THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

IN ELEVEN VOLUMES:

CONTAINING THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY;

JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES;

HISTORY OF HERETICS;

AND HIS SERMONS AND TRACTS;

WITH

GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND COPIOUS INDEXES.

TO THE FIRST VOLUME IS PREFIXED

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

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

VOLUME IX.

LONDON:

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

M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

CONTENTS

OF THE

NINTH VOLUME.

TESTIMONIES OF ANCIENT HEATHENS.

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE.
LIII.	EUNAPIUS	396	1
LIV.	CLAUDIAN	396	15
LV.	MACROBIUS	400	22
LVI.	RUTILIUS	418	26
LVII.	OLYMPIODORUS	425	28
LVIII.	ZOSIMUS	425	31
LIX.	HIEROCLES OF ALEXANDRIA	450	64
LX.	PROCLUS	464	67
LXI.	MARINUS	485	69
LXII.	DAMASCIUS	540	74
LXIII.	SIMPLICIUS	550	84
LXIV.	A REVIEW OF THE JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES IN THE SEVERAL VOLUMES OF THIS WORK	...	89

The State of Gentilism under Christian Emperors.

Sect.		
1	Imperial laws concerning Gentile people and their worship	98
2	A Consultation and Divination of heathen people in the time of Valens, about the year 373	116
3	The Petition of the Roman senate to Valentinian the younger in the year 384, that the Altar of Victory, which had been removed by Gratian, might be restored	132
4	The Correspondence between Maximus of Madaura and Augustine in the year 390	154

Sect. Page.
5 The demolition of the temple of Serapis at Alexandria, and other temples in Egypt, and ſome other temples elſewhere, in the year 391 - - - - - - 158
6 A pretended Heathen Oracle in the year 398, foretelling the period of the Chriſtian religion - - - - 171
7 The demolition of the temple of the goddeſs Cœleſtis at Carthage, in the year 399 - - - - 172
8 An image of Hercules deſtroyed by the Chriſtians at Suffecta, in Africa, in the year 399 - - - - 174
9 A diſturbance at Calama in Numidia in the year 408 - 175
10 The overthrow of Rhadagaiſus the Goth in the year 405 - 177
11 Rome beſieged, taken, and ſacked by Alaric the Goth, in the year 410 - - - - - - 180
12 The Correſpondence between Auguſtine and Volufian in the year 412 - - - - - 183
13 The Correſpondence between the people of Madaura and Auguſtine; time uncertain - - - - - 195
14 The Correſpondence between Auguſtine and Longinian; time uncertain - - - - - 199
15 Obſervations of Oroſius and Auguſtine upon the treatment given to the Gentiles by Chriſtian magiſtrates - - - 201
16 Concluding obſervations upon the ſtate of Gentiliſm under Chriſtian emperors - - - - - - 203

HISTORY OF HERETICS.

BOOK THE FIRST.

General Obſervations concerning Heretics.

1 THE meaning of the word Hereſy - - - - 223
2 It is difficult to define what is Hereſy, or who is an Heretic - 226
3 Of the cauſes of Hereſies - - - - - - 228
4 Many miſtakes in the writings of thoſe who have publiſhed the hiſtory of Hereſies accounted for - - - 230
5 The number of Hereſies hath been augmented without ſufficient reaſon - - - - - - 231
6 Moſt Hereſies of the two firſt centuries may be reduced to two kinds 233
7 Heretics have been often treated with great acrimony - 235
8 Heretics have been greatly calumniated - - - 237
9 The ancient Heretics believed the Unity of God - - 247
10 They made great uſe of the ſcriptures - - - 250
11 Some of them alſo uſed apocryphal books - - - 254
12 They reſpected the apoſtles and apoſtolic traditions - - 256
13 The ancient Hereſiarchs were generally men of letters, and are ſaid to have borrowed moſt of their peculiar notions from ſome of the ſects of philoſophers - - - - 258

Sect. Page.
14 This variety of opinion is no juſt objection againſt the truth of the Chriſtian religion - - - - - 260
15 Curioſity and inquiſitiveneſs of mind were diſpoſitions frequently indulged by Heretics - - - - - 263
16 Heretics were not in general ſolicitous about little matters, and were moderate towards thoſe who differed from them - 265
17 Pernicious conſequences ſuppoſed to ariſe from ſome of their doctrines, were charged upon them, though they did not admit them 266
18 The ſeeds of theſe Hereſies were ſown in the days of the apoſtles 267

BOOK THE SECOND.

The Hiſtory of particular Heretics.

CHAPTER I.

OF SATURNINUS.

1 Of his opinions, as given us by Irenæus - - - 269
2 He was an obſcure perſon, and had probably but few followers 270

CHAPTER II.

OF BASILIDES.

1 Of his time - - - - - - 271
2 The account of him, as given by Irenæus and other ancient authors 272
3 An examination of ſeveral of the opinions attributed to him 274
4 Concerning his notion of 365 heavens - - - 275
5 He believed the world was made by angels, the chief of whom preſided over the Jews - - - - - 276
6 His opinion concerning the perſon of Chriſt - - 277
7 Of the ſtory of Simon the Cyrenian, and whether he believed that Chriſt ſuffered - - - - - 278
8 Beauſobre's view of the ſentiments of Baſilides concerning Chriſt 280
9 He believed the baptiſm of Jeſus - - - - 281
10 He is ſaid to have partaken of things offered to idols, and to have denied the neceſſity or reaſonableneſs of ſuffering martyrdom 282
11 He believed that the ſoul only would be ſaved - - 283
12 He is falſely accuſed of believing that actions are indifferent in their own nature - - - - - - ib.
13 A probable account of the foundation of this charge - 286
14 He is alſo accuſed of uſing magic and incantations - - 287
15 Of the meaning of Caulacau, and his definition of faith and hope 289

Sect.		Page.
16	Of the name Abraxas, which he is ſaid to have given to the prince of the heavens	290
17	Of the number, coſtlineſs, and heatheniſh origin of thoſe gems called Abraxæi	ib.
18	Of the derivation and meaning of the word Abraxas, and to what the Baſilidians applied it	291
19	It probably referred to their philoſophical Arcana	292
20	The gems called Abraxæi were uſed by the heathens as charms	294
21	The Chriſtians accuſed by Adrian of worſhipping Serapis	ib.
22	An examination of Montfaucon's figures	295
23	Theſe gems were undoubtedly of heatheniſh origin	300
24	From hence came the ſuperſtitious cuſtom of writing Abraſadabra as a charm	ib.
25	Beauſobre's obſervations on Chifflet, and arguments againſt theſe gems being Chriſtian; firſt, from the incredibility of the thing; ſecondly, from the ſilence of the fathers	301
26	Farther obſervations on Chifflet	303
27	Of the names of angels found on thoſe gems	ib.
28	Concluſions drawn from the foregoing obſervations	304
29	Of the ſcriptures received by Baſilides	ib.
	§ 1 He did not pay great regard to the Old Teſtament	ib.
	§ 2 He received the whole, or at leaſt the greater part of the New	305
30	Of the goſpel of Baſilides	306
31	Of the prophets Barcabbas and Barcoph	307
32	Of the odes of Baſilides	ib.
33	Theſe things prove the authenticity and wide-ſpread of the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament	ib.

CHAPTER III.

OF CARPOCRATES AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

1	Some account of Carpocrates and Epiphanes, from Clement of Alexandria and other ancient authors	308
2	Of the time in which Carpocrates lived	309
3	Of the principles of the Carpocratians concerning the creation	310
4	Of their opinion concerning the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt	ib.
5	They are accuſed of ſaying that ſome may excel Jeſus	311
6	And are ſaid to have uſed magical arts	312
7	Of marking their diſciples and incenſing the pictures of Chriſt and others	ib.
8	A general view of what they believed	313
9	They are accuſed of aſſerting that there is no difference in the nature of things	314
10	And of practiſing the groſſeſt impurities in their aſſemblies	315
11	The utter improbability of theſe accuſations ſhewn from a variety of conſiderations	316
12	What ſcriptures they received	318

CHAPTER IV.

OF CERINTHUS.

Sect. Page.

1 Ancient authors who ſpeak of Cerinthus
- § 1 Irenæus - - - - - - 319
- § 2 Epiphanius - - - - - - 321
- § 3 Theodoret - - - - - - 322

2 Obſervations relating to the time of Cerinthus - - 323
3 Obſervations tending to illuſtrate his hiſtory - - 324
4 Of his principles and ſentiments - - - - 325
- § 1 He is reckoned by ſome a Gnoſtic - - - ib.
- § 2 He however taught one ſupreme God - - ib.
- § 3 What he thought of te perſon of Jeſus Chriſt - ib.
- § 4 And of the Holy Ghoſt - - - - 326
- § 5 And of the Reſurrection - - - - 327
- § 6 He was zealous for the Moſaic law - - - ib.
- § 7 And was a Millenarian - - - - ib.

5 Of his morals - - - - - - 328
6 An account of what ſcriptures he received - - - ib.

CHAPTER V.

OF PRODICUS AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

1 Of the account of him from Clemens Alexandrinus - - 331
2 Theodoret's account of him, in which he is far from being exact 332
3 Obſervations on Clement, which render it probable that his followers were not ſuch licentious livers as they are ſaid to have been - - - - - - - 333
4 They are accuſed of believing the uſeleſſneſs of prayer - 334
5 From the arguments uſed againſt them by Clement, it appears they reſpected Chriſt and the ſcriptures - - - 335
6 They are accuſed of denying the neceſſity of ſuffering for religion 336
7 Of the time and general character of Prodicus and his followers ib.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THE ADAMIANS, OR ADAMITES.

1 The account of theſe people from Epiphanius and Auſtin 337
2 Conſiderations tending to prove there never were ſuch heretics 338
3 An objection taken from the practice of the Gnoſtics, and anſwers 339
4 An objection taken from Theodoret's aſſertion, that Prodicus inſtituted the ſect of the Adamites, anſwered - ib.

CHAPTER VII.

OF MARC AND HIS FOLLOWERS, CALLED MARCOSIANS.

Sect.		Page.
1	Of his time, his country, and the ſect from which he ſprang	340
2	He is accuſed of being a magician - - - -	342
3	He is ſaid to have had an aſſiſting dæmon, and to have uſed various arts of deceiving - - - - - -	343
4	Some obſervations upon theſe accuſations - - -	ib.
5	The Marcoſians are ſaid to have regarded the letters of the alphabet as myſterious - - - - - -	344
6	They are unjuſtly accuſed of holding two principles, and being Docetæ - - - - - - -	ib.
7	They continued in the practice of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt	345
8	Of their opinion concerning Jeſus Chriſt - - -	ib.
9	Of their rites of redemption, and the meaning of them; as given by Rhenford - - - - - - -	346
10	They believed the facts recorded in the goſpels - -	347
11	They received the ſcriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament	348
12	A particular enumeration of the books of the New Teſtament uſed by them - - - - - - -	ib.
13	Of their apocryphal books - - - -	349

CHAPTER VIII.

OF HERACLEON.

1	Ancient writers who ſpeak of him, and of the time when he lived	350
2	He was a follower of Valentinus, with whoſe opinions his ſentiments nearly correſponded - - - - -	351
3	Commentaries were written by him on ſeveral parts of ſcripture	352
4	Containing remarks on the foregoing paſſages, particularly concerning what parts of ſcripture he received - -	ib.

CHAPTER IX.

OF CERDON.

1	Of his time - - - - - - -	354
2	Of his opinions - - - - - - -	355
3	He was an admirer of virginity, and is ſaid to have recanted his errors - - - - - - -	356
4	What ſcriptures were received by him - - -	357

CHAPTER X.

OF MARCION AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

Sect.		Page:
1	Some general account of him from Irenæus	358
2	Of the time in which he lived	359
3	The hiſtory of him as given by Epiphanius	361
4	The ſtory of his deceiving a young woman doubtful	362
5	Several obſervations tending to ſhew its incredibility	363
6	Some reaſon to ſuſpect it was the invention of Epiphanius	365
7	He began to propagate his errors in his own country, for which he was expelled by his father	366
8	His way of life was very unſettled	ib.
9	He had a great number of followers	ib.
10	Of his opinions, and the number of principles which he held	368
11	His notion of the Creator, and the world formed by him, and the God ſuperior to him	369
12	The Marcionite idea of the difference between good and juſt	371
13	The good God was the maker of beings ſpiritual and inviſible	ib.
14	The Marcionites erroneous in dividing the Deity	373
15	They were believers in a future judgment, and in the neceſſity of human actions	374
16	They thought the ſoul, but not the bodies of the virtuous would be happy in a future ſtate	375
17	The belief of a tranſmigration aſcribed to them by Epiphanius	376
18	Some account of their notion that Chriſt delivered the wicked but left the good	377
19	Marcion's opinion of the perſon of Chriſt that he was not a real man	378
20	Tertullian's arguments againſt this notion	380
21	Marcion believed there were to be two Chriſts	381
22	He allowed the truth of our Saviour's miracles	382
23	And of his death	383
24	And reſurrection	ib.
25	And of the principal facts related concerning him	384
26	The manners of the Marcionites were virtuous, and they had many martyrs	385
27	They contemned marriage, and highly extolled virginity	386
28	They faſted on the Sabbath	388
29	They celebrated Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, but were ſomewhat irregular in the adminiſtration	ib.
30	They had churches for ſtated public worſhip	389
31	Marcion wholly rejected the Old Teſtament	ib.
32	He alſo objected to the appointment of ſacrifices	390
33	He mutilated the New Teſtament wherever it contained quotations from the Old	391
34	He framed antitheſes to ſhew the oppoſition of the law to the goſpel	392

Sect. Page.
35 Marcion received but eleven books of the New Teſtament, and of the goſpels only that of Luke, and this mutilated - 393
36 He rejected the genealogy and baptiſm of our Saviour - 395
37 He alſo rejected the hiſtory of the temptation - - 396
38 An account of many other alterations made by him in St. Luke's goſpel - - - - - ib.
39 There were a ſufficient number of texts remaining to confute his errors - - - - - 402
40 The catholic Chriſtians aſſerted the antiquity of the unmutilated goſpel - - - - - ib.
41 Marcion rejected the Acts of the apoſtles - - 403
42 And received only ten epiſtles of St. Paul, and moſt of theſe altered 405
43 Of the alterations and omiſſions of Marcion in the epiſtle to the Galatians - - - - - 406
44 In the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians - - - 407
45 In the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians - - - 408
46 In the epiſtle to the Romans - - - 409
47 In the firſt epiſtle to the Theſſalonians - - - 410
48 In the ſecond epiſtle to the Theſſalonians - - ib.
49 In the epiſtle to the Epheſians, called by him the epiſtle to the Laodiceans - - - - - 411
50 He probably did not much alter the epiſtle to the Coloſſians - 414
51 Nor at all that to Philemon - - - - ib.
52 Nor but little that to the Philippians - - - ib.
53 An argument from hence in favour of the authenticity of the New Teſtament - - - - - - 415

CHAPTER XI.

OF LUCIAN, OR LEUCIUS.

1 Some general account of him from ancient authors, with obſervations thereon - - - - - 415
2 Of the time when he lived - - - - 416
3 Of his opinions - - - - 417
4 Some obſervations on his notion about the ſouls of brutes and the reſurrection of them - - - - - 420
5 A belief in another kind of reſurrection, aſcribed to him by Tertullian - - - - - - - 421
6 Some general account of his writings - - - 422
7 Some obſervations on the aſſertion of Mr. *Jones* that Leucius was a Manichee - - - - - 423
8 Leucius was the author of the Hiſtory of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary - - - - - 424
9 The writer of it not a Jew - - - - 425
10 The Protevangelion, or Goſpel of James, was compoſed by Leucius 427
11 A current tradition that Joſeph was a widower, and had children by a former wife - - - - ib.

Sect.		Page.
12	Paſſages in Epiphanius referring to the Goſpel of the Nativity and the Protevangelion	428
13	Obſervations on ſome of the contents of theſe two Goſpels	429
14	Leucius is thought to have interpolated the Goſpel of the infancy	ib.
15	He was the forger of the Goſpel of Nicodemus	430
16	Two other Goſpels aſcribed to Leucius	432
17	Of the traditions of Matthias. It is rather uncertain what they were	433
18	Leucius was the author of the forged Acts, or Journeying of the apoſtles	434
19	Some account of the contents of this book	435
20	Theſe forgeries prove the truth of the canonical ſcriptures	436

CHAPTER XII.

OF APELLES.

PART I. His Hiſtory.

1	Of the time when he lived	437
2	Of his connection with Philumene	ib.
3	No foundation for the ſtory of his incontinence	438
4	Unjuſtly accuſed of diſcouraging inquiry	439
5	Of his Writings	440
6	His country uncertain	441

PART II. His peculiar Principles.

7	He believed one firſt Principle, who formed another inferior deity	442
8	He thought that the difference of ſex depended on the ſoul	443
9	He was not a Docete in his opinion concerning the body of Chriſt	ib.
10	He denied the reſurrection of the body	445

PART III. What ſcriptures he received.

11	In other matters he generally agreed with Marcion	446
12	He did not pay any great regard to the Old Teſtament	ib.
13	His ſentiments about the New Teſtament probably not very different from Marcion's	447
14	It is likely he rejected the beginning of St. Matthew's goſpel as well as that of St. Luke	ib.
15	He treated the ſcriptures juſt as Marcion did, by receiving part, and rejecting what did not ſuit his purpoſe	448

CHAPTER XIII.

OF THE SETHIANS.

Sect.		Page.
1	Some general obſervations concerning theſe Heretics, and the Ophites and Cainites	449
2	Epiphanius's account of the Sethians	450
3	They called themſelves the deſcendants of Seth	ib.
4	They ſpoke of Seth in a very honourable manner	451
5	They aſcribed the creation of the world to angels	ib.
6	They believed that Jeſus Chriſt deſcended from Seth in an extraordinary way	ib.
7	By Chriſt who deſcended upon Jeſus they probably meant the Holy Ghoſt	453
8	An account of what books they uſed	454
9	What ſcriptures they received	455

CHAPTER XIV.

OF THE CAIANS, OR CAINITES.

1	Some account of the accuſations brought againſt them, from Epiphanius and Irenæus	456
2	Obſervations tending to ſhew the incredibility of theſe accounts	457
3	That the denomination Cainites aroſe from a way of ſpeaking among the Sethians, rendered probable by paſſages from ſcripture and other writings	458
4	There never was a ſect of Chriſtians who called themſelves Cainites, or who profeſſed the principles above deſcribed	460

CHAPTER XV.

OF THE OPHIANS OR OPHITES.

1	The Ophians are ſaid by Irenæus and Theodoret to be the ſame with the Sethians	460
2	Very different repreſentations given of theſe people by Epiphanius and others	461
3	Origen's account of the Ophians	462

CHAPTER XVI.

OF ARTEMON.

1	Of his opinions	465
2	He founded them on ſcripture, and paid a regard to its authority	ib.
3	Several others held the ſame opinions	466
4	Of the time when he lived	ib.

CHAPTER XVII.

OF THEODOTUS.

Sect.		Page.
1	Of his time and opinions - - - -	467
2	Paſſages from ancient authors concerning him - -	ib.
3	He is accuſed of denying Chriſt in a time of perſecution -	468
4	Two obſervations on what Epiphanius ſays about him -	469
5	The ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament were received by him	ib.
6	There were ſeveral of the ſame name in the ſecond century	471
7	Theodotus the banker, is generally ſuppoſed to be the author of the ſect of the Melchiſedechians - - -	ib.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OF HERMOGENES.

