those adversaries employ only weak and inconclusive arguments, or

make use of ridicule and calumny, we may be thence farther confirmed in the persuasion of the truth of our religion. And it is very likely, that we should see fresh reason to admire the steadiness and perseverance of the Christians of those times, who bore up, and held out, against the virulent pens of keen and witty adversaries, as well as against the sword of the magistrate, and the clamours of the common people.

The most noted adversaries of the Christian Religion, in the first four centuries, are Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, and Julian. The three former wrote within the compass of the first three centuries, and before the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire by Constantine: the last, not till after the middle of the fourth century, and after the reigns of several Christian emperors, Constantine and his sons. But, beside them, there were some others, not so considerable, of whom I shall take some notice here.

The principal adversaries were Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian; as may be inferred from the distinct and frequent mention made of them by ancient Christian writers: who, when they are speaking of the enemies of our religion, sometimes mention those three only, without taking notice of any others. So Jerom<sup>a</sup> in the preface to his book of *Illustrious Men*: and also in another<sup>b</sup> place, where he likewise particularly mentions those learned Christians who had published answers to them. I transcribe both those places below.

It is evident from a letter of<sup>c</sup> Constantine, that in his time the memory of Porphyry was made infamous, and that his books against the Christian Religion were by edict ordered to be burnt. There was afterwards another edict of<sup>d</sup> Theodosius the younger, in 449, for abolishing the writings of Porphyry, and of every one else, who had written against the Christian Religion.

<sup>a</sup> Discant igitur Celsus, Porphyrius, Julianus: discant eorum sectatores, qui putant Ecclesiam nullos philosophos, et eloquentes, nullos habuisse doctores, quanti et quales viri eam fundaverint, extruxerint, adornaverint: et desinant fidem nostram, rusticæ tantum simplicitatis arguere, suamque potius imperitiam agnoscant. De Vir Ill in Proëm. <sup>b</sup> Scripserunt contra nos Celsus atque Porphyrius. Priori Origenes, alteri Methodius, Eusebius, et Apollinarius fortissime responderunt. Quorum Origenes octo scripsit libros: Methodius usque ad decem millia procedit verbum: Eusebius et Apollinarius viginti quinque et triginta volumina condiderunt.

. . . Julianus Augustus septem libros in expeditione Parthica adversus Christum evomuit, et juxta fabulas poetarum suo se ense laceravit. Hieron ad Magn. ep. 83. al. 84. T. iv. P. ii. p. 655. <sup>c</sup> Ap. Socrat. H. E. l. i. cap. ix. p. 32.

<sup>d</sup> Sancinus igitur, ut omnia, quæcumque Porphyrius sua pulsus insania, aut quis alius contra religiosum Christianorum cultum conscripsit, apud quemcumque inventa fuerint, igni mancipentur. Omnia enim provocantia Deum ad iracundiam scripta, et pias mentes offendentia, ne ad aures quidem hominum venire volumus. Cod. Lib. i. Tit. 1. l. iii. in. Vid. et Julian. Nov. 42. cap. i.

In that edict Porphyry only is expressly mentioned. It is a proof of the great aversion which Christians had for his memory.

I do not by any means justify such proceedings; which have been often blamed by learned moderns, who regret the loss of those writings. However, I do not entirely ascribe the loss of them to imperial edicts; but rather to the general contempt which they soon fell under. There is a remarkable passage in Chrysoftom, in which he says, 'that the books written against Christianity were so contemptible, that they had been all in a manner lost long ago. Many of them perished almost as soon as they appeared. But if they are still to be found any where, it is among the Christians.'

Lactantius<sup>b</sup> makes particular mention of two persons in his own time, (though he does not name them,) who wrote against the Christian religion: and he supposeth, that there might be others who did the like about the same time, as well as in former times. One of the two above mentioned is supposed to be Hierocles, who wrote, as is computed, in the year of Christ 303, and was confuted by Eusebius of Cæsarea. Of him we shall be obliged to take particular notice hereafter.

But beside them, I think, there were some others of an earlier age, possibly, about the same time with Celsus, or before him. Minucius Felix published his excellent apology for the Christian religion<sup>h</sup> about the year 210. It is in the form of a dialogue, or conference, between Cæcilius Natalis a heathen, and Octavius Januarius a Christian, in which Minucius sits as judge.

Cæcilius, the heathen interlocutor, arguing against the Christians, speaks to this purpose. 'As<sup>i</sup> for the feast, it is a well

<sup>e</sup> Hinc Porphyrius, Syrus sive Tyrius, . . . vir imprimis subtilis et acutus, longum in Christianos opus componebat, quod Imperatorum Christianorum legibus periisse dolendum est. Mosheim. De Reb. Chr. ante Const. M. p. 561.

At facile aliquis subscripserit virorum doctorum judicio, qui optent exsulare, et Christianorum potius gloriæ futurum putarent, si ad nos Porphyrii opus pervenisset. Verum non minus ego vehementer optem exsulare opera, quæ Porphyrio opposuerant Christiani doctores antiqui: Eusebius, Methodius, Apollinarius, et Philostorgius. Fabr. Lux. Evangel. cap. 8. p. 155.

<sup>f</sup> Ἀλλὰ ποσὸς ἐστὶ τῶν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένων ὁ γέλως, ὥστε ἀφανισθῆναι καὶ τὰ βιβλία παλαιά, καὶ ἀμὰ τῷ διεχθῆναι, καὶ ἀπολεσθῆναι τὰ πολλὰ. Εἰ δὲ πῶς τι καὶ ἐρεβειῆ διασωθῆι, παρὰ χριστιανοῖς τῆλο σωζόμενον εὐροί τις αἰ. De S. Bab. Or. 2.

Tom. ii. p. 539. Bened. l. v. cap. 2, 3, 4, 5. And see in this work vol. iv. p. 43.

<sup>g</sup> Inff. <sup>h</sup> See vol. ii. p. 364—367. <sup>i</sup> Et de convivio notum est. Passim omnes loquuntur. Id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio. Ad epulas solenni die cocunt, cum omnibus liberis, sororibus, matribus, sexus omnes homines, et omnis ætatis. Illic post multas epulas, ubi convivium caluit, et incestæ libidini ebrietatis fervor exarsit, canis, qui candelabro nexus est, jactu ossulæ ultra spatium lineæ, quæ vinculus est, ad impetum et saltum provocatur. Sic everso et extincto conscio lumine, impudentibus tenebris nexus insandæ cupiditatis involvunt per incertum fortis. Et si non omnes operâ, conscientia tamen pariter incesti: quoniam voto universorum appetitur, quicquid accidere potest in actu singulorum. Min. Fel. cap 9.

‘ known thing. Every body talks of it. They come together  
 ‘ upon an appointed day, with all their children, their sisters,  
 ‘ and mother: persons of each sex, and of every condition.  
 ‘ And after feeding plentifully, when the lights are put out,  
 ‘ they practise promiscuously incest, and all manner of un-  
 ‘ cleanness.’

To this Octavius refers, when it comes to his turn to speak.  
 ‘ The story,’ says <sup>k</sup> he, ‘ of the incestuous mixtures is a mere fiction,  
 ‘ a lye invented by dæmons. Nor does your Fronto attest it as  
 ‘ a positive witness; but he flings it out in the way of reproach  
 ‘ as an orator.’

It hence plainly appears, that one Fronto had published an oration against the Christians, in which was that odious calumny, particularly taken notice of by Tertullian, and other ancient Christian apologists. Several learned men <sup>l</sup> have been of opinion, that this Fronto is the same, who was master in the Latin tongue to Marcus Antoninus the <sup>m</sup> philosopher. If so, we may the less wonder at that emperor’s antipathy to the Christians: for <sup>n</sup> Fronto was one of his masters, for whom he had a high respect. As Antoninus’s master was a professed orator and rhetorician, the conjecture that he is the same who published the oration here mentioned, is very probable.

But beside this Fronto, who was of Cirtha in Numidia, expressly mentioned both by Cæcilius and Octavius in their conference, there seem to be references to one or two more, who are anonymous. For before Octavius mentions Fronto, he says:  
 ‘ And <sup>o</sup> he who tells against us the fiction of our worshipping  
 ‘ the priest’s secret parts, only strives to throw scandals upon us,  
 ‘ which are his own, and belong to his own people.’

And soon afterwards: ‘ And <sup>p</sup> now, says Octavius, I would  
 ‘ willingly speak to him, who says, or believes, that we are ini-  
 ‘ tiated with the murder and blood of a child.’

<sup>k</sup> Et de incesto convivio fabulam grandem adversum nos dæmonum coitio mentita est, ut gloriam pudicitie deformis infamie aversione [s. aspersione] macularet. . . . Sic de isto et tuus Fronto, non ut affirmator testimonium fecit, sed convivium ut orator insperlit. Ib. cap. 31.

<sup>l</sup> Nam et ex eadem Africa prodibant hostes minime ignavi, neque improbi minus, quam vehementer calumniatores. Qualis, ne longius abeam, fuit ille, cujus jam memini, Fronto. . . . Nollem huic fuisse Papirium Frontonem Jurisconsultum, qui in Pandectis laudatur. Suspicio potius fuisse Cornelium Frontonem Rhetorem,

quem Capitolinus narrat fuisse præceptorem M. Antonini Philosophi Imp. . . . Balduin. in Præf. ad Min. Felic. cap. iii. Vid. et annotata a Rigaltio in cap. ix.

<sup>m</sup> Latinas autem literas cum Fronto orator nobilissimus docuit. Eutrop. l. viii. cap. 12.

<sup>n</sup> Sed multum ex his Frontoni detulit, cui et statuam in Senatu petiit. Jul. Capitol. M. Antonin. cap. 2.

<sup>o</sup> Etiam ille, qui de adoratis sacerdotis virilibus adversus nos fabulatur, tentat in nos conferre quæ sua sunt. Cap. 28.

<sup>p</sup> Illum jam convenire, qui initiari nos dicit, aut credit, de cæde infantis et sanguine. Cap. 30. in.

Here seem to me to be two different writers, who had aspersed the Christians, beside Fronto. - But whether they were professed adversaries, who wrote a book against the Christians, as Fronto did; or whether they only occasionally flung out reflections upon the Christians in some work, the principal part of which was some other subject, does not clearly appear. But they are authors. And as they are both taken notice of by Octavius, before he comes to Fronto, it is not unlikely, that they were at least as ancient as he; and probably, not very remote in time from Celsus, of whom we are now to speak more distinctly.

I have not particularly mentioned Autolycus, to whom Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, near the end of the second century, addressed three books in the way of apology for the Christians.

Nor Demetrian, to whom Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, about the middle of the third century, wrote a letter, with the same view; because, though they were men of some learning, and of some consideration upon account of their worldly condition, it does not appear, that they ever wrote against the Christians, but only, so far as we can discern, cast reflections upon them in their discourses, and sometimes even in the presence of the above-mentioned bishops, to whom they were not absolute strangers.

---

## C H A P. XVIII.

### C E L S U S.

- I. *His time, and character, and his work against the Christians.*
- II. *Passages in Celsus, representing the Jewish expectation of the Messiah.*
- III. *Passages of Celsus, containing references to the books of the N. T.*
- IV. *Passages of Celsus concerning Christian facts, chiefly such as are recorded in the N. T.*
- V. *Passages of Celsus relating to the Christian principles.*
- VI. *Passages relating to the progress of the Christian Religion.*
- VII. *Passages of Celsus, in which he chargeth the Christians with magical practices.*
- VIII. *Passages relating to Christian worship, and their religious assemblies.*
- IX. *Passages in Celsus concerning those called heretics.*
- X. *Passages in Celsus, containing calumnies, or injurious reflections upon the Christians.*
- XI. *Remarks upon the work of Celsus against the Christians, and upon Origen's answer to it.*
- XII. *A Recapitulation of the preceding extracts.*
- XIII. *Three summaries of the fragments of the work of Celsus preserved in Origen, made by three several learned men.*

## S E C T I O N I.

*His time, and character, and his work against the Christians.*

THE book, which Celsus wrote against the Christians, was<sup>a</sup> entitled 'The true Word.' Origen<sup>b</sup> says, he had understood, that there were two of this name, who were Epicureans: one lived in the time of Nero, the other in the time of Adrian, and afterwards. Him he takes to be the person who had written against us.

Concerning Celsus, and his work, divers learned moderns may be<sup>c</sup> consulted

It was a time of persecution when he wrote: for he several times speaks<sup>d</sup> of the Christians teaching their principles privately, and holding assemblies contrary to law, and hiding themselves, because they were sought for to be put to death. This leads us to the reign<sup>e</sup> of Marcus Antoninus the philosopher. It is also very probable, that this Celsus is the same, to whom Lucian inscribed his<sup>f</sup> Alexander or Pseudomantis, which was not written until after the death of the forementioned emperor. He therefore reached to the time of Commodus. I choose, therefore, upon the whole, to place him with his friend Lucian, (who will be in the next chapter,) in the year of Christ 176, not far from the end of the reign of Marcus, who died in March in the year 180.

Against this adversary of our religion Origen, at<sup>g</sup> the desire of his friend Ambrose, wrote an answer. It was published, as

<sup>a</sup> . . . λόγον αληθην ως επιγραψεν ο Κελσος. Orig. contr. Cels. in Pr. § 4. Bened. p. 3. Spencer. seu Cant.

Και περιεγραψαμεν εν οικιω βιβλίοις παλαια, οσα ωρεπον ειναι ενομισαμεν υπαγορευσαι προς τον επιεγραμμενον Κελσω αληθη λογον. L. viii. § 76. p. 428. et passim.

<sup>b</sup> Contr. Cels. l. i. c. 8. p. 9.

<sup>c</sup> Cav. H. L. p. 96. Fabr. B. Gr. l. iii. cap. 33. T. ii. p. 809. et Lux Evangel. p. 151. Tillem. Origene. art. 34.

<sup>d</sup> Πρωτον τω Κελσω κεφαλαιον εστι βυλομενω οτι πβαλειν Χριστιανισμοι, ως συνθηκας κρυβδον προς αλληλας ποιουμενων Χριστιανων παρα τα νενομισμενα. L. i. § 1. Ben. p. 4. Cant.

Μισα ταυτα περι τη κρυφω Χριστιανης τα αρεσκογια εαυτοις ποιειν και διδασκειν ειπαν, και οτι ο μαθην τωλο ποιουσιν, αλε διωθεμενοι την επηρημενην αυτοις δικην τη θανατι. L. i. § 3. p. 5.

Υμων δε καν πλαναλαι τις ει λαυθανων, αλλα ζηλειαι προς θανατι δικη. L. viii.

§ 69. p. 424.

<sup>e</sup> Ut ut est, Celsus, quem confutat Origenes, suum αληθη λογον scribere non potuit ante Marci Aurelii imperium, quandoquidem teste Origine l. v. n. 62. non solum in eo opere meminerat Marcionitarum, qui circa annum Christi 142 orti sunt, sed ut Marcellianorum, qui nomen trahebant a Marcellina quadam ex Carpocratianorum secta muliere, quæ teste Irenæo lib. i. cap. 24. Romam venit sub Aniceto post annum Christi 157. Verisimile autem admodum est illum hoc opus composuisse ardente Marci Aurelii adversus Christianos persecutione, siquidem teste Origine lib. viii. num. 69. Christianos asserit ubique latere, ut mortis, ad quam quærebantur, periculum evaderent. Benedictin. Monitum ad libros Origenis contr. Cels. p. 313.

<sup>f</sup> Lucian. T. i. p. 746. edit. Gr.

<sup>g</sup> Contr. Cels. in Pr. et sub fin. libri octavi et ultimi.

some think; in the year 246, according to others in 249, an excellent work, greatly esteemed and celebrated, not only by Eusebius and Jerom, but also by many judicious moderns, particularly Du Pin: who says, ‘ it <sup>b</sup> is polite and methodical; not only  
‘ the best work of Origen, but the completest and best written  
‘ apology for the Christian religion, which the ancients have  
‘ left us.’

This apology of Origen consists of eight books, undoubtedly thus divided by that great master himself, that each book might be perused at a single reading, without disgust or weariness. But the Benedictines have now divided the books into sections; which is a very useful and acceptable service.

As Celsus undertook a laboured argument against the Christians, and he wrote so late as the time of Marcus Antoninus, when too the Christians were openly persecuted, and their affairs were rendered better known by the persecution itself, and by the apologies then made for them; we may reasonably expect to find in his work many things which may be now of great use to us: none, however, more valuable, than the testimony here given to the books of the New Testament. As Chrysostom says: ‘ Celsus  
‘ and Bataneotes (meaning Porphyry) are sufficient witnesses to  
‘ the antiquity of our books. For, I presume, they did not op-  
‘ pose writings which have been published since their own time.’

As our collections from the remains of Celsus, preserved in Origen, will be large and various, it is very proper to divide them into several sections,

## S E C T I O N II,

### *Passages in Celsus, representing the Jewish expectation of the Messiah.*

NOR ought it to be thought at all strange, that we find some things in Celsus concerning this matter, because in a large part of his work he personated a Jew.

1. ‘ But <sup>k</sup> my prophet said formerly at Jerusalem, that the  
‘ Son of God will come a judge of good men, and a punisher  
‘ of the wicked.’

Upon this Origen has divers observations, shewing, that these words are improperly put in the mouth of a Jew. First, he says,

<sup>b</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 454.      <sup>i</sup> Ικανοί δε Chryf. in ep. i. ad Cor. hom. vi. T. x. p. 47.  
και οι καθ’ ημων ειρηκόες την αρχαιοτητα      <sup>k</sup> ΑΛΛ’ ΕΙΠΕΝ Ο ΕΜΟΣ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ  
μαρτυρησαι τοις βιβλίοις, οι ωφι Κελσον      εν Ιεροσολυμοις ποτε, οτι ηξει Θεου Υιος, των  
και τον βαλασεωτην τον μελ’ εκεινον. Ου γαρ      οσιων κριτης, και των αδικων κολασης. Contr.  
δη τοις μελ’ αυτης συηθεισιν αηλελεσον.      Cels. l. i. § 49. p. 38.

that the Christ was not prophesied of by one, but by many. Secondly, if by 'my prophet' be meant Moses, here is another absurdity: for the name of Jerusalem was not known in his time. Thirdly, no Jew would say, that any prophet foretold the coming of 'the Son of God,' but the coming of 'the Christ of God.' Not that we deny, says Origen, that the coming of the Son of God was foretold: but no Jew would allow of this.

2. 'There<sup>1</sup> are innumerable, says the Jew in Celsus, who confute Jesus, affirming, that of themselves were said those things which were prophesied of concerning him: that is, concerning the person who was to come.

But those were impostors, as Theudas, and some others, who affirmed without proof: who neither said, nor performed such things as Jesus had done; as Origen<sup>m</sup> well shews.

3. 'And, says he, <sup>n</sup> how could we, who had told all men, there would come one from God, who should punish the wicked, treat him injuriously when he came.'

4. 'But<sup>o</sup> the Jew in Celsus says: For what reason could we reject him, whom we had before spoken of. Was it, that we might be punished more severely than other men?'

5. 'The<sup>p</sup> Jew adds: The prophets say, that he who is to come, is great, and a prince, and lord of all the earth, and of all nations, and of armies.'

6. 'The<sup>q</sup> Jew in Celsus says: What god ever came to men, who did not obtain acceptance, especially, if he came to them who expected him? Or, why should he not be acknowledged by them, who had long before expected him?'

7. 'Afterwards' the Jew, representing their sentiments, says: 'For we certainly expect a resurrection of the body, and eternal life: of which he who is to be sent to us, is to be a pattern: and thereby to shew, that it is not impossible for God to raise up a man with a body.' But Origen makes a doubt, whether any Jews would say this of their expected Messiah.

8. 'Afterwards' Celsus in his own person says: That the contention between the Christians and the Jews is very silly; and that all our dispute with one another about Christ, is no better than about the shadow of the ass, according to the proverb. And he thinks, the whole question is of no importance: both sides believing, that it had been foretold by the Spirit of God,

<sup>1</sup> Τινες δε και ελεγξουσιν, ως φησιν ο παρὰ Κελσῶν Ἰαθδαίος, κυριοι τον Ἰησῦν, φασκοῦτες, περι εαυτων ταυτη εἰρησθαι, απερ περι ταυτων εἰρησθαιεναι. L. i. § 57. p. 44.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. et l. ii. § 8. in. p. 61. med.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. l. ii. § 8. p. 61.

§ 8. p. 62.

<sup>q</sup> L. ii. n. 75. p. 106.

n. 77. p. 109.

<sup>o</sup> L. ii.

<sup>p</sup> L. ii. n. 29. p. 78.

<sup>r</sup> L. ii.

<sup>s</sup> Libr. iii. sub in.

‘ that a Saviour of mankind is to come. But they do not agree, whether he who has been prophesied of, is come, or not.’

9. There are other places, where Celsus speaks of this same matter. Perhaps some of them may appear hereafter in our fourth section. Here is enough to shew, that the Jewish expectation of a great person prophesied of, was a thing well known; and that this expectation was in being before the appearance of Jesus in the world. And indeed their having generally such an expectation in the time of Celsus, is an argument, that they had it before the coming of Jesus: for they would not have taken up such a notion from his followers.

10. I must not go from this section, without putting down a remarkable observation of Origen, that “ the Jews did not join John (the Baptist) with Jesus, and made a difference between the death of each of them.

### S E C T I O N III.

#### *Passages of Celsus containing references to the books of the New Testament.*

1. IN some of these passages we shall observe our scriptures spoken of in general; in others there will be references to particular texts.

2. ‘ After that,’<sup>2</sup> says Origen, ‘ the Jew in Celsus goes on in this manner: I could say many things concerning the affairs of Jesus, and those true too, different from those written by the disciples of Jesus. But I purposely omit them.’

It is not easy to believe, that the Jew, or Celsus, would have done so, if he could have contradicted the disciples, upon good evidence, in any material points. This is only an oratorical flourish, as Origen well observes.

Celsus by ‘ disciples of Jesus’ does not mean his followers in general: for them he calls Christians, or believers, or the like. He therefore here useth that term in the most strict and proper sense, for those who had been taught by Jesus himself, that is, his apostles and their companions.

We hence learn, that in the time of Celsus there were books well known, and allowed to be written by ‘ the disciples of Jesus:’ which books contained a history of Him, and his teaching, doc-

<sup>1</sup> Lib. iv. sub in. et alibi.

<sup>2</sup> L. i. § 48. p. 38. And see before Vol. vii. p. 119.

εχθη λεγειν, και αληθη, περι των καλα Ιησου

γενομενων, και η παραπλησια τοις υπο μαθητων τε Ιησου γραφεισιν, εμων εκεινα παραλειπω. L. ii. § 13. p. 67.

trine, and works. The books here intended, undoubtedly, are the gospels: and, possibly, there may be here also a reference to the Acts of the apostles.

3. 'Then<sup>b</sup> says Origen, he accuseth the disciples, and says: 'It is a fiction of theirs, that Jesus foreknew and foretold all things, which befel him.'

He refers to our gospels, in which it is often related, that Jesus spoke of his sufferings before hand, and likewise of the things that should befall his disciples, who were to be brought before kings and rulers for his name sake.

4. 'Afterwards<sup>c</sup> he says, that some of the believers, as if they were drunk, take a liberty to alter the gospel, from the first writing, three or four ways, or oftener, that when they are pressed hard, and one reading has been confuted, they may disown that, and flee to another.'

So that there was an ancient original account: but the believers, or Christians of after times, had altered it, he says, to serve a purpose. But that is only a general charge, which is of no value, without particular instances; which, so far as we can perceive from Origen, Celsus did not specify. Origen, by way of answer, says, he did not know of any who had altered the gospel, beside the followers of Marcion and Valentinus; and perhaps Lucanus: and that this is not the fault of the word itself, but of those who had been so daring as to corrupt the gospels: and that the fault of those men, who introduce new opinions, ought not to be laid to the charge of genuine Christianity.

However, we hence perceive, that there were ancient written histories of our Saviour, composed by his own disciples. Nor is their genuineness disputed, but allowed of, as well known.

5. 'The<sup>d</sup> Jew in Celsus,' says Origen, 'shuts up that argument in this manner. These things, then, we have alleged to you out of your own writings, not needing any other witnesses. Thus you are beaten with your own weapons.'

6. Origen expressly says, 'That<sup>e</sup> Celsus quoted many things out of the gospel according to St. Matthew, as the star that appeared at the nativity of Jesus, and other wonderful things.'

<sup>b</sup> L. ii. p. 13. p. 67.  
ταύτα τινος των πιστευοντων φησιν ως εκ μεθης ηκούσας εις το εφεσαναι αύλοις μίλαχα-  
ρατλειν εκ της πρώτης γραφης το ευαγγελιον  
τριχη και τέτραχη και πολλαχη. κ. λ. L.  
ii. p. 27. p. 77.  
<sup>d</sup> . . . ταύτα μεν  
εν υμιν εκ των υμετερων συγγραμμάτων, εφ'  
οις υδενος αλλη μαρτυρος χρηζόμεν. κ. λ.  
L. ii. § 74. p. 106.

<sup>c</sup> Μίλα [ων ο Κελσος εκ εξεβηλο την προφήλειαν, [II. vii. 10. . . . 14. Matt. i. 22, 23.]  
δηλον μοι γινέται, εκ τη παραθεμενον αύλον  
πολλα απο τη κατά Ματθαιον ευαγγελιου,  
ωσπερ τον αιαιειλαντα αστρα επι τη γενεσει  
τη Ιησυ και αλλα των παραδοξων, μηδε  
την αρχην τησ εμνημοιευκεναι. L. i. π.  
34. p. 27.

<sup>e</sup> Οτι δε καυης-

7. Celsus<sup>f</sup> says, the composers of the genealogies of Jesus, were very extravagant in making him to descend from the first man, and the Jewish kings. And he thinks he says somewhat very extraordinary, when he observes, that the carpenter's wife was ignorant of her high original.'

Celsus plainly refers to both St. Matthew's and St. Luke's gospels: for he speaks of composers of the genealogy in the plural number: and St. Luke only has carried up our Saviour's genealogy to the first man. See Matt. ch. i. and Luke iii.

8. 'They<sup>g</sup> have likewise such precepts as these. *Resist not him that injures you: and, if a man strike thee, as his phrase is, on the one cheek, offer to him the other also.* That is an old saying: but here it is expressed in a more homely manner.' Then he quotes a passage from Plato's Crito to the like purpose.

Celsus here refers to our Saviour's sermon upon the mount, as it is called, and particularly to Matt. v. 39. *But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.* See likewise Luke vi. 29. Celsus says, the same thing had been said before, and better expressed. This is not a place to enter into controversy upon that head. But Origen answers very well: 'That<sup>h</sup> these precepts of Jesus thus expressed, as Celsus says unpolitely, ἀσποικώλερον, have been more beneficial in life than Plato's discourse in Crito, of which the vulgar have never heard, and hardly they, who have gone through a course of Greek philosophy.'

9. 'He<sup>i</sup> finds fault with Jesus after this manner. He threatens, and feebly reproaches, when he says: *Woe unto you: and I foretel unto you.* For thereby he plainly confesseth his disability to persuade: which is so far below a god, that it is even unworthy a wise man.'

I need not say, that here are references to our gospels. But these are poor remarks.

10. 'Celsus<sup>k</sup> asks, why we may not worship angels, and dæmons, and heroes? Why, the only reason, he says, is, because *it is impossible to serve two masters.*'

He refers to some text, where are those words, either Matt. vi. 24. or Luke xvi. 13. This maxim Celsus has endeavoured to expose<sup>l</sup> several times.

<sup>f</sup> Φησι δε απηνυθαδησθαι της γενεαλογησαιας απο της πρωτης φυλης και των εν Ιουδαισι βασιλευν τον Ιησεν και ομεισαι τι εισφερειν γεναιου, οτι εκ αν η τη τελειου γυνη τυλιχειν γειης τυχαιεσα ησισει. L. ii. n.

32. p. 80.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. n. 61. p. 373.

n. 76. p. 107.

376, 377.

381. et § 15. p. 388.

<sup>g</sup> L. vii. n. 58. p. 370.

<sup>i</sup> L. ii.

<sup>k</sup> L. vii. § 68. p.

<sup>l</sup> L. viii. § 2, 3. p. 380,

11. ' O light, <sup>m</sup> O truth, says the Jew in Celsus: Jesus with his own mouth expressly declares these things, as you have recorded it, that there will come unto you other men, with like wonders, wicked men, and impostors.'

Undoubtedly, he refers to some of our Saviour's predictions concerning the coming of deceivers, and false prophets: as Matt. vii. 15. xxiv. 11. 24. Mark xiii. 22. And the genuineness of the evangelical histories is here clearly acknowledged: they are here alleged as containing our Lord's own words there recorded. And <sup>n</sup> in other places Celsus has taken notice of such like predictions of our Saviour.

12. In another place Celsus is arguing, that Moses and Jesus, though both are said to be sent from God, do not agree. ' Moses <sup>o</sup> encourageth the people to get riches; and destroy their enemies. <sup>o</sup> But his Son, [meaning <sup>o</sup> ' the Son of God,'] the Nazæran man, delivers quite contrary laws. Nor will he admit a <sup>o</sup> rich man, or one that affects dominion, to have access to his <sup>o</sup> Father. Nor will he allow men *to take more care for food, or treasure, than the ravens: nor to provide for clothing, so much as the lilies: and to him that has smitten once, he directs to offer, that he may smite again.*'

Beside the quotation from Matt. v. 39. or Luke vi. 29. which we had before, here are plain references to Matt. vi. 26. *Behold the fowls of the air. For they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns. Yet your heavenly Father feedeth them.* And ver. 28. *Why take ye thought for raiment! Consider the lilies of the field . . . or to Luke xii. 24. . . . 27. Consider the ravens. For they neither sow, nor reap. Which neither have store-house, nor barn. . . . Consider the lilies, how they grow. . . .*

As to what Celsus says of our Lord's discouraging the seeking of riches, power, honour: it is indeed the tenour of our Lord's doctrine in his discourses, that we are to *seek the kingdom of heaven, and its righteousness, in the first place.* Matt. vi. 33. And he condemns the seeking, principally, that honour which comes from men. John v. 44. And in Luke vi. 24. he says: *Woe unto you that are rich: for you have received your consolation: the very same chapter, in which he says, at ver. 29. And unto him that smiteth thee on one cheek offer also the other.* Which are the very words to which Celsus seems to refer.

<sup>m</sup> . . . αλλ' ω φως και αληθεια, τη αυτη φωνη διαρρηδην εξαγορευει Ιησους ταυτα, καθα και υμεις συγγειγραφατε . . . κ. λ. L. ii. § 53. p. 92. <sup>n</sup> Vid. l. vi. § 42. <sup>o</sup> . . . ο δε υιος αρα αυτη, ο Ναζαραιος ανθρωπος, ανινομοθειει. κ. λ. L. vii. § 18. p. 343.

And he calls our Saviour, 'the Nazaræan man,' or man of Nazareth, referring to some texts of the gospels, or the Acts, where Nazareth is mentioned, as the place of our Lord's education and abode, till he appeared publicly in the world. See Matt. ii. 23. iv. 13. Mark i. 9. Luke i. 26. ii. 4. 39. 51. iv. 16. And he is often spoken of as 'the Prophet of Nazareth,' as Matt. xxi. 11. Mark i. 24. x. 47. Luke xviii. 37. xxiv. 19. John i. 45. xix. 19. Acts ii. 22. iii. 6. and elsewhere. This character of Jesus, therefore, Celsus learned from the historical books of the New Testament, though he is pleased to mention it in the way of contempt.

13. 'Of that<sup>p</sup> saying of Jesus, *that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God*, he says, it was plainly taken from Plato: but Jesus had spoiled the observation of Plato, who says: To be very good and very rich is impossible.'

Here was in Celsus a reference to Matt. xix. 24. or Mark x. 25. or Luke xviii. 25. where that expression is recorded. Origen has several good remarks upon this passage of Celsus. He says, it must appear ridiculous, not only to the followers of Jesus, but likewise to all other attentive persons, to say, that Jesus had read Plato: when, according to the true records of his faithful disciples, he was a Jew, educated among the Jews, supposed to be the son of a carpenter, who had never been instructed neither in Greek, no nor Hebrew learning. And he likewise asks, if that observation of Plato does not justify all that our Lord says in the gospels concerning moderating our regards for riches, and other worldly goods?

14. 'He<sup>q</sup> says, it is a saying of ours, that God was sent to sinners. And he asks: But why was he not sent to those who were free from sin? What harm is it, not to have sinned? God accepts an unrighteous man, if he humbleth himself for his wickedness: but a righteous man, who has practised virtue from the beginning, if he looks up to him, he will not accept.'

Here is a manifest reference to what our Lord says in several of the gospels: *I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.* Matt. ix. 13. Mark ii. 17. Luke v. 32. and likewise to the parable of the pharisee and the publican, which last *stood afar off, and would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, and went*

<sup>p</sup> Μὲν ταῦτα τῆς κατὰ τῶν πλουσίων ἀπιφασίης τῆς Ἰησοῦ ἐποίησεν, εὐκοπώτερον καμῶν . . . φησιν, Ἀνδρὸς ἀπὸ Πλάτωνος ἐκτεθεῖται, τὸ Ἰησοῦ παραφρασεύσας τὸ Πλάτωνος, ἐν οἷς εἶπεν ὁ Πλάτων· οὐκ ἄσφατον

οὐκ ἀδιαφοροῦτως, καὶ πλεονεξίαν εἶναι διαφοροῦτως ἀδυνατίον. L. vi. § 16. p. 286.

<sup>q</sup> Φησιν ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ἀμαρτωλοῖς πεπεμφθεὶς τὸν Θεόν, κ. λ. L. iii. § 62. p. 148, 149.

down to his house (from the temple,) justified rather than the other. Luke xviii. 9. . . . 14.

Origen makes good answers to these cavils, which well deserve to be perused: but I must not stay to transcribe them.

15. He also adds: But Celsus insinuates, that we give this encouragement to sinners, because we are not able to persuade any really good and honest men; and therefore we open the doors to the most wicked and abandoned.' 'But, says Origen, if any men will with a tolerable degree of equity examine our conversions, he may see, that we have among us more of such as were converted from no very bad life, than of such as were abandoned.'

16. 'Celsus,' says Origen, 'omitting those things that shew the divinity of Jesus, reproacheth him with those things that are written of him in the gospels, his *deriders, the purple robe, the crown of thorns, and the reed in his hand.*' Matt. xxvii. Mark xv. Luke xxiii. John xix. 'Whence' did you learn these things, Celsus, but from the gospels, says Origen, and tells him, that<sup>u</sup> instead of ridiculing these things, he ought to admire the veracity of those who wrote them, and the greatness of him, who voluntarily suffered such things for the good of men, and bore all with meekness and patience: for it is nowhere written, that he bemoaned himself, or that he said, or did any thing mean and abject, when he was condemned.'

And just before Celsus had said: 'But<sup>x</sup> neither did he who condemned him suffer any thing like Pentheus, who ran mad, and was torn to pieces.'

'He does not consider, says Origen, that Jesus was not so much condemned by Pilate, *who knew that for envy the Jews had delivered him,* as by the Jewish people: for which cause they have been condemned by God, and have been dispersed and scattered over the whole earth more than Pentheus. And why does he designedly omit what is recorded concerning the wife of Pilate, who sent to him, *saying, Have nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream, because of him.*' Matt. xxvii. 19. So writes Origen. But Eusebius says, that<sup>y</sup> Pontius Pilate met with many troubles, and at last made away with himself.

<sup>r</sup> Ημεεις δε, ει τις καλιαροησαι ημων ευγνωμοτως το αθροισμα, πλειονας εχομεν παρρησιας της εκ απο χαλεπης πανυ βιας, ηπερ της απο εξωλεσιων αμαρτηματων επισρεψανιας. L. iii. § 65. p.

<sup>s</sup> L. ii. § 34. p. 81.

<sup>t</sup> Ποθεν εις ω Κελσε, ταυτα μεμαθηκας, η απο των ευαγγελιων;

<sup>u</sup> Μαλλον εν θαυμαζει αυτων το φιλαληθες . . . p. 81.

<sup>x</sup> L. ii. § 31.

<sup>y</sup> H. E. I. ii. cap. 7.

18. 'He<sup>z</sup> pretends,' says Origen, 'that Christians argue miserably, when they say, that the Son of God is the Word himself: and he thinks, he makes good his charge, in that after we have affirmed the Son of God to be the Word, we do not shew him to be a pure and holy Word, but a miserable man, condemned, scourged, and crucified.'

Where, as I apprehend, Celsus referred to St. John's gospel, in which, at the beginning, Jesus is spoken of as *the Word*, and at the end, as indeed in all the gospels, his crucifixion is related.

19. By way of ridicule Celsus speaks 'of<sup>a</sup> the blood, which flowed from the body of Jesus when on the cross.' Referring, as Origen justly supposes, to John xix. 34.

20. The Jew, in Celsus, having referred to some heathen stories, or rather fables, turns himself to Jesus: 'But<sup>b</sup> you, what good or wonderful thing, either in word or deed, did you perform? You shewed us nothing, though they called upon you in the temple to give some manifest sign, that you were the Son of God.'

Here is, I think, a reference to John x. 23, 24. *And Jesus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him: How long doest thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.* See also John ii. 18.

21. 'After<sup>c</sup> this he adds,' says Origen: 'To the sepulchre of Jesus there came two angels, as is said by some, or, as by others, one only. He had observed, I think, that Matthew and Mark mention one only, Luke and John two. But,' says Origen, 'those things are not contrary to each other; they are easily conciled.' See Matt. xxviii. 2. Mark xvi. 5. Luke xxiv. 4. John xx. 12.

Origen supposed, therefore, that Celsus had read all our four gospels: which, indeed, appears to me to be very probable, from the collections which we have made. And their genuineness is here acknowledged. These histories of Jesus were written by his own disciples, the apostles and their companions, as we now say, and as has been said by all Christians in general from the beginning.

22. 'But<sup>d</sup> Celsus, who has often derided a resurrection, which he did not understand, not contented with what he had already said, adds, that we expect a resurrection of the flesh from wood:

<sup>z</sup> L. ii. § 31. p. 79.

<sup>c</sup> Κέλσος. Τι και ανασκολοπιζομεν τω σω-  
ματιος ποιος ισχυος.

Οις περι τε φει μακαρεσαι θρονον,

Εκεις με εν παιζει.

<sup>b</sup> L. i. § 67. p. 52.

<sup>a</sup> Ειπα, φησιν

L. ii. § 36. 81.

<sup>c</sup> . . . ει

και προς τον αυτη τη ιηση ταφον ιστορησαι

εληλυθεναι υπο τινων μεν ανγελου δυο, υπο

τινων δε εις· ηκ οιμαι τρησας Ματθαιου μεν

και Μαρκον εια ιστορηκεναι, Ληκαν δε και

Ιωαννην δυο· απεξ ηκ ην ενανθια. Lib. v.

§ 56. p. 268.

<sup>d</sup> L. vi. § 36. p. 299.

<sup>e</sup> perverting,

‘ perverting, as I suppose, what is figuratively said: *By wood*  
 ‘ [or by a tree] *came death: and by a tree comes life. By Adam*  
 ‘ *came death, but life by Christ.* 1 Cor. xv. 22. Then playing  
 ‘ upon the word, wood, he endeavours to expose it in two re-  
 ‘ spects, and says, “ that wood is honoured by us, either because  
 ‘ our master was fastened to a cross, or because he was a car-  
 ‘ penter by trade.” In answer to which Origen says: That Jesus  
 ‘ himself is no where called a carpenter in any of the gospels re-  
 ‘ ceived by the church.’

Whence it came to pass that Origen said this is not certain: whether it be a slip of memory, or whether the copies used by him had *carpenter’s son*: for in all the Greek manuscripts in general Jesus is called a carpenter, in Mark vi. 3. as in our version.

I suppose, that this passage may afford good proof, that Celsus had seen and read St. Mark’s, as well as the other gospels.

23. ‘ Some<sup>c</sup> of them say: *Do not examine, but believe: and*  
 ‘ *thy faith shall save thee: and the wisdom of this world is evil,*  
 ‘ *and folly good.*’

Afterwards Origen quotes from Celsus the same saying in this manner: ‘ Wisdom<sup>f</sup> in life is evil, and folly good.’ In another place Celsus says, that we say: *Wisdom<sup>g</sup> in men is foolishness with God*: whereas, says Origen, Paul says: *The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.*’

Nor can it be questioned, that Celsus referred to St. Paul’s first epistle to the Corinthians. See 1 Cor. iii. 19. And compare 1 Cor. i. 19. . . . 31.

24. Here I may take a reflection of Celsus upon the Christians, which is in these terms. ‘ These<sup>h</sup> he says, are our institutions: ‘ Let not any man of learning come hither, nor any wise man, ‘ nor any man of prudence; for these things, he says, are reck- ‘ oned evil by us: but if any man be unlearned, if he is ignorant, ‘ if he is silly, let him come without fear. Thus acknowledging, ‘ that these are the men who are acceptable to their God; and ‘ thereby manifesting, that they are neither willing, nor able to ‘ gain any but the foolish, the vulgar, the stupid, slaves, women ‘ and children.’

To which, beside many other things, Origen answers. ‘ Celsus ‘ without reason chargeth us, as if we said: Let not any man ‘ of learning, any wise man, any discreet person come to us. ‘ Yea, let the learned, the wise, the discreet come, if he will:

<sup>c</sup> . . . χρῆσθαι τῷ, Μη ἐξέλαζε, ἀλλὰ  
 πειθεύσον· καὶ ἡ πίστις σε σώσει σε. Καὶ  
 φησὶ αὐτὸς λέγειν. Κακὸν ἔστι τὸ βίω σο-  
 φία, ἀγαθὸν δὲ ἡ μωρία. L. i. § 9. p. 8.

<sup>f</sup> L. i. § 13. p. 11.

<sup>g</sup> L. vi.

§ 12. p. 283.

<sup>h</sup> L. iii. § 44. p. 137.

<sup>i</sup> L. iii. § 48, 49. p. 141.

‘ but let him also come who is unlearned, and uninstructed and ignorant, and foolish: for such likewise the word undertakes to heal, (or promiseth to heal) if they are willing, and will prepare themselves for the divine acceptance.’

‘ For it is false, that the foolish, the ignorant, the vulgar, and slaves, and women, and children, are the only persons, whom the teachers of the divine word are desirous to persuade. Such indeed the divine word calls, that it may improve them; but it calls also those who are of very different characters: for our Saviour Jesus Christ is *the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe*, whether they are wise, or simple.’ 1 Tim. iv. 10.

For certain, that is a misrepresentation of the Christian institution, wherein all who are willing, are called, and invited, to come, and learn, and partake of the blessings appertaining to it, as appears from Matt. xi. 22. . . . 30. See also Rev. xxii. 17. And presently afterwards Origen says, ‘ there<sup>k</sup> is no harm in being learned: for learning leads to virtue.’

25. ‘ If, <sup>l</sup> says Celsus, those idols are nothing, what harm can there be to partake in their feasts? If they are dæmons, then no doubt they are of God; and they are to be believed and honoured according to the laws, and to be prayed to, that they may be propitious to us.’

Origen, with good reason, supposeth, that Celsus here has an eye to 1 Cor. viii. 4. 10, 11. *As concerning therefore things offered to idols, we know, that an idol is nothing in the world.* And what follows.

26. ‘ Notwithstanding<sup>m</sup> the many divisions and contentions which there are among them, says Celsus, you may hear them all saying: *The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.*’ Which are the very words of Gal. vi. 14.

27. ‘ Some<sup>n</sup> of them, he says, will neither give, nor receive a reason of the things which they believe.’

It is St. Peter’s advice, 1 ep. iii. 15. *And be always ready to give an answer to every one that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you.* Whether Celsus alluded to that place, we cannot say positively; though it is not improbable.

28. ‘ After<sup>o</sup> these things, says Origen, he speaks to us in this manner: Surely, you will not say, that when he could not per-

<sup>k</sup> Το μὲν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πεπαιδευθῆναι ἔκα-  
νον· ὁδὸς γὰρ ἐπ’ ἀρίστην ἐστὶν ἡ παιδεία.  
Ib. § 49.

<sup>l</sup> L. viii. § 24. p. 393.

<sup>m</sup> Παρῶν δὲ φησὶν ἀκροῶν . . . λεγομένων το,  
Ἐμὲ κόσμος ἐσταυρώθη· ἄλλω τῷ κόσμῳ.

L. v. § 64. p. 273.

<sup>n</sup> Φησὶ δὲ τις, μὴδὲ βελομένης διδοῦσαι ἢ λαμβάνειν λόγον περὶ ὧν πιστεύουσι. L. i. § 9. p. 8.

<sup>o</sup> L. ii. § 43. p. 85.

‘suade those that were here, he went to Hades, to persuade those who are there.’

St. Peter says, 1 ep. iii. 19, 20. *By which also he went, and preached to the spirits in prison, which some time were disobedient, and what follows.* There seems to be a reference to this text. And Celsus was aware, they would say something like to what he says, ‘surely you will not say:’ and his apprehension might be built upon this text. And in Origen’s next section there follows a quotation from Celsus, which may confirm this supposition; but it would be too prolix to enlarge farther here.

29. Celsus chargeth the Christians with having gross apprehensions of God: ‘He<sup>p</sup> says, we expect to see God with the eyes of the body, and to hear his voice with our ears, and to handle him with our sensible hands.’

St. John says, 1 ep. i. 1. *That which was from the beginning: 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.* And iii. 2. *We shall see him, as he is.* Whether Celsus referred to either of those places, I cannot say positively.

30. I shall allege no more passages from Celsus concerning the books of the New Testament: many more references to them will appear in the next section. In those already cited are plain references to the gospels, and to several of St. Paul’s epistles, if not also to the epistles of St. Peter and St. John. We are assured by Celsus, that there were histories of Jesus, ‘written by his disciples:’ and that these books were well known, and in high esteem with Christians. We have seen plain references to the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John: and probably, he had read, and was acquainted with Mark’s also. Nor is there so much as a pretence or insinuation, that the later Christians, of Celsus’s age, had forged those histories to do honour to Jesus. He only says, that they had altered some things: but of that he produced no proof.

#### S E C T I O N IV.

*Passages of Celsus concerning Christian Faëts, chiefly such as are recorded in the New Testament.*

1. ‘It is but a few years, says<sup>q</sup> Celsus, since He [Jesus] delivered this doctrine, who is now reckoned by the Christians to be the Son of God.’

ρ . . . λεῖπεν προσδεχέσθαι ἡμᾶς οφθαλμοῖς σωματος Θεοῦ ὀφείσθαι, και ὡς της ζωης αὐτοῦ ἀκθεσθαι, και χερσιν αἰσθηταῖς

ψαυειν αὐτοῦ: L. vii. § 34. p. 374.  
q L. i. § 26. p. 21.

Never

Never the worse for that: if Jesus had not been acknowledged to be the Son of God, soon after his coming, he ought never to have been so acknowledged. But he was esteemed to be so, when the evidences, which he produced, might be examined. As there were many in divers parts of the world, who soon owned his divine mission and character, notwithstanding many outward discouragements, there is reason to believe, that they had good evidences of it. Origen answers very well: ‘ That Jesus had by his doctrine so affected many in different parts of the world, Greeks and Barbarians, wise and unwise, that they had contended for Christianity even unto death.’

2. In another place<sup>r</sup> Celsus calls Jesus ‘ the first author of this sedition.’

3. ‘ After this,’<sup>s</sup> says Origen, ‘ he brings in his Jew, arguing against Jesus in this manner. First, that he pretended, he was born of a virgin: then he reproacheth him with his birth in a Jewish village, and of a poor woman of that country, who subsisted by the labour of her hands. And he says, she was put away by her husband, who was a carpenter by trade, he having found, that she was guilty of adultery. Then he says, that having been turned out of doors by her husband, she wandered about in a shameful manner, till she had brought forth Jesus in an obscure place, and that he being in want, served in Egypt for a livelihood; and having there learned some charms, such as the Egyptians are fond of, he returned home: and then valuing himself upon those charms, [powers,] he set up himself for a God.’

4. Farther, Origen says, ‘ that<sup>u</sup> this fictitious person of a Jew says, that the mother of Jesus, being great with child, was put away by the carpenter, who had espoused her, he having convicted her of adultery with a soldier named Pantheras.’ But Origen seems not to give us here the words of Celsus exactly. However, afterwards Celsus goes on: ‘ Was<sup>x</sup> the mother of Jesus handsome, that God should be in love with her beauty? It is unworthy of God, to suppose him to be taken with a corruptible body, or to be in love with a woman, whether she be of royal descent, or otherwise.’

5. In another place<sup>y</sup> Celsus says: ‘ But if God would send forth a spirit from himself, what need had he to breathe him into the womb of a woman? For, since he knew how to make

<sup>r</sup> Οσπερ εστιν αυτος της σασηως αρχητης  
L. viii. § 14. p. 387.  
<sup>s</sup> L. i.  
§ 28. p. 22.  
<sup>t</sup> και απο γυναικος  
εβληθη, και περιχρησας και χειρηνιδος. Ib.

<sup>u</sup> L. i. § 32. p. 25. Of this Pantheras  
see again, l. i. § 69. p. 54.

<sup>x</sup> L. i. § 39. p. 32.  
<sup>y</sup> L. vi.  
§ 73. p. 325.

‘ men, he might have formed a body for this spirit, and not cast  
‘ his own spirit into such filth.’

6. From all which we learn, that there did then obtain among Christians such an account of the miraculous conception of Jesus, as we now have in the gospels: that he was born of a virgin, *by the power of the Highest*: that her husband was a *carpenter*, that Jesus was born in a village, or town of Judea, which was not then of any great extent, and also that he was in Egypt, and returned thence: and that there were some extraordinary works related to be done by him afterwards: upon account of which he was in the highest veneration with many. See Matt. i. and ii: Luke i. and ii.

Origen<sup>z</sup> says very well, that the story of Pantheras is a silly and improbable fiction, the forgery of blind malice, to overthrow the credit of the miraculous conception of Jesus. And he appeals to Celsus, and all the Greeks and Barbarians in general, whether it was at all likely, that a person, whose great design was to deliver men from the corruptions of this world, and who had succeeded to a great degree, in converting men from their vices, should not have so much as a legitimate birth? It was much more likely that it should be of an extraordinary kind, such as that received by Christians.

However, it was no hard matter for malicious enemies, such as the Jews were, to whom Celsus had applied for scandal, to frame a different account from that of the disciples: concerning which I shall only say farther, that undoubtedly, at first, Mary only knew, that the child was conceived in her by a divine interposition, without the concurrence of a man. It is probable, that the account given by her is true, in that her husband was convinced of it, and fully satisfied about it, as appears from the evangelists. Their account is supported by all the great works done by Jesus, and by his resurrection from the dead, and by the miracles of his apostles, and by the wonderful success and great effects of his doctrine in the world. This is said for the truth of the miraculous birth of the Lord Jesus.

As to the fitness of it, I would observe, that there is no absurdity in the evangelists account of this matter: and we may do Celsus the justice to own, that he does not deny the possibility of it.

7. ‘ After these things,’ says<sup>a</sup> Origen, ‘ the Jew in Celsus, instead of the Magians in the gospels, says: It was given out by Jesus, that Chaldeans were moved at the time of his birth, to come, and worship him, as a God, when he was but a little

<sup>z</sup> L. i. § 32, 33. p. 25.

<sup>a</sup> . . . Χαλδαῖες φησὶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λελεχθαι κινήσειας ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει αὐτοῦ. κ. λ. L. i. § 58. p. 45.

‘ child,

‘ child, and that \*\* this was told to Herod the tetrarch; who  
 ‘ issued out an order to have all killed, who had been born there  
 ‘ about that time, intending to kill him with the rest, lest if he  
 ‘ should live to mature age, he should take the government.’

It cannot be questioned, but that here is a reference to the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew’s gospel. We are not to wonder, that Celsus, who was pleased to consider Jesus as an impostor, should say, that this, or some other things in the gospels, ‘ were given out,’ or invented by Jesus himself, by whom therefore his disciples were deceived. But that is only said, not proved: for it is unreasonable to suppose, that the disciples should preach Jesus at the hazard of their lives, without any good evidences of his divine mission and character. There are many great things related of Jesus in the gospels, which the disciples must have certainly known whether they were true, or not. Moreover, it would have been in vain for Jesus, or his disciples, at that time, to tell a story of Chaldeans, or *Wise men of the East*, coming to Jerusalem to worship a new-born child, and of Herod’s thereupon putting to death a great number of children in an adjacent village, unless it had been true, and matter of fact; especially with so many circumstances as are put into the narrative by St. Matthew.

8. ‘ Afterwards <sup>b</sup> the Jew in Celsus addresses Jesus, and says:  
 ‘ What occasion had you, when an infant, to be carried into  
 ‘ Egypt, lest you should be killed? A God has no reason to be  
 ‘ afraid of death. And now an angel comes from heaven to di-  
 ‘ rect you and your relations to flee into Egypt, lest you should  
 ‘ be taken up and put to death; as if the great God, who had  
 ‘ already sent two angels upon your account; could not have  
 ‘ preserved you, his own Son, in safety at home.’

Here is another manifest reference to the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew: but there is nothing solid in this objection of Celsus. Jesus being a man, born of a woman, he was exposed to dangers, as other men are. And it was more agreeable to divine wisdom and goodness, that Jesus should some-

\*\* *And that this was told to Herod the tetrarch.]* Και Ηρωδης τω τετραρχη τειλο διδωλωενται. I would here make two remarks upon Celsus mistaking king of all Judea, in whose time Jesus was born, for his son Herod the tetrarch of Galilee. First, We see the great difficulty of any writer’s taking upon himself the character of a more early age than that in which he lives, without committing some great mistakes. This instance may confirm the ar-

gument, so much insisted on for the credibility of the evangelical history, in the first part of this work: where the evangelists freedom from all errors of this kind was largely shewn. Secondly, Since so learned a man as Celsus, about the middle of the second century, has made such a blunder in history, the Christian writers, of the same age, or later, ought not to be too severely treated for any mistakes of the like kind. <sup>b</sup> L. i. § 66. p. 51.

times decline dangers, than that his enemies should be destroyed. See Matt. ii. 13. and compare ch. i.

In another place Celsus has these words: ‘But \* \* if he [Herod] was afraid, that when you was come of age, you should reign in his stead: why did you not reign when you was of age? But so far from that, the son of God wanders about, cringing like a necessitous beggar.’ Or, as some may choose it should be rendered: ‘Skulking from place to place, as if he was afraid of being taken up.’

These expressions are very irreverent: but they contain another testimony to the second chapter of St. Matthew’s gospel.

9. ‘But that it may not be suspected,’ says Origen, ‘that we pass by any chapters because we have no answer at hand: I have thought it best, according to my ability, to confute every thing proposed by him: not so much observing the natural order of things, but the order which he has taken himself. Let us see therefore what he says, denying that the Holy Spirit was seen by our Saviour in the shape of a dove. It is the Jew, who still goes on, addressing himself to him, whom we own for our Lord. You say, that when you was washed by John, there lighted upon you the appearance of a bird. The Jew adds: What credible witness has said, that he saw this? or who heard the voice from heaven, declaring you to be the Son of God, excepting yourself; and, if you are to be credited, one other of those, who have been punished like yourself.’

This passage bears testimony to many things recorded in the gospels: our Saviour’s baptism by John: that John, as well as our Saviour, had suffered a violent death: that according to the disciples of Jesus, who had written his history, when he was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended like a dove, and abode upon him; and there was a voice from heaven, declaring him to be the Son of God, or the Messiah. Celsus may have referred to several of the gospels, but, as it seems, more particularly to John i. 32, 33. *And John bare record, saying: I saw the Spirit descending from heaven, like a dove, and it abode upon him.* And what follows.

Origen’s answer to this is prolix: toward the conclusion of which he says: ‘I must add, that Celsus is mistaken, when he thinks, that Jesus himself told these things, the opening

\* \* Εἰ δὲ ὅπως μὴ σὺ αὐξήθῃς ἀπὸ ἐκείνου βασιλευσῆς, τί ἐπειδὴ γε κούρηθῃς, ἢ βασιλεύῃς, ἀλλ’ ὅτι θεὸς παῖς ἢ ἴσως ἀφένως ἀφείρῃς, κρυπιάζων [ἢ κρυπιάζων] ὑποφύει, καὶ περιφθειρομένο· αἰὼν ἀμήν. L. i. § 61. p. 47.

ᶜ L. i. § 41. p. 31.

ᵃ Τίς τούτο εἶδεν ἀξιοχρεῶς μαρτυρῶν τὸ φασμα; ἢ τίς ηἰκασεν ἐξ ἕρπου φωνῆς εἰσποισῆς σε υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, πλὴν εἰ σὺ φῃς, καὶ τίνα εἶπα ἐπάσῃ τῶν μεία σὺ κεκολασμένω. Ibid.

ᶜ L. i. § 48. p. 37.

‘ of the heavens, and the descent of the Spirit at Jordan, in the  
 ‘ shape of a dove; forasmuch as in no text of scripture it is  
 ‘ related that he said this. Nor did this great author consider,  
 ‘ how little this suited him, who of the vision in the mount said  
 ‘ to the disciples, *tell this vision to no man, until the Son of man*  
 ‘ *be risen from the dead.* Matt. xvii. 9. It is not likely, that he  
 ‘ who said this, should tell the disciples what had been seen and  
 ‘ heard by John: and any may perceive from his whole life, how  
 ‘ he declined speaking of himself. *If I bear witness of myself,*  
 ‘ *says he, my witness is not true.* John v. 31. He chose to shew  
 ‘ himself to be the Christ by his works, rather than by words;  
 ‘ so far was he from boasting.’

10. ‘ Celsus<sup>f</sup> says, that Jesus taking to himself ten or eleven  
 ‘ abjects, vile publicans and sailors, went about with them getting  
 ‘ his subsistence in a base and shameful manner.’

There is no doubt, that Celsus means the twelve disciples of  
 Jesus, by whom he was usually attended: but he so much dis-  
 liked the truth of the gospels, that he could not endure to put  
 down the right number, though that be a point so indifferent:  
 for the same reason, I suppose, he calls the disciples ‘ sailors’ or  
 mariners, instead of fishermen. Celsus gives ill language, and  
 vilifies the disciples; but it does not appear, that he produced  
 any instances of their wickedness. Publicans and sailors, or  
 fishermen, are oftentimes bad men; but they are not all so. The  
 original employments of the disciples shew, that they were not  
 men of much learning, or of great and wealthy families; but  
 they might be very honest nevertheless. The more despicable they  
 were, the more evidently does the success of the gospel, preached  
 by them, appear to be owing to its truth and importance, and  
 the power of God attending it. That Celsus produced no proof,  
 nor credible account, that the disciples were bad men, is appa-  
 rent: because Origen conjectures, he might find this character  
 upon what is said of them in<sup>b</sup> the epistle of St. Barnabas, or else  
 upon what St. Peter says to Christ, Luke v. 8. *Depart from me,*  
*O Lord, for I am a sinful man.* And though Jesus subsisted in a  
 mean and humble manner, it was not shameful: but it is great  
 and shameful perverseness, to censure the life of Jesus, who,  
 without external pomp and splendor, *went about doing good,* as it  
 is justly said, Acts x. 38. And who was sometimes attended by  
 thousands, whom he fed in desert places; who would have been

<sup>f</sup> . . . δεκα ειπεν, η ενδεκα τινων εξαρ-  
 τησαμενος τον Ιησυν εαυτω επιρρητικας αιθρω-  
 πους, τελωνας και ναυτας της πονηρειας,  
 μιζα τελων τηδε κακεισε αυτον αποδεδρακε-

ναι, αιτηρωσ και γλισχωσ τροφας συνα-  
 λειψα. L. i. § 62. p. 47. <sup>b</sup> Vid.  
 Barnab. Ep. cap. v.

his constant followers, with many others, if he would but have exerted his power for procuring to himself and them such worldly advantages, as they saw he was well able to do.

11. I must not omit, ' that <sup>b</sup> in another place the Jew in ' Celsus says, Jesus set out with ten profligate publicans and sailors.'

12. ' After this,' <sup>i</sup> says Origen, ' Celsus well knowing, what ' great works may be alleged to have been done by Jesus, pre- ' tends <sup>k</sup> to grant, that the things related of him are true, such ' as healing diseases, raising the dead, feeding multitudes with a ' few loaves, of which likewise large fragments were left, and ' whatever other things the disciples, who, as he thinks, delighted ' in strange things, have written. And then adds: " Well, ' then, let us grant, that all these things were done by you." ' After which he instanceth in the tricks of Egyptians, and ' other impostors: and then asketh this question: Because they ' do such things, must we therefore esteem them to be God's ' sons? or must we not rather say, that these are artifices of ' wicked and miserable men?'

Celsus here evidently refers to our gospels, and allows the histories of our Lord, in which those miracles are recorded, to have been written by ' his disciples: ' and he knew, that those works were esteemed proofs, that he was the Son of God. Upon which Origen observes: ' You <sup>l</sup> see,' says he, ' that Celsus in a ' manner allows, there is such a thing as magic; though, possi- ' bly, he is the same who wrote several books against magic.' Origen speaks modestly: but I think it very probable, that he is the same person. Moreover Origen here answers very well, ' that <sup>m</sup> whatever things were performed by the jugglers, whom ' Celsus speaks of, were not done for the reformation of man- ' kind, nor to form in them the fear of God, or other virtues: ' which was the great design of the life of Jesus: who did not ' perform great works to be wondered at; but that the men of ' that and future times, might be induced by his doctrine and ' example, to live well, and aim to please God in whatever they do.'

13. He <sup>m m</sup> asks us, says Origen, " by what reasons are ye in- ' duced to think him the Son of God?" And he makes us ' answer: " because we know his death was undergone for the ' destruction of the parent of evil." And soon after: ' Here

<sup>h</sup> Οτι παρων δεκα ναυτας και τελωνας της εξωδεσας μονης ειλε. κ. λ. L. ii. § 46. p. 86.

<sup>i</sup> L. i. § 68. p. 53.

<sup>k</sup> . . . προσποιεσθαι συγχωρειν αληθη ειναι, οσα περι θεραπειων, η ανατασεως, η περι αβλων ολιγων θρεψαντων πολλης αναγε- Ιραπλαι, η οσα αλλα οεισαι τεραλευσαμενυς

της μαθητας ισορηκεναι, και επιφερει αυτοις' Φερε, πιστευσωμεν ειαι σοι ταυτ' ειρλασμε- να. Ibid.

<sup>l</sup> Ορας ως δια τειλων οι- οιει παραδεχειται μασειαν ειναι' εκ οιδα ει ο αυτος ων τω γραψαντι καλα μασειας βιβλια πλειονα. Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m m</sup> L. ii. § 47. p. 87.

“ he makes us answer him, “ that we therefore have thought  
 “ him to be the Son of God, because he healed the lame, and  
 “ the blind, and, as you say, raised the dead.”

To which Origen makes this glorious answer: ‘ Undoubtedly,  
 ‘ we do think him to be the Christ, and the Son of God, because  
 ‘ he healed the lame, and the blind: and we are the more con-  
 ‘ firmed in this persuasion by what is written in the prophecies.  
 ‘ *Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf  
 ‘ shall hear, and the lame man shall leap as an hart.* Is. xxxv. 5, 6.  
 ‘ But that he also raised the dead, and that this is not a fiction of  
 ‘ those who wrote the gospels, is evident hence: That if it had  
 ‘ been a fiction, there would have been many recorded to be  
 ‘ raised up, and such as had been a long time in their graves.  
 ‘ But it not being a fiction, few have been recorded: for instance  
 ‘ the daughter of the ruler of a synagogue; (of whom I do not  
 ‘ know, why he said: *she is not dead, but sleepeth*: expressing  
 ‘ something peculiar to her, not common to all dead persons:)  
 ‘ and the only son of a widow, on whom he had compassion,  
 ‘ and raised him to life, after he had bid the bearer of the corpse  
 ‘ to stop: and the third, Lazarus, who had been buried four days.’

Witsius, quoting the words of Celsus above cited, in a differ-  
 tation upon our Saviour’s miracles, observes, ‘ that ° many  
 ‘ learned men have understood Celsus to allow, that Jesus had  
 ‘ healed the blind, and the lame. But,’ he says, ‘ he apprehends,  
 ‘ that these words do not represent what Celsus allowed, but what  
 ‘ Christians affirmed.’

It appears to me somewhat difficult to determine, whether  
 Celsus believed those great works of our Lord, or not. But it  
 is not easy to see, how he could disbelieve them: and he was at  
 a loss how to account for them. And, as Origen observed:  
 ‘ You see, how in a manner he allows, that there is such a thing  
 ‘ as magic.’ I think, Celsus could not, or would not allow our  
 Lord’s great works to have been done by the power of God,  
 because he would not admit the consequence, which was, that  
 Jesus had a divine commission, and acted by authority from  
 heaven: and rather than admit that just and necessary conclusion,

“ . . . οτι δια τετ’ ενομισαμεν αυτον εινα  
 υιον θεου επει χωλης και τυφλης εθεραπευ-  
 σεν. Προσθησι δε και το, ως υμεις φαστε  
 αυτη νεκρης. Ibid. § 48. p. 87.

° Simile quid in Celso deprehendere  
 visi sunt viri eruditissimi, ut qui confessus  
 sit, Jesum cæcos et claudos curavisse. Sed  
 ut verum fatear, dubitare licet, an non  
 justo liberaliores hac in parte sint. Operæ

pretium me facturum esse arbitror, si in-  
 genuitati litans, et ne juniores in fraudem  
 inducantur, integrum Origenis contextum  
 describam. L. ii. contr. Cels. p. 87. Can-  
 tabr. Quibus verbis contineri videtur,  
 non quod Celsus dat, sed quod Christiani  
 assumunt. Cæterum perinde nobis est,  
 quid Celsus vel negaverit, vel fuerit falsus.  
 Diss. vi. § xxiii. ap. Melitem. p. 372, 373.

he has recourse to shifts and evasions, which are absurd and inconsistent. As Origen says, 'Celsus<sup>p</sup> not being able directly to deny the great works which Jesus is recorded to have done, asperseth them, and calls them juggling tricks.'

However, we learn from Celsus, that Christians did then believe Jesus to be the Son of God, because he had healed the lame and the blind, and raised the dead: and because after this, he had voluntarily submitted to death for the destruction of sin, or of Satan and his works. And may we not now appeal to all mankind, if those Christians did not act very rationally, in believing Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, provided they had but good ground for the truth and reality of the great works ascribed to him? as they certainly had, and it is well shewn by Origen in the passage before quoted.

14. Still it may be expected, that I should take some notice of the insinuation which we met with some while \*\* ago, that Jesus, when he was in Egypt, might learn some charms and magical powers, whereby he obtained an ability to perform some works, that should appear surprising. To which it has been already well answered by learned Christian writers: 'How<sup>q</sup> should Jesus learn magic in Egypt, when he was yet an infant, and not much more than two years of age: and if he had learned that art in his childhood, how came it to pass, that he performed not any wonderful works before he was thirty years of age? To which might be added, that it is beyond the power of magic to perform such works as were done by Jesus.'

This objection has been considered, and well answered by Grotius. I need only transcribe a part of what he says, referring my readers to the rest. 'That Jesus was in Egypt, is known only from the writings of his disciples, who also say, that he returned thence when he was still an infant. And if in the time of Christ and his apostles, there had been in Egypt, or any

<sup>p</sup> Πολλακις δ' ο Κελσος ηδη μη δυναμενος αντιβλεπειν εις ανασειραπλια περιποιηται δυναμεσιν ο Ιησους, διαβαλλει αυτος ως γοητειας. L. ii. § 48. p. 87.

\*\* See Vol. vii. p. 151, 152. and see here p. 19.

<sup>q</sup> . . . opponimus Munsteri responsum . . . 'Et quomodo quæso, potuisset puer, et infans duorum annorum discere magiam? Quod si in pueritia didicit artem illam, quare non fecit signa ante 30 vitæ suæ annum? Tunc enim cœpit coruscare miraculis. Sed nunquid mortui possunt vivificari per magicam virtutem, ut Jesus Christus fecit?' Wagenf. Confutatio Toldos. Jes-

chu. p. 44.

<sup>r</sup> . Nam fuisse Jesum unquam in Ægypto, non constat, nisi ex discipulorum libris, qui addunt, infantem adhuc inde rediisse. . . . Tum vero, si Christi et ejus discipulorum tempore, usquam aut in Ægypto, aut alibi, extitisset ars ulla magica, qua possent fieri, quæ de Christo prædicantur, muti omnes subito sanari, claudis gressio, cæcis visus dari, Imperatores, Tiberius [Tacit. ann. vi. 20.] Nero [Sueton. ejus vita: cap. 56.] atque alii, qui ad inquirenda talia nullis impedimentis pepercerunt, haud dubie eam deprehendissent. Grot. De V. R. C. lib. v. § 3.

‘ where else; any magical art, by which the blind might be made  
 ‘ to see, the lame to walk, the dumb to speak, and all kinds of  
 ‘ maladies might be healed on a sudden, as they were by Jesus  
 ‘ Christ; the emperors, Tiberius and Nero, and others, who were  
 ‘ very curious and inquisitive, would have spared no cost to ob-  
 ‘ tain it.’

15. ‘ The Jew goes on: How should we take him for a  
 ‘ God, who, as we have understood, performed none of those  
 ‘ things which were promised: [that is, as I apprehend, did not  
 ‘ accomplish the worldly deliverance, which the Jews expected.]  
 ‘ But when we had judged him guilty, and would bring him to  
 ‘ punishment, though he shamefully hid himself, and fled away,  
 ‘ yet was taken, being betrayed by those whom he called his dis-  
 ‘ ciples. But it became not a God to flee, nor to be taken, and  
 ‘ executed: least of all did it become him to be deserted and  
 ‘ betrayed by his companions, who knew all his secrets, who fol-  
 ‘ lowed him as their master, who esteemed him a Saviour, and  
 ‘ the Son and messenger of the Most High God.’

This passage assures us of many things, agreeable to the gos-  
 pels which we now have, and from which Celsus manifestly takes  
 his accounts, whilst he endeavours to form conclusions to the dis-  
 advantage of Jesus.

This passage, then, assures us, that the Jews disliked Jesus,  
 because he did not answer their carnal expectations: that he met  
 with unkindness from his disciples; by one of whom he was be-  
 trayed, and by the rest forsaken: that the Jews plotted against  
 Jesus, and that he was taken and put to death by them. But  
 what Celsus insinuates, that Jesus absconded, is false. He was  
 apprehended, and died voluntarily; though he had at some times  
 retired for safety, *his hour not being yet come*: and the garden, in  
 which he was apprehended, was a place whither he often went  
 with his disciples. We learn also, that the Christian accounts of  
 that time were, (agreeable to our gospels,) that the disciples had  
 conversed intimately with Jesus, and that they owned him for  
 their master, and Saviour, and the Son and messenger of the  
 great God. We learn, finally, that the cross of Christ was mat-  
 ter of offence and scandal with many.

16. ‘ He then finds fault with the disciples, as if it were  
 ‘ their fiction, that he foresaw and foretold the things which be-  
 ‘ fell him. But that this is true, we can shew, whether Celsus  
 ‘ will, or not: for we can allege many other things foretold by  
 ‘ our Saviour, which happened to the Christians his followers in

\* L. ii. § 9. p. 62.  
 § 13. p. 67.

† Εγκαλει δε τοις μαθηταις, ως πλασαμενοις. κ. λ. L. ii.

‘ after times. Who can forbear to admire these words: *And ye*  
 ‘ *shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testi-*  
 ‘ *mony to them and the gentiles?* Matt. x. 18. . . . For if any men  
 ‘ were to be brought before governors and kings for their doctrine,  
 ‘ who should be more likely than the Epicureans, who deny a  
 ‘ Providence? . . . And who, that shall in his mind place himself  
 ‘ near Jesus, must not wonder when he hears him say: *And this*  
 ‘ *gospel shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to them,*  
 ‘ *and to the gentiles.* [Matt. xxiv. 14.] And yet it has been ful-  
 ‘ filled: and the gospel of Jesus Christ has been preached to all  
 ‘ men under heaven, Greeks and Barbarians, wise and unwise:  
 ‘ for the word preached with power has subdued all mankind:  
 ‘ nor there is any sort of men that has refused to accept of the  
 ‘ doctrine of Jesus. And let the Jew in Celsus, who denies that  
 ‘ Jesus foresaw what would happen to himself, consider, how it  
 ‘ should come to pass, that when Jerusalem was standing, and  
 ‘ the Jewish worship was performed there in all its splendor, Jesus  
 ‘ should foretel all that would happen to it from the Romans.  
 ‘ Nor can they say, that the disciples preached the doctrine of the  
 ‘ gospel by word of mouth only, and did not deliver to their  
 ‘ disciples any written memoirs concerning Jesus: but in them it is  
 ‘ written: *When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then*  
 ‘ *know, that the desolation thereof is nigh.* Luke xxi. 20. There  
 ‘ were then no armies near Jerusalem, to surround it, and besiege  
 ‘ it: that first began to be done under Nero, and continued to  
 ‘ Vespasian, whose son Titus levelled Jerusalem with the ground.’

17. ‘ But<sup>u</sup> Celsus says, that the disciples of Jesus, the thing  
 ‘ being too manifest to be denied by them, have bethought them-  
 ‘ selves to say, that he foreknew all these things.’ . . . ‘ But<sup>x</sup> they  
 ‘ are very weak in thinking to vindicate Jesus by writing these  
 ‘ things of him. As if one should affirm a man to be righteous,  
 ‘ and shew him to be wicked: say, he is a good man, and shew  
 ‘ that he has committed murder: say, he is immortal, and shew  
 ‘ him dead: [This last is the point which he is arguing: the  
 ‘ other instances are only for illustration;] prefacing, however,  
 ‘ continually, that he foreknew all these things. For neither do  
 ‘ you say, that he seemed to wicked men to suffer these things,  
 ‘ when he did not suffer; but you openly and expressly say,  
 ‘ that he did suffer.’

It is certain, then, that Jesus died; otherwise his disciples  
 would not have related it: and it is as certain, that he foretold both  
 his death and his resurrection. And it may deserve to be taken  
 notice of, that the Christians of that time, with whom Celsus ar-

<sup>u</sup> L. ii. § 15. p. 69.

<sup>x</sup> L. ii. § 16. p. 70.

gued, did not say, that Jesus only seemed to die, or seemed to suffer; but, that he really suffered, and died. His attacks, therefore, were made upon the founder part of the Christians, not upon Docetæ, or any such like men.

18. 'What god, or dæmon, or wise man, who foreknew that such things were to happen to him, would not have avoided them, if he could, and not fall under the evils he foresaw?'

We learn hence, that the disciples' account of Jesus was, that he foreknew his sufferings, and that he suffered, and died, as we now see in our gospels: and we may observe, that whereas some while ago Celsus pretended, the disciples had been deceived by Jesus, now he makes them designing men, who had contrived to say, that Jesus 'knew all these things.' And whereas just now he insinuated, that Jesus had fled, and absconded, but nevertheless was apprehended; here he endeavours to shew the absurdity of coming in the way of sufferings that had been foretold. So that, after all, the account in the gospels, written by the disciples, was, as now, that Jesus had voluntarily submitted to the sufferings which he had foreseen: in which there is no absurdity. Origen reminds Celsus of Socrates, and other wise men, who underwent sufferings which they could have avoided.

19. 'The Jew in Celsus still goes on, saying more foolish things. If he foretold who should betray him, and who should deny him; how came it to pass, that they did not fear him as a God? so that the one should not dare to betray him; nor the other to deny him? But they betrayed him, and denied him: so little did they regard him.'

Here are more references to some of the material facts and circumstances attending the sufferings of Jesus, as recorded in our gospels; and they are all easily accounted for. Judas, the traitor, was a wicked, covetous man; and acted against his light and conviction. Peter, who denied Jesus, was exceedingly shocked by our Lord's being apprehended, and was overcome by fear, so as to disown his relation to Jesus. However, Judas soon afterwards was so sensible of the greatness of his guilt, as to fall into despair: and Peter soon after bewailed his weakness with many tears.

So long as these facts which Celsus cavils at are in the gospels, they will be thought credible histories: they who put down such things, so disadvantageous to themselves, or their friends, and seemingly so dishonourable to Jesus himself, their lord and master, did not forge a story to aggrandize him, or themselves: but

<sup>y</sup> L. ii. § 17. p. 71.

<sup>z</sup> L. ii. § 18. p. 71, 72.

they wrote the truth impartially, without fear or favour; as is admirably shewn by Origen in this context.

20. ‘How<sup>a</sup> frivolous and manifestly false is what Celsus says, that never any man betrayed another man with whom he sat at table: and how much less would any man, who was so favoured by a God, betray him?’

Origen treats this remark with indignation, and calls it a falsehood; there being many instances of such things, both among Greeks and Barbarians.

It seems to me, that Celsus here not only argues from the intimacy of Christ and the disciples, but intends also to use some of the very expressions of the evangelists. Luke xxii. 21. *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.* And see John xiii. 26. and 28.

21. But Celsus has pushed this argument still farther: which, perhaps, ought not to be omitted by me. ‘It<sup>b</sup> was God, says he, who foretold these things; therefore there was a necessity that they should come to pass. God therefore compelled his own disciples and prophets, with whom he ate and drank, to be wicked and abominable, for whose welfare above all others he ought to have been concerned. Never did man betray another with whom he sat at table. Here he who sits at table with God betrays him: and, which is still worse, God himself lays snares for those who sit at table with him, making them impious traitors.’

To which Origen answers. ‘Celsus thinks, that what has been foretold, comes to pass because it has been foretold: to which we can by no means assent. For we do not say, that he who foretold something future, is the cause of its coming to pass: but whatever is future will come to pass, though it was not foretold: and therefore he who has the gift of foreknowledge foretels it.’

22. ‘If<sup>c</sup> he thought fit to undergo such things, and if in obedience to the Father he suffered death; it is apparent, that they could not be painful and grievous to him, he being a God, and consenting to them. Why<sup>d</sup> then does he lament, and bewail, and pray, that the fear of destruction may be removed, saying to this purpose: *O Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away.*’ Matt. xxvi. 39.

Here Origen observes, that Jesus is not said in the gospels ‘to bewail.’ But we plainly see, that Celsus had our gospels before

<sup>a</sup> . . . οτι ανθρωπω ο κοινωνησας τραπεζης εκ αν αυτω επιβηλευσειν. Ει δε ανθρωπω εκ αν επιβηλευσειε πολλω πλεον ο Θεω συνευχωθεις εκ αν αυτω επιβηλος εβηλειο.

L. ii. § 21. p. 74. Vid. et § 20.

<sup>b</sup> L. ii. § 20. p. 72. <sup>c</sup> L. ii. § 23.

p. 75. <sup>d</sup> L. ii. § 24. p. 75.

him: and in them Jesus is represented suffering in obedience to the Father, himself willing, and consenting thereto. And yet he prayed, that *the cup might pass from him*. I need not stay to shew the consistence of these things.

23. 'Why' did he not now at last, [when condemned] if not before, deliver himself from this ignominy, and do justice upon them, who reviled both him and his Father?' Referring to the reproaches cast upon Jesus when hanging on the cross. Matt. xxvii. 39. . . . 44.

Origen says, that the same answer will serve here, which is given by all others, who hold a divine providence, in answer to the objection, taken from God's not presently punishing wicked men.

24. 'Celsus', as Origen says, selecting some passages out of the gospels, with a design to expose them, reproaches Jesus with "the gall and the vinegar, as if he was mighty eager to drink, and was not able patiently to endure thirst, which common people often bear contentedly."

Celsus here plainly refers to Matt. xxvii. 34. *They gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall. And when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink.* He also as manifestly refers to John xix. 28. . . . 30. *After this . . . that the scripture might be fulfilled, Jesus saith: I thirst. And when a sponge filled with vinegar was reached up to his mouth, it is said, he received the vinegar, and then said: It is finished. And bowing his head, he gave up the ghost.* So that Celsus, in this short passage, referred to St. John's account of the vinegar given to our Lord, at the conclusion of his crucifixion, as well as to *the vinegar, and the gall*, presented to him when they were going to crucify him: but in neither is there any just ground for reflexions upon Jesus<sup>a</sup>.

25. Celsus, in a rude and abusive manner, says: 'What difference can there be for a God to eat the flesh of lambs, and drink gall and vinegar, or to eat any other impurity?' It is likely, that Celsus here refers to our Saviour's eating the paschal lamb with the disciples. Origen answers: 'We do not say, that God ate the flesh of lambs: but Jesus, being clothed with a body, might eat it.'

<sup>a</sup> L. ii. § 75. p. 81.

<sup>b</sup> Μελα εσθιειν, και χολην, η οξος πιειν, πλεκα σκαλοφασειν. L. vii. § 13. p. 340.

<sup>c</sup> L. ii. § 39. p. 82. <sup>d</sup> Concerning our Saviour's thirst upon the cross, See Vol. x. p. 304.

<sup>e</sup> Επει φησι, τι γαρ αλλω ην Θεω το προβαλιν σαρκας

<sup>f</sup> Θεος δε καθ' ημας προβαλιν σαρκας εκσθιειν. Ινα γαρ και δοξη, οτι ησθειν' ως σωμα φορων, ο Ιησους ησθειν. Ibid.

26. ' But <sup>k</sup> says Origen, what the Jew in Celsus affirms, is a downright lye: That he was put to death, and suffered, having convinced no man in his life-time, not so much as his disciples.'

It is, however, very true, that few believed in Jesus then, in comparison of them who believed in him afterwards. Celsus pretends, that the disciples did not believe in Jesus, because they forsook him in the time of his last sufferings.

27. ' They <sup>l</sup> who conversed with him when alive, and heard his voice, and followed him as their master, when they saw him under punishment, and dying, were so far from *dying with him*, or for him, or being induced to despise sufferings, that they denied they were his disciples: but now-a-days you die with him.'

Celsus here refers to the timorousness of the disciples, and particularly to Peter's denying Christ. It is no great wonder, that they were all greatly shaken at the sight of the sufferings of Jesus: which, at that time, they could be hardly induced to think should befall the Messiah. But they afterwards preached him boldly, with the hazard of all that is dear in this world; which shews, that they had good evidence of his resurrection from the dead: otherwise, they would never have resumed their courage. And as the disciples were afterwards undaunted in professing and preaching the name of Jesus; so the Christians in the time of Celsus were in the right to *die with Christ*, or for him, rather than deny him.

Celsus seems to have had an eye to one or more texts of St. Paul's epistles: as 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12. *It is a faithful saying. For if we die with him, we shall also live with him*: and what follows.

Celsus here bears testimony to the fortitude of the Christians in his time. It is manifest from this passage, that many did then die for Christ, rather than deny him: and it is not a little strange, that a learned man, a man of extensive knowledge and understanding, should ridicule, and make a jest of the grievous and unrighteous sufferings of innocent men, and of their patience under them. But so it was. Such was the contempt which was then the lot of the followers of Jesus. And Celsus having taken it into his head to enter into controversy with them, and thenceforward considering them as enemies, made no scruple to ridicule men, who, according to his own confession, were arrived at such exalted virtue, as <sup>m</sup> to despise sufferings, and endure death patiently, rather than speak and act against conviction.

<sup>k</sup> L. ii. § 35. p. 83.

§ 45. p. 86.

θανον αυτη, εδεδε κολασεων καταφρονην επεισ-

<sup>l</sup> L. ii. θησαν . . . νυν δε υμεις αυτη συνιποθησο-  
κειτε. Cels. ibid.

<sup>m</sup> . . . ελε υπεραπει-

28. Having mentioned several Greek stories, generally, if not universally, allowed to be fables and fictions, Celsus says: 'But<sup>n</sup> let us consider, whether any one that has really died, ever rose again in the same body; unless you think, that the stories of others are indeed, as well as seem to be fables: whilst your fable is probable, and credible, because of his voice on the cross, when he expired, and the earthquake, and the darkness; and because that when he was living he could not defend himself, but after he was dead, he arose, and shewed the marks of his punishment, and how his hands had been pierced. But who saw all this? Why, a distracted woman, as you say, and one or two more of the same imposture, and some dreamers, who fancied they saw things as they desired to have them: the same that has happened to innumerable people.' See Matt. xxvii. 50, 51. John xx. 10. . . . 18.

The wonderful things attending the death of Jesus, here taken notice of by Celsus, his loud voice just<sup>o</sup> before he expired, Matt. xxvii. 50. Mark xv. 37, 39. Luke xxiii. 46. the earthquake, and the darkness, are proofs, that Jesus was an extraordinary person. And I think, that the shewing of the prints of the nails in his hands, and appearing again alive to a woman, and others, who knew him, were good proofs that he was risen from the dead, and in the same body that had lived and died. There is no evidence, that they were dreamers, or governed by fancy: they saw Jesus awake, and by day-light, distinctly, again and again, after he had been publickly crucified, and died. And his resurrection from the grave is an argument, that he suffered voluntarily, and that he was not destitute of power, as Celsus insinuates, to help himself in his life-time, if he had seen fit so to do.

Celsus says, Jesus shewed himself to one woman. But he shewed himself afterwards to several women, and to his disciples. Celsus knew this very well: but it was to his purpose, it seems, to use the singular rather than the plural number. That Celsus was well acquainted with the gospels, is apparent: he knows what seems to his advantage; and therefore he calls this woman, meaning Mary Magdalene, 'a distracted woman:' referring to the seven dæmons that were in her: but it should be considered, that these dæmons had been cast out long ago, and she was now very sober when she saw Jesus after his resurrection.

St. John ch. xx. 11. . . . 18. gives the most particular account of Mary Magdalene's seeing our Lord, and conversing with him, after he was risen from the dead: indeed St. Mark xvi. 9, 10, 11.

<sup>n</sup> L. ii. § 55. p. 94.

<sup>o</sup> Την εν τῷ τῷ σχολοποιος αυτῆ φωνην οὐ απεπνευ. Cels. ubi supr.

says, *Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven demons.* But whether Celsus had here an eye to St. Mark's gospel, I cannot determine: for he might refer only to St. John's account of our Lord's shewing himself to Mary, and apply to her the character of a distracted woman, from a remembrance of what he had read concerning her in St. Luke's gospel, ch. viii. 1, 2.

Beside the texts already taken notice of, Celsus may be supposed to refer to Luke xxiv. 39. *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself:* and to our Lord's shewing himself to Thomas, as related, John xx. 24. . . . 29.

29: 'But' Celsus says: If he would make manifest his divine power, he should have shewn himself to them that derided him, and to him that condemned him, and indeed to all: for surely, he had no reason to fear any mortal now, after he had died, and, as you say, was a God.'

To which I would answer: It would have been very mean in Jesus to shew himself to his judge, and to his deriders: it is unspeakably below the character of one, who had publicly wrought so many wonderful works, as Jesus had done, and who, after having been crucified, was really raised from the dead: it might likewise have been called insulting them. As for shewing himself to all, it is absurd and preposterous: Jesus shewed himself to the most proper persons, [and to as many as was fit,] by appearing to those who best knew him. To shew himself to such as did not well know him before, might have been reckoned officious, and impertinent, and vain-boasting. Finally, the works wrought in his name afterwards, by those who attested his resurrection and exaltation, were better evidences of his being risen from the dead, than shewing himself to all the world would have been. They make out the most satisfactory, and most durable testimony to this important fact.

From the objections made by Celsus, we learn, however, that the history, which we now have in our gospels, is the same which the Christians at that time had. Jesus, in our gospels, does not shew himself to all, but to his disciples and acquaintance, of whom there were once *five hundred* together, 1 Cor. xv. 6, probably, at a place in Galilee, where he was best known, and which he had before appointed. Matt. xxviii. 16, 17.

Moreover, all Celsus's attacks, in his argument against the Christians, are against our gospels: which manifests the great esteem they were in. If he confuted those books, he knew he overturned the faith founded on them.

30. He goes on. 'When<sup>a</sup> he was neglected in the body, he was continually preaching to all men: but when he should have given full assurance to all men, he shews himself privately to one woman, and his associates.'

He did once shew himself to one woman only, and to his disciples, when met together privately. But that is not all, as Celsus would insinuate: for he also shewed himself to several women. Matt. xxviii. 1. . . . 9. and to the disciples, and others with them, several times openly. And, as before said, he appointed a place in Galilee, where they might see him. Matt. xxviii. 16. And it cannot be doubted, but that there were great numbers who saw him there. From his appointing beforehand a certain place for meeting his disciples and followers, it is manifest, that he was not shy of shewing himself to those who had known him in his life-time.

31. 'Again' he says: When he was punished, he was seen by all; but when risen, by one: the contrary to which ought rather to have been.'

Any one may perceive, that Celsus affects unfairly to diminish the number of those who saw Jesus after he was risen. He here pretends, that Jesus appeared to one only; whereas before, he owned that he had appeared to his associates, or companions. I am glad, however, that Celsus owns, Jesus preached to all in his life-time, and that he died publickly before all the world: for there must have been some good reasons to induce men to believe in a person, who was himself well known, and his doctrine well known, and who had been publickly crucified.

32. 'If' he would be hid, why was there a voice from heaven, declaring him to be the Son of God? [Matt. xvii. 5.] 'And if he would not be hid, why did he suffer? why did he die?'

I imagine, that in this place Celsus refers to our Lord's transfiguration in the mount, and to what our Lord says, Matt. xvii. 9. *And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying: Tell the vision to no man, till the Son of man be risen again from the dead.* Some while ago Celsus referred to the voice from heaven at Christ's baptism: now he refers to the voice from heaven, when he was on the mount.

So that there were divers testimonies given from heaven, in favour of Jesus, in the beginning, and in the progress of his ministry: and in the end he died. I need not stay to shew the consistence of these things. Nor was he left without witness during the time of his ignominious sufferings.

<sup>a</sup> L. ii. § 70. p. 104.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid.

<sup>s</sup> L. ii. § 72. p. 105.

33. We have now traced, even in Celsus, the history of our Lord's nativity, baptism, preaching, miracles, death, and resurrection; all agreeable to our evangelists.

It will be next incumbent upon us to observe what he says of Christian principles, and of the grounds and reasons upon which they acted.

## SECTION V.

### *Passages of CELSUS concerning Christian Principles.*

1. 'LET<sup>a</sup> us now see,' says Origen, 'how he affects to lessen us with regard to our moral doctrine, saying, that<sup>b</sup> it is only the same with that of other philosophers, and contains in it nothing weighty and new.' He also says, 'That<sup>c</sup> others, as well as the Christians, had disallowed the divinity of gods *made with hands*, forasmuch as oftentimes they were formed by wicked men.'

Whether there be here any reference to Acts xix. 26, I cannot say certainly: but it hence appears, that the Christian moral doctrine had nothing in it to which any just exceptions could be made. Celsus, indeed, would not allow it to have any superior excellence above the doctrine of the philosophers: but he does not deny it to be like to their doctrine, and equal to that of the best sort of the philosophers.

2. 'He<sup>d</sup> says, the same things are better taught by the Greeks, and without the threatenings or promises of God, or his Son.' And that<sup>e</sup> Plato did not pretend to come from heaven, and declare such things.'

Supposing, for the present, that the same things had been taught by others; they would not, and did not so effectually influence men, as when taught with authority from God, and with assurances of suitable recompences.

It would have been more material, if Celsus could have shewn, where the heathen deities, or their priests with authority under them, had recommended sobriety and other virtues: adding likewise threatenings of misery to the refractory, and promises of happiness in a future state to such as feared the gods, and practised righteousness and mercy to their neighbours. Augustine, in his

<sup>a</sup> L. i. § 4, 5. p. 6.

<sup>b</sup> Τω κοινον αυτες χειραποκτητες θεους. § 5.

<sup>c</sup> Φασκωτι, βελιον αυτα παρ' Ελληνων ηρησθαι. κ. λ. . . . L. vi. § 1. p. 275.

<sup>d</sup> . . . γλωσσι, αυτας διζω τελο μη ιομιζειν

<sup>e</sup> L. vi. § 10. p. 281.

work of the City of God, observes, that\* the gods of the Pagans had never authorized the doctrine of virtuous living.

3. 'Celsus' thinks, that we, by worshipping one that was apprehended, and died, do much the same thing with the Gætae, who worship Zamolxis, and the Cilicians, who worship Mopsus.' 'Again<sup>z</sup> he says of us, that we laugh at those who worship Jupiter, because his tomb is shewn in Crete: nevertheless we worship one that was buried.'

The difference is manifest: the Cretans knew of no miracles done by Jupiter; whereas the Christians knew of many miracles done by Jesus in person, and by others in his name, after his resurrection.

A part of Origen's answer here is to this purpose. 'All<sup>z</sup> this we have been forced to say by way of answer to Celsus, who, little favourable to Jesus, believes it to be true which is written of him, that he died, and was buried; but esteems it a fiction only, that he was raised from the dead: although his resurrection had been foretold by the prophets, and there were many proofs of his being alive again after he had died.' Compare Acts i. 3.

4. 'But<sup>b</sup> the Christians, according to Celsus, making some additions to the Jewish notions, say, that the Son of God has been already sent, because of the sins of the Jews: and that the Jews having punished Jesus, and given him gall to drink, have brought upon themselves the anger of God.'

'Which, Origen says, is a plain case; and if it is not so, let any man shew it. For Jerusalem was destroyed within two and forty years after the crucifixion of Jesus; and ever since they have been in subjection to others, without their own proper rites and worship: which is one of those things, that manifests Jesus to have had in him somewhat divine and sacred; forasmuch as upon his account the Jews have suffered so many and so great calamities, and for so long a time.'

5. He argues against a resurrection in this manner. 'But<sup>d</sup> that is another absurdity of theirs, that when God shall throw a fire on the world, and all other things shall be destroyed, they alone shall remain: and that not only the living, but they also who have been ever so long dead, shall come forth out of the

\* Sed demonstrantur, vel commemorantur loca, talibus aliquando conventiculis consecrata: non ubi ludi agerentur obscenis vocibus et motibus histrionum . . . sed ubi populi audirent, quid Dii præciperent de cohibenda avaritia, ambitione frangenda, luxuria refrænanda. . . . Dicatur, in quibus locis hæc docentium Deorum solebant præcepta recitari, et a cultoribus eorum

populis frequentur audiri. De Civ. Dei. l. ii. cap. vi. Vid. et cap. xix. et xxii.

<sup>y</sup> L. iii. § 34. p. 131. <sup>z</sup> L. iii.

§ 43. p. 136. <sup>a</sup> Ibid. § 43. p. 137.

<sup>b</sup> L. iv. § 22. p. 174. <sup>c</sup> . . . κατ

χολην ποισαντες, επι σφας αβιες εκ θεου

χολον επεσπασαντο. lb. <sup>d</sup> L. iv.

§ 14. p. 240.

‘ earth in their own bodies, [or in the same flesh:] which is no  
 ‘ other than the hope of worms. For what soul of a man  
 ‘ would desire a putrified body? Nor is this doctrine of yours  
 ‘ agreed to by all Christians: for some among you reject it as  
 ‘ impure, and abominable, and impossible. For how is it possi-  
 ‘ ble, that a body, which has been entirely corrupted, should re-  
 ‘ turn to its own nature, and to its own primitive constitution,  
 ‘ which it has once lost? When they are able to make no answer  
 ‘ to this, they fly to that absurd refuge, that all things are possible  
 ‘ with God. But neither can God do any thing that is shameful;  
 ‘ nor will he do what is contrary to nature. Nor because you  
 ‘ perversely desire any thing, is God therefore able to do it, or  
 ‘ is it to be supposed, that he will do it. For God is not the au-  
 ‘ thor of extravagant desires, nor of any unbecoming disorders,  
 ‘ but of what is right and fit. God may give everlasting life to  
 ‘ the soul; but dead bodies, as Heraclitus says, are more con-  
 ‘ temptible than dung. To make flesh, full of filthinesses not  
 ‘ fit to be named, eternal, is a thing so unreasonable, that God  
 ‘ neither can nor will do it: for he is himself the reason of all  
 ‘ things in nature; and, therefore, can no more do any thing  
 ‘ contrary to reason, than contrary to himself.’

I have transcribed this long passage, to shew at once the hea-  
 then sentiments and reasonings upon this point: but I do not in-  
 tend a laboured confutation of them. Celsus affects to despise  
 the body; but I presume he goes upon an ill-grounded principle,  
 that the human soul may be as happy, or more happy, without  
 the body, than with it: and, as Origen observes, the body, at  
 the resurrection, is to be changed for the better, and made fit for  
 the soul in a state of perfection. Which, I think, removes all  
 those difficulties, in the reunion of the soul and body, which to  
 Celsus appeared so formidable ††.

What we are here to observe, is, that it hence appears,  
 Christians then expected a change or resurrection of the living  
 and the dead at the end of the world, or the dissolution of the  
 present state of things, according to what St. Paul writes, 1 Cor.  
 xv. 51. . . . 54. and 1 Theff. iv. 13. . . . 17.

When Celsus says, that Christians were not all agreed about  
 the doctrine of the resurrection, it may be doubtful, whether he

†† Says Dr. Cudworth, The true Intel-  
 lectual System of the Universe, B. i. ch;  
 v. p. 877. ‘ However, our Christian faith  
 ‘ assures us, that the souls of good men  
 ‘ shall at length be clothed with spiritual  
 ‘ and heavenly bodies, such as are, in

‘ Aristotle’s language, *αναλογία τῶ τῶν*  
 ‘ *αστρῶν στοιχείων*, analogous to the element  
 ‘ of the stars. Which Christian resurrec-  
 ‘ tion therefore, to life and immortality, is  
 ‘ far from being, as Celsus reproached it,  
 ‘ *σκωληκῶν ἐλπίς*, the mere hope of worms.’

intends some of his own time, or whether he refers to 1 Cor. xv. 12, and the following context. *Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead: how say some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead?*

However that may be, none of my readers will omit to observe, that here is a reference to the above mentioned texts of the first epistle to the Corinthians, and the first to the Thessalonians.

6. It is, I suppose, with regard to the expectation of the resurrection of the body, that, as Origen says, Celsus<sup>e</sup> called the Christians ‘a sort of men that were very fond of the body.’ And yet in another place he says: ‘Is<sup>f</sup> it not exceeding absurd, that you should desire and hope for the resurrection of the same body, as if we had nothing more excellent, nor more precious: and yet to expose it to all manner of sufferings as a thing of no value?’

This needs no answer: but it ought to be observed, that Celsus here again lets us know, that Christians were then in a suffering condition: and he bears testimony to their steadiness and fortitude under the tortures, and all the variety of sufferings which they met with. This ought to be taken notice of.

7. ‘But<sup>g</sup>,’ says Celsus, ‘omitting many things that might be alleged against what they say of their master, let us allow him to be truly an angel. Is he the first, and the only one, that has come? or, have there been others before? If they should say, he only: they are easily convicted of falshood. For they say, that others have often come. . . . And in particular, that there came an angel to his sepulchre: some say one; others, two, to tell the women, that he was risen: for the Son of God, it seems, could not open the sepulchre, but wanted another to remove the stone. And there came also an angel to the carpenter about Mary’s pregnancy; and another angel to direct them to take the child, and flee. And what need is there to reckon up particularly all that were sent to Moses, and others?’

The design of this argument is to draw off Christians from their peculiar veneration for Jesus. He reminds them, therefore, that there had been, even according to themselves, many other messengers from God, whom they might respect as well as him.

From this passage we learn, that the main point with Christians was a faith in Jesus, whom they esteemed their master: nor would they forsake him upon any account.

<sup>e</sup> Λίσει δ’ ημας ειναι και φιλοσωμαλον γιος. L. vii. § 39. p. 357.

<sup>f</sup> Ετι δε πως εκ αλοπα υμων ταυια, το μη σωμα ποθειν, και ελπιζειν, οτι αυλο τη-

λο ανασησειαι, ως υδεν ημιν τιμη κρειττοη υδε τιμιωτερον. παλιν δ’ αυλο ειλπειν εις κολασεις, ως αλιμον. L. viii. § 49. p. 409.

<sup>g</sup> L. v. § 52. p. 265, 266.

Beside the references to the conception of Jesus in the womb of his mother Mary, and his flight into Egypt, observed formerly, here are also references to many circumstances of our Saviour's resurrection, as related in the gospels. There was a stone at the door of the sepulchre: an angel came, and rolled it away: women came to the sepulchre, who saw there an angel; which also told them, that Jesus was risen. The resurrection of Jesus was recorded by more than one; for Celsus observes, that some said, there was one, others, two angels, who told the women, that Jesus was risen. So it is in our gospels. For St. Matthew, xxviii. 5, Mark xvi. 5, mention but one angel. Luke xxiv. 4, and John xx. 12, speak of two angels.

But the angel did not remove the stone, as Celsus insinuates, because Jesus was not himself able to do it: but it was fit, that so great a person as Jesus, should have the attendance and service of angels upon so great an occasion, as his resurrection from the grave.

Finally, any one may now judge, whether Celsus was not well acquainted with our gospels, and whether he has not given a very valuable testimony to them.

8. I shall here take another passage, somewhat resembling that alleged just now.

'After<sup>b</sup> these things,' says Origen, 'he bespeaks us in this manner. How much better were it for you, since you affect novelties, to attend to some other of those who have died nobly, and to whom that fiction of deity might be better applied? For instance, if you did not like Hercules, nor Esculapius, nor others already consecrated, you had Orpheus, a man endowed with a holy spirit, as all allow, who likewise suffered a violent death. But, perhaps, he has been already taken by some others. Well then, you might have thought of Anaxarchus, who, when thrown into a mortar, and cruelly pounded in it, despised it all, saying: "Beat on, beat the case of Anaxarchus. For you do not beat him." Which is, indeed, the saying of a divine spirit. But here you are prevented by some naturalists, who have already followed him. Still, had you not Epictetus, who, when his master bent forward his leg, with a smile, and unmoved, said: "You will break it." And when he had broke it, said to him: "Did I not say, you would break it?" Did your God, when under punishment, say any thing like this? There is also the Sibyl, whom some of your people quote, whom you might as well, or better, have called the daughter

<sup>b</sup> L. vii. § 53. p. 367.

‘ of God. But instead of that, though you have inserted many  
 ‘ impious things into her writings, you will have him to be God  
 ‘ who ended an infamous life with a miserable death. Had it  
 ‘ not been better for you to take Jonas, who was in the whale’s  
 ‘ belly, or Daniel, who was delivered from the beasts, or some  
 ‘ others more wonderful than they?’

To each of these instances Origen makes proper<sup>1</sup> replies. I shall take only a part of what he says.

‘ He also sends us to Epictetus, extolling his fine saying when  
 ‘ his leg was broke: which yet is not to be compared with the  
 ‘ wonderful works and words of Jesus, though they are so despised  
 ‘ by Celsus; forasmuch as his words are accompanied with such  
 ‘ a divine power, as to convert not only many of the simple  
 ‘ sort of people, but also many of the more understanding.’

‘ Then after his catalogue of so many he says: Did your God,  
 ‘ when under punishment, say any thing like this? To which we  
 ‘ shall answer, that his silence under all the abuses and reproaches  
 ‘ which he met with, shewed more fortitude and patience, than  
 ‘ any thing said by the Greeks under their sufferings, provided  
 ‘ Celsus will but believe what has been written by men of the  
 ‘ best credit; who, after they had truly related his miracles, have  
 ‘ also related his silence under his sufferings: and when derided,  
 ‘ and dressed in a purple robe, with a crown of thorns upon his  
 ‘ head, and a reed in his hand instead of a sceptre, was perfectly  
 ‘ meek, saying nothing mean, nor any thing provoking, to those,  
 ‘ who so many ways abused him.’

9. ‘ If<sup>k</sup> Celsus had alleged any kind of infamous actions in  
 ‘ the life of Jesus, we would have done our best to answer to  
 ‘ every thing that seemed to him to be so. As for the miserable  
 ‘ death of Jesus, the same may be objected to Socrates, and  
 ‘ Anaxarchus, just mentioned, and many others. Was then the  
 ‘ death of Jesus miserable, and theirs not? or was theirs not mi-  
 ‘ serable, but that of Jesus miserable?’ So writes Origen.

10. Again<sup>l</sup> Celsus argues: ‘ If you tell them, that it is not  
 ‘ the Son of God, but he who is Father of all, whom men  
 ‘ ought to worship, they will not be satisfied, unless you also  
 ‘ worship him who is the author of their sedition: not that they  
 ‘ exceed in the worship of God, but that they above measure  
 ‘ worship this man.’

Celsus had said somewhat to the like purpose<sup>m</sup> a little before; in both which places Origen’s answers may be seen.

<sup>1</sup> § 54, 55, 56. p. 368, 369.  
 p. 387.

<sup>m</sup> L. viii. § 12. p. 385.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 369. fin.

<sup>l</sup> L. viii. § 12.

11. ‘Afterwards,’<sup>n</sup> says Origen, ‘Celsus speaks to this purpose. But if God at last, like Jupiter in the comedy, awaked out of a long sleep, will deliver mankind from the evils under which they labour, why did he send this spirit, whom you speak of, into one corner only? He should have breathed in the like manner into many bodies, and send persons all over the world. . . . And do you not think it ridiculous to maintain, as you do, that the Son of God was sent to the Jews?’

This then was the Christian account, that Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, came among the Jewish people. Nor is there any absurdity in this. A messenger from the true God is fitly sent, where God is known and worshipped, as he was by the Jews. To them also this special messenger, the Messiah, had been promised. And among them, by many wonderful appearances, God had preserved, for many ages, the knowledge of himself, and the expectation of that great person. And though the Christ came in person to them only, by him others were commissioned, and fully furnished to teach all the world: which was sufficient, and was the wisest\*\* method.

At the beginning of this passage Celsus hints an objection to the Christian religion, taken from the late appearance of Jesus in the world. The same objection appears<sup>o</sup> in some other places of his argument; but I need not transcribe them.

God never neglected mankind; he was constantly teaching them in the works of creation, and in the ordinary methods of his providence. Extraordinary messengers are a favour: several such had been sent of old to the Jews, and before their time to the patriarchs: at last he sent Jesus Christ. We have certain proofs of his mission, and great character. The seasonableness of his coming, and the wisdom of sending him at the time he came, ought not to be disputed: but the favour should be thankfully received, and carefully improved, after due examination, and observing the evidences of his mission ††.

12. ‘The<sup>p</sup> Jew in Celsus,’ says Origen, ‘blames the Christians for alleging the prophets, who had foretold the things concerning Jesus: whereas, he says, the prophecies may be applied to many others more probably than to Jesus.’

We hence learn, that the writers of the New Testament, (to whom Celsus has an eye in most of his arguments,) and the

<sup>n</sup> L. vi. § 78. p. 329.      \*\* See Vol. x. p. 365. . . . 368.      <sup>o</sup> Vid. l. iv. § 7. p. 165.

†† Hæc est igitur animæ liberandæ universalis via, id est, universis gentibus divina misericordie concessa. . . . Nec debuit,

nec debuit ei dici: Quare modo, et quare tam sero? quoniam mittentis consilium non est humano ingenio penetrabile. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. x. cap. 32. n. 2.

<sup>p</sup> L. vii. § 1, 2.

Christians after them, did make use of the prophets in arguing for Jesus; though Celsus, or his Jew, would not allow their arguments to be valid.

13. Celsus, with great indignation, says: ‘The<sup>9</sup> Pythian, the Dodonæan, the Clarian, the Branchidian, the Ammonian oracles, and many others, by whose directions colonies have been successfully planted all over the world, must pass for nothing: but the obscure Jewish predictions, said or not said, the like to which are still practised in Phœnicia and Palestine, are thought to be wonderful, and immutably certain.’

Certainly, the Christians had some benefit by this argument; or Celsus would not have been so much provoked. It deserves our observation also, that those heathens, and even the Epicureans, (for such was Celsus) who had been wont to ridicule the most renowned oracles, were now willing to give them some repute. So hard pressed were they by the progress of Christianity, that they were willing to set up again, as real and valuable, such things as they had before decried as cheats and impostures.

14. We have now seen what Celsus says of Christian principles, and the grounds of them; as we had before seen what he says of their great facts. It may be worth the while, likewise, to observe some hints relating to the success of the Christian doctrine.

## S E C T I O N VI.

### *Passages concerning the Progress of the Christian Religion.*

1. ‘AT<sup>a</sup> first,’ says Celsus, ‘they were few in number, and then they agreed, [or were of one mind.] But being increased, and spread abroad, they divide again and again, and every one will have a party of his own: which is what they were disposed to of old.’

I cannot but think, that Celsus has an eye to some things in the Acts of the apostles, where the wonderful unanimity of the first Christians is recorded, as Acts ii. 44. . . . 47. iv. 32. . . . 37. In his time there were many sects and divisions among them, he says. He adds: ‘Which is what they were disposed to of old,’ or from the beginning, αρχηθεν. Here he may refer to the early divisions in the church of Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 11. . . . 17. iii. 3. . . . 6. xi. 17, 18. and, perhaps, to some of St. Paul’s exhorta-

<sup>a</sup> L. vii. § 3. p. 333.      <sup>a</sup> Αρχομενοι και σχιζομαι, και γασεις ιδιας εχην εκασου  
 μει, φησιν, ολιγοι τε ησαν, και εν εφρονη  
 εις πληθος δε σπαρειλες, αυθις αυ τεμνομαι,      δελασι. κ. λ. L. iii. § 10.

tions to concord and harmony. He may refer likewise to contentions about the method of receiving the Gentile converts, Acts xv. and other places. For it appears to me very probable, that he has here an eye to some things recorded in the New Testament.

However, he owns, that the Christians were now much increased: and, with regard to the divisions which were then among them, it may be observed, that they were foretold by Christ's apostles. But such things are not the fault of the gospel itself, but of men: nor is perfection to be attained or expected in this world. Origen says very well, there never was any thing useful, and considerable, about which men have not differed. In medicine, in philosophy, among Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians, there are different sects and opinions.

2. 'Celsus,' says <sup>b</sup> Origen, 'brings in his fictitious person of a Jew, bespeaking the Jewish believers in this manner: What ailed you, fellow-citizens, that ye left the law of your country, and seduced by him, to whom we spoke just now, you have deserted us, to go to another name, and another way of living?' Again, 'When we had taken, and punished him, who led you about like brute beasts, you have notwithstanding forsaken the law of your country. How can you begin upon our sacred books, and afterwards disregard them? when you have no other foundation but our law?'

It was well known, therefore, that there were Jews who believed in Jesus, and that they fetched arguments for their belief from the Jewish scriptures: and why might not those Jews who believed in Jesus, understand their books, as well as they who rejected him?

It is to be observed likewise, that after Jesus was crucified, or punished, as he expresseth it, there were Jews who were persuaded to believe in Jesus, and to profess his religion. And I pray, how is that to be accounted for, but upon the supposition of some good proofs and evidences afforded of his great character after his crucifixion?

It appears to be very probable, that when Celsus wrote this, he had before him the books of the Acts of the apostles: and there he might have seen sufficient grounds of a faith in Jesus, after he was put to death by the Jews.

3. 'He <sup>d</sup> says, that the Hebrews were originally Egyptians, and owed their rise to a sedition from the rest of that people:

<sup>b</sup> L. ii. § 1. fin. p. 57.  
§ 5, 6. p. 114.

<sup>c</sup> L. ii. § 4. p. 59.

<sup>d</sup> L. iii. § 7. p. 115. Conf.

‘ so some Jews in the time of Jesus made a sedition against the  
‘ body of the Jewish nation, and followed Jesus.’

So that there was a good number of Jews who believed in Jesus, and followed him, though the body of the people did not, as we readily allow: but it was not a sedition, as Celsus calls it. Here again, I cannot but think, that Celsus had an eye to the book of the Acts.

4. In order the better to judge of the progress of the gospel, and the sincerity and steadiness of those who embraced it, it will be of use to observe what Celsus says of any difficulties and hardships which they lay under, who professed these principles, and bore the name of Christians.

5. ‘ The first head of accusation with Celsus against Christianity,’ says Origen at the beginning of his work, ‘ is, that  
‘ Christians secretly hold assemblies together contrary to law.’

Origen supposeth him to refer particularly to their agapæ, or love-feasts. I should think, he might intend all their assemblies in general for divine worship.

6. ‘ Afterwards,’ says Origen, ‘ he speaks of the Christians  
‘ performing and teaching those things which are agreeable to  
‘ their sentiments privately: and that therein they did not act  
‘ without reason, for avoiding the punishment of death hanging  
‘ over them. And he compares their dangers to the dangers  
‘ which men have been liable to on account of philosophy; and  
‘ he instanceth particularly in the case of Socrates: he might  
‘ have added Pythagoras, and other philosophers.’

Does not this imply an acknowledgment, or at least a supposition, of the Christians innocence? Their dangers resembled those of the philosophers. But Socrates did not deserve the capital punishment inflicted upon him. The like may be said of many other of the philosophers: they did not deserve banishment, or other like punishment. They recommended the principles of philosophy, or religion, in a peaceable manner, in the way of reason and argument.

7. We saw before<sup>s</sup> how Celsus ridiculed the Christians, saying: ‘ but now you die with him.’ Afterwards, in another place, he thus insults them. ‘ Do<sup>b</sup> you not see, good Sir, how  
‘ any man that will, may not only blaspheme your dæmon, but

<sup>c</sup> Πρώτον τῷ Κέλσῳ κεφαλαιὸν ἐστὶ, βε-  
λομένῳ διαβάλλειν Χριστιανισμὸν, ὡς συνθηκᾶς  
κρυπτῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιημάτων Χριστιανῶν  
ἐκτὸς τὰ γενναίως μετὰ. Origen. cont. Cels.  
L. i. § 1. Bened. p. 4. Cantab.

<sup>c</sup> Μέγα ταῦτα περι τῆ κρυφὰ τα ἀρεσ-  
τοῦτα λόγοις ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν ἑπιπῶν, καὶ

οὐ μὴ μάτην τὰ το ποιῶσιν, ἀλλε διωθόμενοι τὴν  
ἐπιβήμενην αὐτοῖς δικὴν τὴ θανάτῳ ὁμοίαν  
τοῦ κινδύου κινδύοις τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν ἐπὶ  
φιλοσοφίᾳ, ὡς Σωκράτει. κ. λ. L. i. § 3.  
p. 5. <sup>s</sup> See before, p. 32.

<sup>b</sup> L. viii. § 39. p. 803.

‘ drive him away from the earth and the sea, [or from every quarter of the world under heaven:] and binding you, his sacred image, has you away, and crucifies you? And your dæmon, or as you say, the Son of God, gives you no help.’ And afterwards. ‘ If any one of you absconds, and hides himself, he is sought for to be punished with death.’

But these sufferings of Christians are no objection against their faith, or the doctrine received by them. If the Christians were good men, and alleged weighty reasons for their belief, their sufferings are no reproach to them: the dishonour falls upon those who oppose and abuse them. There might be good reasons for God’s permitting the followers of Jesus to endure great trials for a while: the<sup>k</sup> truth of his religion is the more established by their patience and fortitude. And Celsus himself says, ‘ That he who has once embraced the truth, ought not to forsake it, nor pretend to forsake it, or deny it, through fear of sufferings from men.’ Infomuch that, as Origen says, ‘ he might be understood to be a strenuous defender of those who persevere even to death in their testimony to Christianity.’

What has been just alleged may be sufficient to satisfy us, that the Christians had very bad treatment, and had few or no worldly inducements to follow Jesus, and profess his name: they had therefore some other reasons, of a different kind; they were overcome by the force of truth, *and loved not their lives unto the death*: as it is said of some, Rev. xii. 11. They obeyed our Lord’s command, Rev. ii. 10. *Be thou faithful unto death, in hope of receiving from him a crown of life.* At this very time, when Celsus wrote against them, they underwent a grievous persecution; but they were able to endure and withstand his sharp pointed pen, and also the sword of the magistrate.

8. We go on. ‘ The<sup>m</sup> Jews therefore,’ says Celsus, ‘ being a distinct nation, and having the proper laws of their country, which they still carry about with them, together with a religion, such as it is, however those of their country, act like other men; forasmuch as all follow the institutions of their own country, whatever they are. And that is reasonable enough,

<sup>l</sup> L. viii. § 69. p. 424. <sup>k</sup> Tunc enim Porphyrius erat in rebus humanis, quando ista liberandæ animæ universalis via, quæ non est alia, quam Religio Christiana, oppugnari permittebatur ab idolorum, dæmonumque cultoribus, regibusque terrenis, propter asserendum et consecrandum martyrum numerum, hoc est, testium veritatis, per quos ostenderetur, omnia corporalia mala pro fide pietatis, et commendatione

veritatis esse toleranda. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. x. cap. 32. n. 1.

<sup>l</sup> Εοικε δε μελα δεινότητος συνασπρευειν πως τοις μαρτυροισι τω Χριστιανισμω μεχρι θανατου, λεγων. Και ε τειτο λεγω, ως χρη τον ασαθυ δογματος τει ριχομενον, ει μελλει δε αυλο κινδυνευειν παρ ανθρωπων, αποσηναι τε δογματος, η πλασασθαι ως αφεσηκει, η εξαφρον γεγεσθαι. L. i. § 8. p. 8. <sup>m</sup> L. v. § 25. p. 247.

‘ because

‘ because different laws have been framed by different people :  
 ‘ and it is fit, that those things should be observed, which have  
 ‘ been established by public authority : nor would it be just to  
 ‘ abrogate those laws, which have been enacted from the  
 ‘ beginning in every country.’ . . . But <sup>a</sup> if another appears, I  
 ‘ should ask them, whence they came, and what country-laws  
 ‘ they have for their rule ? They will answer, None at all. For  
 ‘ they descend from the same original ; and they have received  
 ‘ their master and leader from the same country : and yet they  
 ‘ have revolted from the Jews.’

Thus deplorable was the condition of the Christians at that time ! so obnoxious were they to the resentment and displeasure of their neighbours, above and beyond all other men, without any just reason ! The Jewish people were very troublesome subjects of the Roman empire ; the Christians were the most peaceable subjects upon the face of the earth ; and yet they were looked upon with a worse eye than the Jews themselves ; and were judged unworthy of the common rights and privileges, allowed to all other men ! This was the disposition of Celsus himself toward them. It is not to be much wondered at, that many others were in the same way of thinking.

Celsus allegeth not, as a ground of this treatment of them, any crimes in action, or wicked principles in belief ; but only a singularity of institution, not established by the laws of any country.

The reason of this particular enmity to the Christians, beyond the Jews, though they were also worshippers of the one God alone, and condemned all idolatry, I suppose to have been this : Christianity made much greater progress than Judaism, and threatened the utter ruin and overthrow of Gentilism.

This is a passage, which I would recommend to the consideration of those, who deny men the freedom of judging personally for themselves in things of religion ; and found all right of professing religious principles upon the consent and authority of the magistrate, and civil laws and constitutions. Such may observe, how exactly they agree with Celsus ; and they may easily discern, that if they had lived in his time, they must, according to their own principles, have sided with him against Christianity itself.

<sup>a</sup> L. v. § 33. p. 253.

## S E C T I O N VII.

*Passages of Celsus, in which he chargeth the Christians with magical practices.*

WE saw before,\* how Celsus says, that Jesus had learned the Egyptian arts, and valuing himself upon them, had set up himself for a god. And in some other places he has been ready to have recourse to magic, in order to account for the works said to have been done by our Saviour. Now I would observe what he says of Christians to the like purpose.

‘After\* this,’ says Origen, ‘I do not know for what reason Celsus says, that the Christians seem to be well skilled [or very mighty] in the names and invocations of certain dæmons.’

Origen supposeth, that Celsus there refers to those who exorcised, or expelled dæmons: but says, that in so doing Christians made use of no other name but that of Jesus, and the rehearsal of some parts of his history.

‘Celsus<sup>b</sup> says, he had seen with some presbyters of our religion, books, in a barbarous language, containing the names of dæmons, and other charms. And he says, that those presbyters of our religion professed nothing good, but every thing hurtful to mankind.’

This, as well as somewhat else said before, Origen says, is downright fiction. And he says, that all those stories are confuted by all who have conversed with Christians, who never heard of any such things practised by them.

However, this charge of magic against the Christians may be reckoned an argument, that there were some uncommon things done by them at this time; as is often affirmed by Origen, as well as by other ecclesiastical writers; but not to the detriment of mankind, as Celsus insinuates, but for their benefit.

## S E C T I O N VIII.

*Of Christian Worship, and their Assemblies.*

WE have just now seen mention made of Christian presbyters; the only place, so far as I remember, where Celsus has taken

\* See before, p. 19.      <sup>a</sup> Μίλα ταύτα παρα τισι πρεσβυτεροις της ημερας δοξησιν εκ οιδα ποθεν κινημενος ω Κελσος, φησι, βιβλια βαρβαρα, δαιμονων ονοματια εχουσαι δαιμονων τινων ονομασι και καλακηλησσει και τερατειας. κ. λ. L. vi. § 40. p. 302.  
δοξειν ισχυειν Χριστιανης. κ. λ. L. i. § 6.      <sup>c</sup> L. i. § 2. p. 5. L. i. § 46. p. 34. L. p. 7.      <sup>b</sup> . . . εν οις εφησεν εωραχεται      iii. § 24. p. 124.

any notice of them. But though there were then persons of that denomination, who taught the Christian doctrine, and officiated in the worship of God, it does not appear, that Christians had at that time any temples, or sumptuous buildings for public worship. Celsus rather intimates, that they had none. 'They' cannot,' he says, 'so much as endure the sight of temples, altars, statues.' However, he adds: 'Nor do the Persians erect temples.' In another place Origen observes: Celsus<sup>b</sup> says, 'we erect no statues, altars, or temples.'

And that Christians declined joining with heathen people in their public worship, Celsus bears witness. 'God,' says he, 'is the common Lord of all; he is good to all: he needeth not any thing, and therefore is free from envy. What then should hinder the most devoted to him from partaking in the public festivals?' And afterwards, says Origen, 'Celsus' endeavours to persuade us to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to join in the public sacrifices of the solemn festivals, saying: If these idols are nothing, what harm can there be to partake in the public solemnities! If they are dæmons, then for certain they are gods, in whom we ought to trust; and sacrifices ought to be offered to them, and they ought to be prayed to, that they may be propitious to us.' To all which Origen makes a sufficient answer: but it needs not to be transcribed.

However, I am induced to take here a passage of Origen in the third book against Celsus. He is speaking of the great benefit of the Christian religion. 'And God,' says he, 'who sent Jesus, having defeated all the artifices of dæmons, has so ordered it, that the gospel of Jesus should prevail every where for reforming mankind; and that there should be every where churches governed by different laws from the churches of superstitious, intemperate, and unrighteous men: for such are the manners of most of those who belong to the churches of the cities. But the churches of God, instructed by Christ, compared with the churches of the people among whom they live, are as *lights in the world*, Matt. v. 14. Phil. ii. 15. And who is there, who must not acknowledge, that the worst of those who are in the church, and are inferior to the rest, are better than most of those who are in the churches of the people.'

'For instance, the church of God at Athens is quiet, mild, and well behaved, being desirous to approve itself to God who

<sup>a</sup> . . . ηκ ανεχομαι νεως ορωσεις, και βω-  
μες, και ασφαλια. L. vii. § 62. p. 373.

<sup>b</sup> . . . ημας βωμες, και ασφαλια, και  
ως ιδρωσθαι φευσεν. L. viii. § 17. p. 389.

<sup>c</sup> L. viii. § 21. p. 392.

§ 24. et 25. p. 393.

30. p. 128, 129.

<sup>d</sup> L. viii.

<sup>e</sup> L. iii. § 29,

' is over all. But the church of the Athenians is turbulent, and  
 ' by, no means comparable to the church of God there. The  
 ' same you must also acknowledge of the church of God at  
 ' Corinth, and the church of the people of the Corinthians: as  
 ' you must also allow of the church of God at Alexandria, and  
 ' the church of the people of the Alexandrians. Every one who  
 ' is candid, and diligently attends to these things, with a mind  
 ' open to conviction, will admire him who formed this design,  
 ' and has accomplished it; that there should be every where  
 ' churches of God, dwelling together with the churches of the  
 ' people in every city. And<sup>f</sup> if you will observe the senate of  
 ' the church of God, and the senate in every city, you will find  
 ' some senators of the church worthy to govern in the city of  
 ' God, all over the world, if there were such a thing. And on  
 ' the other hand, you will find, that the senators of the cities  
 ' have nothing in their behaviour to render them worthy of the  
 ' distinction allotted to them. And if you should compare the  
 ' presidents of the churches of God with the presidents of the  
 ' people in the cities, you will find the senators and governors of  
 ' the churches, though some may be inferior to others who are  
 ' more perfect, nevertheless you will find them to excel in virtue  
 ' the senators and governors of the cities.'

## S E C T I O N IX.

### *Passages in Celsus concerning those called Heretics.*

C E L S U S was not unacquainted with those particular opinions  
 called heresies, which arose early in the world under the Christian  
 name.

1. I shall transcribe at length a part of what Origen says upon  
 this subject. ' Then<sup>a</sup> he says: Let not any man think me ig-  
 ' norant, that some of them will allow, that their God is the  
 ' same with the God of the Jews; whilst others believe in another,  
 ' and contrary to him, and by whom, as they say, the Son of  
 ' God was sent.'

Here, I think, Celsus must mean the Marcionites, though  
 Origen does not expressly say so.

2. ' He<sup>b</sup> adds, that some are Sibyllists. Perhaps he had  
 ' heard of some, who blamed those who accounted the Sibyl a  
 ' prophetess, and who therefore called them Sibyllists.'

<sup>f</sup> Οὕτω δὲ καὶ βελήν ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ βελή  
 τη καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν συνεξείλαζων, εὐφοῖς ἀν  
 τινες μὲν τῆς ἐκκλησίας βυλευταὶ ἀξιοὶ εἰσιν,

εἷς ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παντί πολις τῆ Θεοῦ; ἐν ἐκείνῃ  
 πολίτευεσθαι. Ibid. num. 30.

<sup>a</sup> L. v. § 61. p. 271.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid.

3. Origen goes on. ‘ Then ‘ heaping up the names of many ‘ among us, he says, “ he knows of some, who are Simonians, “ who following Helena, or a master called Helenus, are called “ Helenians.” But, ‘ says Origen, ‘ Celsus does not know, that ‘ the Simonians do by no means confess Jesus to be the Son of ‘ God, but say, that Simon is the power of God. Many strange ‘ things are told us of that man, who thought, that if he could ‘ perform some wonders like to those which Jesus had done, he ‘ should be honoured in the like manner that Jesus was. But ‘ neither Celsus, nor Simon, were able to comprehend, how Je- ‘ sus, as a good husbandman of the word of God, *ως καλος γεωρ- ‘ σος λολη Θεσ*, was able to sow a great part of Greece, and a great ‘ part of the Barbarian world, and fill them with words, which ‘ convert the soul from every evil, and lead them to the Creator ‘ of all. Celsus was also acquainted with the Marcellians, so ‘ called from Marcellina, and the Harpocratians, who had their ‘ rise from Salome, and others from Mariamne, and others from ‘ Martha: though I, who have made it my business to acquaint ‘ myself with the different sects among us, as well as among the ‘ philosophers, never met with any of these, *εδεπολε τριστοις ωμιλη- ‘ σαμεν*. Celsus has also made mention of the Marcionites, so ‘ called from Marcion.’

4. ‘ And ‘ then, that he may seem to be acquainted with ‘ others, beside those already named, he adds, after his accus- ‘ tomed manner: “ and others form to themselves another mas- ‘ ter and dæmon, walking in the greatest darkness, and prac- ‘ tising more shameful and impious things than the associates of ‘ Antinous in Egypt.”

5. In another place Origen observes, that ‘ the Simonians never were persecuted: and says, he believes, there could not at that time be found thirty Simonians in the world.

Celsus also brings in the Ophians, or Ophitæ, who, as ‘ Origen says, were no more Christians than himself. He ‘ likewise seems to refer to the Valentinians, and to ‘ some other obscure people, whom Origen knew nothing of: and borrowing their sentiments, he forms an objection from them against all Christians in general.

However, the main disputes of Celsus is with our gospels, and those Christians that followed them, as is manifest from the whole of his work; so far as we can judge of it by those fragments that

<sup>c</sup> L. v. § 62. p. 272.

p. 272.

Et Conf. l. i. § 57. p. 44.

§ 28. et 30. p. 294. &c.

<sup>d</sup> Ib. § 63.

<sup>e</sup> L. vi. § 11. p. 282.

<sup>f</sup> L. vi.

<sup>g</sup> L. vi.

§ 34. &c. p. 298.

<sup>h</sup> *Και εν τούτοις*

*δη παλι, εκ αιδ’ απο ποιας αιρεσεως αση-*

*μοιατης ταυτα λαβων, πασι Χριστιανοις απ’*

*αυτων εσκαλει, κ. λ* L. viii. § 15. p. 388.

remain: and there are enough of them in Origen to give us a just idea of it.

8. It is not at all surprising, that Celsus should endeavour to make an advantage of the absurd opinions of those called heretics, for loading Christians in general, or Christianity itself with the reproach of them; or by setting them up against the more prevailing sentiments of the founder part of the Christians, from which indeed proceeded all the fears and apprehensions of heathen people.

## S E C T I O N X.

*Passages in Celsus, containing calumnies, or injurious reflections upon the Christians.*

HE objects after this manner. ‘ That \* I say nothing more  
 ‘ severe than truth obliges me to say, is manifest hence: when  
 ‘ others invite men to the mysteries, they invite men after this  
 ‘ manner: “ Whoever has clean hands, and a good understand-  
 ‘ ing: or, whosoever is pure from vice, whose soul is conscious  
 ‘ of no evil, and lives according to the law of righteousness, let  
 ‘ him come hither.” Now let us see whom they invite.  
 ‘ Whoever, say they, is a sinner, whoever is ignorant, who-  
 ‘ ever is silly, and in a word, whoever is miserable, these the  
 ‘ kingdom of God receives.” Whom do you mean by “ sin-  
 ‘ ners?” Do you not thereby intend thieves, house-break-  
 ‘ ers, poisoners, sacrilegious, and the like? And what else could  
 ‘ men say, who aim to form a society of the worst of men?’ To  
 which Origen answers: ‘ It is one thing to invite sick souls to  
 ‘ come to be healed, and another thing to call such as are cured  
 ‘ to partake of higher mysteries. We who know the difference  
 ‘ of these two things, first invite men to come and be healed,  
 ‘ and we exhort sinners to attend to those who teach men not to  
 ‘ sin; and the ignorant and unwise we exhort to hearken to those  
 ‘ who will teach them wisdom; the weak we exhort to aim at  
 ‘ manly wisdom, and the miserable we invite to accept of hap-  
 ‘ piness, or, to speak more properly, blessedness. And, when  
 ‘ they whom we have admonished, have made some progress,  
 ‘ and have learned to live well, then they are initiated by us.  
 ‘ *For we speak wisdom among the perfect.*’ 1 Cor. ii. 6.

2. That the Christian doctrine gives no encouragement to wickedness, is apparent from the books of the New Testament, in which it is clearly taught: and that the general practice of

\* L. iii. § 59. p. 147.

Christians is here misrepresented appears from Justin Martyr, who lived about the same time with Celsus, who, in his first apology, giving an account of the Christian principles and worship, says: 'Whenever<sup>b</sup> any are persuaded of the truth of the things taught by us, and engage to the utmost of their power to live accordingly, they are directed to pray, joining therewith fasting, that they may obtain from God the forgiveness of their past sins, we also praying and fasting with them: then they are brought by us to a place where there is water, and they are regenerated in the same manner that we were.' Nor were they admitted to the eucharist till afterwards, as<sup>c</sup> he farther shews.

3. So writes Justin. The discipline of the church was much the same in the time of Origen: for some while before, in answer to another reflection of Celsus, not very different from this which we are now considering, he says: 'But<sup>d</sup> what ground is there to compare us with those haranguers, and common strollers? Is there any resemblance between them and us, Who by readings, and by explications of those readings, excite men to piety toward the God of the universe, and to other virtues of like excellence, [και τας συνθρονους ταυτην αρετας] and who call men off from a neglect of religion, and from all things contrary to right reason? Certainly the philosophers would be well pleased to gather together such as are disposed to hear their discourses concerning what is good and honest. Nor ought such to be compared with the common strollers above mentioned: nor is it reasonable to suppose, that Celsus would condemn those philosophers, who, from a principle of humanity, endeavour to instruct and improve the ignorant vulgar.'

'The Christians are more careful in distinguishing their hearers than any other men. When the philosophers speak in public, all attend that will: the Christians carefully examine the tempers and manners of those who come to them; nor are any received by us, till they have given some evidences of a progress in virtue. If afterwards they fall into sin, especially any kind of intemperance, they are excluded from the community: if afterwards they repent, their recovery is considered as a rising again from the dead. But now they are received again not without more difficulty than at the first; nor can they ever be admitted into any office or dignity in the church of God.'

4. Moreover, as Dr. Wall observes in his Notes upon John viii. at the beginning: 'It is no discredit, but an excellence in

<sup>b</sup> Ap. i. p. 93. Paris. § 61. Bened.

<sup>c</sup> Ib. p. 97. § 65. &c.

<sup>d</sup> L. iii. § 50, 51. p. 142, 143.

any religion, that it has rules of pardon for great sins, provided it lay conditions, and strong injunctions of amending, and doing so no more, such as here at ver. 11.' For certain, the gospel promiseth not any special advantages to men who live in sin: such as sin, it calls to repentance; nor is there any pardon, nor salvation for sinners, unless they repent, and practise real holiness and virtue.

5. That charge of Celsus against Christianity, therefore, is altogether absurd and groundless; though it was afterwards renewed by the <sup>d</sup> emperor Julian: and I hope it will be excused, that I have so particularly considered this objection the first time it came in our way.

6. Celsus quotes, or seems to quote, words of a Dialogue, (if they are not his own invention) as written by some Christian, where mention is made of angels of light, and other angels, and <sup>f</sup> their prince at the head, who is mentioned by a very opprobrious name. Then, says Origen, laying hold of those words, he deservedly censures those who say such things. We also are very ready to join in censuring such, as call the God of the Jews accursed, if <sup>e</sup> indeed there are any such men: I mean the God that sends rain and thunder, the God of Moses, and author of the creation described by him.' Here, adds Origen, Celsus seems to have intended somewhat very unfair against us, proceeding from ill-will, unbecoming a philosopher. He intended, that they who read his book, to whom we are unknown, should declare war against us, as men who called the good creator of the world accursed: in which he resembleth the Jews, who, at the first rise of the Christian doctrine, spread abroad calumnies against it; giving out, that they killed a child and ate it, and that when the lights were put out, they practised promiscuous lewdness. Which calumny, however absurd, was of old credited by many who differ from us: and even now there are some who are so deceived by it, that for this reason they are so averse to all Christians, that they will have no discourse or communication with any of them. Somewhat of this kind Celsus seems to have aimed at, when he gave out, that the Christians call the creator of the world the accursed God: that men believing such things of us, might be disposed to do their utmost to extirpate the Christians, as the most impious of all men.'

<sup>d</sup> Julian. Cæf. in fin. p. 336. edit. Spanh. <sup>e</sup> L. vi. § 27, 28. p. 293, 294.

<sup>f</sup> Των μὲν τῶ φίλος, ἑβραίων δὲ τῶν ονομαζομένων αρχουλιχων' και λεγει τον

αρχουλια των ονομαζομενων αρχουλικων λεγεισθαι θεον κατηραμενον. Ib. num. 27.

<sup>e</sup> Ει δὴ τινες εἰσι λεγοντες θεον κατηραμενον τον Ιουδαιων. Num. 27.

By all which we may perceive, that Celsus was filled with enmity against the Christians of his time, and did not spare them.

7. There is yet one place more, which I must take notice of before I leave this article.

‘ After this he insinuates, that the worship paid to Antinous, one of the beloved favourites of Adrian, at Antinopolis in Egypt, differs not from the respect which we have for Jesus. Another instance this of his hatred of us ! But <sup>ε</sup> what have we in common with men, whose manners are so vicious, as not to be exempt from that effeminacy which is contrary to nature ? What comparison can be made between them, and the venerable Jesus, whom we follow, against whom, though innumerable lies and calumnies have been forged, none have dared to charge him with any kind of intemperance whatever ?’

## S E C T I O N XI.

*Remarks upon the Work of Celsus against the Christians, and upon Origen's Answer to it.*

CELSUS says, ‘ he <sup>a</sup> knows all things.’ Which Origen treats as a very arrogant saying: but I think the coherence shews, that Celsus intended to say, he knew all things relating to the Christians: And perhaps he meant no more, than that he was well qualified for the work he had undertaken, of writing against them: and Origen himself, <sup>b</sup> in some other places where he takes notice of this saying, leads us to understand it of his being well acquainted with the Christian affairs.

Which, I apprehend, cannot be disallowed: for Celsus had read the books of Moses, and perhaps all the other books of the Old Testament. He had read, as it seems, all the books of the New Testament: but when he had done that, he supposed, he needed not to give himself much trouble about any of them, excepting the historical books, and particularly the gospels.

He had also made inquiries after those absurd people called heretics, and looked into some of their writings.

<sup>ε</sup> Τί γὰρ κοινὸν ἔχει ὁ γενομένος ἐν τοῖς Ἀδριανῶν παιδικοῖς βίοις, εἶδε τὸν ἀρρενεῖα ἀπαθὴν γυναικείας κοσμοφυλαξάνου, πρὸς τὸν σεμνὸν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ μὴδε οἱ μυρία κατήγορησιάνεις, καὶ ψευδῆ ὅσα περὶ αὐτῆ λεγόντες, εὐδαιμονίαι καλεῖσθαι, ὡς κ' ἂν τὸ τυχόν ἀκορασίας κ' ἂν ἐπ' ὀλίγον γευσάμενος. L. iii. § 36. p. 132.

<sup>a</sup> Λεκτεῖον δὲ πρὸς τα,

παντα γὰρ οἶδα, ἀλαζωνικώτατα ὑπ' αὐτῆ ἀπολέλολημενος. L. i. § 12. p. 11.

<sup>b</sup> Ὁ πάντ' εἶδεναι ἐπαγγελισμένος Κελσὸς τὰ πνεύματα. L. i. § 40. p. 31. Οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει ὁ ἀληθῶς ἀλαζων Κελσὸς, καὶ ἐπαγγελόμενος εἶδεναι πάντα τὰ Χριστιανῶν. L. ii. § 32. p. 80.

Beside all this, he had sent for some Jews to come to him, with whom he had a good deal of discourse. From them he learned their expectation of the Messiah, and their idea of him: by them he endeavoured to inform himself, wherein lay the controversy between the Jewish people and the Christians: with their assistance he formed divers objections against the Christian doctrine: and from them, undoubtedly, he aimed to pick up all the scandal which they could furnish him with against the Christians: and from them he received the infamous account of our Saviour's nativity, before taken notice of.

And it may be well supposed, that there were some reasons, which induced this learned Epicurean to take so much pains to inform himself about the Christians, and then to write a large volume against them. Their principles were very different from his, and contrary to all the established notions about the heathen deities: and their principles had already gained great ground, and were still spreading more and more to the detriment of Epicurism, and all idolatrous schemes; which could not but move his indignation. We see his resentments in the bitterness with which he has treated the Christians, and Jesus himself, whom they followed as their Lord and master. I am unwilling to insinuate, that Celsus was allured into this service, and that he encouraged himself with hopes of success in his design, by the afflictive circumstances of the Christians at that time: but I must say, it was not very generous in him to attack and oppose them in the manner he did, when they were under persecution, and liable to capital punishments.

Celsus<sup>c</sup> expressly quotes the Dispute or Dialogue of Papiſcus and Jason, and speaks of it with great contempt, of which I took notice<sup>d</sup> formerly. It is a work which may be allowed to be written by a catholic Christian. Excepting that one book, I do not recollect, that Celsus has mentioned the name of any of our celebrated ancient Christians, or particularly referred to any of their writings: though there were several before, and about his time, who might have been mentioned; as Clement of Rome, Ignatius bishop of Antioch, Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, Quadratus, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Tatian, not to speak of any others, divers of whom were well versed in Greek literature: which silence about them may be ascribed to a scornful disdain, unwilling to do justice to the merit of a Christian: nor do we perceive from Origen, that Celsus had named any of the evangelists.

<sup>c</sup> . . . φησιν· οταν δη και Παπισκος προς και Ιασονος αλληλοισαν εβων, η γελωσιος, αλλα μαλλον ελεος και μισος αξιαν. L. iv. § 52. p. 199.

<sup>d</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 291.

And

And by the way I would observe here, that we compute the Dialogue of Papiscus and Jason to have been written about the year of Christ 140: Celsus, therefore, could not publish his work against the Christians till after that time.

At the conclusion of his eight books in answer to Celsus, Origen observes, that \* Celsus promised another work, in which he would shew men how to live. This work Origen seems to suppose to have been likewise designed in opposition to Christianity. Origen did not know whether Celsus had performed his promise: but he desires his friend Ambrose to send it to him, if he had met with it; and he engageth to examine it.

Origen's own work, as before shewn, has been greatly commended. Eusebius, entering upon his answer to Hierocles, considers † it as a needless performance; forasmuch as a confutation of him may be seen in Origen's books against Celsus, who had already said every thing that could be said upon the subject.

I do not judge it proper for me to indulge myself in any characters that should be reckoned extravagant: nevertheless I think I may say, that Origen's eight books against Celsus are an invaluable treasure. Every one is now able to judge of the importance of the fragments of the work of Celsus, preserved in it. Origen's answers to Celsus are also valuable. There are likewise many other things, of which good use may be made; whence the curious may learn divers things hardly to be met with elsewhere. I suppose, I shall hereafter have opportunities for verifying this observation, by quotations out of it.

## S E C T I O N XII.

### *The Recapitulation.*

It is a large extract which I have now made out of Origen's eight books against the work of Celsus, entitled *The true Word*: it is fit, that we should now recapitulate what we have seen in several articles.

And it is a great deal. All these things have we seen in Celsus distinctly and clearly. What greater advantage could we expect from the writings of an adversary, who flourished, and wrote not long after the middle of the second century of the Christian epoch; and not much above 130 years after our Saviour's ascension?

\* Ἰσθὶ μὲν τοὶ ἐπαγγελομένου τοῦ Κέλσου νῆς αὐτῶ καὶ δευταμένης πειθεσθαι. L. viii. αἰλλο συνίσταμα μεία τέλο ποιησεῖν, ἐν ᾧ δι- § 76. p. 428. † Contr. Hier. p. 511.  
δαξεί: ἐπιγγειλιέο, ὁπη βιώλεον τῆς βελομε-

In the passages alleged under the \*\* second section we have seen good proofs, that the Jewish people had expectations of that great person the Messiah.

In the passages cited under the third section, we have seen many plain references to the gospels, and to several of St. Paul's epistles, if not also to St. Peter's and St. John's. We are assured by Celsus, that there were histories of Jesus written by his disciples, meaning his apostles and their companions; and that those books were well known, and in high esteem with Christians.

We have seen in his fragments plain references to the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John: it appears also highly probable, or even certain, that he was not unacquainted with the gospel according to St. Mark; but he has not expressly mentioned the books themselves, nor the names of the writers: nor is there so much as an insinuation, that the later Christians, of Celsus's own time, or thereabout, had forged these histories to do honour to Jesus. He only says, that they had altered some things; but of that he produced no proof; nor did he allege any particular instances: he only says, in the place referred to, if Origen has taken the words of Celsus exactly, 'that some of the believers had taken the liberty to alter the gospel from the first writing.'

I presume, I have now particularly shewn, from numerous passages above alleged, the truth of St. Chrysostom's observation: 'That Celsus bears witness to the antiquity of our writings.'

And, as it was in those times a common method to quote authors in a loose manner, and as it is reasonable to believe, that Celsus was far from being scrupulously exact in his citations of Christian books, or in his allusions to them; it may be well reckoned somewhat extraordinary, that we can discern in him so many evident traces of quotations from the books of the New Testament, or references to them.

In the fourth section are many passages of Celsus bearing testimony to the books of the New Testament, and the facts contained in them.

He lets us know, that Jesus was the author of the Christian institution, and that he had lived and taught not very long ago. We learn from him also, that according to the accounts given by his disciples, he was born of a virgin, in a small village of Judea, supposed to have been descended from the Jewish kings: that she was married to a carpenter: that for some while her husband

\*\* The first section is not recapitulated here, as it contains only the history of Celsus, and his work.

was doubtful about her chastity: that Chaldæans, or other wise men from the east, came to Jerusalem, soon after his nativity, to do him homage as king of the Jews, having been excited to that journey by the appearance of a star: that Herod, moved by jealousy, put to death many young children, hoping to kill Jesus with them: that by direction of an angel, he was carried by his parents into Egypt for the preservation of his life; where, as Celsus insinuates, Jesus learned the charms practised in that country. He calls Jesus the Nazaræan man, or man of Nazareth, from the place where he was brought up, and chiefly resided, before his appearance in a public character. He takes notice of our Lord's baptism, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit in the shape of a dove, and of a voice from heaven declaring Jesus to be the beloved Son of God. In another place he speaks again of a like voice from heaven, which seems to be what happened when our Lord was transfigured on the mount. He afterwards takes notice, that when Jesus appeared in a public character, as a teacher of religion, he went about attended by ten or eleven disciples, publicans and sailors, or mariners, as he generally calls them. In the history of Jesus, written by his disciples, he is said to have healed the lame, and the blind, and to have raised some dead persons to life: and though he is unwilling to allow, that these were real miracles done by the power of God, he dares not to deny their truth, and is troubled to account for them, and was almost reduced to the necessity of allowing the power of magic, though he is supposed to have formerly written against it. He has taken notice of our Lord's death on the cross, and almost all the circumstances of his last sufferings: that he was betrayed by one of his disciples, and denied by another: that he was condemned by a judge, and prosecuted by the Jews. He mentions our Lord's deriders, and the reproaches he underwent, the crown of thorns, the purple robe, the reed in his hand. Nor has he omitted the wine mingled with gall, when our Lord was going to be crucified, and the vinegar, when he was near expiring on the cross. He also takes notice of the darkness during our Lord's crucifixion, and the earthquake at the same time, or soon after it. And though he will not admit, that Jesus rose from the dead, he acknowledgeth the disciples to have related it, and that an angel descended, and removed the stone from the door of the sepulchre, and that he is said by them to have shewn himself to one woman, and then to others, and to his disciples. He also observes, that the disciples have recorded, that Jesus foreknew and foretold the things that happened to himself, and which were to happen to them also after he had left them.

So

So that we have in Celsus, in a manner, the whole history of Jesus, as recorded in the gospels: for we have traced in him the history of our Lord's birth, life, preaching, miracles, death, and resurrection; all as taken by him from the writings of Christ's own disciples. In this section, therefore, we have seen many testimonies to the antiquity and genuineness of our scriptures, additional to those alleged in the preceding section.

In the fifth section we have observed the notice which Celsus takes of some Christian principles, in particular, the general resurrection of the dead: as for the moral doctrine he was not able to find any fault with it; but he says, the like things had been before taught by the philosophers, and better expressed. He takes notice of the veneration which the Christians had for Jesus, as their master, and the Messiah promised of old. But he says, the Jews were mistaken in expecting such a person at all; and the Christians were mistaken in thinking that he was actually come: though, as he allows, they argued from the ancient Jewish prophets.

In the sixth section we have seen some passages bearing testimony to the great progress of the Christian religion in the world, notwithstanding many difficulties and discouragements. Indeed, this whole work of Celsus is an evidence of the prevailing power of the Christian religion: he has sufficiently acknowledged the great numbers of Jews and Gentiles, who had been gained over to this belief: and if it had not been still spreading and prevailing, this learned and ingenious man would have saved himself the pains of this laborious argument to confute it: but how so many at that time should embrace this doctrine, under many worldly discouragements, without good reason, is a thing not easy to be accounted for.

Under this section, I suppose, may be observed some passages containing references to the book of the Acts of the apostles.

Under the seventh section we saw, how Celsus was disposed to charge the Christians with magical arts and practices; upon which I need not enlarge here: it is sufficient to remind the reader of what is there alleged.

In the eighth section are some passages relating to Christian worship. It appears from what Celsus says, that they worshipped the one God, Creator of all things, and had a high veneration for Jesus Christ: nor would they worship dæmons, or join in the public sacrifices and festivals of heathen people. He likewise speaks of Christian presbyters; though they had not then any altars, nor temples, nor other sumptuous buildings to meet in. He also reproacheth them with holding their religious assemblies privately;

privately, and contrary to law: nor was it without reason that they aimed at privacy; for, as he owns, they were then sought for to be put to death.

From the passages alleged under the ninth section we learn, that Celsus was not unacquainted with the absurd opinions of some who went under the Christian name: these he brings in, the more to reproach those who were the most rational in their belief. All the attacks of Celsus are against the more sober part of the believers: those others were sought for in order to disparage and expose them, if possible.

Finally, it is well known, that in early times, soon after the rise of Christianity, the followers of Jesus were loaded with many calumnies.

They were said to kill infants, and eat them, and when the lights were put out, to practise promiscuous lewdness in their assemblies. I do not perceive Celsus to insist upon these: I<sup>a</sup> rather think he did not. These calumnies were not yet extinct, nor obsolete: the martyrs at Lyons and Vienna, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus<sup>b</sup> about the year 177, were reproached with them; and they were in vogue after that time. But to me it seems probable, that Celsus thought those charges to be absurd and incredible; and to mention them with any marks of countenance and approbation, he supposed would be a prejudice to his argument. But though he has omitted them, he has brought in divers injurious reflections upon them, and thereby shewn his good will to expose them to general and public resentment; as may be seen in the passages alleged from him under this section.

If therefore we now have any advantage from the work of Celsus, as we certainly have, and very considerable, it is altogether beside the intention of the author: so that we may here apply the words of Sampson's riddle, or ænigma: *Out of the eater, or devourer, came meat, and out of the strong, or the fierce, came sweetness.* Judges xiv. 14.

### S E C T I O N XIII.

*Three summaries of the fragments of the work of Celsus preserved in Origen, made by three several learned men.*

I. A SUMMARY of the Work of Celsus, by the late Rev. Dr. Philip Doddridge.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. L. vi. § 40. p. 302.  
and in this work, vol. vii. Ch. XV. Sect. ii. num. III.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Euseb. H. E. L. v. cap. 4. p. 156. D.

My late excellent friend, Dr. Doddridge, observed to me, that few learned men knew the importance of the remains of Celsus. He said, 'An abridgment of the history of Christ may be found in Celsus:' and he entreated, that when I should come to this writer, 'I would labour the point.' I think I have shewn a regard to his advice, as I have also followed my own judgment and inclination.

Since his decease I have understood, that he had abridged the argument of the eight books of Origen against Celsus, and sent it to an honourable friend<sup>a</sup>. A copy of it having been taken, I have procured it from the Rev. Mr. Ashworth of Daventry in Northamptonshire. I shall now transcribe it with references to the pages of Spencer's edition of Origen at Cambridge, in 1677.

'Of the proof of the genuineness of the New Testament, that may be derived from the fragments of Celsus, as preserved by Origen.'

'The book of Celsus is unhappily lost: but there are large extracts made in Origen, and, as it seems, with such exactness, that it is difficult to find more considerable remains of any ancient book, not now extant. The following collection is confined to the illustration of this thought: "What we may learn from him, concerning the real existence of the New Testament, in his age, and the regard in which it was held among Christians."

'Celsus is, no doubt, an evidence of great value, as he wrote so early. Origen observes, p. 3. that he had been dead long before his undertaking to answer his book against Christianity, which he calls the "The true word." And it appears from another passage of Origen, that he lived in the days of Adrian and his successor, p. 8. So that his book must have been written in the second century: which is farther confirmed by Lucian's dedicating to him one of his works, entitled, *Pseudomantis*. It may be also observed, that he speaks of Christ, as having taught and suffered very lately, p. 21, and p. 282.'

'As for the references to the gospels, we do not find that he quotes any of them by the name of the authors: but he speaks of the gospel, meaning, no doubt, the history of Christ, as being changed three or four times, p. 77. He seems to speak of several of the evangelists, as agreeing to write of Christ's predictions, p. 89. and of things written by the disciples of Christ, p. 67. All which seems to make it evident, that he had more than the book of St. Matthew in his hand: and though the

<sup>a</sup> Gilbert West, Esq; Author of *Observations on the History and Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, published in the year 1747.

‘greatest part of his references may be found there, yet there are  
‘also many of them in the other gospels.’

‘He quotes from the gospels such a variety of particulars,  
‘that the enumeration of them will almost prove an abridgment  
‘of the evangelists’ history: particularly, That Jesus, who, he  
‘says, was represented as the Word of God, p. 79, and who was  
‘the author of the Christian name, p. 21, and also called himself  
‘the Son of God, *ibid.* was a man of Nazareth, p. 343. That  
‘he was the reputed son of a carpenter, p. 30. That his mother’s  
‘pregnancy was at first suspected, *ibid.* but that it was pretended,  
‘that his body was formed in her womb by the Spirit of God:  
‘or, as he elsewhere expresses it, produced by a divine operation,  
‘p. 30. And that to remove the carpenter’s prejudice, an angel  
‘appeared to him to inform him of this, p. 266. That when  
‘he was born, a star appeared in the east to certain Magi, who  
‘came to adore him, p. 31. 45. The consequence of which was  
‘the slaughter of the infants by order of Herod, hoping thereby  
‘to destroy Jesus, and prevent his reign, p. 45. But that his  
‘parents were warned by an angel to fly into Egypt, to preserve  
‘his life, as if his Father could not have protected him at home,  
‘p. 51, and 266, and that he continued in Egypt for a while,  
‘where, he says, he had an opportunity of learning magic, p. 22.’

‘He farther represents it, as pretended in those books, that  
‘when Jesus was washed by John, the appearance of a dove de-  
‘scended upon him, and that a voice was heard from heaven,  
‘declaring him to be the Son of God, p. 31, and 105. That  
‘he was vexed by a temptation, and the assaults of an evil spirit,  
‘303\*. He calls Christ himself a carpenter, p. 300, and insults  
‘his mean life, lurking from place to place, p. 47, gathering up  
‘ten or twelve poor men, publicans, and men that used the sea,  
‘of scandalous characters, and represents Christ as a beggar, p.  
‘47. †† that he was sometimes hungry and thirsty, p. 55, speaks  
‘of his being rejected by many that heard him, and hints,  
‘though not very expressly, at an attempt to throw him down a  
‘precipice, p. 298.’

‘He grants, that he wrought miracles, and particularly, that  
‘he cured some sick people, raised some that were dead, and  
‘multiplied some loaves: but speaks of others doing the like,  
‘p. 53. . He also expressly mentions his curing the lame and the

\* The words of Celsus, to which Dr. Doddridge refers, are these: Ο τε Θεις πας αρα ητταται υπο του διαβολου και νλαζουμενος υπ’ αυτου, διδασκει και ημας ται υπο τειω κολασειω και αφροισιν. L. vi.

p. 303. Cantab. num. 42. p. 663. Bened.

†† The passages of Celsus, to which Dr. Doddridge here refers, may be seen, transcribed above, at p. 22, 23.

‘blind:

‘ blind: and his raising the dead is mentioned a second time, 87.  
 ‘ He lampoons the expression, *thy faith hath saved thee*, p. 8 \*\*.’  
 ‘ He hints at several things concerning the doctrine of Christ,  
 ‘ and the manner of his preaching, taken especially from St.  
 ‘ Matthew’s account of his sermon on the mount, particularly,  
 ‘ that he promised, that his followers should inherit the earth:  
 ‘ that if any strike them on one cheek, they should turn the  
 ‘ other, p. 343, and 370; that he declared, no man can serve  
 ‘ two masters, p. 380: and would have his disciples learn from  
 ‘ the birds of the air, and the lilies of the field, not to be ex-  
 ‘ cessively careful about food and raiment, p. 343. He also re-  
 ‘ fers to some other discourses of Christ, as his saying, that it  
 ‘ was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than  
 ‘ for a rich man to be saved, 286 and 288.’

‘ He observes, that Jesus, however, was not generally at-  
 ‘ tended to, and that he denounced woes upon his hearers for  
 ‘ their obstinate infidelity, p. 107.’

‘ He also says, that his disciples in their writings pretend, that  
 ‘ he foretold all things which he was to suffer, p. 67; and his re-  
 ‘ surrection, p. 93: and likewise, that deceivers would come,  
 ‘ and work miracles, and speaks of the author of these wicked  
 ‘ works by the name of Satan, p. 89.’

‘ He objects, that Jesus withdrew himself from those who sought  
 ‘ to put him to death, p. 62, and yet afterwards did not avoid  
 ‘ death, knowing it was to come, p. 70. He speaks of his eat-  
 ‘ ing the flesh of a lamb, p. 340: and that he foretold to his  
 ‘ disciples, they would give him up to his enemies, thereby  
 ‘ making them wicked, though they were the companions of  
 ‘ his table, p. 72.’

‘ That before his sufferings he prayed in these words: *Father,*  
 ‘ *if it be possible, let this cup pass away*, p. 75. That he was be-  
 ‘ trayed by his disciples, though robbers are faithful to their  
 ‘ leaders, p. 62 and 66. That none of his disciples dared to  
 ‘ suffer for him, p. 86, and that he professed to undergo his suf-  
 ‘ ferings in obedience to his Father, p. 75, and said, that *these*  
 ‘ *things ought to happen*, p. 332.’

‘ That he was denied by one who knew him to be God, p. 71,  
 ‘ to whom, as well as to the traitor, he had foretold, what he  
 ‘ would do, p. 72.’

‘ It is intimated, that he spoke of coming again with an hea-  
 ‘ venly host, p. 337.’

\*\* That is not exact, owing, perhaps, *αλλα πιστευσον και, πισεις οθ σωσει οι*  
 not to the author, but to the transcriber. And see here at p. 16.  
 The original is: *χρησθαι τω; Μη εξελιξει,*

‘ He speaks of Jesus as ignominiously bound, p. 282, as  
 ‘ scourged, p. 79, as crowned with thorns, with a reed in his  
 ‘ hand, and arrayed in a scarlet robe, and as condemned, p. 81,  
 ‘ as having gall given him to drink when he was led away to  
 ‘ punishment, p. 174, as shamefully treated in the sight of the  
 ‘ whole world, p. 282, as distended on the cross, p. 82. He  
 ‘ derides him for not exerting his divinity to punish those out-  
 ‘ rages, p. 81, as taking no vengeance on his enemies, p. 404,  
 ‘ as incapable to deliver himself, and not delivered by his Father  
 ‘ in his extremity, p. 41, and as greedily drinking gall and vine-  
 ‘ gar through impatience of thirst, p. 82, and 340.’

‘ He observes, it was pretended, that when Jesus expired upon  
 ‘ the cross; there was darkness and an earthquake, p. 94, that  
 ‘ when he arose, he needed an angel to remove the stone of  
 ‘ the sepulchre, though he was said to be the Son of God, p. 266.  
 ‘ And according to some, one, according to others, two angels  
 ‘ came to the sepulchre to inform the women of his resurrection,  
 ‘ p. 266. That after his resurrection he did not appear to his  
 ‘ enemies, p. 98, but first to a woman whom he had dispossessed,  
 ‘ p. 94, and 104, that he appeared to a few of his disciples, shew-  
 ‘ ing them the marks of crucifixion, and appeared and disap-  
 ‘ peared on a sudden, p. 94, &c. and 104. And he says: We  
 ‘ take these things from your own writings, to wound you with  
 ‘ your own weapons, p. 106.’

‘ Beside all these circumstances produced from the gospels, he  
 ‘ speaks of Christ's pretending, that he should come again to burn  
 ‘ the wicked, and to receive the rest to eternal life with himself,  
 ‘ p. 175. He refers to the Christian doctrine, of the fall of the  
 ‘ angels, and their being reserved in bonds under the earth, p. 266.’

‘ It is observable, that †† nothing is quoted by him from the  
 ‘ Acts in his whole book: nor does he name St. Paul: but he  
 ‘ quotes his epistles, particularly these words from the epistle  
 ‘ to the Galatians, iv. 14. *The world is crucified unto me, and I*  
 ‘ *unto the world*, p. 273, which \*† Origen says is all that he had  
 ‘ taken from St. Paul. However, he has also these words of  
 ‘ 1 Cor. iii. 29, *the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God*,  
 ‘ p. 283, and *an idol is nothing*, 1 Cor. viii. 4. p. 293. But it is  
 ‘ observable, that in the first of these quotations Celsus reproach-

†† I think, that Celsus was acquainted with the book of the Acts. And I would entreat the reader to observe the passages quoted from him above, at p. 36, 37. 43.

\*† Origen's words are these, p. 273, f. τὸ γὰρ μοι οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου εἶχε μεμνη-

μονευσεναι ο Κελσος. But I suppose, that Origen is not to be understood strictly, but rather in this manner: ‘ That Celsus had seldom quoted Paul; and now took notice of that expression with a design to expose it, so far as he was able.’

' eth the Christians with their many divisions; and yet says, that  
 ' however they differed, they agreed in using that expression. He  
 ' seems also, p. 242, expressly to refer to 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, and  
 ' 1 Thess. iv. 15. . . . 17. when he says, that the Christians ex-  
 ' pected, that they only shall escape in the burning of the world,  
 ' and that not only they who are alive when it happens, but those  
 ' also who have been a long time dead.'

' Upon the whole, there are in Celsus about eighty quotations  
 ' from the books of the New Testament, or references to them,  
 ' of which Origen has taken notice. And whilst he argues from  
 ' them, sometimes in a very perverse and malicious manner, he  
 ' still takes it for granted, as the foundation of his argument, that  
 ' whatever absurdities could be fastened upon any words, or actions  
 ' of Christ, recorded in the evangelists, it would be a valid ob-  
 ' jection against Christianity: thereby in effect assuring us, not  
 ' only that such a book did really exist, but that it was universally  
 ' received by Christians in those times as credible and divine.  
 ' Who can forbear adoring the depth of divine wisdom, in lay-  
 ' ing such a firm foundation for our faith in the gospel-history,  
 ' in the writings of one who was so inveterate an enemy to it,  
 ' and so indefatigable in his attempts to overthrow it!'

' To conclude: Celsus does not appear to have founded any  
 ' single objection against Christianity upon any of the spurious  
 ' gospels, Acts, or Revelations; which, considering his malice  
 ' on the one hand, and the many foolish and exceptionable things  
 ' to be found in them on the other, seems to be a good argument  
 ' that he never saw them. Else he had hardly candour enough  
 ' to forbear pleading such arguments as they might have afforded  
 ' him; even though he had known that the Christians did not  
 ' esteem them of equal authority with those, which he has so  
 ' furiously, but at the same time so impotently assaulted.'

So far Dr. Doddridge.

I shall now take another summary of the argument of Celsus,  
 from Dr. John Leland of Dublin, in his Answer to 'Christianity  
 as old as the Creation, Vol. ii. ch. v. p. 150. . . . 154, omitting  
 for the most part the references to the pages.

' Celsus, a most bitter enemy of Christianity, who lived in  
 ' the second century, produces many passages out of the gospels.  
 ' He represents Jesus to have lived but a few years ago: he men-  
 ' tions his being born of a virgin, the angels appearing to Joseph  
 ' on occasion of Mary's being with child, the star that appeared  
 ' at his birth, the wise men that came to worship him, when an  
 ' infant, and Herod's massacring the children, Joseph's fleeing  
 ' with the child into Egypt by the admonition of an angel, the

Holy

' Holy Ghost's descending on Jesus like a dove when he was bap-  
 ' tized by John, and the voice from heaven, declaring him to be  
 ' *the Son of God*, his going about with his disciples, his healing  
 ' the sick, and lame, and raising the dead, his foretelling his own  
 ' sufferings, and resurrection, his being betrayed and forsaken by  
 ' his own disciples, his suffering, both of his own accord, and in  
 ' obedience to his heavenly Father, his grief and trouble, and  
 ' his praying, *Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me*,  
 ' the ignominious treatment he met with, the robe that was put  
 ' upon him, the crown of thorns, the reed put into his hand, his  
 ' drinking vinegar and gall, and his being scourged and crucified:  
 ' his being seen after his resurrection by a fanatical woman, (as  
 ' he calls her, meaning Mary Magdalene) and by his own com-  
 ' panions and disciples, his shewing them his hands that were  
 ' pierced, the marks of his punishment. He also mentions the  
 ' angel's being seen at his sepulchre, and that some said, it was  
 ' one angel, others, that it was two; by which he hints at the  
 ' seeming variation in the accounts given of it by the evangelists.'

' It is true, he mentions all these things only with a design to  
 ' ridicule and expose them; but they furnish us with an uncon-  
 ' contested proof, that the gospels were then extant. Accordingly,  
 ' he expressly tells the Christians: "These things we have pro-  
 ' duced out of your own writings," p. 106. And he all along  
 ' supposeth them to have been written by Christ's own disciples,  
 ' that lived and conversed with him; though he pretends, they  
 ' feigned many things for the honour of their master, p. 69, 70.  
 ' And he pretends, "that he could tell many other things relating  
 ' to Jesus, beside those things that were written of him by his  
 ' own disciples; but that he willingly passed them by," p. 67.  
 ' We may conclude from his own expressions, both that he was  
 ' sensible, that these accounts were written by Christ's own dis-  
 ' ciples, (and indeed he never pretends to contest this;) and that  
 ' he was not able to produce any contrary accounts to invalidate  
 ' them, as he certainly would have done if it had been in his  
 ' power; since no man ever wrote with greater virulence against  
 ' Christianity than he. And indeed, how was it possible, for  
 ' ten or eleven publicans and boatmen," as he calls Christ's  
 ' disciples by way of contempt, p. 47, to have imposed such  
 ' things on the world, if they had not been true, so as to persuade  
 ' such vast multitudes to embrace a new and despised religion,  
 ' contrary to all their prejudices, and interests, and to believe in  
 ' one that had been crucified?'

' There are several other things which shew, that Celsus was  
 ' acquainted with the gospels. He produces several of our Sa-

' viour's sayings there recorded, as *that it is easier for a camel to*  
 ' *pass through the eye of a needle; than for a rich man to enter into*  
 ' *the kingdom of God: that to him, who smites us on one cheek, we*  
 ' *must turn the other: that it is not possible to serve two masters: his*  
 ' *precepts against thoughtfulness for to-morrow, by a comparison*  
 ' *drawn from crows and lilies: his foretelling, that false prophets*  
 ' *should arise, and work wonders: his saying, Woe unto you, ...*  
 ' &c. He mentions also some passages of the apostle Paul, such  
 ' as these: *The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.*  
 ' *The wisdom of men is foolishness with God: an idol is nothing.'*

' The use I would make of all this is, that it appears here  
 ' with an uncontested evidence, by the testimony of one of the  
 ' most malicious and virulent adversaries the Christian religion  
 ' ever had, and who was also a man of considerable parts and  
 ' learning, that the writings of the evangelists were extant in  
 ' his time: which was in the next century to that in which the  
 ' apostles lived: and that those accounts were written by Christ's  
 ' own disciples, and consequently that they were written in the  
 ' very age in which the facts there related were done, and when  
 ' therefore it would have been the easiest thing in the world to  
 ' have convicted them of falshood, if they had not been true.'  
 So far that learned author.

*A third Summary of the Argument of Celsus.*

Once more, Dr. Sherlock, or whoever is the ingenious author of 'the Evidence of the Resurrection cleared up,' has these following observations at p. 19 and 20.