1	Of his time and country - - - -	473
2	What authors ſay of him, and by whom he is omitted -	474
3	Some account of him, and thoſe who wrote againſt him -	ib.
4	He was ſkilled in painting, and was originally a Chriſtian -	475
5	Some account of his opinions concerning the eternity of matter	ib.
6	He believed one ſupreme God unchangeably good - -	476
7	He aſcribed to matter an irregular motion, but introduced no æons - - - - - - -	477
8	No diſtinct account of his opinion concerning the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt - - - - - -	478
9	Some other opinions of his about the origin of the ſoul, human liberty, the devil, dæmons, and a future judgment - -	ib.
10	He never ſet up a ſeparate communion - - -	479
11	His teſtimony to ſcripture - - - -	ib.
12	He received both the Old and New Teſtament - -	480
13	No account of any writings of his - - - -	481

CHAPTER XIX.

OF THE MONTANISTS.

1	Ancient writers who ſpeak of the Montaniſts - -	481
2	Of the time when they firſt ſprang up - - - -	482
3	From whence they derived their name, and of the extent and continuance of their opinions - - - -	ib.
4	Where Montanus was born, and of certain reproaches caſt on him and his followers - - -	483

Sect. Page.
5 Of his companions and aſſiſtants, and of their prophecies - 484
6 Of his pretenſions and manner of propheſying - - 485
7 Of the opinions of the Montaniſts - - - 487
8 Of ſome peculiarities in their manners, diſcipline, and doctrine 488
9 Of their myſteries, and ſome calumnies caſt upon them on that account - - - - - - - 490
10 Of their teſtimony to the ſcriptures - - - 492

CHAPTER XX.

OF PRAXEAS.

1 Of the time in which he lived - - - - 493
2 What ancient writers ſpeak of him, and by whom he is omitted ib.
3 Of his country - - - - - - 494
4 He ſuffered in the cauſe of Chriſt - - - 495
5 He was once confuted, and ſigned a recantation, but afterwards profeſſed again his former principles - - - ib.
6 A believer in baptiſm and the general articles of the Chriſtian faith ib.
7 A ſtrenuous aſſertor of the divine unity - - 496
8 He would not allow that the father ſuffered - - 497
9 He received both the Old and New Teſtament goſpels and epiſtles 498
10 He founded his arguments upon a great variety of paſſages both in the Old and New Teſtament - - - - 499

CHAPTER XXI.

OF JULIUS CASSIANUS.

1 Of his time - - - - - - - - 501
2 In his writings he argued from the Old as well as from the New Teſtament - - - - - ib.
3 Of his opinions, country, and philoſophical ſpeculations - 502

CHAPTER XXII.

OF THE ELCESAITES, OR OSSENS.

1 The time uncertain when they firſt aroſe - - - 503
2 They were mentioned and written againſt by Origen - - ib.
3 Other ancient authors who ſpeak of this ſect, and of their opinions 504
4 Of the Oſſens, who were the ſame with the Elceſaites, called alſo Sampſæans, and of their time, and opinions - - - 505
5 Of the name of the founder of this ſect, and of ſeveral authors who mention him - - - - - - 509
6 Of the time when he flouriſhed, according to modern authors 510

Sect. Page.
7 Of the duration of this ſect - - - - 513
8 What parts of ſcripture they received - - - ib.
9 Explanation of a prayer of Elxai - - - - 514

CHAPTER XXIII.

OF THE ALOGIANS.

1 The account of them by Epiphanius and Philaſter, as rejecting John's goſpel and the Revelation - - - - 515
2 There never was any ſuch Hereſy - - - 515
3 Some account of Epiphanius's article of the Alogians - ib.
4 This Hereſy was probably invented, upon the occaſion of the controverſy with the Millenarians - - - 517
5 A groundleſs opinion among the moderns concerning the Unitarians of the ſecond century - - - - 518

ERRATA.

Page.	line.		for	read
50	3 b.		595	395
487	6 b.		hat	that

IN THE NOTES.

page.	col.	line.	for	read
14	1	1 b.	τοο	τοῳ
37	1	6 b.	criptura	ſcriptura
154	1	3	crebo	crebro
231	1	2	perjugez	prejugez
248	1	2 b.	τθτυ	τυτυ
274	1	6	Tab.	Fab.
311	1	1	κὺριων	κυριου
331	2	4	αλοναι	αλωναι
351	1	18	αλυς	αλλυς
353	2	11	υοιοι	υιοι
361	2	12	δηθε νησκει	δηθεν ησκει
374	1	2	εσχυροτεϱα	ισχυροτεϱα
431	1	4	νειιι	νειν
459	1	4 b.	*dele* point at end of the line.	

A LARGE COLLECTION OF ANCIENT JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES TO THE TRUTH OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

[CONTINUATION OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.]

TESTIMONIES OF ANCIENT HEATHENS,

CHAP. LIII.

EUNAPIUS.

I. *His time and works.* II. *Extracts from his History of the Roman Emperors.* III. *Extracts from his Lives of the Sophists and Philosophers.* IV. *Remarks upon the foregoing Extracts.*

I. EUNAPIUS [a] was a native of Sardis in Lydia. He came from Asia to Athens, when he [b] was about sixteen years of age, in the year of Christ 363 or 364, and [c] therefore not till after the death of Julian: when likewise Proæresius, the Christian sophist, was returned to his chair, and had resumed his lectures. Under that celebrated sophist Eunapius [d] studied five years. He wrote a book with this title, The [e] Lives of Philosophers and Sophists, which was not finished till near the end of the fourth century:

[a] Nec multo hoc junior Eunapius fuit. Nam Valentiniani, Valentis, et Gratiani temporibus vixit: Sophista, idem Medicus, ac historicus insignis, magni illius Proæresii discipulus, affinis nobilis sophistæ Chrysanthii: quippe qui Eunapii consobrinam duxisset uxorem. Voss. de Histor. Gr. l. 2, c. xviii. Vid. et Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 6. p. 232. &c, Tillem. Theodos. i. art. 95. [b] Eunap. in Vita Proær. p. 102 et 126. [c] Il quitta l'Asie, et vint à Athenes agé de 16 ans, au mois d'October, vers le temps de Julien, mais apparemment, lorsqu'il estoit mort, et que Proeresе avoit repris ses leçons. Ainsi c'éstoit en 363 ou 364. Tillem. ubi supra.

[d] See Eunapius, as before, note [b].

[e] Βιοι φιλοσοφων και σοφιστων.

for which reaſon I place him at the year 396. In that [f] work he ſpeaks of his having written the Hiſtory of the Roman Emperors, and that he ſhould write the ſame hiſtory again: that hiſtory, in the ſecond edition of it, reached to the year 404, as it began at the year 268, with the reign of Claudius the ſecond, who ſucceeded Gallienus. This may ſuffice for the hiſtory of this writer, and his works.

II. I begin my extracts with the Hiſtory of the emperors, of which we have remaining ſome fragments only. Photius in his Bibliotheque gives this account of it: 'We [g] have read,' ſays he, 'the Chronical Hiſtory of Eunapius, in the new edition, in 'fourteen books. He begins his hiſtory with the reign of 'Claudius, where Dexippus's hiſtory concludes; and he ends 'with the reigns of Honorius and Arcadius, ſons of Theodo-'ſius, about the time that the wife of Arcadius died [meaning 'Eudoxia.] This Eunapius was of Sardis in Lydia. As [h] to 'religion he is impious, and a great admirer of the Greek cuſ-'toms. In his hiſtory he aſperſeth thoſe who adorned the em-'pire by their piety, and eſpecially the great Conſtantine. But he 'commends the impious, and above all the reſt Julian the apoſ-'tate: ſo that he ſeems to have written his hiſtory with the view 'of making an encomium upon him.' [He then commends his ſtyle, making however ſome exceptions.] 'He compoſed two 'works containing the ſame hiſtory, the firſt and the ſecond. 'In [i] the firſt he has inſerted many blaſphemies againſt our holy 'Chriſtian religion, and extols the Greek ſuperſtition, and often 'reproacheth the pious emperors. But in the ſecond, which he 'alſo calls a new edition, he omits a great deal of the reproach-'ful language, which he had before uttered againſt our religion. 'Nevertheleſs he has ſtill left ſufficient marks of his enmity to 'us.' So wrote Photius in the ninth century.

If that work of Eunapius were now extant, undoubtedly we ſhould find in it a good deal of railing. But the loſs of it is the leſs regretted by thoſe learned men who have a curioſity to know what he had ſaid, becauſe it is ſuppoſed that [k] Zoſimus

[f] Vid. Vit. Max. p. 75.

[g] Ανεγνωσθη Ευναπιυ χρονικης ιϛοριας, της μετα Δεξιππον πεας εκδοσεως....Ph. p. 169.

[h] Δυσσεβης δε την θρησκειαν ων, τα ελληνων γαρ ϛιμα. Τυς μεν ευσεβεια την βασιλειαν κοσμησαντας, παντι τροπω, και ανεδην κακιζων διασυρει, και μαλιϛα γε τον μεγαν Κωνϛαντινον. p. 169. m. [i] Ibid.

[k] Impulſu hujus Chryſanthii ſcripſit de Vitis Sophiſtarum opus elegans ac venuſtum: ſed in quo paſſim prodat, quam Chriſtiano nomini fuerit infeſtus. Idem res geſtas Cæſarum, exinde orſus, ubi deſierat Herodianus, ad ſua uſque tempora produxit...Eo ex opere ſolum De Legationibus fragmentum, beneficio Andreæ Schotti, lucem vidit. Reliqua exſtare dicuntur in Bibliotheca Veneta. Eo autem æquiori animo iſtis caremus, quod Zoſimum habemus. Nam eaſdem res Eunapius et Zoſimus tractarunt, et ita tractarunt, ut Zoſimus Eunapium prope deſcripſiſſe, viſus ſit, &c. Voſſ. de Hiſt. Gr. l. 2. cap. 18.

has

has copied a good deal out of him, and moreover we shall see a good deal of the temper of Eunapius in his Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists, which remain.

III. To that work therefore I now proceed †. And I intend to take those passages which contain any express mention of the Christians, or any material references to their affairs; in which will be many proofs of that zeal for Gentilism, which Photius observed in his history of the emperors.

1. This work begins with the life of Plotinus. The next is that of Porphyry. After whom follows Jamblichus, then Ædesius, in all three-and-twenty.

2. In his life of Ædesius, who was a Cappadocian, he writes to this purpose: 'At [l] length,' says he, 'Ædesius became little inferior to his master Jamblichus, setting aside the inspiration which belonged to Jamblichus. For of that I have nothing to write, perhaps, because Ædesius concealed it, by reason of the times. For then Constantine was emperor, who threw down the most celebrated temples, and set up the structures of the Christians. For this reason it is likely the chief of his scholars,' that is of the scholars of Jamblichus, 'might affect a kind of mysterious silence, and priestly taciturnity. Whence it came to pass that the writer of this, who from his youth was a scholar of Chrysanthius, spent wellnigh twenty years with him before he was acquainted with the true doctrine. So difficult a matter has it been to bring down to our time the philosophy of Jamblichus!'

3. After which he proceeds, in the same life, to give an account of the death of Sopater, another celebrated Platonic philosopher, who attended on Constantine, as Eunapius says, 'to [m] check and govern by reason the warm temper of that emperor, and who was for a considerable time in great favour with him, so as to excite the envy of many of the courtiers. At length, by Constantine's order, he was put to death.' Our author im-

† I know not of any good edition of that work. I have two: one, Antverpiæ, ex officina Chr. Plantini, 1568; the other, Coloniæ Allobrogum, apud Sam. Crispinum. 1616. J. A. Fabricius seems sometimes to refer to an edition of Eunapius, made by himself. Porphyrii vitam composuit e veteribus Eunapius, ad quem nonnulla annotavi. Bib. Gr. Tom. 4. p. 181. But from the learned Reimar, de Vita et scriptis J. A. Fabricii. p. 209, we learn that though Fabricius had begun an edition of this author, it was never finished. Eunapii vitæ Philosophorum ac Sophistarum Collatæ cum vi. Codd. Mss. a Marquardo Gudio, Græce et Latine, cum notis Fabricii...Tria hujus folia usque ad p. 48. typis exscripta sunt in 8. sed typographo moras nectente, quarum vel maxime impatiens erat vir excitati ingenii, editionem abrupit, nec ipsum opus perfecit. I several years ago was informed that a learned German, whose name I do not remember, was preparing a new edition of Eunapius. In which I make no question there would be many valuable improvements. But I have not yet heard that it is finished. I therefore shall refer to the edition, before mentioned, in 1616.

[l] Eunap. Vit. Ædes. p. 33, 34.

[m] Ib. p. 34. m.

putes his death to Ablabius, præfect of the prætorium. It is not certain when it happened. Tillemont [n] inclines to the year 333. Nor do we clearly diſcern what [o] was the occaſion of it. I may take ſome farther notice of this Sopater hereafter in my extracts from † Zoſimus.

4. In the ſame life he ſpeaks of Euſtathius, another ſcholar of Jamblichus, and intimate friend of Ædeſius, whom he greatly commends upon divers accounts; and particularly for his eloquence: 'Which,' as [p] he ſays, 'was ſo charming, that the emperor [Conſtantine], though fond of the books of the Chriſtians, was deſirous to ſee him.'

'Euſtathius [q] married Soſipatra, who ſurpaſſed her huſband, 'though he was ſo conſiderable.' 'She [r] left behind her three 'ſons: the names of two of them need not to be mentioned; 'but the third, whoſe name was Antoninus, was not unworthy 'of his parents.' 'He, chuſing for the place of his abode one 'of the mouths of the Nile, called Canobus, wholly applied 'himſelf to the learning there taught, and endeavoured to fulfil 'his mother's prediction concerning him. And all the youth 'of ſound judgment, and that were ſtudious of philoſophy, reſorted to him: and the temple was full of young prieſts. At 'that time he was not accounted more than a man, and converſed 'among men. Yet he foretold to all his diſciples that, after his 'death, there would be no temples, but that the magnificent and 'ſacred temple of Serapis would be laid in ruinous heaps, and [s] 'that fabulous confuſion, and unformed darkneſs, would tyrannize over the beſt parts of the earth. All which things time 'has brought to paſs, and his prediction has obtained the credit 'of an oracle.'

Afterwards, of the ſame Antoninus, he ſays: 'But [t] he made 'no ſhow of divine converſe, nor of any thing above the common apprehenſions of men: ſuſpecting, perhaps, the emperor's 'inclinations, which lay another way.' 'But [u] that there was 'ſomewhat divine in him was not long after made manifeſt: for 'he was no ſooner departed out of this world but the worſhip 'of the gods at Alexandria was aboliſhed, and the prieſts were 'diſperſed.' 'And not only the ſacred worſhip was aboliſhed, 'but the ſacred fabricks were thrown down; and all things had

[n] L'Emp. Conſtantin. § 71.

[o] See Tillemont, as before, and Crevier's Hiſtory, vol. x. p. 169, 170.

† See here after my extracts from Zoſimus, num. 7.

[p] Vit. Ædeſ. p. 44.

[q] Ib. p. 48.

[r] Ib. p. 59, 60.

[s] Και τι μυθωδες και ατιθες σκοτος τυραννησει τα επι γης καλλιστα. κ. λ. p. 60. m.

[t] Απεδεικνυτο μεν γαρ ουδεν θεουργον, και παραλογον ες την φαινομενην αισθησιν, τας βασιλικας ισως ορμας υφορωμενος, ετερωσε φερουσας. p. 62.

[u] Οτι δε ην τι θειοτερον το κατ' αυτον, ου εις μακραν απεσημαινθη. κ. λ. p. 63.

'the

'the ſame end with the vanquiſhed giants in the fables of the 'poets. And [x] the temples at Canobus underwent the ſame fate, 'Theodoſius then reigning, Theophilus preſiding over the af- 'fair, Euetius at the ſame time governor of civil affairs [or 'præfect,] and Romanus general of the ſoldiery: who, having 'never ſo much as heard of war, vented all their anger againſt 'ſtones and ſtatues, and levelled the temple of Serapis to the 'ground; and rifling away the conſecrated oblations, they gained 'a complete, though never conteſted and bloodleſs, victory. For 'they fought ſo valiantly with ſtatues and conſecrated donatives, 'that they not only overcame them, but plundered them, and 'carried them away. And it was a part of their diſcipline, that 'whatever they ſtole they kept concealed. They only carried 'not away the foundations of the temple, by reaſon of the weight 'of the ſtones which rendered them not eaſy to be removed. 'Thus theſe warlike and courageous champions, overwhelming 'all things with confuſion and diſorder, and lifting up hands to 'heaven, not ſtained with blood indeed, but foully defiled with 'avarice, gave out that they had overcome the gods, and boaſted 'of their ſacrilege and impiety. Then [y] they introduced into 'the ſacred places a ſort of people called monks, men it is true 'as to their outward ſhape, but in their lives ſwine, who openly 'ſuffered and did ten thouſand wicked and abominable things. 'Nevertheleſs to them it ſeemed to be an act of piety to trample 'under foot the reverence due to the ſacred places. For every 'one that wore a black coat, and was content to make a ſordid 'figure in public, had a right to exerciſe a tyrannical authority. 'Such a reputation for virtue had this ſort of men attained. But '[z] of theſe things I have already ſpoken in the Univerſal Hiſtory. 'Theſe monks alſo were ſettled at Canobus; who, inſtead of 'deities conceived in our minds, compelled men to worſhip 'ſlaves, and thoſe not of the better ſort neither. For picking up 'and ſalting the bones and ſkulls of thoſe whom for many crimes 'juſtice had put to death, they carried them up and down and 'ſhewed them for gods, and kneeled before them, and lay proſ- 'trate at their tombs, covered over with filth and duſt. Theſe '[a] were ſome of them (called martyrs and miniſters and inter- 'ceſſors with the gods) ſlaves that had ſerved diſhoneſtly, and 'been beaten with whips, and ſtill bore in their corpſes the ſcars

[x] Ibid. p. 63. fin. [y] Ειτα επεισηγον τοις ιεροις τοποις της καλυμενης Μοναχης, ανθρωπες μεν κατα το ειδος, ο δε βιος αυτοις συωδης, και ες το εμφανες επασχοντες, και εποιεν μυρια, κακα και αφρασα. κ. λ. Vit. Ædeſ. 64 et 65. [z] p. 65. [a] Μαρτυρες γαρ εκαλειτο και δικαιοι τινες, και πρεσβεις των αιτησεων παρα τω θεω, κ. λ. p. 6. cad. vit.

'of their villanies. And yet the earth brings forth ſuch gods as 'theſe. This highly advanced the reputation of Antoninus's 'foreſight; foraſmuch as he had told every body that the tem-'ples would be turned into ſepulchres.'

So writes Eunapius, with great freedom, as all will allow, under a Chriſtian emperor.

However there are ſome other remarks which may be not improperly made here.

The demolition of the temples, which Eunapius here ſpeaks of, was made by order of the emperor Theodoſius the firſt, in the year 389, as ſome [b] think; or as others [c] in the year 391. Eunapius ſays that Theophilus preſided in this affair. Which [d] is very agreeable to what Socrates ſays of Theophilus, then biſhop of Alexandria. 'At his requeſt the emperor's edict was obtained; and he was alſo intruſted with the execution of it. And inſtead of 'Euetius, governor of civil affairs,' or præfect of Egypt, it has been obſerved that [e] Eunapius ſhould have ſaid 'Euagrius.'

5. In the life of Proæreſius he ſays, 'When [f] Julian was em-'peror, being excluded from the ſchools, becauſe he ſeemed to 'be a Chriſtian, he applied to Hierophantes, [or the high-prieſt 'of Eleuſinium] who had a ſkill of diſcerning futurity, that he 'might inquire of the gods whether this ſtate of things would 'laſt. And underſtanding that it would not, he was the more 'eaſy.'

By Jerom, [g] in his Chronicle, we are informed that Proæreſius was an Athenian ſophiſt: and that when Julian's edict was publiſhed, forbidding Chriſtians to teach the polite arts, Proæreſius reſigned his chair at Athens, though Julian was willing to allow him by a ſpecial privilege to continue there.

For certain therefore Proæreſius was a Chriſtian. Nor does the expreſſion of Eunapius, 'becauſe he ſeemed to be a Chriſ-'tian,' imply any doubt of it. The truth therefore of his making any inquiry of the gods concerning futurity may be

[b] Vid. Tillem. Theodoſ. i. art. 51. et note 40. Pagi ann. 389. num. xv.

[c] Baſnag. ann. 391. num. ix, x. Vid. et Pagi ann. 389. num. xii.

[d] Socrat. l. 5. c. xvi. p. 274. C. Conf. Sozom. l. 7. c. xv. [e] Secundo, loco horum verborum: Ευετιυ δε την πολιτικην αρχην αρχοντος, legendum Ευαγριυ: ac vertendum, 'Evagrio res civiles adminiſ-'trante.' Evagrius itaque non præfectus Urbi, ut perperam vertit Junius, ſed præfectus Auguſtalis. &c. Pagi ann. 389. n. xiv.

[f] Ιυλιανυ δε βασιλευοντος, τοπων της παιδευειν εξειργομενος, εδοκει γαρ ειναι Χριστιανος, συνιοραν τον Ιεροφαντην ωσπερ δελφικον τινα τριποδα προς την της μελλοντος προνοιαν πασι τοις δεομενοις ανακειμενον, σοφια τινι περιηλθε ξειν την προγνωσιν...Ο δε Προαιρεσιος ηξιωσεν αυτον εκμαθειν περι των θεων, ει βεβαια μενει τα της φιλανθρωπιας. Ως δε απεφασαν, ο μεν εγνω το παθησομενον, και ην ευθυμοτερος. Vita Proæreſ. p. 126.

[g] Chron. p. 185. Jerom's words are cited vol. viii. ch. xlvi. § 1. ſub fin.

queſtioned.

questioned. Tillemont [h] was of opinion that this story needs not to be received.

6. In this place Eunapius tells us that 'when [i] he was sixteen 'years of age he came to Athens, and entered himself among 'the scholars of Proæresius, who loved him as if he had been 'his own son. With him Eunapius stayed five years, and then 'returned to Lydia; soon after which Proæresius died,' as may be supposed, in the year 368, when he was about ninety-two years of age. For when Eunapius came to be with him, he was [k] in the eighty-seventh year of his age. And as Proæresius resigned the chair of rhetorick in the time of Julian, it must be supposed that he resumed it after the death of that emperor, in the year 363, about which time our Eunapius came to Athens, and studied five years under him. There is extant [l] a letter of Julian to Proæresius, filled with high compliments upon his eloquence. And I would observe here, in favour of Eunapius, that though he was a zealous Gentile, he has once and again spoken very honourably of Proæresius, as a [m] very amiable, as well as eloquent, man, and in great reputation upon that account. Eunapius therefore, notwithstanding his bigotry, was not wholly destitute of candour.

7. Chrysanthius, as we have seen above, was one of Eunapius's [n] masters. He was descended of a good family, and was much respected by Julian, who [o] by letters several times sent to him to come to court, which Chrysanthius always declined. However, in that reign, he was made high-priest of Lydia: of which event Eunapius, in his life, writes in this manner: 'Chry-'santhius [p] then receiving the high-priesthood of the whole na-'tion, and well knowing what would come to pass, he was far 'from being troublesome in the exercise of his authority, not 'erecting new temples, as almost all men earnestly importuned 'him to do, nor extremely vexatious to any of the Christians. 'But such was the simplicity of his behaviour, that the restoration 'of the sacred rites in Lydia was hardly perceived. So that 'though formerly things had been managed after another man-'ner, yet now there seemed not to be any innovation, nor was 'there any thing surprizing or tumultuous in the alteration, but

[h] L'Emp. Julien. art. 33. [i] Vita Proæres. p. 126. [k] Ibid. p. 102.

[l] Julian. Epist. ii. ap. Spanhem. p. 373.

[m] Ubi supr. p. 102. et p. 126, 127. et alibi. [n] Vit. Chrys. p. 144.

[o] Eunap. ibid. p. 148, et Suid. V. Χρυσανθιος. [p] Ο δε Χρυσανθιος την αρχιερωσυνην του παντος εθνους λαβων, και το μελλον εξεπισταμενος σαφως, ου βαρυς ην κατα την εξουσιαν, ουτε τους ιερως εγειρων, ωσπερ απαντες θερμως και περικαως, ες ταυτα συνεθεον· ουτε λυπων τινας των χριστιανων περιττως· αλλα τοσαυτη τις ην απλοτης του ηθους, ως κατα Λυδιαν μικρου και ελαθεν η των ιερων επανορθωσις. κ. λ. Vit. Chrysant. 148, 149.

'all things tended to calmneſs and ſerenity. And he only was 'admired, whilſt all others were toſſed in a ſtorm.'

Here again, as ſeems to me, Eunapius ſhews moderation. He approves of the mildneſs and gentleneſs of Chryſanthius. At the ſame time there is an intimation that, in Julian's time, the proceedings were more violent and tumultuous in many other places.

8. In the life of Proæreſius * Eunapius tells a long ſtory of Anatolius, in the time of Conſtantius, which is very proper to be inſerted here. But I think it beſt firſt of all to give ſome account of Anatolius from other writers.

Says Photius: 'We [q] read the work of Vindanius Anatolius 'of Berytus, concerning agriculture. It is a collection out of 'ſeveral writers upon the ſame ſubject, ſuch as Democritus, and 'Africanus, and Tarantinus, Apuleius alſo, and Florentius, Va-'lens, Leon, and Pamphilus, and likewiſe from the Paradoxes 'of Diaphones. The work conſiſts of twelve books or ſections. 'It contains many uſeful directions for agriculture and huſband-'men; and may be reckoned one of the beſt books that have been 'written upon the ſubject. At the ſame time here are inſerted 'many ſtrange and incredible things ſavouring of the error of 'Gentiliſm. But a pious huſbandman may let thoſe things 'alone, and ſelect only what is uſeful.'

Several learned men [r] and particularly Valeſius, are of opinion that this is the ſame Anatolius, who, having paſſed through other high offices in the ſtate, came at length to be præfect of Illyricum in 358, as appears from [s] Ammianus Marcellinus, in which office he died [t] in 360. Valeſius's note upon Ammianus, who has diſtinctly mentioned his præfecture of Illyricum in the time of Conſtantius, is ſo clear and inſtructive that [u] I ſhall tranſcribe a part of it below for the uſe of attentive readers.

Several

* p. 117. &c.

[q] Ανεγνωσθη Ουινδανιυ Ανατολιυ Βερυτιυ συναγωγη γεωργικων επιτηδευματων....Εχει δ' ομως ενια και τυτο το βιβλιον τερατωδη και απιστα, και της ελληνικης πλανης υποπλεα· ο δει τον ευσεβη γηπονον εκτρεπομενον, των λοιπων συλλεγειν τα χρησιμα. κ. λ. Phot. Cod. 163. p. 349.

[r] Vide Gothofredi Proſopograph. Cod. Theodoſ. et Tillemont. L'Emp. Conſtance. art. 50. T. 4. p. 840, 841. art. 66. p. 903.

[s] gemina conſideratione alacrior, [Conſtantius]....quodque Anatolio regente per Illyricum Præfecturam, neceſſaria cuncta vel ante tempus coacta, ſine ullius diſpendiis adfluebant. Amm. l. 19. c. xi. p. 243.

[t] Habita eſt iiſdem diebus etiam Florentii ratio....et Anatolio recens mortuo Præfecto Prætorio per Illyricum, ad ejus mittitur locum. Id. l. 21. cap. vi. p. 296.

[u] Anatolius Syrus Beryto oriundus, cum ſcientiam juris civilis in patriâ didiciſſet, Romam profectus admiſſuſque in palatium, per omnes honorum gradus ad Præfecturæ culmen adſcendit. Vir etiam inimicorum judicio admirabilis, ut ſcribit Eunapius in Proæreſio, quem jucundum erit legere. Erat autem ſacrificiis et Græcanicæ Religioni imprimis addictus, teſte ibidem Eunapio. Unde fere adducor, ut credam eum ipſum eſſe, quem Photius in Bibliotheca Vindamum Anatolium appellat, Berytium, qui de Re Ruſtica ſcripſit, cultu Ethnicum, ut

Photius

Several of the letters of Libanius are written to Anatolius, and in divers of them notice is taken of his præfecture of Illyricum, which was a ſtation of great honour. In one of them he ſays: 'He[x] could not but be greatly pleaſed that he was advanced to that dignity, which is ſuperior to all others: for,' ſays he 'we Syrians are proud when we can give a man to the 'Romans who is able to direct the affairs of the ſtate.' In another letter to Anatolius he tells him that 'he[y] had been informed by a perſon who was preſent that, beſide other commendable things, he ſaid to the emperor when he was going away to the government of the province to which he was appointed: "Henceforward no dignity ſhall protect an offender "from puniſhment: let him be one of the judges or a military "man, if he tranſgreſs the laws he ſhall be called to an account "for it." In another letter to Anatolius, he celebrates[z] his great mind, his integrity, his eloquence.

We have evidently diſcerned from Ammianus that Anatolius was præfect of Illyricum under Conſtantius in 358, and 359. Some think he[a] had been put into that office by Conſtans in the year 348, and that Eunapius ſays as much.

I ſhall now tranſcribe a good part of what Eunapius ſays of Anatolius in his life of Proæreſius.

'Anatolius' he[b] ſays, 'was of Berytus in Phœnicia, a man 'ſtudious of eloquence, which alſo he attained, well ſkilled in 'the laws, and a great patron of learning, and ſo proſperous in 'his deſigns, that, going to Rome, and being well received in the 'emperor's palace, he paſſed through ſeveral high offices of the 'ſtate with the applauſe even of his enemies, till at length he 'was advanced by the emperor to the præfecture of Illyricum. 'And[c] being a lover of ſacrificing, and extremely zealous of 'Helleniſm, though at that time the ſtream ran another way; 'and having, by virtue of his high office, a privilege of viſiting 'the beſt parts of the empire, and of directing things as he

Photius teſtatur.....Ejus porro induſtriam, vigilantiam, integritatem, magnitudinem animi, et eloquentiam magnopere commendat Libanius in epiſtola 15. [18. ap. Wolf.] Qui cum Præfecturæ codicillis donatus, jamque in Illyricum profecturus Imperatori valediceret, hæc inter cætera dixiſſe fertur: Poſthæc, Imperator, neminem nocentem dignitas a ſupplicio liberabit. &c. Valeſ. ad Ammian. l. 19. cap. xi. p. 243.

[x] Liban. ep. 394. p. 201. Wolf. edit. an. 1738. [y] Liban. ep. 466. p. 233.

[z] Ep. 18. p. 5. &c. [a] See Tillem. L'Emp. Conſtance. art. 13. p. 701. et note xv. p. 1103, 1104. [b] Eunap. Vita. Proæreſ. p. 117. &c.

[c] Και φιλοθυτης ων, και διαφεροντως ελλην· καιτοιγε η κοινη κινησις προς ετερας εφερε ροπας, εξον αυτω προς τα καιρια της αρχης ελθειν, και διοικειν εκαστα προς ο βουλοιτο. Ο δε χρυσης τινος αυτον μανιας υπολαβουσης ιδειν την ελλαδα....Ο δε Ανατολιος εγγυθεν, και εισεδημησεν Αθηναζε. Θυσας δε θαρσαλεως, και περιελθων τα ιερα παντα, η θεσμος ιερος εκελευσεν, εξεκαλει τους σοφιστας επι τον αγωνα· κ. λ. Eunap. in Proæreſio. p. 117, ...120.

'pleaſed,

'pleased; he was seized with a certain golden phrensy of seeing 'Greece: but before he went thither, he sent a problem to be 'considered by the sophists there, and desiring them to exert 'themselves, and to give the best solution they were able.' 'According to Eunapius, the sophists there fell into vexatious disputes about the state of the question, and the best method of 'solving it. 'One of them,' as he says, 'was Himerius the 'sophist of Bythynia. At length Anatolius came to Athens. 'Upon his arrival he offered sacrifices in a splendid manner, and 'visited the temples as the sacred institution required. He then 'called for the sophists, and invited them to produce their arguments. But,' as Eunapius says, 'they shewed so much self-'love, and vanity, and such ambition to be preferred each one 'above the other, that Anatolius despised them, and pitied the 'parents whose children were under the care of such instructors. Proæresius then was called for, who was the only one 'that had not yet appeared. He spoke to the point in question 'with so much perspicuity, as to give Anatolius complete satisfaction. And,' as Eunapius assures us, 'Proæresius [d] was greatly honoured by Anatolius; the rest he hardly thought worthy 'to sit at his table.'

This story cannot be read without making some reflections.

1. It is easy from this temper of Anatolius, as well as from many other things that come before us, to perceive how great was the affection of many for ancient Gentilism, and how difficult it was to persuade men to alter the sentiments in which they had been educated.

2. Secondly, We see here, in Eunapius himself, an acknowledgment of the defects of education at Athens, a thing insisted on by Gregory Nazianzen [dd] whose accounts are here confirmed.

3. Once more, I reckon that we here see an instance of the candour of Anatolius, in the respect which he shewed to Proæresius, who was a Christian. He allowed him to have a superior excellence above the other sophists at Athens. In short, Anatolius, though a gentile, was a man of great learning, good judgment, and much candour. He was also a faithful subject and able officer under the emperor Constantius. Indeed, he is commended by all who have had occasion to speak of him.

One of the orations of Himerius is in praise of the præfect Anatolius. Photius [e] has made some extracts out of it. But as

[d] Τιμησας γε εκεινον διαφερόντως φαινεται, και τοι γε της αλλης μολις αξιωσας της εαυτου τραπεζης. Ibid. p. 120. [dd] Gr. Naz. Or. 20. p. 327, 328. [e] .... εκ της εις Ανατολιον υπαρχον. Phot. Cod. 243. p. 1139.

there

there are not in them any hiſtorical facts, I tranſcribe nothing from them.

Anatolius is likewiſe commended by [f] Aurelius Victor, and for the ſame uſeful public ſervices, which are mentioned to his honour by [g] Ammianus Marcellinus.

9. There is another like ſtory in the life of Chryſanthius. The exact time of it does not appear to me: but, probably, it might be in the time of Valentinian and Valens. 'But' [h] ſays Eunapius, 'the buſineſs of the Chriſtians prevailing, and ſpreading 'itſelf far and wide, there came ſo far as from Rome a præfect 'of Aſia, whoſe name was Juſtus. He was now conſiderably 'advanced in years, but of a generous and noble diſpoſition, and 'one who had not relinquiſhed the ancient rites and ceremonies 'of his country; but was a profeſſor of that bleſſed and happy 'way of life, and was continually in the ſacred offices of religion, 'and fond of all ſorts of divination, highly valuing himſelf likewiſe upon this temper of mind, and the right performance of 'theſe things. He, croſſing from Conſtantinople to Aſia, and 'finding a governor in the country to his heart's deſire, whoſe 'name was Hilarius, erected ſome extempore altars, (for there 'were none there,) and if he found any ruins of a temple, he ſet 'his hands to repair it. Having appointed a public ſacrifice, 'he ſent an invitation to all who were of note in thoſe parts for 'learning to come to him. Thereupon great numbers ſoon 'reſorted to him: and Juſtus ſacrificed in the preſence of the 'writer of this work, and others.' It appears from what follows that [i] Chryſanthius alſo was there.

So writes Eunapius with an excellent reliſh for Helleniſm.

10. In the life of Maximus, which is the fifth in order, Eunapius has ſeveral times mentioned Julian, and refers [k] to the fuller account which he had given of him in his Hiſtory of the Roman Emperors. He ſays, particularly, 'the [l] family of Con-'ſtantine failing, Julian only was left; who, by reaſon of his

[f] Simul noſcendis ocyus, quæ ubique e Rep. gerebantur, admota media publici curſus. Quod equidem munus ſatis utile, in peſtem orbis Romani vertit poſteriorum avaritia, inſolentiaque: niſi quod his annis ſuffectæ vires Illyrico ſunt, Præfecto medente Anatolio. Aur. Vict. de Cæſar. in Trajano. cap. 13.

[g] Ammian. l. 19. cap. xi. p. 243.

[h] Τῶ δὲ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐπικρατοῦντος ἔργῳ, καὶ κατεχοντος ἁπαντα, διὰ μακρῆ τις ἀπο τῆς Ρωμης εἰσεφοιτησεν ἀρχων τῆς Ἀσιας, Ἰουστος ἐνομαζετο· πρεσβυτης μεν ἠδη κατα την ἡλικιαν· γεγραιος καὶ ἀλλως το ἠθος, καὶ ἀρχαιας καὶ πατριᾳ πολιτειας οὐκ ἀπηλλαγμενος· ἀλλα τον εὐδαιμονα καὶ μακαριον ἐκεινον ἐξηλακως τροπον. Προς ἱεροις ἠν ἀει, καὶ μαντειας ἐξεκρεματο πασης, μεγα φρονων, ὁτι τουτων ἐπιθυμησε τε καὶ κατορθωσεν. κ. λ. Vita Chryſ. p. 153, 154 [i] Vid. p. 155. [k] Vita Maximi. p. 68. in. [l] Καὶ Ψιλοθεοτος τῶ γενει, Ἰουλιανος περιελειφθη μονος....Εὐτυχοι δε ὁμως αὐτον αμφεπολευον βασιλικοι, καὶ παραφυλακαι τινες ἠσαν, ὁπως εἰη Χριστιανος βεβαιος. p. 68.

'tender

'tender age, and mildneſs of temper, was much deſpiſed. Yet 'he was waited on by the emperor's eunuchs, and others, who 'were placed about him as ſpies, to ſee that he continued to be 'a good Chriſtian.' He goes on to extol Julian's ready wit and uncommon memory. 'So ſwift progreſs he made in learning 'as to cauſe uneaſineſs even to his maſters, who had nothing 'more that they could teach him. And Conſtantius was well 'enough pleaſed to ſee him ſtudy philoſophy, inſtead of mind-'ing the affairs of ſtate.' He adds, that 'Julian [m] was old, 'when young:' meaning that he was old in wiſdom and ſcience 'when young in years.'

In the ſame life he ſays, that 'Julian [n] was ſent into Gaul 'with the title of Cæſar, not ſo much that he might rule there, 'but rather with hopes that ſo difficult a government would prove 'his ruin. But, contrary to all expectation, through the good 'providence of the gods, he carried all before him: at * which 'time it was unknown that he was a worſhipper of the gods.'

It is not unlikely that here we ſee ſome things transferred from his Hiſtory of the Roman Emperors into this work of the lives of ſophiſts and philoſophers.

11. Oribaſius, a friend of Julian, is one of the ſophiſts or philoſophers whoſe lives are written in this work; he has therefore a diſtinct chapter for him, but it is not long: it may be worth our while to take a part of it.