' For Celsus lived at no great distance from the apostolic age,  
 ' at a time when all religions were tolerated but the Christian:  
 ' when no evidence was stifled, no books destroyed, but the  
 ' Christian. And yet Celsus laboured under the same want of  
 ' evidence, as Woolston and his auxiliaries, and had only the  
 ' gospel to search (as Origen more than once observes) for evi-  
 ' dence against the gospel. A strong proof, that there never had  
 ' been any books, of any credit in the world, that questioned  
 ' the gospel facts, when so spiteful, and so artful an adversary as  
 ' Celsus, made no use of them.'

' Celsus admits the truth of Christ's miracles: the difference  
 ' between him and Origen lies in the manner of accounting for  
 ' them; the one ascribing them to the power of God, the other  
 ' to the power of magic. So that, if the considerer will stand  
 ' to the evidence of his own witness, the question will not be,  
 ' Whether the miracles are true in fact, (for that is granted on  
 ' both

‘ both sides) but whether the truth of the miracles infers the divine authority of the performer. Now can it be supposed, that Celsus would have admitted the miracles of Christ as real facts, had he not been compelled to it by the universal consent of all men in the age he lived?’

‘ The truth is, that the objections of Celsus are preserved, and preserved in his own language. Origen’s answer is not a general reply to Celsus, but a minute examination of all his objections, even of those which appeared to Origen most frivolous. For his friend Ambrosius, to whom he dedicates the work, desired him to omit nothing. In order to this examination, Origen states the objections of Celsus in his own words: and, that nothing might escape him, he takes them in the order in which Celsus had placed them. Celsus, then, as it happens, is safe; and the considerer needs not to lament over him any more.’

The fragments of the work of Celsus are, undoubtedly, of great importance. I have endeavoured to do justice to them, not only by my own large extracts, but likewise by these observations and summaries of three learned men: hoping, that thereby my defects may be supplied, and that some things may be better expressed by them than they have been by me.

---

## C H A P. XIX.

### LUCIAN, OF SAMOSATA.

- I. *His time, and works.* II. *A passage from him concerning Peregrius in which is a copious testimony to the Christians of that time, with remarks.* III. *His account of Alexander, who set up an oracle in Paphlagonia, with remarks.* IV. *Passages from his True History.* V. *Extracts from the Dialogue, called Philopatris, ascribed to him, with remarks.*

I. LUCIAN<sup>a</sup> was a native of Samosata in Syria. According to Suidas<sup>b</sup> he flourished in the time of Trajan, and afterwards; but<sup>c</sup> that is placing him too early. It is more probable, that<sup>d</sup> he

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. iv. c. 16. T. iii. p. 485. &c. et Lux. Evangel. p. 152. Tillem. L'Emp. M. Aurele, art. 20.

<sup>b</sup> V. Λεξικωνος. <sup>c</sup> Voss. de Hist. Gr. l. ii. cap. 15. et Tillem. ubi supra.

<sup>d</sup> I have taken some pains to adjust the age of Lucian. And from some notes of time, which are preserved in his works,

‘ I have fixed the 40th year of his age to the 164th year of Christ, the fourth of M. Antoninus: and consequently his birth to the 124th year of Christ, and the eighth of Adrian.’ Moyle’s Works, Vol. ii. p. 363. Diss. upon the age of the Philopatris.

was born under Adrian: and he may be more properly said to have flourished in the reigns of Antoninus the pious, and M. Antoninus the philosopher; which last he survived, as appears from his Pseudomantis, where<sup>e</sup> he speaks of that emperor as already deified.

Some have supposed, that in the latter part of his life Lucian was governor of Egypt: on the other hand, divers learned men<sup>f</sup> have shewn, that he was only register of Alexandria. However, he speaks of that post, <sup>g</sup> as both honourable and profitable, and a step to higher preferment, no less than the government of a province. Some have spoken of Lucian, as an apostate from Christianity: but<sup>h</sup> there is no sufficient reason to believe, that ever he was a Christian.

Lucian is placed by Cave<sup>i</sup> at the year 176: and I shall place him there likewise; which is some while after writing his Peregrinus, and several years before publishing his Pseudomantis, another work to be quoted hereafter.

II. The work to be first quoted by me is a Letter to Cronius, concerning the death of Peregrinus, called also Proteus: who publickly burnt himself in the sight of all Greece, soon after the Olympic games were over in the year of our Lord<sup>k</sup> 165, or as others say<sup>l</sup> in the year 169: not long after which this history of him was written by Lucian.

Peregrinus, according to Lucian's character of him, was a person who rambled from place to place, and from one sect of philosophy to another. Having been guilty of parricide, and other crimes, as our author says, he was obliged, for a while, to leave his native country, and travel abroad. 'At<sup>m</sup> which time,' as Lucian says, 'he learned the wonderful doctrine of the Christians, by conversing with their priests and scribes near Palestine:

<sup>e</sup> . . . οἱ θεοὶ Μάρκος ἤδη τοὺς Μαρκομα-  
νοις καὶ Κηάδοις συνεπλεκεῖτο. Pseud. p.  
775. Vol. i.

<sup>f</sup> See Moyle, as  
before, Vol. i. p. 298. et Valesii Annot.  
in Euseb. H. E. l. vii. cap. 11. p. 147.  
<sup>g</sup> Annot. in Marcellin. l. xxviii. cap. i.  
And Tillem. as before quoted, calls him  
Greffier du Prefet. d'Egypte.

<sup>h</sup> Apol. pro mercede conduct. T. i. p.  
491, 492.

<sup>i</sup> Luciani Samosatensis  
clarum inter sophistas nomen est quem fidei  
Christianæ fuisse desertorem, misereque,  
periisse, quippe discerptum a canibus, e  
Suida nonnulli tradiderunt, sed sine suffra-  
gio eruditorum. Tob. Eckhard. Non  
Christian. Testimon. cap. vi. § 9. p. 158.

<sup>j</sup> Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 96.

<sup>k</sup> Vid.

Pagi ann. 165. n. 3. Basnag. ann. 165. iv.  
Cleric. ann. 165. vi.

Bib. Gr. T. iii. p. 500.

<sup>l</sup> Fabric.

<sup>m</sup> Ολιμπια

καὶ τὴν θάυμασθην σοφίαν τῶν Χριστιανῶν  
ἐξεμάθει, περὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην τοῖς ἱερέσιν,  
καὶ γραμματέουσιν αὐτῶν συγγενομένος. Καί  
τι γὰρ; ἐν βραχεὶ παιδάς αὐτὸς ἀπειρητὴς  
προφητικῆς, καὶ διασαρχικῆς, καὶ ξυναλίσει,  
καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὤν. Καὶ τῶν βιβλίων  
ταῦτα μὲν ἐξησεῖτο, καὶ διεσαφεί· πολλὰς δὲ  
αὐτὸς καὶ ξυνεγραφε· καὶ ὡς θεὸς αὐτὸν ἐκεί-  
νοι ἐδίησαν, καὶ τομολογίᾳ ἐχρῶντο, καὶ  
προσάλλῃ ἐπεσφραγοῦ. Τὸν μέγαν γὰρ ἐκεῖ  
εἰς σέβασιν ἀθροῦτον, τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ  
ἀνασκολοπισθέντα, οἱ καὶ τὴν ταύτην τέλει  
εἰσέλαβον ἐς τοῦ βίου. De Morte Peregrin.  
T. i. p. 565. &c. edit. Græv. Amst. 1687.

and in a short time he shewed, they were but children to him ;  
 for he was prophet, high-priest, ruler of a synagogue, uniting  
 all offices in himself alone. Some books he interpreted and  
 explained, others he wrote : and they spake of him as a god,  
 and took him for a lawgiver, and honoured him with the title  
 of master ††. They therefore still worship that great man who  
 was crucified in Palestine, because he introduced into the world  
 this new religion. For this reason Proteus was taken up, and  
 put into prison : which very thing was of no small service to  
 him afterwards, for giving reputation to his impostures, and  
 gratifying his vanity. The Christians were much grieved for  
 his imprisonment, and tried all ways to procure his liberty. Not  
 being able to effect that, they did him all sorts of kind offices,  
 and that not in a careless manner, but with the greatest assiduity :  
 for even betimes in the morning there would be at the prison  
 old women, some widows, and also little orphan children : and  
 some of the chief of their men, by corrupting the keepers,  
 would get into prison, and stay the whole night there with him :  
 there they had a good supper together, and their sacred dis-  
 courses. And this excellent Peregrinus (for so he was still  
 called) was thought by them to be an extraordinary person, no  
 less than another Socrates : even from the cities of Asia some  
 Christians came to him by an order of the body, to relieve,  
 encourage, and comfort him. For it is incredible, what  
 expedition they use, when any of their friends are known to be  
 in trouble. In a word, they spare nothing upon such an occa-  
 sion ; and Peregrinus's chain brought him in a good sum of  
 money from them : for these miserable men have no doubt but  
 they shall be immortal, and live for ever : therefore they con-  
 temn death, and many surrender themselves to sufferings. More-  
 over<sup>n</sup> their first lawgiver has taught them, that they are all  
 brethren, when once they have turned, and renounced the gods  
 of the Greeks, and worship that master of theirs who was cru-  
 cified, and engage to live according to his laws. They have  
 also a sovereign contempt for all the things of this world, and  
 look upon them as common, and trust one another with them

†† I have rendered that paragraph as it  
 stands in Lucian ; but those titles seem not  
 to belong to Peregrinus : and it may be sus-  
 pected, that somewhat is wanting hereabout.  
 Tanaquil Faber, in his notes upon this  
 place, conjectures, that there were here  
 some expressions injurious to our Saviour,  
 which a Christian copyist, more pious than  
 wise, left out. However, of that we can-  
 not be certain. Perhaps, the place is ge-

nuine, and pure, as written by Lucian :  
 but then, here are inaccuracies, owing to  
 ignorance and mistake, or to design and ma-  
 lice. The Christians did not speak of Pe-  
 regrinus in those high terms : but Lucian,  
 as it seems, magnifies the respect which the  
 Christians shewed to Peregrinus, the more  
 to expose them to ridicule. See Fabric.  
*Lux Evangelii.* p. 152. <sup>n</sup> *Ἐπειτα*  
*δε ὁ νεμεσιβίης ὁ πρῶτος. κ. λ. p. 567.*

without any particular security: for which reason any subtil fellow, by good management, may impose upon this simple people, and grow rich among them. But Peregrinus was set at liberty by the governor of Syria, who was a favourer of philosophy: who perceiving his madness, and that he had a mind to die, in order to get a name, let him out, not judging him so much as worthy of punishment.' 'Then,' as our author says, 'Peregrinus returned to his native place Parium, in hopes of recovering his father's estate: but meeting with difficulties, he made over to the Parians all the estate he might expect from his father; who then extolled him as the greatest of philosophers, a lover of his country, and another Diogenes, or Crates.' He then went abroad again, well supplied by the Christians with all travelling charges, by whom also he was accompanied: and he lived in great plenty. Thus it went with him for some while. At length they parted, having given them also some offence, by eating, as I suppose, some things not allowed of by them.'

I now make remarks upon this passage.

1. Peregrinus is mentioned by many authors: but I do not recollect any remaining writer, either heathen or Christian, beside Lucian, who has said any thing of his Christianity.

His death is mentioned by Tertullian, and by Athenagoras, who likewise says he had a statue erected to him at Parium, his native place, situated in Mysia, not far from Lampfacus, which was supposed to give out oracles.

Several heathen authors mention him, and speak honourably of him. Aulus Gellius saw him at Athens, and was acquainted with him: he calls him a famous philosopher, commends him, and ascribes to him some good maxims; but he says nothing of his death. Probably Peregrinus, called also Proteus, was still living when he wrote.

Ammianus Marcellinus mentions his death, and calls him an illustrious philosopher.

ο . . . ἡρθη γὰρ τι, ὡς οἶμαι, ἐσθίωντων ἀπορρήτων ἀύλοις: p. 570.

p Minus fecerunt philosophi, Heraclitus, qui se bubulo stercore oblitum exussit, item Empedocles, qui in ignes Aetnaei montis dissiluit: et Peregrinus, qui non olim se rogo immisit. Tertull. ad Mart. cap. 4. p. 157.

Ἡ Καὶ ὁ τῆς Περσίως (τῆσαν δ' ἡκ' ἀστροειτε ἔριψαντα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πύργον περὶ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν) ὁ μὲν καὶ υἱὸς λεβηταὶ χρηματίζεν. Athenag. p. 30. Par. § 26. p. 304. Bened.

Philosophum nomine Peregrinum, cui postea cognomentum Proteus factum est,

virum gravem, atque constantem vidimus, quum Athenis essemus, diversantem in quodam tugurio extra urbem. Quumque ad eum frequenter ventitaremus, multa hercle dicere eum utiliter, et honeste audivimus, &c. Noct. Att. l. xii. cap. 11. Vid. et l. viii. cap. 3.

Peregrinum illum imitatus Protea cognomine, philosophum clarum: qui cum mundo digredi statisset, Olympiæ quinquenniali certamine, sub Græciæ conspectu totius, adscensu rogo, quem ipse construxit, flammis absumtus est. Amm. l. xxix. cap. 1.

Philostratus,

Philostratus<sup>3</sup>, who also mentions his death, calls him a cynic: and that he maintained that character, appears also from Lucian, who, in the account of his death, often<sup>4</sup> rallies him as a celebrated cynic. And when Lucian ridiculed his vanity, he was<sup>5</sup> like to be torn to pieces by the cynics, who also were spectators of that transaction.

Peregrinus<sup>6</sup> was an old man when he threw himself into the flames in the year 165, or 169. I apprehend, that the time of his Christianity was the early part of his life; and that his imprisonment upon that account, must<sup>7</sup> have been in the time of Trajan, or Adrian at the latest. He was best known by the name of Proteus: but, as Lucian says, whilst he was with the Christians he was called Peregrinus. And it is manifest from all the remaining writers who mention him, that he sustained the character of a philosopher and a cynic. It is probable therefore, that in the greatest, and the latest part of his life, he was a mere heathen philosopher: and it is reasonable, that a man's denomination should be taken from that part of his life which was best known. Lucian himself allows, that after having been some while among the Christians, he and they parted.

2. Having observed all these things relating to the history of Peregrinus, I proceed to some other remarks.

Here is an authentic testimony to some of the main facts and principles of Christianity from a man of free sentiments, not long after the middle of the second century, who knew the world, and was well acquainted with mankind: That the founder of the Christian religion was crucified in Palestine: That he was the great master of the Christians, and the first author of the principles received by them: That those men, called Christians, had peculiarly strong hopes of immortal life, and a great contempt for this world and its enjoyments: That they courageously endured many afflictions upon account of their principles, and sometimes surrendered themselves to sufferings. Honesty and probity prevailed so much among them, that they trusted each other without security. Their master had earnestly recommended to all his followers mutual love; by which also they were much distinguished. And their assiduity in relieving and comforting one

<sup>3</sup> . . . και τα προς τον κυνα Πρωτεια λεχθησιν, ποτε υπ' αυτου Αθηνησιν. Phil. de Vita Sophistar. l. ii. n. 1. § 13. p. 563.

<sup>4</sup> Αλλ' οποιαν Πρωτευσ Κυνικων οχ' αριστος απαντω. . . .

Αλλ' οποιαν Κυνικος πολυμυτομος ες φλοσα πολλην. κ. λ. De Morte Peregr. p. 579.

<sup>5</sup> Αλλ' ολιγυ δειν, υπο των κυνικων ελωσοι δισσπασθην. Ib. p. 560.

<sup>6</sup> . . . σοι εθαυμαζον την απονοιαν τυ γεροντος. Ibid. p. 560.

<sup>7</sup> See Tillem. Persecution sous Trajan. art. vii. M. E. T. ii. and M. Aurelc. art. 29. H. E. T. ii.

another,

another, when under affliction, was known to all men: nor is it, I presume, any disparagement to them that they were imposed upon by Peregrinus, who was admired by many others; and, perhaps, was not so bad a man as Lucian insinuates.

Another thing may be observed, that from his manner of speaking it may be well argued, that Lucian did not know the reason why Peregrinus and the Christians parted.

I think it ought also to be observed, that Lucian, carrying on his drollery, misrepresents and aggravates several things. It was before<sup>z</sup> hinted, that the Christians did not consider Peregrinus as a god. There are divers other loose and inaccurate expressions. He says afterwards, that the Christians looked upon Peregrinus as ‘another Socrates:’ but that is a way of thinking ascribed to them without reason: many of them might think charitably and honourably of Socrates; but every Christian was superior to him. So likewise when Lucian says, that ‘Peregrinus was prophet, high-priest, and ruler of a synagogue, uniting all offices in himself,’ he speaks inaccurately; thus joining together Judaism and Christianity. And as Lucian indulged himself in a loose and improper manner of speaking, I cannot but think it to be a groundless deduction which some have made from these expressions, that Peregrinus had been constituted a bishop among the Christians.

I proceed.

III. Lucian’s Alexander, or Pseudomantis, as before hinted, was not written before the year 180, in the reign of Commodus; forasmuch as here he gives Marcus Antoninus the title of god, or deified. It is a<sup>z</sup> Letter to Celsus, the Epicurean philosopher, containing the history of an impostor, named Alexander, who in the time of the forementioned Antoninus gave out oracles in Paphlagonia, and had vast success in his design: his oracle having been in great repute for some while in that, and neighbouring countries, and even at Rome itself.

‘But,’ says Lucian, ‘when some, who had more wit than others, awaking as out of a drunken fit, that had robbed them of all their senses, made head against him, chiefly men of the Epicurean sect, and the secret arts of his contrivance began to be discerned in several places; he struck a kind of terror among them, saying, “that<sup>b</sup> Pontus was full of atheists and Christians, who had the assurance to raise slanderous stories against him.” And he excited the people not to spare them, but to drive them away with stones, if they would not lose the favour of the god’

<sup>z</sup> See before note † p. 71.

<sup>z</sup> Lucian. Vol. i. p. 746. &c.

<sup>b</sup> . . . εκφερει φεβησειν τι επι αυτου, λε-

γων, αθεων εμπισπλησθαι, και Χριστιανων τον Ποντον\* οτι περι αυτου πολλωσι σα κακια βλασφημειν. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 762, 763.

[Æsculapius.]

[Æsculapius.] . . . ‘ He<sup>e</sup> also appointed rites of initiation, like  
 ‘ those at Athens, and a holy feast of three days continuance;  
 ‘ and on<sup>d</sup> the first day of the solemnity proclamation was made  
 ‘ as at Athens: “ If any atheist, or Christian, or Epicurean, be  
 ‘ come hither, as a spy upon these mysteries, let him depart  
 ‘ with all speed. And a happy initiation to those who believe in  
 ‘ God.” Then they thrust the people away, he going before,  
 ‘ and saying: “ Away with the Christians.” Then the multitude  
 ‘ cried out again: “ Away with the Epicureans.”’

It is honourable to the Christians to be here mentioned with  
 Epicureans by a favourer of the Epicurean sentiments. It evi-  
 dently appears hence, that the followers of Jesus were now well  
 known in the world by the name of Christians; and that they  
 were then numerous in Pontus, and Paphlagonia; and the neigh-  
 bouring countries: and finally, that they were formidable to  
 cheats and impostors.

IV. I shall now cite a passage taken from the second book of  
 what our author calls True History, but is indeed all fiction, as  
 is acknowledged by himself at the beginning of the first book.

‘ He and his companions having travelled a great way<sup>e</sup>, came  
 ‘ to the Island of the Blessed, where Rhadamanthus of Crete  
 ‘ reigned. Soon after they came ashore, they were taken into  
 ‘ custody<sup>f</sup>, and were bound with roses, there being no other  
 ‘ chains in that country: which too fell off of themselves, when  
 ‘ they were set at liberty. ‘ There were then several causes to  
 ‘ be tried before the king of the country: theirs was the fourth  
 ‘ in order. When their cause came on, they were asked, how  
 ‘ they came to be there, when they were yet living? When they  
 ‘ had related their voyage, they were ordered to withdraw. The  
 ‘ judge, having consulted with his accessors and counsellors, de-  
 ‘ termined, that after death they should be punished for their cu-  
 ‘ riosity and presumption: for the present they might converse  
 ‘ with the heroes of the country; but the term of their sojourning  
 ‘ there might not exceed seven months. Then they were con-  
 ‘ ducted into the city, which is all gold, surrounded by a wall of  
 ‘ emerald, Rev. xx. There are seven gates made of the wood of  
 ‘ cinnamon; the pavement of the city, and the ground within  
 ‘ the wall, is ivory; the temples of all the gods are built of the

<sup>e</sup> Ib. p. 770.

<sup>d</sup> Και εν μεν τη  
 πρωτη, προορρησις ην ωσπερ Αθηνησι, τοιαυτη.  
 Ει τις αθεος, η Χριστιανος, η Επικουρειος, ηκει  
 κατασκοπος των ορσιων, φεισειτω. . . . Και ο  
 μει ησειλο λεγων· Εξω Χριστιανους. Το δε  
 πληθος απαν επιθεσειγυλο· Εξω Επικουρειους.  
 γ. λ. Ibid. p. 770.

καθ’ οδον ακηκοσαμεν, ως η μεν ηθσος ειη των  
 μακαρων προσασορευομελων· αρχοι δε ο Κρης  
 Ραδαμανθυς. Ver. Hist. l. ii. T. i. p. 670.  
 ε . . . ελυσιχανομεν τοις φρηροις, και περι-  
 πολοις. Οι δε δεσαιντες ημας εοδινουις γεφα-  
 νοις . . . αιησαν ως τον αρχοντα. Ibid. p. 671.

<sup>f</sup> Παρ’ ων δη

' beryl-stone; the altars in them are very large, consisting of one  
 ' stone only, which is the amethyst, upon which they offer he-  
 ' catombs. Round the city flows a river of the finest oil, the  
 ' breadth of which is an hundred royal cubits, the depth such as  
 ' is most convenient for swimming in. Their baths are large  
 ' houses of glass, kept warm with fires made of cinnamon; in-  
 ' stead of water they have warm dew in basons: their dress is  
 ' purple, made of the finest spiders webs. None grow old here;  
 ' but they remain as they were when they arrived. They have  
 ' no night, nor altogether bright day; but such light as precedes  
 ' the rising of the sun: nor have they more than one season of  
 ' the year; for it is always spring, and the west is the only wind.  
 ' The country abounds with all sorts of flowers and plants, which  
 ' are always flourishing: their vines bear twelve times in the  
 ' year, yielding fruit every month, Rev. xxii. 2. Apples and  
 ' pomegranates, as they say, bear thirteen times in the year,  
 ' yielding fruit twice in the month, called by them *Minous*. In-  
 ' stead of corn the stalks have ready-prepared loaves at their tops  
 ' like mushrooms. There are in the city three hundred and  
 ' sixty-five fountains of water, and as many of honey, and five  
 ' hundred fountains of oil, but less; seven rivers of milk, and  
 ' eight of wine.'

More follows, containing a description of the groves and fields  
 round about the city: but I am not disposed to transcribe any  
 more. They who please may consider, whether here are any al-  
 lusions to the xxi. and xxii. chapters of the book of the Revela-  
 tion. Lucian's description of this island, and the chief city of  
 it, falls so far short of St. John's description of his New Jerusalem,  
 that some may think, he could not have so fine a model before  
 him. However, let all judge as they see fit.

V. With Lucian's works is joined<sup>i</sup> a dialogue, called Philo-  
 patris. Bishop Bull<sup>k</sup>, and some others<sup>l</sup>, have been inclined to  
 think it Lucian's, or however written about his time, in the reign  
 of Marcus Antoninus: many others are persuaded, that it is not  
 his, nor written in that reign. But there is a great diversity of  
 opinion among these concerning the true age of it.

Mr. Moyle<sup>m</sup> thinks it was written in the time of Dioclesian,  
 in the year of Christ 302, and 23 years before the council of

ε . . . ε μην υδε νυξ παρ' αυτοις γινεσθαι  
 υδ' ημερα πανυ λαμπρα. p. 672.

<sup>h</sup> Αι μεν γαρ αμπελοι δωδεκαφοροι εισι,  
 και κατ'α μην'α εκασον καρποφορησι. Ib.

<sup>i</sup> Tom. ii. p. 763 &c. Græv.

<sup>k</sup> Def. Fidei Nicen. sect. 2. cap. 4. p.

69. al. 73.

<sup>l</sup> Et Philopatris, si ejus  
 sit, saltem scriptoris coævi. Cav. H. L.  
 p. 96. Vid. et Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. iii.  
 p. 504. et Lux Evangelii. p. 153.

<sup>m</sup> See his Dissertation upon the age of  
 the Philopatris. Lett. i. Vol. i. p. 292.

Nice. Dodwell<sup>n</sup> varied in his opinion, and in the end placed it in the year of Christ 261, and the eighth of Gallienus. Others<sup>o</sup> have argued for the third of Aurelian, the year of Christ 272. And Gesner<sup>p</sup> is of opinion, that it was written in the time of the emperor Julian, after the middle of the fourth century. None of these learned men think the Philopatris to be a work of Lucian.

I am not able to determine the time when it was written; nor do I think it needful to be much concerned about it. I do not think it to be Lucian's; the style is very different from his, and vastly inferior to it. Some other reasons may offer by and by in our observations upon it: but, as the writer was a heathen, and it is joined with the other works of Lucian, I speak of it in this place.

Says Mr. Moyle: 'It<sup>r</sup> is a Dialogue between Critias and Triephton: the first a professed heathen, the other an Epicurean, personating a Christian. The design of it is, partly to represent Christians as a sect of men disaffected to government, and dangerous to civil society: partly to expose their opinions, as the Trinity, the creation of the world, with several other articles of our faith.'

'Triephton meets Critias, who by his countenance appears greatly indisposed: and being asked the reason, Critias tells him, he<sup>r</sup> had been where he had heard a strange discourse; and<sup>s</sup> that the things which he had heard that day, from those execrable sophists, had most surprizingly affected him. Afterwards, he offers to swear by Jupiter, and Apollo, and other deities, which oaths Triephton rejects. By whom then shall I swear, says Critias. Triephton answers: 'By<sup>t</sup> the most High God, great, immortal, celestial, Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one out of three, and three out of one. These do you think to be Jupiter, him do you esteem to be God. Crit. You teach me numbers: that is an arithmetical oath. . . . I do not know what you mean. One three, three one. Trieph. Hold your peace: you are not to measure the steps of fleas. I will teach you what the universe is, who was before all things, and what is the system of the universe: for it is but the other

<sup>n</sup> See in the same Dissertation. p. 302. 314. 348, 349.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Heuman.

<sup>p</sup> Pæcile, sive Epistolæ Miscellanæ. Tom. i. p. 438. &c.

<sup>r</sup> J. M. Gesneri Diff.

<sup>s</sup> de ætate et auctore Philop. Ad calcem Tom. iii. Lucian. Opp. Amst. 1743.

<sup>t</sup> As before, p. 285, 286.

<sup>u</sup> Ω τριεφτων, μεσαν τρια, και ηπορτημενον λεγει ακηκωα. Philop. Lucian. T. ii. p.

764.

<sup>v</sup> Α γαρ ακηκωα τημερον παρα των τρισκαλαρατων κεινων σοφιστων, μεγαλωσ εξωκωσε με την ηηδυν. p. 765.

<sup>w</sup> Και τινα επωμοσωμαι γε. . . . Τρι. Υψιμεθειλα Θεον, μεσαν, αμβροστον, υρανωσα υιον πατροσ, πνευμα εκ πατροσ εκπορευομενον, εν εκ τριων, και εξ ενοσ τρια. Ταυτα νομιζει ζηνα, του δ' ηση Θεον. p. 770. in.

' beryl-stone; the altars in them are very large, consisting of one  
 ' stone only, which is the amethyst, upon which they offer he-  
 ' catombs. Round the city flows a river of the finest oil, the  
 ' breadth of which is an hundred royal cubits, the depth such as  
 ' is most convenient for swimming in. Their baths are large  
 ' houses of glass, kept warm with fires made of cinnamon; in-  
 ' stead of water they have warm dew in basons: their dress is  
 ' purple, made of the finest spiders webs. None grow old here;  
 ' but they remain as they were when they arrived. They have  
 ' no night, nor altogether bright day; but such light as precedes  
 ' the rising of the sun: nor have they more than one season of  
 ' the year; for it is always spring, and the west is the only wind.  
 ' The country abounds with all sorts of flowers and plants, which  
 ' are always flourishing: their vines bear twelve times in the  
 ' year, yielding fruit every month, Rev. xxii. 2. Apples and  
 ' pomegranates, as they say, bear thirteen times in the year,  
 ' yielding fruit twice in the month, called by them *Minous*. In-  
 ' stead of corn the stalks have ready-prepared loaves at their tops  
 ' like mushrooms. There are in the city three hundred and  
 ' sixty-five fountains of water, and as many of honey, and five  
 ' hundred fountains of oil, but less; seven rivers of milk, and  
 ' eight of wine.'

More follows, containing a description of the groves and fields  
 round about the city: but I am not disposed to transcribe any  
 more. They who please may consider, whether here are any al-  
 lusions to the xxi. and xxii. chapters of the book of the Revela-  
 tion. Lucian's description of this island, and the chief city of  
 it, falls so far short of St. John's description of his New Jerusalem,  
 that some may think, he could not have so fine a model before  
 him. However, let all judge as they see fit.

V. With Lucian's works is joined<sup>i</sup> a dialogue, called Philo-  
 patris. Bishop Bull<sup>k</sup>, and some others<sup>l</sup>, have been inclined to  
 think it Lucian's, or however written about his time, in the reign  
 of Marcus Antoninus: many others are persuaded, that it is not  
 his, nor written in that reign. But there is a great diversity of  
 opinion among these concerning the true age of it.

Mr. Moyle<sup>m</sup> thinks it was written in the time of Dioclesian,  
 in the year of Christ 302, and 23 years before the council of

<sup>ε</sup> . . . ε μην υδε νυξ παρ' αυλοις γινεσθαι  
 υδ' ημερα πανυ λαμπρα. p. 672.

<sup>δ</sup> Αι μεν γαρ αμπελοι δωδεκαφοροι εισι,  
 και καλα μηνα εκασον καρποφορμει. Ib.

<sup>i</sup> Tom. ii. p. 763 &c. Græv.

<sup>k</sup> Def. Fidei Nicen. sect. 2. cap. 4. p.

69. al. 73.

<sup>l</sup> Et Philopatris, si ejus  
 sit, saltem scriptoris coævi. Cav. H. L.  
 p. 96. Vid. et Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. iii.  
 p. 504. et Lux Evangelii. p. 153.

<sup>m</sup> See his Dissertation upon the age of  
 the Philopatris. Lett. i. Vol. i. p. 292.

Nice. Dodwell<sup>n</sup> varied in his opinion, and in the end placed it in the year of Christ 261, and the eighth of Gallienus. Others<sup>o</sup> have argued for the third of Aurelian, the year of Christ 272. And Gesner<sup>p</sup> is of opinion, that it was written in the time of the emperor Julian, after the middle of the fourth century. None of these learned men think the Philopatri to be a work of Lucian.

I am not able to determine the time when it was written; nor do I think it needful to be much concerned about it. I do not think it to be Lucian's; the style is very different from his, and vastly inferior to it. Some other reasons may offer by and by in our observations upon it: but, as the writer was a heathen, and it is joined with the other works of Lucian, I speak of it in this place.

Says Mr. Moyle: 'It<sup>r</sup> is a Dialogue between Critias and Triephton: the first a professed heathen, the other an Epicurean, personating a Christian. The design of it is, partly to represent Christians as a sect of men disaffected to government, and dangerous to civil society: partly to expose their opinions, as the Trinity, the creation of the world, with several other articles of our faith.'

'Triephton meets Critias, who by his countenance appears greatly indisposed: and being asked the reason, Critias tells him, he<sup>s</sup> had been where he had heard a strange discourse; and<sup>t</sup> that the things which he had heard that day, from those execrable sophists, had most surprizingly affected him. Afterwards, he offers to swear by Jupiter, and Apollo, and other deities, which oaths Triephton rejects. By whom then shall I swear, says Critias. Triephton answers: 'By<sup>v</sup> the most High God, great, immortal, celestial, Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one out of three, and three out of one. These do you think to be Jupiter, him do you esteem to be God. Crit. You teach me numbers: that is an arithmetical oath. . . . I do not know what you mean. One three, three one. Trieph. Hold your peace: you are not to measure the steps of fleas. I will teach you what the universe is, who was before all things, and what is the system of the universe: for it is but the other

<sup>n</sup> See in the same Dissertation. p. 302. 314. 348, 349. <sup>o</sup> Vid. Heuman. Pacile, sive Epistolæ Miscellanæ. Tom. i. p. 438. &c. <sup>p</sup> J. M. Gesneri Diss. de ætate et auctore Philop. Ad calcem Tom. iii. Lucian. Opp. Amst. 1743. <sup>r</sup> As before, p. 285, 286. <sup>s</sup> Ω τριεφτων, μεσαν τινα, και ηπορημενον λεγει ακηκοα. Philop. Lucian. T. ii. p.

764. <sup>t</sup> Α γαρ ακηκοα τημερον παρ των τρισκαλαρατων εκεινων σοφιστων, μεγαλωσ εξωκωσε με την εκδον. p. 765. <sup>v</sup> Και τινα επωμοσωμαι γε. . . . Τρι. Υψιμεδωιλα Θεου, μεσαι, αμβροσιον, κρατωια υιον πατροσ, πνευμα εκ πατροσ εκπορευομενον, εν εκ τριων, και εξ ενοσ τρια. Ταυτια νομιζε ζηνα, του θ' ηση Θεου. p. 770. in.

' day

day that I was as ignorant as yourself. But when the Galilean, half-bald, long nosed, who travelled through the air to the third heaven, and there learned the most extraordinary things, came to me, he renewed us by water, he introduced us into the regions of the blessed, and redeemed us from the regions of the wicked. And if you will hearken to me, I will make you likewise a man indeed. . . . Soon after this Triephton tells Critias of the creation, and other things in a ludicrous way. By a word, he dispelled the darkness, as the slow-tongued writer assures us, and founded the earth upon the waters. He stretched out the heavens, formed the fixed stars, and ordered the course of things, which you worship for gods. The earth he adorned with flowers: man<sup>a</sup> he brought out of things that were not: and he is in heaven, beholding the just and the unjust, and writes in books the actions of all, and will accordingly render to all in the day that he has appointed. After other things, Critias says: Wherefore<sup>z</sup> Triephton, I entreat you to say nothing more of the fates, though with your master you should be taken up, and admitted to unspeakable mysteries. Afterwards Triephton says: Do not you see, how inaccurate, and ambiguous and uncertain, all the sayings of the poets are. Wherefore lay aside all those things, that<sup>y</sup> you may be enrolled in the celestial books of the righteous. Crit. But tell me, Triephton, are the affairs of the Scythians also registered in heaven? Trieph. All<sup>x</sup>. For Chrestus has been among the nations. [Or, as others understand this place: Yes<sup>a</sup>, all, provided there is any good man among the nations.] Crit. There must be a multitude of scribes in heaven, according to your account. Trieph. I<sup>b</sup> pray, forbear your jests, and say nothing contemptuous of the dextrous God; but become a catechumen, and be persuaded by me, if you have a mind to live for ever. Since he has stretched out the heavens like a curtain, and founded the earth upon water, and produced man out of nothing, what is there wonderful in his registering the actions of all men? Afterwards Triephton

εε Ηνικα δε μοι Γαλιλαιος ενδουχεν, αναφαλαγγιας, επιρρινης, ες τριον υρανον αεροβατησας, και τα καλλιστα εκμεμαθηκως, δι υδατος ημας ανακαινισεν, ες τα των μακαρων ιχνια παρεισωδευσε. . . . κ. λ. p. 770.

<sup>a</sup> Ανθρωπον εκ μη οντων ες το ειναι παρηλαξε και εστι εν υρανω, βλεπων δικαιως τε καδικως, και εν βιβλοις τας πραξεις απογραφομενος. Αναποδωσει δε πασιν, ην ημεραν αυτος ενεικαλο. p. 771.

<sup>z</sup> Ωσει, ων Τριεφων, δια τελο μηδεν προσθεναι περι των μοιρων εθελησης, ει και ταχα

πεδαρσιος ελεγοεις μελα τη διδασκαλη, και τα απορρητα εμυθηθη. p. 772.

<sup>y</sup> . . . ως και σε εν ταις επερανιοις βιβλοις των ασαθων απογραψωλαι. p. 773.

<sup>x</sup> Παινα, ει τυχοι γε χρηστος και εν εβνισι. Ibid.

<sup>a</sup> Et omnes quidem, si modo bonum aliquem esse inter gentes contingat. Conf. J. M. Gesneri Diss. de auctore et ætate Philop. § 21. p. 717.

<sup>b</sup> Ευσομαι, και μηδεν επιης φλαυρον Οιν δεξιη. p. 773.

desires Critias<sup>c</sup> to give him an account of what he had heard  
 in the assembly of the Christians, and which had so discom-  
 posed him. Critias answers: By<sup>d</sup> the Son out of the Father;  
 it shall never be done. Trieph. Do, tell me, receiving from  
 the Spirit the power of speech. Critias at length tells him,  
 what a beggarly, sorrowful company of people he had met  
 with: insinuates their disaffection to the government, and that  
 they wished for bad news, and delighted in public calamities.  
 Some<sup>e</sup> of them spoke of their fasting ten whole days without  
 eating . . . and of spending whole nights in singing hymns.  
 Triephon<sup>f</sup> then bids him to have done with those stories, and  
 begin with the prayer from the Father, adding at the end the  
 hymn with many names. They conclude: But<sup>ff</sup> let us find  
 out the unknown God at Athens, and stretching out our hands  
 to heaven, offer to him our praises and thanksgivings, that we  
 are worthy to live under so great an empire, and leave others to  
 trifle as they please.

It is now time to make remarks upon this dialogue.

1. There is a general observation very obvious to be made here: That<sup>b</sup> the writer of this dialogue appears much better acquainted with the affairs of the Christians; and their sacred scriptures, than Lucian.

2. We may hence perceive, that the Christians and their principles were in old times ridiculed by their ancient adversaries. It is therefore a mistake of those moderns, who have imagined, that the old heathens neglected this method of opposing Christianity. Nor is this the only instance of the kind which we have met with: Lucian's writings before rehearsed in this chapter are another instance; and, unquestionably, some such writings have been lost, the Christians of later times not thinking them fit, or worthy to be preserved.

3. We see how poorly some men reasoned who opposed Christianity, and still continued to be heathens. They ridiculed the most just and reasonable doctrines; such as<sup>c</sup> the creation of the world, a Divine Providence, or observance of the actions

<sup>c</sup> Ἀλλ' αἰεὶ δὴ το θαυμασιον εκεινο α-  
 κροταῖον αἰσος. p. 774.

<sup>d</sup> Νη τον υιον τον εκ πατρος, η τὸ το γ-  
 εννηαι. Τρι. Λεξε παρα τη πνευματος δυ-  
 ναμι τη λογι λαβων. p. 774.

<sup>e</sup> Ελεγον γαρ, ηλιος δεκα αστροι διαμι-  
 νουν και επι πανυχης υμνωδιας επα-  
 γρηπυλις ονειρωτομεν τα τοιαυτα. p. 778.

<sup>f</sup> Ως εασον τειες, την ευχην απο πα-  
 τρος αρχαμενος, και την πολυωτυμον ωδη-  
 ης τιλος επιθεις. p. 779.

<sup>ff</sup> Ημεις

δε τον εν Αθηναις αλωστον εφευροντες, και  
 προσκυνησαιτες, χειρας εις θρανον εκλεικαλιες,  
 τειω ευχαρισησομεν, ως καλαξιωθεντες τοις  
 κραιβς υπηκοοι γενεσθαι. p. 780.

<sup>g</sup> Mihi vero causa esse nulla videtur, cur  
 Luciano non tribuatur, licet fateor in aliis  
 ejus scriptis non observari tantam Christiani-  
 ismi peritiam: quo argumento illum Lu-  
 ciano abjudicat Huetius. p. 61. Dem.  
 Evang. Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. iii. p. 504.

‘of men, in order to a future retribution.’ Whilst they rejected the Christian revelation, they rejected also, and endeavoured to expose and weaken those principles of religion, which reason alone, if attended to, and improved, might have taught them, with a good degree of evidence and certainty. And the like things may be found in old heathen authors, who<sup>k</sup> have spoken of Jupiter’s ‘registering things on his tablets, and consulting his ‘parchments,’ that all men, good and bad, may be recompensed in due time.

4. It is fit, that we should observe the notice which is taken in this work of Christian writings, and principles, and practices.

Here are references to the book of Genesis, and the Psalms, and the Acts of the apostles, and St. Paul’s epistles, and the Revelation, in which last is frequent mention made of *the book of life*, and writing mens names in it, and of books in which the actions of good and bad are recorded. As Rev. iii. 5. xiii. 8. xvii. 8. xx. 12. 15. xxi. 27. xxii. 19. The phrase, *the book of life*, is also in Philip. iv. 3. And in Heb. xii. 23, some are spoken of, as *written*, or enrolled, *in heaven*.

When Triephton says, that ‘the Galilean, half-bald, . . . who ‘travelled through the air, to the third heaven, and there learned ‘the most extraordinary things, came to me, he renewed us with ‘water:’ there is certainly a reference to 2 Cor. xii. 12. 1 . . . 4, and, possibly, to Tit. iii. 5. and Eph. v. 3, or some other like text. But it cannot be thence inferred, that the writer of this book was a disciple of Paul, or was baptized by him, or was contemporary with him. For, as Mr. Moyle<sup>l</sup> observes: ‘This ‘writer speaks of Christians, throughout his dialogue, as *αιθεριοι*, ‘*αιθεροβαλυντες*, *δαιμονιοι*, *αεροβαλυντες*, &c. that is, a company of ‘dreaming enthusiasts, who, like St. Paul, pretended to a power ‘of flying to heaven when they pleased.

In this dialogue is also a reference to the Lord’s Prayer, and, as often used by Christians. ‘Begin with the prayer from ‘the Father,’ says he, ‘adding at the end the hymn with ‘many names’ That the Lord’s prayer is here referred to, is<sup>m</sup> allowed by learned men: what is intended by the hymn at the

<sup>k</sup> Και παροιμια. Ο Ζευς καλειδε χρο-  
μιος εις τας διφθερας\* επι των ποτε αμειβομε-  
των υπερων πραττουσι καλων η κακων\* οτι  
εκ απρονοηια φασι τα παντα, αλλα τον  
Δια εις διφθερας τινας απογραφεισθαι, και  
ποτε επεξειναι. Suidas. V. Ζευς. Ubi  
Annotator. Huc spectat illud Euripidis  
apud Stobæum, &c. <sup>l</sup> As before,  
p. 287, 288.

<sup>m</sup> Per την ευχην απο

πατρος. p. 779. Orationem Dominican  
Lucianus intelligit, ut recte notatum Ri-  
galtio ad Tertullianum. Sed per πολυωνυ-  
μον ωδην superadditam non existimaverim  
notari clausulam, *quia tuum est regnum*, ut  
persuasum Jo. Gregorio. Fabric. Bib. Gr.  
T. iii. p. 504. Conf. annot. in loc. Phi-  
lop. T. iii. p. 616. ed. Amst. 1743.

end, is doubtful. Some have argued, that thereby is meant the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer in Matt. vi. 13. But to me, as well as to some<sup>n</sup> others, it seems more probable, that some other doxology, more verbose and intricate, is here intended.

There seems to be an allusion to *the gift of tongues*, or some other gift of the Spirit, with which Christians were favoured in the more early ages of the church, in those words: 'Do, tell me, receiving from the Spirit the power of speech.'

Here are also plain references to the Christian custom of initiating by baptism, and of preparing men for it by instruction, or catechizing. The author likewise ridicules the Christian fastings, and singing hymns in the night.

It might carry me too far to remark distinctly upon his ridicule of the doctrine of the Trinity, as represented by him, or as held by the Christians at the time of this author. None of my readers can omit to take notice of this, which comes over so often, and I should think, that this may afford a good argument against the supposition, that this dialogue was written by Lucian, or any other author about his time: for it does not appear, that in the reign of Marcus Antoninus there were any controversies among Christians upon this point. What is here said upon this subject, appears to be more suitable to the fourth century of the Christian epoch.

---

C H A P. XX.

ÆLIUS ARISTIDES THE SOPHIST, AND DION CHRYSOSTOM.

- I. *Aristides, his life, and time, and works.* II. *Select passages from him.*  
 III. *Passages concerning the Christians, and illustrating the books of the N. T.* IV. *His character and importance.* V. *The sophist Dion Chrysostom: His time, and works, and a passage concerning the Christians.*

I. 'ARISTIDES the sophist, says<sup>a</sup> Suidas, a native of Adriani a small town in Mysia, now belonging to Bithynia, was disciple

<sup>n</sup> 'Nay, we know, that in fact it had another doxology sometimes added to it, as we learn from the author of the Books concerning the Sacraments, among the works of Ambrose; [Lib. vi. ad fin.] who having recited the Lord's Prayer, as it is in St. Matthew's gospel, immediately adds: 'What follows? Hear what the priest says: "Through our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom to thee, with whom to

thee, is honour, praise, glory, majesty, power, with the Holy Spirit, from the beginning, now, and for ever. Amen." Of this sort of doxology I suppose the author of the Philopatris speaks. This kind of doxology is much more agreeable to other passages in that dialogue, than the plain one in St. Matthew.' Hallett's Notes and Discourses, Vol. i. p. 144, 145.

<sup>a</sup> V. ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ.

of Polemon the rhetorician of Smyrna, son of Eudaimon, a philosopher and priest of Jupiter in his own country. He also heard Herod at Athens, and Aristocles at Pergamus. He flourished in the time of the emperor Antoninus, and reached to the reign of Commodus: he published many orations; the number of them is not exactly known.

Philostratus confirms that account of Suidas, and farther says, That from his childhood Aristides had an infirm state of health: nevertheless he did not neglect labour. The people of Smyrna erected to him a brass statue, which they set up in their forum: and when they called him the founder of their city, it was no flattery, but a just and true commendation. For when their city had been overthrown, and almost destroyed by earthquakes, he so pathetically represented their calamities in a letter to the emperor, that he could not forbear weeping at some parts of it, and presently promised to restore it. And, as I have been informed by Damian of Ephesus, Aristides had before that had some conversation with Marcus in Ionia. That emperor came to Smyrna, and was there three days before Aristides came to pay his respects to him: the emperor did not then know Aristides personally: he asked of some present, whether Aristides was in the company? They said, they had not seen him. Afterwards they brought him. The emperor then said to him: How comes it to pass, that it is so long before I could see you? He answered, I was employed about a work: and the mind is not easily diverted from what it is engaged in. The emperor, pleased with his ingenuity, and his diligence, said, "And when shall I hear you? Appoint a time," says Aristides, "and you shall hear me, to-morrow, if you please. But I must desire, that my friends may be present, and that they may have leave to applaud, and clap their hands, with all their might." The emperor smiling told him, "that would depend upon himself."

I forbear to add the critical remarks upon Aristides's Orations, which follow in Philostratus.

There are in Photius large extracts out of several of them.

Suidas says, that Aristides flourished in the time of the emperor Antoninus, probably meaning the pious. Nevertheless, as he was also well acquainted with his successor, and is said to have reached to the time of Commodus, I place him at the year 176, in which, as it seems, he saw Marcus Antoninus at Smyrna.

b De Vit. Sophist. l. ii. cap. ix.  
C. 248. p. 1271.

c Cod. 246. p. 1211. C. 247. p. 1233

Though his constitution was infirm, it is supposed, that he did not die before he was 60 or 70 years of age \* \* \*.

II. It is allowed, that Aristides was very superstitious, a humble and devout worshipper of all the gods, especially Esculapius, to whom, as he believed, he was much indebted for the useful instructions which that god gave him, in his dreams, concerning his health.

I think it cannot be amiss to transcribe some passages containing a mixture of good sense and superstition, right sentiments, and absurd and foolish respect for all the deities which were then in repute.

‘ Jupiter <sup>d</sup> made all things: all things whatever are the works  
 ‘ of Jupiter, rivers, and the earth, and the sea, and the heaven:  
 ‘ and whatever things are between them, or are above, or under  
 ‘ them: and gods, and men, and all living things, and all things  
 ‘ obvious to our sight, or that can be perceived by our under-  
 ‘ standing. First of all he made himself: nor was he brought  
 ‘ up in the odoriferous caverns of Crete: nor did Saturn ever  
 ‘ intend to devour him; nor did he swallow a stone in his stead:  
 ‘ nor was Jupiter ever in any danger; nor will he ever be in  
 ‘ danger: . . . nor is there any thing more ancient than Jupiter;  
 ‘ as children cannot be older than their parents; nor things made  
 ‘ than they who made them: but he is the first, and the most an-  
 ‘ cient, and the prince of all things, and himself from himself.  
 ‘ When he was made cannot be said; forasmuch as he has been  
 ‘ from the beginning, and will always be; his own father, and  
 ‘ greater than to be made by any: and as he brought forth Mi-  
 ‘ nerva out of his head, without need of marriage, so he had  
 ‘ before made himself, of himself, not needing any to bring him  
 ‘ into being: on the contrary, all things have had their beginning  
 ‘ from him.’ And what follows.

This is taken from a hymn to Jupiter, and is the first oration in the first volume of his works. He speaks somewhat to the like purpose near the end of the same oration: but I must not allow myself to take it at length.

In the conclusion of an oration to the honour of Neptune, which is the third in the same volume, he speaks to this purpose:  
 ‘ These <sup>e</sup> things are pleasant to see, and hear, and the painting  
 ‘ of the sea reduced to a calm, with the boy from under the sail  
 ‘ smiling upon Neptune. But there are other things, which  
 ‘ ought never to have been in pictures, which are impious and

\* \* They who desire to know more of Charge. p. 91. Tillemont. M. Aurele.  
 Aristides, may consult Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. art. 31. <sup>d</sup> Hymnus in Jovem.  
 iv. cap. 30. § 4. Tom. iv. p. 373. . . . 409. Tom. i. p. 2. al. p. 5. <sup>e</sup> In Nep-  
 Bagnag. Ann. 176. n. v. Dr. Chapman’s tunum Oratio. T. i. p. 28. al. 50.

‘horrible. And I wonder how it came to pass; that they who first saw them, did not presently fly upon the makers, and tear them to pieces: nevertheless they are still to be seen in the temples. But it is not my business to censure such things. Let us therefore offer up our prayers to Neptune, and Amphitrite, and Leucothea, and Palemon, and the Nereids, and all the marine gods and goddeses, to give health and safety, both by land and by sea, to the great emperor, and to all his family, and to the whole nation of the Greeks, and to grant all happiness to us all, suited to our condition.’

III. But the passage which I principally aim at, and for the sake of which Aristides is here brought in among other witnesses, is to this purpose. He<sup>f</sup> is displeas’d with some sophists, whom he compares, as I apprehend, to Christians. ‘But<sup>g</sup> who can avoid being filled with indignation, that men of no worth should censure Demosthenes, whom I look upon as a Mercury come down from heaven to afford us an example of eloquence? What living man can bear this in people, who utter more solecisms than words; who contemn others as much as they deserve to be contemned; who<sup>h</sup> extol virtue, but do not practise it? There is no need to mention their insatiable avarice, when they catch at every thing they can get: who<sup>\*\*</sup> call indigence by the name of communion, who call singularity philosophy, and poverty a contempt of riches. They make great pretensions to humanity, and yet never were beneficial to any, and are injurious to them who would do them a kindness: who are scarcely civil to others; and yet for the sake of rich men they travel to the ends of the earth: and<sup>i</sup> when they have got them, they promise to teach them virtue . . . who shew more regard to porters at the door than to their masters . . . These are they, who call impudence freedom, and to oppose others is reckon’d a laudable boldness . . . Moreover<sup>k</sup> they are arriv’d at a sort of wisdom, which consists in a pretence of neglecting money, whilst they do not refuse to receive what is worth money.

<sup>f</sup> Orat. Platonic. ii. Tom. ii. p. 307. &c. al. p. 511, &c.   
 και των κομιδη τινες υδεις αξιων. . . . T. ii. p. 307. in al. p. 511.

<sup>h</sup> Και σεμνωθησι μεν την αρεινν, ασχησι δε υ πασι. . . . Αλλα μην την γ’ απλησιαν και πλεονεξιαν αυτων. . . . οι τω μεν αποσειρει κοινωειν ονομα τιθειναι, τω δε φθορειν φιλοσοφειν, τω δ’ αποσειν υπεροσαν χρηματων. . . . p. 307, 308. al. p. 511, 512.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Here, probably, Aristides refers to the provision made by Christians for the

poor and necessitous among them. And in ridiculing that custom he approacheth at least to some scripture-phrases. See Acts iv. 44, 45. and ii. 42. And Rom. xii. 13. *Distributing to the necessities of the saints.* Ταις χρηαις των αστων κοινωειν. *Communicating to the necessities of the saints.*

<sup>i</sup> Και παραλαβουεις αστοι, και την αρεινν παραδωσειν υπισχηνησαι. p. 308. al. p. 512.

<sup>k</sup> Εις τωθ’ ηκησι της σοφιας, ως αρσειν μεν υ πραιτοιλαι, αρσειν δ’ αξιως λαμβειν επισησαι. p. 308. al. p. 513.

‘They

They\* have invented a new sort of generosity, not to give largely, but † to take little. . . . These men are neither servile flatterers, nor free-men: for they deceive as flatterers, and correct men as their superiors, . . . joining<sup>m</sup> together two extreme and contrary evils, meanness and confidence. In<sup>n</sup> manners not unlike the impious people in Palestine; for they acknowledge not the gods. They differ from the Greeks, and all good men. Very dextrous in subverting houses, and disturbing families, setting the members of them one against another, and getting the management of their affairs into their own hands. Who never said or did any good thing: who never contributed any thing to the public festivals; nor have honoured the gods, nor have promoted the welfare of the cities, nor have comforted the afflicted, nor have reconciled such as were at variance, nor have instructed youth, nor any others, nor adorned language: but dwelling in corners, they are wonderfully wise. . . . As much as they advance in wisdom on one hand, they lose on the other: mightily pleasing themselves in disparaging the art of rhetorick: as if slaves, and especially such as are often and deservedly beaten, did not oftentimes secretly curse their masters.'

By 'the wicked men in Palestine,' I suppose Aristides to intend Christians who lived in Palestine, and whose religion had its original in that country. He calls them wicked, or profane and atheistical, because they did not worship the established deities, the same that were worshipped by the Greeks and Romans.

\* It is very likely, that Aristides here refers to the revenues of the Christian clergy in ancient times, which depended upon the oblations made by the faithful of bread and wine, and fruits, and other necessaries. . . . nec molestiis et negotiis secularibus alligentur, sed in honore sportulantium fratrum; tanquam decimas ex fructibus accipientes, ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant, sed die ac nocte caelestibus rebus et spiritalibus servant. Cyprian. Ep. i. p. 3. Oxon.

† Καυρία δὲ μοι δοκῶσι μεγαλοψυχίαν εἶναι, ἢ εἰ μέγα δώσωσι, ἀλλ' εἰ μικρὰ ληψέσθαι ἡδὴ. p. 309. al. p. 514.

‡ . . . 'but to take little,' that is, I think, to be contented with a little. Which is true magnanimity, to be as contented in a low station, as if they enjoyed affluence, and could dazzle mankind in a profuse way of living, and gratify them with expensive donatives.

<sup>m</sup> Δυο τοῖς ἐσχάτοις γὰρ τοῖς ἐναντιωμένοις ἐνοχοὶ κακοὶ οὐκ εἰς ταπεινότητι καὶ αὐθαδείᾳ. p. 309.

<sup>n</sup> Τοῖς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ δυσσεβεσὶ παραπληροῖσι τῆς τροπῆς· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοις τῆς ἐπισημολογίας τῆς δυσσεβείας, οἷοι τῆς κρείττης ἢ νομίζουσι, καὶ εἶσι τροπὴν τινὰ ἀφείρασι τῶν ἑλλήνων, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πάντων τῶν κρείττωνων, . . . πάντων ἀχρηστῶν; διωρυξάει δ' οἰκίαν, καὶ ταραξάει καὶ συστρέψασι τῆς εὐθὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ φησὶ πάντ' αὐτῆς διοικῆσαι, πάντων δεινολάοι; οἱ λοῖπον μὲν ἐλκάρπον ἔδονα πωποτ' ἄθ' εὐρον ἢ τ' ἐποιήσαν, ἢ πάντην εὐροὶ ἐκοσμήσαν, ἢ θεὸς ἐπιμήσαν, ἢ πόλιν συνεβλήσαν, ἢ λυπημένους παρεμύθησαν ἢ τασιαζούσας διηλλαξάν, ἢ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς κέρει, ἢ ἀλλῆς ἔδονα, ἢ κόσμον τοῖς λοῖποις κερύοντες· καὶ ἀδύνη δὲ εἰς τῆς χηραμῆς, ἐκεῖ τὰ θαύματα σοφίζονται . . . ὅσον γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς κοῦφωσι τῆς σοφίας, τοσοῦτ' ἀνάφαιρσι μέγα φρονεῖν, εἰν ῥητορικὴν εἰπωσὶ κακῶς, ὡσπερ ἢ καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς τοῖς δεσποταῖς ὑπ' ὁδοῖα πολλὰ καὶ ἀκατανοήτως, καὶ μάλιστα δὴ τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν. p. 309, 310. al. p. 514, 515.

Masson<sup>o</sup> here understands Jews living in Palestine, and squabbles with Tertullian, and other Christian writers, who say, that after Adrian's victory, Jewish people were forbidden to come into Judea: but Carterus understands Aristides as I have done; and in his notes has illustrated this passage with good observations. Indeed we can here trace most of the common reflections which were then made upon the Christians, and are particularly taken notice of in our ancient apologists. They were called 'atheistical': they were complained of<sup>p</sup> as 'unprofitable'; they are represented as 'mean and obscure,' who nevertheless took great liberties in remarking upon the popular deities, and the worship paid to them. They had then no schools of rhetoric for instructing youth, or others, and sometimes spoke slightly of the ornaments of language. Such things offended our sophist. And yet, before the end of the third century, there were among the Christians divers learned men and good writers; and some men of great eminence in our author's own time, or before it.

2. Beside the letter<sup>r</sup> sent to the emperor Marcus, and his son Commodus, imploring their favour for the city of Smyrna, after the earthquake, which is<sup>s</sup> computed to have happened in the year of Christ 177, Aristides published a 'monody, bewailing their unhappy circumstances; and after that he wrote an<sup>t</sup> oration, or epistle, in 178, congratulating the people of Smyrna upon their restoration. Here he celebrates not only the favour and liberality of the emperors, but likewise the generous compassion of many others: 'All<sup>u</sup> the cities of Asia considered their affliction as their own, and sent them relief as to their parents or children. And when they entertained any of them who were destitute in their own houses, who of them did not think themselves gainers thereby? who did not think, that they received, rather than conferred a benefit? Many contributed money, and promised more, if it was needed. All the nations inhabiting Asia

<sup>p</sup> De Aristidis Vita Collectanea Historica. Sect. vi. n. 8.

<sup>r</sup> Sed alio quoque injuriarum titulo postulamus, et infructuosi in negotiis dicimur. Tertull. Ap. cap. 42. p. 38.

<sup>s</sup> . . . homines inquam deploratæ, illicitæ, ac desperatæ factionis, grassari in deos non ingemiscendum est? Latebrosa et lucifugax natio. . . . Minuc. Fel. cap. viii.

<sup>t</sup> Tom. i. p. 512. al. Tom. ii. p. 289.

<sup>u</sup> Vid. Basnag. ann. 177. num. ii.

<sup>v</sup> Tom. i. p. 260. al. p. 455.

<sup>w</sup> Παλινωδία επί Σμυρνης και τω ταύτης ανοικτισμω. T. i. p. 263. al. p. 461.

<sup>x</sup> . . . ωσπερ γαρ κοινη πλιμαλιος της Α-

σιας γεγενημενη, εβω τας γιωμας εκχρησασαι . . . και πασας αφορμας παρασκευασθησαν, ωσπερ γονευσιν η παισιν αυτων. . . . Τις γαρ εχ' ερμαιον αυτου εποιησατο; τις γαρ εχ' ευρισκεσθαι μαλλον, η τιθεσθαι ταυτην γαρ ριν ωρηθη, δεξασθαι σουικης, της τασειν πρωλευσαλιας; . . . Και τι δε ταυτ' εμμερι καταλιθειν; Παντα γαρ τα εθνη τα πλεονημεν την Ασιαν, φιλοτιμιαν κοινην φιλομειλια προς την πολιν, τα κρητισα τω αρχαιων ανισταλια' επι μονης δε ταυτης της πολεως το παλαιον ρημα εξηλιςχθη ψευδεις εχον, το κακως παραξάντων ληθην ειται παρ' τρις φιλοις. Ib. p. 268.

‘ contended, who should exceed in regard to them. And in  
 ‘ your city alone the falshood of that old saying has been shewn,  
 ‘ that the unhappy are forgotten even by their friends.’ Which  
 ‘ occasioned Mr. Tillemont’ to say: ‘ Behold the change which  
 ‘ the Christian religion had made in the world! For it cannot  
 ‘ be doubted, that the Christians, who were numerous in those  
 ‘ provinces, had a large share in these works of charity, which  
 ‘ are the proper effects of the faith and of the grace of Jesus  
 ‘ Christ, and that their ardour inflamed the heathens to shew the  
 ‘ falshood of that ancient proverb, that all the world forgets and  
 ‘ neglects the unhappy: which had been too much the case hitherto.’

So Mr. Tillemont: and his observation may be right, though  
 Aristides does not mention the Christians: but his words, ‘ all  
 ‘ nations living in Asia,’ lead us to think, there was a concurrence  
 of several sorts of men in contributing to the relief of Smyrna  
 under the great calamity that had befallen it.

3. I must add one passage more.

Describing one of his voyages: ‘ We<sup>z</sup> were going to Ceph-  
 ‘ lenia, and again we had a high sea, and a contrary wind, and  
 ‘ we were tossed up and down, to the great detriment of my  
 ‘ health, and beyond what my constitution could bear. After-  
 ‘ wards the like happened in the straits of Achaia, when truly  
 ‘ the good mariners would put out from Patræ, at the very time  
 ‘ of the Equinox, against my will, and very much to my pre-  
 ‘ judice under my indispositions. The like things happened  
 ‘ again in the Ægæan sea, through the obstinacy of the master  
 ‘ of the ship and the mariners; when they would sail, though  
 ‘ the winds were contrary, nor would they hearken to me. So<sup>\*</sup>  
 ‘ we were carried about by the tempest over that whole sea, for  
 ‘ fourteen days and nights, and were oftentimes without food,  
 ‘ and at length with difficulty got to Miletus.’

Here is such an agreement with the history of St. Paul’s voyage,  
 related in Acts xxvii. that some may be apt to think, he had  
 read the book of the Acts: but I rather think, that Aristides  
 had not read any of the books of the New Testament.

IV. Dr. Chapman<sup>b</sup> has formed a plausible argument for the  
 expediency of the continuance of spiritual gifts, and miraculous  
 powers in the church, for upholding and propagating the Christian

<sup>y</sup> L’Emp. Marc. Aurele. art. xxiv.

προσηνεχθημεν. p. 306. al. p. 540.

<sup>z</sup> Sacrorum Sermon. ii. Tom. i. p. 306.  
 al. p. 540.

<sup>a</sup> Τετταρες παλιν αυται  
 προς ταις δεκα ημεραις και νυκτεσ, χειμωνιος  
 νεκλω δια παντος τη πηλασε φερομενων, και  
 ταυταισ ασυβιασ ηκ ολιγαισ, και μολισ Μιδ.ηλω

<sup>b</sup> A View of the Expediency and Credi-  
 bility of Miraculous Powers among the  
 primitive Christians, after the Decease of  
 the Apostles. 1732.

religion, from the influence of the philosophers and sophists of this time; who were in great favour with the Roman emperors, and received from them <sup>c</sup> handsome stipends for instructing youth, and had a great interest with the people in Greece, and at Alexandria, and in many cities in Asia.

Ælius Aristides, from whom some extracts have been now made, was a fine writer, and a good speaker. He is credulous and superstitious, a true heathen, and a servant of the gods: but so far as I have observed, he may be supposed a sober man, and serious. There are in his orations many fine sentences in favour of truth and virtue. If he says, he <sup>d</sup> had rather be a fine speaker, than be Darius the son of Hyftaspes, he joins with it a sober and virtuous life. And again, in another place, where he expresseth his superior value for learning and eloquence above all things, he says: 'Nor <sup>e</sup> can he be so stupid, as to despise glory if it comes to his share, and so far as it may flow from fine speaking, and a life of virtue suited to his discourses. For he did not desire to obtain it by any other means.'

A character of such eminence must have been an ornament to the popular religion, and its rights: and the charms of eloquence in his hymns to the gods, and in his other orations, cannot but have had powerful attractions.

V. I do not intend to make any distinct chapter of the sophist Dion: but I shall give a general account of him. Suidas <sup>f</sup> says, he was the son of Pisicrates, born at Prusa, a sophist, and a philosopher, and called Chrysofom. Both he and Philostratus <sup>g</sup> say, that he was much favoured by the emperor Trajan, who took him up into his triumphal chariot, and told him, that he loved him as well as himself. Eunapius <sup>h</sup> also says, he was of Bithynia, and was called Chrysofom. We still have remaining his eighty Orations, mentioned by <sup>i</sup> Photius, of which a particular account may be seen in <sup>k</sup> Fabricius. Photius <sup>l</sup> says, he flourished in the

<sup>c</sup> The stipends of the philosophers and sophists, at Athens and other places, by appointment of Vespasian at first, and then of Antoninus the pious, and Marcus Antoninus, he computes to have been ten thousand Attic drachms, or 320 £. per annum of our money. See p. 59. . . . 61.

<sup>d</sup> Πλην γε τούτων αν ειποιμι . . . ως εγω δεξαιμην αν δυνασθαι λεγειν μελα χρηστη βιη και σωφρονος εις οσον οιον τε καλλιστα ανθρωπω μαλλον, η μυριακις Δαρειος ο Υστασπης γενεσθαι και μικρα μοι παιθ' ως αληθως προς τετ' ηδη φαιηται. Or. Platon. eda. T. ii. p. 135. al. 224.

μην υπερ γε της δοξης ελω διανοηθην, απαιησαν μεν αυτην δεχεσθαι και σερβειν, η γαρ αν παντα πασι βλαξ ειην τις? παραμαλυσσθαι δε μηδεν εις αυτην εξω των λεγων αυτων, και περι τον βιον ορθοηλος συμφωνη τελος. Or. contr. Proditors Mysterior. Tom. ii. p. 421. al. 724. <sup>f</sup> V. Διω.

<sup>g</sup> De Vit. Sophistar. l. i. cap. vii.

<sup>h</sup> Και Διω ο εκ βιθυνιας, ον επικαλει γρυσοσομον. Eunap. De Vit. Sophist. in Pr. p. 11. <sup>i</sup> Cod. 209. p. 530.

<sup>k</sup> Bib. Gr. T. iii. p. 305.

<sup>l</sup> Ηκμαζε δε καλα τες χρονες τε βασιλειως τραιανου. Ut supr. p. 530.

time of Trajan. To the like purpose Suidas and Philostratus. I therefore place him in the year 98, the first of that emperor's reign: though he was also in favour with Nerva, as we know from<sup>m</sup> himself. Whether he be the same as Cocceianus Dion, mentioned by Pliny<sup>n</sup> in a letter to Trajan, and in Trajan's<sup>o</sup> rescript, is not quite certain.

I shall take but one passage from him; for which I am indebted to<sup>oo</sup> Dr. Chapman: but I shall quote it more at large than he has done. In an oration to the Corinthians he speaks with great vehemence: 'Whom<sup>p</sup> have not these men abused,' says he, 'who abuse every thing? Have they not abused Socrates and Pythagoras, and Plato? Have they not abused Jupiter himself, and Neptune, and Apollo, and the other gods? Nor have they spared the female gods, though, as one might reasonably think, they should have more regard for them than the males. Hear then what they say of Ceres, and Venus, and Aurora: nor do they forbear Minerva, and Diana.'

Dr. Chapman makes no doubt, that by these men Dion meant the Christians, 'who, it seems, had talked contemptuously of the gods of the first rank.' I am also inclined to be of the same opinion. And I think, that this passage of Dion, together with some others which we have seen, may satisfy us, that the Christians were better known in those times than some have imagined. And we cannot help thinking therefore, that the silence of Epictetus about our ancestors, or his disregard of them, was designed and affected, as was also intimated formerly. Indeed the words of St. Paul concerning himself, and other apostles, were often verified in other followers of Jesus after their times. *As deceivers, yet true: as unknown, yet well known . . . as poor, yet making many rich.* 2 Cor. vi. 8. . . . 10. Again: *Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus: that the life of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.* 2 Cor. iv. 10. and see also ver. 11.

<sup>m</sup> Or. 44. p. 512. Or. 45. p. 513.

<sup>n</sup> Lib. x. ep. 85. <sup>o</sup> Ep. 86.

<sup>oo</sup> As before, p. 63.

<sup>p</sup> Τινας

γχε εις; & διαβεβληκασιν οι παντα διαβα-  
 λους; & Σωκρατην; & Πυθαγοραν; & Πλα-  
 τωνα; & κ αυτον τον Διαν; και τον Ποσειδων;  
 και τον Απολλων, και της αλλης θεας; Απ

τοσαι δε και των θελιων θεων, ων εικος ην  
 εις μαλλον, η των αρρενων ειρεπεισθαι. Νυν  
 ακυειε γαρ α λειψισι την Δημητρα, και την  
 Αφροδιτην, και την Εω. Απεχονται δ' εδε  
 της Αθηνας, εδε της Αρλεμιδος. Corinthiac.  
 Or. 37. p. 463.

## C H A P. XXI.

## G A L E N.

## I. His time. II. Passages concerning Moses, and Christ, and the Christians.

I. CLAUDIUS GALENUS<sup>a</sup> or GALEN, the celebrated physician, according to Suidas was a native of Pergamus, and flourished in the times of the Roman emperors, Marcus, Commodus, and Pertinax, and died in the seventieth year of his age. Philip Labbé in his Life, or Elogium Chronologicum of Galen, inserted by Fabricius<sup>b</sup> in the third tome of his Bibliotheca Græca, computes, that<sup>c</sup> he was born in the 131st year of the Christian epoch, and in the 14th or 15th year of the emperor Adrian; and<sup>d</sup> that he died in the seventh year of Severus, of Christ 200, when he was seventy years of age.

Some other learned men<sup>e</sup> have been inclined to protract his life to the year of our Lord 210, near the end of the reign of Severus.

I shall place him at the year of our Lord 180, and the last year of the emperor Marcus Antoninus, to whom he was well known, and by whom he was esteemed: at which time he must have been about fifty years of age.

II. This great author has mentioned Moses, Christ, and his followers.

1. He has twice mentioned our Saviour.

<sup>f</sup> In one<sup>f</sup> place he blames Achigenes for not giving a demonstration, nor so much as a probable reason of some things advanced by him. So that, says he, we seem rather to be in a school of Moses, or Christ, where we must receive laws without any reason assigned, and that in a point, where demonstration ought not by any means to be omitted.

<sup>a</sup> Suid. V. Γαληνος. Photius. Cod. 164. p. 349. Tillem. l'Emp. Severe. art. 31. Moreri Dictionaire, et Supplement. Galien. <sup>b</sup> Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. 17. T. iii. p. 509. &c. <sup>c</sup> Claudius Galenus, omnium Medicorum, post Hippocratem, facile Princeps: atque optimi Imperatoris judicio, γρησιος ιατρος και μονος φιλοσοφος, Niconis eruditissimi . . . filius, natus est Pergami in Asia, . . . anno reparatae per Christum salutis, circiter cxxxi. Hadriani Imperatoris xiv. vel xv. labente. Labb. Elog. Chronolog. Galeni. num. i. ap. Fabric. B. G. T. iii. p. 510.

<sup>d</sup> . . . eam opinor, ex omnibus de obitu Galeni probabiliorē videri sententiam, quæ illum addicit anno Imperii Severi vii. Christi cc. vitæ illius lxx. Id. ib. num. xx. p. 527. <sup>e</sup> Basnag. ann. 210, num. v. And see Tillemont, as referred to at note<sup>2</sup>. <sup>f</sup> Καλλιον γαρ η πολλω προσθειναι τινα, ει και μη βεβαιαι απειδειξιν, παραμυθιαν γενεκατην, τω λεγει, περι των οκτω ποιολητων, ινα μη τις ευθυς και αρχας, ως εις Μωυση και Χριστε διαλεγει αφικμενος νομων αναποδεικτων ακρη, και ταυτα εν οισ ημισα χρι. De Differentia Pulsuum, lib. ii. p. 22. Basil. 1538.

Here is a just description of Christ's delivering his precepts without any long deduction of reasons and arguments: and he allows, that reasons were not there absolutely necessary, or however, not so requisite, as in the points treated of by the author whom he censures. I think, we may be hence disposed to think it probable, that Galen was not unacquainted with our gospels.

2. In another place he says: 'It<sup>e</sup> is easier to convince the disciples of Moses, and Christ, than physicians and philosophers, who are addicted to particular sects.'

Here is an acknowledgment of the steadiness of Christians in the profession of their principles: of which he may have seen many instances in the persecuting reign of Antoninus the philosopher.

3. There is a work, concerning Nephritic Disorders, which is ascribed to Galen, in which<sup>h</sup> the author mentions the Christians, and ranks himself with them: but as it is not Galen's, I do not choose to take any thing from it.

4. And in his celebrated work, concerning 'the Use of the parts of the human body,' he has mentioned Moses. It will be sufficient, that I transcribe below the account<sup>i</sup> which Fabricius has given of the passages of that work relating to Moses: whence it may be argued, that Galen had read the Pentateuch, or at least the book of Genesis.

## C H A P. XXII.

### CONCLUSION OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

I. *Heathen sayings of the Christians.* II. *Anecdotes concerning divers heathen governors of provinces, who persecuted the Christians, or were favourable to them.* III. *Remarks concerning the number of ancient heathen writers, who have mentioned the Christians.*

I. I THINK it not amiss to put down in this place, at the end of the second century, some sayings and observations of heathen

<sup>e</sup> Θαύλον γὰρ ἀνὴς τῆς ἀπὸ Μωϋσῆ καὶ Χριστοῦ μετὰ διδάξαι, ἢ τῆς τὰς αἰρετικῶν προσηλυτικῆς ἰατρικῆς τε καὶ φιλοσοφίας. Id. ib. lib. iii. p. 34.

<sup>h</sup> Διαγνώσις τῶν ἐν ἰεφροῖς παθῶν καὶ θηραπειᾶ. Liber Galeno ascriptus. Dignotio morborum in renibus, eorumque curatio. . . . Christiani scriptoris est, forte Demetrii Pepagomeni ad Imperatorem, cujus Archiatrum συνιδεῶν

suum vocat. &c. Fabric. B. G. T. iii. p. 531.

<sup>i</sup> De Usu Partium corporis humani.] Moysen melius Epicuro scripsisse fatetur. xi. 14. Etsi persuadere sibi homo Ethnicus non potuit, Deum facere posse quæcunque velit, ex cinere equum et bovem, ex lapide hominem, e materia corruptibili animalia immortalia. xiv. 2. Fabric. ib. p. 549, 550.

people

people concerning Christians: which may be of use to shew how far the heathens were acquainted with them, their character, their principles, or their sufferings.

Tertullian, who flourished about the year of Christ 200, in his Apology observes to this purpose: 'Such<sup>a</sup> are your prejudices,' says he, 'that though you cannot but acknowledge the good character of a Christian, yet you will reproach him for his religion. "Truly," says one, "Caius Seius is a good man, only he is a Christian." Another will say: "I wonder that Lucius, who is so wise a man, should on a sudden turn Christian."

II. I will also put down here some anecdotes concerning divers heathen governors of provinces, who had some concerns with Christians.

1. In his book addressed to Scapula, the proconsul of Africa, Tertullian expresseth himself in this manner: 'We<sup>b</sup> can set before you,' says he, 'the deaths of several governors of provinces, who at the end of their days were sensible, that they had done wrong in persecuting the Christians. Vigellius Saturninus, who first persecuted us in this country, lost his sight. Claudius Herminianus, in Cappadocia, being enraged that his wife had embraced this opinion, treated the Christians with cruel severity: and when he alone in his palace was seized with a pestilential disease, and worms crawled out of his body yet alive, he said: "Let none know of this, lest the Christians should rejoice." Afterwards, being convinced of his error, in that he had by torments compelled some to renounce this doctrine, he died almost a Christian. Cæcilius Capella, when he heard of the destruction of the city of Byzantium, cried out: "Christians, you have reason to rejoice." But,' says Tertullian, 'they, who may think they have escaped, will be called to an account in the day of judgment.'

Before I proceed any farther, I must make a few remarks by way of explication.

<sup>a</sup> Quid? quod ita plerique clausis oculis in odium ejus impingunt, ut bonum alicui testimonium ferentes, admisceant nominis exprobrationem: Bonus vir Caius Seius, tantum quod Christianus. Item alius: Ego miror Lucium sapientem virum repente factum Christianum. Ap. cap. 3. p. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Possumus æque et exitus quorundam præsidum tibi proponere, qui in fine vitæ suæ recordati sunt deliquisse, quod vexassent Christianos. Vigellius Saturninus, qui primus hic gladium in nos egit, lumina amisit. Claudius Herminianus in Cappa-

docia, cum indigne ferens uxorem suam ad hanc sectam transisse, Christianos crudeliter tractasset, solusque in Prætorio suo vastatus peste cum vivus vermibus ebullisset: Nemo sciat, aiebat, ne spe gaudeant Christiani. Postea cognito errore suo, quod tormentis quosdam a proposito suo excidere fecisset, pene Christianus decessit. Cæcilius Capella in illo exitu Byzantino, Christiani gaudete, exclamavit. Sed et qui videntur sibi impune tulisse, venient in diem divini judicii. Ad Scap. cap. 3. p. 86.

Tertullus Scapula<sup>c</sup> is supposed to have been consul in Rome in the year 195, and proconsul of Africa in 211, or thereabout. Therefore this work of Tertullian could not be written before that time.

Vigellius Saturninus<sup>d</sup> is supposed to have been proconsul of Africa in the year of Christ 200.

Claudius Herminianus<sup>e</sup> governed in Cappadocia in the reign of the emperor Severus: but his exact time is not now known. Fr. Balduinus seems to allow, that<sup>f</sup> he is the same whom Papinian in the Pandects has mentioned with respect.

The city of Byzantium had sided with Niger. After a long and obstinate siege it was taken, and destroyed by the army of Severus in the year 196. The Christians in that city had been persecuted in the time of Marcus Antoninus. Probably<sup>g</sup> Cæcilius Capella had been then governor of Thrace, in which Byzantium stood, and then persecuted the Christians there with great severity. When he heard of the lamentable fate of that city, he used the expressions mentioned by Tertullian: thinking, that the Christians would rejoice at it, because many of their brethren had there endured very grievous sufferings. But Tillemont says, ‘ That Christians were wont to weep with those that wept, and not to rejoice at the calamities of their greatest enemies: though they might at the same time adore the disposals of divine justice.’

2. It follows in the next chapter of the same work of Tertullian: ‘ And<sup>h</sup> how many governors, and those both resolute and cruel, have declined these causes? as Cincius Severus, who at Thyrdri helped the Christians to an answer that might clear them: as Vespronius Candidus, who, when a Christian was brought before him, called him “ a troublesome fellow, and bid him go, and ask pardon of his fellow citizens:” as Asper, who having slightly tortured a Christian, and thereby overcome

<sup>c</sup> See Tillem. L’Emp. Severe art. vii. Comp. Basnag. ann. 195. num. i.

<sup>d</sup> Tillem. Persecution, sous l’Emp. Severe art. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Tillem. as before, art. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Hunc esse illum Claudium Herminianum, cujus Papinianus in Pandectis mentionem facit, et quem clarissimum appellat, nuper doctissimus Jurisconsultus admonuit. Certe temporibus Severi proconsulem eum fuisse, facile credo. Fr. Balduin. Edicta Princ. Rom. de Christianis. p. 99.

<sup>g</sup> Tillem. L’Emp. Severe. art. 18. See likewise la Persecution sous l’Emp. Marc. Aurele art. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Quanti autem prædides, et constanti-

ores et crudeliores, dissimulaverunt ab hujusmodi causis? ut Cincius Severus, qui Thyrdri ipse dedit remedium, quomodo responderent Christiani, ut dimitti possent: ut Vespronius Candidus, qui Christianum quasi tumultuosum civibus suis satisfacere, dimisit: ut Asper, qui modice vexatum hominem, et statim dejectum, nec sacrificium compulit facere, ante professus inter advocatos et assessores, dolere se incidisse in hanc causam. Pudens etiam missum ad se Christianum, in elogio concussione ejus intellecta, dimisit, scisso eodem elogio, sine accusatore negans se auditorum hominem, secundum mandatum. Ibid. cap. 4.

‘ him,

‘ him, (so that he renounced his profession,) did not compel him  
 ‘ to sacrifice, but let him go, openly declaring to those who sat  
 ‘ upon the bench with him, “ that he was sorry to be at all  
 ‘ concerned in such a cause.” Pudens likewise, when a Christian  
 ‘ was brought before him, and he perceived some unfair dealing  
 ‘ in the libel, dismissed him, and tore the libel to pieces, saying,  
 ‘ he would not receive an accusation, unless the accuser was pre-  
 ‘ sent, as the law directed.”

We<sup>1</sup> have no particular accounts of these things elsewhere: but it is reasonable to believe, that all these magistrates were governors of provinces in the persecution of Severus, or not long before; perhaps, in the time of the emperor Marcus Antoninus.

Basnage<sup>2</sup> supposeth, that Pudens, here mentioned by Tertullian, is Servilius Pudens, who was consul in the year 166.

All these things does Tertullian boldly mention in his address to Scapula, proconsul of Africa: I think, it may be concluded, that they were known facts, and that the truth of them may be relied upon. Doubtless Tertullian speaks according to his own knowledge, or according to such informations as he judged credible: for he would not presume to tell the proconsul stories, which he had any suspicion might be confuted or contradicted. Indeed, most<sup>1</sup> of these men just mentioned had been proconsuls in Africa, where Tertullian lived, in his own time, in the reign of Severus.

3. I should here have inserted the story of Arrius Antoninus, proconsul of Asia, who after having long exercised great cruelty toward the Christians of his province, when some of them came before his tribunal, expressing great resolution, told them: ‘ If  
 ‘ they had a mind to die, there were halts and precipices  
 ‘ enough.’ But this has been taken notice of already in the chapter<sup>m</sup> of the younger Pliny.

III. I have been long ago admonished in a letter, ‘ not to  
 ‘ forget to make some observations concerning the silence of con-  
 ‘ temporary heathen authors concerning Christianity for several  
 ‘ ages: or else mentioning all affairs relating to them in a slight  
 ‘ and superficial manner.’

Surely, that difficulty is there too much magnified: however, I take this opportunity to say something to it.

Some subjects are more agreeable to authors, because they are more entertaining to the generality of readers. Eusebius well

<sup>1</sup> See Tillemont *la persecution de l’Eglise sous L’Emp. Saver.* art. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Basnag. ann. 166. num. i.

<sup>1</sup> See Tillem. *la persecution sous Sever.* art. 6. Basnag. ann. 202. num. ii.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. vii. p. 325.

observes, in the preface to the fifth book of his Ecclesiastical History, 'That<sup>n</sup> most historians have employed their pens in recording wars and victories, and trophies erected over vanquished enemies, the valour of generals, and the exploits of soldiers, besmeared with the blood of innumerable slaughters for their country, their children, and their estates.'

Many writers of great worth, and many affairs of no small importance, have long lain in obscurity, or have been totally buried in oblivion.

It has observed, that Velleius Paterculus, a man of a good family, who flourished in the time of Tiberius, and wrote an abridgment of the Roman History, in two books, has been mentioned by no ancient writer, excepting<sup>o</sup> Priscian. 'But<sup>p</sup> the moderns have done him more justice, by publishing him frequently with notes and commentaries.'

M. Annæus Seneca, father of L. A. Seneca the philosopher, and author of divers works, has been<sup>a</sup> confounded with his son, and has been almost unknown as a writer.

Lucian, a subject of the Roman empire, who has written so many things, and so many sorts of works, has taken little notice of Roman authors, or Roman affairs. He has laboured<sup>r</sup> an encomium of Demosthenes; but says nothing of Cicero; though a comparison between those two great orators would have been very proper, and has been made by Plutarch, and<sup>s</sup> Longinus.

Maximus Tyrius, a Platonic philosopher, flourished in the time of Antoninus the pious, and several of his Dissertations were written at Rome: nevertheless, as<sup>t</sup> Davies, one of his editors, says, he appears little acquainted with Roman affairs. Nay, says he, I do not recollect, that he has made any reference to the Roman history.

We now know of two sons of the emperor Marcus Antoninus, which<sup>v</sup> are not mentioned by any ancient historians.

Some

<sup>n</sup> H. E. l. v. in Pr. p. 154. A.

<sup>o</sup> Pauca de Velleio ejusque scriptis prædicanda sunt: sed pauca, quia latet in turba illa scriptorum præci ævi. Quis veterum eum nominat? præter Priscianum, et si forte Tacitum. Lips. de Vita et Scriptis Velleii. <sup>p</sup> Bibliographia Classica. Vol. ii. p. 189.

<sup>q</sup> Tributa illi quæ hujus erant, et claritate nimia filii obscurus pater hodie, immo ignotus memoriam boni senis fugitivam (impune hoc dixerim) primus retraham ego. Andreas Schottus de Auctore, et declamandi ratione, sub fin.

<sup>r</sup> Tom. ii. p. 685. &c.

Græv.

<sup>s</sup> Cap. 12. p. 92. Toll.

<sup>t</sup> Et sane, ne quid dissimulem, Græcia diutius quam Roma Maximum videtur cepisse: quod in unaquaque fere Dissertatione summam rerum Græcarum ostendat peritiam, cum res Romanas calluisse nullo indicio constet. Certe quoad memini, ad eorum historiam ne semel quidem respexit. Davif. Pr. p. 15.

<sup>v</sup> Plures ex Faustina liberos Marcus suscepit: filios scilicet Commodum cum fratre Antonino gemino, qui quadrimus elatus est. Verum Cæsarem, quem mors stravit, anno clxx. Doctissimo debemus Mabillonio. duos ad-

huc

Some writers are silent from reasons of policy. We are told, in the History of the Reformation of the Low Countries, 'that' 'Margaret, governess in that country, in the year 1525, sent orders to all the convents, enjoining them to forbid preachers to mention Luther and his doctrine, and the opinions of ancient heretics.' 'This order,' says the abridger of the large work of Gerard Brandt, 'was very judicious. The best way of stopping the progress of heresies, is to seem to neglect them.'

From this principle of policy Josephus may have been silent about the Christians, and their affairs, in his writings, that he might bury them in oblivion.

Epictetus, and others, may have suppressed their own thoughts, and have been reserved in their discourses, lest they should excite inquisitiveness in their hearers, and occasion doubts about the popular deities, and the worship paid to them.

I might add, that it is not impossible, nor very improbable, that some writings of heathen authors have been lost, in which the Christians were mentioned: for very few writers in the Syriac language are come down to us.

After all, we have now seen a goodly catalogue of heathen writers, in the first and second century, men of great eminence for their wit and learning, their high stations, and their credit in the world, who have, in their way, bore testimony to Jesus Christ, and the things concerning him, and to the Christians, his disciples and followers, their numbers, their principles, their manners, and their fortitude and patience under heavy sufferings, and a great variety of difficulties and discouragements, which they met with for the profession of what they were persuaded to be the truth. And Celsus, who in this period wrote against the Christians, has borne a large testimony to the books of the New Testament, and to the history of our Saviour.

And we can allege two Roman emperors, Adrian<sup>y</sup> and Titus Antoninus<sup>z</sup>, who have been favourable to † us. And Adrian<sup>a</sup> in his letter to Servian, written in the year 134, bears witness to the numbers and the influence of Christians in Egypt at that time.

We must say the same of Serenius Granianus<sup>b</sup> proconsul of Asia, who wrote so much in favour of the Christians to Adrian,

huc Marci filios, quorum nulla apud veteres historiae scriptores exstat memoria. &c. Basnag. ann. 180. num. ii.

\* Abridgment of Gerard Brandt's History of the Reformation. By Mr. La Roche. Vol. i. p. 29. p. 359. . . . 367.

† See vol. vii. p. 389. . . .

395. and ch. xv. § 3. near the end.

† To those two emperors above named might be added Tiberius: see Vol. vii. p. 231: and Nerva, Vol. vi. chap. ix. sect. vi. and hereafter in the chapter of Dion Cassius.

‡ See vol. vii. p. 363.

§ See Ibid. p. 358.

and of his successor in the same province, Minucius Fundanus, to whom Adrian's rescript was sent.

To them ought to be added some governors of provinces, mentioned in this chapter from Tertullian.

All these great men had some acquaintance with the Christians, and saw through the thick mist of calumnies, with which the Christians were aspersed by the vulgar, and by many others. They perceived, that though the Christians had some religious sentiments peculiar to themselves, and did not join in the established rites, they were not disturbers of the public peace, nor were justly chargeable with any of those crimes which are generally punished by civil magistrates: and, consequently, they were entitled to protection and favour.

THE END OF THE SECOND VOL. OF JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES.

A  
L A R G E C O L L E C T I O N  
O F A N C I E N T  
J E W I S H A N D H E A T H E N T E S T I M O N I E S.

[VOL. III. FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLXVI. CONTAINING THE TESTIMONIES OF HEATHEN WRITERS OF THE THIRD CENTURY, AND TO THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE, THE FIRST CHRISTIAN EMPEROR.]

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE publication of this volume has been deferred beyond expectation: the occasion of it is this.

In the preface to the first volume of this Collection of ancient Testimonies to the Truth of the Christian Religion, I gave an account of several collections of the like kind, published by divers learned men. About two months ago, when this third volume was finishing at the press, I understood, that there had been lately published another work of the like kind, entitled, A †† History of the Establishment of Christianity, taken from Jewish and Pagan authors only, in which is a solid Proof of the Truth of our Holy Religion. By Mr. Bullett, Professor of Divinity in the University of Besançon. I immediately gave orders for procuring it, intending to give an account of it in the preface to this volume: but it is not yet come to hand; nor have I any certain assurance when it will arrive. I now therefore determine, not to wait any longer for it; but if I live to publish the fourth and last volume of this Collection, I will then give some account of it\*: and if the work affords any assistances for improving my design, I shall readily embrace them, and as readily acknowledge how far I am indebted to it.

*February 25, 1766.*

†† Histoire de l'Établissement du Christianisme, tirée des seuls Auteurs Juifs et Payens, où l'on trouve une preuve solide de la Vérité de cette Religion. Par M. Bullett, Professeur Royal de Théologie, et Doyen de l'Université de Besançon, et Associé de l'Académie des Inscriptions, et des Belles Lettres. qto. a Besançon et Paris. See the Bibliothèque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, pour les mois de Janvier, Février, et Mars. 1765. à la Haye.

\* It appears from the following note, prefixed to the fourth volume, that the author was never able to procure this work. E.

N. B. I have not been able to procure the volume of Mr. Bullett, mentioned by me in an Advertisement prefixed to the third volume of this work; though I have used my best endeavours to procure it. Inquiries for it have been made, at my desire, in Holland, and at Paris, but without success.

T E S T I M O N I E S  
O F  
A N C I E N T H E A T H E N A U T H O R S.

---

C H A P. XXIII.

THE PERSECUTION OF SEVERUS, AND SPARTIAN'S TESTIMONY  
TO IT.

I. *The time of the reign of SEVERUS, and that for a while he was favourable to the Christians.* II. *Accounts of his persecution from Christian writers.* III. *How long it lasted.* IV. *His edict against the Christians from Spartian, with Remarks.* V. *An observation of Balduinus upon this reign.*

I, THE<sup>a</sup> reign of SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS is computed from June 1, 193, to Febr. 4, 211. He reigned, therefore, seventeen years, eight months, and three days.

Severus is supposed to have been favourable to the Christians in the former part of his reign. Says Tertullian, in his book to the proconsul Scapula, which we suppose to have been written soon after the death of Severus, and the accession of his son, Antoninus Caracalla: ' And<sup>b</sup> Severus himself, father of Antoninus, was favourable to the Christians. For when he came to be emperor, he inquired after Proculus, a Christian, surnamed Torpacion, and steward to Eulhodia, who had cured him by anointing him with oil, and kept him in his palace so long as he lived: whom Antoninus also knew very well, he having been nursed by a Christian woman. Moreover, Severus openly withstood the fury of the people against some men and women of the first quality, whom he knew to be of this sect: and was so far from bearing hard upon them, that he gave them an honourable testimony \* \* \*

To

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 211. num. ii. et Basnag. 193. num. xv. <sup>b</sup> Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit. Nam et Proculum Christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Eulhodiae procuratorem, qui cum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit, et in palatio suo habuit, usque ad mortem ejus: quem et Antoninus

optime noverat, lacte Christiano educatus. Sed et clarissimas feminas, et clarissimos viros, Severus sciens hujus sectæ fuisse, non modo non læsit, verum testimonio exornavit, et populo furenti in os palam restitit. Ad Scap. cap. 4. p. 87.

\* \* \* Concerning the cure wrought by Proculus upon Severus, or, as others understand

To which I shall now add from Spartian's Life of Caracalla, ' that <sup>c</sup> at seven years of age, when he heard that a boy his play-fellow had been severely beaten, because he was of the Jewish religion, he would not for some while after look upon his own father, nor the father of the boy, nor those who had beaten him.'

By ' the Jewish religion,' very probably, is here meant the Christian religion.

These passages, partly from Tertullian a Christian, and partly from Spartian a heathen, are sufficient to shew, that the emperor Severus was not unacquainted with men who by profession were Christians, and that they were well known in his family.

Instead of Euhodia, in Tertullian, it is thought by some, <sup>d</sup> that we ought to read Euhodus or Evodus, freedman of Severus, who, by Dion Cassius <sup>e</sup>, is said to have been charged with the education of Caracalla: who therefore, as is supposed, had given him a Christian woman for his nurse.

II. But, however favourable Severus may have been to some Christians from personal respects, it is certain, that in his reign the Christians underwent many sufferings. And, as that excellent lawyer Francis Balduinus observes, ' That <sup>f</sup> place of Tertullian shews, that Septimius Severus was not always averse to the Christians: nevertheless, that favour for them was rather owing to a personal benefit, than to any regard for their religion. The favour was personal, without restraining the cruelty with which Christians were openly treated: nor did Severus, by any edict, forbid the hard usage which Christians then met with, and of which Tertullian himself is a good witness.'

Orosius says, ' that <sup>g</sup> in the fifth persecution, which was under Severus, very many of the saints obtained the crown of martyrdom in several countries.'

Sulpicius

stand it, upon Euhodus, may be seen Basnag. ann. 193. num. xxii. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 460. Lux Evangel. p. 232. Jortin's Remarks upon Ecc. History. Vol. II. p. 289. &c. Tillem. Persecution sous Severus. art. i.

<sup>c</sup> Septennis puer, quam collusorem suum puerum, ob Judaicam religionem gravius verberatum audisset, neque patrem suum, neque patrem pueri, vel [al. velut.] auctores diu respexit. Spartian. Ant. Carac. cap. i. p. 707.

<sup>d</sup> Loco Euhodiae, legendum esse Evodi, existimamus. &c. Basnag. ann. 193. num. xxii.

<sup>e</sup> Δι' Εὐδοῦ τρεπίκουρος αὐτοῦ. Dion. l. 76. p. 3273. al. p. 861. V. d. et

p. 1287. lib. 77. in.

<sup>f</sup> Hic Tertulliani locus testis est, Septimum Severum alieno abs Christianis animo semper non fuisse. Sed favor propter curationem magis fuit, quam propter religionem: et privatus quidem favor, propter quem interea nihil sit remissum de publica illa saevitia, qua Christiani vexabantur. Nam neque Severus ullo edicto, ut Christianis parceretur, publice imperavit: qui tamen quam eo tempore crudeliter vexabantur, ex ipso quoque Tertulliano intelligi potest. Balduin de Edict. Princ. Roman. p. 99.

<sup>g</sup> Quinta, post Neronem, persecutione Christianos excruciasit, plurimique sanctorum

Sulpicius Severus <sup>h</sup> calls this the sixth persecution, and observes particularly, that Leonidas, father of Origen, then suffered.

In the Chronicle of Eusebius <sup>i</sup> this is reckoned the fifth persecution, and is placed at the tenth year of Severus. In his Ecclesiastical History he does not, I think, expressly say, when it began: but he intimates, that <sup>k</sup> it was very grievous in the tenth year of Severus, and afterwards: and, according to him, the persecution was general, and very grievous. So he begins the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History: ‘And <sup>l</sup> when Severus raised a persecution against the churches, there were every where in all the churches glorious martyrdoms of the champions for religion: but especially were they numerous at Alexandria, to which city, as to the noblest stadium of God, were brought the most eminent champions from Thebais, and from all Egypt, that by invincible patience under various torments, and divers sorts of death, they might obtain from God a glorious crown.’ He then relates the death of Leonidas, Origen’s father, who was beheaded; and afterwards the deaths of several others, and particularly <sup>m</sup> Potamiæna, a virgin, who with her mother Marcella was burnt to death, by order of Aquila the Judge, and as he relates, in a slow and painful manner, scalding pitch having been by little and little poured upon the several members of her body, from the soles of the feet to the crown of the head: which, nevertheless, she endured with great patience and fortitude.

He says, that <sup>n</sup> at that time there were innumerable martyrdoms. And soon after, in a following chapter: ‘At <sup>o</sup> that time lived Judas, 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 that persecution disturb the minds of many.’

That Commentary of Judas concluded at the tenth of Severus; but it is likely, that the work was not finished until some while after that year: he; therefore, had been a witness of the sufferings

rum per diversas provincias martyrio coronati sunt. Hanc profanam in Christianos et Ecclesiam Dei præsumptionem Severi, cælestis ultio e vestigio acta subsequitur. Oros. l. vii. cap. 17. p. 501.

<sup>h</sup> Sexta deinde, Severo imperante, Christianorum vexatio fuit. Quo tempore Leonidas, Origenis pater, sacrum in martyrio sanguinem fuit. Sul. Sever. l. ii. cap. 32. al. 46.

<sup>i</sup> Chron. p. 172.

<sup>k</sup> H. E. l. vi. cap. 2. p. 201. C.

<sup>l</sup> Ως δε και Σεβηρος διωσμον καια των εκκλησιων εκειει, λαμπρα μεν των υπερ ησεδειας αθλητων εν απασαις ταις εκκλησαις καια παληα τοπον απειλεσει μαρτυρια. κ. λ. Cap. i. p. 201. A. B.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. cap. v.

<sup>n</sup> Και μυριων οσων τοις καια μαρτυριαι αποδυετων σεφαναις. Cap. 2. p. 202. A.

<sup>o</sup> Cap. 7. p. 208.

of his brethren, after the beginning of the persecution, before he published his work.

At this time suffered in Africa, at Tuburbium, or, as others, more probably, at Carthage, Perpetua and Felicitas and their companions; of whom<sup>p</sup> notice was taken formerly.

During this reign, likewise, the Scillitan Martyrs<sup>q</sup> are supposed to have suffered in Africa: though the Acts of their Martyrdom, which we now have, are not allowed by all to be genuine.

Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, who afterwards suffered martyrdom<sup>r</sup> in the time of Decius, was imprisoned<sup>s</sup> now.

Tertullian has mentioned another martyr, named Rutilius, who suffered in this persecution, though the year is not exactly known. Rutilius<sup>t</sup> had absconded and fled from place to place, and had likewise given money to some officers to secure himself from suffering: and yet he was at length apprehended, and through the mercy of God suffered very patiently; though he was at first grievously tormented, and then burnt alive. Tertullian could not avoid speaking honourably of him; though he then condemned both flight in persecution, and pecuniary redemptions.

And in his book to Scapula<sup>u</sup> he mentions Mavilus, an inhabitant of Adrumetum, whom that proconsul had himself condemned to be devoured by wild beasts.

I do not mention Irenæus here, as some do, because I do not think he died by martyrdom, as<sup>v</sup> was formerly shewn.

III. Mr. Dodwell<sup>y</sup> computed the persecution under Severus to have lasted two years only. Bagnage<sup>z</sup> shews, that it lasted more than six years. Mosheim<sup>aa</sup> observes, that some Christians suffered in the beginning of the reign of Caracalla. 'They therefore,' says he, 'judge rightly, who think, that this persecution did not end before the death of Severus.'

<sup>p</sup> See vol. iii. p. 2, 3.

<sup>q</sup> Vid.

Bagnag. ann. 211. num. viii. Ruinart. Acta Mart. p. 84. &c. Tillem. la persecu. de Severe. § 3. Mosheim. de Ætate Apol. Tertull. num. x.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Euseb.

H. E. l. vi. cap. 39. et 46.

<sup>s</sup> L. vi. cap. xi.

<sup>t</sup> Rutilius sanc-

tissimus Martyr, cum totiens fugisset persecutionem de loco in locum, etiam periculum ut reputabat, nummis redemisset, post totam securitatem, quam sibi prospexerat, ex inopinato apprehensus, et Præfidi oblati, tormentis dissipatus, credo pro fugæ castigatione, dehinc ignibus datus, passionem, quam vitarat misericordiæ Dei retulit. De Fugâ. &c. cap. v. p. 693.

<sup>u</sup> Tibi quoque optamus admonitionem

solam fuisse, quod cum Adrumeticum Mavilum ad bestias damnasset, et statim hæc vexatio subsequuta est. Ad Scap. cap. 3. p. 87.

<sup>x</sup> Credib. P. 2. Vol. ii.

p. 157.

<sup>y</sup> Durasse autem conflat

duobus annis. Diff. Cypr. xi. num. xli.

<sup>z</sup> Plus igitur sexennio persecutio continuata est. Bagn. ann. 202. num. ii.

<sup>aa</sup> De fine belli hujus silent veteres. Quum vero certis auctoribus, maxime ex Tertulliano, constet, sub Severi etiam filio Caracalla, nonnullis in locis Christianos vexatos esse, recte illi judicare videntur, qui non ante mortem Severi cessasse illud existimant. De Rebus Christianorum, &c. p. 455.

Sulpicius Severus having spoken of this persecution, says, 'that<sup>b</sup> from that time to the persecution of Decius, the church enjoyed peace eight and thirty years, excepting some disturbance given to the Christian Clergy by Maximin.' It is hence argued by<sup>c</sup> Pagi, that Sulpicius supposed, this persecution did not end before the year 211, in which the emperor Severus died.

It is also supposed by the same learned chronologer, that<sup>d</sup> the ceasing of this persecution, and the peace of the churches are hinted at in a passage of Dion Cassius, who relates, that Antoninus Caracalla, after killing his brother Geta, and committing other acts of cruelty, coming into the senate said: 'Let all hear, what is of great importance, at which all the world may rejoice. Let all exiles, whatever be their crimes, and however they have been condemned, be restored.' The same is in<sup>e</sup> Spartian. And<sup>f</sup> Christians may have been included in this act of indemnity.

And that the persecution continued some while after the death of Severus, is argued from Tertullian's book to the proconsul Scapula, not written before the year 211, or 212: for at that time the Christians underwent heavy sufferings. By that proconsul<sup>g</sup> some seem to have been condemned to the flames: and in some other places there were governors, who inflicted capital punishments upon Christians; though they did not strive to aggravate their death by exquisite torments.

<sup>b</sup> Interjectis deinde annis viii. et xxx. pax Christianis fuit: nisi quod medio tempore Maximinus nonnullarum ecclesiarum clericos vexavit. Sul. Sever. l. ii. cap. 46. al. 32.

<sup>c</sup> Ab anno autem 211, Severi emortuali ad annum 249, quo Decius persecutionem instauravit, anni 38 interjiciuntur. Quare Severus usque ad mortem suam Christianos vexavit, vel vexari permisit, quod perinde illis erat. Pagi ann. 207. num. iii.

<sup>d</sup> Pax itaque Ecclesie non reddita, nisi post Severi interitum. Quod indicare videtur Dio. lib. 77. [p. 1290.] ubi, postquam retulit, Caracallam, Severi filium et successorem, occidisse fratrem Getam, ait, illum dixisse in Senatu: 'Audite, inquit, rem maximam, ut totus terrarum orbis gaudeat. Omnes exules rei facti, cujusvis sceleris, et quomodocunque damnati sint, restituantur,' &c. Persecutio igitur Severiana non solum sanguinolenta, sed etiam longa exstitit. Pagi ann. 207. num. iii.

<sup>e</sup> Post hoc relegatis deportatisque reditum in pa-

triam restituit. Spartian. in Vita Anton. Carac. cap. 3. p. 710.

<sup>f</sup> Quibus et includi Christianos, qui impietatis causa deportati fuerunt, non est negandum. Basn. ann. 212. num. vi.

<sup>g</sup> . . . pro veritate, pro Deo vivo cremamur. Nam et nunc a Præside Legionis, et a Præside Mauritanie vexatur hoc nomen, sed gladio tenus, sicut a primordio mandatum est, animadverti in hujusmodi. Ad Scap. cap. 4. p. 88. A.

Tillemont, Persecution sous Severe, art. vii. translates: 'Le Lieutenant, qui commandoit la legion, qui residoit en Afrique, et le Gouverneur de la Mauritanie se contentoient de faire decapiter les Martyrs.' I rather think, that by Legio is here intended a place, or province, in Africa, so called. Cellarius may be consulted. Geogr. l. iii. cap. 13. p. 505. though he is not there speaking of a place in Africa. Posterior oppidum fuisse, non castra sola alicujus legionis, licet origo et nomen his debeantur.

IV. However, I do not intend to write at length the history of this persecution: but I have been obliged to take some notice of it, not only upon account of the edict of Severus, but also out of regard to the testimony of Spartian, a heathen author, one of the writers of the Augustan History, who flourished in the time of Dioclesian, or soon after. He has mentioned not only the time of this persecution, but also the substance and design of the emperor's edict, more particularly than any of our Christian authors.

In the Life of the Emperor Severus, he says: 'Having<sup>b</sup> passed through Antioch, he gave to his eldest son the manly gown, and appointed him consul with himself: and presently, while they were yet in Syria, they entered upon their consulship. After that, having enlarged the stipends of the soldiers, he went forward to Alexandria. In his journey through Palestine he enacted several laws. He forbid, under a severe penalty, that any should become Jews. He also published a like edict against the Christians.'

This determines the beginning of the persecution to the tenth year of the reign of Severus, the year of Christ 202, when he and his son Caracalla were consuls together: and the design of the edict is represented to be to restrain the increase of Christianity.

Upon this edict Mr. Mosheim observes to this purpose: 'These words,' says he, 'shew, that Severus enacted no new laws against the Christians: nor did he enjoin, that the religion itself, with the professors of it, should be extirpated. He only intended to hinder the increase of the church, and ordered such to be punished, who should abandon the old religion of their ancestors for the sake of the Christian. They, therefore, who

<sup>b</sup> Deinde, cum Antiochiam transisset, datâ civili togâ filio majori, secum cum Consulem designavit, et statim in Syria consulatum inierunt. Post hoc dato stipendio cumulatione militibus, Alexandriam petiit. In itinere Palæstinis plurima jura fundavit. Judæos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit. Spartian. Sever. cap. 16, 17. p. 617, 618.

<sup>i</sup> Hæc verba docent; Severum non novas in Christianos leges tulisse, non religionem ipsam cum professoribus ejus extirpari jussisse, sed modum tantum statuere voluisse incrementis Ecclesiæ, eosque puniri jussisse, qui a majorum sacris ad Christiana deficerent. Natis igitur Christianis, illis item, qui ante hoc edictum Christo nomen dederunt, antiquæ quidem leges molestiæ et periculû aliquid parere poterant, maxime ce-

lebre illud, quod abrogatum per sequentes leges haud erat, Trajani rescriptum. At ex hac nova Severi lege nihil ipsis timendum erat. Verum ægre hoc sibi persuadent viri eruditî. . . . Componit Spartianus edictum adversus Judæos cum edicto in Christianos, hocque ejusdem, cujus illud, formæ fuisse observat. Atqui Severus neque Judæorum religionem unquam vetuit, neque Judaicis parentibus natos Romana suscipere sacra coëgit, sed augeri tantum Judæorum populum ex aliis populis noluit. Igitur nec Christianis, quum idem tantum in illos, quod in Judæos, sanxerit, iniquiorem sese præbuit. Alias Severi leges in Christianos, præter illam, cujus Spartianus meminit, tulisse, ab omni alienum est verisimilitudine. Mosh. de Reb. Christian. ante C. M. p. 456.

‘ were Christians by birth, and were such before the time of  
 ‘ this edict, had nothing to fear from it. The old laws indeed,  
 ‘ particularly the edict of Trajan, which was not repealed, might  
 ‘ occasion them some trouble: but this new law of Severus af-  
 ‘ fected not any who were Christians before. Learned men,’ he  
 ‘ says, ‘ are difficultly brought to allow of this interpretation, be-  
 ‘ cause they see, that many Christians suffered in the time of  
 ‘ this emperor. Nevertheless it is very certain: for Spartian puts  
 ‘ together the two edicts against the Jews and against the Chris-  
 ‘ tians; and they were both of the same tenour. Severus never  
 ‘ did forbid the Jewish religion, nor compel men born of Jewish  
 ‘ parents to embrace the Roman rites: he only forbade the increase  
 ‘ of Jews by the addition of other people to them. Therefore  
 ‘ neither did he enact any thing more severe against the Christians:  
 ‘ for the two edicts were both alike. Nor can there be any good  
 ‘ reason to believe, that Severus published any other edict against  
 ‘ the Christians beside that mentioned by Spartian.’

So says that learned author, upon which I must make some free observations.

First of all Mr. Mosheim seems to say, that ‘ Severus enacted  
 ‘ not any new laws against the Christians.’ Which is not the  
 truth: for he did enact a new law against them. It is mentioned  
 by Spartian; and Mr. Mosheim himself grants, and allows, and  
 supposes it: and after his manner he explains the meaning and  
 design of it.

Secondly, Mr. Mosheim has no right to diminish the sufferings  
 of the Christians in the reign of this emperor. He earnestly con-  
 tends, that Tertullian’s Apology was composed in the year of  
 Christ 198, before there was any law of Severus against the  
 Christians; and he has published a long dissertation<sup>k</sup> to prove it.  
 Nor was Mr. Tillemont<sup>l</sup> very averse to that date of the Apology;  
 though he generally speaks of it as written in the year 200. And  
 according to that later date, it was written before Severus had  
 made any edict against the Christians.

Well, what was the state of the Christians at that time, even  
 before the edict of Severus, which is allowed to be rightly dated  
 at the year of Christ 202. ‘ They<sup>m</sup> underwent,’ our learned au-  
 thor says, ‘ a multiplicity of the greatest sufferings.’ ‘ From<sup>n</sup>  
 ‘ that

<sup>k</sup> De Ætate Apologetici Tertulliani. &c.

<sup>l</sup> Tertullien. art. v. at the beginning.

<sup>m</sup> Hoc loco nihil mihi propositum est aliud, quam ut ante ann. cii. quo Severi in Christianos edicta publice rogata esse concedo, infinitam jam malorum magnitudi-

nem illis exhibitam esse, planum faciam. Diss. de Ætate Apol. num. vii.

<sup>n</sup> Perversissimi ergo iudices non legibus obtemperabant, sed in manifestas leges verandis Christianis peccabant. Suppliciorum atrocitas par erat odio, quo ferebantur Christianorum

‘ that Apology of Tertullian it appears, that they were ‘ crucified  
 ‘ hung upon stakes, burnt alive, thrown to wild beasts, condemned  
 ‘ to the mines, banished into desert islands.’ I have put down  
 no more than a part of the list of their sufferings, extracted  
 by Mosheim himself from that Apology of Tertullian. And  
 moreover, as that learned man likewise observes, ‘ the ° magis-  
 ‘ trates then transgressed the law of Trajan. They were not  
 ‘ contented to punish those who were brought before them; they  
 ‘ fought for them to be punished.’

Such were the sufferings of the Christians then: And were  
 they abated and restrained afterwards, when a new edict was pub-  
 lished against them? No, certainly, they were increased. ‘ If<sup>p</sup>  
 ‘ these things were done, whilst the emperor was as yet no ene-  
 ‘ my to them, and the ancient laws against them were in a man-  
 ‘ ner silent, and those which were favourable to them, were yet  
 ‘ in being: what may we suppose to have been done when Se-  
 ‘ verus was provoked, and not only confirmed the old laws against  
 ‘ them, but added also severe laws of his own.’ They are the  
 words of Mosheim himself. For certain, the persecution then  
 became more violent, and more general, than it had been be-  
 fore; as this<sup>q</sup> learned writer himself acknowledgeth.

Nevertheless, he will say something to mitigate the guilt of  
 their enemies. For he says, ‘ that<sup>r</sup> the Christians fomented the  
 ‘ persecution against themselves by a custom, which now for  
 ‘ some while had obtained among them, of redeeming their  
 ‘ lives and safety by presents of money made to the presidents,  
 ‘ or other magistrates.’

tianorum hostes. Apol. cap. xii. ‘ Cru-  
 ‘ cibus et stipitibus imponitis Christianos  
 ‘ . . . ungulis eraditis latera Christianorum  
 ‘ . . . Cervices ponimus . . . ad bestias im-  
 ‘ pellimur . . . ignibus urimur . . . in me-  
 ‘ tallis damnamur . . . in insulis relegamur.’  
 . . . Eadem fere reperit cap. 30. Mosheim  
 de Reb. Christ. &c. p. 255.

° Tanta vero erat persecutionis hujus  
 immanitas et gravitas, ut ipsa etiam Tra-  
 jani lex, quæ inquiri Christianos vetabat,  
 negligenter. Explorabantur enim con-  
 ventus eorum, et ad Deum colendum con-  
 gregati sine accusatore abducebantur. Cap.  
 vii. ‘ Quotidie obsidemur, quotidie pro-  
 ‘ dimur, ut ipsis plurimum certibus et con-  
 ‘ gregationibus nostris opprimimur.’ Id.  
 ib. p. 254.

p Hæc omnia fiebant,  
 Imperatore Christianis nondum inimico, et  
 antiquis in eos legibus quiescentibus quo-  
 edmodo, et per alias clementiores quasi ob-  
 lictas. Quid factum fuisse putabimus,

Severo exardescente, atque veteres non  
 modo leges firmante, verum novas etiam  
 severiores rogante? Ibid. p. 255.

q Hæc calamitas valde augebatur, quum  
 tertio hujus seculi anno Imperator ipse ani-  
 mum erga Christianos, incertum quibus de  
 causis, quodammodo mutaret, atque propo-  
 sito edicto, cives Romanos sub gravi pœna  
 ad Christianam religionem a majorum sa-  
 cris transire vetaret. Ib. p. 455.

r Malis his, variis ex causis natis, ipsi  
 sine dubio Christiani alimenta suppeditabant  
 per consuetudinem, quæ ab aliquo tempore,  
 approbantibus episcopis, inter eos invalue-  
 rat, salutem et vitam argento magistratibus  
 oblato redimendi. Præsides enim et magis-  
 tratus pecuniæ avidi Christianos sæpe inva-  
 debant, et pauperiorum quosdam necari ju-  
 bebant, quo ditiores fortunis suis emunge-  
 rent, et ecclesiarum thesauris rem suam lo-  
 cupletarent. Ibid. p. 453.

Undoubtedly

Undoubtedly such things were done by some, but not by so many, nor so often, as is insinuated by Tertullian; who, when a Montanist, equally<sup>s</sup> condemned flight in persecution, and pecuniary redemptions. Nor can there be any good reason, why this writer, in accounting for the sufferings of the Christians in this persecution, should forget, as it were, the common hatred and enmity of men toward them, and<sup>t</sup> almost entirely ascribe all their afflictions to the avarice of governors, stimulated and allured by the forwardness of Christians themselves, to redeem their own, or their friends safety by pecuniary presents.

I do by no means think, that there was any other edict of Severus against the Christians, beside that mentioned by Spartian: but possibly<sup>u</sup> he has not fully expressed the whole design of it. There was at the same time an edict published against the Jews: nevertheless, the edict against the Christians might be somewhat different. Whether it was, or not, it is manifest from Tertullian and Eusebius and other ecclesiastical writers, that after the tenth of Severus, there was a general persecution against the Christians, wherein many suffered. And though the edict was exactly as Spartian says, the publication of it would give occasion for heathens of all sorts, both common people and magistrates, to shew their enmity to the Christians; especially, as the rescript of Trajan was still in force. Nor need it be supposed, that they who were unfriendly to the Christians, would be scrupulously exact to the terms of the edict, and forbear to prosecute, or condemn any, beside new converts. It is certain they did not forbear others: for many who were born of Christian parents, or had been Christians by profession a good while before this edict of Severus, suffered martyrdom in this persecution. Trajan's rescript forbids searching for Christians: nevertheless, that part of his rescript was oftentimes transgressed or neglected by presidents, who published orders that they should be sought for.

<sup>s</sup> Ultro igitur de hoc tibi suggeram, definiens persecutionem, quam constat non esse fugiendam, proinde nec redimendam. Pretium interest. Cæterum, sicut fuga redemptio gratuita est, ita redemptio nummaria fuga est. De Fugâ in Pers. cap. 12. p. 697. Vid. cap. 10, et 11.

<sup>t</sup> Oriente seculo multis in provinciis Romanis varie affligebatur res Christiana. Hæc vero calamitas crescebat, quum A. D. ciii. Imperator Severus, Christianis alioquin haud inimicus, lege lata prohiberet, ne quis majorum religionem cum Christiana

aut etiam cum Judaica commutaret. Ut enim hæc lex Christianos non damnaret, sed progressus tantum Christianæ religionis cohiberet, peropportunam tamen avaris et injustis præsidibus et magistratibus occasionem suppeditabat Christianos vexandi, et plurimos inopum necandi, quo ditiores ad periculum argento amovendum invitarent. Moshem. Instit. Hist. Ecc. p. 101. Vid. supra not. r. <sup>u</sup> See Tillemont. Persecution sous Severe art. iv. p. 158, 159. Bruxelles.

Mr. Mosheim says, that<sup>x</sup> the words of the edict of Severus, as represented by Spartian, ' shew, that Severus only intended to hinder the increase of the church, and order'd such to be punished, who forsook the old religion of their ancestors for the sake of the Christian. They, therefore, who were Christians by birth, or were such before the time of this edict, had nothing to fear from it.'

But I very much suspect this observation to be of no moment: for all persecuting edicts may have been of this form. They may have been made so, to give them a more specious appearance, and to cover the real cruelty and malignity of them. The severest edicts of the worst persecutors may have been expressed in the same terms, and in the same form, with this of Severus. So says the emperor Maximin, one of that sort, at the beginning of his letter to Sabinus: ' It is well known to yourself, and to all the world, that our lords and fathers, Dioclesian and Maximian, when they observed, that almost all men were forsaking the worship of the gods, and joining themselves to the sect of the Christians, did rightly ordain, that all who had forsaken the worship of their immortal gods, should be recalled to the worship of the gods, by public chastisement and punishment.'

The letter of this law might affect new converts only, who had forsaken gentilism, and gone over to the Christians: but that cannot be supposed to be the spirit of the law, or the intention of the makers of it.

Upon the whole, I can discern little weight in Mr. Mosheim's observations upon this edict of Severus: and still think, that the common opinion of learned men concerning the persecution of Severus is very right.

V. I have been longer here than I at first intended: and yet I have still one observation more to take notice of. Balduinus, in the place before cited, says: ' Papinian<sup>z</sup> was præfect of the prætorium in this reign. And he says, he has often wondered, that Papinian did not take care to restrain the barbarous fierceness of the presidents, who treated the Christians with so

<sup>x</sup> See before p. 105.

<sup>y</sup> Και παρὰ τῆ σὴ σιβαροῦσι καὶ παραπασιν ἀνθρώποις φαίερον εἶναι πεποιθῆ, τῆς οἰσπίδας ἡμῶν Διοκλησιανὸν καὶ Μαξιμιανὸν τῆς κελίρας παλερας, ἠνικα συνειδὸν σχεδὸν ἀπαῖας ἀνθρώπων παραλειφθεῖσης τῆς τῶν Θεῶν θρησκείας, τῶ εθνεί τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐπίρας συμμιχολίας ὀρθῶς διατεταχῆναι παῖας ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἀπο τῆς τῶν αὐτῶν Θεῶν τῶν ἀθανάτων θρησκείας ἀναχωρησαντίας, προδῆλω κόλασει καὶ τιμωρίᾳ εἰς τὴν θρησκείαν τῶν Θεῶν ἀτακτῆθῆναι. Euseb.

H. E. l. ix. cap. 9. p. 360. C.

<sup>z</sup> Certe temporibus Severi proconsulem cum [Claudium Herminianum] fuisse, facile credo: quibus et Papinianus prætorio præfectus erat. Sed sæpe mirari cogor, Papinianum, qui veluti summus tunc erat Prætor, auctorem non fuisse, ut barbara illa feritas præsidum Christianos exagitantium aliquando reprimeretur: saltem ad aliquam judiciorum legem, rationem, ordinem, revocaretur. Balduin. de Edict. Princ. Roman: p. 99, 100.

' much

‘ much cruelty ; or at least find out a method to reduce their judicial proceedings to some good order, and the common rules of equity.’

We must therefore suppose, that either Papinian did not understand the principles of religious and civil liberty, or that he was not able to establish all the schemes of equity which he had formed in his mind.

---

C H A P. XXIV.

D I O G E N E S L A E R T I U S.

I. *His time and work.* II. *The inscription of the altar to the Unknown God, in Acts xvii. 23. illustrated by a paragraph in this author.* III. *Whether he refers to the Christian eucharist.*

I. DIOGENES<sup>a</sup>, surnamed Laërtius, as is generally supposed from Laërtes his native place, a town or castle in Cilicia, who wrote of the Lives and Opinions of the most famous philosophers in ten books, flourished, as<sup>b</sup> Vossius thinks, in the time of Antoninus the pious, or soon afterwards. Others<sup>c</sup> have thought it more probable, that he lived under Severus and his successors, and that his book of the Lives of the Philosophers was written about the year 210; where also I shall place him.

II. Says St. Luke, Acts xvii. 16. . . . 23. *Now while Paul waited for Silas and Timothy at Athens, his spirit was stirred within him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry. Therefore disputed he in the synagogue with the Jews, and the devout persons [or profelytes:] and in the market daily with them that met him. Then certain philosophers, of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him. And some said: What will this babbler say? Others: He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods, because he preached to them Jesus, and the resurrection. And they took him, and brought him to the Areopagus, saying: May we know, what this new doctrine is, whereof thou speakest? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears: we would know, therefore, what these things mean. (For all the Athenians, and strangers which were there, spent their time*

<sup>a</sup> Voss. de Histor. Gr. l. ii. cap. 13. Tillem. H. Emp. Severe art. 16. Rollin. Hist. Anc. T. xii. p. 266. Diogene Laerte. Diction. de Morery. Crevier's Hist. of

the Roman Emperors. Vol. viii. p. 148.

<sup>b</sup> Nempe vixit Laërtius sub Antonino Pio, vel paullo post. Voss. ut supra.

<sup>c</sup> Tillemont as above.

in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing.) Paul, therefore, standing up in the midst of the Areopagus, said: Ye men of Athens, I perceive, that ye are in all things very religious. For as I passed along, and observed the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this inscription: TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom, therefore, ye worship without knowing him, Him do I declare unto you. After which follows the rest of the apostle's excellent discourse.

The introduction to this speech was distinctly considered<sup>d</sup> formerly: and the propriety and decency of the Apostle's address to the Athenians were clearly shewn.

I now intend to consider the inscription, *To the unknown God*, of which \*\* he here reminds the Athenians, and upon which he argues so rationally. For, if I mistake not, I have now an opportunity to illustrate this text by a paragraph of Diogenes in the Life of Epimenides: which, therefore, I shall here transcribe at length, and then explain.

Epimenides is supposed to have been contemporary with Solon, and to have lived in the forty-sixth Olympiad, almost six hundred years before the nativity of our Saviour. And Laërtius has given us a letter of Epimenides sent to Solon ††.

Diogenes Laërtius, having related some strange things of Epimenides, goes on: ' At<sup>e</sup> this time the fame of Epimenides was  
' very

<sup>d</sup> See Vol. i. p. 192, 193.

\*\* ' The Being and Attributes of God, appear to have been known to the philosophers and sages of antiquity: and that only seems to have been unknown to them, which is also unknown to us, namely, the mode of his existence: the knowledge of which is either unnecessary, or else could not be revealed to such creatures as we are, who cannot comprehend, or have any idea of spirit. . . . It was in this sense, that God was unknown to the sages of antiquity: and to this unknown God, I doubt not, but one or other of them erected the famous altar, which St. Paul took so much notice of, and attributed to the superstition of the Athenians. But in this I cannot help thinking there was some mistake. An altar, with such an inscription, could hardly be set up by the priests of that country, - because it rather tended to destroy superstition, and subvert their power and influence, than to establish either. Their gods were local, their names and temples publicly known, and their priests strove who should gain the greatest number of profitable votaries. This altar, then must surely have been erected by

' some philosopher, to the One True God, who was known by the effects of his infinite power, wisdom, and goodness: but unknown as to the mode of his existence. The one true God, (whom we now adore,) was neither known, nor worshipped by the ignorant, deceived, heathen multitude. Neither was he ignorantly worshipped by philosophers. For they might, and every one who exercises his reason in the inquiry, may, from the works of creation, trace out the Being and Attributes of God.' The Morality of the N. T. digested under various heads. p. 50. . . . 52.

So says the anonymous Writer of the book just mentioned. I do not perceive, what is ' the mistake,' which is here imputed, or intended to be imputed to St. Paul. Nor indeed am I able to understand, or make out a consistent sense in the rest which is here said. However, it may be all clear to some, and important likewise. I therefore thought it not improper, that these observations should lie before my readers, in a note at least, that such use may be made of them, as is judged to be reasonable.

†† Diogen. La. l. i. § 113. p. 72.

<sup>e</sup> Γνωσθεις δε παρα τοις Ελλησι θεοφιλες αλλοις

very great among all the Greeks, and he was supposed to be in  
 great favour with the gods. The Athenians being afflicted  
 with a pestilence, they were directed by the Pythian oracle to  
 get their city purified by expiation. They therefore sent  
 Nicias, son of Niceratus, in a ship to Crete, inviting Epimeni-  
 des to come to them. He coming thither in the forty-sixth  
 Olympiad, purified their city, and delivered them from the  
 pestilence in this manner. Taking several sheep, some black,  
 others white, he had them up to the Areopagus; and then let  
 them go where they would: and gave orders to those who fol-  
 lowed them, wherever any one of them should lie down, to sa-  
 crifice it to the God to whom it belonged. And so the plague  
 ceased. Hence it comes to pass, that to this present time may  
 be found in the boroughs of the Athenians anonymous altars,  
 a memorial of the expiation then made.

This paragraph, I think, will mightily illustrate the text above  
 cited from the Acts: but before I make my observations, it may  
 be not amiss to allege the observations of divers Christian inter-  
 preters, both ancient and modern.

Jerom, in his comment upon the first chapter of Titus, ver.  
 12, says: 'The inscription of the altar at Athens was not to  
 the unknown God, as St. Paul quotes it, but to the gods of Asia,  
 and Europe, and Africa, unknown and strange gods.' He speaks  
 to the like purpose in another place; and supposeth, that the  
 apostle had not quoted the inscription exactly, but dextrously  
 applied it to his own purpose.

Chrysofom, in a homily upon the Acts of the apostles, speaks  
 to this purpose: 'I found an altar with this inscription, to the

Unknown

λεγόμενος είναι υπεληφθη. Οθεν Αθηναίοις τῷ  
 τε λοιμῷ κατεχομένοις ἐχρησεν ἡ Πυθία κα-  
 θηραι τὴν πόλιν. Οἱ δὲ πεμπασί ναυι τε  
 καὶ Νικίαν τὸν Νικηραῖον εἰς Κρήνην, καλεῖν-  
 τες τὸν Ἐπιμηνίδην. Καὶ ὅς ἐλθὼν Ὀλυμπια-  
 δὶ τεσσαρακοστῇ ἐκὴν ἐκαθέρην αὐτῶν τὴν πό-  
 λιν, καὶ ἐπαύσε τὸν λοιμὸν τῆσιν τὸν τροπὸν.  
 Λαβὼν προβάτια μελανα τε καὶ λευκα, ἤλασε  
 πρὸς τὸν Ἀρειὸν πάγον· καὶ κείθεν εἰσένειναι  
 αἱ βηλοῖοι, πρὸς ἄξας τοῖς ἀκολυθητοῖς, εἰθα-  
 αὖ καλακλινοὶ αὐτῶν ἕκαστον, θυεῖν τῷ προστη-  
 κοῦσι Θεῷ καὶ εἰσὶν ληξάει τὸ κακόν. Οθεν ἐτι καὶ  
 νῦν εἰσὶν εὐρεῖν κατὰ τῆς δημοῦς τῶν Ἀθηναίων  
 βωμῆς ἀνωθυμῆς, ὑπομνημα τῆς τότε γενο-  
 μένης ἐξίλασεως. Diog. Laërt. in Epime-  
 nide. l. i. segm. 110. p. 70, 71.

f Nec mirum, si pro opportunitate tem-  
 poris, gentilium poetarum versibus abuta-  
 tur: quum etiam de inscriptione aræ ali-  
 qua commutans, ad Athenicenses loquutus

sit: Pertransiens enim, inquit, et contemplans  
 culturas vestras, inveni et aram, in qua scri-  
 per scriptum est: Ignoto Deo. Quod ergo ig-  
 norantes colitis, hoc ego annuncio vobis. In-  
 scriptio autem aræ non ita erat, ut Paulus  
 asseruit, Ignoto Deo, sed ita; Diis Asia et  
 Europa, et Africa, diis ignotis et peregrinis.  
 Verum quia Paulus non diis indigebat ig-  
 notis, sed uno tantum ignoto Deo, singulari  
 verbo usus est. &c. In ep. ad Titum. cap.  
 i. T. iv. P. i. p. 420.

h Ac ne pa-  
 rum hoc esset, ductor Christiani exercitus,  
 et orator invictus pro Christo causam agens,  
 etiam inscriptionem fortuitam, arte torquet  
 in argumentum fidei. Didicerat enim a  
 vero David extorquere de manibus hostium,  
 et Golizæ superbissimi caput proprio mo-  
 crone truncare. Ad magnum. ep. 83. T.  
 iv. P. ii. p. 655.

h . . . εὐρεῖν καὶ  
 βωμῶν, ἐν ᾧ ἐπιεῖς ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου Θεῶν.

‘ *Unknown God.* What is that! The Athenians, who in a long tract of time had received various gods from their neighbours, as the temple of Minerva, Pan, and others from elsewhere; apprehensive that there might be still some other god, unknown to them, who was worshipped elsewhere in other places, for the greater safety erected also an altar to him. But because the god was not manifest, they put upon it this inscription, *To the Unknown God.* This God, Paul says, is Jesus Christ, or rather the God of the universe. *Whom therefore you ignorantly worship,* says he, *him declare I unto you.*’

So speaks Chrysoftom: nor do I perceive him to have had any doubt about the genuineness of the inscription, as composed in the singular number, *To the Unknown God.*

Nevertheless Theophylact<sup>l</sup> and Oecumenius<sup>k</sup> after saying the same that is in Chrysoftom, add: that the whole of the inscription was to this purpose. *To the gods of Asia, and Europe, and Libya, to the unknown and strange God.*

Isidore of Pelusium has a letter upon this subject, which begins in this manner. ‘ There<sup>l</sup> were, as is said, two causes of the inscription of the altar at Athens, *To the unknown God.* And having taken notice of the second occasion, which was a pestilence, he says, that<sup>m</sup> after their deliverance the Athenians erected a temple and altar, with this inscription, *To the Unknown God.*’ Nor do I perceive that there is, throughout that letter, any the least intimation, that there was at Athens any altar inscribed *to unknown gods* in the plural number.

There is, therefore, great inaccuracy in the quotation of Isidore of Pelusium, which is in Mr. Wetstein’s New Testament. For<sup>n</sup> there he is quoted as saying, that ‘ the whole inscription of the altar, was, *To the gods of Asia, Europe, and Libya, the unknown and strange God.*’ Which, indeed, is very agreeable to Theophylact and Oecumenius, as just seen: but Isidore says nothing of that kind.

εσι τῶ; οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι; ἐπειδὴν κατὰ καιρὸς πολλὰς ἐδεξάντο θεοὺς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπεροχῆς αὐτοῦ, τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν, τὸν Παιῖα, καὶ ἄλλοι; ἀλλαχούθεν, δεδοικότες, μηποτέ καὶ ἄλλοι; τίς ἢ αὐτοῖς μὲν εὐδαιμονία γινώσκοντο, δευτερευούσης δὲ ἀλλαγῆς, ὑπερπλεονεξίας δὲ ἀσφαλείας, καὶ τῶν βωμῶν ἐσησάν. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐκ τῆς ὁμοίας οὗ θεοῦ, ἐπέσειραπτο, Ἀσιῶν θεῶν. Τῶν ἂν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Παιῖα λέγει· μαλλοῦ δὲ τῶν παλίων θεῶν. Οἱ ἂν ἀπιστοὶ, φησὶν εὐσεβεῖν, τῶν ἐν ἐκείνοις ἡμέραις. In Act. Apost. hom. 38. T. ix. p. 287. A. Bened.

<sup>l</sup> Theoph. in Act. Ap. p. 151.

<sup>k</sup> Ἐστὶ δὲ πάντα τὰ βωμῶν ἐπιγραφή τοιαύτη· Θεοῖς Ἀσίας καὶ Ἑυρώπης καὶ Λιβύης· Θεῶ Ἀσιῶν καὶ ξένων. Oecum. in Act. Ap. p. 137.

<sup>l</sup> Δύω φασὶν Ἀσίας εἶναι, τὴν ἐπιγραφομένην Ἀθηνᾶσι τῶ βωμῶ Ἀσιῶν θεῶν. κ. λ. Ibid. l. iv. ep. 69.

<sup>m</sup> . . . ἰσχυροὶ δειμαμένοι καὶ βωμῶν, ἐπιγραφαί, Ἀσιῶν θεῶν. Ibid.

<sup>n</sup> Isidorus iv. 69. Ἡ πάντα τὰ βωμῶ ἐπιγραφή, Θεοῖς Ἀσίας, καὶ Ἑυρώπης, καὶ Λιβύης, Θεῶ Ἀσιῶν καὶ ξένων. Wetsten. in Act. Ap. cap. xvii. 23.

We have seen therefore two ancient Christian writers, Chrysostom and Isidore of Pelusium, in the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century, who supposed; that the inscription at Athens was in the singular number, as St. Paul quotes it.

The opinions of learned moderns have been different. Many maintain the genuineness of the inscription, as cited by St. Paul. But Le Clerc says, that<sup>o</sup> though the inscription was in the plural number, St. Paul was in the right to allege it in the singular number.

In the year 1724 was published at Cambridge a Latin sermon upon this<sup>p</sup> subject. I read it when it came out: but I know not now where to find it. I remember well, that it is a very learned and elaborate discourse: and I made some extracts which are still by me; but they are defective and imperfect. However, I perceive<sup>r</sup> by them, that the<sup>q</sup> author Dr. Drake asserted the inscription to have been in the singular number; though my extracts are not particular enough, to shew how he made it out. But I know, that he argued from the place of Oecumenius above quoted by me, and likewise from the dialogue Philopatris, which I also shall quote by and by.

Having seen the judgment of learned Christians, ancient and modern, I here intend to propose my own observations.

Diogenes Laërtius informs us, that the Athenians, by the direction of an oracle, sent for Epimenides to purify, or expiate their city, when they were afflicted with a pestilence: Epimenides, when he came to Athens, took several sheep, some black, some white, and then let them go where they would, directing those who followed them, when any one should lie down, to sacrifice it to the God to whom it belonged: which in the Latin version is<sup>r</sup> rendered, ‘to the god next the place.’ Which translation, as I perceive by my extracts, is disliked by Dr. Drake. He therefore translates in this manner: to ‘<sup>s</sup> the proper god, to whom  
‘ that

<sup>o</sup> Quamvis plurali numero legeretur inscriptio, Ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, recte de Deo Ignoto loquutus est Paulus, quia plurali numero continetur singularis. Cleric. H. E. A. 52. p. 374. in notis.

<sup>p</sup> *Ara Ignoto Deo sacra*: ad Clerum habita Cantabrigiæ vii. Idus Julii 1724, pro gradu Doctoratus in sacra Theologia. Auctore Samuele Drake. S. T. P. Collegii Divi Johannis Evangelistæ Socio. . . . Cantab. 1724. <sup>q</sup> Fatendum tamen est, plures fuisse olim Deos, quorum opem auxiliumque anonymis aris invocabant. . . . Hanc autem, de quâ speciatim egit Apostolus in-

scriptionem singulari fuisse numero protata: confirmat ipsius Pauli fides, industria, non sequioris ætatis testimonio, non Hieronymi conjecturæ posthabenda. Drake ubi supra. p. 5. In Excerptis nostris.

<sup>r</sup> His qui illas sequebantur, ubicunque illæ accubuissent, singulas mactarent loci ejus proximo Deo. <sup>s</sup> Hujus [Epimenidis] consilio monitos tradit, Athenienses, cum patrios deos frustra fatigarent, sacra ut facerent, aram que construerent τῷ προστάκοντι Θεῷ: non, ut male Laërtii interpres. . . . ‘loci ejus proximo Deo: verum Deo convenienti,’ Deo, ad quem res illa

‘ that affair belonged, to him, whoever he was, who should remove the inflicted pestilence.’ Dr. Doddridge, reciting this paragraph in his notes upon Acts ch. xvii. understands the direction to be, ‘ when the sheep lay down, to sacrifice them to the god, near whose temple or altar they then were.’

There is another sense, which appears to me to be very obvious, and therefore I think to be right. Epimenides took with him up to the Areopagus several sheep, ‘ some black, some white.’ And when he let them go, he directed, that each one, when it lay down, ‘ should be sacrificed to the god to which it appertained, or belonged,’ ut eam mactarent Deo, ad quem pertineret. Black sacrifices were offered to some gods, white to others. Epimenides knew not by what god the pestilence had been inflicted upon the Athenians. When he was desired to purify the city, in order to its deliverance, he chose out sacrifices of different kinds, black sheep, and white sheep, and led them up to the Areopagus: and from that place, the citadel or the seat of the senate and of the court of judicature, he sent out the sheep, as in the name of the whole city and commonwealth, to be sacrificed, in order to appease the offended Deity, whoever he was. A sheep with a black fleece, when it lay down, was to be offered to a deity who delighted in such sacrifices. A sheep with a white fleece was to be offered to a deity, to whom white sacrifices were acceptable. By this means he hoped to ingratiate the offended deity, whoever he was.

It follows in Laërtius: ‘ And so the plague ceased. Hence it has come to pass, that to this present time, may be found in the boroughs of the Athenians, anonymous altars, a memorial of the expiation then made.’

‘ In the boroughs of the Athenians.’ So I have translated, καὶ τὰς δημοὺς τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Of them Potter speaks in this manner: ‘ These Δῆμοι were little boroughs in Attica, several of which were reckoned together in the business of the commonwealth; yet had separate habitations, and distinct rites, and gods too; for each of them adored peculiar deities: and yet all unanimously agreed in worshipping Minerva, who was the tutelar goddess of the whole country.’

ista pertinebat: ei, quisquis tandem is fuerit, qui immissam luem propulsaret. Drake, ubi supra, p. 6.

Which seems to me to be much the same with that of Grotius. . . . Sicut Laërtius, originem hujus rei narrans, dicit ab Epi-

menide monitos Athenienses, ut sacra facerent τῷ προσηκούσι Θεῷ, id est, ‘ ei Deo, ad quem ea res pertineret,’ non addito nomine. Grotius.

† Potter’s Antiquities of Greece. B. i. ch. ix. p. 50. vol. i. Oxford. 1699.

Thus I have explained this paragraph as I am able. I am now to make some observations: but they will be no more than two only. First, there were several anonymous altars at Athens, and in the adjoining country. We know not how many sheep Epimenides took up with him to the Areopagus, and then let them go away at pleasure: but they would all lie down when weary, if not before; some, it is likely, in the streets, or other public places of the city of Athens; others in the adjacent country: where they were sacrificed to the god, to whom they were supposed to appertain; according to their different colours. And the city being hereby expiated, and purified, and delivered from the pestilence, there was an anonymous altar erected in every place, where a sacrifice had been made, in memorial of the obtained deliverance. Secondly, all these altars were in the singular number. For each 'sheep, when it lay down, was to be sacrificed to the god to whom it appertained.'

Thus then, according to this curious history in Laërtius, St. Paul must have been in the right, when he said, *he had found an altar with this inscription: To the Unknown God.* And even to the time of Laërtius, there were still such anonymous altars to be found in the boroughs of the Athenians.

Let us now observe some other heathen writers; where, possibly, we may find some things confirming these observations, or however at least casting farther light upon them. I shall first quote Pausanias, who flourished and wrote before the end of the second century. Having mentioned an altar of Jupiter Olympius, he says, 'and nigh unto it is an altar of unknown gods.' He does not say, 'the altar,' but 'an altar.' Therefore there may have been several such altars, as Laërtius says. And when he says, 'an altar of unknown gods,' he needs not to be understood to mean, that the inscription was in the plural number: it may have been, and probably was, in the singular number.

In another place Pausanias speaks of 'altars of gods called unknown, and of heroes, and of the sons of Theseus, and Phalerus.' The inscription of this altar likewise may have been in the singular number: but as there were several altars at Athens, or near it, inscribed *To the unknown God*, it was natural enough for some writers to call them 'altars of unknown gods.' So says Grotius: 'When Pausanias says, that there were at

<sup>v</sup> Καλεῖται δὲ Ὀλυμπίου Διός. Πρὸς αὐτὴν δ' ἔστιν ἀγνωστῶν θεῶν βωμός. Pausan. l. v. p. 412. <sup>x</sup> Βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνωστῶν, καὶ ἡρώων, καὶ παίδων τῶν Ἑστιάων, καὶ Φαληρέων. Paul. l. i. p. 4.

<sup>y</sup> Cum Pausanias ait, aras Athenis fuisse θεῶν ἀγνωστῶν, hoc vult, multas fuisse aras tali inscriptione θεῶν ἀγνωστῶν: quamquam potuere et aliæ esse pluraliter inscriptæ, aliæ singulariter. Grot. ad Act. xvii.

‘ Athens altars of unknown gods, he means, that there were  
 ‘ many altars with such an inscription, *To the Unknown God* :  
 ‘ though, possibly, there were some with an inscription in the  
 ‘ plural number, whilst others were in the singular.’ Olearius<sup>z</sup>  
 has expressed himself in the like manner.

The first observation appears to me very right. The second  
 observation, ‘ that there might be also some altars in the plural  
 ‘ number, to *unknown gods*,’ is a supposition, without proof, or  
 evidence, so far as I see, and therefore may not be true.

Philostratus records it, as an observation of Apollonius Tya-  
 næus, ‘ that<sup>a</sup> we are never to speak disrespectfully of any of the  
 ‘ gods: intimating also at the same time, that there was some  
 ‘ special reason to be upon the guard in that respect, at Athens,  
 ‘ where are altars to unknown dæmons.’

But neither does this necessarily imply, that there were altars  
 with inscriptions to *unknown gods* in the plural number. It implies  
 no more, than that there were several altars with that inscription  
*To the Unknown God*. And farther: We are hereby led to think,  
 that inscriptions, to *the Unknown God*, were peculiar to the Athe-  
 nians. There were no such inscriptions any where else.

I come now at length to the Dialogue Philopatris, quoted by  
 Dr. Drake, and others, as a work of Lucian: but I rather think,  
 of some anonymous heathen author in the fourth century.

Here Critias confirms what he says, swearing ‘<sup>b</sup> by the Un-  
 ‘ known God at Athens.’ And near the end of the Dialogue:  
 ‘ But<sup>c</sup> let us find out the Unknown God at Athens, and stretch-  
 ‘ ing our hands to heaven, offer to him our praises and thankf-  
 ‘ givings, that we are worthy to live under so great an empire,  
 ‘ and leave others to trifle as they please.’

Which must lead us to think, that the inscription at Athens  
 was in the singular number. There can be no reason assigned,  
 why this author doing his utmost to expose and ridicule the  
 Christians, should adopt the singular number, if the inscription  
 was plural.

<sup>z</sup> Cæteri auctores omnes, qui altarium meminerunt των ασγνωτων, plurali numero illos deos esserunt. Puto tamen Pausaniæ et Philostrati loca viris doctis observata, in quibus βωμων Θεων ασγνωτων mentio, ita accipi posse, ut aræ existisse multæ intelligantur, quorum singulis, aut saltem quibusdam ex iis inscriptio fuerit, Θεω ασγνωτω. Olearius apud Wolf. in Act. Ap. xvii. 23.

Θεων εν λεξειν, και ταυτα Αθηνησιν, εν εν ασγνωτων δαιμοιων βωμοι ιδροθαι. Philost. Apoll. Tyan. l. vi. cap. 3. p. 232. Conf. Suid. V. Τιμασιων. <sup>b</sup> Νη τον ασγνωτον εν Αθηναϊς. Lucian. Philop. p. 767. Tom. ii. Γραν. <sup>c</sup> Ημεις δε, τον Αθηναϊς ασγνωτον εφευροντες, και προσκυνησαιτες, χειρας εις ορανον εκτειναντες, ταυτα ευχαρισησομεν. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 780.

... σαφροιστερον γαρ το περι παντων

Thus I have now illustrated this text by the testimonies of heathen authors, who wrote whilst these altars with their inscriptions were in being: Diogenes Laërtius, Pausanias, Philostratus, and the author of Philopatris. The inscription upon the altar at Athens was in the singular number: nor does it appear, that there were any in the plural to *Unknown Gods*. And this inscription seems to have been peculiar to the Athenians. It does not appear, that there were any altars inscribed *To the Unknown God* in any other countries. But when I say, these altars were peculiar to the Athenians, I do not intend the city of Athens alone: for there were several like altars in the boroughs of the Athenians, and possibly in some other adjoining places. The altar observed by Paul, probably, was in some street, or open place of the city of Athens: the altars mentioned by Pausanias were elsewhere. That which I first quoted from him was at Olympia: the other was at Phalerus, as<sup>d</sup> he expressly says, which was the nearest sea-port to Athens, and not far off from the city.

I shall now recite the observations of the late Mr. Hallett of Exeter. Having argued the great ignorance of the heathen people concerning the Deity, and having alleged several texts from the New Testament to the same purpose, he goes on: ‘ The  
 ‘ same St. Paul, when he was at Athens, where, if any where,  
 ‘ the heathens should have known better, took notice, that the  
 ‘ people had no knowledge of the true God. He found there  
 ‘ an altar erected *to the Unknown God*, Acts xvii. 23, that is, they  
 ‘ did not know by what name to call him. This is manifest from  
 ‘ the occasion of erecting the altar, which was this: About 600  
 ‘ years before our Saviour’s birth, there was a pestilence at Athens.  
 ‘ In order to get it removed, upon the advice of the philosopher  
 ‘ Epimenides, (who appears by this to have been as ignorant of  
 ‘ the true God as the Athenian populace) the people sacrificed  
 ‘ many sheep, not to any particular idol, but to that God, be  
 ‘ he who he would, who was able to remove the pestilence from  
 ‘ them: upon which, it is said, the plague was stayed, In me-  
 ‘ mory of this deliverance the Athenians erected several altars,  
 ‘ which the historian Diogenes Laërtius calls Anonymous, because  
 ‘ there was no name of any particular god inscribed upon them.  
 ‘ The altars were erected, not to the honour of Jupiter, Mars,  
 ‘ Apollo, by name, but to that particular god, whoever he was,  
 ‘ who had wrought out this deliverance for them. See Laërtius  
 ‘ in his Life of Epimenides. If they had known, that Jupiter

<sup>d</sup> Ο δε επι Φαληρω, καλα και πολυρον ειρηλαι μοι. . . . Paus. p. 4.  
 Notes and Discourses upon texts of Scripture. Vol. i. p. 307. . . . 309.

<sup>e</sup> Mr. Hallett’s

' had removed the plague, they would have inscribed their altars  
 ' to Jupiter. If they had known, that Apollo had removed the  
 ' plague, they would have inscribed the altars to Apollo. But  
 ' while they could not tell, which of all their gods it was, who  
 ' had removed the plague, they did not dedicate the altars to any  
 ' one god by name, but to that god, whoever he was, who had  
 ' thus delivered them. But still they thought, this god, who-  
 ' ever he was, was one of the idols of the heathen world. They  
 ' did not suspect him to be a being of any greater wisdom and  
 ' power than their own Jupiter and Apollo. They took their  
 ' deliverer to be an idol of the same sort and size as the rest  
 ' whom they worshipped. But the truth was, (though they did  
 ' not know it,) that he, who delivered them by his providence  
 ' from that distress, was the one infinite, supreme God. And  
 ' therefore St. Paul justly says, that the Athenians worshipped  
 ' him: for they worshipped him who removed the plague, who-  
 ' ever he was. But the true God removed the plague: therefore  
 ' they worshipped the true God. But still, as the apostle ob-  
 ' serves; they worshipped him ignorantly, that is, they were ig-  
 ' norant of his true greatness, majesty, and power, and looked  
 ' upon him as no greater than one of their own idols. Which  
 ' worshipping of him in this ignorant manner, and under this de-  
 ' basing notion, was not much, if any thing, better than their not  
 ' worshipping him at all. Accordingly St. Paul, in this same dis-  
 ' course, chargeth them, as men who yet wanted *to seek and find*  
 ' *out* the true God, ver. 27. as thinking, that the *Godhead was*  
 ' *like to gold and silver images*, ver. 29, and as men *living in times*  
 ' *of ignorance*, ver. 30. To which we may add what the same  
 ' apostle says, 1 Cor. i. 21, that *the world, by means of wisdom,*  
 ' that is, of the philosophy of the heathens, which was accounted  
 ' wisdom, *knew not God*. Agreeably to this, we may take no-  
 ' tice throughout the Old Testament, that the heathen nations,  
 ' who heard of Jehovah, did not look upon him as any other  
 ' than the idol of Judea, a being of the same kind with Baal,  
 ' Chemosh, and the like.' So writes my much esteemed friend  
 the late Mr. Joseph Hallett.

III. In the Life of Pythagoras, among his precepts, Diogenes  
 Laërtius mentions this: ' That <sup>f</sup> a loaf should not be broke,  
 ' because it was anciently the custom for friends to meet together  
 ' at one loaf, as the Barbarians do now. And therefore that  
 ' should not be divided which brings them together.'

<sup>f</sup> Ἄριστοι μὴ κατὰ τὴν εἰς ἐπὶ εἰς αἱ παλαιὰ τῶν φίλων εἰσοίων, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν αἱ βαρ-  
 βάρη μὴ διαιρεῖν ἐς συνάσει αἰθέρι. Diog. La. l. viii. § 35. p. 518.

Gregorius Giraldus supposed, that <sup>s</sup>, by Barbarians Laërtius here meant Christians, and that he refers to their assemblies, where they met together to partake of the eucharist. But other learned men with more reason, as seems to me, believe, that he here intends such as were properly called Barbarians, and that there is here no reference at all to the Christians.

For certain, I lay not any stress upon this passage: I only put it down here, that it might not be suspected to be omitted merely through oversight, and that all may judge of it.

---

C H A P. XXV.

A L E X A N D E R S E V E R U S.

- I. *His time.* II. *Divers passages concerning the Christians, from his Life, written by Lampridius, an heathen author, about the year of Christ 306.* III. *Of Mammæa, the emperor's mother, by some said to have been a Christian.*

I. SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS was succeeded by his son Caracalla; he by Macrinus; he by Heliogabalus, concerning whom I shall transcribe a passage from <sup>a</sup> Lampridius, when I come to the chapter of the Augustan writers. Heliogabalus was succeeded by ALEXANDER SEVERUS, whose <sup>b</sup> reign is computed from March 6, 222, to March 14, or 19, in the year 235. He reigned thirteen years, and died before he was seven and twenty years of age. Alexander is much commended, as an excellent prince, by <sup>c</sup> Lampridius, as well as by <sup>d</sup> others.

II. His Life of Alexander is addressed to Constantine: he has in it several passages relating to the Christians, which must be taken notice of.

<sup>s</sup> Gregorius Giraldus, vir doctissimus, in libello de Pythagoræ symbolis, quid de hoc symbolo scribat, omnibus in promptu est. Quod autem barbaros Laertius Christianos hoc loco significet, id mihi nullo modo probatur. Neque enim solent a scriptoribus quantumvis Ethnicis hoc nomine appellari. Sed barbaros intelligo vere barbaros, apud quos certum est, eum morem viguisse, coeundi in conviviis, qui idem omnium fere gentium mos est. Aldobrand. in loc. Et Conf. Menag. p. 370. Vid. et Jamblich. de Vita Pythagoræ. num. 86.

cap. 18.

cap. iii. p. 796.

235. num. ii. Basn. ann. 222. num. iii. Tillem. L'Emp. Alexandre. art. xxv. 2<sup>a</sup> Crevier's Hist. of the Roman Emperors. Vol. viii. p. 277.

<sup>c</sup> Atque hæc parva sunt, nisi quod dignum re exhibuit, quem Senatus servaret, quem salvum milites cuperent, quem omnium bonorum sententia principem diceret. Æl. Lamprid. Sever. Alex. cap. 2. p. 883.

<sup>d</sup> Judæis privilegia reservavit: Christianos esse passus est. Ib. cap. 22. p. 914.

1. Of this emperor Lampridius says: 'He<sup>e</sup> maintained the privileges of the Jews: He tolerated the Christians.'

2. Of the same emperor he says: 'His<sup>f</sup> way of living was this. Early in the morning, if there was no impediment, he performed some acts of religious worship in his own private chapel, in which were the deified emperors, and also some eminently good men, and among them Apollonius: and, as a writer of his time says, Christ, Abraham, and Orpheus, (whom he considered as deities,) and the images of his ancestors.'

3. In a following chapter Lampridius says: 'this<sup>g</sup> emperor called Virgil the Plato of poets, and placed his image with that of Cicero, in his second chapel, where also were the statues of Achilles, and other great men: but Alexander the great he placed among the deified, and the best, in his more honourable chapel.'

Whereby it appears, that this emperor had two chapels, one greater, and more honourable, the other less honourable. Christ was in the former. We are likewise to observe, that this was mentioned by a writer of this emperor's own time: who, probably, was a gentile, or heathen, our author himself being a heathen, and making his collections from such.

4. Of the same emperor Lampridius likewise says: 'He<sup>h</sup> had a mind to build a temple to Christ, and to receive him into the number of the deities. Which Adrian also is supposed to have thought of before; who ordered temples without images to be erected in all cities: which temples, at this very time, because they have no deities in them are called Adrian's. And he is said to have prepared them for that purpose: but he was forbid by those who consulted the oracles, they having found, that if that was done, all men would become Christians, and the other temples would be forsaken.'

<sup>e</sup> Fuit ita moratus Alexander, ita vitæ acque animo constitutus, ut inter Ethnicos, paucos æquales habuerit, superiorem forte æminem. Basnag. ann. 222. num. v.

<sup>f</sup> Usus vivendi eidem hic fuit: primum, ut, si facultas esset, id est, si non cum uxore cubasset, matutinis horis in larario suo, in quo et divos principes, sed optimos, electos, et animas sanctiores, in quibus et Apollonium, et quantum scriptor suorum temporum dicit, Christum, Abraham, et Orpheum, (et hujuscemodi deos habebat,) ac majorum effigies, rem divinam faciebat. Ib. cap. 29. p. 930.

<sup>g</sup> Virgilium autem Platonem poetarum vocabat, ejusque imaginem cum Ciceronis simulachro, in

secundo larario habuit, ubi et Achillis, et magnorum virorum. Alexandrum vero Magnum inter divos et optimos, in larario majore consecravit. Ib. cap. 31. p. 936.

<sup>h</sup> Christo templum facere voluit, eum<sup>i</sup> que inter deos recipere. Quod et Adrianus cogitasse fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitatibus sine simulachris jusserat fieri: quæ hodie idcirco, quia non habent numina, dicuntur Adriani. Quæ illæ ad hoc parasse dicebatur. Sed prohibitus est ab iis, qui consulentes sacra, repererunt, omnes Christianos futuros, si id optato evenisset, et templa reliqua deserenda. Ib. cap. 43. p. 993.

What

What Lampridius here says of the temples built by Adrian, without statues, was considered formerly in another place<sup>1</sup>, to which the reader is referred. We did not then think it reasonable to believe, that Adrian intended to have those temples consecrated to Christ: consequently, it may be questioned, whether we ought to rely upon what Lampridius here says of Alexander's designing to build a temple to Christ.

Farther, he says of this emperor: 'When<sup>k</sup> he was about to appoint any to the governments of provinces, or to other like offices, he published their names, inviting the people, if they had any crimes to lay to their charge, to produce their evidences: at the same time declaring, that if any charged what he could not prove, he should be put to death. And he said: 'It was a miserable thing, that when the Christians and Jews observed this method, of publishing the names of their priests before they were ordained, the like care should not be taken about the governors of provinces, with whom the lives and fortunes of men were entrusted.'

That is a testimony to a custom in use among Christians, and to the concern they had for the good character of those, who were to be ordained to any offices in the church. It is also an argument, that Christians, and their affairs, were then well known in the world.

6. Afterwards, in the same Life, Lampridius says: 'When<sup>l</sup> the Christians had seized a spot of ground which was public; and on the other hand the victuallers said, it ought to be granted to them; he gave this rescript, That it was better that God should be worshipped there in any manner, than that the ground should be granted to the victuallers.'

It cannot be determined, whether the Christians intended to raise a church upon that spot of ground, or only to make use of it for a cœmety, or burying place.

This emperor ought to be commended for his moderation, and for the justness of his sentiments. He judged a place, in which God was to be worshipped, though not in his own way,

<sup>i</sup> See before Vol. vii. p. 364—367.

<sup>k</sup> Et quia de publicandis dispositionibus mentio contigit, ubi aliquos voluisset vel rectores provinciis dare, vel præpositos facere, vel procuratores, id est, rationales, ordinare, nomina eorum proponebat, hortans populum, ut si quis quid haberet criminis; probaret manifestis rebus, si non probasset, subiret pœnam capitis. Dicebatque, grave esse, quum id Christiani et

Judæi facerent in prædicandis sacerdotibus qui ordinandi sunt, non fieri in provinciarum rectoribus, quibus et fortunæ hominum committerentur et capita. Ib. cap. 45. p. 997.

<sup>l</sup> Quum Christiani quendam locum, qui publicus fuerat, occupassent, contra popinarii dicerent, sibi eum deberi: rescripsit, melius esse, ut quocumque illic Deus colatur, quam popinariis dedatur. Ibid. cap. 49. p. 1003.

to be better employed, than when put to the uses of luxury. And we can hence conclude with certainty, that it was then well known, and generally believed, that promiscuous lewdness was no part of Christian worship, or at all practised in their assemblies.

Here Crevier<sup>m</sup> writes to this purpose: ‘ I observed before, that he favoured the Christians, and honoured Jesus Christ in his domestic chapel. It is added, that he intended to build a public temple to him; but this is far from being proved: on the contrary, it seems, as if, how much soever he might esteem the moral precepts of Christianity, he by no means approved of its religious worship. And this he shewed even upon an occasion in which he protected it. The Christians being molested by the vintners of Rome, on account of a building where they used to assemble, the emperor determined the dispute in favour of the former, by saying, that the building in question had better be used for the worship of the Divinity in any manner whatever, than to be made a tavern. Thus Alexander, loving virtue, esteemed it in the Christians: but he must not be said to have favoured them any farther.’

‘ If the building, I have been speaking of, was a church belonging to the Christians, which may be naturally enough supposed; this is the oldest testimony we have of any edifice publicly consecrated to the worship of our holy religion, known to be such by the Pagans.’

So Crevier. But I think it may be questioned, whether these observations are exactly suited to this passage of Lampridius.

7. Once more. The same writer says of the same emperor: ‘ If any went out of the road into the grounds of any private person, according to the nature of the ground, he was to be beaten with sticks in his presence, or whipped with rods, or fined. And if the quality of the offender exempted him from such punishments, he would severely reprove him, saying: “ Are you willing to have that done in your own field, which you do in another’s?” And he would often use a saying, which he had heard from some Jews or Christians, and which he well remembered: and when any one was corrected, he ordered the cryer to proclaim: “ What you would not have done to yourself,

<sup>n</sup> History of the Rom. Emperors. vol. 8. p. 345. <sup>n</sup> Si quis de viâ in aliquas possessionem deslexisset, pro qualitate lecti, aut fustibus subiciebatur in conspectu ejus, aut virgis, aut condemnationi. Aut si hæc omnia transfiret dignitas hominis, aut gravissimis contumeliis, quum diceret: Vis- te hoc in agro tuo fieri, quod alteri facis?

Clamabatque sæpius quod a quibusdam sive Judæis sive Christianis, audierat, et tenebat. Idque per præconem, quum aliquem emendaret, dici jubebat: ‘ Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.’ Quam sententiam usque adeo dilexit, ut in palatio, et in publicis operibus, præscribi juberet. Id. ib. cap. 51. p. 1006.

“ that

“ that do not you do to another.” Which saying he so highly esteemed, that he ordered it to be engraved upon his palace, and upon public buildings.’

These and other things, mentioned by Lampridius, are very honourable to this emperor.

III. His mother Mammæa also is greatly commended by some Christian writers. Eusebius<sup>o</sup> calls her a pious and religious woman. And Orosius says, she<sup>p</sup> was a Christian. The main foundation of this supposition is, that as Eusebius informs us, she sent for Origen to come to her at Antioch: which might be no more than curiosity to see and discourse with a man, who was then in great reputation for learning. Crevier<sup>q</sup> therefore justly observes: ‘ She is said to have been a Christian; but that fact is not sufficiently proved.’ And Basnage<sup>r</sup> has offered divers arguments, sufficient to overthrow that supposition.

---

## C H A P. XXVI.

### U L P I A N.

I. *His time.* II. *A passage of Lactantius concerning his work of the Duty of a Proconsul, in which he says, that Ulpian had collected all the edicts of former emperors against the Christians.* III. *Observations of learned men concerning Ulpian, and his work.* IV. *Qu. Whether there remain, in the Pandects, any laws against the Christians?*

I. DOMITIUS ULPIANUS<sup>a</sup>, OF ULPIAN, was a native of Tyre in Phœnicia. After he had distinguished himself as a great lawyer in former reigns, he was made præfect of the prætorium by Severus Alexander; but was murdered by the prætorian soldiers, as is computed, in the year 228. I place him at the year 222, when the emperor Alexander began his reign.

II. ‘ Lactantius<sup>b</sup>, among other cruelties practised by worshippers of idols, or heathen deities, reckons laws of princes, and

<sup>o</sup> H. E. l. vi. cap. 21. mater Mammæa, Christiana, Origenem presbyterum audire curavit. Oros. l. vii. cap. 18. <sup>q</sup> Hist. of the Rom. Emperors. vol. viii. p. 277. <sup>r</sup> Ann. 222. num. iv. <sup>a</sup> Vid. Dion. Cass. lib. 80. Eutrop. l. viii. c. 23. Zos. l. i. p. 638. Spartian. de Pescennio Nigro.

<sup>p</sup> Cujus cap. 7. Lamprid. in Alexandro Severo. cap. 26. 31. 51. Victor. de Cæsarib. cap. 24. Tillem. L’Emp. Alexandre. art. xvii. Crevier in his Lives of the Roman Emperors. Vol. viii. p. 112. &c. Fabric. Bib. Lat. Tom. i. p. 820. <sup>b</sup> Hoc est Deorum disciplina. Ad hæc opera cultus suos erudiunt. Hæc sacra desiderat. Quincius

‘ and decrees of lawyers, against good men worshippers of the true God.’ ‘ Domitius, writing of the office of a proconsul, in the seventh book of that work, put together the wicked edicts, that he might shew, what punishments ought to be inflicted upon those who professed themselves to be worshippers of God.’

III. Herman Witfius supposeth, ‘ that Ulpian was very averse to the Christians: but the emperor was favourable to them. He saw, that Alexander would never enact any laws against them, which should bring them into any danger of their lives: Ulpian therefore put together the laws, which had been made against the Christians in former times, that the proconsuls might see how they might treat them.’

Tillemont<sup>d</sup> thinks, that work was published before the reign of Alexander. Basnage likewise is of opinion, that<sup>e</sup> this work was composed some good while before, in the time of Septimius Severus. Nor can he believe, that Ulpian would publish such a thing in the time of Alexander, when it would be far from being acceptable.

Crevier<sup>f</sup> expresseth himself after this manner: ‘ Ulpian has been praised by all the pagans without exception, and without reserve. The Christians have reproached him with carrying his aversion so far, as contrary to the inclination of his sovereign, who did not dislike them, to collect all the edicts which former emperors had published against them. Let us pity a blindness, in which he was confirmed even by his regard for the laws, which he had so much studied.’

So Crevier. But a part of those remarks depend upon a supposition, that these books of the Duty of a Proconsul were published in the time of Alexander; which, as we have just seen, is far from being certain.

Quinetiam sceleratissimi homicidæ contra pios jura impia condiderunt. Nam et constitutiones sacrilegæ, et disputationes Jurisperitorum leguntur injustæ. Domitius de Officio Proconsulis, libro septimo, rescripta nefaria collegit, ut doceret, quibus panis affici oporteret eos qui se cultores Dei profiterentur. Lactant. Inst. l. v. cap. 11. fin.

<sup>c</sup> Cujus collectionis hanc credible est fuisse occasionem. Ulpianus Alexandrum Severum regebat, et ejus nomine Proconsulibus provincias ituris mandata dabat. Sed quum videret abs Christianis non alienum, ab eorum sanguine certe abhorrentem, viz impelli posse, uti iis exterminandis aliquid ediceret: videtur vetera

impiorum tyrannorum rescripta Proconsulibus objecisse, ut ex iis suum in hoc genere officium æstimarent. Witf. se Legion. Fulmin. num. lxxv.

<sup>d</sup> Ubi supra, note a. <sup>e</sup> Quæ collectanea edidisse existimamus, imperante Severo, cum Papiniano in consiliis fuit Regnante quidem Alexandro, nil perniciæ Christianis machinatus est Ulpianus, quos Mammææ, et filio ejus acceptos esse noverat. Ad dominorum ergo suorum studia sese composuit aulicus homo. Nec Alexandri Mammææque gratiam retinisset, si Ecclesiam, cui favebant, ad sanguinem usque persecutus fuisset. Basnag. ann. 228. num. iii.

<sup>f</sup> As before, p. 46.

As for Ulpian's having been 'praised by all the pagans,' (which Crevier repeats after Tillemont,) it is acknowledged, that he has been commended by several heathen authors, and the confidence placed in him by Alexander, is much to his honour. Nevertheless by<sup>s</sup> Dion Cassius, or by Xiphilinus from him, he is said to have killed Flavian and Chrestus, that he might succeed them. And Zosimus, giving an account of Ulpian's death, says, 'The<sup>b</sup> soldiers were much offended with him: the reason he could not say exactly, because the accounts were different.'

IV. There are in the Pandects several fragments of his, which by some learned men are understood to relate to the Christians. I shall here alledge one or two.

1. In a treatise of his concerning Courts of Justice were these words. 'They<sup>1</sup> may be reckoned physicians, who undertake the cure of the body, or of any particular distemper, in the ears, the throat, the teeth: but not, if they use incantations, or invocations, or, to use the common word of impostors, exorcisms. These are no sort of medicine, although there are people who boast of having received benefit by them.'

Whether Ulpian here refers to Jews, or Christians, or heathens, I cannot certainly say. Bingham<sup>k</sup> says: 'Some think the order (of exorcists,) was as old as Tertullian, because Ulpian the great lawyer who lived in Tertullian's time, in one of his books speaks of exorcising as a thing used by impostors, by whom, probably, he means the Christians. Gothofred thinks, he means the Jewish exorcists, who were commonly impostors indeed.'

2. From the third book of his work, Concerning the Duty of a Proconsul, are cited these words: 'The<sup>1</sup> deified Severus and Antoninus have permitted those who follow the Jewish superstition to enjoy magistracies. But they imposed upon them some conditions, which did not prejudice their superstition.'

<sup>s</sup> Τον δὲ δὴ Φλαβίαν, τον τε Χρηστον αποκτείναντες, ἵνα αὐτοὺς διαδεξήσιν, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἔτι πολλὰ ὑπερον ὑπο τῶν δορυφόρων ἐπιθεμένων οἱ νεκροὶ, καλεσθῶσι. Dio. Cass. l. 80. p. 1369.

<sup>b</sup> Ἐν ὑποψίᾳ δὲ τοῖς στρατοπέδοις γενομένου, (τὰς δὲ αἰτίας ἀκριβῶς ἔχει εἶναι διεξελθεῖν· διαφορὰ γὰρ ἰστορησάσι περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς προαίρεσεως) ἀναίρεται. Zos. l. i. p. 638.

<sup>1</sup> Medicos furtassis quis accipiet etiam eos, qui alicujus partis corporis, vel certi doloris sanitatem pollicentur: ut puta si auricularius, si fistularum, vel dentium: non tamen, si incantavit,

si imprecatus est, si (ut vulgari verbo impostorum utar,) exorcizant. Non sunt ista medicinae genera, tametsi sint, qui hos sibi profuisse cum praedicatione adfirmant. D. lib. 1. Tit. 13. l. 1. § 3. De extraordinariis Cognitionibus. &c. <sup>k</sup> Bingham's Antiquities. &c. B. 3. ch. iv. § 3.

<sup>1</sup> Ejus, qui Judaicam superstitionem sequantur, D. Severus et Antoninus honores adipisci permiserunt: sed et necessitates eis imposuerunt, quae superstitionem eorum non laederent. De Decurionibus. &c. D. L. 1. Tit. 2. l. iii. § 3.

When Ulpian wrote that book of his work, as Schulting<sup>m</sup> says, Antoninus Caracalla was living. Therefore the blessed, or deified, is to be understood of Septimius Severus only, and not to be applied to both the emperors here mentioned.

Whether by 'the Jewish superstition,' be here meant the Jewish religion only, or whether the Christians also were intended, has been doubted.

3. However, it may not be improper for me, before I conclude this chapter concerning Ulpian, to observe, that some learned lawyers are of opinion, 'that' in our Corpus Juris, or 'Collection of ancient Roman Laws, there is not preserved one 'edict against the Christians, nor any thing that is against them.'

And says Witsius<sup>o</sup> in the place to which we referred just now: 'The books of Ulpian concerning the Duty of a Proconsul are 'not now extant. But there are in the Pandects many frag- 'ments of them: in which, however, there is not one word 'about the Christians. From the third book of that work is 'cited a law of Severus and Antoninus, allowing the Jews to 'possess magistracies: but it is not at all probable, that Christi- 'ans are here included. The design of Ulpian was to collect 'the laws against the Christians: the same malignity of temper 'would induce him to suppress every thing that was favourable 'to them.'

That being our case, we must submit to it. Through a mistaken friendship, and misguided zeal, all edicts against the Christians have been suppressed, and none of them admitted into the Pandects.

Since, therefore, the collections of Ulpian, so far as they related to the Christians, are entirely lost, we can only make some general reflections upon them: which every reader is able to do.

<sup>a</sup> Adeoque legendum Divus Severus, et Antoninus, non Divi, ut habet Florentinus. Schulting. Jurispr. Vet. p. 552.

<sup>b</sup> Illud addo, in corpore juris nostro nullum contra Christianos edictum, immo nihil, quod illis adversum exittimari certo possit, inveniri. In qua sententia etsi Balduinus non fuit, sed Ulpianum cum primis accusat, quod Christianos l. i. § 3. ff. De extraordin. cognit. Exorcistas appellavit: sunt tamen viri docti, qui plane alterius commatis homines eo nomine comprehendi existimant. N. H. Gundling. Præf. ad Balduin. Comm. de Constant. Imp. Leg. Ecc. et Civilibus, p. 16, 17.

<sup>c</sup> Non exstant quidem hi de Officio Proconsulis libri Domitii. Multa tamen in

Pandectis supersunt eorum fragmenta: sed in his nullum verbum de Christianis. Unus locus exstat ex libro tertio, ubi laudatur hoc de quo disputamus Severi et Antonini rescriptum, quo Judæis permittitur honores adipisci. Hæc cum retulisset Balduinus, ita insit: 'An Ulpianus, quo magis Christianos ureret, hoc commemoravit? Ut 'Julianus Imperator odio Christianorum 'favisse Judæis dicitur.' Quum ergo totus in eo fuerit Ulpianus, ut ea quæ adversa Christianis erant, ad eos vexandos colligeret, faventia vero maligne supprimeret, non est probabile, hoc quod de Judæis proderet voluit, ad Christianos pertinere. Wits. ut supra, num. lxii.

I have cited the passage of Lactantius, and have also alledged the observations of divers learned moderns relating to this subject, and need not add any thing more. I shall only say, that if ever 'the seventh book' of that work of Ulpian should be found, it would be a great curiosity, and would afford us a great deal of light and instruction.

Dr. Jortin, in his Discourses concerning the Christian religion, at p. 58, says, 'If Ulpian's treatise on the Duty of Proconsuls were extant, we should know, what edicts had been published against the Christians by the emperors, down to the time of Alexander Severus.'

---

C H A P. XXVII.

D I O N C A S S I U S.

I. *His work and time.* II. *His account of the siege, and taking of Jerusalem by Titus.* III. *His account of Domitian's persecution of the Christians.* IV. *Nerva's favourable treatment of the Christians.* V. *That Marcia, concubine of Commodus, was friendly to the Christians.* VI. *His account of the shower, by which Marcus Antoninus, and his army, were saved in Germany.*

I. DION CASSIUS COCCEIANUS <sup>2</sup> son of Apronianus, who in the reigns of Trajan and Adrian was governor of Cilicia, and afterwards of Dalmatia, was a native of Nice in Bithynia. He was made a senator of Rome in the reign of Commodus, and had the honour of several considerable posts and employments under the succeeding emperors. He was twice consul, the second time with Severus Alexander, in the eighth year of that emperor's reign, A. D. 229. After which, with the emperor's leave, he retired into his own country, and dwelt at Nice. He wrote the Roman History in eighty books, from the very beginning to the reign of Alexander. A great part of his work is lost. There is, however, an epitome of his work from the time of Pompey to the end of it in the reign of Alexander, which was made by John Xiphilinus, nephew to the patriarch of

<sup>2</sup> Suid. V. Διον, ὁ Κασσιος χρηματιστας, et Scriptis Dionis. ap. Dion. T. ii. p. 1533.  
 ο επικληθῆ Κοκκίος, αἱ δὲ Κοκκινιστῆς. Phot. &c. Cav. H. L. Tom. ii. p. 146. Til-  
 cod. 71. p. 105. Voss. Hist. Gr. I. ii. lem. Hist. des Emp. T. iii. Alexandre,  
 cap. 15. Fabr. Bib. Gr. I. iv. cap. 10. art. 27, 28. Crevier's Hist. of the Rom.  
 Tom. 3. p. 319. &c. Reimarus de Vita Emp. Vol. viii. p. 347. &c.

Constantinople. But then, as Dion's History is justly admired, notwithstanding some defects, so Xiphilinus's Epitome is likewise in good esteem. And in some places we find fragments of Dion himself: and the Epitome oftentimes represents Dion in his own words.

Though Dion's History was not published till some time afterwards, I may well place him in the year 230, he having then been, from the time of his admission into the senate, almost forty years in a publick character. And he was employed above twenty years in this work, ten years in making collections, and twelve more in digesting his materials, and putting them in order. And it is likely, that his work was published soon after the year 230.

II. I begin my extracts from this author, with his account of the siege and taking of Jerusalem, to which a reference was made †† formerly.

' In <sup>b</sup> the mean time,' says he, ' TITUS, who was appointed  
' general in the war with the Jews, endeavoured to gain them by  
' embassies and fair promises. When they refused to enter into  
' treaty, he determined to subdue them by the force of arms.  
' For a while they fought with equal success: but having gained  
' some advantages over them, he laid siege to JERUSALEM,  
' which was encompassed by three walls. The Romans drawing  
' near, attacked and battered them with their engines. And in-  
' deed they had a numerous army, having in their camp large  
' supplies from divers barbarian kings, who joined them as  
' auxiliaries. The Jews likewise were very numerous, having  
' with them the people out of the country, and others who  
' agreed with them in their religious rites, and not only such of  
' their nation as lived in other parts of the Roman empire, but  
' also people from the countries situate beyond the Euphrates.  
' And as they fought from the walls, they had an advantage in  
' throwing darts and stones: and as often as favourable oppor-  
' tunities offered, they made sallies, and annoyed the Romans,  
' by overthrowing and destroying their platforms and batteries,  
' and by other ways. Moreover <sup>c</sup> the Romans were in want of  
' water,

†† See Vol. vii. p. 111.

<sup>b</sup> Dion. lib. 76. p. 746. &c. al. p. 1079.

... 1082.

<sup>c</sup> Το δε δη πλειστον οι  
Ρωμαιοι τη ανδρια εκακοπαθει, και φαν-  
ηαι και πορφαλει υδαρ επαλειμενοι. p. 1080.

On the contrary, Josephus, l. v. cap.  
ix. § 3. p. 350. in Havercamp. represents  
the Romans to have had great plenty of  
water. Reimar thinks this account of

Dion more probable. I shall transcribe  
part of his note upon the place. Josephus  
contra vices mutatas refert, ut fontes Ju-  
dæis, etiam ante Titi adventum exaruerint,  
nunc Tito uberiores manarint. Sed hæc  
aut comparate intelligenda sunt, aut a pacis  
auctore Judæis jactata. Probabilius Dio  
aquæ inopiâ Romanos dicit laborasse. Nam  
fontes tota Palæstina rari, circa Hierosoly-

‘ water, and were forced to go a great way to fetch it; though  
 ‘ sometimes they got none but what was very indifferent. At  
 ‘ such seasons the Jews made excursions, and fell upon the sol-  
 ‘ diers as they were dispersed abroad in the country. For they un-  
 ‘ dermined the ground, and made passages under their very  
 ‘ walls, to come at the Romans: but afterwards Titus stopt up  
 ‘ all those passages.’

‘ While these things were doing, many were wounded and  
 ‘ killed on both sides. Titus himself was wounded by a stone  
 ‘ on the left shoulder, which weakened his arm ever after. At  
 ‘ length the Romans became masters of the outer wall: and  
 ‘ then encamping between the two walls, they attacked the inner  
 ‘ wall; but with doubtful success: for the besieged being now  
 ‘ inclosed in a lesser compass, were the better able to make a  
 ‘ vigorous defence. However, Titus now renewed to them offers  
 ‘ of peace by heralds, which he sent to them: but they pe-  
 ‘ remptorily refused to accept of them. Moreover, if any of  
 ‘ them were taken prisoners, and they who deserted, privately  
 ‘ corrupted the water of the Romans, and killed them when they  
 ‘ found any of them alone: for which reason Titus determined  
 ‘ to receive no more of them. In the mean time the Romans  
 ‘ were greatly dispirited, as is common in long sieges, and sus-  
 ‘ pecting the truth of what was given out, that the city was im-  
 ‘ pregnable, some went over to the besieged: who, though  
 ‘ they were themselves in great want of provisions, readily re-  
 ‘ ceived them, and cherished them, to let the besiegers know,  
 ‘ that they also had deserters.’

‘ Though the Roman engines battered down the inner wall,  
 ‘ yet the Jews were not overcome, but killed many who were  
 ‘ striving to get within it. However, at length the Romans  
 ‘ prevailed: and thus a way was opened for them to the temple.  
 ‘ Nevertheless<sup>d</sup> they did not immediately attack it, being re-  
 ‘ strained by a certain superstitious respect for it: but in the end  
 ‘ they moved forward and took possession of it, Titus compelling  
 ‘ them so to do. At which time the Jews of all sorts, the  
 ‘ meaner people, their elders, and the priests, exerted themselves  
 ‘ to the utmost: thinking themselves happy in being employed

*mam rarissimi: plurima aqua ex cisternis:  
 et imbris cessantibus majus sitis quam  
 famis periculum: ut testatur Hieronymus  
 ad Amos. cap. iv. T. 3. edit. Martianzi.  
 p. 1401. Conf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 3. Joel i.  
 20. Strab. xvi. p. 761. Accedebat bello  
 feviente multorum fontium et cisternarum  
 obturatio. Reimar. p. 1080. § 30.*

<sup>d</sup> Ου μὴν καὶ παραχρημα, δια τὸ δέου  
 δαίμονησαι, ἐσεδραμον ἄλλ’ ὄψε σίτι, τὴ  
 Τίτησφας καὶ ἀναγκασαίτος, εἰσω παρὶχ-  
 σαν. p. 1081. And Josephus says, that the  
 Roman soldiers had a respect for the tem-  
 ple. Τῶν μὲντε ἑβραίων ἔκ ἐστὶν ὁσις ἢ ἡ  
 τα φρικτὴς εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἀφῆρα, καὶ πρὸς  
 κνησι. κ. λ. De B. I. vi. cap. ii. § 3.

to fight for the temple, or to die near it: nor were they overcome, though they were few against many, till a part of the temple was set on fire. Then they willingly surrendered; some yielded themselves to be killed by the Romans, some killed each other, others killed themselves, and some threw themselves into the flames: and it appeared to them not a calamity, but victory and safety, to be so happy as to perish with the temple.'

Many were taken prisoners, and among them Bargioras their general; who only was put to death at the time of the triumph. Thus Jerusalem was taken on a Saturday, the day still respected by the Jews above any other. From that time it was appointed, that all who adhere to their religion should annually pay a didrachm to the capitol of Jupiter. Upon this occasion both the generals [Vespasian and Titus] received the appellation of emperor: but neither took the surname of Judaicus, although triumphal arches, and other honours customary after great victories, were decreed to them.'

Such is the account of this great event, which we have in Dion Cassius. It is indeed short and defective: nevertheless, it is a testimony to the ruin of the temple and city of Jerusalem, and the conquest of Judea under Titus and Vespasian. The account is imperfect: but then we may conclude, that we here have Dion himself, and not his abridger, who was a Christian. We must not much wonder at the conciseness: that may be owing to the contempt which the author had for the Jewish people, who were scorned and despised by the great men among the Romans, and by all heathens in general. Dion agrees with Josephus in many particulars, which every reader may be able to recollect, by comparing our accounts formerly given from Josephus himself. But he differs from him so much, and is so defective, that we may be apt to think he did not borrow from him: indeed, I should very much question, whether Dion had read Josephus's seven books of the history of the Jewish War. If he never read them, it is very likely, that he never read the other works of that

<sup>c</sup> Οὕτω μὲν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐν τῇ τῶν Κρητικῶν ἱστορίᾳ ἐξώλετο. p. 1081.

So writes Dion. But Cardinal Noris computes, that this happened on Sunday. *Eo anno Ebul, mensis in anno Judæorum sextus, juxta hodiernos ipsorum cyclos, cepit die 26 Augusti. Ejus vero dies octavus fuit secundus Septembris, idemque dies Dominicus, sive Solis, qui postremus urbi toto orbe celeberrimæ illuxit.* Noris *De Epoch Syro-maced. Diss. i. cap. 3. p. 53. Lipsiæ. 1696.*

And, as Mr. Reimar observes, Josephus does not say, that Jerusalem was taken on the Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath. And if it had been taken on that day, he would not have omitted that circumstance. *Nec Josephus ea die captam urbem adnotavit, non omissurus, credo, si ita fuisset.* Reimar in *Dionis loc. Et supra.* Notandus autem est error Dionis, ut aliorum, qui Hierosolyma fere semper Sabbatho capta tradiderunt, sibi hodiernum persuadent, &c. *Id. ibid.*

Jewish historian. It seems to me, that though Dion spent several years in making collections for his large history of the Romans, he was not very curious or inquisitive about that part of it which related to the Jewish people<sup>f</sup>. By which means he was led to give the very imperfect history, which we have seen, of the final period of their commonwealth. It is in this way that I would account for his saying nothing of the miseries of the grievous famine endured by the Jews in the siege of Jerusalem; and his omitting the numbers of those who perished, or were made captives, in the siege, and during the war, which are so particularly mentioned by Josephus. However we see in him, that the several parts of the city were taken, one after another, and that the temple was consumed by fire, and that the Jews were very resolute and obstinate in their defence of themselves. Whence it may be inferred, and concluded, that they suffered a great deal, before they were subdued, and overthrown.

III. We now proceed to another remarkable passage, which is in the history of the emperor Domitian. ‘And<sup>g</sup> in the same year [that is, when Domitian and Flavius Clement were consuls, or the year of Christ 95] Domitian put to death, beside many others, Flavius Clement the consul, although he was his cousin, and had for his wife Flavia Domitilla, who also was his relation. They were both accused of the crime of impiety [or atheism.] Upon which same account many others likewise, who had embraced the Jewish customs were condemned: some of whom were put to death, others suffered the confiscation of their goods. Domitilla was only banished into Pandateria. Glabrio, who had been consul with Trajan [in the year 91,] accused also, beside other matters, of the same crime with the rest, and because he had fought with wild beasts, he put to death; against whom he was particularly incensed from a pri-

<sup>f</sup> Dion, in his account of the conquest of Judea by Pompey, betrays great ignorance of the Jewish people in several respects. Vid. lib. 37. p. 121. &c. al. p. 36, 37. He says, ‘the Temple, which they had built to their God at Jerusalem, was large and magnificent, but open at the top.’ Which is a great mistake. Και αυτω νεων τε μερισον και περικαλλιστα τον, πλην καθ’ οσον αχανης τε και ανωροφος η, εξεποιησαν. p. 122. <sup>g</sup> Και τω αυτω ειει αλλες τε πολλες και τον Φλαδιον Κλημεντα υπαλευσινα, καιπερ ανηψιον ουνα, και γυιαικα, και αυτην συγγενη εαυτου, Φλαβιαν Δομιλλιαν εχουσα, καιεσφαξεν ο Δομιτιανος. Επηνεχθη δε αμφοιν εσκλημα α-

θεοιολογ, εφ’ ης και αλλοι ες τα των Ιουδαιων ηθη εξοκειλουσιν πολλοι καλειδικασθησαν. Και οι μιν απεθανον· οι δε των γυναικων εσερηθησαν· η δε Δομιλλιλα υπερωρισθη μιν εις Παυδαριαια. Τον δε δη Γλαβριου του μετ’ αυτην Γραικου αρχαιου, καιεσθησαν· Ια τα τε αλλα, και οια οι πολλοι, και οι και θηριοις εμαχηθη, απεκλειθεν· εφ’ ουσε και τα μαλιστα ορθην αυτω υπο φθουου εσχηθη υπαλευσινα αυτον ες τον Αλδαναι επι τα νεανισκειματια ωτομασμεια καλεσασιν· δι’ ουνα απεκλειθη μετ’ αυτην ηλιασασιν· και ες τον μονον εδεν ελυμασθη, αλλα και ευτοχουσιν αυτον καιεσθησαν. L. 67. p. 766. al. p. 1112.

‘ciple of envy. For having sent for him in his consulship to Albanum, at the time of the Juvenalia, he made him enter the lists with a great lion: but he was so far from being hurt in the combat, that with wonderful dexterity he killed the lion.’

Who Flavius Clement was, and how he was related to Domitian, was shewn before, in our chapter of <sup>b</sup> Suetonius. Domitilla we suppose to have been daughter of Domitilla, Domitian's sister; she therefore was Domitian's niece. Undoubtedly, she<sup>l</sup> and her mother were so named from Flavia Domitilla wife of the emperor Vespasian, and mother of Titus and Domitian, and of their sister Domitilla, just mentioned.

Some difficulties there are, arising from a comparison of this account of Dion with that of Suetonius, formerly quoted. But they were then considered, and need not to be again stated †† here.

Here are three persons named, as accused of impiety, and suffering upon that account. Two of them were put to death, and one was banished.

Domitilla we conclude to have been a Christian. It is probable, that <sup>k</sup> Clement also was a Christian, or favourer of them. Glabrio's christianity is not so evident. However, some learned men<sup>l</sup> have been willing to allow them all three the character of Christians, and martyrs: but <sup>m</sup> Tillemont does not put Glabrio in that number. I likewise think it may be questioned, whether he was a Christian, though accused of that, or Judaism. It is not unlikely, that some designing and malicious people took the opportunity to accuse Glabrio of what would, at that time especially, render him obnoxious to Domitian. And the emperor made no scruple of laying hold of this pretence to destroy a man, against whom he had a grudge of three or four years standing, ever since the year 92. Nor is this the first instance we have met with of men unfairly charged with Christianity by their enemies. Pliny's letter to Trajan affords some such instances, and there may have been many more.

<sup>b</sup> See vol. vii. p. 271. hæc Flaviam Domitillam duxit uxorem, lænaque conditionis, sed mox ingenuam et civem Romanam recuperatorio iudicio pronunciatam. . . . Ex hac liberos tulit, Titum, et Domitianum, et Domitillam. Sueton. Vespas. cap. 3. <sup>††</sup> See vol. vii. p. 271, 272. <sup>k</sup> Vere autem Martyrem fuisse Clementem Consulem constat ex Dione. Pearson. Opp. Post. p. 215. 1. 22. <sup>l</sup> Vero igitur proximum est, hinc causa Clementem, Domitillam, Clabionemque damnatos fuisse. Basnag.

ann. 95. num. v. Nec alios sub eo quam exules habemus in probis Ecclesiæ monumentis, Flaviam illam Domitillam, et S. Joannem Apostolum. Antipas in Asia populi furore passus est. Nisi forte Glabriorem, quam Judaismi, et Flavium Coss. quem Atheismi nomine interfectos testis est Dio, Christianismi nomine interfectos intelligamus. Dodw. Diss. Cypr. xi. § 16. <sup>m</sup> Vid. Domitien. art. xiv. et Note i. sur la persecution de Domitien. M. E. T. ii. p. 523.

According to Dion's account, Glabrio was a man who had indulged himself in the hazardous and unreputable diversion of fighting with wild beasts: which can by no means agree with the character of a Christian. For skill in that exercise he was much celebrated: and Domitian sent for him to Albanum, at the feast of the Juvenalia, even in the time of his consulship, to add to the splendor of the shows: and perhaps hoping to have destroyed him that way. But Glabrio was victorious, though the lion was very formidable; and Domitian, instead of being well pleased therewith, was provoked. However, he let him escape at that time: but now he laid hold of the pretence of irreligion to put him to death.

Dion Cassius calls Domitilla 'wife of Clement.' Eusebius from Bruttius calls her 'niece of Clement.' Hence some have argued, that there were two of this name, who suffered for Christianity in the time of Domitian, one a virgin, the other a married woman, and banished into different places, one to the island Pontia, the other to Pandateria. I rather think, that there was but one Domitilla, who suffered at this time, the wife of the consul Clement, and niece of Domitian. Eusebius and Jerom have not mentioned more than one; which surely they must have done, if there had been two. Domitilla was banished into Pontia, as Bruttius says. It was easy for Dion to mistake Pandateria for Pontia. Jerom has particularly mentioned the confinement of Domitilla in the island Pontia: nor does he call her virgin, as he would have done, if he had supposed that to have been her condition.

Jerom tells us, that Paula, in her voyage from Rome to Jerusalem near the end of the fourth century, saw the place of her habitation in that island: where, as he says, she 'suffered a long martyrdom.' Possibly, when other exiles were recalled, Domitilla was not. Her near relation to Domitian, whose memory was infamous, might some way or other be an obstacle.

What we have principally to observe, is the attestation here given by this noble and diligent historian to the progress of Christianity, and the sufferings of its professors. It had now got footing in the imperial family. Clement suffered death upon ac-

▪ H. E. l. iii. cap. 18. p. 89.

° See Tillemont *sainte Flavie Domitille, Vierge et Martyre, avec son oncle Clement, Consul et Martyre.* Mem. Ecc. Tom. ii. p. 124; &c. p Vid. Basnag. ann. 95. num. vii. et viii.

¶ Delata [Paula] ad insulam Pontiam, quam clarissimæ quondam seminarum sub

Domitiano principe pro confessione nominis Christiani, Flavie Domitillæ nobilitavit exilium: videntque cellulas, in quibus illa longum martyrium duxerat, sumptis fidei aliis, Jerosolyman et sancta loca videre cupiebat. Hieron. ep. 86. al. 27. T. iv. p. 672. fin.

count of it; and his wife Domitilla was banished to a remote and unwholesome island, where persons were wont to be sent for state-crimes, or other like offences.

It is generally allowed, that <sup>c</sup> Clement was a Christian, as well as Domitilla: some have supposed, that <sup>c</sup> his whole family was Christian. That, I think, is more than we can say: but it is very likely, that some of their servants were Christians. Many were accused and condemned upon the same account: some suffered death, others confiscation of goods; others were banished, as Domitilla. This is at least <sup>c</sup> the fourth heathen author, who has afforded us a testimony to the persecution of the Christians in the reign of the emperor Domitian: and though it was but short, it seems to have been felt by many persons.

IV. In the month of September, in the year 96, Domitian was succeeded by NERVA: of whom Dion says: <sup>c</sup> He <sup>u</sup> published a pardon for those who were condemned for impiety, and <sup>c</sup> recalled those who were banished.' And after the mention of a law of the same emperor concerning slaves, he adds: <sup>c</sup> And <sup>c</sup> besides, he forbade the accusing of any men upon account of <sup>c</sup> impiety, or Judaism.'

It has been a question among learned men; whether Domitian, by any edict, put an end to the persecution of the Christians before his death. This <sup>x</sup> passage of Dion has been thought sufficient by some to determine the question, and to assure us, that the persecution did not cease till after the beginning of Nerva's reign.

We may be satisfied of this passage likewise, that it is not Xiphilinus's, but Dion's, in his own words, though perhaps contracted. The style is the style of a heathen, and not of a Christian: and this passage may be supposed to confirm the supposition of the severity of Domitian's persecution, though it was not long. Beside those put to death, or banished by him, there were others under accusation, or under a sentence of condemnation, who now escaped by the lenity or goodness of Nerva.

I may add a short passage from Orosius, a Christian writer, who says, <sup>c</sup> that <sup>\*\*</sup> Nerva, by his first edict, recalled all such as

<sup>c</sup> Ipsum etiam Clementem Christianum fuisse, nonnulli colligunt ex Suetonio cap. 15. quia contemptissimæ inertiae hominem appellat: qua notâ Christiani solent inuri. Reimar. ad Dionem. p. 1113. § 82.

<sup>c</sup> . . . et totam Clementis familiam fuisse Christianam, verisimillimum est. Id. ib. § 83. <sup>c</sup> See Juvenal. vol. vii. p. 263. Suetonius. p. 270, 271. Bruttius, p. 367. and now Dion Cassius.

<sup>u</sup> Καὶ ὁ Νέρουας τῆς τε κριτομένης ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφῆκε, καὶ τῆς φευσομένης κατήλασε. . . . Τῶν δὲ ἄλλοις ἐπ' ἀσεβείας ἐπ' Ἰουδαίᾳ βίᾳ καταλείψασθαι τινας συνέχωρησε. Lib. 68. p. 769. al. 1118.

<sup>x</sup> See Vol. vi. Ch. ix. § 6.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Hic primo edicto suo cunctos exules revocavit. Unde et Joannes Apostolus hoc generali indulgentia liberatus, Ephesum rediit. Oros. l. vii. cap. 11. p. 485.

‘ had been exiled : and the apostle John, improving this general  
‘ indulgence, then returned to Ephesus.’

V. I shall take one passage more from this author, concerning Marcia, concubine of the emperor Commodus. ‘ She ’ is related to have had a great affection for the Christians, and to have done them many good offices, she having a great ascendancy over Commodus.’

What is here said may be true : for the Christians enjoyed great peace in the reign of this emperor ; and Marcia, though a woman of low condition, had a great influence upon him : she sometimes gave him good advice : and the honours paid to her were little below those of an emprefs. I need not add any other particulars of her history.

But <sup>b</sup> this paragraph I rather think to be Xiphilinus’s than Dion’s : the style at least is Xiphilinus’s. In the other passages before quoted, Dion speaks of impiety, or atheism, or Judaism, but never useth the word Christians. Another thing that may make us doubt, whether this observation be entirely Dion’s, is the phrase, ‘ it is related.’ For at the beginning of the reign of Commodus he says : ‘ These things, and what follows, I write not from the report of others, but from my own knowledge and observation.’ However, the sense may be Dion’s : but I wish, we had also his style without any adulteration.

VI. Dion’s account of the extraordinary shower, by which Marcus Antoninus and his army were preserved in Germany, was observed formerly, together with Xiphilinus’s remarks upon it : to which <sup>d</sup>, therefore, the reader is now referred.

<sup>γ</sup> Ἰσορροπία δὲ αὐτῆ πολλὰ τε ὑπὲρ τῶν Χριστιανῶν σπεύδασαι, καὶ πολλὰ αὐτῆς εὐερέσθηκεναι, αἰεὶ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Κομμοδῷ πᾶν δυναμένη. Lib. 72. p. 819. al. p. 1206.

<sup>z</sup> Huic Marcia, generis libertini, formā tamen meretriciisque artibus pollens, cum animum ejus penitus devinxisset, egresso e balneo, veneni poculum dedit. Victor. Epit. cap. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν γυναικὴν αὐτῆ ταύτην ἀνηνέσκε πρὸς Μαρκίαν, ἣν εἶχε τὴν παλλακίδα τιμιώδη, ἣ ἔδεν τι ἀπειχε γαμήτης γυναικός, ἀλλὰ παῖλα ὅσα σέβασθαι πλὴν τῶ πυρός. Herodian. l. i. p.

486. Sylburg.

<sup>b</sup> Hæc de Marcia Christianis favente, non Dionis esse, sed Xiphilini, suspicor : quod etiam innuit præmissa formula, ἰσορροπία δὲ. Neque tamen hodie scio, an apud alios scriptores Christianos merita ejus prædicata legantur. Eoque minus Dioni id tanti poterat videri, quod commemoraret. Reimar. ad Dion. p. 1207. § 34.

<sup>c</sup> Λέγω δὲ ταῦτα τε καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, ὅτι ἐξ ἀλλοθρίας εἰς παραδόσεως, ἀλλ’ ἐξ οικείας ἢ δὴ τηρησεως. Ib. p. 818. al. p. 1205.

<sup>d</sup> Vol. vii. p. 47 ... 49.

## C H A P. XXVIII.

## THE PERSECUTION OF MAXIMIN THE FIRST, OR THE THRACIAN.

MAXIMIN the first, or Lucius Maximinus the Thracian<sup>a</sup> succeeded Severus Alexander in the year 235, and died in 238. The<sup>b</sup> excessive cruelty of his disposition is acknowledged by heathen historians.

Sulpicius Severus, passing from Septimius Severus to Decius, mentions this persecution, without numbering it. He says, that Maximin persecuted the clergy of some churches: which implies, that this persecution was local only, and not general.

Says Eusebius: 'The emperor Alexander being slain, after he had reigned thirteen years, he was succeeded by Maximin: who being<sup>d</sup> filled with hatred against the family of Alexander, in which there were many Christians, raised a persecution: appointing, that the presidents only of the churches should be put to death, as being the men who spread abroad the doctrine of the gospel. At which time Origen composed his book of martyrdom, which he inscribed to Ambrose, and Protoctetus presbyter of the church of Cæsarea; forasmuch as they were at that time in great danger of suffering death. And they gained great honour by that confession.' That book of Origen, which is an exhortation to martyrdom, is still extant: I made several valuable extracts from it<sup>e</sup> formerly. It appears hence, that Ambrose and Protoctetus were imprisoned, though the place is not now exactly known.

Orosius, not very disagreeable to Eusebius, says, 'that<sup>f</sup> Maximin's persecution proceeded chiefly from aversion to the

<sup>a</sup> Sed occiso Alexandro, Maximinus primum e corpore militari, et nondum senator, sine decreto Senatus, Augustus ab exercitu appellatus est, filio sibimet in participatum dato. Capitolin. Maximin. cap. 8. p. 24. Conf. Pagi ann. 238. iv. Basn. ann. 235. num. ii.

<sup>b</sup> Sed inter has virtutes tam crudelis fuit, ut illum alii Cyclopem, alii Busiridem, nonnulli Phalarim vocarent. Senatus eum tantum timuit, ut vota in templis publice privatimque mulieres etiam cum suis liberis facerent, ne ille unquam urbem Romam videret. Id. ib.

<sup>c</sup> Interjectis deinde annis 38 pax Christianis fuit: nisi quod medio tempore Maximinus nonnullarum ecclesiarum clericos vexavit. S. Sev. l. ii. cap. 32. p. 247.

<sup>d</sup> Ο; ὅτι κατὰ κόλον τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Αλεξάνδρου

δρῆσιν οἶκον ἐκ πλεονων πιτρῶν συνεσῶλα, διασῶμον εἰσελάς, τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀρχοντίας μόνες, ὡς αἰτίαι τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας ἀναίρεσθαι προσάττει. H. E. l. vi. cap. 28.

Maximinus adversum ecclesiarum sacerdotes persecutionem facit. Chron. p. 174.

<sup>e</sup> Vol. ii. p. 461—463.

<sup>f</sup> Sed continuo, hoc est tertio quam regnabat anno, a Pupieno Aquileiæ interfecit, et persecutionis et vitæ finem fecit. Qui maxime propter Christianam Alexandri, cui successerat, et Mammææ matris familiam, persecutionem in sacerdotes et clericos, et doctores, vel præcipue propter Origenem presbyterum miserat. Oros. l. vii. cap. 19. p. 509.

Christian family of his predecessor Alexander, and his mother Mammæa: and that his persecution was intended against the clergy, and particularly against the presbyter Origen.' So Orosius. And some learned men are of opinion, that Origen, though he sent his Exhortation to Martydom to the two above named confessors, retired<sup>s</sup> himself, and lived privately a part of this reign.

It has been argued by Pagi<sup>h</sup>, and other learned<sup>i</sup> men, that this persecution did not reach to Africa.

There was at this time a persecution of the Christians in Pontus and Cappadocia, as appears from<sup>k</sup> Firmilian's letter to Cyprian: but it is not clear, that it was occasioned by any edict of Maximin. But the president was bigotted and cruel, and the Christians were greatly molested by him. However, the neighbouring provinces being peaceable, the Christians left their own country, and went thither.

Mr. Mosheim, to<sup>l</sup> whom I refer, has very good observations upon this persecution. He allows, that<sup>m</sup> during that whole reign Christians suffered in some places. There may therefore, as I apprehend, have been more sufferers, than now we have the exact knowledge of.

## C H A P. XXIX.

### T H E E M P E R O R P H I L I P.

#### THE QUESTION CONSIDERED, WHETHER HE WAS A CHRISTIAN.

I. *His time.* II. *Reasons for this inquiry.* III. *An argument, shewing, that he was not a Christian. and the judgments of divers learned men concerning it.*

<sup>s</sup> See Tillem. in Origene art. 21. and Mosheim. p. 469.

ann. 235. num. iii.

235. num. v. ~

et duos fere annos, temporibus post Alexandrum Imperatorem, multæ illic conflictationes et pressuræ acciderunt, vel in commune omnibus hominibus, vel privatim Christianis. Terræ etiam motus plurimi et frequentes exsisterunt, ut per Cappadociam et per Pontum multa subruerent, . . . ut ex hoc persecutio quoque gravis adversum nos Christiani nominis fieret. Quæ post longam retro ætatis pacem repente oborta, de inopinato et infueto malo ad turbandum populum nostrum terribilior

effecta est. Serenianus tunc fuit in nostra provincia Præses, acerbus et dirus persecutor. In hac autem perturbatione constitutis fidelibus, et huc atque illuc persecutionis metu fugientibus, et patrias suas relinquentibus, atque in alias partes regionum transeuntibus, (erat enim transeundi facultas, eo quod persecutio illa non per totum mundum, sed localis fuisset) &c. Firmilian ad Cyprian. ep. 75. p. 222. Oxon. p. 146. Baluz.

<sup>i</sup> De Reb. Christianorum. &c. p. 467 . . . 470. <sup>m</sup> Hinc facile credimus illis, qui per totum illud, quod Maximinus regnavit, triennium vexatos passim Christianos fuisse, censent. Ib. p. 468.

I. THE

I. THE emperor Gordian was succeeded by PHILIP, who took his son into partnership with him. He<sup>a</sup> was an Arab, son of a captain of Arabian robbers. He<sup>b</sup> reigned five years and somewhat longer. His<sup>c</sup> time is computed from March in the year of Christ 244, to July in 249.

II. Of this emperor Eusebius tells the following story. ‘ When Gordian had reigned six whole years, he was succeeded by Philip and his son. It<sup>c</sup> is reported, that this emperor, as being a Christian, on the last day of the vigils of Easter, desired to partake in the prayers of the church with the rest of the people; but that the bishop would not permit him, till he had made confession of his sins, and had placed himself in the number of the lapsed, and among the penitents. And if he had not done that, he would never have been admitted by the bishop, because of his many crimes. And<sup>f</sup> it is said, that he readily complied, and that he manifested a sincere fear of God by his deeds.

It is obvious to observe, that Eusebius speaks only upon the ground of report, and common fame: nor does he name the bishop, nor the place where it happened. Chrysostom<sup>g</sup> is supposed to supply that defect, as he ascribes a like action to Babylas bishop of Antioch: but then he does not name the emperor.

I forbear to transcribe the absurd and inaccurate account of the same thing in<sup>h</sup> the Paschal Chronicle.

According to the Acts or Passion of the Martyr Pontius<sup>i</sup>, Philip and his son were converted by the same Pontius, and baptized by Fabian bishop of Rome. And, fabulous as those Acts may be, Huet seems to rely upon them, and believes, that<sup>k</sup> those emperors were baptized by Fabian.

In a chapter following that before quoted, Eusebius, among other proofs of Origen’s great reputation at that time, says, he<sup>l</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Igitur Marcus Julius Philippus Arabs Thraconites, sumpto in consortium Philippo filio. Romam venero. Victor. de Caesar. cap. 28.

<sup>b</sup> Marcus Julius Philippus imperavit annos quinque. . . . Is Philippus humillimo ortus loco fuit, patre nobilissimo latronum ductore. Victor. Epit. cap. 28. Conf. Eutrop. l. ix. § iii. et Capitolin. iii. cap. 29. p. 124.

<sup>c</sup> Hoc etiam anno uterque Philippus pater et Filius Imp. circa mensem Julium occisi sunt, sexto imperii anno inchoato. Pagi ann. 249. num. v. Conf. Balsag. ann. 244. n. iv.

<sup>d</sup> H. E. l. vi. cap. 34.

<sup>e</sup> 2. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Τελον κατεχει λωσας. . . .  
<sup>f</sup> Και περιβαρχειται γε προ-

θυμωσ λεσσαι.

<sup>g</sup> Chryl. de S. Babyla contr. Julian. et Gent. T. ii. p. 544, 545.

<sup>h</sup> p. 270.

<sup>i</sup> Tunc beatissimus Pontius ad episcopum urbis Romæ nomine Fabianum, qui ecclesie Dei præerat, convolavit, et omnia ei ex ordine pandit. . . . Alia vero die cum simul ad Principes venissent, et sacramenta eis divina demonstrassent, baptismi gratiam consequuti sunt. Passio. S. Pontii. num. xiii. T. ii. p. 133. edit. Baluz.

<sup>k</sup> Sic igitur sentio, Christi sacris a Fabiano Papa initiatum fuisse Philippum. Origen. l. i. c. 3. p. 19.

<sup>l</sup> H. E. l. vi. cap. 36.

wrote a letter to the emperor Philip, and another to his wife Severa. Which <sup>m</sup> is also mentioned by Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men: who likewise there calls Philip the first Christian emperor, and says, those letters were still extant. Nevertheless I think it does not appear, what was in those letters, nor that ever they were seen either by Eusebius, or Jerom.

In Jerom's Latin edition of Eusebius's Chronicle <sup>n</sup>, Philip is said to be the first Christian emperor: and in like manner speak <sup>o</sup> Orosius, and some other Christian authors.

All which has occasioned a debate among learned men of late times, whether Philip was a Christian or not: Baronius <sup>p</sup>, Huet <sup>q</sup>, and <sup>\*</sup> some others, taking the affirmative side of the question, others the negative. Tillemont <sup>r</sup> says, it is not without difficulties. And Mr. Mosheim <sup>s</sup> has done his utmost to perplex this question: and the more to increase the difficulty, argues, that <sup>t</sup> he might be a Christian secretly, though not openly. And upon the whole, according to him, it is a point not to be decided, whether the two Philips, father and son, were Christians or not.

III. For my own part I should think, that we might spare ourselves the trouble of inquiring into the privacies of this emperor, and may <sup>u</sup> do better to determine his character by his public conduct. But without indulging harangue or complaint, I shall now immediately refer to some ecclesiastical historians, where, so far as I am able to judge, the question is fairly treated, and rightly decided. They are <sup>x</sup> Pagi, <sup>y</sup> Basnage, <sup>z</sup> Cellarius, <sup>a</sup> Frederick Spanheim, not forgetting <sup>b</sup> the great Scaliger.

<sup>m</sup> Quodque ad Philippum Imperatorem, qui primus de Regibus Romanis Christianus fuit, et ad matrem [uxorem] ejus literas fecit, quæ usque hodie extant. De V. I. cap. 54. de Origene.

<sup>n</sup> Philippus Philippum filium suum consortem regni fecit. Primusque omnium ex Romanis Imperatoribus Christianus fuit. Chr. p. 174.

<sup>o</sup> Hic primus Imperatorum omnium Christianus fuit. &c. Oros. l. vii. cap. 20.

<sup>p</sup> Baron. ann. 246.

<sup>q</sup> Origen. l. i. cap. iii. n. 12.

<sup>\*</sup> Our writers of Universal ancient History, in the article of Roman History. B. 3. ch. xxiii. vol. xv. p. 408. &c. note (L).

<sup>r</sup> Hist. Emp. Tom. iii. L'Emp. Philip. note 1.

<sup>s</sup> De Reb. Christianor. ante C. M. p. 471 . . . 476.

<sup>t</sup> Neque desunt argumenta, quæ hos Imperatores clam licet et secreto ad sacra Christiana transiisse probabile reddant. Sed his rationibus quum

aliæ possint opponi æque validæ ac speciosæ, quæstio illa, quæ tot viros doctos exercuit, de Philippi Arabis, ejusque filii religione, in medio relinqui debet. Moshem. Insti. p. 110.

<sup>u</sup> Quæ vero signa in eo sunt Christianæ pietatis? Nullum ejus rei vestigium apparet. Nobis vero id valde dubium est, quia nec ullus idoneus auctor ostendit, vel deorum templa clausisse, vel Christo aliud dedicasse, vel aliud egisse, quod Christianam vitam et professionem probaret. Cellar. Diff. p. 323.

<sup>x</sup> Ann. 244. n. iv. et seqq. ann. 247. num. vi. et seqq. Vid. et Fr. Pagi Breviarium Pont. Roman. T. i. p. 40. &c.

<sup>y</sup> Basnag. ann. 244. n. vi. &c.

<sup>z</sup> Cell. Diff. de primo principe Christiano. § xxi. &c. p. 322.

<sup>a</sup> Spanhem. Opp. T. ii. p. 405. &c. Qua disquiritur, quo jure Philippi Imp. Pater et Filius, pro Christianis habeantur.

<sup>b</sup> Animadversion in Euseb. p. 234.

1. My first argument is, that divers ancient Christian writers expressly say, that Constantine was the first Roman emperor who made profession of the Christian religion.

The first to be quoted is Lactantius, contemporary with Eusebius, but rather older, who<sup>c</sup> in his inscription of his Institutions to Constantine, addresseth him in the character of the first emperor of the Romans who had forsaken the errors of Gentilism.

In like manner Sulpicius Severus, who published his Sacred History in the year 400, or soon after. 'That<sup>d</sup>,' says he, 'was the end of the persecution: from that time there have been Christian emperors, of whom Constantine was the first.'

Theodoret, at the end of his Ecclesiastical History, says, that<sup>e</sup> before Constantine all the Roman emperors were enemies to the Christians.

Chrysoftom says, 'that<sup>f</sup> all the Roman emperors, Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Nero, Vespasian, Titus, and after him all the rest, were Gentiles, till the time of the blessed Constantine: and all of them opposed the church, some indeed with greater, others with less violence, however all of them in some measure. And as they all lived in impiety, that alone was an encouragement to the people to oppose the Christians.'

Nor can Eusebius be omitted, who at the conclusion of his Life of Constantine, says, 'that<sup>g</sup> he was the only Roman emperor, who hitherto had worshipped the true God with sincere piety, and had embraced and recommended the doctrine of Jesus Christ.'

Pagi therefore says, he<sup>h</sup> is persuaded, that all which Eusebius says about the Christianity of Philip, he had received from uncertain tradition.

<sup>c</sup> Quod opus nunc nominis tui auspicio inchoamus, Constantine, Imperator maxime. Qui primus Romanorum principum, repudiatis erroribus, majestatem Dei singularis, ac veri cognovisti et honorasti. Inst. 1. l. c. 1. <sup>d</sup> Sed finis persecutionis illius fuit, adhuc annos ix et lxxx. A quo tempore Christiani Imperatores esse cœperunt. Namque tum Constantinus rerum potiebatur, qui primus omnium Romanorum principum Christianus fuit. Sacr. Hist. l. ii. cap. 33. p. 248. Cleric.

<sup>e</sup> Και γάρ προ της Κωνσταντινυ τε μεγαλη βασιλειας, οσοι Ρωμαιων εβουλο βασιλεις γαλα ται διασωτων της αληθειας ελυτησαν. Theod. II. E. l. v. cap. 39. p. 248.

<sup>f</sup> Ελληνες ησαν βασιλεις Αυγυος, Τιβεριος, Γαιος, Νερων, Ουσπεσιανος, Τιτος, και μετ' εκεινοι απαιτες εως των τε μακαριων

Κωνσταντινυ χρονων τε βασιλειως. Και παντες υιοι, οι μεν ελαττοι, οι δε σφοδροτερον επολεμην την εκκλησιαν' επολεμην δ' ην ομως απαιτες. Ει δε τινες αυτων και ησυχασειν εδοξαν, αυλο τελο το της βασιλευοιτας καταδηλης ειναι επι ασεβεια, υποθεσις ωλεμων εβινελο, των αλλων κολακευοιων αυτης, δεραπευοιων εν τω της εκκλητιας πολεμω. Chr. Contr. Jud. et Gent. T. i. p. 578. Bened.

<sup>g</sup> Μονη μεν Ρωμαιων βασιλειως του παμβασιλευα θεου υπερβολη θεοσεβειας τελμηκολος' μονη δε τοις πασι πεπαρρησιασμενως τον τε Χριστον κηρυξαιλος λογον. κ. λ. De Vita Const. l. iv. cap. 75.

<sup>h</sup> Verum te maturius examinata nunc non dubito, quin Eusebius, quod habet de Christiana professione Philippi, ex incerta auditione retulerit. Ann. 244. n. v.

2. All heathen writers are silent about the Christianity of Philip and his son.

It seems to me, that<sup>i</sup> Spanheim does rightly insist on this argument of no small weight. Nor has<sup>k</sup> Julian in his *Cæsars* taken any notice of it. If Philip had been a Christian, they would some of them have reproached him upon that account, and they would have reproached his Christianity with the crimes of which he was guilty: for his treachery to the young Gordian was well known, and was very odious, and<sup>l</sup> is spoken of as such.

3. Philip celebrated the secular games at Rome in the thousandth year of the city, and in the usual manner, with great magnificence: as we are assured by ancient medals, and by Christian as well as by heathen writers.

In the Chronicle of Eusebius it is said, that<sup>m</sup> at that time innumerable beasts were slain in the Circus, and there were theatrical shews in the Campus Martius for three days and three nights. And<sup>n</sup> Orosius acknowledgeth, that the secular games were celebrated by Philip with great magnificence; though he will have it, that all was designed to the honour of Christ.

Capitolinus,<sup>o</sup> one of the writers of the Augustan History, is very particular in representing the great number, and various sorts of beasts produced to publish show, or slain by Philip upon occasion of this solemnity. And other heathen authors, as well as ancient medals, bear witness to his celebrating this festival with great magnificence, as<sup>p</sup> Eutropius, whom I transcribe below, and refer to the<sup>q</sup> *Victors*.

<sup>i</sup> Primo silent isti historici, qui res Philipporum Deciorumve ex professo quondam tradiderunt. . . . Certe apud Ælium Spartianum, Julium Capitolinum, Ælium Lampridium, Aurelium Victorem, Eutropium abbreviatorem, Zosimum, . . . nulla vestigia deprehendas Christianæ in Philippis religionis. Span. p. 413.

<sup>k</sup> Julianus Imp. in Satyrâ suâ de Cæsaribus, de Philippo tacet, non facturus, si quidem hic Christianus fuisset. &c. Ibid. p. 413. m.

<sup>l</sup> Ita Philippus impie non jure obtinuit imperium. Capitolin. Gordian. iii. cap. 31. p. 127.

<sup>m</sup> Regnantibus Philippis millesimus annus Romanæ urbis expletus est: ob quam solemnitatem innumerabiles bestię in circo magno interfectę: ludique in Campo Martio theatrales tribus diebus et noctibus populo pervigilante celebrati. Euseb. Chr. p. 174.

<sup>n</sup> Ita magnificis ludis augustissimus omnium præteritorum hic nata-

lis annus a Christiano Imperatore celebratus est. Nec dubium est, quin Philippus hujus tantę devotionis gratiam et honorem ad Christum et ecclesiam reportavit, &c. Oros. l. vii. c. 25.

<sup>o</sup> Fuerunt sub Gordiano Romę Elephanti xxx. et 11 . . . tigres x. leones mansueti lx. . . . gladiatorum fiscalium paria mille: hippopotamus, et rhinoceros unus. . . . equi feri xl. et cętera hujusmodi animalia, innumera et diversa: quę omnia Philippus ludis secularibus vel dedit, vel occidit. . . . Nam omnia hæc Philippus exhibuit secularibus ludis et muneribus atque Circensibus, quum millesimum ab urbe condita annum in consulatu suo et filii sui celebravit. Capitol. Gordian. iii. cap. 33. p. 132 . . . 134.

<sup>p</sup> His imperantibus, millesimus annus Romę urbis ingenti ludorum apparatu spectaculorumque celebratus est. &c. Eutrop. l. ix. cap. 3. <sup>q</sup> Vide *Victor. de Cæsar. cap. 28. et Epit. cap. 28.*

4. Once more, finally, the Philips were deified after their death, as Eutropius says: which shews, that they were reckoned to be heathens. And Philip put Gordian in the number of the gods, as Capitolinus<sup>3</sup> says, in which he acted like a heathen.

Upon the whole therefore I can see no reason to believe, that the emperor Philip was by belief or profession a Christian; though he might be favourable to some who were so.

As I do not love to be singular, I shall now transcribe the judgments of several learned men upon this point. Says Crevier: 'He<sup>1</sup> is said to have been a Christian: but if he was, it seems to me very strange, that none of the Pagan writers who have spoken of him should have mentioned it. Zosimus, in particular, who is full of venom against Christianity, and who takes a pleasure in loading Constantine with the most atrocious calumnies, would surely not have spared Philip. The Christian writers, upon whose authority the notion of this prætorian præfect's Christianity is founded, certainly deserve respect. But their accounts are so confused, so full of circumstances, either palpably contradictory, or absolutely refuted by history, that the weight of their testimony is considerably diminished. Though Mr. Tillemont inclines to their opinion, I am not afraid to own, that what he himself has written upon this subject makes me of a different mind. If Philip did profess our religion, he was certainly a bad Christian. I had rather believe, that being born in the neighbourhood of the country which was the cradle of Christianity, he might thence acquire some tincture of it; and that he favoured it, as Alexander Severus had done, but without renouncing his idolatrous superstition to which he adhered when emperor.' And afterwards<sup>2</sup> 'The celebration of the secular games, in which all the pomp of the Pagan superstition was displayed, is a direct proof of the public profession which Philip made of his attachment to idolatry. It is a violation of all probability to suppose, without any evidence, that the emperor could celebrate them without taking part in the sacrifices that accompanied them, or rather which were the essential part of them, and the very foundation of the whole festival.'

<sup>1</sup> Ambo inde ab exercitu interfecti sunt: Senior Philippus Veronæ, Romæ junior. Annis v. imperaverunt, inter Divos tamen relati sunt. Eutrop. l. ix. cap. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Denique Philippus quum cum interfecisset, neque imagines ejus tolleret, neque statuas deponeret, neque nomen abraderet,

sed Divum semper appellans etiam apud ipsos milites, cum quibus factionem fecerat, serio animo et peregrina calliditate veneratus est. Capitolin. ut supra, p. 128.

<sup>3</sup> History of the Roman Emperors, vol. viii. p. 419.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. vol. ix. p. 9.

Pagi, at the conclusion of one part of his argument upon this subject, has an observation which may be reckoned sage and pertinent. ‘There<sup>z</sup> is no more reason,’ says he, ‘to believe what Eusebius here says of the Christianity of the emperor Philip, than what he says of Abgarus king of the Edessens, that having heard of the fame of Christ’s miracles, he wrote a letter to him; and that our Lord returned him an answer, promising to send to him one of his apostles. Nor is there any more regard to be had to Jerom, when he calls the emperor Philip a convert to Christianity; than when he speaks of the Letters of Paul to Seneca, and Seneca to Paul. The first Christians,’ says he, ‘wholly intent upon propagating our faith, and being men of great candour, oftentimes too easily admitted stories which were favourable to our religion: of which there are many instances.’ A remarkable observation of a Franciscan monk, but a truly learned man.

Cellarius has an observation to the like purpose. ‘The<sup>y</sup> more greedily this story was received by our ancestors, the more carefully ought we to examine their testimony concerning it: for they seem (some of them at least) to have embraced this opinion about Philip; being desirous to have it thought, that the secular games of the thousandth year of the city of Rome were celebrated to the honour of Christ, and not of the gods.’ I must not allow myself to take any thing more from this author: though his Observations upon the Christianity ascribed to Philip appear to me very clear and solid: and I recollect, that I did before transcribe some of his thoughts upon this point at p. 140, note<sup>u</sup>.

\* Hic tantum dicam, non majorem fidem adhibendam Eusebio, Philippum Imp. Christianum facienti, quam eidem affirmanti Abgarum Edessenorum Regem, auditis Christi miraculis ad ipsum literas dedisse, et Christum mutuas ad eum literas scripsisse, quibus se missurum ad ipsum unum ex Apostolis suis pollicitus est. . . . Nec etiam major fides Hieronymi de conversione Philippi Imperatoris loquentis, quam cum in lib. de Script. Eccles. de Seneca scribit. ‘Quem non ponerem in catalogo sanctorum, nisi me illæ epistolæ provocarent, quæ leguntur a plurimis Pauli ad Senecam, et Senecæ ad Paulum.’ Priores Christiani fidei nostræ promovendæ toti addicti, et summo animi candore præditi, sese sæpe nimis faciles in iis, quæ religioni

favabant, præbuerunt, ut innumera exempla demonstrant. Pagi ann. 244. num. vii. y Quam cupide autem hoc creditum a majoribus fuit, tanto id minus sit verosimile, si veteres auctores excutiantur. Qui adseverant Christianum fuisse, ideo videntur in hanc opinionem ingressi, ut millesimum Urbis annum Christi potius quam deorum cultori vindicarent. Oros. l. vii. c. 28. de Constantino Magno. ‘Primus Imperatorum Christianus, excepto Philippo, qui Christianis annis admodum paucissimis ad hoc tantum constitutus fuisse mihi visus est, ut millesimus Romæ annus Christo potius, quam idolis dicaretur.’ Cellar. Diss. de primo principe Christiano, num. xxii. p. 322.

## C H A P. XXX.

## THE EMPEROR DECIUS.

I. *His time, and character.* II. *Accounts of his Persecution.* III. *A Persecution at Alexandria, before the publication of his edict.* IV. *That this Persecution was universal.*

I. WE sometimes meet with chronological difficulties; where they might be little expected. Eusebius in his Chronicle says, that <sup>a</sup> DECIUS reigned only one year and three months: and in his History, that <sup>b</sup> he and his sons were slain before he had reigned two years: which <sup>c</sup> account Baronius follows. But learned men are now rather of opinion, that <sup>d</sup> Decius reached to the third year. And it is computed, that <sup>e</sup> he reigned from July or August 249, to November or December 251.

Eutropius <sup>f</sup>, and Victor <sup>g</sup> in his Cæsars, say, he reigned two years; the other Victor <sup>h</sup> says thirty months. He was born in Pannonia: and, as has been observed, he is the first of the many Roman emperors who were natives of Illyricum. His name, as inscribed upon <sup>i</sup> medals, is Caius Messius Trajanus Decius. He has a very good character in the Epitome of <sup>k</sup> Victor, and <sup>l</sup> Zosimus, heathen authors: but he is little taken notice of by Christian writers, excepting upon account of his persecution. Some of their passages I shall transcribe, sufficient to afford my readers a general notion of it.

II. The author of the Deaths of Persecutors says, that <sup>m</sup> Decius began to persecute the Christians as soon as he began to reign: but he does not tell us what the edict was, nor the occasion of it.

<sup>a</sup> Romanorum vicesimus quintus regnavit Decius anno uno, menses iii. Chron. p. 175.

<sup>b</sup> H. E. l. vii. cap. i.

<sup>c</sup> Ann. 254. n. xlix.

<sup>d</sup> Dece

a certainement commencé la troisième année de son règne, comme on le voit par les médailles. Tillem. H. E. T. iii. p. 599. Brux.

<sup>e</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 251.

num. xxx. Basnag. ann. 249. num. iii.

<sup>f</sup> Post hos Decius, e Pannonia inferiore, Babelia natus, imperium sumsit . . . Cum biennio ipse et filius ejus imperassent, uterque in Barbarico interfecti sunt, et inter Deos relati. Eutrop. l. ix. cap. iv.

<sup>g</sup> Cap. 29.

<sup>h</sup> Decius e Pannonia inferiore . . . imperavit menses triginta.

Hic Decium filium suum Cæsarem fecit: vir artibus cunctis virtutibusque instructus, placidus et communis domi: in armis promptissimus. Vict. Epit. cap. 29.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Noris. Ep. Syro-Maced. Diss. 2. cap. x. p. 344, 345. Lips. <sup>k</sup> See note h.

<sup>l</sup> Δεξιῶ μὲν ἐν ἀριστῶ βασιλευσὶ τέλος τοιοῦδε συνέβη. Zol. l. i. p. 644. in.

<sup>m</sup> Exsistit enim post annos plurimos execrabile animal Decius, qui vexaret Ecclesiam. Quis enim justitiam nisi malus persequatur? Et quasi hujus rei gratia provectus esset ad illud principale fastigium, sistere protinus contra Deum cepit, ut protinus caderet. De M. P. cap. 4.

Eusebius writes to this purpose. ‘ Philip <sup>n</sup> having reigned seven years, he was succeeded by Decius, who being an enemy to Philip, raised a persecution against the churches: in which Fabian at Rome having been perfected by martyrdom, he was succeeded by Cornelius in that bishoprick. In Palestine Alexander, bishop of the church at Jerusalem, is again brought before the governor’s tribunal at Cæsarea for Christ’s sake: and having made a second glorious confession is put in prison, being now venerable for his age and grey hairs. Having died in prison, after a noble and illustrious confession before the governor’s tribunal, he was succeeded in the bishopric of Jerusalem by Mazabanes. In like manner Babylas having died in prison at Antioch, after a public confession of the faith, was succeeded in that church by Fabius. How many and how great sufferings Origen endured at that time, imprisonment, chains, fetters upon his legs, his feet stretched in the stocks to the fourth hole for several days, menaces to burn him alive, and other torments, the judge all the while carefully endeavouring that he might not die under them, may be fully known from some letters written by him.’

Origen was then in the sixty-sixth or sixty-seventh year of his age: but neither his age, nor his learning, nor his many works, nor the greatness of his fame, secured him from a share in this trial. And Alexander before-mentioned, bishop of Jerusalem, was also a truly excellent and valuable man. They who desire to know more of him, may see his history more at large in another<sup>o</sup> place. Origen survived that trial, being set at liberty at the period of the persecution; but he died a few years after.

III. The beginning of the Decian persecution<sup>2</sup> must be dated in the year 249, or the beginning of 250: but there was a persecution raised against the Christians at Alexandria in the year 248, whilst other churches enjoyed great peace under the emperor Philip. This persecution lasted a whole year, and was concluded by nothing but a sedition and disturbance among the gentiles themselves. Of this we have an account in the fragment of a letter of Dionysius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch. That fragment is preserved in Eusebius, and as the account is authentic, as well as curious, I am induced to transcribe it here. ‘ The<sup>3</sup> persecution with us, says he, had not its beginning from the imperial edict; but began a whole year before. A soothsayer and poet, such as he was, stirred up the multitude of the Gen-

<sup>n</sup> H. E. i. vi. cap. 39.  
Euseb. iii. iv. Basnag. ann. 249. ii. &c.

<sup>o</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 391—397.

<sup>p</sup> Pagi ann. 250.

<sup>q</sup> Ap. Euseb. H. E. i. vi. cap. 41.

tiles against us, exciting them to contend for the superstition of  
 their country. Being stirred up by him, and having it in their  
 power to do as they pleased, they thought that religion lay in  
 nothing more than killing us. First of all they lay hold of a  
 man of great age named Metras, requiring him to repeat some  
 profane words: he not doing as they desired, they laid many  
 blows upon his body with clubs, and pricked him in the face  
 and eyes with sharp reeds, and then leading him into the sub-  
 urbs, they stoned him to death. After that, dragging a faith-  
 ful woman named Quinta to their idol temple, they require  
 her to fall down and worship it: but she refusing so to do, they  
 tied her feet, and dragged her through the city, which is paved  
 with sharp stones, and having dashed her against millstones, and  
 scourged her, they led her to the same place without the city,  
 and stoned her. They then broke into the houses of many  
 pious men, robbing and plundering them of what they had.  
 If they found any thing valuable, that they kept for their own  
 use: but lumber, and utensils made of wood, they threw out  
 in the streets: so that the city looked as if it had been taken  
 by an enemy. However, many of the brethren retired, and  
 saved themselves by flight, *joyfully taking the spoiling of their*  
*goods*, like to those mentioned by Paul, Heb. x. 34. Nor do  
 I yet know of more than one, that fell into their hands, who  
 has denied the Lord. Moreover, at this time they laid hold  
 of an admirable virgin, of a great age, named Apollonia:  
 they struck her upon the cheeks, and beat out all her teeth:  
 then lighting a fire without the city, they threatened to burn  
 her alive, unless she would join with them in pronouncing cer-  
 tain profane words: but she begging a short respite, and being  
 let loose, presently threw herself into the fire, and was con-  
 sumed to ashes. Serapion they seized in his own house, and  
 having tortured him with grievous torments, and broken all  
 his limbs, they threw him headlong from the upper part of his  
 house. Nor had we, says this bishop of Alexandria, a safe pas-  
 sage any where, through high-streets, or narrow lanes, neither  
 by night nor by day; but continually, and every where,  
 the people were universally crying out: "if any man refuse to  
 pronounce such or such impious words, let him be immedi-  
 ately taken up and thrown into the fire." So things went on  
 for some time, till a sedition among themselves, and a civil  
 war returned this cruelty upon them. We had then a short  
 breathing time: but presently news came of the end of that  
 reign which had been favourable to us; and all were seized  
 with fears of an impending storm. Then came the edict,

<sup>t</sup> which was very terrible, putting us in mind of what was fore-  
<sup>c</sup> told by the Lord, that *if it were possible, they should seduce even*  
<sup>c</sup> *the elect,* Matt. xxiv. 24.

Dionysius proceeds to relate the consequences of the imperial edict at Alexandria, and other places in Egypt. Some were overcome by fears of suffering, and sacrificed: others (divers of which are named by him) patiently and courageously endured various kinds of death, under exquisite torture. But I transcribe nothing more here. But it is observable, that many Christians fell in the time of this persecution: and when it was over, there were in many places disputes about the manner of receiving such as had lapsed, when they desired to be reconciled to the church:

IV. Sulpicius Severus <sup>t</sup> calls the persecution under Decius the seventh persecution, as does <sup>s</sup> Jerom in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers, in the chapter of Alexander bishop of Jerusalem. Orosius <sup>t</sup> also reckons Decius the seventh persecutor of the church, and says, *That by his cruel edicts he sent many of the saints to receive crowns from Christ for the torments which they endured.* In <sup>u</sup> Augustine likewise it is the seventh persecution. There can be no doubt but <sup>x</sup> it was universal, as it was ordered by an imperial edict.

---

## C H A P. XXXI.

### T H E E M P E R O R G A L L U S.

*His time, and that he was a persecutor.*

DECIVS was succeeded by GALLUS and VOLUSIAN near the end of the year 251. GALLUS is not mentioned among the persecuting princes by Sulpicius Severus, or Orosius, or Augustine, or the Author of the Deaths of Persecutors: nevertheless he must have been a persecutor.

<sup>r</sup> Mox Decio imperante; jam tum septima persecutione factum in Christianos. S. Sev. l. ii. c. 32. al. 46.

<sup>s</sup> Septima autem persecutione sub Decio, quo tempore Babylæ Antiochiæ passus est, ductus Cæsaream, et clausus in carcere ob confessionem Christi, martyrio coronatus. De V. l. cap. 62.

<sup>t</sup> Idem continuo,

in quo se etiam ob hoc Philippos intercessisse docuit, ad persequendos interficiendosque Christianos, septimus post Neronem, feralia dispersit edicta, plurimosque sanctorum ad coronas Christi de suis cruciatibus misit. Oros. l. vii. cap. 21.

<sup>u</sup> De Civ. Dei. l. xviii. cap. 52.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Balsag. ann. 250. num. iv. v.

Says Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, 'Decius' being slain with his sons, when he had not yet compleated the second year of his reign, he was succeeded by Gallus, at which time died Origen in the seventieth year of his age. And Dionysius in his letter to Hermammon speaks thus of Gallus: But Gallus did not attend to the fate of Decius, nor consider what was his ruin; but stumbled upon the same stone, which lay before his eyes. When his empire was in a happy state, and all things succeeded according to his wishes, he<sup>h</sup> persecuted those truly holy men who prayed to God for his health and prosperity; and with them drove away those prayers which they offered up for him.' Thus he writes of Gallus.

As there is little notice taken of this matter by ancient ecclesiastical writers, Pagi<sup>e</sup> argues, that this was only a local persecution, and that it was felt in few places, except Rome, where Cornelius, and afterwards Lucius, bishops of that city, were banished by this emperor. As the conduct of Gallus is so particularly mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria, I have been apt to think, that some Christians suffered in that city, or in the countries near it. Mosheim's<sup>d</sup> observations upon this persecution may be consulted.

## C H A P. XXXII.

### THE EMPERORS VALERIAN AND GALLIENUS.

I. Valerian's time, and character. II. General accounts of his Persecution from several Christian writers. III. How long it lasted. IV. Accounts of this persecution from Dionysius bishop of Alexandria. V. The emperor Gallienus's edict, restoring peace to the churches. VI. Farther accounts of that persecution from Cyprian bishop of Carthage. VII. The remarkable History of Marinus, who suffered martyrdom at Casarea in Palestine, after the publication of the fore-mentioned edict of Gallienus.

<sup>a</sup> H. E. l. vii. cap. 1. 4 . . . τβ; ης αὐτῶν τῆς περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης πρὸς θεοῦ τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλοτρίους ἐδίωξε καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς προσευχάς. Ibid. p. 250.

<sup>b</sup> A. 250. num. x. xii. xvi. . . . xxi. Magnantibus his Christianorum certatibus Decius cum filiis anno ccl. necavit. In eujus locum Gallus cum filio Vo-

lufiano succedebat. Is sequenti anno bellum in Christianos, quod ultimis Decii temporibus remissius gestum erat, aut novis edictis propositis, aut antiquis renovatis, instaurari jubebat: unde multa iterum mala Christianis in variis orbis Romani provinciis subeunda erant. &c. De Reb. ante C. M. p. 527.

I. VALERIAN having enjoyed many offices and dignities in the state with great applause, and <sup>a</sup> been highly celebrated for his prudence, modesty, gravity, and other virtues, was proclaimed emperor in the year 253: and his son GALLIENUS was taken into partnership with him in the same year. It is not needful for me to enlarge in his history. But about the seventh year of his reign, in 259 or 260 at the latest, he was taken prisoner by Sapor king of Persia: where <sup>b</sup> he lived the remainder of his days in a miserable captivity.

II. He is reckoned the eighth persecutor of the Christians by <sup>c</sup> Sulpicius Severus, <sup>d</sup> Orosius, <sup>e</sup> Augustine. The Author of the Deaths of Persecutors does not mention the number of persecutions: nevertheless he speaks distinctly of this, and says, 'that Valerian shed the blood of many righteous men in a short time.' As does Orosius likewise, and says that this persecution was universal all over the Roman empire.

III. 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. Dionysius <sup>g</sup> speaks of this persecution having lasted 'forty-two months,' or three years and a half: which ought to be understood of Egypt only, not of the rest of the empire. In that manner some difficulties relating to this point are adjusted and cleared up by <sup>h</sup> Pagi, to whom I refer, and to <sup>i</sup> Basnage, who does not much differ from him.

IV. Of this persecution we have some authentic accounts in Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian, and his deacon Pontius, all contemporaries, which therefore cannot but deserve our regard.

Says <sup>k</sup> Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History: 'In the mean time Gallus being slain, when he had scarcely reigned two

<sup>a</sup> Trebell. Poll. in Valerian. cap. i. ii. p. 171. &c.

<sup>b</sup> Id. in Valerian. cap. 3. p. 178. &c. et Cæcilius de M. Persecut. cap. 5. Oros. l. vii. cap. 22. Euseb. Chron. p. 176.

<sup>c</sup> Inde Valerianus octavus sanctorum hostis. S. Sever. l. ii. cap. 32.

<sup>d</sup> Valerianus siquidem, mox ut arripuit imperium, octavus a Nerone, adigi per tormenta Christianos ad idololatriam, abnegantesque interfici iussit, fuso per omnem Romani regni latitudinem sanctorum sanguine. Valerianus illico, nefarii auctor edicti a Sapore Persarum rege

captus, Imperator populi Romani ignominiose apud Persas servitute consenuit. &c. Oros. l. vii. cap. 22.

<sup>e</sup> De Civ. Dei. l. xviii. cap. 52.

<sup>f</sup> Non multo post Valerianus quoque non dissimili furore correptus, impias manus in Deum intemavit et multum, quamvis brevi tempore, iusti sanguinis fudit. De M. P. cap. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Ap. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 10. in.

<sup>h</sup> Ann. 261. n. viii. et seqq.

<sup>i</sup> Ann. 257. num. iii.

<sup>k</sup> H. E. l. vii. cap. 10.

years, he was succeeded by Valerian and his son Gallienus. Here it will be worth the while to attend to what Dionysius says in his letter to Hermammon. Concerning this too John had a revelation. For he says: Rev. xiii. 5. *And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies. And power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.* It is wonderful to observe, how both these things were fulfilled in Valerian: and it deserves to be considered what he was before; how mild and how kind he was to the men of God. For none of the emperors before him were so favourable and benevolent to them; not even those<sup>l</sup> who are said to have been openly Christians; as he was in the beginning of his reign; and his house was full of pious men, and was a church of God. But his master, and the chief of the magicians of Egypt, [he means Macrian, presently afterwards mentioned by name,] persuaded him to alter his measures, telling him that he ought to kill and persecute those men who opposed and obstructed his incantations, and then he might be happy.

Soon after the arrival of Valerian's edict at Alexandria, before the end of the year 257, as<sup>m</sup> seems most probable, Dionysius was summoned before Emilian, then præfect of Egypt, of which he writes to this purpose in his letter to Germanus. 'I<sup>n</sup> came to Emilian, says he, not alone. I was attended by my fellow-presbyter Maximus; and also by Faustus, Eusebius, and Chæremon, deacons, and a brother from Rome, who was then at Alexandria. Emilian did not then say to me, You ought not to hold assemblies; for that was needless: nor was that his chief concern, but that we should not be at all Christians: he therefore commanded me to forsake that way of worship. For he thought, that if I would change my mind, others would do so likewise. I answered, and as I apprehend not improperly, though in short, *We ought to obey God, rather than men.* Acts v. 29. And I plainly and openly declared, that I worship him, who alone is God, and no other: and that I could not alter my mind, nor cease to be a Christian. After which he ordered us to go to Cephro, a small village near the desert. But it may be worth the while to transcribe here the very words of both of us from the public register. "When Dionysius, Faustus, Maximus, Marcellus, and Chæremon, were brought in, Emilian the præfect said: I have not only written to you, but I have also by word of mouth represented to you the hu-

<sup>l</sup> Meaning, probably, Severus Alexander, and Philip.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 257.

<sup>n</sup> v. Balsag. 247. num. vi.

<sup>n</sup> Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. vii. cap. 11. p. 257.

“ manity of our lords, the emperors, which they shew to you,  
 “ For they grant to you the privilege of living in safety, if you  
 “ will turn to that which is agreeable to nature, and will worship  
 “ the gods, which are the preservers of their empire, and will  
 “ forsake that which is contrary to nature. What therefore do  
 “ you say to this? I hope you will not be ungrateful to their hu-  
 “ manity; forasmuch as they endeavour to bring you to that  
 “ which is right. Dionysius answered: All men do not worship  
 “ all the gods; but they worship such as they think to be gods.  
 “ We worship and adore the one God, maker of all things, who  
 “ also has put the empire into the hands of the sacred and august  
 “ emperors Valerian and Gallienus. Him we worship, and to  
 “ him we continually pray that he will prolong their empire in  
 “ safety and prosperity. Emilian the governor then said to them  
 “ again: Who forbids you to worship him also, if he be God,  
 “ together with them who are by nature gods? For you are  
 “ commanded to worship the gods, particularly those whom all  
 “ know to be gods. Dionysius answered: We worship no other.  
 “ Emilian the governor then said to them; I see that you are  
 “ both ungrateful and insensible of our august emperors’ lenity  
 “ toward you. You therefore may not stay any longer in this  
 “ city, but shall be sent into Libya, to a place called Cephro:  
 “ for I have chosen that place for you, agreeably to the order  
 “ of the august emperors. Nor shall it be lawful for you, or  
 “ any others, to hold assemblies, or to meet together in the  
 “ places called coemeteries. If any one does not go to the place  
 “ which I have appointed, or is found in any assembly, he brings  
 “ danger upon himself; for a needful observation will not be  
 “ neglected. Depart therefore to the place whither you are or-  
 “ dered.” Nor could I, says Dionysius, obtain the delay of  
 “ one day, though I was sick. At Cephro he had a large num-  
 “ ber of the faithful with him, partly such as came thither from  
 “ Alexandria, partly such as came from other places of Egypt.  
 “ And here, says he, *God opened a door to us for preaching the*  
 “ *word.* 2 Cor. ii. 12. Col. iv. 3. At first the people of the place  
 “ were rude, and ready to pelt us with stones; but afterwards,  
 “ not a few of the Gentiles, *foraking idols turned unto God.* 1 Thess.  
 “ i. 9. . . . 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  
 “ uncomfortable place than Libya itself, gave orders for dispersing  
 “ some others in several villages of Mareotis, and us he com-  
 “ manded to reside in the district of Colluthio, near the great  
 “ road:

‘road: that we might be the nearer at hand to be brought to Alexandria, if he should think fit.’

Afterwards. ‘Moreover,’ says ° Eusebius, ‘the same Dionysius in his letter to Domitius and Dydimus writes again of the persecution in 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 persons of both sexes, and of every age and condition, and soldiers, and country people, have been victorious in this combat, and have 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 intervening he says: “At present I have only with me Caius and Peter, deprived of the rest of the brethren. And soon afterwards: “Some have hid themselves in the city, that they may privately visit the brethren: as Maximus, Dioscorus, Demetrius, and Lucius, presbyters: for Faustinus and Aquila, being much known, travel up and down in Egypt. The deacons that survive after those who have died of the plague, are Faustus, Eusebius, Chæremon; Eusebius, I say, whom God has qualified from the beginning, and furnished with great resolution and ability for fulfilling the office of ministrætion 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 præfect does not cease to treat our people in the most cruel manner, killing some, and torturing others, and making others pine away in fetters and dungeons; forbidding any to be admitted to them, and strictly inquiring likewise whether his orders are 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 exigence.” So writes Dionysius.’

In these fragments of Dionysius’s letters which Eusebius has preserved, and, as I think, judiciously inserted in his Ecclesiastical History, we have valuable memoirs of Valerian’s persecution. And we see not only the fortitude of those who were perfected by martyrdom, but also the resolution and courage, the discretion, and the amiable and friendly tenderness of the Christian

° Ibid. p. 260.

brethren,

brethren, in relieving and comforting each other, which are truly admirable and exemplary.

In the chapter<sup>b</sup> next following Eusebius mentions three men, and a Marcionite woman, at Cæsarea in Palestine, who in Valerian's persecution were condemned to wild beasts, and were crowned with martyrdom.

V. Then in the next chapter he writes to this purpose. ‘ But  
 ‘ not long after Valerian being taken captive, and reduced to  
 ‘ slavery by barbarians, his son, who then reigned alone, acted  
 ‘ more prudently in his empire. He immediately by edicts put  
 ‘ a stop to the persecution against us, and gave command, that  
 ‘ the presidents of our religion should be at liberty to perform  
 ‘ the usual offices of their function. The edict is to this purpose:  
 ‘ The emperor, Cæsar, Publius Licinius Gallienus, Pious,  
 ‘ Happy, Augustus, to Dionysius, and Pinna, and Demetrius,  
 ‘ and to the other bishops. I have directed, that the favour of  
 ‘ my indulgence should be published throughout the whole  
 ‘ world; that all may depart from the places of worship. You  
 ‘ are therefore impowered to make use of this copy of my edict,  
 ‘ that none may trouble you. And that you may perform what  
 ‘ is lawful for you to do, has been already granted by me. And  
 ‘ let Aurelius Cyrenius our high-steward observe this edict now  
 ‘ given by me.” This, says Eusebius, has been translated from  
 ‘ the Roman tongue. There is also another edict of the same  
 ‘ emperor, sent to other bishops, and appointing, “ that the  
 ‘ places called cœmeteries should be restored.”

In his<sup>c</sup> Chronicle likewise Eusebius observes, that Valerian being taken captive by the Persians, Gallienus gave peace to the churches.

VI. I began with Dionysius, and have carried on the history of Valerian's persecution from him: but as Cyprian suffered martyrdom in this persecution, dying on the 14th Sept. 258, and there are some authentic memoirs of his sufferings, I shall now allege some things from them also.

Cyprian seems to have been one of the first persons in Africa, who was called upon to make public confession in this persecution: and I therefore immediately take the beginning of the proconsular acts of his passion, which I shall transcribe below in the original, and also translate literally. ‘ The<sup>d</sup> emperor Valerian  
 ‘ being

<sup>b</sup> L. vii. cap. 10.

<sup>c</sup> Cap. 19.

<sup>d</sup> Valeriano in Persas ducto, Gallienus nostris pacem reddidit. Ch. p. 176.

<sup>e</sup> Imperatore Valeriano quartum; et

Gallieno tertium Consulibus tertio Calendarum Septembrium, Carthagine in Secretario, Paternus Proconsul Cypriano Episcopo dixit: Sacratissimi Imperatores Valerianus

being consul the fourth time, and Gallienus the third time, [that is the year of Christ 257,] on the thirtieth day of August, at Carthage, in the secretary's office, Paternus the proconsul said to Cyprian the bishop: the most sacred emperors, Valerian and Gallienus, have vouchsafed to send to me a letter, wherein they command, that they who do not observe the Roman Religion, should now perform the Roman rites. I therefore have made enquiry after you. What answer do you make to me? Cyprian the bishop said: I am a Christian, and a bishop. I know no other gods, but the one true God, who made the heaven, and the earth, and the sea, and the things that are in them. This God we Christians serve, to whom we pray night and day, for you, and for all men, and for the safety of the emperors themselves. Paternus the proconsul said: And do you persist in this purpose? Cyprian the bishop answered: A good purpose, agreeable to God, cannot be altered. Can you then, according to the command of Valerian and Gallienus, go an exile to the city Cucurbis? Cyprian said: I go. Paternus the proconsul said: The emperors have written to me not concerning bishops only, but also concerning presbyters. I desire therefore to know of you who are the presbyters that live in this city. Cyprian the bishop answered: By your own laws it has been wisely enacted, that informers should not be encouraged: therefore they cannot be discovered and accused by me: but they will be found in their cities. Paternus the proconsul said: I now inquire after those who are in this place.

rianus et Gallienus, literas ad me dare dignati sunt, quibus præceperunt, eos qui Romanam Religionem non colunt, debere Romanas caeremonias recognoscere. 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 cælum et terram, mare, et quæ in eis sunt omnia. Huic Deo nos Christiani deservimus, hunc deprecamur diebus ac noctibus, pro vobis, et pro omnibus hominibus, et pro incolumitate ipsorum Imperatorum. Paternus Proconsul dixit: In hac ergo voluntate perseveras? Cyprianus Episcopus respondit: Bona voluntas, quæ Deum novit, immutari non potest. Paternus Proconsul dixit: Poteris ergo secundum præceptum Valeriani et Gallieni exil ad urbem Curubitanam proficisci? Cyprianus Episcopus dixit: Proficiscor. Paternus Proconsul dixit: Non solum de Episcopis, verum etiam de Presbyteris mihi

scribere dignati sunt. Volo ergo scire ex te, qui sint Presbyteri, qui in hac civitate consistunt. Cyprianus Episcopus respondit: Legibus vestris bene atque utiliter censuistis, delatores non esse. Itaque detegi atque deferri a me non possunt: in civitatibus autem suis invenientur. Paternus Proconsul dixit: Ego hodie in hoc loco exquiro. Cyprianus dixit: Cum disciplina prohibeat, ut quis se ultro offerat, et tunc quoque censuræ hoc displiceat, nec offerre se ipsi possunt. Sed a te exquisiti invenientur. Paternus Proconsul dixit: A me invenientur. Et adjecit: Præceperunt etiam, ne in aliquibus locis conciliabula fiant, nec cæmeteria ingrediantur: Si quis itaque hoc tam salubre præceptum non observaverit, capite plectetur. Cyprianus Episcopus respondit: Fac quod tibi præceptum est. Tunc Paternus Proconsul iussit beatum Cyprianum Episcopum in exilium deportari. Acta Proconsul. *Itall.* S. Cyprian. p. 11, 12.

‘ Cyprian

‘ Cyprian said: Since our religion forbids men to offer themselves to sufferings, and since it is contrary to your own laws, they cannot offer themselves: but they may be found if inquired after. Paternus the proconsul said: They shall be found by me. And he added: The emperors have also ordered, that no assemblies should be held in the cœmeteries, and that none enter into those places. If therefore any one does not observe this wholesome command, he shall be put to death. Cyprian the bishop answered: Do as you are commanded. Then Paternus the proconsul ordered, that Cyprian the bishop should be carried into exile.’

His deacon Pontius accompanied him to the place of his exile, where he arrived on the thirteenth or fourteenth of September, in the same year, 257.

About the same time many others suffered in Africa, upon account of their profession of Christianity. For we have a letter of Cyprian<sup>†</sup>, written during the time of his being at Curubis, 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.’

Whilst Cyprian continued at Curubis, Galerius Maximus<sup>‡</sup> succeeded Paternus as proconsul of Africa. He recalled Cyprian from his banishment: who then went to his gardens or country-house near Carthage, by orders, as it seems, of the proconsul.

Moreover, as there were many uncertain reports in Africa, Cyprian<sup>×</sup> had sent to Rome, and received thence some intelligence which might be relied upon, and was to this effect: ‘ that

<sup>†</sup> Ep. 76. al. 77. <sup>‡</sup> Cumque diu ibidem moraretur, successit Aspasio Paterno Proconsuli Galerius Maximus Proconsul. Acl. Pass. p. 12.

<sup>×</sup> Sciatis autem eos venisse, quos ad Urbem propter hoc miseram, ut quomodocunque de nobis rescriptum fuisset, exploratam sibi veritatem ad nos referant. Multa enim varia et incerta opinionibus ventilantur. Quæ autem sunt in vero, ita se habent. Rescripsisse Valerianum ad senatum, ut Episcopi, et Presbyteri, et Diacones in continenti animadvertantur: Senatores vero, et viri egregii, et Equites Romani, dignitate amissa, etiam bonis spoliarentur, et si ademptis facultatibus Christiani esse perseveraverint, capite quoque multentur: Matrōna ademptis bonis in exilium relegentur: Cæliam quæcumque vel patris confessi fuerant, vel matris conciliis legant,

confiscentur, et vincli in Cæsarianas possessiones descripti mittantur. Subjecit etiam Valerianus Imperator orationi suæ exemplum literarum, quas ad præfides provinciarum de nobis fecit: quas literas quotidie speramus venire, stantes secundum fidei firmitatem ad passionis tolerantiam, et expectantes de ope et indulgentia Domini vitæ æternæ coronam. Xistum autem in cœmeterio animadvertum sciat, octavo iduum Augustarum die, et cum eodem Quartum. Set et huic persecutioni quotidie insistant Præfidi in Urbe: ut si qui sibi oblati fuerint, animadvertantur, et bona eorum hinc vindicentur. Hæc peto per vos et Collegis nostris innotescant, ut ubique hortatu eorum possit fraternitas corroborari, et ad agorem spiritalem preparari. &c. Cyp. ep. 79. al. 80.

' the emperor Valerian had ordered, by a rescript sent to the se-  
 ' nate, that bishops, presbyters and deacons, should be put to  
 ' death without delay; that senators, and persons of quality and  
 ' Roman knights, should be deprived of their dignity and their  
 ' goods: if after that they persist in being Christians, they  
 ' should be beheaded: that ladies of quality should be deprived  
 ' of their goods, and sent into exile: that the emperor's freed-  
 ' men, who have confessed, or shall hereafter confess, shall lose  
 ' their goods, which are to be seized by the treasury: and that  
 ' they be sent chained to the emperor's estate, and that they be  
 ' put in the list of slaves to work there. To his own rescript  
 ' the emperor Valerian has subjoined copies of letters to be sent  
 ' to the presidents of the provinces; which letters we daily ex-  
 ' pect, standing prepared for the trial, and hoping to obtain,  
 ' through the divine aid and goodness, the crown of eternal life.'  
 ' We are also assured, that Xistus [the bishop of Rome] was  
 ' put to death in the cœmety on the sixth day of August, and  
 ' with him Quartus. We also learn, that the præfects in the  
 ' city are intent to execute the emperor's orders: and if any are  
 ' brought before them, they are punished, and their goods con-  
 ' fiscated. These things, says Cyprian in his letter to Successus,  
 ' I am desirous should be made known by you to my brethren,  
 ' that all may be prepared for the combat that now lies before us.'

When those orders for the governors of the provinces arrived at Carthage is not certain; but very probably before the end of August.

Galerius Maximus the proconsul, who had succeeded Pater-  
 nus, was at Sexti, a place about six miles from Carthage, for the  
 sake of his health. ' On the 13th day of September, [A. C.  
 ' 258,] an officer with soldiers was sent by the proconsul to

y Cumque diu ibidem moraretur, suc-  
 cessit Aspasio Paterno Proconsuli Galerius  
 Maximus Proconsul, qui sanctum Cypri-  
 anum episcopum ab exilio revocatum sibi  
 iussit presentari. Cumque Cyprianus sanc-  
 tus... de civitate Cucurbitana, in qua ex-  
 ilio præcepto Aspasii Paterni tunc Procon-  
 sulis datus fuerat, regressus esset, ex sacro  
 præscripto in hortis suis manebat... Et  
 cum illic demoraretur, repente Idibus Sep-  
 tembris Tusco et Basso consulibus, venerunt  
 ad eum principes duo, ... qui et in curri-  
 culum eum levaverunt, in medioque po-  
 suerunt, et in Sexti perduxerunt. Ubi  
 idem Galerius Maximus Proconsul, bonæ  
 valetudinis recuperandæ gratia secesserat.  
 ... Cumque oblatus fuisset, Galerius Maxi-  
 mus Proconsul dixit: Tu Papam te sacri-

legæ mentis hominibus præbuisi? Cypri-  
 anus Episcopus respondit: Ego. Galerius  
 Maximus dixit: Jusserunt te sacratissimi  
 Imperatores ceremoniari. Cyprianus Epif-  
 copus dixit: Non facio. Galerius Maxi-  
 mus ait: Consule tibi. Cyprianus Epif-  
 copus respondit: Fac quod tibi præceptum  
 est. In re tam iusta nulla est consultatio.  
 Galerius Maximus, collocutus cum con-  
 silio, sententiam vix ægre dixit verbis hu-  
 jusmodi: Diu sacrilega mente vixisti, et  
 plurimos nefariæ tibi conspirationis homi-  
 nes aggregasti... Et his dictis, decretum  
 ex tabella recitavit. Thassium Cyprianum  
 gladio animadverti placet. Cyprianus E-  
 piscopus dixit. Deo gratias. Apost. p.  
 12, 13.

' Cyprian's

‘ Cyprian’s gardens, where he had been some while, to bring  
 ‘ him before him. Cyprian’s cause was deferred for that day.  
 ‘ The next morning, the 14th of September, he was led to the  
 ‘ proconsul’s palace, furrounded by a mixed multitude of people,  
 ‘ and a strong guard of soldiers. ‘ After some time the pro-  
 ‘ consul came out into the hall, and Cyprian being set before  
 ‘ him, he said: Are you Thascius Cyprian? Cyprian the bishop  
 ‘ answered: I am. Galerius Maximus the proconsul said: The  
 ‘ most sacred emperors have commanded you to sacrifice. Cy-  
 ‘ prian the bishop answered: I do not sacrifice. Galerius Maxi-  
 ‘ mus said: Be well advised. Cyprian the bishop answered: Do  
 ‘ as thou art commanded. In so just a cause there needs no  
 ‘ consultation. 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 sen-  
 ‘ tence out of a tablet: It is decreed, that Thascius Cyprian be  
 ‘ beheaded. Cyprian the bishop said: God be praised.’

That is the account in the Acts of his Passion, which I have translated literally: and Pontius<sup>z</sup> writes to the like purpose. Cyprian was then led away to the field of Sexti, a large level spot of ground, encompassed with trees, the boughs of which were then loaded with spectators. And in the presence of a great multitude of people Cyprian was there beheaded, according to the sentence pronounced upon him on Sept. 14, in the year of Christ<sup>a</sup> 258.

VII. I have set before my readers some authentic memoirs of Valerian’s persecution from Dionysius of Alexandria, and Cyprian of Carthage. There is another remarkable story in Eusebius, which must not be omitted.

‘ In<sup>b</sup> the mean time,’ says Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, ‘ when peace had been restored to all the churches every  
 ‘ where, Marinus, a military man, and eminent upon account  
 ‘ of his birth and riches, suffered martyrdom for Christ at Cæsarea in Palestine. A centurion’s place was vacant; he put  
 ‘ up for that office, to which he had a claim by the order of his  
 ‘ promotions. When he was about to receive that honour,  
 ‘ another appeared before the tribunal, asserting, that according  
 ‘ to the ancient laws of the Romans, Marinus could not be ad-  
 ‘ mitted into that office, forasmuch<sup>c</sup> as he was a Christian, and  
 ‘ did not sacrifice to the emperors; and that the office did of

<sup>z</sup> S. Cyprian. Vit. p. 9, 10.

<sup>b</sup> L. vii. cap. 15.

<sup>c</sup> Χριστιαν

<sup>a</sup> If any are desirous to see the history of this bishop of Carthage more at large, they may consult Vol. iii. p. 133—144.

γρ οντι, και τοις βασιλευσι μη θυετι. Ib. p. 262. C.

‘ right belong to him. Achæus the judge, being much moved, asked Marinus what was his sentiments. Perceiving, that he confidently affirmed he was a Christian, he allowed him the space of three hours to consider of the matter. When the three hours were expired, he returned to the tribunal. And when called upon again to deliver his sentiments, he made a profession of the faith with greater cheerfulness than before. Whereupon he was immediately had out to be put to death, and so was perfected.’

Eusebius adds. ‘ Then <sup>d</sup> Asturius, who is still celebrated for religious zeal and courage, a Roman senator, and in esteem with the emperors, who was present at the death of the martyr, taking up the body, laid it upon his shoulders, and covering it with a rich cloth carried it off, and interred him in a decent manner.’

Mr. Mosheim’s <sup>e</sup> observations upon this remarkable history are to this purpose. ‘ Marinus was not condemned by the edict of Valerian, which had been abrogated by Gallienus, but by the ancient law of Trajan: for an accuser was received. The man who confessed himself to be a Christian was required to renounce the faith: when he would not, he was without delay led out to punishment. In <sup>f</sup> this instance therefore it is apparent, that the ancient laws of the emperors against the Christians still retained their force, though milder had been enacted: And therefore under merciful emperors, who were lovers of peace, the presidents might punish Christians, who were accused, and confessed themselves such. The body of Marinus was carried off by Asturius, a Roman senator, and buried: nor did he suffer for it: the reason is, that by Trajan’s law the judge had no right to punish any but such as were accused: and there was no body who was willing, or who dared to accuse so considerable and honourable a man as Asturius was.’

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 16.

<sup>e</sup> De Reb. &c.

p. 557.

<sup>f</sup> Ex hoc igitur exemplo liquet, antiquas Imperatorum in Christianos leges, aliis etiam et mitioribus latis, vim suam retinuisse, et Præsides propterea etiam sub clementibus Imperatoribus, pacisque temporibus, in Christianos accusatos et falsos animadvertere potuisse. Cadaver Marini Asturius, Senator Romanus, vir maxi-

mæ auctoritatis, humeris suis auferbat, et sepulturæ tradebat, idque faciebat impune ac sine periculo. Ratio in promptu est. Sine accusatore Judici non licebat punire ex Trajani lege. Tanti autem nominis et dignitatis virum, amicum præterea Imperatorum, nemo accusare vel volebat, vel audebat. Moshem. ibid.

## C H A P. XXXIII.

## A M E L I U S.

- I. *His history, and time.* II. *His testimony to St. John's gospel, with remarks.*

I. THE next testimony will be the noted passage of AMELIUS, a Platonic philosopher, fellow-disciple<sup>a</sup> and intimate acquaintance of Porphyry, who wrote against the Christians. Amelius, as<sup>b</sup> Suidas says, was of Apamea. Porphyry<sup>c</sup> in the Life of Plotinus calls him a Tuscan: but then he expressly says, that<sup>d</sup> when Plotinus died, Amelius was at Apamea in Syria: which may give occasion to think, that he was originally of that place, though perhaps he was born in Tuscany. Moreover Porphyry mentions a book of his inscribed<sup>e</sup> to Hesychius of Apamea, whom he had adopted for his son. His proper name, as we also learn from Porphyry, was Gentilian: and he chose to have his surname written with an r, Amerius, as indeed it is in Eunapius, and not Amelius: the last in Greek denoting negligence, the former integrity. According to Porphyry's account, he was the most studious and laborious of all the disciples of Plotinus, with whom he spent 24 years at Rome, from the third year of Philip to the first of Claudius, that is, from the year of Christ 246, to the beginning of the year 269. Amelius<sup>b</sup> was a diligent observer of the sacred rites, which his master Plotinus regarded very little. I have placèd Amelius at the year 263, because<sup>b</sup> Porphyry intimates, that he published little or nothing before the tenth year of Gallienus, when he had been eighteen years with Plotinus. This will suffice for his history.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Eunap. de Vita Porphyr. p. 19, 20.

<sup>b</sup> Αμελιος, Απαμειος, φιλοσοφος, μαθητης Πλωτίνου, διδασκαλος Πορφύριου, συγχρονιστας Αμμοनिω και Ωριγνηνη. Suid.

<sup>c</sup> Έσχε δε ακροασις μεν πλειους ζηλωτας δε και δια φιλοσοφιαν συνομιτας, Αμελιον τε απο της Τυσκιας, ο το ονομα ην Γεντιλιανος το κυριον αυτος δε δια της Ρ Αμεριον αυτου καλει απο της Αμεριας η της Αμελειας πρεπειν αυτω καλεισθαι λεγων. Porph. de vita Plotin. cap. vii. ap. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 104.

<sup>d</sup> Τελευτωνη δε αυτω εγω μεν ο Πορφύριος εβουχανον εν Λιλυβαιω διατριβων, Αμελιος δε εν Απαμειω της Συριας. Ib. cap. 2. p. 95.

<sup>e</sup> . . . α Ιωσηφ Ηουχιω τω Απαμειω ο

υιον εθελο, κεχαρισται. Ib. cap. 3. p. 98.

<sup>f</sup> . . . φιλοπονια δε υπερβαλλομενος τω κατ' αυτον παιδων. Ib. cap. 3. p. 98.

<sup>m</sup> Προηλθε δε αυτω ο Αμελιος, τριτον εις ασον εν Ρωμη και τα το τριτον της Φιλίππου βασιλειας ειλος, και αχρειω παρ της Κλαυδίου βασιλειας παραμεινας, ειη ετα συγγεγονεν εικοσι και τεσσαρα. Ibid.

<sup>n</sup> Φιλοθυια δε γενοιοτος της Αμελιου, και τα ιερα και τα ιεμενιαν, και τας εορτας εκπιρμιοντος και ποτε αξιωσις τον Πλωτιου, ει αυτω παραβαλειν, εφη' εκεινης δε προς με ερχεσθαι, οκ εμε προς εκεινης. κ. λ. Ib. cap. x. 111, 112.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid. cap. 4. p. 99. Et Conf. cap. 3. p. 98.

II. ' More.

II. 'Moreover,' says Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical Preparation, 'Amelius' a celebrated philosopher among the moderns, and a great admirer of the Platonic philosophy, though he has not mentioned the evangelist's name, bears testimony to his doctrine, saying, in these very words: And this plainly was the Word, by whom, he being himself eternal, were made all things that are, as Heraclitus also would say: and by Jove the same, whom the barbarian affirms to have been in the place and dignity of a principle, and to be with God, and to be God: by whom all things were made, and in whom every thing that was made has its life and being. Who descending into body, and putting on flesh, took the form of man; though even then he gave proof of the majesty of his nature: nay, and after his dissolution he was deified again, and is god, the same he was before he descended into body, and flesh, and man.'

I suppose that all will agree with Eusebius, and other ancient Christian writers, that by 'the barbarian' Amelius intended the evangelist John, and that he here refers to his gospel. He calls him 'barbarian,' because, though he wrote in Greek, that was not his native language, and he was of Jewish or Hebrew extraction: or, as Cyril<sup>9</sup> expresseth it, he was a Hebrew of Hebrews, and not a Greek.

This passage of Amelius is a testimony to St. John's whole gospel, which, I think, he had read.

1. That he refers to the beginning of St. John's gospel is manifest. See Ch. i. 1. . . . 4. and ver. 14.

2dly. He also says, that the Word, after he had descended into body, and had put on flesh, 'even then he gave proof of the majesty of his nature.' Here Amelius must refer to the great works performed by our Lord, as related in the following parts of that gospel.

3. Finally, Amelius says, that 'after his dissolution he was deified again, and was the same that he was before he descended

Ἡ Εὐσέβιος ὁμοίως καὶ τῶν νεῶν φιλοσοφῶν διαφαίνεται γὰρ ὡς Ἀμελίος, . . . εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐπισημαίνει ἐξ ὧσε τὸ εὐαγγελιστὴν Ἰωάννην μνησθῆναι, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἐν ὁμοίᾳ ταῖς αἰσὶ φαντασίαις αὐτοῦ ὅτι ταῦτα πρὸς ἕτημα γράφει. Καὶ ἴσως ἀρα ἦν ὁ Λύσιος, καθ' ὃν αὐτὸς εἶπε τα γινόμενα εἶπε, ὡς ἀν καὶ ὁ Ἡρακλείδης ἀξιώσει· καὶ ἢ δι' ὃν ὁ Βαρβαρὸς ἀξίως ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς τάξει τε καὶ ἀξίως καθ' ἑαυτὸν πρὸς Θεὸν εἶναι· ὅτι ἔπειθ' ἀπὸ τῆς γέννησθαι ἐν ὡ τὸ γεγομένον ζῶν καὶ ζῶν, καὶ ὃν πεφυκεῖν· καὶ εἰς σωματικὰ πρῶτον, καὶ σαρκα ἐνδύσασθαι, φαίνεται

ζῆσθαι ἀνθρώπου· μετὰ καὶ τὴν πνευματικὰ δεικνύειν τῆς φύσεως τὸ μετὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπου ἀναβῆσθαι, καὶ Θεὸν εἶναι, οἷος ἦν πρὸ τοῦ εἰς σῶμα, καὶ τὴν σαρκα, καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπου καλεῖσθαι. Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. xi. cap. 19. p. 540.

Ἡ Βαρβαρὸν ἦν ὡς γὰρ οἶμαι, τὸν δεσπεσιον Ἰωάννην ἀποκαλεῖ, διὰ τὴν τῆς γλωττίης ταχῆα ὡς τὸ εἰρηόβη. Ἰβραϊὸς γὰρ ἦν ἐξ Ἰβραίων, καὶ ἔκ ἀποτῆς τῆς Ἑλληνῶν χώρας τε καὶ γῆς. Cyr. contr. Julian. l. viii. p. 283.

‘ into body.’ Here, I think, he had in his eye, John xvii. 5. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thy own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* And ch. xvi. 5. *But now I go my way to him that sent me, and none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou?* Comp. ch. xiv. 4. . . . 8. and xx. 17. and other places.

Upon the whole I cannot but think, that Amelius had read over St. John’s gospel from the beginning to the end.

This same passage is also quoted at length by <sup>r</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, in his answer to the emperor Julian.

It is likewise quoted by Theodoret in his work against the gentiles: he introduceth it in this manner. ‘ Plutarch <sup>s</sup> also and <sup>t</sup> Plotinus had heard of the sacred gospels. This is apparent <sup>u</sup> from Amelius, who presided in the school of Porphyry: for <sup>v</sup> he greatly admires the proëm to John’s theology, saying, in <sup>w</sup> these very words: “ And this plainly was the Word.”

Here is some inaccuracy. ‘ Amelius did not preside in the <sup>x</sup> school of Porphyry:’ but he was an eminent man of the school of Plotinus, where Porphyry was also in great repute.

Theodoret from this passage of Amelius concluded, that <sup>y</sup> Plutarch and Plotinus were acquainted with our gospels.’ It is, I suppose, no more than a probable supposition. Theodoret might be hence led to think as much of Plutarch: but we cannot affirm it. We see no proofs of it in his works: nor can we certainly say, that Plotinus was acquainted with our gospels, or had read them. But I suppose it may be reckoned certain, that he had heard of the Christians, and had some knowledge of them. It is manifest from a passage of Porphyry in his life of <sup>z</sup> Plotinus, which will be alleged in the chapter of Porphyry.

And it may be reckoned somewhat remarkable, that from the school of Plotinus we have so many testimonies to Christianity. One of his disciples was Porphyry, who wrote so learnedly and so bitterly against the Christians. Amelius, just quoted, who had read St. John’s gospel, was another of the same school. And Longinus, from whom we shall also have a testimony, was well acquainted with those two disciples, and their master Plotinus. I think it may be hence concluded, that the learned men of that time had some knowledge of the Christians: their reading and considering the sacred books of the Christians, depended upon

<sup>r</sup> Contr. Jul. l. viii. p. 283.

<sup>s</sup> Και μεν δη και των θειων ευαγγελιων ο δε Πλωταρχος και ο Πλωτινος υπηκουσαν. Δηλοι δε τω σαφως ο Αμελιος της Πορφυριου προλιουσας διατριβης. Σπερασαιαι γαρ

το της Ιωαννη θεολογιας προλιουσι, ελιστιλιων. κ. λ. Theod. Gr. Aff. Serm. 2. p. 500. Tom. iv. <sup>t</sup> Porphyr. de Vita Plotin. cap. xvi. p. 118. ubi supra.

their inquisitiveness, and openness to conviction, in things of religion.

Augustine speaks of a Platonic philosopher, who<sup>u</sup> greatly admired the beginning of St. John's gospel, and said, 'It deserved to be written in letters of gold, and to be set up in the most conspicuous place in every church.' Whether that Platonic philosopher was Amelius, or another, we cannot say certainly.

Basil, in a homily upon the beginning of St. John's gospel, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*, says: 'I<sup>x</sup> have known many, who are aliens from the word of truth, and boast themselves of their worldly wisdom, who have admired this text, and have also dared to insert it in their own writings.' Basil does not name them, and therefore we cannot say who they were.

---

## C H A P. XXXIV.

### L O N G I N U S.

I. *His time, and character.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures, with a curious observation upon a fragment ascribed to him.*

I. SAYS Suidas: 'Longinus<sup>a</sup> Cassius, a philosopher, master of Porphyry the philosopher, a man of great learning and exact judgment in things of literature. He flourished in the time of the emperor Aurelian, by whom he was put to death, as an accomplice with Zenobia wife of Odunatus.' After which Suidas mentions the titles of several of his works, and says, he wrote many others.

Longinus Cassius. He is generally called Dionysius Longinus.

Suidas says, he lived in the time of Aurelian, who did not begin to reign before the year of Christ 270, and by whom Lon-

<sup>u</sup> . . . Quod initium sancti Evangelii, cui nomen est Secundum Joannem, quidam Platonicus, sicut a sancto sene Simpliciano, qui postea Mediolanensis ecclesie præsedidit episcopus, solebamus audire, aureis literis conscribendum, et per omnes ecclesias in locis eminentissimis proponendum esse dicebat. De Civ. Dei. l. x. cap. 29.

<sup>x</sup> Ταύτα εἶδα πολλὰς καὶ τῶν ἐξω τῆς λογῆς τῆς ἀληθείας, μὲν φρονεῖν ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ

κοσμικῆ, καὶ θαυμασάντας, καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν συντάγμασιν ἐγκαλεῖται πολυμαθίας. Basil. hom. 16. in Illud, In Principio erat Verbum, Tom. ii. p. 134. A. B. Edit. Bened. 1722.

<sup>a</sup> Λογγίνος ὁ Κασσιός, φιλόσοφος, διδάσκαλος Πορφύριου τῆς φιλοσοφίας, πολυμαθὴς καὶ κριτικὸς γενομένος. Ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ Αὐρηλιανῆ τῆς Καίσαρος, καὶ ἀγρεῖθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς, ὡς συμπλεκτὴς Ζηνοβίας, τῆς Οὐνιαίας γυναικί. Suid.

ginus was put to death. Tanaquil Faber <sup>b</sup> says, that Suidas would have expressed himself more accurately if he had said, that ‘ Longinus flourished under Gordian, Decius, Valerian, Gallienus, and Claudius.’ For, indeed, the reigns of most of the Roman emperors about that time were very short. Tanaquil Faber adds: ‘ and therefore Longinus was contemporary with Origen:’ which also is another just observation. Photius says, that ‘ Longinus flourished in the time of Claudius, whose reign began in the year 268. I place him at the year of Christ 264, the twelfth of Gallienus: for he did not die before the year 273; and he could not then be young, as may be concluded from the number of his works: and he is always reckoned one of Porphyry’s masters.

His father’s name is not known. ‘ His <sup>c</sup> mother was Frontonis, sister of Fronto, of Emesa, the orator, who was at Rome in the time of the emperor Severus, and afterwards taught rhetoric at Athens: where he died when he was about sixty years of age, leaving <sup>f</sup> Longinus the critic his heir.’ So says Suidas. Nevertheless Longinus did not lose his parents whilst very young: they <sup>e</sup> accompanied him in his travels; as we learn from a letter of his to Marcellus, a part of which is preserved in Porphyry’s Life of Plotinus; whom <sup>h</sup> he saw, and continued some while with Ammonius and Origen: probably meaning Ammonius Saccas and our Origen, called Adamantius.

Learned men <sup>i</sup> are not agreed about the place of his nativity. Some think he was an Athenian: others think it more likely, that he was born at Emesa in Syria, the place of his uncle’s, and probably of his mother’s nativity. His connexions with Zenobia, to whom he was master in the Greek language, and privy-counsellor, are proofs of his being in that part of the world in the latter part of his life: and <sup>k</sup> there is a letter of his written to Porphyry, when in Sicily, desiring him to come to him in Phœnicia. In his excellent remaining work, Of the Sublime, he <sup>l</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Tanaquilli Fabri note ad Suidæ testimonium. Vid. Longin. ex editione Jac. Tollii. <sup>c</sup> Itaque Origeni συγχρονος fuit Longinus. Fab. ibid. And Longinus is reckoned by Porphyry among the other gentile writers, which had been read and studied by Origen. Vid. Euseb. H. E. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 220. C. <sup>d</sup> . . . επι Κλαυδίου δε υἱος ημεραζε. Phot. cod. 265. p. 1470. <sup>e</sup> Suid. V. Φροσιων, Εμισσηος. <sup>f</sup> Και αδελφης Φροσιωνιδος παιδα οντα Λογγινον τον κριτικον κληρονομον κατελιπεν. Suid. ut sup. <sup>g</sup> . . . ες απαντας μεν επηρξεν ιδειν ημιν, δια της εκ

παιδων επι πολλας τοπους αμα τοις γυναικιν επιδημιαν. De Vit. Plot. cap. 20. p. 127. <sup>h</sup> Vid. ib. p. 128. <sup>i</sup> De patriâ Longini inter doctos multum disputatur: sed mihi quidem placet J. Jos. sii conjectura, qui eum Atheniensem esse fuisse. Z. Pearce de Vita et scriptis Longini. p. 1. <sup>k</sup> Αξιων γαρ με' απε της Σικελιας καλιναι προς αυτον εις τη Φοινικην. κ. λ. Porph. de Vit. Plotin. cap. 19. p. 123. <sup>l</sup> . . . ει και ημιν ες Εδουσσιν εφειται τι γιωσκειν. κ. λ. De Sublim. cap. xii. 6. p. 92. Tollii.

reckons

reckons himself among the Greeks: and so he might do, and be born in Syria; the people of that country being often called Greeks by ancient writers.

Eunapius says, ' that <sup>m</sup> Longinus was esteemed a living library, and walking museum. He had a kind of established authority to judge of ancient authors. If <sup>n</sup> any man presumed to remark upon an ancient author, his sentence was not allowed of till the judgment of Longinus was known.' Porphyry <sup>o</sup> and Zosimus <sup>p</sup> extol Longinus in the like manner.

I must add, that Longinus is quoted by Eusebius in his Evangelical Preparation, where <sup>q</sup> he calls him a writer of our time. By Photius <sup>r</sup>, in the place before referred to, he is called Longinus the Critic. He is also mentioned by <sup>s</sup> Jerom and <sup>t</sup> Theophylact; and with a view to his distinguishing excellence, his critical skill, upon whose judgment the sentences of all others depended. Not now to repeat any thing of Suidas; I take notice of this as a proof of the taste and candour of our Christian ancestors: among whom, as well as among others, a judgment according to Longinus was a proverbial expression, denoting a right judgment.

Zenobia queen of the Palmyrens, who also called herself ' queen of the east,' contended with the Roman emperors after the death of her husband Odenatus, which happened in the year 267. In the end she was overcome, Palmyra was taken, and she also was taken prisoner: Aurelian then <sup>u</sup> sat in judgment upon her and her people in a place near the city Emesa; when <sup>v</sup> he determined to give Zenobia her life, and reserve her to do honour to his triumph. Many of her officers and counsellors were condemned to suffer death, and among them Longinus, who was

<sup>m</sup> Λογγίνος δὲ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον ἐξιδούθηκε τις τῶν ἐμφυχῶν, καὶ περιπατεῖν ἤθελεν, καὶ κριεῖν γὰρ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐπέειπται. Eunap. de Vit. Porph. p. 16.

<sup>n</sup> Καὶ εἰ τις καλέσειε τινος τῶν παλαιῶν, καὶ τὸ δεξιᾶσθαι ἐκράτει πρότερον, ἀλλ' ἢ Λογγίνου πάντως ἐκράτει κριτικῶς. Ib. p. 17.

<sup>o</sup> Porph. de Vit. Plotin. cap. 14. p. 116. Cap. 21. p. 135. <sup>p</sup> Zos. lib. i. p. 659.

<sup>q</sup> . . . τὰ παρὰ Λογγίνου τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς. Pr. Ev. lib. xv. p. 822. &c. Vid. et lib. x. cap. 3. p. 464.

<sup>r</sup> Οὐ τοῦ προσομιῶν Λογγίνος μὲν ὁ κριτικὸς ἀκριτικὸν νομίζει. Cod. 265. p. 1470.

<sup>s</sup> Criticum diceret esse Longinum, Censuramque Romanæ facundia. Ad Rusticum ep. 95. al. 4. p. 776.

<sup>t</sup> Μη μοι εἰ τὰς Λογγίνου κριτικὰς περιεπέε, μη καὶ ἐξέτις τισὶν ἀέλος γὰρ καὶ κατὰ Λογγίνου κριεῖν.

Theophyl. ep. xvii. <sup>u</sup> . . . ἐπαλεθῶν εἰς τὴν Ἐμισαίαν, εἰς κρισὶν πλάσε Ζηνοβίαν τε καὶ τῆς ταύτης συλαραμένους. Zos. l. i. p. 659. in. <sup>x</sup> Ingens tamen militum strepitus militum fuit omnium, Zenobiam ad pœnam poscentium. Sed Aurelianus indignum existimans mulierem interimi, occisis plerisque, quibus auctoribus illa bellum moverat, paraverat, gesserat, triumpho mulierem reservavit, ut populi Romani esset ostentui. Grave inter eos qui caesi sunt, de Longino philosopho fuisse perhibetur, quo illa magistro usu esse ad Græcas literas dicitur. Quem quidem Aurelianus idcirco dicitur occidisse, quod superbior illa epistola ipsius dictata consilio, quamvis Syro esset sermone contexta. Vopisc. Aurelian. cap. 30. p. 486.

supposed to have dictated a letter of Zenobia to Aurelian, written, as the emperor thought, in a haughty strain. It is manifest from Vopiscus, that this judgment of Aurelian was disliked by many. However, at this time Longinus shewed himself to be not a philologer only, but a philosopher, and so died as to comfort those who bewailed his fate.

II. I now proceed to observe some testimonies in the writings of this great critic.

1. In his treatise of the Sublime, which we still have, but not complete, he says: 'So the lawgiver of the Jews, who was no ordinary man, having formed a just sentiment concerning the power of the Deity, he also declared it in a suitable manner, thus writing in the beginning of his laws: *God said: Let there be light, and there was light. Let the dry land appear, and it was so.*'

Undoubtedly Longinus refers to the first chapter of the book of Genesis: and as he was convinced, that Moses 'was no ordinary man,' and openly declared his high opinion concerning him, it may be reckoned not unlikely that he had read over his Pentateuch.

From this passage Casaubon, in his notes upon Vopiscus argues, that Longinus was a Christian, or much inclined to be so. But that does not appear: for Longinus swears by the gods as other heathens did; we have proofs of it in some of his fragments undoubtedly genuine.

2. Beside this, there is a fragment of a work ascribed to him, which was first published by Dr. Hudson, and has been since repeated in the bishop of Rochester's edition of Longinus. It is to this purpose.

'And for a conclusion of this whole discourse concerning Greek orators, and their manner of writing, I now just mention Demosthenes, Lyfias, Æschines, Aristides, Isæus, Timar-

y I allude to a passage in Porphyry's Life of Plotinus: αναγνωσθέντος δὲ αὐτῷ τῆ τε περὶ ἀρχῶν Λογικῆς, καὶ τῆ Φιλαρχικῆς φιλοσοφίας μὲν εἶπε ὁ Λογικὸς, φιλοσοφὸς δὲ ἀδαμῶς. De Vit. Plotin. cap. 14. p. 116.

z Zof. l. i. p. 659. + Ταύτη καὶ ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων θεσμοθέτης, ὅχι οὐ τυχῶν αἰτίας, ἐπειδὴ τὴν τῆ Θεοῦ δύναμιν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐγνωρίσει, καξέφησεν, εἰδὺς ἐν τῇ εἰσέοδῳ γραφῆς τῶν ρομῶν. Εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, φησι. Τι, γενεσθῶ φως, καὶ ἐγένετο γενεσθῶ γῆ, καὶ ἐγένετο. De Sublim. cap. ix. p. 60. Toll.

o Extat hodieque Longini περὶ ὑψῆς libellus vere aureolus, ex quo semi-christianum fuisse, non male fortasse

colligas, propter illud quod facit de Mosis scriptis iudicium. Casaub. ad Vopisc. cap. 30. p. 486.

c . . . ὡσεὶ ἡ τῆς Θεοῦ Ἐρ. ad Porph. De Vita Plotini. cap. 19. p. 122. Et inter Fragment. ap. Tollium. p. 250. Τι γὰρ ὁ πρὸς Θεῶν. Ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev. l. xv. p. 823. et inter fragm. p. 254. Toll.

d Κορωνίς δ' ἐσω λῶσθ παύσας καὶ φρονημάτος Ἑλληνικῆς Δημοσθενεῖς Λογικῆς, Αἰσχίνης, Ἀριστιδῆς, Ἰσάιος, Τιμαρχος, Ἰσοκράτης, Δημοσθενῆς ὁ καὶ Κριθίου Ξεινοφῶν, πρὸς τοῖς Παύλος ὁ Ταρσεύς ἢ τινὰ καὶ πρῶτον φημι προσημαμεῖσθ' ὁδὸν ἀναποδείκναι. Longini fragm. 1. apud Pearce. p. 259.

chus, Isocrates, Demosthenes Crithinus, and Xenophon, to whom must be added Paul of Tarsus, of whom I may say, that he first excelled in an argument which is not of the demonstrative kind.'

This fragment<sup>c</sup> was received by Dr. Hudson from L. A. Zacagni, who transcribed it from a very good manuscript of the gospels preserved in the Vatican library. But Fabricius<sup>f</sup> plainly declares his opinion concerning this last clause relating to Paul of Tarsus, that it is not genuine: nor have I any thing to say in favour of its genuineness: probably it was added by a Christian.

3. However, I shall here insert some curious observations upon this fragment ascribed to Longinus, in which a testimony is given to St. Paul's abilities as an orator. I have received them from the learned Mr. James Merrick without any prohibition to publish them: and I believe my readers will be pleased with seeing them here.

'I transmit to you,' says Mr. Merrick, 'an observation communicated to me in conversation some years since by a very ingenious friend, which may deserve to be considered in any future disquisition concerning the authenticity of the fragment. Δημοσθενης ο και Κριθινος is one of the orators mentioned in it: by which person my friend understood Dinarchus to be meant, alleging, that a commentator on Hermogenes (Syrianus, if I rightly remember) affirms, that Dinarchus was called Δημοσθενης Κριθινος, which name, as the above-mentioned gentleman supposed, was designed to intimate, that the eloquence of Dinarchus bore the same proportion to that of Demosthenes, that barley bears to wheat. From this curious discovery, (for such it seems) made by my learned friend, who also added, that hordeaceus rhetor occurs in Suetonius de Illustr. Rhetor. cap. 2. I am inclined to draw this conclusion, That we owe the words, Δημοσθενης ο και Κριθινος, if they originally stood in the fragment, of which I am speaking, not to Longinus, but to some less knowing critic, who having somewhere met with Δημοσθενης Κριθινος, was not aware, that it was a name given to Dinarchus, but thought that it had belonged to an orator whose real name

<sup>c</sup> Hoc Longini de Rhetoribus testimonium exstat in præstantissimo codice Evangeliorum Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ Urbinatis, signato Num. 2. Quod mecum communicavit Laur. Alex. Zacagnius. Hudson.

<sup>f</sup> Περὶ συθέσεως λόγων. Lib. de sublimi oratione sect. 39. Longinus ipse testatur se de hac satis copiose tractasse in duobus commentariis. . . . Extat et similis argu-

menti liber inter Dionysii Halicarnassei opera, de quo lib. 3. c. 32. Ex illis Longini petitum videtur testimonium de Rhetoribus, quod ex codice MSS. Vaticano Evangeliorum cum Hudsono Zacagnius communicavit. . . . Postrema de Paulo Apostolo a Christiano homine adjecta sunt. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. 31. T. iv. p. 445.

‘ was Demosthenes, and who was also called Κριθινος, in order  
 ‘ to distinguish him from the more celebrated orator of that name.  
 ‘ If, therefore, we admit the fragment as genuine, we should, I  
 ‘ imagine, read Δεινυχρος, ο και Δημοσθενος Κριθινος.

‘ P. S. Not having an opportunity of consulting the comments  
 ‘ on Hermogenes, I have looked into Fabricius’s Bibliotheca  
 ‘ Græca, and find there Vol. iv. p. 434, Dinarchus mentioned  
 ‘ in the Index of Authors quoted by Hermogenes, and styled  
 ‘ Hordeaceus Demosthenes. Again: in the same volume, p.  
 ‘ 467, I find him mentioned in the Index of Authors taken  
 ‘ notice of in the Comments of Hermogenes, (but placed by  
 ‘ mistake after Diodorus,) by the title of κριθινος Demosthenes.’

Whether this fragment be rightly ascribed to Longinus or not,  
 these observations will be allowed to be curious.

---

C H A P. XXXV.

N U M E N I U S.

*His testimony to the scriptures of the Old Testament.*

‘ NUMENIUS<sup>a</sup>, of Apamæa in Syria,’ says Suidas, ‘ a Pytha-  
 ‘ gorean philosopher. This is the man who charged Plato with  
 ‘ stealing from the writings of Moses his sentiments concerning  
 ‘ God, and the original of the world, saying: “ What is Plato,  
 ‘ “ but Moses in Greek ?”

The same saying is in Clement of Alexandria. ‘ And<sup>b</sup> Nu-  
 ‘ menius, the Pythagorean philosopher, writes expressly: “ What  
 ‘ “ is Plato, but Moses in Greek ?”

The same is also quoted from Clement by Eusebius in his  
 Evangelical Preparation.

Eusebius presently afterwards<sup>d</sup> quotes ‘ the first and the third  
 ‘ book of Numenius concerning What is Good: Where Nume-  
 ‘ nius speaks of the rites and institutions of several nations, par-  
 ‘ ticularly the Brachmans, the Jews, the Magians, and the  
 ‘ Egyptians: and mentions Jannes and Jambres, two sacred

<sup>a</sup> Νημενιος, Απαμειος, απο Συριας φι-  
 λασοφος Πυθαγορειος. Ουλος εστιν ο την τα  
 Πλατωνος εξελειξας διαοικαν, ως εκ Μωσαι-  
 κων τα περι Θεου και κοσμου γενεσεως αποσο-  
 ρησασαι, και δια τούτο φησι τι γαρ εστι

Πλατων, η Μωσης απηκικτων. Suid. V. Νη-  
 μηνιος.

<sup>b</sup> Clem. Str. l. i. p. 342.  
 Par. p. 411. Oxon. <sup>c</sup> L. ix. cap.  
 6. p. 411. <sup>d</sup> Ib. cap. 7. et 8. p. 411.

‘ Egyptian

‘ Egyptian scribes, who, when the Jews were expelled Egypt, being reckoned very skilful in the magical art, were by common consent \* chosen to oppose Musæus, [meaning Moses,] who was very powerful in his prayers with God, that they might remove the calamities brought by him upon that country.’

Numenius is quoted several times by Origen in his books against Celsus: I shall take notice of those places by and by. He is also quoted twice or thrice by Theodoret. I do not recollect, that he is at all quoted by Augustine in any of his works, nor by Cyril of Alexandria in his answer to the emperor Julian. Porphyry, as quoted by † Eusebius, chargeth Origen with reading and borrowing from Plato, and Numenius, and Cronius. Porphyry says, that ‡ the Commentaries of Severus, Cronius, Numenius, Gaius, and Atticus, Platonic philosophers, were read in the school of Plotinus. He likewise says in the same work, the Life of Plotinus, that § Amelius was very diligent in learning the opinions of Numenius, and out of them composed Commentaries of near an hundred books. Finally, Porphyry in his book, *De Antro Nympharum*, quotes † Numenius and his friend Cronius.

From Macrobius ‡ we learn, that Numenius was reproached by some with having divulged or exposed the Eleusinian mysteries: and to be avenged of him, Ceres and Proserpine appeared to him in a very strange manner.

We now return to Origen: who quotes † the first book of Numenius the Pythagorean, concerning What is Good, or Concerning the Good: and ‡ a book of his concerning the Immortality of the soul. And still once more after this manner: ‘ I § know also that Numenius, a skilful commentator upon Plato, and well acquainted with the Pythagorean doctrines, in many places of his writings has quoted the books of Moses and the

\* Μουσαιο γενε τῶ Ιουδαίων ἐξηγησαμένων αὐτῶν γινόμενῶ Θεῷ εὐχασθαι δυνατώτατον. Ib.

† . . . συνη γὰρ αἰετῶ Πλάτωνος τῶν τε Νημησίου καὶ Κρονίου. H. E. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 220.

‡ De Vita Plotini. cap. xiv.

§ Ibid. cap. iii.

† Νημησίου καὶ οὐτῶν εἰσαίρος Κρονίου. De antro Nymph. p. 263. Vid. et p. 271.

‡ Numenio denique inter philosophos occultorum curiosiori offensam numinum, quod Eleusinia sacra interpretando vulgaverit. somnia prodiderunt, visas sibi ipsas Eleusianas Deas habitu meretricio ante apertum lupanar ludere prostantes. &c. Macrobi. Somnium Scip. l. i. cap. 2. p. 9.

† Contr. Cels. l. i. p. 13. § 15.

‡ Ibid. l. v. p. 269. § 57.

‡ Εἶσω δ' οἶδα καὶ Νημησίου τὸν Πυθαγορείου . . . πολλὰ καὶ συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐπιθεμένων τὰ Μωυσεως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ ἔκ ἀπιθανῶς αὐτὰ τροπολοῦσθαι, ὡς περ ἐν τῷ καλεσμένῳ Ἐποπῆ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀριθμῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοπῆ. Ἐν δὲ τρίτῳ περὶ τ' ἀθανε ἐκλιθεταὶ καὶ περὶ τῆ Ἰησῆ ἱστορίαν τινα, τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἔλεων, καὶ τροπολοῦσι αὐτὴν ὑπερὸν δ' ἐπιπέλευσμεως, ἢ ἀπέπελευσμεως ἀλλῶ καὶ ἄλλῃ εἰσὶν εἰπεῖν. . . Ἀλλ' ἔκ ἐν ἐκείνῃ σεμνυνομεθα' ἀποδεχομεθα δ' αὐτὸν μᾶλλον Κέλσον καὶ ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων, βεληθεῖτα φιλομαθῶς καὶ τὰ πλείερα ἐξείασαι, καὶ κινήθειτα ὡς περ τροπολοῦσμεων, καὶ ἑμῶν συγγραμμάτων. Ib. l. iv. p. 198. § 51.

‘ prophets,

‘ prophets; and has allegorized them in no improbable manner:  
 ‘ as in his book called the Epops, and in his books concerning  
 ‘ Numbers, and those concerning Place. And in his third book  
 ‘ concerning What is Good, he relates a history concerning Jesus  
 ‘ without mentioning his name, and allegorizeth it: whether  
 ‘ rightly or not, I do not now stay to inquire. He also relates a  
 ‘ history concerning Moses, and Jannes, and Jambres. Not  
 ‘ that I think this a matter to be much boasted of: nevertheless,  
 ‘ we have more reason to be pleased with him, than with Celsus  
 ‘ and other Greeks: forasmuch as he had read our scriptures,  
 ‘ and candidly paid a regard to them as no contemptible writings,  
 ‘ and worthy to be allegorized.’

To this passage of Origen there is a reference in Grotius, Of the Truth of the Christian Religion, or in the Notes upon him: where it is said, ‘ that ° divers heathen authors have made men-  
 ‘ tion of Jesus, as Suetonius, Tacitus, the younger Pliny, and  
 ‘ many others. And Origen, in his fourth book against Celsus,  
 ‘ lets us know, that in Numenius the Pythagorean there was a  
 ‘ history concerning Jesus.’

Having now, as I think, paid a due regard to the quotations of Numenius, which are in our early Christian writers, I must take the liberty to say, that the time of Numenius is uncertain. And I cannot but doubt, whether he lived after the coming of our Saviour. Says Tillemont: ‘ It<sup>p</sup> is thought, that we ought  
 ‘ to place about the time of Marcus Aurelius the celebrated phi-  
 ‘ losopher Numenius, of whom Eusebius and Theodoret have  
 ‘ made great use in their arguments with the heathens. Theo-  
 ‘ doret does in effect say, that he lived after Christ.’ Neverthe-  
 less that manner of speaking seems to shew, that Tillemont hesitated: for Theodoret speaks plainly enough, if we could rely upon him, as accurate and well informed. Having quoted Plotinus, he says: ‘ And<sup>q</sup> many other like things are said by him,  
 ‘ and Plutarch, and Numenius, and others of that sect. For  
 ‘ these men living after the coming of our Saviour, have joined  
 ‘ many parts of the Christian theology with their own doctrines.’ And Origen likewise in the place before referred to, speaks in this manner. First he quotes Chrysippus, and then adds: ‘ The

° Testantur idem et Pagani . . . ut Suetonius, Tacitus, Plinius junior, et post hos multi. Historiam quandam de Jesu etiam apud Numenium Pythagoricum extitisse, docet nos Origenes contra Celsum quarto. Grot. de Verit. Rel. Chr. l. ii. § 2.

p . . . Theodoret dit en effet, qu’il a vécu

après Jesus Christ. L’Emp. Marc. Aurele art. 31. q Gr. Aff. l. ii. p. 500.

† Μέλα γὰρ δὴ τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιφανείας ἡμῶν γενομένοις, τῆς Χριστιανικῆς διδασκαλίας πολλὰ τοῖς οἰκείοις ἀνέμιξαι λόγοις. Ibid.

‘like things may be seen in the latter philosophers who lived not long ago, as Plutarch, and Numenius in his second book of the Immortality of the Soul.’

J. Tollius, in his notes upon a fragment of Longinus, where Numenius is mentioned, supposeth, he lived in the times of the Antonines: and Jonsius likewise thought it probable, that \*\* Numenius flourished in the time of Antoninus the pious. And indeed it is easy to shew, as Jonsius has done, that Numenius lived before Origen, and some others, who read him, or have quoted him: but I do not perceive any marks of his real time alleged from any.

I therefore am still in suspense. It is, I think, remarkable, that Suidas, who tells us in whose reigns lived Plutarch, and Dion Cassius, and Dion Chrysostom, and Aristides, and Numenius the orator and many others, says nothing of that kind of Numenius the philosopher. He knew that he was of Apamea in Syria, but does not mention the name of the emperor in whose time he lived. And Numenius, as we have seen, is often joined with Plato and Cronius: but the time of Cronius is uncertain, so far as I know. Nor have I observed any thing in the quotations of the works of Numenius, made by Eusebius, or others, that can determine his age: for any thing that is observable in those quotations, he might live when gentilism was at its height, and in all its splendor. He was acquainted with the writings of Moses and the prophets: but I discern not any references to the scriptures of the New Testament. That history concerning Jesus, which Numenius had allegorized, as Origen says, ‘without naming him,’ may have been somewhat different from what has been generally apprehended. Perhaps it related to Joshua, successor of Moses in the government of the people of Israel. For if that history had related to the Lord Jesus, it might be expected, that we should see it repeated over again in Eusebius or Theodoret, or some other writer since Origen. After all, as I apprehend, such a reference as that in Origen is of little importance: he has not quoted the passage; nor so much as hinted what was the subject of the history.

I could not omit Numenius, as he has quoted Moses and the prophets, and allegorized some part of their writings: but I

\* Η δὲ καὶ παρὰ τισὶ τῶν νεώτερον, καὶ χθὲς καὶ πρὸν γέγραμμένων. Ut supr. l. v. § 57. \* Floruit sub Antonino et Vero, Apamea Syriæ oriundus. . . . Hujus dicebatur Plotinus scripta compilasse. Defendit autem Plotinum Amelius libro De Differentia Doctrinæ Plotini et Nume-

nii, quem Porphyrio inscripsit: ut est apud Porphyrium in Vita Plotini. Toll. in Longin. p. 248. \*\* Si conjecturæ hæc res committenda, sub Antonino Pio Numenium floruisse dixerim. J. Jonf. de Scriptorib. Hist. Philosoph. l. iii. cap. 10. p. 264.

know not when he lived. I put him down here, being desirous to join him with Amelius and Longinus, two learned critics and philosophers. Numenius, as we learn from Origen, made use of 'Moses and the prophets,' and allegorized some parts of them. If he had lived after the publication of the books of the New Testament, it is reasonable to believe, that he would have made use of them, likewise. As it does not appear that he took any notice of them, it seems to me probable, that he lived before the rise of the Christian religion.

---

C H A P. XXXVI.

T H E E M P E R O R A U R E L I A N.

I. *His time, and character.* II. *How the Christians are mentioned by him in a letter to the senate of Rome.* III. *His conduct toward Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch.* IV. *His persecution of the Christians.*

I. AURELIAN<sup>a</sup>, a man of mean original, but of a severe disposition, and a great captain, having performed good services in the times of Valerian, Gallienus, and Claudius the second, was, after the death of this last, proclaimed emperor in the year 270, and died in 275. Some have ascribed to him a reign of six years: but now it is the opinion of the best chronologers, that<sup>b</sup> he did not complete his fifth year, and died after he had reigned four years and four months and some days.

II. Flavius Vopiscus of Syracuse is the sixth and last of the Augustan writers, but not the worst of them: for he is generally reckoned as learned a man, and as regular an historian as any of them.

In his *Life of the Emperor Aurelian*, he makes mention of a letter of his to the senate of Rome, written, probably, in the beginning of his reign in the year 270, or<sup>c</sup> 271, upon occasion of an incursion made into Italy by some people of Germany.

'There<sup>d</sup> is,' says Vopiscus, 'a letter of Aurelian concerning the Sibylline books, which I insert here to confirm the account

<sup>a</sup> Aurelianus, modicis ortus parentibus, a prima etate ingenio vivacissimus. &c. Vopisc. Aurelian. cap. 4. p. 420.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 275. num. ii. iii. Basn. ann. 270. num. vi.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Basnag. ann. 291. num. ii.

<sup>d</sup> Est epistola Aureliani de libris Sibyl-

linis. Nam ipsam quoque indidi ad fidem rerum. Miror vos, Patres Sancti, tamdiu de aperiendis Sibyllinis dubitasse libris, proinde quasi in Christianorum ecclesia, non in templo decorum omnium tractaretis. Vopisc. Aurelian. cap. 20. p. 463.

<sup>e</sup> which

“ which I have given. “ I wonder that you, holy fathers, “ have so long hesitated about opening the Sibylline books : just “ as if your consultations were held in some church of the Chris- “ tians, and not in the temple of all the gods.”

The meaning of the emperor\* is very evident. The Christians were reckoned a profane and atheistical sort of men, without temples, without rites and ceremonies, or however, averse to all the rites of the public establishment. The emperor tells the senate, that they were as backward to open those books, which should inform them what sacrifices ought to be offered up for the good of the public, as if they were so many Christians met together who were averse to all sacrifices, and not the Roman senate sitting in the temple of all the gods, the very place of whose assembly admonished them of their duty, to take in the direction and assistance of the gods in this difficult conjuncture.

This passage affords a good argument, that the true Sibylline books which were in the hands of the Romans, and were still made use of by them, were full of heathen superstition, and not agreeable to the Christian doctrine or worship, as some have supposed. This is manifest from the whole context before and after this letter of Aurelian. There are divers other proofs of it, occurring in the Lives of the Roman Emperors, written by these Augustan historians, particularly in the<sup>f</sup> Life of Gordian the third, written by Julius Capitolinus, and in<sup>g</sup> the Life of Gallienus, written by Trébellius Pollio.

But that is not now our principal concern. The design of alleging this passage is to shew, that Vopiscus the Augustan writer, and the emperor Aurelian, were not unacquainted with the Christians and their principles.

However, there is another thing which may be observed here : That this passage may lead us to think, Aurelian was not free from superstition. And there are some other things said of him, which may concur to support this supposition. For his mother<sup>h</sup> is said by Vopiscus to have been priestess of the temple of the Sun, which was in the place where his parents dwelt : and this her son appears also to have had a peculiar respect for that deity.

\* Vid. annot. in Vopisci loc. et Basnag. ann. 271. num. ii. et ante Dom. 4. num. x. xi.

<sup>f</sup> Fuit terræ motus eousque gravis imperante Gordiano, ut civitates etiam terræ hiatu cum populis deperirent : ob quæ sacrificia per totam urbem, totumque orbem terrarum ingentia celebrata sunt. Et Cordus quidem dicit, inspectis libris Sibyllinis, celebratisque omnibus, quæ illic jussa videbantur, mundanum malum esse

sedatum. Jul. Capit. Gordian. cap. iii. 22. p. 118.

<sup>g</sup> Pax igitur Deum quaesita, inspectis Sibyllæ libris, factumque Jovi Salutari, ut præceptum fuerat, sacrificium. Treb. Poll. Gallien. cap. 5. p. 198.

<sup>h</sup> Matrem quidem ejus Callierates Tyrius, Græcorum longe doctissimus scriptor, sacerdotem templi Solis, in eo vico, in quo habitabant parentes, fuisse dicit. &c. Vopisc. Aurelian. cap. 4. p. 120.

This

This is an observation for which I am indebted<sup>1</sup> to Mr. Mosheim; and I have brought it in here for the sake of some things which may follow hereafter.

III. For there are some other things concerning this emperor in Christian writers which must now be taken notice of.

Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, was deposed by the second council held in that city upon his account in<sup>k</sup> the year 269, and Domnus was appointed in his room: but Paul being supported by Zenobia, kept his seat for some time after that, till near the end of the year 272, or the beginning of 273, when Aurelian was master of Antioch. ‘Paul<sup>l</sup> therefore,’ says Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, ‘having fallen from the faith, and from the episcopate, Domnus took upon him the care of the church of Antioch. But when Paul refused to leave the house of the church, a petition was presented to the emperor Aurelian, and he rightly determined the matter, giving orders that the house should be delivered to them, to whom the bishops of the Christian religion in Italy and Rome should write. Thus,’ as Eusebius adds, ‘the forementioned person was with great disgrace thrust out of the church by the secular power.’

IV. Upon that history, and particularly upon that passage of Eusebius, divers remarks were made formerly<sup>m</sup> which need not to be repeated here. I proceed to the only thing farther to be observed concerning Aurelian, that by divers Christian authors he is reckoned among the persecutors of the church. Sulpicius Severus quite omits him in his catalogue. Nevertheless Eusebius, presently after the place just cited, adds: ‘Thus<sup>n</sup> was Aurelian affected toward us at that time, but in the farther advances of his empire his mind was altered towards us, owing to the advices of some men about him, so that he raised a persecution against us. Much discourse there was every where about it. But the divine justice arrested him, when he was just signing the edicts against us: so, as it were, holding his hand, that he should not perform what he had designed; and thereby manifesting to all men, that the princes of this world can do nothing against the churches of Christ, but when God allows it for our correction and amendment.’

<sup>1</sup> Vix eo inter Imperatores, ante Constantinum M. quisquam supersticiosior, Deorumque commentitiosorum studiosior fuit. Mater ejus sacerdos fuerat solis: . . . et filius idcirco solem summi Numinis loco per totam vitam venerabatur. Orationem, qua Valeriano de honoribus ab eo acceptis gra-

tias agit, his verbis claudit: Dii faciant, et Deus certus Sol, ut et Senatus de me sic judicet. &c. &c. Mosheim. ut supr. p. 559.

<sup>k</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 83. &c.

<sup>l</sup> H. E. l. vii. cap. 30. p. 282. D.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 85, 86.

<sup>n</sup> H. E. l. vii. cap. 30. p. 283. B.

In Jerom's Latin edition of the Chronicle of Eusebius it is said, 'that<sup>o</sup> when Aurelian had raised a persecution against us, he was terrified by lightning that fell near him and his companions, and soon after he was slain between Constantinople and Heraclea.'

Orosius<sup>p</sup> speaks much to the like purpose, and makes this the ninth persecution.

The author Of the Deaths of Persecutors says, 'that<sup>q</sup> though Aurelian was not ignorant of Valerian's captivity, yet as if he had forgot his guilt and punishment, he provoked the anger of God by his cruel proceedings. However, he was not able to finish what he designed, but perished in the beginnings of his fury. And before his cruel edicts had reached the more distant provinces, he was slain at a place in Thrace.'

Augustine<sup>r</sup> expressly mentions this among the other heathen persecutions of the Christians, and reckons it the ninth.

Mr. Dodwell<sup>s</sup> supposeth, that Aurelian's persecution was only intended and not put in execution: and indeed Eusebius has so expressed himself about this matter in his Ecclesiastical History, as has occasioned some learned men to hesitate about it. But upon more carefully examining his words, and observing the accounts of other authors, learned men<sup>t</sup> have generally, and, as I think, very judiciously determined, that Aurelian not only intended but did actually persecute: but his persecution was short, he having died soon after the publication of his edicts.

Mr. Mosheim is of opinion, that many Christians did not suffer at this time: but<sup>u</sup> considering Aurelian's cruel temper,

<sup>o</sup> Aurelianus quum adversum nos persecutionem movisset, fulmen juxta eum comitesque ejus ruit: ac non multo post inter Constantinopolim et Heracleam in Cœnophrurio viæ veteris occiditur. Chr. p. 177.

<sup>p</sup> Novissime, cum persecutionem adversus Christianos agi, nonus a Nerone decerneret, fulmen ante eum magno pavore circumstantium ruit, ac non multo post in itinere occisus est. Oros. l. vii. cap. 23.

<sup>q</sup> Aurelianus, qui esset naturâ vâlanus et præceps, quamvis captivitatem Valeriani meminisset, tamen oblitus sceleris ejus et pœnæ, iram Dei crudelibus factis laceffit. Verum illi ne perficere quidem quæ cogitaverat licuit, sed protinus inter initia sui furoris extinctus est. Nondum ad provincias ultiores cruenta scripta pervenerant, et jam Cœnophrurio, qui locus est Thraciæ, cruentus ipse humi jacebat, falsa quadam suspitione ab amicis suis interemptus. De M. P.

cap. 6. Conf. Eutrop. l. ix. cap. 15. et Victor. Epit. cap. 35.

<sup>r</sup> . . . Ab Aureliano nonam. De Civ. Dei. l. xviii. cap. 52.

<sup>s</sup> Intentata enim duntaxat erat ab Aureliano, non item executioni mandata. De Paucitate M. § lxiv. in.

<sup>t</sup> Non intentatam modo, sed executioni quoque brevissimo tempore mandatam, nobis est infixum in animo. &c. Basnag. ann. 275. n. ii. Et conf. Pagi ann. 272. n. iv. . . . xii. et 273. ii.

<sup>u</sup> Aurelianus, qui Claudium excipiebat, A. cclxx. etsi Diis immodice serviens, et inique de Christianis sentiens, nihil tamen in eos noxium per quadriennium moliebatur. Quinto vero imperii anno, sive propria superstitione, sive aliena motus, bellum in eos parabat: quod si vixisset, ut crudelis erat, ferocisque ingenii, Deorumque amicis et sacerdotibusque obnoxius, præteritis atrocius futurum fuisset. &c. Mosh. De Reb. &c. p. 558.

and

and how much he was addicted to the superstitions of Gentilism, he thinks that if he had lived, his persecution would have exceeded all the former persecutions in severity.

The author Of the Deaths of Persecutors before cited, says, that Aurelian provoked God by his 'cruel proceedings,' and calls his 'edict cruel,' or bloody, 'cruenta scripta.' Possibly that author, who did not live very long after Aurelian, had seen some copies of his edicts: if so, I wish he had inserted in his volume one of them, or only the substance of them; it would have been esteemed very curious by some in our times. By such neglects, and such want of accuracy, we suffer greatly.

---

C H A P. XXXVII.

P O R P H Y R Y.

- I. *His time, and history, and works.* II. *A passage, from Eusebius, of Porphyry in his third book against the Christians, concerning Origen, with Remarks.* III. *Porphyry's Objections against the book of Daniel, in the twelfth book of his work against the Christians, extracted from Jerom's Commentary upon the book of Daniel.* IV. *Remarks upon those Objections, and upon the Answers made to them.* V. *Passages of Porphyry in the fourth book of his work against the Christians, where he acknowledgeth the great antiquity of Moses.* VI. *An Objection of Porphyry against the prohibition to eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. Gen. iii. 5.* VII. *Passages of Porphyry containing quotations of the books of the N. T.* VIII. *A Review of his testimony to the scriptures of the O. and N. T.* IX. *Passages of Porphyry concerning the Christian religion, and the affairs of Christians.* X. *Of the work ascribed to Porphyry, and entitled, The Philosophy from Oracles.*

I. I HAVE already observed several things relating to PORPHYRY in the introduction to the chapter of Celsus; where is a general account of all such heathen authors as had written against the Christians.

Porphyry's history may be collected from his Life written by Eunapius, and from the Life of Plotinus written by himself: however, I refer<sup>a</sup> also to divers learned moderns, who ought to be consulted by such as are inquisitive.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Suid. Voss. de Hist. Græcis. l. ii. cap. 16. Luc. Holsten. de Vit. et Scriptis Porphyrii. Cav. Hist. Lit. Pagi in Baron. Ann. 262. iv. 263. iii. iv. et alibi. Basnag. ann. 278. n. iii. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. 27. Tom. iv. p. 182. &c. Tillemont. Diocletien. art. 28... 31. Hist. des Emp. Tom. iv.

Porphyry was born at Tyre in Phœnicia, as we are assured by <sup>b</sup> himself, and <sup>c</sup> by Libanius and <sup>d</sup> Eunapius, who also says, that he was descended from honourable ancestors. It is computed, that he was born in the twelfth year of Alexander Severus, of Christ 233.

His <sup>e</sup> original name was Meleck, which in the Syriac language signifies King, and with a Latin termination is Malchus: and sometimes he was called in Greek βασιλευς King. Longinus, under whom he studied some time, changed his name into Porphyry, signifying in Greek Purple, which was usually worn by kings and princes.

He was at Rome in the year 253, but made no long stay there. He came thither again in the tenth year of the emperor Gallienus, when he was thirty years of age, as he says <sup>\*</sup> himself. As the tenth year of that emperor answers to the year of our Lord 262, or 263, it is concluded, that Porphyry was born in the year of Christ 233. At that time Plotinus had a school at Rome; and Porphyry being much taken with him, spent there <sup>f</sup> six years under his instructions: at the end of which term, as <sup>g</sup> he says himself, he had a strong propensity to put an end to his own life. Plotinus perceiving it, told him, that thought did not proceed from reason, but from a melancholic disorder, and advised him to leave the city. Whereupon in the year 268 he went into Sicily, where <sup>h</sup> he was in the second year of the emperor Claudius, in the year 270, when Plotinus died in Campania.

How long he staid in Sicily is not certain: but Eunapius says, he <sup>i</sup> afterwards returned to Rome, where he acquired great fame for his learning and eloquence. Eunapius says likewise, that <sup>k</sup> he lived to a great age. And Porphyry <sup>l</sup> himself, in his Life of Plotinus, mentions something which happened to him in the sixty-eighth year of his age; at which time, probably, he was about seventy years old. There can therefore be no reason to doubt, that he reached to the latter part of the reign of Dioclesian, and died, as may be supposed, in the year of Christ 202, or

<sup>b</sup> Εσχέ δε και εμε Πορφυριον Τυριον οντα, ε τωις μαλιστα ειζιρον. Porphyry. Vit. Plotin. cap. vii. p. 107. ap. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 107.

<sup>c</sup> Πορφυριω Τυρος μεν η πατρις η πρωτη των αρχαιων Φοινικων η πολις και πατερεις δε ηκ ασημοι. Eunap. p. 16.

<sup>d</sup> . . . τω Τυριω γεροντιος. Liban. ap. Socrat. H. E. l. iii. cap. 23. p. 196.

<sup>e</sup> Μαλχος δε καλα την Συρων πολιω ο Πορφυριος εκαλειτο τα πρωτα. Τωιο ε: δουαλαι βασιλια λεγει. Πορφυριον δε αιωνι ωνομασε Λοβγινος, εις το βασιλικον

της εσθητης παρασημον την προσθησαν επισημας. Eunap. ib. p. 16.

<sup>\*</sup> Vid. Plotin. cap. 4. p. 99.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 5. p. 101.

<sup>g</sup> Ib. cap. 11.

p. 113. Conf. Eunap. p. 17.

<sup>h</sup> Porph. de Vita Plotini. cap. 2. §. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Αυτος μεν εν επι την Ρωμικην επατηληθε, και της περι λοβοις εχειλο σπεσθης, ωσε παρρει, και εις το δημοσιον κατ' επιδειξειν. Eunap. Porph. p. 19.

<sup>k</sup> Φαινεσαι

δε αφικουμενις εις γγραφας βαθυ. p. 21.

<sup>l</sup> De Vita Plotin. cap. 23.

203. Eunapius supposeth, that<sup>m</sup> he ended his days at Rome. Suidas says truly, but without much accuracy, that<sup>n</sup> he lived in the time of Aurelian, and reached to the emperor Dioclesian. Nor is Eunapius much more exact, who speaking of Porphyry, and some others, says, they<sup>o</sup> flourished in the times of Gallienus, Claudius, Tacitus, Aurelian, and Probus.

Porphyry, as Eunapius<sup>p</sup> assures us, had a wife named Marcella, a widow with five children, to whom he inscribed one of his books; in which he says, he married her, not for the sake of having children by her himself, but that he might educate the children which she had by her former husband, who was his friend: which shewed a virtuous and generous disposition; nor indeed do we meet with any reflections made upon his conduct of life. Cyril of Alexander, in his answer to<sup>q</sup> Julian, makes honourable mention of Marcella, as a woman of a philosophical turn of mind, and for that reason esteemed by Porphyry.

Porphyry is called Bataneotes<sup>r</sup> by Jerom and<sup>s</sup> Chrysostom. Baronius<sup>t</sup> hence argued; that Porphyry was a Jew, and was so called from Batanea, a city in Palestine: which opinion is rejected by his learned<sup>u</sup> annotator. Porphyry certainly was a Syrian, as was shewn above from unquestioned authority. Fabricius<sup>v</sup> suspects, that Porphyry was born at Batanéa, a town in Syria, which might be a colony of the Tyrians. Heuman thought, that<sup>y</sup> Porphyry did not put his own name to the work against the Christians, but published it under the borrowed and fictitious name of Bataneotes. There are divers other conjectures concerning the original of this appellation, which may be seen in<sup>z</sup> Lucas Holstenius, and<sup>a</sup> Tanaquil Faber, and other learned men. Which of them is right, or whether any one of them be so, I cannot say.

Socrates, in his Ecclesiastical History, represents<sup>b</sup> Porphyry as originally a Christian: but having been beaten by some Christians

at

<sup>m</sup> Εν Ρωμη δε λεβηαι μεταλλαττειν τον βιον. Eun. ib. <sup>n</sup> . . . γεγονως επι των χρονων Αυρηλιανη, και παραλειπας εως Διοκλησιανη τη βασιλευς. Suid. V. Πορφυριος. <sup>o</sup> Eunap. p. 21.

<sup>p</sup> Και προς Μακεδλασε αυτη γεναικα γενομενη, βιβλιον φερειαι, ην φησιν αβγαγεσθαι, και ταυτα εσαν πεντε μηερα τωντων. κ. λ. Id. ib. <sup>q</sup> Contr. Julian. l. vi. p. 209.

<sup>r</sup> Quod nequaquam intelligens Bataneotes, et sceleratus ille Porphyrius, &c. Pr. in Comment. in ep. ad Galat. T. iv. p. 223. <sup>s</sup> Οι περι Κελου και τον Βατανεωτην τον μετ' εκεινου.

In 1 Cor. hom. 6. p. 47. T. x.

<sup>t</sup> Porro cum constat natione Judæam, Batanæ, quæ est in Judea civitas, natum. Hincque est quod S. Hieronymus cum Bataneotem appellat. Baron. ann. 203. n. li.

<sup>u</sup> Pagi ann. 302. n. viii.

<sup>v</sup> Suspicor patriam veram ejus fuisse Bataneam oppidum Syriae, . . . Tyrionum forte coloniam. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 181.

<sup>y</sup> Heuman. Poc. seu Epist. Miscell T. iii. p. 251. <sup>z</sup> De Vita Porph. cap. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Fab. Ep. 1. ep. 64.

<sup>b</sup> Εκεινος μεν γαρ πηλητας εν Καισαριε της Παλαιστηνης υπο τινων Χριστιανων εδρα

at Cæsarea in Palestine, out of resentment and melancholy he was induced to renounce Christianity: and afterwards out of hatred against those by whom he had been beaten, he wrote against the Christians: and he seems to intimate, that Eusebius had said as much. But nothing of that kind is now to be found in Eusebius: nor do the words of Socrates clearly import that Eusebius had said so. Augustine too<sup>c</sup> has been referred to as confirming this account: but, as Tillemont<sup>d</sup> has observed, the connection of the discourse shews, that Augustine intended no more, than that this philosopher was too proud to embrace Christianity. Heuman<sup>e</sup> also has considered this story, and rejects it as a mere fable.

If Porphyry had ever been a Christian, it was a thing too remarkable not to have been often and expressly mentioned by Christian authors, who have had occasion to speak of him: and he would have been frequently called an apostate as well as Julian.

Porphyry, as cited by<sup>f</sup> Eusebius, speaks of his having in his youth seen Origen. Some have hence argued, that Porphyry went to Alexandria to see Origen: and it is expressly said by<sup>g</sup> Vincentius Lirinensis. But it must be a mistake; for Origen left Alexandria before Porphyry was born, having removed thence<sup>h</sup> in the year 231. But Porphyry may have seen Origen at Cæsarea, or Tyre, where he resided a good while after he had left Alexandria.

Mill, in his Prolegomena, a work which one would not suspect to have been written in haste, calls Porphyry<sup>i</sup> Origen's school-fellow. Indeed Eunapius makes mention of an Origen, whom<sup>k</sup> he so calls; but it is not our Origen. That Origen published but two books only, as we learn from Porphyry himself in the<sup>l</sup> Life of Plotinus; which cannot suit so voluminous an author as our Origen. Moreover Porphyry, in the place where he speaks

φως, και μη εμελων της ορθης, εκ μεγαλχη-  
λιας του μεν Χριστιανισμου απειλειπει. Μισει  
οι των τυπλησασιων αυτου, εις το βλασφημα  
νατα των Χριστιανων γραφειν εξεπεσει, ως  
αυτω Εισεβειος ο Παμφιλος εξελειξεν, ανα-  
σινιασας της λογιης αυτου. Soer. l. iii. c. 23.  
p. 200.

<sup>c</sup> Quam [sapientiam] si  
vere ac fideliter amasses, Christum Dei vir-  
tutem et Dei sapientiam cognovisses, nec  
ab ejus saluberrima humilitate tumore in-  
flatus vanæ scientiæ resiluisses. De Civ.  
Dei. l. x. cap. 28.

<sup>d</sup> Diocletien.  
art. 28. <sup>e</sup> Ubi supr. Epist. Miscell.  
T. iii. p. 53. &c. <sup>f</sup> H. E. l. vi.  
c. 19. p. 219. C. <sup>g</sup> Namque im-

p. 448. <sup>i</sup> Sub hoc tempore, seu  
etiam aliquanto post, Origenis condiscipu-  
lus, Porphyrius, libros quosdam adversus  
Christianos edidit. Prol. num. 702.

<sup>k</sup> Συμφοιτηται μεν εν (ως αυτος αναβρα-  
φει) χαλειςτοι τιτες υπηρχου, Ωριγενης τε,  
και Αμελιος, και Ακυλιος. Eunap. vit.  
Porph. p. 19. <sup>l</sup> Vit. Plotin. cap. 2.

of his having seen Origen, acknowledgeth, that he was then in great repute among the Christians \* \* \*.

Divers other erroneous and groundless opinions concerning Porphyry have been entertained by some learned moderns: which may be seen confuted in Pagi, and other authors, referred to by me at the beginning of this chapter.

Porphyry's works were very numerous: there is a large catalogue of them in Suidas, though not complete; his defects are supplied by Fabricius and Lucas Holstenius. I shall mention but a few of them.

Beside that inscribed to Marcella already mentioned, and his Life of Plotinus, he wrote Of <sup>1</sup> Abstinence from Animals, in four books, still extant.

A Philosophical History, or History of Philosophers, also in four books, quoted several times by Cyril of Alexandria in his work against Julian: mentioned also by <sup>m</sup> Socrates in his Ecclesiastical History. From Eunapius we know, that <sup>n</sup> it concluded with the Life of Plato.

And, probably, in the first book of that work was the Life of Pythagoras, which we now have, but not complete.

Against <sup>o</sup> the Christians in fifteen books: but there is nothing of this work remaining excepting some fragments, which it is incumbent on me to collect out of several authors in which they are to be found. He was answered by Methodius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Apollinarius of Laodicea in Syria. All which confutations of this adversary of the Christians are entirely lost.

They were all very prolix, as appears from Jerom's accounts of them. That of Methodius <sup>p</sup> consisted of ten thousand lines; Eusebius's of twenty books, or more; Apollinarius's thirty books: and the twenty-sixth book, which was taken up in answering Porphyry's objections against the book of Daniel, was very long.

\* \* Concerning this point may be seen Valef. Ann. in Euseb. l. vi. c. 19. p. 120. et Fabr. de Vit. Plotini. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 97. in notis.

<sup>1</sup> Περὶ ἀποχρῆς ἐμψυχῶν. δ. Suid. <sup>m</sup> Περὶ φιλοσοφίας ἀποχρῆς τῶν ζῴων ἀποχρῆς τῶν φιλοσοφῶν. Σωκράτης τὸν βίον διέσχευεν ἐν τῇ γερμανικῇ ἀντὶ φιλοσοφῆς ἱστορίᾳ. Soer. l. iii. c. 23. p. 197. D.

<sup>n</sup> Τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἱστορίας, καὶ τῆς τῶν φιλοσοφῶν ἀποχρῆς βίῳ, ἢ Περὶ φιλοσοφίας ἀποχρῆς τῶν ζῴων ἀποχρῆς τῶν φιλοσοφῶν. Eunap. Pr. p. 10.

Suid.

<sup>o</sup> Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀποχρῆς βίῳ. <sup>p</sup> See a passage before cited

from Jerom, in the general account of the early adversaries of the Christians, p. 2, to which I now add here some others.

... et contra Porphyrium, qui eodem tempore scribebat in Sicilia, ut quidam putant, libri triginta: de quibus ad me viginti tantum pervenerunt. Hieron. de V. l. cap. 81.

Extant ejus [Apollinar. Laod.] adversus Porphyrium triginta libri, qui inter cetera opera ejus vel maxime probantur. Id. de V. l. cap. 104.

Apollinarius quoque uno grandi libro, hoc est, vicesimo sexto, &c. Præf. in Dan. T. iii. p. 1071.

It is generally supposed, that Porphyry's work against the Christians was written in Sicily, as is intimated by <sup>9</sup> Eusebius, and <sup>r</sup> Jerom. And by Cave, Porphyry is placed as flourishing in the year 270, where I also place him; and I do so partly out of regard to Suidas, who, as before seen, says, he flourished in the time of Aurelian; whose reign commenced before the end of the year 270. Porphyry was then almost forty years of age; at that time he was in Sicily: but I do not recollect any thing that should determine the exact time when he published his work against the Christians; for he might reside in Sicily some while: nor is there any remaining evidence, that immediately after coming into that island he set about this work. But we know that it was answered by Methodius, who <sup>r</sup> is supposed to have suffered martyrdom in the year of Christ 311 or 312, near the end of Dioclesian's persecution, if not sooner. Eusebius flourished from the year 315, and after; but when his confutation of Porphyry was published cannot be said exactly: I think it <sup>r</sup> was one of his first works, and might be published before he was bishop. Porphyry's long stay in Sicily was so well known, or so much talked of, that <sup>r</sup> Augustine seems to have thought it to be his native country.

Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, has preserved a letter of Constantine, written soon after the council of Nice, which was held in 325. It is to this purpose: 'As <sup>z</sup> Arius has imitated the impious and profane, it is but just, that he should undergo the same infamy with them. As therefore Porphyry, that enemy of true piety, has received a fit reward for his impious writings against religion; so that he is made infamous to all future times, and covered with reproach, and his impious writings have been destroyed: so now it is decreed, that Arius and his followers should be called Porphyrians, that they may bear the denomination of those whom they have imitated. And if any writing of Arius is found, it should be burnt.' And what follows.

From which I think it may be concluded, that before that time there had been an order for destroying all the books of Porphyry against the Christian religion. But that edict had not its full effect: for Apollinarius, who wrote so voluminous a confu-

<sup>9</sup> H. E. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 219.  
<sup>r</sup> De V. I. cap. 81.  
 iii. p. 306.  
<sup>u</sup> . . . quia quidam philosophi eorum, sicut in libris suis Porphyrius siculus prodidit, &c. De Consensu Evang. l. i. cap. 15. T. iii. P. 2.

. . . præsertim quia nonnullæ earum a Porphyrio philosopho propositas dixit. Sed non eum esse arbitror Porphyrium Siculum illum, cujus celeberrima est fama. Retract. l. ii. cap. 31. Tom. i.  
<sup>z</sup> Soer. l. i. cap. ix. p. 32.

ration of Porphyry, did not flourish till after the middle of the fourth century: and Libanius, who lived at the same time, was<sup>a</sup> pleased to give a preference to Julian's work against the Christians to that of Porphyry, 'the Tyrian old man,' as he calls him. Which implies a supposition, that he had read what Porphyry had written upon that subject, or at least that it was then extant. And Jerom, in his works written in the latter part of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, has made large extracts out of some parts of that work of Porphyry. Finally, there was a new edict<sup>b</sup> of Theodosius the younger in 449, for abolishing the works of Porphyry: which affords reason to believe, that they subsisted, and were in being, till that time.

There is another work which is now generally ascribed to Porphyry, and is quoted as his by Eusebius in his Evangelical Preparation and Demonstration. It is entitled, 'Of<sup>c</sup> the Philosophy from Oracles.' I formerly declared my opinion<sup>d</sup> concerning it, that it is not genuine: before we conclude this chapter we shall have occasion to speak more distinctly about that work.

II. The first passage of Porphyry which I shall transcribe, will be taken from Eusebius; who, in the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History, speaking of Origen, says, that many of the Greek philosophers, who were his contemporaries, had made honourable mention of him, and some had dedicated books to him. 'But,' as he adds, 'what need I to insist on them, when Porphyry<sup>e</sup>, who in our time, whilst he was in Sicily, wrote against us, and endeavoured to disparage our scriptures, speaking of those who had interpreted them, for want of arguments betakes himself to railing, and reviles those interpreters, and among them especially Origen; whom, as he says, when he was young, he was acquainted with. But let us hear his own words, which are these: "Some," says<sup>f</sup> he, "determined not to see the depravity of the Jewish scriptures, but to find out a solution of objections that may be brought against them, have adopted forced interpretations, inconsistent in themselves, and unfuitable to those writings, and such as should not only be a

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Socrat. H. E. l. iii. cap. 23. in.

<sup>b</sup> See before p. 2.

εκ λογιων φιλοσοφιας.

p. 212.

<sup>c</sup> Οτι και ο ηαθ' ημας εν σικελια κατασας Πορφυριος, συγγραμματα καθ' ημων ενσησάμενος. κ. λ. H. E. l. vi.

c. 19 p. 219.

<sup>d</sup> Της δε μοχθηριας των ιουδαϊκων γραφων εκ αποσασιν, λυσιν δε τινες ευρειν προθυμηθειτες, επ' εξηγήσεις

ειραπονησιν ασυκλωσθης και αναρμοσθης της γεγραμμενοισ' εκ απολογιασ μαλλον επι των οθνειων, παραδοχην δε και επαίνου τω οικειοισ φερσας. Αιτιγγραφα γαρ τα φαιρωσ παρα Μωυσει λεγομενα ειναι κρημασ σαυτες, και επιθειασαντες ως θεσπισμασ πληρη κρυφιων μυσηριων, δια τε τη τυφωτη κρηλικον της ψυχης κατασηλευσαυτες, επαυθισιν εξηγήσεις. Ib. p. 219, 220.

« vindication

“ vindication of those absurdities, but afford likewise a recom-  
 “ mendation of their own particular opinions. For having  
 “ given out, that the things delivered plainly by Moses are types  
 “ and allegories, and pretending that those writings are inspired,  
 “ and to be looked upon as oracles full of hidden mysteries; and  
 “ having by this means captivated the judgments of men, they  
 “ with a critical pride and vanity set forth their expositions.’  
 ‘ And afterwards ‘ as he goes on: “ An example of this absurd  
 “ method may be observed in a man, whom I saw when I was  
 “ very young, who was then in great esteem, and is so still, for  
 “ the writings which he has left behind him: I mean Origen,  
 “ whose authority is very great with the teachers of this doctrine.  
 “ For he being a hearer of Ammonius, who was so eminent in  
 “ our time for skill in philosophy, in point of learning made  
 “ great improvements by the instructions of that master, but  
 “ with regard to the right way of life took a quite different  
 “ course from him. For Ammonius, a Christian by birth, and  
 “ brought up by Christian parents, as soon as he was arrived to  
 “ maturity of age, and had gained a taste of philosophy, re-  
 “ turned to the way of life prescribed by the laws. But Origen,  
 “ a Greek, and educated in the Greek sentiment, went over to  
 “ the barbarian temerity; to which he devoted himself, and cor-  
 “ rupted himself, and the principles of literature which he had  
 “ received: as to his life, living as a Christian, and contrary to  
 “ the laws: with regard to his sentiments concerning things, and  
 “ the Deity, a Greek, and joining Greek sentiments with their  
 “ absurd fables: for he was very conversant with Plato, and  
 “ Numenius, and Cronius, as well as with the writings of Apol-  
 “ lophanes and Longinus, as also of Moderatus and Nicoma-  
 “ chus, and other learned Pythagoreans. He also read the  
 “ works of the Stoic Chæremon, and of Cornutus.’ When he  
 “ had learned from them the allegorical method of explaining  
 “ the Greek mysteries, he applied it to the Jewish scriptures.”  
 ‘ So writes Porphyry in the third book of his work against the  
 ‘ Christians.’

Upon this passage we may make a few remarks.