'Oribaſius,' ſays [o] Eunapius, 'was born at Pergamus, and 'was deſcended from parents of good condition. He made a 'quick progreſs in the liberal arts, which greatly conduce to 'virtue. He ſtudied under the great Zeno at the ſame time 'with Magnus, whom he greatly excelled. Indeed he haſtened 'to the ſummit of the medical art, imitating his country god as 'far as it is poſſible for man to imitate divinity. [I ſuppoſe he 'means Æſculapius, who had an ancient temple at Pergamus.] 'Being in great reputation, even in early life, Julian, when he 'was made Cæſar, took him to be with him as his phyſician. 'He alſo excelled in other qualifications, inſomuch [p] that he 'raiſed Julian to the empire, as is ſhewn by us in our hiſtory of 'his reign: but afterwards he felt the ſtrokes of envy. And be-'cauſe of his great fame, the emperors, who ſucceeded Julian, 'ſtript him of all he had. And after deliberating whether they 'ſhould put him to death, they ſent him into baniſhment among 'cruel barbarians. [Eunapius does not ſay who thoſe barbarians

[m] Ο και εν μειρακι πρεσβυτης Ιουλιανος. p. 68. m. [n] Ibid. p. 76. * .... παντας μεν λανθανων, οτι θεραπευει θεους. Ibid. [o] Eunap. De Vit. Sophiſt. p. 139, 140. [p] ωστε και βασιλεα τον Ιουλιανον αποδειξαι. P. 140. in.

'were.]

'were.] In that hoſtile country he exhibited proofs of his abi-
'lities, reſtoring ſome to health from long and grievous ſick-
'neſſes, and recovering others from the very gates of death.
'Whereby, in a ſhort time, he gained great eſteem with the
'barbarian kings, and was revered with almoſt divine honours.
'The Romans then were deſirous of his preſence with them;
'and the emperors, changing their former counſels, gave him
'leave to return; which he was very willing to do out of regard
'to his native country. He then married a wife with a large for-
'tune, and of an honourable deſcent, by whom he had four ſons
'ſtill living. And may they long be ſo! He is alſo ſtill living
'at my time of writing this. And may he long continue ſo!
'He alſo had his eſtate reſtored to him out of the public treaſury,
'the emperors revoking their former ſentence againſt him as
'unjuſt.'

This, I think, is very honourable to the Chriſtian emperors of that time. It hence appears that Oribaſius reached to a good old age. If Eunapius wrote at about the year of Chriſt 400....it was now more than forty years ſince Oribaſius went with Julian into Gaul in the character of his phyſician. And Oribaſius and his family lived very comfortably; if he met with ſome difficulties, as Eunapius intimates, they could not be of any long duration; and the reſt of his life, in particular the latter part of it, was eaſy and proſperous.

Oribaſius, as [q] Philoſtorgius ſays, attended Julian in his Perſian expedition. And it has been obſerved by ſome that he was not able to cure the emperor. But that is no reflection upon his ſkill, as Julian's wound was mortal. He likewiſe attended [r] Chryſanthius in his laſt ſickneſs without healing him; but neither is that any juſt reflection upon him, ſince Chryſanthius was then of a great age; and under his indiſpoſitions he was relieved and comforted by the mollifying medicines preſcribed by Oribaſius.

There is ſtill extant [s] a letter of Julian to Oribaſius, ſuppoſed to have been written in 358. Tillemont ſays it [t] contains marks of their mutual confidence, and of their idolatrous ſentiments.

Eunapius gives no particular account of the works of Oribaſius. But Suidas, who, as well as Philoſtorgius ſays he was of Sardis, and calls him 'friend [u] of Julian the apoſtate,' mentions theſe following: 'Concerning the doubts and difficulties of phy-
'ſicians, in four books: to Julian the emperor, a work in ſeventy-

[q] Ιατρων μεντοιγε αριστος ο Λυδος Οριβασιος αυτω συνην, ο εκ Σαρδεων· αλλ' η πληγη πασαν χλευαζουσα θεραπειαν....απαλλαττει τον βιον. Philoſt. l. 7. p. 510. B.

[r] Eunap. p. 160. [s] Ep. xvii. p. 384.
[t] Tillem. Julien. art. 34. [u] Οριβασιος, Σαρδιανος, γνωριμος Ιουλιανου παραβατου. Suidas.

'two

'two books: An Epitome of them in nine books, to his ſon Euſtathius: Of [x] Royalty, and of the paſſions or maladies.'

Photius [y] has four articles of the works of Oribaſius. And in the introduction to his account of them he ſays: 'he had written 'four books, compriſing the art of medicine, and ſeven others 'of a like ſort.'

The firſt of the four was an abridgment of the works of Galen, in ſeveral books. The ſecond contained the ſentiments of other phyſicians, as well as Galen's, in ſeventy books, according to Photius, or ſeventy-two, as Suidas ſays. Theſe two works were inſcribed to Julian, and the prefaces or dedications are preſerved in Photius. In the preface to the ſecond, Oribaſius reminds Julian that [z] the former work had been compoſed at his command, when they were in Gaul, in the weſtern part of the empire. And the ſtyle of it is very particular, addreſſing Julian as a deity. Julian therefore was now ſole emperor, and he is expreſsly ſtyled emperor in this ſecond preface. The third work was an abridgment of the other two, and was inſcribed by Oribaſius to his ſon Euſtathius, in nine books. The fourth was another compendious repreſentation of the principles of medicine, in four books, inſcribed to Eunapius, at whoſe deſire alſo it was compoſed, whom he qualifies with the character of a man of great eloquence, probably meaning our Eunapius, writer of theſe lives of ſophiſts, and among them the life of Oribaſius himſelf.

I add no more. If any are deſirous of a farther account of the works of Oribaſius, and the merit of them ſeverally, and what parts of them are ſtill extant, they may conſult [a] others.

Some may be of opinion that this article is needleſs, and might have been omitted. Nevertheleſs, I think it to be of uſe for ſhewing the ſtate of Gentiliſm under Chriſtian emperors. Oribaſius was at firſt deſigned to be put by me in another place in this volume. But now I have brought him in here, in the chapter of Eunapius, who was his great admirer, and by whom we are informed of ſome things concerning him, which cannot be met with elſewhere.

I make here no more extracts from this work of Eunapius. But he will be quoted again hereafter.

IV. We may now make ſome general obſervations upon theſe extracts.

[x] .... και περι βασιλειας, και περι παθων.

[y] Cod. ccxvi. ccxvii. ccxviii. ccxix. p. 556....565.

[z] Τας προσαχθεισας επιτομας παρα της σης θειοτητος, Αυτοκρατορ Ιουλιανε, προτερον, ηνικα διετριβομεν εν Γαλατια τη προς εσπεραν, εις τελος ηγαγον. κ.λ. Phot. Cod. 217. p. 557.

[a] See Tillemont. L'Emp. Julien. art. 34, and the Univerſal Ancient Hiſtory. vol. xvi. p. 374. &c.

1. We

1. We have ſeen many proofs of great zeal for Gentiliſm in divers perſons.

2. Though the majority of the people of the Roman empire were now Chriſtians, and the laws were favourable to them, and adverſe to the Gentiles, yet theſe laſt enjoyed many privileges, and a great deal of liberty. We ſee many evidences of this. The writer of this work openly profeſſeth great zeal for Gentiliſm, and expreſſeth himſelf with great freedom concerning things and perſons. Here is mention made of divers men of diſtinction who were zealous Gentiles, and were in ſome of the higheſt offices of the empire. Anatolius, præfect of Illyricum; Juſtus, preſident of Aſia; Hilarius, alſo governor of a province. Anatolius, and theſe other great men here mentioned, ſacrificed and performed all the peculiar rites of Gentiliſm in the preſence of many others. And the chairs of rhetoric and philoſophy at Athens were filled chiefly with profeſſors who were zealous for Gentiliſm.

3. Doubtleſs my readers have alſo obſerved the indignation with which Eunapius ſpeaks of the monks: and it is a juſt indignation: they were too numerous: they were in too much credit, and had too much influence, and heaped up riches beyond meaſure. Eunapius is likewiſe offended at the reſpect given to Chriſtian martyrs; and we may well allow that it was exceſſive and unreaſonable: and we may wiſh that the remonſtrances made againſt it by learned Gentiles, and ſome learned and diſcerning Chriſtians, had prevailed to check and control it. But popular things will have their courſe, as was obſerved by us [b] long ago in the hiſtory of Gregory of Neocæſarea, called Thaumaturgus. We ſee proofs of it in every age.

CHAP. LIV.

CLAUDIUS CLAUDIANUS; or CLAUDIAN.

I. *His time and works.* II. *His teſtimony to Theodoſius's victory over Arbogaſtes and Eugenius in the year* 394.

I. Claudian has been already quoted as bearing witneſs to the wonderful deliverance of Marcus Antoninus and his army in [a]

[b] See vol. iii. p. 54. [a] See Vol. vii. p. 451.

Germany.

Germany. He is now to be quoted again upon another like occaſion. And he may be quoted again hereafter.

Accounts of him, and his works, may be ſeen in ſeveral [b] authors. I refer particularly to [c] Tillemont, and our writers of Ancient Univerſal [d] Hiſtory.

Says Suidas: 'Claudian [e] of Alexandria, a late heroic poet: 'He flouriſhed in the times of the emperors Arcadius and Ho-'norius.'

In Blount's Cenſura Auctorum he is placed at the year 385: by Cave at the year 395, in the conſulſhip of Olybrius and Probinus, which he celebrated in an excellent poem, and was his firſt Latin poem. I place him in 396, becauſe I ſhall largely quote his panegyric upon the third conſulſhip of Honorius, written in that year.

It appears to me ſomewhat extraordinary that a native of Egypt, at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, ſhould ſo excel in Latin verſe as to approach the beſt writers of the Auguſtan age in purity and elegance.

As Oroſius calls Claudian 'an obſtinate pagan,' Cave [f] thought it might be reaſonably argued that he had written againſt the Chriſtian religion, though there are no traces of it in any of his writings now extant. Fabricius [g] ſays that the words of Oroſius afford no ground for ſuch an apprehenſion. But I preſume that Cave did not intend to ſay that ſuch a concluſion could be certainly made. However, it may be reckoned ſomewhat remarkable that a learned man, a devout worſhipper of all the gods, a wit, and a poet, and author of many works, ſhould never ſay any thing diſreſpectful to Chriſtianity. Nevertheleſs nothing of that kind has been obſerved in his writings that I know of. Undoubtedly the Chriſtian poems, which have been aſcribed to him, are ſpurious.

It might have been worth the while, and would have been very proper, for me to give ſome account of an eminent heathen poet, who flouriſhed under Chriſtian emperors in the fourth and fifth centuries, though there had been nothing in him relating to Chriſtian affairs. But there is ſomething of that kind well de-

[b] See the Life of Claudian, and the teſtimonies to him, prefixed to the edition of his works in Uſum Delphini. Pope Blount's Cenſura Auctorum. p. 185. Cave H. L. Tom. i. p. 348. Fabric. Bib. Lat. l. 3. cap. 13. p. 624. &c. Tom. i. p. 148, &c. Tom. 3. Rollin. Hiſt. ancienne, p. 172. T. xii. [c] Tillem. L'Emp. Honoré. art. 66. [d] Vol. xvi. p. 533, 534.

[e] Κλαυδιανος, Αλεξανδρευς, επικος νεωτερος· γεγονεν επι των χρονων Αρκαδιου και Ονωριου βασιλεων. [f] Immo 'paganum 'pervicaciſſimum' vocat Oroſius. Unde jure quis inferre poſſit, ipſum ſcriptis editis fidem Chriſtianam oppugnaſſe, etiamſi in iis quæ ſuperſunt, nulla veſtigia deprehenduntur. Cav. p. 348. [g] Sed argumentum hoc ab Oroſii verbis petitum levius videtur, quam ut eo facile duci ſe quis patiatur. Bib. Lat. T. i, p. 624.

ſerving

ſerving of our notice. It was occaſioned by ſome remarkable events which muſt be firſt related from Chriſtian authors.

II. Valentinian the ſecond died in the year[h] 392, on the fifteenth day of May, when he was ſomewhat more than twenty years old, after having borne the title of Auguſtus ſixteen years, and almoſt ſix months; though he cannot be ſaid to have reigned till after the death of Gratian, that is, eight years and nine months.

Arbogaſtes, a general of great authority and influence, having been provoked by ſome treatment received from Valentinian, was the author, or at leaſt the occaſion, of his death. For the manner of his death is differently related. It happened near Vienne in Gaul.

Arbogaſtes might have ſet up himſelf for ſovereign: but being deſirous, as is ſuppoſed, to avoid the reproach of the crime which he had been guilty of, he gave that title to Eugenius. 'Who,' as[i] Socrates ſays, 'was originally a grammarian, who 'had taught Latin with reputation; but[k] leaving that employ-'ment, he obtained a military poſt in the palace, and was made 'maſter of the deſks to the emperor. After the death of the em-'peror [Valentinian] he aſſumed the ſupreme government of 'affairs in the weſtern part of the empire. The emperor Theo-'doſius, hearing of theſe things, was greatly diſturbed in mind. 'Collecting his forces therefore, and having appointed his ſon 'Honorius Auguſtus, when himſelf was the third time conſul, 'together with Abundantius, [in the year 393] on the tenth day 'of the month of January, he ſet out in great haſte for the weſ-'tern parts, leaving both his ſons at Conſtantinople. As he 'marched along to the war againſt Eugenius, many barbarians, 'living beyond the Danube, joined him in this expedition, vo-'luntarily offering their aſſiſtance againſt the tyrant. In no long 'ſpace of time he arrived in Gaul with a numerous army; for 'there the tyrant had put himſelf in a poſture of receiving him 'with great force. They came to an engagement near the river 'Frigidus, at the diſtance of ſix and thirty miles from Aquileia. 'In that part of the army, where Romans were engaged with 'Romans, the battle was doubtful. Where the barbarians, the 'emperor's auxiliaries, engaged, Eugenius's forces had much the 'better. When the emperor ſaw the ſlaughter made of the bar-'barians, he was in great concern; and, caſting himſelf upon the

[h] Vide Pagi. ann. 392. num. iii. iv. Tillem. L'Emp. Theodoſe. i. art. lxix. et Conf. Baſnag. ann. 392. iii. et iv. [i] Socrat. H. E. l. 5. cap. 25. [k] .... αφιςται παιδευτηρια, εν τοις βασιλειοις εγραμματευετο, και αντιγραφευς του βασιλεως καθιςαται. κ. λ. Ib. p. 293. D.

'ground, he called upon God to afford him all his aid. Nor 'was his prayer rejected. For Bacurius, præfect of the prætori-'um, was greatly encouraged; and, hastening with his van-guard 'to the place where the barbarians were hard pressed, he broke 'through the enemies ranks, and put to flight those who before 'were pursuing. At[l] the same time happened somewhat de-'serving admiration: a vehement wind arose on a sudden, 'which beat back upon themselves the darts thrown by those 'with Eugenius, and also carried with redoubled force upon the 'enemy those thrown by the soldiers of Theodosius. So preva-'lent was the emperor's prayer! Thus the battle was turned, and 'the tyrant threw himself at the emperor's feet, requesting that 'his life might be spared. But the soldiers beheaded him as he 'lay prostrate on the ground. These things happened on the 'sixth day of the month of September, in the third consulship 'of Arcadius, and the second consulship of Honorius. Arbo-'gastes, who had been the cause of all these troubles, on the 'third day after the battle, finding there were no hopes of safety, 'ran himself through with his own sword.'

I have taken Socrates's account, and have translated it very literally. Rufinus, who was contemporary with the event, and from whom Socrates differs very little, says, that 'when[m] the 'emperor saw the barbarians, his auxiliaries, turning back, stand-'ing upon an eminence where he might see and be seen by both 'armies, laying aside his weapons, he betook himself to his 'wonted resource, and falling down upon the ground, and lift-'ing up his eyes to heaven, he said: "O Almighty God, thou "knowest that in the name of thy Son Jesus Christ, I have un-"dertaken this war, in the way of just vengeance, as it has ap-"peared to me. And if it be not so, let thy vengeance fall upon

[l] Επιγινεται δε και αλλο θαυματος αξιον· ανεμος γαρ σφοδρως επιπνευσας, τα πεμπομενα βελη παρα των Ευγενιου, κατ' αυτων περιετρεπεν· ου μην αλλα και των αντιπαλων, μετα σφοδροτερας της ορμης εφερε κατ' αυτων. Τοσουτον ισχυσεν η του βασιλεος ευχε. Socrat. ibid. p. 294. D.

[m] Stetit aliquamdiu anceps victoria: fundebantur auxilia Barbarorum, terga jam hostibus dabant....Tum ille, ut conversas suorum acies vidit, stans in edita rupe, unde et conspicere et conspici ab utroque posset exercitu, projectis armis, ad solita se convertit auxilia, et prostratus in conspectu Dei: Tu, inquit, omnipotens Deus, hosti, quia in nomine Christi filii tui ultiones justæ, ut puto prælia ista suscepi: si secus, in me vindica. Si vero cum caussa probabili, et in te confisus, huc veni, porrige dextram tuam, ne forte dicant Gentes, ubi est Deus eorum? Quam supplicationem pii principes, certi a Deo esse susceptam, hi qui aderant duces, animantur ad cœdem....Etenim compertum est, quod post illam Imperatoris precem, quam Deo fuderat, ventus ita vehemens exortus est, ut tela hostium in eos qui jecerant, retorqueret. Cumque magna vi persistente vento, omne jaculum missum ab hostibus frustraretur, fracto adversariorum animo, seu potius divinitus repulso, Arbogasto duce nequicquam fortiter faciente, Eugenius ante Theodosii pedes, vinctis post terga manibus, adducitur. Ibique vitæ ejus et certaminis finis fuit. Rufin. H. E. l. 2. cap. 33.

"me:

" me: but if upon good ground, and truſting in thy bleſſing, I " came hither, do thou graciouſly afford thy aſſiſtance, that the " Gentiles may not ſay, Where is their God?" After which, all ' his generals were greatly animated, and eſpecially Bacurius, ' [who is here much commended] who fought with great ' courage, and gained great advantages. At the ſame time ' there aroſe a vehement wind which beat back the enemies ' darts upon themſelves, and rendered them vain and fuitleſs. ' Thus the enemies were diſcouraged, and Arbogaſtes, though ' he fought valiantly, was defeated; and Eugenius was brought ' bound to the emperor, and there was an end put to his life ' and deſigns.'

Auguſtine alſo has particularly related this event, and it's circumſtances, in his work of the City of God, and ſays, he [n] had the account from ſome of the ſoldiers, who were preſent in the battle, and fought on the ſide of the enemy.

Oroſius, [o] though an hiſtorian, has deſcribed the ſtorm very oratorically. He alſo ſays that it was atteſted by many witneſſes ſtill living.

There are ſome fabulous ſtories, relating to this event, in [p] Sozomen, and [q] Theodoret, which are taken notice of by [r] Baſnage, and are rejected and expoſed by him as becomes a good critic, and a genuine Chriſtian and proteſtant.

I need not mention them. But that there was then a vehement ſtorm of wind, which was favourable to Theodoſius and his army, and adverſe to the enemy, is atteſted by Claudian, in his panegyric upon the third conſulſhip of Honorius, in the year 396, written about eighteen months afterwards. I ſhall give, as well as I can, a literal tranſlation in proſe, of what is elegantly expreſſed in verſe.

[n] ...eoque, [Valentiniano] ſive per inſidias, ſive quo alio pacto, vel caſu, proxime exſtincto, alium tyrannum Eugenium, qui in illius imperatoris locum non legitime fuerat ſubrogatus, accepto rurſus prophetico reſponſo, fide certa oppreſſit, [Theodoſius,] contra cujus robuſtiſſimum exercitum magis orando, quam feriendo, pugnavit. Milites nobis qui aderant, retulerunt, extorta ſibi eſſe de manibus quæcunque jaculabantur, cum a Theodoſii partibus in adverſarios vehemens ventus iret, et non ſolum quæcunque in eos jaciebantur, concitatiſſime raperet, verum etiam in eorum corpora retorqueret. Aug. De civ. Dei. l. v. cap. 26.