† Ἀγρεύτης γὰρ υἱὸς Ἀμμωνίου . . . εἰς μὲν ἑλλήσιν παιδευθεὶς λόγοις πρὸς τὸ βαρβαρὸν ἐξώκειλε τολμήματα· ὡ δὲ φερὼν αὐτὸν τε καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἐξὶν ἐκαπήλευσε· κατὰ μὲν τὸν βίον, Χριστιανῶς ζῶν, καὶ παραδομῶς· κατὰ δὲ τὰς περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ τὰς δεινὰς δοξὰς, ἐλληκίζων τε καὶ τὰ ἐλληνικῶν τοῖς ὀνειοῖς υποβαλλόμενος μυθοῖς. Ib. p. 220.

1. Eusebius supposeth, that Porphyry's book against the Christians was written in Sicily. The same is intimated by <sup>s</sup> Jerom.

2. Porphyry speaks of his having in his youth seen Origen: some have hence concluded, that Porphyry went to Alexandria on purpose to see Origen; but that must be a <sup>h</sup> mistake, as was shewn just now.

3. Porphyry calls Origen a Greek, and says he was educated in the 'Greek sentiments,' but afterwards, when grown up, he embraced the Christian religion: all which Eusebius, who must have well known Origen's history, shews to be false. Origen's father, Leonidas, was a Christian, and a martyr for the Christian religion. Certainly, I think, our ecclesiastical historian's account may be relied upon, as <sup>l</sup> was formerly observed. This mistake of Porphyry, in my opinion, affords a good argument to believe that he was not originally a Christian: if he had, he could not have been so strangely ignorant about Christian affairs.

4. From this passage we can conclude, that in the third book of his work, as well as elsewhere, Porphyry made objections against our scriptures, and the Christian interpretations of them.

5. None can forbear to observe Porphyry's manner of speaking of the Christians, and the Christian religion: this he calls 'the barbarian temerity:' they who embraced it, acted 'contrary to the laws;' they who forsook it, 'returned to the way of life prescribed by the laws.' This way of speaking seems not so very becoming a philosopher, who should follow the dictates of reason, whether they have the encouragement of human authority or not. However, we hence perceive, that Christianity was not so encouraged at that time, though perhaps it was not openly persecuted. And I humbly conceive, that they who then embraced a life contrary to the laws, may be reasonably supposed to have been as honest and understanding men, as they who in all things complied with the laws: they who lived a life contrary to the laws must have practised some self-denial, which they would not have done without some reason for it.

III. I shall now allege Porphyry's objections against the book of Daniel, which was in the twelfth book of his work against the Christians,

1. In the first place I shall transcribe a part of St. Jerom's preface to his Commentary upon the prophet Daniel, written about the year 410, or sooner.

<sup>s</sup> . . . et contra Porphyrium, qui eodem tempore scribebat in Sicilia. De V. l. cap. 81,      <sup>h</sup> Vid. Vales. in loc,      <sup>l</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 443, 444.

‘The <sup>k</sup> twelfth book of Porphyry,’ says Jerom, ‘was written against the book of the prophet Daniel: in which he says, that it was not written by him whose name it bears, but by another, who lived in Judea in the time of Antiochus, furnamed Epiphanes: and that the book of Daniel does not foretel things to come, but relates what had already happened. In a word, whatever it contains to the time of Antiochus is true history: if there is any thing relating to after times, it is all falshood: forasmuch as the writer could not see things future, but at the most only make some conjectures about them. To him several

Contra Prophetam Danielem duodecimum librum scripsit Porphyrius, nolens eum ab ipso, cujus inscriptus est nomine, esse compositum: sed a quodam, qui temporibus Antiochi, qui appellatus est Epiphanes, fuerit in Judæa: et non tam Danielem ventura dixisse, quam illum narrasse præterita. Denique quicquid usque ad Antiochum dixerit, veram historiam continere: si, quid autem ultra opinatus sit, quia futura nescierit, esse mentitum. Cui solertissime responderunt Cæsariensis episcopus tribus voluminibus, id est, octavo decimo, et nono decimo, et vicesimo: Apollinarius quoque uno grandi libro, hoc est vicesimo sexto: et ante hos, ex parte, Methodius. Verum, quia nobis propositum est, non adversarii calumniis respondere, quæ longo sermone indigent: sed ea quæ a Propheta dicta sunt, nostris differere, id est, Christianis, illud in præfatione commoneo, nullum Prophetarum tam aperte dixisse de Christo. Non enim solum scribit eum venturum, quod est commune cum cæteris: sed etiam quo tempore venturus sit, docet, et reges per ordinem digerit, et annos enumerat, ac manifestissima signa prænuntiat. Quæ quia vidit Porphyrius unversa completa, et transacta negare non poterat, superatus historię veritate, in hanc prorupit calumniam: ut ea quæ in consummatione mundi de Antichristo futura diceret, propter gestorum in quibusdam similitudinem, sub Antiocho Epiphane impleta contendit. Cujus impugnatio testimonium veritatis est. Tanta enim dictorum fides fuit, ut Propheta incredulis hominibus non videatur futura dixisse, sed narrasse præterita. Et tamen sicubi se occasio in explanatione ejusdem voluminis dederit, calumniæ illius strictim respondere conabor. . . . Sed et hoc nosse debemus inter cætera, Porphyrium de Danielis libro nobis objicere, idcirco illum apparere confictum, nec haberi apud Hebræos, sed Græci sermonis esse commentum, quia in Susannæ

fabula contineatur, dicente Daniele ad Presbyteros, ἀπο τῆς σχινοσχισαι, καὶ ἀπο τῆς πρινοπρισαι, quam etymologiam magis Græco sermone convenire, quam Hebræo. Cui et Eusebius et Apollinarius pari sententia responderunt, Susannæ, Belisque, ac Draconis fabulas non contineri in Hebraico, sed partem esse prophetiæ Abacuc, filii Jesu de tribu Levi: sicut juxta i. x. x. interpretes in titulo ejusdem Belis fabulæ ponitur: ‘Homo quidam erat sacerdos, nomine Daniel, filius Abda, conviva regis Babylonis: quum Danielem et tres pueros de tribu Juda fuisse,’ sancta scriptura testetur. . . . Et miror quosdam μεμψιμοίεωσιν indignari mihi, quasi ego decurtaverim librum, quum et Origenes et Eusebius et Apollinarius, alique ecclesiastici viri et doctores Græciæ, has, ut dixi, visiones non haberi apud Hebræos fateantur, nec se debere respondere Porphyrio, pro his, quæ nullam scripturæ sanctæ auctoritatem præbeant. . . . Ad intelligendas autem extremas partes Danielis, multiplex Græcorum historia necessaria est: Suctorii videlicet, Callinici, Diodori, Hieronymi, Polybii, Posidonii, Claudii, Theonis, et Andronici cognomento Alipii, quos et Porphyrius esse sequutum se dicit: Josephi quoque, et eorum quos ponit Josephus, præcipueque nostri Livii, et Pompeii Trogi, atque Justinii, qui omnem extremæ visionis narrant historiam: et post Alexandrum usque ad Cæsarem Augustum, Syriæ, et Ægypti, id est, Seleuci, et Antiochi, et Ptolomæorum bella describunt. Et si quando cogimur literarum secularium recordari, et aliqua ex his dicere quæ olim omisimus, non nostræ est voluntatis, sed ut ita dicam, gravissimæ necessitatis: ut probemus ea quæ a sanctis Prophetis ante secula multo prædicta sunt, tam Græcorum, quam Latinorum, et aliarum gentium literis contineri. Hieron. Pr. ad Explan. in Daniel. ad Pam-mach. et Marcellam. Tom. iii. p. 1071. &c.

of our authors have written answers with great labour and diligence, in particular Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea in three volumes, the 18th, the 19th, and the 20th. Apollinarius also in one large book, that is, the 26th, and before them, in part, Methodius. As it is not my design to confute the objections of the adversary, which would require a long discourse, but only to explain the prophet to our own people, that is, Christians: I shall just observe, that none of the prophets have spoken so clearly of Christ as Daniel: for he not only foretels his coming, as do the others likewise, but he also teaches the time when he will come, and mentions in order the princes of the intermediate space, and the number of the years, and the signs of his appearance. And because Porphyry saw all these things to have been fulfilled, and could not deny that they had actually come to pass, being overcome by the power of truth, he was compelled to say as he did: and because of some similitude of circumstances, he asserted, that the things foretold as to be fulfilled in Antichrist at the end of the world, happened in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Which kind of opposition is a testimony of truth: for such is the plain interpretation of the words, that to incredulous men the prophet seems not to foretel things to come, but to relate things already past. And though, as before said, it is not my intention to confute all his objections, I shall, as occasion offers, take notice of some of his weak arguments. . . . And it may be proper for us, among other things, to observe now, that Porphyry argued, that the book of Daniel was not genuine, because it was written in Greek, and therefore certainly was not the work of any Jew, but the forgery of some Greek writer. This he argued from some Greek words which are in the fable of Susanna: to which both Eusebius and Apollinarius returned the same answer: That the fabulous stories of Susanna, and Bel, and the Dragon, are not in the Hebrew, and are said to have been composed by a person of the tribe of Levi: whereas the sacred scripture assures us, that Daniel and the three children his companions were of the tribe of Judah. And they said, they were not accountable for what was not received by the Jews, nor was a part of the sacred scriptures. . . . It ought to be farther observed, that in order to understand the latter parts of the book of Daniel, an acquaintance with many Greek historians is absolutely necessary, such as Suctorius, Callinicus, Diodorus, Hieronymus, Polybius, Possidonius, Claudius, Theon, and Andronicus, surnamed Alipius, whom also Porphyry says he had followed: as likewise Josephus, and Livy, and Pompeius

Trogus,

‘ Trogus, and Justin, who all relate the history of the last  
 ‘ vision, and wrote the history of the wars of Syria and Egypt,  
 ‘ that is, of Seleucus, and Antiochus, and the Ptolomies, from  
 ‘ the time of Alexander to the Roman emperor Augustus. And  
 ‘ if I also consult these profane authors, it is out of mere ne-  
 ‘ cessity, that I may shew the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies,  
 ‘ from the writings of Greek, and Latin, and other authors.’

From all which we perceive, that Porphyry’s work against the  
 Christians was much laboured, and that in this argument he dis-  
 played all his learning, which was very considerable. Hence  
 also we can perceive the difficulty of undertaking an answer to  
 him; for which very few were fully qualified; in which none of  
 the apologists for Christianity seem to have answered expectations.  
 The preface of Jerom to his commentary upon Daniel, which I  
 have now so largely quoted, is supposed to have been written  
 about the year 407, as before said. In the preface to his Latin  
 translation of Daniel from Hebrew, computed to have been  
 made in 392, or sooner, he says: ‘ The objections of Por-  
 ‘ phry against this book are well known from Methodius, Eu-  
 ‘ sebius, and Apollinarius, who have written prolix answers to  
 ‘ him. I cannot say, whether they have satisfied the curious  
 ‘ reader.’

Thus writes Jerom, with great freedom, as may be supposed.  
 In short, Porphyry was a formidable adversary. The public was  
 satisfied with Origen’s one answer to \*\* Celsus: for we hear not  
 of any other attempted afterwards. But against Porphyry, after  
 Methodius wrote Eusebius, and after him Apollinarius, these two  
 last especially very large volumes: and yet all together seem not  
 to have made out a complete answer.

I now intend to transcribe several articles of Jerom’s Commen-  
 tary upon Daniel, in which some notice is taken of Porphyry.

2. Dan. ii. 40. *And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron:  
 for as much as iron breaketh in pieces, and subdueth all things.* . . .

! Quæ autem ex hoc Propheta, immo  
 contra hunc librum, Porphyrius objiciat,  
 testes sunt Methodius, Eusebius, Apollina-  
 rius, qui multis versuum milibus ejus ve-  
 lensiter respondententes, nescio an curioso lectori  
 fassicerint. Hieron. T. i. p. 990.

\*\* Jerom in one place intimates, that  
 very many had written against Celsus and  
 Porphyry. Adversum impiissimos Celsum  
 atque Porphyrium, quanti scripsere nostro-  
 rum? Advers. Rufin. l. iii. T. iv. p. 472.  
 But that may be principally intended of  
 Porphyry, against whom several had writ-  
 ten, as we have seen. And many Christian

writers may have, in their works, occasion-  
 ally confuted Celsus: but it does not ap-  
 pear that any, beside Origen, had written  
 against him on set purpose: nor did Jerom  
 know of any other; as is evident from the  
 manner of his expressions in divers places.  
 Origenes, Methodius, Eusebius, Apollina-  
 ris, multis versuum millibus scribunt ad-  
 versus Celsum et Porphyrium. Adv. Jo-  
 vinian. ep. 30. al. 50. p. 236. Scripserunt  
 contra nos Celsus atque Porphyrius. Priori  
 Origenes, alteri Methodius, Eusebius et  
 Apollinaris fortissime responderunt. Ad  
 Magnum. ep. 83. al. 84. p. 655.

‘ Which,’

‘ Which,’ as Jerom<sup>m</sup> observes, ‘ plainly denotes the Romans.’  
 And afterwards: ‘ But in the end of all these kingdoms, of  
 ‘ gold, silver, brass, and iron, *was cut out* [see ver. 34, and 45,]  
 ‘ a stone, which denotes our Lord and Saviour, *cut out without*  
 ‘ hands, that is, born of a virgin without the concurrence of  
 ‘ man. Which, breaking in pieces all the other kingdoms, be-  
 ‘ came a great mountain and filled all the earth: which the  
 ‘ Jews and the impious Porphyry refer to the people of Israel,  
 ‘ who in the end of the world, as they will have it, shall be very  
 ‘ powerful, and break in pieces all other kingdoms, and reign  
 ‘ for ever.’

3. Ver. 46, 47. *Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell on his face, and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours unto him.* ‘ Upon this place<sup>n</sup> Porphyry  
 ‘ says, it is not reasonable to believe, that a proud king should  
 ‘ worship a captive: as if,’ says Jerom, ‘ it were not true that  
 ‘ the Lycaonians intended to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barna-  
 ‘ bas, when they were surprized at the greatness of the miracles  
 ‘ which they had seen. [Acts xiv.] The fault lies in the heathen  
 ‘ people, who reckon every being above them to be a god. The  
 ‘ scriptures are not to be blamed, which only relate things truly  
 ‘ as they happened. And it may be said, that the king himself  
 ‘ sufficiently explains the grounds of his worship, and his offering  
 ‘ sacrifices and incense, in his own words which follow. Ver.  
 ‘ 47. *The king answered unto Daniel, and said: Of a truth it is,*  
 ‘ *that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a re-*  
 ‘ *vealer of secrets: seeing thou couldst reveal this secret.* Therefore  
 ‘ the king did not so much worship Daniel as God in Daniel,  
 ‘ who had revealed those secrets.’

And lest that solution should not satisfy, Jerom proposeth another, which I need not mention.

<sup>m</sup> Regnum autem quartum, quod perspicue refertur ad Romanos, ferrum est, quod comminuit et domat omnia. . . . In fine autem horum omnium regnorum, auri, argenti, æris et ferri, abscissus est lapis Dominus atque Salvator, sine manibus, id est, absque coïtu et humano semine, de utero virginali, et contritis omnibus regnis factus est mons magnus, et implevit universam terram. Quod Judæi et impius Porphyrius male ad populum referunt Israel, quem in fine seculorum volunt esse fortissimum, et omnia regna contere, et regnare in æternum. Hieron. Tom. iii. p. 1081. <sup>n</sup> Hunc locum calumniatur Porphyrius, quod nunquam superbilli-

mus rex captivum adoraverit: quasi non et Lycaones ob signorum magnitudinem Pauli et Barnabæ voluerint hostias immolare. Error ergo est Gentilium, qui omne quod supra se est deos putant. Scripturæ non debet imputari, quæ simpliciter refert universa quæ gesta sunt. Sed et hoc possumus dicere, quod causas adorandi et immolandum victimarum, et incensi et sacrificii ipse rex exposuerit, dicens ad Daniele. *Vere Deus vester Deus Deorum est, et Dominus Regum.* . . . Ergo non tam Daniele, quam in Daniele adorat Deum, qui mysteria revelavit. Quod si displicet hoc, dicendum est. . . . Ib. p. 1081, 1082.

4. . . . ver. 48. *Then the king made Daniel a great man, and gave him many great gifts.* ‘Here,’ says<sup>o</sup> Jerom, ‘the reviler of the church, (probably meaning Porphyry, the same that had been mentioned before,) takes upon him to blame the prophet for not refusing those gifts, and for readily accepting Babylonish honours: not considering,’ as Jerom adds, ‘that therefore the king had the dream, and the secrets of it had been revealed to Daniel, that he might rise, and in the place of his captivity be made chief of all the Chaldæans, that the divine omnipotence might be made known.’ Jerom goes on to say, ‘That the like favours had been shewn to Joseph in Egypt in the time of Pharaoh, and to Mordecai in the time of Ahasuerus: that in both places the Jewish people, who were there captives and strangers, might be comforted and supported, beholding a man of their own nation made lord of the Egyptians and Chaldæans.’

5. Having recited the first three verses of the fourth chapter, Jerom says: ‘The<sup>p</sup> letter of Nebuchadnezzar is inserted in the volume of the prophets, that the book might not be afterwards thought to be a forgery, as a certain sycophant pretends, but might be known to be the book of Daniel himself.’

6. Ch. v. ver. 10. *Now the queen, by reason of the words of the king, and his lords, came into the banqueting-house.* ‘Her<sup>q</sup>, Josephus reckons the grandmother of Belshazzar; Origen calls her his mother. She therefore was acquainted with the things past in former times, which the king was ignorant of. Let Porphyry then awake, who dreams that she was Belshazzar’s wife: and ridicules her for knowing more than her husband.’

7. Ch. vii. ver. 7. *After this I saw in the night-visions, and behold, a fourth beast . . . and it had ten horns.* ‘Porphyry,’ says<sup>r</sup> Jerom,

<sup>o</sup> Et in hoc calumniator Ecclesiæ, Prophetam reprehendere nititur, quare non recusavit munera, et honorem Babylonium libenter suscepit: non considerans, ideo regem vidisse somnium, et interpretationis mysteria per puerum revelata, ut Daniel cresceret, et in loco captivitatis princeps omnium fieret Chaldæorum, et Dei omnipotentia nosceretur. Quod quidem et in Joseph apud Pharaonem et Ægyptum factum legimus: Et in Mardocheo apud Assurum: ut in utraque gente haberent captivi et peregrinantes Judæi solatia, videntes hominem gentis suæ Ægyptiorum esse principem vel Chaldæorum. p. 1082.

<sup>p</sup> Epistola Nebuchodonosor in Prophetæ volumine ponitur: ut non fictus alio postea

liber, sicut sycophanta mentitur, sed ipsius Danielis esse credatur. p. 1087.

<sup>q</sup> Hanc Josephus aviam Balthazaris, Origenes matrem scribunt. Unde et novæ præterita, quæ rex ignorabat. Evigilet ergo Porphyrius, qui eam Balthazaris somniat uxorem: et illudit, plus scire quam maritum. p. 1093.

<sup>r</sup> Porphyrius duas posteriores bestias, Macedonum et Romanorum in uno Macedonum regno ponit, et dividit: Pardum volens intelligi ipsum Alexandrum: bestiam autem dissimilem cæteris bestiis, quatuor Alexandri successores, et deinde usque ad Antiochum, cognomento Epiphanem, decem reges enumerat, qui fuerunt sævissimi: ipsosque reges non unius ponit regni, verbi gratia, Macedoniæ,

Jerom, ' puts the two last beasts, that of the Macedonians and  
' Romans, in the one kingdom of the Macedonians; and then  
' divides it in this manner. By the leopard he understands  
' Alexander himself, and the beast *diverse from the others*, he  
' supposes to mean the four successors of Alexander: and then  
' he computes ten kings, till the time of Antiochus, surnamed  
' Epiphanes, who were exceeding cruel: and those kings he  
' reckons not of one and the same kingdom, for instance, Ma-  
' cedonia, Syria, Asia, or Egypt; but out of divers kingdoms  
' he forms one succession of kings: this he does, that those  
' words, *a mouth speaking great-things*, may be understood to re-  
' late, not to Antichrist, but to Antiochus.'

Doubtless, this way of interpretation best suited Porphyry's notion, that the book of Daniel was not prophetic, but only related events to the time of Antiochus. However, it may not be amiss to consult Grotius, as well as other commentators upon this place.

8. . . . ver. 9. *I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn. . . . And, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.*

' In ' vain does Porphyry imagine, that the little horn which  
' came up after the ten horns denotes Antiochus Epiphanes.  
' Therefore let us say, as all the writers of the church have de-  
' livered it to us, that in the end of the world, when the Ro-  
' man empire is to be destroyed, there shall be ten kings, who  
' will divide the Roman government among themselves.' . . .  
And what follows. Upon this place likewise Grotius might be consulted by such as are curious.

9. . . . ver. 14. *And there was given him a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion . . . and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*

' Let ' Porphyry answer, to whom among men this can agree:  
' or, who is so powerful as to break in pieces and trample upon

Macedoniæ, Syriæ, Asiæ, et Ægypti: sed de diversis regnis unum ellicit regum ordinem: ut videlicet ea quæ scripta sunt: *Os loquens ingentia*: non de Antichristo, sed de Antiocho, dicta credantur. p. 1100, 1101.

' Frustra Porphyrius cornu parvulum, quod post decem cornua ortum est, Epiphanem Antiochum suspicatur. . . . Ergo dicamus quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt: In consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum, decem futuros reges, qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant. . . .

&c. p. 1101.

' Hoc cui potest hominum convenire, respondeat Porphyrius: aut quis tam potens sit, qui cornu parvulum, quem Antiochum interpretatur fregerit, atque contriverit? Si responderit, Antiochi principes a Juda Maccabæo fuisse superatos, docere debet, quomodo cum cæli nubilus veniat, quasi filius hominis: et offeratur vetusto dierum, et detur ei potestas, et regnum, et omnes populi, tribus, ac linguæ serviant illi: et potestas ejus æterna sit, quæ nullo sine claudatur. p. 1103.

‘ the little horn, which he takes to be Antiochus? If he answers, that the generals of Antiochus were overcome by Judas Maccabæus, he ought to shew, *how he came with the clouds of heaven as the son of man: and how he was brought before the Ancient of days: and power, and a kingdom was given unto him: so that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him: and his kingdom should be everlasting, and without end.*’

10. Ch. ix. 1. *In the first year of Darius, the son of Abasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldæans. Ver. 2. In the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood by books.*

‘ This <sup>u</sup> is Darius, who together with Cyrus overcame the Chaldæans and Babylonians, and not that Darius, in whose second year the temple was built, as Porphyry pretends, that he may bring down the times of Daniel the lower; or he, who was overcome by Alexander the Macedonian.’

This Darius, as learned moderns \*\* observe, is the same who by heathen historians is called Cyaxares, the son of Astyages. Porphyry<sup>x</sup> is here much blamed by Grotius, for his insinuation to the prejudice of the real time of Daniel, writer of this book.

11. Ch. xi. ver. 20. *Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes, in the glory of the kingdom. But within a few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.*

‘ He <sup>y</sup> intends Seleucus surnamed Philopater, son of Antiochus the great, who did nothing worthy of his father, or the kingdom of Syria, and died ingloriously. Porphyry will have this person not to be Seleucus, but Ptolemy Epiphanes . . . against which Jerom proceeds to argue.’ For this likewise Porphyry is corrected by <sup>z</sup> Grotius.

12. Upon ch. xi. 21 . . . 24. Jerom remarks. ‘ Such <sup>a</sup> is the order of the history: nor is there here any difference between  
‘ Porphyry

<sup>u</sup> Hic est Darius, qui cum Cyro Chaldæos Babyloniosque superavit, ne putemus illam Darium, cujus secundo anno templum ædificatum est, (quod Porphyrius suspicatur, ut annos Danielis extendat,) vel eum, qui ab Alexandro, Macedonum rege, superatus est. p. 1107. \*\* See Pri-

deaux Connexion, at the year before Christ 612. Vol. i. p. 48. and Lowth upon Dan. ix. 1. <sup>x</sup> *In anno primo Darii:]* id est, Nabonnedi, ut supra dictum. Improbe Porphyrius, ut Daniele[m] serius vixisse imperius persuadeat, hunc Darium eum vult esse, ab quo templum est restitutum. Gr. in Dan. ix. 1. <sup>y</sup> Seleucum dicit cognomento Philopatorem, filium magni

Antiochi, qui nihil dignum Syriæ et patris gessit imperio, et absque ullis præliis inglorius periit. Porro Porphyrius non vult hunc esse Seleucum, sed Ptolomæum Epiphanem. . . . p. 1126. <sup>z</sup> Illud,

*stabat in loco ejus,* et Porphyrium refutat, qui hæc ad Ptolomæum Epiphanem Ægypti regem traherat, et Hebræos, qui ad Tryphonem Antiochi Sedetæ tutorem. Gr. ad cap. xi. 20. <sup>a</sup> Hucusque ordo

historiæ sequitur, et inter Porphyrium ac nostros nulla contentio est. Cætera quæ sequuntur usque ad finem voluminis ille interpretatur super persona Antiochi, qui cognominatus est Epiphanes, filius Antiochi Magni, qui post Seleucum undecim

‘ Porphyry and our people. The rest, which follows to the end  
 ‘ of the volume, he interprets of Antiochus Epiphanes, brother  
 ‘ of Seleucus, son of Antiochus the great, who after Seleucus  
 ‘ reigned eleven years in Syria, who subdued Judea: in whose  
 ‘ time happened the persecution of the Jewish laws, and the  
 ‘ wars of the Maccabees. Our people suppose, that all these  
 ‘ these things are prophetic of Antichrist, who will appear in  
 ‘ the last days of the world. As many things in the following  
 ‘ part of this book agree to Antiochus, they say, he was a type  
 ‘ of Antichrist; and that those things which were partly verified  
 ‘ in him, will be more fully accomplished in Antichrist. This,  
 as Jerom says, ‘ is the manner of scripture, which before-hand  
 ‘ represents in types what will be more completely fulfilled after-  
 ‘ wards. So what is said in the 72d Psalm of Solomon cannot  
 ‘ all agree to him: in part, and as in a shadow and figures, they  
 ‘ are said of him, but are more completely fulfilled in our Lord  
 ‘ and Saviour. As therefore our Saviour had for types Solomon  
 ‘ and other saints, so Antichrist is to be thought to have had a  
 ‘ type of himself in that bad prince Antiochus, who persecuted  
 ‘ the saints, and profaned the temple. However,’ says Jerom,  
 ‘ let us observe Porphyry’s exposition as well as our own. In  
 ‘ the room of Seleucus, as he and his followers say, came up  
 ‘ his brother Antiochus Epiphanes, who did such and such things.  
 ‘ . . . All these things which I have thus rehearsed compendiously,  
 ‘ Porphyry, following the guidance of Suctorius, has drawn out  
 ‘ with great prolixity in an insinuating manner: but our people  
 ‘ more truly and justly explain this of Antichrist, who shall ap-  
 ‘ pear in the end of the world.’

annis regnavit in Syria, obtinuitque Judæam: sub quo Legis persecutio, et Macabæorum bella narrantur. Nostri autem hæc omnia de Antichristo prophetari arbitrantur, qui ultimo tempore futurus est. Quumque multa quæ postea lecturi et exposituri sumus, super Antiochi persona conveniunt, typum eum volunt Antichristi habere: et quæ in illo ex parte præcesserint, in Antichristo ex toto esse complenda. Et hunc esse morem scripturæ sanctæ, ut futurorum veritatem præmittat in typis, juxta illud, quod, in Domino Salvatore, in septuagesimo primo psalmo dicitur, qui prænotatur Salomonis: et omnia quæ de eo dicuntur, Salomoni non valent convenire. . . . Ex parte autem, et quasi in umbra, et imagine veritatis in Salomone præmissa sunt, ut in

Domino Salvatore perfectius implerentur. Sicut igitur Salvator habet, et Salomonem, et cæteros sanctos in typum adventus sui: sic et Antichristus pessimum regem Antiochum, qui sanctos persecutus est, et templum violavit, recte typum sui habuisse credendus est. Sequamur igitur expositionis ordinem, et juxta utramque explanationem, quid adversariis, quid nostris videatur, breviter annotemus. Stabit, inquit, in loco Seleuci frater ejus Antiochus Epiphanes. . . . Hæc Porphyrius sequens Suctorium sermone lacinosissimo prosequutus est, quæ nos brevi compendio diximus. Nostri etiam et melius interpretantur, et rectius: quod in fine mundi hæc sit facturus Antichristus. p. 1127, 1128.

In his annotations upon ver. 21st, Grotius<sup>b</sup> expresseth an earnest wish for Suctorius, and other writers, made use of by Porphyry, for explaining what follows. In the mean time, he says, we must do the best we can with what we have.

13. Upon ver. 25th and 26th of the same xith ch. Jerom goes on: 'These<sup>c</sup> things Porphyry explains of Antiochus. . . . But our people, according to the forementioned sense . . . interpret all of Antichrist.'

14. I forbear to take any thing from Jerom's comment upon ver. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

15. Ver. 34. *Now when they shall fall, they shall be bolden with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries.* Ver. 35. *And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed.*

'By<sup>d</sup> the little help Porphyry supposes to be intended Mattathias, of the town of Modin, who rebelled against the generals of Antiochus, and endeavoured to uphold the worship of God. He calls it,' he says, 'a little help, because Mattathias was killed in battle, and afterwards his son Judas, called Maccabæus, fell also: and his brothers were imposed upon by the treachery of their adversaries. Read the books of the Maccabees. All these things, as he says, were therefore done, that the pious might be tried, and purified, and made white, to a certain time; because the victory was deferred to another time. But our people explain the little help under Antichrist after the following manner.' See 1 Macc. ii. 1 . . . 5.

16. Ver. 36. *And the king shall do according to his will. And he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper, till the indignation be accomplished. For that that is determined shall be done.*

<sup>b</sup> Magno velim ad explicanda quæ sequuntur Suctorium mihi dari, quo usus olim Porphyrius. Eum multosque alios cum non habeamus, utendum nobis iis scriptoribus qui restant, et iis quæ ex Porphyrio nobis dedit Hieronymus. Gr. in Dan. xi. 21.

<sup>c</sup> Hæc Porphyrius interpretatur de Antiocho, qui adversus Ptolomæum, sororis suæ filium, profectus est cum exercitu magno. . . . Nostri autem, secundum priorem sententiam, interpretantur omnia de Antichristo. p. 1128.

<sup>d</sup> Parvulum auxilium, Mattathiam significari arbitratur Porphyrius de vico Mo-

din, qui adversum duces Antiochi rebellavit, et cultum veri Dei servare conatus est. Parvum autem, inquit, auxilium vocat, quia occisus est in prælio Mattathias, et postea Judas filius ejus, qui vocabatur Maccabæus, pugnans cecidit, et cæteri fratres ejus adversariorum fraude decepti sunt. Lege Machabæorum libros. Hæc, ait, omnia idcirco sunt facta, ut probentur, et eligantur sancti, et dealbentur usque ad tempus præfinitum: quia in aliud tempus erat dilata victoria. Sub Antichristo parvum auxilium nostri intelligi volunt. . . . p. 1130.

‘ This ’ also, ’ says Jerom, ‘ we understand of Antichrist. But  
 ‘ Porphyry and they who follow him think it to be said of  
 ‘ Antiochus Epiphanes, who set up himself against the worship  
 ‘ of God, and arrived at such pride, as to order his own statue  
 ‘ to be set up in the temple at Jerusalem. *And shall prosper, till  
 ‘ the indignation be accomplished.* This they understand after this  
 ‘ manner: that he should prevail, till God is offended with  
 ‘ him, and appoints his death. Forasmuch as the historians  
 ‘ Polybius and Diodorus relate, that he did not only oppose  
 ‘ himself to the God of Judea, but likewise, that moved by avarice  
 ‘ he attempted to plunder the temple of Diana in Elimaïs,  
 ‘ which was very rich; but was hindered by the guardians of the  
 ‘ temple, and by neighbouring nations: and that having been  
 ‘ agitated by terrifying thoughts and apprehensions, he became  
 ‘ mad and so expired. They say, this happened because he  
 ‘ had attempted to violate the temple of Diana. We say, if that  
 ‘ was his end, it befel him because he had exercised great cruelty  
 ‘ toward the saints of God, and had polluted his temple: for it  
 ‘ is more reasonable to think, that he was punished for what he  
 ‘ had done, than for what he had only attempted to do, and then  
 ‘ forbore from an apprehension of guilt.’

17. Afterwards, in his comment upon ver. 44, 45, Jerom again observes what Porphyry said concerning the death of Antiochus, which he had collected out of divers authors: ‘ Which  
 ‘ is, <sup>f</sup> that having gone into the east, when he came into the  
 ‘ province

‘ Quod quidem et nos de Antichristo intelligimus. Porphyrius autem, et cæteri qui sequuntur eum, de Antiocho Epiphane dici interpretantur, quod erectus sit contra cultum Dei, et in tantam superbiam venerit, ut in templo Hierosolymis simulachrum suum poni jussit. Quodque sequitur: *Et diriget, donec compleatur ira, quia in ipso erit consummatio:* sic intelligunt, tam diu eum posse, donec irascatur ei Deus, et ipsum interfici jubeat. Siquidem Polybius et Diodorus, qui Bibliothecarum scribunt historias, narrant eum non solum contra Deum fecisse Judææ, sed avaritiæ facibus accensum, etiam templum Dianæ in Elimaide, quod erat ditissimum, spoliare conatum: oppressumque a custodibus templi, et vicinis circum gentibus, et quibusdam phantasiis atque terroribus versum in amentiam, ac postremum morbo interiisse. Et hoc ei accidisse commemorant, quia templum Dianæ violare conatus est. Nos autem dicimus, etiam si, accidisset ei, ideo accidisse, quia in sanctos Dei multam exercuerit cru-

delitatem, et polluerit templum ejus. Nec enim pro eo quod conatus est facere, et acta penitentia desivit implere, sed pro eo quod fecit punitus esse credendus est. p. 1131. <sup>f</sup> Et in hoc loco Porphyrius tale nescio quid de Antiocho somniat. Pugnans, inquit, contra Ægyptios, et Libyas Æthiopsque pertransiens, audiet bellum ab Aquilone, et ab Oriente prælia contrari: unde et regrediens capiet Aradios resistentes. . . . *Et veniet, inquit, usque ad summum montem ipsius montis,* in Elimaide provincia, quæ est ultima Persarum ad Orientem regio: ibique volens templum Dianæ spoliare, quod infinita donaria habebat, fugatus a barbaris est, qui mirâ veneratione sanum illud suspiciebant, et mortuus est morore conceptus in Tabes, oppido Persidis. Hæc ille in fugillationem nostri, artificiosissimo sermone composuit. Quæ etiam si potuerit approbare, non de Antichristo dicta, sed de Antiocho: quid ad nos, qui non ex omnibus Scripturarum locis Christi probamus adventum, et Antichristi mendaciam?

' province of Elimais, the remotest country of the Persians lying  
 ' that way: when he attempted to plunder the temple of Diana,  
 ' which had in it abundance of rich offerings, he was put to  
 ' flight by the barbarians who greatly respected that temple, and  
 ' died overwhelmed with grief in Tabes a city of Persia. This  
 ' he writes by way of argument against us in a very artful man-  
 ' ner: and if he could shew that those things are said, not of  
 ' Antichrist, but of Antiochus, what is that to us, who do not  
 ' attempt to prove the coming of Christ, nor of his opposite,  
 ' Antichrist, out of every text of scripture? Allowing these  
 ' things to be said of Antiochus, what prejudice is that to our  
 ' cause? Rather let him set aside doubtful things, and keep to  
 ' such as are clear. Let him say, *who is that stone, which being*  
 ' *cut out of the mountain without hands,* should increase to a great  
 ' mountain, and was to fill the whole earth, and to break in  
 ' pieces the fourfold image: and who is that Son of man who is  
 ' to come with the clouds, and to be brought before the ancient  
 ' of days, to whom was to be given a kingdom that has no end:  
 ' and whom all people and nations and tongues should serve.  
 ' These things, which are manifest, he passeth over, and affirms  
 ' they relate to the Jews, whom nevertheless we know to be still  
 ' in bondage: and he likewise says, that he who wrote the book  
 ' in the name of Daniel, told lies to please and comfort his  
 ' own people: he pretended to prophecy, but indeed only wrote  
 ' history.'

Jerom then proceeds to shew how our people, as he says, ex-  
 plain the last paragraph of this vision concerning Antichrist:  
 and then he concludes his observations upon this chapter.  
 ' This <sup>s</sup>,' says he, ' I have now shewn with some prolixity, that  
 ' I might expose the folly of Porphyry, who either was ignorant  
 ' of these things, or pretended not to know them; and likewise  
 ' to shew the difficulty of the sacred scriptures, which many

eum? Pone enim hæc dici de Antiocho,  
 quid nocet religioni nostræ? Numquid et  
 in superiori visione, ubi in Antiocho pro-  
 phetia consummata est, aliquid de Anti-  
 christo dicitur? Dimittat itaque dubia, et  
 in manifestis hæreat: dicatque, quis sit ille  
 lapis, qui de monte abscissus sine manibus,  
 creverit in montem magnum, et orbem  
 impleverit, et quadriformem imaginem con-  
 triverit: qui sit ille filius hominis, qui cum  
 nubibus venturus sit, et staturus ante ve-  
 tullum dierum, et dandum ei regnum, quod  
 nullo sine claudatur: omnesque populi, tri-  
 bus, ac linguæ ipsi servituri sunt. Hæc  
 quæ manifesta sunt præterit, et de Judæis

asserit prophetari, quos usque hodie servire  
 cognoscimus. Et dicit eum, qui sub no-  
 mine Danielis scripsit librum, ad refocil-  
 landam spem suorum fuisse mentitum. Non  
 quo. omnem historiam futuram nosse potu-  
 erit, sed quo facta memoraret. Nostri au-  
 tem extremum visionis hujus capitulum su-  
 per Antichristo sic exponunt. p. 1133.

& Hoc ideo prolixius posui, ut et Por-  
 phyræ ostendam calumniam, qui hæc om-  
 nia ignoravit, aut nescire se finxit: et scrip-  
 turæ sanctæ difficultatem, cujus intelligen-  
 tiam absque Dei gratia, et doctrina majo-  
 rum, sibi imperitissimi vel maxime veudi-  
 cant. p. 1134.

‘ people; and even such as are very unskilful, pretend to understand, without the grace of God, or an acquaintance with the doctrine of our ancestors.’

Concerning the death of Antiochus, they who have opportunity may do well to consult 1 Maccabees ch. vi. and 2 Macc. ch. ix. and Josephus in his <sup>h</sup> Antiquities: to whom might be added <sup>i</sup> Polybius, not forgetting <sup>k</sup> the Connection of that learned modern writer Humphry Prideaux.

18. The beginning of the twelfth chapter of the book of Daniel is in these terms. *And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince that standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was, since there was a nation, even to that same time. And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame, and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever.*

‘ Hitherto <sup>l</sup>,’ says Jerom, ‘ Porphyry has written with some sort of reserve and modesty, and has imposed upon unskilful people among us, and the ill-instructed on his own side: but what can he say upon this paragraph, in which the resurrection of the dead is spoken of. . . . There is nothing which the perverseness of men may not do. His explication is this: And this also is written of Antiochus, who when he went into Per-

<sup>h</sup> L. xii. cap. 9. al. 13.

<sup>i</sup> Ap. Excerpt. Valesii. p. 144.

<sup>k</sup> Connection at the year before Christ. 164. p. 200.

<sup>l</sup> Hactenus Porphyrius utquomque se tenuit, et tam nostrorum imperitis, quam suorum male eruditis, imposuit, de hoc capitulo quid dicturus est, in quo mortuorum describitur resurrectio: aliis suscitatis in vitam æternam, et aliis in opprobrium sempiternum? . . . Sed quid non faciat pertinacia? . . . Et hoc, inquit, de Antiocho scriptum est, qui vadens in Persidem, Lyfiæ, qui Antiochiæ et Phœnicæ præerat, reliquit exercitum, ut adversus Judæos pugnaret, urbemque eorum Jerusalem subverteret: quæ omnia narrat Josephus, historiæ auctor Hebrææ: quod talis fuerit tribulatio, qualis nunquam: et tempus advenerit, quale non fuit, ex quo gentes esse cœperunt usque ad illud tempus. Reddita autem victoria, et cæsis Antiochi ducibus, ipsoque Antiocho in Perside mortuo, salvatus est populus Israel: omnes qui scripti in libro Dei, hoc est, qui legem fortissime defenderunt, et e contrario, qui de-

leti sunt de libro, hoc est, qui prævaricatores existerunt legis, et Antiochi fuerunt partium. Tunc, ait, hi qui quasi in terræ pulvere dormiebant, et operati erant malorum pondere, et quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad insperatam victoriam de terræ pulvere resurrexerunt: et de humo elevaverunt caput custodes legis, resurgentes in vitam æternam, et prævaricatores in opprobrium sempiternum. Magistri autem et doctores, qui legis notitiam habuerunt, fulgebunt quasi cælum, et qui inferiores populos exhortati sunt ad custodiendas ceremonias Dei, ad instar astrorum fulgebunt in perpetuas æternitates. Ponit quoque historiam de Machabæis, in qua dicitur, multos Judæorum sub Mattathia et Jucâ Machabæo ad eremum confugisse, et latuisse in speluncis, et in cavernis petrarum, ac post victoriam processisse: et hæc *μὲν οὖν* quasi de resurrectione mortuorum esse predicta. Tempore autem Antichristi tale tribulationem fore, qualis nunquam fuit et quo gentes esse cœperunt, melius intelligitur. p. 1135.

‘*sia, he left an army with Lyfias, who was governor of Antioch  
 ‘ and Phœnicia, that he might fight with the Jews, and destroy  
 ‘ their city Jerusalem: all which things are related by Josephus,  
 ‘ the Jewish historian, shewing, that there was then such distress  
 ‘ as never had been before. But the Jews overcoming, and the  
 ‘ generals of Antiochus being slain, and himself having died in  
 ‘ Persia, the people of Israel were delivered: even all they who  
 ‘ were written in the book of God, that is, who had valiantly stood  
 ‘ up for the law. On the contrary, they were blotted out of the  
 ‘ book, who had apostatized from the law, and joined the interest of  
 ‘ Antiochus. Then, says he, they who, as it were, slept in the  
 ‘ dust of the earth, and were covered over with the weight of af-  
 ‘ fliction, and were, as it were, buried in sepulchres, rose out of  
 ‘ the dust of the earth to unexpected victory. The keepers of  
 ‘ the law lifted up their heads out of the ground, rising to eter-  
 ‘ nal life: and the apostates from it to everlasting contempt. The  
 ‘ masters and teachers who understood the law, will shine as the  
 ‘ firmament, and they who had exhorted the lower orders of the  
 ‘ people to keep God’s ordinances, will shine as the stars for ever  
 ‘ and ever. He also allegeth the history of the Maccabees, in  
 ‘ which it is said, that many of the Jews fled into the deserts,  
 ‘ and hid themselves in caves and holes of the rocks, and after  
 ‘ the victory came out. This, he says, is expressed metapho-  
 ‘ rically, as if it were a resurrection from the dead.’ 1 Macc. ii.  
 28, 29. 2 Macc. viii. 1.*

But Jerom says, that the tribulations here spoken of are better understood of the times of Antichrist.

Grotius, however, does not altogether reject Porphyry’s \*\* interpretation.

19. . . . Ver. 7. *And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand, and his left hand to heaven, and swore by him that liveth for ever and ever, that it shall be for time, times, and a half.*

Upon which Jerom observes: ‘ This <sup>m</sup> time, and times, and  
 ‘ *be f*

\*\* *Et multi de his qui dormiunt in terræ pulvere exigilabunt.*] Bene veritas: *Et multi qui cubarunt in pulverulenta humo exsurgent.* Id est, qui ob religionem eiekti urbe, oppidis, vicis et villis, non habuerunt ubi caput reponerent, (ut Christus de se loquitur, Luca ix. 58.) redibunt in urbem et alia loca habitata. Reddendum est Porphyrio quod ei debetur testimonium: Est enim hunc locum optime interpretatus de iis qui ob legis cultum diu extorres ad sua redire:

fic tamen ut voces mira arte ita sint temperatae, ut resurrectionis mysterium, quod aperte ante Evangelium revelari non debuit, innuant magis quam explicent. Nihil potius dici verius.

*Alii in vitam æternam*] Sensus primus hic est. *Illi quidem* [consurgenti] *ad vitam longam,* quâ Deus eos donabit ob constantiam et mala tolerata. &c. Grot. ad locum.

<sup>m</sup> Tempus, et tempora, et dimidium temporis, tres et semis annos interpretatur Porphyrius;

‘ *half a time*, Porphyry interprets, as meaning three years and  
 ‘ a half: nor do we deny this to be agreeable to the style of  
 ‘ scripture. And Porphyry, referring this to Antiochus, says,  
 ‘ that by his means the temple was deserted for three years and  
 ‘ a half: but,’ says Jerom, ‘ Josephus and the book of Macca-  
 ‘ bees mention no more than three years, during which space  
 ‘ the temple was defiled, and the image of Jupiter stood there  
 ‘ by the order of Antiochus Epiphanes. Therefore,’ as Jerom  
 ‘ adds, ‘ that space of three years and a half relates not to An-  
 ‘ tiochus, but to Antichrist.’ Of this I may take some further  
 notice hereafter: at present we proceed.

20. Same ver. 7. *And when he shall have accomplished to scatter  
 the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.*

‘ That<sup>n</sup> is,’ says Jerom, ‘ When the people of God shall be  
 ‘ dispersed in the persecution of Antiochus, as Porphyry will  
 ‘ have it: or in the time of Antichrist, as our people truly shew,  
 ‘ then all these things shall be fulfilled ††.’

21. Ver. 11. *And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be  
 taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there  
 shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.*

‘ These<sup>p</sup> thousand two hundred and ninety days, Porphyry  
 ‘ says, were fulfilled in the time of Antiochus, and in the deso-  
 ‘ lation of the temple: whereas Josephus and the book of Mac-  
 ‘ cabees, as before said, mention three years only. Whence it  
 ‘ is manifest, that the three years and a half are to be understood  
 ‘ of the times of Antichrist, who will persecute the saints for  
 ‘ three years and a half, that is, a thousand two hundred and  
 ‘ ninety days.’

So writes Jerom, not considering that three years and a half,  
 computing 360 days to a year, make no more than twelve hun-

Porphyrius: quod et nos juxta scriptura-  
 rum sanctarum idioma non negamus. . . .  
 Si itaque superiora refert Porphyrius ad  
 Antiochum, et ad tres et semis annos, qui-  
 bus templum dicit desertum. . . . Legimus  
 in Machabeorum libris. Josephus quoque  
 in eandem consentit sententiam, quod tri-  
 bus annis templum pollutum fuerit in Jeru-  
 salem, et in eo Jovis idolum steterit sub  
 Antiocho Epiphane. . . . Sub Antichristo  
 autem non tres anni, sed tres et semis, hoc  
 est, mille, ducenti nonaginta dies, desola-  
 tionis templi sancti, et eversionis futura  
 esse dicuntur. p. 1136. et 1133. bis.

† Quando, inquit, populus Dei dispersus  
 fuerit, vel Antiocho persequente, ut vult  
 Porphyrius: vel Antichristo, ut nostri ve-

rius probant, tunc hæc omnia complebun-  
 tur. p. 1133. bis. †† *Et cum ex-  
 pleta fuerit dispersio manus populi sancti.]*  
 Id est, cum maxime extra urbes et vicus  
 per agros sparsi erunt pii Judæi. Vide  
 1 Maccab. ii. 29. 2 Macc. viii. 1. Grot.  
 in loc. † Hos mille, ducentos,  
 nonaginta dies, Porphyrius in tempore An-  
 tiochi, et in desolatione templi dicit com-  
 pletos: quem et Josephus et Machabeorum  
 (ut diximus) liber, tribus tantum annis  
 fuisse commemorant. Ex quo perspicuum  
 est tres ipsos, et semis annos, de Antichristi  
 dici temporibus, qui tribus et semis annis,  
 hoc est, mille, ducentis, nonaginta diebus  
 sanctos persecuturus, &c. . . . p. 1133. bis.

dred and sixty days. To which are added thirty days in the number one thousand two hundred and ninety days: which, possibly, might be accounted for without any very great difficulty \*\*.

22. Ver. 12. *Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days,*

‘ Porphyry<sup>9</sup> says, that the five and forty days over and above the one thousand two hundred and ninety, shew the time of the victory gained over the generals of Antiochus; when Judas the Maccabee fought valiantly, and cleansed the temple, broke the idol in pieces, and offered sacrifices in the temple: which might be rightly said, if the book of Maccabees had related that the temple was polluted three years and a half, and not three years.’

So writes Jerom. But this additional number of *five and forty days* may be understood to reach to the time of the death of Antiochus, when the deliverance of the Jewish people would be completed, and their tranquillity farther secured ††.

Jerom, as we have seen, insists upon the term of ‘three years,’ mentioned by Josephus and the book of the Maccabees: and indeed Josephus in one place computes the time of the desolation of the temple, as said by Jerom at ‘three years.’ In other places<sup>9</sup> he mentions ‘three years and a half.’ According to different computations of the beginning and ending of the troubles of the Jewish people, the numbers may vary a little without any detriment to the true ‘history. Prideaux has shewn largely, as well from the books of the Maccabees as from Josephus, that the desolation of the temple happened just three years and six months before it was again restored by Judas Maccabæus. And therefore that restoration having been made\* on the

\*\* ... *dies mille ducenti nonaginta.*] Jam designatius ostendit dies aliquot excursuros ultra triennium et semestre tempus, post quod totum tempus, et non diutius, cessabit εἰδολεχισμος, sacrificium jure. In eo tempore comprehenditur etiam collocatio idoli vallantis in templo. Vide quæ diximus, vii. 25. Grot. in loc.

<sup>9</sup> Porphyrius hunc locum ita edisserit, ut quadraginta quinque dies, qui super mille ducentos nonaginta sunt, victoriæ contra duces Antiochi tempus significant: quando Judas Machabæus fortiter dimicavit, et emundavit templum, idolumque contrivit, et victimas obtulit in templo Dei. Quod recte diceret, si Machabæorum liber tribus et semis annis templum scriberet esse pollutum, et non tribus. p. 1134. bis.

†† *Ad dies mille trecentos triginta quinque.*] Ad mortem usque Antiochi, indicatam su-

pra. xi. 45. quo tempore Judæi non malis tantum, sed et omni malorum metu levabuntur. Grot. in loc. ‘Antiq. l. xii. cap. x. al. cap. 7. § 6.

<sup>9</sup> ... και καλασγων εἰσι τρισι και μηνσιν εξ. De B. Jud. Pr. § 7.

... αυλος και τον ιαον εσυλησε, και τον ειδελεχισμον των καθ’ ημεραν ειασιασμων επαυσεν επ’ εη τρια και μνας εξ. De B. J. l. i. c. 1. in.

<sup>†</sup> Quorum omnium facilis est conciliatio. Stetit enim in templo Idolum tribus annis non amplius. Ab urbe vero capta et interdictis ritibus sex præterea menses effluxerant, cum diebus paucis, qui numeri rotundi gratiâ negliguntur. Aldrich. ad Joseph. De B. J. l. i. cap. 1. § 1. <sup>u</sup> Year before

Christ 168. Conn. P. 2. B. 3. p. 175.

<sup>x</sup> 1 Mac. i. 59. iv. 52. 54. 2 Mac. x. 5.

‘ twenty-fifth day of the ninth month of the Jews, called Cisleu,  
 ‘ in the 148th year of the æra of the Seleucidæ: it follows, that  
 ‘ the time of this desolation must have been in or about the  
 ‘ twenty-fifth day of their third month, called Sivan, in the æra  
 ‘ of the Seleucidæ 145, which answers to the year before Christ  
 ‘ 168: then it was, that by the command of Antiochus, and  
 ‘ the wicked agency of Apollonius, the daily sacrifices, whereby  
 ‘ God was honoured every morning and evening at Jerusalem,  
 ‘ were made to cease, and the temple turned into desolation.’

At the end of that period of three years and a half the temple was cleansed, and dedicated by Judas Maccabæus; and an annual feast of eight days was appointed in memory of that deliverance, as related 1 Macc. iv. 36 . . . to the end, and 2 Macc. ch. x. and by Josephus<sup>y</sup>. Which feast was still observed by the Jews at Jerusalem in our Saviour’s time, as we learn from the<sup>z</sup> gospels.

IV. I shall now make some observations upon the preceding objections, and the answers made to them.

I. From what has been now transcribed from St. Jerom, we may be able to form some notion of the nature of that part of Porphyry’s work, so far as it related to the book of Daniel: we may likewise be able to discern some defects in the answers which were made to it by Christian writers.

Says Dr. Prideaux: ‘ The<sup>a</sup> prophecies of Daniel concerning  
 ‘ the Persian kings, and the Macedonians, that reigned as well  
 ‘ in Egypt as Asia, having been all, according to the best his-  
 ‘ torians, exactly fulfilled, Porphyry could not disprove them by  
 ‘ denying their completion: and therefore for overthrowing their  
 ‘ authority he took the quite contrary course, and laboured to  
 ‘ prove their truth; and from hence alleged, that being so exactly  
 ‘ true in all particulars, they could not therefore be written by  
 ‘ Daniel so many years before the facts were done, but by some  
 ‘ one else under his name, who lived after the time of Antiochus  
 ‘ Epiphanes: for which purpose he made use of the best Greek  
 ‘ historians then extant. Such were Callinicus Sutorius, Dio-  
 ‘ dorus Siculus, . . . and from them made evident proof, that all  
 ‘ that is written in the eleventh chapter of Daniel was truly, in  
 ‘ every particular, acted and done in the order as there related.  
 ‘ And from this exactness of completion endeavoured to infer  
 ‘ the assertion mentioned: that these prophecies were written  
 ‘ after the facts were done; and therefore are rather historical

<sup>y</sup> *Antiq* 1 xii. c. 10. al. 7 sub fin.  
 P. 2. B. 3. year before Christ 164. p. 206.

<sup>z</sup> *John* x. 22.

<sup>a</sup> *Connectio.*

‘ narratives,

‘ narratives, relating things past, than prophetic predictions,  
 ‘ foreshewing things afterwards to come.’ . . . ‘ Jerom<sup>b</sup> and Por-  
 ‘ phyry exactly agree in their explication of the eleventh chapter  
 ‘ of Daniel till they come to the 21st verse. But what follows  
 ‘ thence to the end of the chapter, was all explained by Porphyry  
 ‘ to belong to Antiochus Epiphanes, and to have been all trans-  
 ‘ acted in the time of his reign. But Jerom here differs from  
 ‘ him, and saith, that most of this, as well as some parts of the  
 ‘ viii. and xii. chapters of the same book, relate principally to  
 ‘ Antichrist: that though some particulars in these prophecies  
 ‘ had a typical completion in Antiochus Epiphanes, yet they  
 ‘ were all of them wholly and ultimately fulfilled only in Anti-  
 ‘ christ. And this, he saith, was the general sense of the fathers  
 ‘ of the Christian church in his time.’

But what need was there to bring in Antichrist, in any answers to Porphyry or other heathen adversaries? Some, as <sup>c</sup> Grotius did, may think this one defect in our ancient apologists. Those prophecies of Daniel relating to Antiochus, and the state of the Jews in his time, were punctually fulfilled. Porphyry himself shewed, that all recorded relating to him was exactly true: he proved it from the best authors extant at that time. The Christians might thank him for it, and stand to their point, that all this was not history, but prophecy formerly delivered; and history had shewn the accomplishment. The predictions were so clear, and the fulfilment so manifest, that as Jerom well said in his preface to his Commentary upon this book, ‘ a determined  
 ‘ adversary was compelled to say, that the book of Daniel was  
 ‘ not a prophecy of things to come, but a narrative of what  
 ‘ had already happened. Which kind of opposition,’ as he added, ‘ was a confession of truth, and testimony to it.’ And as all things foretold concerning Antiochus were fulfilled, so likewise were the prophecies of the same book concerning the coming of the Messiah. And if there were in it predictions of things after his appearance, and in late ages of the world, the fulfilment might be safely expected and relied upon.

2. Porphyry was in the wrong to deny<sup>d</sup> the genuineness of the book of Daniel: which had been always received by the Jews;  
 as

<sup>b</sup> Ib. p. 207, 208.  
 Græcos autem ad sensum horum vaticiniorum proxime accessit Polychronius, Porphyrii lector diligens, et Chrysostomus. Hæc autem intelligi hæc vaticinia refert Platimum: primum ut eo lucidius appareat hæc providentia et præscientia; deinde ne

<sup>c</sup> Inter prava interpretatio, tempora confundens, impediatur Judæos Messiae tempora agnoscere. Quod vel maxime ii faciunt, qui quæ de Antiocho Illustri dicta sensum habent manifestum, ad Antichristum trahunt, ut Hippolytus, multique alii. Grot. Pr. ad Daniel.  
<sup>d</sup> . . . cujus ille auctoritatem

as we perceive from the books of Maccabees, and Josephus, and from our evangelists; not now to mention any later writers. To dispute the real age of Daniel, and the genuineness of his book, is arbitrary and unreasonable: as if a man should deny that Virgil and Horace lived in the time of Augustus, or wrote those works which with general consent are ascribed to them, and received as theirs. The book of Daniel is as genuine as any of those histories which Porphyry made use of in his work against the Christians.

3. Porphyry, as we have seen in Jerom, said, that the book of Daniel could not be genuine, because it was written in Greek; this he argued from some Greek words in the history of Susanna, and other spurious things added to the book of Daniel.

Upon this argument I must say, first, that it is a very weak argument, because those stories of Susanna, Bel, and the Dragon, never were received by the Jews, nor by learned men among Christians. If Porphyry did not know this, it shews great ignorance. But, secondly, I imagine, he did know this, and that, according to the tradition of Jews and Christians before his time, the book of Daniel was written in Hebrew, excepting some parts of it in Chaldee: consequently this argument was unfair, and was owing to want of candour; and formed only to impose upon ignorant and uninstructed men; this indeed I take to be the case.

4. By the queen mentioned Dan. v. 10. Porphyry, as we learn from Jerom, understood the wife of Belshazzar: which must be a mistake, as is now allowed by all learned men in general, and was shewn by Jerom himself. Says Prideaux: 'The queen that entered the banqueting-house to direct the king to call for Daniel, could not be his wife: for all his wives and concubines, the text tells us, sat with him at the feast. [Ver. 2.] And therefore it must have been Nitocris, the queen-mother, a lady famous for her wisdom, who had the chief management

tatem ut eluderet, scriptos dixit libros post eventum. Quod quam sit impudens, alibi diximus. Grot. Pr. ad Daniel.

A Daniele vero translatio imperii ab Assyriis ad Medos ac Persas, (significata,) inde ad Alexandrum Macedonem; cujus deinde ex parte successores forent Lagidar, et Seleucidæ: quæque mala populus Hebraeus ab his omnibus, maxime vero ab Antiocho Illustri, accepturus esset, adeo perspicue, ut Porphyrius, qui historias Græcas, suo adhuc tempore exstantes, cum vaticiniis istis contulit, aliter se expedire non potu-

erit, quam ut diceret ea, quæ Danieli tribuebantur, post eventum fuisse scripta. Quod perinde est, quasi quis neget, quæ sub Virgilii nomine exstant, et pro Virgilianis habita sunt semper, ab ipso scripta Augusti ævo. Non enim de illo, quod dicimus, magis unquam dubitatum inter Hebræos fuit, quam de hoc apud Romanos. Grot. de V. R. C. l. i. cap. 18.

e Connection. P. i. B. 2. Vol. i. p. 122. year before Christ 539. See likewise Grotius, and Lowth upon the place.

of public affairs, and is called the queen by way of eminence.' Nitocris, as it seems, was a lady of too much gravity, and too much engaged about public affairs, to take part in that entertainment.

This then is an error at the best; but I do not think it to be an innocent error: I rather think it to have been a designed and wilful misrepresentation. *When the queen came into the banquet-house, she said to Belshazzar: O king live for ever. Let not thy thoughts trouble thee. . . . There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the spirit of the holy gods: and in the days of thy father [or grandfather] light and understanding and wisdom, like the wisdom of the gods was found in him . . .* and what follows, ver. 10 . . . 12. This did not please Porphyry: it afforded an argument for the real age, and peculiar wisdom, and prophetic character of Daniel. The real truth, therefore, did not suit Porphyry. This therefore I consider as an unfair argument, and another instance of want of candour. We may be the more confirmed in this supposition, in that, as Jerom says, 'Porphyry ridiculed the queen for pretending to know more than her husband.' There is no foundation for ridicule in the history itself.

5. Ch. ii. ver. 48. *Then the King made Daniel a great man, and gave him many great gifts.* Here, as we before learned from Jerom, 'Porphyry took upon him to blame Daniel for not refusing those gifts, and for readily accepting Babylonish honours.' But there is no ground for such a censure: Daniel was guilty of no mean compliances: he ascribed all his wisdom to God; and upon every occasion preserved his integrity without blemish, and openly professed his zeal for true religion, and the worship of God according to the directions of the law of Moses. It was not decent for him to refuse the honours bestowed by a great king, when no sinful compliances were exacted; and when he might, in the high station to which he was advanced, both promote the interest of true religion, and the welfare of his people in a strange country. Daniel does not appear to have been fond of worldly honours. When Belshazzar made him great promises, he answered: *Let thy gifts be to thyself, and give thy rewards to another.* Ch. v. 17. That remark, therefore, I consider as an instance of Porphyry's malignant temper toward Daniel, and in him toward Christians.

6. I shall add no more observations here. I have again and again acknowledged, that Porphyry's work against the Christians was a work of great labour, in which he shewed great learning: and it might have been of some use to us now if it had been preserved. At the same time it appears to me very probable, that there were in it many mistakes, and many instances of want

of

of candour: and I make no doubt, but that, if it were still extant, it would appear to us very provoking and offensive, as it did to the Christians in former times, who saw and read it.

7. Dan. xi. 38. *But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces, or munitions.*

In his commentary upon the 30th chapter of Isaiah, Jerom<sup>f</sup> blames Porphyry for rendering this ‘the god of the town of Modim,’ meaning the god who was worshipped there. However, curious readers should consult Grotius, as well as Lowth, upon that text.

8. Jerom seems to say elsewhere, that<sup>g</sup> Porphyry had written largely about Daniel’s seventy weeks: if he intends any thing beside what I have already taken notice of, I know nothing of it.

V. Having made such large extracts out of Jerom’s Commentary on the book of Daniel, for shewing the nature of that part of Porphyry’s work, I now proceed to other things.

In the first book of his Evangelical Preparation<sup>h</sup>, Eusebius exposing the absurdity of the heathen polytheism, which had long prevailed in the world; which, as he says, having been first introduced among the Phœnicians and Egyptians, had been propagated among the Greeks and other nations: This, he says, he will shew, beginning with the Phœnicians.

‘ Their affairs are written by Sanchoniathon, an ancient author, older, as is said, than the Trojan times: who, they say, has written the Phœnician history with great exactness and fidelity. Philo, not the Jew, but Biblius, has translated the whole work into Greek out of the Phœnician language. He<sup>i</sup> is quoted by that person, who in our time wrote against us, in the fourth book of his work, in these very words. “ Sanchoniathon

<sup>f</sup> Hoc annotavimus, ut quod in Danielis extrema legimus Visione Deum Maōzim, non ut Porphyrius somniat ‘ Deum viculi Modim,’ sed robustum Deum et fortem intelligamus. In If. cap. xxx. T. iii. p. 252. m.

<sup>g</sup> Sin autem supradictos viros, magistros Ecclesiæ nominavi, illud intelligant, me non omnium probare fidem, qui certe inter se contrarii sunt: sed et distinctionem Josephi, Porphyriique dixisse, qui de hac questione plurima disputarunt. Præf. in libr. xi. Comment. in If. T. iii. p. 283.

<sup>h</sup> Pr. Ev. l. i. cap. 9. p. 30, 31.  
<sup>i</sup> Μεμνηται τῆσαν ο καθ’ ημας των καθ’ ημων πεποιημενος συσκευη, εν τελειω τω προς ημας υποθεσεως, ω δε τω ανδρι μαρτιραν προς λεξιν. Ισχει δε τα περι Ισθαιων κληθεσατα, οτι και ταις τοποις και τοις

ονομασιν αυτων τα συμνοσιατα, Σαρχωνιαθων ο Βηρυλιος, ειληφως τα υπομνηματα παρα Ιερομδαλα τῃ ιερως θεῳ τῃ Ιου<sup>α</sup> εσκιβαλα τῳ βασιλει Βηρυλιῳ τῃν Ισραηλια<sup>α</sup> ναθεισ υπ’ εκεινη και των κατ’ αυτου εξηλαστων της αληθειας, παρεδεχθη. Οι δε τεινε χρονοι και προ των Τροικων πιπυσι χρονη και σχεδον τοις Μωσεως πλησιαζουσι, εσ αι των Φοινικης βασιλειων μηνυσι διαδοχαι Σαρχωνιαθων δε καλα τῃν Φοινικων διαλογον, φιλαληθως τῃν παλαιαν Ιστοριαν εκ των καλα περι υπομνηματων, και των εν τοις ιεροις αναγραφω συνταξασων και συγγραψαις επι Σεμιραμεως γερονε της Ασσυριων βασιλεδω, η προ των Ιλιακων, η κατ’ αυτου γερονεσ γενεσθαι αναλειραπται. κ. λ. Præf. Ev. l. i. p. 30, 31.

“ Sanchoniathon of Berytus writes the history of the Jews very exactly,  
 “ and mentions times and places; taking his accounts from the  
 “ Memoirs of Jerombal, priest of the god Jevo: who dedicated  
 “ his history to Abibal king of Berytus, by whom, as well as  
 “ by others his contemporaries, capable judges of the truth, it  
 “ was approved. Their age was before the Trojan times, and  
 “ approaches near to the times of Moses, as is evident from the  
 “ succession of the kings of Phœnicia. Sanchoniathon, who  
 “ with great fidelity wrote their ancient history in the Phœnician  
 “ language, collecting it partly from the registers of cities, and  
 “ partly from the records kept in temples, lived in the time of  
 “ Semiramis, queen of the Assyrians, who is computed to have  
 “ reigned before the times of Troy, or about them. The work  
 “ of Sanchoniathon was translated into Greek by Philo Biblius.”  
 ‘ So writes that person, bearing testimony to the veracity and  
 ‘ antiquity of that historian.’

But, as Eusebius adds: ‘ That ancient writer <sup>k</sup>, in the pro-  
 ‘ gress of his work, does not recommend the worship of God  
 ‘ who is over all; nor of the heavenly bodies, but of mortal men  
 ‘ and women; who so far from being respectable for the probity  
 ‘ of their manners, or the excellence of their virtues, or their  
 ‘ great wisdom, which might recommend them to esteem and  
 ‘ imitation, that their characters are blemished with the most  
 ‘ foul and flagitious vices: and they appear to be the very same  
 ‘ that are now worshipped as gods in all cities and countries.’

The same passage of Porphyry is quoted again by Eusebius,  
 in the ninth chapter of the tenth book of the same work, the  
 Evangelical Preparation. He there introduceth it, and argueth  
 from it after this manner.

His subject in that place is the antiquity of Moses and the  
 Jewish prophets. He first refers to his Chronical Canons, where  
 he had already shewed the same thing. ‘ Now, says <sup>l</sup> he, to  
 ‘ what was then said, I would add here the testimony of the most  
 ‘ bitter enemy to the Jews and us that ever was: I mean that

<sup>k</sup> Ο δὲ προίων ἢ τον ἐπι πάντων Θεῶν,  
 καὶ μὴ τῆς κατ’ ἕνα ἰδέας, διήλθης δὲ ἀνδρῶν  
 καὶ γυναικῶν, καὶ τοῦ τρόπου ἀσείων οἰῶν δι-  
 ἀρίτων ἀξιοὶ εἶναι ἀποδεξασθαι, ἢ ζῆλωσαι  
 τῆς φιλοσοφίας, φασιλοῦτος δὲ καὶ μοχθη-  
 ρίας ἀταξίας κακίαν περιβεβλημένος θεολο-  
 γῆν. Καὶ μαρτυρεῖ γὰρ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκείνης  
 εἶναι, τῆς εἰσὶν ἰὼν θεῶν παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσι  
 ἀκαταστασίας καὶ τὰς πᾶσι καὶ τὰς  
 γυναικῶν. Ib. p. 31. <sup>l</sup> Ταῦτα μὲν ἐν  
 ἀποδείξει καὶ τοῖς ποιηθεῖσιν ἡμῖν χρονικοῖς  
 ἀκαταστασίας ἐχθρῶν συνέστη. Ἐπι δὲ τῶ

παροῦτος, πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημιστοῖς, μαρτυρεῖ τῆς  
 Μωσέως ἀρχιερέως χρησομαι τῶ πάντων  
 δυσμενεστάτῳ καὶ πολεμιωτάτῳ Ἑβραίων τε  
 καὶ ἡμῶν. φημι δὲ τῶ καθ’ ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφῶ-  
 ος τὴν καθ’ ἡμῶν συσκευὴν ὑπερβολὴ μίσους  
 προβεβλημένος, ἢ μόνος ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ  
 Ἑβραίων, αἰὲν τε Μωσέα, καὶ τῆς μετ’  
 αὐτοῖς προφητῶν τῶν ἰσραὴλ ὑψηλῶν βλασ-  
 φημῶν. Διὰ γὰρ τῆς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὁμολο-  
 γίας ἀναμνηστικῶς ἵσθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν  
 πιστωσέσθαι. Pt. Ev. l. x. p. 484, 485.

‘ philosopher

philosopher of our time, who in the abundance of his enmity against us, published a work, in which he reviles not us only, but also the Jews, and Moses, and the prophets after him, and all in the like manner: for the confession of enemies is always reckoned credible. Porphyry, then, in the fourth book of his work against us, says in these very words: "Sanchoniathon of Berytus writes the history of the Jews very exactly." So quoting the passage before transcribed by me at length. After which Eusebius proceeds: 'Upon<sup>m</sup> which we may argue in this manner. If Sanchoniathon flourished in the time of Semiramis, and she lived long before the times of Troy, it follows, that Sanchoniathon was older than the same times. But he is said to have taken his memoirs from others, who were before his times; and who were not contemporaries with Moses, but only lived near his times. It follows, that Sanchoniathon is still so much later than Moses, as he is later than those of greater antiquity, who only lived near the times of Moses.'

This passage of Porphyry is also cited by<sup>n</sup> Theodoret in his books against the gentiles, and as from his work written against us. He likewise quotes it in proof of the antiquity of Moses, and that he lived before the times of Troy.

And Eusebius, in his introduction to the second book of his Chronical Canon, as we now have it in Jerom's Latin translation, says: 'The<sup>o</sup> antiquity of Moses is asserted by many of our own writers, and among the Jews by Josephus and Justus, and among the Greeks [or Gentiles], the impious Porphyry in the fourth book of his work, which with fruitless labour he composed against us, affirms, that Moses was older than Semiramis.'

VI. Severian, bishop of Gatala in Syria, at the beginning of the fifth century, in his sixth homily upon the Creation of the world, having quoted Gen. iii. 5. *For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil*, goes on: 'Many<sup>p</sup> say, and especially they who follow that enemy of God, Porphyry, who wrote against the Christians, and has perverted many from the truth: Why did God forbid the knowledge of good and evil? He might forbid evil; but why

<sup>m</sup> Ib. p. 485.

T. iv. p. 493.

Josephus et Justus veteris historiae monumenta replicantes. Ex Ethnicis vero impius ille Porphyrius, in quarto Operis sui libro, quod adversum nos casto labore contexit, post Moysen Semiramim fuisse as-

<sup>n</sup> Gr. Aff. l. ii.

<sup>o</sup> . . . ex Judæis

firmat. Chr. Can. p. 34.

<sup>p</sup> Λεῖπει πολλοί, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ τῷ θεῷ ἐχθροὶ Πορφύριον ἀκολούθησαντες, τῷ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν συγγραφῆντι, καὶ τὰ θεῶν δόγματα πολλὰς ἀποστῆσαντι. κ. λ. Sever. de Mundi Chr. hom. 6. ap. Chryl. T. vi. p. 498.

should

'should he forbid good?' Severian answers, that God did not forbid the knowledge of good, and that Adam had that knowledge before he tasted of the forbidden fruit.

VII. I now proceed to passages of Porphyry, concerning the books of the New Testament.

Mill, in his \* *Prolegomena* to the New Testament, has taken notice of several texts in the gospels, to which Porphyry made exceptions.

1. Matt. i. 11, 12. *And Josias begat Jechonias, and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon. And after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel.*

Here, as it seems, one and the same person, Jechonias, ends the second fourteen, and begins the third class of fourteen: consequently one generation was supposed to be wanting. Porphyry<sup>9</sup> therefore, as we learn from Jerom, charged St. Matthew with a mistake. But Jerom says, that Porphyry herein betrayed his own ignorance and unskilfulness.

It is not needful that I should attempt the solution of this difficulty: it is sufficient, that I refer<sup>r</sup> to some learned editors of the New Testament, or commentators upon this text.

But we can hence clearly argue, that in Porphyry's time the genealogy in St. Matthew was generally received by Christians: otherwise there had been no reason, why he should make any remark upon it: for, as Jerom observes, Porphyry mentioned this supposed error of the evangelist as a reflection upon the church.

2. Matt. ix. 9. *And as Jesus passed out 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.*

'Here', says Jerom, 'Porphyry and the emperor Julian pretend, that either the historian has told a lye: or else people were very silly to follow Jesus at his call; acting as if they were ready to follow any man that beckoned to them. Not considering,' says Jerom, 'that before this time many great miracles and signs had been done by Jesus; of which the apostles were witnesses before they believed.'

\* Vid. *Prolegom.* num. 702, 703.

<sup>9</sup> Et ob hanc causam in Evangelio secundum Matthæum una videtur deesse generatio: quia secunda τεσσαραδεκας in Joacim definit filio Josiæ, et tertia incipit a Joachim filio Joacim. Quod ignorans Porphyrius, calumniam struit Ecclesiæ, suam ostendens imperitiam, dum Evangelistæ Matthæi arguere nititur falsitatem. Hieron. in Dan. cap. i. ver. 1. Tom. iii. p. 1075. Confer. idem in Matt. Cap. i.

Tom. iv. p. 7.

<sup>r</sup> Mill. in loc. et *Prolegom.* num. 702. et Wetsten. et Bez. in loc.

<sup>s</sup> Arguit in hoc loco Porphyrius et Julianus Augustus vel imperitiam historici mentientis, vel stultitiam eorum, qui statim sequuti sunt Salvatorem, quasi irrationabiliter quemlibet vocantem hominem sequuti: quum tantæ virtutes, tantæque signa præcesserint, quæ apostolos antequam crederent, vidisse, non dubium est. Hier. in loc. T. iv. P. i. p. 30.

3. Matt. xiii. 35. *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: I will open my mouth in parables.*

That is a reference to Ps. lxxviii. 2. which is entitled a *Psalm of Asaph*. In some copies of St. Matthew, where we have *by the prophet*, was read *by the prophet Isaiab*. This gave an occasion to an objection of Porphyry, which we meet with in the *Breviarum* upon the *Psalter*, generally ascribed to Jerom, but not reckoned his by the Benedictine editors. ‘It’ is not Isaiab that says this, but Asaph, says that writer. Therefore the impious Porphyry allegeth this against us, and says: Your evangelist Matthew was so ignorant as to say: Which was written by the prophet Isaiab: *I will open my mouth in parables: I will utter things kept secret from the foundation of the world.*’

This various reading was observed by Jerom in his comment upon Matt. xiii. 35. who has considered the difficulty, though he does not mention Porphyry. He<sup>a</sup> thinks the original reading was thus: *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Asaph*, by whom that *Psalm* was composed. But some transcriber of St. Matthew, not recollecting Asaph to have been a prophet, and imagining therefore that it was a mistake, inserted the name of Isaiab, who was better known, in his room.

They who are curious, and have leisure, should by all means consult Mill and Wetstein upon Matt. xiii. 35: where they will observe some other quotations of ancient authors which I have not room to transcribe.

4. Upon Gen. i. 10. Jerom says: ‘It’ is to be noted, that all collections of waters, whether they are salt or sweet, are called seas, according to the Hebrew language. Porphyry therefore without ground insinuates, that the evangelists, the better to impose a miracle upon ignorant people say, *Our Lord walked upon the sea*, meaning only the lake of Gennesareth: for all lakes, or collection of waters, are called seas.’

<sup>a</sup> Hoc Isaias non loquitur, sed Asaph. Denique, et impius Porphyrius proponit adversum nos hoc ipsum, et dicit: Evangelista vester Matthæus tam imperitus fuit, ut diceret, quod scriptum est per Isaiam prophetam. . . . Breviarium in Psalt. ap. Hieron. T. ii. P. ii. p. 316.

<sup>u</sup> Sed mihi videtur a principio ita editum: *Quod scriptum est per Asaph prophetam, dicentem*. Septuagesimus enim septimus Psalmus, de quo hoc sumtum est testimonium, Asaph prophetæ titulo inscribitur: et primum scriptorem non intellexisse Asaph, et putasse scriptoris vitium, atque

emendasse nomen Isaiæ, cujus vocabulum manifestius est. Hieron. in Matt. xiii. T. iv. p. 58.

<sup>x</sup> Notandum, quod omnis congregatio aquarum sive salæ sint, sive dulces, juxta idioma linguæ Hebrææ, maria nuncupantur. Frustra igitur Porphyrius Evangelistas ad faciendum ignorantibus miraculum, eo quod Dominus super mare ambulaverit, pro lacu Gennesareth, mare appellasse calumniatur: quum omnis lacus et aquarum congregatio mare nuncupentur. Quæst. Hebr. in Gen. T. ii. p. 509.

This is related Matt. xiv. 25. *Jesus went unto them walking on the sea.* The same expression is also used on the same occasion, Mark vi. 48. and John vi. 19. Jerom says, that Porphyry upon this account 'calumniated the evangelists.' Whether he referred to more than one of them I do not determine: but we shall soon find, that Porphyry had read St. Mark's and St. John's gospels, as well as St. Matthew's.

5. Matt. xxi. 21. *Jesus answered, and said unto them: If ye have faith, and doubt not; ye shall not only do this, which is done to the fig-tree, but also, if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done.*

Here St. Jerom says: 'The dogs of the Gentiles bark against us in the volumes which they have left as monuments of their own impiety, saying: It is plain the apostles had not faith, forasmuch as they never removed mountains.'

Such observations may tend to produce mirth; but it is very silly to understand such figurative expressions literally.

Jerom does not name the persons to whom he refers: but it is likely, that he means Porphyry and Julian, they having been both before mentioned in his Commentary upon St. Matthew. If he does not intend them, there were other writers against us who had remarked upon this expression.

6. Matt. xxiv. 15. *When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel, standing in the holy place.*

Jerom \*\* in his Commentary upon St. Matthew lets us know, that Porphyry, in the 13th volume of his work against the Christians, poured out many blasphemies upon that text.

7. Matt. xxvii. 45. *Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour.*

Upon which text Jerom observes: 'They<sup>z</sup> who have written against the gospels suspect, that the disciples of Christ in their account of our Lord's resurrection, have mistaken this darkness, which was only an eclipse of the sun, that happens at certain seasons in the ordinary course of things: Whereas,' says

y Latrant contra nos Gentiles canes in suis voluminibus, quæ in impietatis propriæ memoriam reliquerunt, asserentes, apostolos non habuisse fidem, quia montes transferre non potuerint. In Matt. xxi. 21. Ib. p. 99.

\*\* De hoc loco, id est, de abominatione desolationis, quæ dicta est, a Daniele propheta stante in loco sancto, multa Porphyrius tertio decimo operis sui volumine contra nos blasphemavit. Hieron. in Matt. T. iv. p. 115.

<sup>z</sup> Qui scripserunt contra Evangelia, sus-

picantur, deliquium solis, quod certis statutisque temporibus accidere solet, discipulos Christi ob imperitiam super resurrectione Domini interpretatos: quum defectus solis nunquam nisi ortu lunæ fieri soleat. Nulli autem dubium est, Paschæ tempore lunam fuisse plenissimam. Et ne forsitan videretur umbra terræ, vel orbis lunæ soli oppositus, breves et ferrugineas fecisse tenebras, trium horarum spatium ponitur, ut omnis causantium occasio tolleretur. Ib. p. 129.

Jerom, ‘ an eclipse of the sun can never happen but at the time  
 ‘ of new moon; and all the world knows that at the passover  
 ‘ it is full moon: and that there might be no pretence for  
 ‘ saying, that this darkness was owing to the shadow of the earth,  
 ‘ or to an interposition of the moon between us and the sun, it  
 ‘ is recorded to have continued for the space of three hours.’

Here also, it is not unlikely, that Jerom intends the same writers beforementioned, Porphyry and Julian.

8. Upon Matth. iii. 3. *This is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying: The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.*

Here Jerom observes to this purpose: ‘ Porphyry<sup>a</sup> compares  
 ‘ this place with the beginning of St. Mark’s gospel, in which  
 ‘ it is written: *The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God. As it is written in the prophets: Behold, I send my messenger  
 ‘ before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice  
 ‘ of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord,  
 ‘ make his paths straight.* ‘ For since this quotation is composed  
 ‘ out of Malachi [iii. 1.] and Isaias [xl. 3.] he asks, how it  
 ‘ comes to pass, that it is all said to be taken from Isaias? To  
 ‘ which question,’ says Jerom, ‘ ecclesiastical writers have an-  
 ‘ swered largely: but I am of opinion, that the name of Isaias  
 ‘ has been added through the fault of the transcribers of the  
 ‘ gospels.’

Hence, I think, it appears, that Porphyry had read the gospels with care, and that he did not overlook any advantage against them.

Jerom has considered this point<sup>b</sup> elsewhere. We hence perceive, that at that time the name of Esaias was read in St. Mark as well as in St. Matthew: whereas now in St. Mark it is *in the prophets*. Concerning this various reading divers learned moderns<sup>c</sup> may be consulted.

Once more. It appears from the homily of an ancient anonymous writer, that<sup>d</sup> this objection of Porphyry was in the fourteenth book of his work against the Christians.

<sup>a</sup> Porphyrius istum locum Marci Evangelistæ principio comparat: in quo scriptum est. *Initium evangelii Jesu Christi, Filii Dei, sicut scriptum est in Isaiâ Propheta.* . . . Quum enim testimonium de Malachia Isaiâque contextum sit, quærit, Quomodo velut ab uno Isaiâ exemplum putemus assumptum. Cui ecclesiastici viri plenissime responderunt. Nos autem nomen Isaiæ putamus additum scriptorum vitio. Ibid. p. 10.

<sup>b</sup> De optimo genere interpretandi. Ad Pam. ep. 33. al. 101. T. iv. P. 2. p. 253.

<sup>c</sup> Mill. et Wett. et Bez. in loc.

<sup>d</sup> Incertus auctor homiliæ de principio Evangelii secundum Marcum inter opera Chryostomi: Locum istum, inquit, impius ille Porphyrius in quarto decimo volumine disputat, et dicit: Evangelistæ tam imperiti fuerunt homines, non solum in secularibus sed etiam in scripturis divinis, ut testimonium, quod alibi scriptum est, de alio ponerent Propheta. Citat. ap. Wett. in loc. Vid. et Bez. in loc.

9. Jerom, writing against Vigilantius, who disliked the excessive veneration then paid to the martyrs, and did not give credit to every miracle said to be wrought by their reliques, useth these expressions: 'Unless', says he, after the manner of the Gentiles, 'and the impious Porphyry and Eunomius, you pretend that these are only artifices of the dæmons, and that the dæmons do not complain, but only feign themselves to be tormented.'

It is likely that Jerom here refers to some disagreeable reflections, which Porphyry had made upon our Lord's cure of the dæmoniacs in the country of the Gadarenes, or elsewhere. See Matt. viii. 29. Mark v. 7. Luke viii. 28. and Mark i. 23, 24. Luke iv. 33, 34.

10. Theophylact, in his Commentary upon the beginning of St. John's gospel, has these expressions: 'So' that the sophism of that Gentile writer, Porphyry, falls to the ground. He, endeavouring to overthrow the gospel, makes use of these divisions. "If," says he, "the Son of God be Word, he must be either outward word, or inward word." [That is, reason, thought, or speech.] "But he is neither this, nor that. Therefore he is not Word."

Upon which Theophylact observes, that such divisions may be made use of concerning us, and other natural things, but have no place among things supernatural.

11. In a work of Jerom against the Pelagians we find this passage. 'Our Lord says to his brethren, that he should not go up to the feast of tabernacles. John vii. 8. And yet afterwards it is written: *But when his brethren were gone up, then went he up also to the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret.* ver. 10. He said he would not go: and yet he went. Here Porphyry barks, charging our Lord with fickleness and inconstancy.'

We now read in ver. 8. *I go not yet up to the feast.* But from this place of Jerom, as well as from the quotations of other ancient authors, it appears, that the common reading then was: *I*

ε Spiritus ille immundus, qui hæc te cogit scribere, sæpe hoc vilissimo tortus est pulvere: imo hodieque torquetur, et qui in te plagas dissimulat, in cæteris confitetur. Nisi forte in morem Gentilium, impiorumque Porphyrii et Eunomii, has præstigias dæmonum esse coningas et non vere clamare dæmonas, sed sua simulare tormenta. Adv. Vig. T. iv. P. ii. p. 286.

ε Ωσε διαπεπλώκε τω ελληνος Πορφυριω το σιφισμα. Εκεινος γαρ αναλρεπειν πειρώμενος το ευαγγελιοι, τοιαυταις εχρηλο διαίρε-

σειν. Ει γαρ λοφος, φησιν, ο Υιος τε Θεου, ητοι προφορικος εστιν, η ειδιαθειος' αλλα μην ελε τειλο, ελε εκεινο. Ουκ αρα εδε λοφος εστιν. Theoph. p. 558. A.

ε Negat fratribus et propinquis, ire se ad Scenopagiam. Et postea scriptum est: Ut autem ascenderunt fratres ejus, tum et ipse ascendit. . . . Iturum se negavit, et fecit quod prius negaverat. Latrat Porphyrius: inconstantiae ac mutationis accusat. . . . Hieron. adv. Pelag. lib. ii. T. iv. p. 521.

go not up to the feast. Upon which divers learned men<sup>a</sup> may be consulted. Supposing that to be the true reading, I see not any reason for the charge of inconstancy, or of our Lord's altering his intention. The context shews, that he had spoke of deferring his journey to Jerusalem for a short time: not that he had resolved not to go at all to the feast. He went to the feast; and he always intended so to do: but he went not up to that feast so soon, nor so publickly, as he did at some other seasons: and he assigns the reason of that conduct, which may be seen ver. 6, and 7.

12. In his Commentary upon Joel ii. 28 . . . 31. Which words are quoted by St. Peter, Acts ii. 16 . . . 20. Jerom speaking of the apostles' way of arguing: 'Not,' says<sup>i</sup> he, 'that they abused the simplicity and ignorance of their hearers, as the impious Porphyry insinuates.'

However, I do not affirm, that Porphyry referred to this place of the Acts; he might refer to some other: and possibly, often said such things of the apostles, or some of them.

13. In another place Jerom, speaking of the charity of the first believers at Jerusalem, and of the behaviour of Ananias and his wife Sapphira, Acts v. 1 . . . 14. has this observation: 'Lastly<sup>k</sup>, the apostle Peter by no means imprecates death to them, as the foolish Porphyry [or, as in some MSS. philosopher,] calumniates: but by the prophetic spirit declares the judgment of God, that the punishment of two persons might be an instruction to many.'

14. Gal. i. 15, 16. *But when it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, I conferred not with flesh and blood.*

'I know<sup>l</sup>,' says Jerom in his comment upon this text, 'that many so understand this expression of the apostle. And Porphyry likewise objects, that after the revelation of Christ, Paul did not vouchsafe to go to any men, to confer with them, lest, truly, after having been taught by God, he should receive instruction from *flesh and blood*. But I can never persuade myself to think, that by *flesh and blood* are to be understood Peter, James and John.'

<sup>h</sup> Vid. in loc. Mill. Wetst. Bez. Grot. &c.

<sup>i</sup> Non quod abuterentur audientium simplicitate et imperitia, ut impius calumniatur Porphyrius. In Joel cap. 2. Tom. iii. p. 1359.

<sup>k</sup> Denique et Apostolus Petrus nequaquam imprecatur eis mortem, ut stultus Porphyrius [MSS. Philosophus] calumniatur: sed Dei iudicium prophético spiritu annuntiat, ut poena duorum hominum sit doctrina multorum.

Ad Demetriad. ep. 97. al. 8. T. iv. p. 792.

<sup>l</sup> Scio, plerosque de apostolis hoc dictum arbitrari. Nam et Porphyrius objicit, quod post revelationem Christi non fuerit dignatus ire ad homines, et cum iis conferre sermonem: ne post doctrinam videlicet Dei, a carne et sanguine instrueretur. Sed absit, ut ego Petrum et Jacobum et Johannem carnem et sanguinem putem. In ep. ad Gal. cap. i. p. 233.

But,

But, notwithstanding that judgment of Jerom, I suppose, that still most will be of opinion, that in the expression *flesh and blood*, are intended all men, not excluding the greatest apostles. Compare this with ver. 12. *For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.* And see ver. 17, 18. There can be no question made, but that Porphyry had an eye to these passages of the epistle to the Galatians.

15. Gal. ii. 11, 12, 13, 14. St. Paul says: *But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles. . . . But when I saw, that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all. . . .*

In the preface to his Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, Jerom speaks thus of this matter. 'The<sup>m</sup> wicked Porphyry not understanding this, in the first book of his work against us, objects, that Peter was reprov'd by Paul: that he did not proceed uprightly in preaching the gospel: aiming thereby to affix the blot of a mistake upon the one, and of peevishness upon the other. And hence he argues the falshood of the whole doctrine, as if it were a mere invention, since the heads of the churches disagreed.'

In his Commentary upon the words above quoted, Jerom says, 'that<sup>n</sup> some think Cephas, whom Paul *withstood to the face*, was not the apostle Peter, but another of the same name, possibly, one of the seventy disciples. They argued, that Peter could not withdraw from conversation with the Gentiles, who had baptized Cornelius. They argued likewise from the defence he made of what he had done at the house of Cornelius, when *they of the circumcision at Jerusalem contended with him*, as recorded Acts xi. 1. . . . 18. They also said, that St. Luke in the Acts makes not any mention of this dissension; nor that

<sup>n</sup> Quod nequaquam intelligens Bataneotis et sceleratus ille Porphyrius in primo operis sui adversus nos libro, Petrum a Paulo objecit esse reprehensum: quod non recto pede incederet ad evangelizandum: volens et illi maculam erroris injurare, et hanc procacitatis: et in commune fidei dogmatis accusare mendacium, dum inter se ecclesiarum principes discrepent. Pr. in ep. ad Gal. p. 223.

<sup>n</sup> Sunt qui Cephan, cui hic in faciem Paulus restitisse se scribit, non putent Apostolum Petrum, sed alium de septuaginta discipulus, isto vocabulo nuncupatum. Et dicunt, nequaquam Petrum a convictu Gentium se potuisse subtrahere, qui et Centurionem Coraelium

baptizarat . . . et locum dari Porphyrio blasphemanti, si aut Petrus errasse, aut Paulus procaciter Apostolorum principem confutasse credatur. Quibus primum respondendum, alterius nescio cujus Cephæ nescire nos nomen, nisi ejus qui in Evangelio, et in aliis Pauli epistolis, et in hac quoque ipsa modo Cephas modo Petrus scribitur . . . Ad extremum, si propter Porphyrii blasphemiam alius nobis fingendus est Cephas, ne Petrus putetur errasse, infinita de Scripturis radenda divinis: quæ ille, quia non intelligit, criminatur. Sed adversum Porphyrium in alio, si Christus jusserit, opere pugnabimus. Nunc reliqua prosequamur. In ep. ad Gal. ib. p. 244.

Peter and Paul ever were together at Antioch. They also insisted, that there would be an advantage given to Porphyry, if it were allowed, either that Peter erred, or that Paul peevishly confuted the chief of the apostles. To all which Jerom answers, that he knows not of any Cephas, but him who is mentioned in the gospels, and in other epistles of Paul, and in this same epistle, and is sometimes called Cephas, sometimes Peter. And after considering the other just mentioned arguments, he concludes: Finally, if because of Porphyry's blasphemy, another Cephas must be invented, lest Peter should be thought to have erred, innumerable passages must be struck out of the divine scriptures; which he finds fault with, because he does not understand them.'

Jerom occasionally refers to this objection of Porphyry in his Commentary upon the fifty-third chapter of ° Isaiah.

In a letter to Augustine upon this subject, Jerom tells him, how<sup>p</sup> he and others had asserted the prudence of the apostles, and restrained the impudence of the blaspheming Porphyry, who says, that Peter and Paul had a childish quarrel with one another; and that Paul burned with envy at the virtues of Peter, and had written in a boasting manner of things, which either he never did; or if he did, it was meer peevishness to blame that in another which he had been guilty of himself.'

Here we might wish to see Porphyry himself in his own words. But there seems to have been a reference to several things said by Paul in other epistles, besides this to the Galatians: in the last words of the passage just transcribed, I think it plain, that there is a reference to what is said by Paul 1 Cor. ix. 20. *Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews*: and, perhaps, to some other like texts: and, possibly, he had also a regard to several things done by St. Paul, and related by St. Luke in the Acts; such as his *circumcising Timothy*, Acts xvi. 1 . . . 3. his *vow at Cenchrea*, ch. xviii. 18: and to what he did at Jerusalem by the advice of St. James. xxi. 20 . . . 28.

Ex quo, qui dispensatoriam inter Petrum et Paulum contentionem, vere dicunt jurgium fuisse atque certamen, ut blasphemanti Porphyrio satisfaciant, et veteris legis cæremonias in ecclesiâ Christi, a stirpe credentis Israel asserunt esse servandas, debent et auream in mille annis expectare Jerusalem. . . . In Is. cap. liii. T. iii. p. 388. <sup>p</sup> Ego, imo alii ante me exposuerunt causam quam putaverant, non officiosum mendacium defendentes, sicut

tu scribis, sed ostendentes honestam dispensationem, ut et Apostolorum prudentiam demonstrarent et blasphemantis Porphyrii impudentiam coercerent, qui Paulum et Petrum puerili dicit inter se pugnasse certamine: imo exarsisse Paulum in invidiam virtutum Petri, et ea scripsisse jaélanter, quæ vel non fecerit, vel si fecerit, procciter fecerit, id in alio reprehendens quod ipse commiserit. Ad Augustin. ep. 74. al. 89. T. iv. P. ii. p. 622.

Jerom

Jerom had before spoken of this matter in another place of the same epistle to Augustine: telling him, 'that<sup>9</sup> others before him had explained the conduct of the two apostles in the same manner that he had done, in answer to the blasphemous Porphyry, who charged Paul with peevishness, in that he presumed to reprove the chief of the apostles, and dispute with him to the face, and tell him, that *he was to be blamed*, that is, was in an error: when he who reprov'd the other was as guilty himself.'

By all which, I think, we may perceive the force of Porphyry's argument upon this point. 'He supposed Peter to have taught, for a while at least, a different doctrine from Paul: and thence argued, that the religion taught by them could not be a revelation from heaven. Or, if Peter did not for a while teach a doctrine different from what himself had taught at other times; and different from that generally taught by Paul, he was guilty of some improper compliance, for which he was blamed by Paul. But that Paul, if indeed he did reprove Peter at Antioch, as he boastingly says to the Galatians, ch. ii. he shewed therein pride, and envy, and peevishness; and was a very unfit reprover of another, when he had himself been guilty of the same fault, and had often complied in a like manner.'

This seems to be the substance of Porphyry's observations upon this, and some other texts of scripture: and undoubtedly he hence argued, that both Peter and Paul were deceivers, and impostors, and that the doctrine taught by them could not be a revelation from heaven.

And it must be owned, that this has appeared a difficulty to many; and the solutions of learned Christians have been different: to me the case seems to be this.

St. Peter never taught a doctrine different from himself, nor from St. Paul: but he was not uniform in his conduct. Once, at least, he complied too far with those believers of the Jews, who were for imposing circumcision, and the other rites of the law, upon the Gentiles, as necessary to salvation. As St. Paul says, Gal. ii. 11. . . . *When Peter was at Antioch, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when some came from Jerusalem, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.* Herein, out of fear of offending others, Peter acted contrary to his

<sup>9</sup> Hanc autem explicationem, quam primus Origenes in decimo Stromateon libro, ubi epistolam Pauli ad Galatas interpretatur, et ceteri deinceps interpretes sunt sequuti, illa vel maxime causa introducunt, ut Porphyrio respondeant blasphemanti, qui Pauli

arguit procacitatem, quod principem Apostolorum Petrum ausus est reprehendere, et arguere in faciem, ac ratione constringere, quod male fecerit, id est, in errore fuerit: in quo fuit ipse, qui alium arguit delinquentem. Ibid. p. 619.

own judgment: therefore Paul calls it *dissimulation*, and shews the bad consequence of such conduct; and that it implied the necessity of the Gentiles being circumcised in order to obtain salvation, and to the having communion with the Jewish believers. *But when I saw, that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all: If thou being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews: why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?* Literally, *to judaize*, that is, to become Jews, and observe all the rites of the law of Moses, as necessary to salvation. That never was Peter's doctrine: but it was the tendency of his late conduct at Antioch, for which Paul now reproved him: and undoubtedly Peter submitted and acquiesced, and never more prevaricated in his conduct in the like manner. Augustine \* says exactly as I have done: and I place his words below.

St. Paul's doctrine was always the same; and his conduct was ever uniform and consistent. He always said, that circumcision was not necessary, or available, in any, to justification and salvation: He never said, that it was sinful or unlawful in any.

To the Galatians he writes ch. v. 2, 3, 4. *Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify unto every man that is circumcised, that he is debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you. Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace.* It is plain, that he is here speaking of such as expected to be justified by the law; who embraced circumcision, as necessary to acceptance

\* Τι τα εθνη αναλαζεις ιουδαζειν; That word is explained in Vol. vi. Chap. 18. § iii. near the end. To which I would now add Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. cap. 10. *Αποποιεσθαι Χριστου Ιησου καλειν, και ιουδαζειν.* Quapropter non ideo Petrum emendavit, quod paternas traditiones observaret. Quod si facere vellet, nec mendaciter, nec incongrue faceret. Quamvis enim jam superflua, tamen solita non nocerent. Sed quoniam gentes cogebat judaizare: quod nullo modo posset, nisi ea sic ageret, tanquam etiam post Domini adventum necessaria saluti forent, quod vehementer per apostolatam Pauli veritas dissuasit. Nec apostolus Petrus id ignorabat, sed id faciebat, timens eos qui ex circumcisione erant. Augustin. ap. Hieron. ep. 67. al. 87. T. iv. P. ii. p. 605.

Præinde, si post hoc Apostolorum decretum, Petrus habuit illam in Antiochia simulationem, quâ Gentes cogeret judaizare, quod nec ipse cogebatur, quamvis propter

commendanda eloquia Dei, quæ Judæis sunt credita, non prohibebatur: quid mirum, si constringeret eum Paulus libere asserere, quod cum cæteris Apostolis se Jerosolymis decrevisse meminerat.

Si autem hoc, (quod magis arbitror,) ante illud Jerosolymitanum Concilium Petrus fecit: nec sic mirum est, quod eum volebat Paulus non timide obtegere, sed fidenter asserere, quod eum pariter sentire jam noverat. Sive quod cum eo contulerat evangelium: sive quod in Cornelii centurionis vocatione, etiam divinitus eum de hac re admonitum noverat: sive quod antequam illi, quos timuerat, venissent Antiochiam, cum Gentibus eum convesci viderat. Neque enim negamus, in hac sententiâ fuisse jam Petrum, in quâ et Paulus fuit. Non itaque tunc eum quod in ea reverum esset docebat. Sed ejus simulationem, quâ Gentes judaizare cogebantur, arguebat. &c. August. ap. Hieron. ep. 76. al. 97. T. iv. p. 632, 633.

with God and eternal salvation. Such men departed from the grace of the gospel, and could have no benefit by it: they came under an obligation to observe all the rituals of the Mosaic law; and if they did not obey the law in all things, they exposed themselves to a curse, as he shews, ch. iii. 10.

In the fifth chapter at ver. 6, he says: *For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision: but faith, which worketh by love.* And afterwards, in the same epistle, vi. 15, 16. *For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.* And 1 Cor. vii. 18; 19. *Is any man called circumcised? Let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? Let him not become circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing: but keeping the commandments of God.*

That was St. Paul's doctrine; and his conduct was agreeable to it. The same was the doctrine of Peter, and of all the apostles, though Peter once deviated from it in his conduct, as we have seen. What was Peter's doctrine, we learn (not now to argue from his epistles, as we might) from his speech at Jerusalem: Acts xv. wherein he plainly declares, as Paul does, that the works of the law are of no avail either to Jews, or Gentiles, in point of justification with God: for with these words he concludes that speech: ver. 11. *But we believe, that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we Jews shall be saved, even as they, the Gentiles.* And see before ver. 8, 9, 10. and ch. x. 34, 35. and xi. 1 . . . 18. And compare this with words of St. Paul, Gal. ii. 15, 16.

Though St. Paul may be thought to have yielded to some Jewish prejudices in the several actions above mentioned, it had no such bad tendency as the behaviour of St. Peter at Antioch had: as has been well shewn by Augustine in explaining 1 Cor. xi. 20. He says, 'that Paul practised some rites of the law, for shewing, that it was not sinful, even under the gospel, for Jews to observe the ordinances which they had received from their ancestors by means of the law. At the same time he taught them, that they should not place their hopes of salvation in obedience to such ordinances; nor impose that yoke upon the Gentiles, as necessary to their salvation.'

† Sed ideo suscepit ea celebranda, quum jam Christi esset Apostolus, ut doceret non esse perniciosam his qui ea vellent, sicut a parentibus per legem acceperant, custodire, etiam cum in Christo credidissent: non tamen in eis jam constituerent spem salutis, quoniam per Dominum Jesum salus ipsa,

qua ipsis sacramentis significabatur, advenerat, ideoque Gentibus, quod insuetos a fide revocarent onere gravi et non necessario, nullo modo imponenda esse censebat. August. ap. Hieron. ep. 67. al. 87. T. iv. p. 605.

Augustine

Augustine has particularly considered all those actions of Paul, which have been looked upon by some as unwarrantable compliances: to which also Porphyry may be supposed to have referred: his circumcising Timothy, his vow at Cenchrea, his conduct at Jerusalem. And he well shews, how<sup>u</sup> they differed from Peter's behaviour at Antioch. What Peter did, implied the necessity of circumcision in order to salvation, which Paul constantly and earnestly opposed. By all his several compliances just mentioned, he only shewed, that he did not think the Jewish rites evil and sinful.

I shall now observe only upon the last of those compliances, particularly related Acts xxi. 17. . . . 28. *And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly. And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and the elders were present. And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly, what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. And what follows.*

For it had been said at Jerusalem, that Paul, in all countries where he had been, *had taught, that the Jews ought not to circumcise their children: that is, that it was sinful and unlawful for them so to do.* This Paul had never done: and<sup>\*</sup> James, and the elders with him, were persuaded it was a false report: but for giving satisfaction to all, they advised him to join himself with some others then at Jerusalem, *who had a vow on them. Them take, say they, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads, and all may know that those things whercof they were informed concerning thee are nothing.*

With that advice Paul complied: nor could it be of any bad consequence after what had passed, as related by St. Luke: 'that James and the elders rejoiced, and praised God for the apostle's success among the Gentiles; and declared, that no legal services were expected of the Gentiles that believed.' After that, what Paul did only shewed, that it was not sinful for Jews to practise the rites and ceremonies of the law. Nothing

<sup>u</sup> Ego quidem illud Petrum sic egisse, credo, ut Gentes cogeret judaizare. Hoc enim lego scripsisse Paulum, quem mentitum esse non credo: et ideo non recte agebat hoc Petrus. Erat enim contra evangelii veritatem, ut putarent, qui credebant in Christum, sine illis veteribus sacramentis salvos esse non posse. Hoc enim contendebant Antiochiæ, qui ex circumcisione crediderant. Contra quos Paulus perseveranter acriterque confligit. Ipsum vero Paulum non ad hoc egisse, quod vel Timotheum circumcidit, vel Cenchreis votum

persolvit, vel Jerosolymis a Jacobo admonitus, cum eis qui voverant, legitima illa celebranda suscepit, ut putari videretur per ea sacramenta etiam Christianam salutem dari: sed ne illa, quæ prioribus ut congruebant temporibus, in umbris rerum futurarum Deus fieri jussisset, tamquam idololatriam Gentilium damnare crederetur. Aug. ap. Hier. ep. 76. al. 97. T. iv. p. 631.

<sup>\*</sup> Non, ut opinor, obscurum est, et Jacobum hoc ideo monuisse, ut scirent falsa esse quæ de illo audierant. Aug. ut supra. p. 633.

then done by him was any prejudice to the doctrine, always, and every where, taught by him, that the observation of those rites was not necessary to salvation, nor at all available to any, whether Jews or Gentiles, to justification in the sight of God. As <sup>y</sup> Augustine says: ‘The apostles in their council at Jerusalem had decreed, that no man ought to compel the Gentiles to judaïze. They did not decree, that any man should forbid the Jews to judaïze: though the Christian doctrine did not require that even of them.’

Augustine says again very well: ‘There <sup>z</sup> was no better way for Paul to confute the false report that had been raised, than for him to perform those things which he was thought to condemn as sinful: and thus to shew, that neither the Jews were to be forbidden them, as evil, nor the Gentiles to be compelled to do them, as necessary.’

Thus I have represented this case as it has long appeared to me: and all along I have been supported by observations of Augustine, the fruit of that good sense which <sup>a</sup> is a distinguishing part of his character. And I persuade myself, that most of my readers will with pleasure read them in his own words placed at the bottom of my pages. Jerom’s solution, propounded by him in his Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, and in his letters to Augustine, though he was very positive, deserves not to be mentioned, nor taken any notice of.

This point has detained us rather too long: but I do not see, how it could be passed by without notice, or without clearing up a difficulty which came in our way, and has been supposed to affect the credit of two of Christ’s apostles, and in them also the Christian cause \* \*.

VIII. We may now look back upon what we have seen in Porphyry: whence, I think, it manifestly appears, that he was well acquainted with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. For we have had before us many of his objections against the book of Daniel, an objection against a text in the book of Genesis. And we have observed plain references to the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John, the Acts of the apostles, and

<sup>y</sup> Præsertim, quia in ipsis Jerosolymis Apostoli jam decreverant, ne quisquam Gentes cogeret judaïzare. Non autem decreverant, ne quisquam Judæos judaïzare prohiberet: quamvis etiam ipsos jam doctrina Christiana non cogeret. Aug. ib. p. 632.

<sup>z</sup> Et ideo illi invidiam et persecutionem molientes concitare, tanquam inimicum legis mandatorumque divinatorum criminabantur; cujus falsæ cri-

minationis invidiam congruentius devitare non posset, quam ut ea ipsa celebraret, quæ damnare tanquam sacrilega putabatur: atque ita ostenderet, nec Judæos tunc ab eis tanquam nefariis prohibendos, nec Gentiles ad ea tanquam necessaria compellendos. Id. ib. p. 632.

<sup>a</sup> See vol. v. p. 81, 82. \* \* This difficulty is largely considered in the Remarks upon Dr. Ward’s Dissertations. See vol. xi. p. 343.

the epistle to the Galatians; and in his remarks upon that epistle, probable references to others of St. Paul's epistles. There can be no question made, that in his work against the Christians, many other books of the New Testament were quoted, or referred to by him. It is well, that in the remaining fragments of his work we have evidences of so many references to them as there are. But it may be remembered, that Jerom, who seems to have had the whole work before him, said not long ago: 'That if because of Porphyry's blasphemies, another Cephas must be invented, lest Peter should be thought to have erred; innumerable passages must be struck out of the divine scriptures, which he has found fault with, because he did not understand them.' The places of scripture, therefore, which Porphyry had remarked upon were very numerous. Theodoret observes, that \* Porphyry read the scriptures very carefully when he was composing his work against us.

IX. I now proceed to observe some other passages of Porphyry, concerning the Christian religion, or the professors of it, and their affairs; where also there may be some references to our scriptures.

1. Eusebius, in his Evangelical Preparation, has these words: 'And<sup>b</sup> that evil dæmons have had no power of doing any thing, since our Saviour's dwelling among men, the advocate of dæmons in our time somewhere testifies in his work against us in this manner: "And now people wonder, that this distemper has oppressed the city so many years, Æsculapius and the other gods no longer conversing with men. For since Jesus has been honoured, none have received any public benefit from the gods." So says Porphyry in those very words.'

Here is proof, that the Christians were then very numerous in the Roman empire. It likewise shews, that Porphyry adopted the common cant, and was willing to expose them to popular reproach, by insinuating, that they were the causes of the calamities that beset the empire.

This passage is also quoted by Theodoret, in the same terms, in his work against the Gentiles. And then he subjoins; 'So'

\* Τέτοις ακριβώς εβουχων ο Πορφυριος<sup>a</sup> μαλα γαρ εν ανιοις ανεδιετριβε, την καθ' ημων πορευων γραφην. Theod. Therap. Serm. vii. p. 588. A. <sup>b</sup> Περι δε τα μηκειν δυνασθαι τι και ισχυειν φαυλος δαιμονας, μελα τοι τε σωτηριος ημων εις ανθρωπισ παροδος, και αυτος ο καθ' ημας των δαιμοιων προσηγορος, εν τη καθ' ημων συσκευη, τετον πε λετων μαριυρει τον τροπον.

Νυνι δε θαυμαζουσιν ει τοσηων εινω καλει- ληφε την πολιν η ιεσος, Ασκληπιου μεν επι- δημιας και των αλλων θεων μηκειτ' εστι. Ιησθ γαρ τιμωμειθ εδωμιας τις θεων δημο- σιας ωφελιας ποθελο. κ. λ. Pt. Ev. l. v. cap. i. p. 181. D. <sup>c</sup> Ταυτα ο πατριων ημων εχθιστος Πορφυριος ειρηκε. Gr. All. l. xii. T. iv. p. 679.

‘ says our greatest enemy Porphyry.’ But he does not say, no more than Eusebius, in which book of his work against the Christians it was found.

2. Upon Is. iii. 12. *As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them*; Jerom had this practical reflection: ‘ Let<sup>d</sup> us also take care therefore, that we be not oppressors among the people; lest, according to the impious Porphyry, matrons and women compose our senate; and they rule in the churches, and the priestly order be disposed of according to the good pleasure of women.’

3. Jerom, in his letter to Ctesiphon against the Pelagians, having mentioned divers events and proceedings hard to be accounted for, goes on: ‘ And<sup>e</sup> finally (which your good friend Porphyry useth to object to us,) how came it to pass, that the gracious and merciful God should suffer all nations, from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to the coming of Christ, to perish through ignorance of his laws and commands? Forasmuch as neither Britain, fruitful of Tyrants, nor the Scottish nations, nor the barbarous people all around, were acquainted with Moses and the prophets. What necessity therefore was there, that he should come in the end of the world, and not till after an innumerable multitude of men had perished.’

4. I shall now make some extracts out of a book or letter of Augustine<sup>f</sup>, in answer to six questions or difficulties, as taken from Porphyry, proposed by a pagan at Carthage, and sent to him by a presbyter named Deogratias.

They are a proof of the esteem which heathen people then had for Porphyry’s work against the Christians. However, of these six questions three only appear to be taken from Porphyry. I may therefore for the present confine myself to them, without taking particular notice of the rest. This letter of Augustine is supposed to have been written in the year 408.

<sup>d</sup> Caveamus ergo et nos, ne exactores sumus in populo: ne juxta impium Porphyrium, matronæ et mulieres sint noster senatus: quæ dominantur in ecclesiis, et de sacerdotali gradu favor judicat seminarum. In Is. cap. iii. T. iii. p. 38.

<sup>e</sup> Et ad extremum (quod solet nobis objicere contubernalis vester Porphyrius,) qua ratione clemens et misericors Deus ab Adam usque ad Moysen, et a Moyse usque ad adventum Christi, passus sit universas gentes perire ignorantia legis et mandatorum Dei. Neque enim Britannia fertilis provincia tyrannorum, et Scoticæ gentes, omnesque ad oceanum per circuitum barbaræ

gentes, Moysen Prophetasque cognoverant. Quid necesse fuit eum in ultimo venire tempore, et non priusquam innumerabilis periret hominum multitudo? Ad Ctesiph. adv. Pelagian. ep. 43. T. iv. p. 481.

<sup>f</sup> Inter hæc missæ sunt mihi a Carthagine Quæstiones sex, quas proposuit amicus quidam, quem cupiebam fieri Christianum, ut contra paganos solverentur, præsertim quia nonnullas earum a Porphyrio philosopho propositas dixit: . . . Harum quæstionum disputationes in unum librum contuli, non prolixum, cujus titulus est, Sex Quæstiones contra Paganos expositæ. . . Retr. l. ii. cap. 31.

5. The <sup>z</sup> second question, and as taken from Porphyry, and supposed to be of great weight, was concerning the time of the Christian revelation.

‘ If Christ, as he says, be the way of salvation, the truth, and the life, [John xiv. 6.] and they only who believe in him can be saved, what became of the men which lived before his coming?’ which difficulty is there enlarged upon.

Augustine, beside other things, says in the way of solution, ‘ that <sup>h</sup> there were revelations made to men from the beginning of the world, such as were suited to the circumstances of things: and that all good men, in every part of the world, were accepted and saved. In the sacred Hebrew volumes, down from the time of Abraham, some are mentioned who had the knowledge of the true religion, who neither were descended from him, nor were of the people of Israel, nor ingrafted in among them. The like may be supposed of some in other nations, who also would obtain salvation.’

6. The third of the six questions was to this purpose: ‘ The Christians find fault with sacred rites and sacrifices, and incense, and other things in which the worship at temples consists. And yet they allow, that this kind of worship began in ancient times by the appointment of God, who also is represented as wanting first-fruits.’

This <sup>k</sup> difficulty, as Augustine observes, was founded on what is written in our scriptures, where it is said: Gen. iv. 3, 4. *That Cain*

<sup>z</sup> Quæstio secunda. De tempore Christianæ religionis. . . . Item alia proposuerunt, quæ dicerent de Porphyrio contra Christianos tamquam validiora decerpta. Si Christus se, inquit, salutis viam dicit, gratiam, et veritatem, in seque solo ponit animis sibi credentibus reditum, quid egerunt tot seculorum homines ante Christum? &c. Aug. ep. 102. al. 49. n. 8. Q. ii. T. ii. <sup>h</sup> Et tamen ab initio generis humani, alias occultius, alias evidentius, sicut congruere temporibus divinitus visum est: nec prophetari destitit, nec qui in eum crederent defuerant, ab Adam usque ad Moysen, et in ipso populo Israel, quæ speciali quodam mysterio gens prophetica fuit, et in aliis gentibus, antequam venisset in carne. Cum enim nonnulli commemorantur in sanctis hebraicis libris jam ex tempore Abraham, nec ex stirpe carnis ejus, nec ex populo Israel, nec ex adventitia societate in populo Israel, qui tamen hujus sacramenti participes fuerunt: cur non credamus etiam in cæteris, hac atque illac gen-

tibus, alias alios fuisse, quamvis eos commemoratos in eisdem auctoritatibus non legamus? Ita salus religionis hujus, per quam solam veram salutem veraciter proponitur, nulli unquam defuit, qui dignus fuit. Ib. n. 15. <sup>i</sup> Jam videamus eam, quæ sequitur quæstionem. Accusant, inquit, ritus sacrorum, hostias, thura, et cætera, quæ templorum cultus exercuit: cum idem cultus ab ipsis, inquit, vel a Deo quem colunt exortus est temporibus præcis, cum inducitur Deus primitiis eguisse. Ib. n. 16. <sup>k</sup> Huic respondetur, quoniam, ex illo scripturarum nostrarum loco hæc quæstio proposita agnoscitur, ubi scriptum est, Cain ex fructibus terræ, Abel autem ex primitivis ovium obtulisse munus Deo. Hinc potius est intelligendum, quam sit res antiqua sacrificium, quod non nisi uni Deo vero offerri oportere veraces et sacræ literæ monent: non quod illo egeat Deus, cum in eisdem ipsis literis apertissime sit scriptum, Dixi Domino: Deus meus es tu, quoniam honorum meorum non eges. . . . n. 17.

*Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel brought of the firstlings of the flock.* Which, as Augustine allows, shews, that sacrifices were appointed of old, which were to be offered to God alone: and that they were designed for the good of men, not of God, who needed not any thing, as is plainly declared Ps. xvi. 2. *I have said unto the Lord: Thou art my God, thou needest not my goods:* or in our version, *my goodness extendeth not to thee.* Nor, as he goes on, do Christians blame pagans for their temples and sacrifices, but because they offer them to idols and dæmons.

7. The fourth of the six questions is to this purpose: ‘Christ threatens everlasting punishment to those who do not believe in him. And yet in another place he says: *With what measure you mete, it shall be meted to you again.* Which is absurd and contradictory: for all measure must be limited to time.’

Augustine<sup>m</sup> thinks this a trifling argument, not becoming a philosopher. However, he says, it<sup>n</sup> may be depended upon, that the judgment of Christ will be equitable, and that none shall be punished beyond the demerit of their offences.

If these difficulties are indeed taken out of Porphyry’s work against the Christians, they serve to assure us, that his objections were very much levelled at our scriptures, which he knew were in great esteem: and to overthrow them would be overthrowing the faith built upon them.

8. The<sup>o</sup> fifth and sixth questions contain also pagan objections: but as they do not appear to be taken from Porphyry, I omit them now; nor do I intend to take them at all, they<sup>\* \* \*</sup> being trifling.

9. Ps. lxxxii. 8. *Arise, O God, judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations.*

... n. 17. . . . Quapropter qui Christianas literas utriusque Testamenti sciunt, non hoc culpant in sacrilegis ritibus paganorum, quod construunt templa, et instituant sacerdotia, sed quod hæc idolis et dæmoniis exhibeant. Ib. n. 18.

<sup>l</sup> Jam nunc deinde videamus, quale sit, quod de mensura peccati atque supplicii proposuit, sic Evangelio calumniatus. Minatur, inquit, Christi sibi non credentibus, æterna supplicia. Et alibi ait: In qua mensura mensi fueritis, remetietur vobis. Sans, inquit ridicule atque contrarie. Nam si ad mensuram redditurus est pœnam, et omnes mensura circumscripta est sine temporis, quid sibi volunt minæ infiniti supplicii? Ib. n. 22.

<sup>m</sup> Istam quæstionem a qualicumque philosopho esse objectionem atque propositam, difficile est cre-

dere. n. 23. <sup>n</sup> Nunc tamen arbitrator, satis esse monstratum, non esse contrarium æternitati suppliciorum, quod in eadem mensura redduntur, in qua peccata commissa sunt. Ib. num. 27.

<sup>o</sup> Qu. V. Post hanc quæstionem, quæ eas ex Porphyrio proposuit, hoc adjunxit. . . . Ib. n. 28.

Q. VI. Postrema quæstio proposita est de Jona, nec ipsa quasi ex Porphyrio, sed tamquam ex irrisione paganorum. . . . Ib. n. 30.

<sup>\* \* \*</sup> The sixth Question or difficulty relates to the history of Jonah; which, as Augustine observes, afforded laughter in conversation among Pagans. Hoc enim genus quæstionis, multo cachinno a Paganis graviter irrisum animadverti. Ibid. num. 30.

Here

Here Jerom, or whoever is the author of the Breviary upon the Psalter, in a style and manner somewhat resembling Jerom's, extols the success of Peter and Paul in preaching the gospel. God<sup>p</sup> sent Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other prophets. And *in Judah was God known, his name was great in Israel, a small tract of land only.* He sent Peter, no philosopher nor orator, but an illiterate fisherman, who went from Jerusalem to Rome, and converted Rome, which the most eloquent men were not able to do. Again he sent out the apostle Paul, and he preached the gospel from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum. [Rom. xv. 19.] Alexander the great, king of the Macedonians, with a powerful army did not conquer so many nations as they did. This Paul, who once was a persecutor, who says of himself, that he *was rude in speech, though not in knowledge*, who made solæcisms in his speech, subdued the whole world. Some one may say, all this was done for the sake of gain: so says Porphyry. Ignorant and indigent men, because they had nothing, performed some signs by magical art: which is no great matter; for the magicians in Egypt, and many others, have wrought signs. Let it be granted: and, as you say, the apostles wrought signs, that they might enrich themselves with the treasures of rich women whom they perverted. But then, why did they die? Why were they crucified? Others have wrought signs by magical arts, but they did not die for a dead man: they were not crucified for a man that had been

<sup>p</sup> Quamdiu Moysen miserat, quamdiu Isaiam, quamdiu Jeremiam, quamdiu alios prophetas: notus erat in Judæa Deus, in Israel magnum nomen ejus. In modica terra nominis Dei notitia ferebatur. Misisti Petrum piscatorem, qui dimiserat rete, qui ab opere callosam habebat manum. Non misisti oratorem, non misisti philosophum. Misisti hominem rusticum, hominem piscatorem. Iste piscator, ille rusticus de Jerosolyma perrexit Romam, et rusticus cepit Romam, quam eloquentes capere non potuerunt. Rursum ixit Paulus apostolus, et de Jerosolyma prædicavit usque in Illyricum. Deinde dicit, quod de urbe Roma iret in Hispaniam. . . . Ubi sunt, qui prædicant Alexandrum Magnum Macedonum imperatorem, quod in brevi tempore vicerit tantas gentes? Habuit exercitum, habuit et ingentes turbas. Non tale aliquid potuit, sed modicum quiddam. Iste vero Paulus quondam persecutor fuit, qui dicebat: Etsi imperitus sum sermone, non tamen scientiâ. Qui solæcismos facit in loquendo, crucem Christi portat, et

quasi triumphans omnes capit. Totum orbem subegit ab Oceano usque ad mare Rubrum. Dicat aliquis: Hoc totum lucrifecerunt. Hoc enim dicit Porphyrius. Homines rustici et pauperes, quoniam nihil habebant, magicis artibus operati sunt quædam signa. Non est autem grande facere signa. Nam fecerunt signa in Ægypto magi contra Moysen. Fecit et Apollonius, fecit et Apuleius. Infiniti signa fecerunt. Concedo tibi, Porphyri, magicis artibus signa fecerunt, ut divitias acciperent a divitibus mulierculis, quas induxerant. Hoc enim tu dicis. Quare mortui sunt? quare crucifixi? Fecerunt et alii signa magicis artibus, sed pro homine mortuo non sunt mortui, pro homine crucifixo non sunt crucifixi. Sciunt isti hominem esse mortuum, et moriuntur sine causa? Felix ergo nostra victoria, quæ in sanguine Apostolorum dicata est. Fides nostra non probatur, nisi per illorum sanguinem. Benedicamus ergo Deum, cui est gloria in secula seculorum. Amen. Breviarium in Psalt. ap. Hieron. T. ii. p. 334, 335.

‘ crucified. They knew him to be dead: and did they die  
 ‘ without any reason? Our victory is completed in the blood of  
 ‘ the apostles: our faith is ratified in their blood. Let us there-  
 ‘ fore praise God, to whom be glory for ever and ever.’

If Porphyry did indeed cast that reflection upon the apostles, saying they were deceivers, who were influenced by worldly views; (of which I think no doubt can be made :) we have here another proof of his malevolence: and we see the reason, why his work was so offensive to the Christians.

10. Porphyry, in his *Life of Plotinus* written in his old age and still extant, says: ‘ There<sup>s</sup> were at that time many Chris-  
 ‘ tians, and others, heretics, who had sprung from the ancient  
 ‘ philosophy, followers of Adelphius and Acylinus, who deceiv-  
 ‘ ing others, and being deceived, pretended, that Plato had not  
 ‘ gone to the bottom of the intelligible essence. Against them  
 ‘ Plotinus often argued in his disputations, and also wrote a  
 ‘ little book, to which we gave this title, *Against the Gnostics.*’

Porphyry says, ‘ he gave it that title,’ because<sup>s</sup> he was the editor of that and other works of Plotinus. That little book, treatise, or chapter, is still extant among the works of Plotinus: but<sup>s</sup> there is not in it any express mention either of Gnostics or Christians. It was written whilst Porphyry was with Plotinus; therefore between the year 263 and 268.

11. Porphyry’s four books, *Of Abstinence from Animals*, are inscribed to his friend Firmus Castricius, who had forsaken the Pythagorean institution, and had begun to eat the flesh of animals. In his introduction to that work, near the beginning of the first book, are these words: ‘ For, says<sup>\*\*</sup> Porphyry, I do  
 ‘ not ascribe this defection of your’s to intemperance or gluttony:  
 ‘ nor do I think your disposition to be worse than that of some  
 ‘ mean people; who having embraced rules different from their  
 ‘ former way of life, will endure to be torn limb from limb ra-  
 ‘ ther than return to their old course; and now abstain from  
 ‘ some animals, which they once ate greedily, with more care  
 ‘ than from human flesh.’

<sup>s</sup> Γεγονασιν δε κατ’ αυτον των χριστιανων πολλοι μεν, και αλλοι αιρετικοι δε εκ της παλαιας φιλοσοφιας ανηλθειναι, οι περι Αδελφιον και Ακυλινου . . . πολλης εξηπα- τειν, και αυτοι ηπαλημενοι. κ. λ. *Vit. Plotin. cap. 16.*

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid. cap. 24.*

<sup>s</sup> *Est Enneados secundæ liber nonus, licet in illo ne semel quidem vel Gnostico- rum nomen vel cujusquam ex his Porphyrio nominatis, mentio occurrat.* *Fabr. annot. in vit. Plotin. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p.*

219.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Ου γαρ δη δι’ ακρασιαν και ποθον την εψοφασθ λαιμαρσιας, καλια- φρονησαι των παλριων, ης εξηλωκας φιλο- σοφιας νομων, φησαιμι αν σε’ εδ’ ελαττω την φυσιν των παρα τινων ιδιωλων ειναι’ οι νομης εναιλιθς, οισ εξων προτερον καταδεξα- μενοι, τομας τε μοριων υπομεινσι, και τινων ζων, ων προσθεν ενεφορηθη, αποσχοινηο μωλλον η κρεων αιθρωπειωι. *De Abst. ab. esu animal. lib. i. cap. 2. p. 3.*

1. This cannot relate to Jews, who always were under a strict rule of diet. 2. Therefore, probably, it relates to Christians, who had departed from their former way of living, and were then generally mean people, or so esteemed by Porphyry. They did not abstain from any kinds of animals, but they generally forbore to eat blood, and refused to eat animals that were strangled, from which the blood had not been fairly drained. 3. And they were resolute in adhering to the principles which they had received. 4. If this reflection relates to Christians, (as I think it does) it shews great resentment and bitterness of spirit. 5. And it ought to be observed, that it is brought in without any necessity, in a work of Porphyry unquestionably genuine. The design of the observation, I suppose, is to recommend to his friend openness to conviction: he hoped, he could not be so obstinate and inflexible in his new opinion, as the mean people here spoken of.

12. Thus I have now alleged all such passages of Porphyry's work against the Christians, as I have met with quoted by Christian writers, the work itself not being now extant. I may have overlooked † some; but I have omitted none which occur to my memory. I have also just now alleged a short passage concerning the Christians from Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus*, still extant: and another from his work *Of Abstinence from the flesh of animals*, which is also still extant, and unquestionably genuine.

X. There is another work ascribed to Porphyry, and often quoted by Eusebius, entitled *The Philosophy of Oracles*. Lucas Holstenius, in his *Life of Porphyry*<sup>t</sup>, has given an account of all his works, and of this in particular, without any suspicion of its being spurious. Fabricius<sup>u</sup> likewise still thinks it genuine, notwithstanding the objections of \* Fontenelle. Another learned man says: 'Some \* have suspected, but without sufficient reason, this book of Porphyry to be forged.' Dr. Gregory Sharpe also makes use of this work in his *Argument for Christianity*, taken

† Dr. Macknight, in *The Truth of the Gospel History*, p. 319, 320, says, 'Porphyry blames Jesus, as giving encouragement to fraud, by the parable of the Steward, who wasted his Lord's goods.' The same observation is also in his *Harmony of the four Gospels*, p. 404, 2d edition. Not having in my papers any reference to such a passage of Porphyry, I have written to Dr. Macknight, entreating him to refer me to the place intended by him, where that observation might be found. Nevertheless I have not received from him any such reference. I must therefore conclude, that by some means or

other, that learned and laborious writer has been led into a mistake. However, I still wish the place might be found, if there is any such.

<sup>t</sup> *De Vita et Scriptis Porphyrii*, cap. x. al. ix.

<sup>u</sup> Quare non assentior elegantissimo Fontenello, qui hoc opus Porphyrio suppositum esse suspicatur, in *Historia Oraculorum*. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 191.

\* See Fontenelle's *History of Oracles*, Diff. i. ch. iv.

<sup>x</sup> Dr. Jortin. *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. i. p. 301. See what there follows the above quotation.

‘ from the Concessions of the most ancient Adversaries.’ He seems not to have had any doubt of its genuineness: for after having quoted a good deal from it, he says: ‘ I ’ will only make ‘ this one observation upon this long quotation from Eusebius: ‘ That it contains not only the opinion of Porphyry, but the ‘ testimony of their gods, or, if you please, of their priests, who ‘ did not dare to deny the excellence of the character of Jesus. ‘ These oracles cannot be called the forgeries of Christians. And ‘ whatever may be justly said against those of the Sybil, these ‘ must have their weight with all who regard the authority of ‘ Porphyry, or the testimony of our adversaries.’

This work is also approved by <sup>z</sup> Mr. Mosheim and <sup>a</sup> Dr. Chapman.

It is also much approved by Colonia, who, beside other things, says: ‘ Porphyry <sup>b</sup> declares, and makes our greatest mysteries to be declared by the oracles of Apollo.’ Again: ‘ He ‘ makes the goddess Hecate say, and he acknowledgeth himself, that Jesus Christ is a man illustrious for piety, and that he ‘ is more powerful than Æsculapius, and all the other gods.’

This work is quoted with approbation by many other learned <sup>d</sup> men.

This work, as I said just now, is approved by the late Mr. Mosheim. It is the consequence of a scheme formed by him

<sup>y</sup> p. 71, 72. <sup>z</sup> De Rebus Christian. ante Const. M. sec. 2. § xxxii. p. 293 . . . 299.

<sup>a</sup> See his Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury. p. 10. and p. 76. &c.

<sup>b</sup> Porphyre annonce, et fait annoncer nos plus grands mysteres par les Oracles d’ Apollon. La Religion Chrétienne autorisée par le temoignage des anciens Payens. P. i. ch. lx. § vi. p. 342.

<sup>c</sup> Porphyry fait dire à la Déesse Hecaté, et il reconnoit lui-même, que Jesus Christ est un homme illustre par sa pieté, et qu’il est plus fort qu’ Esculape, et que tous les autres Dieux. Ib. § vii. p. 345.

<sup>d</sup> Says Dr. Doddridge, *Course of Lectures*, &c. p. 252. ‘ Porphyry also, though ‘ an inveterate enemy to Christianity, not ‘ only allowed there was such a man as ‘ Christ, but honoured him as a most wise ‘ and pious man, translated into heaven, ‘ as being approved by the gods, and accordingly quotes some oracles referring ‘ to his sufferings and virtues, with their ‘ subsequent rewards.’

And Dr. Macknight, *Truth of the Gospel-History*, p. 328. ‘ The same Porphyry

‘ gives a most honourable testimony to the ‘ character of Jesus, which must not be ‘ omitted here. It is preserved by Eusebius in his *Demonstr. Evangel.* p. 134: ‘ . . . This now is what Porphyry has said. ‘ The respectful manner in which Porphyry ‘ here writes of our Lord, plainly shews ‘ us, that the bitter speeches, which in ‘ the passage of Cyril before cited, p. 317, ‘ he is said to have uttered, were levelled ‘ only against the Christians, and not against ‘ their master.’ So then, this justly suspected and paltry book, has at length gained such authority, as to be superior to the indisputable testimony of an ancient Christian writer. And ‘ Porphyry,’ it seems, ‘ did not write against Jesus Christ, but ‘ only against Christians.’ However, we have been assured, that Porphyry reflected upon Jesus for what is said John vii. 8 . . . 10. charging him with fickleness and unsteadiness, first saying, ‘ he should not go ‘ up to the feast, and yet going afterwards.’ Was this pert remark levelled against Christ, or against those who called themselves his followers?

concerning<sup>e</sup> a ‘Disturbance caused in the Church by the later ‘Platonic Philosophers.’ I presume it will not be disallowed, that I have a great regard for Mr. Mosheim, and have oftentimes expressed myself concerning him with great respect: but I do not adopt this scheme; I think it a chimerical and visionary notion. According to which, there is little or no difference between a heathen and a Christian, or between Origen, a sincere and zealous Christian, if ever there was such an one, and an excellent defender of the Christian doctrine, and an indefatigable preacher and commentator, and Porphyry, a mere heathen, as is manifest from his Lives of Pythagoras and Plotinus, and a bitter enemy of the Christians and Christianity, as we are assured by many ancient Christian authors, and as his own long work against the Christians testifies. If that opinion of Mr. Mosheim should prevail, it would indeed occasion great disorder in ecclesiastical history, and much confusion in the characters of many ancient Christian writers of great eminence. It may also create much confusion in the characters of divers men of great eminence among the heathens: who †† will no longer be allowed to have been what they really were, throughout Gentiles; but for the future must be reckoned in a sense Christians, or at least, half heathens, and half Christians. But upon that I enlarge no farther now: another occasion may offer to clear up their characters.

As this disturbance, this confusion and mixture of Gentilism and Christianity, is all ascribed to<sup>f</sup> Ammonius Saccas, I must say somewhat farther concerning him, though<sup>g</sup> I formerly said as much as I could then think to be needful.

<sup>e</sup> De turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesiã. Diss. ii. inter Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes. p. 83. &c.

†† Quantum vero detrimenti Sophistæ hi, aut Philosophi, Scientiæ suæ opinionem, odioque Christiani nominis inflati, rei Christianæ compararent, cum multa ex hoc ævo exempla, tum Julianus potissimum ostendit, qui ab hoc genere deceptus est. Ex his, qui sapientiores videri volebant, et temperationem quandam consecrati, multi disputationibus et interpretationibus eorum adduci sese sinebant, ut mediam sibi quamdam religionem inter veterem ac recentiore effingerent, Christumque id ipsum præcepisse, sibi persuaderent, quod sub cæremoniâ diu a sacerdotibus Deorum reconditum fuisset. Sic animo affecti fuerunt AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, vir in primis consideratus, CHALCIDIUS, philosophus, THEMIS-

TIVUS, orator nobilissimus, et alii, qui utramque religionem istis rebus præcipuis, modo recte capiantur, amice consentire, idioque nec Christum spernendum, nec cum contemtionem Deorum colendum esse, arbitrati sunt. Mosheim. Instit. p. 149, 150.

<sup>f</sup> Christianam religionem, quo et novæ philosophiæ suæ et antiquæ religioni consentaneam faceret, [Ammonius] fatebatur, Christum, magnum et sapientem virum, Deique numine ac consilio plenum, ‘admirabilem præterea Theurgum, et dæmonibus amicum,’ sanctissimam proposuisse Disciplinam, miraculisque eam firmasse: eundem vero negabat aliquid sententiis suis adversum docuisse, veteraque populorum sacra, dæmonumque populis et naturæ divinitus præpositorum cultum abrogare voluisse. Mosheim. De Reb. Christian. p. 293. Conf. p. 283. et alibi. <sup>g</sup> Vol. ii. p. 414, 415.

It is to be observed then, that from <sup>b</sup> Eusebius we learn, that Porphyry in his work against the Christians says of Ammonius, the celebrated philosopher of Alexandria, master of Plotinus and other learned men: ‘ That having been educated a Christian by Christian parents, as soon as he came to years of understanding, and had a taste of philosophy, he presently betook himself to a life agreeable to the laws.’ To which Eusebius says: ‘ It is a downright falshood, to say he exchanged Christianity for Gentilism: for Ammonius maintained sincere and uncorrupted the doctrine of the divine philosophy to the end of his life; as his works which he left behind him still testify, and for which he is in great repute: such as the treatise entitled, ‘ Of the Consent of Moses and Jesus, and many others, which may be found with the curious.’

From Eusebius, and agreeably to him, Jerom, in his book of Ecclesiastical <sup>1</sup> Writers, says of Ammonius of Alexandria: ‘ Among many excellent monuments of his wit, he composed also an elegant work of the Consent of Moses and Jesus, and invented the Evangelical Canons, which Eusebius of Cæsarea afterwards followed. This person is falsely reproached by Porphyry, that of a Christian he became a heathen: whereas it is certain, he continued a Christian to the end of his life.’

Accordingly, it has been of late the general opinion of learned men, that Ammonius, sometimes called Saccas, was a Christian; But Fabricius <sup>3</sup> has contradicted it, and well observed and plainly shewn, that Eusebius has confounded two authors, and has ascribed the works of Ammonius, a Christian writer, to Ammonius master of Plotinus.

Many learned men have been well satisfied with the reasons assigned by Fabricius. Mr. Mosheim himself was well satisfied with them when he wrote the above mentioned Dissertation. He <sup>4</sup> then made no doubt that Eusebius was mistaken, and confounded two of the name Ammonius, one a philosopher, the other a Christian writer. Ammonius, he says, ‘ was better known to Porphyry, who had heard Plotinus, one of the

<sup>b</sup> H. E. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 220.

<sup>1</sup> De V. l. cap. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. 26. Tom. iv p. 172, 173. Vid. et p. 159, 160, 161.

<sup>3</sup> Negat quidem Eusebius hæc ita se habere, et Ammonium ad extremum usque spiritum immotum in religione Christiana perstitisse, perhibet: cui credendum esse potius, quam Porphyrio, maximi nominis viri censent: quos inter Henr. Valesius, Petr. Baylius, et Jac. Basnagius eminent: Ego vero Eu-

sebius errasse, atque duos inter se Ammonios, alterum philosophum, alterum Christianum scriptorem confudisse, nullus dubito: quam sententiam præclare confirmavit Jo. Alb. Fabricius. Notior certe Porphyrio esse debuit Ammonius, qui Plotinum audiverat, præcipuum Ammonii discipulum, quam Eusebio, qui a temporibus ejus longo satis intervallo remotus est. Mosheim. Diss. de turbata Ecclesia, § vii. p. 101.

‘ principal disciples of Ammonius, than to Eusebius, who lived  
‘ a good while afterwards.’ He there adds other reasons for the  
same opinion.

Nevertheless, undoubtedly, it would be more commodious for  
the support of the notion advanced by him, to suppose, that  
Ammonius, from whom all that disturbance proceeded, was a  
Christian, or a half-Christian, or somewhat like it. Accordingly,  
Mr. Mosheim has since altered his opinion concerning that great  
‘ man. I do not allege his reasons, which appear to me to be of  
no weight, and tend only to form a character which never existed  
any where, and was never heard of before; and is indeed mere  
invention without evidence.

Eusebius must have been mistaken: Ammonius, master of  
Plotinus, could not be the author of the Christian books men-  
tioned by him; they must have been written by another of that  
name, which, probably, was not uncommon among the Ægypt-  
tians. Porphyry may have been mistaken about his early life:  
he must have known what was his character, when he taught  
philosophy in the latter part of his life. And it is agreeable to  
what is said of Ammonius by <sup>x</sup> Longinus and <sup>y</sup> Ammianus Mar-  
cellinus: who also is called the <sup>z</sup> divine Ammonius by Hierocles,  
another celebrated philosopher of Alexandria in the fifth century.

Whence it came to pass, that Eusebius was so mistaken about  
Ammonius, cannot be said now; but I am persuaded, that he  
did not learn it from Origen. The contrary may be perceived  
from a part of a letter of Origen preserved in Eusebius; and  
which, I think, is decisive, and may fully satisfy us, that Am-  
monius was a heathen philosopher. I therefore transcribe it  
largely: and it follows in course immediately after his remarks

<sup>v</sup> Magnis certant argumentis, qui Por-  
phyrio adfentiantur: quibus ego motus  
ipse olim affirmare non dubitavi, Ammo-  
nium sacra Christiana deseruisse. . . . Dum  
vero denuo hanc litem pertracto, in eam  
fere descendo sententiam, Ammonium ani-  
mo licet valde mutatum, et a communibus  
Christianorum dogmatibus alienatum, a  
Christianis tamen haud palam secessisse, ve-  
ramque disciplinam suam occultasse. &c.  
&c. De Reb. Christianor. Sec. Secund.  
§ xxvii. p. 281. &c. et § 28. p. 283. &c.

This last opinion, as I suppose, Mosheim  
continued to maintain: and at p. 78 of  
Institutiones Historiæ Eccles. § vii. has  
these words. Hæc philosophandi ratio  
mutabatur, quum Ammonius Saccas, occi-  
dente jam seculo, [secundo] scholam A-  
lexandriæ magno cum plausu apperiret, et

sectæ illius, quæ recentior platonica dicitur,  
fundamenta jaceret. Homo hic Christianus,  
et fortassis ad obitum usque Christianæ re-  
ligionis simulator. . . . &c. And at p. 126  
of the same work he says: ‘ Ammonius  
‘ Harmoniam Evangeliorum composuit.’  
See Mr. Maclain’s version, p. 143. But I  
must take the liberty to say: It appears to  
me very strange, that any learned man  
should be able to persuade himself, that  
the ‘ Harmony of the Gospels’ was com-  
posed by Ammonius, master of Plotinus.

<sup>x</sup> Vid. Longini fragmenta. p. 246. edit.  
Tollii. <sup>y</sup> Et Saccas Ammonius  
Plotini magister. &c. Marcellin. l. xxii.  
cap. 16. p. 374. <sup>z</sup> Καὶ διεμει-  
ντο το παθος τοις φιλοσοφοις ενσηλσαι,  
εως Αμμωνιου τῃ θεοδιδακτῃ. Ap. Phot.  
Cod. 251. p. 1381. m.

upon

upon Porphyry. ‘ All <sup>a</sup> this I have said for convicting that liar, and for shewing Origen’s great skill in the Greek learning. Concerning which Origen himself speaks also in a letter, in which he makes an apology for himself, to those who blamed him for his so much attending to that sort of literature. “ When,” says he, “ I was wholly employed in reading and explaining the word of God, the reputation of my progress being spread abroad every where, there came to me some heretics, and also some others, studious of Greek literature, and particularly of philosophy. I therefore thought it expedient for me to make inquiries into the opinions of heretics, and likewise the sentiments of the philosophers, who boast much of their teaching the truth. This we did, in imitation of Pantænus, who before us excelled in that knowledge; as <sup>b</sup> also of Heraclas, who is now presbyter in the church of Alexandria: whom I found with a master of philosophical learning, under whom he had studied five years, before I began to be an auditor of those discourses, who, though before he had worn the common habit, put on that of a philosopher, which he still wears: and to this time continues diligently to read the writings of Greek authors.” Thus he speaks, apologizing for his study of the Greek learning.’

So writes Eusebius. The ‘ master of philosophical learning, on whom Heraclas attended five years, is not named:’ but he can be no other than Ammonius, of whom we are speaking; as is allowed by <sup>c</sup> Valesius, and cannot be contested by any. And I think, the coherence leads us to suppose him, without hesitation, to have been a heathen philosopher: in proof of which therefore I shall say nothing more.

Upon the whole, it appears to me very evident, that Ammonius, master of Plotinus and other great men of whom Porphyry speaks, was a heathen philosopher. Ammonius, author of divers Christian writings, of whom Eusebius speaks, was a genuine Christian, without any exceptions ever made to his Christianity, that we know of: nor does it appear from antiquity, that his faith was corrupted with any mixtures of heathenish doctrines \* \* .

The

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. H. E. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 221.

<sup>b</sup> . . . και τον νυν εν τῷ πρεσβυτεριῳ καθιζομενον Αλεξανδρεων Ηρακλαν, ονιτα ευρον παρα τῷ διδασκαλῳ των φιλοσοφων μαθηματων, ηδη πηνε ετεσιν αυτω προσκαρτερησαντα, πριν εμε αρχασθαι ακθειν εκεινων των λογων. κ. λ. Ib. p. 221. B. C.

<sup>c</sup> Est his verbis colligere est, Origenem eodem magistro quo Heraclam usum esse in philosophia. Vocabatur autem ille Ammonius, ut Porphyrius supra dixit. Vir fuit sui temporis philosophorum celeberrimus. Vales. ad Eusebii locum.

\* \* \* Mr. Molheim, as seems to me, is so

The design of all these observations is to shew, that Ammonius, called Saccas, was a heathen, and that from any other character groundlessly imputed to him, no argument can be formed in favour of the genuineness of the work entitled, the Philosophy of Oracles, ascribed to Porphyry.

Many learned men, as just seen, have received it, and quoted it as his. But Vandale<sup>d</sup> considers it as a spurious work: and as it is now a good while since he delivered his opinion about it, I cannot but wonder, that none of the learned men above mentioned have attended to his argument. I likewise many years ago expressed my suspicions about the genuineness<sup>e</sup> of it: and still it appears to me to have in it plain marks of forgery. I shall now give my reasons at length, and in such a manner, as to allege those passages of it which are favourable to Christianity, and ought to be alleged as Porphyry's, if this work could be allowed to be genuine.

1. The first mark of forgery is in the introduction, in which the author makes professions of veracity in terms so strong, as to raise a suspicion of some bad design.

Eusebius, proceeding to quote this book, says, 'he' will not

so intent upon his notion of a late, or 'modern sect of Platonic Philosophers,' as to forget himself sometimes. In his Institutions he says, that 'Celsus, who wrote against the Christians, was not, as Origen thought, an Epicurean, but a Platonic Philosopher, of the sect of Ammonius.' *Libro ex instituto Christianos oppugnavit Celsus philosophus, quem Origenes, a quo confutatus est, Epicureum facit, nos firmiter argumentis ducti, Platonicum fuisse, ex Ammonii secta putamus.* *Instit. H. E. Sec. 2. P. i. cap. 2. p. 75.* And to the like purpose in his work *De Reb. Christian. ante C. M. p. 255, 256.* But how could that be? How should Celsus be a follower of Ammonius, who lived a good while before? Celsus lived and wrote in the second century: Ammonius did not flourish before the third century. Plotinus, as we know from Porphyry, came to study under Ammonius, at Alexandria, in the 38th year of his age, in the year of Christ 233, and staid with him eleven years, leaving him in the 38th or 39th year of his age, in the year of Christ 244. *Vide Porphyr. de Vita Plotini. cap. 3. et Conspectus Vitæ Plotini. ap. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 88. 89.* Which plainly shews, that Ammonius did not flourish before the beginning of the third century. Moreover, Origen was a hearer of Ammonius. If

Celsus also had studied under him, he and Origen might have been fellow-disciples. Or, suppose that Celsus was a little older, and had preceded him in the same school, Origen could not have been altogether unacquainted with him. Whereas, we have learned from Origen himself, that he knew of two only of that name, one who lived in the time of Nero, the other in the time of Adrian, and afterwards. See p. 6. <sup>d</sup> Circa hanc rem tamen, non tam mihi oboritur admiratio, . . . Baronium, aliosque, etiam magni nominis viros, sæpe satis lapsos . . . quam magnum illum, immo maximum. . . . Hugonem Grotium, ex Porphyrio (in notis suis ad librum de V. R. C.) protulisse oracula, quasi Hecate de Christo, deque ejus dignitate, &c. eadem facilitate, quâ illa ipsa ex Porphyrio transcripserat Eusebius. Nam quod Porphyrius, irrisor illi Christi, Christianæque Doctrinæ, talia unquam de Domino nostro Jesu Christo testatus est, quis credat? Nisi simul credat, Porphyrium hunc ipsum nesciisse quid, et in quos scripserit, atque in quorum gratiam hæc sic dicta oracula protulerit: adeoque ipsum fuisse hominem delirum, nec cui quid pro aut contra differeret, constaret. *Vandale de Orac. Ethnic. p. 14. Amst. 8vo. 1683.*

<sup>e</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 212.

<sup>f</sup> Pr. Ev. l. iv. cap. 6. p. 142, 143.

'insist

‘insist on the testimony of friends, which might be of little value, but those of strangers, not of our body. And of all the Greek historians and philosophers that ever were, none can be more fitly alleged here, than <sup>s</sup> that very friend of dæmons, who in our time has gained so much reputation by the falsehoods which he has published against us. In the work which he has written of the Philosophy from Oracles, he has made a collection of the oracles of Apollo, and the other gods, and good dæmons.’

‘And,’ says Eusebius, ‘it will be worth the while, in the first place, to observe, how the fore mentioned person begins his work, confirming the truth of what he says by an oath, in these very words. “For,” says <sup>b</sup> he, “I call the gods to witness, that I have added nothing to the sense of what has been delivered by oracle: nor have I taken any thing from it. I have only corrected some literal mistakes, or supplied the metre when it was defective, or have left out some things not material. But whatever alterations of this kind I have made, I have preserved the sense entire; being more afraid of committing such an impiety, than of undergoing the penalty of sacrilege.”’

This asseveration of veracity is abundantly too strong: an honest man can seldom have occasion for such solemnity in his writings: nor do I perceive any reason, that Porphyry should have to prefix such an introduction to any thing he had to say about philosophy, or theology.

2. Another mark of forgery is the strict injunction of silence, contained also in this author’s introduction to his work.

Eusebius goes on in the same place: ‘After <sup>i</sup> that preface to his work, he earnestly requires, and enjoins, that what he is about to say should not be divulged: and in these very words. “Thou therefore above all take care not to publish these things, nor to mention them before the profane, neither for the sake of glory, or of gain, or any other low advantage: for thereby will accrue danger, not only to thyself for transgressing this precept, but to me also, who have too easily confided in a person not able to conceal such benefits. But <sup>k</sup> they may be communicated to such as order the course of their life with a view to the salvation of the soul.” And afterwards he adds:

8 . . . τον δαιμονων φιλον αυτον εκεινον, οτι καθ’ ημας γενομενος, τοις καθ’ ημων ελ-  
λαμπρυνσαι ψευδηγοριας. . . Ουλος τοις α-  
ρις ει εις επιβραψε περι της εκ λογιων φι-  
λοσοφιας, συναλωστην επιεισταλο χρησμων τυ

τε Απολλωνος, και των λοιπων θεων τε και ασαθως δαιμονων.

p. 143.

<sup>k</sup> Δουλος δε τοις τον βιον εντασταμενοις προς την της ψυχης σωτηριαν. p. 144. B.

“Thou

“Thou<sup>1</sup> art to conceal these things as the greatest of secrets:  
 “for neither have the gods spoke plainly of themselves in their  
 “oracles, but obscurely.”

This strict injunction of silence is another just ground of suspicion: it affords reason to believe, that this work could not bear the examination of the public. Moreover here is a Christian phrase: it may be communicated ‘to such as order the course of their life with a view to the salvation of the soul.’ A like phrase, ‘hopes<sup>m</sup> of salvation,’ occurs in what Eusebius calls the preface, of which, for the sake of brevity, I have omitted a part, and have taken only the oath of veracity.

It is hence plain, that this work was to be communicated to Christians only. But why so, provided these oracles were genuine? For if they had really been delivered by the gods, they must have been of as much advantage to heathens as to Christians: or rather more to the former, who, as one might think, should have greater regard to what their gods said than Christians, who believed those gods to be no other than evil dæmons.

3. This book is not Porphyry’s, because it often notoriously contradicts the sentiments which Porphyry has delivered in those writings which are certainly his.

In his work of Abstinence from animals he starts an objection: ‘If<sup>n</sup> animals are not to be killed, we shall be deprived of the benefits of divination, which depends upon searching their entrails. To which he answers, that a philosopher abstracted from the world, seldom has occasion to go to dæmons, or priests, and diviners, and the entrails of animals. He rarely wants advice about marriage, a lost servant, commerce: and as for things of religion, he consults his own breast, and goes to God dwelling in him. Concerning<sup>o</sup> such things as he is most desirous to know, no certain information can be had from diviners and the entrails of animals.’

After such a declaration, it seems improbable, that Porphyry should consult oracles concerning any point, especially about the Christian religion, concerning which he had long ago formed his judgment, and had published it to the world in books written with great diligence and earnestness.

But passing over that, there is an instance of contradiction in the first quotation, which Eusebius makes after the preface to

<sup>1</sup> Ταῦτα μοι, ὡς ἀρρήτων τὰ ἀρρήτοισι κρυπτείν. Οὐδε γὰρ οἱ θεοὶ φανερώς περὶ αὐτῶν εἰσπέσαν, ἀλλὰ δι’ αἰνισμάτων. p. 144. C. <sup>m</sup> . . . ὡς ἀν ἐκ μόνῃ βεβαιῶ τὰς ἐλπίδας τῆ σωθῆναι ἀρυτῆμενος.

p. 143. C. cap. 51, 52.

<sup>n</sup> Abstinencia, &c. l. ii.

<sup>o</sup> Περὶ ὧν δε ζῆται, μάλισ μὲν ἠδεις, ἠδὲ σπλαγχνὰ ζῶν μνησσε το σαφες. lb. cap. 52.

this work: it contains a long oracle in verse, and then the writer's explication and observations in prose, according to the usual method of this work.

In this oracle Apollo himself reckons up the several kinds of deities, heavenly, aerial, earthly, subterraneous; and teaches what animals, and of what colours, ought to be offered to those several deities, and in what manner. After producing that passage, 'now,' says<sup>p</sup> Eusebius, 'compare this discourse with what the same author has said in his books, which he entitles *Of Abstinence from animals*. For there he very rationally teaches, that sacrifices and incense are not to be offered to the God over all, nor to the divine and heavenly powers next after him: and proceeds so far as to say, that they deserve not to be accounted gods who delight in such sacrifices. For the killing of animals is a great and detestable impiety, and therefore not acceptable to the gods. Whence it appears,' adds Eusebius, 'that his god is condemned: for, as he says, the oracle commanded animals to be sacrificed not only to the subterraneous deities, but also to the aerial, and heavenly, and æthereal. Thus Apollo directs here. But he [in the other work] citing also Theophrastus to the same purpose, says, that sacrifices of animals ought not to be offered to gods, but only to dæmons. So that, according to himself and Theophrastus, Apollo is no god, but a dæmon. Nor are the other, who are called gods, any better, who are every where worshipped with animals by princes and people, in cities and villages.' Very right.

Nevertheless, the present argumentation is of no weight. There ought first of all to be good proof of the genuineness of a writing, that contradicts the sentiments which an author has advanced in another work, evidently his, and that not by the bye only, but on set purpose, and in a long series of arguments, of which he appears to be fully persuaded.

If the books *De Abſtinentia*, &c. are Porphyry's (as they undoubtedly are) and if the sentiments therein taught contradict those of the *Philosophy of Oracles*, this last is not genuine. Indeed, this appears to be the work of some Christian, who intended to decry the heathen worship, and all the whole system of heathen theology.

I forbear to allege passages of these oracles at length, in which the gods are reviled in a manner very agreeable to the Christian notions of them at that time. But I ought not to omit to observe, that they are here represented, as acknowledging

themselves compelled to answer the questions put to them. 'One says, Hear <sup>s</sup> me speaking unwillingly what necessity obliges me to say.' In another of these oracles Apollo says: 'This <sup>f</sup> is a powerful and hard necessity laid upon me.' When they have been brought down from heaven to answer the inquiries made of them, they <sup>s</sup> earnestly solicit a return, and to be let go away. The gods of this work likewise are made to <sup>t</sup> teach the art of magic.

But it is time to have done with these absurdities. If Porphyry was not a Christian, but a heathen philosopher and an enemy to the Christians, this work is not his.

4. In this work are many things very favourable to the Christian religion: therefore it cannot be Porphyry's, who wrote against the Christians, and long afterwards lay under great reproach upon that account, as the worst and most abusive enemy they ever had.

Here I shall produce those passages which ought to have been alleged before, if it could with good reason be supposed, that this work was composed by Porphyry.

In his Evangelic Preparation Eusebius writes thus: 'Porphyry <sup>u</sup>, in the first book of the Philosophy taught by oracles, brings in his own god bearing witness to the wisdom of the Hebrews, together with other people, who were renowned for their learning and knowledge. It is Apollo,' says Eusebius, 'that speaks in this oracle, and it follows what had been before delivered concerning sacrifices: and he demands especial attention, as to words full of divine wisdom. "The way leading to the gods is difficult and rough, and the entrance shut with brazen doors. The Phœnicians, the Assyrians, the Lydians, and Hebrews, have found out many ways to the seat of the blessed." [All that in verse.] To which the author subjoins: "The way leading to the gods is shut with brazen bolts, and is rugged and difficult. The barbarians have found out many paths: but the Greeks have quite wandered out of the way; and <sup>x</sup> they who now prevail have corrupted it. But the god declared, that the finding it out was owing to the Egyptians, the Phœnicians, the Chaldæans, the Lydians, and the Hebrews."

<sup>q</sup> Και παλιν αλλος, ανασκαζομενος εφη Κλυθι μεν εκ θελονησ, επει μ επεδησας ανασκη. Pr. Ev. l. v. § 8. p. 194. B.

<sup>f</sup> Ουνομ' ανασκαιης το δε καρτεροτ, ηδ' εις βριθυ. Ib. C. <sup>s</sup> Λυειε λοιπον ανακλια. . . . c. 9. p. 195. <sup>t</sup> Cap. 14. p. 202. <sup>u</sup> Ο δε Πορφυριος εν τω

πρωτω της εκ λογιων φιλοσοφιας αυτον εισαγει τον εαυτη θεοτ, τω Εβραιων γεγει, μισω των αλλων των επι συνεσει βωμενων εθιω σοφιαν επιμαρτυρησα. κ. λ. Pr. Ev. l. ix. cap. x. p. 412, 413. <sup>x</sup> Οι δε κρια- γηνιες ηδη, και διεφθειραν. p. 413. B.

This passage of the author, subjoined to the oracle by way of explication, is also cited at length by Theodoret as Porphyry's, and from the same work, the *Philosophy of Oracles*.

It follows in Eusebius, immediately after what has been just quoted. 'And<sup>2</sup> moreover, in another oracle Apollo says: "The Chaldæans only, and the Hebrews, have attained to wisdom, chastely worshipping the self-existent king, and god."

Upon the foregoing quotations I now make these remarks:

It is very strange that Apollo should say, 'the Hebrews had found out some of the ways to the gods, and to happiness:' and that, when going to deliver such an observation, he should demand especial attention. It is as strange that Apollo should say, as he is afterwards made to do, that 'the Chaldæans only, and the Hebrews had attained to wisdom, chastely worshipping the eternal king and god.' And is this the work of Porphyry? Is Porphyry become so fond of the Jews, who, as Eusebius assured us not long ago, in his work against the Christians, 'equally reviled us, and the Hebrews, and Moses himself, and the prophets after him?' Or rather, is Porphyry, who wrote against the Christians, and, as is generally said, with great virulence, become himself a convert, and concerned to make converts to Christianity? For to recommend the Hebrews, and their principles, is at least preparatory to Christianity. Theodoret therefore having made that quotation, as above observed, and as Porphyry's, goes on very rationally: 'If<sup>2</sup> our greatest enemy chargeth the Greeks as in error, and ascribes the knowledge of truth to the Hebrews, and the Phœnicians, and Ægyptians, and Chaldæans, and says that Apollo has so taught, why do you not hearken to your own philosopher, and receive the oracle of the Delphic tripod, and learn of the Hebrew prophets and apostles? and what follows.' Very just reasoning!

Surely it is altogether incongruous to suppose, that Porphyry should place the Greeks the lowest of all nations in the search of wisdom, and say, that the 'barbarians had found out many paths to it, whilst the Greeks had wandered quite out of the way.' It is as improbable, that Apollo should give the honour of this invention to the Hebrews, and others, rather than to the Greeks.

<sup>1</sup> Gr. Aff. Serm. i. T. iv. p. 471, 472.

<sup>2</sup> Εἰς δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἐβραῖους ἐν εἰερῷ χρησμῷ φησὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων.  
Μετὰ Χαλδαίους σοφίαν λάχον, ἡδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι,  
Ἀέθλιε βλῆν ἀνακτὰ σεβάζομενοι θεῶν ἀστυς.  
Ib. p. 413.

<sup>2</sup> Εἰ δὲ καὶ πάντων ἡμῶν ἐχθιστὸς κατήγορος μὲν Ἑλλήνων, ὡς πλαιῖτη δεδελθηθέντων . . . τι δηποῖε μὴ τὰ φιλοσοφῶν πειθεσθε τῷ φιλοσοφῶν, . . . καὶ τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῖς Ἑβραίων προφήταις καὶ ἀποστόλοις παρεχέτε; Gr. Aff. Serm. i. p. 472.

<sup>2</sup>. This

2. This book was written after the establishment of Christianity by Constantine: for the author, as we have just seen, speaks of the Christian as the prevailing religion. ‘They who now prevail, have corrupted it:’ or, according to a different pointing, ‘they who prevail, have already corrupted it.’ There is no reason to believe, that Porphyry lived to the time of Constantine’s conversion to Christianity. The composer of this work here forgot the character which he had assumed: he pretended to be Porphyry; but did not now consider, that Porphyry had died before the Christian could be called ‘the prevailing religion,’ or the Christians ‘the men that prevailed.’ However, it must be owned, that in what the author here says, he is upon his guard, and he casts a reflection upon these men as having corrupted philosophy, or the knowledge of wisdom: but it is a thin disguise, easily seen through.

I make no more remarks upon what is already transcribed, but proceed to another passage of this work.

5. In his Evangelic Demonstration, Eusebius expresseth himself in this pompous manner.

‘But<sup>b</sup> if none of these things will convince you, hearken to your dæmons and gods speaking in their oracles, who impute to our Saviour, not imposture, as you do, but piety and wisdom, and ascent to heaven. What more credible assurance can you have of this than the testimony of our enemy, who in the third book of his work, entitled *Of the Philosophy taught by Oracles*, speaks in these very words: “It will perhaps seem strange to some, which we are about to say. For the gods declared Christ to be most pious, and to be made immortal, and they spoke honourably of him.” And presently after he says: “When we inquired concerning Christ, whether he be a god, the answer was: That the soul is immortal after the death of the body, knows every body who is favoured with wisdom. But the soul of that man is most eminent for piety. Him therefore he declared to be most pious, and his soul, like the souls of others, after death made immortal, which<sup>d</sup> the ignorant Christians worship. Then, when we asked, why he was put to death, the oracular answer was: The body is always liable to slight torments: but the soul of the pious escapes to the heavenly country.” And after

<sup>b</sup> . . . Αλλα ουτε, και των σαυτη δαιμονων, αυτων δη των χρησμωνδων θεων ακηε, τω σωτηρι ημων εχ’ ωσπερ συ γοησεις, αλλ ευσεβειας, και σοφιας, και εις θρανους ανωδον μαρτυρησιν. Dem. Ev. l. 3. cap. 6.

p. 133, 134.

<sup>c</sup> . . . αλλατε ψυχη  
Ανερος ευσεβιη προφερεται εν εκειν.  
<sup>d</sup> ην σεβειν ανωθιας της Χριστιανης.

‘ the oracle he adds: “ He therefore is pious, and is gone to  
 “ Heaven, as the pious do. Him therefore you are not to  
 “ blaspheme, but to pity the ignorance of men.” Thus writes  
 ‘ Porphyry.’

Here the composer of this work was upon his guard: but not  
 so Eusebius, who receives all without hesitation. The author  
 was aware, that what he was about to say was very unlikely: he  
 therefore introduceth it with that preface: ‘ It may seem strange  
 ‘ which we are going to say.’ And he afterwards throws in a  
 reflection upon the Christians, as if they carried their respect for  
 Christ too far. However, he and his god bear an honourable  
 testimony to Jesus, as we have seen.

Porphyry, in this work, and his gods, as Eusebius says, ‘ im-  
 ‘ pute not to our Saviour imposture, but piety and wisdom, and  
 ‘ ascent to heaven.’ But who can believe that, when Porphyry had  
 written a large work, the great design of which, in his remarks  
 upon the book of Daniel, and elsewhere, was to prove Jesus an  
 impostor? And is Porphyry now become an apostle, preaching  
 to the world Christ’s resurrection and ascension?

Eunapius indeed, in his *Life of Porphyry*, says, ‘ that ‘ he  
 ‘ lived to a great age. Whence it came to pass, that he has  
 ‘ left many sentiments different from those which he had delivered  
 ‘ in works formerly written.’ But that may relate to some lesser  
 matters only. We still have his *Life of Plotinus*, written when  
 he was seventy years old, or thereabout; where he appears a true  
 heathen philosopher.

To me it seems very strange, that any Christian, especially a  
 learned Christian, should call upon heathen people, as Eusebius  
 here does, ‘ to hearken to their dæmons and gods speaking in  
 ‘ their oracles:’ who might know, from the scriptures of the  
 Old and New Testament, as well as from reason, that ‘ heathen  
 deities were nothing, and had neither power nor wisdom: if they  
 were any thing they were evil spirits, and their testimonies were  
 of no value. Our Lord never received the testimony of men  
 who were supposed to be acted by dæmons. St. Paul did not

ε . . . πολλας γην τοις ηδη προπεπρασμα-  
 τικουσις βιβλιοις θεωριας ειαληιας καλελιπε.  
 Eunap. Vit. Porph. ad fin.

‘ Christians sometimes speak very justly,  
 agreeable to the doctrine of the ancient  
 prophets, that all the gods of the heathens  
 were vanity, or senseless idols. It is a pity,  
 that they are not always consistent with  
 themselves. Et idola quidem omni sensu  
 carere, quis dubitet? Verum tamen cum

his locantur sedibus, honorabili sublimita-  
 te, ut a precantibus atque immolantibus ad-  
 tendantur, ipsa similitudine animatorum  
 membrorum atque sensuum, quamvis in-  
 sensata et exanima, afficiunt infirmos ani-  
 mos, ut vivere et spirare videantur: acce-  
 dente præsertim veneratione multitudinis,  
 quâ tantus eis cultus impenditur. August.  
 ep. 102. al. 49. n. 18. An excellent ob-  
 servation of that great and eminent ancient.

value the testimony of the young woman at Philippi, who was said to have a spirit of Python, Acts xvi. 16. And I am persuaded, that our Saviour will never thank any of his followers for bringing in dæmons, or heathen deities in their oracles, speaking in his favour. May I not here adopt the language of St. Paul upon another occasion, and say: *What communion has light with darkness? And what concord has Christ with Belial? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?* 2 Cor. vi. 14 . . . 16.

6. Once more: this work, of the Philosophy of Oracles, is rarely mentioned by Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries: therefore it was little known, or not known to be written by so considerable a man as Porphyry, who had written against the Christians.

It is often quoted by Eusebius, as we have seen: it was also known, as it seems, to <sup>e</sup> Julius Firmicus Maternus, about the middle of the fourth century: it is also quoted by Theodoret, about 420, as we have seen; but not very often: it is likewise quoted by Augustine in the fifth century; I shall transcribe him presently with remarks: but these are a very few only. I forbear to enumerate here the names of the many writers of the fourth and fifth centuries who have taken no notice of this work: but it appears to me a great objection against its genuineness, that it is never mentioned in any of the numerous works of Jerom, or Cyril of Alexandria. Jerom wrote in the fourth and fifth centuries, and has often taken notice of Porphyry, but says nothing of this work: Cyril lived in the fifth century, and published a work against the emperor Julian in ten books: in that work he has quoted divers of Porphyry's writings, and made good use of them: his Philosophic History, Of Abstinence from animals, and some others. These Cyril quotes often, and largely; but has not once quoted or named this work, of the Philosophy taught by Oracles.

He has, it is true, the verses before quoted from Eusebius, which are likewise partly in Augustine: but not as taken from any writing of Porphyry, nor as a certain thing, but in this manner. 'When <sup>h</sup>, ' says Cyril, 'some body came to the Pythoness at the temple of Apollo, and inquired which nations were

<sup>e</sup> J. F. M. de Errore Prof. Rel. p. 432, 433. ed. Gronov. 1709.

<sup>h</sup> Αφικόμενα γὰρ τῆς Πυθίας πρὸς τὸν Ἀπολλωνίου νεών, ἐρομένη τε καὶ ἀναμαθεῖν εὐελπίως, τινὲς αὐτῶν οἱ μαλιστα σοφοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν; χρῆσαι φασὶ τὸν ἀνλοθὶ δαίμονα.

Μυνοὶ Καλδαῖοι σοφίην λαχόν, οἱ δ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι Ἀνλοσηθὸν ἀνάκλια σεβάζομενοι Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Διαμεινήσαι δὲ καὶ Πορφύριος τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων Ἑσσαιῶν, καὶ φησὶν ὡς περὶ αὐτῶν. Contr. Jul. l. v. p. 180.

' wisest;

wisest; it is said, the dæmon there gave this answer: The Chaldæans only have obtained wisdom; but the Hebrews worship the self-existent King, God himself. And Porphyry makes mention of the Essenes of Judea in these words. Where Cyril proceeds to quote a passage of the fourth book of his Abstinence from animals, cap: 13, though without saying from what work of Porphyry he takes it. It is plain, that Cyril does not quote that oracle from any work of Porphyry:

It is likely, that in Cyril's time it was a common story; that the Pythian oracle had some time delivered such an answer as this: but he would not vouch for the truth of the relation. The same is in Justin Martyr's Cohortatio ad Græcos, if it be his; and it is brought in much after the same manner as in Cyril. 'When one, as you say, asked your oracle who had been religious men, the oracle, as you say, gave this answer:

"The Chaldæans only have obtained wisdom, and the Hebrews worship the self-existent king, God himself."

7. We will now see what Augustine says of this work.

He is shewing, that the God whom the Christians worship is the true God. 'Lastly,' says<sup>k</sup> he; 'He is God; whom Porphyry, the most learned of the philosophers though a bitter enemy of the Christians; and also the oracles, whom he thinks to be gods, acknowledge to be the great God.'

'For' in his books, which he calls the Philosophy of Oracles; and writes of things pertaining to Philosophy; as delivered in answers

<sup>i</sup> Ερμειε γαρ τινος, ως αυτοι φασι, τε παρ' εμου χρηστηριε, τινας συνεθη θεοσεβεις αυτας γελεισθαι ποτε, ειω το χρηστηριον ερκειται φασι.

Μενοι Καλδαισι σοφην λαχον, κδ' αφε' Εβραιοι; Αδ' γε ητοι αι ακλα σε βαζομενοι Θεον αυτον. Just. M. ad. Gr. Coh. p. 15. Ben. 12 Par.

<sup>k</sup> Postremo ipse est Deus, quem doctissimus philosophorum, quamvis Christianorum acerrimus inimicus, etiam per eorum oracula, quos Deos putat, Deum magnum Porphyrius confitetur. De Civ. Dei. l. xix. cap. 22.

<sup>i</sup> Nam in libris, quos <sup>α</sup> λογιων φιλοσοφιας appellat, in quibus exsequitur, atque conscribit rerum ad philosophiam pertinentium velut divina responsa, ut ipsa verba ejus, quemadmodum ex lingua Græca in Latinam interpretata sunt, ponam. Interroganti; inquit, quem Deum placando revocare possit uxorem suam a Christianismo, hæc ait versibus Apollo. Deinde verba velut Apollinis ista

sunt: Forte magis poteris in aqua impressis literis scribere, aut ad instans pennas leves per aëra ut avis volare, quam semel pollutæ revoces impiæ uxoris sensum. Pergat quomodo vult inanibus fallaciis perseverans, et lamentationibus fallacissimis mortuum Deum cantans, quem iudicibus recta sentientibus perditum, pessima in speciosis ferro juncta mors interfecit. Deinde post hos versus Apollinis, qui non sancte metro Latine interpretati sunt, subjunxit, atque ait: In his quidem tergiverlationem irremediabilis sententiæ eorum manifestavit; dicens, Quoniam Judæi suscipiunt Deum magis quam isti. Ecce ubi decolorans Christum, Judæos præposuit Christianis; confitens, quod Judæi suscipiunt Deum: Sic enim exposuit versus Apollinis, ubi a iudicibus recta sentientibus Christum dicit occisum, tanquam illis justè judicantibus; merito sit ille punitus. Viderit, quid de Christo vates mendax Apollinis dixerit; atque ille crediderit: aut fortasse vatem; quod non dixerit; dixisse iste ipse confixerit.

R

Quam

answers from the gods, he speaks to this purpose. And I shall  
 put down his very words, as they have been translated out of  
 the Greek tongue into Latin. He says, when he inquired what  
 god he should appease in order to reduce his wife from Chris-  
 tianity, Apollo answered in verse: "Possibly you may more  
 easily write in water, or fly in the air like a bird, than convert  
 your wife once polluted with impiety." Let him go on as he  
 will, singing with his fallacious lamentations the dead god,  
 whom the judges rightly condemned, and the worst death de-  
 stroyed. Then, after these verses of Apollo, which are not  
 translated into good Latin metre, he subjoins, and says: Hereby  
 he, [the god] "expressed their incurable obstinacy. For the  
 Jews may sooner acknowledge God than they." Observe,  
 how to disparage Christ he prefers the Jews before Christians,  
 confessing that the Jews acknowledge God: for so he explained

Quam vero sibi constet, vel ipsa oracula inter se faciat convenire, postea videbimus. Hic tamen Judæos, tanquam Dei susceptores, recte dicit judicasse de Christo, quod eum morte pessima excruciantum esse censuerint. Deus itaque Judæorum, cui perhibet testimonium, audiendus fuit, dicens: *Sacrificans Diis eradicabitur, nisi Domino tantum.* Ex. xxii. 20. Sed ad manifestiora veniamus, et audiamus quam magnum Deum dicat esse Judæorum. Item ad ea quæ interrogavit Apollinem, quid melius, sive verbum sive ratio, an lex. Respondit, inquit, versibus hæc dicens. Ac deinde subjicit versibus, et in quibus et ista sunt, ut quantum satis est, inde decerpam: In Deum, inquit, generatorem, et regem ante omnia, quem tremunt cælum et terra, atque mare, et infernorum abdita, et ipsa numina perhorrescunt: quorum lex est Pater, quem valde sancti honorant Hebræi. Tali oraculo Dei sui Apollinis, Porphyrius tam magnum Deum dixit Hebræorum, ut eum, et ipsa numina perhorrescunt: quorum lex est Pater, quem valde sancti honorant Hebræi. Tali oraculo dei sui Apollinis, Porphyrius tam magnum Deum dixit Hebræorum, ut eum et ipsa numina perhorrescant. Cum ergo Deus ille dixerit, *Sacrificans Diis eradicabitur*, miror, quod ipse Porphyrius non perhorruerit, et sacrificans Diis non formidaverit. Cap. 23. n. 1.

2. Dicit etiam bona philosophus iste de Christo, quasi oblitus illius, de qua paullo ante locuti sumus, contumeliæ suæ: aut quasi in somnis dii ejus maledixerint Christo, et vigilantes bonum esse cognoverint, dignèque laudaverint. Denique, tanquam

mirabile aliquid atque incredibile prolaturus, præter opinionem, inquit profecto quibusdam videatur esse, quod dicturi sumus. Christum enim dii piissimum pronuntiaverunt, et immortalem factum, et cum bona prædicatione ejus meminerunt. Christianos vero pollutos, inquit, et contaminatos, et errore implicatos dicunt: et multis talibus adversus eos blasphemias utuntur. Deinde subjicit velut deorum oracula blasphemantium Christianos. Et post hæc. De Christo autem, inquit, interrogantibus, si est Deus, ait Hecate: Quoniam quidem immortalis anima post corpus ut incedit, tu noli: a sapientia autem abscissa semper errat: viri pietate præstantissimi est illa anima. Hanc colunt aliena a se veritate: Deinde post verba hujus quasi oraculi sua ipse contexens, piissimum igitur virum, inquit, eum dixit, et ejus animam, sicut et aliorum piorum, post obitum immortalitate donatam, et hanc colere Christiani errantes. Interrogantibus autem, inquit, Cur ergo damnatus est? Oraculo respondit Dea: Corpus quidem debilitantibus tormentis semper obpositum est: anima autem piorum cælesti sede infidet. Illa vero anima aliis animabus fataliter dedit, quibus fata non annuerunt deorum obtinere dona, neque habere Jovis immortalis agnitionem, errore implicari. Propterea ergo diis exosi quia quibus fato fuit non nosse Deum, nec dona a diis accipere, his fataliter dedit iste errore implicari. Ipse vero pius, et in coelum, sicut pii, concessit. Itaque hunc quidem non blasphemabis, misereberis autem hominum dementiam, ex eo in eis facile præceptique periculum. Ib. n. 2.

‘ the verses of Apollo, where he says, that Christ was put to  
 ‘ death by judges thinking right things, as if they had passed a  
 ‘ just judgment, and he had been deservedly punished. Let  
 ‘ him see to it, what the lying priest of Apollo said of Christ,  
 ‘ and he believed: or, perhaps, he himself pretended, the priest  
 ‘ had said what he did not say. But how he is consistent with  
 ‘ himself, or how he makes the oracles to agree, we shall see  
 ‘ hereafter. However, here he says, the Jews, as worshippers  
 ‘ of God, judged rightly concerning Christ, when they con-  
 ‘ demned him to suffer the worst death: therefore the God of  
 ‘ the Jews, to whom he bears this testimony, ought to be heard,  
 ‘ who says: *He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord*  
 ‘ *only, shall be destroyed.* Ex. xxii. 20. But let us proceed to  
 ‘ plainer things, and let us hear how great a God, he says, the  
 ‘ God of the Jews is: and therefore let us observe the question  
 ‘ he put to Apollo, Which is the best instructor, reason or law?  
 ‘ He says, he made the answer in verse, saying these things.  
 ‘ Then he puts down Apollo’s verses, in which are these, that I  
 ‘ may take what is sufficient: “ You must worship the God  
 ‘ creator, king, before all things, before whom the heaven, and  
 ‘ the earth, and the sea, and things hidden in the deep tremble,  
 ‘ and whom the gods themselves dread: whose law is the Father  
 ‘ whom the pious Hebrews adore.” In that oracle of his god  
 ‘ Apollo, Porphyry declares the God of the Hebrews to be so  
 ‘ great, that the gods themselves dread him. When therefore  
 ‘ that god has said, *he that sacrificeth to other gods shall be destroyed,*  
 ‘ I wonder that Porphyry himself did not dread him, and did  
 ‘ not fear to be destroyed when he sacrificed to other gods.’

‘ This philosopher also says good things of Christ, as if he  
 ‘ had forgot the reproach before mentioned; or, as if his gods  
 ‘ blasphemed Christ in their sleep, and when they awoke ac-  
 ‘ knowledged his merit, and gave him due praises. Finally,  
 ‘ then, as if he was about to say something wonderful and in-  
 ‘ credible, he says: “ It may indeed appear strange which we  
 ‘ are going to say. For the gods declared Christ to be most  
 ‘ pious, and made immortal, and spoke honourably of him:”  
 ‘ but, as he says, they said, “ the Christians were polluted and  
 ‘ corrupted, and involved in error.” And many such reproaches  
 ‘ they cast upon them. Then he subjoins oracles of the gods  
 ‘ reproaching the Christians: afterwards he says, “ when we in-  
 ‘ quired concerning Christ, whether he be a god, Hecate an-  
 ‘ swered: That the soul after separation from the body becometh  
 ‘ immortal thou knowest. A soul void of wisdom always wan-  
 ‘ ders: but that is the soul of a man most eminent for piety.

“ This they worship not rightly.” Then, after the words of the oracle, he adds himself: “ Therefore,” says he, “ the oracle declared him to be a most pious man; and his soul, like the souls of other pious men, after death favoured with immortality; and that the mistaken Christians worship this. And,” says he; “ when we asked, why then was he condemned? The goddess answered: The body indeed is ever liable to debilitating torments; but the soul of the pious dwells in the heavenly mansion: But that soul has fatally been the occasion to many other souls to be involved in error, to whom it has not been given to acknowledge the immortal Jove. But himself is pious; and gone to heaven as other pious men do. Him therefore thou shalt not blaspheme, but pity the folly of men because of the danger they are in.”

‘ Who <sup>l</sup> is so weak,’ says Augustine; ‘ as not to perceive, that these oracles were contrived by a cunning man, and an enemy to the Christians? or at least that those answers were given by impure dæmons, with this view, that because they commend Christ, they may be thought to speak truly when they blame the Christians; and thereby, if possible; shut up the way of salvation in which all Christians are.’

Augustine has afterwards another quotation from this work, which I shall not transcribe. I only observe; ‘ that <sup>m</sup> Jesus is there spoken of as one of the Hebrew wise men, as had been before declared in the oracles of Apollo.’

That whole quotation is taken from Augustine’s large work, *Of the City of God*, supposed to have been written by him between the years 413 and 426. He <sup>n</sup> has also referred to this book, as Porphyry’s, in his work of the *Consent of the Evangelists*, written about the year 400, where he speaks too favour-

<sup>l</sup> Quis ita stultus est, ut non intelligat, aut ab homine callido, eoque Christianis inimicissimo, hæc oracula fuisse conficta, aut consilio simili, ab impuris dæmonibus ista fuisse responsa: ut, scilicet, quoniam laudant Christum, propterea credantur veraciter vituperare Christianos: atque ita, si possint, intercludant viam salutis æternæ, in quâ sit quisque Christianus. *Ib.* n. 3.

<sup>m</sup> Ab his sapientes Hebræorum, quorum ille etiam Jesus unus fuit, sicut audisti divina Apollinis, quæ superius dicta sunt. *n. 4. ib.* <sup>n</sup> Quid quod isti vani Christi laudatores, et Christianæ religionis obliqui obtrectatores, propterea non audent blasphemare Christum, quia quidem phi-

losophi eorum, sicut in libris suis Porphyrius Sicularius prodidit, consuluerunt deos suos, quid de Christo responderent, illi autem oraculis suis Christum laudare compulsi sunt. Nec mirum, cum et in Evangelio legamus cum dæmones fuisse confessos... Ac per hoc isti ne contra deorum suorum responsa contentur, continent blasphemias a Christo, et eas in discipulos ejus effundunt. Mihi autem videtur, quod illi dii gentium, quos philosophi Paganorum consulere potuerunt, etiam si de discipulis Christi interrogarentur, ipsos quoque laudare cogentur. *De Consensu Evangelist. l. i. cap. 15. Tom. iii. P. 2.*

ably of it. I shall not translate it; but I have transcribed the passage below in Augustine's own words.

I shall now make remarks.

1. Augustine's quotations of this work are somewhat different from those in Eusebius; which, perhaps, is owing to the translation: for Augustine intimates, that the Latin translation which he made use of was not very exact.

2. The quotations of this book in Eusebius and Augustine agree in the main; for in both the worship of the God of the Jews is recommended, and honourable mention is made of Christ, as a most excellent man, and gone to heaven.

3. Therefore this is not a work of Porphyry: for in his work against the Christians, as Eusebius says, he had 'equally reviled the Jewish people and us, Moses, and the Jewish prophets.'

4. Here is a story concerning Porphyry's wife which we have not found in Eusebius: it is very likely to be a fiction of the writer of this work, for we do not meet with it elsewhere: nor is the character of this work such, as alone, without any other voucher, to give it much credit. However, agreeably enough to the general design of this work, here is an honourable testimony given to the Christians, that they were very steady in the belief and profession of their principles.

5. In this book, as cited by Augustine and also by Eusebius before, are some reflections upon Christians: they are spoken of as 'in error, corrupted, and polluted.' These reflections were inserted, as seems to me, for a disguise; that the author might cover his real intention: his design was to recommend Christianity: but he had assumed the character of a heathen and enemy; the better to keep up that appearance, he casts out reflections upon the followers of Jesus. However, he does not blame them for believing in Jesus: he recommends him to all as 'most pious, and excellent, and gone to heaven.' His reflections upon the Christians therefore, as 'in error and corrupted,' relate not to the general scheme of Christianity which was right, but to some opinions maintained by some of its professors: and indeed all these reflections upon Christians, as erroneous and ignorant, I consider as arguments of the late original of this work; and that it was not composed till some while after the conversion of Constantine. I am not positive what opinions the author intends, but he may have an eye to the disputes concerning the Arian and other Trinitarian doctrines, which must have been controverted in the year 315 or sooner, before which time Porphyry had died.

6. The conclusion to be made from the whole is, that this is not a work of Porphyry a heathen philosopher and enemy to Christianity, but of a Christian and patron of Christianity.

Augustine himself doubted of the genuineness of this work, and of the oracles contained it; though he shews it rather too much respect, when he proceeds to allege it as an argument in behalf of the true Deity, saying, as above, 'he is God, whom Porphyry the most learned of the philosophers, and the oracles alleged by him, acknowledge to be the true God.'

Augustine says very truly, 'It is plain, that it is the work of some cunning man.' The self-contradictions, or the seeming-self-contradictions and inconsistencies, are plain proofs of insincerity, design, and artifice.

It is the artifice or forgery of some Christian, designed and contrived to serve the interests of Christianity in general, and possibly likewise of some particular notions of the author himself. Augustine, though he suspects it to be a contrivance, imagines it may be the contrivance, not of a Christian, but of an enemy to Christians: but, so far as can be judged from what we have remaining of this work, it is not the work of an enemy, but of a friend to Christianity. Undoubtedly, it was needful to cover the forgery of these oracles, and the real character of the writer, by some things that had the appearance of heathenism: for the assumed character of the writer is that of an heathen, and an enemy to Christianity: there is no doubt of that. He must therefore say some things to the disadvantage of Christianity itself, or of the professors of it: accordingly, he has here and there blamed the Christians with some freedom and seeming sharpness; and now and then, as it should seem from Augustine's account (though that does not appear in Eusebius,) he did also, in an obscure manner, speak disrespectfully of Christ himself. But, that the writer held Christian notions, and designed to favour the cause of Christianity, is evident from his commendations of the Jews, from his recommending the worship of the God of the Jews as the true and great God: and in that, when he said any thing to the disadvantage of Jesus he spoke obscurely, when to his advantage he spoke clearly. So this appears in Augustine's own account. Having shewn what the author had said of the justice of the death of Christ, in ambiguous terms, he adds: 'but let us proceed to clearer things:' Where the oracle and the writer plainly commend Christ: and the difference between these passages, in which Christ is reproached, from those in which he is commended, is thus represented by Augustine: the former things  
were

were spoken by the gods, 'when asleep, these, when they  
'awaked.'

How favourable to the Christian cause this work was understood to be by Theodoret, manifestly appears from what we quoted from him some while ago, where he calls upon the heathen people, and asks them: 'Why do you not hearken to  
'your own philosopher, and receive the oracle of the Delphic  
'tripod, and learn of the Hebrew prophets and apostles?'

Add to all this the many quotations of this work in Eusebius's Evangelical Preparation, all, some way or other, on the side of Christianity, and directly, or indirectly, reviling the heathen deities and their worship; and it can be no longer doubted, that the design of this work was to favour Christianity, and weaken heathenism; therefore it was not composed by Porphyry.

Eusebius, as may be remembered, introduceth his first quotation of this work in his Preparation in this manner: 'But ° I  
'shall not now insist upon the testimonies of friends, which  
'might be reckoned of little value, but of strangers: and who  
'of all the Greek historians or philosophers can be more fitly  
'alleged, than he who in our time gained so much reputation  
'by writing against us?' And again in his Demonstration, addressing himself to heathen people, he says: 'What ° more  
'credible assurance can you have of this than the testimony of  
'our enemy?'

The composer of this work, (whoever he was,) had the same thought. Having formed a design to exhibit a covert testimony in behalf of Christianity in the name of some learned heathen, and to bring it into oracular answers of heathen deities, he supposed, that no fitter name could be taken than that of Porphyry's; who was in great repute for learning, and had not long since published the bitterest invectives against Jews and Christians, and the strongest arguments that had ever been alleged against their scriptures: and he hoped by this work to overthrow Porphyry's long work against the Christians, which had done so much mischief.

But it is wonderful that Eusebius should be so easily deceived, and adopt the same thought, and be pleased with it.

Upon the whole, this work is the artifice of some cunning but not wise Christian,

I presume I have now said enough to justify my not alleging any passages from this work, as testimonies of Porphyry, or of any other heathen writer, in favour of Christianity.

° Pr. Ev. l. iv. p. 142.

° Dem. Ev. l. iii. p. 134. A.

And though this argument has detained us a great while, perhaps the length of it may be excused, when it is considered, how long the genuineness of this work has been admitted by learned men with great unanimity, and has been suspected by a very few only. If the several reasons here alleged are not impertinent, but to the purpose, the whole argument ought not to be charged with prolixity: learned men, as well as others, are oftentimes hard to be convinced of the falshood of an opinion once embraced by them; nor will they yield till they are overwhelmed by a heap of reasons.

This argument is not very honourable to our ecclesiastical-historian: I acknowledge it, but I cannot help it; truth must be asserted. So<sup>9</sup> says the learned and generous HEUMANN, arguing against such as were unwilling to allow a fault in Socrates, when he recorded the story of Porphyry's having deserted Christianity.

---

C H A P. XXXVIII.

SIX WRITERS OF THE AUGUSTAN HISTORY.

I. *A general account of these authors.* II. *Passages of SPARTIAN concerning Septimius Severus and Caracalla.* III. *Passages of LAMPRIDIUS concerning Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus.* IV. *Passages of FLAVIUS VOPISCUS concerning Adrian and Aurelian.*

I. THERE<sup>9</sup> are six authors, called writers of the Augustan History, who have written the history, or rather the lives of the Roman emperors from Adrian to Carinus. Their names are Ælius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Ælius Lampridius, Vulcatius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus, who lived in the times of Dioclesian, Constantius Chlorus, and his son Constantine the great. Some of these Lives are inscribed to Dioclesian, others to the forementioned Constantius, others to

<sup>9</sup> Quis, inquam, non videat, narrationem illam esse referendam inter viles panos purpure historie ecclesiasticæ affatos ab hominibus minus circumspèctis? Nec audio Celeb. Sibirum, parcendum esse dagentem auctoritati scriptorum ecclesiasticorum. Imo vero non parcamus erroribus veterum, nec ulla quantumvis clari scriptori, auctoritate absterreamur ab investigati-

tione veri. Veterum libros legere nos oportet criticis oculis. Atqui critici est, fugere omnem  $\pi\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\ \pi\omega\lambda\eta\psi\iota\sigma\iota$ . Heumann. Ep. Miscell. T. iii. p. 59, 60.

<sup>9</sup> Vid. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. ii. cap. 5, 6, 7. Fabr. Bib. Lat. l. iii. cap. vi. T. 1. p. 546. &c. et T. iii. p. 83. &c. Tillemont Dioclesian art. 26 et 27. H. E. T. iv. p. 98. &c.

Constantine;

Constantine; some are without an inscription, nor does it appear to whom they are addressed: nor is it absolutely certain to which author every life belongs; for those which are generally ascribed to Lampridius, are by some ascribed to Spartian. They all lived much about the same time, under Dioclesian and his successors, near the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century. I place them all, as at a mean, in the year 306: but I bring them in here a little before the true order of their time, partly, that we might not be interrupted in our accounts of Dioclesian's persecution; and partly, because the testimonies of these several authors relate to things near the beginning of the third century, or however some good while before the end of it.

Most of their passages concerning the Christians have been already alleged in this work, under the several emperors of whom they write: nevertheless, I have a mind to take here a general review of them all together in this place, adding now one or two which have not yet been taken notice of.

II. Spartian, in his Life of Septimius Severus, addressed to the emperor Dioclesian, says of Severus: 'He<sup>b</sup> forbade under a severe penalty, that any should become Jews. A like edict was published by him against the Christians.'

Spartian intends the persecution of the Christians begun in the tenth year of Severus, A. D. 202, mentioned by Eusebius and other ecclesiastical writers, and of which we gave a distinct account some while<sup>c</sup> ago.

2. The same historian, in<sup>d</sup> the Life of Antoninus Caracalla, son and successor of Severus, says of him: 'At<sup>e</sup> the age of seven years, when he had heard that a boy his play-fellow had been grievously beaten, because he was of the Jewish religion, he would not for a good while after so much as look upon his own father, nor the father of the boy, nor those who had beaten him.'

It is probable, that by the 'Jewish' is here intended the 'Christian religion': forasmuch as Tertullian, who lived at that time, says, that Caracalla was nursed by a Christian woman. Of this likewise we took notice<sup>f</sup> formerly.

III. Lampridius, in his Life of Antoninus Heliogabalus, [who succeeded Macrinus, and reigned from 218 to 222,] ad-

<sup>b</sup> Judæos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit. idem etiam de Christianis sanxit. Spartian. Sever. cap. 17. p. 618. quoted before in this volume, p. 105. <sup>c</sup> See before p. 101, &c. <sup>d</sup> It is not certainly known to whom that Life is addressed.

<sup>e</sup> Septennis puer, quum collusorem suum puerum; ob judaicam religionem gravius verberatum audisset, neque patrem suum, neque patrem pueri, vel auctores verberum diu respexit. Spartian. Carac. cap. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Ad Scap. cap. 4.

<sup>g</sup> See p. 101.

dressed

dressed to Dioclesian, says: ‘ He <sup>b</sup> erected a temple upon Mount  
 ‘ Palatine, near the imperial palace, to the god Heliogabalus,  
 ‘ intending to bring into that temple the image of the mother of  
 ‘ the gods, and the fire of Vesta, and the Palladium, and the  
 ‘ shields of Mars, and every object of the veneration of the  
 ‘ Romans, that no god might be worshipped at Rome beside  
 ‘ Heliogabalus. He said likewise, that the religion of the Jews  
 ‘ and the Samaritans, and the devotion of the Christians, must  
 ‘ be transferred thither, that the priesthood of Heliogabalus  
 ‘ might comprehend in it the mysteries of all religions.’ This  
 is the passage which I promised some while \*\* ago.

This <sup>1</sup> mad emperor, remarkable for the worst follies and  
 vices, was a native of Emesa in Syria, where the sun was wor-  
 shipped under the appellation of Heliogabalus, or Elagabalus,  
 to whom this emperor himself was <sup>2</sup> priest.

There is no need to make many remarks upon this story of  
 Lampridius. It shews however, that the Christian religion,  
 though mentioned last here as being of the latest original, was  
 then well known in the world, and was so considerable, as not  
 to be omitted in this emperor’s design of uniting the devotions  
 of all men in the worship of the god to whom he was priest.

They who are desirous to inform themselves concerning the  
 origin of the name Heliogabalus, may consult divers learned  
 men <sup>1</sup>, whose works are in every body’s hands.

2. The same writer, in his Life of Alexander Severus, suc-  
 cessor of Heliogabalus, has several passages relating to the  
 Christians, which have been already transcribed with remarks;  
 to which <sup>m</sup> therefore the reader is now referred.

IV. Flavius Vopiscus of Syracuse is the sixth and last of the  
 Augustan writers, but not the worst of them; for he is generally

<sup>b</sup> Sed ubi primum ingressus est Urbem, omiſſis iis, quæ in provincia gerebantur, Heliogabalum in Palatino monte juxta ædes imperatorias consecravit, eique templum fecit, studens et Matris typum, et Vestæ ignem, et Palladium, et Ancilia, et omnia Romanorum veneranda in illud transferre templum, et id agens, ne quis Romæ deus nisi Heliogabalus coleretur. Dicebat præterea, Judæorum et Samaritanorum religiones, et Christianam devotionem illuc transferendam, ut omnium culturarum secretum Heliogabali sacerdotium teneret. Lamprid. Heliog. cap. iii. p. 796.

\*\* See before p. 120.

<sup>1</sup> Vitam Heliogabali Antonini impurissi-

mam, qui Varius etiam dictus est, nunquam in literas misissem, ne quis fuisse Romanorum principem sciret, nisi ante Caligulas, et Neronem, et Vitellios, hoc idem habuisset imperium. Lamprid. ibid. cap. i. p. 790.

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Antonini Caracallæ, ut putabatur filius, et sacerdos Eliogabali templi, adeo impudice in imperio suo vixit, ut nullum genus obscænitatis omiserit. Euseb. Chron. p. 173.

<sup>k</sup> Fuit autem Heliogabalus, vel Jovis, vel Solis Sacerdos, atque Antonini sibi nomen asciverat. &c. Lamprid. ibid. p. 793.

<sup>1</sup> Joseph. Scaliger. Animadv. in Euseb. Chron. p. 231. Basnag. ann. p. 218. num. viii. <sup>m</sup> See before p. 121 . . : 124. &c.

reckoned as learned a man, and as regular an historian, as any of them; as was observed \* before.

I have already taken from him a large article in the chapter of the emperor Adrian, to <sup>n</sup> which the reader is referred. It is taken out of his *Life of Saturninus* <sup>o</sup>, who was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers at Alexandria in the time of <sup>p</sup> Probus, and after a short reign, or rebellion and tyranny, was put to death; and, as <sup>q</sup> Eusebius says, at Apamea.

2. The same writer, in his *Life of the emperor* <sup>r</sup> Aurelian, speaks of a letter of his to the senate of Rome, written probably in the beginning of his reign, in the year 270 or 271, where the Christians are mentioned: the passage was transcribed formerly <sup>s</sup> with remarks; to which therefore I now refer my readers.

---

## C H A P. XXXIX.

TWO AUTHORS WHO WROTE AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS IN THE TIME OF DIOCLESIAN'S PERSECUTION, ONE ANONYMOUS, THE OTHER SUPPOSED TO BE HIEROCLES.

WHERE ALSO OF APOLLONIUS TYANÆUS, AND THE TWO LIVES OF PYTHAGORAS, WRITTEN BY PORPHYRY AND JAMBlichus.

- I. *An Anonymous Author against the Christians.* II. *Hierocles, with a large account of his work from Lactantius and Eusebius.* III. *A great cruelty of Hierocles, in the time of Dioclesian's persecution, when he was præfect of Alexandria.* IV. *Remarks upon the accounts of his work, as given by Lactantius and Eusebius.* V. *That Apollonius was not so considerable as many learned men of late times have supposed.* VI. *A large account of the Life of Apollonius Tyanæus written by Philostratus, with remarks upon it, shewing that it was not written with a design to oppose the miracles of our Saviour.* VII. *An account of the Lives of Pythagoras, written by Porphyry and Jamblichus, with remarks upon them, shewing, that in those works there was not any intention to oppose the Christian religion.* VIII. *Another work of Jamblichus concerning the images of the gods.*

\* See p. 172.

p. 359. &c.

ninus. cap. 7, 8.

progre- diar, dicendum est quod præcipue ad hunc pertinet. Errare quosdam scio, et putare hunc esse Saturninum, qui Galien temporibus imperium occupavit: quum hic longè alius fuerit, et Probo pene nolente sit occisus. . . . Obsessum denique in castro quodam ab iis, quos Probus mise-

n See Vol. vii.

o Fl. Vopisc. Satur-

p Et ne longius

rat, invito Probo esse jugulatum. Id. ib. cap. xi. p. 734.

q Saturninus, magister exercitus, novam civitatem Antiochiæ exorsus est condere. Qui postea imperium molitus invadere Apamiæ occiditur. Euseb. Chron. p. 177. Conf. Scalligeri Animadv. p. 241.

r Vopisc. Aurelian. cap. 20. p. 463. &c.

s See before p. 172, 173.

### I. LACTANTIUS

I. LACTANTIUS speaks of two professed adversaries of the Christian religion at the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution. 'I forbear,' says <sup>a</sup> he, 'to take notice of those who in former times in vain opposed our religion. When I taught rhetoric at Nicomedia, having been invited thither for that purpose, and at the same time the temple of God was demolished, there were two men who with great pride unseasonably insulted the injured truth: one of whom professed himself to be a master of philosophy, but was extremely vicious. . . . This man, who overthrew his discourses by his manners, or condemned his manners by his discourses, and thus was a severe censor and bitter reprover of himself, at that very time when good men were unrighteously abused, published three books against our religion, and the Christian name: professing likewise to act therein the part of a philosopher, in delivering men from their errors, and bringing them back to the way of truth, that is, to the worship of the gods, by whose power and providence,

<sup>a</sup> Omitto eos, qui prioribus eam temporibus nequiequam lacefferunt. Ego cum in Bithynia oratorias literas accitus docerem, contigissetque, ut eodem tempore Dei templum everteretur: duo exsisterunt, qui jacenti atque abjectæ veritati, nescio utrum superbius, an importunius insultarent. Quorum alter antistitem se philosophiæ profitebatur. Verum ita vitiosus, ut continentiæ magister, non minus avaritia, quam libidinibus arderet, in victu tam sumtuosus, ut in schola virtutis assertor, parsimoniæ, paupertatisque laudator, in palatio pejus cenaret quam domi: tamen vitia sua capillis, et pallio, et (quod maximum est velamentum,) divitiis prætegebat: quas ut auget, ad amicitias judicum miro ambitu penetrabat. . . . Hic vero, qui suas disputationes moribus destruebat, vel mores suos disputationibus arguebat, ipse adversus se gravis censor, et accusator acerrimus, eodem ipso tempore, quo justus populus nefarie læcerabatur, tres libros evomit contra religionem, nomenque Christianam. Professus ante omnia, philosophi officium esse, erroribus hominum subvenire, atque illos ad veram viam revocare, id est, ad cultus deorum, quorum numine ac majestate, ut ille dicebat, mundus gubernetur: nec pati homines imperitos quorundam fraudibus illi, ne simplicitas eorum prædæ ac pabulo sit hominibus astutis. Itaque se suscepisse hoc munus philosophia dignum, ut præferret non videntium lumen famientiæ, non modo, ut susceptis deorum cultibus refunderent, sed etiam ut pertinaci ob-

stinatione deposita, corporis cruciamenta devitent, nec sævas membrorum lacerationes frustra perpeti velint. Ut autem appareret, cujus rei gratia opus illud elaborasset, effusus est in principum laudes, quorum pietas et providentia (ut quidem ipse dicebat,) cum in cæteris rebus humanis, tum præcipue in defendendis deorum religionibus claruisset: consultum esse tandem rebus humanis, ut cohibita impia et anili superstitione universi homines legitimis sacris vacarent, ac propitios sibi deos experirentur. Ubi autem religionis ejus, contra quam perorabat, infamare voluit rationem, ineptus, varius, ridiculus apparuit, quia gravis ille consultor utilitatis alienæ, non modo quid oppugnaret, sed etiam quid loqueretur, nesciebat. Nam si qui nostrorum assuerunt, quamvis temporum gratia conniverent, animo tamen deridere: utpote cum viderent hominem profitentem se illuminaturum alios, cum ipse cæcus esset, redacturum alios ab errore, cum ipse ignoraret, ubi pedes suos poneret: erudituram alios ad veritatem, cujus ille ne scintillam quidem unam vidisset aliquando: quippe cum sapientiæ professor profligare sapientiam videretur. Omnes tamen id arguebant, quod illo potissimum tempore id opus esset aggressus, quo lucebat odiosa crudelitas. O philosophum adulatorem ac temporis servientem! Verum hic sua inaniæte contentus est: qui et gratiam, quam sperabat, non est adeptus, et gloria, quam captavit, in culpam, reprehensionemque conversa est. Lactant. Inst. l. v. cap. 2.

' as he said, the world is governed; and not to suffer ignorant  
 ' and unskilful men to be misled by the frauds of others, and that  
 ' their simplicity might no longer be the prey and food of cunning  
 ' men. Therefore he had undertaken this office, well becoming  
 ' a philosopher, not only to hold out the light of wisdom to those  
 ' who do not discern it; but also to persuade them; laying aside all  
 ' perverse obstinacy, to avoid heavy sufferings; and not give up  
 ' themselves to torments without reason. And that it might appear  
 ' with what views this work of his was composed, he enlarged in  
 ' the praises of the emperors, whose wisdom and piety, he said,  
 ' were conspicuous, not only in the affairs of the state, but also,  
 ' and chiefly, in upholding the religion of the gods; and had  
 ' taken due care of the welfare of mankind, in restraining an  
 ' impious and foolish superstition, that all men performing the  
 ' legal rites might enjoy the favour and protection of the gods.  
 ' But when he came to confute the religion against which he was  
 ' arguing, he appeared very contemptible, not knowing what he  
 ' opposed, nor what to say; so that our people in general, though  
 ' upon account of the times they might think it best to say  
 ' little, could not but despise him, and look upon him as a man  
 ' who attempted to enlighten others when he was blind himself,  
 ' and to bring others back from error when he was himself ignorant,  
 ' and knew not where to set his feet, and to teach others the truth,  
 ' of which he never had a glimpse himself. All thought it strange,  
 ' that at this very time he should engage in such a work, when the  
 ' most cruel measures were taken. Behold then a flattering philosopher  
 ' and a server of the times. However, this man was despised for  
 ' his emptiness: nor did he obtain the favour he hoped for: and  
 ' instead of the glory which he aimed at, he met with reproach  
 ' and censure.'

Upon which I shall make only two or three remarks, and then proceed.

1. This writer is anonymous; nor do we know that he is mentioned by any one beside Lactantius in this place. Some have imagined that he is the same as Porphyry, but altogether without reason. Porphyry is older, and his character very different from that of the person here described: Porphyry was a man of virtue; and his work against the Christians, so far from being contemptible, was perhaps the most formidable of all the arguments written against them by any of their ancient heathen adversaries.

And we may therefore hence infer, that many books were written against the Christians in the first ages of which we now know

know nothing. They have been buried in oblivion; but they may have given the Christians a good deal of trouble at the time when they were published.

2. Though we have not the work of this anonymous writer, we perceive what was in it. Lactantius, who was perfectly honest, as well as zealous for his religion, may be relied upon for having given a true and just account of the character of the author, and the design and contents of his work: and therefore I have judged it highly proper to transcribe him at length.

This author, by profession a philosopher, and a teacher of philosophy; represented Christianity to be 'superstition, foolish,' and also 'impious, neglecting the deities,' by whom, as he said, the world was governed: 'contrary' likewise to the 'established laws,' and 'prejudicial to the interests of mankind,' as exposing men to the displeasure of the gods. To cure men therefore of this superstition, (no matter how,) was to recommend them to the favour and blessing of those deities. He was also a flatterer, and he expatiated in the praises of the emperor; but his arguments were very inconsiderable.

3. I must be allowed to transcribe here a paragraph of Mr. Bayle, who was a witness of the persecution of the Protestants in his own country in the time of Lewis the XIVth.

'The <sup>b</sup> preface of this philosopher,' says he, 'may enable us to discern the great conformity of Pagan and Christian persecutions. A self-interested and flattering author never fails to take up the pen against the persecuted party: it appears a fine opportunity to praise his prince: he lays hold of it, and enlarges upon the importance of the service done for God, and the charity of adding instruction to the authority of the laws: that enlightening the erroneous, they may be delivered from the pain to which their obstinacy might expose them. The voluptuous philosopher of Nicomedia forgot none of these common-places. It may be said, that he was the original to many French authors, who wrote during the sufferings of the Protestants. It is easier to depart from the method of Dioclesian's persecution than from that of his panegyrist.'

II. Of the other writer Lactantius speaks after this manner: 'The <sup>c</sup> other,' says he, 'treated the same subject more accurately:

<sup>b</sup> See his Dictionary in Hierocles: note (C).  
<sup>c</sup> Alius eandem materiam mordacius scripsit. Qui erat tum e numero judicum, et qui auctor in primis faciendæ persecutionis fuit: quo scelere non

contentus etiam scriptis eos, quos affixerat insecutus est. Composuit enim libellos duos, non contra Christianos, ne inimice insectari videretur, sed ad Christianos, ut humane, ac benigne consulere putarentur.

‘rately: he was then one of the judges, and a principal adviser  
 ‘of the persecution; and not contented with that piece of wick-  
 ‘edness, he also pursued those with his writings whom he had  
 ‘brought into trouble. For he composed two books, not en-  
 ‘titled, Against the Christians, lest he should seem to bear hard  
 ‘upon them, but ‘To the Christians,’ that he might be thought  
 ‘to advise them in a kind and friendly manner: in which books  
 ‘he endeavoured to shew, that the sacred scriptures overthrow  
 ‘themselves by the contradictions with which they abound: he  
 ‘particularly insisted upon several texts as inconsistent with each  
 ‘other; and indeed on so many, and so distinctly, that one  
 ‘might suspect he had some time professed the religion which he  
 ‘now exposed. However, the sacred scriptures may have by some  
 ‘accident or other fallen into his hands: but the scriptures are  
 ‘as far from inconsistencies as he was from the truth. . . . But  
 ‘he chiefly reviled Paul and Peter, and the other disciples, as  
 ‘propagators of falsehood: who nevertheless,’ as he says, ‘were  
 ‘ignorant and illiterate, and some of them got their livelihood  
 ‘by fishing; as if he was displeased, that some Aristophanes or  
 ‘Aristarchus had not handled the subject.’

In quibus ita falsitatem scripturæ sacræ arguere conatus est, tanquam sibi esset tota contraria. Nam quædam capita, quæ repugnare sibi videbantur exposuit: adeo multa, adeo intima enumerans, ut aliquando ex eadem disciplina fuisse videatur . . . nisi forte casu in manus ejus divinæ literæ incidant. . . . Tantum enim abest a divinis literis repugnantia quantum ille abfuit a veritate. Præcipue tamen Paulum Petrumque laceravit, cæterosque discipulos, tanquam fallaciæ seminatores: quos eisdem tamen rudes, et indoctos fuisse, testatus est. Nam quosdam eorum piscatorio artificio fuisse quæstum: quasi ægre ferret, quod illam rem non Aristophanes aliquis, aut Aristarchus commentatus sit. Ib. cap. 2.

Abfuit ergo ab his fingendi voluntas, et astutia, quoniam rudes fuerunt. Aut quis possit indoctus, apta inter se, et cohærentia fingere. Cum philosophi doctissimi, Plato, et Aristoteles, et Epicurus, et Zenon, ipsi sibi repugnantia et contraria dixerint. Hæc est enim mendaciorum natura, ut cohæerere non possint. Illorum autem traditio, quia vera est, quadrat undique, ac sibi tota consentit: et ideo persuadet, quia constanti ratione suffulta est. Non igitur quæstus et commodi gratia religionem istam commenti sunt: quippe qui et præceptis, et re ipsa, eam vitam secuti sunt, quæ et voluptatibus

caret, et omnia quæ habentur in bonis spernit: et qui non tantum pro fide mortem subierint, sed etiam morituros esse se et scierint, et prædixerint: et postea universos, qui eorum disciplinam secuti essent, acerba, et nefanda passuros. Ipsum autem Christum affirmavit, a Judæis fugatum, collecta nongentorum hominum manu, latrocinia fecisse. Quis tantæ auctoritati audeat repugnare? Credamus hoc plane. Nam fortasse hoc illi in somnis Apollo aliquis nuntiavit. Tot semper latrones perierunt, et quotidie pereunt: utique multos et ipse damnasti. Quis eorum post crucem suam, non dicam deus, sed homo appellatus est? Verum tu forsitan ex eo credidisti, quia vos homicidam Martem consecrasti, ut Deum. Quod tamen non fecissetis, si illum Arcopagite in crucem sustulissent. Item, cum facta ejus mirabilia destrueret, nec tamen negaret, voluit ostendere Apollonium, vel paria, vel etiam majora fecisse. Mirum, quod Apuleium prætermisit, cujus solent et multa et mira memorari. . . . Si magus Christus, quia mirabilia fecit, peritior utique Apollonius, qui, ut describis, cum Domitianus eum punire vellet, repente in judicio non comparuit, quam ille, qui et comprehensus est, et cruci affixus. Ib. cap. 3.

‘But

' But it hence follows, that they were not cunning and de-  
 ' signing men, being entirely unacquainted with the arts of de-  
 ' ceit. And how should unlearned men, of their own heads,  
 ' contrive a plausible story in every part, and throughout con-  
 ' sistent, when the most learned philosophers; Plato, Aristotle,  
 ' Epicurus; and Zeno, have delivered inconsistencies and con-  
 ' tradictions. For this is the nature of falshood, that it cannot  
 ' hold together: but the doctrine of Christ's disciples being  
 ' true, it is all of a piece and consistent throughout; and there-  
 ' fore it satisfies and gains followers, because it is built upon solid  
 ' reason. Nor did they invent this religion for the sake of any  
 ' worldly profit whatever: for the precepts of it give no en-  
 ' couragement to voluptuousness, and in their whole conduct  
 ' they shewed a contempt of those things which are most valued.  
 ' Nor did they only lay down their lives for the truth, but knew  
 ' before hand that they should do so, and also foretold it; and  
 ' plainly declared to all others who embraced the same doctrine,  
 ' that they must expect the like sufferings. But he says, that  
 ' Christ was banished by the Jews, and after that got together  
 ' nine hundred men, and committed robbery. Who can with-  
 ' stand such an authority? By all means let us believe him; for  
 ' perhaps some Apollo told it him in his sleep. Many robbers  
 ' have been executed in all times, and are executed daily. You  
 ' have condemned a great many: but who of them after cruci-  
 ' fixation has been esteemed as a god, or even as a man? But pos-  
 ' sibly you have the more easily belived this, because your people  
 ' have deified the murderer Mars: which however you would  
 ' not have done, if he had been crucified by order of the court  
 ' of Areopagus. Moreover,' as Lactantius goes on to say, ' this  
 ' writer endeavours to overthrow Christ's miracles, though he  
 ' does not deny the truth of them: he aims to shew, that like  
 ' things, or even greater, were done by Apollonius. It is some-  
 ' what strange that he omitted Apuleius, of whom many won-  
 ' derful things are commonly said. . . . Christ, it seems, must be  
 ' reckoned a magician, because he did many wonderful things:  
 ' but Apollonius is more able, because, as you say, when Do-  
 ' mitian would have put him to death, he escaped: whereas  
 ' Christ was apprehended and crucified.'

More follows concerning Apollonius, but I think I need not proceed any farther.

Lactantius has not told us the name of this writer; but from the author of the book of the Deaths of Persecutors, different  
 from

from Lactantius, but contemporary with him, we learn, that he was Hierocles, at first vicar, afterwards president in Bithynia, of whom he expressly says, that he was a persecutor, and an adviser of the persecution.

Hierocles is also mentioned by<sup>f</sup> Epiphanius, as præfect at Alexandria in the time of Dioclesian's persecution.

Against his work Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote an answer, still extant, of which I shall now give an account: by which it will farther appear, that Lactantius and Eusebius speak of the same author, and the same work.

Eusebius at the beginning tells his friend, to whom he addresseth himself, that<sup>e</sup> Hierocles had made a comparison of our Saviour and Master with Apollonius of Tyana, giving the preference to the latter. To this part he intended to confine himself: for, says he, As for the rest of his work, which he calls Philalethes, or Lover of Truth, I do not think it needful to take much notice of it; it not being his own, but shamefully borrowed from others, and had been already fully answered by Origen in his answer to the work of Celsus, called "The true Word."

Referring therefore, says Eusebius, to that work of Origen, such as are desirous to inform themselves more particularly of our religion, we shall at this time examine the comparison made of Jesus Christ and Apollonius by this Philalethes.

He<sup>h</sup> admires then and extols this man, as if by some divine and hidden wisdom, and not by magical arts, he had performed great wonders, saying in these very words: "They are continually crying up Jesus for opening the eyes of the blind, and

<sup>e</sup> That he is different from Lactantius, I argued largely some while ago. Vol. iv. p. 37--42. At the end of that argument are mentioned several learned men, who have been of the same opinion. To them ought to be added Dr. Chapman, in his Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury. p. 125.

<sup>f</sup> Nam cum incidisset in Flaccinum Præfectum, non parvum homicidam, deinde in Hieroclem ex Vicario Præsidentem, qui auctor et consiliarius ad faciendam persecutionem fuit, postremo in Priscillianum successorem ejus, documentum omnibus invidiæ fortitudinis præbuit. De Mortib. Persecut. cap. 16.

<sup>g</sup> Κελευσιανός μιν ην επαρχος της Θεσσαλιαι, Αλεξανδρειας δε Ιεροκλεις. Eriph. H. 68. num. 1.   
 <sup>h</sup> Αρ' εν, ω φιλαλιπ, κακια σε τα συγγραφεις αξιον αποβαιμαζειν, α τω ημιλερω Σωτηρι τε και διδασ-

καλω τον Τυαγια ζυγκριων, παρεδουλοσει. Προς μιν γαρ τα λοιπα των εν τω Φιλαληπει. . . εδεν αν εη σπευδαιον επι το παροιος ισασθαι, μη αυτη ιδια τυχαιοηια σφοδρα δε εναιδως εξ ειρων εν αυτοις μοιουχη τοημασιν, αλλα και ρημασιν και συλλαβαις απροσευδημεια. γ. λ. Euseb. Contr. Hier. p. 511. ad calc. Dem. Evang.

<sup>h</sup> Θαυμαζει εν και αποδεχεται δεια τινι και αρρητω σοφια, εν δε γοητειασ σοφισμασιν τε θαυματηρηκειαι φασκων αυτον. . . Ακει δ' εν α φησιν αυταισ συλλαβαισ. Αιω δε και κατω θρυλλησιν, σημειωσιν τον Ιησυν, ως τυφλοισ αναβλειψαι τε παρασχυοια, και τια τοιαυτα διασανηα θαυμασια. Εισα τια μεταξυ απων, επιδελει. Σκεδωμεθα γε μην οσω βελιον και σιελωτερον τιμεισ εν δεγωμειθα τα τοιαυτα, και ην ωρι των εναρτων εχομεν γιαμην ανδρων. . . lb. p. 512. B. C.

“ other like works.” And presently after he adds: “ But it  
 “ ought to be considered upon how much better grounds we re-  
 “ ceive such things, and how much more reasonably we judge  
 “ of divers excellent men.” After which, passing over Aristeas  
 “ of Proconnesus, and Pythagoras, and other ancients, he goes  
 “ on. “ In the time of our ancestors, in the reign of Nero,  
 “ flourished Apollonius of Tyana, who, ‘ having when very  
 “ young sacrificed at Ægis in Cilicia to that good god Æscu-  
 “ lapius, wrought many and wonderful works; some of which  
 “ I shall mention, omitting others.” Then he recites his ex-  
 “ traordinary works from the beginning.’ [It were to be wished  
 that Eusebius had not abridged as he does here: it would cer-  
 tainly have been a great curiosity to have had that passage at  
 length, to see what works Hierocles ascribed to Apollonius.]  
 “ And afterwards says, in these very words: “ To what purpose  
 “ have I mentioned these things? That all may perceive our just  
 “ and reasonable judgment, and the levity of the Christians: for-  
 “ asmuch as we do not esteem him who did these things a god,  
 “ but a man favoured by the gods:” [as if the heathen people  
 were very scrupulous of giving the title of deity to none but  
 such as well deserved it, when they had such a rabble of paltry  
 deities, young and old, males and females, good and bad.  
 Moreover, if Philostratus may be relied upon, Apollonius him-  
 self was called a god by many, and in his life-time: and he ac-  
 cepted the title, saying, that every good man is honoured with  
 it. Πάλιν ηρέο, τὴ χάριν οἱ ἄνθρωποι Θεοῦ σε ὀνομαζουσιν; Οἱ πᾶς,  
 εἶπεν, ἄνθρωπος, ἀλαθὸς νομιζόμενος, Θεὸς ἐπωνυμία τιμάσαι. *Apoll.*  
*Vit. l. viii. cap. 5. p. 325. in.]* “ Whereas they for the sake of  
 “ a few tricks call Jesus God.” [The works of Jesus were not  
 a few, but numerous, great, truly wonderful, and conspicuous  
 beyond all contradiction.] “ It is also reasonable to think, that  
 “ the actions of Jesus have been magnified by Peter and Paul,  
 “ and others like them, ignorant men, liars and impostors. But

<sup>i</sup> Ος . . . ἀφ' ἕπερ . . . ἱερασαίῳ τῷ φιλα-  
 θρωπῷ Ἀθηναίῳ, πολλὰ καὶ θαύματα διε-  
 πράξαίῳ ὡς τὰ πλεῖστα παρῆς, ἡμῖν ποιη-  
 σόμεαι μνημῆν. Εἶσα καὶ ἀλεῖται ἀπο πρῶτον  
 ἀρχαίῳ τα παραδοξά. Μεθ' αὐτῆ καὶ ἐπι-  
 λέγει ταῦτα κατὰ λέξιν. Τίνος ἔστι εἰκα τῆ-  
 τῶν ἐμνησθῆν; Ἰνα εἴη συζητεῖν τὴν ἡμέτε-  
 ραν ἀκριβῆ καὶ βεβαίαν ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ κρίσιν,  
 καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν κηφόρησά· εἴπερ ἡμεῖς  
 μὲν τὸν τοιαῦτα πεποιηκότα, ἢ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ  
 θεοῦ κεχαρισμένοι ἄνδρα ἡσμεθα· οἱ δὲ δι'  
 εὐλας τερατίαις τινῶν τὸν Ἰησοῦ θεοῦ ἀνα-  
 γορεύουσι. Τῶν ἐπιφέρει μεθ' εἰσα φασκαῖ·

κακίῳ λοῖσασθαι ἀξίον, οἱ τὰ μὲν τῷ  
 Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ τινες τῶν  
 παραπληστοὶ κεκομπασιν, ἄνθρωποι ψευταί,  
 καὶ ἀπαιδεῖτοι, καὶ γοῆτες. Τα δὲ Ἀπολ-  
 λωνίου Μαξίμου ὁ Αἰσεύς, καὶ Δαμῆς ὁ φι-  
 λосоφος, ὁ συνδιαλεψας αὐτῶν, καὶ Φίλο-  
 στρατός ὁ Ἀθηναίος, παιδεύσεως μὲν ἐπὶ  
 πλεῖστοις ἡκούτες, το δ' ἀληθῆς τιμῶντες, διὰ  
 φιλανθρωπίας ἀνδρὸς γενναίῳ, καὶ θεοῦ φησὶ  
 πράξεις μὴ βελομένοι λαθεῖν. Ταῦτα ἔη-  
 μασιν αὐτοῖς ἱεροκλεῖ τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιγρα-  
 φοῖ φιλαλληθῆ λόγον, εἰρηλαί. *Euseb. ib.*  
*p. 512, 513.*

“ the

“ the things of Apollonius have been written by Maximus of  
 “ Ægis, and Damis a philosopher, who conversed with him,  
 “ and Philostratus the Athenian, men of great learning: and  
 “ being lovers of truth, and friends to mankind, they were un-  
 “ willing that the actions of so great a man, dear to the gods,  
 “ should lie hid.” So writes Hierocles in his work against us,  
 ‘ entitled by him Philalethes. The case is this: Damis, who  
 ‘ was very conversant with Apollonius, was a native of Assyria:  
 ‘ there he became acquainted with Apollonius, upon his travelling  
 ‘ into that country, and afterwards wrote the history of what  
 ‘ happened after his acquaintance with him. The history of  
 ‘ Maximus is very short and imperfect: but Philostratus of  
 ‘ Athens having met with these and some other histories of Apol-  
 ‘ lonius, as he says, composed a history of his life from his birth  
 ‘ to his death.’

That Eusebius there gives a true account of the work of Phi-  
 lostratus, may be perceived by any who<sup>k</sup> will look into the in-  
 troduction to it: and yet he omits one particular in that intro-  
 duction, which may be justly reckoned to render the truth of  
 Philostratus’s history suspected. For having mentioned Maximus  
 and Damis, as observed by Eusebius, he adds: ‘ For<sup>l</sup> there is  
 ‘ no regard to be had to Mœragenes, who wrote four books con-  
 ‘ cerning Apollonius, but was unacquainted with many things  
 ‘ concerning him.’ Which may induce us to conclude, that in  
 those books were some things not very much to the honour of  
 Apollonius: and Philostratus does himself afterwards quote<sup>m</sup>  
 Mœragenes for an account of the writings of Apollonius. There-  
 fore Philostratus, as it seems, put together what he thought to  
 be to the advantage of his hero, and omitted other things.

‘ However, omitting other things,’ says Eusebius, ‘ we shall  
 ‘ confine ourselves to the history written by Philostratus, by  
 ‘ which we shall clearly shew, that Apollonius was far from de-  
 ‘ serving to be compared with our Saviour Jesus Christ, as is  
 ‘ pretended by the author of Philalethes.’ Whereupon he pro-  
 ceeds to examine the Life of Apollonius, written by Philostratus  
 in eight books, upon each of which he makes remarks.

And though this answer of Eusebius to Hierocles is short, I  
 suppose it was sufficient, and such as was suited to the circum-  
 stances of things at that time. The greatest part of the objections  
 in this work of Hierocles were trifling and stale, and such as had  
 been already answered by Origen, and other learned apologists,

<sup>k</sup> Philost. de Vit. Apol. l. i. c. 3.

πολλα δε περι του ανδρα αγρασησθη. Ibid.

<sup>l</sup> Ου γαρ Μοιραζειται τε προσελθειν, βιβ-  
 λισ μιν ξυγρηθησιν ες Απολλωνιον τετταρα,

<sup>m</sup> Vid. ib. l. iii. cap. 41.

and which all Christians in general were able to confute. All<sup>a</sup> that was new in Hierocles was a comparison of our Saviour with Apollonius: this had never been attempted by any before: to that therefore Eusebius confined himself, as before said.

III. Eusebius has recorded a great cruelty of this Hierocles, when præfect of Alexandria, though he has not expressly named him. It is in his book of the Martyrs of Palestine, where he writes of the sufferings of Christians in that country. But having in the fourth chapter of that book related the grievous sufferings of Apphianus at Cæsarea, a young man about twenty years of age, of a good family and a liberal education, he is led in the following chapter to relate the martyrdom of Ædesius at Alexandria, though it did not happen till some while afterwards. ‘ For<sup>o</sup> Ædesius was brother of Apphianus, not only in a religious sense, but also by nature, as he had the same father: and he had made greater progress in learning than his brother. He also led a philosophical life, and wore their cloak. He being at Alexandria, and beholding the judge insulting the Christians, who were brought before him in the most opprobrious manner, though they were men of great gravity; and also delivering women, some of which were devoted to virginity, into the hands of bawds to be abused by them, he was exceedingly provoked, and<sup>p</sup> going up to the judge, reprovèd him in word and deed: for which he was condemned to the severest torments, and then thrown into the sea.’

It is supposed, that<sup>q</sup> Ædesius struck the judge: for which he has been censured by some; but I think it must be acknowledged, that the provocation was very great. And when a magistrate departs from his dignity, and reviles prisoners at his bar, and condemns virtuous and modest women to the stews for prostitution, and thus acts contrary to all the laws of decency and good manners, as well as of strict justice, he forfeits the respect that would be otherwise due to him.

For certain these are strange things in a man of letters, as Hierocles was: whose<sup>r</sup> learning is readily acknowledged by Eusebius in his confutation of him. Nor is it much to be wondered at, that a man of an honourable family, and a liberal edu-

<sup>n</sup> Μονα δε ειχοντες νυν τα περι Απολλωνιον επισημομεθα: επει και μονω περι της παπολε καθ' ημων γεγραφοιας, εξαιρετας νυν τελω γερονεν η τυδε προς τον ημετερον τληρα παραθεσις τε, και συζησις. Euseb. ibid. p. 512. A.

<sup>o</sup> De Mart. Palæst. cap. v. p. 326. A.

<sup>p</sup> . . . λογος τε και ερσις τον διαστην εισηχυη και αιμιζ

περιβαλων. . . . De Mart. Pal. cap. v. p. 326. B.

<sup>q</sup> Hujus loci explicatio ex Menæo Græcorum petenda est: in quo Ædesius Hieroclem Præfectum Ægypti in Christianos savientem, pugno dicitur percussisse. &c. Vales. in loc.

<sup>r</sup> . . . παιδευσιως μεν επι πλειστον χρονος. Contr. Hierocl. p. 314. B.

cation, as Ædesius was, should think he had a right to expose a magistrate whose proceedings were so extraordinary.

There was another of this name, a Platonic philosopher, who taught at Alexandria in the fifth century, and wrote of Providence and Fate, and likewise a Commentary upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, as they are called. These two were confounded by many learned men for some time. But that<sup>s</sup> mistake has been since corrected, and it is now universally allowed, that Hierocles governor of Bithynia and præfect of Alexandria, who wrote against the Christians, and was answered by Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Hierocles the Platonic philosopher of Alexandria, were two different persons.

IV. It is now high time that we should make remarks upon the accounts of the work of Hierocles, which we have seen in Lactantius and Eusebius.

1. Hierocles had read the scriptures of the New Testament, if not of the Old likewise. He observed particularly upon a great many passages of the books of the New Testament, endeavouring to shew them inconsistent with each other. This shews, that those books were now well known, and that they were greatly respected by Christians. If, therefore, the credit of these books was overthrown, the Christian religion must fall with it. In<sup>t</sup> the imperial edict for Dioclesian's persecution in 303, it was expressly ordered, not only that the Christian churches should be demolished, but also that their scriptures should be burned: and this was the first time that any such order was published by any of the heathen persecuting emperors. And it is a proof, as was before observed, that the heathen people were then sensible of the importance of those scriptures, which the Christians made use of as the ground of their religion, the rule of their conduct, and the great support of their steadiness and zeal.

2. Hierocles bears testimony to the existence of the several parts of the New Testament, the gospels and the epistles: for, as Lactantius says, 'he reviled Peter and Paul, and the other disciples; who, as he says, were ignorant and illiterate, and some of them got their livelihood by fishing.' And, as quoted from Eusebius, he says: 'It is also reasonable to think, that the works of Jesus have been magnified by Peter and Paul, and the others like them, ignorant men, liars and impostors.' By 'the other disciples, and the others, like Peter and Paul,' plainly meaning our evangelists: as we also learn from Eusebius, who

<sup>s</sup> Vid. Bayle Diction. in Hierocles, and Needham Præf. in Hieroclem, sub fin.

<sup>t</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 88—90.

says: 'He<sup>a</sup> gives the preference to Philostratus above our divine evangelists, not only upon account of his superior learning, but likewise upon account of his superior regard to truth.'

Here is a testimony to the genuineness of the scriptures now received by us; here are references to six at least of the eight writers of the books of the New Testament: Peter and Paul are expressly named; and there are references to the gospels of the four evangelists. The books now received by us therefore are the same which were received by the Christians of that time; and were received by them from their ancestors, and were respected by them as genuine and authentic.

3. Hierocles did not dispute the genuineness or antiquity of the writings of our apostles and evangelists; but he endeavoured to disparage them, calling them 'illiterate, liars and impostors.' This last charge is manifestly false, their writings having in them all the marks of truth and credibility that can be wished for or desired. But some of the writers, as we own, were 'unlearned;' but Paul was learned both in Jewish and Greek learning, and knew the world: nor was Luke altogether illiterate. Barnabas, who joined the apostles soon after our Saviour's resurrection, was a Levite, and a man of good understanding, and very remarkable for his generosity. Jesus, in the time of his abode on this earth, notwithstanding the meanness of his outward circumstances, had some affectionate and respectful friends and followers of great distinction, attracted solely by the excellence of his words, the greatness of his works, and the amiableness of his conduct. Such were Jairus, Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea: *And among the rulers many believed on him, but because of the pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue.* John xii. 42. And there were men of lower rank, of very good understanding, who were open and undaunted in their profession notwithstanding discouragements. See John v. 1 . . . 16, and ixth throughout. And among women, *Joanna, wife of Chuzza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and divers others:* one of whom was Mary of Magdala, usually mentioned in precedence before all the rest. Luke viii. 1 . . . 3. And soon after our Lord's resurrection, there were great accessions made to him and his apostles of persons of all characters, too many to be here enumerated. These are things that must assure us of the truth of the history of Jesus, as written by his apostles and evangelists; things which cannot be said of Apollonius, or any other.

<sup>a</sup> . . . των κρειττων θειων ευαγγελιστων προκρινων τον Φιλοστρατον, ως μη μονον παιδειας επι πλειστον ηχησα, αλλα και αληθειας επιμελημενον. Adv. Hier. l. iii. p. 523. B.

4. Hierocles did not deny the truth of our Saviour's miracles, such as *giving sight to the blind*, and other like works recorded by the just mentioned writers: but he endeavoured to disparage and depreciate them by ascribing them to magical arts; which is altogether unreasonable, because the works are such as could be done by the power of God only, to which they are always ascribed by the historians. He likewise insinuated, that there might be reason to suspect, that the evangelists had magnified our Saviour's works beyond the truth and reality. Which insinuation is also unreasonable: forasmuch as the historians of the Lord Jesus have not particularly recorded all the great works done by him, but have quite omitted very many, and contented themselves with a general mention or reference to others.

There is another great advantage which the historians of the Lord Jesus have over Philostratus, on whom Hierocles relied for the accounts of Apollonius, that they were all contemporary with Jesus, and most of them his hearers and eye-witnesses: whereas Philostratus did not write till more than an hundred years after the death of Apollonius: but of that more hereafter.

5. By Lactantius we are told, that this writer, meaning Hierocles, gave out, that Jesus had been expelled from Judea, and after that, committed robbery, accompanied by a band of nine hundred men. If this be true, (nor is there any reason to doubt it,) it shews, that heathen people at that time made no scruple of inventing lies to the disparagement of our Saviour: and though those stories were quite groundless and very improbable, they might be regarded by many ignorant and prejudiced people, who had never read the scriptures, and had heard, that about our Saviour's time, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, there were many robbers in Judea.

6. Beside other just observations in Lactantius, one is this, that the respect shewn to Jesus by vast numbers of men, though he was crucified, is a demonstration, that he was not a man of a bad character. Robbers, and other malefactors, who suffer for their crimes, are never deified, nor much respected after their death.

7. We are assured both by Lactantius and Eusebius, that there was in Hierocles a comparison made of our Saviour and Apollonius, with a preference of this latter: and by Eusebius we are expressly assured, that Hierocles was the first who had formed such a comparison. This ought to be particularly attended to by us, and will engage us in some farther observations, which shall be reserved for another section, that I may not too much prolong this.

V. Says Cudworth \* in his Intellectual System: ‘ It is a thing  
 ‘ highly probable, if not unquestionable, that Apollonius Tya-  
 ‘ næus, shortly after the publication of the gospel to the world,  
 ‘ was a person made choice of by the policy, and assisted by the  
 ‘ powers of the kingdom of darkneſs, for the doing ſome things  
 ‘ extraordinary, merely out of deſign to derogate from the mi-  
 ‘ racles of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and to enable paganiſm the  
 ‘ better to bear up againſt the attacks of Chriſtianity.’

So Cudworth: and I ſuppoſe that many learned men of late times may have expreſſed themſelves in a like manner; but I cannot aſſent to them. With due ſubmiſſion, I do not think, that Apollonius was a man of ſo great importance as is here ſuppoſed: for it does not appear, that any adverſaries of the Chriſtians, either Celfus or Porphyry, or any other, before Hierocles, at the beginning of the fourth century, under Diocleſian’s perſecution, ever took any notice of him in any of their arguments. Nor do I know, that he has been once mentioned by any Chriſtian writers of the firſt two centuries.

When I firſt met with that obſervation of Cudworth I was very much ſurprized, conſidering the ſilence of all early antiquity. If this obſervation were right, I ſhould have expected to find frequent mention of Apollonius in the hiſtory of St. John, and the other apoſtles of Chriſt; but there is none. We had in that ſpace of time divers learned men, ſome of them as eminent for extenſive literature as any men that ever lived: as Juſtin, Tatian, Bardeſanes the Syrian, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Julius Africanus, Tertullian, Minucius Felix: not to inſiſt upon Clement of Rome, Ignatius, or Polycarp, or the hiſtories of them. Of all theſe we have ſome remains: they lived in the firſt two centuries, or at the beginning of the third; but of Apollonius they have not taken any the leaſt notice.

The firſt Chriſtian writer who has mentioned him, ſo far as I can recollect, is Origen in his books againſt Celfus, written not long before the middle of the third century. Where he ſays:  
 ‘ He † who would know, whether magic has any power over  
 ‘ philoſophers, may read the memoirs of Mæragenes, concern-  
 ‘ ing Apollonius of Tyana, both ‡ a magician and a philoſopher.  
 ‘ In which, Mæragenes, who was not a Chriſtian, but a philo-  
 ‘ ſopher, ſays, that ſome, and no inconfiderable philoſophers,  
 ‘ were taken by the magical art of Apollonius, and came to him  
 ‘ as to a magician. [γοῦν.] Among them, I ſuppoſe, he

\* B. 1. ch. iv. p. 265, 266. ed. 1678.

† . . . μαγία καὶ φιλοſοφία. Ibid.

‡ Contr. Celf. 1. vi. § 41. p. 302.

§ means

‘ means Euphrates, and a certain Epicurean. But we can affirm, upon the ground of our own experience, that they who worship the God over all through Jesus Christ, and live according to the gospel, and pray as they ought to do day and night, have no reason to fear any thing from magic or dæmons.’ So Origen is led to speak in answer to some things in Celsus: but it does not appear, that Celsus had at all mentioned either Apollonius, or his historian.

Apollonius is mentioned by <sup>a</sup> Lucian; but what he says of him is far from being to his advantage. He is also mentioned by <sup>b</sup> Apuleius, who was contemporary with Lucian: nor <sup>c</sup> is there any older author now extant where he is mentioned; which must be reckoned an argument of his great obscurity, till he was set up by Philostratus.

After that time Apollonius is taken notice of by many; as <sup>d</sup> Arnobius, and Lactantius, and Eusebius, who were led to observe upon Hierocles, whose whole book against the Christians was founded upon the memoirs of Philostratus. He is afterwards mentioned by Augustine, and other Christian writers: and he is mentioned several times by the writers <sup>e</sup> of the Augustan History, who flourished in the time of Dioclesian, or soon afterwards, and by <sup>f</sup> Dion Cassius, and <sup>g</sup> by Eunapius, who commends the history of Philostratus, but says, that instead of entitling it ‘ the Life of Apollonius, he might have called it the ‘ Peregrination of a God among men.’

I must stay here to add, that we have a kind of positive evidence, that Celsus took no notice of Apollonius, though he did speak of several others of a like character. ‘ There <sup>h</sup> were miracles wrought every where, or however in many places, says Origen. Celsus himself presently afterwards instanceth in Æsculapius, who performed cures, and delivered out oracles in all cities consecrated to him, Epidaurus, Cöus, Pergamus; and Aristæus of Proconnesus, and Clazomenius and Cleomedes. But among the Jews, who esteemed themselves consecrated to the God of the universe, there was, it seems, no

<sup>a</sup> Lucian. Pseudem. p. 750. T. i. Gr. Vid. et ejusd. Demonax. p. 866.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Apul. Apol. p. 544. in Usum Delph. Et Conf. Olearii Præf. in Philostr. p. 33.

<sup>c</sup> Ante Lucianum vix reperies, qui ejus meminerit. Eru- ditill. certe Philostrati enarrator Lucianum cum Apuleio coætaneo primos facit. Præf. p. 33. Solon. annot. ad Lucian. Pseud. p. 213. T. ii. Amst. 1743.

<sup>d</sup> Arnob. l. i. p. 31.

<sup>e</sup> Vid.

Lamprid. Alex. Sever. cap. 29. p. 930. Vopisc. de Aurelian. cap. 24. p. 475.

<sup>f</sup> Dion. in Domitian. l. vi. p. 1116. Reimar. Et in Caracalla. l. 77. p. 1304.

<sup>g</sup> Ἀλλὰ το μὲν ἐς τέλος ὁ Δημιῖος ἐπιτέλεσε Φιλοστράτου, βίον ἐπιγραψάς Ἀπολλωνίου τὰ βιβλία, δεόν ἐπιδημίαν ἐς ἀνθρώπους θεῶν καλεῖν. Eunap. Pr. p. 11.

<sup>h</sup> Contr. Cels. l. iii. num. 3. p. 113. Et Conf. num. 26. p. 125.

<sup>h</sup> miracle,

‘ miracle, no prodigy, to establish their faith in the creator of  
 ‘ all things.’ For certain, Apollonius was not mentioned by  
 Celsus here: probably therefore he was not brought in by him  
 any where.

The silence of Celsus about Apollonius must be reckoned  
 good proof, that in the middle of the second century Apollonius  
 was not a man of much consideration among the heathen people.

VI. Since therefore Apollonius is very much, if not entirely  
 indebted to the memoirs of Philostratus, for his great reputation  
 in the world, it is very fit that we should consider that work  
 distinctly.

I propose, then, to consider these several things.

1. The time and occasion of writing it. 2. Its veracity, or  
 credibility. 3. Its importance.

1. The time and occasion of it.

It<sup>1</sup> was composed about the year of Christ 210, at the desire  
 of the empress Julia, wife of Septimius Severus. Says Philo-  
 stratus himself, in the third chapter of his first book: ‘ There was  
 ‘ one Damis, a man not unskilful in philosophy, a native of the  
 ‘ ancient Nineveh. He was much conversant with Apollonius,  
 ‘ and attended him in his travels, and wrote down his sentiments,  
 ‘ and sayings, and divinations. A friend of Damis brought his  
 ‘ memoirs, hitherto unknown, to the empress Julia. She was  
 ‘ herself a friend to literature; and as I was in her family, she  
 ‘ commanded me to digest these materials into proper order. I  
 ‘ also met with the book of Maximus of Ægis, which contained  
 ‘ an account of what happened to Apollonius at Ægis. There  
 ‘ is also extant the last will and testament of Apollonius, whence  
 ‘ it may be learned, that he philosophized under a divine im-  
 ‘ pulse. Mœragenes composed four books concerning Apollo-  
 ‘ nius; but no regard is to be had to him, forasmuch as he was  
 ‘ ignorant of many things relating to him. Thus I have shewn  
 ‘ whence these collections were made, and how I have digested  
 ‘ them: and I cannot but wish, that this work of mine may be  
 ‘ honourable to him of whom I write, and useful to such as are  
 ‘ lovers of good letters: for, certainly, they may hence learn  
 ‘ things which they knew not before.’

That may suffice for shewing the time and occasion of this  
 work of Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius.*

2. Hence we may be able to judge of the truth or credibility  
 of what is here related. It<sup>2</sup> must be all uncertain, and deserving  
 of

<sup>1</sup> See Tillemont. *L'Emp. Sever. art. des Emp. Tom. ii. P. i. p. 200. &c. Brux.*  
 §7. and Apollone de Tyanes, &c. *Hist.* \* *Quicquid igitur de iis fertur, id de-*  
 plorat

of very little credit. Philostratus's principal author Damis, is an obscure person; his memoirs were unknown till brought to the empress Julia; his friend who is said to have brought them to her is not named. Though Mœragenes had published four books concerning Apollonius, Philostratus determined to pay no regard to them; very probably, because they were not favourable to his hero: and he concludes with saying, 'That the curious may hence learn what they knew nothing of before.' But how can things be received, which were not known till more than an hundred years after the death of the person spoken of.

That Philostratus's history is not written with impartiality, and that he forbore to insert things not favourable to Apollonius, is manifest upon divers occasions. According to Philostratus, Vespasian met with Apollonius, Euphrates, and other philosophers, at Alexandria, in his way to Rome, after he had been proclaimed emperor. At<sup>l</sup> his desire Apollonius gave him good advice for the right management of himself in his high station: Vespasian then asked the advice of Euphrates also: 'Who declared his assent to what had been already said by Apollonius. Nevertheless<sup>m</sup>,' says he, 'O emperor, I may add this: Approve and cherish the philosophy which is agreeable to nature; and avoid that which boasts of commerce with the deity.' Which, as Philostratus says, was designed against Apollonius, and was the result of envy.

When Vespasian was gone from Egypt, Apollonius and Euphrates quarrelled more openly. 'But,' says<sup>n</sup> Philostratus,

ploratæ hujus hominis fidei innititur: Hæc vero sunt, quæ de illis habet. Damidis quemdam familiarem in lucem eos primum protraxisse, ac Juliæ Augustæ obtulisse. Hanc cum artis dicendi studiosa esset, sibi id laboris imperasse, ut quæ agresti et incondita oratione Damis prodiderat, expoliret, et meliori ordine digereret. Fecisse id opere, quod De Vita Apollonii hodie adhuc tenemus. Ex his statim intelligitur, cum ante Severi tempora volumen hæc nulli visum fuerit, nullam etiam Apollonio parere existimationem potuisse. Deinceps vero actum esse de omni ejus auctoritate ex hac ipsa narratione constat. Quis Damidem illud consignasse, auctor est? Obscurus quidam homo, cujus nomen nescit, tacet Philostratus, qui Damidi tamen sese familiarem gloriabatur. Quis præter hunc? Nullus plane. . . . Sed quis rustico labori exornando præficitur? Philostratus, rhetor, ex eorum nimirum ordine, quibus omnia fucata et simulata erant. Egregie sane! Mosheim. Diss. de existimatione Apollonii

Tyanæi § ix. apud ejusdem Commentationes et Orationes varii argumenti. Hamburg. 1751. 8vo.

Alius certe dixerit, quis qualisve, ater, an albus fuerit. [Apollonius.] Mihi omnibus solícite ponderatis, collatisque pro quavis sententia argumentis, id unum perspicuum esse fateor, talem, quam Philostratus fingit, non fuisse. Id. ib. § 1.

Si Mœraginis de vita ejus narratio exstaret, quanti apud multos vivus fuisset habitus, curatius enarrari posset. Perit ea, quam Origenes suo adhuc tempore legit, eorum sine dubio, qui famæ hominis consultum cupiebant, studio. . . . Unicus igitur nobis hodie Philostratus restat, ex quo quæ ad vitam ejus pertinent, haurienda sunt. Id. ib. § 2.

<sup>l</sup> De Vit. Apol. l. v. cap. 36.

<sup>m</sup> . . . φιλοσοφίαν δε, ω βασιλευ, (τῆς γαρ λοιπον προσειρησεσαι) την μεν καλα φουσιν επαινει και ασπαζη' την δε θεοκλυειν φασκεσαν παραίτε. κ. λ. Cap. 37.

<sup>n</sup> Cap. 39.

' I must

‘ I must dismiss that affair; it is not my design to blame Euphrates, but to write the life of Apollonius, for the sake of those who are as yet unacquainted with it.’

Euphrates is several times mentioned by Philostratus: but it has been observed by learned men, that Euphrates has a good character from <sup>o</sup> the younger Pliny, and <sup>p</sup> from Epictetus, who have never mentioned Apollonius, and from <sup>q</sup> Eunapius. Eusebius <sup>r</sup> has made good remarks upon the differences between Apollonius and Euphrates; and fails not to observe, that Euphrates was in his time a very celebrated philosopher, and was still in great esteem.

3. From what has been already said, we may be able to judge of the importance of this work. A history that is false or uncertain, and not to be depended upon, cannot be of much value. Nevertheless, we must bestow some observations upon this point, out of deference to the opinions of some learned moderns.

Dr. Cudworth, as before cited, goes on at p. 268. ‘ For among the many writers of this philosopher’s life, some, and particularly Philostratus, seem to have had no other aim in their undertaking, than only to dress up Apollonius in such a garb and manner, as might make him best seem to be a fit rival with our Saviour Jesus Christ, both in respect of sanctity and miracles. . . . And it is well known that Hierocles, to whom Eusebius gives the character of a very learned man, wrote a book against the Christians, the chief design of which was to compare this Apollonius Tyanæus with, and to prefer him before our Saviour: and that this was the use, commonly made by the pagans of this history of Philostratus, appears sundry ways. Marcellinus, in an epistle of his to St. Augustine, declares this as the grand objection of the pagans against Christianity, and therefore he desires St. Augustine to answer the same: *Nihil aliud Dominum, quam alii homines facere potuerunt, fecisse mentiuntur. Apollonium siquidem suum nobis, et Apuleium, aliosque magicæ artis homines in medium proferunt, quorum majora contendunt existisse miracula.*” So Cudworth, and in like manner many other learned men.

But whereas Cudworth supposeth, that ‘ among the many writers of this philosopher’s life, some,’ beside Philostratus, ‘ wrote with that view;’ it is said without ground. There were not many writers of this man’s life; nor are any of them come

<sup>o</sup> Plin. Ep. l. i. x.

<sup>p</sup> Arian. Epiët. l. iv. c. 8.

<sup>q</sup> De Vit. Sophist. in Pr.

<sup>r</sup> Contr. Hierocl. p. 532, 533.

<sup>s</sup> Ap. Augustin, ep. 136. [al. iv.] Tom. ii. edit. Bened.

down to us: Hierocles, in his comparison of our Saviour with Apollonius, made use of Philostratus only.

The question is, whether Philostratus designed to set up Apollonius as a 'còrrival with our Saviour:' it has been the opinion of Cudworth; and of 'divers other learned men of late times: nevertheless I do not think that to be clear. My late learned friend Mr. Michael de la Roche used to say, 'that Philostratus said nothing more in the Life of Apollonius, than he 'would have said if there had been no Christians in the world.' Whether he any where published this his opinion in any of his Literary Memoirs I cannot say \* \*: but I had this thought from him in our correspondence together. At first it appeared strange to me; but upon farther consideration, and upon reading Philostratus again, I have embraced the same opinion, and am now confirmed in it. Hierocles made use of the work of Philostratus in forming his comparison of Christ and Apollonius; and many heathen people afterwards were willing enough to set up Apollonius against our Saviour: but it does not clearly appear that Philostratus had any such thing in view.

Huet specifies several ends and views which Philostratus might have in composing that work. He<sup>u</sup> allows, 'that it has no

† Multis de putidis fabellis non agemus. Sed satis liquet, hic esse historię Christi pravam imitationem. Cleric. H. E. An. 92. num. iv.

Videtur nobis quoque, ut viris doctissimis visum est, fabula hæc esse a Philostrato centum post annis, ea de causa conscripta, ut haberent Ethnici, quem Jesu Christo, cujus doctrinam et discipulos invalescere in dies, non sine invidia videbant, opponerent. Cleric. ib. Ann. 85. n. i. et ii.

\* \* Since writing what is above, (and indeed a good while since,) I have accidentally observed this paragraph in Mr. La Roche's New Memoirs of Literature. Vol. 1. art. viii. p. 99. 'It is commonly believed, that Philostratus wrote the Life of Apollonius, to draw up a parallel between his miracles and those of Jesus Christ. I read that author long ago, that I might be able to judge whether that opinion was well grounded. But after reading of Philostratus, I was fully persuaded, that he never designed to draw up such a parallel. It is no difficult thing to prove it, and to shew what gave occasion to the mistake just now mentioned.' That is the whole of what he says.

Nullis ergo ac solidis intumbit fundamentis tota hæc Philostrati moles, sed ca-

duca, et in ruinam prona est: cujus ad speciem extruendæ causam hanc habuit precipuam, ut Juliæ et Caracallæ gratificaretur. . . . Juliæ vero philosophiæ deditam fuisse memorant idem Dio et Philostratus, Sophistarumque, Rhetorum ac Geometrarum choro plerumque stipata erat. . . . Quamobrem et de prisorum philosophorum moribus ac studiis edoceri se volebat, atque hanc Apollonii potissimum historiam a Philostrato tradi literis optavit, eique Damidis commentarios suppeditavit. Altera Philostrato accessit causa concinnandi hujus operis, vana nimirum collectæ per otium eruditionis expromendæ ac ostentandæ cupiditas. Quorsum enim ambitiosi illi excursus, et importunæ dissertationes, de rebus ad Apollonium haudquaquam pertinentibus: de Pantheris Armenis, de elephantis, de martichora, de gryphibus, pygmæis, &c. &c. Id præterea spectasse se in primis videtur Philostratus, ut invalescentem jam Christi fidem ac doctrinam deprimeret, opposito hoc omnis doctrinæ sanctitatis, ac mirificæ virtutis scæneo simulachro. Itaque ad Christi exemplar hanc expressit effigiem, et pleraque ex Christi Jesu historia Apollonio accommodavit, ne quid Ethnici Christianis invidere possent. Huet. Dem. Ev. Prop. 9. cap. 147. § 3. p. 561.

' foundation

foundation in truth: his chief design in writing was to please  
 Julia and Caracalla. Julia was a lady of a philosophical tem-  
 per of mind: she was desirous to know the history of the  
 ancient philosophers, and particularly of Apollonius; and for  
 that end she furnished Philostratus with the memoirs of Damis.  
 In pursuit of this design he also gratified his own vanity, and  
 laid hold of every opportunity for shewing his learning, making  
 digressions concerning a great variety of subjects not at all ap-  
 pertaining to the history of Apollonius. He also aimed, Huet  
 says, and thinks that to have been his principal design, 'to ob-  
 struct the progress of the Christian Religion, by drawing the  
 character of a man of great knowledge, sanctity, and miracu-  
 lous power. Therefore he formed Apollonius after the ex-  
 ample of Christ, and accommodated many things in the his-  
 tory of our Lord to Apollonius.'

The several views and ends first mentioned are very conspicu-  
 ous in this work; but I cannot clearly discern the last: and I  
 shall assign my reasons. Philostratus was a Pythagorean, or  
 however assumed that character upon this occasion; and he de-  
 signed to extol Apollonius, and recommend him to esteem, as  
 a wonderful man and a follower of Pythagoras. Philostratus,  
 as other writers generally do, declares his design at the begin-  
 ning of his work, and to this purpose: 'They \* who admire  
 Pythagoras of Samos say of him, that he wore no clothing  
 taken from animals, and that he forbore the use of animals in  
 food and sacrifice, offering up only cakes with honey, and  
 frankincense and hymns. And they say that he conversed with  
 the gods, and from themselves knew what things were most  
 acceptable to them, and what were displeasing. And many  
 other things are said of him by those who philosophize after  
 the institution of Pythagoras; which I must forbear to relate,  
 as I must hasten to the history which I have undertaken.'

'For † Apollonius, who lived not very long ago, nor yet very  
 lately, attempted the like things in a more perfect manner  
 than Pythagoras.'

Huet ‡ has in one place expressed himself after the same man-

\* De Vit. Apoll. l. i. cap. 1.

† Ἀδελφα γὰρ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύουσι Ἀπολλωνίῳ, καὶ θεϊτέρῳ ἢ ὁ Πυθαγόρας τῆς σοφίας προσελθοῖν, κ. λ. Cap. 1.

‡ Mihi vero rem introspectanti Pythagoricæ philosophiæ penitus videtur addictus fuisse Philostratus. Ex qua disciplina quicumque prodierunt, quod jam supra monui, in σαυματοποιίας et παραδοξολογίας fuerunt pronissimi, nihil non et fingere prompti

et credere. Testis aureum Pythagoræ scimus, testis et Abatidis sagitta, et quæcumque de Epimenide, et Empedocle, aliisque ex Italica schola profectis memorantur. Vel primum legatur Philostrati caput, ex quo, velut ex ungue leonem, hominis propensum in Pythagoræ deliramenta animum et superstitionis credulitatem deprehendat. Huet. ib. n. v. p. 664.

ner that I have done, upon a view of this work of Philostratus: his words, which I have placed below, are very remarkable.

And Eunapius, who was as likely to understand the design of Philostratus as any modern, speaks also to the same purpose. In the preface to his work, speaking of such as had written the lives of sophists and philosophers: ‘And<sup>a</sup> Apollonius of Tyana,’ says he, ‘was a philosopher indeed, but more than a philosopher, being somewhat between the gods and man: for following the philosophy of Pythagoras, he raised the reputation of it as truly divine and excellent. Philostratus of Lemnus has written his history in several books, calling his work, The Life of Apollonius; which might have been more properly entitled, The Peregrination of God among men.’

Apollonius is drawn by Philostratus in resemblance of Pythagoras, not of Jesus Christ. ‘When<sup>b</sup> he was sixteen years of age, he determined to follow the institution of Pythagoras, higher powers instigating him thereto. From that time he forbore the food of animals, and wore linen garments, not admitting such as were made of wool taken from animals, and wore long hair.’ How strictly he professed to observe the Pythagorean discipline, every where, and in all things, may be seen l. i. cap. 32, if Damis may be relied upon. Pythagoras was a great traveller: according to Philostratus, Apollonius visited many parts of the then known world, Europe, Asia, and Africa. He also observed the Pythagorean five years silence, notwithstanding the great difficulty with which it was attended. A plague broke out at Ephesus; Apollonius was at Smyrna; the Ephesians sent to Apollonius to come to them, expecting help from him. ‘He<sup>c</sup> said to those about him, Let us not delay the journey. And he was at Ephesus: therein imitating, as I think,’ says Philostratus, ‘Pythagoras, who was at the same time with the Thurians and at Metapontus.’ Porphyry’s account in his life of Pythagoras is to this purpose: ‘That<sup>d</sup> in one and the same day Pythagoras was at Metapontus in Italy, and at Tauromenum in Sicily, and conversed with his friends in both places. Almost all agree in asserting this,’

<sup>a</sup> Ἀπολλωνίῳ τε ὁ ἐκ Τυανῶν, ἐκείνῳ φιλοσοφῶν, ἀλλ’ ἦν τι θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Τὴν γὰρ Πυθαγορείου φιλοσοφίαν ζήλοσας, πολὺ τε δεϊοτέρου καὶ ἐνεργῆς καὶ αὐτῷ ἐπιδείξασθε. Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ἐς τέλος ὁ Ἀπὸλλωνίος ἐπέειλεσε Φιλοστράτου βίον ἐπιγραψάσθαι Ἀπολλωνίου τὰ βιβλία, δεῶν ἐπιδημιῶν ἐς εὐρώπης θεῶν καλεῖται. Eunap. Pr. p. 11.

<sup>b</sup> De Vit. Ap. l. i. c. 7, 8. p. 9, 10.

<sup>c</sup> L. i. cap. 14. p. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Ὁ δὲ ἐκωλο δειν ἀναβαλλεσθαι τὴν ὁδὸν· ἀλλ’ εἰπων ἡμεῖς, ἦν ἐν Ἐφεσῶ, τῆ Πυθαγορεῖ, οἱμαί, ἐκεῖνο πρᾶτῶν, τὸ ἐν Θερμοῖς οἰεῖται καὶ Μεταποντίοις εἶναι. l. iv. c. 10. p. 147.

<sup>e</sup> De Vit. Pyth. num. 27. p. 34. al. p. 192.

Διαβεβαιῶνται σχεδὸν ἀπ᾿ αὐτοῦ. Another like story is afterwards told of Apollonius by <sup>b</sup> Philostratus.

It is manifest therefore, that Philostratus compared Apollonius and Pythagoras; but I do not see, that he endeavoured to make him a rival with Jesus Christ. Philostratus has never once mentioned our Saviour, or the Christians his followers, neither in this long work, nor in the Lives of the Sophists, if it be his, as <sup>c</sup> several learned men of the best judgment suppose: nor is there any hint, that Apollonius any where in his wide travels met with any followers of Jesus. There is not so much as an obscure or general description of any men met with by him, whom any can suspect to be Christians of any denomination, either catholics or heretics. Whereas I think, that if Philostratus had written with a mind averse to Jesus Christ, he would have laid hold of some occasion to describe and disparage his followers, as enemies to the gods, and contemners of their mysteries and solemnities, and different from all other men.

Nor is there any resemblance between Jesus and Apollonius. Apollonius travelled from Spain to the Indies, a Gadibus ad Gangem. Our Lord never travelled abroad: he never was out of the small tract of the land of Israel, excepting when he was carried into Egypt to avoid the design of Herod upon his life: and he ate and drank and dressed like other men, without any affectation of austerities like those of the Pythagoreans. Nor was John the Baptist, the fore-runner of Jesus, like them: there was somewhat austere in his character, but he likewise ate animal food, and wore animal clothing. *He had his raiment of camels hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins: and his meat was locusts and wild honey.* Matt. iii. 4. Nor has Philostratus told any such wonderful works of Apollonius, as should make out any tolerable resemblance between Jesus and him in that respect.

Huet is the person who has taken the most pains to shew this. He <sup>k</sup> affirms, that Philostratus transferred many things from the history of Christ into his life of Apollonius: and he has alleged a great number of particulars; but to me they appear so slight, and so inadequate to the purpose, as to deserve little regard.

For instance, <sup>c</sup> of <sup>l</sup> our Lord it is said, Luke ii. 52. *that he increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and men.*

<sup>b</sup> De Vit. Ap. l. viii. c. 10 . . . 12.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Fabr. B. Gr. l. iv. cap. 24 T. iv. p. 49. et Gothofr. Olear. Pr. in Philost. p. 3. &c. <sup>k</sup> Ex historia Christi pleraque in suam Apollonii vitam transtulit. Huet. ib.

<sup>l</sup> Quod de Christo scriptum legisset Phi-

lostratus: *Et Jesus proficiebat sapientia et aetate . . . idcirco scripsit Apollonium procedentibus annis egregia ingenii et memorie dedisse specimina, et formæ elegantia omnium in se oculos convertisse.* Ib. num. iv. p. 661.

‘ And Philostratus says, that Apollonius in early life, as he grew up, gave proof of great ingenuity, and a strong memory, and was much taken notice of.’

But, first of all, what is there extraordinary in this? Has not the like been said of innumerable men who have afterwards made a figure in the world? And, secondly, here is an imitation of Pythagoras, of whom the same is said by the <sup>m</sup> writers of his life.

Again: ‘ Jesus <sup>n</sup> ascended to heaven: nor would Philostratus,’ says Huet, ‘ have his Apollonius inferior to him in that respect.’

Nevertheless here is no resemblance at all; nor can there be any. According to all the gospels, Jesus was publicly crucified at Jerusalem: and it was in all the ancient creeds received by all catholic Christians in general, ‘ that Jesus suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried: the third day he rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven.’ But Philostratus did not know, when, or where, or how Apollonius died, nor at what age: how is it possible then that there should be here any resemblance? ‘ Concerning <sup>o</sup> the manner of his death, if indeed he died, there are various reports. But Damis says nothing. . . . Nor does Damis inform us of his age: but some say he lived to be eighty years old, others more than ninety, some more than an hundred. Some say he died at Ephesus, others say he died at Lindus, others at Crete, and that having gone into the temple there, he disappeared in a wonderful manner: and that there were heard virgins singing this ode: “ Come from the earth, Come to heaven, come.”’ So writes Philostratus.

Surely this is all uncertainty, and nothing to be depended upon; as <sup>p</sup> Huet himself, and <sup>q</sup> other learned men of the best note, have acknowledged.

But though this is all uncertainty, and here is no resemblance of Jesus Christ, here is an imitation of the writers of the life of

<sup>m</sup> Περὶ τῆς δ' ἐκ παιδῶν εἰς πᾶσαν μα-  
δρῶν οἰσὶς εὐφρεσῶ. κ. λ. Porph. de Vit.  
Pyth. num. 1. Vid. et Diog. Laert.  
lib. viii. § 2. et Jambl. de Vit. Pythag.  
num. 9, 10.

<sup>n</sup> Jesus ascendit in  
cælum: nec hac parte inferiorem esse  
Apollonium suum voluit Philostratus.  
Huet. ib. num. iv. p. 662.

<sup>o</sup> Περὶ γὰρ τρεπὲ καὶ ὄν ἐλεεύθια, εἰς  
ἐλεεύθια, πλεῖστοι μὲν λόφοι. Δαμιδοὶ δὲ εἶδεν  
οὐδὲν. . . . Philost. l. viii. cap. 29, 30.

<sup>p</sup> . . . nec usquam postea comparuisse.  
Quæ quam inconcinne et absurde conficta  
sunt, clarissime patefaciunt ea, quæ a Phi-

lostrato præmissa sunt. Nam quo ætatis  
anno decesserit Apollonius, ignorari ait,  
. . . discrepantes quoque esse de loco obitus  
ipsius sententias, Ephesi aliis, aliis Lindi,  
aliis in Creta interiisse narrantibus, sepul-  
chrum vero ejus nullibi gentium reperiri.  
Huet. ib. p. 662.

<sup>q</sup> Quando, et  
quo mortis genere obierit, incertissimum  
est. Philostratus ipse hic nihil explorati  
scire profiteretur. Quare justo confidentiores  
habendi sunt qui in tempore mortis ejus  
constituendo elaborarunt. &c. &c. Mo-  
stem ubi supr. § 4.

Pythagoras; who either give no account of his death, or say, there <sup>r</sup> are different accounts in several authors of the manner of his death. And some said he <sup>s</sup> died in the eightieth year of his age, others in the ninetieth year; and some said he <sup>t</sup> lived to be almost an hundred, others, that <sup>u</sup> he reached to the hundred and fifth year of his age.

Upon the whole, I do not see any reason to believe, that Philostratus had read any of our gospels, or any other of the books of the New Testament, or that he any where makes any references to the history of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Before I proceed any farther, I would just observe here, that <sup>x</sup> Photius has two articles concerning this work of Philostratus, entitled, The Life of Apollonius Tyanæus: one of which is a general account of the work; the other is a copious abridgment of all the eight books of it: but I do not recollect, that he any where hints it to have been his design to oppose Apollonius to Jesus. However, in the first article he gives the true character of it, representing it to be extremely <sup>y</sup> fabulous.

Jerom <sup>\*\*</sup> likewise has given a particular account of Philostratus's eight books of the Life of Apollonius, whom, as he says, the vulgar called a magician, the Pythagoræans a philosopher: but he gives not any hint, that Philostratus had designed to set up Apollonius in opposition to our Saviour.

And beside that every thing is uncertain, and nothing related in a credible manner and upon good authority, as was formerly shewn; the things ascribed to Apollonius by Philostratus are not so extraordinary as some imagine. Some <sup>z</sup> cures of dæmoniacks, and others, are inserted after a sort in this history of Apollonius, but not one instance of a miraculous resurrection is as-

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Diog. Laërt. lib. viii. segm. 39. 40, 41.

<sup>s</sup> Ο γυν Πυθαγορας, ως μεν Ηρακλειδης φησιν, υγδοηκοινητης ετελευτα . . . ως δε οι πλειεις, ειη βιης εννεηκοινητα. Id. Segm. 44.

<sup>t</sup> . . . το παντα βιωσαντα ειη εςγυς των εκατον. Jambl. Vit. Pyth. cap. 36. num. 265.

<sup>u</sup> Οι εκατον και τεσσαρων ετων λειπει εζηκεναι τον Πυθαγορον. Anon. de Vit. Pythag. ap. Phot. cod. 259. p. 1313. et apud Kulleri Jamblichum. p. 56.

<sup>x</sup> Phot. Cod. 44. p. 29. et 241. p. 996.

<sup>y</sup> Ταυτα μεν περι εαυτου αναπλαττει. p. 29. lin. 51. . . Παραπλησια τειλαι ανοιας μεντα, και ειερα πλειετα, τερατευσαμενος. Εν οκτω δε λογοις η πασα αυτη της μαθαισπονιας σπειδη καλαναλασαι. p. 38. in.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Apollonius (sive ille magus, ut vulgus loquitur, sive philosophus, ut Pythagorici tradunt,) intravit Persas, per-

transiit Caucasum, Albanos, Scythas, Massagetas, opulentissima Indiæ regna penetrauit: et ad extremum latissimo Phison amne transmissis, pervenit ad Brachmanas, ut Jarcam in throno sedentem aureo, et de Tantalii fonte potantem, inter paucos discipulos, de natura, de moribus, ac siderum cursu audiret docentem. Inde per Elamitas, Babylonios, Chaldaeos, Medos, Assyrios, Parthos, Syros, Phœnices, Arabes, Palæstinos, reversus Alexandriam, perrexit Æthiopiam, ut Gymnosophistas, et famosissimam Solis mensam videret in fabulo. Invenit ille vir ubique quod disceret: et semper proficiens, semper se melior fieret. Scripsit super hoc plenissime octo voluminibus Philostratus. Hieron. ad Paulin. ep. 50. al. 103. T. iv. P. 2. p. 568.

<sup>z</sup> L. iii. cap. 38, 39. l. iv. c. 20.

serted by him. Something of this kind he attempts in one<sup>a</sup> place; but after all, it was not certain to those who were present that the young woman was dead; nor does Philostratus affirm it: for there were, it seems, some signs of life in the person who had been supposed by some to be dead. Upon which story Eusebius has made good remarks: who says, ‘as<sup>b</sup> it was not credited by Philostratus himself, we need not much mind it: for in reasoning about it, he supposeth, that there were some remains of life, the maid still breathing, and having a dew of sweat upon her face: and moreover, as this is said to have happened at Rome, if it had been true, it would undoubtedly have come to the knowledge of the emperor Domitian and his courtiers, and to the philosopher Euphrates, then at Rome, and would have been particularly taken notice of, either in favour of Apollonius, or to his disadvantage: neither of which happened.’

Of this Eusebius takes notice again afterwards, saying: ‘As<sup>c</sup> for the young woman brought to life from the dead, or rather still breathing, having in her symptoms of life, according to the historian himself, it cannot be reckoned a miracle: nor, as before said, would so great a work have been buried in silence, if it had been performed at Rome itself, where the emperor then was.’

Some will ask here, how then came it to pass, that many heathen people were disposed to equal Apollonius to Jesus, or even to prefer him before our Lord! I answer, the reason was, that they were willing to lay hold of any thing that offered to save the sinking cause of polytheism, and the rites belonging to it: as shipwrecked men catch at every twig or straw that comes in their way to save themselves from drowning.

This observation may be illustrated and confirmed by an argument of Origen with Celsus.

‘Now,’ says<sup>d</sup> Origen, ‘let us observe some of the strange

<sup>a</sup> L. iv. cap. 45.

<sup>b</sup> Το γε μὴν

ἐπι τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολέως μεία ταύτα κορίον, οἷ δὴ μεία θανάτου ἐπι δούλειαν ζωὴν ἵστασεν, ἀπιστοτάτην καὶ αὐτῷ δοξάν τῷ Φιλοστράτῳ παραίτητοι. Ἐν διστασμῷ μείλοι ἀμφιβάλλει, μὴ ἀρα σπινθηρ τῆς ψυχῆς εὐπαρχῶν τῆ παιδί, τῆς θεραπευοῦσας ἐλεληθει. Λεγέσθαι γὰρ φησὶν ὡς ψεκάσοι μετ ὁ ζεύς, ἡ δὲ ἀμιζοὶ ἀπο τῆ προσώπη. Καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἐι ἀληθῶς αὐτο τοιον καὶ ἐπι τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπεπρακίε, ἔκ ἀν ἐλεληθει βασιλεα τε πρώτοι, καὶ τῆς μετ’ αὐτον ἀπάνιας ὑπαρχῆς, μαλιστα δὲ τον φιλοσοφον Εὐφράτην εἰχωρίαζήια κατ’ ἐκεينو καιρῶ, καὶ ἐπι Ῥώμης δια-

τριβοῖα. Contr. Hierocl. p. 530.

<sup>c</sup> Το γὰρ τῆς ἀναβιωσασῆς κορῆς, ἐπ’ ἐμπῆς ὑπῆρχε, σπινθηρα ψυχῆς καὶ αὐτον συγγραφεα, καὶ ἰκμαδα ἐπι τῆ προσώπη φερυσαν, περιαιρέλιον τῆς θάυμαλοποιας. Οὐ γὰρ ἀν, ὡς καὶ προσθεῖ εφην, σιωπῆ το τηλικῆσον παρεδοθη ἐπ’ αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, βασιλεως ἐπι παρόντος γεγενημειον. Ib. p. 534. D.

<sup>d</sup> Ἰδῶμεν δὲ καὶ α μεία ταύτα λεσει ὁ Κελσος παρὰ ἰθιθεμενος ἀπο ἰστοριων παραδοξῶ, καὶ καθ’ αὐτα μὲν ἀπιστοις εοικῶια, ὑπ’ αὐτῆ ἔκ ἀπισθημενα, ὁσον γε ἐπι τῆ λεξει αὐτῆ. Contr. Cels. l. iii. n. 26. p. 125.

‘ things alleged by Celsus, which, though in themselves incredible, are believed by him, if we may credit his word. Such are the stories which he alleges, first concerning “Aristeas of Proconnesus, who after he had wonderfully disappeared from the eyes of men, was afterwards seen again, and visited many parts of the world, and related the wonderful things he had seen.” ‘ Afterwards ‘ he insists upon the history of Cleomedes, “of whom it is said, that his soul often left the body, and wandered about without the body.” ‘ He ‘ also speaks of Cleomedes of Astipyléa, letting us thereby know, that he was not unacquainted with the Grecian histories. “Who,” as he says, “when he was shut up in a chest held it fast: nevertheless, when it was opened he was not found in it, having escaped by some divine power.”

If Celsus, an Epicurean, when arguing against the Christians, could lay hold of such things, and speak of them as true, what might not other prejudiced and ignorant men do? For these things must have been looked upon as fabulous by all wise men, when they had no particular interest to serve. Plutarch having related how Proculus said and swore, that he had seen Romulus after he was dead, goes on: ‘ This ‘ is like some of the Grecian fables of Aristéas the Proconnesian, and Cleomedes the Astypaleian. For they say, that Aristéas died in a fuller’s work-house; and his friends coming to him, his body vanished; and that some presently after coming from a journey, said they met him travelling to Croton. And that Cleomedes, being an extraordinary strong man, and withal crazed, committed many desperate freaks. At last, in a certain school-house striking a pillar that sustained the roof with his fist, broke it in the middle: so the house fell and destroyed the children in it, and being pursued he fled into a great chest, and shutting to the lid, held it so fast, that many men with all their strength could not force it open. Afterwards breaking the chest to pieces, they found no man in it. . . . Many such improbabilities do your fabulous writers relate.’ So says Plutarch.

As Celsus, and possibly some others, for want of better laid hold of old Greek stories to oppose to the miracles of Jesus, and the Jewish prophets: so many heathens in latter times might endeavour to improve the history of Apollonius in opposition to Jesus and his followers: though Philostratus had no such thing

‘ Ib. num. 32. p. 129.

‘ Ib. num. 33. p. 130.

‘ Εδίκη μὲν ταῦτα τοῖς ὑφ’ ἑλλήνων, περὶ

τε ἀριστέου τε προκοννησίου, καὶ κλεομένηος τε ἀστυπυλαίους μυθολογήματα. Plutarch. sub fin. Vit. Rom.

in view, no more than the first inventors of the old fabulous stories among the Greeks.

One thing here offers itself to our observation, for shewing the temper of the heathen people in this point, which therefore cannot be omitted.

For in the time of Augustine many heathen people, and those of no small consideration, ascribed not only to Apollonius, but to Apuleius of Madaura likewise, many miracles. Says <sup>b</sup> Mr. Bayle, ‘nothing can more sensibly demonstrate the absurd credulity of the pagans, than their saying that Apuleius had done so great a number of miracles, that they equalled, or even surpassed those of Jesus Christ. Undoubtedly there were many people who took for true history all that he relates in his Golden Ass; though himself published that book as a Romance, or a Milesian fable, as he calls it in the <sup>i</sup> introduction.’ And as the same author goes on: ‘It <sup>k</sup> could not be easily believed that any had formed such a notion, were it not that it is attested by men of good credit; and that <sup>l</sup> the great prelate Augustine was earnestly entreated to confute it. Nay,’ says Bayle, ‘these pretended miracles were talked of long before Augustine: for Lactantius <sup>m</sup> wonders, that the author of whom he is speaking did not join Apuleius with Apollonius of Tyana; for of him also many wonderful things are related.’ So Mr. Bayle.

And I think it does appear from Lactantius, that in his time many wonderful things were ascribed to Apuleius, and believed by some; but, as it seems, they were mean and vulgar people only. For which reason Hierocles, of whom he speaks, did not bring them into his argument against the Christians; he was wiser than to do it. But things were altered before the time of Augustine: the Christian religion had made farther progress in the world, and the necessities of the heathen people were increased; and they now added the miracles of Apuleius to those of Apollonius to strengthen their cause, though there was no ground for either. It is manifest from the letter of Marcellinus to Augustine, that the works then ascribed to Apuleius and others, were a real and weighty objection against Christianity in

<sup>b</sup> Apulée. <sup>i</sup> At ego tibi sermone illo Milesio varias fabulas conferam. Apul. in prol. Assini Aurei. <sup>k</sup> Apulée note (L). <sup>l</sup> . . . preceptor accesserunt, ut ad ea vigilantius respondere dignerentur, in quibus nihil amplius Dominum quam alii homines facere potuerunt, gessisse commemoratur. Apollonium siquidem suum fabulæ, et Apuleium, aliosque magicæ artis

homines in medium proferunt, quorum majora contendunt extitisse miracula. Marcellin. ad Augustin. ep. 136. [al. 4.] Tom. ii. ed. Bened. <sup>m</sup> Voluit ostendere Apollonium vel paria vel etiam majora fecisse. Mirum, quod Apuleium prætermisit, cujus solent et multa et mira memorari. Lactant. Div. Inst. lib. v. cap. 3.

the minds of some heathen people of note, and who were well disposed to it: with how little reason we can now easily discern. But such cases as these are continually happening in this world of ours, owing to want of careful and impartial examination, the great source of ignorance and error in all sorts of people in all ages.

We have now finished our digression, and return to Philostratus.

Apollonius pretended to know the thoughts of men, and to foresee futurities: nevertheless, as Tillemont<sup>n</sup> observes, ‘ he<sup>o</sup> composed a very long apology for himself with a design to deliver it to Domitian; but his pretended prophetic spirit did not advertise him, that Domitian would not give him time to pronounce it, and that the pains he was at in composing it would be useless.’

A man<sup>p</sup> who had lost an eye came to a temple of Æsculapius, where also Apollonius was, hoping to have his eye restored to him: but understanding that his affliction was the punishment of his intemperance, the priest and Apollonius agreed to dismiss him, as a profane wretch unworthy of cure. ‘ May it not be reasonably suspected, that the cure was above their ability?’

We are indebted to Eusebius for his account of the work of Hierocles, and for his remarks upon Philostratus: nevertheless it is somewhat unhappy for us, that he did not transcribe at length that passage of Hierocles, where<sup>q</sup> he enumerated the wonderful works ascribed to Apollonius: that passage might have enabled us to judge better for ourselves, and to form a distinct notion of Hierocles’s argument, and what were the actions of Apollonius upon which he chiefly relied. However, as we still have the work of Philostratus, we can be assured, that nothing more than human was credibly related of him; and I have endeavoured to supply the above mentioned defect by divers quotations and observations; to which I shall add a few more, though to some they may appear unnecessary.

‘ A<sup>r</sup> plague broke out at Ephesus; and no remedy offering,’ says Philostratus, ‘ they sent messengers to Apollonius at Smyrna, who presently came to them: and gathering together all the Ephesians in general, he bid them be easy, for he would stop the plague that very day. Having thus said, he invited the people of every age to the theatre, where now stands the statue in memory of their deliverance. Here was seen an old man in the shape of a beggar, winking with his eyes, and a

<sup>n</sup> Tillem. H. E. Tom. ii. P. i. p. 220, 221. Brux.

<sup>o</sup> Philost. de Vit. Apoll. l. viii. cap. 7. p. 327 . . . 353.

<sup>p</sup> Vit. Apoll. l. i. cap. 10.

<sup>q</sup> Εἶτα κατέλειπε ἀπο πρῶτον ἀρχαίως τὰ παραδοξά. Contr. Hier. p. 512. D.

<sup>r</sup> Vit. Ap. l. iv. cap. 10.

‘ scrip by his side, where he put pieces of bread, with ragged  
 ‘ clothes, and sorrowful face. He bid the Ephesians to surround  
 ‘ him, and to throw stones at that enemy of the gods. The  
 ‘ Ephesians wondered at what he said, and thought it inhuman  
 ‘ to kill a stranger who earnestly importuned their mercy. But  
 ‘ he renewed his orders to the Ephesians, and that they should  
 ‘ not let him escape. Some then began to attack him. Where-  
 ‘ upon he, who before seemed to wink, looked fierce with  
 ‘ eyes full of fire; whereby the Ephesians perceived it to be a  
 ‘ dæmon. They therefore went on casting stones at him, till  
 ‘ they had raised a great heap upon him. Soon after Apollonius  
 ‘ directed them to remove the stones, that they might discern  
 ‘ the wild beast which they had killed. When that was done,  
 ‘ the person whom they thought they had killed was vanished: but  
 ‘ a dog, in shape like to a mastiff, in size equal to a very great  
 ‘ lion, appeared overwhelmed with stones, and foaming after  
 ‘ the manner of mad dogs: which is the form of the averting  
 ‘ statue. Moreover, a statue of Hercules stands in the place  
 ‘ where this spectre was stoned.’

There is no need of remarks upon so silly a story of our great  
 rhetorician: justly does Eusebius say, that Philostratus’s accounts  
 of Apollonius’s miracles are inconsistent, *αυσεαλα*, and therefore  
 altogether incredible.

But it was necessary that some miracle of this kind should be  
 ascribed to Apollonius, in order to make out a resemblance with  
 Pythagoras, of whom, among other things, are mentioned \* the  
 sudden removals of plagues.

However, I shall observe a few more passages in this work of  
 Philostratus.

‘ When † Damis first met Apollonius in Assyria, he said, he  
 ‘ believed he could be of use to him, as he knew the road to  
 ‘ Babylon, and understood the languages of those barbarians,  
 ‘ the Armenians, the Medes, the Persians, the Cadusians.  
 ‘ Apollonius answered, “ my friend I understand them all, though  
 “ I have learned none of them.” At which Damis was much  
 ‘ surprized. But Apollonius proceeded: “ Do not wonder at  
 “ that, my friend, that I know all the languages of men: for I  
 “ know their secret thoughts.” Damis then worshipped him,  
 ‘ considering him as a dæmon, and continued with him improv-  
 ‘ ing in wisdom.’

\* . . . και λημων απορροπαι συν ταχει. Jambl. Vit. Pythag. cap. 28. num. 135.  
 † Vit. Ap. l. i. cap. 19. p. 23.

Upon which Eusebius <sup>a</sup> observes, ‘ that according to Philo-  
 ‘ stratus, Apollonius <sup>x</sup> was a very forward child, taking learning  
 ‘ very well, and having a good memory: and that at the four-  
 ‘ teenth year of his age he was carried by his father to Tarsus,  
 ‘ to be there instructed by Euthydemus the Phœnician, who was  
 ‘ a good rhetorician. Where he was also instructed in the phi-  
 ‘ losophy of Plato, and Chrysippus, and the Peripatetics, not  
 ‘ neglecting entirely that of Epicurus: but the Pythagoræan  
 ‘ doctrine he most approved. In all these things,’ says Eusebius,  
 ‘ this man was instructed, who is said to have learned no lan-  
 ‘ guage, and to have known the thoughts of men by a divine  
 ‘ power.’ A just observation.

I shall now take another passage from the first book of the  
 Life of Apollonius. ‘ That ’ my history might be the more  
 ‘ complete,’ says Philostratus, ‘ I once intended to omit nothing  
 ‘ related by Damis, and to give a particular account of what  
 ‘ passed among the barbarians: but my design leads me to higher  
 ‘ and more wonderful things. Two things, however, there are  
 ‘ which cannot be omitted: one is the fortitude of Apollonius  
 ‘ in travelling among barbarous people, whose country abounds  
 ‘ with robbers, as having never been under the Roman govern-  
 ‘ ment: the other is his wisdom, whereby, after the manner of  
 ‘ the Arabians, he attained to the knowledge of the languages  
 ‘ of brute animals. This he learned among the Arabians; for  
 ‘ this science is common among the Arabians: and they attend  
 ‘ to the voices of birds with the same respect as they do to oracles.’

But what is there wonderful in all this? The celebrated forti-  
 tude is merely human; and the interpretation of the languages  
 of brutes is all conjecture; and any man who undertakes it may  
 ascribe what meaning he pleases to their sounds, without being  
 confuted by any. Nevertheless, such pretensions can expose  
 men to laughter only.

Upon which Eusebius <sup>z</sup> remarks after this manner: ‘ So that  
 ‘ to all the forementioned masters must be added the wise men  
 ‘ of Arabia, who taught him the art of divination, and enabled  
 ‘ him to understand, that <sup>y</sup> sparrows by chirping call others to  
 ‘ partake of food with them; an observation delivered by him  
 ‘ with the admiration of many. And in like manner when in  
 ‘ his journey to Assyria he espied a lioness just dying with eight  
 ‘ whelps, by the same learning he understood how long he should  
 ‘ stay with the Persians.’

<sup>a</sup> Contr. Hierocl. p. 518.

<sup>x</sup> Philost. l. i. cap. 7.

<sup>y</sup> L. i. cap. 20.

<sup>z</sup> Ut sup. p. 518.

<sup>z</sup> Vid. Philost. l. iv. cap. 3.

I shall here refer such readers as are curious, and have leisure, to some chapters of Porphyry \* \* in his work concerning Abstinence from the flesh of animals: where he speaks of some men having attained to the skill of understanding the languages of animals, and then of animals understanding each others languages.

The story of the lionsess to which Eusebius refers, as it stands in Philostratus is to this purpose: ‘As <sup>b</sup> Apollonius and Damis were travelling, a lionsess was killed near them in hunting, which was of an uncommon size, and when opened had eight whelps. Apollonius therefore, after observing the wild beast, and after having meditated a good while, said: “O Damis, the time of our stay with the king will be a year and eight months; for he will not let us go sooner; nor will it be easy for us to leave him before that time. From the whelps the number of the months is to be concluded, as the lionsess herself denotes a year.” Wonderful mystery, truly!

This story brings to my mind what is said by Laërtius <sup>c</sup> of Empedocles, ‘an ancient Pythagorean philosopher; who, when the Etesian winds were very violent at Agrigentum, so as to destroy the fruits of the earth, he ordered some asses to be flayed: and having made bottles of their skins, they were placed at the tops of the hills for stopping the winds: and the effect being answerable, he obtained the name of Averter of winds.’

Menage, in his notes, says: ‘nothing <sup>d</sup> more silly could possibly be invented.’ But yet it is mentioned with tokens of approbation and credit by Porphyry <sup>e</sup> and Jamblichus <sup>f</sup> in their Lives of Pythagoras, and by Philostratus <sup>g</sup> in his Life of Apollonius: and, indeed, I think it as likely a method for stopping a plague, as that taken by Apollonius at Ephesus before mentioned.

Upon the whole, this work of Philostratus appears to me throughout Pythagorean; as Jamblichus himself says in his Life of Pythagoras: ‘Hence <sup>h</sup> it comes to pass, that all Pythagoreans in general readily assent to such things as are related of Aristeas the Proconnesian, and Abaris the Hyperborean, and all other such like things. They assent to all these stories, and they invent many other themselves, as thinking nothing incredible which is said of the deity. . . . Nor do they think,

\* \* De Abst. &c. l. iii. § 3, 4, 5. &c.

<sup>b</sup> De Vit. Ap. l. i. cap. 22.

<sup>c</sup> Diog. l. viii. § 60.

<sup>d</sup> Nihil creptius fingi potest eo quod refert hic Laërtius, Empedoclem excoriatas compluribus asinis, et eorum pellibus oppositis castris, exclusisse ventum, et simul pestem,

quam, perniciosi isti flatus Agrigentinis inducebant. Menag. in loc. p. 379.

<sup>e</sup> . . . num. 29, 30.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 28.

num. 136.

<sup>g</sup> L. viii. cap. 7. § 8.

p. 339.

<sup>h</sup> Vit. Pyth. cap. 28.

num. 138, 139. Vid. et num. 135, 136.

‘ that

‘ that they therefore are weak and silly, but others are so who  
 ‘ disbelieve them. For to say, some things are possible to the  
 ‘ gods, others impossible, is the principle not of wise men, but  
 ‘ of ignorant pretenders to science.’ A very fair and honest  
 confession!

My advice, therefore, with which I would conclude this  
 section is, that they who are desirous to understand the history  
 which Philostratus has left us of Apollonius Tyanæus, should  
 read the Life of Pythagoras written by Diogenes Laertius, Por-  
 phyry, Jamblichus, and the anonymous author in Photius, and  
 the Lives of Empedocles, and other Pythagoræans in Laërtius:  
 observing likewise the stories relating to these men found in  
 Plutarch, Ælian, and other ancient authors.

Let me however add an observation from Chrysostom: ‘ Jesus  
 ‘ Christ ††,’ says he, ‘ not only prescribed a rule of life, but  
 ‘ also planted it every where throughout the whole world. How  
 ‘ many things have been said of Apollonius Tyanæus! but that  
 ‘ you might be satisfied they are all falsehood and fiction, and no-  
 ‘ thing true, they are extinct, and come to an end.’

I have now enlarged upon this point, and have said a great  
 deal of Apollonius, and the history of Philostratus, and some  
 things very different from the general apprehensions of learned  
 men in our time: nevertheless, if I am not mistaken, I have  
 said little more than was said long ago by Dr. S. Parker, bishop  
 of Oxford, in his Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the  
 Law of Nature, and of the Christian Religion: and I therefore  
 intend to transcribe his observations upon this subject as an ap-  
 pendix to this chapter.

VII. As I have been led to say so much about the Life of  
 Apollonius, written by Philostratus, I shall take this opportunity  
 to consider two Lives of Pythagoras, written, one by Porphyry,  
 whom we have placed at the year of Christ 270, the other by<sup>i</sup>  
 Jamblichus of Chalcis, a disciple of Porphyry: who, as<sup>k</sup> Fa-  
 bricius says, lived in the time of Constantine, and probably died

†† Ο δε Χριστος εκ εβραΐσε πολίσειαν μοιοι.  
 αλλά και πανταχθ της οικουμένης αυτην κα-  
 λειψιευσε. Ποσα λεγεται Απολλωνιος ο εκ  
 Τυανων περιποιηκεται; Αλλ’ ινα μαθης ολι-  
 ψευδος παντα εκεινα ην, και φαντασια, και  
 αληθεις εδεν’ ισθειςαι, και τελος ελαβεν.  
 Chryf. adv. Judæos. Or. v. T. i. p. 631. A.

<sup>i</sup> Vid. Eunap. de Vit. Philosoph. p. 21.  
 &c. I think it best to transcribe here en-  
 tire the article of Jamblichus in Suidas.  
 Ιαμβελιχος ειςρος. Χαλκιδος της Συριας,  
 φιλοσοφος, μαθητης Πορφυριου τθ φιλοσοφου

τθ Πλωσιου αυστου, γεγονως, και τα τας χρι-  
 νης Κωνσταντινου τθ βασιλευς. Εβραΐσε βίβ-  
 λια φιλοσοφα διαφορα. Suid.

<sup>k</sup> Hoc certe constat, regnante adhuc  
 Constantino M. atque, ut videtur, ante  
 A. C. 333, e vita discessisse. Nam post  
 Jamblichi mortem Sopater, ejus discipulus,  
 in Constantini M. se aulam contulit, teste  
 Eunapio, in Ædesio. p. 34. Fabr. Bib.  
 Gr. l. iv. cap. 28. T. iv. p. 283. Vid. et  
 Tillem. L’Emp. Constantin. art. 91.

before the year 333: I therefore place him at the year 313. I speak of these writings together, and in this place, for the sake of brevity, that I may not be obliged to make distinct articles of works that are of little importance to us.

Here I shall transcribe at length the observations of Mr. La Roche referred to <sup>l</sup> before: 'I am by no means,' says he, 'of Mr. Kuster's opinion in his <sup>m</sup> note upon Jamblichus. I think, he did not design to oppose the pretended miracles of Pythagoras to those of Jesus Christ: nor do Rittershufius or Lucas Holstenius in their notes say, that Jamblichus or Porphyry had any such intention. There is nothing in Jamblichus, or in what remains of Porphyry's Life of Pythagoras, but what they would have said if there had been no Christians in the world: the same may be said of Philostratus in the Life of Apollonius. I wonder the learned Dr. Gale should suspect in his notes upon Jamblichus de mysteriis, p. 244, <sup>n</sup> that Jamblichus did indirectly reflect upon the incarnation of the Θεω-  
\* \* \* \* \*

I am of opinion, that this last observation, as well as the others, is very right: but what I add farther shall relate to the two Lives of Pythagoras, written by Porphyry and Jamblichus; and that they had no intention to oppose Pythagoras to the Lord Jesus Christ, appears to me very evident for these two reasons.

First of all, they have said nothing new of Pythagoras, nothing but what had been often said of him before the appearance of the Christian religion in the world. As Josephus says, 'many' authors have written the history of Pythagoras: so it appears from the two writers of his Life above mentioned, and from Diogenes Laërtius, who expressly quote many authors by name for what they say, and seem also sometimes to refer to traditionary accounts.

<sup>l</sup> See above. p. 269. <sup>m</sup> Vid. Jambl. de Vita Pythag. cap. 2. num. 10. not. 13. p. 7. Amst. 1707.

<sup>n</sup> Suspicio interim Jamblichum per hæc jamdudum oblique notasse εἰσαφικασίῃ Θεω-  
\* \* \* \* \*  
what is above, and indeed, since finishing this whole chapter, as I was revising it, I have observed, that Mr. Mosheim also went into the common opinion concerning these two Lives of Pythagoras. I shall therefore here transcribe what he says; but I do not think it needful to add one syllable to my argument as already finished. Pythagoræ vitam hoc sæculo Porphyrius,

sequenti Jamblichus, uterque eo sine dubio consilio exaravit, ut per Christo rebus omnibus, maxime miraculis et præceptorum sapientia, philosophus ille videretur. Demonstratum hoc dedit in adnotationibus ad Jamblichi vitam a se editam Ludolphus Kusterus, et videbit facile, cui placebit cum Servatoris nostri historia utramque vitam conferre. Non agnus agno similior esset, quam Christo Pythagoras, si vera forent quæ de hoc duumviri illi scripta reliquerunt. Moshem. de Reb. Christian. ante C. M. p. 562. <sup>o</sup> . . . πολλοί δὲ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστορικᾶσι. Contr. Ap. l. i. cap. 22.

And

And Origen observes, ' that <sup>p</sup> many strange things were said of Pythagoras, who shewed his ivory thigh at the assembly of the Greeks, and pretended to know the shield (hung up at Mycenæ) with which he had fought when he was Euphorbus, and is said to have been seen on one and the same day in two cities.' So writes Origen; and they were old stories long before his time.

Kuster <sup>q</sup> was of opinion, that in his Life of Pythagoras Jamblichus borrowed from Porphyry without naming him; and he wonders at it. Vossius <sup>r</sup> was of the same opinion; and other learned men, I suppose, have formed the same judgment: nevertheless I must take the liberty to say, that I cannot see any good ground for that supposition: and I am of opinion, that they both found the same stories in writers more ancient than themselves; whom they both transcribed, and sometimes almost word for word.

Secondly, most of the things related by those two authors are so trifling, and so manifestly fabulous, that I cannot believe they intended to oppose them to the miracles of Jesus Christ.

The golden or ivory thigh of Pythagoras comes over again and again in <sup>s</sup> Jamblichus; nor is it omitted by <sup>t</sup> Porphyry: and his solicitous concern to dissuade men from eating beans; which they endeavour to justify by saying, that <sup>u</sup> by their food he endeavoured to lead men to virtue. Abaris the Scythian, or Hyperborean, they <sup>x</sup> say, travelled with great ease and expedition over seas and rivers upon an arrow: ' Which, ' <sup>y</sup> as they also say, ' some supposed to have been the case of Pythagoras, when he was in one and the same day in Metapontus and Tauromenium.' This is both in Jamblichus and Porphyry in the places above referred to: and says Porphyry, ' if <sup>z</sup> credit is to be given to his historians, and those ancient and of unquestioned authority, he extended his instructions to brute animals. He laid hold of the Daunian bear, which had done abundance of mischief,

<sup>p</sup> Cont. Cels. l. vi. num. 8. p. 280.

<sup>q</sup> Vid. Jambl. de Vit. Pythag. cap. 14. num. 63. et Porph. de Vit. Pythag. num. 27 et 45.

Cum Jamblichus, ob argumenti et materię similitudinem conjunximus Porphyrium de Vita Pythagorę: cujus scriinia nosler (quamvis tacito, quod miror, ejus nomine,) identidem compilavit. Kust. Pręf. in Jambl.

<sup>r</sup> Tradlarat hoc argumentum antea præceptor ejus Malchus, sive Porphyrius: ex cujus de Pythagora libro multa, vel hisdem, vel leviter immutatis verbis scripsit Jamblichus. Voss. de Hist. Gr. l. ii. cap. 18.

<sup>s</sup> Jambl. cap. 19. n. 92. cap. 22. n. 135. Vid. et num. 140.

<sup>t</sup> Porph. num. 28. <sup>u</sup> . . . δια της τροφης αρχομενος εις αριστη οδησειν της ανθρωπου. Jamb. cap. 23. num. 109.

<sup>x</sup> Jambl. cap. 28. n. 136. Porph. num. 28, 29.

<sup>y</sup> Οπως υπειροησαν και Πυθαγοραν τινες πεποθειναι τοις, ημεκα εν Μεταποντιω και εν Ταυρομενιω τοις εκατερωθι ελαιροις ωμιλησεν τη αυτη ημερα. Porph. num. 29. Jambl. n. 138.

<sup>z</sup> Ει δε δει πιστευει τοις ιστορητασι περι αυτου, παλαιους δε εστι και αξιολογοις, κ. λ. De Vit. Pyth. num. 23, 24. Vid. et Jambl. de Vita Pythagorę cap. 13. num. 60, 61.

<sup>c</sup> and

‘ and having stroked it a long while, and given it bread and  
 ‘ acorns, he adjured it no more to eat flesh, and let it go: after  
 ‘ which it lived quietly in the woods and on the mountains, and  
 ‘ never more attacked so much as a brute animal. And when  
 ‘ he saw the ox at Tarentum straying at will in the fields, and  
 ‘ eating green beans, he went to the herdsman, and desired him  
 ‘ to speak to the ox, “ not to eat beans:” but he said, he did  
 ‘ not understand the language of oxen. Pythagoras then went  
 ‘ to the ox himself, and whispered it in the ear: whereupon the  
 ‘ ox not only left the field in which the beans were, but never  
 ‘ more eat any.’ So writes that great philosopher Porphyry;  
 and to the like purpose Jamblichus.

The miracles of our Saviour are all great and awful, related by credible witnesses, with all the circumstances of credibility: the trifling and fabulous accounts of Pythagoras cannot be set in competition with them. It is sufficient disparagement to those proud and learned philosophers, that they gave credit to the Pythagorean fables: we need not reproach them with an intention to oppose them to the miracles of Jesus Christ.

I therefore allege no testimonies out of these two works; I see not in them any references to our Saviour’s miracles, or the evangelical history: they are all over Pythagorean, like the Life of Apollonius written by Philostratus; upon which I have expatiated so much, that there can be no need for me to enlarge any farther upon these.

VIII. As I have been obliged to take some notice of these two Lives of Pythagoras, I shall also observe upon another work of Jamblichus not now extant, entitled, Of Images, or as Fabricius<sup>a</sup> calls it, Of the Divinity of Images, of which there is some account in Photius.

Says Photius: ‘ We<sup>b</sup> read the treatise of John Philoponus  
 ‘ against the work of Jamblichus, which he inscribed Of Images.  
 ‘ The design of Jamblichus is to shew the divinity of idols, (for

<sup>a</sup> Περὶ εἰδωμάτων, seu de divinitate imaginum liber, quem confutavit Joh. Philoponus, teste Photio, quem vide codice 215. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. iv. c. 24. T. iv. p. 293. Conf. Tom. ix. p. 450.

<sup>b</sup> Λογισθῆναι Ἰωάννη τῷ Φιλοπόνῳ κατὰ τῆς σπεύδης Ἰαμβλίχου, ἣν ἐγράψεν περὶ εἰδωμάτων. Ἐστὶ μὲν ἐν τῷ σκοπῷ Ἰαμβλίχου δεῖξαι τὰ εἰδώλα (ταῦτα γὰρ ὑποκαλεῖται τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ εἰδωμάτων) καὶ δεῖξαι ῥησιν ἀπλῆσιν ἕ μόνον ὅσα χεῖρες αἰετῶν, κρητῶν, πρῶτον τεχνισαμεῖαι, διατὰ ἀλλοῖς τε τεχνισθῶν διότι τῆ ἐπωνομασάν· τὰ γὰρ ἑρῶν τε φύσει εἶναι, κακῶν

ἐπι γῆς πρῶτον, ἐξ ἑ καὶ τὴν ἐπωνομασάν φέρειν συνερησαντο· ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσα τεχνισθῶν χαλκευτική τε καὶ λαξευτική, καὶ ἡ τεχνισθῶν ἐπι δὴλων μισθῶ καὶ ἐρῶν διαμορφωσαντο. Τῶν ἐν ἀπλῶν ἐρῶν τε ὑπερφῶν, καὶ δόξης ἀνθρώπινης κρητῶν γράφει Ἰαμβλίχος, πολλὰ μὲν ἀπίθανα μυθολογῶν, πολλὰ μὲν εἰς ἀδελφῶν φέρων αἰτίας, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὀρῶν εἰς αἰτίας γράφειν ἐκ αἰσχυνομενῶν. Εἰς δύο δὲ ὅλην τὴν πρῶτον διαλεγει, τὴν μὲν μείζονα καλεῖ, τὴν δὲ ἐλαττοῖα. Καθ’ ἑκάστης δὲ τῶν καὶ Φιλοποῖος ἰσάται. Phot. cod. 215. p. 353.

' so he calls images,) and that they are filled with the divine  
 ' presence, and not only such as having been formed by a secret  
 ' art, and therefore are said to have fallen down from Jupiter;  
 ' for these being of an heavenly nature, and having fallen down  
 ' thence to this earth, are always so called; but also such as have  
 ' been formed by the skill of the founder, or engraver, or smith.  
 ' All these, Jamblichus says, are supernatural works, and surpass  
 ' the common opinion of men about them. In support of this,  
 ' he tells a great many incredible stories; some things he ascribes  
 ' to occult causes: nor is he ashamed to assert things contradic-  
 ' tory to what is obvious to human sight. The whole work is  
 ' divided into two parts, one called the greater, the other the  
 ' less; both which are confuted by Philoponus.'

A wonderful work truly! Another instance of Pythagorean  
 credulity, and in that respect exactly resembling the Lives of  
 Pythagoras before mentioned. So writes Jamblichus, himself a  
 philosopher and a disciple of Porphyry, also a renowned philoso-  
 pher and hearer of Plotinus.

Lucas Holstenius was of opinion, that Porphyry likewise  
 published a work with this same title, *Of Images*.

Such were the philosophers of that time: they did little or  
 nothing to improve the sentiments of mankind: they confirmed  
 the prejudices of the common people, and made them still worse  
 than they otherwise would have been. If any others have since  
 resembled them therein, they are far from deserving commendation.

#### AN APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XXXIX.

I SHALL now, according to my promise at p. 282, transcribe  
 the observations of Dr. S. Parker<sup>a</sup> upon the character of Apol-  
 lonius Tyanæus, and the history of him written by Philostratus.

<sup>c</sup> See before p. 282, note i.

<sup>d</sup> Luc. Holsten. de Vita et Scriptis Porphyrii. cap. ix. p. 53. Cantabrig. 1655. cap. x. p. 268. Ap. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. iv.

<sup>a</sup> A Demonstration of the Divine Authority of the Law of Nature, and of the Christian Religion, in two Parts. By Samuel Parker, D. D. Archdeacon of Canterbury. 1681. Dr. Parker was afterwards

bishop of Oxford. The passage to be quoted by me is taken from P. 2. § xxvii. p. 293 . . . 300. I leave his references as they are, made to the Paris edition of Philostratus in 1608. And in some places I add, at the bottom of the page, references to the edition of Olearius at Leipsich, in 1709.

His observations, I believe, will be generally allowed to be right and pertinent. They are particularly remarkable upon two accounts: First, he considers Apollonius as a professed and conceited Pythagorean philosopher, or, as his terms are, ‘a mere fanatic and pedantic Pythagorean.’ Secondly, he rejects the parabelisms of Huet, and shews their futility. Consequently, he did not embrace the opinion of Dr. Cudworth, and divers other learned men, who have supposed, that ‘Philostratus intended to set up Apollonius as a rival with our Saviour.’ I thought I had been singular in the opinion which I received from Mr. La Roche, but here is a learned man who wrote almost an hundred years ago, and thought in the same manner.

His words are these: ‘But the man of wonders is Apollonius Tyanæus, of whom they boast and insult as the true heathen Messias: in that he wrought not, as Vespasian did, one or two chance miracles, but his whole life was all prodigy, and equal to our Saviour’s both for the number and the wonder of his works. But here, first, we have in part shewn what undoubted records we have of the life of Jesus: whereas all the credit of Apollonius his history depends upon the authority of one single man, who, beside that he lived an hundred years after him, ventured nothing, as the apostles did, in confirmation of its truth, but only composed it in his study: thereby, as appears from his frequent digressions, to take occasion of communicating to the world all the learning which he had raked together. Nay, so far was he from incurring any loss by the work, that he was set upon it by a great empress, whose religious zeal in the cause would be sure to see him well rewarded. And though he made use of the Commentaries of Damis, the inseparable companion of Apollonius, yet he confesses, that Damis himself never published his own Commentaries, but that a friend of Damis communicated them to the empress, which himself might probably have forged (as is common in courts) to pick her pocket. However, as for Damis himself, it is evident from Philostratus his whole story, that he was a very simple man, and that Apollonius only picked him up as a fit Sancho Pancha to exercise his wit upon; so that upon all occasions we find him not only baffling the esquire in disputes, but breaking jests upon him, which he always takes with much thankfulness, and more humility, still admiring his master’s wisdom, but much more his wit.

‘But after all, what the story of Damis was, or whether there were ever any such story, we have no account, unless from Philostratus himself; and therefore we must resolve it all into his

‘ autho-

' authority alone. And there it is evident, that Apollonius was  
 ' neither a god nor a divine man as his friends boasted, nor a  
 ' magician or conjurer, as his enemies imagined, but a meer  
 ' fanatic and pedantic Pythagorean: who for the honour of his  
 ' sect travelled, as many others have done, into all parts of the  
 ' world: and when he returned home told his countrymen, that  
 ' all men renowned for wisdom all the world over were of the  
 ' sect of the Pythagoreans; and then for advancement of their  
 ' authority told strange and prodigious tales of their wonder-  
 ' working power. Though here either he, or his historian, has  
 ' acquitted himself so awkwardly, as utterly to spoil the tale  
 ' and defeat the design. This Eusebius has shewn at large  
 ' in his book against Hierocles, by taking to pieces all parts of  
 ' the story, and discovering all its flaws and incoherences.'

' But I shall content myself with proving the vanity of the  
 ' whole from the notorious falshood of one particular narration,  
 ' upon which depends all that extraordinary power which he pre-  
 ' tends to; and that is his conversation with the Indian Brach-  
 ' mans, from whom, if we may believe his account of himself,  
 ' he learned all that he could do more than the common philo-  
 ' sophers of Greece. And if this prove a romance, all the rest  
 ' of his history must unavoidably follow its fortune. And for  
 ' this little proof will serve, when most of the stories are so very  
 ' mean and childish, as to be more contemptible than those little  
 ' tales wherewith nurses are wont to quiet their children.

' For what could be contrived more unphilosophically, than  
 ' the Bramans keeping tubs of rain wind and thunder by them,  
 ' which they bestow upon their friends as their necessities<sup>b</sup> re-  
 ' quired. l. iii. c. 3. And the swelling of the earth like the  
 ' waves of the sea, only with the stroke of a Braman's wand?  
 ' c. 5. Though<sup>c</sup> the most pleasant scene of the whole comedy  
 ' was their feast, in which there was no need of any attendants;  
 ' but the chairs and the stools, the pots and the cups, the dishes  
 ' and the plates, understood every one their own offices: and so  
 ' served in the entertainment themselves, and ran hither and thither  
 ' as the guests commanded, or their attendance required.' c. 8.

' But of all lyes the geographical lye is the most unhappy:  
 ' for the matter of them being perpetual, and not as the actions  
 ' of men are, transient, they may be confuted in any age. And  
 ' yet in this very thing he has outdone Sir John Mandevil him-  
 ' self, for incredible monsters and fables, describing men and  
 ' beasts of strange shapes, that were never seen by any man but

<sup>b</sup> L. iii. cap. xiv. p. 104. Olear. edit.

<sup>c</sup> L. iii. cap. xxvii. p. 117, 118.

<sup>c</sup> himself:

‘ himself: as <sup>d</sup> a sort of women half black, half white, a nation  
 ‘ of pigmies, living under ground, c. 14, griffins, apes as big  
 ‘ as men, beasts with the faces of men, and bodies of lions,  
 ‘ wool growing like grafs out of the earth, and <sup>f</sup> dragons almost  
 ‘ as common as sheep in other countries, c. 2. All which being  
 ‘ so vulgarly known at this day to be mere fables, they cannot  
 ‘ but overthrow the credit of the whole story. For either he  
 ‘ wandered as far as the Indies, or not: if not, then his saying  
 ‘ that he did is one lie for all: if he did, then it is evident from  
 ‘ these particulars that he made no conscience of truth or fals-  
 ‘ hood, but designed only to amuse the world with strange and  
 ‘ prodigious reports of the power of Pythagorism.’

‘ And that is the most that I can make of the story; though  
 ‘ I know that Huetius \* is of opinion, that all the substantial mi-  
 ‘ racles are stolen out of the gospels and the Acts of the apostles,  
 ‘ and that, for the most part, in the words and phrases of St. Luke.  
 ‘ And this he has endeavored to make good by a great variety  
 ‘ of parallel instances; and then thinks it a manifest discovery  
 ‘ both of the vanity of Philostratus and the imposture of Apol-  
 ‘ lonius, when he is only adorned with borrowed feathers, but a  
 ‘ great accession to the credit of our Saviour, that when his ene-  
 ‘ mies would frame the idea of a divine man, they were forced  
 ‘ to steal their best feathers from his picture. So that, he says,  
 ‘ it was no wonder, that Hierocles should so confidently compare  
 ‘ the miracles of Apollonius to those of Jesus, when those of  
 ‘ Jesus were with so little disguise clapped upon Apollonius.’

‘ This were a pretty discovery if it stood upon good grounds:  
 ‘ but alas! most of the parablelisms are so forced, or so slender,  
 ‘ or so far fetched, that it were easie to make as many, and as  
 ‘ probable, between any other histories whatever. And indeed,  
 ‘ in such a design as this of Philostratus, viz. to make up a story  
 ‘ as full of strange things as he could contrive, it is scarce possi-  
 ‘ ble not to have hit upon some things like some of those mi-  
 ‘ racles which are recorded in the gospels; so that in some few  
 ‘ of them there may be some resemblance, as particularly there  
 ‘ seems to be in that of the Gadarene daemoniac and the Cor-  
 ‘ cyrean youth; yet it is very obvious to apprehend, that this  
 ‘ might happen not by design but by chance. Propos. i. § 5.  
 ‘ And whereas Huetius will needs have it, that Philostratus has  
 ‘ stolen not only the stories but the very words of St. Luke, I  
 ‘ find no instance of it but only in this one relation, where they

<sup>d</sup> L. iii. cap. 3; p. 96.  
 P. 99, 100, 101.

<sup>e</sup> L. iii. cap. 47; p. 133.  
 \* Demonstr. Evang. c. 147. § 4.

<sup>f</sup> L. iii. cap. 6, 7, 8.

‘ both, it seems, use the word βαρυνειν; and this they might  
 ‘ easily do without theft or imitation, it being the common  
 ‘ Greek word that signifies to torment: so that they could no  
 ‘ more avoid that in Greek, than we could this in rendering it  
 ‘ into English. Nay, setting aside this one story, I find so little  
 ‘ resemblance between the history of Philostratus and that of the  
 ‘ gospels, that I scarce know any two histories more unlike:  
 ‘ for it is obvious to any man that reads Philostratus, that his  
 ‘ whole design was to follow the train of the old heathen my-  
 ‘ thology; and that is the bottom of his folly, by his story to  
 ‘ gain historical credit to the fables of the poets. So that it is  
 ‘ a very true and just censure which Ludovicus Vives has given  
 ‘ of him, that as he had endeavoured to imitate Homer, so he  
 ‘ had abundantly out-liked him. For there is scarce any thing  
 ‘ extraordinary reported in the whole history, in which he does  
 ‘ not apparently design either to verify or to rectify some of that  
 ‘ blind ballad singer’s tales: but especially in conjuring Achilles  
 ‘ out of his tomb, and discoursing with him about the old stories  
 ‘ that were told of the Trojan war.’

‘ And yet after all, few of Apollonius his miracles are sufficiently  
 ‘ vouched, even in his own history: v. g. the last that I men-  
 ‘ tioned, of the apparition of <sup>g</sup> Achilles; which had no other tes-  
 ‘ timony but of Apollonius himself, who stubbornly refused to  
 ‘ have any companion or witness of the fact: beside many other  
 ‘ absurdities in the story itself; as his rising out of the tomb five  
 ‘ foot long, and then swelling to twice the length; his being forced  
 ‘ to vanish away at cock-crowing, and the nymphs constantly  
 ‘ visiting him.’

‘ And so again, he pretended to understand all languages with-  
 ‘ out learning any: and yet, when he came to the Indian king,  
 ‘ he was forced to converse with him by an <sup>h</sup> interpreter. And  
 ‘ <sup>i</sup> whereas the story tells us of the devil’s being cast out of a  
 ‘ young man by a mandate from the Bramans, yet it gives us  
 ‘ no account of the event of it, only they pretended to do it:  
 ‘ but whether it was effectually done, we do not find that either  
 ‘ Apollonius or Damis ever inquired.’

‘ But the great faculty which he pretended to was the under-  
 ‘ standing of the languages of birds and beasts; which he says  
 ‘ he learned from the Arabians, and the citizens of Paræa in  
 ‘ India, who acquired it by eating dragons <sup>k</sup> hearts. Now all  
 ‘ stories of dragons are hard of belief, but especially of his Indian

<sup>g</sup> L. iv. cap. 15, 16. p. 151 . . . 154.

<sup>h</sup> L. ii. cap. 26. p. 77. et Conf. l. i. c. 27. et l. ii. cap. 23.

<sup>i</sup> L. iii. cap. 38. p. 128.

<sup>k</sup> L. iii. cap. 9. p. 101. Conf. l. i. cap. 20. p. 25.

‘ dragons;

‘ dragons; which he says were as commonly <sup>l</sup> hunted by the  
 ‘ inhabitants as hares in other countries. But granting that there  
 ‘ were so great numbers of them in his time, though since that  
 ‘ they were never seen by any man, it is very hard to believe, that  
 ‘ the mere eating a piece of their hearts should inspire men with  
 ‘ such an odd and singular faculty.’

‘ But the great miracle of all was his vanishing away at his  
 ‘ trial before Domitian, in the presence of all the great men of  
 ‘ Rome. But then, though our historian be very desirous we  
 ‘ should believe it, yet he falters afterwards, like a guilty liar,  
 ‘ in his confidence. For whereas <sup>m</sup> at first he positively affirms,  
 ‘ *ηφανισθη τῶ δικαστηρίῳ*, that he quite vanished away; at last he  
 ‘ only <sup>n</sup> says, *απηλθε*, that he went away. l. viii. c. 4. And this,  
 ‘ though he would seem to affirm, that it was after a wonderful  
 ‘ manner, and no body knows how, is a pitiful abatement to the  
 ‘ bigness of his former expression, “vanishing away.” Though  
 ‘ the truth is, if he had stood to it, it must unavoidably have  
 ‘ proved itself a lie; for it is utterly incredible, that so strange  
 ‘ a thing as that should have been done in so great a presence,  
 ‘ and yet never any notice be taken of it.’

‘ But in the last place, the historian would fain bid at some-  
 ‘ thing of his hero’s appearing after death: yet he does it so  
 ‘ faintly, that in the conclusion of all it comes to nothing, espe-  
 ‘ cially when he tells us, that the time of his death was alto-  
 ‘ gether unknown, and that the uncertainty of it took in no less  
 ‘ than the compass of thirty years. And then, they that were  
 ‘ so utterly at a loss as to the time of his decease, and that for  
 ‘ so long a space, were very likely to give a very wise account of  
 ‘ the certain time of any thing that he did after it!

‘ But how, or to whom did he appear? Why, to a young  
 ‘ man, one of his followers, that doubted of the immortality of  
 ‘ the soul, for ten months together after his death. l. viii. c. 13.  
 ‘ But how, or where? Why, <sup>o</sup> the young man being tired with  
 ‘ watching, and praying to Apollonius, that he would appear to  
 ‘ him only to satisfy him in this point, one day fell into a dead  
 ‘ sleep in the school, where the young men were performing their  
 ‘ several exercises: and on the sudden he starts up in a great fright,  
 ‘ and a great sweat, crying out, *πεισομασι σοι*, I believe thee, O  
 ‘ Tyanaeus. And being asked by his companions the meaning  
 ‘ of this transport: Why, says he, do you not see Apollonius?  
 ‘ They answer him, no; but they would be glad to give all the

<sup>l</sup> See the references at note f.  
 p. 353. f. et cap. 10. p. 354.

<sup>m</sup> L. viii. cap. 5. p. 326.  
<sup>o</sup> L. viii. cap. 31. p. 370, 371.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. cap. 8.

‘ world if they could. It is true, says he; for he only appears  
 ‘ to me, and for my satisfaction, and is invisible to all others.  
 ‘ And then he tells them what he had said to him in his sleep  
 ‘ concerning the state of souls. This poor account of a dream  
 ‘ and vision of an over-watched boy, is all that this great story  
 ‘ affords to vye with our Saviour’s resurrection.’

‘ And now, upon the review of this whole history, it seems  
 ‘ evident to me, that this man was so far from being endowed  
 ‘ with any extraordinary divine power, that he does not deserve  
 ‘ the reputation of an ordinary conjurer: for though Huetius  
 ‘ has taken some pains to prove him so, yet he gives no evidence  
 ‘ of it beside the opinion of the common people; and if that  
 ‘ were enough to make a conjurer, there is no man of an odd  
 ‘ and singular humour (as Apollonius affected to be) who is not  
 ‘ so thought of by the common people. And therefore, when  
 ‘ he was accused for it before Domitian, the emperor, upon  
 ‘ coming to hear the cause, slighted both him and his accusers,  
 ‘ and dismissed him the court for an idle and fantastical fellow.’

‘ And it is manifest from the whole series of his history, that  
 ‘ he was a very vain man, and affected to be thought something  
 ‘ extraordinary: and so wandered all the world over in an odd  
 ‘ garb to be gazed at and admired, and made himself considera-  
 ‘ ble in that age by wit, impudence, and flattery; of all which  
 ‘ he had a competent share. And for his wonder-working  
 ‘ faculty which he would needs pretend to, he fetched that as  
 ‘ far off as the East-Indies, that is, the farthest off, as he thought,  
 ‘ from confutation: and yet the account which he has given of  
 ‘ those parts is so grossly <sup>p</sup> fabulous, that that alone convicts his  
 ‘ whole life of imposture and impudence.’

‘ And this may suffice to make good this part of the demon-  
 ‘ stration of our Saviour’s divine authority, from the certain  
 ‘ evidence both of his own and his apostle’s miracles, and to set  
 ‘ it above the reach of all manner either of objection or com-  
 ‘ petition.’

That is the whole of the article of Dr. Parker concerning  
 Apollonius: whence it appears, that the history of him in Phi-  
 lostratus is fabulous, and not to be relied upon; and that  
 Apollonius was not so considerable a person as some have  
 imagined. And I hope I may say, that these observations of  
 Dr. Parker do in a great measure confirm those which have been  
 before proposed by me.

<sup>p</sup> That is a just and valuable observation, and is fully verified by the second and  
 third books of Philostratus’s *Life of Apollonius*.

## C H A P. XL.

## DIOCLESIAN'S PERSECUTION OF THE CHRISTIANS.

I. *An introduction to the history of this persecution.* II. *The civil state of the empire at that time.* III. *General accounts of this persecution taken from ancient authors.* IV. *The date of it; and the several edicts then published against the Christians.* V. *The sufferings of the Christians at that time.* VI. *The edict of Maximian Galerius in their favour in the year 311.* VII. *How the persecution was still carried on by Maximin in the East.* VIII. *How Constantine overcame Maxentius at Rome in 312, and he and Licinius in the same year published their first edict in favour of the Christians.* IX. *Maximin's letter to Sabinus in favour of the Christians in 312.* X. *The second edict of Constantine and Licinius in favour of the Christians.* XI. *Maximin is overcome by Licinius, publisheth a new edict in favour of the Christians, and dies.* XII. *Two ancient inscriptions concerning Dioclesian's persecution.* XIII. *Concluding observations upon this persecution.*

I. IT is not my intention to write at length a history of the persecution which began in the reign of Dioclesian, or to give an account of all who suffered at that time: but I shall refer to several ancient authors who have given a general account of it, and shall take some remarkable events of it from Eusebius, and from Lactantius or Cæcilius, or whoever is the author of the book concerning the Deaths of Persecutors. I shall likewise take particular notice of the several edicts which were then published against the Christians, and the edicts published in their favour by Constantine and Licinius, and others: to all which may be added some remarks.

Eusebius begins the eighth book of his Ecclesiastical History in this manner: 'It<sup>a</sup> is beyond our abilities, fully to declare how great credit the doctrine concerning the worship of the God over all, which had been published to the world by Christ, was in with all men, both Greeks and barbarians, before the persecution which happened in our time. However there are these evidences of it: for such was the favour of the emperors toward our people, that some of them were entrusted by them with the government of provinces, at the same time excusing them from the necessity of offering sacrifices, out of respect to our religion. What need have I to mention the many who were in the palaces of the emperors? by whom not only they,

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. H. E. l. viii. cap. 1. p. 291, 292,

' but likewise their wives, and children, and servants, were allowed  
 ' to live openly according to the principles of their religion; and  
 ' who were preferred to others for their fidelity. Among these  
 ' I may particularly mention <sup>b</sup> Dorotheus, who was advanced  
 ' above the most honourable magistrates and governors of pro-  
 ' vinces: to whom I might add the excellent Gorgonius, and  
 ' divers others, who attained to the like glory, and who, like  
 ' them, strictly adhered to the doctrine of the word of God.  
 ' And great respect was shewn to the presidents of the churches,  
 ' not only by private persons, but also by procurators and gover-  
 ' nors of provinces. Great multitudes of men daily embraced  
 ' the faith of Christ: assemblies in the places of prayer were nu-  
 ' merous: and not contented with the old edifices, they erected  
 ' from the foundation in every city spacious buildings. Thus  
 ' they went on continually increasing till they had provoked the  
 ' divine displeasure.' For, as he goes on to acknowledge, this  
 liberty and prosperity had produced looseness of manners and  
 carelessness about their conduct: and there were contentions  
 among the presidents of the churches, and the people were di-  
 vided into factions.

Thus writes Eusebius, somewhat oratorically as must be owned:  
 nevertheless, I believe, very truly. And I have thought fit to  
 take this his preface for my Introduction to the account of this  
 persecution: for it is a testimony to the great progress of the  
 Christian religion, and shews what was at that time the state of  
 things among the professors of it.

II. And as it is needful to have some notion of the civil state  
 of the empire at that time, I shall here briefly rehearse some  
 things, which were formerly shewn more at large in another  
 place.

Dioclesian, born at Dioclea an obscure town in Dalmatia, was  
 proclaimed emperor on the 17th day of September, in the year  
 of Christ 284. On the first day of April in 286, Maximian,  
 called Herculus, born near Sirmium in Pannonia, who had  
 been Cæsar some while before, was declared Augustus, and  
 joint emperor with Dioclesian.

On the first day of March 292, Constantius Chlorus and Ga-  
 lerijs Maximian were created Cæsars by the two forementioned  
 emperors: and the better to secure the fidelity of the Cæsars,  
 new marriages were concluded for them. Constantius, dismissing  
 Helena, mother of Constantine, married Claudia Theodora,

<sup>b</sup> Those two great men had the honour to suffer martyrdom in the beginning of this persecution, being put to death by strangling. Euseb. H. E. l. viii. cap. 6. p. 297.

<sup>c</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 141—148.

daughter-

daughter-in-law of Maximian Herculus; and Galerius Maximian married Valeria, daughter of Dioclesian.

Constantius, the first of the two Cæsars, is highly commended by Eusebius; and has likewise a good character in heathen authors. By Claudia Theodora, whom he now married, he had several sons and daughters.

Under those two emperors and their two Cæsars, in the year 303, began what is called Dioclesian's persecution, which lasted ten years or more, in some parts of the empire, before it was extinguished.

In the year 305 Dioclesian and Maximian Herculus resigned the empire, both<sup>d</sup> on the same day, the first of May; the former at a place near Nicomedia, the other at Milan. At the same time Constantius Chlorus and Galerius Maximian were declared august and emperors, and Maximin and Severus Cæsars. Dioclesian after that spent the remainder of his days near Salonæ in Dalmatia, and died in 313. Maximian Herculus retired for the present into that part of Italy which was called Lucania.

The empire was then divided between Constantius and Galerius and their Cæsars: Constantius had for his part Italy, Gaul, Britain, Africa, and the other provinces of the western part of the empire: Galerius had Illyricum, Thrace, Asia, and the East, with Egypt. Constantius soon quitted Italy, and the other provinces belonging to him, and gave them to Severus, contenting himself with Gaul and Britain. Galerius too kept only Illyricum, Thrace, and Asia, yielding to Maximin the East, that is, Syria, with the provinces depending upon it, together with Egypt.

Constantius died at York in Britain on July 25, in the year 306; and upon his death bed appointed his son Constantine, who was with him, his heir and successor, with the stile and title, as it seems, of emperor and Augustus. Immediately upon the death of his father, Constantine was so proclaimed by the soldiers in Britain: but Galerius Maximian would allow him no higher title than that of Cæsar: which Constantine accepted of for the present. So, as Eusebius says<sup>e</sup> in his Chronicle, Constantine began to reign in the fourth year of the persecution.

On the 27th day of October in 306, Maxentius, son of Maximian Herculus, who had married the daughter of Galerius, as-

<sup>d</sup> Uterque una die privato habitu, imperii insignie mutavit, Nicomediæ Diocletianus, Herculus Mediolani. Concesserunt autem Salonas unus, alter in Lucaniam. Diocletianus in villa, quæ haud procul a Salonis est, præclaro otio senuit, inusitata

virtute usus. &c. Eutrop. l. ix. cap. 27. et 28. Conf. Victor. de Cæsar. cap. 39. et Victor. Epit. cap. 39. <sup>e</sup> Quarto persecutionis anno Constantinus regnare pit. Chr. p. 180.

sumed the title of emperor and Augustus at Rome: and being sensible that this would displease Galerius, he sends for his father Maximian Herculus, who thereupon resumed the purple. And in this year, or the following, 307, Severus, who, as Cæsar, had for his share Italy and Africa, was overcome and put to death.

Maximian and his son Maxentius did not long agree together. Maximian therefore, the better to strengthen his interest, and carry on his own views, goes to Constantine in Gaul: and some time in this year 307 gives to him in marriage his daughter Fausta; Minervina his former wife, by whom he had his eldest son Crispus, being dead, as is supposed: and now, as it seems, Constantine receives the title of Augustus from Maximian.

About this time Galerius makes Licinius, his old acquaintance, a man of mean extraction, Augustus: and now there were in effect six emperors; Maximian, who, as before said, had resumed the purple, Galerius, Constantine, Maximin, Maxentius, and Licinius.

Maximian Herculus, after a base and unsteady conduct, was condemned and put to death by Constantine's order in 310. Galerius died in 311, of a long and grievous distemper, supposed to have been inflicted upon him as a judgment from heaven for his inhuman treatment of the Christians. Maxentius was overcome by Constantine, and drowned in the river Tiber on the 27th day of October in 312. Maximin died in 313: the manner of his death is particularly described in the <sup>f</sup> book of the Deaths of Persecutors, and in <sup>g</sup> Eusebius. I just add here, though it was mentioned before, that Dioclesian also died in the year 313.

But before the death of Maximin in the same year 313, Constantine married his sister Constantia to Licinius: and, as from that time their interests were united, so, upon the death of Maximin, the whole empire was in their power, and was divided between them.

But their friendship did not long subsist without interruption: for in the year 314 the animosity between them broke out into an open war, and two battles were fought: after the last of which, peace was concluded, and a new partition was made of the empire.

A second war between them began in 323, and was concluded in 324, with the entire defeat of Licinius, who was then reduced to a private condition: and though his life was then given him, at the intercession of Constantia, he was put to death in the year 324 or 325.

<sup>f</sup> De M. P. cap. 49.

<sup>g</sup> H. E. l. ix. cap. 10. p. 363. C. D. 364. A.

That was the end of those civil wars in the empire; and Constantine now became sole emperor of the East and the West: and having reigned above thirty years from the death of his father Constantius, he died on the day of Pentecost, May 22, 337.

III. I shall now observe some general accounts of this persecution, which are to be found in divers ancient authors.

Says Orosius: 'The<sup>h</sup> tenth persecution was ordered by Dioclesian and Maximian Herculus, the one ruling in the East, and the other in the West; which persecution was longer and more grievous than any of the former: it was carried on for ten years without ceasing, with burning down the churches, proscriptions of innocent men, and slaughters of martyrs.' But he presently after says, that<sup>i</sup> in the second year of the persecution Dioclesian and Herculus resigned the empire, leaving the government to Galerius and Constantius.

Sulpicius Severus says, 'that<sup>k</sup> in the reigns of Dioclesian and Maximian began that severe persecution which for ten whole years afflicted the people of God. At which time almost the whole world was stained with the precious blood of martyrs: for then glorious martyrdoms were as earnestly contended for, as bishoprics are now fought by ambitious men. Never was the world more wasted by any war; nor ever had we a more glorious victory, than when we could not be overcome by the slaughters of ten years. After the end of that persecution there began to be Christian emperors, which have continued to this time.'

Theodoret<sup>l</sup> says, this persecution lasted nine years: the author

<sup>h</sup> Interea Diocletianus in Oriente, Maximianus Herculus in Occidente vastari ecclesias, adfligi interficique Christianos, decimo post Neronem loco, præceperunt. Quæ persecutio omnibus fere ante ædis diuturnior et immanior fuit. Nam per decem annos incendiis ecclesiarum, proscriptionibus innocentum, cædibus martyrum, incessabiliter acta est. Oros. lib. vii. cap. 25.

Per annos decem everse sunt ecclesie vestre, ut etiam tu fateris: dilacerati cruciatibus, exinaniti mortibus toto orbe Christiani. Tenemus evidens testimonium tuum, nullam superiorem persecutionem adeo vel gravem vel diuturnam fuisse. Id. lib. vii. cap. 26.

<sup>i</sup> Secundo persecutionis anno Diocletianus ab invito exegit Maximiano, ut simul purpuram imperiumque deponerent. . . . &c. Id. ibid. <sup>k</sup> Post eum [Valerianum] interjectis annis fere quinquaginta,

Diocletiano et Maximiano imperantibus, acerbissima persecutio exorta, quæ per decem continuos annos plebem Dei depopulata est: qua tempestate omnis fere sacro martyrum cruore orbis infectus est: quippe certatim gloriosa in certamina ruebatur, multoque avidius tum martyria gloriosis mortibus querebantur, quam nunc episcopatus pravis ambitionibus adpetuntur. Nullis unquam magis bellis mundus exhaustus est: neque majore unquam triumpho vicimus, quam cum decem annorum stragibus vinci non potuimus. Sed finis persecutionis illius fuit abhinc annos ix et lxxx. A quo tempore Christiani imperatores esse cæperunt. Namque tum Constantinus rerum potiebatur, qui primus omnium Romanorum principum Christianus fuit. &c. Sul. Sever. Hist. lib. ii. cap. 47. al. cap. 32. et 33. <sup>l</sup> Theod. H. E. l. viii. cap. 39. p. 248. B.

of *The Deaths of Persecutors* says, <sup>m</sup> ten years and about four months, making his computation from the first beginning of it at Nicomedia, to the edicts of Constantine and Licinius, which restored full peace to the churches.

IV. These are only general accounts of this persecution: the particulars of it, the time, the events and circumstances of it, and the several edicts then published against the Christians, or in their favour, may be seen in Eusebius, and in the Author of *The Deaths of Persecutors*, who by many has been supposed to be Firmianus Lactantius, but I rather think to be Lucius Cæcilius, as was formerly <sup>n</sup> shewn at large, and has often been hinted again in several places.

There had been before a persecution in the army, which began, as some think, <sup>o</sup> in the year 298, others <sup>p</sup> in the year 301. It is taken notice of by Eusebius <sup>q</sup> in his Chronicle, and by <sup>r</sup> the Author of *The Deaths of Persecutors*. In his Ecclesiastical History <sup>s</sup> Eusebius says, that many military men embraced a private life, rather than renounce the worship of the great creator of all: and that some of them not only resigned their honours, but also suffered death for their resolution in professing the truth.

In the year 303 <sup>t</sup> the persecution became general; for <sup>u</sup> on the 23d day of February in that year, the church of the Christians at Nicomedia in Bithynia was demolished, Dioclesian and Galerius being then both in that city: on the next day, Feb. 24, the <sup>x</sup> edict against the Christians was published. According to <sup>y</sup> the Author of *The Deaths of Persecutors*, and <sup>z</sup> Eusebius likewise, Galerius was the chief author of this persecution. When the edict had been published at Nicomedia, it <sup>a</sup> was sent to Heracilius and Constantius, to be put in execution by them in those parts of the empire which were particularly under their care.

<sup>m</sup> Sic ab everfa ecclesia usque ad restitutam fuerunt anni decem, menses plus minus quatuor. De M. P. cap. 48. ad fin.

<sup>n</sup> See Vol. iv. p. 37—41.

<sup>o</sup> Pagi 298. num. ii. et ann. 302. iii.

<sup>p</sup> Itaque ab anno 298, particularis militum vexatio incipere potuit. Ab anno 301, generalis exorsa est. Basnag. ann. 301. num. ii.

<sup>q</sup> Veturius, magister militiæ, Christianos milites persequitur, paullatim ex illo jam tempore persecutione adversum nos incipiente. Chr. p. 179. Et Conf. Vales. ann. in H. E. l. viii. cap. 4. Vid. et Basnag. ann. 301. n. ii. iii. iv.

<sup>r</sup> . . . datisque ad Præpositos literis, etiam milites cogi ad nefanda sacrificia præcepit, ut qui non paruissent, militiâ solverentur. De M. P. cap. 10.

<sup>s</sup> L. viii. cap. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Vide Pagi

302. num. iii. v. Basnag. 303. num. v.

<sup>u</sup> Terminalia deliguntur, quæ sunt ad septimum Calendas Martias: ut quasi terminus imponeretur huic religioni. . . . Qui dies cum illuxisset . . . ad ecclesiam profectus cum ducibus, et tribunis, et rationalibus venit. . . . Veniebant igitur prætoriani, acie structâ, cum securibus. . . et immissi undique, tamen illud editissimum paucis horis solo adæquatur. De M. P. cap. 12.

<sup>x</sup> De M. P. cap. 13. in.

<sup>y</sup> De M. P. cap. 10, 11, 12.

<sup>z</sup> Euseb. H. E. l. viii. c. 16. p. 314. D.