[o] Hiſtoriam notam etiam oculis plurimorum, quam melius qui ſpectavere noverunt, diſſeri verbis non opus eſt....At ubi ad contigua miſcendæ pugnæ ſpatia perventum eſt, continuo magnus ille et ineffabilis turbo ventorum in ora hoſtium ruit. Ferebantur per aëra ſpicula miſſa noſtrorum manu, atque ultra menſuram humani jactus per magnum inane portata, nuſquam propemodum cadere, priuſquam impingerent, ſinebantur. Porro autem turbo continuus ora pectoraque hoſtium nunc illiſis ſcutis everberabat, nunc impreſſis pertinaciter obſtructa claudebat, nunc avulſis violenter deſtituta nudabat, nunc oppoſitis jugitur in terga trudebat. Tela etiam, quæ ipſi vehementer intorſerant, excepta ventis impetu ſupinata, ac retrorſum coacta ipſos infeliciter configebant. Oroſ. l. 7. c. 35. [p] Soz. l. 7. cap. 24. [q] Theod. l. 5. c. 24.

[r] Baſnag. ann. 394. num. v.

'Such [s] is your good fortune that the victory was ſpeedily ac-
'compliſhed. Both fought: you by your deſtiny, your father
'in perſon. For your ſake even the Alps are eaſy to be ſeized.
'Nor was it of any advantage to a ſubtle enemy to be poſted in
'a fortified place. The walls, in which he confides, fall down,
'and rocks are removed, and ſet open their hiding places. For
'your ſake Boreas overwhelms the adverſe forces, with cold tor-
'rents poured down from the mountains, and caſts back their
'darts upon thoſe who throw them, and blunts their ſpears. O
'[Honorius] highly favoured of God, for whoſe ſake Æolus
'ſends out from his caverns ſtormy winds; for whom heaven
'itſelf fights, and the winds conſpire to come at the call of your
'trumpet. The ſnowy Alps are ſtained red, and the river Fri-
'gidus foams with diſcoloured ſtreams; and would be ſtopped
'with the heaps of the ſlain, if the rapid blood did not
'ſtrengthen the current.'

Here is every thing that can be deſired to confirm the Chriſtian accounts of the ſtorm, which favoured the army of Theodoſius: 'nothing to be complained of, but that he flatters Ho-
'norius, and aſcribes to the fate of the ſon, who was yet but an in-
'fant, ten or eleven years old, what was due to the ſole faith and
'piety of the father:'—which is Tillemont's [t] obſervation.

This teſtimony of Claudian is alleged by Oroſius and Auguſtine in their accounts of this event. And do we not think that the Chriſtian writers of that time, and eſpecially ſuch of them as were engaged in the defence of the Chriſtian religion againſt Gentiles, endeavoured to make an advantage of the remarkable victory which Theodoſius gained over thoſe enemies? Yes, certainly they did. Oroſius harangues and triumphs in this man-

[s] .... Victoria velox
Auſpiciis effecta tuis. Pugnaſtis uterque:
Tu fatis, genitorque manu. Te propter et Alpes
Invadi faciles. Cauto nec profuit hoſti
Munitis hæſiſſe locis. Spes irrita valli
Concidit, et ſcopulis patuerunt clauſtra revulſis.
Te propter gelidis Aquilo de monte procellis
Obruit adverſas acies, revolutaque tela
Vertit in auctores, et turbine reppulit haſtas.
O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris
Æolus armatas hyemes: cui militat æther:
Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti!
Alpinæ rubuere nives, et Frigidus amnis
Mutatis fumavit aquis, turbâque cadentum
Staret, ni rapidus juviſſet flumina ſanguis.
Claudian. de tertio Conſulatu Honorii Auguſti Panegyris. ver. 87...101.

[t] L'Emp. Theodoſ. i. art. 80. at the end.

ner:

ner: 'I [u] would not inſult thoſe who revile us. But may I not 'aſk, if ſince the foundation of the city they can allege one war 'ſo juſtly undertaken, ſo happily concluded by divine interpo-'ſition, and quieted with ſo merciful benignity; where neither 'the battle was grievous for ſlaughter, nor the victory followed 'with cruel revenge? And then perhaps I may allow that theſe 'advantages were not the reward of the faith of the Chriſtian 'prince. Although indeed I need not labour this point, ſince 'one of themſelves, an excellent poet, though obſtinate pagan, 'has borne teſtimony to God and man in theſe lines:

'O beloved of God, for you the heavens fight: and the 'winds conſpire to come at the call of your trumpet!'

'Thus was the cauſe decided by heaven in favour of that ſide, 'which without human aid humbly truſted in God alone againſt 'that ſide, which arrogantly boaſted of their own ſtrength, and 'their idols. Soon after which Theodoſius, having ſettled the 'public tranquillity, went to Milan, where he died.'

Auguſtine, likewiſe, having mentioned the vehement ſtorm, and the circumſtances of it, ſo favourable to Theodoſius, adds: 'Hence [x] alſo the poet Claudian, though alien from the name 'of Chriſt, celebrates his praiſes, ſaying: "O beloved of God, "for whoſe ſake Æolus ſends out from his caverns ſtormy "winds, for whom heaven fights, and the winds conſpire to "come at the call of your trumpet:" thus quoting ſomewhat more of Claudian than we find in Oroſius.

Whether the victory of Theodoſius was miraculous, as [y] ſome

[u] Non inſulto obtrectatoribus noſtris. Unum aliquod ab initio Urbis conditæ bellum proferant, tam pia neceſſitate ſuſceptum, tam divina felicitate confectum, tam clementi benignitate ſopitum: ubi nec pugna gravem cædem, nec victoria cruentam exegerit ultionem: et fortaſſe concedam, ut non hæc fidei Chriſtiani ducis conceſſa videantur: quamvis ego hoc teſtimonio non laborem, quando unus ex ipſis, poëta quidem eximius, ſed Paganus pervicaciſſimus hujuſmodi verſibus et Deo, et homini teſtimonium tulit, quibus ait:

O nimium dilecte Deo! tibi militat Æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti.

Ita cœlitus judicatum eſt inter partem, etiam ſine præſidio hominum de ſolo Deo humiliter ſperantem, et partem arrogantiſſime de viribus ſuis, et de idolis præſumentem. Theodoſius autem, compoſita tranquillitate Reipublicæ, apud Mediolanum conſtitutus diem obiit. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 35. [x] Unde et poeta Claudianus, quamvis a nomine Chriſti alienus, in ejus tamen laudibus dixit;

O nimium dilecte Deo! cui fundit ab antris
Æolus armatas hyemes, cui militat æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti! Aug. De Civ. Dei. l. 5. c. 26.

[y] Claudien meſme, qui ſe rendoit alors celebre par ſes poeſies, quoiqu'il fuſt payen, et tres fortement attaché à l'idolatrie, n'a peu s'empeſcher de rendre temoignage à la verité de ce miracle, par de tres beaux vers, qu'il fit 18 mois apres. Tillem. L'Emp. Theodoſ. i. art. 80. à la fin. And ſee Colonia. Tom. i. ch. v. p. 157.

think, or not, it was a remarkable event, and very ſeaſonable and advantageous to the Chriſtian cauſe. And this teſtimony of Claudian well deſerves our notice.

CHAP. LV.

MACROBIUS.

I. *His name, works, time, dignity.* II. *His religious profeſſion and character.* III. *His teſtimony to Herod's ſlaughter of the infants at Bethlehem.*

I. AURELIUS THEODOSIUS AMBROSIUS MACROBIUS is an author well known by name, and by ſome works which are generally aſcribed to him. Nevertheleſs the place of his nativity, his religious profeſſion, and his time, are either unknown, or at leaſt doubtful and uncertain. Even his names are written differently. Macrobius is generally put laſt, but there is a variety in the order in which the others are placed.

He writes in Latin, but what was his native place is unknown; for himſelf ſays he [a] was born in a country where the Latin tongue was not in uſe.

The works aſcribed to him [b] are a Commentary upon the dream of Scipio, as repreſented by Cicero, in two books: The Saturnalia, in ſeven books, and a grammatical treatiſe concerning the Differences and Agreements between the Greek and Latin languages.

At the head of his works he is qualified [c] with the title of Illuſtrious, which is proper to ſuch as were advanced to ſome of the higheſt poſts of the empire. Concerning which [d] ſeveral learned men may be conſulted. But it is generally ſuppoſed that he was vicar of Spain in 399 and 400, proconſul of Africa in 410, and grand chamberlain to Theodoſius the ſecond in 422.

[a] .... oratio ſollertior, ſermo incorruptior: niſi ſicubi nos ſub alio ortos cœlo Latinæ linguæ vena non adjuvet. Quod ab his, ſi tamen quibuſdam forte nonnumquam tenuous voluntaſque erit iſta cognoſcere, petitum impetratumque volumus, ut æqui bonique conſulant, ſi in noſtro ſermone nativa Romani oris elegantia deſideretur, Saturn. lib. i. in Pr. [b] Commentarius ex Cicerone in Somnium Scipionis. Convivia Saturnalia. De Differentiis et Societatibus Græci Latinique Verbi.

[c] V. Cl. et Illuſtris. [d] Vid. Gothofredi Proſop. Cod. Theodoſ. p. 370. and Tillemont L'Emp. Honoré. art 68. at the beginning.

Tillemont

Tillemont [e] ſays it may be well queſtioned whether Theodoſius the ſecond would have a pagan for grand chamberlain, that is, for him who was neareſt his perſon. However, upon the whole, Tillemont [f] thinks that 'Macrobius lived under Theo-'doſius the firſt, or rather a ſhort time after him: for he acknow-'ledgeth that [g] he had put ſome perſons into his Dialogues, who 'were lower in time than Prætextatus.' Let this ſuffice for his time [h].

II. As for his religious profeſſion, ſome [i] have ſuppoſed him to have been a Chriſtian, others a heathen, whilſt others have doubted and been in ſuſpence. Tillemont is very clear. He [k] ſays, 'every thing in the Saturnalia [l] is pagan. Symmachus, 'Flavianus, Prætextatus, who appear in every part, were the 'moſt zealous patrons of paganiſm: ſo that there can be no 'doubt that the author, and all thoſe whom he makes ſpeak, were 'of the ſame profeſſion. Among them, beſide thoſe already 'mentioned, may be reckoned Poſtumian, a celebrated advo-'cate, Euſebius, profeſſor of rhetorick, who was very learned 'in Greek and Latin, and Servius the grammarian.'

But no one has treated this point more fully than [m] Mr. Maſſon, he having had a particular occaſion for it. To him therefore I refer my readers if they have any doubts about it: there, as I apprehend, they will find more than enough to ſatisfy them that Macrobius was a ſincere Gentile.

III. I formerly [n] quoted this author. Having alleged divers Chriſtian writers who have borne teſtimony to the truth of St. Matthew's hiſtory, in the ſecond chapter of his goſpel, concerning the ſlaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, I added:

'There [o] is alſo a noted paſſage of Macrobius a heathen au-'thor, who flouriſhed near the end of the fourth century, who 'among other jeſts of Auguſtus has this: When [p] he had heard

[e] As above, at p. 1381. [f] Ibid. p. 1382. [g] Nec mihi fraudi ſit, ſi uni aut alteri ex his, quos cœtus coëgit, matura ætas poſterior ſeculo Prætextati ſit. Macrob. Saturn. l. i. cap. 1.

[h] There is a large account of Macrobius and his work, in the xvith vol. of the Ancient Univerſal Hiſtory. p. 536, 537.

[i] Non minus incerta res de religione Macrobii. Chriſtianis eum annumerat Barthius. Contra homo Ethnicus dicitur Spanhemio. Dub. Evang. T. i. p. 533. Cui ego aſſentiri malim. Ambigui hærent Grotius ad Matt. ii. 16. et Huet. Dem. Evang. p. 789. Fabr. Bib. Lat. lib. 3. cap. xii. Tom. i. p. 620.

[k] As before, p. 1382, 1383.

[l] Saturn. l. i. c. 2, 3. [m] The Slaughter of the Children in Bethlehem, as an hiſtorical fact in St. Matthew's Goſpel vindicated: and the ſuſpected Chriſtianity of Macrobius, who alſo mentions the ſame fact, diſproved, &c. At the end of the biſhop of Coventry and Litchfield's Vindication of Chriſtianity; in 1728.

[n] Vol. 1. p. 336. [o] Ibid. p. 336.... 338. [p] Cum audiſſet inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes Rex Judæorum intra bimatum juſſit interfici, filium quoque ejus occiſum, ait: 'Melius eſt Hero-'dis porcum eſſe quam filium.' Macrob. Sat. l. 2. cap. iv. p. 332.

'that among the children within two years of age, which He-
'rod king of the Jews commanded to be ſlain in Syria, his own
'ſon had been killed, he ſaid: "It is better to be Herod's hog
"than his ſon."

Upon which I then ſaid: 'I lay little or no ſtreſs upon this
'paſſage, becauſe it comes too late; partly becauſe there is rea-
'ſon to ſuppoſe that Macrobius has been miſtaken about the oc-
'caſion of the jeſt. No early Chriſtian writers have ſaid any
'thing of Herod's having a young child of his own killed in the
'ſlaughter at Bethlehem. If Auguſtus did paſs this jeſt upon
'Herod, it might be occaſioned by the death of Antipater, or
'rather of Alexander and [pp] Ariſtobulus.'

'That [q] is what I ſaid of this paſſage in the firſt edition. I
'would now add: It ought to be allowed that Auguſtus did paſs
'this jeſt on Herod upon ſome occaſion or other; and that Ma-
'crobius has given us the words of the jeſt. This paſſage alſo
'ſhews that Herod's ſlaughter of the infants in Judea was a thing
'well known in the time of Macrobius, and was not conteſted by
'heathen people.'

'If we could be aſſured that Macrobius tranſcribed this whole
'paſſage, not only the jeſt itſelf, but the occaſion of it likewiſe,
'from ſome more ancient author, it would be a proof that this
'event was known in that author's time alſo: and we ſhould
'have a great deal of reaſon to ſuppoſe that author to have been
'a heathen, becauſe it is likely that Macrobius, a bigoted hea-
'then himſelf, [r] did not much deal in Chriſtian writers.'

'But it is poſſible that Macrobius found only the jeſt in his
'author, and added the occaſion, having collected it from the
'common diſcourſe of the Chriſtians in his time, who frequently
'ſpoke of this cruel action of Herod. There is ſome reaſon to
'ſuſpect this, becauſe it is very likely that Auguſtus's reflection
'upon Herod was ocaſioned by the death of one of thoſe ſons
'whom Joſephus has mentioned; and that it has no relation at
'all to the ſlaughter of the infants at Bethlehem. This ſuſpi-
'cion may be farther ſtrengthened by the great agreement of
'Macrobius with St. Matthew, in the words which he uſeth
'concerning the [s] children. Macrobius being ignorant of He-
'rod's ſtory, and having heard of the ſlaughter of the infants;
'when he met with this jeſt in ſome author, concluded, that

[pp] See Dr. Whitby's Annotations upon Matt. ii. 16, 17.

[q] Vol. i. p. 337.

[r] 'This is very evident from his works. 'And the reader may ſee a full proof of it 'in the Rev. Mr. Maſſon's ſlaughter of 'the children at Bethlehem, as an hiſtori-'cal fact, vindicated. ſect. 3.'

[s] 'Children within two years of age, 'which Herod king of the Jews command-'ed to be ſlain. So in Macrobius.'

'there

'there had been ſome young child of Herod put to death with 'them.'

'I am content therefore to leave it a doubtful point, whether 'Macrobius tranſcribed this whole paſſage, or the jeſt only, from 'ſome more ancient author.'

'Upon the whole then, there lies no objection againſt this 'relation of St. Matthew. There is nothing improbable in the 'thing itſelf, conſidering the jealous cruel temper of Herod. 'The ſilence of Joſephus, or of the ancient Greek and Roman 'hiſtorians, can be no difficulty with any reaſonable perſon. 'This fact is confirmed by the expreſs teſtimony of very early 'Chriſtian writers, and by Macrobius, a heathen author about 'the end of the fourth century; from whom it appears that this 'event was not then conteſted, and that it was even better 'known than the fate of thoſe ſons of Herod, whom Joſephus 'ſays he put to death at man's eſtate.'

All this I wrote formerly. Nor am I now able to ſay any thing more pertinent, or more material.

However, I ſhall obſerve that this jeſt of Auguſtus ſtands in a chapter of Macrobius, which [t] contains a collection of Auguſtus's witty ſayings or jeſts upon others, and the repartees or ſmart ſayings of others upon him; which, as it ſeems, to his no ſmall honour, he bore very [u] patiently. As they are all independent on each other; no elucidations can be brought in from the connexion; for there is none.

Pontanus, in his notes upon this place, ſays, 'Scaliger [x] won-'dered that Auguſtus ſhould make this reflection upon Herod, 'ſince Auguſtus himſelf had confirmed the ſentence of death 'upon the three ſons of Herod.'

I do not find that place in Scaliger. But whoever wondered at it, it was without reaſon in my opinion. For though Auguſtus complied with the requeſts or propoſals of Herod, and gave him leave to do with thoſe ſons as he pleaſed, the emperor might ſtill think it a ſtrange thing that any prince ſhould put ſo many of his own ſons to death; and he might well ſay, alluding to the Jewiſh cuſtom of forbearing to eat ſwine's fleſh, 'it was better to 'be Herod's hog than his ſon.' Very probably that was the oc-

[t] De jocis Auguſti in alios, et aliorum rurſus in ipſum. Saturn. l. 2. cap. iv.

[u] Soleo in Auguſto magis mirari quos pertulit jocos, quam ipſe quos protulit, quia major eſt patientiæ quam facundiæ laus: maxime cum æquanimiter aliqua etiam jocis mordaciora pertulerit. Sat. l. 2. cap. 4. p. 335.

[x] Miratur autem Scaliger ad Euſebium. p. 163. Hæc verba excidiſſe, cum ipſe Auguſtus ſententiam capitis in tres filios Herodis judicio ſuo probatam confirmaverit. Pont. in loc.

'caſion

caſion of the jeſt of Auguſtus. And therefore, as Whitby ſays: 'It muſt be confeſſed that Macrobius is miſtaken about the cir. 'cumſtances of this ſtory.'

CHAP. LVI.

RUTILIUS.

His time, and character, and work, and extracts from him.

I. CLAUDIUS RUTILIUS NUMATIANUS, [a] whoſe father had borne ſeveral high offices in the Roman empire with great applauſe and acceptance, was a native of Gaul. He had himſelf been præfect of the city, and maſter of the palace; and, as ſome ſay, conſul and præfect of the prætorium, which I do not think to be certain. In the year 418, in the time of Theodoſius the younger, he made a viſit to his native country, or returned to it, with a deſign to reſide there. He has deſcribed his voyage thither from Rome in an elegant Latin poem, conſiſting of two books, the ſecond of which is almoſt entirely loſt.

II. In his voyage he touched at Capraria, a ſmall iſland lying between Leghorn and Corſica. 'This [b] iſland,' ſays he, 'is 'full of men that ſhun the light. They call themſelves monks, 'a name borrowed from the Greek language, becauſe they chuſe 'to live alone. They dread the gifts of fortune, becauſe they 'are not able to bear her frowns: and make themſelves miſera- 'ble becauſe they are afraid of being ſo. What fooliſh diſtrac- 'tion

[a] Vid. Voſſ. de Hiſt. lat. l. 2. cap. 15. Tillem. L'Emp. Honorè. art. 67. Fabric. Bib. Lat. l. 3. cap 13. Tom. i. p. 630.

[b] Proceſſu pelagi jam ſe Capraria tollit.
Squallet lucifugis inſula plene viris.
Ipſi ſe monachos Grajo cognomine dicunt,
Quod ſoli nullo vivere teſte volunt.
Munera Fortunæ metuunt, dum damna verentur.
Quiſquam eſt ſponte miſer, ne miſer eſſe queat.
Quænam perverſi rabies tam ſtulta cerebri?
Dum mala formides, nec bona poſſe pati.
Sive ſuas repetunt ex fato ergaſtula pœnas,
Triſtia ſeu nigro viſcera felle tument.
Sic nimiæ biliis morbum aſſignavit Homerus
Bellerophonteis ſollicitudinibus.
Nam juveni offenſo ſævi poſt tela doloris
Dicitur humanum diſplicuiſſe genus.
Rutilii Itinerarium, lib. i. ver. 439....452.

'tion

tion of mind—to dread adverſity, and yet not be able to bear proſperity! He goes on to aſcribe their way of life to melancholy, ill-nature, and hatred of mankind.'

III. Soon after, at Gorgona, another ſmall iſland near Piſa, among the hermits there, he met with a young gentleman of his own acquaintance, whom he laments and banters in the following manner: 'And [c] here a Roman citizen has buried himſelf among the rocks alive. For the young man, once our friend, of noble parentage, and ample fortune, happy too in marriage, impelled by the furies, forſakes the ſociety of gods and men. The ſuperſtitious fool hides himſelf in a dark hole. The unhappy wretch believes the cœleſtial deities to be pleaſed with human miſery, and plagues himſelf worſe than the angry gods would do. What new miſchief do we ſee worſe than the ſorceries of Circe? She metamorphoſed the bodies of men into the ſhape of ſwine. This religion makes men brutes all over!'

IV. Hence it is apparent that hermitages, and monaſteries, which had their religion in the eaſt, were now got alſo into Europe. Other reflections I forbear, as obvious, and eaſy to be made by all who are diſpoſed to think.

V. Beſide theſe two paſſages, more directly relating to Chriſtian affairs, it may be obſerved that, at the port Faleria, when Rutilius went aſhore, he found the heathen people celebrating the feaſt of Oſiris. 'Here [d] he met with a Jew who had ſome authority

[c] Aſſurgit ponti medio circumflua Gorgon,
Inter Piſanum Cyrniacumque latus.
Adverſus ſcopulos, damni monumenta recentis
Perditus hic vivo funere civis erat.
Noſter enim nuper juvenis, majoribus amplis,
Nec cenſu inferior, conjugiove minor,
Impulſus furiis homines, divoſque reliquit,
Et turpem latebram credulus exul agit.
Infelix putat, illuvie cœleſtia paſci,
Seque premit læſis ſævior ipſe Deis.
Non, rogo, deterior Circæis ſecta venenis?
Tunc mutabantur corpora, nunc animi.
Ibib. ver. 515....526,

[d] Sed male penſavit requiem ſtationis amœnæ
Hoſpite conductor durior Antiphate.
Namque loci querulus curam Judæus agebat,
Humanis animal diſſociabile cibis.
Vexatos frutices, pulſatas imputat algas.
Damnaque libatæ grandia clamat aquæ.
Reddimus obſcœnæ convicia debita genti,
Quæ genitale caput propudioſa metit.
Radix ſtultitiæ, cui frigida ſabbata cordi:
Sed cor frigidius religione ſuâ eſt.
Septima quæque dies turpi damnata veterno,
Tanquam laſſati mollis imago Dei.

Cætera

'authority in the place: and he laments the conqueſt of Judea by 'Pompey and Titus, which had occaſioned the ſpreading of 'the Jewiſh ſuperſtition over the empire.'

I have thought this worth notice, becauſe, poſſibly, here is a reference to the increaſe of Chriſtianity, which was derived from Judaiſm, and certainly had ſpread farther in the Roman empire than Judaiſm itſelf. I therefore put the verſes in the margin. An exact tranſlation is not needful.

[d] However, at the year 418, the year of this voyage of Rutilius, Pagi [e] has ſome curious obſervations upon the laws of the empire at that time. He ſays that [f] the Jews were then of great account.

This author is in [g] Colonia.

CHAP. LVII.

OLYMPIODORUS.

His work, and time, and extracts from him.

1. I begin immediately with Photius's account of this [a] author. 'We read,' ſays [b] Photius, 'the two-and-twenty books of 'Olympiodorus. He begins his hiſtory at the ſecond conſulſhip 'of Honorius, emperor of Rome, and the ſecond of Theodoſius, 'and brings it down to the time that Valentinian, ſon of Placi- 'dia and Conſtantius, was declared emperor of Rome. This [c] 'writer was of Thebes in Ægypt, a chymiſt by employment, as 'he ſays himſelf, and as to religion a Greek. He dedicates his 'hiſtory to the emperor Theodoſius, ſon of Arcadius, and nephew 'to Honorius and Placidia.'

Cætera mendacis deliramenta cataſtæ,
Nec pueros omnes credere poſſe reor.
Atque utinam numquam Judæa ſubacta fuiſſet
Pompeii bellis, imperioque Titi.
Latius exciſæ peſtis contagia ſerpunt,
Victoreſque ſuos natio victa premit.
Ibid. ver. 381....398.

[c] ann. 418. num. lxx. [f] Judæorum magna ratio hoc adhuc tempore habita. Id. Ibid. [g] Tom. 2. chap. vi. p. 203. &c. [a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 468. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 5. T. 6. p. 237. &c. et lib. v. cap. 38. T. 9. p. 400. Tillem. H. E. Honoré. art. 66. Voſſ. de Hiſtor. Gr, l. 2. cap. 20. Univerſal Ancient Hiſtoire. vol. xvi. p. 532.

[b] Cod. 80. p. 178.

[c] Ουτος ο συγγραφευς Θηβαιος μεν εστιν, εκ των προς Αιγυπτον Θηβων το γενος· ποιητης, ως αυτος φησι, το επιτηδευμα, ελλην την θρησκειαν. Phot. p. 178. med.

Hereby

Hereby it appears that the hiſtory of Olympiodorus began at the year 407, and reached to the year 425, when Valentinian the third was declared emperor. The hiſtory was dedicated to Theodoſius the younger, who reigned from the year 408 to 450. As it reached to the reign of Valentinian, it muſt have been publiſhed between the year 425 and 450. I place him at the year 425, where he is placed by Cave.

Photius ſays the author's ſtyle is clear; nevertheleſs he paſſeth a cenſure upon his manner of writing. However Tillemont [d] ſays that, 'the extract, which Photius has preſerved, makes us 'regret that we have no more of him: for, certainly, he would 'clear up many things. Zoſimus [e] cites him by name, and ap-'pears to have borrowed ſeveral things from him, as well as So-'zomen.'

Cave [f] conſiders him as a very ſuperſtitious Gentile, and thinks he was partial in what he ſays of ſome Chriſtians. Nevertheleſs, if his hiſtory were now extant, I believe it would have been curious and entertaining. But the bigotry of ſome people who have deſtroyed works which they did not like, has deprived us of a great deal of pleaſure, as well as inſtruction, which we might have had.

2. I ſhall tranſcribe a few things out of the extracts of Photius, which are all we now have of this hiſtory.

Olympiodorus gives a brief account of one Conſtantine [g] a common ſoldier, who was proclaimed emperor by the Roman army in Britain out of reſpect to his name, in the reign of Honorius, A. D. 407, and was put to death in 411.

'Whilſt [h] theſe things were tranſacting,' ſays he, 'Conſtantius 'and Ulphilas are ſent by Honorius againſt Conſtantine: who 'coming to Arles, where Conſtantine then was with his ſon, laid 'ſiege to it. And [i] Conſtantine, taking refuge in a Church, was 'ordained preſbyter, his life having been promiſed to him with 'the ſecurity of an oath. The gates of the city were then open 'to the beſiegers; and Conſtantine, with his ſon, was ſent to 'Honorius. But the emperor not being able to forgive the treat-'ment of his couſins, † whom Conſtantine had killed contrary

[d] As before, Honoré, art. 66.

[e] Zoſ. l. 5. p. 803.

[f] In hac hiſtoria non modo ſuperſtitionum Gentilium ritus commendavit, ſed et in Chriſtianos clam invectus eſt, præcipue in Olympium officiorum magiſtrum, quem ob pietatem vere Chriſtianam miris effert laudibus Auguſtinus, eumque ut ανσιεργον falſo non minus quam invidioſe traducit. Cav. ib. p. 468.

[g] Hujus loco Conſtantinus, ex infima militia, propter ſolam ſpem nominis, ſine merito virtutis eligitur, qui continuo ut invaſit imperium, in Gallias tranſiit. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 40. p. 576.

[h] Apud. Phot. ib. p. 184.

[i] Και Κωνσαντινος καταφυγων εις ευκτηριον, πρεσβυτερος τοτε χειροτονειται, ορκων αυτω υπερ σωτηριας δοθεντων. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 184. † He means Didymus and Verinianus. Vid. Sozom. l. 9. cap. 4. et 13. et Zoſim. l. 5. et 6.

'to

'to the oath that had been given, ordered them to be both put 'to death, when they were yet thirty miles off from Ravenna.'

3. I ſhall obſerve briefly another paſſage or two in the extracts of Photius.

'This writer,' ſays he, 'gives an account of a voyage he 'made to Athens, not without ſome danger.' He [k] ſays that by 'his intereſt Leontius was advanced to the ſophiſtic chair when he 'did not himſelf at all deſire it.' He likewiſe ſays that 'none, 'eſpecially ſtrangers, might wear the cloke without leave of the 'ſophiſts, and ſubmitting to the ceremonies of initiation.' Which are there tranſcribed, and are ridiculous enough.

Upon occaſion of this paſſage, Tillemont, and other learned men, refer to an oration of [l] Gregory Nazianzen, and obſerve that the ſame fooleries were ſtill practiſed at Athens, with regard to ſcholars newly arrived, which are deſcribed by Gregory in his time. I think we may alſo hence conclude that Gentiliſm ſtill prevailed very much at Athens, and that it was *not* reſtrained with much rigour and ſeverity by Chriſtian magiſtrates.

4. 'Once more, there is a ſtory told by this [m] writer, which 'he had heard from a man of great note, of three ſilver images 'found in the earth in Thrace. And when this treaſure was in- 'quired into, it was found that they had been hid by the people 'of the country in a conſecrated piece of ground, as a ſecurity 'againſt the incurſions of barbarians. The images lay with their 'faces toward the north, the country of the barbarians. And,' as he ſays, 'the removal of them was ſoon followed by the in- 'curſions of Goths, and afterwards of Hions.'

This ſtory is a proof of the writer's ſuperſtition and credulity: which, as I apprehend, were common diſpoſitions in heathen people of all ranks, high and low, learned and unlearned. Indeed, we have ſeen many proofs of it.

[k] Λεγει δε και εις τας Αθηνας καταχραι, και τη αυτου σπουδη και επιμελειᾳ και εις τον σοφιστικον θρονον αναχθηναι Λεοντιον υπ' αυτου θελοντα· Λεγει δε και περι του τριοδιτου, ως αν εξη κατα τας Αθηνας περιβαλεσθαι αυτου τινα....ω μη η των σοφιστων γνωμη επετρεπε ....κ. λ. Ib. p. 189. [l] Or. 20. p. 327.

[m] Ap. Phot. p. 188, 189.

CHAP.

CHAP. LVIII.

ZOSIMUS.

I. *His time and works.* II. *Extracts from his history.* III. *Concluding remarks upon the foregoing extracts.*

I. I shall likewise begin the history of this writer with the extracts of Photius.

'We [a] read,' says Photius, 'the history of Zosimus, count, 'and ex-advocate of the treasury, in six books. As to religion, 'he is impious, and often reviles the pious. His style is concise 'and perspicuous. He begins his history at the time of Augus-'tus, and runs through the several reigns to Diocletian, in a 'brief and hasty manner, mentioning little more than the suc-'cessions of the emperors. But after Diocletian he is more par-'ticular, writing their history in five books, whereas the first alone 'comprehends all the rest from Augustus to [b] Diocletian. And 'the sixth book concludes with Alarich's second siege of Rome.' Photius adds farther that, 'Zosimus [c] so nearly resembles Euna-'pius, that he may be said to have transcribed him, rather than 'to have written a new history, except that he is more concise, 'and does not rail at Stilicho; for the rest, his history is much 'the same. And they agree in reviling the pious emperors.'

So says Photius: but Zosimus has not mentioned Eunapius.

There needs little more to be said by way of a previous account of this writer. Cave [d] placeth him as flourishing about the year 425. And Euagrius says he [e] lived in the time of Honorius and Arcadius, and afterwards. As he quotes Olympiodorus he must have written after him, if that passage be genuine: and some learned men are of opinion that he plainly borrows some things from Olympiodorus, in the fifth and sixth books of his work. I shall place below [f] what Fabricius says concerning his time, not very disagreeably to what has been already observed.

Zosimus

[a] Ανεγνωσθη ιστορικοι λογοι εξ Ζωσιμου, κομητος απο φισκου ηηγορου· Εστι δε θρησκειαι αστοις, και πολλακις ες τους θειους υβριστα, κατα τα ευσεβη. κ. λ. Phot. Cod. 98. p. 269.

[b] In our present copies the latter part of the first book is wanting. Hodie postrema pars libri primi, ea nempe quæ a Proto usque ad Diocletianum, desideratur. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 6. p. 604.

[c] Ib. 271. m. [d] Hist. Lit. Tom. I. p. 468. [e] .... η και μετ' αυτους γεγοιμως· Euagr. l. 3. cap. 51. p. 312. A.

[f] Scriptitle videri possit non post Eunapium modo, sed Olympiodorum Thebanum quoque (adeoque post A. C. 425.) quem libro v. cap. 27. allegat, ubi de Ravenna urbe disserit, quamquam locus ille glossema videtur Lambecio,....Ea vero,

quæ

Zoſimus has been often blamed for his ſevere reflections upon Conſtantine and Theodoſius the firſt, and has been defended by others. He is manifeſtly an enemy to the Chriſtians; and, in point of his own religion, very ſuperſtitious and credulous. I think it beſt for me to tranſcribe from him a good part of what he ſays directly or indirectly of Chriſtians: and I ſhall alſo take in ſome of his remarkable ſtrokes in favour of Gentiliſm. Theſe things may entertain my readers, as I apprehend, without perverting any of them. Indeed I think this method neceſſary to ſet before my readers the ſtate of things in the Roman empire at that time, both with regard to Gentiliſm, and to Chriſtianity.

But before I proceed to make my extracts I ſhall put down here a part of what Voſſius ſays of this author, in his work concerning the Greek hiſtorians. 'Zoſimus, [g] count, and ex-advocate of the treaſury, lived in the time of the younger Theodoſius, as appears from Euagrius. He has left ſix books of hiſtory: the firſt of which runs through the emperors from Auguſtus to Diocleſian. In the other he relates more at large the Roman affairs to the ſecond ſiege of Rome by Alarich, and his appointing Attalus emperor, and then dethroning him again. It is probable that he went ſomewhat lower, as ſomething ſeems to be wanting at the end of what we have....The ſtyle of Zoſimus is conciſe, pure, and perſpicuous, as is obſerved by Photius in his Bibliotheque. But he was a pagan, and frequently blames Chriſtian princes: upon which account he has been cenſured by Photius, Euagrius, Nicephorus, and others. But Leunclavius is of opinion that, even in thoſe things, Zoſimus ought to be credited. For it is certain that Chriſtian princes were guilty of great faults, which a faithful hiſtorian ought not to conceal.'

quæ de Conſtantino Tyranno habet libro vi. et quæ de Alaricho ac Stilichone ſcribit libro quinto, cuncta fere ex Olympiodoro, mutuatum eſſe notat Henr. Valeſius ad Sozom. p. 170. Quoniam porro Olympiodorus Hiſtoriam ſuam uſque ad Valentiniani iii. ſive Placidi imperium produxit, quod cœpit A. C. 425. hinc conſtat, Zoſimum non ante id tempus Hiſtoriam ſuam compoſuiſſe. Poſt Arcadii et Honorii tempora rejicit etiam Euagrius. iii. 41. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 5. cap. v. T. 6. p. 606, et 607.

[g] Zoſimus quoque, comes et exadvocatus fiſci, vixit tempore Theodoſii junioris, ut ex Euagrio Scholaſtico conſtat. Reliquit Hiſtoriæ libros ſex, quorum primus Cæſares ab Auguſto uſque ad Diocletianum percurrit. Cæteris quinque fuſius perſequitur res Romanas uſque ad Romam iterum ab Alaricho obſeſſam, Attalum ab eo deſignatum Imperatorem, poſteaque ea dignitate exutum....Sed homo fuit Paganus....Unde creber eſt in fugillandis principibus Chriſtianis. Quo nomine etiam a Photio reprehenditur, item Evagrio, Nicephoro, et aliis. Sed Leunclavius cenſet, ne in iſtis quidem fidem facile Zoſimo eſſe abrogandam. Nam et Chriſtiani principes quædam enormia vitia habuiſſe: que fidelis hiſtoricus minime debeat præterire. G. J. Voſſ. Hiſt. Gr. l. 2. cap. xx. Vid. etiam J. A. Boſius, ap. Blount Cenſura auctor. in Zoſimo. p. 209.

So

So ſays Voſſius. And I have thought it beſt not to ſuppreſs his judgment.

Voſſius, as we have ſeen, ſuppoſed ſomewhat to be wanting at the end of the laſt book. But Fabricius, who has ſince conſidered that point, is of opinion that we [h] have it entire.

I have not obſerved any where an account of the place of this writer's nativity, nor of his uſual reſidence. He is called count, which ſhews his dignity, and is ſaid to have been ex-advocate of the treaſury: which ſeems to ſhew that he had for ſome time an honourable employment under the emperor, in whoſe time he lived; but the emperor is not named. Valeſius, in his notes upon Euagrius, is inclined to place Zoſimus much lower than is generally done. He thinks he flouriſhed in the time of the emperor Anaſtaſius: and ſays that * the character of advocate of the treaſury, differs little from that of ſophiſt.

II. I now proceed to make extracts.

1. In his firſt book, in the reign of Aurelian, ſpeaking of ſome ſuperſtitious cuſtoms of the Palmyrens, and the benefit of them: 'But [i] theſe things,' ſays he 'I leave with the happineſs of thoſe 'men. For the preſent race has rejected the divine benefit.' And ſoon afterwards: 'Such [k] was the divine benevolence to-'ward the Romans, ſo long as the ſacred rites were obſerved. 'But when I ſhall come down to thoſe times, in which the Ro-'man empire became in a manner barbarous, and very ſmall, 'and that little corrupted, I ſhall ſet down the cauſes of thoſe 'misfortunes, and ſhall alſo endeavour to add, as I am able, thoſe 'oracles by which the unhappy event was foretold.'

Theſe, and other like paſſages may convince us, how ſtrong the prejudices had always been in favour of Gentiliſm, and how much men were afraid of departing from ancient cuſtoms, leſt they ſhould thereby bring down upon themſelves, and the ſtate, miſery and confuſion. And it may enable us to conceive, in ſome meaſure, how great fortitude of mind muſt have been needful, to

[h] Geſta hæc ſunt, in quibus deſinit Zoſimi hiſtoria, anno Chriſti 410. Honorii Imp. 16. Theodoſii Junioris 3. Atque ex illo Photii loco patet, Hiſtoriam Zoſimi, quam ipſe legit, non longius productam fuiſſe, quam in noſtris codicibus exſtat: quamquam Voſſius.....verſimile putavit paullo uiterius progreſſum. &c. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 6. p. 607.