<sup>a</sup> Et jam literæ ad Maximianum et Constantium commeaverant, ut eadem facerent. Eorum sententia in tantis rebus non expectata erat. De M. P. cap. 15.

Maximian Herculus<sup>b</sup> in Italy readily complied; but Constantius,<sup>c</sup> though he did not dare openly to oppose his colleagues, moderated the persecution within the extent of his government.

When<sup>f</sup> the prætorian and other soldiers, who were appointed to demolish the church at Nicomedia, had broken open the doors, they searched for the image of the God of the Christians, but found none: however, they found their scriptures, which they burnt.

When the edict was set up the next day, a Christian of uncommon zeal took it down, and tore it to pieces, not rightly, as Cæcilius acknowledgeth: for which he was put to death, after having suffered great torments; all which he endured with great fortitude. This particular is mentioned both<sup>g</sup> by Cæcilius and<sup>h</sup> Eusebius.

By that<sup>i</sup> edict, as Cæcilius says, whom I consider as author of the book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, “it was ordained, “that all men of the Christian religion should be deprived of “all honours and dignities; that of whatever rank or degree “they were they should be liable to torture; that any action “might be received against them; and that they, on the other “hand, should have no right to bring an action against any, for “any violence done to them, or for any goods taken from “them; and finally, that they should lose all privileges, and “the right of voting.”

Eusebius says, ‘that<sup>l</sup> in the nineteenth year of the reign of ‘Dioclesian, in the month of March, were set up every where ‘imperial edicts, “appointing, that the churches should be “demolished to the foundation, that the scriptures should be “burnt; that they who enjoyed any honours should lose them, “and that men of private condition should be deprived of their “liberty if they persisted in the profession of Christianity.”

<sup>b</sup> Et quidem senex Maximianus libens per Italiam paruit, homo non adeo clemens. Id. ib.

<sup>c</sup> Nam Constantius, ne dissentire a majorum præceptis videretur, conventicula, id est, parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est: verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit. De M. P. cap. 15.

Vexabatur ergo universa terra, et præter Gallias, ab oriente usque ad occasum tres acerbissimæ bestię sæviebant. Id. cap. 16. Vid. et Euseb. H. E. l. vii. cap. 13. p. 309. D. et p. 317. D. Vit. Const. l. i. cap. 13. p. 413. D. et cap. 16. et 17.

<sup>f</sup> . . . et revulsis foribus, simulachrum Dei quaeritur. Scripturæ repertæ incenduntur, datur omnibus præda. Rapitur,

trepidatur, discurritur. De M. P. cap. 12.

<sup>g</sup> Quod edictum quidam, etsi non recte, magno tamen animo diripuit et conscidit.

. . . Statimque productus, non modo extortus, sed etiam legitime coctus, cum admirabili patientia postremo exustus. De M. P. cap. 13.

<sup>h</sup> H. E. l. viii. c. 5.

<sup>i</sup> Postridie propositum est edictum, quo cavebatur, ut religionis illius homines carent omni honore et dignitate, tormentis subiecti essent ex quocunque ordine aut gradu venirent, adversus eos omnis actio caleret: ipsi non de injuria, non de adulterio, non de rebus ablatis agere possent, libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent. De M. P. cap. 13.

<sup>l</sup> L. viii. cap. 2. p. 294. B.

Such was the first edict that was published against us. Soon after which, by other edicts it was ordered, “ that <sup>m</sup> all presidents of the churches every where should be put into prison, and then that they should by all ways imaginable be compelled to sacrifice.”

He afterwards speaks of a third edict, to this purpose: “ The <sup>n</sup> former edicts were followed by another, in which it was ordained, that they who were in prison should be set at liberty upon their having sacrificed: but that they who refused should be subjected to all kinds of torments.” ‘ Whereupon,’ he says, ‘ it is scarcely possible to reckon up the numbers of martyrs who after that suffered in every province, especially in Africa, Mauritania, Thebais, and Egypt: from which [last] many went to other cities and provinces, where they were honoured with martyrdom.’

In the third chapter of his book concerning the Martyrs of Palestine, Eusebius has these words: ‘ Afterwards <sup>o</sup> in the second year of this terrible war waged against us, imperial edicts were first brought to Urbanus governor of this province, in which by a general precept it was ordered, that all people in every city should be required to offer sacrifice and incense to idols.’

This must be a fourth edict; for there were three before this, all set forth in the first year of the persecution. When Eusebius says, that this edict was now, in the ‘ second year, first brought to Urbanus:’ he must not be understood, that no edict against the Christians had been brought to Urbanus before: but no such edict.

This edict Eusebius supposeth to have been more general than any of the former: and indeed he expressly says at the end of the preceding chapter, ‘ that <sup>p</sup> the first year of the persecution affected the presidents of the churches only.’ I do not think that to be exactly true: for Eusebius himself has related martyrdoms of divers others in the first year of the persecution. But we must conclude, from what he here says, that the edict in the second year was expressed in more general and comprehensive

<sup>m</sup> . . . πρώτα μὲν δεσμοῖς παραδιδύσθαι, εἰθ' ὑπερον πάση μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζεσθαι. Ibid.

<sup>n</sup> Αὐτίς δ' ἐξέρων τα πρώτα γραμματεία επικαλειληφόρων, ἐν οἷς τῆς κατὰ κλειτῆς, δυσανίας μὲν, εἰς βαδίζειν ἐπ' ἐλευθερίας ἐνισαμένως δὲ μύριας κατὰ ξαινεῖν προσελακτο βασιλεῖς. Ib. cap. 6. p. 298. C.

<sup>o</sup> Δευτέρη δ' εἰς διαλαβόντος, καὶ δὴ σφοδρότερον ἐπίλαθεντος τῆ καθ' ἑμῶν πόλεμος, τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἡγε-

μὲν τῆνικαδὲ Οὐρβανῆς, γραμματῶν, τῶν πρώτων βασιλικῶν πεφοίτηκόντων, ἐν οἷς καθολικῶν προσελακτο πάντας πάνδημι τῆς κατὰ πόλιν θύειν τε καὶ σπενδεῖν τοῖς εἰδωλοῖς ἐκελευέτο. De Mart. Pal. cap. 3. p. 301. A.

<sup>p</sup> Ταῦτα μὲν εἰς πρώτην τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεδρῶν ἐπηρήμενα τῆ δ' αὖ μὲν. De Mart. Pal. cap. 2. p. 300. D.

terms than any of the foregoing: which is a proof of the increasing rage of the persecutors.

We have now settled the date of this persecution, and have seen the several edicts which were published at the beginning of it; and in all these four edicts Dioclesian must have joined with Maximian Galerius, for they were published before his resignation in 305, the third year of the persecution.

V. I should now give some account of the many and grievous sufferings of the professors of Christianity at this time; but it must be a summary account only: however, we cannot pass over in silence this affecting scene, in which we behold the grievous sufferings of many innocent and excellent men, and their heroic patience and fortitude under them.

1. At the beginning of his history of the calamities of this time, Eusebius with great grief says, ' he <sup>9</sup> had with his own eyes seen the houses of prayer demolished to the foundation, and the divinely inspired and sacred scriptures burnt in the market-places.'

2. After having mentioned the edict before taken notice of by us, which ordered, that all presidents of churches should be bound, and imprisoned, he says: ' There' followed a spectacle, which no words can sufficiently express. Great multitudes were thereupon confined every where; and in every place, the prisons, which used to be filled with murderers, and robbers of sepulchres, were then filled with bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, and readers, and exorcists, so that there was no room left for such as were condemned for crimes.'

3. In the thirteenth chapter of the eighth book of his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius rehearseth in a summary manner, the martyrdoms of divers presidents of the churches: of which he gives a more particular account in some other chapters of the same book, or of his book concerning the martyrs of Palestine.

As the titles of the chapters are supposed to have been drawn up by Eusebius himself, I also transcribe the title of this chapter, which is in these words: ' Of the presidents of the church, who demonstrated the truth of the religion which they preached, by the effusion of their own blood.'

' Among those presidents of the churches, who suffered martyrdom in the most noted cities, the first to be recorded by us in the monuments of the pious, as a witness of the kingdom of

9 . . . οπιηκα των μεν προσευκτηριων της αυτοις επειδομεν οφθαλμοις. H. E. I. viii. cap. 2. p. 293. C. τ Ibid. cap. 6. p. 298. B. τ Cap. 13. p. 307, &c.

' Christ,

‘ Christ, is Anthimus bishop in the city of Nicomedia, who was  
 ‘ beheaded. Of Antioch, Lucian a presbyter of that 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.  
 ‘ The most eminent martyrs in Phœnicia, and most acceptable  
 ‘ to God, were those pastors of the flock of Christ, Tyrannio  
 ‘ bishop of the church at Tyre; Zenobius presbyter of the  
 ‘ church at Sidon; Silvanus bishop of the church at Emesa,  
 ‘ who, with several others, was given to be food to the wild  
 ‘ beasts at Emesa itself, and in that way was numbered among  
 ‘ the martyrs. The other two suffered at Antioch, where they  
 ‘ glorified the word of God by patience unto death. The bishop  
 ‘ Tyrannio was drowned in the sea. Zenobius, a most excellent  
 ‘ physician, whose sides were cruelly racked, died courageously  
 ‘ under those tortures. Among the martyrs of Palestine, Sil-  
 ‘ vanus bishop of the churches at Gaza, was beheaded, together  
 ‘ with nine and thirty others, at the mines of brass which are in  
 ‘ Phæno. Peleus and Nilus, Egyptian bishops, with divers others,  
 ‘ were burnt to death in the same place. Nor can ‘ Pamphilus  
 ‘ be omitted here, a presbyter, who was the great ornament of  
 ‘ the church of Cæsarea, the most admirable man of our age,  
 ‘ whose virtues we have also celebrated elsewhere. Of those who  
 ‘ were perfected by a glorious martyrdom at Alexandria, and  
 ‘ throughout all Egypt and Thebais, the first to be mentioned  
 ‘ is Peter bishop of Alexandria, a most excellent preacher of  
 ‘ the Christian religion: and of the presbyters, who were with  
 ‘ him, Faustus, and Dius, and Ammonius, were perfect martyrs  
 ‘ of Christ. Phileas likewise, and Hefychius, and Pachumius,  
 ‘ and Theodorus, bishops of the churches in Egypt. And be-  
 ‘ side these, many others, eminent men, who have an honour-  
 ‘ able mention among the churches, which are in those places  
 ‘ and countries.’

4. The eighth chapter of the same book not being very long,  
 I shall transcribe it entire, as it represents a variety of sufferings,  
 endured by the Christians at that time. ‘ Such <sup>u</sup> was the combat  
 ‘ of those Egyptians, who gloriously contended for the faith at  
 ‘ Tyre. They also are justly admirable, who suffered martyrdom  
 ‘ in their own country; where innumerable men, [*μυριοι τον*

† A more particular account of Pamphi-  
 lus, who, with eleven others, suffered mar-  
 tyrdom at Cæsarea, may be seen, De Mart.  
 Palest. cap. 11. p. 336. The history of

this excellent man, and remarks upon it,  
 may be seen, Vol. iii. p. 335—351.

<sup>u</sup> L. viii. cap. 8. p. 300.

‘ *αριθμον ανδρες* ] with their wives and children, despising this temporal life for the sake of our Saviour's doctrine, underwent various sorts of death. Some of them, after their flesh had been torn off by torturing irons, after having been racked and cruelly scourged, and a great variety of other tortures frightful to hear of, were committed to the flames, or thrown into the sea. Some cheerfully offered their heads to be cut off by the executioners; some expired under their tortures; some died by famine; some were crucified; some of them after the usual manner of inflicting that punishment upon malefactors, others after a more cruel manner, being nailed to the cross with their heads downward, and kept alive, till they died by famine on the crosses.’

5. Eusebius still goes on in the next chapter, of which also I shall take a part. ‘ But <sup>x</sup> the pains and tortures endured by the martyrs at Thebais exceed all expression; for they were torn all over their bodies with sharp shells, instead of torturing irons, till they expired. Women were tied by one of their feet, and drawn up on high into the air by certain machines, with their heads downwards; and their bodies being naked and wholly uncovered, they were made a shameful, as well as inhuman spectacle to all beholders. Others were bound to the boughs of trees, and so killed; for by certain engines they drew together the strongest boughs, and having fastened the legs of the martyrs to each of them, they let the boughs return to their usual situation, that the members of the persons, against whom they had invented that torture, might be presently pulled asunder. Such things were done, not for a few days, nor a small space of time, but for whole years together; when sometimes more than ten, at other times above twenty in number, were destroyed; at sometimes not less than thirty, at other times almost sixty, and at other times an hundred men together, with many little children and women, were killed in one day; they having been condemned to various and interchangeable punishments. We ourselves also, when in that country, have seen many suffer in one day; when some were beheaded, others were consumed by fire: insomuch that the swords of the executioners were blunted, and being useless were broken to pieces; and the executioners being tired, they succeeded each other by turns.’

6. In a following chapter: ‘ But <sup>y</sup> what need can there be, that I should mention any more by name, or recount the vast

<sup>x</sup> Cap. 9. p. 300.

<sup>y</sup> Cap. 12. p. 305.

‘ number of the persons, or describe the various torments of the  
 ‘ admirable martyrs of Christ? But some were beheaded, as it  
 ‘ happened to those in Arabia; others had their legs broken, as  
 ‘ it happened to those in Cappadocia. Some were hung up on  
 ‘ high with their heads downwards, and a slow fire being put  
 ‘ under them, they were suffocated by the smoke of that com-  
 ‘ bustible matter; which was the case of those in Mesopotamia.  
 ‘ Others had their noses or their ears and their hands cut off,  
 ‘ and the other members and parts of their bodies mangled, as  
 ‘ it happened to those in Alexandria. What need I to revive  
 ‘ the remembrance of what was done at Antioch; where some  
 ‘ were broiled on gridirons, not to kill them outright, but to  
 ‘ prolong the pains of their sufferings?’

‘ These things were done at Antioch; but to hear what was  
 ‘ done at Pontus must fill the mind with horror. Some had  
 ‘ sharp reeds thrust up the fingers of both their hands from the  
 ‘ tops of their nails; others had melted lead poured upon their  
 ‘ backs, whilst it was boiling, which ran down and scalded the  
 ‘ most necessary parts of the body: others, without commiseration,  
 ‘ were made to endure obscene tortures in their bowels,  
 ‘ and those members of the body which modesty forbids to mention;  
 ‘ by <sup>z</sup> all which these noble and legal judges manifested  
 ‘ their wonderful acuteness; as if they had thought it a part of  
 ‘ wisdom and virtue to exceed each other in contriving new ways  
 ‘ of torture; and as if such inventions were entitled to signal  
 ‘ rewards. Nor was there an end put to these calamities, till,  
 ‘ despairing to add any thing new to those already practised,  
 ‘ wearied with slaughters, and fatiated with the effusion of blood,  
 ‘ they betook themselves to what was esteemed by them clemency  
 ‘ and humanity, that they might seem no longer to practise  
 ‘ severity toward us. Nor was it fit, they said, that the cities  
 ‘ should be polluted by the blood of their inhabitants; nor that  
 ‘ the government of the emperors, who were benign and merciful  
 ‘ to all, should be blemished by any excessive cruelties: but  
 ‘ it was reasonable, that the imperial benevolence should be extended  
 ‘ to all, and that Christians should not suffer capital punishments;  
 ‘ forasmuch as we were now exempted from it by the indulgence of  
 ‘ the emperors. From that time, therefore, it was enjoined, that  
 ‘ their eyes should be plucked out, and that one of their legs  
 ‘ should be debilitated. Such was their humanity, and that the most  
 ‘ gentle punishment that could be

<sup>z</sup> . . . ας οι γειγαστοι και νομιμοι δικασται την των σφων επιδεικνυμενοι δεινοτητα, κ. λ. ρ. 306. C.

‘ inflicted

‘ inflicted upon us ! And henceforward, upon account of this  
 ‘ lenity of those impious wretches, it is \* impossible to reckon  
 ‘ up the numbers of those, who had their right-eyes first thrust  
 ‘ out with a sword, and then seared with red-hot irons ; and of  
 ‘ those who had the flexures of their left legs seared with irons ;  
 ‘ after which they were sent to the brass mines in the province,  
 ‘ not so much for the sake of the service they could do there, as  
 ‘ with a view to increase their miseries.’

7. In <sup>b</sup> his book of the Martyrs of Palestine, Eusebius again makes mention of this, and says, ‘ that Firmilian, president of  
 ‘ the province after Urbanus, inflicted this punishment upon  
 ‘ many, and as by express order from the emperor Maximin.’ Nor <sup>c</sup> has Cæcilius, in his book of The Deaths of Persecutors, omitted to take notice of this cruelty.

8. And in another place <sup>d</sup> Eusebius has particularly mentioned an excellent man, named John, of whom he says, ‘ He had  
 ‘ before lost his sight ; nevertheless, in the confessions which he  
 ‘ had made, when the flexures of one of his feet were seared, as  
 ‘ those of others were, his eyes likewise, though already deprived  
 ‘ of sight, were burnt with the searing irons.’

9. Once more under this article, Eusebius assures us, ‘ that <sup>e</sup>  
 ‘ armed soldiers invested a town in Phrygia, and set fire to it,  
 ‘ and consumed all the people therein, men, women, and chil-  
 ‘ dren : because all the inhabitants of the place, the curator, the  
 ‘ duumvir, and the rest of the magistrates, and all the common  
 ‘ people, professed themselves Christians, and would not obey  
 ‘ those who commanded them to sacrifice.’ Lactantius, <sup>f</sup> in his Institutions, representing the great cruelty of this persecution, and the number of sufferers in it, has referred to this, among other severities of the governors of provinces, at that time.

VI. In the year 309, Galerius Maximian was seized with a grievous distemper, the symptoms of which are described very particularly and at large, both in <sup>g</sup> Eusebius and <sup>h</sup> Cæcilius. It

<sup>a</sup> ουκειτι δυνατον εξειπειν το πλεθος των υπερωπατων λογος. p. 307. A.

<sup>b</sup> De M. Pal. cap. 8. p. 330. B.

<sup>c</sup> Nam cum clementiam specie tenus profiteretur, occidi servos Dei vetuit, debilitari iussit. Itaque confessoribus effodiebantur oculi, amputabantur manus, pedes detrancabantur, nares vel auriculae defecabantur. De M. P. cap. 36. in fin.

<sup>d</sup> De Martyr. Pal. cap. 13. p. 344. A. Compare Credib. Vol. iii. p. 340, 341.

<sup>e</sup> H. E. l. viii. cap. 11. p. 304.

<sup>f</sup> Quæ autem per totum orbem singuli gesserunt, enarrare impossibile est. Quis

enim voluminum numerus capiet tam infinita, tam varia genera crudelitatis ? Accepta enim potestate pro moribus suis quisque sævivit. Alii præ nimia timiditate, plus ausi sunt, quam jubebatur. Alii suo proprio adversus justos odio : quidam naturali mentis feritate : nonnulli, ut placerent, et hoc officio viam sibi ad altiora munirent : alii ad occidendum præcipientes existiterunt, sicut unus in Phrygia, qui universum populum cum ipso pariter conventiculo concremavit. Lact. Inst. l. v. cap. 11. p. 490. <sup>g</sup> H. E. l. viii. cap. 16.

<sup>h</sup> De M. P. cap. 33.

continued above a year. And when he was near expiring, in 311, he published an edict in favour of the<sup>1</sup> Christians. It is still extant in Latin in Cæcilius, and in Eusebius in Greek, with the inscription, which is omitted by Cæcilius. I intend to translate it from the Greek of Eusebius, and to put the Latin of Cæcilius at the bottom of the page.

‘ Having<sup>k</sup> long struggled with his disease,’ says Eusebius, ‘ he in the end, seriously recollecting things within himself, became sensible of the injuries he had done to pious men; and having first made confession to the God of the universe, he called to him the chief officers of his court, and ordered, that they should cause the persecution against the Christians to cease immediately without any delay. And by an imperial edict he directed, that the churches of the Christians should be rebuilt, that they might there perform their usual worship, and make supplications to God for the emperor. Whereupon edicts were without delay set up in all the cities, containing a retractation of what had been done against us, and conceived in the form following.’

“ The emperor Cæsar Galerius Valerius Maximian, Invincible, August, High-Priest . . . to the people of the province. Among<sup>l</sup> other things which we have ordered, with a view to the benefit and prosperity of the publick, we did indeed formerly strive to correct all things according to the ancient laws, and established constitution of the Romans. And, among other things, that the Christians, who had forsaken the religion of their ancestors, should return to a right

<sup>i</sup> Et hæc facta sunt per annum perpetem, cum tandem malis domitus, Deum coactus est confiteri, novi doloris urgentis per intervalla exclamat, se restitutum Dei templum, satisque pro scelere facturum. Et jam deficiens edictum misit hujusmodi. De M. P. cap. 33. fin. <sup>k</sup> Euseb. H. E. l. viii. cap. 17. p. 315, &c.

<sup>l</sup> Inter cætera, quæ pro reipublicæ semper commodis et utilitate disponimus, nos quidem volueramus antehac juxta leges veteres, et publicam disciplinam Romanorum cuncta corrigere, atque id providere, ut etiam Christiani, qui parentum suorum reliquerant sectam ad bonas mentes redirent. Siquidem quadam ratione tanta eosdem Christianos voluntas invasisset, et tanta stultitia occupasset, ut non illa veterum instituta sequerentur, quæ forsitan primum parentes eorum constituerant, sed pro arbitrio suo, atque ut hisdem esset licitum, ita sibi met leges facerent, quas observarent, et per diversa varios populos congregarent.

Denique cum ejusmodi nostra jussio existisset, ut ad veterum se instituta conferrent, multi periculo subjugati, multi etiam deturbati sunt: atque cum plurimi in proposito perseverarent, ac videremus, nec Diis eosdem cultum ac religionem debitam exhibere, nec Christianorum Deum observare, contemplationem mitissimæ nostræ clementiæ intuentes, et consuetudinem sempiternam, quâ solemus cunctis hominibus veniam indulgere, promptissimam in his quoque indulgentiam nostram credidimus porrigendam: ut denuo sint Christiani, et conventicula sua componant, ita ut ne quid contra disciplinam agant. Aliâ autem epistolâ judicibus significaturi sumus quid debent observare. Unde juxta hanc indulgentiam nostram, debent Deum suum orare pro salute nostrâ, ut reipublicæ, ac suâ, ut undiqueversum res publica persisteret incolumis, et securi vivere in sedibus suis possint. De M. P. cap. 34.

“ mind:

“ mind: forasmuch as by some means such an obstinacy had  
 “ seized them, and such was their folly, that they followed not  
 “ the institutions of the ancients, which, possibly, some of their  
 “ own ancestors had appointed; but, according to their own  
 “ fancy, and just as they pleased, they made laws for themselves  
 “ to be observed and followed by them: and in many places  
 “ they drew over multitudes of people to follow their customs.  
 “ Wherefore, when after we had published our edict, that they  
 “ should return to the institutions of the ancients, many have  
 “ been exposed to danger, and many have been greatly afflicted,  
 “ and have undergone various kinds of deaths: and forasmuch  
 “ as great multitudes persist in their opinions, and we have per-  
 “ ceived that they give not due worship and reverence to the  
 “ immortal Gods, nor yet worship the God of the Christians:  
 “ we duly considering our accustomed mildness and humanity,  
 “ with which we are wont to dispense pardon to all men, we  
 “ have thought proper readily to hold forth to them our in-  
 “ dulgence; that they may at length be Christians, and that  
 “ they may rebuild the houses in which they have been used to  
 “ assemble, provided they do nothing contrary to good govern-  
 “ ment. By another letter we shall make known our pleasure  
 “ to the judges, for the direction of their conduct: wherefore,  
 “ agreeably to this our indulgence, they ought to pray to their  
 “ God for our welfare, and for that of the publick, and for their  
 “ own, that on all sides the publick may be preserved in safety,  
 “ and they may live securely in their own habitations.”

This edict, as <sup>m</sup> Cæcilius says, was published at Nicomedia, on the last day of the month of April, in the year 311. It was of benefit to many; Donatus <sup>n</sup> in particular, to whom Cæcilius addresseth his book, *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, was set at liberty, after having endured an imprisonment of six years. During <sup>o</sup> which time he had made divers confessions before several governors of the province, and undergone various tortures. And, to his great honour, he continued steady to the persuasion of his own mind, <sup>p</sup> shewing an example of invincible fortitude.

It is obvious to all to observe, that this edict bears testimony to the great progress of the Christian religion. There were many Christians in the Roman empire, and they were continually making new converts, and increasing their numbers. Some

<sup>m</sup> Hoc edictum proponitur Nicomediæ pridie Calendas Martias, ipso octies et Maximo iterum consulibus. Cap. 35.

<sup>n</sup> Tunc apertis carceribus, Donate carissime, cum cæteris confessoribus e custodia liberatus es: cum tibi carcer sex annis pro

domicilio fuerit. Id. ib.

<sup>o</sup> Novies enim tormentis cruciatibusque variis subiectus, novies adversarium gloriosa confessione vicisti. &c. Id. cap. 16.

<sup>p</sup> Documentum omnibus invictæ fortitudinis præbuiti. Ibid.

were unsteady; but many others persisted, notwithstanding the sufferings they were exposed to. We seem also to see here a very bad effect of persecution. Some became desperate, and cast off all religion; neither worshipping with due reverence the established, nor any other deities. We have here also evident proof of the strong and prevailing prejudice in favour of antiquity. As the Christians had departed from the ancient customs, they were judged to deserve the severest treatment upon that account, till they returned to them. This alone was reckoned sufficient to cast and condemn them; without weighing the reasons which they might allege for their innovation.

There are still other remarks which might be made, and have been made upon this edict, and the accounts given of it by our ecclesiastical historians.

Says Mr. Mosheim: 'Eusebius<sup>q</sup> and the author of the book, 'Of the Deaths of Persecutors say, "that Maximian, before he  
" published

<sup>q</sup> Eusebius et Lactantius tradunt, Maximianum, antequam hoc edictum ferret, 'Deo errorem suum confessum esse, atque 'exclamasse inter dolores, se pro scelere 'satisfacturum.' Quod si ita sese haberet, professus esset, se Christianorum Deo justas crudelitatis adversus Christianos pœnas dare, atque ultionem ejus sentire. Sed ne hoc verum esse putemus, obsistit ipsum Imperatoris, quod nobis hi scriptores exhibent, edictum. Tantum enim abest, ut Maximianus in eo fateatur, se male ac injuste egisse, ut potius bene ac sapienter acta esse omnia, quæ in Christianos sanxerat, contendat. Nempe ait, voluisse se legibus suis efficere, 'ut Christiani qui parentum 'suorum reliquerant sectam, ad bonas 'mentes redirent.' Amentes ergo Christianos etiam in ultimo vitæ suæ actio judicabat, et Romanorum religionem meliorem longe et sanio rem Christiana non esse dubitabat. Paulo post diserte Christianos stultitiæ arguit, neque vocula ipsi excidit, ex quâ cogi possit, pœnitentiam factorum animum ejus subivisse, aut Christianam religionem ipsi sanctam et unice veram esse visam. Duplicem vero causam asserti animi sui erga Christianos mutati: primum animadvertisse se, Christianos vi et periculo ad sacrificandum coactos omnis religionis expertes vivere, atque nec Christum nec Deos colere. 'Cum plurimi in proposito per- 'severarent, ac videremus, nec Diis eisdem 'cultum ac religionem debitam exhibere, 'nec Christianorum Deum observare.' Qualemcunque igitur et pravam etiam religionem meliorem esse ducebat nulla re-

ligione, Christianosque malebat sua sacra sequi, quam sine religione vivere. Causæ huic aliam addit, clementiam nempe suam: 'Contemplationem mitissimæ clementiæ 'nostræ intuentes, et consuetudinem sempiternam, quâ solemus cunctis hominibus 'veniam indulgere, promptissimam in his 'quoque indulgentiam nostram credimus 'porrigendam, ut denuo sint Christiani.' Non ergo juri et justitiæ, verum clementiæ suæ videri volebat Maximianus obtemperare: veniam, ut ait, hominibus, quos stultos esse dixerat, et bonæ mentis inopes, indulgebat: non innocentibus et bonis justum sese præbebat. Credam facile, has rationes Imperatori amicos et consiliarios suggestisse, quibus utebatur. Sed ultima edicti verba veram sine dubio causam aperiant, quæ ipsi hoc edictum expressit, et mentem simul ejus de religione Christianorum declarant: 'Unde juxta hanc indulgentiam nostram debebunt Deum suum 'orare pro salute nostra et reipublicæ, ac 'suâ, ut undique versum res publica resset 'incolumis, et securi vivere in sedibus 'suis possint.' Ex his verbis manifestum est, 1. Maximianum credidisse, habere Christianos Deum quemdam. Atqui, 2. Deum hunc non esse supremum rerum omnium conditorem, quem omnes homines colere debent, sed Deum tantum Christianorum, id est, certæ cujusdam gentis Deum, quales multi Dii videbantur esse. Suos enim cuique genti Deos esse proprios et peculiare, Romani Græcique, omnesque illa ætate populi arbitrabantur. 3. Huic certæ gentis Deo magnam esse potentiam,

ut

“ published this edict, confessed his offence to God, and amidst the  
 “ pains of his distemper, cried out, that he would make satis-  
 “ faction for the injuries he had done to the Christians.” If that  
 ‘ be true, he must have acknowledged, that the distemper under  
 ‘ which he laboured, was a just punishment from God for his  
 ‘ cruelties against the Christians. But so far is he from doing  
 ‘ so, that, on the contrary, the edict shews, that the emperor is  
 ‘ so far from confessing that he had acted unjustly, that he de-  
 ‘ clares that all his sanctions against the Christians were well and  
 ‘ wisely ordered. “ His aim,” he says, “ had been, to effect  
 “ by his laws, that the Christians, who had forsaken the religion  
 “ of their ancestors, should return to a right mind.” In this last  
 ‘ act of his life, therefore, he considered the Christians as labour-  
 ‘ ing under distraction, and did not at all doubt, that the reli-  
 ‘ gion of the Romans was much better and sounder than the  
 ‘ Christian. A little lower he expressly chargeth the Christians  
 ‘ with folly. Nor does one word drop from him, whereby we  
 ‘ should be induced to suppose, that he believed the Christian  
 ‘ religion to be true. He assigns a twofold reason of the change  
 ‘ of his mind toward the Christians. First of all, he had ob-  
 ‘ served, that the Christians who had been compelled by force  
 ‘ to sacrifice, had thrown off all religion, and worshipped neither  
 ‘ Christ nor the Gods. And he thought that any religion, though  
 ‘ bad, was better than none; and he had rather that the Chris-  
 ‘ tians should follow their own religion, than be without religion.  
 ‘ To this reason he adds another, which is his own clemency:  
 ‘ for he had been accustomed to hold forth pardon to all men.  
 ‘ Therefore Maximian would not be thought to yield to right  
 ‘ and justice, but he would display his own clemency. He gave  
 ‘ pardon to men, whom he had called “ fools,” and “ destitute  
 ‘ of a sound mind:” but he did not shew himself just to innocent

ut bonam valetudinem largiri, periculaque a republica depellere possit. 4. Beneficia vero hæc sua non erogare Deum illum, nisi a cultoribus suis exoretur. Sine dubio igitur aliquis eorum, qui misere ægrotanti Maximiano aderant subjecerat, Deum Christianorum, his in terris agentem, mortuis vitam, ægrotantibus sanitatem reddidisse; hanc ejus beneficentiam non desisse; multa exempla extare hominum Christianorum precibus mirabili modo sanatorum. Fieri ergo posse, ut ipse quoque ejus ope atrocem illum morbum, a quo consumebatur, superaret, si cultoribus illius pacem daret, precesque eorum expeteret. Fidem

Imperator, vitæ cupidissimus monitori huic habebat, et eâ re, quum omnia desperata essent, frustra que Dii Romanorum precibus et sacrificiis fatigati essent, postremo ad Christianorum Deum, quem tamen ipse colere volebat, confugiebat. Metus ergo mortis, visque superstitionis, non vero angor conscientie admilla scelera detestantis, edictum illud pariebat. Promulgato vero eo statim ubique bellum in Christianos cessabat; captivi dimittebantur: exules revocabantur: conventus ubique, nemine repugnante, habebantur. Moshem. De Reb. Christian. &c. p. 956 . . . 958.

‘ and good men. I can easily believe,’ says Mr. Mosheim, ‘ that  
 ‘ these reasons were suggested to the emperor by his friends  
 ‘ and counsellors, who were about him. But the last words of  
 ‘ the edict, no doubt, open the true reason which drew it from  
 ‘ him, and at the same time declare his mind concerning the  
 ‘ religion of the Christians. “ Wherefore, agreeably to this  
 ‘ our indulgence, the Christians ought to pray to their God for  
 ‘ our welfare, and for that of the publick, and for their own,  
 ‘ that on all sides the publick interest may be safe, and they  
 ‘ may live securely in their own habitations.” From these words  
 ‘ it appears, 1. That Maximian believed the Christians had  
 ‘ some God. 2. That this God was not the supreme God,  
 ‘ maker of all things, whom all ought to worship, but the God  
 ‘ of the Christians only, that is, the God of some certain people,  
 ‘ as many of the Gods were supposed to be. For at that time  
 ‘ the Greeks and Romans, and all other people believed that  
 ‘ there were Gods proper and peculiar to every nation. 3. He  
 ‘ believed, that this God of one nation had great power, and  
 ‘ was able to bestow health, and deliver the publick from many  
 ‘ evils: 4. That this God did not bestow such benefits upon  
 ‘ any, unless they who worshipped him asked them of him.  
 ‘ Without doubt, therefore, some of those who attended on  
 ‘ Maximian in his deplorable sickness, had informed him that  
 ‘ the God of the Christians, when he dwelt on this earth, had  
 ‘ given life to the dead, and health to the sick; and that this his  
 ‘ beneficence had not yet ceased: and that there were many in-  
 ‘ stances of men who had been healed in a wonderful manner  
 ‘ by the prayers of Christians. It was not impossible, therefore,  
 ‘ but that he also might obtain deliverance from his grievous  
 ‘ malady, if he gave peace to his worshippers, and asked their  
 ‘ prayers for him. The emperor, earnestly desirous of life, had  
 ‘ a regard to this adviser, and thereupon, when prayers and sa-  
 ‘ crifices to the gods of the Romans had failed of success, he  
 ‘ at length fled to the God of the Christians, whom, neverthe-  
 ‘ less, he himself would not worship. Fear of death, therefore,  
 ‘ and the force of superstition, produced this edict; not anguish  
 ‘ of conscience for the sins which he had been guilty of. How-  
 ‘ ever, upon the promulgation of this edict, the persecution  
 ‘ against the Christians ceased, the prisoners were set at liberty,  
 ‘ the exiles were recalled.’

These observations of Mr. Mosheim are uncommon, and, as  
 seems to me, curious. I therefore have transcribed them here,  
 supposing that my readers may be willing to see them.

VII. At the beginning of the ninth book of his Ecclesiastical History Eusebius says: ' The ' revocation contained in the fore-  
 ' said imperial edict was published throughout Asia, and in  
 ' all its provinces. But Maximin, who ruled in the provinces  
 ' of the East, an impious man, if ever there was one, and a  
 ' bitter enemy to the worship of the God of the universe, being  
 ' much displeas'd with it, instead of publishing the edict itself,  
 ' only ' sent orders by word of mouth to the governors, directing,  
 ' that they should forbear to give us any disturbance, and no  
 ' longer persecute us: which ordinance the governors of pro-  
 ' vinces were to communicate to each other. And Sabinus,  
 ' who had the præfecture of the prætorium, which is the highest  
 ' office in the empire, made known the emperor's mind to the  
 ' governors of the several provinces in a letter written in the  
 ' Roman language, which we have translated into Greek, and is  
 ' to this purpose: " The majesty of our most sacred lords the  
 " emperors, influenced by the pious and devout principle with  
 " which their minds are filled, have long since designed to bring  
 " all men to the true and right way of living; and that they  
 " who have embrac'd different usages from the Romans, should  
 " be induced to give due reverence to the immortal gods. But  
 " such is the obstinacy and perverseness of some men, that neither  
 " the justice of the imperial edicts, nor the imminent dan-  
 " ger of punishment could prevail upon them. Forasmuch  
 " therefore, as by this means it has happened, that many have  
 " brought themselves into great dangers, our most sacred and  
 " powerful lords the emperors, agreeable to their innate piety  
 " and clemency, considering it to be far from their intention,  
 " that upon this account many should be expos'd to danger;  
 " have commanded us to write this letter to you, and to direct  
 " you, that if any of the Christians should be found practising  
 " the worship of their sect, you should not bring him into any  
 " danger, nor give him any trouble, nor appoint any punishment  
 " to him upon that account. Forasmuch as it has been mani-  
 " festly found, by the experience of a long course of time, that  
 " they cannot by any means whatever be induced to depart from  
 " this obstinacy of disposition, you are therefore to write to the  
 " curators, and other magistrates, and to the governors of the  
 " villages of every city, that they are no longer to concern  
 " themselves in this affair."

: H. E. l. ix. cap. 1. p. 346. &c.

αρχαφω προσαμαλι τοις υπ' αυλον αρχουσι

... λογω προσατιει τοις υπ' αυλον αρ-  
 χουσι, τον καθ' ημων ανειναι πολεμον . . .

τον καθ' ημων διωξον ανειναι προσατιει.  
 Ib. p. 347. A. B.

Here is a remarkable testimony, from enemies, to the patience and fortitude of the Christians at that time: they were not induced to renounce their religion through fear of sufferings: if some yielded, as undoubtedly some did, many persevered, and were faithful to death.

Eusebius goes on: ‘ Hereupon the presidents of provinces  
 ‘ thought that to be the real mind of the emperor, which had  
 ‘ been communicated to them in the letter of Sabinus. And  
 ‘ they accordingly wrote to the officers and magistrates ‘ in coun-  
 ‘ try places: nor did they only write these things in their letters,  
 ‘ but by their actions also they endeavoured to secure a regard  
 ‘ to those orders of the emperor. They therefore presently set  
 ‘ at liberty all whom they had confined in prisons for the con-  
 ‘ fession of their faith in God. A like liberty was granted to  
 ‘ such as had been condemned to the mines: for they really  
 ‘ thought that to be the mind of their prince, though it was  
 ‘ quite otherwise. However, upon this occasion our places of  
 ‘ worship were opened, and the congregations of the faithful  
 ‘ were numerous. . . . And many were seen returning to their  
 ‘ habitations, singing hymns of praise to God as they travelled  
 ‘ along the roads.’

‘ But,’ says <sup>u</sup> Eusebius, ‘ that enemy of good men, and of  
 ‘ all goodness, who ruled in the East, could not endure this,  
 ‘ nor suffer this state of things to last more than six months:  
 ‘ and trying all manner of ways to subvert the peace, upon some  
 ‘ pretence or other he forbade our meeting in the cœmeteries.  
 ‘ Then <sup>x</sup> he took care to send embassies to himself from the  
 ‘ Antiochians, and the people of other cities, in which they ask  
 ‘ it of him as the greatest benefit, that no Christians might be  
 ‘ allowed to live in their cities. The author of this contrivance  
 ‘ at Antioch was Theotecnus, a subtle and wicked impostor,  
 ‘ who then had the office of Curator in that city.’

‘ This <sup>y</sup> man forged against us many injurious reports and  
 ‘ calumnies, that we might be treated as thieves and the worst  
 ‘ of malefactors. At length he erected an image to Jupiter  
 ‘ Philus, and consecrated it with magic charms; and in honour  
 ‘ of it instituted many vain and impure ceremonies of initiation,  
 ‘ and detestable rites of expiation; and sent some of the oracles  
 ‘ of his god to the emperor himself: and the better to flatter  
 ‘ and please the emperor, he stirred up his dæmon against the  
 ‘ Christians; and gave out, “ that the god commanded, that

<sup>z</sup> Καὶ τοῖς κατ’ αἰῶνες ἐπιβλασμένοις. p. 348. A.      ἀνδρῶν αὐτοῦ ἐαυτῶν καθ’ ἑμῶν πρεσβεύσαι.  
<sup>u</sup> H. E., l. ix. cap. 2, p. 349. B.      γ Ibid, cap. 3. p. 349.  
<sup>x</sup> . . . εἶπε δια τῶν πονηρῶν

“ the Christians should be expelled out of the city and the territories belonging to it, as being enemies to him.”

In the next chapter <sup>2</sup> Eusebius says, that the like things were practised in some other places; and the magistrates and people in general, in the countries subject to this emperor, behaved very uncivilly and injuriously to the Christians.

‘ Then <sup>a</sup> having composed some Acts and Memoirs of Pilate and our Saviour, filled with all manner of blasphemy against Christ, by the authority of the emperor they were sent abroad every where into cities and country places, and published all over the empire: and it was commanded, that they should be set up every where in country places and cities to be read by all men; and that they should be delivered by schoolmasters to the boys to get them by heart, and to declaim upon them instead of other themes. Whilst these things were doing, a military officer, whom the Romans call Dux, at Damascus in Phœnicia, fetched some infamous women from the marketplace, whom by threatenings he compelled to declare, and testify in writing, that they formerly had been Christians, and that they were acquainted with their worship, and that in their places of worship they practised obscene actions, and every thing else which he required them to say for defaming our religion. Having inserted the testimonies of those women into the Acts, he sent them to the emperor; and by his command, those Acts were published in every city, and other place.’

In another place <sup>b</sup> Eusebius has observed, that the falshood of those pretended Acts of Pilate was manifest from the date of them; for they placed the sufferings of our Saviour under Pilate in the seventh year of the reign of Tiberius; whereas, says he, it is certain from Josephus, that Pilate was not then come into Judea, and that he was made procurator of Judea in the twelfth year of that emperor’s reign:

‘ Moreover,’ says <sup>c</sup> Eusebius, ‘ in the midst of the cities, which never was done before, decrees of cities and imperial rescripts against us were set up to publick view, engraven on tables of brass: and the boys in the schools had nothing in their mouths all the day long, but Jesus and Pilate, and the Acts which had been forged to our prejudice. I think it proper for me here to insert the very rescript of Maximin, which was engraven in tables of brass. It was conceived in these very words: “ A copy of the translation of Maximin’s

<sup>2</sup> Cap. 4. p. 350.

<sup>a</sup> H. E. l. ix. cap. 5.

<sup>b</sup> H. E. l. i. cap. 9. p. 27.

<sup>c</sup> H. E. l. ix. cap. 7. p. 352.

“ rescript

“ rescript in answer to the decrees of the cities against us, tran-  
 “ scribed from the brass table set up at Tyre. Now at length,”  
 “ says he, “ the impudent confidence of men, having once  
 “ shaken off the dark mists of error and ignorance, which for a  
 “ while blinded the minds of men rather miserable than wicked,  
 “ may discern, that the world is governed by the indulgent  
 “ providence of the immortal gods. It is impossible to say,  
 “ how grateful, how delightful, how acceptable, your pious re-  
 “ solution for the honour of the gods has been to us: nor was  
 “ it before unknown to any, how great is your respect and ve-  
 “ neration for the gods, which have been manifested not by vain  
 “ words only, but also by great works: upon which account  
 “ your city may be deservedly stiled the seat and habitation of  
 “ the immortal gods. And it is evident by many proofs, that  
 “ she flourisheth by the advent and presence of the heavenly  
 “ deities. And now your city, negligent of your own particular  
 “ interests, and no longer sending to me the requests which you  
 “ formerly were wont to send, conducive to your own prosperity,  
 “ when it perceived, that the promoters of the detestable vanity  
 “ began to creep abroad again; and like fire carelessly raked  
 “ up, it broke out again with redoubled violence: immediately,  
 “ without delay, you had recourse to our piety, as the metropolis  
 “ of all religion, requesting redress and assistance. Nor can it  
 “ be doubted, that this wholesome design has been put into your  
 “ minds by the immortal gods, for the sake of your pious regard  
 “ for them. The most high and most mighty Jupiter has sug-  
 “ gested this petition to you, who presides in your famous city:  
 “ who preserveth your country gods, your wives, your children,  
 “ your families and houses, from destruction. He it is who  
 “ has breathed into your minds this salutary resolution; evidently  
 “ shewing, how excellent, and noble, and profitable it is to wor-  
 “ ship him, and to perform the sacred rites and ceremonies of  
 “ the immortal gods with due veneration. Who can be so void  
 “ of all sense and reason as not to know, that it is owing to the  
 “ propitious favour and bounty of the gods towards us, that the  
 “ earth does not neglect to restore to us the seeds committed to  
 “ it, and that the hope of the husbandman is not disappointed;  
 “ and that the aspect of destructive war is not immovably fixed  
 “ on the earth; and that our bodies are not destroyed by the in-  
 “ temperance of the air, and that the sea is not perpetually tossed,  
 “ and made to overflow with stormy winds; and that the earth,  
 “ the mother and nurse of all things, is not rent asunder by agi-  
 “ tations within its own bowels, and mountains swallowed up by  
 “ vast and unexpected scissures? There is no man that does not  
 “ know,

“ know, that all these and worse calamities have heretofore often  
 “ happened: and they have befallen us, because of the pernicious  
 “ error and empty vanity of those execrable men, which has so spread  
 “ as to cover almost the whole earth with shame and dishonour.”  
 “ Then after some other things he adds: “ Let men now look  
 “ into the open fields, and see the flourishing corn waving its  
 “ full ears: let them see the meadows bedecked with plants and  
 “ flowers, they having been watered with seasonable rain: let  
 “ them observe the calm and agreeable temperance of the air:  
 “ Let all men therefore henceforth rejoice, that by your piety  
 “ and respect for the sacred rites of religion, the deity of the  
 “ most valiant and most potent Mars has been appeased; and  
 “ that they may now securely enjoy the benefits of a profound  
 “ and delightful peace. And as many as have forsaken that  
 “ blind error, and intricate maze of vanity, and are returned to  
 “ a right and sound mind, let them rejoice abundantly, as men  
 “ delivered from a dangerous tempest, or a grievous disease,  
 “ and have now before them the prospect of a pleasant and com-  
 “ fortable life for time to come. But if any still persist in their  
 “ vain and detestable folly, let them be expelled far away from  
 “ your city and country as you have desired; that thus, con-  
 “ formable to your laudable care in this matter, your city being  
 “ purged from all defilement and wickedness, you may, ac-  
 “ cording to your own genuine disposition, with all due veneration  
 “ and solemnity, perform the sacred rites of the immortal gods.  
 “ And that you may know how grateful this your petition has  
 “ been to me, and that without decrees, and without petitions,  
 “ I am of myself forward to encourage well disposed minds;  
 “ we permit you to ask the greatest benefit you can ask, as a  
 “ reward of so religious a purpose. Take care that you ask  
 “ immediately, and that you receive what you ask; for you  
 “ shall obtain it without delay. Which benefit bestowed upon  
 “ your city, shall be henceforward throughout all time a mo-  
 “ nument of your devout piety for the immortal gods, and shall  
 “ declare to your children and posterity, that you have received  
 “ from our hands a recompence of your love and virtue.”

These petitions from the cities to Maximin, Eusebius, in a place before quoted, elegantly calls ‘ embassies to himself,’ they having been solicited by his agents in those cities. Cæcilius<sup>d</sup> also has taken notice of these petitions, and expresseth himself

<sup>d</sup> In primis indulgentiam Christianis communi tutela datam tollit, subornatis legationibus civitatum, quæ peterent, ne intra civitates suas Christianis conventicula

extruere liceret, ut quasi coactus et impulsus facere videretur quod erat sponte facturus. De M. P. cap. 36.

much after the same manner, saying, that these petitions from the cities were procured by himself.

Eusebius, having exhibited the above rescript taken from the tables at Tyre, goes on: ‘ This ‘ rescript against us was set up ‘ on pillars in every province, and as far as it was in the power ‘ of man, shut us out of all comfortable hopes: so that, according ‘ to that divine oracle, *if it were possible, even the elect themselves ‘ would be offended.*’

These and other things do certainly shew the bitter spirit of heathenism at that time: and these edicts, and the hard usage which the Christians met with in consequence of them, are sufficient to satisfy us, that the heathen people did their utmost to extirpate Christianity; and if it had been in the power of man, they would have actually destroyed it.

The sufferings of Christians at that time, in that part of the empire which was subject to Maximin, were then very grievous. Deliverance was very desirable, and it was near at hand.

VIII. Constantine overcame Maxentius at Rome on the 28th day of October in the year 312. ‘ And,’ as Eusebius says, ‘ soon ‘ after that, Constantine, and Licinius, who was colleague ‘ in the empire with him, having first adored and praised God, ‘ who had been the author of these successes and of all the good ‘ that had happened, did with one mind and consent enact a full ‘ and comprehensive edict in favour of the Christians; and then ‘ sent it to Maximin, who ruled in the eastern parts of the ‘ empire, and who pretended friendship for them. Though ‘ Maximin was extremely uneasy about it, he could not refuse ‘ it: and now first,’ as Eusebius says, ‘ he sent an edict to ‘ the presidents in favour of the Christians; and as of his own ‘ proper motion, though really out of necessity and against his will.’

IX. That edict of Constantine and Licinius, which Eusebius calls a ‘ full and complete law,’ is not now extant. It was published, as may be supposed, at Rome, in the month of November 312, and then sent to Maximin, who then immediately published a Letter to Sabinus in favour of the Christians, which now follows in Eusebius.

‘ Ubi supr. p. 354. C.

δη επι τολοις αυλοσ τε Κωνσταντινος και συν αυλω βασιλευσ Δικινιος . . . Θεοσ τον των ασαθων απαντων αυλοισ αλλιον ευμενισαλλης

‘ Και αμφω, μια βυλη και γνωμη, νομουν υπησ Χριστιανων τελευταλον πληρεςαλα διαλυπειν Ιαι. κ. λ. Η. Ε. l. ix. cap. 9. p. 360.

A COPY OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE LETTER OF THE  
EMPEROR MAXIMIN.

“ Jovius Maximin Augustus to Sabinus. It is, I am per-  
 “ suaded, well known to yourself, and to all men, how that our  
 “ lords and fathers Dioclesian and Maximian, when they saw  
 “ that almost all mankind were forsaking the worship of the gods,  
 “ and going over to the sect of the Christians, did rightly or-  
 “ dain, that<sup>b</sup> all men who had forsaken the worship of their im-  
 “ mortal gods, should be called back again to the worship of  
 “ the gods by public pains and penalties. But when I first of  
 “ all happily came into the East, and perceived that great numbers  
 “ of men who might be useful to the publick, were for the fore-  
 “ mentioned cause banished by the judges into several places, I  
 “ gave orders, that for the future none of them should be severe  
 “ toward the people of their province, but rather endeavour to  
 “ reduce them to the worship of the gods by fair words and  
 “ good usage. So long therefore as my orders were obeyed by  
 “ the judges, no men in the eastern parts were banished or other-  
 “ wise ill treated: and by reason of the mildness of the treat-  
 “ ment given to them, they were the more disposed to return  
 “ to the worship of the gods. But after that, when I the last  
 “ year happily entered into Nicomedia, the citizens of that place  
 “ came to me with the images of the gods, earnestly entreating  
 “ me, that by all means, none of that sect might be at all per-  
 “ mitted to dwell in their country. But as I knew that a great  
 “ many of that religion were in those parts; I returned them  
 “ this answer: That I willingly granted their petition, but I did  
 “ not perceive that the thing was desired by all: if therefore  
 “ there were any who persisted in their superstition, every one  
 “ should, according to his own discretion, choose as he saw fit;  
 “ and if they would embrace the worship of the gods they  
 “ might. At the same time I was under a necessity to give a  
 “ favourable answer to the citizens of Nicomedia, and to the  
 “ other cities, who also had presented to me the like petitions,  
 “ that none of the Christians might live in their cities, the ra-  
 “ ther because this had never been allowed by the former em-  
 “ perors; and moreover it was pleasing to the gods themselves,  
 “ by whom all men and the public weal subsist. Upon all these  
 “ accounts I was under a necessity to grant their request in be-

<sup>r</sup> Ibid. p. 360, 361.      <sup>h</sup> . . . ορθως αναχωρησαιλας, προςδηλω κυλασει και τι-  
 ειδικαχρηται, πασιλας, αιθρωπε; της απο      μωρια εις της θεουκειαι τωι Θεωι ανακλη-  
 της, τωι ακωι θεωι των αθανατωι θεουκειαις      βηται. p. 360. C.

“ half of the worship of the gods. Wherefore, though I have  
 “ often before, both by letters and by word of mouth, recom-  
 “ mended to you, that nothing grievous should be done to this  
 “ sect in the provinces, but that they should be treated with  
 “ mildness and gentleness: yet that no injury may be done to  
 “ them by any of the inferior officers, I have thought it need-  
 “ ful now by these letters again to remind you, that by fair words  
 “ and good usage, you should induce the people of our govern-  
 “ ment to acknowledge the providence of the gods. Therefore  
 “ if any of their own accord embrace the worship of the gods,  
 “ they ought to be cheerfully received; but if any will still ad-  
 “ here to their own religion, you are to leave them in their own  
 “ power. You are therefore carefully to observe these orders;  
 “ nor let any one be permitted to oppress the people of our  
 “ government by fines or other hardships: and that this our  
 “ edict may be known to all men in the provinces, you are to  
 “ publish it with a decree also set forth by yourself.”

This<sup>1</sup> edict of Maximin is supposed to have been published before the end of the year 312.

Eusebius having alleged this edict goes on to say: ‘ These<sup>k</sup>  
 ‘ orders being published by him from a kind of compulsion,  
 ‘ and not according to the sense of his own mind, he was not  
 ‘ reckoned to be sincere, or worthy to be trusted; and the rather,  
 ‘ because after publishing a like indulgence, he had shewed him-  
 ‘ self to be deceitful and perfidious. Therefore none of our  
 ‘ people dared to assemble together for worship, nor to shew  
 ‘ themselves abroad openly. Nor indeed did the edict in express  
 ‘ terms allow of this, but only that we might be secure from  
 ‘ violence and bad treatment: it did not empower us to meet  
 ‘ together, nor to build houses for our worship, nor to perform  
 ‘ any of those solemn acts of religion which are customary among  
 ‘ us; though Constantine and Licinius, those patrons of peace  
 ‘ and religion, had particularly signified in their letters to him,  
 ‘ that such things had been granted by them, and they were ex-  
 ‘ pressed in the laws set forth to the view of all men. But that  
 ‘ wicked wretch would not yield yet; nor till at last, when pur-  
 ‘ sued by the divine vengeance, he was compelled to do it against  
 ‘ his will.’

X. Constantine did not stay long at Rome after his victory over Maxentius, but before the end of the year 312, or in the

<sup>1</sup> Postea refert Eusebius epistolam, quam Maximinus ad Sabinum Præfectum Prætorii sui scripsit, quamque currenti anno datam esse, non vero anno insequenti, ut multi eruditi credidere, ex dictis liquet. Pagi ann. 312. xv. <sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 362.

beginning of 313, he went thence to Milan, where he gave his sister Constantia in marriage to Licinius: and there these two emperors now set forth a second edict in favour of the Christians; which is preserved in Eusebius<sup>1</sup> in Greek, and is in Cæcilius<sup>m</sup> in Latin, excepting that he has omitted the introduction, or preamble. I shall, as I did in another instance, translate the Greek of Eusebius, and place the Latin from Cæcilius at the bottom of the pages.

‘ Now,’ says<sup>n</sup> Eusebius, ‘ I shall allege the imperial constitutions of Constantine and Licinius, translated from the Latin.’

“ Having been long since convinced, that the freedom of religion ought not to be restrained, but that leave should be given to every one to follow the sense of his own mind in things of religion, we have ordained, that as well all others, as the Christians, should adhere to that sect and way of worship which they approve. But because in that rescript where this liberty was granted, many and divers sects are expressly named, some possibly have desisted from such worship. Wherefore<sup>o</sup> when I  
“ Constantine

<sup>1</sup> H. E. l. x. cap. 5. p. 388. &c.

<sup>m</sup> De M. P. cap. 45.

<sup>n</sup> Φερει

ει λοιπον και των βασιλικων διαταξεων Κωνσταντου και Λικινιου τας εκ Ρωμαιων γραφης μεταληφθεισας ερμηνειας παραθεμισθαι. Ib. p. 388. A.

<sup>o</sup> Cum

feliciter tam ego Constantinus Augustus, quam etiam Licinius Augustus apud Mediolanum convenissemus, atque universa, quæ ad commoda et securitatem publicam pertinerent, in tractatu haberemus, hæc inter cætera, quæ videbamus pluribus hominibus profutura, vel in primis ordinanda esse credidimus, quibus divinitatis reverentia cominebatur, ut daremus et Christianis, et omnibus, liberam potestatem sequendi religionem, quam quisque voluisset: quod quidem divinitas in sede cœlesti nobis atque omnibus, qui sub potestate nostra sunt constituti, placatum ac propitium possit existere. Itaque hoc consilio salubri, ac rectissima ratione ineundum esse credidimus, ut nulli omnino facultatem abnegandam putarem, qui vel observationi Christianorum, vel ei religioni mentem suam dederat, quam ipse aptissimam esse sentiret: ut possit nobis summa divinitas, cujus religioni hberis mentibus obsequimur, in omnibus solum favorem suum benevolentiamque præstare. Quare scire dicationem tuam convenit, placuisse nobis, ut amotis omnibus conditionibus, quæ prius scriptis ad officium tuum datis, super Christianorum nomine videbantur, nunc cavere, ac sim-

pliciter unusquisque eorum, qui eandem observandæ religioni Christianorum gerunt voluntatem, citra ullam inquietudinem ac molestiam sui idipsum observare contendant. Quæ sollicitudini tuæ plenissime significanda esse credidimus, quo scires, nos liberam atque absolutam colendæ religionis suæ facultatem hisdem Christianis dedisse. Quod cum hisdem a nobis indultum esse pervideas, intelligit dicatione tua etiam aliis religionis suæ vel observantiæ potestatem similiter apertam et liberam pro quiete temporis nostri esse concessam: ut in colenda quod quisque diligeret, habeat liberam facultatem, quas . . . honori neque cuiquam religioni aut aliquid a nobis. Atque hoc ipsum in persona Christianorum statuendum esse censuimus, quod si eadem loca, ad quæ antea convenire consueverant, de quibus etiam datis ad officium literis certa antehac forma fuerat comprehensa, priore tempore aliquid vel fisco nostro, vel ab alio quocumque videntur esse mercati, eadem Christianis, sine pecunia, et sine ulla pretii petitione, proposita omni frustratione atque ambiguitate restituantur. Qui etiam dono fuerant consecuti, eadem similiter hisdem Christianis quantocyus reddant etiam vel tui qui emerunt, vel qui dono erant consecuti, si putaverint de nostra benevolentia aliquid, Vicarium postulent, quo et ipsis per nostram clementiam consulatur. Quæ omnia corpori Christianorum protinus per intercessionem tuam, ac sine mora tradi oportebit.

“ Constantine Augustus, and I Licinius Augustus, happily met at  
 “ Milan, and we consulted together what might be best and  
 “ most conducive to the benefit of the publick, among other  
 “ things these following were resolved upon as beneficial for all.  
 “ And in the first place it was resolved, that such constitutions  
 “ should be ordained as might secure the worship and veneration  
 “ of the Divine Being: that is, that we should grant both to  
 “ the Christians, and to all others, a free choice to follow that way  
 “ of worship which they judge best; that † so the Godhead,  
 “ and whatever is divine and heavenly, may be propitious to  
 “ us, and to all living under our dominion. We publish this  
 “ therefore as our will and pleasure, and agreeable to sound and  
 “ right reason, that leave shall not be denied to any man what-  
 “ ever to follow and choose the constitution and worship of the  
 “ Christians: and that leave be given to every one to betake  
 “ himself to that religion which is most agreeable to him, that  
 “ so the Divine being [το Θειον] may in all things display his  
 “ usual favour and benignity toward us. Moreover it is now  
 “ thought proper to signify to you, that all the restraints con-  
 “ cerning the Christians, which were in the former letter sent  
 “ to you, should be left out, that whatever is unsuitable to our  
 “ benignity may be omitted, and that now for the future every  
 “ one who chooseth to adhere to the Christian religion, may ob-  
 “ serve it freely without any impediment or molestation. These  
 “ things we have thought proper to signify to you, in order to  
 “ your perceiving, that we have given free and full liberty to  
 “ these same Christians to follow their own religion. And you  
 “ may perceive, that as we have granted this full liberty to  
 “ them, so in like manner we have granted the same liberty to  
 “ others to observe their own institution and religion: for, as is  
 “ manifest, this is suitable to the tranquillity of our times, that

oportebit. Et quoniam iidem Christiani non in ea loca tantum, ad quæ convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur, ad jus corporis eorum, id est, ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum, pertinentia, ea omnia lege qua superius comprehendimus, citra ullam prorsus ambiguitatem vel controversiam hisdem Christianis, id est, corpori et conventiculis eorum reddi jubebis, supradicta scilicet ratione servata, ut ii qui eadem sine pretio, sicut diximus, restituerint, indemnitate de nostra benevolentia sperent. In quibus omnibus supradicto corpori Christianorum intercessionem tuam efficacissimam exhibere debebis: ut præceptum nostrum quantocyus compleatur: quo etiam in hoc per clementiam

nostram quieti publicæ consulatur. Hactenus fiet, ut sicut superius comprehensum est, divinus juxta nos favor, quem in tantis sumus rebus experti, per omne tempus prospere successibus nostris cum beatitudine nostra publica perseveret. Ut autem hujus sanctionis benevolentiae nostræ forma ad omnium possit pervenire notitiam, prolata programmata tuo hæc scripta et ubique proponere, et ad omnium scientiam te perfere conveniet, ut hujus benevolentiae nostræ sanctio latere non possit. De M. P. cap. 48.

† Οπως ο, τι ποτε εστι θειου και εραυου παρακαλο, ημιν και πασι τοις υπο τη ημετερα εξουσια διαθεσιν ευμενεσ εναι ον-  
 1767. Ap. Euseb. II. E. p. 388. D.

“ every

“ every one should have liberty to choose and follow the worship of  
 “ that deity which he approves [*ο ποιον δ' αυ βελειαι Θειον*]. This  
 “ we have determined, that it may appear, we do not forbid or  
 “ restrain any religion or way of worship whatever. And far-  
 “ ther, with regard to the Christians we ordain, that the places  
 “ of worship (concerning which in the letter formerly sent to  
 “ you there was another rule) in which they had been wont to  
 “ assemble, that if any of them have been adjudged to our trea-  
 “ sury or exchequer, or have been purchased by any, they should  
 “ be restored to the Christians without price and without delay:  
 “ and if any by grant have obtained such places, they are to be  
 “ immediately restored to the Christians: and if any of those  
 “ who have purchased such places, or have obtained them by  
 “ grant, are desirous to have an allowance made to them by us,  
 “ let them apply to the officer who administers justice in the  
 “ place where they reside, that a proper regard may be had to  
 “ them according to the benevolence of our disposition. You  
 “ are to take care, that all these things be restored to the body  
 “ of the Christians without failure. And whereas the same  
 “ Christians, beside the places where they assemble, are well  
 “ known to have also other possessions, and such as belong not  
 “ to particular persons separately, but to the community, you  
 “ are to take care, that such places also be restored to the body  
 “ to which they appertain without any subterfuge or delay; upon  
 “ this condition however, that they who restore these things with-  
 “ out price, may expect indemnity from our liberality. In all  
 “ these things you are to exert yourself with the utmost care and  
 “ vigour, in behalf of the aforesaid body of the Christians, that  
 “ our appointment may be performed with all speed: that by  
 “ this means, agreeably to our gracious intention, provision may  
 “ be made for the common and publick tranquillity without de-  
 “ lay. Hereby, as before said, the divine favour, of which we  
 “ have already had great experience, will be secured to us for  
 “ ever. And that the design of this our law and our gracious in-  
 “ dulgence may come to the knowledge of all, you are to take  
 “ care, that this our Letter be set up every where to public  
 “ view, that none may be ignorant of this appointment of our  
 “ gracious indulgence.”

This<sup>p</sup> constitution or edict was signed and published at Milan

<sup>p</sup> *Litteræ de restituenda Ecclesia ad Præ-*  
*sidem niſſæ, die quidem Idum Juniarum*  
*Nicomediæ proposita, ut testatur Lactantius,*  
*ſed datæ fuerant Mediolani eodem anno,*

*Chriſti 313, circa menſem Martium, ut*  
*Constantinus et Licinius in iisdem diſerte*  
*aſſerunt. Pagi ann. 314. num. viii.*

in the former part of the year 313, in the month of March, as it seems, by the joint authority of Constantine and Licinius.

In the mean time Maximin, who had sided with Maxentius, took this opportunity, whilst Constantine and Licinius were at Milan, and in the depth of winter marched with his army from Syria into Bithynia, and crossed the Hellespont into Thrace. Licinius left Milan, and went to meet him, and in a pitched battle overcame him near Adrianople on the 30th day of April in the year 313, and pursued him into Bithynia. Maximin fled to mount Taurus, and thence to Tarsus, where he took poison, and died miserably about the month of August in the same year, 313.

When Licinius came to Nicomedia, having offered up his thanksgivings to God for the victory vouchsafed to him, as Cæcilius says, he set up the forementioned edict in favour of the Christians at Nicomedia on the 13th day of June. So that, as the same writer says, from the time of the edict which proclaimed the persecution, to the restoring of peace to the churches, was the space of ten years and about four months: or in other words, from the 23d day of February in the year 303, to the 13th day of the month of June in 313, was the space of ten years, three months, and nineteen days.

In the first edict published by Constantine and Licinius there were some defects or faults, which were supplied, or corrected and rectified in the second edict. What those faults or defects were cannot be perceived with certainty, as the expressions in this new edict relating to that matter are obscure. Various things have been proposed by learned men in the way of conjecture; but I do not think it needful to take particular notice of them here.

¶ Constantinus rebus in urbe compositis, hyeme proxima, Mediolanum contendit. Eodem Licinius advenit, ut acciperet uxorem. Maximinus, ubi eos intellexit nuptiarum solemnibus occupatos, exercitum movit e Syria, hyeme quam maxime sæviente, et mansionibus geminatis, in Bithyniam concurrit debilitato agmine. &c. De M. P. cap. 45. Vid. et cap. 46, 47.

¶ Tum cap. 48. Licinius vero accepta exercitus parte ac distributa, trajecit exercitum in Bithyniam paucis post pugnam diebus: et Nicomediam ingressus, gratiam Deo, cujus auxilio vicerat, retulit, ac die Iduum Juniarum Constantino atque ipso ter Consulibus (anno nempe Christi 313, de restituenda Ecclesia hujusmodi literas ad Præsidem datas proponi jussit.) Tum literas refert, quas Euse-

biius lib. x. cap. 5. describit e lingua Latina, quâ primum editæ sunt, ut ipsemet docet. Postea Lactantius [al. Cæcilius] ait: 'His literis propositis, etiam verbo hortatus est' (nempe Licinius) 'ut conventicula in statum pristinum redderentur. Sic ab everfa Ecclesia' (a die sc. xxiii. Februarii anni 303) 'usque ad restitutam' (usque ad diem videlicet, xiii mensis Junii anni 313 qua propositum est Nicomediæ edictum de restaurandis ecclesiis,) 'fuerunt anni decem, plus minus quatuor: nempe menses tres, dies novemdecim. Ideoque pax universæ Ecclesiæ anno tantum cccxiii reddita. Pagi ann. 314. num. vi.

¶ Vales. in Euseb. loc. Basnag. ann. 313. num. xi. xii. Mosheim, de Reb. Christianorum. p. 973. &c.

It is, however, manifest, that this second edict is full and comprehensive, giving liberty to all men to worship God according to the best of their own judgment, and in the way that each one should choose. At the same time, as I apprehend, there is special regard had to Christians; and the places of worship, of which they had been deprived, are restored to them, and likewise some other possessions which belonged to their religious societies, in a body.

XI. Maximin, after his arrival at Tarsus, beside the shame and disappointment of his defeat by Licinius, was afflicted with a grievous distemper, and violent pains, described at large by <sup>t</sup> Cæcilius; who also says, that now Maximin confessed his fault, and implored the forgiveness of Christ, and relief from him under his distemper; soon after which he expired.

Eusebius says, that after the forementioned defeat, Maximin 'gave' glory to the God of the Christians, and enacted a full and complete law for their liberty; and then being struck with a mortal distemper, he expired, no longer respite being granted to him. The law issued by him is to this purpose.

'The copy of the edict of Maximin in favour of the Christians, translated out of the Roman into the Greek language.'

"The emperor Cæsar Caius Valerius Maximin Germanicus Sarmaticus Pius Happy Invincible Augustus. It is notorious to all, that by all means, and at all times, we have consulted the welfare of our subjects in the provinces, and have endeavoured to procure for them what might be most for the good and benefit of the publick in general, and for the comfort and satisfaction of every one in particular; and we trust that all who shall look back upon our past proceedings and administration of affairs, will be convinced in their own minds of this. For when formerly it came to our knowledge, that upon occasion of the law enacted by our deified fathers, Dioclesian and Maximian, which forbade the assemblies of Chris-

<sup>t</sup> . . . Tarsum postremo confugit. Ibi cum jam terra marique perterreretur, non ullum speraret refugium, angore animi ac metu confugit ad mortem, quasi ad remedium malorum, quæ Deus in caput suum congescit. Sed prius cibo se iniecit, ac vino ingurgitavit . . . et sic hausit venenum. . . . Deinde post multos gravesque cruciatus, cum caput suum parietibus infligeret, exili-erant oculi ejus de cavernis. Tunc demum, amisso visu, Deum videre cepit candidatis nimiris se judicantem. Exclamabat ergo sicut ii, qui torqueri solent, et non se, sed alios fecisse dicebat. Deinde, quasi tor-

mentis adactus fatebatur, Christum subinde deprecans, et plorans, ut suimet miseretur sic inter gemitus quos tamquam cremaretur, edebat, nocentem spiritum detestabili genere mortis efflavit. De M. P. cap. 49.

<sup>u</sup> Εἶτα ὁ ἄδης δέξαι τῶν Χριστιανῶν Θεῶ, ἰσμον τε τῶν ἐπιβ-ελευθερίας αὐτῶν τελευτάτα καὶ πληρεστάτα διατάξαμενος, δισθανάτης αὐτικά, μη δὲ μίας αὐτῶ χρεῖν ἐδοθείσης προθισμίας, τελευτά τῶν βίῳ. H. E. l. ix. cap. 10. p. 363. D. <sup>x</sup> Ap. Euseb. ib. p. 363, 364.

“ tians, many injuries and extortions have been committed by  
 “ the officers, and that these mischiefs increased among our  
 “ people, and the goods and estates of our subjects were wasted,  
 “ for whose welfare we are always earnestly concerned: we <sup>y</sup> the  
 “ last year sent letters to the governors of every province, by  
 “ which it was enacted, that if any one would adhere to such  
 “ custom, and the observance of their own religion, he should  
 “ be at liberty to follow his own judgment and inclination, with-  
 “ out obstruction or hindrance from any man: and that they  
 “ should be permitted freely to do, without fear or distrust,  
 “ whatever in this matter they approved of. Nevertheless, at  
 “ the same time, it could not be concealed from our know-  
 “ ledge, that some of the judges have misunderstood our orders,  
 “ and have endeavoured to make our people distrust the sincerity  
 “ of our intentions, and have made them afraid to perform the  
 “ worship agreeable to them. Wherefore, that for the time to  
 “ come, all fear and suspicion of ambiguity may be removed,  
 “ we have ordered this edict to be published, that it may be  
 “ known to all, that by this our grant, it is lawful for those who  
 “ choose this religion and worship, to act therein as they see best,  
 “ and to perform worship in the way to which they have been  
 “ accustomed. And it is granted to them that they may repair  
 “ their dominical houses. And that our beneficence may be the  
 “ more conspicuous, we have thought fit farther to enact, that  
 “ if any buildings or lands, aforetime belonging to the Chris-  
 “ tians, have by virtue of the edict of our fathers been con-  
 “ fiscated, and brought into our treasury, or have been seized  
 “ and occupied by any city, or have been sold, or given in grant  
 “ to any, we have ordered, that all these should be returned to  
 “ the former right and possession of the Christians; that all men  
 “ may be fully persuaded of our piety and provident concern in  
 “ this matter.”

Eusebius said, as quoted above, that now Maximin ‘ gave full  
 ‘ and complete liberty to the Christians.’ And, indeed, this  
 edict, so far as it relates to the Christians, is conformable to  
 the edict of Constantine and Licinius, before exhibited.

I have nothing farther to add here, but that <sup>z</sup> according to  
 the

<sup>y</sup> Upon this place Valesius rightly ob-  
 serves: ‘ He intends his epistle sent to Sa-  
 binus, Præfect of the Prætorium, which  
 Eusebius had alleged before. Maximin  
 here says, he had written that letter in  
 the preceding year, meaning the year of  
 Christ 312. It follows, therefore, that  
 this last edict of Maximin was written

‘ in the year of Christ 313.’ And see Pagi  
 ann. 314. num. viii. <sup>z</sup> Baluzius  
 recte in Notis observat non statim mortuum  
 esse Maximinum ac Tarsum pervenit, sed  
 aliquanto tempore gravissimos dolores susti-  
 nuisse, sicque non videri, eum ante mensem  
 Augustum periisse. Vide quæ ibidem  
 sequuntur. Pagi ann. 314. num. viii.

the computation of learned critics, Maximin died, as already hinted, in the month of August, in the year 313.

XII. I have now recited at length all the edicts concerning the persecution of Dioclesian.

There are two inscriptions in <sup>a</sup> Gruter, relating to it, in which it is intimated, that in the times of ' Dioclesian, and ' Maximian Herculus, and Galerius, the name of the Christians, who had overthrown the republick, was extirpated.' And again, ' that the superstition of the Christians was every ' where extirpated, and the worship of the gods restored.'

I shall put down those two inscriptions at length, in the Latin original. They are said to have been found in Spain, at a place called Clunia, which <sup>b</sup> was a Roman colony.

*Cluniæ in Hisp. in pulchra columna.*

DIOCLETIANUS. JOVIUS. ET  
MAXIMIAN. HERCULIUS  
CAES. AUGG  
AMPLIFICATO. PER. ORIEN  
TEM. ET OCCIDENTEM  
IMP. ROM  
ET  
NOMINE. CHRISTIANORUM  
DELETO. QUI. REMP. EVER  
TEBANT.

*Cluniæ Hisp.*

DIOCLETIAN. CAES.  
AUG. GALERIO. IN ORI  
ENTE. ADOPT. SUPER  
STITIONE. CHRIST. —  
UBIQUE. DELETA. ET CUL  
TU. DEOR. PROPAGATO

XIII. I think it may not be improper to add some concluding observations upon this persecution. Mr. Mosheim will furnish me with some; after which I may subjoin others of my own.

Il mourut, vers le mois d'Aoust a Tarse Paris.  
dans Cilicie. Tillem. Persecution de Dio-  
clatien art. 48. Mem. E. T. v. p. 117. cap. 1,

<sup>a</sup> Ap. Gruter. p. 280.

<sup>b</sup> Vide Cellarii Geogr. Antiq. l. ii.

Obs. 1. This <sup>c</sup> persecution might as properly, or more properly be called Maximian's as Dioclesian's. It is evident from <sup>d</sup> Cæcilius, and from <sup>e</sup> Eusebius, that Maximian Galerius was the first mover in this design. He seems to own as much himself, at the beginning of the edict published by him in favour of the Christians, a short time before his death. Cæcilius, in his book Of the Deaths of Persecutors, has largely related, how <sup>g</sup> Galerius urged Dioclesian to it: who <sup>h</sup> for some while objected to it, alleging the great disturbances which it might occasion in the empire. And it is allowed, that the persecution did not begin till the 19th year of Dioclesian's reign, before which time many Christians were admitted to posts of honour, near the emperor's person, and in the provinces. Moreover, in the third year of the persecution, Dioclesian resigned, and concerned himself no longer in the the affairs of the empire. However, it must be acknowledged, that he joined and concurred in the several edicts against the Christians, which were published in the first two years of the persecution. Nor <sup>hh</sup> do we aim to acquit him of all guilt in this affair; but only to mitigate the reflections which have been cast upon him both in former and later times. Dioclesian was timorous and superstitious; but it does not appear that he delighted in cruelty.

Obs. 2. In the first edict for the persecution, as we learn from <sup>i</sup> Eusebius, the sacred scriptures were ordered to be burnt; and, so far as we know, this is the first imperial edict of that kind. Mr. Mosheim suspects, that <sup>k</sup> Hierocles, or some other learned

<sup>c</sup> Quæ a Diocletiano nomen habet decennis, et omnium atrocissima Christianorum vexatio, rectius Maximiana vocanda esset. Etsi enim Diocletianus, fraudibus sacerdotum deceptus, injuriarum aliquid Christianis in aula degentibus, et castra sequentibus, intulit, leges etiam deinde in eos rogavit: certum tamen est, præcipuum hujus calamitatis auctorem, generum ejus, Maximianum Galerium fuisse. De Reb. Christian. p. 916.

<sup>d</sup> De M. P. cap. 10, 11, 12.  
<sup>e</sup> H. E. l. viii. cap. 16. p. 314. D.  
<sup>f</sup> Vid. De M. P. cap. 31. in. Euseb. H. E. l. viii. cap. 17. p. 316.

<sup>g</sup> Deinde, interjecto aliquanto tempore, in Bithyniam venit hyematum [Diocletianus:] eodemque tempore Maximianus quoque Cæsar inflammatus scelere advenit, ut ad persequendos Christianos instigaret senem vanum, qui jam principium fecerat. De M. P. cap. 10.

<sup>h</sup> Ergo habito inter se per totam hyemem consilio, cum nemo admitteretur . . . diu senex furori ejus repugnavit, ostendens, quam perniciosum esset inquietari orbem terræ, fundi

sanguinem multorum: illos libenter mori solere: satis esse, si palatinos tantum et milites ab ea religione prohiberet. Nec tamen desistere potuit præcipitis hominis insaniam. Ibid. cap. 11.

<sup>hh</sup> Quocirca multum, meo quidem judicio, de contumeliis et querimoniis detrahi debet, quibus et veteres et recentiores Imperatorem hunc obruunt. Peccabat, fateor, levitate, superstitione, timiditate: at multo tamen, quam vulgaris opinio fert, tolerabilius peccabat. Mosheim. ubi supr. p. 922. M. <sup>i</sup> H. E. l. viii. cap. 2. p. 294. B.

<sup>k</sup> Non dubito vero, malignam hanc voluntatem libros Christianorum delendi, Hieroclem, de quo diximus, Augustis injecisse. Certe, non hominum iudium, et rei Christianæ ignorantium, quales Maximianus, ejusque socer erant, sed eruditorum, et sacri codicis peritorum, qui quid illis traderetur, et quantam vim haberent ad Christianorum animoꝝ contra deorum cultum et superstitionem muniendos ex lectione eorum ipsi percipissent. Id. ib. p. 925.

men,

men, were the contrivers of this malignant order, and suggested it to the emperors. Mr. Mosheim is also of opinion, that <sup>1</sup> ecclesiastical history has greatly suffered by it. The precept in the edict might speak only of sacred books, or scriptures. But the officers employed in the execution, when they searched for sacred books, would lay hold of any writings, which they found in the places of Christian worship, or in the habitations of bishops or other Christians. The copies of the sacred books of the Old and the New Testament were now so numerous, that they could not be all found and destroyed. But of some Acts of Martyrs, Registers of church-affairs, Epistles of Bishops to each other, there might be few copies only, or perhaps one alone. If such papers were seized and thrown into the flames, they were irrecoverably lost.

Those observations are from Mr. Mosheim. I shall now add two or three others.

Obs. 3. Dioclesian's persecution was very grievous; indeed, it was the longest and the worst that the Christians had ever endured. This may appear from the particulars alleged above from Eusebius, though my accounts have been designedly brief, and therefore defective. Sulpicius Severus, as may be remembered, said, 'Never was the world more wasted by any war.' That observation is verified by the eighth and ninth books of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, together with his book Of the Martyrs of Palestine: containing the authentic accounts of a learned and eminent man, who was a contemporary, and an eye-witness of many of the cruelties related by him. I say, that observation may be verified by those authentic histories, without having recourse to spurious acts of martyrs, or any other legendary writings.

Sulpicius Severus adds: 'Nor ever had we a greater victory, than when we were not overcome by the slaughters of ten years.' Another true and just observation! For the patience and fortitude of the Christians of that time were invincible and admirable. Some of all orders, pastors of churches, and others, were presently terrified, and fell away; but many were faithful to death. They patiently endured calumnies, stripes, imprison-

<sup>1</sup> Ex Actis purgationis Felicis apud Baluzium Miscell. Tom. ii. p. 84. constat, epistolas etiam salatorias, quas episcopi mutuo sibi variis de rebus scribebant, combustas esse. Nam hæc in tabulariis etiam templorum reponi solebant. Hinc incredibilem Historia Christiana jacturam in hoc bello Diocletiano fecit. Nam ex

primis rerum Christianorum temporibus quæ supererant documenta, chartæ, epistolæ, leges, Acta Martyrum et Conciliorum, ex quibus antiqua Christianæ civitatis historia egregie illustrari potuisset, omnia in his turbis, plurima saltem, interierunt. Id. ib. p. 924, 925.

ments, maiming of members, exquisite tortures of every kind, and still persevered; and though many were taken off by cruel deaths of every kind, the number of the faithful was not diminished, but increased and multiplied under that heavy weight of afflictions.

Obf. 4. The revolution made in the Roman empire, in favour of the Christians, upon the conversion of Constantine, was a gracious dispensation of divine Providence; it put an end to scenes of cruelty, which are shocking to think of, and were disgraceful to human nature. The professors of the religion of Jesus had now endured many severe trials, and had approved their zeal and fidelity under them. They had been tried, and were *found faithful, and loved not their lives unto the death.* Rev. ii. 10. xii. 11. And thereby they had done great and lasting honour to the principles of their religion. Now, therefore, God appointed them rest from those troubles. *For, as it is said, Ps. cxxv. 3. the rod of the wicked shall not always rest upon the lot of the righteous, lest the righteous put forth their hands unto iniquity.*

Obf. 5. And lastly, the cruelties of Dioclesian's and other heathen persecutions, which have been endured by Christian people, may fill our minds with horror for persecution, and every degree of it.

Never let us be persecutors: never let us encourage or give countenance to persecution: never let the cruelties of heathen persecutions be practised in Christian countries.

If we would effectually secure ourselves from temptations to persecution, let us take care to derive our religion from the books of the Old and New Testament, without adding other doctrines, not found in them, as important parts of religion. Where transubstantiation, or other like absurdities are taught as articles of religion, there will be persecution. Ancient Gentilism could not stand before the light of the gospel. It was absurd, and could not be maintained by reason and argument. The Christians, therefore, were continually gaining ground. They drew men off from the temples, from sacrifices, from the religious solemnities, from public sports and entertainments. This was a provocation to heathen people, which they could not endure; they had recourse, therefore, to violence, and tried every possible way to discourage the progress of the Christian religion; and in the space of about two hundred and fifty years, from the emperor Nero to Maximin, there were ten, or more, heathen persecutions of the Christians: the last of which was the longest, and the worst of all; at the end of which Christianity prevailed. But if Gentilism had been revived, heathen persecutions would have been repeated, and the cruelties of former times would have been practised

over again, with equal, or, if possible, with redoubled rage and violence. The emperor Julian, when he became a heathen, though he was a man of wit and learning, and though he dressed up his scheme of Gentilism in as plausible a form as he was able, to recommend it to the judgments of men, could not help being a persecutor, like his admired Marcus Antoninus, and many others, his heathen ancestors and predecessors. So it will be always. An absurd religion cannot maintain itself by reason and argument: it needs, and will have recourse to force and violence for its support. But true religion, which is throughout reasonable, can rely upon its own intrinsic excellence, and those testimonials, which God, in his good Providence, has been pleased to afford it, as the proper evidences of its high original,

---

C H A P. XLI.

*A review of the foregoing period, from the beginning of the third century to the conversion of Constantine: with some general observations upon the state of Christianity under heathen emperors.*

I. I HAVE now given an account of the heathen writers of the third century, who have taken notice of the Christians: and I have made large extracts out of them, and transcribed many passages at length. It may be worth the while to recollect here what we have met with.

In Dion Cassius's noble work, *The History of the Romans*, published about the year 230, we have seen <sup>a</sup> another testimony to that important event, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish people in Judea by Vespasian and Titus. In him also we have seen <sup>b</sup> another testimony to Domitian's persecution of the Christians. From him also we <sup>c</sup> learn Nerva's favourable regard to them.

In Amelius, a Platonic philosopher, disciple of Plotinus, about the year 263, we have seen a very distinct and honourable testimony to St. John's <sup>d</sup> gospel.

That eminent critic Longinus, about the year 264, in his work, *Of the Sublime*, has made very honourable mention of Moses, the Jewish Lawgiver, and commends the style, in which he represents the creation of the <sup>e</sup> world. There is also a Fragment <sup>f</sup> ascribed to him, where the apostle Paul is mentioned to advantage.

<sup>a</sup> In this volume, p. 129 . . . 132.  
<sup>d</sup> p. 161 . . . 163.

<sup>e</sup> p. 166.

<sup>b</sup> p. 132 . . . 135.  
<sup>f</sup> p. 166, 167.

<sup>c</sup> p. 135.

And

And we have met with a passage in Diogenes Laërtius, <sup>e</sup> about the year 210, which gives great light to St. Paul's discourse at Athens, where he puts the Athenians in mind of an *altar* of theirs, *with an inscription to the Unknown God*.

The saying of Numenius, ' what is Plato, but Moses in Greek ?' is well known, and recorded in divers ancient <sup>b</sup> writers. But the time of Numenius appears to me uncertain. Nor is it clear, that he has at all referred to the affairs of Christians, or their scriptures.

The emperor Alexander Severus, whose reign began in the year 222, as we learn from Lampridius, <sup>l</sup> one of the Augustan writers, was favourable both to Jews and Christians, and had a respect for the Lord Jesus Christ. He had two private chapels, one more honourable than the other. In the first were placed the deified emperors, and also some eminently good men, and among them Christ, and Abraham, and Orpheus. Some other things of a like kind may be seen in his chapter, which need not be recollected here; but they are of use to shew that the Christians were then well known, and that their innocence, or freedom from licentious principles and great crimes, was manifest. And this emperor deserves to be commended for his moderation, and for the justness of his sentiments.

The emperor Philip, whose reign began in 244, and ended in 249, has been by some supposed to be a Christian. We have examined that question, and now refer our readers to what has been said upon it by divers learned <sup>k</sup> men.

The emperor Aurelian reigned from 270 to 275. Flavius Vopiscus, one of the Augustan writers, has preserved a part of a letter written by him to the senate at the beginning of his reign, in which the Christians are expressly <sup>i</sup> mentioned: which shews that the Christians were then well known to the Roman emperors, and to the Roman senate, and to all men.

A like observation may be made upon a story told by the same writer <sup>m</sup> concerning Heliogabalus, whose reign began in 218.

In this period were several learned men, who wrote against the Christians, and the Christian religion: one of whom is <sup>n</sup> Porphyry. He was born about the year 233. We have placed him as flourishing in the year 270. He was disciple of the celebrated Plotinus, and was himself a learned man, and a philosopher of the first rank. He published many books, some of which are still extant. His work against the Christians consisted of fifteen books, and seems to have been prolix, and carefully studied, and filled with a great deal of learning, and the quota-

<sup>e</sup> p. 111, 112.  
<sup>l</sup> p. 172, 173.

<sup>b</sup> p. 168.  
<sup>m</sup> p. 250.

<sup>i</sup> p. 121 . . . 124.

<sup>n</sup> See his chapter, p. 176, &c.

<sup>k</sup> p. 139 . . . 144

tions of divers authors not now extant. Rufinus \* calls him a determined enemy of Christ, and says he did his utmost to overthrow the Christian religion by his writings. His objections against Christianity were in esteem with heathen people for a great while, as we learn from Augustine and others; and his memory was in abhorrence with Christians, for the bitterness with which he had opposed them. His work was a violent attack upon our scriptures, both of the Old and the New Testament; as we can perceive by the fragments of his work still remaining in Christian writers, who have quoted him; at the same time they are a testimony to them; they bear witness to their antiquity, and to the great esteem which they were in with Christians; and if his work were still extant, it might be of farther use to us in that respect, and upon some other accounts. I have made a large collection of the remaining fragments of his work, to which I refer my readers, without adding any more observations here. But the work called *The Philosophy of Oracles*,<sup>p</sup> which has been quoted by some as his, I take to be a forgery; and I have assigned my reasons at large for that opinion.

At the beginning of Dioclesian's persecution, about the year 303, another<sup>q</sup> published a work against the Christians. We do not know his name, but he likewise was by profession a philosopher. His work was written in an insinuating manner, making fair pretences of good-will to the Christians, that he might recover them from error, and deliver them from the sufferings, to which they were exposed by a worship contrary to the laws. It seems to have been a large volume, for it consisted of three books; Lactantius flights it; but this philosopher's objections may have been sufficient to affect many of the common people among the Gentiles, and if it were now extant, it would be a great curiosity.

About the same time another work was written against the Christians by<sup>r</sup> Hierocles, a man of learning, and a person of authority and influence, as he was a magistrate; it was in two books. Nor did he take upon him the character of an enemy to the Christians; he aimed rather to be esteemed a kind and friendly counsellor and adviser. He was well acquainted with

\* Si nihil aliud est, vel de Porphyrio filere debuerat, qui specialis hostis Christi est, qui religionem Christianam, quantum in se fuit, penitus subvertere conatus est scriptis suis. Rufin. in Hieron. Invektiv. lib. ii. ap. Hieron T. 4. p. 418.

Nam Porphyrius tuus, dic quæso quid te docuit: qui adversum Christianos, et ad-

versum religionem nostram blasphemiarum volumina conscripsit? &c. Ib. p. 424.

... ipsum Porphyrium sequendo, qui adversum Christum, et adversus Deum libros impios ac sacrilegos scripsit. Id. ib. p. 422. p. 226. &c.

q p. 252. &c.

r p. 254: &c.

our scriptures, and made many objections against them; thereby bearing testimony to their antiquity, and to the great respect which was shewn to them by the Christians: for he has referred to both parts of the New Testament, the gospels and the epistles.

And by Dioclesian's edict, the Christian scriptures were ordered to be burnt when their temples were demolished: it was the first order of the kind; it shews, that our scriptures were then well known, and that the Gentile people were sensible of their importance: whether Hierocles was the adviser of that order we cannot say.

He did not deny the truth of our Saviour's miracles; but in order to weaken the argument which the Christians formed from them, in proof of our Saviour's divine authority and mission, he set up Apollonius Tyanæus as a rival, or superior to him: but it was a vain effort. We still have the Life of Apollonius, which Hierocles made use of, written by Philostratus; we are therefore able to pass a judgment upon his argument, and we can discern it to be very weak: for the works there ascribed to Apollonius are not equal to our Saviour's miracles, nor comparable with them: nor are the things ascribed to Apollonius written in a credible manner. And moreover, the history of him which Hierocles made use of, was not written till more than an hundred years after his death.

By Lactantius we are informed, that \* the famous lawyer Domitius Ulpian, about the year 222, in his book *Of the Duty of a Proconsul*, made a collection of all the edicts of former emperors against the Christians.

And we have now in this volume seen an account of all the persecutions endured by the Christians, from the year of our Lord 202, when the emperor Severus published his edict against the Christians, to the year 312, or 313, when Constantine and Licinius put an end to the persecution begun by Dioclesian.

The progress of the Christian religion in this period is abundantly attested: every thing bears witness to it. Porphyry says, that 'there<sup>t</sup> were many Christians and others who censured Plato, 'against whom Plotinus' [about the year 260 and before] 'often 'argued in his disputations, and also wrote a little book, which 'was entitled, *Against the Gnostics.*' Porphyry complained also, that 'since<sup>u</sup> Jesus had been honoured, none had received 'any publick benefit from the gods.' I presume, it could not be a very small number of Christians, in some obscure place, which so disgusted the gods, as to induce them to withhold their

\* p. 125.

<sup>t</sup> See p. 225.<sup>u</sup> p. 220.

gracious influences from the whole Roman empire. From his reflections upon Origen, \* who, as he says, ' had many admirers and followers,' it appears, that the Christians were then a numerous body of men.

If the number of the professors of the Christian religion had not been increased and multiplied, there would have been no persecutions, nor any adversary writers: those learned men and philosophers would have spared the labour of composing voluminous works against the Christian religion if it had few or no votaries. Persecutions likewise bear witness to the growing number of the Christians. Says the Author of the book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, near the beginning of his work: ' In ' the time of Nero, Peter came to Rome, and having wrought ' divers miracles by the power of God, he converted many to ' righteousness. Nero being informed of this, and hearing like- ' wise, that not only at Rome but every where else, many for- ' sook the worship of idols, and slighting antiquity went over ' to the new religion, he resolved to extirpate that doctrine, and ' was the first who persecuted the servants of God. At which ' time, by his order, Peter was crucified and Paul beheaded.'

Sulpicius Severus has expressed himself much after the same manner: I shall place a part of what he says below <sup>z</sup> without translating him.

And Maximin, one of the last persecuting emperors, in his letter to Sabinus above \* quoted, speaks to this purpose: " It is, " I am persuaded, well known to yourself, and to all men, how " that our lords and fathers, Dioclesian and Maximian, when " they saw that almost all mankind were forsaking the worship of " the gods, and going over to the sect of the Christians, did " wisely ordain, that all men, who had forsaken the worship of " their immortal gods, should be brought back to the worship of " the gods by public pains and penalties." Where the great increase of men professing Christianity is expressly assigned as

\* p. 182. &c. y Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit, et editis quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei, data sibi ab eo potestate faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, deoque templum fidele ac stabile collocavit. Quare ad Neronem delata, cum animadverteret, non modo Romæ, sed ubique quotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum, et ad religionem novam, damnata vetustate, transire, ut erat execrabilis ac nocens tyrannus, profilivit ad excidendum cæleste templum, delendamque justitiam, et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos,

Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit. &c. De Mortib. Persec. cap. 2.

<sup>z</sup> Interea, abundante jam Christianorum multitudine accidit, ut Roma incendio conflagraret, Nerone apud Antium constituto. . . . Hoc initio in Christianos sæviri cœptum. Post etiam datis legibus religio vetabatur: palamque edictis propositis Christianum esse non licebat. Tum Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati: quorum uni cervix gladio desecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est. Sulp. Sever. l. ii. cap. 29.

\* See p. 317, 318.

the reason of inflicting pains and penalties upon them at that time: "that they might be brought back to the old religion." And what is here so clearly owned, must be supposed to have always been the real occasion of those violent methods, which had been so often made use of to check the increase of the number of Christians, and to root them out, if possible, and all traces and footsteps of their religion. And the several edicts of all the persecuting emperors are proofs, that the Christian religion was continually making progress, and gaining ground.

Let this suffice for a review of the argument of this volume.

II. I now proceed to make some observations upon the state of Christianity under heathen emperors; and they shall be these three.

It was all along in a state of persecution:

Nevertheless it prevailed greatly;

Which is honourable to the religion of Jesus, and to the professors of it at that time.

I. Christianity, from the time of its first appearance in the world, was all along in a state of persecution till the conversion of Constantine.

I forbear to shew here, how it was opposed and persecuted after the resurrection of Jesus by the Jewish rulers at Jerusalem, and in Judea, and then by Herod Agrippa when king of Israel, and afterwards by other Jews in Judea, and out of it. Upon these things I do not now insist, which may be seen in the Acts of the apostles, and the epistles of the New Testament, and also in the second chapter of the seventh volume of this work, where was shewn 'the treatment given to the first Christians by the unbelieving Jews.' I am now only to consider the state of Christianity in Gentile countries, and under heathen emperors, from the time that it began to be preached among the Gentiles, and to make some progress among them, from about the middle of the first century to the end of this period, when Constantine embraced the Christian religion, and by edicts gave leave to Christians to worship God according to their own judgment and conviction.

St. Luke, in the Acts of the apostles, has taken notice of some difficulties which St. Paul met with in preaching the gospel in Gentile cities; particularly at Lystra in Lycaonia, ch. xiv. 19, 20. at Philippi, ch. xvi. 19 . . . 24. St. Paul himself speaks of some of his sufferings, 2 Cor. xi. 23 . . . 26. particularly at 25. *thrice was I beaten with rods*: meaning, as I suppose, by Roman magistrates: though St. Luke has mentioned one instance only, which was at Philippi, as just mentioned, when both

Paul

Paul and Silas underwent that hard usage. But there were no imperial edicts issued against the Christians, before that of Nero in the year of Christ 64 or 65; at which time the two apostles, Peter and Paul, were put to death.

It has now of a long time been a prevailing opinion, that Christians suffered ten persecutions under heathen emperors: nevertheless, there have been some exceptions made to this opinion by a learned writer, who is deservedly in great repute. ‘If you speak,’ he says, ‘of heavy persecutions that prevailed every where, there were not so many, if of lesser troubles, there were more than ten. The number of ten general persecutions is no more than a popular error which arose in the fifth century, destitute of good foundation in history, and founded in a fanciful interpretation of some texts of the Old Testament, where the Christian persecutions have been thought to be foretold. Lactantius, in his book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, makes but six persecutions: Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History* does not number the persecutions, though nine persecutions may be made out from it. Upon the whole, the notion of ten heathen persecutions had its rise in the fifth century.’

Upon all which I must say, that in the book *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*, whether written<sup>b</sup> by Lactantius, or another, we cannot expect to see an account of all the persecutions which Christians had suffered in former times. His book is entitled, *Of the Deaths of Persecutors*; his design therefore is to speak of such persecutors only as came to an untimely end: accordingly he writes of the persecution of Nero, Domitian, Decius, Valerian, and Aurelian, who suffered a violent death. Of their per-

<sup>a</sup> Numeramus a multis jam sæculis decem ejusmodi persecutiones. Verum non suffragatur huic numero vetus rerum Christianarum historia. Si graviores intelligas persecutiones, et per universum orbem Romanum pertinentes, pauciores sunt, quam decem: si minores, et provinciales, multo plures sunt, quam decem. Auctores hujus numeri non cum in historia invenerunt, sed historiam ad partes quasdam sacri codicis accommodarunt, quibus persecutiones Christianorum prædictas esse opinabantur. . . . Perantiqua est, et a quinto sæculo ad nos ducta sententia, de decem Christianorum sub Imperatoribus a Christo averis persecutionibus. Quam ego tamen omnes veri amantes popularibus et fundamento destitutis erroribus, meo periculo ascribere jubeo. Auctores ejus ignoti

sunt. Hoc vero certum est, eos hanc sententiam non ab historia traditam accepisse, sed parum felicibus auspiciis ex divinis libris eruisse, atque historiæ reluctanti obtrusisse. Quarto post natum servatorem sæculo numerus persecutionum Christianarum nondum definitus erat. Lactantius libello de *Mortibus Persecutorum* sex tantum numerat. Eusebius, in *Historia Ecclesiastica*, mala quæ Christianis evenerant, recenset, numerum malorum non addit. At novem tamen ex eo Christianorum calamitates colligi quodammodo possunt. Totidem sæculo quinto Sulpicius Severus commemorat. Mosheim. de *Reb. Christianor.* p. 97, 98.

<sup>b</sup> That Lactantius is not the author of that little book, was shewn Vol. iv. p. 37—41.

secutions

secutions he gives a brief account in the first chapters of his book; and then he proceeds to Dioclesian's persecution, upon which he enlargeth. Here he computes four several persecutors, Dioclesian, Maximian Hercules, Maximian Galerius, and Maximin. And according to his account Dioclesian <sup>e</sup> met with great misfortunes, Maximian <sup>d</sup> was strangled by order of Constantine for base treachery, and an attempt upon his life; Galerius <sup>e</sup> and Maximin <sup>f</sup> died miserably by grievous distempers, supposed to have been inflicted upon them by way of judgment from heaven, for their inhumanity to the Christians. That is the design and substance of that book; and from it no argument can be formed for determining the number of persecutions which Christians endured from heathen emperors.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, does not number the great afflictions which the Christians had endured; but he has mentioned eleven persecutors, though the persecutions of some of them may have been of but short duration. The persecutors mentioned by Eusebius are these: Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Marcus Antoninus, Severus, <sup>g</sup> Maximin the first, or the Thracian, Decius, <sup>h</sup> Gallus, <sup>i</sup> Valerian, <sup>k</sup> Aurelian, Dioclesian, and his colleagues.

The several persecutions of heathen emperors did not come to an end before the beginning of the fourth century; they could not be numbered till they were all over. Orosius <sup>l</sup> counts ten persecutions, and expressly calls Dioclesian's the tenth and last. Augustine likewise reckons ten heathen persecutions: he numbers them in this manner: <sup>m</sup> the first Nero's, the second Domitian's, the third Trajan's, the fourth Marcus Antoninus's, the fifth Severus's, the sixth Maximin's, the seventh Decius's, the eighth Valerian's, the ninth Aurelian's, the tenth Dioclesian's. These two learned writers lived partly in the fourth and partly in the fifth century: and it may be thence argued, that this way of computing was in use before the end of the fourth century; and indeed we can prove it. Jerom's book Of Illustrious Men, or Ecclesiastical Writers, was published in the year 392, and he there sometimes numbers the persecutions. In the chapter of

<sup>e</sup> De Mort. Persecut. cap. 26.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 30.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 49.

<sup>h</sup> l. vii. cap. 1.

<sup>k</sup> l. vii. cap. 30. p. 283. B.

<sup>l</sup> Interea Diocletianus in Oriente, Maximianus Hercules in occidente vastari ecclesias, affligi interficique Christianos, decimo post Neronem loco præceperunt, quæ persecutio omnibus fere ante actis diuturnior

atque immanior fuit. &c. Oros. l. vii. cap. 25. Vid. et cap. 27.

<sup>m</sup> Primum quippe computant a Nerone quæ facta est, secundum a Domitiano, a Trajano tertiam, quartam ab Antonino, a Severo quintam, sextam a Maximino, a Decio septimam, octavam a Valeriano, ab Aureliano nonam, decimam a Diocletiano et Maximiano. De Civ. Dei. l. xviii. cap. 52.

St. John he calls <sup>n</sup> Domitian's the second persecution; in the chapter of Ignatius <sup>o</sup> he expressly mentions Trajan's persecution, though without numbering it; in the chapter of Polycarp <sup>p</sup> he says, he suffered in the time of the fourth persecution under Marcus Antoninus. He expressly calls Decius's <sup>q</sup> the seventh; and Cyprian's martyrdom he placeth <sup>r</sup> in the eighth persecution, in the time of Valerian and Gallienus: and in his Latin edition of the Chronicle of Eusebius are ten persecutions, all expressly mentioned and numbered as in Augustine's.

There may have been some affectation in numbering the persecutions. Orosius <sup>s</sup>, and some others, have found out a way to compare the ten persecutions of the Christians with the ten plagues of Egypt, which is trifling: but the number of persecutions has a foundation in history, as we have seen in the several chapters of this and the preceding volume. Some may compute nine, others ten, or eleven, but ten was a round number, and has generally prevailed: I think there were eleven; it seems to me that there is good ground to say so from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History.

The primitive Christians, I think, called those troubles persecutions, which were ordered by edicts of emperors. Sulpicius Severus, having given an account of Nero's cruelty toward the Christians at Rome, under a pretence that the city had been set on fire by them, adds: 'That <sup>t</sup> was the beginning of the cruel proceedings against the Christians. Afterwards the Christian religion was forbidden by laws; and by public edicts it was declared, that no man might be a Christian.' Of such edicts or rescripts there were ten or eleven: and I suppose; that all persecutions ordered by imperial edicts were general; they were intended for the whole Roman empire subject to their government, but possibly they did not all actually reach to every part of the empire. The edict of Maximin the Thracian <sup>u</sup> is said to have been 'against the clergy only,' and his is sometimes called a local persecution: nevertheless, I think, it must have been general, and intended against the Clergy every where. There is this proof of it: that Ambrose and Protoctetus were then imprisoned:

<sup>n</sup> De V. l. c. 9.

<sup>o</sup> De V. l. c. 16.

cere, ob confessionem Christi, martyrio coronatur. Ib. cap. 62.

<sup>r</sup> Passus

<sup>p</sup> Postea vero, regnante Marco Antonio, et L. Aurelio Commodo, quarta post Neronem persecutione, Smyrnae, sedente Praefensule, et universo populo in Amphitheatro adversus eum personante igni traditus est. Ib. cap. 17.

sub Valeriano et Gallieno principibus, persecutione octava. Ib. cap. 67.

<sup>s</sup> Oros. l. vii. cap. 27.

<sup>t</sup> Hoc

<sup>q</sup> Septima autem persecutione sub Decio, quo tempore Babylas Antiochiae passus est, Alexander Celsus Caesarem, et clausus in car-

initio in Christianos saeviri coeptum Post etiam datis legibus religio vetabatur: palamque edictis propositis, Christianum esse non licebat. Sul. Sever. l. ii. cap. 29. Cleric.

<sup>u</sup> See p. 137, 138.

this last was presbyter at Cæsarea in Palestine, and Ambrose is supposed to have been deacon in that or some other church not far off: and Orosius says, that this persecution was particularly intended against the presbyter Origen. But all those eminent Christians lived in Syria, at a great distance from the capital of the empire; the edict, therefore, may have been intended against the clergy every where.

I apprehend I need not say any thing more here, nor make any recapitulation of what we have seen: but I would refer my readers to the accounts of the heathen persecutions which have been given in this and the preceding volume; which, I hope I may say, are authentic, and will be allowed to be so: and we have seen genuine copies of divers of the imperial edicts which were sent by them to the proconsuls, or other governors of provinces.

But it may be said, that all these ten persecutions will not prove, that Christians were all along in a state of persecution till the conversion of Constantine: for the lives of some of those persecuting emperors were short, and when they were dead their edicts were little regarded; and then peace might be restored to the churches.

Undoubtedly there is some truth in what is here alleged; therefore I shall add some farther observations for clearing up this point, and for shewing that they might still be in a state of persecution.

For Trajan's edict was never abrogated, but was still in being; and thereby the presidents were required to pronounce sentence of death upon all who were brought before them, and accused of Christianity, unless they denied themselves to be Christians, and made out the truth of what they said. And many might be accused by the spiteful and ignorant vulgar, as well as by other malicious people.

And some judges or governors of provinces might act without law, or contrary to it, as Pliny<sup>x</sup> had done. According to the edict of Trajan, Christians were 'not to be sought for:' but the president at Lyons, in the time of Marcus Antoninus, 'issued out public orders, that strict searches should be made for them.' And it is manifest, that many Christians suffered in the time of Adrian and Titus Antoninus, though there were then no laws against them except the edict of Trajan: and though there were some laws in their favour, particularly the<sup>z</sup> Rescript of Adrian to Minucius Fundanus proconsul of Asia, which was also to be

<sup>x</sup> See Vol. vii. p. 303, 304, 318, 319, 359 . . . 361.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 433.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p.

a rule to other governors of provinces, and the <sup>a</sup> Letter of Titus Antoninus to the states of Asia, and other <sup>b</sup> letters to the Larissæans, the Thessalonians, the Athenians, and all the Greeks.

We may do well to recollect here the history of Apollonius, a Roman senator, who suffered martyrdom in the reign of Commodus, in the year of our Lord 186, or 187, or thereabout; of which I gave some account <sup>c</sup> formerly, but shall now transcribe more distinctly that chapter of Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History: where, after having given an account of the sufferings of Christians in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, and then of the works of Irenæus, and some other Christian writers, he says: ‘ At <sup>d</sup> that time, in the reign of Commodus, there was a happy change in our affairs, and by the divine favour the churches enjoyed peace and tranquillity throughout the whole world. And by the same word of the gospel, many of all ranks were converted to the worship of the God of the universe: so that at Rome itself, many who were eminent for their riches, and for their descent, did with their whole families, and their kindred, embrace the way of salvation. But that was a thing not to be borne by the evil dæmon, envious of the happiness of men, and an enemy to all goodness. He therefore arms himself again, and sets his instruments to work against us; and he brings before the judgment-seat Apollonius, one of the faithful, a man celebrated for learning and philosophy. A wicked wretch, one of his ministers, well fitted for such a purpose, is stirred up to accuse him: but that miserable man having brought his accusation unseasonably, when there was an imperial edict <sup>e</sup> appointing capital punishment for such things, had his legs broke, and was put to death by order of Perennis the judge. And the admirable man <sup>f</sup> the martyr, of whom I am speaking, being desired by the judge to give an account of himself to the senate, complied, and delivered an elegant apology for the faith for which he suffered, before the senate: and then, as by decree of the senate, was condemned to die; there being, as it seems, an ancient law, that if any Christian were accused in a court of justice he should be punished, unless he denied himself to be a Christian.’ Eusebius then adds, ‘ that they who are desirous to read what Apollonius said before the judge, and his answers to the interrogatories of Perennis [præfect of the prætorium], and his whole apology in the senate, they might see them in the collection which he had made of the ancient

<sup>a</sup> Ib. p. 390, 391.

<sup>b</sup> p. 391.

<sup>c</sup> See Vol. vii. p. 391.

<sup>f</sup> Ο δὲ

<sup>e</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 303, 304.

γὰρ θεοφιλεστάτος μάρτυς. . . .

<sup>d</sup> Euseb. H. E. l. v. cap. 21. p. 189.

‘martyrdoms.’ But that is entirely lost, to our great grief: for those Acts of the martyrdom of Apollonius, if they were extant, we may reasonably think, would be instructive as well as entertaining.

This shews, that in times called times of ‘peace and tranquillity’ for the churches, some might suffer capital punishment as Christians.

The ancient law to which Eusebius here refers, probably is Trajan’s edict concerning the Christians, and is so understood by <sup>b</sup> Valesius.

The edict of Severus against the Christians was not published before the year of our Lord 202; but from Tertullian’s apology, published in the year 198, or thereabout, it plainly appears, that the Christians had suffered persecution for some while before the publication of that edict. Indeed it appears to have been a day of heavy affliction to the Christians, as may be seen in what we have already written in this <sup>b</sup> volume.

And by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, we are fully assured, that <sup>1</sup> there was in that city a persecution under the emperor Philip, and that for a whole year the Christians in that place underwent a great variety of heavy sufferings, before the publication of the edict of Decius.

And my readers will here recollect the remarkable history of Marinus before related in this volume, <sup>b</sup> who suffered martyrdom at Cæsarea, after that Valerian’s persecuting edict had been revoked by his son Gallienus.

These things are sufficient to assure us, that the Christians in this period were generally in suffering circumstances, and were always liable to suffer.

Nevertheless, after all it is not to be supposed, that persecution was always violent and uninterrupted; there might be some abatements of those troubles, and some seasons of rest and peace: what they were, may be collected from what we have seen in this and the preceding volume; and I shall here reckon them up in a summary manner. We reckon, that *Nerva* was favourable to them, who, when he repealed the other acts of Domitian, repealed also his law against the Christians. His successor Trajan published an edict against the Christians, which, as has been often hinted already, never was abrogated, but continued in force as long as Heathenism subsisted in the Roman empire. Nevertheless we can perceive, that in the reigns of Adrian and Titus

<sup>a</sup> Legem igitur, seu rescriptum Trajani ad Plinium secundum intelligo, in quo cavetur, Christianos quidem inquirendos non esse, oblatos vero puniri oportere. Vals. in loc. <sup>b</sup> See p. 106, 107.

<sup>c</sup> p. 146 . . . 148.

<sup>d</sup> p. 158, 159.

Antonini,

Antoninus, there were some edicts, or rescripts, which were favourable to them; though during those very reigns many Christians still suffered in almost every part of the empire. They also received some favour and indulgence from Alexander Severus and Philip. They might also enjoy peace and tranquillity in the reigns of Commodus and Caracalla, who did not much concern themselves about the affairs of religion. The first years of Valerian, and the reign of Gallienus, after Valerian's captivity, were favourable to them; as likewise the former part of the reign of Dioclesian, when the <sup>1</sup> Roman empire was disturbed by enemies on every side.

In such seasons as these, it is reasonable to believe that the Christians would exert themselves, and considerable accessions of new converts might be made to them. So it is said, Acts ix. 31. *Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria: occasioned by <sup>m</sup> the consternation, into which the Jewith people were thrown by Caligula's order to have his statue set up in the temple at Jerusalem: and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.*

When therefore I say, that all this while 'Christianity was in a state of persecution;' I am willing that proposition should be understood in a mild and qualified sense: We now proceed.

2. 'Nevertheless it prevailed.'

Of this we have seen good evidence in Heathen, as well as in Christian writers; which must be reckoned <sup>n</sup> very wonderful, admitting all the softenings and qualifications in the forementioned proposition, that can be asked, or desired. From small beginnings it had mightily prevailed and increased in a short †† time; and Christians were very numerous, in every part of the empire,

<sup>1</sup> Ita cum per omnem orbem terrarum res turbatae essent, et Carausius in Britannia rebellaret, Achillaus in Ægypto. Africanam Quirquentiani infestarent, Narsus Oceanum bellum inferret: Diocletianus Maximianum Herculium ex Cæsare fecit Augustum, Constantium et Maximinum Cæsares. &c. Eutrop. l. ix. cap. 22. Conf. Victor. de Cæsare. et Epitome. c. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Ita per omnes Romani Imperii fines turbationum fragores concrepuit. Carausio rebellante in Britannia, Achillaus in Ægypto, cum et Africanam Quirquentiani infestarent, Narsus etiam Oceanum bellum inferret. Diocletianus per motus, Maximianum Herculium ex Cæsare fecit Augustum. &c. Oros. l. vii. c. 25.

<sup>m</sup> See Vol. i. p. 97—100.

<sup>n</sup> Hoc temporum fractu, mirum est, quantum invaluerit Religio Christiana! Sulp. Sever. l. ii. cap. 33. al. 49.

†† Now were fulfilled those prophetic parables of the first founder of this religion: Matt. xiii. 31 . . . 33. *The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and hid in his field. Which indeed is the least of all seeds, but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. Another parable spake he unto them: The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.* Compare Mark iv. 30 . . . 32. Luke xiii. 18 . . . 21.

before the conversion of Constantine. Though they never had the princes of this world on their side, and from their first original they had endured a variety of difficulties, and several open persecutions, and now were under a severe persecution, which had raged with great violence for several years in most parts of the empire; some have imagined it a suspicion not altogether without foundation, that a great prince may have joined himself to them from considerations of <sup>o</sup> interest. At least he perceived that he might do it, without dreading any bad consequences from the Gentile people in the empire.

Nor were they considerable only for their numbers: they were also respectable for their quality. There now were among them, and always had been, men eminent for their skill in every part of literature, who wrote some in the Greek, others in the Roman language, and with uncommon purity and elegance: as appears from their works still remaining.

3. and lastly, 'This is honourable to the religion of Jesus, and to the professors of it at that time.'

The contention was between God and idols; and the cause of God prevailed. Many in every part of the empire *turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his son from heaven, even Jesus, who delivers us from the wrath to come.*

1 Thess. i. 9. 10. 'The design of whose coming is to bring men to repentance, and reclaim them from idolatry, and all other evil practices, and thereby to deliver his faithful followers from the future misery, which will be the portion of all wicked and impenitent men, and to bestow upon them everlasting happiness and salvation.'

Many there were at that time who were inquisitive, and open to conviction; they therefore seriously attended to what was proposed to them, and impartially weighed the evidences of what was said. They forsook the error of their past way of worship; they embraced, and professed the Christian doctrine, notwithstanding many difficulties and discouragements, and then recommended it to others.

Our blessed Lord, in one of his beautiful parables, has expressed himself after this manner: *The kingdom of heaven, the state of things under the gospel dispensation, is like unto a certain king, who made a marriage for his son; and he sent forth his servants*

o Avant que trois siècles se soient écoulés depuis la mort de J. C. le parti des Chrétiens est déjà si fort, qu'un Empereur l'embraße sans craindre celui des Payens. Il semble même, que loin d'affoiblir par

là sa puissance, il l'augmenta, et la fortifia par ce moyen. Sermons de S. Werenfels. p. 27. 1723.

That passage is quoted Vol. iv. p. 161. where are other like observations.

to call them that were bidden to the wedding, and they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come unto the marriage. But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandize: and the remnant took his servants, and intreated them spitefully, and slew them. Mat. xxii. 1 . . . 6.

This parable may have been primarily intended to represent the conduct of the Jewish people in the time of our Saviour, and his apostles; but it is a just description of the temper and conduct of Gentiles also, and of all men in general. The things of this world are preferred to those of another, and secular affairs are more minded than the things of religion. Few only are engaged in the search of truth: religious truth is the least regarded, and the most opposed of any. This truth may be hard to be found; when it is discerned, and obtained by impartial inquiries and serious meditation, it may be dangerous to own and profess it. The blessed Jesus therefore, our divine master, says again, Mat. xiii. 44 . . . 46. *The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field: the which when a man has found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchantman seeking goodly pearls; who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.*

In the first ages of Christianity truth bore a high price; nevertheless there were those who bought it, and would not part with it upon any consideration whatever. Prov. xxiii. 23. Nor was this distraction or obstinacy, as through mistake it is called by the propraetor<sup>p</sup> Pliny, and the emperor<sup>q</sup> Marcus Antoninus. It was a just and reasonable resolution; it is agreeable to all sound philosophy, and the sentiments of all philosophers, who have considered the obligations of human conduct, that<sup>r</sup> we ought to suffer death rather than deny the truth, of which we are persuaded. And our Lord has expressed himself clearly upon this point, and without reserve, Matt. x. 32, 33. *Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven.* And he has given us full assurance that none shall be losers by fidelity to him, or by any act of self-denial for the sake of him and his gospel. And he said to his disciples, Luke xviii. 29, 30. Matt. xix. 29. *Verily I say unto you there is no man, who has left house, or parents, or*

<sup>p</sup> See Vol. vii. p. 292.

<sup>q</sup> Ib. p. 398.

<sup>r</sup> Ib. p. 400, 401.

*brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come everlasting life. Mark x: 29, 30. He has himself engaged in this warfare, and knows by experience what it may cost; and therefore he has sometimes expressed himself after this manner. John xvi. 33. In the world ye will have tribulation: but be of good cheer: I have overcome the world. Again: Rev. iii. 21. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.*

If any of the first Christians were too forward, and needlessly exposed themselves to sufferings, they are not to be vindicated; for they acted contrary to repeated precepts of Jesus himself. *Behold, says he to his disciples, I send you forth as sheep among wolves. Be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves: and, when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another. Matt. x. 16, 23.*

But I do not think that they often transgressed those rules. I am rather of opinion that they were generally mindful of them, and paid them due regard. We have seen examples of it in <sup>s</sup> Polycarp and his people, in <sup>t</sup> Cyprian bishop of Carthage, in the <sup>u</sup> Christians at Alexandria, during the persecution of Valerian, and in the Christians <sup>x</sup> living in Pontus and Cappadocia, in the time of Maximin the Thracian. Other instances of their discretion might be alleged.

The Christians of the first three centuries were not perfect nor infallible: they had their failings and their errors; nor were they altogether free from strife and contention: but there were among them many men of sincere and undissembled virtue, and some eminent therein, who were shining examples of every thing excellent and commendable in human life. They were quiet and peaceable, and obedient to magistrates in all things appertaining to their <sup>a</sup> jurisdiction. They <sup>b</sup> prayed for the Roman emperors, and for the officers under them, and for the prosperity of the empire. They were kind to each other, and to <sup>c</sup> strangers. 'Our affair,' said the ancient <sup>d</sup> apologists Justin Martyr and Athe-

<sup>s</sup> Ib. p. 414. <sup>t</sup> Ib. 403. and in this volume, p. 155. and vol. iii. p. 136, 137.

<sup>u</sup> See here in this volume, p. 153.

<sup>x</sup> As before, p. 138.

<sup>a</sup> See Vol. vii. p. 312.

<sup>b</sup> Oramus etiam pro Imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum, ac potestatibus, pro statu seculi, pro mora finis. Tertull. ap. cap. 39. cited above, in vol. vii. p. 317. And see here in this volume, p. 149, 152, 155.

<sup>c</sup> Instances of both those kinds of gene-

rosity to such as were in affliction, may be seen in the chapter of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, vol. iii. p. 138, 139. and in the chapter of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, vol. iii. p. 64, 65. and here at p. 153. See also the chapter of Lucian, of Samosata, p. 71. <sup>d</sup> Ου γαρ μελέη λούων, αλλ' επιδειξει και διδασκαλιαν εργασιων ημετερων. Athen. p. 37. B. Vid. et p. 12. A. et Justin. ad Gr. Coh. p. 53. B.

nagoras, 'lies not in words, but in works.' And Lactantius, so low as the beginning of the fourth century, could say, 'the great concern of our people is to be holy and unblamable in their lives.' Pliny has borne an honourable and ample testimony to the good design of their religious 'assemblies; and they were remarkable for their patience and fortitude under sufferings for the principles which they had embraced: by all which they glorified God, edified each other, and were continually making converts from among their Gentile neighbours, and even from among such as hitherto had been their enemies.

If afterwards Christians altered for the worse: if they departed from *the faith once delivered to the saints*, Jude ver 3: if they admitted into their belief and profession corrupt mixtures of human invention: if instead of being persecuted themselves, they persecuted other men: or, if they persecuted one another for difference in speculative opinions, of little importance: or if they did any thing else contrary to the purity of the doctrine of the gospel, we shall be obliged to acknowledge it without partiality, when we see the proofs of it.

And indeed, Chrysostom has observed, 'that <sup>g</sup> Christianity rather declines under Christian emperors; so far is it from being cherished by the honours and preferments of this world: but it thrives most when it is persecuted, and lies under worldly discouragements.' And said Sulpicius Severus not long <sup>h</sup> ago, speaking of Dioclesian's persecution, 'Glorious martyrdoms were then as earnestly contended for, as bishoprics have been since sought by ambitious men.'

We may do well therefore to emulate the best times, and the sincerest disciples of Jesus Christ, whom we have taken for our master and guide in the things of religion: and we may sometimes recollect what our Lord said *before Pontius Pilate, therein witnessing a good confession. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.* 1 Tim. vi. 13. John xviii. 37.

Let us then carefully attend to that word of the gospel which was first *preached every where*, by men chosen and appointed, and fully qualified for that purpose, Mark xvi. 20. *the Lord himself working with them, and confirming it with signs following*: and has been since recorded by his faithful apostles and evangelists. Amen.

<sup>e</sup> Nostro autem populo, quid horum possit cogeri, cujus omnis religio est, sine peccato, et sine macula vivere? Inst. l. v.

cap. 9. sub fin.

<sup>f</sup> Vol. vii. p. 293.

<sup>g</sup> De S. Bab. contr. Gentil. T. ii. p. 548.

Bened.

<sup>h</sup> p. 297.

## L A R G E C O L L E C T I O N

## O F A N C I E N T

## J E W I S H A N D H E A T H E N T E S T I M O N I E S.

[VOL. IV: FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLXVII. CONTAINING THE TESTIMONIES OF HEATHEN WRITERS, OF THE FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH CENTURIES. TO WHICH IS ADDED, THE STATE OF GENTILISM UNDER CHRISTIAN EMPERORS.]

## C H A P. XLII.

## C H A L C I D I U S.

I. *His time, work, and character.* II. *His testimony to the appearance of an extraordinary star at the time of our Saviour's nativity, with remarks.*

I. CHALCIDIUS translated into Latin the former part of the *Timæus* of Plato, and added a prolix commentary of his own upon it; in which he shews a great deal of learning, and good skill in the sentiments of the ancient philosophers. This work is inscribed to *Osius*, or *Hosius*, supposed to be the bishop of Corduba in Spain, and a principal member of the council of Nice in the year 325, but without any intimation of his character, as bishop, or ecclesiastic, or Christian.

And the time and character of this author are uncertain. By some he has been supposed to be deacon or arch-deacon in the church of Carthage; others think he was an heathen. According to *Humphrey Hody*<sup>a</sup> he was a Gentile, well acquainted with Christian writings. *Beaufobre*<sup>b</sup> calls him a Christian philosopher, and intimate friend of *Hosius*; and, as he says, he<sup>c</sup> joined Christianity with Platonism. *Cave*<sup>d</sup> is at an absolute uncer-

<sup>a</sup> Chalcidius, Commentator in *Timæum* Platonis, ipse quidem Gentilis, sed in libris Christianorum versatus . . . *Hod. De Bibl. Textib. Origin.* l. iii. p. 1. cap. 4. p. 299. Vid. et cap. vii. p. 310.

<sup>b</sup> Chalcidius donc, Philosophe Chrétien, et intime Ami- d' *Osius*, n' admettoit pas seulement l' eternité de matière, mais . . . *Hist de Manich.* Tom. 2. p. 238.

<sup>c</sup> Chalcidius, qui ajoutoit le Christianisme

au Platonisme, &c. *Ib.* p. 469. *Conf.* Tom. i. p. 478, 479.

<sup>d</sup> De hac re pridem me monuit *Sellerus* noster. Et cum in hanc quidem sententiam viros quosdam non indoctos propendere video, locum ei inter scriptores ecclesiasticos non denegavimus. Me certe *prophetæ* fateor; neque enim satis constat, philosophum solum Platonium fuisse, an etiam Christianum. &c. *Cav. H. L.* p. 199.

tainty about his real character; he knows not whether he was a Gentile or a Christian. Fabricius, the last editor of Chalcidius, publisheth him as <sup>e</sup> a Christian, who wrote near the beginning of the fourth century; and has <sup>f</sup> endeavoured to answer objections. Nevertheless Mosheim <sup>g</sup> still hesitates.

I shall, after others, take notice of some difficulties; for <sup>h</sup> Chalcidius seems to approve of the divinations of Gentilism, and to allow them to be of use for discovering futurities. He <sup>i</sup> quotes Moses, as a wise man, and ‘as said’ to have divine inspiration, as well as human knowledge. However, that expression ‘as said, ut ferunt,’ Fabricius <sup>k</sup> thinks need not to be understood to denote any uncertainty in the author’s mind.

It ought to be observed by us likewise, that he <sup>l</sup> has quoted Solomon’s Book of Proverbs once or twice, and also the words of Ecclesiasticus, ch. xxix. 21.

I think it must be allowed that there is some difficulty in determining this writer’s true character; Fabricius <sup>m</sup> himself has acknowledged as much, and that he may be compared to another author mentioned by Photius, whose character was doubtful: his manner of writing not clearly shewing what was his religion, whether Christianity or Gentilism.

I dare not be positive; but to me it seems, that he was a polite Platonic philosopher, who was willing to be upon good terms

<sup>e</sup> Chalcidii Christiani scriptoris, qui sub quarti seculi initia vixit. Fabric. p. 225. ad calcem Operum S. Hippolyti. Hamburg. 1716.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Fabric. Annot. in Chalcidii Prolog. p. 226. et Bib. Lat. lib. iii. cap. 7. Tom. i. p. 554.

<sup>g</sup> Vid. De turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesiâ. § 31. p. 165. &c. et Institution. Hist. Eccl. Sec. 4. P. 1. cap. 1. p. 149, 150.

<sup>h</sup> Quæ cuncta observatione, scientiâ, artificiosâ quoque solertiâ colliguntur. Aut enim alitum volatu, aut extis, aut oraculis, homines præmonentur: prædicente aliquo propitio dæmone, qui sit eorum omnium, quæ deinceps sequuntur, sciis. Chalcid. in Tim. cap. 7. § 183. p. 346. al. p. 275.

<sup>i</sup> Hebræi sylvam generatam, esse confitentur. Quorum sapientissimus Moyse non humanâ facundiâ, sed divinâ, ut ferunt, inspiratione vegetatus, in eo libro, qui De Genitura mundi censetur, ab exordio sic est præfatus, juxta interpretationem septuaginta prudentum. Ib. cap. 13. § 274. p. 380. al. p. 372.

<sup>k</sup> Verba, ut ferunt, non dubitantis sunt, sed Hebræorum sententiam exponentis.

Fabric. not. (d) p. 380.

<sup>l</sup> Tum initii multas esse significationes, ut *Initium sapientiæ timorem Domini esse*, Salomon dixit. [Prov. i. 7.] . . . Atque etiam in præconio sapientiæ cælestis auctor: *Initium vitæ panis et aqua, et tunica, inquit, et domus idonea velandis pudendis*. [Sirach. xxix. 21.] . . . Est tamen unum rerum omnium initium, de quo Salomo in Proverbiis. *Creavit me, inquit, Deus progressionis suæ semitam*. . . [Prov. viii. 22. . . . 25.] Chalcid. cap. 13. § 274. p. 380. al. p. 373.

<sup>m</sup> Chalcidius V. C. et gnavissimus veteris philosophiæ, dubium reliquit lectoribus suis, utrum Christo nomen dederit, fueritne Hebræus, an Ethnicam probaverit superstitionem. Possis de eorum uti verbis, quæ Photius [Cod. 180. p. 211. al. p. 405.] de Joanne Laurentio Philadelphensi Lydo scripta reliquit, . . . Την δε Σρησκείαν ο αιτης εοικε θεισιδαιμων εναι σέεται μεν τα Ελληνων και θειαζει θειαζει δε και ημετερα, με διδους τοις αιαγιωσκησιν εκ τη εαση συμβαλειν, ποτερον ετω νομιζων θειαζει, η ως επι σκηνης. Fabric. Bib. Lat. l. iii. cap. 7. Tom. i. p. 554.

with Christians, whose religion prevailed at that time; and I place him, with <sup>n</sup> Cave, as flourishing about the year 330.

II. I now proceed to quote the passage of this commentary of Chalcidius, for the sake of which I produce him among other authors in this work. ‘There <sup>o</sup> is likewise,’ says he, ‘another  
‘more sacred and more venerable history, which relates, that  
‘the appearance of a certain star declared not diseases and deaths,  
‘but the descent of a venerable God, for the salvation of man-  
‘kind, and the good of the world. When this star had been  
‘seen upon a journey in the night-time, by some truly wise men  
‘of the Chaldeans, who were well versed in the contemplation  
‘of the heavenly bodies, they are said to have made inquiry  
‘concerning the late birth of a God; and when they had found  
‘the young majesty, they paid him the worship and homage  
‘which was worthy of so great a God. But to none are these  
‘things so well known as to yourself.’

It is manifest, that the author here refers to the history in St. Matthew, ch. ii. 1. *Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, ver. 2. Saying, Where is he that is born king of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. Ver. 9. When they had heard the king [Herod] they departed, and lo the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was. 10. And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. 11. And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child, with Mary his mother, and they fell down and worshipped him. And when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts, gold, and frankincense and myrrh. Comp. Matt. i. 21 . . . 23.*

Fabricius <sup>p</sup> thinks this paragraph to be a good proof of the writer’s Christianity. And from the compliment at the end made by him to the person to whom the work is inscribed, we may be induced to allow his episcopal character.

<sup>n</sup> Claruit forsan circa annum 330, certe Hosio ætate par, si modo Hosius Cordubensis erat, quo suadente, Chalcidius Platonis Timæum Latine interpretatus est, et erudito commentario explicavit. Cav. H. L. p. 199.

<sup>o</sup> Est quoque alia sanctior, et venerabilior, historia, quæ perhibet, ortu stellæ cujusdam, non morbos mortalesque denunciatas, sed descensum Dei venerabilis ad humanæ conservationis, rerumque mortalium gratiam. Quam stellam,

cum nocturno itinere suspexissent Chaldæorum profecto sapientes viri, et consideratione rerum cælestium satis exercitati, quæsisse dicuntur recentem ortum Dei: repertaque illâ majestate puerili veneratos esse, et vota, Deo tantum convenientia, nuncupasse, quæ tibi multo melius sunt comperta, quam cæteris. Cap. 7. § 125. p. 325. al. 219.

<sup>p</sup> Hoc loco satis perspicue Christianum se prodit Chalcidius. Fabric. p. 325. not. (e).

Whether

Whether this writer was a Christian or a heathen, this passage is a valuable testimony to St. Matthew's gospel, and to this remarkable history. And if this commentary upon Plato's *Timæus* be reckoned the work of a Gentile philosopher, the several quotations of the Old Testament, which we before saw, and now this of the New, afford proof, that the sacred scriptures were then well known in the world. To me it seems, that the style of the paragraph just cited, is the style of a Gentile, not of a Christian writer. Cave <sup>a</sup> seems to have made the same judgment upon it.

### C H A P. XLIII.

#### ALEXANDER OF LYCOPOLIS, IN EGYPT.

I. *His work, time, and character.* II. *Extracts out of his work, containing many references to the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and to the Christian doctrine.*

I. ALEXANDER of LYCOPOLIS, in Egypt, was mentioned by me long ago, in the History of the Manichees, among those authors <sup>a</sup> who had written against them: but learned men are not agreed about his character, as was also observed formerly. Some think he was a Christian; others suppose him to have been a heathen. If this last be his character, he comes in properly to be mentioned here among such writers; we must therefore now more distinctly consider that point.

Fabricius <sup>b</sup> thinks, he was at first a heathen, then a Manichee, and afterwards a good catholic Christian, when he wrote this work; and he placeth him in the fourth century.

All which is agreeable to the sentiments of our <sup>c</sup> Cave; who

<sup>a</sup> Semel meminit stellæ, Christum recensentem præmonstrantis, cujus in historia evangelica fit mentio: de quibus nihilominus, haud satis pro Christiani scriptoris more loquitur. Cav. H. L. p. 199.

<sup>b</sup> Vol. III. p. 384. <sup>b</sup> Alexandri Lycopolitæ, ex Ethnico Manichæi, atque inde ad Ecclesiam reducti, liber . . . Videtur scripsisse seculo quarto. Bib. Gr. lib. v. c. 1. Tom. 5. p. 290.

<sup>c</sup> Alexander Lycopolita, natione Ægyptius, Lyco urbe Thebaidos oriundus. . . . Erat quidem primum cultu Gentilis, deinde ad Manichæos, in Ægyptum recens delatos

se contulit. Tandem ejurata hæresi ad Catholicorum castra transiit. Et cum ex eorum grege fuerat, opiniones probe novit, scripsitque librum *προς τας Μανιχαϊσ δειξας* . . . Ætas auctoris etsi certo definirî nequit, antiquissimum tamen esse, et quarti seculi scriptorem, nec forsan ab ipsius Manetis temporibus longe remotum, suspicere fas est. Ait se relationem hujusce opinionis *απο γνωριμων τε αρδεις*, ab iis qui cum homine familiariter conversati fuerint accepisse. Cave Diss. de Scriptor. incertæ ætatis, §. 2.

also supposeth him to have been acquainted with some of the first followers and disciples of Mani himself. If so, he must have lived not far from the beginning of the fourth century.

Photius <sup>d</sup> in his work against the Manichees, calls Alexander archbishop of Nicopolis.

Tillemont <sup>e</sup> says, ' that by his book he appears to have been  
' a pagan philosopher; who, observing that some of his fellow-  
' disciples embraced the opinion of the Manichees, and think-  
' ing it to be very absurd, composed that book to confute it by  
' natural and philosophical reasons. He speaks with respect of  
' Jesus Christ, and prefers the doctrine of the (\*) churches (those  
' are his terms) to that of Mani. But we can perceive from  
' those very places that he was not at all a Christian. Combesis,  
' his editor, thinks him to be very ancient, because he had  
' learned the doctrine of the Manichees from the disciples of  
' the author of the sect; but the place, upon which he relies,  
' may denote no more than that Egypt knew Mani by his dis-  
' ciples, without necessarily implying that Alexander himself  
' knew any of them.'

Beaufobre <sup>f</sup> is of the same opinion. He calls Alexander a pagan philosopher. He argues after this manner: ' First, he  
' never alleges the scriptures in his dispute with the Manichees,  
' which a Christian would not have failed to do, since the Mani-  
' chees admitted the authority of the books of the New Testa-  
' ment. 2. He speaks of the souls of Nymphs, which is not  
' the style of a Christian. 3. He <sup>g</sup> speaks of the deluge of  
' Deucalion, and Phoronæus, without mentioning that of Noah.  
' 4. He expresth himself altogether like a pagan, saying, that  
' <sup>h</sup> of all the gods, the Manichees honoured only the sun and  
' the moon. 5. He manifestly placeth himself in the number  
' of pagans; for, after having observed, that the Manichees  
' endeavoured to confirm their error by the history, or fable of  
' Bacchus, and the attempt of the giants, he adds: the <sup>i</sup> more  
' learned among them, says he, who have some knowledge  
' of the Greek literature, remind us of our own ceremonies,

<sup>d</sup> Οτε της πολευς Λυκων Αλεξανδρος της αρχιερατικης εγκεχειρισμενος νομης. Phot. contr. Manich. l. i. cap. 11.

<sup>e</sup> Mem. Ec. T. 4. Les Manicheens. art. 16. (\*) See p. 18. to be cited by and by at note <sup>f</sup>. <sup>f</sup> Hist. de Manicheens. Vol. 1. p. 236, 237.

<sup>g</sup> P. 17. B. C. <sup>h</sup> . . . εν η ηλιος και η σεληνη, ως μονης θεων αιδεισθαι φασιν. Alex. Lycop. contr. Manich. p. 7. C.

But it should be observed, that Alexander

elsewhere owns, that the Manichees did not worship the sun and moon, as gods: but only as the way by which they attain to God. Τιμωσι δε μαλιστα Ηλιον και Σεληνην, ως θεους, αλλ' ως οδον δι' ης εστιν προς Θεον αφικεσθαι. Ibid. p. 5. D.

<sup>i</sup> Οι δε εν τατοις χαριεσφοι, και Ελληνικων ουκ απειροι λογων, αναμιμνησκουσιν ημας εκ των οικειων\* εκ μεν των τελετων. κ. λ. Alex. p. 6. A.

‘ and our own mysteries.’ These arguments Beaufobre thinks decisive ; and Mosheim \* has declared his approbation of them.

I shall presently make large extracts out of this writer ; whereby all my readers will be qualified to judge for themselves concerning his character.

The time when he lived is uncertain ; there is nothing in his work to shew clearly, that he wrote near the beginning of the fourth century. But it seems to me not improbable, that he wrote soon after the principles of Manichæism had gained some footing in Egypt : he might, therefore, compose this work about the middle of the fourth century, or even before it ; I therefore place him at the year of Christ 350.

II. The work of Alexander begins in this manner : ‘ The philosophy of the Christians is called simple ; for its principal concern is to regulate the manners of men, having first intimated the right doctrine concerning the Deity, as the one efficient cause of all things. It forbears obscure questions and nice arguments about the reason of things ; nor does it labour to describe particularly the grounds and nature of every virtue ; but holdeth forth in a general way the precepts of all virtue. By attending to which, as experience shews, the common people are much influenced, and gradually allured to the love and practice of piety.’

‘ But <sup>m</sup> this simplicity being disliked, some have moved difficult and abstruse questions ; and delighting in contention, have formed sects. Such an one was MANICHEE, who was of the country of Persia. One Papias, and after him Thomas, teachers of that doctrine, brought it in among us. He lived, as it is said, in the time of Valerian ; and accompanying Sapor in his wars, he offended him, and so lost his life. Such <sup>n</sup> is said to have been the origin of this doctrine, which has been brought in among us by his disciples. They hold two principles, God and matter :’ and what follows, giving an account of the Manichæan notions.

\* Hujus philosophandi libellus exstat Græce contra Manichæos . . . De religione ejus accurate egit Isaac de Beaufobre . . . Mosheim. Institut. H. E. p. 235.

<sup>l</sup> Χριστιανων φιλοσοφια απλη καλειται. Αιτη δε επι την τε ηθικη κατασκευην την πληστι επιμελειαν ποιειται, αιτιτομειη περι των ακριβεστερων λογων περι Θεου ων το κειθαλειον της περι ταυτα σπευδης εικοσιως αν αταλεις αποδεξαμην, εθθα το ποιηλικον αυτου τιμωριαισι τιθειται και πρεσβυτιαιον, και παρων αυτων των οισι. παραγγελματια ει παρθερα ως εινεχαιεν επισωρευουσις. ων

ο πολυς δημοσ ακουει, ως εκ της σειρας εστι μαθει, σφοδρα επιδιδωσιν εις επιεικειαν και της ευσεβειας χαρακτηρ ενιζανει αυτων τοις ηθεσιν, αναζωπυρων το εκ της τοιαυτης συνθειας συνεκλημμενον ηθος, και καθολισον εις την τε καλη αυτη ορεξει οδωτων. Alex. Lycop. adv. Manich. p. 3. ap. Combesis. Auctarium Patr. Græc. novissimum. Paris. 1672.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. p. 3. 4.  
<sup>n</sup> Τοια δε εν τις φημη της εκεινη δοξης, απο των γνωριμων τε αιδρος αφικειλο προς ημας. Αρχακς ελιθεις, Θεον και Υλην. P. 4. B.

I have

I have transcribed below a large part of the introduction, of which I have made only a loose translation. But Alexander here gives a very honourable character of the genuine Christian philosophy, as ‘ simple, and intended by plain precepts, without  
 ‘ nice disquisitions, and intricate reasonings, to promote virtue  
 ‘ among all sorts of men, and even among the lower ranks, and  
 ‘ common people,’ which, indeed, are the bulk of mankind. We shall see this character of the Christian religion repeated again by and by; but let me proceed to take other passages as they lie in the book itself.

2. For, soon afterwards, in his representation of the Manichæan doctrine, he says: ‘ They <sup>p</sup> suppose man to be an image of  
 ‘ the divine power, and that Christ is mind; and that having  
 ‘ descended from above, he sent back to God a large part of  
 ‘ this power: at length he was crucified, and by that means  
 ‘ afforded knowledge.’ And what follows.

I do not stay to explain these Manichæan absurdities; I only produce this passage to shew that Alexander was not silent about Christ. We go on.

3. ‘ But <sup>q</sup> it would be much better for them to say, that wisdom had been given to men by God, that by the exercise of  
 ‘ reason they might be gradually delivered from the love of  
 ‘ pleasure, and other vicious affections; and they who profess to  
 ‘ be teachers of virtue, might be examples of it to others. In  
 ‘ this way, it might be hoped, that evil might cease, when all  
 ‘ were become wise. This seems to me to have been the design  
 ‘ of JESUS: and that husbandmen, and carpenters, and masons,  
 ‘ and other artificers, might not want this help to goodness, he  
 ‘ appointed a common council of all together; and by plain and  
 ‘ easy discourses, he aimed to bring them, both to the knowledge  
 ‘ of God, and the love of virtue.’

This appears very honourable to our Saviour. Alexander, I think, must have read the books of the New Testament, the gospels at least. What he means by the ‘ common council of

Ρ Υπαρχειν γαρ αυτον θειας δυναμειωσ  
 σικονα' τεν δε Χριστον ειναι Νην' ον δη και  
 αφικομενον ποτε απο τε ανω τοπε, πλειστον  
 τε της δυναμειωσ ταυτης προς τον Θεον λελυ-  
 κεναι' και δη και τελευταιου αιωσ αυρωθεντα  
 παρασχεσθαι γνωσιν τοιωδε τροπω' και την  
 δυναμιν την θειαν ενημεσθαι, ενεσ αυρωσθαι  
 τη γλη. p. 5. C.

¶ Πολυ δε καλλιον ην την σοφιαν οπλον  
 φαισι τοις αιθρωποις υπο τη Θεω δεδοσθαι,  
 εν' ο εσιν αυτοις δια το αισθητικοις ειναι εξ  
 επιθυμιασ και ηδονησ, τησο κλιμα μικρον εις  
 το ασαθον περιελθουσα, το επομενον αισθρον εξ

αυτων ανελη. Ουτωσ γαρ ουτοι τε αριστη  
 επαγγελουμενοι διδασκειν, ζηλωται αι ησαν  
 της προθεσειωσ και τη βιω' πολλη τε αυτη  
 ελπις τη, οτι ποτε παυσειται τα κακα, σαρ-  
 των γενομενων σοφων. Ο δουκει μοι κατα-  
 κεινοκεναι ο Ιησυσ. Και ινα μη απελθω-  
 μειοι ωσι τη ασαθη γεωρσοι τε και τεκνοις  
 και οικοδομοι, και οι αλλοι απο των τεχνων  
 κοινον σινεδριον καθισαι παντων ομη' και  
 δια απλων και ευκολων διαλεξειων, και εις  
 Θεω εννοιαν αυτης απειτηροχειται, και τη  
 καλη εις επιθυμιαν ελθειν ποιησται. p. 13.  
 C. D.

‘ all together,’ may be doubtful; but it seems to me not unlikely, that he intends the college of Christ’s apostles, among whom were a publican and several fishermen, and if we take in Paul, a tentmaker.

4. ‘ They ’ speak of Christ, though they do not know him; ‘ and they call him Mind; and they would appear to speak ‘ agreeably to the doctrines of the churches: but if so, why do ‘ they reject that which is called the ancient history?’

It is hence evident, that Alexander had some knowledge of the received doctrine of the churches, or the reputed orthodox Christians. Accordingly, he here seems to blame the Manichees, for not receiving the scriptures of the Old Testament.

5. Presently afterwards, ‘ in an obscure manner, he argues against their opinion, that Christ was Mind.

6. Again, a little lower, he argues against their notion, that Christ was crucified, but without suffering. ‘ But,’ ‘ says he, ‘ it ‘ would be more reasonable to say, agreeably to the ecclesiastical ‘ doctrine, that he gave himself for the remission of sins. And ‘ it is agreeable to the sentiments of others, and even of the ‘ Greek histories, which speak of some who gave themselves for ‘ the welfare of their countries. Of which also the Jewish history has an example; for it tells us, that Abraham prepared ‘ his son for a sacrifice to God.’

7. He seems to refer to the history of Cain’s killing his brother ‘ Abel, Gen. ch. iv.

8. He plainly refers to Gen. vi. 1. 2. and says, that \* the Jewish History speaks allegorically, when it says, that angels fell in love with the daughters of men.

9. This I think to be all which is needful to be taken from this writer. I am not able to determine with certainty, whether he was a Christian or a Gentile; but I am rather inclined to think he was a Gentile. He must have had good knowledge of the Manichees and other Christians; and he appears to be not unacquainted with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. He evidently was a learned and rational man.

† Τοι δε Χριστον εδωκε γνωσκειν, αλλα Χριστον αυτον προσαφορευοντες . . . . Νενειναι φασιν . . . . Ει μιν το γνωστον, και το γνωστων, και την σοφιαν αυτε λεγοντες ομοφωνα, εις τας απο των εκκλησιων περι αυτου λεγουσι διαλαττομενοι, ειω γε αλωσοικαι\* πως την λεβομεινην παλαιαν απασαν ιστοριαν εκβαλλουσι; p. 18. D.

‡ Το μεν καλα τον εκκλησιαστικον λογον ηπειν, εις λυσιν αμαρτιων αυτου επιδεδωκεν, εχειν πισιν τινα φρας της πολλης και των ιστοριων των καθ’ Ελληνιας, ε’ αν

φασιν, τινας υπερ σωτηριας πολεων εαυτες επιδεδωκεν. Και παραδειγμα τε λογε εχει και η Ιουδαιων ιστορια, τον τε Αβρααμ παιδα εις θυσιαν τα Θεω παρακειασασα. p. 19. C. D.

u p. 11. B. C.

\* Οι μεν γαρ περι τελων διαλαττομενοι, εν αλληγοριαις τα τοιαυτα προσφερονται, το σημειον τε λογε αποκρυπτοις τη τε μυθω ιδεα. Οιον ε’ αν η των Ιουδαιων ιστορια φη, της ασβητος ταις θυσιαις των αυρωπων εις αφροδισω συνελθηθηναι μιξιν. p. 20. A.

His observations concerning the Christian philosophy, 'as plain and simple, and designed to reform the manners of men of all ranks,' deserve particular notice. To me this work of Alexander appears very curious.

---

C H A P. XLIV.

P R A X A G O R A S.

'PRAXAGORAS' of Athens,' says Photius, 'wrote the History of Constantine the Great, in two books.'

Having made an abridgment of the work, 'containing an account of Constantine's early life, his succeeding to his father, his wars in Gaul and Germany, and then his wars with Maxentius and Licinius, of both which he gives a bad character, as vicious and tyrannical,' he adds: 'Praxagoras, though he was of the Gentile religion, says, that the emperor Constantine had surpassed all the preceding emperors in every virtue, and in every kind of felicity; and so concludes his history.' That must be reckoned honourable to Constantine.

Photius adds: 'Praxagoras, as he says, was of the age of two and twenty years, when he wrote that history. He also wrote two other books of the History of the kings of Athens, when he was nineteen years of age. He likewise composed six other books, containing the History of Alexander, king of the Macedonians, when he was one and thirty years of age. His style,' says Photius, 'is clear and agreeable, but somewhat unequal. He wrote in the Ionic dialect.'

Praxagoras 'is supposed to have flourished in the time of Constantius; I place him, therefore, at the year 350; though the exact time of his writing cannot be known.

<sup>a</sup> Ανέγνωσθη Πραξαγόρου τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ τῆς παλαιᾶς τῶν μὲν Κωνσταντίνου ἱστορίας βιβλία δύο. Phot. Cod. 6. p. 64.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid.

<sup>c</sup> Φησὶν ἂν ὁ Πραξαγόρας, καίτοι τὴν θρησκείαν ἐλάττωεν, εἰς πᾶσιν ἀρετῇ καὶ καλοκα-

ταθία, καὶ πάντι ἐὺτυχηματι, πάντας τὰς πρὸ αὐτοῦ βασιλευκότας ὁ βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντίνος ἀπεκρυψάτο. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 65. in.

<sup>d</sup> Vid. Voss. Hist. Gr. l. ii. cap. 17. Tillemont, L'Emp. Constantin. art. 90.

## C H A P. XLV.

## B E M A R C H I U S.

IN the next place I take BEMARCHIUS, who also follows next after Praxagoras in Vossius's work of the Greek historians.

' Bemarchius <sup>a</sup>, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, sophist,' says Suidas, ' wrote the history of the emperor Constantine in ten books: he also wrote several declamations and orations.'

He also is supposed to have written in the time of Constantius: and Tillemont <sup>b</sup> therefore, beside what is in Vossius, observes: ' that <sup>c</sup> Libanius speaks of one Bemarchius, a pagan sophist, who was much in favour with Constantius.' There is nothing of him remaining: nevertheless I cannot forbear to wish, that his history of Constantine was in being. His work was in ten books, and therefore must have been large and copious; and, as may be supposed, it was favourable to Constantine. This may be argued from Libanius, whose words imply, that Bemarchius had a great respect for Constantius, and was his admirer.

Tillemont observes in the same place, ' that Eunapius <sup>d</sup> also wrote the history of Constantine: but undoubtedly,' as he says, ' it was in the body of his Universal History, which he had made of the emperors from the death of Severus.' This also, if extant, I believe would be very curious: and I heartily wish that Universal History of Eunapius may be found in some library.

## C H A P. XLVI.

## T H E E M P E R O R J U L I A N.

- I. His time, history, and character, and his behaviour toward the Christians.
- II. His works, particularly his work against the Christians.
- III. His regard to the Jewish people, and his design to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem.
- IV. Extracts out of his work against the Christians.
- V. Extracts out of his Orations and Epistles.

I. JULIUS CONSTANTIUS, brother of Constantine the great, had two wives: Galla, by whom he had Gallus and several other

<sup>a</sup> Βημαρχιος, Καισαρευς, εκ Καππαδογιας, σοφιστης. Ουλος εγραψε τας Κωνσταντου τη βασιλειωσ πραξεις εν βιβλίοις δεκα, μίσας τε και λοσθς διαφορες. Suid.

<sup>b</sup> L'Emp. Constantin. art. 90.

<sup>c</sup> Ομοιωσει δη τοις ωδε πεπραμμενοις ερχεται βημαρχιος συμμαχος μηι εβδομα, μαλα δη τον Κωνσταντιον ηρηκως ανηρ. κ. λ. Liban. Vit. p. 15, 16.

<sup>d</sup> Eunap. de Vit. Sophist. cap. 4. p. 40.

children; and Basilina, a lady of an illustrious family, by whom he had FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JULIANUS, or JULIAN, who was her only child, she dying soon after his <sup>a</sup> birth.

Julian <sup>b</sup> was born at Constantinople on the sixth day of November, in the year of Christ 331, and died the 26th day of June in the year of our Lord 363, in the 32d year of his age, which was not complete.

As I have not room to write the history of Julian at length, I refer to several learned moderns, <sup>c</sup> where more particulars may be found, and my mistakes, if I should make any, may be corrected.

Julian was about six years of age when Constantine died in 337: soon after which, in the year 339, when <sup>d</sup> Julian was in the eighth year of his age, several <sup>e</sup> of Constantine's family were put to death, and among them the father of Julian, and his eldest brother. The infirmities and weak constitution of Gallus, another brother of Julian, saved his life, it being thence concluded, that he could not live long; and Julian's tender age was a security to him.

Constantius took care that they should be educated by Christian masters. When Julian was about fourteen or fifteen years of age, he and his brother Gallus were sent to a palace in Cappadocia, where they lived at ease, but were well guarded; so that, as <sup>f</sup> Julian says, they were shut up as in a prison. Here they spent about six years, till the year 351, when Gallus was made Cæsar. At that time Julian was permitted to come to Constantinople: but his fine parts making him to be much taken notice of, he was sent away to Nicomedia, where Libanius then taught rhetorick. But Julian had been particularly charged not to converse with him, nor learn any thing of him. However, he had here a good deal of liberty, and was acquainted with divers heathen philosophers; some of whom came hither on purpose to pay their respects to him. Here Julian, at about the age of twenty, took a liking to Hellenism: and it is said, that some of these philosophers did then give him hopes of being emperor. Con-

<sup>a</sup> . . . epotâ gelidâ aquâ quam petiit, medio noctis horrore vitâ facilius est absolutus, anno ætatis altero et tricesimo: natus apud Constantinopolim: a pueritiâ usque parentis obitu destitutus Constantii, quem post fratris Constantini excessum inter complures alios turba consumpsit Imperii successorum, et Basilinâ matre, jam inde a majoribus nobili. Am. M. l. xxv. cap. 3. fin.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Pagi in Baron. ann. 337. num. ix. et 363. iv. v.

<sup>c</sup> Pagi, ubi supra, et passim. Basnag.

ann. 363. et alibi. Cav. H. L. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 8. Tom. vii. p. 76. &c. Tillemont Hist. Emp. Tom. iv. Vie de l'Emp. Julien par Bletterie. See likewise Tillemont's long article of Julian's Persecution in the seventh Tome of his Memoirs.

<sup>d</sup> Pagi ann. 337. num. ix. <sup>e</sup> Vide Julian. ad Athenienses, p. 270. C. D. Amnian. ut supra. Socrat. l. iii. cap. 1. Liban. Or. x. p. 262. C. D.

<sup>f</sup> Ad Athenienses. p. 271. B. C.

stantius had informations concerning him: and Julian, for preventing disagreeable suspicions, as <sup>s</sup> Socrates says, was shaved, and made profession of being a monk. He privately studied philosophy, and publickly read the scriptures: and he was ordained reader in the church of Nicomedia.

In 354, Gallus was killed, and Julian was suspected of disaffection: he was sent for therefore to come to Milan, where the emperor then was, and a guard was set upon him. In this danger Julian's life was saved by the intercession of the empress Eudocia, who also obtained leave for him to travel into Greece: which was very agreeable to Julian, who wanted nothing more than to complete his studies at Athens; and the emperor likewise was willing he should employ his time in matters of literature rather than politicks. In the year 355 Julian arrived at Athens; where also Basil and Gregory Nazianzen were studying eloquence, and other parts of polite literature. But Julian made no long stay there; for in the same year he was sent for by Constantius to Milan, and <sup>b</sup> on the sixth day of November 355 he was declared Cæsar, that he might go into Gaul, and take the command of the army there: and Britain and Spain were also put under his government. A few days after that, Constantius gave him in marriage his sister Helena.

Julian left Milan on the first day of December, and before the end of the year came to Vienne in Gaul. In the wars with the Franks and Germans, who had made incursions into the country, he was very successful, and gained a great deal of honour and reputation there, and all over the empire.

In the year 360, about <sup>l</sup> the month of March or April, in the 29th year of his age, he was against his will declared Augustus by the soldiers at Paris; who in a manner compelled him to accept the title, and to take upon him the government, no longer in the quality of Cæsar, but of emperor.

Julian thereupon sent some of his officers with a letter to Constantius, who was then in the East preparing for the war with the Persians, giving him an account of what had been done, desiring him to yield to him the title of Augustus, and promising all the submission that could be expected from a second and a partner in the empire. Julian's officers found Constantius at Cæsarea in Cappadocia; who resented the conduct of Julian, and sent him a letter, requiring him to be content with the title of Cæsar. That letter was received by Julian at Paris, and was read in the pre-

<sup>s</sup> Socrat. l. iii. cap. 1. p. 166. A. Conf.  
Theod. H. E. l. iii. cap. 2. Gregor. Naz.  
Invectiv. i. seu Or. 3. p. 58. D.

<sup>b</sup> Pagi ann. 355. num. iv.  
<sup>l</sup> See Tillemont L'Emp. Constance. art.  
55. Bletterie Vie de Julien. liv. 2. p. 170.

sence of the people and the soldiers. Julian offered to submit to the proposal of Constantius, if the soldiers approved of it; but with loud acclamations they confirmed to him the title of Augustus. Of this likewise Julian sent an account to Constantius; and afterwards several letters passed between them.

Julian came to Vienne near the end of the year 360, about which time <sup>k</sup> he lost his wife Helena. He was still at Vienne on the sixth day of January <sup>l</sup> in 361: soon after which he went forward into Illyricum, and took possession of Sirmium the chief city. Constantius died in Cilicia the third day of November <sup>m</sup> 361: on the <sup>n</sup> 11th day of December following Julian <sup>o</sup> made his entrance into Constantinople, with the general acclamations of the people, attended by the senate, by whom he was proclaimed emperor.

Here he stayed about eight months: and <sup>p</sup> having settled matters, and conferred many favours upon that city, the place of his nativity, he set out for Antioch in Syria, where he arrived in July 362. And having completed his preparations for the war with the Persians, he set out with his army from Antioch in the beginning of March 363. In an action with the Persians he received a wound with a dart on the 26th day of June; and being carried to his tent, he expired there in the night of the 26th day of June 363, in a calm and composed manner, entertaining his friends with philosophical <sup>q</sup> discourses.

Thus died Julian, in the 32d year of his age, having been Cæsar about seven years and a half, Augustus, after his proclamation by the soldiers in Gaul, about three years, and sole emperor, after the death of Constantius, a year and almost eight months.

From whom that dart came was always <sup>r</sup> uncertain; whether from the Persians, or from some of Julian's own men. His death was charged upon the Christians by Libanius, because, as he argued, they were the only men who had an interest in it: and no Persian was rewarded for it; nor did any of them claim any honour upon that account. But there never was any proof brought of that charge; nor have other heathen writers joined

<sup>k</sup> Ammian. l. xxi. cap. 2. <sup>l</sup> Id. diligebat eam ut genitalem patriam, et colebat. Amm. l. xxii. cap. ix. p. 346.

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Pagi ann. 361. num. iv. B. Snag. ann. 361. n. iv.

<sup>n</sup> Pagi 361. num. vi. <sup>o</sup> Ammian. l. xxii. cap. 2.

<sup>p</sup> Omnibus igitur, quæ res diversæ poscebant et tempora, perpen-  
sa deliberatione dispositis, . . . cunctorum favore sublimis, Antiochiam ire contendens, reliquit Constantinopolim incrementis multis sultam. Natus enim illic,

<sup>q</sup> Ammian. l. xxv. cap. 3. Liban. Or. Parent. T. ii. p. 323. B. C. D. et apud Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom vii. § 14. p. 362.

Vid. et Sozom. l. vi. cap. 1. et 2. Zof. l. iii. p. 728.

<sup>r</sup> Vid. Socrat. l. iii. cap. 21. Sozom. l. vi. cap. 2. Theod. l. iii. cap. 25.

with Libanius in it, but rather suppose, that \* the dart came from the enemies.

There are reported some blasphemous expressions to have been spoken by him at that time, of which Theodoret writes in this manner: 'It † is said, that when he was wounded, he took a handful of his blood, and threw it up into the air, saying at the same time; O thou Galilean, thou hast got the better of me.' Sozomen † tells the same story a little differently, and then adds: 'But some say, he was displeas'd with the sun, who had sided with the Persians and deserted him: and that holding up his hand, and shewing his blood to the sun, he threw it up into the air.' The same is also related by † Philostorgius.

Theodoret says, 'that † a man of good understanding, who taught children at Antioch, was in company with Libanius the celebrated sophist, who asked that person, what the carpenter's son was doing. He replied: The maker of the world, whom you jeeringly call the carpenter's son, is making a coffin. And in a few days after tidings came of Julian's death.'

If Libanius was pleas'd to talk in that rude manner, I think, such an answer might be made without a spirit of prophecy. Some other like things may be found in our ecclesiastical historians, which I forbear to take notice of.

Nevertheless, I think it not improper to observe a short story told by Jerom, in his comment upon the third chapter of the prophet Habakkuk: who says, 'When † he was yet very young, and at a grammar-school, when all the cities were polluted with the blood of victims, on a sudden, in the heat of the persecution, came news of the death of Julian. Whereupon one of the heathen people said not much amiss: How comes it, says he, that the Christians style their God patient and long-suffering? For none can be more hasty and passionate; he was not able to defer his indignation for the shortest space. So said that person in a jesting way: but the church of Christ sang with exultation: *Thou didst strike through the heads of the powerful*

† . . . dum se inconsultius præliis inferit, hostili manu interfectus est. Eutrop. l. x. cap. 16. Et Conf. Ammian. l. xxv. c. 3.

† Εκείνον δὲ γε φασὶ, δ. ξαμενον τὴν πλῆθος, εὐθὺς πλῆσαι τὴν χεῖρα αἱματος, καὶ τὸ εἶψαι εἰς τὸν αἶρα, καὶ φαναι. Νεστορικῆς Γαλιλαίε. Theod. l. iii. c. 25, p. 147.

† Soz. l. vi. cap. 2. p. 638. C. D.

† L. vii. cap. 15. † Theod. l. iii. cap. 23. † Dum adhuc essem puer, et in grammaticæ ludo exercerer, omnesque urbes victimarum sanguine pollueren-

tur, ac subito in ipso persecutionis ardore, Juliani nunciatus est interitus, eleganter unus de Ethnicis: Quomodo, inquit, Christiani dicunt Deum suum esse patientem, et ανεξικακον? Nihil iracundius, nihil hoc furore præsentius: nec modico quidem spacio indignationem suam differre potuit. Hoc ille ludens dixerit. Cæterum Ecclesia Christi cum exultatione cantavit: Divisisti cum stupore capita potentium. Hieron. in Hab. T. iii. p. 1636.

‘with astonishment.’ Habakkuk iii. 14. according to the reading of the Seventy.

It is not needful that I should draw the character of Julian at full length, but I shall observe some things. Ammianus Marcellinus was well acquainted with him, and was his great admirer, and was present with him in the Persian expedition; he has twice touched upon the lines of his character: First, entering upon the history of his conduct in Gaul, after Julian had been declared Cæsar, where he says, in the way of panegyric, ‘that<sup>a</sup> he might  
‘be compared to Titus son of Vespasian for prudence, to Trajan  
‘for valour, to Titus Antoninus for clemency, and for strong  
‘reasoning to Marcus Antoninus, whom he took for his great  
‘model of imitation in all his actions.’

Again, after Julian’s death he draws his character more at length, describing<sup>b</sup> his person, his temper, and manners: ‘He  
‘‘was extremely temperate in eating and drinking, and slept  
‘little: his chastity is represented<sup>d</sup> as exemplary and inviolate:  
‘his skill in every branch of science was very great for his age.’ His genius for learning is highly applauded by heathen authors; nor is it disowned by<sup>k</sup> Christians; and his remaining works are proofs of it. His great ability, and his facility in writing, appear in the several works composed by him in the space of those twenty months in which he was sole emperor; and that amidst the hurries of a joyful accession, and the diligent administration of justice, beside all the ordinary affairs of so vast an empire, and the preparations for a hazardous war with the Persians. As Libanius says, ‘he<sup>l</sup> has left behind him works in all kinds of  
‘writing, in all of them excelling all other men, and in his  
‘Epistles himself.’ His valour likewise is undisputed; though his prudence, especially in the Persian expedition, has been often

<sup>a</sup> Namque incrementis velocibus ita domi forisque colluxit, ut prudentiâ Vespasiani filius Titus alter assimilaretur, bellorum gloriosis cursibus Trajani simillimus, clemens ut Antoninus, rectæ perfectæque rationis indagine congruens Marco, ad cujus æmulationem ætus suos effingebat et mores. &c. &c. Ammian. l. xvi. cap. 1. Vid. et cap. v.

<sup>b</sup> Mediocris erat staturæ, capillis tanquam pexisset mollibus, hirsuta barba in acutum desinente vestitus. . . &c. Id. l. xxv. cap. 4. p. 463, 464.

<sup>c</sup> Vir profecto heroicis connumerandus ingeniis. . . Cum enim sint, ut sapientes definiunt, virtutes quatuor præcipuæ, temperantia, prudentia, justitia, fortitudo, . . . intento studio coluit omnes ut singulas.

Et primum ita inviolata castitate enituit, &c. Ammian. l. xxv. cap. 4. sub in.

<sup>d</sup> Νυν δε την μεν γυναικα επενθησει, ετερας δε εδε προλερον, ουθ υφερον ηψαλο. Liban. Or. Parental. § 88. p. 313. ap Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vii.

<sup>k</sup> Επει δε περι Ιελιαου τε βασιλευς ελλοσιμους αιδρας ολιγα διεξελθειν προκειται Socr. l. iii. cap. 1. in.

Εχων τοιουν ευφρα την γλωτταν ο κρατιστος Ιελιαουος. Cyril. contr. Jul. l. i. p. 3. D.

<sup>l</sup> Ο δε πολεμων τε ομυ και πλαττων λογος, πασας μορφας καταλειοιπει, απασαις μεν απαντας νικων, τα δ αυτη τη τωι επισολων. Or. Parent. § 154. p. 375. ap Fabric. alter. Or. x. p. 330. C.

called in question: which<sup>m</sup>, as has been said, was rashly undertaken, resolutely pursued against many discouragements, and carried on, attended with several instances of mismanagement and bad conduct.

After all he<sup>n</sup> had his faults, as is acknowledged by his best friends. He had a certain levity of mind, was a great talker, and very fond of fame: superstitious rather than properly religious; so addicted to sacrificing, that it was said, the race of bulls would be destroyed if he returned victorious from Persia. And<sup>o</sup> such was the multitude of his victims, that his soldiers, who partook of them, were often much disordered by excess in eating and drinking. So Ammianus. It would be tedious to rehearse all the instances of excessive, and even ridiculous superstition, which may be found in heathen writers. Says Libanius: ‘He<sup>p</sup> received the rising sun with blood, and attended him again with blood at his setting.’ ‘And<sup>q</sup> because he could not go abroad so often as he would, he made a temple of his palace, and placed altars in his garden, which was purer than most chapels.’ ‘By<sup>r</sup> frequent devotions he engaged the gods to be his auxiliaries in war, worshipping Mercury, Ceres, Mars, Calliope, Apollo, and Jove; whom he worshipped in his temple upon the hill, and in the city,’ meaning Antioch. . . . ‘And complaining of the gods who had deserted him: Whom<sup>s</sup> shall we blame, says Libanius? not one, but all: for none were neglected by him, neither gods nor goddesses. And is this the return,’ says he, ‘for all his victims, for all his vows, for all the incense, and all the blood offered up to them, by day

<sup>m</sup> Sed in hoc bello, parum prudenter cepto, et gesto, A. 363. telo in præliis percussus interibat. Mothem. Instit. H. E. p. 147.