* Et Advocati fiſci dignitas, quâ ornatus Zoſimus, non multum abhorret a Sophiſta. Valeſ. Ann. ad Euagr. l. 3. [illegible]

[i] Ταυτα μεν τη τηνικαυτα των ανθρωπων ευδαιμονια παριημι, τε καθ' ημας γενους απεσεσαυτε θειαν ευεργεσιαν. Zoſ. l. 1. p. 666. A. ed. Sylburg. Francof. 1590.

[k] Η μεν ουν εις Ρωμαιους ευμενεια τε θειε, της ιερας αγιστειας φιλαττομενης, τοιαυτη. Επειδαν δε εις εκεινους αφικωμαι τους χρονους, εν οις η Ρωμαιων αρχη κατα βραχυ βαρβαρωθεισα, εις ολιγον τι, και αυτο διαφθαρεν, περιεξω τηνικαυτα και τας αιτιας παραξησω τε δυστυχηματος, και τας χρησμους ως αν οιος τ' ω παραθησομαι, τους τα συνενεχθεντα μηνυσαντας. Ibid. p. 666. fin.

enable the first Christians to bear up under all the reproaches which they met with upon that account. They must have been persuaded that they had good reason to act as they did, against the prevailing opinion. This observation we have had occasion to make several times.

2. In the second book of his history, having given a large and particular account of the secular games, and the manner of celebrating them, and the rites accompanying them, he says: 'Whilst '[l] therefore all these things were performed, according to the 'appointment of the oracle, and as they really ought to be done, 'the Roman empire was safe, and they had in a manner the 'whole world in subjection to them. But the festival having 'been neglected from the time that Dioclesian abdicated, it has 'decayed, until it is become almost barbarous. I shall put down 'the true account of the time. For from the consulship of Cilo 'and Libo [A. C. 204.] in which Severus celebrated the secular 'games, to the ninth consulship of Dioclesian, and the eighth of 'Maximian, [A. C. 304.] are an hundred and one years. But 'then Dioclesian of an emperor became a private man. The 'same was the case of Maximian. In the third consulship of 'Constantine and Licinius [A. C. 313.] the time of a hundred 'and ten years was complete, when the festival ought to have 'been observed according to custom. And not having been 'then observed, there was a necessity that affairs should sink into 'the distress and misery in which they now are.'

3. In the same book: 'At [f] that time [in the year 309, or 'thereabout] there happened a fire at Rome, whether from the 'air, or from the earth, is uncertain, and it took the temple of 'Fortune. When all men ran to extinguish the fire, a soldier, 'who had spoken some blasphemous words against the deity, 'was killed by the multitude out of veneration for the goddess. 'This inflamed the soldiery into a sedition; which might have 'ruined the whole city, if Maxentius had not interposed and re-'strained their fury.'

4. 'But [g] when the whole empire came to be in the hands of 'Constantine alone,' meaning after the death of Licinius, in the

[l] Lib. 2. p. 671.

[f] Κατα δε την Ρωμην εκπεσοντος πυρος, ειτε εξ αερος, ειτε εκ γης (τουτο γαρ αδηλον) ο της Τυχης εφλεχθη ναος, Παντων δε σβεσαι την πυραν συνδραμοντων, βλασφημα ρηματα κατα του θειου των στρατιωτων τις αφεις. κι λ. l. 2. p. 675.

[g] Περιστασης δε της πασης εις μονον Κωνσταντινον αρχης, ουκετι λοιπον την κατα φυσιν ενουσαν αυτῳ κακοηθιαν εκρυπτεν, αλλα ενεδιδου τῳ κατ' εξουσιαν απαντα πραττειν. Εχρητο δε ετι και τοις πατριοις ιεροις, ου τιμης ενεκα, μαλλον η χρειας· η και μαντεσιν επειθετο πεπραγμενοις ως αληθη προειπουσιν επι πασι τοις κατωρθωμενοις αυτῳ. Επει δε εις την Ρωμην αφικετο, μεστος πασης αλαζονειας, αφ' εστιας ωηθη δειν αρξασθαι της ασεβειας. Κρισπον γαρ παιδα....κ. λ. l. 2. p. 685.

'year

year 323 or 324, [g] 'he no longer concealed his bad nature, but 'did every thing as he pleaſed. Hitherto he had practiſed the 'ſacred rites of his country, not ſo much indeed out of real ve- 'neration for them, as out of neceſſity. And he therefore gave 'credit to ſoothſayers, as men expert in their art, and who had 'truly foretold his future ſucceſſes. And when he came to 'Rome, being exalted with pride and arrogance, he began with 'exerciſing cruelty in his own family; for he put to death his 'ſon Criſpus, whom he had before declared Cæſar, upon a ſuſ- 'picion of unlawful commerce with his mother-in-law Fauſta. 'Conſtantine's mother Helena being extremely grieved for the 'death of the young man, as if he had aimed to comfort her 'by adding one evil to another, he had Fauſta ſuffocated in a 'bath. Being [h] conſcious to himſelf of theſe things, and of his 'breaches of faith, he applied to the prieſts for ſome expiatory 'purifications of thoſe crimes. They anſwered him, that there 'were not delivered to them any purifications which could ex- 'piate ſuch crimes as thoſe were. At that time there came an 'Ægyptian to Rome from Spain, who getting acquainted with 'the women of the court, and at length coming into Conſtan- 'tine's company, he told him that the Chriſtian doctrine could 'wipe away all offences: for [i] it contained this aſſurance, that the 'wicked, who embraced it, ſhould be immediately freed from 'the guilt of all ſin. Conſtantine, readily embracing that diſ- 'courſe, hearkened to the Ægyptian; and forſaking the rites of 'his country, he began his impiety with neglecting divination 'and augury: and at length he aboliſhed ſuch things. And 'when a day came that, according to cuſtom, the army ſhould 'go up to the capitol, Conſtantine ſpoke ſlightly of that 'cuſtom. And thus, abandoning the ſacred rites, he loſt the 'affections of the ſenate and people of Rome. And not be- 'ing able to endure the reproaches caſt upon him on that ac- 'count, he then thought of chuſing another city for the ſeat 'of the empire. At length he fixed upon the city of Byzantium, 'afterwards called Conſtantinople.'

This paragraph will certainly require ſome remarks. To me it ſeems not at all ſtrange that ſuch reflections as theſe ſhould be ſometimes thrown upon Conſtantine, and the Chriſtian religion, by heathen people. Sozomen, near the beginning of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, ſpeaks to this purpoſe: 'I [k] am not ignorant

[h] Ταυτα συνεπιστάμενος ἑαυτῷ, καὶ πρὸσιτι γε ὀρκων καταφρονήσεις, πρὸσηει τοις ιερευσι καθαρσια των ἁμαρτημάτων αἰτων... p. 685. in. [i] Καὶ τουτο ἐχειν ἐπαγγελμα, το τους ἀσεβεις μεταλαμβανόντας αὐτης, πασης ἁμαρτιας ἐξω πραγχθηναι καθισασθαι. p. 685.

[k] Sozom. H. E. l. i. cap. 5. p. 406.

'that the Gentiles are wont to ſay that Conſtantine, having put 'to death ſome of his relations, and particularly his ſon Criſpus, 'and being ſorry for what he had done, applied to Sopater 'the philoſopher, and the chief maſter of the ſchool of Plotinus 'at that time: and he anſwering that there were no expiations 'for ſuch offences, the [l] emperor then had recourſe to the 'Chriſtian biſhops, who told him, that by repentance and bap-'tiſm he might be cleanſed from all ſin; with which doctrine, 'as they ſay, he was mightily pleaſed. Whereupon he became 'a Chriſtian himſelf, and required his ſubjects to be ſo likewiſe. 'But,' ſays Sozomen, and very honeſtly, 'it [m] ſeems to me that 'theſe ſtories have been invented by thoſe who are deſirous to 'reproach the Chriſtian religion. For Criſpus, upon whoſe ac-'count, as they ſay, Conſtantine needed a purification, died in 'the twentieth year of his father's empire. And whilſt he was 'yet living having the ſecond poſt in the government, as being 'Cæſar, he enacted many laws in favour of the Chriſtians, jointly 'with his father, as the laws ſtill in being teſtify. He likewiſe 'ſays,' following [n] Euſebius, 'that Conſtantine embraced Chriſ-'tianity, before his war with Maxentius, and before his coming 'to Rome, and into Italy. Nor is it probable that Sopater 'ſhould have an opportunity of converſing with Conſtantine in 'Britain or Gaul.' So writes Sozomen.

That Conſtantine was no longer a heathen and idolater, but a Chriſtian, may be concluded from his edict, publiſhed in favour of the Chriſtians, in the year 313, ſoon after the defeat of Maxentius. Nevertheleſs his notions concerning the Chriſtian religion, and his knowledge of it, might be afterwards more full and clear.

That Conſtantine was a Chriſtian before this time, is manifeſt from Zoſimus himſelf. For, as we ſaw juſt now, he complained that the great feſtival of the ſecular games, which ſhould have been celebrated in the year 313, was omitted by Conſtantine. Is not that a proof that he was then a Chriſtian?

This may ſuffice for a general obſervation upon this paragraph. However, I ſhall take ſome farther notice of the ſeveral particulars of it.

1. Zoſimus inſinuates that for a long time Conſtantine practiſed divination.

With regard to this, it ſhould be obſerved that there are laws

[l] αδημονηντα δε τον βασιλεα επι τη απαγορευσει, περιτυχειν επισκοποις, οι μεταδιδ ναι βαπτισματι υπεσχοντο, πασης αυτον αμαρτιας καθαιρειν. Ib. 406. B.

[m] Εμοι δε δοκει, ταυτα πεπλασθαι τοις σπουδαζουσι την Χριστιανων θρησκειαν κακηγορειν. Ibid. [n] Vid. Euſeb. de Vita Conſtantini, l. i. c. 26,,32.

extant,

extant, two [o] paſſed by Conſtantine in the year 319, one directed to Maximus præfect of Rome, the other to the people, and another [p] in the year 321, wherein the ſenate of Rome, and others are allowed to conſult ſoothſayers upon occaſion of lightning and thunder, or other ſurpriſing events, provided it be done publicly, in the temples, and at the uſual altars. At the ſame time ſoothſayers are ſtrictly forbidden to go to private houſes.

I have put the laws below in their original language.

Theſe laws have occaſioned ſome reflections upon Conſtantine. Baronius [q] was greatly offended, eſpecially at the laſt of them, and exclaims againſt Conſtantine, as if he had for a while apoſtatized from Chriſtianity. Other learned men, particularly [r] James Gothofred, in his notes upon theſe laws, and [s] Pagi, and [t] Baſnage, and [u] Tillemont, argue, that the terms of theſe laws import not any approbation of ſoothſaying, or any rites belonging to it, but rather a diſlike of them. They are only permitted in condeſcenſion to the prejudices of heathen people, and eſpe-

[o] Imp. Conſtantinus ad Maximum. Nullus aruſpex limen alterius accedat, nec ob alteram cauſſam, ſed hujuſmodi hominum, quamvis vetus, amicitia repellatur. Concremando illo haruſpice, qui ad domum alienum acceſſerit: illo et qui eum ſunctionibus vel præmiis evocaverit, poſt redemtionem bonorum, in inſulam detrudendo. Superſtitioni enim ſuæ ſervire cupientes poterunt publice ritum propium exercere. Accuſatorem enim hujus criminis non delatorem eſſe, ſed dignum magis præmio arbitramur. De Maleſic. et Mathematicis. Cod. Theod. l. 9. Tit. 16. l. 1. Tom. 3. p. 114. Idem A. ad Populum. Haruſpices, et eos qui huic ritui ſolent miniſtrare, ad privatam domum prohibemus accedere, vel ſub prætextu amicitiæ limen alterius ingredi, pœnâ contra eos propoſitâ, ſi contemſerit legem. Qui vero id vobis exiſtimatis conducere, adite aras publicas atque delubra, et conſuetudinis veſtræ celebrate ſollemnia. Neque enim prohibemus præteritæ uſurpationis officia libera luce tractari. Dat. Id. Maii. Conſtantio. Aug. V. et Licinio. Coſſ. Ibid. l. 2. Tom. 3. p. 115.

[p] Si quid de Palatio noſtro, aut cæteris operibus publicis deguſtatum de fulgore eſſe conſtiterit, retento more veteris obſervantiæ, quid portendat, ab haruſpicibus requiratur, et diligentiſſime ſcriptura collecta ad noſtram ſcientiam referatur. Cæteris etiam uſurpandæ hujus conſuetudinis licentiâ tribuendâ: dummodo ſacrificiis domeſticis abſtineant, quæ ſpecialiter prohibita ſunt. Eam autem denunciationem atque interpretationem, quæ de tactu Amphitheatri ſcripta eſt, de quâ ad Heracli-anum Tribunum, et magiſtrum officiorum ſcripſeras, ad nos ſcias perlatum. Dat.... Criſpo ii. et Conſtantino ii. Coſſ. De Paganis, &c. Cod. Theod. lib. 16. Tit. x. l. 1. p. 257.

[q] Baron. Ann. 321. num. 18, &c.

[r] Vice verſa, ſicut haruſpicinam privatim exerceri Conſtantinus his legibus vetat, ita contra publice eam exerceri permittit. Publice, inquam, apud aras publicas, et delubra, et retento more veteris obſervantiæ ..Quin, et infra, De Paganis, haruſpicinam in publicis quoque cauſſis a Senatu urbiciſque magiſtratibus Romæ uſurpari idem Conſtantinus conceſſit. Sic tamen ut ad ſe reſponſa haruſpicum referri vellet....Et hæc omnia non tanquam ipſe haruſpicinam probaret, vel ei obnoxius fieret, quod Zoſimus credidiſſe videtur, et Baronius hinc colligit, verum quia evellendæ è Gentilium animis haruſpicinæ par nondum erat, et Romæ quidem, et per Italiam, quam haruſpicinæ nominatim fidem maximam habuiſſe ſcribit Herodianus, lib. 8. p. 612. Ideoque ſatis habuit Conſtantinus ſuæ interim ſaluti et publicæ quieti his legibus eâ quam dixi ratione conſuluiſſe: prohibitis ſacrificiis domeſticis, et privatarum ædium ingreſſu haruſpicibus interdicto, &c. J. Gothofred. not. ad leg. i. et ii. de Maleficiis, &c. Tom. 3. p. 116.

[s] Pagi Ann. 319. num. xi. et 321. num. iv.

[t] Baſn. ann. 321. num. v.

[u] L'Emp. Conſtantin. art. xlii.

cially the people of Rome, who were extremely fond of haruſpices.

The obſervations of thoſe learned men ſeem to me to contain a proper vindication of Conſtantine. Nevertheleſs Mr. Moſheim [x] is not ſatisfied: he ſtill thinks theſe laws a proof that Conſtantine had not yet forſaken Gentiliſm, or acquieſced in the Chriſtian, as the only true religion. I have put his words below. But I do not think his exceptions to be of any great weight.

As to what Zoſimus ſays that, 'Conſtantine ſtill paid a regard 'to ſoothſayers, having experienced the truth of their predic-'tions in his own ſucceſſes;' Tillemont [y] ſays, we need not believe it upon his word alone. And it ſeems to be contrary to what is ſaid in the panegyric of an uncertain author, to Conſtantine himſelf, in the year 313, where he ſays that, 'in [z] undertaking 'the war with Maxentius, Conſtantine had acted contrary, not 'only to the advices of his friends and generals, but likewiſe 'contrary to the admonitions of the haruſpices.'

Upon the whole, I do not perceive any thing in thoſe laws, which we are now conſidering, contrary to the edict of Conſtantine and Licinius, in favour of the Chriſtians, in the year 313. There it is ſaid: 'We [a] publiſh this therefore as our will and 'pleaſure, and agreeable to right reaſon, that leave ſhould not 'be denied to any man whatever to follow and chuſe the con-'ſtitution 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.'

Thoſe laws contain no enlargement of the privileges of heathen people; they are rather a reſtriction of them: for all rites of ſoothſaying are here confined to public temples and altars; no haruſpex, or ſoothſayer, is allowed to go into private houſes. If any thing is done there privately, diſcovering the fact is encouraged. 'Such ſhall not be reckoned informers, or accuſers, but

[x] Notæ ſunt leges ejus de tolerandis haruſpicibus, modo publice artem ſuam exerceant....Septimo et nono poſt debellatum Maxentium anno ſanctitæ: quarum tametſi turpitudinem Gothofredus, Tillemontius, et alii extenuare ſtudent, haud tamen impedient, quo minus ex illis pateat, nondum tum temporis Imperatorem prorſus a veteri Romanorum religione deſciviſſe, atque in unius Chriſtianæ profeſſione acquieviſſe. Neque video, cur Zoſimus mentiri putandus ſit, qui Conſtantinum diu poſt firmatum imperium hariolis aures præbuiſſe, fidemque habuiſſe narrat. lib. 2. p. 203. edit. Oxon. 1079. Moſheim. De Reb. Chriſtian. ante C. M. p. 975.

[y] Mais pour ce qu'il ajoute, qu'il avoit ſouvent éprouvé dans ſes heureux ſuccés la verité de leurs predictions, nous ne l'en croirons pas aſſurément ſur ſa parole. Tillem. ib.

[z] Quiſnam te Deus, quæ tam præſens hortata eſt majeſtas, ut, omnibus ferre tuis comitibus et ducibus non ſolum tacite muſſitantibus, ſed etiam aperte timentibus, contra conſilia hominum, contra haruſpicum monita, ipſe per temet liberandæ Urbis tempus veniſſe ſentires. Incerti Paneg. Conſt. Aug. cap. 2. p. 233.

[a] See before vol. viii. ch. xl. num. x.

'ſhall

'shall be entitled to a reward.' And all anſwers or determinations of haruſpices, relating to the public, are to be tranſmitted to the emperor himſelf in writing.

Moreover Zoſimus himſelf ſays, that, at the time of which he is here ſpeaking, 'Conſtantine practiſed the rites of his country, 'not from any real veneration for them, but from neceſſity:' that is, in condeſcenſion to the ſentiments of others, and that he might not too much offend and provoke heathen people.

It is reaſonable therefore to think that none of thoſe laws abovementioned, or what is here imputed to Conſtantine by Zoſimus, ought to be underſtood as any impeachment of his Chriſtianity at that time.

2. With regard to the death of Criſpus and Fauſta, it is to be ſaid that no Chriſtians juſtify any bad actions of Conſtantine, or any other Chriſtian emperor. Such things as have been reckoned blemiſhes in the reign of Conſtantine, with the occaſions of them, were particularly conſidered [b] formerly. And ſince that, in the chapter of Eutropius [c], I have propoſed ſome additional obſervations, and therefore need not enlarge now.

3. Here is a reflection upon Chriſtian baptiſm, the like to which we have met with already in * Celſus and † Julian: but there is no foundation for it. By Sozomen, this is repreſented after this manner, as we ſaw juſt now: that 'Conſtantine met 'with ſome Chriſtian biſhops, who told him that by repentance 'and baptiſm he might be cleanſed from all ſin. With which 'doctrine the emperor was mightily pleaſed.' And is there any abſurdity in this? Crimes are not to be expiated by ſacrifices of animals, nor by bodily pains and mortifications: but they may be expiated by ſincere repentance, and ſolemn engagements to univerſal virtue and piety for time to come, which are implied in baptiſm. This doctrine is reaſonable in itſelf, and is agreeable to the declarations of the ancient Jewiſh prophets, and of Jeſus Chriſt and his apoſtles. It is a reaſonable doctrine, and worthy of all acceptation. If God is not inexorable to his creatures, who have offended againſt him and his laws, how can they appeaſe his diſpleaſure, or recommend themſelves to his favour, in any other or better way than this?