<sup>n</sup> Digestis bonis, quæ scire potuimus, nunc ad explicanda ejus vitia veniemus, licet dicta sint carptim. Levioris ingenii. Verum hoc instituto rectissimo temperabat, emendari se, cum deviares a fruge bona, permittens. Linguæ fusioris, et admodum raro silentis: præfagiorum sciscitationi nimiam deditus: ut æquiparare videretur in hac re principem Hadrianum. Superstitiosus, magis quam sacrorum legitimum observator, innumeras, sine parcimonia, pecudes mactans: ut æstimaretur, si revertisset de Parthis, boves jam defuturos: Marci illius similis, in quem id acerrimus dictum: Οι λευκοι βοες Μαρκω τω Καισαρι: Αν συ ικησης, απωλομεθα. Vulgi plausibus lætus, laudum etiam ex minimis rebus intemperans appetitor, popularitatis cupiditate cum indignis loqui sæpe adfectans.

Ammian. l. xxv. cap. 4. p. 462, 463.

<sup>o</sup> Inter hæc expeditionem parans in Persas . . . Hostiarum tamen sanguine plurimo aras crebritate nimia perfundebat, tauros aliquoties immolando centenos, et innumeras varii pecoris greges, avesque candidas terrâ quæsitæ et mari: adeo ut in dies pene singulos milites carnis dissentiore faginâ visitantes incultius, potusque aviditate corrupti, humeris impositi transeuntium per plateas ex publicis ædibus . . . ad sua diversoria portarentur. &c. &c. Id. l. xxii. cap. 12.

<sup>p</sup> Αιμαλι μεν δεχομενος αιισχονια τον Θεον· αιυαλι δε παραπεμπων εις δυση. Liban. Or. 8. p. 245. D.

<sup>q</sup> Επει μη τρεχειν εις ιερον παρ ημεραν ερεσι, ιερον ποιησαι τα βασιλεια, και τον κηπον καθαρωτερον των παρ εμοις αδελων. &c. Ibid.

<sup>r</sup> Liban. Legat. ad Julian. p. 170. <sup>s</sup> Liban. Or. 9. in Julian. necem. p. 252. A. B.

‘ and

‘ and by night.’ Again, says the same writer: ‘ Wherever  
‘ there was a temple, whether in the city, or on the hill, or on  
‘ the tops of the mountains; no place so rough, or so difficult  
‘ of access, but he ran to it, as if the way had been smooth and  
‘ pleasant, if it had a temple, or ever had one.’

But though Julian was so devout and religious in his way, when disappointed he could be displeas'd, and even angry with his gods, like <sup>u</sup> other heathen people, especially the vulgar among them. In <sup>x</sup> the Persian war, having had some advantages, and expecting more, he prepared a grand sacrifice for Mars: but the omens not being favourable, he was exceedingly moved, and called Jupiter to witness, that he would never more offer a sacrifice to Mars.

This excess of superstition, it seems to me, is an argument of want of judgment: which defect appeared upon divers occasions, and in many actions, not altogether becoming the dignity of an <sup>y</sup> emperor.

Ammianus Marcellinus, though very favourable to Julian, makes no scruple to blame him upon some occasions.

After he had been declared Augustus, and when he was in the way to the East to meet Constantius, he sent a letter, or oration, to the senate of Rome, in which were many reflections upon Constantius. ‘ When <sup>r</sup> Tertullus, who was then præfect of the  
‘ city, read the letter in the senate, they manifested their gen-  
‘ rosity and gratitude: for with one voice, and directing them-  
‘ selves as to Julian himself, they cried out aloud: “ We beseech

<sup>r</sup> Δρομοί τε εις τεμενη<sup>u</sup> τα μεν εν τη πολ-  
λει, τα δε εν ακροις ορεσι. Και εδεν ελω  
χαλεποι, εδε δυο εαλον, ο μη λειον εδοκει,  
βειων εχων, η προτερωνε ισχυκος. Or. 9.  
p. 255. A.

<sup>u</sup> Tamen longe majora  
et firmitiora de eo [Germanico] judicia in  
morte ac post mortem existitero. Quo de-  
functus est die, lapidata sunt templa, sub-  
versæ Deum aræ, Lares a quibusdam fa-  
miliares in publicum abjecti, partus conju-  
gum expositi. Sueton. Calig. cap. 5.

<sup>x</sup> Abunde ratus post hæc prosperitates  
similes adventare, complures hostias Marti  
parabat Ultori. Et ex tauris pulcherrimis  
decem ad hoc perductis, nondum aris ad-  
moti voluntate sua novem procubuere trif-  
tissimi. Decimus vero, qui distractis vin-  
culis lapsus, ægre reductus est, mactatus  
ominosa signa monstravit. Quibus visis  
exclamavit, indignatus acriter Julianus,  
Jovemque testatus est, nulla Marti jam sacra  
facturum. Nec reseravit, celeri morte

præreptus. Ammian. l. xxiv. cap. 6. fin.

<sup>y</sup> Et cum die quodam ei causas ibi spec-  
tanti, venisse nuntiatum esset ex Asia philo-  
sophus Maximus, exsiluit indecore: et qui  
esset oblitus, effuso cursu a vestibulo longe  
progressus, exosculatum susceptumque re-  
verenter secum induxit, per ostentationem  
intempestivam nimius captator inanis gloriæ  
visus. . . . Ammian. l. xxii. cap. 7. p. 330.

<sup>r</sup> Jamque altius se extollens, et num-  
quam credens ad concordiam provocare  
posse Constantium, orationem acrem et in-  
vectivam, probra quædam in eum expla-  
nantem et vitia, scripserat ad Senatum.  
Quæ cum Tertullo administrante adhuc  
Præfecturam, recitarentur in Curia, emi-  
nuit Nobilitatis cum speciosa fiducia benignitas grata. Exclamatum est enim, in  
unum cunctorum sententia congruente,  
Auctori tuo reverentiam rogamus. Am-  
mian. l. xxi. cap. 10.

‘ you,

“ you, Sir, shew more respect to him, to whom you are indebted for what you are.”

Constantine, in the necessity of his affairs, had advanced some men of low rank to high posts in the republick: with that Julian reproached Constantine in the just mentioned letter, or oration, to the senate: and yet he himself made Nevita, a man of mean original, consul in the year 362. But, says Ammianus, a man should not do what he had blamed in others.

He moreover censures some of the executions made at the beginning of his reign soon after the death of Constantius: he says, ‘ It seems to him, that justice itself wept for the death of Ursulus, superintendant of the treasury, to whom Julian was under many obligations: and when many were offended with the emperor upon that account, he pretended that it was done without his knowledge, and was entirely owing to the resentments of the soldiery.’ So Ammianus.

I need not enlarge any farther here: these several particulars now mentioned may be sufficient to satisfy us, that in the conduct of Julian there might be many things liable to exception; and, that like other great men, he was upon some occasions guilty of indiscretion, and even of injustice: and if the friends of Constantine were so disposed, they might make reprisals upon the panegyrist of Julian.

Before we pass on to other things, it may be requisite to take notice of some exceptions that have been made to Julian’s virtue.

The first relates to his chastity. Mamertinus, in his panegyric, says, ‘ That Julian’s bed was as pure as that of any vestal.’ Libanius<sup>\*</sup> likewise ascribes to Julian complete purity. But no one has so enlarged upon this point as the historian Ammianus Marcellinus, whose testimony must be allowed to be as satisfac-

<sup>\*</sup> Tunc et memoriam Constantini, ut novatoris turbatorisque prisca legum et moris antiquitus recepti, vexavit, eum aperte incusans, quod barbaros omnium primus a usque fasces auxerat, et trabeas Consulares: insulse nimirum et leviter: qui cum vitare deberet id quod infestius objurgavit, brevi postea Mamertino in Consulatu junxit Nevitam, nec splendore nec gloria horum similem, quibus Magistratum amplissimum detulerat Constantinus: contra inconsummatum, et subagrestem, et quod minus ferendum, celsa in potestate crudelium. Ammian. ibid.

<sup>†</sup> Urtuli vero necem Largitionum Comitum ipsa mihi videtur fuisse Justitia, Imperatorem arguens

ut ingratum. . . . Quo extincto cum maledictis execrationibusque multorum se Julianus sentiret expositum, impurgabile crimen excusari posse existimans, absque conscientia sua hominem affirmabat occisum, prætendens, quod eum militaris ira delevit, memor quæ dixerat, ut ante retulimus, cum Amidam vidisset excisam. Ammian. l. xxii. cap. 3.

<sup>u</sup> . . . lectius, . . . Vestalium toris purior. Mamert. cap. 13, p. 292.

<sup>x</sup> Οἱ δὲν γὰρ ἐπρατίετο τῆς τυχίος τῶν τοιείων γειτοῶν ἀναξίον. Liban. Or. x. p. 292. B.

Οὐ σωφρονεστερος μὲν Ἰππολύτου; Ibid. p. 225. C.

tory as that of any man: he<sup>y</sup> not only ascribes to Julian inviolate chastity after the death of his wife, but also says, that this virtue was always in high esteem with him. He likewise mentions some considerations by which Julian supported his resolution, and says, that none of those who were most intimate with him, ever suspected him of liberties contrary to that branch of temperance in any time of his life.

Nevertheless, exceptions have been made to this part of Julian's character by some of late times, who say: 'As<sup>z</sup> to his chastity, we are not fully convinced that it deserved those mighty encomiums which Mamertinus, Libanius, and Ammianus Marcellinus have been pleased to bestow upon it: for on one side it is certain, that by Helena, his only wife, he had but one son, whom the midwife, bribed by the empress Eusebia, destroyed as soon as born: on the other side, Julian himself, in a letter which he wrote in 363, that is, three years after the death of Helena, mentions his children, and the person who was charged with the care of their<sup>a</sup> education.'

1. To which I answer; That the testimony of the forementioned writers ought to be relied upon: the truth of what they say ought not to be contested. If Julian's chastity had not been real and well known, heathen historians and panegyriste might and would have been silent, and have said nothing about it.

2. There is a remarkable instance of his self-government in this respect recorded in the Persian expedition, and which ought to be mentioned to his honour. The city Maogamalcha was taken after a difficult siege: when<sup>b</sup> they came to divide the spoil,

<sup>y</sup> Et primum ita inviolata castitate enituit, ut post amissam conjugem nihil unquam venereum ageret: illud advertens, quod apud Platonem legitur, Sophoclem tragediarum scriptorem aetate grandævum interrogatum, ecquid adhuc feminis misceretur, negantem id adjecisse, quod gauderet harum rerum amorem, ut rabiosum effugisse dominum et crudelem. Item ut hoc propositum validius confirmaret, recolbat sæpe dictum lyrici Bacchylidis, quem legebat jucunde, id asserentem, quod ut egregius pictor vultum speciosum effingit, ita pudicitia celsius consurgentem vitam exornat. Quam labem in adulto robore juventutis ita caute vitavit, ut ne suspicione quidem tenus libidinis ullius vel ceterioris vitæ ministris incusaretur, ut sæpe contingit. Hoc autem temperantiæ genus crescebat in majus, juvante parcimonia ciborum et somni, quibus domi forisque tenacius ute-

batur. Ammian. l. xxv. cap. 4. p. 458.

<sup>z</sup> Tillemont L'Emp. Julien, art. xxx. p. 1031. and the Writers of Universal Ancient History. Vol. xvi. p. 269, 270.

<sup>a</sup> Παλιῶν ἐπασιονῶν οἰκαδὲ τὴν προφῆαν τῶν ἐμαυτῆς παιδίων, εἰρῶν τρεχόντων πρὸς οἰγραμμάτων. Ep. 40. p. 417. Spanh.

<sup>b</sup> Divisa itaque perpensis meritis et laboribus præda, ipse, ut erat parvo contentus, mutum puerum oblatum sibi suscepit gesticularium, multa quæ callebat nutibus venustissimis explicantem, et tribus aureis nummis partæ victoriæ præmium jucundum ut existimabat et gratum. Ex virginibus autem quæ speciosæ sunt captæ, ut in Perside, ubi feminarum pulchritudo excellit, nec contrectare aliquam voluit, nec videre: Alexandrum imitatus et Africanum, qui hæc declinabant, ne frangerentur cupiditate, qui se invictos a laboribus ubique præstiterunt. Ammian. l. xxiv. cap. 4. p. 436.

the Persian women being then renowned for beauty, it was proposed, that some of those beautiful captives should be allotted to the emperor and general: but Julian would not so much as see any of them. Which shews, that he was upon his guard against every thing that should endanger the steadiness of his resolution.

3. When Julian speaks of 'the tutor of his children,' who is not named, the expression must be understood figuratively; for Julian had no children, legitimate or illegitimate. Historians are quite silent about them, excepting that one which he had by his wife Helena above mentioned, who was not suffered to live. If Julian had any children out of lawful marriage, and therefore illegitimate, can it be supposed, that Christian writers would have been silent about it? By no means. Eumenius, in his Panegyric, recommends 'to Constantine not only his five children, of whom he was the parent, but his other children likewise, as he calls them, whom he had educated for the bar, or the court. In some such figurative sense Julian must be understood: he intends some young persons under his special care.

4. Upon the whole therefore, the accounts of Julian's inviolate chastity ought not to be reckoned unlikely. Ammianus has mentioned divers considerations by which Julian supported his resolution. . . . And he adds, that he was assisted therein by his great and constant temperance in food and sleep. Moreover, Julian's ardent thirst of fame may have been another preservative of this virtue. When Mamertinus says, that Julian was free from every vice incident to human nature, it is not improbable, that he has a regard to incontinence. His expressions are to this purpose: 'To<sup>d</sup> some,' says he, 'your justice, your moderation, your humanity, your freedom from every vice incident to human nature, may appear wonderful, and even incredible: but not to me, who know that you aim at immortality; and that in all your designs and actions you have an eye to the impartial judgment of posterity. He can do nothing mean and abject, who expects to be in the mouths of all men in all time.'

<sup>c</sup> Tibique, quod superest, commendo liberos meos. . . . Cæterum quod de omnibus liberis dixi, lata est, Imperator, ambuo. Præter illos enim quinque quos genui, etiam illos quasi meos numero, quos provexi ad tutelam fori; ad officia palatii. Eumen. Paneg. cap. 23. p. 217.

<sup>e</sup> Sed sint, sanctissime Imperator, ea quæ tu juste, moderate, civiliter facis, aliis fortasse miraculo, mihi esse non possunt: qui

te omnibus humanis vitiis absolutum et liberum, sciam solo immortalitatis amore flagrare, dirigere omnes opes et cogitationes tuas ad memoriam posteritatis æternam, atque his maxime servire iudicibus, qui de rebus gestis tuis sine odio et gratia venturis seculis iudicabunt. Non potest quidquam abjectum et humile cogitare, qui scit de se semper loquendum. Mamert. cap. 31. p. 303.

Secondly,

Secondly, it is objected from <sup>e</sup> Chrysoſtom, ‘ that on festivals  
 ‘ to the honour of Venus, or on ſome other like occaſions, Julian  
 ‘ walked in proceſſion with lewd women, and others of the worſt  
 ‘ characters, followed by his horſe and guards.’ Which is too  
 true, though very ſtrange; Ammianus <sup>f</sup> acknowledgeth it, and  
 intimates that he was ridiculed by ſome upon that account.

Still, it ſhould be obſerved, that Chryſoſtom, and <sup>g</sup> other ec-  
 cleſiaſtical writers, who mention theſe and the like things, do  
 not charge him with being guilty of debauch. In the ſtyle and  
 language of <sup>h</sup> Bletterie: “ All this was done in publick, and  
 ‘ from a principle of religion. Thus making a monſtrous mix-  
 ‘ ture of folly and wiſdom, he honoured the debauch as a pagan,  
 ‘ and abſtained himſelf as a philoſopher.’ Indeed, I am of  
 ‘ opinion, that though Julian, in the exceſs of his zeal for  
 Helleniſm, was willing to bear a part in all its rites and ſolem-  
 nities, yet he ſcorned all debauch, and was entirely above it.

Once more, thirdly, it is ſaid, that <sup>i</sup> he practiſed necromancy,  
 and ripped up the bellies of women and children, and ſearched  
 their entrails for diſcovering future events.

But I muſt confeſs, that I do not think theſe ſtories ſufficiently  
 attested; they are to be found in Chriſtian writers only, who were  
 his enemies, and therefore their teſtimony may be ſuſpected. I  
 might add, that <sup>k</sup> Gregory Nazianzen’s accounts are extravagant,  
 and improbable, and incredible; for he affirms, ‘ that the courſe  
 ‘ of the river Orontes was choaked by the heaps of dead bodies  
 ‘ thrown into it in the night-time, ſome of them children, and  
 ‘ virgins, ſacrificed in the way of divination, beſide all the reſt,  
 ‘ that were hid in pits and caverns, and other private places,  
 ‘ in and near the palace.’ A man who talks in that manner,  
 minds not what he ſays, and cannot be ſuppoſed to regard truth  
 in his words. Or, as Bletterie ſays, more reſpectfully, ‘ St. <sup>l</sup>  
 ‘ Gregory is not to be underſtood literally.’

<sup>e</sup> Vide de S. Babyla. contr. Jud. et  
 Gentil. T. 2. p. 559. 560. Bened.

<sup>f</sup> . . . et culpabatur hinc opportune, cum  
 oſtentationis gratia vehens licenter pro  
 ſacerdotibus ſacra, ſtipatusque mulierculis  
 lætabatur. Amm. l. xxii. cap. 14. p. 359.

<sup>g</sup> Τας δε προποσεις τε και φιλοθησιας, ας  
 δημοσια ταις πορναις προουπινε τε και ανλι-  
 προουπινε’ο, υποκλεπιων το ασιδεις μυσηρια  
 ποροχημαλι, πως η θαυμαζειν αξιον; Gr.  
 Naz. Or. 4. p. 121. C.

<sup>h</sup> Vie de L’Emp. Julien. p. 348.

<sup>i</sup> Τι αν τις λελοι τας νεκυομαγείας, τας  
 των παιδων σφαξας; Chryſ. adv. Gent.  
 T. 2. p. 560. B. Vid. et Theodoret. H.

E. l. iii. cap. 25.

<sup>k</sup> Σιωπησομαι  
 τον Ορονην, και της ευκλειους νεκρης, ους τη  
 βασιλει συνεκρυπτεν ουλος γεινομενος ιεκυ-  
 εσσι, και κλειων αδηλως’ εβλαυθα γαρ τα  
 τε επης ειπεν οικειοτερον’ παραδραμμαι  
 και των βασιλειων τα κοιλα και απωλαιω,  
 οσα τε εν λακκοις, και φρειαρσι, και διωρξει,  
 κακων γεμογια θησαυρων τε και μυσηριων’  
 ου μονον των αναλεμνομετων παιδων τε και  
 παρθενων επι ψυχαλωγια και μαγεία, και  
 θυσαις ου νετομισμεναις, αλλα και των  
 υπερ ευσεβειας κινδυνευογιων. Gr. Naz. Or.  
 3. p. 91.

<sup>l</sup> Ce qu’on ne doit pas  
 ſans doute prendre a la lettre. Vie de  
 Julien. p. 349.

Theodoret says, ' that<sup>m</sup> when Julian, in his march into Persia, came to Carrhæ, where was a celebrated temple of the moon, he performed sacrifices privately, unknown to almost every body; and having done so he had the temple closely shut up and sealed, forbidding it to be opened till he returned, and leaving also a guard of soldiers to secure it: but upon the news of his death, the temple being opened, they found there a woman hanging by the hair of her head, her arms stretched out, with her belly dissected.'

But the circumstances of this relation are so improbable, as to lessen the credibility of it; for it is altogether unlikely, that so horrible a sacrifice, if it had been performed, should be left in that shameful posture, and hanging by the hair of the head; or that Julian should leave soldiers to guard it, when he had none to spare. It is much more reasonable to suppose, that some person invented this story, and others received it, at a time when Julian's memory was infamous, and his enemies were at liberty to say of him what they pleased.

We have briefly gone over the history of Julian from his birth to his death; and thereby have been led to take in also his character: but it will be fit that we should enlarge upon some transactions and events.

The two consuls in the year 362, were Claudius Mamertinus and Flavius Nevitta; and on the first day of January, Mamertinus pronounced in the senate at Constantinople a panegyric upon the the emperor, by way of thanks for the honour of the consulship bestowed upon him. Early<sup>n</sup> in the morning of that day, when they entered on their office, the two consuls went out to wait on the emperor at his palace, fearing he should be before-hand with them. As soon as Julian knew they were coming, he rose up suddenly, and went out to meet them, with tokens of concern in his countenance, as if he had been wanting in respect, and came forward and saluted them with the greatest possible regard; and<sup>o</sup> when the consuls were carried to the senate in their chairs, he attended them on foot with their friends in

<sup>n</sup> Theod. Hist. l. iii. cap. 26.

<sup>a</sup> ... Ego et collega meus, ne quid maximus Imperator propensius humanitatis studio faceret, verebatur. Itaque matutino crepusculo palatium petimus. Adventare nos Principi, forte tum danti operam saluatoribus, nunciatur. Statim a solo tanquam præceptus exiit, vultu trepido atque satagente, qualis mens mea esse potuisset, si principi serus occurrerem. Ægre remotis populi qui nos prægredie-

batur agminibus, ut quam longissime nobis obviam procederet, laboravit. Mamertin. Paneg. cap. 28. p. 301.

<sup>o</sup> Pene intra ipsas palatinæ domus valvas, lecticas Consulares jussit inferri: et cum honori ejus venerationique cedentes, sedile illud dignitatis amplissimæ recusaremus, suis prope manibus impositos mixtus agmini togatorum præire cœpit pedes, gradum moderans pene ad liëtoris nutum, et viatoris imperium. Ib. n. xxx. p. 302.

the crowd. These things are in the panegyric itself, where they may have been inserted, after it was pronounced. The same is in Ammianus, who says, that <sup>p</sup> some applauded this humble behaviour of Julian, whilst others disliked it, as mean, affected, and below his dignity. It was customary for the emperor to accompany the new consuls, when they entered on their office; but, as it seems, not on foot, or in the crowd.

A few days after, as we also learn from Ammianus <sup>q</sup>, when Mamertinus exhibited the sports of the circus, a number of slaves were brought forth, according to custom, to be manumitted by him; and Julian being present, and not minding what he did, or unacquainted with the prerogative of the several magistrates, declared them free himself; and being put in mind that he therein intrenched upon the jurisdiction of the consuls, he condemned himself in a fine of ten pounds weight of gold.

Julian appears to have renounced Christianity, and to have embraced Hellenism, about the twentieth year of his age; but it was kept very secret, and was known to a very few only, who were his intimate friends, until after he was declared Augustus by the soldiers in Gaul; and even after that he was upon the reserve: for, as Ammianus has observed, ‘when <sup>x</sup> he was at Vienne, in his way to Constantinople, he still pretended to follow the Christian rite, from which he had departed a good while before; and privately with his friends he practised augury and divination, and all other things customary with the Greeks: and in the month of January, [in the year 361,] on the festival called Epiphany, he went to the church of the Christians.’

But upon his being declared sole emperor, all reserve was laid aside. As the same historian says: ‘Though <sup>y</sup> he had long disguised his respect for the gods, to which he had been inclined

<sup>p</sup> Allapso itaque Calendarum Januariarum die, cum Mamertini et Nevittæ nomina suscepissent Paginæ Consulares, humilior Princeps visus est, in officio pedibus gradiendo cum honoratis: quod laudabant alii, quidam ut affectatum et vile carpebant. Amm. l. xxii. cap. 8. p. 329.

<sup>q</sup> Dein Mamertino ludos edente Circenses, manumittendis ex more inductis per admissionum proximum, ipse lege agi dixerat, ut solebat: statimque admonitus, jurisdictionem eo die ad alterum pertinere, ut errato obnoxium decem libris auri semetipso multavit. Ibid.

<sup>x</sup> Utque omnes, nullo impediante, ad sui favorem illiceret, adhærere cultui Christiano fingebat, a quo jam pridem occulte desiverat, arcanorum participibus paucis, haruspiciæ auguriisque intentus, et cæteris

quæ Deorum semper fecere cultores. Et ut hæc interim celarentur, feriarum die, quem celebrantes mense Januario Christiani Epiphania dicitant, progressus in eorum ecclesiam, solemniter numine orato discessit. Ammian. l. xxi. cap. 2.

<sup>y</sup> Et quamquam a rudimentis pueritiæ primis inclinatio erat erga numinum cultum paullatimque adolescens desiderio rei flagrabat, multa metuens tamen agitabat quædam ad id pertinentia quantum fieri poterat occultissime. Ubi vero abolitis quæ verebatur, adesse liberum tempus faciendi quæ vellet, advertit, sui pectoris patefecit arcana: et planis absolutisque decretis aperiri templa, arisque hostias ad moveri ad Deorum statuit cultum. Amm. l. xxii. cap. 5.

‘ from his youth, now finding himself at liberty to act as he saw  
 ‘ good, he made express edicts for opening the temples, erecting  
 ‘ altars, and performing sacrifices.’

And I think it appears from <sup>z</sup> Libanius, that the temples had been opened at Athens before the death of Constantius. Socrates <sup>a</sup> evidently supposeth, that the temples were opened, and sacrifices performed by Julian’s authority in several cities, whilst Constantius was still living.

And in a letter to the philosopher Maximus, written after he had been proclaimed emperor by the soldiers, but, as I apprehend, before <sup>b</sup> the end of the year 361, and whilst he was in Illyricum, he tells him: ‘ You <sup>c</sup> will be glad to hear what I am  
 ‘ going to say: we worship the gods publickly; the soldiers with  
 ‘ me are become pious; we sacrifice bulls openly, and have  
 ‘ given thanks to the gods in many hecatombs.’ However, as just seen, there were no edicts to this purpose, till after Julian was sole emperor.

And now he gave orders for the return of the bishops, who had been banished by Constantius, and for restoring their estates, which had been (\*) confiscated. Jerom (††) has taken notice of this indulgence, and mentions the names of several catholic bishops, who now returned to their sees. This order, and the edict for opening the temples, according || to Socrates, were of the same date, soon after Julian’s coming to Constantinople. Ammianus (\*\*\*) likewise joins these things together; but he supposeth, that the liberty given to the bishops to return home, was not done with any good intention; but with a view of increasing divisions and contentions among them: as § Sozomen also expressly says. The Donatists had their share in this in-

<sup>z</sup> Liban. Or. x. p. 288. C.

<sup>a</sup> Socrat. l. iii. cap. 1. p. 167. C. D.

<sup>b</sup> Bletterie allows, that this letter was written in the year 361, whilst Julian was yet in Illyricum: as indeed I think the letter itself shows. See his *Lettres Choisies de L’Emp. Julien.* p. 200. & 205. So likewise Tillemont. *L’Emp. Julien.* art. x. et note 4. et la persecution par Julien, art. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Julian. Ep. 38. p. 415.

(\*) Socrat. l. iii. cap. 1. p. 168. C. D.

(††) Omnes episcopi, qui de propriis sedibus fuerant exterminati, per indulgentiam principis ad ecclesias redeunt. Tunc triumphatorem suum Athanasium Ægyptius excepit: tunc Hilarium de proelio reverentem, Galliarum ecclesia complexa est. &c. Hieron. adv. Luciferian. T. 4. P. 2. p.

301. in.

(||) I. oc. cit.

(\*\*\*) Utique dispositorum roboraret effectum, dissidentes Christianorum antislites cum plebe discissa in palatium intromissos monebat, ut civilibus discordiis consopitis quisque nullo vetante religioni suæ serviret intrepidus. Quod agebat ideo obstinate, ut dissensiones augente licentiâ non timeret unanimantem postea plebem: nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus. Ammian. l. xxii. cap. 5.

§ Λεβίται δὲ μὴ φοιδοὶ τῆ περι αὐτῆς ταῦτα προσεξαι· ἀλλως τε ὑπο τῆς προς ἀλλήλων ἐριδος ἐμφυλιῶ μαχῆ πολεμεισθαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν οικειῶν διαμαρτεῖν θεσμων. Soz. l. v. c. 5. p. 601. A. Conf. Theod. l. iii. cap. 4.

dulgence; but it seems not to have been pleasing to <sup>a</sup> Augustine, and some other Catholics. At this time, undoubtedly, Julian openly declared, that they might all worship God in their own way, without molestation from him. As Ammianus says in the place just cited: ‘ Ut quisque nullo vetante religioni suæ serviret intrepidus.’

Having given orders for restoring all the bishops in general, he wrote a letter to <sup>b</sup> Aëtius, a learned Arian writer, inviting him to come to court. The <sup>c</sup> letter is still extant. ‘ Julian to the bishop Aëtius. I have restored all others, who were banished by the emperor Constantius, upon account of the madness of the Galileans. I not only forgive you, but in regard to our friendship and acquaintance, I desire you to come to me. I allow you the use of a publick chariot, and a horse-man for your journey.’

And it is reasonable to believe, that at this time Hellenism was established by some edict, or edicts. Among Julian’s letters there is one to Artabius; who he was is not certainly known; nor is the letter entire; but it may be considered as an edict, published at the commencement of Julian’s sole empire. ‘ By the gods,’ says he, ‘ I will not have the Galileans put to death, nor beaten unjustly, nor suffer any evil; but I am by all means for preferring the worshippers of the gods before them; for, by the madness of the Galileans, all things were brought to the brink of ruin, and now we are all safe by the goodness of the gods; therefore we ought to honour the gods, and those pious men and cities that worship them.’

That edict sufficiently indicates what treatment the Christians were to expect under his reign. Socrates says, ‘ that he ordered that none should have any military offices at court, who would not renounce Christianity, and offer sacrifices to images. Nor would he give the government of provinces to Christians, because, as he said, their law forbids the use of the sword for the punishment of such as deserved death. Many he gained by flatteries and presents: others resigned their offices, being willing to part with the honours of this world, rather than deny Christ; among whom were Jovian, Valentinian, and Valens, who afterwards were emperors.’ Sozomen <sup>f</sup> not only confirms this account, but likewise says, ‘ Julian not only deprived the Chris-

<sup>a</sup> Denique tunc reddidit basilicas hæreticis, quando templa demoniis. Aug. ep. 105. num. 9. al. ep. 166. Tom. 2. Conf. Opt. l. ii. cap. 16. p. 122.

<sup>d</sup> Ep. 7. p. 376.

<sup>c</sup> Ep. 31. p. 404.

<sup>e</sup> Socrat. l. iii.

cap. 17.

<sup>f</sup> . . . παρασημειους θρανιστοπολιτείας εφθορει, και συλλογως και εφορει μελεχεν και τε δικαζειν, η αρχειν, η αξιων μαλιν καιωνειν η μελεδιδω. Soz. l. v. cap. 18. p. 623. B.

‘ tians of magistracy, and all honours and dignities, but like-  
 ‘ wise of equal rights of citizenship.’ Which may have been  
 true in some instances. But I do not suppose that there were any  
 edicts, depriving all Christians who would not sacrifice to the  
 gods, of the privileges of citizens in the places where they lived.

However, Libanius says: ‘ He <sup>b</sup> beheld with pleasure, and  
 ‘ favoured those cities which had preserved the temples of the  
 ‘ gods; but other cities, in which they had been all or most of  
 ‘ them destroyed, he looked upon as abominable; and thought  
 ‘ he allowed them the privileges of subjects, it was not without  
 ‘ some indignation and ill-will.’ And Ammianus acknowledgeth,  
 ‘ that <sup>b</sup> sometimes when he was hearing causes, he would very  
 ‘ unseasonably inquire into the religion of the parties; but he  
 ‘ affirms, that Julian never passed an unjust or partial sentence  
 ‘ upon account of religion, or any other account whatever.’

I need not enlarge upon this subject. Some <sup>f</sup> of those who  
 suffered in this reign, and have been called martyrs, may not  
 deserve that title. Socrates says, ‘ that <sup>k</sup> Julian avoided the  
 ‘ excessive cruelties of Dioclesian’s persecution; nevertheless he  
 ‘ did not forbear to persecute, for I call that persecution,’ says  
 he, ‘ when men who live peaceably are molested. He molested  
 ‘ the Christians in this manner; he forbade that they should  
 ‘ partake of human literature; lest, as he said, when they have  
 ‘ whet their tongue, they should be more ready in answering  
 ‘ the Greek disputants.’ Sozomen says, ‘ he <sup>l</sup> would not allow  
 ‘ the children of the Christians to be instructed in the Greek  
 ‘ poets, or orators, nor to frequent the schools of such as ex-  
 ‘ plained those writers.’ To the like purpose <sup>m</sup> Theodoret.  
 Augustine says, that <sup>n</sup> Julian forbade the Christians both to teach  
 and learn polite literature. Gregory Nazianzen <sup>o</sup> has not failed  
 to take notice of this restraint, and to ridicule Julian for it.

Ammianus <sup>p</sup> has twice mentioned it, and always with dislike,

28

<sup>b</sup> Ος γε και των πωλεων, αις μεν ην ιερα  
 μειλια, και προσορων ηδεις, και τα  
 μειστα ευ παθειν αξιας ενομιζε. Τας δε  
 απεπακνυιας, η τα πλειω, μιαντες τε ενομιζε,  
 και τωσ αφελειαν μελεσιδω μεν ως υπηκοις,  
 η μη: αειν τε δυο: εργαθειν. Orat. Parent.  
 in Julian. ap. Fabr. T. 7. § 61. p. 288.  
 Vid. et § 59. et 60.

<sup>h</sup> Et quam-  
 quam in deceptando aliquoties erat intem-  
 pestivus, quid quisque jugantium coleret,  
 tempore alieno interrogans; tamen nulla  
 ejus definitio huius a vero dissonans reperitur:  
 nec argui unquam potuit, ob religionem,  
 vel quodcunque aliud ab æquitatis recto

tramite deviasse. Amm. l. xxii. cap. x. in.

<sup>i</sup> Vidē Basnag. ann. 362. num. xi.

<sup>k</sup> Socrat. l. iii. cap. 12.

<sup>l</sup> Soz. l. v. cap. 13.

<sup>m</sup> Theod.

<sup>n</sup> An ipse non est

<sup>o</sup> Greg.

<sup>p</sup> Illud autem erat

as a great hardship. Julian's edict is still extant<sup>9</sup>; if it had not been long I should have alleged it here, but I shall remember it hereafter. Orosius says, that<sup>r</sup> when Julian published his edict, forbidding the Christian professors of rhetoric to teach the liberal arts, they all in general chose rather to resign their chairs than deny the faith: and Jerom; in his Chronicle, assures us, that<sup>s</sup> when Julian published his law, that no Christian should teach the liberal arts, Proæresius, the Athenian sophist, shut up his school, though the emperor had granted him a special licence to teach. Augustine<sup>t</sup> records the like steadiness of Victorinus, who had long taught rhetoric with great applause at Rome. But Ecebolius, a Christian sophist at Constantinople, who<sup>u</sup> had been Julian's master in rhetoric, was overcome by the temptations of the times, and<sup>x</sup> openly professed Hellenism: however, when Julian was dead he recovered himself, and with great humiliations intreated to be reconciled to the church.

It was his fancy to call the Christians Galileans: it is taken notice of by divers ecclesiastical writers<sup>y</sup>, who have made good remarks upon it: and some of them say, that he ordered by edicts that they should be so called. In this appellation there was no reason nor argument; but it might answer Julian's purpose, to make the Christians appear contemptible in the esteem of weak people.

That was no late thought of Julian: we find him using this style at the beginning of his sole empire, before he left Constantinople. He there offered sacrifices to the genius of that city: after which, as Socrates says, Maris, the Arian bishop of Chalcedon, was brought to him, who was an old man, and had lost his sight. He<sup>z</sup> reproached Julian, calling him impious, apostate, and

præter pauca. Inter quæ erat illud inclemens, quod docere vetuit magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos Christianos, ni transfissent ad numicum cultum. Id. l. xxv. cap. 4. p. 463.

<sup>9</sup> Ep. 42. p. 422. <sup>r</sup> Aperto tamen præcepit edicto, ne quis Christianus docendorum liberalium studiorum professor esset. Sed tamen, sicut a majoribus compertum habemus, omnes ubique propemodum præcepti conditiones amplexati, officium quam fidem deserere maluerunt. Oros. l. vii. cap. 30. <sup>s</sup> Proæresius, Sophista Atheniensis, lege lata, ne Christiani liberalium artium doctores essent, et sibi specialiter Julianus concederet, ut Christianos doceret, scholam sponte deseruit. Chr. p. 185. <sup>t</sup> . . . et illud addidit,

[Simplicianus] quod Imperatoris Juliani temporibus lege data prohibiti sunt Christiani docere literaturam, et oratoriam: quam legem ille amplexus loquacem scholam deserere maluit, quam verbum tuum, quo linguas infantum facis disertas. Aug. Confess. l. viii. cap. 5. num. 10. And see in this work, vol. iv. p. 378, 379.

<sup>u</sup> Socr. l. iii. cap. 1. p. 165. A. B. <sup>x</sup> . . . ἐπι δε Ἰουλιανῆ γοργῶς ἑλλην ἐφζι- νεῖο. κ. λ. Socr. l. iii. cap. 13. p. 184. D. <sup>y</sup> Gr. Naz. Or. 3. p. 81. A. B. Theod. l. iii. cap. 21. Chryl. Or. 2. de S. Bab. T. i. p. 783. A. et alibi. Socrat. l. iii. cap. 12. p. 183. D. <sup>z</sup> Πολλὰ τοῦ βασιλεῖα προσελθὼν περιεβρισε, τὸν ἀσέβητον καλῶν, τὸν ἀποσταθῆν, καὶ ἀθιστ. Ο δὲ λο- σοῖς τὰς ὑβρεῖς ημεῖς εἶλο, τυφλοὺ καλίστα. Κκ.

and atheist: who returning reproach for reproach, called Maris blind: nor, says he, is your Galilean God able to cure you. For he was wont to call Christ the Galilean, and the Christians Galileans. Maris replied: I thank God who has made me blind, that I might not see the face of a man who has so fallen into impiety as you have done. To which Julian made no farther answer. Sozomen, who tells the same story, adds: 'For' 'he thought he should better advance the cause of Hellenism, 'by shewing himself, beyond expectation, mild and patient to- 'ward the Christians.' And I also think, that the Christians would have acted more agreeably to the doctrine of the gospel; and more for its honour, if they had avoided abusive and indecent reproaches of an emperor\*.

It cannot be denied that Julian was a persecutor. Ammianus thought his prohibiting the Christians to have a liberal education a rigorous proceeding. Eutropius also, another heathen, and contemporary, says, that <sup>b</sup> Julian bore hard upon the Christians, though without putting them to death. Socrates, as we have already seen, says he avoided the excessive cruelty of Dioclesian's persecution: and other Christian writers say, that he <sup>c</sup> envied Christians the honour of martyrdom. Jerom, in <sup>d</sup> his Chronicle; gives this character of Julian's persecution, that it was mild and enticing rather than compelling men to sacrifice: but he acknowledgeth, that many were drawn aside. Orosius <sup>e</sup> speaks to the like purpose. Gregory Nazianzen, near the end of his second invective against Julian, remarking upon his Misopogon, or Sa- tyr against the people of Antioch, expresseth himself after this manner: 'You <sup>f</sup> boast mightily of your never eating to excess, 'as a wonderful thing; but say not, how you have oppressed the 'Christians, an innocent and a numerous body of men. Not 'considering, that whether some particular person is troubled

Και εκ αι, φησιν, ο Γαλιλαιος ου Θεος  
δερπυσει σε Γαλιλαιον γαρ ειωθε ο Ιουλι-  
αιος καλει τον Χριστον, και της Χριστιανης  
[Γαλιλαιης]. Socrat. l. iii. c. 12. p. 183. D.

<sup>a</sup> Και ο βασιλευς μηδεν αποκρινομενος  
παρισταμεν ωειο γαρ ταυτη μαλλον ελλη-  
νιστην κρανισαι, ανεξικακον και πραον αδο-  
κτας τω πληθει των Χριστιανων εαυτον επι-  
εινους. Soz. l. v. cap. 4. p. 599. D.

\* I am not singular in that judgment, Saur, Hist. de l'Eglise et de l'Empire, at the year 362. T. iii. p. 235. thus delivers the last part of that discourse. Maris re- pondit vigoreusement, ou plutot insolent- ment. Je rends graces à mon Dieu, de ce qu'il m' a osté la vue, afin qu'elle ne fût

souillée de voir un si mechant-homme que  
toy.

<sup>b</sup> Nimijs religionis Christianae  
infectator, perinde tamen ut cruore absti-  
nuerit. Eutrop. l. x. cap. 16.

<sup>c</sup> Vide Gr. Naz. Or. 3. p. 72. &c.

<sup>d</sup> Juliano ad idolorum cultum converso,  
blanda persecutio fuit, illiciens magis,  
quam impellens ad sacrificandum: in qua  
multi ex nostris voluntate propria corrue-  
rant. Chr. p. 185.

<sup>e</sup> . . . Christianam  
religionem arte potius quam potestate in-  
fectatus est, ut negaretur fides Christi, et  
idolorum cultus susciperetur, honoribus  
potius provocans, quam tormentis cogere  
studuit. Oros. l. vii. cap. 30.

<sup>f</sup> Gregor. Or. 4. p. 133, 134.

‘ with crudities, or not, is a thing of little consequence to the  
 ‘ public; whereas by the persecution which you have raised,  
 ‘ the whole Roman empire has been disturbed.’

No ancient Christian writer, perhaps, has drawn Julian’s character to greater advantage than Prudentius, who <sup>g</sup> ascribes to him great fortitude: and not only says, that he was a fine speaker and writer, but also that he made good laws, and was a good emperor; but he was an enemy to the true religion: he was faithful to the interests of the state, but was unfaithful to God, and worshipped innumerable deities, which he shews largely.

And I would take this opportunity to refer curious and inquisitive readers to <sup>h</sup> several learned moderns, who have made remarks upon Julian’s writings, and upon his conduct as an emperor, and are not unfavourable in their judgments concerning him.

And it has been observed, ‘ that <sup>i</sup> there was such a mixture  
 ‘ of good and bad qualities in this prince, that it is easy to praise  
 ‘ and blame him at the same time, without deviating from the  
 ‘ truth \* \*.’

II. It cannot be necessary, that I should take notice of all Julian’s works; but there is one which cannot be omitted. For at length, in his great zeal, in the midst of his preparations for the Persian war, and when he was almost ready to set out upon that expedition, he was at the pains to compose an argument against the Christian religion. Jerom <sup>k</sup> says, it consisted of seven books; and <sup>l</sup> in another place he has quoted the seventh book of

<sup>g</sup> Principibus tamen e cunctis non desuit unus,  
 Me puero, ut memini, ductor fortissimus armis.  
 Conditor et legum, celeberrimus ore manique,  
 Consultor patriæ, sed non consultor habendæ  
 Religionis, amans ter centum millia divum.  
 Perfidus ille Deo, quamvis non perfidus orbi.

Prudent. Apoth. ver. 450. &c.

<sup>h</sup> Vide Petri Cunæi Præf. in Juliani Cæsares. Leunclavii Apologia pro Zosimo. p. 629. &c. Gundling. Præf. in Balduin. de Legib. Constantini M. sub in. See likewise Ez. Spanheim’s French version of Julian’s Cæsars, and Montaigne’s Essays. B. 2. ch. 19. <sup>i</sup> Fleury’s Ecc. Hist. Vol. 2. p. 361. English edition.

<sup>e</sup> \* It may not be improper to insert here a part of Julian’s character, as given by Cave in his Introduction, p. xlvii. ‘ A prince truly of great virtues, prudent, considerative, impartial, strictly just, chaste, and temperate, patient of hardships, unwearyed in his labours, valourous in his

‘ attempts, even to rashness and precipi-  
 ‘ tancy. . . . In short, to give him his due,  
 ‘ had not his memory been stained with an  
 ‘ apostacy from the best religion that ever  
 ‘ was, and so bitter and incurable a spleen  
 ‘ against the Christians, he might have  
 ‘ passed for one of the best princes that  
 ‘ ever managed the Roman empire.’

<sup>k</sup> Julianus Augustus septem libros in expeditione Parthica, adversus Christum vomuit: et juxta fabulas poetarum, suo terense laceravit. Hieron. ep. 83. T. iv. p. 655. <sup>l</sup> In Osee. cap. 11. T. iii. p. 1311. fin.

that

that work; but Cyril of Alexandria, in the preface to his confutation of it, mentions<sup>m</sup> only three books, written by Julian against the holy gospels, and the venerable religion of the Christians. Cyril, who dedicates this defence of our religion, in ten books, to Theodosius the younger, did not write, as is supposed, before the year 432: whether any part of Julian's work was lost between the time of Jerom and Cyril, or whether it was differently divided, I cannot say. But that Cyril mentions three books only, because he intended to answer a part only of the work, I cannot believe. When he says, that Julian had written three books against the Christian religion, I suppose he intends the whole of the work which he had before him.

Philip Sidetes, who flourished about the year 418, published a confutation of Julian's work, as we learn from<sup>n</sup> Socrates; but it was never much valued, and has been long since lost: we therefore can have no information from him.

Jerom seems to say, that Julian's work was composed in the Persian expedition, 'in expeditione Parthica.' But I do not think it needful to suppose, as some have done, that he intended to say, it was written after Julian was set out from Antioch, in his march toward Persia. I think, we may rely upon Libanius for the time of this work; who, as cited by Socrates, says: 'In the winter season, during the long nights, the emperor set himself to confute those books which make the man of Palestine a God, and the Son of God: and in a long and unanswerable argument he shewed, how trifling and absurd those things are which are admired by them. In which work he excelled the Tyrian old man: let the Tyrian forgive me, that I say, he was exceeded by his son.' But, says Socrates, I am of opinion, that if Porphyry had been an emperor, he would have preferred his work above Julian's. Cave<sup>p</sup> likewise speaks very slightly of this performanc. Indeed, I apprehend, there could not be much in it that was new, and had not been said before: but Julian's work might be more sprightly for the manner, and might have some satyrical strokes against the followers of Jesus peculiar to himself. And I am apt to think, that he oftener quoted the writers of the New Testament by name, and more distinctly, than any of his predecessors in this argument: and therefore he will afford us good evidence of their genuineness and

<sup>m</sup> Και δη τρια συγγραφε βιβλια κατα των αλων ευαγγελιων, και κατα της ευαγγελικης Χριστιανικης θρησκειας. Cyril. contr. Julian. l. i. p. 3. D. ερ. 27.

ισχιας εκλεισθιλος, επιθεμενος ο βασιλευς ταις βιβλοις αι τον εν Παλαιστινης ανθρωπον Θεον και Θεη παιδα ποιησι. κ. λ. Socr. l. iii. cap. 23. p. 196. D.

<sup>n</sup> L. vii.

<sup>o</sup> Τη χειμωνος, φησι, τας

p H. L. T. i. p. 345. in Libanio.

antiquity. Some have imagined, that<sup>q</sup> in this design Julian was assisted by Libanius, and other philosophers who accompanied him: but I believe, that he needed not their assistance, and that he was better qualified to write upon this argument than any of those sophists or philosophers. According to our account then, this work was composed by Julian near the end of the year 362, or in the beginning of the year 363.

Libanius calls it a long work: indeed I believe it was prolix. Cyril transcribes many passages from it at length: afterwards he abridges, and plainly omits some tedious quotations from the scriptures, especially from the Old Testament. And at<sup>r</sup> the beginning he complains, that Julian's work was very immethodical, and had many repetitions, saying the same thing again and again.

In Cyril's Confutation are many large fragments of Julian's work, in which he argues against the Old and the New Testament, against Moses and the Jews, as well as against Jesus and his apostles, and followers. Cyril promiseth to<sup>s</sup> cite Julian in his own words; but he declares, that<sup>t</sup> he omits some of his blasphemous reflections upon our Saviour. However, he has taken a good many things that are free and offensive: and in Julian and Libanius we may see what was the language of those times.

Cyril's answer to Julian, as before said, was not written before<sup>u</sup> the year 432. Theodoret<sup>v</sup> had read it, and says he admired it. Du Pin<sup>w</sup> considers it as one of the principal of Cyril's works: he says it is clear and learned, and more solid than the work of Julian; though it is far from being so elegant and agreeable.

III. I intend to give a particular account of that work: after which I shall make extracts out of some of Julian's epistles and edicts. But before I proceed to those things, it is needful that I consider what is said of Julian's regard for the Jews, of which as yet I have taken no notice.

We are informed by some<sup>x</sup>, or all our ecclesiastical historians, who write of Julian, that he sent for some of the chief men of the Jewish nation, and enquired of them, why they did not now sacrifice as the law of Moses directed. They told him, that they were not to sacrifice at any place except Jerusalem; and the tem-

<sup>q</sup> On peut juger, que ce Rheteur, et les philosophes qui accompagnoient Julien, eurent part aux livres contre la religion Chrestienne, que ce Prince composoit pendant les longues nuits de l'hiver. Bletterie Vie de Julien. p. 383. <sup>r</sup> Contr. Julian. l. i. p. 38. C. D.

<sup>s</sup> . . . ἀνέμενοι δὲ τῆς σιχῆς ἐπὶ λέξεως

αὐτῆς. Ib. l. ii. p. 38. C. <sup>t</sup> Ibid. D.

<sup>u</sup> Tillem. Cyril d' Alex. art. 157. Tom. xiv. p. 671. <sup>x</sup> Καὶ ἀναστροφῆς ἐθαύμαζαμεν. Theod. ep. 83. p. 960. B.

<sup>v</sup> S. Cyril d' Alex. Tom. iii. Part ii. p. 48. Amst. <sup>w</sup> Socr. H. E. l. iii. cap. 20. Sozom. l. v. cap. 22. Theod.

l. iii. cap. 20.

ple being destroyed, they were obliged to forbear that part of worship. He thereupon promised to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem. And we still have a letter of Julian inscribed to the Community of the Jews: in which he boasts of his having abolished some taxes which had been laid upon them, and calls their venerable patriarch Iulus his brother. He also intreats their prayers for him, that when he shall be returned victorious from the Persian war, he may rebuild the holy city Jerusalem, which for a long time they had earnestly desired to see inhabited, and that he might come and dwell there himself, and together with them offer up prayers to the supreme Deity.

This letter, however extraordinary, must be reckoned genuine: for Sozomen expressly says, that Julian wrote to the patriarchs and rulers of the Jews, and to their whole nation, desiring them to pray for him, and for the prosperity of his reign. That is an exact description of the letter we have, which is inscribed to the Community of the Jews.

It was written in the year 362, as Bletterie supposeth: in the beginning of that year say Tillemont and the bishop of Gloucester.

And we are informed by many ancient writers, that Julian did actually give orders for rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem, and that the attempt was defeated by divine interposition. It is mentioned by three contemporary writers, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Ambrose bishop of Milan, all Christians, and also by Ammianus Marcellinus, a learned heathen, and afterwards by Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Philostorgius, as well as by later writers. Let us begin with the contemporaries.

Julian, says Gregory Nazianzen, having sent for the Jews, assured them, that he had discovered from their own books, that now the time was come when they were to return to their own country, when their temple was to be rebuilt, and they were to live again according to the laws of their ancestors. They were easily persuaded to believe what was so desirable to them; and immediately great numbers of them, with the utmost alacrity, set about the work. And it is said by those

<sup>1</sup> Ιουλιανὸς Ἰουδαίων τῷ Κοινῷ. Ἐρ. 25. p. 396.

<sup>2</sup> . . . τον ἀδελφον Ιηλδον τον αιδεσιμωτατον πατριάρχην παρηνεσα. p. 397.

<sup>3</sup> . . . ινα κελω τον των Περσαι πολεμον διορθωσαμεις, την εκ πολλων ετων επιθυμημενην παρ υμιν ιδειν οικημενην πολιν ασιαν Ιερουσαλημ εμοις καματαις ανοικοδομησας οικησω, και εν αυτη εδωαι ωσω μεθ υμων τῷ κρειττοτι. p. 398.

<sup>4</sup> και πατριάρχαι, και αρχησεις αυτων

και αυτω δε πληθει εβραψαν, ευχεσθαι υπερ αυτε και της αυτε βασιλειας. Soz. l. v. cap. 22. in.

<sup>5</sup> Lettres choisies de Julien. p. 236.

<sup>6</sup> Persecution par Julien. art. 35. M. E. Tom. vii.

<sup>7</sup> See his Julian. p. 65.

<sup>8</sup> Ruf. H. E. l. i. cap. 37. et 38.

<sup>9</sup> Gr. Naz. Or. iv. p. 111 . . . 113.

<sup>10</sup> Φασι γε τοι τας γυναικας αυτω ει τα εκεινων δεσπομαζονται . . . κ. λ. p. 111. B.

who

' who are their good friends, that their women not only resigned  
 ' all their valuable ornaments with great readiness, but also joined  
 ' in the work, carrying earth in their bosoms, and in their richest  
 ' garments, not thinking any thing too much to promote so  
 ' pious a design. But being interrupted by a hurricane, and an  
 ' earthquake, they ran to a church not far off, either to pray or  
 ' for shelter: and <sup>f</sup> there are who say, that the church would  
 ' not admit them; and that though they found the doors open,  
 ' they were presently shut again, and bolted by an invisible  
 ' power. . . . However it is said by all, and universally believed,  
 ' that as they were using their utmost efforts to get into the  
 ' church, a flame issued out from it which entirely destroyed and  
 ' consumed some of them, and scorched and maimed others in  
 ' their members; so that they were living monuments of the  
 ' justice and vengeance of God upon sinners. . . . And moreover,  
 ' as he goes on, <sup>e</sup> there was a light in the heaven, exhibiting a  
 ' cross with a circle round it. . . . And <sup>b</sup> when there were such  
 ' signs in earth and in heaven, were there not also some in the  
 ' air? Was not that also sanctified with the signs of our Lord's  
 ' passion? Let them who were spectators of this wonderful event,  
 ' and partakers in it, now shew their garments which were  
 ' then marked with the prints of the cross. For at that time,  
 ' as any one spoke of it, or heard it related, whether he was one  
 ' of our own people, or a stranger, each one presently observed  
 ' the wonder either upon himself, or upon his neighbour; dis-  
 ' cerning manifestly a radiant mark upon his body, or in his  
 ' garments, surpassing the finest embroidery or painting. Which  
 ' so affected the minds of those who saw them, that almost all,  
 ' as with one consent, were induced to acknowledge the God of  
 ' the Christians, and endeavoured to appease him by prayers and  
 ' praises: and they came to our priests, humbly intreating the  
 ' favour of baptism.'

So writes Nazianzen in his invective against Julian, written  
 soon after that emperor's death. It is not yet time for me to  
 make remarks; but, surely, no attentive reader can forbear to  
 make some observations upon so strange a relation; in which a  
 contemporary, representing a matter of so great importance,  
 more than once refers to hear-says and common reports, instead  
 of appealing to his own sight and knowledge.

Chrysostom has several times spoken of this thing, and deserves  
 to be taken notice of as well as any.

<sup>f</sup> Εἰσι μετ' αὐτῶν ὡς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν αὐτῆς προσεδιέξατο. Ib. D. 8 . . . 157  
<sup>e</sup> καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑρατῷ τοῦ σταυροῦ περιβραχίον. . . . p. 112. B. <sup>b</sup> p. 118.

‘And<sup>1</sup> in our time the emperor; who exceeded all men in impiety, gave them leave to build their temple, and assisted them in it. And they began the work, but could not proceed at all: for a fire, rising up from the foundation, drave them all away. And that they had a mind to it, appears from the foundations which still lie open: whereby it may be discerned, that they began to dig, but were not able to build, they having met with an obstruction.’

In another place, the same great orator and fine writer, having largely related the conversation of Julian with the Jews, and his proposal to them that they should sacrifice, he goes on: ‘Nevertheless<sup>k</sup> still blinded against all means of conviction, they intreated him to join with them in rebuilding the temple: and he furnished them with money, and appointed officers of great distinction to superintend the work, and sent for artificers from all parts. He attempted every thing; he omitted nothing that could be done; hoping, that if he could bring them to sacrifice, he should also persuade them to the worship of images; hoping likewise, in his great perverseness, to confute the declaration of Christ, that the temple should not be rebuilt. But he who *taketh the wise in their own craftiness*, soon shewed by the effects, that the decrees of God are more powerful than all things, and that his word is firmly established. For as soon as they began their impious attempt, and were removing the foundations, and had dug away a good deal of earth, and were ready to set about the building, fire bursting from the foundations burnt many of them, and cast away many stones from the place, and interrupted the vain attempt. And not only they who were employed in the work, but many Jews likewise, when they saw what had happened, were confounded and ashamed. And the emperor Julian having been informed of these things, though he was to distraction intent upon the design, fearing lest he should bring down the fire upon his own head, desisted, being overcome, together with the whole nation. And now, if you should go to Jerusalein, you may see the foundations open: and if you enquire the reason, you will hear no other than that just mentioned. And we are witnesses of it; for it happened in our time, not long ago. And observe the splendor of this

<sup>1</sup> Και γαρ επι της γενεας της υμετερας, παντας εις ασεβειαν νικησας βασιλευς, και εδωκεν εξουσιαν τοις, και συνεπραξε, και ην εβη κηφανο, και εδε μικροι προσελθειν εουκνησαν, αλλα και αυρη απο των δεμελων εκπηδησαν παντας αυλης απηλασεν. Ως δε κηβληθησαν, και τελη δειγμα εστιν εως

τη νυκ δεμελια ηνιμωθεντα: ινα ρειθης, ος επεχειρησαν διασκαπειν, οικοδομησαι δε ηκ ισχυσαν, της αποφασως ταυτης ανιμωρατης αυλης. Contr. Jud. et Gent. T. i. p. 580. E. <sup>k</sup> Adv. Judæos. Or. v. T. i. p. 646, 647.

‘ victory; for it happened not in the time of pious emperors,  
 ‘ lest some should say, they were the Christians who obstructed  
 ‘ the work: it happened when we were in affliction, when all  
 ‘ were in fear for their lives, when our liberty was gone, when  
 ‘ Hellenism flourished; and the faithful were some of them shut  
 ‘ up in their houses fearing to stir abroad, others were retired  
 ‘ into deserts, and fled from cities. Then these things happened,  
 ‘ that the most impudent might have no pretence to deny them.’

Again; having observed the declaration made to Julian by the  
 Jews, that they could not now offer sacrifices, the temple being  
 in ruins; ‘ he <sup>1</sup> ordered money to be allowed them out of the  
 ‘ public treasury, and every thing else necessary to carry on the  
 ‘ building, and then bid them go and repair the temple, and  
 ‘ offer sacrifices according to their ancient custom. And they  
 ‘ who were blind from the womb, and even to old age, went  
 ‘ away and set about the work under the emperor’s favour: but  
 ‘ as soon as they began to remove the earth, fire issuing from  
 ‘ the foundations consumed them all. When these things were  
 ‘ related to the emperor, he dared not to proceed any farther,  
 ‘ being restrained by fear: nevertheless he did not forsake the  
 ‘ worship of dæmons, to whom he was subject.’

Once more, where he says, that after the Christian religion  
 had been established, there were not so frequent miracles as at  
 the beginning; ‘ yet <sup>2</sup> in our time,’ says he, ‘ in the reign of  
 ‘ Julian, who surpassed all men in impiety, there were many  
 ‘ miracles. And when the Jews attempted to rebuild the temple  
 ‘ at Jerusalem, fire issuing out from the foundations of the temple  
 ‘ restrained them.’

This may suffice for shewing the testimony of Chrysoſtom in  
 this point.

Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in a letter to the emperor Theo-  
 dosius, supposed to have been written in the year 388, says:  
 ‘ Have <sup>3</sup> you not heard, Sir, that when Julian gave command to  
 ‘ rebuild the temple at Jerusalem, the workmen were destroyed  
 ‘ by fire sent from God?’

There still remains one contemporary writer to be quoted,  
 who is Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen, and a good historian,  
 and well acquainted with the emperor.

<sup>1</sup> De S. Babyla. contr. Julian. et Gentil.  
 Tom. ii. p. 547. C. D.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ ὡς  
 αὐτὸν τε ὁμοῦ τὸν χρόνον ἡξίατο κενεῖν, καὶ  
 πύργους τῶν θεμελίων ἐκπηδήσαν ἀθροῦν ἀπαι-  
 ῆας αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνάλωσαν. Ib. p. 574. C.

<sup>3</sup> In Matt. hom. 4. Tom. 7. p. 47. A.

<sup>4</sup> Non audisti, Imperator, quia cum jus-  
 sisset Julianus reparari templum Hierosoly-  
 mis, divino, qui faciebant repurgium, igne  
 flagrarunt? Ambr. Ep. 40. Cl. i. T. ii.  
 p. 949.

‘ Julian <sup>9</sup>,’ says he, ‘ who had been already thrice consul, taking for his colleague Sallust, præfect of the Gauls, entered for the fourth time on that high office: and although he was not without a solicitous concern for futurity, considering the various events which this year was likely to produce, he carried on his preparations for the war with the utmost diligence. And still enlarging his views, and being desirous to perpetuate the memory of his reign by some great works, he resolved to rebuild at a vast expence the magnificent temple at Jerusalem; which after a long and obstinate siege, begun by Vespasian, and carried on by Titus, had been with great difficulty taken and destroyed. The conduct of this affair was committed by him to Alypius of Antioch, who formerly had been lieutenant in Britain, with orders to forward it as much as possible. When therefore Alypius had set himself to the work with the greatest resolution, and was also assisted by the governor of the province, frightful balls of fire broke out near the foundations: and those eruptions being repeated, they rendered the place inaccessible to the workmen, who were scorched and burnt several times before they left off. But the element continuing to repel them, the enterprize was laid aside.’

So writes Ammianus: according to whom, therefore, this attempt was made in the beginning of the year 363, when Julian was setting out from Antioch on his Persian expedition.

So likewise says Socrates, whom I shall allege next. Having mentioned Julian’s conference with the Jews, who told him, that they could sacrifice no where but at Jerusalem, he says, ‘ Julian <sup>9</sup> immediately gave orders for rebuilding Solomon’s temple: and then he went away against the Persians. But the Jews, who had long been desirous to see the temple rebuilt, set about the work with great diligence. . . . And as the emperor had directed that the expence should be borne out of the public

<sup>9</sup> Julianus vero, jam ter Consul, adscito in collegium trabæ Sallustio præfecto per Gallias, quatuor ipse amplissimum iniverat magistratum: et videbatur novum adjunctum esse Augusto privatum, quod post Diocletianum et Aristobulum nullus memineral gestum. Et licet accidentium varietatem sollicita mente præcipiens, multiplicatos expeditionis apparatus flagranti studio perurgeret: diligentiam tamen ubique dividens, imperiique sui memoriam magnitudine operum gestiens propagare, ambitiosum quondam apud Hierosolymas templum, quod post multa et interneciva certamina obsidente Vespasiano, posteaque

Tito, ægre est expugnatum, inflaurare sumtibus cogitabat immodicis: negotiumque maturandum. Alypio dedit Antiochensi, qui olim Britannias curaverat pro præfectis. Cum itaque rei idem fortiter instaret Alypius, juvaretque provinciæ rector, metuendi globi flammæ prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes, fecere locum exustis aliquoties operantibus inaccessum. Hocque modo elemento destinatus repellente, cessavit inceptum. Ammian. Mar. cel. l. 23. cap. 1. L. iii. cap. 20.

• . . . κελευει ταχος κτισθαι τον Σολομωνος ναον. Και αυτος επι Περσας ηλαυνε. Ib. p. 192. D.

‘ treasury,

' treasury, materials were soon provided; timber, stones, burnt-  
 ' brick, clay, lime, and all other things needful for a building.  
 ' At that time Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, mindful of the pro-  
 ' phecy of Daniel, and of what Christ had said in the gospels,  
 ' predicted ' before many people, that the time was now come,  
 ' that one stone would not be left upon another in that temple,  
 ' and our Saviour's word would be \* \* \* fulfilled. So said that  
 ' bishop. And in the night there was an earthquake, which  
 ' tore up the stones of the old foundations, and dispersed them,  
 ' with the adjacent edifices: and by that accident the Jews were  
 ' much terrified; and the fame of it brought many to the place  
 ' from distant parts. When therefore many were gathered to-  
 ' gether another prodigy happened; for there came down from  
 ' heaven a fire which consumed all the workmen's tools: and you  
 ' might see mallets, irons for polishing stones, saws, axes, spades,  
 ' and all such instruments which are made use of in building,  
 ' consumed by the flames: the fire preyed upon these things for  
 ' a whole day together. The Jews thereupon being terrified,  
 ' acknowledged, though unwillingly, Christ to be God. How-  
 ' ever, they obeyed not his will, but still remained prepossessed  
 ' in favour of Judaism. Nor did the third miracle, which after-  
 ' wards happened, induce them to the belief of the truth: for  
 ' in the night following radiant marks of the cross were impressed  
 ' on their garments. When they saw them the next day, they  
 ' endeavoured to rub and wash them out, but in vain: to so  
 ' great a degree were they blinded.'

The same story is told at length by Sozomen<sup>u</sup>, Theodoret<sup>x</sup>,

' Πολλοίς τε προείπον, ως αρα νυν ηκει  
 ο καιρος, οτι λιθος επι λιθον εκ αν μενοι εις  
 του ναου, αλλα το τμ σωτηρας λογιον απληρω-  
 θησειαι. p. 193. B. \* \* \* It is very  
 absurd for any Christians to talk in that  
 manner. Christ's words had been fulfilled  
 almost 300 years before that time. Matt.  
 xxiv. 24. *Verily, I say unto you, this gene-  
 ration shall not pass till all these things be  
 fulfilled.* And so it came to pass, as we  
 know from Josephus and others. There  
 is, in my opinion, a much better sense in  
 Rufinus. 'Cyril was then bishop of Jeru-  
 ' salem; and when the Jews were about  
 ' to lay the foundations of a new temple,  
 ' he, considering the prophecies of Daniel,  
 ' and the words of our Lord recorded in  
 ' the gospels, confidently asserted, that it  
 ' could not be, that the Jews should be  
 ' able to lay there one stone upon another.'  
 His words are these; Cyrillus post maxi-

mum confessorem Hierosolymis episcopus  
 habebatur. Apertis igitur fundamentis,  
 calce cementoque adhibitis, nihil omnino  
 decrat, quin die postera veteribus deturbatis,  
 nova jacerent fundamenta: cum tamen  
 episcopus, diligenti consideratione habita,  
 vel ex illis quæ in Danielis prophetia de  
 temporibus legerat, vel quæ in Evangeliiis  
 Dominus prædixerat, persisteret, nullo ge-  
 nere fieri posse, ut ibi a Judæis lapis super  
 lapidem poneretur. Rufin. l. i. cap. 37.  
 So writes Rufinus. And, perhaps, the sense  
 which we have in Socrates's History is  
 owing to his misinterpretation of Rufinus,  
 and not rightly understanding him: for I  
 suppose that Socrates here borrowed from  
 Rufinus. However, undoubtedly the  
 learned reader will consult the Annotations  
 of Valesius upon Socrates.

u Soz. l. v. cap. 22.  
 x Théod.  
 l. iii. cap. 20.

Philostorgius,

Philostorgius<sup>y</sup>, and other Christian writers, though with somewhat different circumstances. Theodoret in particular tells us, it<sup>z</sup> was said, that upon this occasion the Jews had shovels, mallets, and baskets made of silver.

Some Jewish writers also have been alleged as bearing testimony to this event: I shall also allege them<sup>a</sup> here as cited by Wagenfeil, to whom divers learned men have referred.

That is the history of this affair, which is generally credited; and indeed it seems hard to deny, or dispute the truth of a relation, attested by several contemporaries, beside many others who lived not very long after them. Accordingly the truth of this history is maintained by Fabricius<sup>b</sup>, Witsius<sup>c</sup>,<sup>d</sup> the learned and laborious Dr. Warburton, now bishop of Gloucester, and others, men of the highest reputation in the republic of letters.

Basnage<sup>e</sup> made some objections to the truth of this history, which have been considered by<sup>f</sup> divers learned men, and particularly and largely by<sup>g</sup> the bishop of Gloucester in the work before referred to: I also have had many thoughts upon this subject, which I desire now to propose with due deference to the

<sup>y</sup> Philost. l. vii. § 9. p. 566.

<sup>z</sup> Φασι δε αυτες και σκαπανας εξ ολας αρ-  
γυρης και αμας και κοφινας κατασκευασαι.  
Ut supra. p. 142. C.

<sup>a</sup> Equidem aut valde fallor, aut, non sine peculiari curâ numinis factum est, ut ipsi adeo Judæi suis monumentis historiam inseruerint, quamquam non bonâ omnes fide. R. David Gansius enim animadvertisse videtur, quantopere isthæc suæ genti incommodent: ideo veritatem malitiosissime adulteravit. Nam etsi negare non audet, Deo sic disponente, Judæos in restaurando templo fuisse impeditos, tamén genuinam rationem modumque, quibus id factum est, nequitèr dissimulat, et solam Juliani mortem Judæos ædificantes sufflamine strinxisse, ex suo ingenio confinxit. Ejus verba sunt . . . 'Julianus Cæsar præcepit, ut restitueretur templum sanctissimum magno cum decore et pulchritudine, huicque rei ipse sumptus suppeditavit. Verum cœlitus impedimentum injectum est, ne perficiatur fabrica. Nam Cæsar in bello Persico perierat.' . . . At enim non opus est, ut operose probem, verum certumque esse, Judæos ante cessasse ab opere, quam Julianus postremam expeditionem adversus Persas, quæ ei exitium attulit, suscepisset. Sufficit coram hac adducere R. Geddalium, qui . . . candidè narrationem intulit, et sine favore . . . 'In diebus R. Channan, et so-

ciorum ejus, anno circiter orbis conditâ 4349, memorant libri annalium, magnum in orbe universo fuisse tertæ motam, collapsumque esse templum, quod struxerunt Judæi Hierosolymis, præcepto Juliani Apostatæ, impensis maximis. Postridie ejus diei (quo mota fuit terra) de cœlo ignis multus cecidit, ita ut omnia ferramenta illius ædificii liquecerent, et arderentur Judæi multi, atque adeo innumerabiles.' Wagenfeilii Carmin. Lipsmanni. Confutatio. p. 231, 232.

<sup>b</sup> Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 76. &c. Lux Evangelii. cap. vi. p. 120. &c.

<sup>c</sup> Miscellanea Sacra. Tom. ii. p. 374. &c.

<sup>d</sup> Julian. &c. It is a handsome octavo of 320 pages, beside an Introduction. The late Mr. Mollheim, who had seen the first edition of that work, seems to have thought his lordship had overdone it. His words are: Nuper ex instituto, sed interdum ingeniosius, quam necesse erat, pro veritate miraculi disputavit Guil. Warburton, Julian. or a Discourse. &c. Lond. 1750. in 8vo. Mosheim. Instit. H. E. p. 148.

<sup>e</sup> Hist. des Juifs. l. vi. ch. 4. Tom. iv. p. 1957. &c.

<sup>f</sup> Vid. Fabric. Lux Evangelii. p. 130. in notis.

<sup>g</sup> See His Lordship's Julian. B. ii. ch. 4. p. 274. &c. the second edition, in 1751.

judgment

judgment of others: I shall not transcribe Basnage; but I have been led to argue in this manner.

1. Julian's own writings may dispose us to think, that he never attempted to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem. He designed it, but it is not so clear that he attempted it, or actually set about it, or gave orders for it. In his Letter to the Community of the Jews, before taken notice of, he desires their prayers for the prosperity of his reign, 'and the rather, forasmuch as if he succeeded in his war with the Persians, he would rebuild their holy city of Jerusalem.' But he did not succeed in the war, and he never returned from Persia, therefore he never set about rebuilding Jerusalem, or the temple there: nor did he, at the time of writing that letter, intend to set about it, unless he first succeeded in the war with the Persians. He seems to have supposed it to be a work, which he should not be able to undertake till after the Persian war was over, and had a good issue.

In the fragment of some oration or epistle, having taken notice how often the Jewish temple had been destroyed, and was not yet restored, he adds: 'I say not this by way of reproach; for I also have designed, [or have had a design] to raise that temple, which has been so long in ruins, to the honour of the God who is there worshipped.' Therefore, when that letter was written, this design was laid aside; or, he did not think that to be a proper time and season to set about it. The present circumstances of his affairs did not admit of such an undertaking, nor allow him to give orders about it.

When that letter or oration was written is not clear. Dr. Warburton thinks it was written in the spring of the year 363; his words are these [at p. 73]: 'Where Julian, speaking of the customary honours paid to the gods, says: "Which not three years, nor three thousand have established, but all past ages among all nations upon earth." By the three years he evidently alludes to his restoration of idolatry; which at any time sooner than the Persian expedition, was not entitled to so high a date. For he was first saluted Augustus in the spring of the year 360, and the Persian expedition was in the spring 363; at this time, therefore, he had well digested his defeat at Jerusalem.'

That is an ingenious conjecture, but not decisive. It is not clear, that Julian here refers to his own restoration of the heathen rites: the phrase, 'three years,' needs not to refer to any deter-

<sup>h</sup> Julian. Ep. p. 397. D. See the words cited above at p. 377. note x.

<sup>h</sup> Ἐὼ δὲ εἶπον ἐκ οὐρανῶν ἐκείνοις' οἱ

γε τοσούτοις ὑπερὸν χρόνοις ἀπελευσθαι διὰ νοσθῆν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν τιμὴν τῆς κληθείης ἐπ' αὐτῷ Θεοῦ. T. ii. p. 295. D.

minate period; it may denote no more than this: 'which not a few years, nor several thousand years have established, but all past ages.' Secondly, it cannot refer or allude to Julian's restoration of idolatry; for that had not been done 'three years,' nor two years by a great deal. In the spring of the year 363, it was not more than three years since he had been declared Augustus by the soldiers in Gaul: not yet quite a year and half, since his being sole Augustus; and not more than two years, since he had at all made an open profession of Hellenism, allowing him to have begun to make it when he was in Illyricum, before the death of Constantius. Julian in this place, as I think, useth a definite for an indefinite number, by 'three' meaning a few only. So in his work against the Christians, he says, the law of Moses was designed to be everlasting. 'And this he says, he<sup>h</sup> will demonstrate not from ten only, but from ten thousand passages of Moses himself.' Which answers to the place under consideration, and may shew, that by 'three years,' no certain space of time was intended: consequently this argument of his lordship for the date of this epistle must fall to the ground. And there can be no reason to believe, that this letter was written in the beginning of the year 363, or that Julian here refers to any extraordinary defeat, which had been given to his design of rebuilding the temple: and whenever that letter was written, it affords reason to believe, that Julian had not yet given any orders for rebuilding the temple.

Once more, I argue from some things said by Julian in his work against the Christians, where he observes, that the Jews might offer sacrifices at other places beside Jerusalem. We know, that work was not composed long before he set out upon the Persian expedition. If that was his mind then, it seems, that he was grown more indifferent about rebuilding the Jewish temple than he had formerly been.

The words to which I refer stand thus: 'But<sup>i</sup> this person,' says Cyril, 'I know not how, sometimes approves of the Jewish customs; at other times he blames them, as separate from all other men; and as having most unreasonably given over sacrificing, though Elias, as he says, sacrificed in Carmel, and not in the holy city Jerusalem.' It appears to me very unlikely,

<sup>h</sup> Τέτα οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰουδαῖος λείψανον, ἀποδείξω σαφέστατα καὶ τῆς Μωσέως ἢ δέκα μόνως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς παρεχόμενης μαρτυρίας. Cyril. Cont. Jul. lib. ix. p. 319. D.

<sup>i</sup> Ὁ εἰς ἐν οὐδ' οὐκ παθῶν, ἀποδέχεται τὰ Ἰουδαῖα, καταψέπει δὲ πάλιν αὐτῶν, ὡς τῶν

μεν ἄλλων ἀπατῶν ἀπὸ τῆς μενῆς, ἀλοφωτῆρα δὲ τοῦ θυνοῦ ἐκινῆσαι, καίτοι, φησι, Ἡλίου τεθυκότος ἐν τῷ Καρμηλῶ, καὶ ἔκ ἐν τῇ Ἀσια πῶλει, φημι δὴ τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ. Cyril. Cont. Jul. l. ix. p. 324. C.

that Julian should be disposed to gratify the Jews at a vast, and then unseasonable, and inconvenient expence, in what he reckoned an unreasonable fancy.

If Julian's work against the Christians, as Libanius says, was composed 'in the winter-season, during the long nights,' that is, near the end of the year 362, and the beginning of 363, it is not at all likely, that he should in the beginning of the same year 363, issue out orders for rebuilding the Jewish temple at Jerusalem.

In that oration, or epistle, to which we have referred several times, at p. 295, are these expressions. 'What will the Jews say to their own temple, which has been thrice demolished, and is not raised again to this day? Τι περι τῆς νεωφισῆσι, τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς, τριῶν ἀναστραπέυσης, εἰρηόμενης δὲ ἄδε νῦν; Some learned men have supposed, that <sup>k</sup> here is a reference to the defeat of Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple, and that Julian himself here acknowledgeth it. But the bishop of Gloucester, p. 74, in the notes, has candidly, and judiciously shewn that to be a mistake. For, 1. 'Defeating an attempt to rebuild cannot in any known figure of speech, be called the overthrow of a building. 2. And 'is not raised again to this day, cannot be said of a building that had been destroyed but two months before.' And by the three subversions here spoken of, his lordship supposes may be meant that by the Assyrians, and that by the Romans; and by the third may be meant the profanation of the temple by Antiochus.

If I should allow myself to represent this a little differently, it would be after this manner. The case was this; the temple was then in ruins, and had been so for a long time; it had been demolished more than once; Julian did not think himself obliged to say how often; and it was to his purpose to augment, rather than diminish the number of its subversions. Indeed, it had been demolished but twice; that is, by the Assyrians, and then by the Romans; the emperor says thrice, not being careful to be exact.

Or, if it be needful to understand Julian literally, we may suppose, that he refers to the subversion of Jerusalem, and the Jewish people in the time of Adrian, spoken of by Eusebius in (\*) his History, and in his (\*\*\*) Chronicle, and by other writers (||) elsewhere. This Julian might compute for the third.

<sup>k</sup> So Bletterie, Vie de Julien. l. v. p. 398. and Dr. Chapman in his Eusebius, against the Moral Philosopher. Tom. i. p. 408, 409. (\*) Euf. H. E. l. iv. cap. 6. (\*\*\*) Bellum Judaicum quod in Palæstina gerebatur, finem accipit,

rebus Judæorum penitus oppressis: ex quo tempore etiam introcundi eis Jerosolymanam licentia ablata. &c. Chron. p. 167.

(||) Vid. Vales. in Euseb. H. E. and see here in this work, vol. VII. p. 142, 145.

2. That Julian should give orders for building the temple, and allot money for it out of the public treasury, when he was setting out for Persia, is very unlikely. It is not easily credible, that he should at that time do any thing that might at all impede the expedition against the Persians, upon which he had been so long intent. We may reasonably suppose, that when he wrote his letter to the community of the Jews, and told them, ' he would build their temple, if he returned victorious ;' he was then sensible he could not attempt it sooner ; and that he should want all the resources of money and treasure for that one design : which seems actually to have been the case. And when Marcellinus speaks of Julian's attempt, he appears to have been very sensible that the emperor's hands were full, and that there was at that time no room for any other expensive undertaking, beside the Persian war.

3. Great weight is laid upon the testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus, who was a heathen, and an impartial historian.

But then, it has been said by some, that he had his account from the Christians, and took it up without examination. To which I would add, that he was credulous, as appears from many things <sup>1</sup> in his history ; he might, therefore, without scruple, record a miraculous interposition, which had been reported to him. Indeed, he appears very ready to receive the reports of extraordinary things. Some things are mentioned by him (\*\*) which we cannot but wonder to see related by a man of gravity, and with plain marks of assent.

4. The history of this event, as related by Christian writers, is loaded with miracles, or pretended miracles, which appear to be incredible. For it is not easy to believe that by divine interposition crosses were formed in the air, and impressed with a ' fine embroidery or painting ' upon men's bodies or garments. Not now to mention any other of the strange things, most of them silly and trifling, inserted in the accounts of this affair, and which

<sup>1</sup> Nocte tamen, quæ declarationis Augusti præcesserat diem, junctioribus proximis retulerat Imperator, per quietem aliquam visum, ut formari Genius publicus solet, hæc objurgando dixisse . . . Ammian. l. xx. cap. 5. fin.

. . . vidit squalidius, ut confessus est proximis, speciem illam Genii publici, quam cum ad Augustum surgeret culmen conspexit in Gallia. Id. l. xxv. cap. 2. p. 451. (\*\*) Ne sit hoc mirum, homines profutura discernere et nocentia, quarum mentes cognatas cælestibus arbitra-

mur, animalia ratione carentia salutem suam interdum alto tueri silentio solent : ut exemplum est hoc perquam notum. Linquentes Orientem anseres ob calorem, plagamque petentes occidentem, cum montem penetrare cœperint Taurum aquilis abundantem, timentes fortissimas volucres, rostra lapillis occludunt, ne eis eliciat vel necessitas extrema clangorem : iisdemque collibus agiliore volatu transcursis projiciunt calculos, atque ita securius pergunt. Amm. l. xviii. cap. 3. p. 209.

the reader doubtless well remembers. But all God's works have a dignity becoming himself.

Mr. Mosheim having largely considered the story of the cross appearing to Constantine in the air, or in a dream, with a direction from Christ, that he should make use of that sign in his wars, and assuring him of victory thereby, concludes, that it is not a thing worthy of Christ: and says, that 'it could be nothing more than the natural dream of a general, and an emperor, who fell asleep, as he was thinking of the impending war, and the best method of overcoming his enemies. Let us take heed, says he, lest by too stily defending the narratives of the ancient Christians, concerning the miracles of their time, we should offend against the majesty of God himself, and against our most holy religion, which teacheth us, not to overcome our enemies, but ourselves.' A sage observation! which may be justly applied upon divers occasions, and upon this in particular, as I apprehend.

5. There was at that time no occasion for such miraculous interpositions. Undoubtedly, the Jewish temple was not to be rebuilt; it is not to be thought, that Divine Providence would permit it to be done at that time; but there was no need of such miracles to hinder it; Julian did not live long; supposing the Jews to have begun in his reign to erect the temple at Jerusalem; the Christian emperors, who succeeded him, would take care, that they should not proceed. The rebuilding the temple was not a work of a few weeks, or months, no, nor years. Supposing they had set about the work at the beginning of the year 363, they could not have done a great deal before Julian died, and then their work would be effectually obstructed.

6. Once more. There are several Christian writers, who have said nothing about this affair, who were very likely to mention it, if any thing of this kind had been done. I shall instance in three: Jerom, Prudentius, and Orosius.

*Quid, quæso, dicit? Num Constantium exhortatur, ut credat, atque sanctitati studeat? Num superstitionem et impietatem fugere et oppugnare, rem publicam juste ac sapienter administrare, num penitentiam admissorum facinorum agere, atque civium salutem rebus omnibus anteponebat? Nihil vero horum. Quid igitur? Monstrat rationem victoriæ obtinendæ, docetque Constantium, quali signo militari uti debeat in præliis. Hæcine oratio servatore generis humani, qui peccata hominum morte sua expiavit, hæcine oratio*

*illo digna est, qui pacis auctor mortalibus est, et suos hostibus ignoscere vult? Quid multa? Naturale hoc somnium est militis et Imperatoris, quem de impendente bello, et optima hostes superandi ratione cogitantem somnus invalerat. Caveamus, ne veterum Christianorum narrationibus de ætatis suæ miraculis acriter defendendis in ipsam majestatem Dei, et sanctissimam religionem, quæ non hostes, sed nos ipsos debellare docet, injurii simus. Mosheim. de Reb. Christian. ante Const. M. p. 984. 985.*

Jerom

Jerom was a contemporary; he was a young man when Julian died; a great part of his time he lived at Bethlehem; and he had travelled over the land of Israel, or Palestine; but never takes notice of this uncommon event. Dan. xi. 34. *Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help.* In his comment upon that verse, he<sup>a</sup> mentions several, to whom that prophecy had been applied. Some, he says, understood thereby the emperor Julian, who pretended to love the Jews, and promised to offer sacrifices in their temple. It is allowed by all, that Julian favoured the Jews, and pretended to love them, though he bore them no good-will, and that he likewise talked of rebuilding their temple, and sacrificing there. But Jerom says nothing here (though there was so fit an occasion) nor elsewhere, of his attempting it, and then, being defeated by such miraculous interpositions as those related by some above quoted. He has often spoken of the overthrow of the temple by Vespasian and Titus, which he calls the<sup>o</sup> last. He<sup>o</sup> has often mentioned Julian, as an adversary to the Christians, and has quoted his work against them. He has likewise often appealed to Josephus's history of the Jewish<sup>a</sup> war; but says nothing of any attempt to rebuild Jerusalem, and the temple there, in his own time. It is inconceivable that he should omit it, though he insists, as he does more than once, on the ruinous condition in which the temple had been to that time, ever since the days of Titus and Adrian.

Prudentius was another contemporary of Julian; for he was born in the year 348; and did not write, till a good while after

<sup>a</sup> Alii vero de Juliano Imperatore: quod quando oppressi fuerint a Caio Cesare, et a captivitate angustiis multa perpassi, ille consurget, Judæos amare se simulans, et in templo eorum immolaturum se promittens: in quo parvam spem auxiliū habebunt, et applicabuntur illis Gentilium plurimi, non in veritate, sed in mendacio. In Dan. cap. xi. Tom. 3. p. 1130.

<sup>o</sup> Quæ Hebræi in ultima everfione Templi, quæ sub Vespasiano et Tito accidit, interpretantur. . . . In Dan. cap. xi. ver. 33. Tom. 3. p. 1130.

<sup>p</sup> Vid. Prol. in libr. de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis. Tom. 4. p. 98. et alibi.

<sup>q</sup> . . . ad tempus Romanæ victoriæ universa referimus, quæ Josephus Judaicæ scriptor historiæ septem explicat voluminibus, quibus imposuit titulum captivitatis Judaicæ. . . . Et superfluum est ea sermone distendere, quæ oculis pateant, quum omnia & desiderabilia eorum versa sint in ruinas: et

templum in toto orbe celebratum, in sterquilinum urbis novæ, quæ a conditore appellatur Ælia, et in habitaculum transivit nocturnum. Hieron. in Is. cap. lxiv. 10. . . . 12. T. 3. p. 476.

Ad extremum sub Vespasiano et Tito urbis capta, templumque subversum est. Deinde civitatis usque ad Hadrianum principem per quinquaginta annos mansere reliquæ. Post everfionem Templi paullo minus per quadringentos annos urbis et templi ruinae permanent. Ad Dardan. Tom. 2. p. 610.

Scribit plenius Josephus septem Voluminibus Vespasiani et Titi narrans triumphos. Ælii quoque Adriani contra Judæos expeditionem legimus, qui ita Jerusalem, muroque subvertit, ut de urbis reliquiis et favillis sui nominis Æliam conderet civitatem. Id. in Joel cap. i. Tom. 3. p. 1340.

the death of that emperor. He <sup>r</sup> has gone over the history of Julian's reign; he <sup>s</sup> has also insisted upon the ruin of Solomon's temple, the <sup>t</sup> long captivity of the Jewish people ever since the time of Titus; and with him he mentions Pompey, who first brought the Jewish people into subjection to the Romans. But he says nothing of any attempt made in his time by Julian to rebuild Jerusalem, or the temple there. If he had known of it, and had been acquainted with credible accounts of miraculous interpositions to defeat it, I do not see how he could omit to mention it.

Orosius was an historian, who lived not far below the beginning of the fifth century. He <sup>u</sup> has an article for Julian; but does not say that he attempted to build the temple at Jerusalem, and was wonderfully defeated. He was greatly offended with Julian, and seems to aim to hint at all his incivilities to the Christians, of <sup>x</sup> which the attempt to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem has been generally reckoned one; but yet says nothing of it <sup>z</sup> \* \*. If Julian had attempted to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem, and had been defeated by a miraculous interposition, it was an event much to his purpose, and altogether suited to the great design of his history, and could not have been omitted by him.

To me the silence of these three writers appears very remarkable. I do not know how others may be affected by it; but I acknowledge that I was much struck with it, when I first observed it in my inquiries into this transaction.

And I must now add farther, that I do not recollect, that Cyril of Alexandria, in his books against Julian, or in any other of his works elsewhere, has at all spoken of an attempt of that emperor to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, and that he was miraculously defeated.

<sup>r</sup> Me puero, ut memini, ductor fortissimus armis.

Perfidus ille Deo. . . . Apoth. ver. 450. &c.

<sup>s</sup> Destructione jacent Salomonica saxa metallo,  
Ædificata manu? Jacet illud nobile templum.  
Cur jacet. . . ? Ibid. ver. 512. &c.

<sup>t</sup> Quid mereare, Titus docuit: docuere rapinis  
Pompeianæ acies: quibus extirpata per omnes  
Terrarum pelagique plagas tua membra feruntur.  
Ex illis vagus huc illuc fluitantibus errat  
Judæus. . . . Ibid. ver. 538. &c.

<sup>u</sup> Oros. l. vii. cap. 30.

<sup>x</sup> Καὶ κατ' ἄλλαν δὲ τρόπον ὁ βασιλεὺς  
τῆς Χριστιανῆς ἐλαπίειν σπεύδαζεν. . . κ. λ.  
Seclet. l. iii. cap. 20. in. p. 192. C. D.

<sup>z</sup> \* \* Dr. Warburton, in his Julian, p.

118. mentions Orosius among other ancient writers, who have borne testimony to this attempt. If that be right, I have overlooked the place.

What

What Zonaras says, in the 12th century, may likewise deserve notice. ‘He’ gave leave to the Jews to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem; and they having begun to build with great labour, and at much expence, when they endeavoured to dig up the earth in order to lay the foundation, it is said, that flames of fire burst out, and consumed the workmen, so that they were obliged to desist from the building.’

Let not any be offended, that I hesitate about this point; I think we ought not too easily to receive accounts of miraculous interpositions, which are not becoming the Divine Being. There are many things said of Julian, which all wise and good men do not believe.

Julian, and his elder brother Gallus, as is said, while they were young, undertook to build a church over the sepulchre of a martyr, named Mamas, who had suffered at Cæsarea, in Capadocia. They divided the work between them, and both carried on their parts severally with great diligence. That part of the building which was the care of Gallus advanced prosperously; but some invisible power obstructed Julian’s attempt; there was no fixing the foundations, the earth throwing up the stones again; or if any part of the building was raised up to some height, it was presently shattered, and tumbled down to the ground. This is related by <sup>2</sup> Gregory Nazianzen, as a miracle, and with great parade; and for the truth of it, he appeals to eye-witnesses. The same story is told by <sup>3</sup> Sozomen; ‘who says, there were many still living, who received the account from those who saw it.’ It is also briefly related by <sup>b</sup> Theodoret.

Again, it is said, that when Julian was sacrificing, a cross within a circle was found impressed upon the entrails of the victim. This also is related by <sup>c</sup> Gregory Nazianzen, and <sup>d</sup> Sozomen.

Both these accounts are scornfully rejected as monkish fables, by the truly learned and right reverend the lord bishop of Gloucester <sup>e</sup>; though, as he owns, ‘Church History informs us of them.’ And very unfortunately, those observations are in the conclusion of a volume composed with great labour and zeal, in which divers other accounts are received, which are not more probable in their own nature, nor supported by better authority.

Υ Οὗτος καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολυμοῖς ἀνεγερθεὶς ναὸν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπέβριψε. Κακῶν σπυδαίων πόλεον καὶ μεγάλας δαπαναῖς τῆς οικοδομῆς ἀρχαίωσι, καὶ εὐρίτερον τὴν γῆν, εἰς κατὰ τὸν τῶν δεμελιῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων, αὐτῶν λείπειν τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀθροῦν ἀναδιδόμενον, κατὰ τὴν τῆς σκαπτοῦσας, ὡς ἀναβρασθῆναι εἶπε, τῆς οικοδομῆς ἀποσχίσθαι. Ζοναρ.

Tom. 3. 21. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Gr. Naz. Or. 3. p. 59 . . . 61.

<sup>3</sup> Soz. l. v. cap. 2. p. 594. A.

<sup>b</sup> Theod. l. iii. cap. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Gr. Naz. Or. 3. p. 70 . . . 77.

<sup>d</sup> Sozom. l. v. cap. 2. p. 592. B. C.

<sup>e</sup> See his lordship’s Julian. p. 319. 320.

The truth of history is not at all affected by rejecting improbable relations. Nor is the cause of Christianity at all hurt by our refusing to assent to some things which Christian writers have said of Julian. That he pretended favour for the Jews, and sometimes talked of rebuilding their city and their temple, is allowed; but that he actually attempted it, and ordered money for the work out of the public treasury, when he was setting out upon the Persian expedition, and that his attempt was frustrated by many miraculous interpositions, is not so certain. Though these things should be contested, or denied, it can be of no bad consequence. Other histories, which are void of the like improbabilities, are not affected by it; and the Evangelical History remains firm and inviolate, having in it all possible marks of truth and credibility. At the beginning of his discourse on the attempt of Julian to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, his lordship says, 'that the evidence of the miracles recorded in Church-History, doth not stand on the same foot of credit with the miracles recorded in Gospel-History.'

As for the testimony of the two Jewish writers, upon which some insist, I have above put it down from Wagenfeil's *Tela Ignea Satanæ*; but I do not think the testimony of writers in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, to be of much value. They appear to have borrowed from Christian writers; therefore one of them calls the emperor Julian, the apostate. However, though they relied chiefly upon Christian authors, they may have in part altered and perverted the Christian accounts, to abate the reproach which this story, as told by them, casts upon the Jewish people.

Nevertheless, that it may not be said I affect to slight what others reckon material, I shall now be a little more particular in my remarks upon those two Jewish testimonies.

Rabbi David Gans, in the sixteenth century, says: 'The emperor Julian ordered, that the most holy temple should be rebuilt with great beauty and magnificence, at his own expence; but by interposition from heaven an impediment was thrown in the way, so that the building could not be finished; for the emperor died in the Persian war.'

This is very agreeable to what I have said; and may be thought to confirm my argument; but, indeed, I am not disposed to set much value upon so late a testimony,

Rabbi Gadaliah, in the fifteenth century, says: 'In the days of R. Channan, and his brethren, about the year of the world 4349, our annals tell us, that there was a great earthquake over

<sup>f</sup> Julian, p. 1.      <sup>g</sup> Apud Wagenfeil. p. 231. The words are cited above at p. 383.  
<sup>h</sup> Ap. Wagenf. p. 232. The words are cited above at p. 383.

‘ all the world ; by which the temple, which the Jews had raised  
 ‘ at Jerusalem, with vast expence, at the command of the em-  
 ‘ peror Julian the apostate, was thrown down. The next day  
 ‘ after the earthquake, a dreadful fire fell from heaven, by which  
 ‘ all the iron-work of the building, [or, “ perhaps all the iron-  
 ‘ tools employed about the work”] were melted, and many, yea  
 ‘ innumerable Jews were consumed.’

Upon this account it appears to me very obvious to observe :  
 First, this testimony is too late to be of any considerable value.  
 Secondly, the author had his account from Christian writers ;  
 therefore he calls Julian the apostate. Thirdly, in some things,  
 and as I suppose, at will, and of his own invention, he differs  
 from ancient Christian writers. Fourthly, the account is con-  
 fused, and in some respects, manifestly false. He seems to say,  
 that the temple ‘ had been built’ at a great expence, and that  
 after it had been built, it fell down, occasioned by an earthquake.  
 Here he differs from Christians, who speak only of an ‘ attempt’  
 to raise the temple. And it is a falsehood ; for it certainly was  
 not rebuilt, or raised up in Julian’s time. He also speaks of an  
 earthquake ‘ over all the world ;’ which is his own invention,  
 without any ground. Upon the whole, this account appears to  
 me confused and absurd, as well as very late, and therefore of no  
 authority ; but, as I said before, let others judge. However, I  
 am of opinion, that if the Christian testimonies fail, we are not  
 to expect any thing relating to this event of much importance  
 from the Jews.

Finally, to put an end to these critical observations ; Julian’s  
 favourable regards for the Jewish people, and his intention, (or  
 desire at least) to rebuild the city of Jerusalem and the temple  
 there, are manifest, and fully attested by contemporary witnesses,  
 and by his own writings : it is as manifest, that his design to re-  
 build Jerusalem and the Jewish temple, was never accomplished,  
 but was frustrated and defeated. Whether it was owing to mi-  
 raculous interpositions, or to his expensive preparations for the  
 Persian war, and other circumstances of his affairs, and to his  
 death and defeat in that war ; the overruling providence of God  
 ought to be acknowledged in the event : and the argument for  
 the truth of the Christian religion, taken from the fulfilment of  
 our Saviour’s predictions in the destruction of Jerusalem, and  
 the overthrow of the Jewish people by Vespasian and Titus, and  
 their continued dispersion, remains in all its force. It is an argu-  
 ment which I never intended to weaken ; it is, I think, a demon-  
 strative argument for the truth of the Christian religion ; and, as  
 I have often hinted in this work, deserving the attentive regard,  
 and serious consideration of all mankind. IV. I

IV. I have now written the history of Julian, so far as I can suppose to be needful; I therefore proceed to a more particular account of his work against the Christians, and to make extracts out of <sup>a</sup> it.

1. Cyril's answer to it consists of ten books; the first of which is an introduction of his own. In the second book he begins to make quotations from Julian's work; and from the many passages quoted from it by Cyril in his several books, it may be concluded, that Julian's performance was intended to be a laboured confutation both of Judaism and Christianity.

2. Julian's preface or introduction to his work, as we learn from Cyril, was in these words: 'I <sup>b</sup> think it right for me to shew to all men the reasons, by which I have been convinced, that the religion of the Galileans is a human contrivance, badly put together, having in it nothing divine; but abusing the childish, irrational part of the soul, which delights in fable, they have introduced a heap of wonderful works, to give it the appearance of truth.'

3. Afterwards, and near the beginning of the work: 'It <sup>c</sup> will be worth the while,' he says, 'to compare together the things said of the Deity by the Greeks and the Hebrews; and then we shall inquire of those, who are neither Greeks nor Jews, but of the sect of the Galileans, why they have preferred their notions to ours; and then, why they have not stood to them neither, but forsaking them also, they have taken to a way peculiar to themselves; holding nothing good and valuable taught by us Greeks, or by the Hebrews, the disciples of Moses; but collecting what is bad in both, they have taken atheism from the Jewish absurdity, and a wicked dissolute life from our carelessness and indifference. And this they call a most excellent religion.'

4. 'That <sup>d</sup> Moses says, God was the God of Israel only, and of Judea, and that they were his chosen people, I shall demonstrate presently; and that not only he, but the prophets after him, and Jesus the Nazarene, say the same; yea, and Paul also, who exceeded all the jugglers and impostors that

<sup>a</sup> For the time of writing that work, and of Cyril's answer to it, see above, p. 374, 375.

<sup>b</sup> Καλως εχειν μοι φαινεται τας αιτιας ενθισθαι πασιν ανθρωποις, υψων επεισθην, οτι των Γαλιλαιων η σκευαρια πλασμα εστιν ανθρωπων, υπο κακηρλιας συλλεθει: εχουσα μοι υδιν θειοι, αποχρησαμενη δε τω φιλομυθω, και παιδαριωδει, και αισιω της ψυχης μεριω, την τερατολογια εις πρισιν

ησαθεν αληθειας. Cyril. contr. Julian. l. ii: p. 39. edit. Spanhem.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. l. ii. p. 42. 43.

<sup>d</sup> Πλην οτι το Ισραηλ αυτω μωυθ Θεου, και της Ιουδαιας, και τληης εκλεκτες φισιν ειναι, αυτος τε, και οι μετ εκεινον προφηται, και Ιησους ο Ναζαρειος, επιδειξω. αλλα και τον παντας παλαιαχ των σωπολι γουρας και απαλειωας υπερβυλλομειον Παυλου. Contr. Jul. l. iii. p. 100. Λ.

ever were.' For this, he presently after alledgeth, Exod. iv. 22. 23. v. 3. vii. 1.

5. Soon afterwards, Julian proceeds in this manner: 'But that God from the beginning took care of the Jews only, and that they were his chosen lot, appears not only from Moses, and Jesus, but from Paul also; though this may be justly thought strange in Paul: but upon every occasion, like a polyplus upon the rocks, he changeth his notions of God; at one time affirming, that the Jews only are God's heritage; at another time, to persuade the Greeks, and gain them over to his side, saying: *Is he the God of the Jews only? . . . Yes, of the Gentiles also.* It is reasonable therefore to ask Paul, If he was not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles; why did he, for the most part at least, send to the Jews the prophetic spirit, and Moses, and the anointing, and the prophets, and the law, and miracles, and prodigies of fables? And you hear them saying, *man did eat angels food.* At length he sent Jesus also to them: not a prophet, not the anointing, not a master, not a preacher of the late mercy of God to us. However, he overlooked us for myriads, or if you please, for thousands of years, and left us in such ignorance, as to worship idols, as you say, from east to west, and from north to south, excepting only a small nation about two thousand years ago; planted in a part of Palestine. But if he be the God of all, and the Creator of all, why did he neglect us?'

Here is a quotation of Rom. iii. 29, and Ps. lxxviii. 25. and a reference to Rom. ix. 4. 5:

And notwithstanding Julian's cavils, it is the doctrine of the Old and the New Testament, that God is the creator of the whole world, and directs and overrules all things in heaven and on earth, with unerring wisdom, and uncontrollable power. Nor did he at any time neglect any part of mankind. He taught all by the light of nature, and the visible works of his hand, and the various methods of his providence, tempering mercy and judgment. Acts xiv. 16. 17. Rom. i. 18. . . . 21. But for wise reasons, and great ends and purposes, he chose the Jewish people, the seed of Abraham, to be a peculiar people, and made some special manifestations of himself among them, thereby setting them up for a light amidst the nations. At length, in the ful-

c Lib. iii. p. 106. B. . . D.  
... και κληρος αυτου γεγονεν ουλος  
εξαυτου. B. . . τη χαριτι εις  
της Ιουδαϊας μεν, πολυ το προφητικον επεμψε  
τουτα, και τοι Μωσαι, και το χρισμα,  
και της προφητιας, και τον νομον, και τα

παραδοξα, και τα τερασια των μυθων? C.  
Η Επι τελει δε και τον Ιησυν εκεινοιοις  
επεμψεν, ου προφητην, ου χρισμα, ου διδ  
δασκαλον, ου κηρυκα της μελλουσης οψη  
ποτε γην εισθαι και εις ημας τη Θει  
φιλανθρωπιας. Ib. C.

ness of time, at the most proper season, and according to his most gracious promise, he sent Jesus the Messiah.

The light of reason is common to all. A particular revelation is a special favour, which God may vouchsafe where; and when, and to whom he pleaseth. Whenever he has made a revelation, he has given evident proofs of its divine original. But unthinking and careless, proud and perverse men, have not diligently improved the one, nor thankfully accepted the other.

6. Julian objects against the Mosaic account of the creation of the world, the fall of man, and the confusion of languages. He finds fault also with the decalogue of Moses; which, <sup>1</sup> as he says, contained no precepts, that are not equally regarded by all nations, excepting these two: *Thou shalt worship no other gods, and Remember the sabbath-day.* He prefers <sup>2</sup> Lycurgus and Solon to Moses. 'He <sup>3</sup> reflects upon David and Samson,' Cyril says, 'as not very remarkable for valour, and exceeded by many Greeks and Egyptians; and all their power was confined within the narrow limits of Judea.' He says the <sup>4</sup> Jews never had any general equal to Alexander or Cæsar. The <sup>5</sup> wise Solomon is not to be compared with some eminent men among the Greeks; such as Phocylidès, Theognis, Isocrates. Moreover, as he adds, Solomon is said to have been overcome by women, and therefore does not deserve to be reckoned a wise man.

7. These things I mention but slightly, and quite pass over some other objections to the books of Moses, and the Old Testament: supposing it to be rather incumbent upon me to enlarge upon those objections, which more immediately relate to Christianity, and the books of the New Testament.

8. Julian cavils at several prophecies of the Old Testament, which were applied to Jesus by his followers. To this purpose, I shall allege a passage here, though it be somewhat prolix. 'Since <sup>6</sup> therefore they differ from the Jews of the present time, and say that they are the true Israelites, and that they highly respect Moses and the other prophets after him; let us see wherein they agree with them; and we shall begin with Moses, who, as they say, foretold the future nativity of Jesus. Moses, then, not once, nor twice, nor thrice, but often, taught the worship of one God only; others he calls angels, or lords; but he never teacheth any other second God, neither like, nor unlike, as you do. If you have one word in Moses, favoring

<sup>1</sup> Ποιον εθνος εστι, προς των θεων, εξω της ουπροσχυνησης θεοις ελεγοις, και της Μεσηθητι των σαδουαιων, ο μητας αλλας ονειται χρηναι φυλαττειν ενιολας; L. γ. p. 152. C.

<sup>2</sup> L. γ. p. 168. B.

<sup>3</sup> L. v. p.

176. C.

<sup>4</sup> L. vii. p. 218. B. C.

<sup>5</sup> Ο σοφωτατος Σαλομων παρομοιος εστι εν ψωμοις Ελλησι Φωκυλιδου, η Θεογνιδι, η Ισοκράτει; ποθεν; κ. λ. L. vii. p. 224. C. D.

<sup>6</sup> Lib. viii. p. 253. B... E.

such

such expressions, you should produce it. What he says is: *For the Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me. Unto him shall ye hearken.* Deut. xviii. 15. This cannot be spoken concerning the son of Mary. But, if we grant you that, he would be like unto Moses, not unto God: meaning a prophet like himself, and from men, not from God. That text also, Gen. xlix. 10. *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet:* is not said of him, but of David's kingdom, which appears to have ended in king Zedekiah. . . . But that none of these things belong to Jesus is manifest: for neither is he of Judah: and how should he be so, when, according to you he was not born of Joseph, but of the Holy Ghost? When you reckon up the genealogy of Joseph, you carry it up to Judah: but you have not been able to contrive this dexterously; for Matthew and Luke have been shewn to differ with one another about the genealogy.' Matt. i. Luke iii.

Upon this passage some remarks may be proper.

1. Julian here and elsewhere insinuates, that the doctrine of Christians concerning the Deity was different from that of Moses: but I apprehend, that the divine unity is as clearly taught in the New as in the Old Testament. *When one of the scribes came to Jesus, and asked him, Which is the first commandment of all: Jesus answered him: The first of all the commandments is: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord,* and what follows, Mark xii. 28, 29, 30. To another, who came to our Lord with a like question, and called him, *good master,* Jesus said: *Why callest thou me good? None is good, save one, that is, God.* Luke xviii. 18, 19. Again: *And this is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* John xvii. 3. See Matt. iv. 10. And says St. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.* The doctrine therefore of more gods than one, or of inferior deities, if it was held by any Christians in Julian's time, is not the doctrine of the New Testament.

2. Julian insinuates, that Christians did not consider Jesus as a prophet like unto Moses: but, however some Christians in Julian's time might express themselves, it is certain, that the apostles did esteem Jesus a prophet like unto Moses; as appears from Acts iii. 22. vii. 37. though he was greater than Moses, and was counted worthy of more glory than Moses. Heb. iii. 3.

3. Julian insinuates, that Jesus, son of Mary, could not be of the tribe of Judah, or descended from Judah, because he is said by the evangelists, not to have been born of Joseph, but of the  
Holy

Holy Ghost. Matt. ch. i. But those things are not inconsistent. Jesus was the son of Joseph, as he was born of Mary, who was espoused to him. But he was not conceived in the ordinary way, but by the immediate agency and interposition of God: therefore he is said to have been *conceived of the Holy Ghost*. Matt. i. 18. 20. and on that account was also called the *Son of God*. Luke i. 35.

4. Julian acknowledgeth the genuineness of the two genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke: and though he says they differ, they have been reconciled by learned Christians both ancient and modern.

Jerom, in particular, has taken notice <sup>p</sup> of Julian's objections to the two genealogies; and has made answers to them too long to be transcribed in this place.

9. It will not be improper for me to allege here a passage of Jerom in his commentary upon Hos. xi. 1. *When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt*. He there informs us, that Julian, in his work against the Christians, found fault with St. Matthew for applying that to Christ, ch. ii. 15. which belonged to Israel. And he says, that the evangelists did it with a design to impose upon ignorant Gentiles; which charge Jerom there considers and confutes.

10. And upon Matt. ix. 9. where it is said, that our Lord called Matthew, and *he followed him*: Jerom observes, that both Porphyry and Julian had reflected upon the apostles, as ready to follow any man without sufficient reason: which may induce us to think, that Julian sometimes borrowed from Porphyry. This has been already taken notice of by us in the chapter of <sup>s</sup> Porphyry. Jerom here says very well, as we also observed formerly, that before the disciples became stated followers of Jesus, they had seen many miracles done by him.

11. 'Jesus,' says Julian, as quoted by Cyril, 'whom you celebrate, was one of Cæsar's subjects. If you dispute it, I

<sup>p</sup> *Jacob autem genuit Joseph, virum Mariæ. &c. Matt. i. 16.]* Hoc loco objecit nobis Julianus Augustus dissonantiam Evangelistarum. Cur Evangelista Matthæus Joseph dixerit filium Jacob: et Lucas eum filium appellavit Heli: non intelligens consuetudinem scripturarum. &c. Hieron. in Matt. T. iv. P. i. p. 7. <sup>q</sup> Hunc locum in septimo volumine Julianus Augustus, quod adversum nos, id est, Christianos evomuit, calumniatur, et dicit, quod de Israel scriptum est, Matthæus Evangelista ad Christum transtulit: ut simplicitati eorum, qui de Gentibus crediderant, illu-

deret. In Osee. cap. 11. Tom. iii. p. 1311.

<sup>r</sup> Arguit in hoc loco Porphyrius et Julianus Augustus, vel imperitiam historici mentientis, vel stultitiam eorum, qui statim sequuti sunt Salvatorem, quasi irrationabiliter quemlibet vocantem hominem sint sequuti, quem tantæ virtutes, tantaque signa præcesserint, quæ apostolos, antequam crederent, vidisse non dubium est. Hieron. in Matt. T. iv. p. 30. <sup>s</sup> See p. 207.

<sup>t</sup> Ο παρ' υμιν κηρυττομενος Ιησους εις τω των Καισαρος υπηκοω. κ. κ. Ap. Cyril. contr. Julian. l. vi. p. 213.

‘ will prove it by and by ; but it may be as well done now. For  
 ‘ yourselves allow, that he was enrolled with his father and mo-  
 ‘ ther in the time of Cyrenius : but after he was born, what  
 ‘ good did he do to his relations ? For *they would not*, as it is  
 ‘ said, *believe on him*. And yet, that stiff-necked and hard-  
 ‘ hearted people believed Moses. But Jesus, who *rebuked the*  
 ‘ *winds, and walked on the seas, and cast out demons*, and, as you  
 ‘ will have it, made the heaven and the earth, (though none of  
 ‘ his disciples presumed to say this of him, except John only,  
 ‘ nor he clearly and distinctly : however, let it be allowed that  
 ‘ he said so :) could not order his designs so as to save his friends  
 ‘ and relations.’ Luke ii. John vii. 5. Matt. xiv. 25. Mark vi.  
 48. John i.

Upon this it may be observed : <sup>1</sup>. Julian does not contest the  
 account of our Saviour’s nativity, which is in St. Luke’s gospel,  
 but confirms it. <sup>2</sup>. I believe, St. John’s doctrine concerning  
 the person of Jesus Christ, is not different from that of the other  
 evangelists. <sup>3</sup>. Julian acknowledgeth, that many great and won-  
 derful works are ascribed to Jesus by the historians of his life,  
 the evangelists : nor does he deny the truth of them. <sup>4</sup>. He  
 confirms the truth of what is said of some of our Lord’s rela-  
 tions, or *brethren*, that *they did not believe in him*, at least not  
 rightly, or for a while, though they might do so afterwards, and  
 probably did <sup>o</sup> so. However, if they never did believe in him,  
 it need not be reckoned at all dishonourable to Jesus : for he  
 made no offers of special advantages to his own kindred or fa-  
 mily ; they were to be saved in no other way than other men, by  
*hearing the word of God, and doing it, or by doing the will of his*  
*Father, who is in heaven.* See Matt. xii. 50. Mark iii. 35. and  
 Luke viii. 21. If among them were sensual and worldly men,  
 they might as well reject his spiritual doctrine as any others.

12. ‘ But <sup>x</sup> Jesus having persuaded a few among you, and  
 ‘ those the worst of men, has now been celebrated about three  
 ‘ hundred years ; having done nothing in his life-time worthy  
 ‘ of remembrance ; unless any one thinks it a mighty matter to  
 ‘ heal lame and blind people, and exorcise dæmoniacs in the  
 ‘ villages of Bethsaida and Bethany.’

<sup>1</sup>. This is plainly acknowledging the truth of the evangelical  
 history, though he does not refer to the whole of it, nor specify

<sup>2</sup> See vol. vi. ch. 16. § 8.

<sup>3</sup> Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς αἰαπεισας το χειρισον των  
 παρ’ αυτην ολιγους προς τοις τριακοσιοις ενι-  
 στας σιμαζιαι, ερμασαμενους παρ’ αυ εζη-  
 χησεν εφγοι υδου ακουης αξιον’ ει μη τις ει-

εται της κυλλας και της τυφλης ιασασθαι  
 και δαιμονιας εφοριζειν εν βησβαιδα και  
 εν βηθανια ταις κωμαις των μετρωων ερσω-  
 ειται. Cyr. contr. Jul. l. vi. p. 191.

all the great works that Jesus did, nor all the places in which they were performed. <sup>2</sup>. He acknowledgeth, that for three hundred years, or more, Jesus had been celebrated: which regard for him was founded upon the works done by him in his lifetime; which works had been recorded by his disciples, eye-witnesses of those works: and the tradition had been handed down from the beginning to the time in which Julian lived. <sup>3</sup>. Why should not 'healing lame and blind men, and such as were afflicted with other distempers generally ascribed to dæmons,' be reckoned great works? All judicious and impartial men must esteem them great works, when performed on the sudden, and completely, as all our Lord's works of healing were: greater works than founding cities, erecting an extensive monarchy, or subduing whole nations by slaughter, and the common methods of conquest; though such things have been often thought more worthy to be remembered and recorded by historians. <sup>4</sup>. If there were but a few only persuaded by Jesus during his abode on this earth, it was not for want of sufficient evidence: there was enough, it seems, to persuade some *bad men*, called in the gospels *publicans and sinners*, the 'worst men,' as you say. But there were also some serious and pious men thoughtful and inquisitive, as Nathaniel, Nicodemus, and others, who were persuaded, and fully satisfied, though for a while they had been averse and prejudiced. And there were worse men than those whom you call 'the worst,' even scribes and pharisees, proud, covetous, ambitious men, whom no rational evidence, however clear and strong, could persuade to receive religious principles, contrary to their present worldly interests.

13. 'But' you are so unhappy, as not to adhere to the things 'delivered to you by the apostles: but they have been altered 'by you for the worse, and carried on to yet greater impiety. 'For neither Paul, nor Matthew, nor Luke, nor Mark, have 'dared to call Jesus God. But honest John, understanding that 'a great multitude of men in the cities of Greece and Italy, 'were seized with this distemper; and hearing likewise, as I 'suppose, that the tombs of Peter and Paul were respected, and 'frequented, though as yet privately only, however, having heard 'of it, he then first presumed to advance that doctrine.'

Υ Οὕτω δὲ εἶπε δυστυχῆς, ὡς εἶδε τοῖς ὑπο  
των ἀποστόλων ὑμῖν παραδιδόμενοις ἐκμειν-  
καί, καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον καὶ ὀσσε-  
βιστερον, ὑπο τῶν ἐπιβινομένων ἐξείρισθη.  
Τὸν γὰρ Ἰησοῦν εἶπε Παῦλος εἰσομνησεν εἰπεῖν

Θεόν, εἶπε Ματθαῖος, εἶπε Λουκᾶς, εἶπε Μάρκος:  
ἀλλ' ὁ χρηστὸς Ἰωάννης, αἰσθημένος ἢ ἢ πολλῶν  
πληθὸς ἐαλωκὸς ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν  
καὶ Ἰταλιωτικῶν πόλεων ὑπο ταύτης τῆς ἰσ-  
σε. κ. λ. Cont. Jul. l. x. p. 327. A. B.

In

In answer to this I must, <sup>1</sup>. say again, as I have already said several times, that the doctrine of St. John, concerning our Saviour's person, is not different from that of the other apostles and evangelists, but the same. <sup>2</sup>. Julian here acknowledgeth many things extremely prejudicial to his cause, and more so than he was aware of. For he here acknowledgeth the genuineness and authority of most of the books of the New Testament; the writings of Paul, the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and that these books contain the doctrine of Christ's apostles, the persons who accompanied him, and were the witnesses of his preaching, works, death, resurrection, and taught in his name afterwards. <sup>3</sup>. He acknowledgeth the early and wonderful progress of the gospel: for he supposeth, that there were in 'many cities of Greece and Italy,' multitudes of believers in Jesus, before John wrote his gospel; which, as he computes, was published soon after the death of Peter and Paul. <sup>4</sup>. Therefore the antiquity of the first three gospels is here evidently acknowledged: they were written and published before the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, that is, about the time now supposed by all Christians in general. <sup>5</sup>. And in what he says of the time of John's writing his gospel, he speaks not disagreeably to the general opinion of Christians at that time, and since. For it has been generally supposed, and indeed is manifest, that he did not write till after the other three evangelists, because he appears to have seen and read their gospels, and to have designed to make some additions to them, in the way of a supplement. I think it highly probable, that though he did not write till after the other evangelists, his gospel was published before the destruction of Jerusalem, about the year of Christ 68, as was at large argued <sup>2</sup> formerly.

14. 'They <sup>2</sup> say, they agree with Isaiah, who prophesieth: 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and shall bear a son, ch. vii. 14. 'Let this be said of God, though it is not: for she was not a virgin, who was married, and cohabited with her husband before she brought forth. However, grant that this also is said of him: does he say, that God should be born of a virgin? But you are continually calling Mary mother of God.' Θεοτοκον δε υμεις & παυσθε Μαρναν καλεντες.' Matt. i. 18 . . . 25.

We are not to be surprized, that the adversaries to Christianity did contest, or deny the virginity of Mary. They who withstood the evidences of our Saviour's divine mission, recorded in the gospels, might also dispute his miraculous conception and birth.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. vi. ch. 9. § 9.

<sup>2</sup> Contr. Julian, l. viii. p. 262. D.

But for the truth of it I have already said enough in the remarks upon <sup>b</sup> Celsus.

In another place <sup>c</sup> also Julian argues again upon that title given to Mary, ‘mother of God;’ and upon that expression ‘God of God.’ But I have no reason to say any thing in defence of either, as they are not scripture phrases.

15. ‘But <sup>d</sup> you miserable people,’ says Julian, ‘at the same time that ye refuse to worship the shield that fell down from Jupiter, and is preserved by us, which was sent down to us by the great Jupiter, or our father Mars, as a certain pledge of the perpetual government of our city: you worship the wood of the cross, and make signs of it upon your foreheads, and fix it upon your doors. Shall we for this most hate the understanding, or most pity the simple and ignorant among you, who <sup>e</sup> are so very unhappy, as to leave the immortal gods, and go over to a dead Jew?’

By a ‘dead Jew,’ it is likely, that Julian means still dead: but though Jesus died, and was buried, he rose again, and ascended to heaven: and of this there are other evidences, than the heathen people had of the shield’s coming down from heaven. Nor was it certain, it seems, whether it came from Jupiter or from Mars. Here is an instance of Julian’s credulity and superstition.

As for the extraordinary respect shewn by some Christians to the ‘wood,’ or the ‘sign’ of the cross, I have no reason to defend it: the New Testament gives no encouragement to it that I know of.

Julian blames Christians for having destroyed temples and altars; and then goes on: ‘You <sup>f</sup> have killed not only our people who persisted in the ancient religion, but likewise heretics, equally deceived with yourselves; but who did not mourn the dead man exactly in the same manner that you do. But these are your own inventions: for Jesus has no where directed you to do such things; nor yet Paul. The reason is, that they never expected you would arrive at such power. They were contented with deceiving maid-servants and slaves, and by them some men and women, such as Cornelius and Sergius. If there were then any other men of eminence brought over to you, I mean in the times of Tiberius and Claudius, when these things happened, let me pass for a liar in every thing I say.’

<sup>b</sup> See p. 19, 20. l. viii. p. 276. E.

<sup>c</sup> Contr. Julian. <sup>d</sup> Εἶσα, ὡ δυνάμεις αἰθρώποισι, σωζομένη τῆ σπαρῆ ἡμῶν ὀπλῆς Αἰουπέρας; ὁ καλεπόμενος ὁ μέγας Ζεὺς, ἦτος

παλῆς Ἀρης. . . . κ. λ. Lib. vi. p. 194. C.

<sup>e</sup> . . . ὡς τῆς αἰωνίης ἀφείλες Θεός, ἐπι τῶν Ἰουδαίων μελαδῆναι νεκρῶν. Ib. D.

<sup>f</sup> Contr. Julian, l. vi. p. 206. A. B.

This is another very important passage. <sup>1</sup>. Julian acknowledgeth, that persecution and cruelty were the inventions of later Christians: that neither Jesus, nor Paul, nor any other of the first preachers of the gospel; had taught men to kill others for being of a different religion; or for differing about lesser matters among themselves. <sup>2</sup>. But he is mistaken about the reason of this: for Jesus foresaw the vast success and speedy propagation of his doctrine. [Matt. viii. 11. xvi. 18. xxviii. 19. and many other places] though it would be opposed; and his apostles would be ill treated by many. [Matt. x. 16 . . . 26. xxiii. 34. xxiv. 9. John xx. 18, 19.] But the reason is, that his doctrine is a doctrine of universal virtue and goodness, and he *came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them*, Luke ix. 56. And the apostles knew this very well, when they began to preach publickly in his name, after his ascension, and after the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon them. So that the followers of Jesus Christ, who killed men for dissenting from them in things of religion, acted not only without orders from Christ, or his apostles, but contrary to the commandment delivered by them. <sup>3</sup>. Julian does strongly confirm the evangelical history: for he owns, that the beginnings of Christianity were in the times of the emperors Tiberius and Claudius. He speaks of the conversions of 'maid-servants and slaves,' probably meaning the *maid possessed with a spirit of divination*, Acts xvi. 16. and Onesimus, servant to Philemon. He likewise speaks of the conversion of other men and women, particularly the conversion of Cornelius and Sergius Paulus, mentioned Acts x. and xiii. <sup>4</sup>. Julian is very cautious here, when he limits his exceptions to the times of those two emperors, the latter of whom died in the year of Christ 54. Moreover, he is to be understood to speak of heathen people only. But it should be observed, that for some considerable time after the ascension of Jesus, the apostles confined their preaching to native Jews and proselytes. And among them were converted some priests and pharisees, as well as meaner people, and also the chamberlain and treasurer of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, a very eminent, and probably a very understanding and inquisitive man, Acts viii. 26 . . . 40. Whom I suppose to have been a Jewish proselyte; and, undoubtedly, Julian also considered him as a man of the Jewish religion, otherwise he would have named him. It is therefore to be reckoned very considerable success, if by the end of the reign of Claudius, or, if you please, somewhat later, were converted from among the Gentiles Cornelius and his family, and many of his friends; and Sergius Paulus proconsul of Cyprus. If they are not now renowned in profane history for any great ex-

plots, it may nevertheless be inferred from their station and character, that they were able to judge of things done before their eyes, and of the truth of principles proposed to them, and of facts related to them to have been done a few days or years before, in a country not far distant from the places of their own residence.

5. This passage does wonderfully confirm the genuineness of the book of the Acts of the apostles, and the truth of the history contained in it. Julian challengeth the Christians, after he had excepted the two above-mentioned, to produce the names of any more eminent men converted [from the Gentiles] to Christianity in the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius. Which is a proof, that Julian did not, and could not contest the truth of the history in the Acts of the apostles; and likewise, that he was well satisfied, the Christians had no other authentic history of things done at that time. He knew they relied upon the accounts given in that book, and that they did not pretend to have any other authentic accounts of them.

6. Once more, since the accounts given in the New Testament, and particularly in the Acts of the apostles, of the conversions of ‘ slaves and maid-servants, ‘ and of Cornelius and Sergius Paulus,’ are allowed to be true, it is reasonable to believe also, that the grounds and reasons of their conversion to the Christian faith are truly and faithfully related; and consequently, that they were not deceived or imposed upon, but were convinced, and persuaded upon sufficient and undeniable evidence, such as ought to sway and satisfy wise and good men.

17. ‘ But <sup>z</sup> why do you not observe a pure diet as well as the ‘ Jews? but eat all things like herbs of the field, believing Peter, because he said: *What God has cleansed, that call not thou ‘ common*, Acts x. 15. What does that mean, unless that God ‘ formerly declared them to be impure, but now has made them ‘ clean? For Moses, speaking of four-footed beasts, says: *What- ‘ soever divideth the hoof, and cheweth the cud, is clean: but what- ‘ ever does not do so, that is unclean*, [Lev. xi. 4. Deut. xiv. 6.] If ‘ then, since the vision of Peter, the swine has chewed the cud, ‘ let us believe him: for that would be truly wonderful, if since ‘ Peter’s vision it has got that faculty: but if he feigned that ‘ vision, or, to use your phrase, the revelation at the tanner’s, ‘ why should you believe him in a thing of that nature?’

This is really trifling; but it serves to shew, that the book of the Acts was generally received by Christians. It also shews what was Julian’s manner of reasoning: he wanted to form an objection here, but knew not how.

<sup>z</sup> Lib. ix. p. 314. B. C.

18. ' We are also expressly assured by Cyril, that <sup>h</sup> Julian, ' quoted the epistle of the apostles, which they wrote to the ' converted from among the Gentiles who had lately embraced ' Christianity. *It has seemed good unto the Holy Ghost, and to us, ' to impose upon you no other burden than these necessary things. . . .* ' Acts xv. 23 . . . 29.

19. Cyril, toward the end of his work, where he abridgeth, has these words: ' And <sup>l</sup> moreover this daring gentleman reviles ' the chief of the apostles Peter, and says he was a hypocrite, ' and was reprov'd by Paul, for living sometimes after the man- ' ner of the Greeks, and at other times after the manner of the ' Jews: ' Referring to what is written in the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians.

We might wish, that Cyril had here transcribed Julian more distinctly. However, this is an old objection, which had been made before by Porphyry, and has been also carefully considered by <sup>n</sup> us: and therefore I do not now enlarge any farther upon this point.

20. ' But <sup>n</sup> omitting many other things, ' says Julian, ' by ' which I might shew the law of Moses to be perpetual, do you ' shew me some place where that is said, which is affirmed by ' Paul with so much assurance: *ibat Christ is the end of the law.* ' Rom. x. 4.

21. ' But <sup>o</sup> now I must again return to them. Why then ' are you not circumcised? To which they answer: Paul says, ' it is *the circumcision of the heart*, which was required, not *that ' of the flesh.* ' Rom. ii. 28, 29.

22. ' To <sup>p</sup> which he adds, ' says Cyril, ' that Christ also has ' said, that the law ought to be kept, saying at one time, *I came ' not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it.* And again: *Whosoever ' shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, ' he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.* ' Matt. v. 17, 19.

23. ' We <sup>q</sup> cannot, say they, keep the feast of unleavened ' bread, or the passover, *because Christ has been once sacrificed for ' us.* ' 1 Cor. v. 7.

24. ' Since <sup>r</sup> you have forsaken us, why do you not adhere ' to the Jews . . . ? And why do you not sacrifice? The Jews ' indeed are hindered, because they have no temple or altar:

<sup>h</sup> Διαλεμισται δε και της των αστων απο-  
σταλν επιστολης, ην γεγραφασιν . . . τοις εκ  
εξου κειλεται. L. ix. p. 324. E.

<sup>i</sup> Κατασκευασται δε προς τελους των αποστο-  
λων εκαρθον Πιλρον ο γενναδας, και υποκρι-  
την εναι φησι, και ελεγελεχσθαι δια τη

Παυλο. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 325. C. D.

<sup>m</sup> See p. 216.

<sup>n</sup> L. ix. p. 320. A.

p. 351. A.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. C.

<sup>q</sup> L. x. p. 354. A.

<sup>r</sup> L. ix. p. 305, 306.

<sup>o</sup> L. x.

‘ but ’ you, who have a new sacrifice, have no need of Jerusa-  
 ‘ lam. But it is superfluous for me now to enlarge upon this,  
 ‘ having before ’ spoken of this matter; when I undertook to  
 ‘ shew, that the Jews agree with the Greeks, except that they  
 ‘ think that there is but one God only. That is peculiar to  
 ‘ them, and in that they differ from us: but as to other things,  
 ‘ they are in a manner all common to us both; temples, shrines,  
 ‘ altars, purifications, certain ritual observances. In all which  
 ‘ things there is little or no difference between them and us.’

2. Here seems to be a reference to the ordinance of the Lord’s  
 Supper, in that phrase, ‘ a new sacrifice.’ 2. In this passage is  
 a general and just description of Christianity: it is a plain, simple  
 worship, without sacrifices of animals, without external purifica-  
 tions, and other ritual observances. It is a character of the  
 Christian religion which is very honourable to it. It is truly ra-  
 tional and philosophical, consisting in the practice of virtue, and  
 the spiritual sacrifices of prayer, and praise, and other good  
 works. 3. Here is a popular argument against the Christians,  
 taken from their singularity, and their difference from all other  
 people: it was, indeed, a popular prejudice, and had been of  
 great force in former times; but there were men who withstood  
 it, and professed the just sentiments of religion, whilst the greatest  
 numbers rejected them, and were much incensed against men  
 upon that account. But in Julian’s time the force of it was  
 much abated, though he was willing to set it up again.

25. ‘ And ’ that not only they of this time, but that some of  
 ‘ those who at the beginning received the word from Paul were  
 ‘ such, is apparent from what Paul himself says, writing to them.  
 ‘ For I presume he was not so void of shame, as to send them  
 ‘ such reproaches in his letter to them, if he had not known  
 ‘ them to be just. These are the things which he writes of his  
 ‘ disciples, and to themselves: *Be not deceived: neither idolaters,*  
 ‘ *nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with man-*  
 ‘ *kind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor*  
 ‘ *extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And you are not ig-*  
 ‘ *norant, brethren, that such were you also. But ye are washed, but*  
 ‘ *ye are sanctified, in the name of Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. vi. 9 . . . 11.*  
 ‘ You ’ see,’ he says, ‘ they were such; but they had been sanc-  
 ‘ tified, and washed, having been cleansed and scoured with  
 ‘ water, which penetrates even to the soul. And baptism, which

2 Υμεις δε οι την καινην δοξασαν ευροιτες, 2 Οφρας, οτι και τωλυς γενεσθαι οφρα τω  
 εδεν δεομειοι της Ιερουσαλημ, αρις τινος ε ελες . . . St. Paul’s words are, *such were*  
 δευθε; p. 306. Α. Vid. l. vii. *some of you; και ταυτα τινες ης.*  
 p. 238. u L. vii. p. 245.

‘ cannot

‘ cannot heal the leprosy, nor the gout, nor the dysentery, nor any other distemper of the body, takes away adulteries, extortions, and all other sins of the soul.’

So writes Julian, and with great assurance: nevertheless it is not very easy to say upon what this argument is founded: perhaps it is built upon some extravagant assertions of Christians of that time concerning the value and efficacy of baptism: for I see no ground for it in the New Testament. Jesus, and his forerunner, preached, that men should *repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance.* After his resurrection, when his apostles were to go abroad in the world, he told them, *that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations.* Luke xxiv. 47. And says St. Peter, Acts ii. 38. *Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.* See also ch. iii. 26. and likewise ch. xx. 21. and xxvi. 20. and elsewhere: and St. Peter says, 1 ep. iii. 21. *that putting away the filth of the flesh does not save, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.*

In the text quoted by Julian from the first epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul speaks of a real change made in those converts. It is not certain, that baptism is there at all referred to; if it is, it is not the only, nor the principal thing. They had been, some of them, such sinners as are there mentioned, but they were now changed and reformed: and if they were not, neither baptism, nor the profession of Christianity, nor any external privileges, would be of advantage to them. For he there says to them, and with great seriousness and earnestness: *Know ye not, that unrighteous men shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived,* and what there follows.

If men were turned from error and vice by the preaching of the gospel, it was the greatest honour to it that could be: the great design of Christ’s coming was *to save men from their sins,* Matt. i. 21. from the practice of them, and from the misery to which they had been exposed by them. When that end is obtained, his joy, and the joy of the faithful preachers of the gospel are fulfilled.

26. There is another like passage of Julian in his *Cæsars*, which may not be quite omitted; and it may be as well taken now as hereafter. In his satire upon Constantine, he brings in his son Constantius, in the presence of his father, proclaiming to all in this manner: ‘ Whosoever <sup>r</sup> is a ravisher, a murderer, guilty of sacrilege, or any other abomination, let him come

<sup>r</sup> Julian. *Cæsars.* p. 336. edit. Spanhem.

boldly. For when I have washed him with this water, I will immediately make him clean and innocent: and if he commits the same crimes again, I will make him, after he has thumped his breast, and beat his head, as clean as before.'

Upon this I need not say any thing myself, after all that has been said just now. I may answer it in the words of Dr. Bentley, whose remarks upon it, in the borrowed name of Phileleutherus Lipsiensis, are to this purpose. 'A <sup>z</sup> ridiculous and stale banter, used by Celsus and others before Julian, upon the Christian doctrines of baptism, and repentance, and remission of sins. Baptism is rallied, as "mere washing," and repentance, as "thumping the breast," and other outward grimace: the inward grace, and the intrinsic change of mind; are left out of the character. And whom are we to believe? these pagans, or our own-selves? Are we to fetch our notions of the sacraments from scraps of Julian and Celsus? or from the scripture, the pure fountain, and from what we read, know, and profess? And yet the banter came more decently out of Celsus, an Epicurean's mouth, than out of Julian's, the most bigotted creature in the world. He to laugh at expiation by baptism, whose whole life, after his apostasy, was a continued course of καθαρμοι, washings, purgations, expiations, with the most absurd ceremonies! addicted to the whole train of superstitions, omens, presages, prodigies, spectres, dreams, visions, auguries, oracles, magic, theurgic, psychomantic: whose whole court in a manner consisted of haruspices, and sacrificuli, and philosophers as silly as they: who was always poring in the entrails of cattle, to find futurities there: who, if he had returned victor out of Persia, (as his very Pagan friends jested on him) would have extinguished the whole species of bulls and cows by the number of his sacrifices? I have drawn this character of him from his own writings, and the heathens his contemporaries, that I might not bring suspected testimonies from Christian authors.' So that learned man.

27. 'That <sup>a</sup> evil had its rise from John. But who can sufficiently express his indignation against all your following inventions, in adding many more dead men to him who died so long ago? So that you have filled all places with sepulchres and monuments; though it has been no where commanded you to wallow in sepulchres, and worship there. But you are arrived at such perverseness, as to think, that in this matter

<sup>z</sup> See Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-thinking. § 43. p. 335. B. C.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. 1.

' you

‘ you need not regard the words of Jesus of Nazareth. Hear, therefore, what he says of monuments: *Woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites. For ye are like unto whited sepulchres. The sepulchre appears beautiful outward, but within it is full of dead men’s bones, and all uncleanness.* If then Jesus has said, that sepulchres are full of uncleanness, why do you pray to God over them?’ Matt. xxiii. 27.

To this, says Cyril, he adds: ‘ That <sup>b</sup> when a certain disciple said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father, he answered: Follow thou me, and let the dead bury their dead.’ Matt. viii. 21, 22. Luke ix. 59, 60.

Julian might be justly offended at that superstitious custom of the Christians which he here censures, and which we do not justify. However, he here cites our Lord’s words from our gospels, in a manner that puts their genuineness out of question: and he bears witness, that our Lord, Jesus of Nazareth, taught and said the things there recorded.

28. Having quoted from Moses those words of Deut. vi. 13. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,* he goes on: ‘ How <sup>c</sup> then is Jesus said in the gospels to command: Go, teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ Matt. xxviii. 19.

To which I think I may say, though Christians have formed different interpretations of this text, it cannot be reasonably supposed, that our Lord would command his apostles to begin with teaching any mysterious doctrine to their converts. Nor does any thing of that kind appear in the book of the Acts, where we have the history of their preaching, in many places, in obedience to their Lord and master, to all sorts of men, Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles.

The design of the words is this: ‘ That they should teach men to receive and profess the doctrine, which Jesus had taught with authority from God the Father, and confirmed by miracles done by the finger, the power, or the Spirit of God.’ Accordingly, we are assured in the book of the Acts, that men were baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ, or into his name.* Acts ii. 38. viii. 16. xix. 5. Which imports the same as being baptized into the belief, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: or that he taught by divine authority, and that there had been full assurance given to men of this by his many miracles, and by his resurrection from the dead.

<sup>b</sup> p. 335. D. <sup>c</sup> Πως εν ο Ιησους εν τοις Ευαγγελιαις παραδεδοται προς αττων  
 Η ομοιως μαθητευσαι. κ. λ. L. ix. p. 291. Δ.

29. 'Why<sup>d</sup> do you meddle with Greek learning, since the reading of your own scriptures is sufficient for you? And indeed, it might be of more importance to restrain men from reading the Greek authors, than from eating things *sacrificed to idols*. For by that, as Paul also says, *he that eats is not hurt. But the conscience of the brother who sees it is offended*, according to you,' 1 Cor. viii. 7 . . . 10.

More there follows which I forbear to transcribe: and there seems to be somewhat wanting, lost out of the text. However, he there insinuates, that whenever a man of good sense gains but a smattering of Greek learning, he forsakes what Julian is pleased to call 'impiety.' But if he had really thought so, I suppose, he would have filled the Christians with Greek learning, instead of doing all he could to prevent their having a taste of it.

My readers cannot but observe, that this is taken from Julian's work against the Christians: which shews, how intent he was upon doing all in his power to make the Christians ignorant and unlearned. It was a strange design, and could proceed from nothing but malice and envy.

30. We will now take a summary view of what we have seen in Julian's Work against the Christians.

He argues against the Jews as well against them: but we have supposed it expedient, to take more especial notice of what he writes relating to Jesus Christ, and his followers. And he has borne a valuable testimony to the history, and to the books of the New Testament, as all must acknowledge who have read the extracts just made from his work. He allows, that Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, at the time of the taxing made in Judea by Cyrenius: that the Christian religion had its rise, and began to be propagated in the times of the emperors Tiberius and Claudius. He bears witness to the genuineness and authenticity of the four gospels, of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the apostles: and he so quotes them, as to intimate, that these were the only historical books received by Christians as of authority, and the only authentic memoirs of Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the doctrine preached by them. He allows their early date, and even argues for it. He also quotes, or plainly refers to the Acts of the apostles, to St. Paul's epistles to the Romans the Corinthians and the Galatians. He does not deny the miracles of Jesus Christ, but allows him to have 'healed the blind, and the lame, and dæmoniacs,' and 'to have rebuked the winds, and walked upon the waves of the

<sup>d</sup> L. vii. p. 229.

<sup>e</sup> sea.

‘ sea.’ He endeavours indeed to diminish these works ; but in vain. The consequence is undeniable: such works are good proofs of a divine mission. He endeavours also to lessen the number of the early believers in Jesus, and yet he acknowledgeth, that there were ‘ multitudes of such men in Greece and Italy,’ before St. John wrote his gospel. He likewise affects to diminish the quality of the early believers ; and yet acknowledgeth, that beside ‘ men servants, and maid servants,’ Cornelius a Roman centurion at Cæsarea, and Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, were converted to the faith of Jesus before the end of the reign of Claudius. And he often speaks with great indignation of Peter and Paul, those two great apostles of Jesus, and successful preachers of his gospel. So that, upon the whole, he has undesignedly borne witness to the truth of many things recorded in the books of the New Testament : he aimed to overthrow the Christian religion, but has confirmed it: his arguments against it are perfectly harmless, and insufficient to unsettle the weakest Christian. He justly excepts to some things introduced into the Christian profession by the late professors of it, in his own time, or sooner ; but has not made one objection of moment against the Christian religion, as contained in the genuine and authentic books of the New Testament.

V. I now intend to make some extracts out of Julian’s Oration and Epistles : this is fit to be done, because divers of them relate to Christianity, and the affairs of Christians in Julian’s time.

1. I have already transcribed that which is the seventh epistle in the order of Spanheim’s edition<sup>a</sup>, containing a kind of establishment of Hellenism. I now proceed.

2. And the first to be now taken, is the law or edict prohibiting Christians to teach rhetoric, and other parts of polite literature: I need not transcribe the whole, but I shall take a large part of it.

‘ He<sup>b</sup> says, Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, Lysias, were guided by the gods, and esteemed themselves consecrated, some to Mercury, others to the Muses. It is absurd, therefore, for such as explain their works, to neglect the gods whom they worshipped: but though I think that to be absurd, I do not desire that they should change their sentiments for the sake of instructing youth. I give them their choice; either not to teach what they do not approve of; or, if they will teach, that they first inform and persuade their scholars, that neither Homer, nor Hesiod, nor any one of those

<sup>a</sup> See before p. 370.

<sup>b</sup> Ep. 42. p. 422, 423, 424.

whom

' whom they have explained, and had condemned for impiety,  
 ' and ignorance, and error concerning the gods, is such: for  
 ' otherwise, since they are maintained by teaching their works,  
 ' they must not deny, that they are lovers of filthy lucre, and  
 ' can do any thing for a small profit. There were many things to  
 ' hinder their frequenting the temples; and they might be afraid  
 ' to profess the right sentiments concerning the gods. But now,  
 ' since by the favour of the gods we have obtained liberty, it  
 ' appears to me absurd for any man to teach what they do not  
 ' think to be right. But if they think there is any wisdom in  
 ' the authors works, of which they are interpreters, let them  
 ' first learn to imitate their piety toward the gods. But if they  
 ' judge that those authors are in an error about the gods; let  
 ' them go to the churches of the Galileans, and there explain  
 ' Matthew and Luke. . . . I desire, to use your own terms, that  
 ' your ears and your tongue might be regenerated, as to those  
 ' things which I esteem, and which I wish that I and all that  
 ' love me, may always partake of. Let <sup>c</sup> this be a common law  
 ' to professors and masters; but if any youth should have a mind  
 ' to go to school to learn these things, they are not pro-  
 ' hibited; for it would not be at all reasonable to restrain children,  
 ' who know not what course to take, from the right way; as it  
 ' would not also be, to compel them to embrace the old religion.  
 ' It might, indeed, be just to treat them as out of their senses, in  
 ' order to cure them; but let all be forborne, who labour under  
 ' this distemper; for I suppose, that ignorant people are rather  
 ' to be taught than punished.'

By what was transcribed formerly <sup>d</sup> we saw, that Christians understood themselves to be prohibited by Julian to learn, as well as to teach the Greek literature. Some have doubted, whether that be the intention of the law just now recited; and therefore they have supposed there was another. The question is of no great importance; but even this law deprives young persons of the privilege of learning, unless they went to the schools of Greek masters. So that there was no necessity of another law for that purpose.

I must add, that I think it may be concluded, from expressions in this letter, that whatever forbearance, or liberty, Julian allowed Christians, it was done very grudgingly and unwillingly.

3. The next letter is to Hecebolus; and I shall take it now.  
 ' As <sup>e</sup> for myself,' says Julian, ' I have determined to act with so  
 ' much clemency and moderation toward all the Galileans; that

<sup>c</sup> Τ ο ι ς μ ε ν κ α θ η γ ο ρ ο ι ς κ α ι δ ι δ α σ κ α λ ο ι ς ε λ ω σ ε κ ρ ι ν ο ς κ ε ρ ι λ α ι ν ο μ ο ς. p. 423. D.

p. 37 1.

<sup>e</sup> Ep. 43. p. 424.

<sup>d</sup> See

<sup>e</sup> none

‘ none of them should any where suffer any violence, nor be  
 ‘ compelled to the temples, nor be violently forced to any thing  
 ‘ against their inclinations. But they of the Arian church;  
 ‘ waxing wanton with riches, have insulted the followers of Va-  
 ‘ lentinus, and have presumed to do such things at Edessa, as  
 ‘ are never to be suffered in a well constituted city: therefore,  
 ‘ since they are so commanded by their most wonderful law,  
 ‘ that they may the more easily go to the kingdom of heaven,  
 ‘ and that we may give them some assistance in their design, we  
 ‘ have ordered all the money of the church of Edessa to be  
 ‘ taken away, and given to the soldiers, and that their estates be  
 ‘ united to our demesnes: that being poor, they may become wise,  
 ‘ and may not fail of the kingdom of heaven, which they aim at.’

Doubtless, Julian refers to divers texts of the gospels: perhaps, to Matt. v. 3. Luke vi. 20. Matt. xix. 21. or some other parallel places; but few will allow him to be a good interpreter of scripture, or that he deduces right conclusions from it.

Hecebolus, to whom this letter was sent, is supposed to have been the chief magistrate at Edessa.

4. The heathen people of Alexandria, murdered George, the Arian bishop of that city, in a tumultuous manner. The letter, which Julian sent to the Alexandrians upon that occasion, is still extant; and it was inserted by <sup>z</sup> Socrates, in his Ecclesiastical History; but being long, I forbear to transcribe it.

Sozomen also has taken particular notice of that transaction, and of Julian’s letter. His remarks are to this purpose. ‘ Julian <sup>a</sup> wrote a letter to the Alexandrians, in which he seems to be very angry with them; but he reprov’d them by a letter only, remitting the punishment due to them, out of regard to their god Serapis their protector, and the great Alexander their founder, and from other considerations.’ That is sufficient to represent the substance and design of this letter.

5. George had a good library; and Julian wrote to Ecditius, governor of Egypt, to procure it entire for him. ‘ Some,’ <sup>1</sup> says he, ‘ delight in horses, others in birds, others in wild-beasts: from my childhood I have been always in love with books. . . . Wherefore you must do for me this private piece of kindness, to get together all George’s books. He had a large number of books, many philosophical and rhetorical, and also many concerning the doctrine of the impious Galileans; which <sup>k</sup> I

<sup>c</sup> Ep. x. p. 378. edit. Spanhem.

<sup>r</sup> Socrat. l. iii. cap. 3.

<sup>s</sup> Sozom. l. v. cap. 7. p. 604.

<sup>t</sup> Ep. ix. p. 377.

<sup>k</sup> . . . α βελοικην μιν εφαισθαι παντη τω δε μη συν αυτοις αφαιρηθηναι τα χρησιμωτερα, ζηλειστω κα κεινα μετ’ ακριβειας απαλλα. p. 378. B.

‘ could

‘ could wish to have utterly destroyed ; but lest books of value  
 ‘ should be destroyed with them, let these also be carefully sought  
 ‘ for. George had a secretary ; let him help you. If he serves  
 ‘ you faithfully, let him be rewarded with freedom : If he en-  
 ‘ deavours to conceal any of his master’s books, he may be put  
 ‘ to the torture. I am not unacquainted with George’s books ;  
 ‘ for when I was in Cappadocia, I borrowed some of them,  
 ‘ though not all, in order to have them transcribed, and then  
 ‘ returned them to him.’

But it was a mean thing in Julian, to wish, that all Christian writings might be destroyed. It was below a philosopher, as one would think, to entertain such a thought.

6. We have another letter of Julian to the like purpose, sent to Porphyry, treasurer of Egypt. ‘ George <sup>1</sup> has left a large  
 ‘ library, consisting of books of various sorts, philosophy and  
 ‘ history, as also of the Galileans, in great number. You are  
 ‘ to procure the whole library for me, and send it to Antioch.  
 ‘ You are to make the most diligent inquiries after the books ;  
 ‘ otherwise you may expect to be severely punished. If you  
 ‘ suspect any persons to have concealed any of them, you are to  
 ‘ examine them upon oath : if they are slaves, they may be put  
 ‘ to the torture. If you cannot persuade them by fair means,  
 ‘ you must use force, to make them bring all to you.’

7. I now take a letter to the Alexandrians, concerning Athanasius. ‘ It <sup>m</sup> was certainly very fit, that a man, who had been  
 ‘ banished by repeated edicts of several emperors, should wait  
 ‘ at least for one imperial edict, before he returned home ; and  
 ‘ not audaciously insult the laws, as if they were all extinct :  
 ‘ forasmuch as even now we have not granted to the Galileans  
 ‘ banished by the blessed Constantius, a return to their churches,  
 ‘ but to their countries ; but I hear, that the audacious Atha-  
 ‘ nasius, behaving with his usual insolence, has seized on the  
 ‘ episcopal throne, as they call it ; and that this is not a little  
 ‘ grievous to the pious people of Alexandria : wherefore we  
 ‘ command him to depart from the city on the day he receives  
 ‘ our letter. If he stays in the city, we warn him of a severer  
 ‘ punishment.’

Athanasius had been once banished by Constantine, twice by Constantius ; to which Julian here refers. Nor did he make use of the liberty to return granted by Julian, till after the death of George ; when, as it seems, he was disagreeable to the heathen people of Alexandria, whom Julian calls pious. Julian here says, that he had not given leave to the banished bishops to re-

<sup>1</sup> Ep. xxxvi. p. 411.

<sup>m</sup> Ep. xxvi. p. 398.

turn to their sees, or churches, but only to their countries. I should have thought, that his edict had included a return to both. And this explication seems to be evasive, and, perhaps, now first thought of from particular enmity to Athanasius.

8. The Catholic Christians at Alexandria wrote to Julian, as in the name of the city, requesting him to revoke his order against Athanasius, by a new edict; which he answered in the following letter to the Alexandrians. ‘He<sup>a</sup> says, the distempered part of them had taken upon themselves the name of the city. By the gods, ye men of Alexandria, I am ashamed that any Alexandrian should acknowledge himself to be a Galilean. He tells them, that Alexander, the Ptolomies, and other princes, their founders and patrons, were worshippers of the gods: and had not raised their city and constitution to its grandeur by the words of Jesus, nor by the doctrine of the hateful Galileans. . . . None of those gods do you worship; but Jesus, whom neither you nor your fathers have seen, him you think to be God the Word,’ John i. ‘Him you prefer to the great sun, who has so long enlightened and blessed the world. You may do well to hearken to me, who, till I was twenty years of age, went in the same way; but now for twelve years I have been a worshipper of the gods. If you hearken to my admonitions, it will be for your benefit: however, if you will still follow the instruction and superstition of knavish men, agree among yourselves, and no longer desire Athanasius: there are disciples enough of his to please *your itching ears*, who want such impious discourses,’ 2 Tim. iv. 3. ‘I wish this wickedness were confined to Athanasius and his impious school; but you have among you a multitude of such people. . . . And you may take notice, that whereas before I banished Athanasius out of Alexandria, I now banish him out of all Egypt.’

9. In a letter to Ecditius, præfect of Egypt, he says: ‘Though you write to me about no other matters, you should, however, have written to me about that enemy of the gods, Athanasius: especially, when you know what I have rightly determined. I swear by the great Serapis, if Athanasius does not depart from the city, or rather from all Egypt, before the first day of December next, the cohort under you shall be fined a hundred pounds of gold. You know how backward I am to condemn, and that I am still more backward to forgive those who have been once condemned. [And in his own hand *καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν χριστοῦ.*] It concerns me extremely, that all the gods are despised. I desire not to hear so much of any service of yours,

<sup>a</sup> Ep. li. p. 432.

<sup>o</sup> Ep. vi. p. 376.

‘ as that you have expelled the wicked Athanasius out of Egypt,  
 ‘ who, under my government, has been so audacious as to per-  
 ‘ suade Greek women, wives of illustrious men, to receive baptism.’

10. Surely this, and the other letters, relating to Athanasius, shew that Julian did not practise that indulgence and moderation toward the Christians which he sometimes boasted of; for no fault is alleged against Athanasius, except that he was ‘ an enemy of the gods,’ and made converts to Christianity from among the Gentiles.

11. However, there is another letter of Julian, which seems to be written with better temper. It is inscribed to the people of Byzantium, or Constantinople. But Bletterie<sup>p</sup> suspects the inscription to be false, and that it was not sent to the people of Byzantium, but of some other place, whose name had some resemblance, and has been mistaken by the transcriber.

‘ We<sup>q</sup> have restored to you all your senators and patricians,  
 ‘ whether they are Galileans, or otherwise exempted from that  
 ‘ charge.’ However, perhaps, that was not a privilege, but rather a burdensome office; the terms of the letter seem to lead to that sense; and Bletterie may be again consulted.

12. We have a letter of Julian<sup>r</sup> to Arfacius, high-priest of Galatia; which is also inserted by Sozomen<sup>s</sup> at length in his Ecclesiastical History. I take a good part of it.

‘ If<sup>t</sup> Hellenism does not prosper according to our wish, it is  
 ‘ the fault of those who profess it. . . . Why do we not look to that  
 ‘ which has been the principal cause of the augmentation of im-  
 ‘ piety, humanity to strangers, care in burying the dead, and  
 ‘ that sanctity of life, of which they make such a show; all which  
 ‘ things I will have to be really practised by our people. It is  
 ‘ not sufficient that you are unblameable yourself; all the priests  
 ‘ in Galatia ought to be so likewise. I will therefore, that you  
 ‘ persuade, and even compel all the priests in Galatia to live  
 ‘ soberly; otherwise do you depose them from the priestly office,  
 ‘ unless they and their wives, and children, and servants, do re-  
 ‘ ligiously worship the gods: and<sup>u</sup> also forbear to converse with  
 ‘ the

<sup>p</sup> Letters choisies de l'Emp. Julien. p. 371. &c.

<sup>q</sup> Ep. xi. p. 380.

<sup>r</sup> Αρσακιω αρχιερεϊ Γαλατίας . . . Ep. xlii. p. 429. &c.

<sup>s</sup> Sozom. l. v.

<sup>t</sup> Ελληνισμος εγω πραττει καλα λογον ημων, ενεκα των μελιονων αυτων. If Hellenism does not prosper, &c. That was the style at that time. Hellenism is Heathenism, or Gentilism. And Heathens are called Hellenes, and Hellenists, by our ecclesiastical historians, Socrates, Sozomen,

and Theodoret, especially in their history of Julian's reign.

<sup>u</sup> And also forbear to converse with, &c. αλλα ανεχεσθαι των οικειων, η υιων, η των Γαλιλαιων γαμελων, ασεβειων μεν εις της θεας, αθεων δε θεοσεβειας προσιμωνων. I have attempted a new translation of this place, not being quite satisfied with any other, which I have met with. In Spanheim's edition the Latin version is: et ne patiantur servos, aut filios, aut conjuges Galilæorum impie in Deos

‘ the servants, children, and wives of the Galileans, who are  
 ‘ impious toward the gods, and prefer impiety to religion. You  
 ‘ are likewise to order them, not to frequent the theatre, nor to  
 ‘ drink in taverns, nor to exercise any mean and fordid employ-  
 ‘ ments. Such as hearken to your directions you are to en-  
 ‘ courage; others you are to reject. You are also to erect hos-  
 ‘ pitals in every city, that strangers also may share in our hu-  
 ‘ manity: and not only those of our own religion, but others  
 ‘ likewise, if they are necessitous.’ ‘ He then tells him what  
 ‘ allowances he had made for that purpose... For, says he, it is  
 ‘ a shame, when there are no beggars among the Jews, and the  
 ‘ impious Galileans relieve not only their own people, but ours  
 ‘ also, that our poor should be neglected by us, and be left help-  
 ‘ less and destitute.’

13. There is a long fragment of some oration <sup>2</sup> or epistle, in  
 which Julian gives many directions for regulating the behaviour  
 and studies of heathen priests, and recommends humanity, and  
 near the end, particularly, a regard to the poor, where he says:  
 ‘ This ’ ought to be carefully attended to, as what may be a  
 ‘ good remedy for the present disorder. For it having so hap-  
 ‘ pened, as I suppose, that the poor were neglected by our  
 ‘ priests, the impious Galileans observing this, have addicted  
 ‘ themselves to this kind of humanity; and by the show of such good  
 ‘ offices have recommended the worst of things. For <sup>2</sup> beginning  
 ‘ with their love-feasts, and the *ministry of tables*, as they call it;  
 Acts vi. 2. ‘ (for not only the name, but the thing also is common  
 ‘ among them:) they have drawn away the faithful to impiety.’

There ends the fragment; but it seems not to be the con-  
 clusion of the piece. As it is plainly defective at the beginning,  
 it appears to be so likewise at the end; otherwise we might have  
 had somewhat more, not unworthy of observation.

In that fragment, nearer the beginning, <sup>2</sup> he says, ‘ he does not  
 ‘ believe any man is the poorer for what he gives to the neces-  
 ‘ sitous. I who have often relieved the poor, have been re-

Deos se gerere, et impietatem pietati præ-  
 ponere. And much to the same purpose  
 is the Latin translation of this epistle in  
 Sozomen, made by Valesius. Which  
 would be commanding every heathen priest  
 and his family, to become persecutors;  
 which cannot be supposed to be probable.  
 Cave, in the Introduction to his History of  
 the Fathers of the fourth century, p. 34.  
 ‘ not suffering their servants, children, or  
 ‘ wives, to be Galileans, who are despisers  
 ‘ of the gods, and prefer impiety before

‘ religion.’ Which cannot be right; for  
 it is a tautology, saying over again the same  
 thing which had been said just before. And  
 yet Bletterie’s translation is much to the  
 same purpose: S’ ils souffrent dans leur  
 famille de ces impies de Galileens.

<sup>x</sup> Tom. i. p. 288. &c.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 305.

<sup>z</sup> Τον αυτον και  
 αυτοι τροπον αξαμενοι δια της λεισημενης  
 παρ αυτοις ασαπης και υποδοχης και δια-  
 κωνιας τραπειζων’ κ. λ. p. 305. C. D.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 288. C.

warded by the gods manifold: though riches is a thing which I never was intent upon.'

It may be hence argued, that the scandalous stories about the Christian worship and manners, which were spread abroad at the first rise of Christianity, were without foundation. Nor were the Christians now charged with them; at least Julian never mentions them; and here he celebrates their virtue; however, still, their religion was, with him, very bad. But it is somewhat strange, that should be the worst impiety, which had produced such exemplary humanity, as to be recommended to heathen priests for a pattern of imitation.

14. I may now take a passage or two of Julian, where he exposeth monkery.

In his seventh oration, which is addressed to Heracleas, a cynic philosopher, Julian tells him, that <sup>b</sup> 'the cynics are like that sort of men, whom the impious Galileans call renouncers; many of whom quitting a small substance, scrape together a great deal, or rather every thing, from all quarters, and arrive at such dignity, as to secure a numerous attendance, and all kinds of respect.'

15. In the fragment of the oration, or epistle, before quoted, he speaks <sup>c</sup> of some people, who left cities, and retired into deserts. 'Whereas,' says he, 'man is a social animal. Moreover,' as he adds, 'many of these load themselves with chains and shackles.' The place is obscure; but I think he means Christians, forasmuch as he supposeth them to be men, who had forsaken the immortal and good gods. And <sup>d</sup> in his Misopogon he speaks of old women lurking about sepulchres.

16. In his letter to the people of Athens, he mentions <sup>e</sup> Epictetus, a bishop of Gaul, whom Constantius had sent to him. In <sup>f</sup> a fragment of an epistle, he speaks of bishops and presbyters of the Galileans.

17. In his Misopogon, <sup>g</sup> a satyr upon the people of Antioch, in which he says what he pleaseth, both of himself and them, are these following things, which may be taken notice of.

'I <sup>h</sup> suppose,' says he, 'you are very happy, because you

<sup>b</sup> . . . απολακίνας τινας ονομαζουσι οι δυσσεβεις Γαλιλαιοι τειων οι πλειεις μικρα προεμενοι, πολλα πανν, μαλλον δε τα παντα πανταχοθεν συσκομιζουσι, και προσπνιμιαι το τιμασθαι, και δορυφορεισθαι, και δεραπνευσθαι. Ibid. Or. vii. p. 224. B.

<sup>c</sup> . . . ηδη δε και δεσμα, και κλοιους εξευρησιν πολλοι τουτων. Ουτω παλαιαχοθεν αιτ' ο κακος συλλαμβει δαιμων, η δεδωκασιν εκουσις αυτους αποσαντες των αιδων και

σωτηρων θεων. κ. κ. p. 288. B.

<sup>d</sup> Τοις περι της ταφης καλινδουμειης γραιδιοις συνεχωρησαν. Misop. p. 344. A.

<sup>e</sup> Αλλ' Επικλητον τινα των Γαλλιων επισκοπου επεμψεν. Ad: l. P. 2. Athen. p. 286. C.

<sup>f</sup> Οι μεν των Γαλιλαιων ισως επισκοποι και πρεσβυτεροι συκατιζουσι σοι. Ep. lxii. p. 450. C.

<sup>g</sup> p. 337, &c.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 356. D.

' have

‘ have renounced all kinds of servitude, first to the gods, then  
 ‘ to the laws, and lastly to me, who am the guardian of the  
 ‘ laws.’

And soon after: ‘ But <sup>l</sup> it is said, that Chi and Kappa never  
 ‘ did the city any harm: it is hard to know the meaning of this  
 ‘ wile riddle of yours; but by some interpreters of your city we  
 ‘ have been informed they are initial letters of names, the one  
 ‘ denoting Christ, the other Constantius.

‘ But <sup>k</sup> you love Christ, and esteem him the tutelar patron of  
 ‘ your city, instead of Jupiter and Apollo of Daphne. . . . Many  
 ‘ of you, it seems, I have offended, in a manner all of you, the  
 ‘ senate, the rich, the people. The greatest part of the people,  
 ‘ or rather the whole of them, are offended with me, because  
 ‘ they are in love with impiety, and they see that I embrace and  
 ‘ adhere to the religion of my ancestors.’

‘ You <sup>l</sup> say, I wage war with Chi, and you admire Kappa.’

Omitting some other things, Julian <sup>n</sup> went on a feast day to  
 pay his homage to the temple of Apollo at Daphne, in the neigh-  
 bourhood of Antioch: but there were neither people nor sacri-  
 fices; the priest had only a small victim, of his own preparing.  
 Of this Julian complains grievously, that so large a city had not  
 provided some bulls for a sacrifice on that solemnity: ‘ You <sup>n</sup>  
 ‘ ought,’ says he, ‘ to have sacrificed both privately and pub-  
 ‘ lickly. But you let your wives carry away every thing to the  
 ‘ Galileans; and they maintain the poor with your goods, and  
 ‘ so bring their impiety into esteem.’

It is hence apparent, that Christianity was now the prevailing  
 religion at Antioch.

18. I am disposed to conclude my accounts and extracts of  
 Julian’s Orations and Epistles, with a translation of his epistle to  
 the people of Bosra, the chief city in Arabia, of which some  
 notice was taken <sup>o</sup> long ago: and before I do that, I am led to  
 recite an article of Sozomen, representing the state of things in  
 the time of that emperor. Sozomen, though sometimes rather  
 too credulous of miracles, was a lawyer, and a man of good un-  
 derstanding and great moderation: and therefore his testimony

<sup>i</sup> Το Χι, φασιν, εδεν ηδικησε την πολιτην,  
 εις Καππα. κ. λ. Ib. p. 357. A.

<sup>k</sup> Χριστον δε ασταπεινους εχειε πολιτηχον αν-  
 τι τε Διου, και τε Δαφναιου. . . . Ελυπησα  
 δ’ εγω . . . υμων μειλοι πολλης, και ολιγισ-  
 δις φαιται παιδας, την βυλην, της ευπορης,  
 του δημου. Ο μιν γαρ δημος ακυβηται μοι  
 τα πλειστα μερει, μαλλον δ’ απας αθεοηλη-  
 σφιλομενος, οτι τοις παιρσις ορα της ασιο-

τειας δεσμοις προσκειμενοι. Ibid. p. 357.  
 C. D.

<sup>l</sup> Και εις πολεμω τω Χι,  
 ποθος δε υμας εισεισι τε Καππα. Ibid.  
 p. 360. D.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid. p. 362.

<sup>n</sup> Πρεπειν δ’ οιμαι, τη πολει θυσιν ιδια  
 και δημοσια. ουκ δε υμων εκαστος επιρρηται  
 μιν τη γυναικι παιδα εκφερειν ειδυθεν εις της  
 Γαλιλαιας. κ. λ. p. 363. A.

<sup>o</sup> Vol. iii. p. 387.

must deserve a good deal of regard, he being less partial than some others. He was born in Palestine, and wrote his Ecclesiastical History at Constantinople about the year 440.

‘ This <sup>p</sup> emperor,’ says Sozomen, ‘ hearing that Athanasius  
 ‘ held assemblies in the church of the Alexandrians, and that he  
 ‘ boldly taught the people, and brought over many Greeks [or  
 ‘ Gentiles] to Christianity, ordered him to leave Alexandria:  
 ‘ threatening him with a severe penalty if he did not go away:  
 ‘ pretending this as a crime, that whereas he had been banished  
 ‘ by former princes, he had without his authority again taken  
 ‘ possession of the episcopal chair; forasmuch as he had not granted  
 ‘ leave for the bishops, who had been banished by Constantius,  
 ‘ to return to their churches, but only to their country. When  
 ‘ in obedience to this order of the emperor he left Alexandria,  
 ‘ and the people were in tears, he said: “ It is only a small  
 ‘ cloud, which will soon pass away.” . . . And,’ says Sozomen,  
 ‘ though the emperor was determined by all means to restore  
 ‘ Hellenism, he judged it imprudent to compel men by punish-  
 ‘ ments to sacrifice against their will; for he knew that compul-  
 ‘ sion was of no avail in things which depended upon men’s free  
 ‘ choice. Nevertheless, he would not permit them to meet to-  
 ‘ gether, and offer the usual prayers. Therefore he took care  
 ‘ to banish the clergy and presidents out of cities, intending by  
 ‘ their absence to abolish the assemblies of the people, when  
 ‘ there were none to teach them, nor perform the accustomed  
 ‘ rites, that in length of time the memory of their worship should  
 ‘ be lost. His pretence for doing so was, that the clergy excited  
 ‘ the people to sedition. Under this pretence he banished Eleu-  
 ‘ sius and his friends from Cyzicum, though there was no sedition  
 ‘ there, nor any reason to apprehend it: and he required, that  
 ‘ the people of Bosra should, by a public decree, send away from  
 ‘ their city, Titus bishop of their church: for, when he had  
 ‘ threatened, that if any disturbance happened there, he should  
 ‘ impute it to the bishop and his clergy. Titus thereupon sent a  
 ‘ letter to the emperor, assuring him, that the Christians of  
 ‘ Bosra were equal in number to the Greeks [or Gentiles] and  
 ‘ that they were very quiet, and that paying a regard to his ad-  
 ‘ monitions, they had no thought of making any disturbance.  
 ‘ From those words Julian took occasion to write a letter to the  
 ‘ people of Bosra, 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. Thus exciting the people to expel him out of  
 ' their city as a public enemy. And it is likely, that there were  
 ' many such things, partly owing to the command of the em-  
 ' peror, and partly to the violence and petulance of the people.  
 ' But the whole fault of all is to be ascribed to the emperor  
 ' himself, who neglected to punish, according to the laws, those  
 ' who out of hatred to our religion transgressed in these respects;  
 ' seemingly reprovng them in words, but by his actions really  
 ' exciting them to such irregularities. Therefore<sup>9</sup> though he  
 ' did not openly persecute, yet the Christians were banished from  
 ' cities and villages: of this, as many others of my ancestors,  
 ' so particularly my grandfather was an instance. His father  
 ' was a Gentile; but he and the whole family were converted  
 ' to Christianity by Hilarion; and they were the first Christians  
 ' at Bethelia, a populous village near Gaza.' So writes Sozomen,  
 with great discretion and judgment, as seems to me.

I now proceed to the letter or edict abovementioned.

' Julian to the people of Bosra.'

' I' imagined, that the presidents of the Galileans would ac-  
 ' knowledge themselves to be under greater obligations to me,  
 ' than to my predecessor: for in his reign many of them were  
 ' banished, persecuted, imprisoned: and many of those who are  
 ' called heretics were put to death, particularly at Samosata,  
 ' and Cyzicum in Paphlagonia, in Bithynia, in Galatia, and  
 ' other places, where many villages were plundered and utterly  
 ' ruined. In my time it has been quite otherwise: for they who  
 ' had been banished are permitted to return home; and all their  
 ' goods that had been confiscated have been restored by a law  
 ' of mine. Nevertheless, because they have now no longer  
 ' power to tyrannize over any, nor to practise their usual violences  
 ' upon one another, nor upon us the pious worshippers of the  
 ' gods, they are become furious, and try every method to raise  
 ' seditions and disturbances among the people. In which they  
 ' shew themselves void of fear toward the gods, and of respect  
 ' to our edicts, though full of moderation and humanity: for  
 ' we suffer not any of them to be dragged to the altars against  
 ' their own choice. And we openly declare, that if any are de-  
 ' siring to partake in our worship, they must first of all offer sa-  
 ' crifices of expiation, and so reconcile themselves to the gods:  
 ' so far are we from desiring, that any of the impious should  
 ' communicate with us, till they have purified their souls by

<sup>9</sup> Οθεν και μη διωκοντες αυτην, κατ'α πο-  
 λεις, και χωμας εφευρον οι Χριστιανοι ταυτης  
 εστις φιλης μελεσχοι πολλοι των εμων προ-  
 γωνων, και ο εμος παππος. κ. λ. p. 617. A.  
 Ep. 52. p. 435. &c.

‘ prayers to the gods, and their bodies by the appointed expia-  
‘ tions. It is plain therefore, that the clergy mislead the people  
‘ for no other reason, but because they are not suffered to lord  
‘ it over others. For they who have been hitherto accustomed to  
‘ tyrannize over others, are not satisfied that they have obtained  
‘ forgiveness of past crimes; they would still, as formerly, act as  
‘ judges, make testaments, and appropriate estates to their own  
‘ use, and bring every thing to themselves: for this reason they  
‘ blow up the fire of sedition among the people. Wherefore we  
‘ by this edict declare, and make known to all people, that they  
‘ join not the clergy in seditions, nor be persuaded by them to  
‘ throw stones, nor to disobey the magistrates, but to be con-  
‘ tented with saying their prayers among themselves in their own  
‘ assemblies. This edict is particularly addressed to the city of  
‘ the Bostrenes; because their bishop Titus, and his clergy, in a  
‘ petition sent to me, have accused their people as ready to raise  
‘ disturbances if not restrained by their admonitions. I insert  
‘ here their own words: “ though the Christians are equal in  
‘ number to the Gentiles, they are so restrained by our admoni-  
‘ tions, that they are not at all inclined to make any distur-  
‘ bances.” These are your bishop’s words concerning you:  
‘ see, how he says, your good order proceeds not from your own  
‘ mind; and that you have been unwillingly restrained by his  
‘ admonitions. Therefore do you willingly, and of your own  
‘ accord, expel him out of your city as your accuser. Do you  
‘ live in concord with each other: let no one be an enemy, or  
‘ injurious to another. Let not them who are in error disturb  
‘ those who rightly and justly worship the gods, according to  
‘ the tradition handed down to us from ancient time. Nor let  
‘ the servants of the gods disturb or pillage the houses of those,  
‘ who err more through ignorance than choice. Men ought to  
‘ be persuaded and taught by reason, not by blows, reproaches,  
‘ and corporal punishments: I therefore again and again, and  
‘ often exhort those who embrace the true religion, not to abuse  
‘ nor insult the Galileans. We ought to pity rather than to hate  
‘ men, who suffer the greatest calamity: for indeed true religion  
‘ is the greatest good, and, on the contrary, impiety is the  
‘ greatest of evils: which calamity they bring upon themselves,  
‘ who forsaking the immortal gods, betake themselves to dead  
‘ men, and their relics. With those who are sick we sympathize:  
‘ and we rejoice with them who obtain deliverance from the  
‘ gods. Given at Antioch the first day of August.’ That is,  
in the year of Christ 362.

From

From this edict, as well as from other things, it appears, that Julian was very fond of Hellenism, or heathenism: and Sozomen's observations abovementioned appear to be very pertinent. Julian was very ready to laid hold of every pretence, and to improve every occasion, to rid himself of the presidents of Christian churches, especially such as had an influence with the people. Here we see three instances of this in Athanasius of Alexandria, Eleusius of Cyzicum, and Titus of Boftra; all of them men of great distinction.

Julian here makes repeated professions of moderation and equity toward the Christians; but the letter bears witness against him. Titus was one of the most learned men of the age: his people were peaceable, and he had exhorted them to be so: and yet Julian commands his people to expel him out of their city; under a pretence, that his exhortations to a peaceable behaviour implied an accusation of an unpeaceable temper.

I add no more. The extracts now made are sufficient to cast some light upon the circumstances and state of things in the time of Julian; and to shew the real temper of that emperor, and that he was intent upon extirpating Christianity, and with the greatest dispatch. He was a man of great ingenuity, sobriety of manners, and good natured in himself: but his zeal for the religion which he had embraced was excessive, and degenerated into bigotry and superstition; insomuch, that with all his pretensions to right reason, and all his professions of humanity, moderation, tenderness, and equity, he has not escaped the just imputation of being a persecutor.

I cannot but think, that a review of the history of this person, of shining abilities and high station, may lead us to some serious reflections: particularly it holds out to us this humbling and useful admonition: *Let him that thinks he stands take heed lest he fall.* 1 Cor. x. 12,

---

C H A P. XLVII.

H I M E R I U S,

' H I M E R I U S, the <sup>a</sup> sophist,' says Suidas, ' was the son of the rhetorician Aminius, and was born at Prusias in Bithynia.

<sup>a</sup> V. Ἱμεριος.

‘ He lived in the time of the emperor Julian, and was rival of Proæresius at Athens. In his old age he lost his sight. He made declamations.’ That is the whole article.

His life was also written by Eunapius <sup>b</sup> among other sophists and philosophers: but it is short. He says, Himerius was born in Bithynia. He says, he did not know Himerius, though he lived at the same time with him. Julian sent for him, by whom he was well received. He seems to say, that Himerius accompanied Julian so long as he lived, and that he did not settle at Athens till after the death of Proæresius. He commends the style of Himerius, and says, he imitated the divine Aristides. He lived to a great age, and for some time was afflicted with the leprosy: but perhaps he means the epilepsy, or falling sickness.

Cave <sup>d</sup>, in the Life of St. Basil, observes, ‘ that for the direction of his studies he chiefly applied himself to Himerius and Proæresius, two of the most eminent sophists at that time at Athens, men renowned for learning and eloquence, and upon that account in favour with the emperor Julian.’ For which Cave refers to <sup>e</sup>. Socrates and Sozomen; who in the same place <sup>f</sup> say the same of Gregory Nazianzen, and that they afterwards studied under Libanius at Antioch.

Photius has two articles for Himerius: in <sup>g</sup> the first of which he has a catalogue of his declamations; in the other <sup>h</sup> he makes some extracts out of them. He seems to say, that <sup>i</sup> Himerius taught some while at Corinth. His declamations were in number <sup>k</sup> almost seventy: one, <sup>l</sup> Photius calls a dissertation at Philippi, when he was there in his way to Julian, who had invited him to come to him: the next is an oration at Constantinople, in praise of that city and Julian. One of these declamations, or orations, was <sup>m</sup> in praise of Prætextatus, proconsul of Greece; to which office he had been appointed by Julian <sup>n</sup> in the year 362, and he continued in it for some while under <sup>o</sup> Valentinian.

<sup>b</sup> Eunap. p. 129.

μετας νοση. p. 129.

Fathers. p. 219.

cap. 26. p. 242. Soz. l. vi. cap. 27. p. 659.

<sup>c</sup> . . . της . . . νεοι γαρ οη οίεις θλοι εν ταις Αθηναις γενομενοι των τοις ακμασαντων σοφιστων, Ημεριου και Προαιρεσιου ακροαται γενομενοι, και μελα ταυτα εν τη Αντιοχεια της Συριας Λιβανιω συμφουησαντες, ακρωσ την εηλορικην εξεπονησαν. Socr. p. 242.

<sup>e</sup> Cod. 165. p. 351. &c.

<sup>h</sup> Cod. 243. p. 1075. &c.

<sup>i</sup> Είλα προς της ελαιρας συλλακληριος, οτε εξειει εις Κορινθον. Cod. 165. p. 352. sub fin.

Και οη και εις την απο Κορινθου επανοδον.

<sup>c</sup> . . . της

<sup>d</sup> Lives of the

<sup>e</sup> Socrat. l. iv.

Soz. l. vi. cap. 27. p.

659.

<sup>f</sup> . . . νεοι γαρ οη οίεις θλοι

εν ταις Αθηναις γενομενοι των τοις ακμα-

σαντων σοφιστων, Ημεριου και Προαιρεσιου ακ-

ροαται γενομενοι, και μελα ταυτα εν τη Αν-

τιοχεια της Συριας Λιβανιω συμφουησαντες,

ακρωσ την εηλορικην εξεπονησαν. Socr. p.

242.

<sup>g</sup> Cod. 165. p. 351. &c.

<sup>h</sup> Cod. 243. p. 1075. &c.

<sup>i</sup> Είλα προς της ελαιρας συλλακληριος, οτε

εξειει εις Κορινθον. Cod. 165. p. 352. sub

fin.

p. 353. in. Et vid. ibid. ad fin.

<sup>k</sup> p. 353. fin.

<sup>l</sup> Και διαλιξις η

Φιλιπποισ, οτε απηει παρα Ιβλιανη βασι-

λεως καλωμειος εϊλα ρηθεις εν τη πολει εις

αυτην τε την Κωνσταντινουπολιν, και Ιβλιανη

τον βασιλεα. p. 353. m.

<sup>m</sup> . . . και

εις τον ανθυπαλον της ελλαδος Πραξιερσαιο.

Phot. p. 353. m.

<sup>n</sup> Ad erat his om-

nibus Prætextatus, præclare indolis gravi-

tatisque prisæ Senator, ex negotio proprio

forte repertus apud Constantinopolim,

quem arbitrio suo Achaiæ Proconsulari

præfecerat potestate. Ammian. Marc. l.

xxii. cap. 7. p. 331.

<sup>o</sup> Vid. Zof.

l. iv. p. 735. fin.

At the end of the first article, having highly commended the style of Himerius, Photius concludes in these words: 'But<sup>p</sup> though he was so excellent a writer, yet as to religion he was plainly impious: and for his reflections upon the Christians he may compared to a snarling dog. He flourished in the time of Constantius, and the most impious Julian; and presided in the school of rhetoric at Athens.'

They who desire to know more of Himerius may consult<sup>q</sup> Tillemont, and the<sup>r</sup> writers of The ancient Universal History; and especially Fabricius<sup>s</sup> in the places referred to by me at the bottom of the page. By Cave<sup>t</sup> he is placed at the year 361: I place him at 363.

Himerius must be reckoned an example of the moderation of the Christian government at that time. The reign of Julian was short: Himerius lived to a great age: a good part of his time was spent under the Christian emperors, Julian's predecessors and successors. He was a zealous Gentile, and in favour also with Julian: nevertheless he suffered not any ill usage. For a while he taught at Corinth; afterwards he presided in the school of rhetoric at Athens. He was a great author, and published many declamations written with elegance; a proof of his high spirit and easy circumstances; and in some of them he made free reflections upon the Christians.

His father Aminius likewise was a rhetorician, or sophist, and undoubtedly of the Greek religion. He must have lived in the times of Constantine and Constantius; under whom he taught rhetoric at Prusias in Bithynia without molestation or disturbance. His son Himerius, more eminent, and more famous than himself, was one of his scholars, and did honour to his school: so, in like manner, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, and others, by their oratorical talents, did honour to Himerius.

Ἡ ἄλλα ποιητὸς ὡν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ἀσιβῆς, (ὡς δὲ λέγει) τὴν ἑρησκείαν, εἰ καὶ τῆς λαβρῆς μιμνήσκων τῶν κυνῶν, καθ' ἡμῶν ὑλακταί. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ τῷ ἑρσικρίστῳ Ἰουλιανῷ, καὶ τῷ ἐν Ἀθηναῖσι κατὰ ῥητορίαν πρῶτος διδασκαλίῃ. Cod.

165. p. 356.

Julien. art. 34.

<sup>s</sup> Bib. Gr. l. iv. c. 30. T. iv. p. 413.

&c. et l. v. cap. 38. Tom. ix. p. 426. &c.

<sup>t</sup> Hist. Lit. p. 346.

<sup>q</sup> Tillem. L'Emp.

<sup>r</sup> Vol. xvi. p. 276.

## C H A P. XLVIII.

## T H E M I S T I U S.

- I. *His time, and writings, and character.* II. *Extracts out of his Oration to the emperor Jovian.* III. *An account of another Oration addressed by him to Valens.* IV. *Farther remarks upon his character.*

I. THEMISTIUS, \* surnamed Euphrades, or 'the fine speaker,' a philosopher, greatly celebrated for his eloquence, was born in Paphlagonia about the year 317, and reached to the year 385, or later. His father was Eugenius, likewise a professor of philosophy.

Beside thirty-six Orations (thirty-three of which are still remaining, including that to Valens, which we have in Latin only) he wrote Commentaries upon Plato and Aristotle. Having gained in other places a great deal of reputation for his philosophy and eloquence, he settled at Constantinople; which he made the place of his ordinary residence for the space of near forty years. He was in great esteem with all the emperors of his time, from Constantius to Theodosius. His first Oration was pronounced before Constantius in 347: by whom he was made senator of Constantinople in the year 355: by which senate <sup>e</sup> he was ten times deputed to several emperors. He <sup>d</sup> had the honour of two brass statues, one of which was erected by order of Constantius in 357. He was made præfect of Constantinople by Julian in the year 362, and again afterwards by Theodosius in 384.

Some, by mistake, have supposed him to have been a Christian, confounding him with another of the same name. The style of all his Orations shews him to be a heathen; one proof of which may be sufficient. He concludes an Oration, in praise of Gratian, spoken in the Roman senate in the year <sup>e</sup> 377, 'with <sup>f</sup> an ardent prayer to Jupiter, father of gods and men, founder and protector of Rome, and to Minerva, and Quirinus, tutelary demon or genius of the Roman empire, that Rome may be

<sup>a</sup> Vide Phot. Cod. 73. p. 164. Suid. V. Θεμιστιος. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 18. T. viii. P. i. &c. Tillemont. H. E. Theodof. i. art. 93. et 94. Universal ancient History. Vol. xvi. p. 346.

<sup>b</sup> Vid. Themist. Or. 2. p. 28. D. ed. Harduin. Paris. 1684. <sup>c</sup> Vid. Orat. 17. p. 214. Or. 31. p. 352, 353.

<sup>d</sup> Or. 17. p. 214. Or. 31. p. 353.

<sup>e</sup> Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 11.

<sup>f</sup> Συ δε, ω πατερ μεν θεων, πατερ δε ανθρωπων, Ζευ Ρωμης κληρο, και πολιευχης και προμηθερ Αθηνα, και Κυριος δαιμων επιτροπε Ρωμαιων ηγεμονιας, διδουητε τοις εμοις παιδικοις εραν μεν Ρωμης, ανιερσθηαι δε υπο Ρωμης. Or. 13. p. 180.

<sup>g</sup> loved

‘loved by the emperor, and the emperor be again be loved by Rome \* \*.’

He may be said to have twice quoted the Old Testament, but as a book with which he was not much acquainted. In the first place he says, ‘he<sup>s</sup> had observed an elegant saying in the writings of the Assyrians, that *the mind of the king is held in the hand of God.*’ Prov. xxi. 1. To the like purpose in another place: ‘that<sup>b</sup> he had often admired some things in the Assyrian writings. And that particularly he could not but admire and commend that saying, which is somewhere to be found in them: *The heart of the king is held in the hand of God.*’ There can be no doubt, that<sup>1</sup> by ‘the writings of the Assyrians’ he intends the scriptures of the Old Testament.

This may suffice for a general history of Themistius: some more particulars will be added hereafter.

And indeed, before I proceed any farther, I would take notice of his article in Suidas: who<sup>k</sup> says, he was a philosopher who lived in the time of Julian the apostate, by whom he was made præfect of Constantinople. And having mentioned divers philosophical works written by him he adds, ‘and<sup>1</sup> dissertations.’ If by these he does not interd his Orations, he has not mentioned them at all.

On the other hand, Photius begins his article of Themistius, saying, ‘he<sup>m</sup> had read his thirty-six political discourses, spoken to the emperors Constantius, Valens, the younger Valentinian, and Theodosius. After which he mentions his philosophical writings. He says his father was Eugenius, who<sup>n</sup> also was a philosopher.’

\* \* Mr. Mosheim had a fancy, that many learned men about that time made little difference between Gentilism and Christianity, and were willing to join them in one. Among these he placeth Themistius; but I see no ground for it. They lived in the time of Christian emperors, when Christians were numerous in every part of the empire; they judged it proper to be civil to Christians: nevertheless, they kept their Gentilism entire. The character of Themistius is manifest in the place above cited; and, perhaps, may be still more apparent before we finish this chapter. Mr. Mosheim’s argument may be seen quoted above p. 228.

Ε . . . ΑΛΛ’ ΕΓΩ ΠΩΣ ΕΥΠΡΟΣΒΟΜΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΑΣΣΥΡΙΩΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΩΝ ΤΑΥΤΟ ΤΥΧΟ ΚΟΜΨΕΥΟΜΕΝΩ, ΩΣ ΑΡΑ Ο ΝΕΣ ΤΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΤΗ ΘΕΩ ΠΑΛΑΜΗ ΔΟΡΥΦΟΡΕΙΣΤΑΙ. Ογ. 7. p. 89. D.

<sup>h</sup> ΑΛΛΑ ΤΗ ΗΓΑΣΘΗΝ ΠΟΛΛΑΚΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΣΣΥΡΙΩΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΩΝ ΑΙΑΡ ΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΥΧΟ ΔΑΥΜΑΣΩΣ ΑΓΑΜΑΙ, ΚΑΙ ΑΠΑΙΝΩ’ ΛΕΙΒΕ ΓΑΡ ΠΩΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΑ ΤΑ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ, ΤΗΝ ΤΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΘΕΩ ΠΑΛΑΜΗ ΔΟΡΥΦΟΡΕΙΣΤΑΙ. Ογ. 11. p. 147. C.

<sup>i</sup> Unde, ut cætera huc faventia mittam, Themistius grammata των Ασσυριων, Assyriorum literas, substituit pro eo quod est sacra Hebræorum volumina; ubi scilicet Salomonis laudat dictum, de corde seu mente regis in manu Dei. Selden. de Jure naturali et Gentium. l. i. c. 2. p. 85. Vol. i. Londini. 1726.

<sup>k</sup> Θεμιστιος φιλοσοφος, γενονως επι των χρονων Ιηλιας τη Παραβατη, υφ’ η και υπαρχος παρεβληθη Κωνσταντινοπολεως. Suid.

<sup>l</sup> . . . και Διαλεξεις. <sup>m</sup> Ανειρωσθησαν Θεμιστιος λογοι πολιτικοι λς. Cod. 74. p. 164.

<sup>n</sup> . . . και αυτος φιλοσοφησας. Ibid.

He

He appears to have been greatly esteemed for his learning and eloquence, and other abilities. Among the letters of Gregory Nazianzen, there are two <sup>o</sup> to Themistius, which are very polite and complaisant. He calls him the <sup>p</sup> king of eloquence; and says, it <sup>q</sup> was that in which he most excelled, though he excelled in every thing. There is also still <sup>r</sup> extant a very long letter of Julian written to him. Fabricius <sup>s</sup> has made a collection of fourteen letters of Libanius to him: and there are still more among the epistles of Libanius published by Wolfius. How he was esteemed by the emperors Constantius, Julian, Valens, Gratian, and Theodosius, he has himself observed in one of his Orations, in a beautiful paragraph <sup>t</sup> to which I refer.

II. There are two Orations of which we must take particular notice; one of which is to Jovian, or Jovinian, upon his accession after the death of Julian, when also the emperor was consul: for which reason it is called a Consular Oration. And I place Themistius as flourishing at this time. Of this Socrates speaks in this manner: ‘The <sup>u</sup> affairs of the Christians were then in great agitation: for the presidents of the several sects made addresses to the emperor, intreating his support and assistance against those who differed from them. To whom he made such answers as were suitable. For <sup>v</sup> the emperor had formed this determination, with kind words, and civil usage, to compose the dissensions of all parties. And he declared, that he would give no disturbance to any upon account of their opinions; but that he would love and highly esteem those who promoted the peace and unity of the churches. That this was his conduct is attested by Themistius the philosopher; for in his Consular Oration, he commends the emperor for allowing to all full liberty to worship the Deity according to their own sentiments, thus checking the designs of flatterers; whom also he ridicules very freely, saying, that they worship the purple, not the Deity; and they mightily resemble the Euripus, which sometimes flows one way, and at other times quite the contrary.’

Socrates goes on to say: ‘That <sup>w</sup> the emperor leaving Antioch, went on to Tarsus of Cilicia, where he interred the body of Julian. Having finished the funeral solemnities, he intended to go to Constantinople, and was got as far as Dadaftana, upon the borders of Galatia and Bithynia: there Themistius, and

<sup>o</sup> Gr. Naz. Ep. 139, 140. Tom. i. p. 865, 866.

<sup>p</sup> Εἰπερ σὺ βασιλεὺς τῶν ῥωμίων. p. 866. A.

<sup>r</sup> Julian. Opp. Tom. i. p. 253. edit. Spanhem.

p. 37. &c.

<sup>s</sup> Bib. Gr. Tom. viii.

<sup>t</sup> Or. 31. p. 354. D.

<sup>u</sup> Socr. l. iii. c. 25. in. p. 203.

<sup>x</sup> Ο μέγιστος βασιλεὺς προθεῖσιν εἶχε, καλὰ κεία καὶ πειθοί, τῶν διεσπῶτων τῆν φιλομικίαν ἐκκοψαί, φησας, μηδενὶ οὐχληρὸς τῶν ὁπωσεν πεισευομένων εἰσεσθαι. κ. λ. ib. p.

204, 205.

<sup>y</sup> Cap. 26. p. 205.

<sup>z</sup> others

others of the senatorian order, met him: and he then pronounced his Consular Oration, which he afterwards recited at Constantinople in the presence of all the people.'

Thus I have transcribed from Socrates this authentic account of the oration to Jovian, which must have been pronounced before the emperor in the beginning of the year 364.

I shall now recite a part of the Oration itself: it can by no means be omitted: it has a double claim to our regard, for the relation it has to Christian affairs, and for the excellence of the sentiments. 'The beginning of your care of mankind,' says this senator, 'is a law concerning religion. . . . For you alone, as it seems, are not ignorant, that it is impossible for an emperor to compel his subjects in all things: and that there are some things above compulsion, and beyond the reach of threatenings and commands; as indeed is every virtue, and especially piety toward God: and that in order to be sincere in it, there must be an unforced disposition of mind, which is in its own power, and willing of itself. This you have wisely considered: for it is not possible for you, O emperor, by an edict to make him love you who is not disposed to it: how much less can you make men pious and religious by the terror of human ordinances; a short necessity, and weak fear, which time has often introduced, and often removed? If this fear prevailed, we should only become ridiculous, worshipping the purple rather than the Deity, and shifting our religion as often as Euripus. . . .

... This, O most divine emperor, is not your case: but, as in other things you are supreme, and ever will be so, you ordain, that the affair of religion should be in every man's power: herein resembling God, who has made the disposition to be religious common to the human nature, but has left the particular way of worship to every man's own choice. And he who introduces force here, takes away that freedom which God has granted. For this reason the laws of Cheops and Cambyfes scarcely lasted so long as the lives of those who made

<sup>a</sup> Εἶθα καὶ Θεμιστιος ὁ φιλοσοφος μίλα εἰς ἄλλων συγκλητικῶν ἀπαίτησας, τὸν ὑπατικὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆ διεξήλθε λόγον, ὃν ὑστερον καὶ ἡ Κωνσταντίνη πωλεῖ ἐπὶ τῆ πλεθῆς ἐπιείξει. p. 205. C. <sup>a</sup> Εἶλα σοι πρῶτον γέρονε τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἐπιμελείας ἡ περὶ τῆ θεῶν νομοθεσία. . . . Μόνος γὰρ, ἃς εἰκεῖ, ἢ κ' ἀστοεῖς, ὅτι μὴ πάντα ἐνεστὶ τῷ βασιλεὶ βιάζεσθαι τῆς ὑπηκόου, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ἃ τῆ ἀνάγκῃ ἐκπεφευγῆ, καὶ ἀπειλήσ ἐστὶν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπιτάσματος. Themist. Or. 5.

p. 67. <sup>b</sup> Εἶλα ἐλεγχόμεθα πάντων γελοῖως ἀληθειῶν, ἢ Θεὸν θεραπευοῦντες, καὶ ῥᾶον Ἐυριπίδῃ μίλαβαλλόμενοι τὰς ἀσιστίας. p. 67. D.

This, I suppose, is the passage to which Socrates referred in the place above cited.

<sup>c</sup> ΑΛΛ' ἢ σὺ γε, ὦ θεοειδὲς αἰε βασιλεὺς ἀλλὰ τὰ τε ἀλλὰ ἀυτοκρατορῶν ὡν τε, καὶ εἰς τέλος ἐσομεῖς, τὸ τῆς ἀγιστίας μέρος ἀπαιτούς εἶσαι νομοθέτας. κ. λ. p. 68. A.

them.

‘ them. But <sup>d</sup> the law of God, and your law, remains for ever;  
 ‘ that the mind of man be left free to that way of worship which  
 ‘ it thinks best. Nor have fines, or gibbets, or fires, prevailed  
 ‘ to abrogate this law. The body indeed you may gain or kill,  
 ‘ if you please; but the soul will escape, carrying with it the free  
 ‘ sentiments of the law, though you may force the tongue.’ He  
 proceeds to argue, that different sentiments and studies produce  
 emulation, which is of great advantage. ‘ And, perhaps,’ says he,  
 ‘ it is not pleasing to God that there should be this agreement  
 ‘ among men: for nature, according to Heraclitus, loves to be hid;  
 ‘ and, above all, the author of nature: whom for this reason we  
 ‘ the more reverence and admire, because the knowledge of him  
 ‘ is not easy, nor to be attained without a great deal of study  
 ‘ and labour. This law I esteem no less than I do the friendship  
 ‘ that has been made with the Persians: by that we are freed  
 ‘ from a war with barbarians; by means of this law we live  
 ‘ together without contention. We were before worse to one  
 ‘ another than the Persians: accusations brought against each  
 ‘ other from each sect in every city, in the midst of the com-  
 ‘ monwealth, were more grievous than their incursions. The  
 ‘ time past, O emperor, dear to God, affords you evident ex-  
 ‘ amples of this. Let the balance remain suspended on itself;  
 ‘ depress it not on either side by your weight: let prayers be of-  
 ‘ fered up to heaven for the prosperity of your government from  
 ‘ all quarters.’ He then reminds the emperor, that his army  
 consists of men of different nations, of different ranks and offices,  
 and different kinds of armour. ‘ Yet,’ says he, ‘ all are subject  
 ‘ to you, and depend upon your pleasure; and not only the mi-  
 ‘ litary men, but likewise all other who bear no arms, husband-  
 ‘ men, rhetoricians, they who speak, and they who hear, and  
 ‘ they who philosophize. Believe, and be persuaded, that the  
 ‘ governor of the universe is even pleased with this variety: it  
 ‘ is his will and pleasure, that the Syrians should have their par-  
 ‘ ticular institutions, the Greeks theirs, and the Ægyptians theirs;  
 ‘ and that the Syrians should not all have entirely the same. For  
 ‘ even among them are differences: for no man agrees exactly  
 ‘ with his neighbour, but one thinks in this way, another in that.  
 ‘ Why then should we attempt by violence to obtain what is  
 ‘ impossible?’

Here is no express mention of the Christians. This learned philosopher, and honourable senator, though speaking to a Chris-

<sup>d</sup> Ο δε τῆ θεῆ καὶ σοῦ νομοῦ ἀκινήτος μένει τὸν πάντα αἰῶνα, ἀπολεισθῆναι τῆ ἐκείνου  
 ψυχῆν ὡς οὐκ οἶσται οὐδὲν εὐσεβείας. p. 68. B.

tian emperor upon so joyful an occasion, when also he had so good reason of gratitude for so just and excellent a law, and was disposed to commend and praise him for it, has not vouchsafed to make particular mention of the religious sect which this emperor professed, and for which he was very zealous. However, none can make any doubt, that he applauds a general toleration allowed by a Christian emperor. And I suppose, that \* by Syrians in the last cited paragraph, we are to understand Christians: for they had their original in Palestine, a branch of Syria. Then he names them first: the reason of which seems to be respect for the emperor. The next mentioned are the Greeks; the speaker's own sect or people, and lastly the Ægyptians. Besides, he particularly observes, that there were differences even among the Syrians: if by these are intended Christians, the consideration must be of weight to confirm the emperor in his present moderation toward all men. Finally, this interpretation is supported by the quotation from the Old Testament, which he calls 'the writings of the Assyrians,' as seen above.

III. We are now to make inquiries after another Oration, addressed by Themistius to Valens in the year 375.

Socrates, having related the death of Valentinian, goes on: 'Valens<sup>f</sup> however, still residing at Antioch, was free from foreign wars. . . . But he persecuted those who held the Homouſian doctrine in a most grievous manner; and was every day inventing greater punishments for them: till<sup>g</sup> the philosopher Themistius, by a monitory oration, reduced his great severity to some degree of moderation. In which oration he observed, that the emperor ought not to wonder at the diversity of opinions which there was among the Christians: for the diversity among them was small, if compared with the multitude and confusion of opinions among the Greeks, which were not less than three hundred: and it was necessary that there should be great variety. And moreover, that God was well pleased with the difference of opinions, that all men might the more reverence his majesty, because the knowledge of him was not obvious, and easy to be attained. These and other things having been observed by the philosopher, the emperor became milder for the future.'

To the like purpose Sozomen: 'Valens<sup>h</sup> still residing at An-

<sup>e</sup> The word is so understood by Petavius. See his notes upon the place. p. 403.

<sup>f</sup> Socrat. l. iv. cap. 32. p. 250.

<sup>g</sup> Εως αυτη την πολλην σπηλαιαν ο φιλοσοφος Θεμιστιος μετριωτεραν τη προσφωκλικη

λογω εισασατο εν ω μη δειν ξενισθαι επι τη διαφωνια των Χριστιανικων δογματων παραινει τω βασιλει. Ibid.

<sup>h</sup> Sozom. l. vi. cap. 36. p. 696.

‘tioch in Syria, grew more and more bitter toward those who  
 ‘had different sentiments from himself. At which time the phi-  
 ‘lofopher Themiftius, addreffing an oration to him, reminded  
 ‘him, that <sup>l</sup> he ought not to wonder at the diverfity of ecclesi-  
 ‘aftical opinions, it being lefs in degree and number than that  
 ‘which was among the Greeks. For among them there was a  
 ‘very great variety of opinions.’ And more to the like purpofe,  
 fo agreeable to what we have already feen in Socrates, that it  
 needs not to be rehearfed.

But it is greatly to be fufpected, that neither of thefe hiftorians  
 has confined himfelf to the very words of Themiftius. ‘Chriftian,’  
 and ‘ecclefiastical opinions,’ or ‘opinions in the church,’ are phrafes  
 that appear no where in any of this philofopher’s orations now  
 extant, though we have a large part of them.

However, the main queftion is, whether the oration to which thefe  
 hiftorians refer be now extant. There is an oration to <sup>k</sup> Valens  
 in Latin, in which is to be found what thofe writers fay of the  
 neceffity and ufe of different opinions. Valefius, in his notes upon  
 the forecited paffage of Socrates, declares himfelf <sup>l</sup> in favour of the  
 genuinenefs of it; as <sup>m</sup> does Baftnage likewise. Petavius <sup>n</sup>, who  
 publifhed an edition of this philofopher’s Oration, does not allow  
 it to be the fame that was fpoken to Valens, and affigns many  
 reafons for his judgment; though <sup>o</sup> he was at the pains to tran-  
 flate it into Greek. Fabricius is of opinion, that <sup>p</sup> the oration of  
 which Socrates and Sozomen fpeak is loft; and he refers to Baro-  
 nius, as having been before of the fame fentiment. Tillemont <sup>q</sup>  
 fays: ‘We have ftill in Latin an oration addreffed to Valens,  
 in which is what thefe writers mention: but it is fo like to that  
 which we have in Greek, and was certainly addreffed to Jovian,  
 that it is not eafy to believe that

<sup>i</sup> . . . παρηει, μη χρηναι θαυμαζειν την διαφωνιαν των εκκλησιαστικων δογματων. κ. λ. Ibid. &c.

<sup>k</sup> Orat. xii. p. 154. <sup>l</sup> Hæc oratio Themistii ad Valentem hodie extat Latine edita a Duditio. Nam quod Socrates ait, Themistium in ea oratione locutum esse de discrepantia dogmatum philosophicorum, habetur in versione Duditii. Valef. in Socrat. p. 58.

<sup>m</sup> Cum porro Valens majore in dies odio adversus Homoiſianos æſtuaret, quos acerrime vexabat, Themistius furentem oratione placare tentat. Quam Latine olim ab Andrea Duditio publicatam, Græce Petavius vertit. Baſn. ann. 375. num. viii.

<sup>n</sup> Hanc ipſam eſſe orationem, quâ in

Catholicos exacerbatus Valens a Themistio compellatus, ac mitigatus dicitur, miror cuiquam in animum induxiſſe. Petav. annot. ad Themist. p. 459.

<sup>o</sup> Nos, ut jaſturam hanc aliqua ex parte ſublevemus, Græcam noſtram interpretationem pro germana Themistii oratione ſubſtituimus. Petav. ibid. p. 460.

<sup>p</sup> Alter vero Themistii λοſος προςφωνητικος, quo ab illa etiam perſecutione Socrates iv. 32. et Sozomenus vi. 36. Valentem ſcribunt revocatum eſſe, intercidit, ut recte Baronius ad A. C. 374. num. ix. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 10.

<sup>q</sup> L’Emp. Theodoſ. art. 94. H. deſ. Emp. Tom. v.

‘ that Themistius composed both. It \* is more probable, that  
 ‘ the true oration to Valens being lost, some person left out that  
 ‘ which was peculiar to Jovian, the better to accommodate the  
 ‘ whole to Valens.’

There can therefore be no good reason, why I should be at the pains to make extracts out of this Latin oration; though the truth of what is written by Socrates and Sozomen ought not to be contested. Themistius did address an oration to Valens recommending moderation; and the emperor was mitigated: he was milder in the punishments inflicted upon those who differed from him; some were only banished, who otherwise might have been put to death.

IV. We may now, I think, see what judgment ought to be made of this philosopher and senator: he was eminent for learning and eloquence, esteemed by all learned men in general, both Christians and others; in favour with all the emperors in whose time he lived: excepting Julian, they were all Christians; and \* they were all flattered by him. But it does not appear, that he was at all inclined to embrace the Christian sentiments. Nevertheless, he may have been a very useful man: for during his abode at Constantinople, he educated many young persons in the knowledge of the polite arts and sciences. Moderation was for the interest of Gentilism at that time: such principles were approved and embraced by this philosopher, and recommended by him upon proper occasions. Jovian was handsomely commended by him for his law of general toleration for all opinions, including Gentilism, and the several sects among Christians. The same sentiments were recommended by him afterwards to Valens, from the same just, and equitable, and forcible reasons and considerations; and not altogether without effect. The severity of that bigotted prince toward Homoüsians was mitigated, and they had a benefit by it.

\* Il y a plus d'apparence, que le véritable discours à Valens étant perdu, on a retranché de l'autre ce qui estoit particulier à Jovien pour l'accommoder à Valens. . . . Le P. Harduin n'en a pas voulu dire un mot. Tallein. *ibid.* \* Il y a peu de faits dans ses éloges. Mais on y trouve des maximes allez belles, et il prend presque

toujours un caractère d'un homme d'honneur. Cependant, quoiqu'il se declare grand ennemi des flatteurs, je ne vois pas, qu'on le puisse excuser de l'avoir este luy-mesme. Car les discours, qu'il fait aux Empereurs sont tous éloges, souvent mal fondez. Et Valens y paroist aussi-bon, et aussi grand que Theodose. *Id. ib.*

## C H A P. XLIX.

## L I B A N I U S.

- I. *His time, works, and character.* II. *Extracts out of his epistles.* III. *Extracts out of his other works.* IV. *His Oration for the temples, to the emperor Theodosius, in the year 390, translated from the original, with notes.* V. *General, and concluding observations upon that Oration.*

LIBANIUS <sup>a</sup> a celebrated sophist of the fourth century, flourished under Constantius, and the following emperors, till the time of Theodosius the great. He was born at Antioch; in Syria, in the year of Christ 314, or 315. He taught rhetoric for some while at Constantinople, and afterwards at Nicomedia. About the year 354, he came to his native place Antioch; where he resided, for the most part, the remainder of his life.

He is placed by Cave at the year 360; I place him at the year 370, at which time he was considerably above fifty years of age. When he wrote his life, he was in the sixtieth year of his <sup>b</sup> age. He speaks of his being fifty years old in the time of <sup>c</sup> Jovian, who succeeded Julian, and in the time of Valens <sup>d</sup> fifty-seven. In a letter to Priscus, he says, he <sup>e</sup> was seventy-six years old; which he could not be before the year of our Lord 390, or 391, and near the end of the reign of Theodosius, before mentioned, who died in 395.

He was the author of many works, still extant. His letters, which which were very numerous, are particularly recommended by <sup>f</sup> Eunapius, and <sup>g</sup> Photius. And the late Mr. Wolfius, in our time, has made a large collection of them, amounting to the number of more than sixteen hundred: the greatest part of which are unquestionably genuine, and very entertaining.

Libanius was a great admirer of Julian, fond of Gentilism, and averse to Christianity, but not an enemy to all Christians. He did not embrace Christianity, having been educated in great prejudices against it, and having never examined its evidences. Nevertheless I cannot but esteem him an useful man; for, as Socrates <sup>h</sup> acknowlegeth, he was an excellent sophist: and he

<sup>a</sup> Liban. De vitâ suâ. Eunap. de Vitis Philosoph. et Sophist. Phot. Cod. xc. p. 209. Suid. V. Λιβανίου. Fabr. Bib. Gr. Tom. vii. p. 378. &c. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tillemont. Hist. des Emp. Tom. iv. Julien. art. 36. 37. Le Clerc. Bib. Anc. et Mod. T. iii. p. 353 &c. Bib. Raisonnée. T. 24. p. 177. &c. Bib. Germanique. T. 47. p.

1. &c.

<sup>b</sup> De Vitâ suâ. p. 19.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 46.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. p. 48.

<sup>e</sup> Το δε ημετερον, εξ μεν και εβδμηκοσια ετη γεσεναι. Ep. 866. p. 405.

<sup>f</sup> In Libanii Vit. p. 133.

<sup>g</sup> Ubi supr. p. 212.

<sup>h</sup> Εγω δε σοφιστην μεν αυτον αριστον γινεσθαι φημι. Socr. l. iii. cap. 23. in.

was continually employed in teaching polite literature, and had many scholars; some of whom were afterwards men of great eminence. Among them Socrates<sup>1</sup> and Sozomen<sup>2</sup> reckon John Chrysoftom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Maximus, bishop of Seleucia, in Isauria.

And Sozomen says, that when Libanius was dying, and his friends asked him whom he would have to succeed him in his school, he said, 'he<sup>1</sup> should have chosen John [Chrysoftom], but the Christians had got him...' He says, in one of his epistles, that<sup>2</sup> philosophers are to be respected next after the gods; for they are next to them in dignity. Recommending Letoïus to Eutocius, he says: 'Letoïus<sup>3</sup> is my friend, because he is a good man, and exceeds what might be expected from one in his station. By profession he is a soldier, but in his mind he is well affected to literature, and to those who make that their study.' These, and many other like things, in his writings, shew how desirous Libanius was to promote learning and knowledge.

Eunapius says, that<sup>4</sup> Libanius was well qualified for public offices in the state, and that one of the emperors, in whose time he lived, meaning Theodosius the great, bestowed upon him the honorary title of præfect of the prætorium, the highest office in the empire; but Libanius declined it, saying, that the title of sophist was more honourable. We may observe him in his epistles expressing the same<sup>5</sup> sentiment. And by the force of his eloquence he appeased two emperors, Julian and Theodosius, when they were much offended with the people of Antioch. His pathetic orations upon both these occasions are still<sup>6</sup> extant. However, undoubtedly, there were others beside him, who joined together in mitigating the displeasure of those emperors.

Divers letters of our sophist are written to Christians, and Christian bishops. Indeed, the correspondence between him and Basil, consisting<sup>7</sup> of more than twenty letters, is<sup>8</sup> suspected, (and I think justly), not to be genuine. There is also a letter<sup>9</sup> to John, by whom many learned men suppose to be meant Chrysoftom; but

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Socrat. l. vi. cap. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Soz. l. viii. cap. 2. p. 757. A. B.

<sup>3</sup> ... λέγειται Ἰωάννην εἶπει, εἰ μὴ Χριστιανικοὶ τυλοὶ ἐσυλησαν. Id. ib. p. 755. B.

<sup>4</sup> Φιλοσοφός, ὡ μακαρίας, μέγα τῆς Θεῆς Σεραπειεύει, ἐγὼ οὐκ ἴσθαι τῶν Θεῶν. Ep. 1524. p. 649.

<sup>5</sup> Ἀπλοῖος ἤμιν φίλος ἐστίν, ἀπο τῆς ἁγίας εἶναι, καὶ κρείττων τῆς σχηματικῆς, ἢ ὡς ἡ Ζη μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῆς αἰωνίου μοίρας, τῆς ἁγίας δὲ μέγα τῶν περιλαβῆς ἐστίν. Ep. 433. p. 821.

<sup>6</sup> Ἰκανός δὲ καὶ πολιτικοῖς

ομιλεῖν πρᾶγμασι ... Eunap. ib. p. 135.

<sup>7</sup> Ἐμοὶ σχήμα μὲν ἀρκούν οἱ λαοί, δι' ἧς εὐδαιμονοῦσι ταπεινότερον ἠήσαμην ἐμαυτῶν, ὡν ἡ λαμπρότης ἔρχος τοῖς κολαξί. Ep. 18. p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Legatio ad Julianum. T. 2. p. 151. Ad Theodos. Imp. de Seditioe Antiochena, p. 389. &c. Vid. et ad Theodos. Antiochenis reconciliatum. p. 406. &c.

<sup>9</sup> Ap. Wolf. ep. 1580. ... 1605.

<sup>10</sup> Vid. Garnor. de Vita. S. Basilii. cap. 39.

<sup>11</sup> Ep. 1576.

Valesius <sup>u</sup> hesitates, and I think, with good reason. There is also one letter <sup>x</sup> to Athanasius, by whom may be intended the celebrated bishop of Alexandria: another <sup>y</sup> to Amphilochius, bishop. Wolfius makes no doubt, that hereby is intended Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. The <sup>z</sup> letter next following, is inscribed to Optimus, appointed bishop. Hereby may be meant Optimus, who for some while was bishop of Antioch in Pisidia; who likewise, as appears from this letter, was disciple of Libanius, and had been chosen bishop without his own consent. In <sup>a</sup> a letter to Olympius, Libanius recommends Heliodorus; whom Wolfius suppoeth to be the author of the Ethiopicks, and a Christian. There is also <sup>b</sup> a letter of our author to Heliodorus, supposed to be the same. Concerning him may be consulted <sup>c</sup> Fabricius. Phorius <sup>f</sup> gives an agreeable account of the Ethiopicks. When Heliodorus wrote that work, he was a Christian; and it is supposed, that afterwards he was a bishop.

II. I cannot forbear to take particular notice of some of our sophist's letters. Good sentiments may be observed in several of them.

1. He expresseth himself very agreeably concerning forgiveness of injuries, and readiness to be reconciled, in a letter to <sup>g</sup> Ulpian, a part of which I shall transcribe here. ' I am glad  
' that you have the emperor's good-will, [meaning Jovian  
' as is supposed:] I conclude it from your being still in the ma-  
' gistracy; for without that you could not have this. If the  
' difference between you and Seleucus is made up, so much the  
' better; if not, by Jupiter, let it be brought to an end without  
' delay. If you was the first author in the injury, it is fit you  
' should be the first author of peace. If the fault is on his side,  
' the greater honour will you have from a reconciliation. It is  
' not he who avengeth an injury, whom we admire, but he who  
' has power to avenge it and does not. The former belongs to  
' barbarians and wild-beasts; the latter to Greeks and Athenians,  
' and such as resemble the gods. Call to mind him, whose death  
' has cost you so many tears; and, perhaps, you will find, that  
' he forgave many men offences, which were not small, and greater  
' than those which have caused a difference between you.'

2. There is another letter <sup>d</sup> equally pleasing, written upon the same sentiments, and in the time of Julian, and in favour of a Christian. ' Orion,' says he, ' was my friend, when he was in prof-

<sup>u</sup> In notis ad Socrat. l. vi. cap. 3. p. 75. 437. p. 222. <sup>b</sup> Ep. 595. p. 286.  
<sup>x</sup> Ep. 691. p. 331. <sup>y</sup> Ep. 1226. <sup>c</sup> Bib. Gr. lib. v. cap. 6. T. 6. p. 784.  
p. 581. <sup>z</sup> Ep. 1227. p. 582. <sup>f</sup> Cod. 73. p. 157. <sup>e</sup> Ep. 1138.  
Ὀπίμω ἐπισκοπῶ ἡλιόδωρῳ. <sup>a</sup> Ep. p. 542. <sup>d</sup> Ep. 730. p. 349.  
' perity;

perity; and now he is in affliction, I have the same disposition toward him. If he thinks differently from us concerning the Deity, he hurts himself, being deceived: but it is not fit that his friends should look upon him as an enemy.'

He goes on to dissuade against treating Orion with severity. It is, indeed, a curious letter; upon which Wolfius<sup>1</sup> has made remarks, and Le Clerc<sup>2</sup> yet more. Orion was plainly a Christian, as appears not only from this, but also from another letter<sup>3</sup> of Libanius. In the time of his prosperity, it is likely, he had done some things to the detriment of Hellenism, which were liable to resentment in the reign of Julian. But Libanius extenuates his fault, and endeavours to mitigate his sufferings.

3. Wolfius<sup>4</sup> justly considers these letters as proofs of the equity of Libanius toward Christians.

4. It must be owned, I think, that Libanius was of a friendly disposition, good-natured, tender-hearted, and compassionate. And I would farther observe here, that though he sometimes speaks with great dislike, and even with indignation against the Christians, calling them profane, and impure, and the like; he never adopts the language of Julian, or calls them Galileans, though Julian never spoke of them under any other denomination.

5. I would here mention another observation upon our author. I do not perceive that he had read the books of the New Testament: I may add, nor the Old, that I can discern. Wolfius thinks, that<sup>5</sup> in one of his letters published by him, Libanius alludes to St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians. iv. 26. *Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.* And thence he concludes, that<sup>6</sup> Libanius had read the books of the New Testament. But it should be considered, that that letter is one of the letters to Basil, which are not known to be genuine, and probably are not.

6. Libanius, formerly quoted by us,<sup>7</sup> passed a judgment upon the writings of Julian and Porphyry against the Christians; preferring the work of Julian to that of Porphyry. Whence some may argue, that he must have been well acquainted with the books of the New Testament, and the principles contained in them: but I do not think there is any proof of this. The judgment of Libanius upon that controversy is of no value; and might be founded, such as it was, upon only a very general

<sup>1</sup> Vide Notas. p. 349.

<sup>2</sup> Bib. A. et M. Tom. 3. p. 366. &c.

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 673. p. 322.

<sup>4</sup> Notanda est hæc epistola, tanquam index æquitatis, quia Libanius in Christianos usus est. Not.

(19.) ad. ep. 673. p. 323.

<sup>5</sup> ... πρὸς ἄλλοις κηρύττων μὴ χρῆναι

μέχρι δυσμῶν ἤλιε λυπὴν φυλάττειν, αἴλιος ἐν πολλοῖς ἡλίοις ἐφύλαξας. Ep. 1586. p. 721.

<sup>6</sup> Vult omnino illa S. Pauli Eph. iv. 26. Ex his, itemque aliis locis, patet, Libanium sacros Novi Testamenti libros evoluisse. Wolf. Ib. in not. p. 721.

<sup>7</sup> See before. p. 375.

knowledge of Christianity, of which he could not be destitute. In short, our sophist, with all his discernment in many other things, being prejudiced and conceited, shut his eyes against the evidences of the Christian religion, and would not examine them; nor vouchsafe to read, with any attention, the writings of the apostles and evangelists of Jesus Christ, who had not the reputation of being skilled in Greek learning.

III. I shall now make some extracts out of his other works.

1. In a panegyric upon Julian, at the beginning of the year 363, when Julian was for the fourth time consul, he says of him: 'By the guidance of philosophy he soon wiped off the reproach of impiety, and learned the truth, and acknowledged those for gods, who were such indeed, instead of him, who was only thought to be so. That day I call the beginning of liberty to the world.'

2. In a funeral oration upon Julian, he gives this account of his conduct in religious matters, when he came to be sole emperor, after the death of Constantius. 'Having,' as he says, 'paid all honours due to Constantius, he began with remedying matters relating to the gods, sacrificing in the view of all, and expressing his satisfaction in those who followed him, and deriding those who did not, and endeavouring to persuade them to imitate him, but without compulsion. Indeed, they who were in wrong sentiments, were filled with fear, and expected pulling out of eyes, beheadings, and rivers of blood, flowing from innumerable slaughters; and that this new lord would find out new ways of torture; and that fire and sword, and drowning, and burying alive, and amputation of limbs, would be trifling things. Such things had been practised by those who went before; but now more grievous things were expected. But Julian dissented from those who had practised such things, as not obtaining the end aimed at; and he was sensible, that no benefit was to be expected from such violence. For men labouring under diseases of the body, may be relieved by bandages; but a false opinion about the gods is not to be expelled by cutting and burning; and if the hand sacrificeth, the mind reproves the hand, and condemns the infirmity of the

ἡ φιλοσοφίας δὲ ἡμμενον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν  
θεοῦ παρακινῶντα λειμῶνα, διέξαν περι-  
τε δὲ παρὰ τὸν οὐκ ἐγγὺς περιφέρειν· ἀλλ'  
εὐθὺς τὴν κηλιδά διέρρηψε, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας  
αὐτοῦ τε δικεῖνος ἐπέστρω' πρὸς τὴν ἀληθινὰν  
ἡγεμονίαν φιλοσοφία χρησαμένους. Ἐκείνην ἔσω  
τὴν ἡμέραν ἀρχὴν ἐλευθερίας τῆ γῆ καὶ λαοῦ.  
κ. λ. Panegyric. Imp. Juliano Cos. didius.

Or. 8. T. 2. p. 234. C. Conf. Or. 10.  
p. 265. A. Concio Funeb. super  
Juliani Imp. necis, Or. x. Tom. 2. p. 289.  
D. 290. 291. et ap. Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom.  
vii. Parentalis in Julian. Imp. cap. 58. 59.  
p. 289. &c. Ταῦτ' ἔμεν γὰρ τοῖς  
πρὸς θεὸν ἐπεπρακτοῦ πολὺν δὲ τῶν κληρονομιά-  
καλεπώλετα. κ. λ. p. 290. B.

' body,

‘ body, and still approves what it approved before. There is  
 ‘ only an appearance of a change, but no real alteration of sen-  
 ‘ timent. Moreover, they who comply, are pardoned afterwards,  
 ‘ and they who die [under torture] are honoured as gods.’

‘ Considering, ‘ therefore, these things, and observing like-  
 ‘ wise, that their affairs had been increased by slaughters, he  
 ‘ declined what he could not approve of. Thus he brought  
 ‘ over all to the truth, who were to be persuaded; but did not  
 ‘ compel those who were in love with falsehood. However, he  
 ‘ did not cease to call to them, and say, Whither do you run?  
 ‘ Are you not ashamed to think darkness brighter than light? ...  
 ‘ They who were of the same sentiments, were dearer to him  
 ‘ than his kindred: esteeming him his friend, who was a friend  
 ‘ to Jupiter, and him his enemy, who was an enemy to Jupiter:  
 ‘ or rather esteeming him his friend, who was a friend to Jupiter;  
 ‘ but not every one his enemy, who was an enemy to Jupiter:  
 ‘ for such as he thought might be changed in time, he did not  
 ‘ reject, but by good usage gained upon them; and though  
 ‘ they refused at first, he brought them at length to dance about  
 ‘ the altars.’

Upon this passage I may be allowed to make some remarks.  
 1. Here is an acknowledgment, that in times past, under heathen  
 emperors, Christians had undergone very ill usage. 2. And that  
 under those sufferings their numbers had increased, and their re-  
 ligion had prospered. This could never be said of Hellenism.  
 3. Here is a reference to some customs of the Christians. They  
 who were overcome by tortures, and other sufferings, in time of  
 persecution, afterwards acknowledged their weakness, and upon  
 due humiliation, were pardoned. They who persevered and died  
 for their religion, were honoured as martyrs, or as gods, as he  
 represents it. 4. Libanius has here produced good reasons against  
 persecuting men upon account of religious sentiments. 5. It is  
 intimated, that Julian, by his management, prevailed upon  
 many, and made more than a few converts to Gentilism. 6. This  
 account of Julian’s conduct, as I apprehend, may be considered,  
 as intended, partly at least, to be an apology for him to heathen  
 people. Upon Julian’s accession, the Christians feared a heavy  
 persecution; and there were also, as it seems, a good number of  
 heathens, who wished, and expected to see the Christians treated  
 with the utmost rigour and severity; and some there were, who  
 gave such counsel, and advised him to act in that manner.

3 Ταῦτα ἐν ἀλιωμένῳ, καὶ ταῖς σφαγαῖς ὄρωι νυξήμενα τὰ ἱερῶν, εἴφου αὐ καλέμεται  
 §. p. 290. C.

The better to satisfy such persons, Libanius argues against the severities of persecution, and shews, that milder methods were not without effect.

IV. I must now give a particular account of an Oration of Libanius, entitled, <sup>u</sup> 'For the Temples.' It is addressed to Theodosius the first, or the great, who then had for his colleague in the empire Valentinian the second, or the younger. James Gothofred <sup>z</sup> the publisher of this oration, has endeavoured to determine the time of it. He argues from divers notes of time in the oration itself, that (\*) it must have been written after the year 388, and before 391, and very probably in the year 390. Nevertheless, Mr. Tillemont has since argued, that <sup>y</sup> it might be written in the year 384. And Gothofred himself has also since said, that (\* \*) this oration was written in the year 387, if that be not a fault of the impression, as I think it must be. I do not think it needful for me to enter here into a debate upon this point; Gothofred's argument in his notes has an appearance of probability; and I may observe some characters of time in my own notes upon the oration, as we pass along.

Whether this oration was spoken to Theodosius, may be questioned: for though Libanius seems to speak to the emperor, as present, it cannot be thence certainly concluded that he was so, because Libanius expresseth himself in a like manner in some other orations, when it is plain the emperor was absent, as Gothofred has observed.

The occasion of the oration was this. In the reign of Theodosius several heathen temples, some of them very magnificent, were pulled down and destroyed in the cities, and especially in country-places, by the monks, with the consent and connivance, as Libanius intimates, of the bishops, and without express order of the emperor to that purpose. Of this Libanius complains, and implores the emperor's protection, that the temples may be preserved.

Throughout the whole oration Libanius professeth himself a heathen, and worshipper of the gods, and takes great liberty with a Christian emperor; nevertheless it will be of use to us upon many accounts. We shall see, particularly, the state of Christi-

<sup>u</sup> Λιβανίου λόγος υπεὶ τῶν ἱερῶν

<sup>x</sup> Libanii Antiocheni pro Templis Gentilium non excindendis, ad Theodosium M. Imp. Oratio: nunc primum edita a Jacobo Gothofredo J. C. notisque illustrata Geneva. 1634. (\*) Vide Gothofred notas in Oration. Libanii. p. 37. . . 40.

<sup>y</sup> See H. E. L'Emp. Theodose. i. art. xviii. et note xvi. (\* \*) Quæ

[sacrificia] paullo ante hanc Legem Romæ stetit Libanius discrete testatur oratione, quam edidi υπεὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, quæ scripta est anno D. 387. Goth. in Cod. Theod. T. 6. p. 272.

anity and Gentilism at that time: how the heathens argued against the Christians, and how the Christians defended themselves.

As almost every part of this oration is of some moment to us, and the original is uncommon, I intend to make a literal translation of the whole \* \*.

At the bottom of the pages, under the translation, I shall place some notes, by way of explication, chiefly taken from Gothofred, the editor of it. I shall likewise put the pages of his edition in the text, that the translation may be the more easily compared with the original, by such of the curious who are possessed of it. And at the end I shall add such remarks as are especially suited to our design.

‘ Having already, O emperor, often offered advice which has been approved by you, even when others have advised contrary things; I come to you now upon the same design, and with the same hopes, that now especially you will be persuaded by me.’ p. 6. ‘ But if not, do not judge the speaker an enemy to your interests, considering, beside other things, the great honour which you have conferred upon me, and that it is not likely, that he who is under so great obligations, should not love his benefactor.’ p. 7. ‘ And for that very reason, I think it my duty to advise, where I apprehend I have somewhat to offer, which may be of advantage; for I have no other way of shewing my gratitude to the emperor, but by orations, and the counsel delivered in them.’

‘ I shall, indeed, appear to many to undertake a matter full of danger, in pleading with you for the temples, that they may suffer no injury, as they now do. But they who have such apprehensions, seem to me to be very ignorant of your true character.’ p. 8. ‘ For I esteem it the part of an angry and severe disposition, for any one to resent the proposal of counsel,

\* \* At first I intended to translate the greatest part of the oration, and give an abstract of the rest. But upon consulting my good friend, Dr. Ward, the late learned professor of rhetoric at Gresham College, London; he recommended a translation of the whole, and the publication of the original Greek with it, as the Oration is very scarce. Accordingly, I have followed his advice, so far as to translate the whole. Which translation was made by me, and then kindly revised and corrected by Dr. Ward, several years before his decease, which happened in the year 1758. For this work has been long in hand: I may say, almost half a century.

<sup>2</sup> The honour here referred to, as Go-

thofred observes, was that of Præfectus Prætorio, which Libanius had received by a commission or patent from Theodosius. It was the highest office at that time under the emperor. After the division of the empire, there were four of these præfects, two in the eastern, and two in the western empire, who commanded as vicegerents of the emperor; but, I suppose, that the honour conferred upon Libanius was only the title of an office, without the administration. This must be what Eunapius means. *Vita Libanii. sub fin. Τον γαρ της αυλης επαρχον μεχρι προσωποριας εχειν εκλελυον: εκ εδεξαις, φησας, τον σοφιστην ειναι μειζονα.* p. 135.

‘ which

‘ which he does not approve of: but the part of a mild, and  
 ‘ gentle, and equitable disposition, such as yours is, barely to  
 ‘ reject counsel not approved of. For when it is in the power  
 ‘ of him, to whom the address is made, to embrace any counsel,  
 ‘ or not, it is not reasonable to refuse a hearing which can do  
 ‘ no harm; nor yet to resent and punish the proposal of counsel,  
 ‘ if it appear contrary to his own judgment: when the only thing  
 ‘ that induced the adviser to mention it, was a persuasion of its  
 ‘ usefulness.’

‘ I intreat you, therefore, O emperor, to turn your counte-  
 ‘ nance to me while I am speaking, and not to cast your eyes  
 ‘ upon those, who in many things aim to molest both you and  
 ‘ me; forasmuch as oftentimes a look is of greater effect than  
 ‘ all the force of truth. I would farther insist, that they ought  
 ‘ to permit me to deliver my discourse quietly, and without in-  
 ‘ terruption; and then, afterwards, they may do their best to  
 ‘ confute us by what they have to say.’ [Here is a small  
 breach in the Oration. But he seems to have begun his argu-  
 ment with an account of the origin of temples, that they  
 were first of all erected in country places.] ‘ Men then hav-  
 ‘ ing,’ as he goes on, ‘ at first secured themselves in dens  
 ‘ and cottages, and having there experienced the protection  
 ‘ of the gods, they soon perceived how beneficial to mankind  
 ‘ their favour must be: they therefore, as may be supposed,  
 ‘ erected to them statues and temples, such as they could in  
 ‘ those early times. And when they began to build cities, upon  
 ‘ the increase of arts and sciences, there were many temples on  
 ‘ the sides of mountains, and in plains: and in every city,’ [as  
 they built it,] ‘ next to the walls were temples and sacred  
 ‘ edifices raised, as the beginning of the rest of the body. p. 9.  
 ‘ For from such governors they expected the greatest security:  
 ‘ and, if you survey the whole Roman empire, you will find  
 ‘ this to be the case every where. For<sup>a</sup> in the city next to the<sup>b</sup>  
 ‘ greatest, there are still some<sup>c</sup> temples, though they are deprived  
 ‘ of their honours; a few indeed out of many, but yet it is not  
 ‘ quite destitute. And with the aid of these gods the Romans  
 ‘ fought, and conquered their enemies; and having conquered  
 ‘ them, they improved their condition, and made them happier  
 ‘ than they were before their defeat; lessening their fears, and

<sup>a</sup> . . . επει γαρ τη μελα την μελίσση  
 πωλη. <sup>b</sup> He means Constantinople,  
 called by Libanius in other orations also,  
 ‘ the second city after the greatest of all:  
 ‘ the greatest city after Rome,’ and the  
 like. Hence it appears, that this Oration

was not written or spoken at Constantinople,  
 but at some other place. <sup>c</sup> He  
 means the ancient temples of Byzantium,  
 before Constantine the great enlarged it,  
 and called it after his own name Constau-  
 tinople.

‘ making

' making them partners in the privileges of the commonwealth.  
 ' And ' when I was a child, he ' who led the Gallic army over-  
 ' threw him that had affronted him; they having first prayed to  
 ' the gods for success before they engaged. But ' having pre-  
 ' vailed over him, who at that time gave prosperity to the cities,  
 ' judging it for his advantage to have another deity, *ηγησαμενος*  
 ' *αυτω λυσισελειν ελερον τινα νομιζειν Θεον*, for the building of the  
 ' city, which he then ' designed, he made use of the sacred '   
 ' money, but made no alteration in the legal worship. p. 10.  
 ' The temples indeed were impoverished, but the rites were still  
 ' performed there. But when the empire came to his ' son, or  
 ' rather the form of empire, for the government was really in  
 ' the hands of others, who from the beginning had been his  
 ' masters, and to whom he vouchsafed equal power with himself:  
 ' he therefore being governed by them, even when he was em-  
 ' peror, was led into many wrong actions, and among others  
 ' to forbid sacrifices. These his cousin ' k, possessed of every vir-  
 ' tue, restored: what he did otherwise, or intended to do, I  
 ' omit at present. After his death in Persia, the liberty of sa-  
 ' crificing remained for some time: but at the instigation of  
 ' some innovators, sacrifices were forbidden by the two ' l brothers,  
 ' but not incense. Which state of things your law ' m has ratified.  
 ' So that we have not more reason to be uneasy for what is de-

' Libanius seems there to speak of the  
 Licinian war. And being born in the  
 year 314, or 315, he must have been a  
 child at that time, in 323.

' He  
 means Constantine, who came from Gaul,  
 with Gallic forces, when he conquered  
 Maxentius in 312. The soldiers of the  
 same country are here supposed by Libanius  
 to have been the strength of Constantine's  
 army when he fought with Licinius.

' Libanius supposes Constantine not to  
 have been converted to Christianity till  
 after the defeat of Licinius in 323, though  
 he really was a Christian many years before.  
 ' But,' says Gothofred in his notes at p.  
 43. ' I know not how it comes to pass,  
 ' the Gentile writers pretend, that Con-  
 ' stantine was not a Christian till after the  
 ' Licinian war. So Zosimus, lib. ii. p.  
 ' 685. The reason of which I suspect to  
 ' be, that if Constantine did not so long  
 ' approve of southsaying, which yet Zosi-  
 ' mus says he did, he bore with it, as sever-  
 ' al of his edicts shew. l. i. Cod. Th. de  
 ' Paganis. l. i. ii. iii. C. Th. de Maleficis  
 ' et Mathematicis: as also because from  
 ' that time he began more earnestly to op-  
 ' pose the Heathen worship, and also left

' Rome, not without some offence and dis-  
 ' gust.' See more of this in our notes  
 ' upon Zosimus.

' z Meaning Con-  
 stantinople.   
 ' h That is true, as  
 Gothofred says in his notes p. 43. *Cæte-  
 rum verum est, quod Libanius scribit, Con-  
 stantinum M. in condenda urbe Constantino-  
 politana, sacris pecuniis usum, id est, redi-  
 tibus et donariis Templorum Gentilitiorum.  
 Adde et simulachris, quæ templis ab eo de-  
 tracta, atque in urbis ornatum translata.*

' l Constantius: who, as Gothofred ob-  
 serves, p. 44, often forbade sacrifices, as  
 his edicts shew. l. iv. v. vi. C. Th. de  
 Paganis. sacrif. and other writers say.

' k Julian.   
 ' l Valentinian and  
 Valens.

' m That law of Theodosius  
 is often mentioned, and insisted upon in  
 this Oration by Libanius: a law, in which  
 sacrifices were expressly forbidden, but not  
 incense. Gothofred, p. 45, thinks, that  
 Libanius may refer to several laws of Theo-  
 dosius to that purpose: as l. vii. and ix.  
 and perhaps xi. C. Th. de paganis. sacrif.  
 And, as he says, in the year 392, after the  
 composing of this Oration, incense also  
 was forbidden by the same emperor. l. xii.  
 C. Th. de Paganis.

' nied

'nied us, than to be thankful for what is allowed. You, therefore,  
 'have not ordered the temples to be shut up, nor forbidden any  
 'to frequent them: nor have you driven from the temples, or  
 'the altars, fire or frankincense, or other honours of incense.  
 'But<sup>a</sup> those black-garbed people, who eat more than elephants,  
 'and<sup>b</sup> demand a large quantity of liquor from the people<sup>p</sup> who  
 'send them drink for their chantings; but who hide their luxury  
 'by their pale artificial<sup>q</sup> countenances: p. 11: these men, O  
 'emperor, even whilst your law is in force, run to the temples,  
 'bringing with them wood, and stones, and iron, and when they  
 'have not them, hands and feet. Then<sup>r</sup> follows a Mysian prey,  
 'the roofs are uncovered, walls are pulled down, images are  
 'carried off, and altars are overturned: the priests all the while  
 'must be silent upon pain of death. When they have destroyed  
 'one temple, they run to another, and a third, and trophies are  
 'erected upon trophies: which are all contrary to ("your")  
 'law. This is the practice in cities, but especially in the coun-  
 'tries. And there are many enemies every where. After innu-  
 'merable mischiefs have been perpetrated, the scattered multi-  
 'tude unites and comes together, and they require of each other  
 'an account of what they have done; and he is ashamed, who  
 'cannot tell of some great injury which he has been guilty of.  
 'They therefore spread themselves over the country like torrents,  
 'wasting the countries together with the temples: for wherever  
 'they demolish the temple of a country, at the same time the  
 'country itself is blinded, declines, and dies. For, O emperor,  
 'the temples are the soul of the country; they have been the  
 'first original of the buildings in the country, and they have  
 'subsisted for many ages to this time; and in them are all the  
 'husbandman's hopes, concerning men, and women, and chil-

<sup>a</sup> Οἱ δὲ μελαντοιμοῦντες ἴσθιοι, καὶ πλεω-  
 μεν τῶν ἐλεφάντων ἐσθιοντες, ποτὸν δὲ παρ-  
 χοντες τῷ πλεθει τῶν ἐκπαλαιῶν τοῖς δι' ἀσ-  
 μαίων αὐτοῖς παραπεμπῶσι το πῶλοι, συ-  
 κρυπλοντες δὲ ταυτα ὠχρότητι τῆ δια τεχνης  
 αὐτοῖς περιπορισμενη. κ. λ. p. 10, 11.

<sup>b</sup> By 'black-garbed people,' undoubtedly  
 Libanius means the monks, who wore  
 dark-coloured garments. <sup>p</sup> Thereby,  
 possibly, Libanius ridicules the liberality of  
 well-disposed Christians, who made contri-  
 butions for the support of the monks. And  
 the ground of charging the monks with de-  
 manding liquor for their hymns, might be  
 the practice of some heathen priests.

<sup>q</sup> It seems unreasonable in Libanius to  
 charge those men with a luxurious life.  
 The paleness of their countenances was a  
 good argument of abstemiousness. I do

not believe, that he had as good proof of  
 the contrary, or that they made use of art  
 to procure paleness.

<sup>r</sup> Demosthenes, in his oration for  
 Ctesiphon, cap. 22, uses this as a prover-  
 bial expression. And Harpocration says,  
 it took its rise from the Mysians, who in  
 the absence of their king Telephus, being  
 plundered by their neighbours, made no  
 resistance. Hence it came to be applied  
 to any persons who were passive under  
 injuries. See likewise Suidas in voce.  
 Μυσῶν λεία. That is a note received  
 from Dr. Ward before mentioned. I shall  
 add the note of Gothofred from p. 47.  
 Mysorum præda. Frequens illud prover-  
 bium in ore scriptisque Libanii, hic, et in  
 Orat. in Julianum Cof. p. 236. et in Anti-  
 ochico. p. 335. et in Juliani necem. p. 269.

'dren,

dren, and oxen, and the seeds and plants of the ground. p. 12.  
 Wherever any country has lost its temples, that country is lost,  
 and the hopes of the husbandmen, and with them all their  
 alacrity: for they suppose they shall labour in vain, when they  
 are deprived of the gods who should bless their labours: and  
 the country not being cultivated as usual, the tribute is di-  
 minished. This being the state of things, the husbandman is  
 impoverished, and the revenue suffers. For be the will ever  
 so good, impossibilities are not to be surmounted. Of such  
 mischievous consequence are the arbitrary proceedings of those  
 persons in the country, who say, "they fight with the temples."  
 But that war is the gain of those who oppress the inhabitants,  
 and robbing these miserable people of their goods, and what  
 they had laid up of the fruits of the earth for their sustenance,  
 they go off as with the spoils of those whom they have con-  
 quered. Nor are they satisfied with this, p. 13, for they also  
 seize the lands of some, saying, it is sacred: and many are de-  
 prived of their paternal inheritance upon a false pretence.  
 Thus\* these men riot upon other people's misfortunes, who  
 say, *they worship God with fasting.* And if they who are abused  
 come to the pastor in the city, (for so they call a man who is  
 not one of the meekest) complaining of the injustice that has  
 been done them, this pastor commends these, but rejects the  
 others; as if they ought to think themselves happy that they  
 have suffered no more. Although, O emperor, these also are  
 your subjects, and so much more profitable than those who in-  
 jure them, as laborious men are than the idle: for they are  
 like bees, these like drones. Moreover, if they hear of any  
 land which has any thing that can be plundered, they cry pre-  
 sently: "Such an one sacrificeth, and does abominable things,  
 and an army ought to be sent against him." And† presently  
 the reformers are there: for by this name they call their depre-  
 dations, if I have not used too soft a word. Some of these  
 strive to conceal themselves, and deny their proceedings; and  
 if you call them robbers you affront them. Others glory and  
 boast, and tell their exploits to those who are ignorant of them,  
 and say, they are more deserving than the husbandmen. p. 14.  
 Nevertheless, what is this, but in time of peace to wage war  
 with the husbandmen? For it by no means lessens these evils  
 that they suffer from their countrymen. But it is really more  
 grievous to suffer the things, which I have mentioned, in a

\* Οἱ δ' ἐκ τῶν εἰρῶν τρυφῶσι κακῶν, οἱ (καλεῖται γὰρ εἷς αἰθρᾶ ἢ παῖν χρηστὸν.)  
 τῶ πατρὸς ὡς φασὶ θεραπενούλης θείον. Ἦν κ. λ. p. 13. † Καὶ παρῆσιν οἱ  
 ἢ ἀπεργάζονται παρὰ τοῖς ἐν αἰσὶ ποιεῖν ἀσφραγίσαι. p. 13.

' time of quiet, from those who ought to assist them in a time  
 ' of trouble. For you, O emperor, in case of a war, collect an  
 ' army, give out orders, and do every thing suitable to the emer-  
 ' gency. And the new works, which you now carry on, are de-  
 ' signed as a farther security against our enemies, that all may  
 ' be safe in their habitations, both in the cities and in the coun-  
 ' try: and then if any enemies should attempt inroads, they  
 ' may be sensible they must suffer loss rather than gain any ad-  
 ' vantage. How is it then, that some under your government,  
 ' disturb others equally under your government, and permit  
 ' them not to enjoy the common benefits of it? p. 15. How  
 ' do they not defeat your own care and providence and labours,  
 ' O emperor? How do they not fight against your law by what  
 ' they do?'

' But they say, " We have only punished those who sacrifice,  
 ' and thereby transgress the law, which forbids sacrifices." O  
 ' emperor, when they say this they lie. For no one is so auda-  
 ' cious, and so ignorant of the proceedings of the courts, as to  
 ' think himself more powerful than the law. When I say the  
 ' law, I mean the law against sacrificers. Can it be thought,  
 ' that they who are not able to bear the sight of a collector's  
 ' cloak, should despise the power of your government. This  
 ' is what they say for themselves. And they have been often  
 ' alleged to <sup>u</sup> Flavian himself, and never have been confuted, no,  
 ' not yet. For I appeal to the guardians of this <sup>z</sup> law: who  
 ' has known any of those whom you have plundered to have sa-  
 ' crificed upon the altars, so as the law does not permit? What  
 ' young or old person, what man, what woman? Who of those  
 ' inhabiting the same country, and not agreeing with the sacri-  
 ' ficers in the worship of the gods? p. 16. Who of their neigh-  
 ' bours? For envy and jealousy are common in neighbourhoods.  
 ' Whence some would gladly come as an evidence, if any such  
 ' thing had been done: and yet no one has appeared, neither  
 ' from the one, nor from the other: [that is, neither from the  
 ' country, nor from the neighbourhood.] Nor will there ever  
 ' appear for fear of perjury, not to say the punishment of it.  
 ' Where then is the truth of this charge, when they accuse those  
 ' men of sacrificing contrary to law?

' But this shall not suffice for an excuse to the emperor: some  
 ' one therefore may say: " They have not sacrificed. Let it  
 ' be granted. But oxen have been killed at feasts and entertain-

<sup>u</sup> Bishop of Antioch at that time.

<sup>z</sup> Ἰδὲ γὰρ δὴ προκαλεῖται τῆς κηδεμονίας τῆς τοῦ νόμου. p. 15. Libanius here evi-

dently appeals to Christians, whom he calls  
 ' guardians of this law.'

“ ments,

ments, and merry meetings." Still there is no altar to receive the blood, nor a part burned, nor do salt-cakes precede, nor any libation follow. But if some persons meeting together in some pleasant field, kill a calf, or a sheep, or both, and roasting part, and broiling the rest, have eat it under a shade, upon the ground, I do not know, that they have acted contrary to any laws. For neither have you, O emperor, forbid these things by your law; but mentioning one thing, which ought not to be done, you have permitted every thing else. So that though they should have feasted together with all sorts of incense, they have not transgressed the law, even though in that feast they should all have sung, and invoked the gods. p. 17. Unless you think fit to accuse even their private method of eating, by which it has been customary for the inhabitants of several places in the country, to assemble together in those [places] which are the more considerable, on holidays, and having sacrificed, to feast together. This they did whilst the law permitted them to do it. Since that, the liberty has continued for all the rest except sacrificing. When therefore a festival day invited them, they accepted the invitation, and with those things which might be done without offence or danger, they have honoured both the day and the place. But that they ventured to sacrifice no one has said, nor heard, nor proved, nor been credited: nor have any of their enemies pretended to affirm it upon the ground of his own sight, or any credible account he has received of it.

They will farther say: "By this means some have been converted, and brought to embrace the same religious sentiments with themselves." Be not deceived by what they say: they only pretend it, but are not convinced: for they are averse to nothing more than this, though they say the contrary. For the truth is, they have not changed the objects of their worship, but only appear to have done so. They join themselves with them in appearance, and outwardly perform the same things that they do: but when they are in a praying posture, they address to no one, or else they invoke the gods; not rightly indeed in such a place, but yet they invoke them. p. 18. Wherefore, as in a tragedy he who acts the part of a king, is not a king, but the same person he was before he assumed that character; so every one of these keeps himself the same he was, though he seems to them to be changed. And what advantage

These things were allowed by some de paganis. But were totally forbidden edicts of Christian emperors about this afterwards. l. xix. cod. tit. as Gothofred time, and somewhat later, l. xvii. C. Th. observes. p. 51.

‘ have they by this, when the profession only is the same with  
 ‘ theirs, but a real agreement with them is wanting? for these  
 ‘ are things to which men ought to be persuaded, not compelled.  
 ‘ And when a man cannot accomplish that, and yet will practise  
 ‘ this, nothing is effected, and he may perceive the weakness of  
 ‘ the attempt. It <sup>2</sup> is said, that this is not permitted by their  
 ‘ own laws, which commend persuasion, and condemn compul-  
 ‘ sion. Why then do you run mad against the temples? When  
 ‘ you cannot persuade, you use force. In this you evidently  
 ‘ transgress your own laws.’

But they say, “ It is for the good of the world, and the men  
 “ in it, that there should be no temples.” p. 19. ‘ Here, O  
 ‘ emperor, I need freedom of speech; for I fear lest I should  
 ‘ offend. Let <sup>2</sup> then any of them tell me, who have left the  
 ‘ tongs and the hammer and the anvil, and pretend to talk  
 ‘ of the heavens, and of them that dwell there, what rites the  
 ‘ Romans followed, who arose from small and mean beginnings,  
 ‘ and went on prevailing, and grew great: theirs, or these, whose  
 ‘ are the temples and the altars, from whom they knew by the  
 ‘ soothsayers, what they ought to do, or not to do?’ [Here  
 Libanius instanceth in the successes of Agamemnon against  
 Troy; and of Hercules before, against the same place; and  
 some other things.] ‘ And many other wars might be men-  
 ‘ tioned, which have been successfully conducted, and after that  
 ‘ peace obtained, by the favour, and under the direction of the  
 ‘ gods. p. 20. But what is the most considerable of all, they  
 ‘ who seemed to despise this way of worship, have honoured it  
 ‘ against their will. Who are they? They <sup>b</sup> who have not ven-

<sup>2</sup> Λοσος δε μη εν τοις τελων αυλων τρισ  
 ενειναι νομοις, αλλ ευδοκιμειν μεν το πειθειν,  
 κακως δε ακειν την αναγκην. Τι ην μαι-  
 νισθε καλα των ιερων; Ει το πειθειν μεν ηκ-  
 εστιν, βιαζισθε δε, σαφως μεν ειως, και της  
 ημετερας αν αυλων παραβαινετε νομους. p. 18.

<sup>a</sup> The note of Gothofred upon this  
 place, at p. 53, is this: Commune hoc ar-  
 gumentum et delirium Gentilium hoc ævo  
 fuit, quasi religionibus Romanis imperium  
 in eam magnitudinem excrevisset. Quod  
 refutant passim Christiani. Vide vel Ter-  
 tullianum, Arnobium, Symmachum, Pru-  
 dentium.

<sup>b</sup> Libanius must needs  
 mistake, or misrepresent the case, and con-  
 sequently, he argues upon a wrong founda-  
 tion. The Christians had no respect for  
 the heathen deities, nor were they appre-  
 hensive of any evil from a neglect of them.  
 Vid. Euseb. de Vita Constantin. l. iv. cap.  
 25. Theodor. H. E. l. v. cap. 22. p. 229.  
 A. Libanius owned just now, that they

said, ‘ it was for the good of the world,  
 ‘ that there should be no temples:’ that  
 is, in other words, that heathen superstition  
 and idolatry should cease, and the true  
 Deity only be worshipped. If therefore  
 they approved, or consented to, the per-  
 mission of sacrifices, or other heathen rites,  
 in some places, it could not be for the rea-  
 son assigned by Libanius; but either be-  
 cause they were unwilling to do any thing  
 that had the appearance of persecution, or of  
 force and compulsion; or because they were  
 apprehensive of tumults of the heathen  
 people, and perhaps more in some places  
 than in others. Cum, uti dixi, hæc indul-  
 gentiæ singularis fuerint, et quidem in  
 duabus maximis et populosissimis urbibus,  
 [Româ et Alexandria] morisque veteris re-  
 tinentissimis: ubi non tam facile, certe non  
 simul et semel mores vertuntur, vertive po-  
 terant. Quod mox tamen effectum. Go-  
 thofred. p. 53.

‘ tured

' tured to forbid sacrifices \* at Rome. But if all this affair of  
 ' sacrifices be a vain thing, why has not this vain thing been  
 ' prohibited? and if it be hurtful likewise, why not much more?  
 ' But if in the sacrifices there performed consists the stability of  
 ' the empire, it \* ought to be reckoned beneficial to sacrifice  
 ' every where; and to be allowed, that the dæmons at Rome  
 ' confer greater benefits, these in the country and other cities  
 ' less. This is what may be reasonably granted: for in an army  
 ' all are not equal; yet in a battle the help of each one is of use:  
 ' the like may be said of rowers in a vessel. So one [dæmon]  
 ' defends the sceptre of Rome, another protects a city subject to  
 ' it, another preserves the country, and gives it felicity. Let  
 ' there then be temples every where. p. 21. Or let those men  
 ' confess, that you are not well affected to Rome in permitting  
 ' it to do things by which she suffers damage. But neither is it  
 ' at Rome only, that the liberty of sacrificing remains, but also  
 ' in \* the city of Serapis, that great and populous city, which  
 ' has a multitude of temples, by which it renders the plenty of  
 ' Egypt common to all men. This [plenty] is the work of the  
 ' Nile. It therefore celebrates the Nile, and persuades him to  
 ' rise and overflow the fields. If those rites were not performed,  
 ' when and by whom they ought, he would not do so. Which  
 ' they themselves seem to be sensible of, who willingly enough  
 ' abolish such things, but do not abolish these; but permit the  
 ' river to enjoy his ancient rites, for the sake of the benefit he  
 ' affords.'

' What then, some will say: " Since there is not in every  
 " country a river to do what the Nile does for the earth, there  
 " is no reason for temples in those places. Let them therefore  
 " suffer what these good people think fit." Whom I would  
 ' willingly ask this question: Whether changing their mind, they  
 ' will dare to say, Let there be an end of these things done by  
 ' [or for] the Nile. Let not the earth partake of his waters, let  
 ' nothing be sown nor reaped. p. 22. Let him afford no corn,  
 ' nor any other product, nor let the mud overflow the whole  
 ' land, as at present. If they dare not own this, by what they

\* That is reckoned to be one mark of  
 time in this Oration. Sacrifices were still  
 permitted at Rome: but they were prohibi-  
 ted there by Valentinian the younger,  
 with the advice of Theodosius the great.  
 A. D. 391. l. x. C. Th. de paganis, sacri-  
 ficiis. So says Gothofred, p. 53.

τα μειζω, τες δ' εν τοις ασροις, η και τοις  
 αλλοις ασειν, ελαττω. κ. λ. p. 20.

\* By the city of Serapis is meant Alex-  
 andria. This is another note of the time  
 of this Oration: for the temple of Serapis  
 was destroyed in 391. l. xi C. Th. de pa-  
 ganis, sacrif. et templis. Vid. et Socrat.  
 H. E. l. v. cap. 16, 17. Sozom. l. xvii.  
 c. 5. Theod. l. v. cap. 22.

d . . . απαλαχθ δε νομιζειν τελειν το  
 ζειν, και διδοιαι τες μιν εν Ρωμη δαμιυιας

forbear to say, they confute what they do say: for they who do not affirm, that the Nile ought to be deprived of his honours, confess, that the honours paid to the temples are useful \*\*.

And since they mention him <sup>f</sup> who spoiled the temples [of their revenues and gifts] we shall omit observing, that he did not proceed to the taking away the sacrifices. But who ever suffered a greater punishment for taking away the sacred money [out of the temples], partly in what he brought upon <sup>g</sup> himself; partly in what he suffered after his death, insomuch that his family <sup>h</sup> destroyed one another, till <sup>i</sup> there were none left. And it had been much better for him that some of his posterity should reign, than to enlarge with buildings a city of his own name: for the sake of which city itself all men still curse his memory, except those who live there in wicked luxury, because by their poverty these have their abundance. And since next to him they mention <sup>k</sup> his son, and how he destroyed the temples, when they who pulled them down <sup>l</sup> took no less pains in destroying them, than the builders had done in raising them: so laborious a work was it to separate the stones cemented by the strongest bands. p. 23. Since, I say, they mention these things, I will mention somewhat yet more considerable. That he indeed made <sup>m</sup> presents of the temples to those who were about him, just as he might give a horse, or a slave, or a dog, or a golden cup: but they were unhappy presents to both the giver and the receivers of them: for he spent all his life in fear of the Persians, dreading all their motions, as children do bugbears. Of these some were childless, and died miserably intestate: and others had better never have had children; with such infamy and mutual discord do they live together who descend from them, whilst they dwell among sacred

\*\* All this argument is vain and trifling. If the heathen priests at Alexandria were still permitted to perform the ancient rites, it was not for the sake of any benefit they were of: for every Christian supposed them useless and insignificant. They were permitted; therefore, for some such reasons as those hinted above. <sup>f</sup> Constantine the great. <sup>g</sup> Libanius refers to Constantine's son Crispus, and his wife Fausta, who were put to death by him.

<sup>h</sup> Libanius intends the brothers, nephews, and sons of Constantine the great. For after his death, his son Constantius put to death two of his father Constantine's brothers, and six of their children. [Vid. Julian. Orat. ad S. P. 2. Atheniens. 497. Vid. et Victorem, Julian, Orat. 7. p. 424.

Eutropium, Zosimum. l. ii. Socrat. l. iii. c. 1. imo et Libanium nostrum Orat. 7. in Julian. Imp. Cos. p. 236. et Orat. in Juliani necem p. 262.] Of his sons, Constantine the younger was killed in the war with his brother Constans; and Constans himself in the tyranny of Magnentius. Gothofred. p. 54. <sup>i</sup> Constantine's issue was at an end in Constantius. Constantini M. Stirps in Constantio desecit. Gothofred. p. 55. <sup>k</sup> Constantius.

<sup>l</sup> Theodoret H. E. l. v. cap. 21, takes particular notice of the difficulty of pulling down the temple of Jupiter at Apamea, which was destroyed about this time.

<sup>m</sup> For this Gothofred, p. 55, 56, refers to Orat. in Juliani necem p. 253, 266. et l. viii. C. Theod. de Jure fisci.

pillars taken from the temples. To whom I think these things are owing, who knowing how to enrich themselves, have taught their children this way to happiness! And at this time their distempers carry some of them to <sup>a</sup> Cilicia, needing the help of Æsculapius. But instead of obtaining relief, they meet with affronts only for the injury done to the place. p. 24. How can such return without cursing the author of these evils? But let the conduct of this emperor be such as to deserve praises living and dead; such as we know that he <sup>b</sup> was who succeeded him; who had overturned the Persian empire if treachery had not prevented it. Nevertheless he was great in his death: for he was killed by <sup>c</sup> treachery, as Achilles also was; and is applauded for that, as well as for what he did before his death. This has he obtained from the gods, to whom he restored their rites, and honours, and temples, and altars, and blood: from whom having heard, “that he should humble the pride of Persia, and then die,” he purchased the glory of his life, taking many cities, subduing a large tract of land, teaching his pursuers to fly; and was about to receive, as <sup>d</sup> all know, an embassy which would have brought the submission of the enemy. Wherefore he was pleased with his wound, and looking upon it rejoiced, and without any tears rebuked those who wept, for not thinking that a wound was better to him than any old age. So that the embassies sent after his death were all his right. p. 25. And the reason why the <sup>e</sup> Achemenidæ for the future made use of intreaties instead of arms, was, that the fear of him still possessed their minds. Such an one was he who restored to us the temples of the gods, who did things too good to be forgotten, himself above all oblivion. But I thought, that <sup>f</sup> he who reigned lately would pull down and burn the temples of those who were of the opposite sentiment, as he knew how to despise the gods. But he was better than expectation, sparing

<sup>a</sup> He seems to mean the temple of Æsculapius at Ægis in Cilicia. This temple, according to Eusebius, vit. Constantin. l. iii. c. 56. and Sozomen. l. ii. c. 5. was destroyed by Constantine. Libanius is here supposed to ascribe it to Constantius. But I do not think it necessary so to understand him. It is sufficient for his argument, if some of those to whom Constantius had made presents of sacred things, or some of their descendents, went in vain to this place, by whomsoever the temple there was destroyed. <sup>o</sup> Julian.

<sup>p</sup> Libanius intimates, that Julian was killed by some Christian, one of his own

soldiers.

<sup>q</sup> Gothofred observes, (p. 57.) that here, and in some other places, Libanius affirms, or intimates, that Julian had actually overcome the Persians: Persas jam devictos a Juliano Imp. cum is percussus fuit, asserit hic Libanius, ut et Oratione in Juliani necem. p. 303. et 308. Legatosque a Persis pacis oratum jam decretos: idque omnibus notum esse: quod et ipsum duobus aliis locis prodit: puta, Orat. in Juliani necem. p. 303. et de vita sua. p. 45.

<sup>r</sup> Another name for the Persians, so called again by Libanius, Orat. in Juliani necem. p. 268. Gothofred. p. 57. <sup>s</sup> Valens.

‘ the temples of the enemies, and not disdaining to run some  
 ‘ hazards for preserving those of his own dominions, which had  
 ‘ been long since erected with much labour, and at vast expence:  
 ‘ For if cities are to be preserved every where, and some cities  
 ‘ outshine others, by means of their temples, and these are their  
 ‘ chief ornaments, next to the emperor’s palaces: how is it that  
 ‘ no care must be taken of these, nor any endeavours used to  
 ‘ preserve them in the body of the cities?’

‘ But it is said: “ There will be other edifices, though there  
 ‘ should be no temples.” But ‘ I think tribute to be of im-  
 ‘ portance to the treasury. Let these stand then, and be taxed.’  
 p. 26. ‘ Do we think it a cruel thing to cut off a man’s hand,  
 ‘ and a small matter to pluck out the eyes of cities? And do  
 ‘ we not lament the ruins made by earthquakes? and when there  
 ‘ are no earthquakes, nor other accidents, shall we ourselves do  
 ‘ what they are wont to effect? Are <sup>u</sup> not the temples the pos-  
 ‘ session of the emperors, as well as other things? Is it the part  
 ‘ of wise men to sink their own goods? Does not every one sup-  
 ‘ pose him to be distracted, who throws his purse into the sea?  
 ‘ or, if the master of a ship should cut those ropes which are of  
 ‘ use to the ship: or, if any one should order a mariner to throw  
 ‘ away his oar, would you think it an absurdity? And yet think  
 ‘ it proper for a magistrate to deprive a city of such a part of it?  
 ‘ What reason is there for destroying that, the use of which may  
 ‘ be changed? Would it not be shameful for an army to fight  
 ‘ against its own walls? and for a general to excite them against  
 ‘ what they have raised with great labour; the finishing of which  
 ‘ was a festival for them who then reigned? Let no man think,  
 ‘ emperor, that this is a charge brought against you. For there  
 ‘ lies in ruins, in the Persian borders, a <sup>x</sup> temple, to which there  
 ‘ is none like, as may be learned from them who saw it, so mag-  
 ‘ nificent the stone-work, and in compass equal to the city.’ p. 27.  
 ‘ Therefore in time of war the citizens thought their enemies  
 ‘ would gain nothing by taking the town, since they could not  
 ‘ take that likewise, as the strength of its fortifications bid defiance  
 ‘ to all their attacks. . . . At length, however, it was attacked,

<sup>t</sup> Secundum hoc paganorum argumentum, quo sub Christianis Imperatoribus persuadere conabantur, ne Tempora excinderentur, ab utilitate desumptum est: nempe quod vectigalia ex locatione Templorum colligi possent, eaque in alios usus transferri &c. Gothofred. p. 58.

<sup>u</sup> That is, as Gothofred supposes, the temples, when diverted from their sacred use, and brought into the public treasury,

come under the same laws with other things belonging to the emperor’s revenue. Tempora, semel religioni vel superstitioni detracta, fiscoque delata, pari jure, quo cæteras res fiscales haberi definit Libanius. Goth. p. 58.

<sup>x</sup> It is uncertain what temple our author means. Gothofred is inclined to think, it was the temple at Edessa. Goth. p. 59.

‘ and

‘ and with a fury equal to that of the greatest enemies, animated  
 ‘ by the hopes of the richest plunder. I have heard it disputed  
 ‘ by some, in which state it was the greatest wonder; whether  
 ‘ now that it is no more, or when it had suffered nothing of this  
 ‘ kind, like the temple of Serapis. But that temple, so mag-  
 ‘ nificent and so large, not to mention the wonderful structure of  
 ‘ the roof, and the many brass statues, now hid in darkness out  
 ‘ of the light of the sun, is quite perished; a lamentation to  
 ‘ them who have seen it, a pleasure to them who never saw it.  
 ‘ For the eyes and ears are not alike affected with these things.  
 ‘ Or rather to those who have not seen it, it is both sorrow and  
 ‘ pleasure: the one, because of its fall, the other, because their  
 ‘ eyes never saw it.’ p. 28. ‘ Nevertheless; if it be rightly con-  
 ‘ sidered, this work is not yours, but the work of a man<sup>y</sup> who  
 ‘ has deceived you: a profane wretch, an enemy of the gods,  
 ‘ base, covetous, ungrateful to the earth that received him when  
 ‘ born, advanced without merit, and abusing his greatness, when  
 ‘ advanced; a slave to his wife, gratifying her in any thing, and  
 ‘ esteeming her all things; in perfect subjection to them<sup>z</sup> who  
 ‘ direct these things; whose only virtue lies in wearing the habit  
 ‘ of mourners; but especially to those of them who also weave  
 ‘ coarse garments. This<sup>a</sup> work-house deluded, imposed upon  
 ‘ him, and misled him. [And it is said, that<sup>b</sup> many gods have  
 ‘ been deceived by gods;] for they gave out, “ that the priests  
 ‘ sacrificed, and so near them, that the smoke reached their  
 ‘ noses:” and after the manner of some simple people, they  
 ‘ enlarge and heighten matters, and vaunt themselves, as if they  
 ‘ thought nothing was above their power. By such fiction,<sup>c</sup> and  
 ‘ contrivance, and artful stories, proper to excite displeasure,  
 ‘ they persuaded the mildest<sup>d</sup> father [of his people] among the  
 ‘ emperors.’ p. 29. ‘ For these were really his virtues, humanity,

<sup>y</sup> Gothofred, p. 59, supposeth the person, against whom Libanius here rails so heartily, to be Cynegius, præfect of the prætorium in the east, or the emperor’s lieutenant, from 384, to 388.

<sup>z</sup> Monks, who wove garments for themselves, and for the use of poor people. For which reason he also presently afterwards calls their monastery a work-house.

<sup>a</sup> Το. εἶδος ἐφασκετοῦ ἡπαλήσεως, ἐφεινάκιον, ἐπὶ τῆς αἰσῆς, παρασκευασαίον. p. 28. M.

<sup>b</sup> Upon this place Dr. Ward observed as follows. ‘ Here seems to be a compliment designed upon the emperor, to soften the charge of his being imposed upon: since it was not an unusual thing for the gods

‘ to impose upon one another. So Juno in Homer calls Jupiter δολοειδής. Il. a. ver. 540. And Horace, speaking of Mercury.

“ Voce dum terret, viduus pharetrâ, .

“ Risit Apollo. Car. i. ode 10.

And Virgil, referring to Juno:

“ Adnuit, atque dolis risit Cytherea  
 “ repertis. Æn. iv. ver. 128.”

<sup>c</sup> He insinuates, that the monks scrupled not to say any thing against the Gentiles, to incense the emperors: charging them with conspiracies, and treasonable designs.

<sup>d</sup> Gothofred supposeth our author to intend Valens. Got. p. 61.

tenderness, compassion, mildness, equity, who had rather save  
 than destroy. But there were those who gave juster counsel;  
 that if such a thing had been done, the attempt should be  
 punished, and care taken to prevent the like for time to come.  
 Yet he who thought he ought to have a Cadmean victory,  
 carried on his conquest. But after he had taken his own  
 pleasures, he should have provided for his people, and not  
 have desired to appear great to those who shun the labours of  
 the country, and converse in the mountains, as they say, with  
 the former of all things. But let your actions appear excellent  
 and praise-worthy to all men. There are at this time many,  
 so far friends, as to receive and empty your treasures, and to  
 whom your empire is dearer than their own souls; but  
 when the time comes, that good counsel and real services are  
 wanted, they have no concern upon them, but to take care of  
 themselves; and if any one comes to them, and inquires what  
 this means, they excuse themselves as free from all fault. They  
 disown what they have done, or pretend “that they have  
 obeyed the emperor’s order; and if there is any blame, he  
 must see to it.” p. 30. Such things they say, when it is  
 they who are guilty, who can give no account of their actions.  
 For what account can be given of such mischiefs? These men  
 before others deny this to be their own work. But when they  
 address you alone, without witnesses, they say, “they have  
 been in this war serving your family.” They would deliver  
 your house from those who by land and sea endeavour to defend  
 your person: than which there is nothing greater you can re-  
 ceive from them. For these men, under the name of friends  
 and protectors, telling stories of those, by whom they say they  
 have been injured, improve your credulity into an occasion of  
 doing more mischief.

But I return to them, to demonstrate their injustice by what  
 they have said: Say then, for what reason you destroyed that  
 great temple? Not because the emperor approved the doing  
 it. They who pull down a temple; have done no wrong, if  
 the emperor has ordered it to be done. Therefore they who  
 pulled it down did not do wrong by doing what the emperor

• Το σωζειν πολλοι η απολλυνται.

† Gothofred p. 61. supposes Libanius to refer to the consultations of the heathen magicians and soothsayers about a successor to Valens: of which there are accounts in divers authors. Ammianus M. l. xxix. Zosimus, l. iv. Sozom. l. vi. c. 35. lex 8. C. Th. de Maleficis. Tom. iii. p. 127.

And see hereafter in volume ix. the state of Gentilism, &c. Sect. ii. p. 116, &c.

§ By a Cadmean victory is to be understood a victory prejudicial to the conqueror.

h The monasteries were generally at some distance from cities, in solitary places. He particularly refers to the monks, not far from Antioch.

• approved

‘ approved of. But he who does that which is not approved by  
 ‘ the emperor does wrong; does he not? You, then, are the  
 ‘ men who have nothing of this to say for what you have done.’  
 p. 31. ‘ Tell me why<sup>l</sup> this temple of Fortune is safe, and the  
 ‘ temple of Jupiter, and of Minerva, and of<sup>k</sup> Bacchus? Is it,  
 ‘ because you would have them remain? No; but because no  
 ‘ one has given you power over them; which, nevertheless you  
 ‘ have assumed against those which you have destroyed. Now,  
 ‘ then, are you not liable to punishment? or how can you pre-  
 ‘ tend that what you have done is right, when the sufferers have  
 ‘ done no harm? Of which charge there would have been some  
 ‘ appearance, if you, O emperor, had published an edict to this  
 ‘ purpose: “ Let no man within my empire believe in the gods,  
 “ nor worship them, nor ask any good thing of them, neither  
 “ for himself, nor for his children, unless it be done in silence  
 “ and privately: but let all present themselves at the places where  
 “ I worship, and join in the rites there performed. And let  
 “ them offer the same prayers which they do, and bow the head  
 “ at<sup>l</sup> the hand of him who directs the multitude. Whoever  
 “ transgresses this law, shall be put to death.” It was easy for  
 ‘ you to publish such a law as this; but<sup>m</sup> you have not done it;  
 ‘ nor have you in this matter laid a yoke upon the souls of men.  
 ‘ But though you think one way better than the other, yet you  
 ‘ do not judge that other to be an impiety, for which a man  
 ‘ may be justly punished.’ p. 32. ‘ Nor have you excluded  
 ‘ those of that sentiment from honours, but<sup>n</sup> have conferred  
 ‘ upon them the highest offices, and have given them access to  
 ‘ your table, to eat and drink with you. This you have done  
 ‘ formerly, and at this time; beside others, you have associated to  
 ‘ yourself (thinking it advantageous to your government) a man,  
 ‘ who<sup>o</sup> swears by the gods, both before others, and before your-

<sup>i</sup> Εἶπε μοι, δια τι το της Τυχης, τῆλο  
 εαν εστιν ιερον, και το τη Διος, και το της  
 Αθρας, και το τη Διονυσῆ· αρ’ ολι βηλοισθ’  
 αι αλζα μειειν; Ου, αλλ’ ολι μηδεις την επ’  
 αλζα δεδωκεν υμιν εξουσιαν. κ. λ. p. 31. in.

<sup>k</sup> These were heathen temples at An-  
 tioch; therefore this passage affords a good  
 argument, that this Oration was composed  
 in that city.

<sup>l</sup> The deacons directed,  
 and regulated the behaviour of the people  
 in Christian assemblies. See Bingham’s  
 Antiquities, &c. B. 15. ch. i. Vol. vi. p.  
 574. octavo edition, and elsewhere. At  
 heathen sacrifices there was a person, who  
 had a like office. To this Libanius here  
 alludes. Gothofred’s note, p. 63. is dif-  
 ferent; but I think not so right.

<sup>m</sup> Ου μη κξιωσας γει, υδ’ επισησας ζυ-  
 λον ενλαυθα ταις των ανθρωπων ψυχαις.  
 p. 31.

<sup>n</sup> . . . αλλα και αρχαις  
 δεδωκας, και συσσιτης ποιησας.

<sup>o</sup> A man who swears by the gods, before  
 others, and before yourself.] What Li-  
 banus says here is very true. This passage  
 itself may be reckoned one instance of that  
 freedom. I shall here allege another from  
 another Oration to the same Theodosius,  
 where he swears by Jupiter, and all the  
 gods. Δακρυεις, ω βασιλευ. Πολλα αλαθα  
 σοι γενοιτο δια την ασαν χρησθηλια· και ελωτ’  
 ιη του Δια, και πασας της Θεης, τυτ’  
 οφεισθαι προσεδωκων. De Vinclis. p. 57.  
 Geneva. 1631.

' self; and you are not offended at it; nor do you think yourself  
 ' injured by those oaths: nor do you account him a wicked man  
 ' who placeth his best hopes in the gods. When, therefore, you  
 ' do not reject us, as neither did he who subdued the Persians  
 ' by arms, reject those of his subjects who differed from him in  
 ' this matter, what pretence have these to reject us? How can  
 ' these men reject their fellow-subjects, differing from them in  
 ' this matter? By what right do they make these incursions?  
 ' How do they seize other men's goods with the indignation of  
 ' the countries? How do they destroy some things, and carry off  
 ' others? adding to the injury of their actions the insolence of  
 ' glorying in them. We, O emperor, if you approve, and  
 ' permit these things, will bear them; not without grief indeed;  
 ' but yet we will shew, that we have learned to obey. But if  
 ' you give them no power, and yet they come, and invade our  
 ' small remaining substance, or our walls: know, that the owners  
 ' of the countries will defend themselves.'

That is the whole Oration of this learned sophist, for the Temples, that they may be preserved; and it may be considered as a laboured apology for Gentilism.

The translation has been made with the utmost care; and it has been a difficult task; and though I have had the assistance of a learned friend, I hardly dare be positive that it is right every where. There are some ambiguous expressions, about which learned critics may hesitate which is the true meaning; however, I hope, the translation is generally exact and right.

V. It is very fit that some remarks should now be made upon this Oration. But it is not necessary to observe particularly, what confirmation Libanius affords to the accounts given by Christian ecclesiastical historians, in his agreement with them about the succession of the Roman emperors, from Constantine to that time, whom, though Libanius has not expressly named them, he has sufficiently distinguished by some characters. The great aversion for Constantine, the first Christian emperor, and the affection for Julian upon account of his Gentilism, are apparent. The credulity and superstition of our learned author, even to old age, and the last period of life, are also obvious. Nor will any omit to observe the great freedom of speech used with a Christian emperor throughout the Oration. There are, however, several things, of which I would remind the reader, and put them together briefly, in the following order.

1. In this Oration we see the state of Christianity and Gentilism. Christianity was the prevailing religion; heathenism was declining, and under many disadvantages and discouragements.

Sacrifices

Sacrifices were generally forbidden, and allowed of in but few places; though incense and other rites were not totally prohibited.

2. Libanius mentions a general title and character of Christian bishops, who, by his account, had the highest office among them. They were called pastors; and he particularly mentions Flavianus, at that time bishop of Antioch.

3. Here is much discourse of a sort of people who were called monks by the Christians. According to our author's account, they were numerous in the eastern part of the empire, which we also know very well otherwise. They were distinguished from other Christians by a black or sad-coloured garment, by their fastings and abstemiousness, by singing hymns or prayers in their worship. They dwelt in distinct societies in the mountains, or other places at some distance from cities. They sometimes laboured with their hands, particularly, in weaving garments, probably for themselves and other poor people. Here is a hint that they had their support, partly at least, from the charitable contributions of others, as an encouragement and recompence for their extraordinary devotions; and that upon account of their reputation for piety, they had a good deal of power and influence; but nevertheless were subject to the bishop or pastor of the neighbouring city, which was next to their dwellings; to whom application was made by those who had any complaints against them.

4. About this time there were some heathen temples demolished, and some other offences offered to the heathens by these people, whom Libanius particularly describes by their 'black garments,' or the 'habit of mourners.' Undoubtedly, this conduct is not to be justified; they ought not to have demolished temples without the emperor's order: such a thing could hardly be done by virtue of an imperial edict, but it would occasion some tumults and disturbances, much more, if they acted in this matter without authority. And if they plundered the heathen people of any of their goods upon false pretences, that is another thing for which they were justly blameable. It may be reasonably supposed, that Libanius aggravates things; but, at the same time, it is to be feared, that they, whose zeal outran the laws in demolishing temples, did not rigorously observe the rules of justice and equity in other matters.

5. Libanius considers several arguments of the Christians for destroying the temples, and offers divers things by way of answer: 'That the heathen people sacrificed in them contrary to law.' Which he denies. 'That they killed oxen in the countries, at the festivals:' in which he denies that they did any thing contrary

trary to law. ' That by destroying the temples many had been converted to Christianity, and more would be so, if all the temples were destroyed.' In answer to which, he denies, that any sincere converts were made by that method. ' That it was for the benefit of mankind, that the temples should be destroyed, and that if there were an end put to heathen sacrifices, and all their rites, it would conduce to the prosperity of the empire.' Which he not only denies, but affirms, that the grandeur and prosperity of the Roman empire were owing to the worship of the gods: and that all late calamities which had befallen the empire, were owing to the neglect of them.

6. In his answer to those arguments of the Christians, and in the course of his Oration, he offers a variety of arguments for the preservation of the temples: That in them, and the rites belonging to them, consisted the prosperity and safety of the people, the countries, the cities, and the stability of the empire: that they who had destroyed any temples, or deprived them of their ornaments, and applied them to other uses, had been punished in themselves, or their posterity: that the temples at least might be saved, and applied to other uses; that they were some of the greatest ornaments of the cities: that to destroy them, and forbid the rites belonging to them, was persecution; which is unreasonable in itself, and contrary to the Christian doctrine: finally, that the Christians themselves were sensible of the benefit of temples, and the sacrifices performed in them; particularly, that they were beneficial at Rome, and at Alexandria in Egypt; insomuch that they dared not to destroy the temples in those cities; consequently, they ought to allow them to be beneficial every where, and therefore they ought to be preserved.

It is not necessary for me to inquire into the validity of these arguments; but in the notes, at the bottom of the pages, some observations have been made, especially upon the argument last mentioned.

7. And I would here farther observe concerning one of these arguments, that it seems to be weakly and imprudently insisted upon at this time: ' That the Christians were sensible the temples were beneficial in some places, and that they dared not to destroy them, fearing the bad consequences of it, as to the prosperity of the empire, and the fruitfulness of the earth.' For, as this was certainly a mistake, so the open pleading of this argument would, in all probability, hasten the ruin of the temples; and the zealous Christians would hereupon endeavour to persuade the emperor to grant effectual orders for destroying them, as necessary to shew they despised their deities; and as the  
only

only means of removing a pretence, by which the heathen people were supported and encouraged in their erroneous and absurd superstition.

8. Libanius condemns force and compulsion in matters of religion. It had been well if heathen people had been always of this opinion; but time was, when the best arguments for moderation and toleration were rejected by them. And they not only denied Christians the use of their temples, but compelled them to worship the gods, though contrary to their consciences, by the terror of the greatest evils, and inflicting upon them pains and punishments disgraceful to the Roman government, and contrary to all the principles of reason, and the sentiments of humanity.

9. Libanius owns, that the Christians also condemned persecution: he says, 'it was not permitted by their own laws, which commend persuasion, and condemn (\*) compulsion.' That is a proof it was their avowed sentiment. Libanius seems not much to have studied the books of the New Testament; he took his notion of the Christian laws, and the Christian religion, from the professors and teachers of them.

And it might be easily shewn, that the Christians of old had alleged the same reasons and arguments against persecution, with those now made use of by this learned sophist. They argued, that compulsion did not make real converts, but hypocrites only. So said Lactantius; † whom I shall transcribe briefly below.

10. The moderation of the Christian emperors, of Theodosius in particular, ought to be observed. That emperor advanced several, yea many heathens to governments and magistracies; and shewed favour to our Libanius, though he was so open in his zeal for Gentilism.

11. We may observe what we have seen upon many occasions in many others, that our orator displays that popular argument, taken from the successes and victories of Rome, whilst a worshipper of the gods. This was an argument, very proper to work upon the passions. The greatness of the Roman empire had been attained, before the rise of the Christian religion; it was easy to insinuate the danger of innovation, and to terrify men with the apprehension of the consequences of it. Doubtless this argument had a great influence upon many; but there were those,

(\*) See above, p. 448.

† Res est enim præter cæteras voluntaria, nec imponi cuiquam necessitas potest, ut colat, quod non vult: Potest aliquis forsitan simulare, non potest velle. Denique cum metu tormentorum aliqui aut cruciatibus victi ad execranda sacrificia con-

ferunt, numquam ultro faciunt, quod necessitate fecerunt; sed data rursus facultate, ac reddita libertate, referunt se ad Deum, eumque et precibus et lachrymis placant. . . . Quid ergo promovet, qui corpus inquinat, quando immutare non potest voluntatem? Lactant. Epit. cap. 54,

who were so far influenced by reason, as to believe, that the world had been in all times governed by the providence of the one God, creator of the heavens and the earth, not by inanimate images, or dæmons; these were the Christians: and upon the ground of this most just and reasonable persuasion, they stood the charge of their heathen neighbours, and bore all the hatred which they loaded them with, as enemies to the welfare of the empire, and of the world in general, by forsaking the ancient worship of the gods.

12. Nor has Libanius omitted the old and common reflexion upon the Christians, as if they had been all mean and ignorant mechanics. This reflexion had been always false and unjust, because there were in all times among the professors of Christianity some men of learning and good condition. But this argument should have been dropt before this time. It might be turned against the heathens. The emperors themselves were now Christians, and had been so for some while, except Julian. Governors and magistrates were now generally Christians; and there were many eminent wits, philosophers, and orators, among the bishops and Christian people. To this greatness and splendour had the Christian church attained, from mean and small beginnings indeed, by the force of truth, and a rational evidence, without, and against worldly terrors and allurements. A greater wonder this, and a work of greater power, as well as of more virtue, than the magnificence of Rome, and the grandeur of her empire!

---

## C H A P. L.

### E U T R O P I U S.

- I. *His work and time.* II. *His character of Constantine, with remarks.*  
 III. *His character of Julian.*

I. EUTROPIUS<sup>a</sup> is called by Suidas<sup>b</sup> an Italian sophist. He says, 'he wrote an Abridgment or Summary of the Roman History, in the Latin tongue, and other things.' That Summary of the Roman History, from the foundation of Rome to the death of Jovian, is still extant. He served under Julian in the Persian expedition, as he says<sup>c</sup> himself.

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Voss. de Hist. Lat. lib. ii. cap. 8. Fabr. Bib. Lat. lib. iii. cap. 9. Tom. 2. p. 576. &c. Tillem. Valens. art. 24.

<sup>b</sup> Εὐτρόπιος ἰταλός, σοφιστής. Τὴν Ρωμαϊκὴν ἱστορίαν ἐπιτομικῶς τῇ Ἰταλῶν φωνῇ ἔγραψε· καὶ ἀλλὰ. Suid.

<sup>c</sup> Historiæ Romanæ Breviarium.

<sup>d</sup> Hinc Julianus rerum potitus est, ingentique apparatu Parthis intulit bellum: cui expeditioni ego quoque interfui. Brev. l. x. cap. 16.

His Summary was written in the time of Valentinian and Valens. But it is inscribed to Valens only, and must have been written about the year 370.

Our writers of Universal ancient History say, after Tillemont: 'He' seems to have been of the senatorial order; for at the head of his work he is distinguished with the title of Clarissimus, which was peculiar to Senators.' Nevertheless, I do not see that title in any of the editions of his work, which I have; nor in the Greek paraphrase of Pænius, though I have two editions of it.

He is generally reckoned a heathen: I think he must be so esteemed. If he had been a Christian, there would have appeared some intimations of it in the history of Dioclesian and Constantine; especially when it is considered, that he wrote in the time of Christian emperors.

II. Eutropius enlargeth in the history and character of Constantine; but without taking any notice of his Christianity. He says, 'that' Constantine had a great and aspiring mind. He aimed at no less than to be sole governor of the whole world. He blames him for his wars with Licinius, though he was related to him by marriage: and then censures him for putting Licinius to death, after he had overcome him, though he had promised him his life with the solemnity of an oath. He adds, that for a while Constantine's reign was mild, and generally acceptable; but the long continuance of prosperity in some measure perverted him; and he then put to death several of his own relations, one an excellent man [meaning his son Crispus], and his sister's son, a hopeful youth [meaning Licinianus, or young Licinius], then his wife, and after that many of his friends.'

With regard to all which it will be readily allowed, that we do not aim to justify any bad actions of Constantine. When I formerly wrote the history of this emperor, all these things were particularly considered. And I also alleged the judgments of divers learned men, some favourable, others less favourable to him.

The case of Licinius is there<sup>b</sup> particularly considered, and the judgments of divers learned men produced. I now add here the

<sup>c</sup> Univ. Hist. vol. xvi. p. 352.

<sup>f</sup> Constantinus tamen, vir ingens, et omnia efficere nitens quæ animo præparasset, simul principatum totius orbis affectans, Licinio bellum intulit: quamvis necessitudo illi et affinitas cum eo esset. Nam soror ejus Constantia, nupta Licinio erat. Varia deinceps inter eos bella, et pax reconciliata ruptaque est. Postremo Licinius navali et terrestri prælio victus apud Nicomediam se

dedidit, et contra religionem sacramenti Thessalonicæ privatus occisus... Verum insolentia rerum secundarum aliquantum ex illa favorabili animi docilitate mutavit. Primum necessitudines persecutus, egregium virum, et sororis filium, commodæ indolis juvenem, interfecit, post numerosos amicos. Eutrop. Brev. l. x. cap. 5, 6.

<sup>g</sup> See vol. IV. p. 171—179.

<sup>h</sup> p. 172, 174.

judgment of Mr. Mosheim; who first gives an account of the wars between Constantine and Licinius, and the event of them; and then, in a note, refers to Julian's Cæsars. And he observes, that Julian himself, than whom no man was less favourable to Constantine, has represented Licinius as a great tyrant, and a very vicious man.' Mr. Mosheim is also of opinion, that Aurelius Victor has referred to Licinius's persecution of the Christians, and severely condemned the cruelty of it: I place his words below, that the curious and learned reader may the better consider the justness of his observation.

And I shall now refer to a place in Pagi, which also was omitted formerly. He is very particular in his answers to the several complaints before mentioned. 'We know not,' he says, 'the reason, why young Licinius was put to death; but possibly he was an accomplice with his father. In the death of Crispus, Constantine may have been rather unhappy than criminal. Fausta may have been condemned by a just sentence. As for his many friends,' Eutropius has named none. But some of them may at length have been brought to condign punishment, for having abused the emperor's credulity by their malicious accusations of others. Nor has any one been named, who suffered from him for not being a Christian, or that had one hair of his head touched upon that account.'

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Inst. S. 4. P. 1. cap. 1. § 10. p. 145, 146. <sup>k</sup> Ipse Julianus, quo nemo iniquior fuit in Constantinum, non potuit, quin Licinium infamem tyrannum, vitiiisque et sceleribus obrutum, diceret. Moshem. ibid.

I think it best for me to transcribe here the passages of Julian, in his own original language. Λικινιον δε μεχρι των προθυρων ελθουσα, πολλα και αλοπα πλημμελεια, ταχως ο Μινως εξηλασεν. Julian. Cæs. p. 315. ed. Spanhem.

Δυο γαρ τυραννης [Maxentium et Licinium] (εισεχρητ' αληθη φανασι) καθηρηκει, τον μεν απολεμονει και μαλακον τον δε, αθλων τε, και δια το γηρας, αμφοτερω δε θεοις τε και ανθρωποις εχθισω. Id. ib. p. 329. <sup>l</sup> Liceat mihi hic observare, quod neglectum esse adhuc video, Aurelium Victorem, libro de Cæsaribus cap. 41. Licinianæ hujus vexationis mentionem his fecisse verbis. 'Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cruciatus adhibiti modum fecere.' Philosophi, quos hic excruciasse Licinius dicitur, Christiani sine dubio sunt: quos multi, disciplinæ nostræ parum gnari, Philosophorum sectam esse, opinati sunt. Intactum dimiserunt huic locum Aurelii in-

terpretes. Moshem. ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Et hæc quidem Eusebius [lib. iv. cap. 54. de Vita Constantini.] universim de cunctis, in quibus Constantinus utcumque culpabilis videbatur aliquibus. De cædibus autem, si rationem in particulari reddere voluisset, dixisset forsitan cum ipso Baronio, Licinium juniorem ex sorore Constantiæ natum, etsi causa vulgo ignoraretur, verosimiliter tamen complicem patri suo fuisse: in Crispo filio infelicem magis quam reum: in Fausta conjuge etiam justum judicem appellandum. Numerosos amicos, quos successive interfectos scribit Eutropius. lib. x. . . . credendum, plerosque id commertos, quod nimia principis credulitate tandem deprehenderentur fuisse abusi ob suam exuberantem malitiam, ut loquitur Eusebius, et insatiabilem cupiditatem, qualis proculdubio fuit Sopater ille philosophus, tandem Ablabio agente interfectus: idque jussa Dei dispensatione, quia Constantinum conatus a vera religione abalienare. . . . Et si plures quam alias tunc fuissent, quid hoc ad fidem Christianam spectat, impingendumque Constantino nomen persecutoris, quamdiu nec unus quidem nominatur, cui ea de causa vel pilus capitis tactus fuerit? Pagi ann. 324. n. 12.

So Pagi, whom I have transcribed below in his own words, that they who please may attend to these Observations. Undoubtedly, heathen people in general were much prejudiced against Constantine, the first Roman emperor, who made an open profession of Christianity. And we may be allowed to apologize for him, so far as can be done upon good foundations.

I may not omit to observe, that after all that has been already transcribed from him; Eutropius adds, still speaking of Constantine: 'For<sup>n</sup> the former part of his reign he deserves to be reckoned among the best princes, and for the latter part he must be ranked with those of a middle sort. He was distinguished by many good qualities of body and mind. He was especially desirous of military honour: and indeed was prosperous in his wars. Nor was his success therein beyond the merit of his abilities.'

That is the judgment of Eutropius, whom I take to be rather a military man, than a sophist. In his opinion Constantine was a great man, and no bad prince.

III. In his character of Julian, beside other things, he says, 'he<sup>o</sup> was very ambitious of glory and honour; an enemy to the Christian religion: however, so as to abstain from blood.'

In some editions there is a word denoting that Julian was 'too great' an enemy to the Christians. But some learned editors are of opinion, that that word is an interpolation; and, probably, it is so. Without it, it is here implied, that Julian in his enmity to the Christian religion, bore hard upon the Christians, and incommoded them in divers respects, though he did not put them to death, as some other emperors had done.

This is all I think needful to take from Eutropius. I should have been well pleased to find more in a work, which is so filled with a variety of events in many reigns, some since the rise of Christianity, and others before it.

<sup>n</sup> Vir primo imperii tempore optimis principibus, ultimo mediis comparandus. Innumerae in eo animi corporisque virtutes claruerunt: militaris gloriae appetentissimus, fortuna in bellis prospera fuit: verum ita, ut non superaret industriam.

Id. ib. l. x. cap. 7.

<sup>o</sup> Gloriae avidus, ac per eam animi plerumque immodici: nimius religionis Christianae insectator, perinde tamen ut cruore abstineret. Lib. x. cap. 16.

## C H A P. LI.

## A M M I A N U S M A R C E L L I N U S.

I. *His time and work, and character.* II. *Extracts from him.*

I. AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS<sup>a</sup> was a Greek, of a good family at Antioch, who lived under Constantius, and the following emperors, to the reign of Theodosius, and near the end of the fourth century. He had early a military post, called domestic protector; which is reckoned to be an argument, that he was of a good family. From the year 350 to 359, he served in divers places under Ursicinus, master of the horse to Constantius. He was with Julian in his Persian expedition in 363. After which he seems to have continued in the east, and to have lived pretty much at Antioch, in which he was born; which place he did not leave before the year 374, when he went to Rome, where he wrote his history, as appears from several parts of his work: which is the history of the Roman affairs from Nerva to the death of Valens, in 378.

This history consisted of one and thirty books, the first thirteen of which are lost, and the last eighteen only remaining; which begin at the 17th year of Constantius, of our Lord 353.

His style is remarkably rough; but it is not strange, that the style of a soldier, and a Greek, writing in Latin, should have some faults; which, however, are fully compensated by his faithfulness and impartiality.

Some have thought him a Christian; but that is evidently a mistake, and they have had very few followers. They who have any doubts about this matter, may do well to consult the preface of<sup>b</sup> Adrian Valesius to his edition of this author, and<sup>c</sup> Mr. Bayle's Dictionary. As he wrote under Christian emperors, he might not judge it proper to profess his religion unseasonably, and might think fit to be somewhat cautious in his reflexions upon Christianity.

<sup>a</sup> Vide Auctorem ipsum. Voss. de Hist. Latin. lib. ii. cap. 9. Vales. Præf. Fabric. Bib. Lat. T. i. p. 612. et T. 3. p. 113. Pope Blount Censura Auctorum. p. 181. Tillemont H. E. Valens. art. 23. Bayle Diction. Hist. Crit. Marcellin. The Writers of Universal Ancient History, vol. xvi. p. 351, 352.

<sup>b</sup> Sed qui attente legerit, quæ præter cætera in fine libri xiv. de Adrastia et

Nemese, quæ in libro xvi. de Mercurio, quæ in libro xxi. de numine Themidis, de Haruspicina, de Auguriis, variisque artibus futura prænoscenti, veteres Theologos suos et Physicos ac Mysticos secutus scripsit: profecto fateri cogetur, eum cultui Deorum addictum ac devotum fuisse. A Vales. Præf. <sup>c</sup> See Ammian. Marcellin. note (B.)

Says Tillemont, ' It <sup>d</sup> is manifest, that he is zealous for idols, and for such as worshipped them; and particularly for Julian the apostate, whom he makes his hero; and, on the contrary, he appears to be a great enemy to Constantius. Nevertheless, he often speaks with some equity both of one and the other \* \* .'

He is plainly an admirer of Julian. Nevertheless he deserves, in my opinion, the character which he gives of himself at the conclusion of his work <sup>f</sup> of a faithful historian. If I should have occasion to complain of some instances of partiality, I shall take the liberty to mention them.

Says Sueur: ' \* Ammianus Marcellinus is a celebrated Historian, who was in divers honourable military offices in the reigns of several emperors. He speaks as an eye-witness of many things of which he writes, and oftentimes of having a part in them. Though he was a pagan, he shews no animosity against the Christian religion, but expresseth himself with a great deal of modesty, and represents things faithfully and equitably, with great care, and in good order.'

As it appears from some things said in the work itself, that it was not finished before the year of Christ 390, I have placed him no earlier than 380, though he had then flourished a great while, as is evident from what has been just said of him.

II. Having given this account of the author himself, and his work, I now proceed to make extracts from him.

I. Ammianus informs us, ' that <sup>b</sup> Constantine, desirous to know exactly the opinions of several sects, the Manichees in particular, and the like, and not finding any one fit for that

<sup>d</sup> L'Emp. Valens. art. 23.

\* \* The late learned and excellent Mr. Motheim was of opinion, that Marcellinus, and some other learned men about this time, were a sort of neutrals; they neither rejected the Christian religion, nor forsook the religion of their ancestors. His argument may be seen quoted above, p. 228; which appears to me a particularity in that great man. To me it seems, that Ammianus was as much a heathen, as he would have been, if Christianity had never appeared in the world. I refer to a quotation of Valeus at p. 464, note <sup>b</sup>, and particularly to Ammianus's defence and commendation of heathen augury, and other like methods of investigating futurities, which are at the beginning of the 21st book of his History. And there are many other places proper to support the same judgment concerning him. <sup>f</sup> Hæc ut miles quondam et Græcus, a principatu

Nervæ exorsus, ad usque Valentis interitum, pro virium explicavi mensura: opus veritatis professum nunquam, (ut arbitror,) sciens silentio ausus corrumpere vel mendacio. Ammian. l. xxxi. cap. 16. sub sibi.

<sup>g</sup> Hist. de l'Eglise et de l'Empire. A. 384. p. 446.

<sup>h</sup> Domitiano crudeli morte consumpto, Musonius ejus successor Orientem Prætoriani regebat potestate Præfecti, facundiâ sermonis utriusque clarus: unde sublimius quam sperabatur eluxit. Constantinus enim, cum limatius superstitionum quæreret sectas, Manichæorum, et similium, nec interpret inveniretur idoneus, hunc ipsum commendatum, ut sufficientem elegit: quem officio functum perire, Musonianum voluit appellari, ante Strategium dictatum. Et ex eo percursis honorum gradibus multis ascendit ad præfecturam: prudens alia, tolerabilisque provinciis, et mitis, et blandus. &c. Ammian. l. xv. cap. 13.

‘ purpose, he accepted and employed Strategius, who had been  
 ‘ recommended to him. And he discharged that office so much  
 ‘ to satisfaction, that the emperor ordered, that for the future  
 ‘ he should be called Musonianus.’

That must be reckoned a curious passage, though we are not acquainted with the report made after inquiry: nor do I know, that this is mentioned any where else by any other ancient writer now extant.

Strategius, who now approved himself to Constantine, was afterwards in several high offices. In the reign of Constantius he was for a while proconsul of Achaia, and in the year 354 was made by the same emperor præfect of the prætorium in the east.

I transcribe in the margin more of this paragraph of Ammianus than I have translated. He says, that Strategius was noted for his skill in both languages, meaning Greek and Latin: and he commends him for the moderation and mildness with which he governed the people of the provinces, who had been committed to his care. As does also <sup>l</sup> Libanius. I must likewise refer to <sup>k</sup> Gothofred.

2. In the history of affairs in the year 355, he says: ‘ that  
 ‘ Leontius, who was then præfect of Rome, having performed  
 ‘ an act of justice becoming his office, he received an order from  
 ‘ Constantius, to send to him at Milan, Liberius a priest of the  
 ‘ Christian law [bishop of Rome], as having been disobedient  
 ‘ to the commands of the emperor, and the decrees of many  
 ‘ of his brethren. And I shall give a short account of the af-  
 ‘ fair. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria at that time, taking  
 ‘ more upon him than became his character, as was confidently  
 ‘ reported, was deposed by a numerous assembly, which they  
 ‘ called a synod. For by his great skill in the augury of birds,  
 ‘ and other arts of prognostication, he was said to have often

<sup>i</sup> Liban. de Vita sua. p. 29. C. D.

<sup>k</sup> Vid. Musonianus, in Prosopogr. Cod. Theodof.

<sup>l</sup> Hoc administrante Leontio, Liberius, Christianæ legis antistes, a Constantio ad Comitatum mitti præceptus est, tanquam Imperatoris iussis, et plurimorum sui consortium decretis obstitens, in re, quam brevi textu percurram. Athanasium episcopum eo tempore apud Alexandriam, ultra professionem altius se effertentem, sciscitarique conatum externa, ut prodidit rumores assidui, cæctus in unum quæsitus ejusdem loci multorum (synodus ut appellant) removit a sacramento quod obtinebat. Dicebatur enim fatidicarum sorium fidem, quæve augurales portenderent alites, scientissime callens, aliquoties

prædixisse futura. Super his intendebantur ei alia quoque a proposito legis abhorrentia, cui præsidebat. Hun: per subscriptionem abjicere sede Sacerdotali, paria sentiens cæcteris, jubente Principe, Liberius monitus perseveranter renitebatur, nec visum hominem, nec auditum damnare, nefas ultimum sæpe exclamans, aperte scilicet recalcitrans Imperatoris arbitrio. Id enim ille, Athanasio semper infessus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quoque, quâ potiores æternæ Urbis Episcopi, firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti. Quo non impetrato, Liberius ægre populi metu, qui ejus amore flagrabat, cum magna difficultate nostris medio potuit absportari. Lib. xv. cap. 7.

‘ foretold

‘ foretold future things. He was also charged with other things  
 ‘ contrary to the Christian law. When Liberius was desired by  
 ‘ the emperor to assent to the rest, and to subscribe to the sen-  
 ‘ tence for removing him [Athanasius] from the sacerdotal see,  
 ‘ he obstinately refused to comply; again and again declaring,  
 ‘ that it was the height of wickedness to condemn a man un-  
 ‘ seen and unheard; thus openly withstanding the emperor’s  
 ‘ will and pleasure. For he being ever averse to Athanasius,  
 ‘ though he knew the thing was already done effectually, yet he  
 ‘ was very desirous to have it confirmed by the authority also of  
 ‘ that superior power, which belongs to the bishops of the eter-  
 ‘ nal city. Liberius not complying, he was sent for to come to  
 ‘ the court; and was at length carried away [to Milan] under a  
 ‘ strong guard in the night time, for fear of the people, by  
 ‘ whom he was dearly beloved.’

So writes Ammianus, representing this part of the conduct of Liberius, not disagreeably to the accounts of our ecclesiastical<sup>m</sup> writers. Liberius, however, was not always steady: but there is no necessity that I should now concern myself any farther in his history.

3. We must take another passage concerning Constantius. In his character of this emperor, at the end of his reign, Ammianus says: ‘ The<sup>n</sup> Christian religion, which in itself is plain and  
 ‘ simple, he adulterated with a childish superstition: for studying  
 ‘ it with a vain curiosity instead of sober modesty, he raised  
 ‘ many dissensions, which when caused, he cherished and in-  
 ‘ creased by a strife about words. And the publick carriages  
 ‘ were even worn out by the troops of priests galloping from all  
 ‘ quarters to their synods, as they call them, to bring the whole  
 ‘ sect to their particular opinion.’

Most persons will allow this to be a judicious passage. First, he calls the Christian religion ‘ a plain and simple religion.’ They who best understand the New Testament, will most admire the justness of this observation. Secondly, the ‘ strife about words,’ very probably has a reference to those two words, ‘ homoïsius,’ and ‘ homoioïsius, of the same,’ and ‘ the like substance,’ which caused so much disturbance among Christians of the fourth cen-

<sup>m</sup> Vid. Theodoret. l. ii. c. 16. Sozom. l. iv. cap. 9. Athanas. Histor. Arian. ad Monachos. p. 364 . . . 368. edit. Bened. Rufin. H. E. l. i. cap. 20. Sulp. Sever. Hist. l. ii. cap. 39. al. cap. 55. et 56.

<sup>n</sup> Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem auli superstitione confundens: in qua scrutanda perplexius, quam com-

ponenda gravius, excitavit discidia plurima: quæ progressa fufius aluit concertatione verborum: ut catervis Antistitum jumentis publicis ultro citroque discurrentibus per synodos quas appellant, dum ritum omnem ad suum trahere conantur arbitrium, rei vehiculariæ succideret nervos. Amm. M. l. xxi. cap. 16. seu ult.

tury. Thirdly, we plainly see, that the Arians rendered themselves ridiculous, and exposed the Christian religion, by the multitude of their synods in this reign. Nor were the heathen people only, but the catholicks likewise, concerned for the poor post-horses: as appears from a passage of Hilary<sup>r</sup> observed by Valesius in his notes upon this place of Ammianus. I shall also transcribe below a part of the conference at Milan, between Liberius and the emperor Constantius, and Eusebius his great Chamberlain, as it stands in<sup>r</sup> Theodoret. Fourthly, the design of these councils was impertinent, namely, to bring all Christians to an agreement in some words and phrases, which were the invention of a vain and eager curiosity; when it was sufficient for Christians to agree in the main things of religion. Lastly, take away the additions of human invention, and Christians might agree, and be of one mind: which is a very desirable thing, and is the command and earnest request of Christ and his apostles: but till that is done, unity is in vain expected, and Christianity will be reproached.

4. In the year 355 Constantius made Julian Cæsar, and sent him into Gaul. ‘When<sup>r</sup> he came to Vienne, he was received  
‘with great rejoicings. And,’ says Ammianus, ‘at that time  
‘an old woman, who had lost her sight, asked, who it was that  
‘was then making his entrance into the city; and being informed  
‘that it was Julian the Cæsar, she cried out: “This man will  
“repair the temples of the gods.”’

5. Ammianus gives this account of Julian’s dissimulation of his real sentiments, even after he was declared emperor and Augustus by the soldiers at Paris, and after he had accepted of those titles. It is in the history of affairs at the beginning of the year 361. Julian was then marching toward Constantinople, and was got as far as Vienne in Gaul.

‘In<sup>r</sup> the mean time,’ says Ammianus, ‘making no alteration  
‘in

◦ Some notice was taken of their numerous creeds and synods formerly. Vol. iv. p. 114, 115. Where also this same passage of Ammianus is quoted.

<sup>r</sup> Cursusque ipse publicus attritus ad nihilum reducitur. Hilar. Fragmentum iii. p. 1320. C. Paris. 1693.

<sup>r</sup> Ἐπιπέλιος ἐπισκοπὸς εἶπεν. Ἀλλ’ ὁ δόγμας τῶν δημοσίων εἶχ’ ἐποσησῆσαι τὴν χρεῖαν τῆς τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν παροδοῦ. Λιβέριος ἢ χρεῖαι εἶχεν τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικά δημοσίων ἄρματα. κ. λ. Theod. l. ii. cap. 16. p. 94. B.

<sup>r</sup> Cumque Viennam venisset, ingredientem optatum quidem et

impetrabilem [al. Imperatorem] honorifice susceptura omnis ætas concurrebat et dignitas. . . . Tunc anus quædam orba luminibus, cum percontando quinam esset ingressus, Julianum Cæsarem comperisset, exclamavit, hunc Deorum templa reparaturum. Id. l. xv. cap. 8. fin.

<sup>r</sup> Agebat itaque nihil interim de statu rerum presentium mutans, sed animo tranquillo et quieto incidentia cuncta disponens, paullatimque se corroborans, ut dignitatis augmento virium quoque congruerent incrementa. Utque omnes, nullo impediante, ad sui favorem illiceret, adhærere cultui Christiano fingebat,

‘ in the present state of things, but with a sedate and composed  
 ‘ mind disposing matters according as incidents led him, and by  
 ‘ degrees confirming his authority, that the increase of his power  
 ‘ might be proportionable to the increase of his dignity. And  
 ‘ that he might secure the affections of all, he pretended to be  
 ‘ still a Christian, though he had for some good while before secretly  
 ‘ forsaken that religion, and practised soothsaying, and augury,  
 ‘ and other things, which are always performed by the wor-  
 ‘ shippers of the gods. But those things were done privately,  
 ‘ and were known to a very few only, who were acquainted with  
 ‘ all his secrets. And that this change might be still concealed  
 ‘ for a while, on a holiday, which the Christians keep in the  
 ‘ month of January, and call the Epiphany, he went to their  
 ‘ church, and publickly worshipped the Deity according to their  
 ‘ custom.’

By Zonaras the same story is told in this manner: ‘ Though  
 ‘ Julian had long since renounced Christianity, fearing the sol-  
 ‘ diers, whom he knew to be almost all Christians, the better to  
 ‘ cover his wickedness, he gave leave to all to follow their own  
 ‘ religious rites. And on the day of our Saviour’s nativity he  
 ‘ went to church and worshipped, that he might seem to agree  
 ‘ with the soldiers.’ Zonaras calls that ‘ our Saviour’s nativity,’  
 which Ammianus calls ‘ the Epiphany.’ They mean the same  
 day, the sixth of January, on which many Christians in the East  
 celebrated both our Saviour’s nativity and baptism.

6. He gives this account of Julian’s conduct in matters of re-  
 ligion, after the death of Constantius, and after his entrance into  
 Constantinople.

‘ And ’ though from his early youth he had been inclined to

frugebat, a quo jam pridem occulte descive-  
 rat, arcanorum participibus paucis, haruf-  
 picinæ, auguriisque intentus, et cæteris,  
 quæ Deorum semper fecere cultores. Et  
 ut hæc interim celarentur, feriarum die,  
 quem celebrantes mense Januario Christiani  
 Epiphania dicitant, progressus in eorum  
 ecclesiam, solemniter numine orato dis-  
 cessit. L. xxi. cap. 2. fin.

Ἦδη δὲ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ἐξομωσάμενος  
 πρὶν, ἐλαττοῖο διατελοῦντος τῆς στρατιῶν, εἰ-  
 ῶς σχίσαντος ἑμπροσθέντος χριστιανὸς οὐσίας. Διο-  
 σκουριάζων τὴν ἐαυτοῦ κακίαν, ἐκάστον ἐκέλευε  
 δεύσαι εἰς ὡς βελτίον. Αὐτὸς δὲ τῆς γενεθ-  
 λίας τῆ σωτήρος ἡμερῶν ἡφεστηκίας εἰσῆλθεν  
 εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ προσκυνησας, ἢ εὐδοξῶς  
 τῆς στρατιῶν δόξης, ἀπηλθὲν. Ζοναρ.

Et quamquam a rudimentis pueritiæ  
 fœmis inclinatio erat erga nūminum cul-

tum, paullatimque adolescens desiderio rei  
 flagrabat, multa metuens tamen agitabat  
 quedam ad id pertinentia, quantum fieri  
 poterat occultissime. Ubi vero abolitis  
 quæ verebatur, adesse sibi liberum tempus  
 faciendi quæ vellet, advertit, sui pectoris  
 patefecit arcana: et planis absolutisque de-  
 cretis aperiri templa, arisque hostias ad-  
 moveri ad Deorum statuit cultum. Uique  
 dispositorum roboraret effectum, dissidentes  
 Christianorum Antislites cum plebe discissa  
 in palatium intromissos monebat, ut civili-  
 bus discordiis consopitis quisque nullo ve-  
 tante religioni suæ serviret intrepidus.  
 Quod agebat ideo obstinate, ut dissensiones  
 augente licentiâ; non timeret unanimantem  
 postea plebem: nullas infestas hominibus  
 bestias, ut sunt sibi feræ plerique Chris-  
 tianorum, expertus. L. xxi. cap. 5.

‘ the worship of the gods, as he grew up, his affection for it  
 ‘ was greatly increased. But being full of fears, he performed  
 ‘ only some of the rites belonging to it, and with the utmost  
 ‘ secrecy. But when the causes of his fears were removed, and  
 ‘ he found the time was come that he could freely do what he  
 ‘ pleased, he discovered the secrets of his mind; and by plain  
 ‘ and express edicts he ordered the temples to be opened, and  
 ‘ sacrifices to be offered in the worship of the gods. And that  
 ‘ he might the better secure the success of his designs, having  
 ‘ sent for the disagreeing bishops of the Christians, together with  
 ‘ the divided people, and they being introduced into his palace;  
 ‘ he told them, that all civil discord being laid aside, every one  
 ‘ might practise his own religious rites without fear or molesta-  
 ‘ tion. Which he did with this view, that liberty increasing  
 ‘ their dissensions, he might have nothing to fear from their una-  
 ‘ nimity among themselves: for he had observed, that no beasts  
 ‘ were so cruel to men, as the generality of Christians are to one  
 ‘ another.’

7. Having \* commended Julian for some alterations for the better in proceedings at law, he adds: ‘ But that was an unmerciful law, and to be for ever buried in silence, which forbade the Christians to teach grammar or rhetoric.’

He speaks again of this law in his general character of Julian after his death. ‘ His † laws,’ he says, ‘ were generally right, and commendable for their plainness and perspicuity, whether they commanded, or forbade the doing any thing, except a few only. Among which must be reckoned that unmerciful law, which forbade the Christian professors of rhetoric and grammar to teach, unless they came over to the worship of the gods.’

Of this we said something formerly in the chapter of Julian, to which place, therefore, the reader is now ‡ referred.

8. Soon after the first of those two passages, he relates the murder of George, the Arian bishop of Alexandria, by the heathen people of that place; which must have happened near the end of the year 362. In this account I may omit some particulars for the sake of brevity. By \* Julian’s order, Artemius, duke,

\* Post multa enim etiam jura quædam correxit in melius, ambagibus circumcisis, indicantia liquide, quid juberent fieri, vel vetarent. Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros Rhetoricos et Grammaticos, ritus Christiani cultores. Lib. xxii. cap. 10. fin. † Namque et jura condidit non molesta, absolute quædam ja-

bentia fieri, vel arcentia, præter pauca. Inter quæ erat illud inclemens, quod docere vetuit magistros Grammaticos Christianos, ni transissent ad numinum cultum. Lib. xxv. cap. 5. ‡ See before. p. 371, 372. \* Of Artemius may be seen Theodoret. H. E. l. iii. cap. 18. And compare Basnag. Ann. 362. num. xi.

or governor of Egypt, had been put to death: this seems to have been very acceptable to the heathen people of that city. ‘ When<sup>a</sup>, ‘ they heard of that,’ as Ammianus says, ‘ they turned their ‘ rage against George the bishop, who had often abused them, ‘ and, as I may say, with a viperous malice: a man born, as it ‘ is said, in a fulling mill at Epiphania, a town in Cilicia, and ‘ who had grown great to the ruin of many: and at length, nei- ‘ ther for his own, nor for the public good, was ordained bishop ‘ of Alexandria, a place, as is well known, very apt to go into ‘ sedition. To those turbulent and exasperated spirits George him- ‘ self added fuel, often accusing people to Constantius, whose ears ‘ were too open to such things, as disaffected to his government. ‘ Thus forgetting the office of his profession, which recommends ‘ nothing but justice and lenity, he went into the vile methods of ‘ informers. . . . To all these provocations he added this also, ‘ which soon hastened his ruin. Being returned home from the ‘ the imperial court, as he was passing by the beautiful temple ‘ of Genius, accompanied with a numerous attendance, as usual, ‘ turning his eyes to the temple itself, “ How long,” says he, ‘ shall this sepulchre stand?” Being greatly enraged, they fell ‘ upon George, and some others, and killed them. The mad ‘ multitude, not content with that, took the mangled bodies of

<sup>a</sup> Cumque tempus interstetisset exiguum, Alexandrini Artemii comperto interitu, quem verebantur ne cum potestate reversus (id enim minatus est) multos læderet ut offensus, iram in Georgium verterunt Episcopum, vipereis, ut ita dixerim, morsibus ab eo sapius appetiti. In fullonio natus, ut ferebatur, apud Epiphaniam Ciliciæ oppidum, auctusque in damna complurium, contra utilitatem suam, rei que communis, Episcopus Alexandriae est ordinatus, in civitate, quæ suo pte motu, et ubi causæ non suppetunt, seditionibus crebris agitur et turbulentis, ut oraculorum quoque loquitur fides. His efferatis hominum mentibus Georgius quoque ipse grave accesserat incentivum, apud patulas aures Constantii multos exinde incusans, ut ejus recalcitrantes imperiis: professionisque suæ oblitus, quæ nihil nisi justum suadet et lenè, ad delatorum ausa feralia desciscibat. . . . Ad hæc mala id quoque addiderat, unde paullo post trusus est in exitium præceps. Revertas ex comitatu Principis, cum transiret per speciosum Genii templum, multitudine stipatus ex more, flexibus ad ædem ipsam laminibus, ‘ Quamdiu,’ inquit, ‘ sepulchrum hoc stabit?’ Quo audito velut fulmine multi percussi, metuentisque ne illud

quoque tentaret evertere, quicquid poterant, in ejus perniciem clandestinis insidiis concitabant. Ecce autem repente perlato lætabili nuntio, indicante exstinctum Artemium, plebs omnis elata gaudio insperato vocibus horrendis infrendens, Georgium petit: raptimque diversis mulcandi generibus poterens et conculcans: divaricatis pedibus. . . . Quo non contenta multitudo inhumanis dilaniata cadavera peremptorum camelis imposita vexit ad litus: iisdemque subdito igne crematis, cineres projecit in mare, id metuens, ut clamabat, ne collectis supremis, ædes illis extruerentur, ut reliquis, qui deviare a religione compulsi, pertulere cruciabiles pœnas, adusque gloriosam mortem intemerata fide progressi, et nunc Martyres appellantur. Poterantque miserandi homines ad crudele supplicium ducti, Christianorum adjumento defendi, ni Georgii odio omnes indiferece flagrabant. Hoc comperito, Imperator ad vindicandum facinus nefandum erectus, jamque expetiturus pœnas a noxiis ultimas, mitigatus est lenientibus proximis. Missoque edicto, acri oratione scelus detestabatur admissum, minatus extrema, si deinde tentatum fuerit aliquid, quod justitia vetet et leges. lib. xxii. cap. 11.

‘ those whom they had killed, and placing them upon the backs  
 ‘ of camels, they carried them to the sea-side; and having burnt  
 ‘ them, threw the ashes into the sea, lest, as they said, if their  
 ‘ relicks were gathered up, they should have temples built to  
 ‘ their honour, as had been done for others; who, when required  
 ‘ to renounce their religion, had suffered the most cruel torments,  
 ‘ and even a most glorious death, with unshaken constancy, and  
 ‘ are now called martyrs. Those unhappy men, who were thus  
 ‘ destroyed, might have been saved with the assistance of the  
 ‘ Christians, [meaning, I suppose, the catholics, friends of Atha-  
 ‘ nasius;] but that all in general, without exception, were filled  
 ‘ with hatred of George. The emperor, when he heard of this  
 ‘ transaction, was much provoked, and intended to inflict an ex-  
 ‘ emplary punishment: but his displeasure was moderated by  
 ‘ those who were about him. Whereupon he sent an edict to  
 ‘ the Alexandrians, severely reproving them for this outrage, and  
 ‘ threatening the heaviest penalties, if they should again do any  
 ‘ thing contrary to justice and the laws.’

Of this transaction we took some notice before, in the life  
<sup>b</sup> of Julian, and observed, that the letter, or edict, here men-  
 tioned, as sent upon this occasion, is still extant: however, I  
 have thought it best to bring up this story again, as related by  
 Ammianus.

And upon this account of our heathen author, we may ob-  
 serve, that Ammianus knew very well, ‘ that the office of a  
 ‘ Christian bishop taught him nothing but justice and lenity.’  
 Farther, he was acquainted with the sufferings of Christians in  
 former times: and though they are here mentioned by the by  
 only, if I do not misunderstand him, he appears to have had a  
 high opinion of their fidelity and fortitude, in patiently enduring  
 the most exquisite tortures, rather than do any thing contrary to  
 the conviction of their own minds: and he esteemed their death  
 ‘ glorious,’ and honourable to themselves.

It seems to me very probable, that if we still had remaining  
 the first books of this work of Ammianus, which are now irre-  
 coverably lost, we should have seen many things relating to Chris-  
 tian affairs, that would have been instructive and entertaining.

9. Whilst Julian was at Antioch, in his way to the Persian  
 war, the temple of Apollo at Daphne, near that city, was sud-  
 denly burnt down on the 22d day of October 362. ‘ By<sup>c</sup> which  
 ‘ sudden

<sup>b</sup> p. 413.  
 die xi. Kalend. Novembrium amplissimum  
 Daphnæi Apollinis sanum, quod Epiphanes

<sup>c</sup> Eodem tempore

Antiochus Rex ille condidit iracundus et  
 fœvus, et simulachrum in eo Olympiaci  
 Jovis imitamenti æquiparans magnitudinem,  
 subita

‘ sudden and terrible accident,’ says Ammianus, ‘ the emperor’s  
 ‘ displeasure was greatly raised; so that he commanded a more  
 ‘ than ordinary strict inquiry to be made by tortures into the  
 ‘ cause of it, and ordered the great church at Antioch to be shut  
 ‘ up. For he suspected, that the Christians out of envy had set  
 ‘ fire to the temple, because it was surrounded by a magnificent  
 ‘ colonnade.’

10. The passage to be next taken would be this author’s account of Julian’s design to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem: but that has been already quoted in the chapter of ‘ Julian, and nothing farther needs to be now said about it.

11. Of Jovian, who succeeded Julian, Ammianus says, he ‘ was a zealous Christian.

12. Liberius, bishop of Rome, before mentioned, having died in September 366, the third year of Valentinian and Valens, there was a warm contention for his place between Damasus and Ursinus, who was deacon in that church. Ammianus speaks of this matter at the year 367.

‘ Damasus ‘ and Ursinus,’ says he, ‘ heated with an extrava-  
 ‘ gant ambition for the episcopal seat, were so fierce in their  
 ‘ contention, that on each side the quarrel proceeded to wounds,  
 ‘ and even to death. Juventius [præfect of Rome] not being  
 ‘ able to stop, nor to compose the difference, was compelled to  
 ‘ retire into the suburbs. Damasus overcame in the contest, the  
 ‘ party that was with him prevailing. It is certain, that in the  
 ‘ basilick of Sicinnius, where was an assembly of the Christians,  
 ‘ an hundred and seven and thirty were killed in one day: and it  
 ‘ was a good while before the exasperated multitude were brought

subita vi flammaram exustum est. Quo tam atroci casu repente consumpto, ad id usque Imperatorem ira provexit, ut quæstiones agitari juberet solito acriores, et majorem ecclesiam Antiochiæ claudi. Suspiciabatur enim id Christianos egisse stimulos invidia, quod idem templum inviti videbant ambitioso circumdari peristylis. L. xxii. cap. 13.

<sup>d</sup> See above. p. 381.

<sup>e</sup> Christianæ legis idem studiosus . . . L. xxv. cap. 10. sub fin.

<sup>f</sup> Damasus et Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam Episcopatus sedem ardentes, scillis studiis asperrime conflictabantur, adusque mortis vulnerumque discrimina adjumentis utriusque progressis: quæ nec corrigere sufficiens Juventius nec mollire, coactus vi magna secessit in suburbanum. Et in concertatione superaverat Damasus, parte quæ ei favebat instante. Constatque in basilica Sicinnini, ubi ritus

Christiani est conventiculum, uno die centum triginta septem reperta cadavera peremptorum: esserantque diu plebem ægre postea delentam. Neque ego abnuo, ostentationem rerum considerans Urbanarum, hujus rei cupidos ob impetrandum quod appetunt, omni contentione laterum jurgari debere: cum id adepti, futuri sint ita securi, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspicte vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut earum convivia regales superent mensas. Qui esse poterant beati revera, si magnitudine Urbis despecta, quam vitis opponunt, ad imitationem Antistitum quorundam provincialium viverent: quos tenuitas edendi potandique parcissime, vilitas etiam indumentorum, et supercilia humum spectantia, perpetuo numini verisque ejus cultoribus ut pueros commendant et verecundos. L. xxvii. cap. 3. fin.

' to good temper. Nor do I deny, considering the pomp and  
 ' wealth of the city, that they who are desirous of such things,  
 ' are in the right to contend with all their might for what they  
 ' are fond of: since having obtained it, they are sure of being  
 ' enriched with the offerings of matrons, and will ride in cha-  
 ' riots, and be delicately clad, and may make profuse entertain-  
 ' ments, surpassing the tables of princes. But they might be  
 ' happy indeed, if despising the grandeur of the city, which they  
 ' allege as an excuse for their luxury, they would imitate the  
 ' life of some country bishops, who by their temperance in eat-  
 ' ing and drinking, by the plainness of their habit, and the mo-  
 ' desty of their whole behaviour, approve themselves to the eter-  
 ' nal Deity, and his true worshippers, as men of virtue and piety.'

Under the year 368 he greatly commends PRÆTEXTATUS, who had succeeded Juventius as præfect of Rome, and says,
 ' that <sup>s</sup> by his wisdom and good conduct the disturbance was  
 ' composed which the quarrels of the Christians had occasioned,  
 ' and Ursinus having been banished, tranquillity was restored.'

What Ammianus here writes is very true: Damasus was bishop of Rome after Liberius: and Socrates says, that <sup>b</sup> in the contention between Damasus and Ursinus many were killed. And he observes, ' that the ground of the contention was not any  
 ' heresy, or difference of opinion, but only which of them should  
 ' be bishop.' And Sozomen, in the very words of Ammianus, says, this <sup>i</sup> contention proceeded to wounds and death.

It is plain from Ammianus, that at that time the bishops of Rome lived in great splendour, and that this contention about the bishoprick was a scandalous thing. There were, however, some country bishops, who not having the temptation of riches, were humble and modest, as became their profession. In short, it was the opinion of Ammianus, that a man may be a good bishop without being rich; and that piety and modesty do more recommend religion, than a great deal of state and splendor. Once more, in the opinion of this heathen author, a Christian bishop who despises grandeur, may be a more happy man, than he who enjoys the grandeur even of the city of Rome, is enriched with the presents of ladies, rides in a coach, is delicately clad, and is able to give more than princely entertainments.

<sup>s</sup> Cujus auctoritate justisque veritatis suffragiis tumultu lenito, quem Christianorum jurgia concitarunt, pulsoque Ursino, alta quies parata, proposito civium Romanorum aptissima. Lib. xxvii. cap. 9.

<sup>b</sup> Εξασιαζοι εν πορει εαυτης, & δια τιτα

πρισιν η αιρεσιν, αλλα περι τη μοιου τις οφειλει τη επισκοπικη θρονη εσφαλτης γινισθαι. Socrat. H. E. l. iv. cap. 29.

<sup>i</sup> Ως μεχρι και τραυματων και φορων το κακον προσελθει. Soz. l. vi. cap. 23. p. 666. D.

13. As we have seen in Ammianus some notice taken of the splendour of the bishops of Rome at that time, I may add a short story from Jerom concerning PRÆTEXTATUS, just mentioned, who was a very eminent man, and was well acquainted with Damafus, and, as may be supposed, saw how he lived. Jerom then tells us, ‘ that <sup>k</sup> Prætextatus, in conversation with Damafus, would sometimes pleasantly say to him: “ Make me bishop of Rome, and I will presently be a Christian.”

14. Ammianus relates several cruelties of Valentinian: as Christianity is mentioned in some of them, I am likewise obliged to observe these passages. ‘ Among <sup>m</sup> his cruelties,’ says he, ‘ that were much observed, this was one. Diodorus, who had been his steward, and three serjeants of the vicar of the præfect of Italy, were cruelly put to death by him upon the complaint of a certain count, whom Diodorus had judicially summoned to appear before the vicar, and to whom the serjeants, by orders of the vicar, had delivered the summons. Whose memory,’ says Ammianus, ‘ is still honoured by the Christians at Milan, who call the place where they were buried, The Innocents. Then also in the case of one Maxentius, when, on account of a sentence legally pronounced, he ordered the officers of three towns to be put to death. Whereupon Eupraxius, the quæstor, interceded in this manner: “ Be more moderate, O most pious of princes: for they whom you command to be put to death as guilty, the Christian religion reverenceth as martyrs, that is, men acceptable to the Deity.”

15. Ammianus <sup>n</sup> speaks afterwards of another cruelty of Valentinian, in putting to death a presbyter of the Christian religion upon account of Octavianus, formerly proconsul: but the passage is defective, some words being wanting. It is supposed by Valefius, in his notes upon Ammianus, to be the same thing which

<sup>k</sup> Misericordis Prætextatus, qui designatus Consul est mortuus. Homo sacrilegus, et idolorum cultor, solebat ludens beato Papæ Damaso dicere: ‘ Facite me Romanæ Urbis Episcopum, et ero protinus Christianus.’ Hieron. Ep. 38. al. 61. Tom. iv. p. 310. fin.

<sup>m</sup> Eminuit tamen per id tempus inter alias humilium neces, mors Diodori, ex Comite Largitionum Illyrici, quem ob delicta levia flammis jussit exuri: et Diodori ex Agente in rebus, triumque Apparitorum potestatis Vicariæ per Italiam, ob id necatorum atrociter, quod apud eum questus est Comes, Diodorum quidem adversus se civiliter implorasse juris auxilium, officiales vero jussu judicis ausos monere proficiscentem, ut responderet ex lege. Quo-

rum memoriam apud Mediolanum colentes nunc usque Christiani, locum ubi sepulti sunt, ‘ Ad Innocentes’ appellant. Deincum in negotio Maxentii cujusdam Pannonii ob executionem recte maturari præceptam trium oppidorum ordines maclari jussisset, interpellavit Eupraxius tunc Quæstor: et, ‘ Parcius,’ inquit, ‘ ægito, Pissime Principum. Hos enim, quos interfici tamquam noxios jubes, ut Martyras, id est, Divinitati acceptos, colit religio Christiana.’ Lib. xxvii. cap. 7.

<sup>n</sup> Epistoten aliquem ritus Christiani Presbyterum . . . tam Octavianum ex proconsule . . . offensarum auctore licet tardius ad sua redire permissio. Amm. l. xxix. c. 3. p. 614.

is inserted by Jerom in his Chronicle at the year of Christ 372, who says: 'In <sup>n</sup> this year a presbyter of Sirmium was most unjustly beheaded, because he did not discover Octavianus formerly proconsul, who lay concealed at his house.'

16. In his character of Valentinian, at the end of his reign, Ammianus says: 'Lastly <sup>o</sup> he was remarkable for the moderation of his government, that he stood neuter between all the diversities of religion, and was troublesome to none, nor did he require any to follow either this, or that. Nor did he strive by severe edicts to bend the necks of his subjects to his own way of worship, but left matters untouched in the condition he found them.'

Socrates says, 'that <sup>p</sup> Valentinian was favourable to the men of his own opinion, [meaning the Homouſians] without being troublesome to the Arians.' Which is very true. But the observation of Ammianus is more extensive, including moderation toward Hellenists, as well as Christians. An instance of this may be hereafter taken notice of by us from <sup>r</sup> Zosimus, and perhaps from some other writers also.

Having alleged the principal passages of Ammianus, I shall now put down some others, though out of the order of time, as being of some use.

17. In the affairs of Gallus Cæsar, in the reign of Constantius, at the year 553, he speaks of one <sup>s</sup> Maras, a deacon, as the Christians call it.

18. Silvanus, master of the horse to Constantius, who had performed many services for him, and for his father Constantine, fell under suspicion of disaffection to the government: whereby he was in a manner obliged, for his own safety, to rebel, and take the imperial purple at Cologne, where he then was, in the year 355. 'The soldiers of Ursicinus got into that city and killed the guards, and soon after Silvanus himself,' Ammianus says, 'as <sup>t</sup> he was fleeing to a conventicle of the Christians.' That

<sup>n</sup> Presbyter Sirmii nequissime decollatur, quod Octavianum ex proconsule apud se latitantem prodere noluisse. Hieron. Chr. p. 187.

<sup>o</sup> Postremo hoc moderamine Principatus sui inclaruit, quod inter religionum diversitates medius stetit, nec quemquam inquietavit, neque ut hoc coleretur imperavit, aut illud: nec interdicitis minacibus subjectorum cervicem ad id quod ipse coluit inclinabat, sed intemeratas reliquit has partes; ut reperit. Lib. xxx. cap. 9. P Socr. l. iv. c. 1. p. 211. B.

<sup>r</sup> Zos. l. iv. sub in.

... Maras

quidam nomine inductus est (ut appellant Christiani) diaconus. L. xiv. cap. 9.

<sup>s</sup> Firmato itaque negotio per sequentes quosdam gregarios, obscuritate ipsa ad id patrandum idoneos, præmiorum expectatione accensos, solis ortu jam rutilo subitus armatorum globus erupit: atque ut solet in dubiis rebus audentior, cæsis custodibus, regiâ penetratâ, Sylvanum, extractum ædicula, quo exanimatus confugerat, ad conventiculum ritus Christiani tendentem, densis gladiatorum ictibus trucidarunt. Lib. xv. cap. 5. p. 92.

was the end of Silvanus, in about a month after he had assumed the title of emperor.

19. When Sapor, king of Persia, had gained some advantages over the Romans, in the time of Constantius, 'and' had 'taken some virgins, after the Christian manner devoted to God,' as Ammianus says, 'he gave orders, that no man should hurt them, and that they should be permitted to perform their religious worship in their own way, without molestation.'

20. 'He' also speaks of a bishop of the Christian law, in a castle besieged by Sapor, who went out to the king to persuade him to desist from his design upon the place. But he was suspected of informing the king where the castle was weakest, and might be attacked to the best advantage.'

21. In the beginning of the reign of Valentinian, 'Apronianus' præfect of Rome condemned a person to death for the practice of some magical arts. But the executioner, as Ammianus says, 'losing his hold, the criminal fled to a chapel of the Christian rite: but being presently taken thence, had his head cut off.'

22. In the year 367, or 368, in the time of Valentinian, 'a' German prince, named Rando, surprized the city of Mentz, 'then without a garrison. And,' as Ammianus says, 'finding the people engaged in celebrating a feast of the Christian rite, he plundered the place, and carried off without resistance the people of both sexes, and of every condition, with all their effects.'

\* Inventas tamen alias quoque virgines Christiano ritu cultui divino sacratas, custodiri intactas, et religioni servire solito more, nullo vetante, præcepit. Lib. xviii. cap. 10. fin.

u Verum secuto die otio communi ad sensu post ærumnas multiplices attributo, cum magnus terror circumfunderet muros, Persæque paria formidarent: Christianæ legis Antistes exire se velle gestibus ostendebat et nutu: acceptaque fide, quod redire permetteretur incolumis, adusque tentoria Regis accessit. Ubi datâ copiâ dicendi quæ vellet, suadebat placido sermone discedere Persas ad sua. . . . Sed perstabat incassum hæc multaque similia differendo, efferata vesania Regis obstante, non ante castrorum excidium digredi pertinaciter adjurantis. Perstrinxit tamen suspicio vana quædam, Episcopum, ut opinor, licet asseveratione vulgata multorum, quod clandestino colloquio Saporem docuerat, quæ mœnium appeteret membra ut fragilia intrinsecus et invalida. L. xx. cap. 7.

\* Dum hæc in Oriente

volubiles fatorum explicant sortes Apronianus regens Urbem æternam, judex integer et severus, inter curarum præcipua, quibus hæc Præfectura sæpe sollicitatur, id primum operâ curabat enixâ, ut veneficos, qui tunc rarecebant, captos, . . . indicatis conficiis morte multaret . . . Denique . . . Hilarinum aurigam convictum atque confessum . . . capitali animadversione damnavit: qui, laxius retinente carnifice, subito lapsus confugit ad ritus Christiani sacrarium, abstractusque exinde illico abscissa cervice consumptus est. L. xxvi. cap. 3. p. 488.

y Sub idem fere tempus Valentiniano ad expeditionem caute ut rebatur profecto, Alemannus Regalis Rando nomine, diu præstruens quod cogitabat, Moguntiacum præsidiis vacuum cum expeditis ad latrocinandum latenter irrepit. Et quoniam casu Christiani ritus invenit celebrari solemnitate, impræpedite cujusquemodi fortunæ virile et muliebre secus cum suppellectili non parva indefensum abduxit. L. xxvii. cap. 10. p. 542.

23. ‘Palladius, notary, or secretary of state, had been taken up by order of Valentinian for some offences. And<sup>z</sup>,’ says Ammianus, ‘sensible of his guilt, early in the evening, when his keepers were absent, being gone to spend the night in a neighbouring church on a festival of the Christian rite, he hanged himself.’ Tillemont\* thinks, it might be the eve of Easter in 374.

24. I have now transcribed a great deal from Ammianus: nevertheless I hope not too much. Many of the passages are important, as well as entertaining: some are curious. If any others are less material, they are still of some use: they serve to shew, that Christian people were then of some consequence. A heathen historian, writing of public affairs, could not decline to take notice of them; and for the most part he speaks civilly of them, and with marks of moderation.

---

C H A P. LII.

V E G E T I U S.

FLAVIUS VEGETIUS RENATUS<sup>a</sup> wrote a treatise in five books, of the Art of War, dedicated to an emperor, by whose order it was composed. In most copies it is inscribed to Valentinian the second; though some think, it was rather dedicated to Theodosius the first. Fabricius<sup>b</sup> is inclined to think him a Christian. As that is only a doubtful point, I suppose I ought to quote him among heathen writers, and at the year 390, which is some while before the death of Valentinian the second, and five years before the death of Theodosius.

<sup>z</sup> His literis ad Comitatum missis et lectis, Valentiniani jussu Meterius raptus suam esse confitetur epistolam: ideoque Palladius exhiberi præceptus, cogitans quas criminum coxerit moles, in statione primis tenebris observatâ custodum absentia, qui festo die Christiani ritus in Ecclesia pernoctabant, innodato gutture laquei nexibus interiit.

Lib. xxviii. cap. 6. p. 593.

\* See L'Emp. Valentinien. art. xxvii: Tom. v. p. 196.

<sup>a</sup> Fabric. Bib. Lat. L. iii. cap. 12. T. i. p. 616. Tillem. H. Emp. Theodos. i. art. 92.

<sup>b</sup> Fl. Vegetius Renatus videtur fuisse Christianus. Fabr. Bib. Lat. T. iii. p. 132. Hamb, 1722.

He gives this account of the oath taken at that time by soldiers, when enlisted into the legions: 'They swear,' says he, 'by God, and by Christ, and by the Holy Spirit, and by the emperor's majesty, who is to be loved and honoured by mankind in the next place after God.'

c Jurant autem per Deum, et per Christum, et per Spiritum Sanctum, et per Majestatem Imperatoris, quæ secundum Deum generi humano diligenda est et colenda. Veget. Institutio Rei Militaris. l. ii. c. 5. Quemadmodum Legio constituatur.

[THIS FOURTH VOLUME WILL BE CONCLUDED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NEXT VOLUME.]

THE END OF THE EIGHTH VOLUME.