4. Zoſimus tells us that when Conſtantine was under concern of mind, 'there came an Ægyptian to Rome from Spain, who 'firſt got acquaintance with the women of the court, and then

[b] See Vol. iv. p. 172....178.
[c] See vol. viii. ch. l. num. ii.
* See Vol. viii. p. 52....54.
† Ibid. ch. xlvi. num. iv. 25, 26.

'with Conſtantine himſelf, and taught him how he might obtain 'the expiation of his offences and ſins.'

All this is ſaid without ground, ſo far as we know, and may all be the fiction of Zoſimus, or of ſome other Gentile people before him. However, upon this [d] Tillemont remarks in the following manner: 'Euſebius has not told us who they were 'whom God employed to inſpire this prince with the firſt prin-'ciples of the truth: all that can be ſaid is, that Zoſimus, amidſt 'the falſities which he relates concerning the converſion of Con-'ſtantine, there inſerts one thing which may be true, that an Æ-'gyptian having come from Spain to the place where Conſtantine 'was, he was the cauſe of his abandoning the Roman religion. 'This ſeems to agree well enough with the great Oſius of Corduba 'in Spain, whom ſome affairs may have brought to the court of 'Conſtantine. He was at that time famous in the quality of con-'feſſor of the name of Jeſus Chriſt: and we ſhall hereafter ſee 'him employed by Conſtantine in the diſtribution of his alms, 'and in the greateſt affairs of the church, as a man for whom 'Conſtantine had a very particular reſpect and eſteem.'

But that is mere conjecture. Nor do I know of any reaſon to believe that Oſius of Corduba was acquainted with Conſtantine at the time of his converſion, or very ſoon after it.

5. Zoſimus reflects upon Conſtantine for leaving Rome, and building Conſtantinople. But as this will come over again, I defer for the preſent to make the proper obſervations relating to that event. We therefore proceed.

5. Zoſimus [e] finds great fault with Conſtantine for making alterations in the magiſtracy, and, inſtead of two præfects of the Prætorium, appointing four with ſeveral diſtricts. But I do not think it needful for me to tranſcribe him here at length, nor to make any remarks. I refer to [f] ſome learned modern hiſtorians and chronologers, where this new diſtribution of the ſeveral parts of the empire is conſidered.

6. Having given an account of Conſtantine's enlarging the city of Byzantium, and calling it Conſtantinople, and having expatiated upon the expences of that undertaking, and the conſequences of it, he goes on: 'Indeed [g] Conſtantine miſtook pro-'digality for magnificence. And moreover he impoſed a tax of 'gold and ſilver upon all merchants and traders throughout the 'empire, not excepting miſerable proſtitutes: inſomuch, that 'upon the return of every fourth year, when the tax was to be

[d] L'Emp. Conſtantin. § xxiv. [e] Zoſ. l. 2. p. 687, 688. [f] Vide Pagi ann. 332. n. iv. Baſnag. ann. 333. ii. Tillem. L'Emp. Conſtantin. art. 84.
[g] Lib. 2. p. 691.

collected,

'collected, there was nothing to be heard but lamentations and 'complaints in every city; and whips and torments were inflicted 'upon thoſe, who, by reaſon of extreme poverty, were not able 'to pay it. And mothers were forced to part with their chil-'dren, and fathers proſtituted their daughters, that they might 'ſatisfy the collectors of this gold and ſilver exaction.'

So ſays Soſimus. And I refer to [h] Gothofred, and [i] Pagi, and [k] others, who have vindicated Conſtantine from the ſcandal of this tax. They ſay it was not new, not even the more infamous part of it, but had been in force in the time of heathen emperors. Some alterations, however, in all probability, were made [l] by Conſtantine. Poſſibly, he appointed the collecting it every fourth or fifth year; for which reaſon it is ſometimes called the Chryſargyral, at other times the Luſtral tax. Nor [m] are any ancient laws of Conſtantine, or any other emperor relating to it, now in being; all copies of them, and all papers concerning it, having been carefully deſtroyed [n] by Anaſtaſius, who aboliſhed this tax.

Some part of this tax was abrogated by Theodoſius the younger in the year 439. The reſt was in force through the reigns of ſeveral Chriſtian emperors, till the eighth or ninth of Anaſtaſius, in the year [o] 499. And that it was exacted with great rigour in the time of Julian, appears from an oration of Libanius to that emperor, againſt Florentius, then præfect of the Prætorium: 'An [p] unſufferable tax,' he ſays, 'which fills all men with hor-'ror, at the approach of the Luſtral year, and eſpecially labour-'ing mechanics who have nothing but the inſtruments of their 'trade. Whom I have often ſeen,' ſays Libanius, 'lifting up 'their eyes to heaven, with an awl or an axe in their hands, 'and profeſſing that they had nothing elſe.'

Undoubtedly the building and adorning Conſtantinople occaſioned great expence. Jerom, in his Chronicle, ſays: 'At

[h] Gothofred. in Cod. Theod. lib. 13. Tit. i. De Luſtrali Collatione. leg. 1. Tom. 5. p. i. &c. [i] Pagi in Baron. ann. 330. n. vi. ann. 491. num. xii. [k] Baron. ann. 331. n. 33, &c. Baſn. ann. 449. num. i. Tillemont L'Emp. Conſtantin. § 80. Bingham's Antiquities of the Church. B. v. chap. iii. § 6.

[l] Quare ſi quid hac parte a Conſtantino factum, forma tantum ejus mutata. Forte luſtralis hæc collatio ab eo facta, [illegible], quæ antea annalis, vel ejuſmodi erat: ſic, ut pro facultatum incremento, totidem luſtris augeretur. Goth. ut ſupra. p. 4. [m] Cod. Juſt. De Luſtralis auri Collatione: quo titulo abſunt omnes hujus tituli conſtitutiones: utpote ſublata hac collatione ab Anaſtaſio, teſte Euagrio, et Zonara. Gothof. ib. p. 1.

[n] Vid. Euagr. H. E. l. 3. cap. 41. Zonar. ann. T. 3. p. 45. [o] At lenonum quidem vectigal jam ſuſtulerat Theodoſius anno 439....Anaſtaſius vero infame vectigal ubique locorum exſtinguere decrevit. Baſn. ann. 499. num. i. Conf. Pagi ann. 330. num. vi.

[p] Liban. Invect. in Florentium. ad Imp. Julian. T. 2. 427, 428.

this

'this [q] time Conſtantinople is built, and all other cities ſtript al-'moſt naked to enrich it.'

But whatever reflections may be made upon Conſtantine by Zoſimus, or others, for enlarging Byzantium, his choice ſeems to have been approved in the end. For all ſucceeding emperors made it the ſeat of the eaſtern part of the empire. And the emperor Julian was exceeding fond of Conſtantinople, as being his native place, and conferred upon it many privileges, as we are aſſured [r] by Ammianus. Zoſimus himſelf ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. 'Conſtantinople [s] was his native city, and he made their 'ſenate equal to that of Rome, improved their harbour, adorned 'the city with a magnificent portico, and a library in which he 'placed his own books.' And [t] Julian in a letter to the Alexandrians, to induce them the more readily to part with a ſtone obeliſk, which lay on the ſea ſhore of their city, tells them, that 'Conſtantine had built a veſſel for bringing it to Conſtantinople 'his native city; but had been prevented by death. That city,' ſays he, 'now aſks the ſame of me, which is my native country, 'and therefore more dear to me than to him. He loved it as 'a ſiſter, I as a mother. For there I was born and bred, and 'therefore cannot be ungrateful to her.'

Julian, I think, might have ſaid, that Conſtantine loved the city as his daughter: and then he could have had no pretence to magnify his affection for that place above Conſtantine's. However, the more to ſatisfy the Alexandrians, he promiſeth them a coloſſus of braſs, of a large ſize, in the room of the Ægyptian obeliſk of ſtone. And thus Julian does what had been blamed in Conſtantine. He robs and ſtrips Alexandria, to enrich and adorn Conſtantinople.

All which, as ſeems to me, is ſufficient to ſhew that Conſtantine's choice of Byzantium was approved of by ſucceeding emperors, and that his conduct therein was juſtified by them. But I think that ſomewhat more may be ſaid; and that what Conſtantine did now, had been in effect done before. Diocleſian, who was the firſt and eldeſt emperor, had for ſome while reſided chiefly at Nicomedia; and Maximian in Italy. Diocleſian's re-

[q] Conſtantinopolis dedicatur pene omnium urbium nuditate. Chron. p. 181.

[r] Antiochiam ire contendens reliquit Conſtantinopolim incrementis multis fultam. Natus enim illic, diligebat eam ut genitalem patriam et colebat. Ammian. l. 22. c. ix. p. 346.

[s] Επει δε εις το βυζαντιον παρεγενετο, παντες μεν αυτον συν ευφημιαις εδεχοντο, πολιτην και τροφιμον εαυτων ονομαζοντες (οια δη εν ταυτη τειχθεντα τε και τραφεντα τη πολει) ....Εν ταυτη της πολεως αμα και των γραμματοφορων επιμελουμενος, εδωκε μεν τη πολει γερουσιαν εχειν ωσπερ εν τη [πολει] Ρωμη. κ. λ. Zoſ. l. 3. p. 713.

[t] Ep. 58 p. 443. edit. Spanhem. et ap. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 5. c. 8. T. 7. p. 84.

ſignation

ſignation in the year 305, was performed at a place near Nicomedia, and Maximian's at Milan. Diocleſian and Galerius were at Nicomedia, when the edict for a general perſecution of the Chriſtians was publiſhed in 303, and had been there ſome while before. There Diocleſian had a palace. He alſo endeavoured to increaſe the confluence of people there, by making Nicomedia the ſeat of learning. For that end he invited the profeſſors of other countries, moſt eminent for their ſkill in the arts and ſciences, to come and make it the place of their reſidence. One of theſe was the celebrated Firmianus Lactantius, [u] who was invited to ſet up there a ſchool of rhetoric, which he did. And, as we learn from Jerom, Flavius Grammaticus was invited at the ſame time, who was in repute for his ſkill in medicine; and likewiſe had a talent for poetry. And if Conſtantine be cenſured for the expences of building, ſo was Diocleſian [x] likewiſe, and for a deſign to make Nicomedia equal to Rome. And Ammianus Marcellinus ſays, that [y] Nicomedia in the time of it's proſperity, reſembled Rome itſelf for the number and grandeur of it's private and public buildings with which it had been adorned by divers princes.

Zoſimus, as may be remembered, in a place above cited, ſays: 'When a day came that, according to cuſtom, the army ſhould 'go up to the capitol, Conſtantine ſpoke ſlightly of that cuſtom. 'And then abandoning the ſacred rites, he loſt the affections of 'the ſenate, and people of Rome. And not being able to endure 'the reproaches caſt upon him upon that account, he thought 'of chuſing another city for the ſeat of the empire. At length 'he fixed upon the city of Byzantium, afterwards called Con'ſtantinople.'

So ſays Zoſimus. Nevertheleſs that might not be the whole of the reaſon why Conſtantine determined to make Byzantium the place of his reſidence. For, as I apprehend, the authority and influence of the ſenate had been for ſome while troubleſome to the emperors; they therefore choſe to be generally at a con-

[u] Firmianus, qui et Lactantius, Arnobii diſcipulus, ſub Diocletiano principe, accitus cum Flavio Grammatico, cujus de medicinalibus verſu compoſiti extant libri, Nicomediæ Rhetoricam docuit. Hiero. De V. I. cap. 8. Ego cum in Bythinia oratorias literas accitus docerem. &c. Lact. Inſt. l. 5. cap. 2.

[x] Huc accedebat infinita quædam cupiditas ædificandi, non minor provinciarum exactio in exhibendis operariis, artificibus, et plauſtris omnibus, quæcunque ſint fabricandis operibus neceſſaria....Repente magna pars civitatis exceditur. Migrabant omnes cum conjugibus et liberis, quaſi urbe ab hoſtibus capta....Ita ſemper dementabat, Nicomediam ſtudens urbi Romæ coæquare. Cæc. de M. P. cap. vii. [y] Inde Nicomediam venit urbem antehac inclytam, ita magnis retro Principibus amplificatam impenſis, ut ædium multitudine privatarum et publicarum recte noſcentibus regio quædam Urbis æſtimaretur æternæ. Ammian. l. 22. c. ix. p. 346.

ſiderable

siderable distance from it. And the present extent of the empire, and the state of things called them much into the eastern part of it. And to me it seems not improbable that, if Constantine had never been converted to Christianity, and if Gentilism had continued to subsist in it's ancient splendour, Nicomedia, or some other city near it, would have been chosen for the place of the chief residence, for the emperor, or for the first of the emperors if there were more than one. And at length a senate likewise might have been appointed in it, with suitable privileges, as a rival with the ancient senate at Rome.

And for certain, Constantine in the choice of Byzantium shewed his judgment and sagacity. For no place could be pitched upon, as to it's situation more agreeable, or more convenient for an imperial seat, in the whole extent of the Roman empire, nor perhaps upon the face of the whole earth.

These thoughts are my own, and therefore are proposed, as they ought to be, with diffidence. But I was willing to mention them for abating the reproaches cast upon Constantine upon this account: which have often appeared to me invidious, excessive, and unreasonable. They came originally from Gentile writers, who laid hold of every occasion to disparage the first Christian emperor. And others, as seems to me, not being duly upon the guard, have incautiously embraced them.

7. Among those who were put to death soon after the accession of Constantius, Zosimus says: 'At [z] that time also was put to 'death Ablabius, præfect of the Prætorium, in the way of a just 'punishment for his procuring the death of the philosopher So-'pater, because he envied him the friendship of Constantine.'

Eunapius * likewise, who enlarges more than Zosimus in the character of Ablabius, who, from a mean original, arose to great splendour and dignity, ascribes the death of Sopater to the intrigues of Ablabius. Jerom [a] also in his Chronicle, mentions the death of Ablabius among other executions at the beginning of the reign of Constantius.

I do not think it needful for me to enlarge in the history, or character of Ablabius, who was præfect of the Prætorium from the year 326 to 333, or longer. I shall refer therefore to [b] Gothofred, and [c] Tillemont. But perhaps it may be expected that I should here say somewhat of Sopater, who was so much

[z] Ἀπρεθη δε τοτε Αβλαβιος ο της αυλης υπαρχος· της δικης αξιαν αυτῳ ποινην επιθεισης ανθ' ων επεβουλευσε θανατον τῳ Σωπατρῳ τῳ φιλοσοφῳ, φθονῳ της Κωνσαντινου προς αυτον οικειοτητος. Zos. l. 2. p. 692.

* Eunap in Ædes. p. 37.

[a] Ablabius præfectus Prætorio, et multi nobilium occisi. Chron. p. 182.

[b] Gothof. Prosopographia p. 347.

[c] L'Emp. Constantin. § 60.

esteemed

esteemed by the learned men of those times, who were zealous for Gentilism. He is said to have been a disciple of Jamblichus, who was disciple of Plotinus. Eunapius says 'he [d] was a man of 'great abilities; and disdaining to live in obscurity, he hastened 'to the court of Constantine, with a view of restraining the im-'petuosity of that prince against the old religion, and to govern 'him by reason. And for a while he was in great esteem, and was 'openly favoured and honoured by Constantine. But,' as he says, 'there being a scarcity of corn at Constantinople, and the 'people there thinking that, [e] by magical arts, he bound up the 'winds, and obstructed the arrival of ships laden with corn for 'their relief, his enemies, and particularly Ablabius, who envied 'his credit with the emperor, obtained an order for putting him 'to death. Which † order was immediately executed by those 'who bore him ill-will.' That is Eunapius's account of the occasion of Sopater's death. Here I would refer to [f] Crevier, who has a conjecture concerning the occasion of Sopater's death; which does not appear to me so material as to deserve to be transcribed.

Sopater is in Suidas, who says: 'Sopater was of Apamea, a 'sophist, and a philosopher, whom the emperor Constantine put 'to death that he might convince all that he no longer favoured 'Gentilism: for to that time he was very familiar with him, and 'friendly to him. He wrote a work concerning Providence, and 'another concerning such as had been without their own desert 'happy or unhappy. Constantine however did not do well in 'killing Sopater. For no man is good by necessity, but by 'choice only.'

There follows in Suidas another article, which is to this purpose: 'Sopater of Apamea, or rather of Alexandria, sophist. 'He [g] made epitomes of several books. Some ascribe to him a 'work of historical collections.'

Whether this be the same with the forementioned, and celebrated Sopater of Apamea, may be questioned. However, those works are ascribed to him by [h] some. And in Photius [i] is an article of 'Collections, or extracts from several, in twelve books, 'by

[d] Σωπατρος δε ο παντων δεινοτερος, δια τε φυσεως υψος και ψυχης μεγεθος, ουκ ενεγκων τοις αλλοις ανθρωποις ομιλειν, επι τας βασιλειας αυλας εδραμεν οξυς, ως την Κωνσταντινου προφασιν τε και φοραν τυραννησων, και μεταστησων τω λογω. Και ες τοσουτον γε εξικετο σοφιας και δυναμεως, ως ο μεν βασιλευς εαλωκει τε υπ' αυτω, και δημοσια συνεδροι ειχει, εις τον δεξιον καθιζων τοπον. In Ædesio. p. 34.

[e] .... αλλα Σωπατρος γε, εφασαν, ο παρα σου τιμωμενος, κατεδησε τους ανεμους δι' υπερβολην σωφιας. κ. λ. Id. ib. p. 37.

† Και εγενετο δια τους βασκαινοντας ταυτα θαττον η ελεγετο. Eunap. ibid.

[f] History of the Roman emperors. vol. x. p. 169, 170.

[g] Επιτομας πλειστων. Τινες δε και την εκλογιαν των ιστοριων τουτου ειναι φασι..

[h] Vide Voss. Hist. Gr. l. 2. cap. xvii.

[i] Ανεγνωσθησαν εκλογαι διαφοροι εν βιβλιοις δυοκαιδεκα Σωπατρου σοφιστου.

'by Sopater the ſophiſt.' They are indeed out of many authors, and moſt of them of great note. Photius ſays, 'the [k] work may 'be uſeful to the readers, though there are in it not a few fables, 'and prodigies, and falſe and incredible ſtories.'

8. In the beginning of the reign of Valentinian all the friends of Julian were looked upon with diſlike. But Zoſimus ſays, that '[l] Valentinian was particularly incenſed againſt the philoſopher 'Maximus, bearing in memory a charge which he had brought 'againſt him in the time of Julian, of impiety toward the gods, 'out of reſpect for the Chriſtian religion.'

However, Maximus was not now put to death, nor till a good while afterwards, as we may ſhew in another place.

9. Preſently afterwards, ſtill at the beginning of the ſame reign, in the year 364, he ſays: 'Valentinian [m] made a law for- 'bidding nocturnal ſacrifices, intending thereby to prevent the 'enormities which were ſometimes committed at thoſe ſeaſons. 'But Prætextatus, then proconſul of Greece, a man adorned 'with every virtue, aſſuring him, that law would do no leſs 'than deprive the Greeks of all the comfort of their lives, if they 'were hindred from performing thoſe moſt ſacred myſteries, ac- 'cording to the appointment, upon which the welfare of man- 'kind depended, he permitted them to be done, his law lying 'dormant, provided that all things were done according to the 'laws of the country, as they had been done from the begin- 'ning.'

The law prohibiting nocturnal ſacrifices may be a law dated the ninth day of September, in the year 364, which [n] I ſhall place below, with a reference to Gothofred's notes upon it. But Zoſimus ſays that law was ſuffered to lye dormant, or without effect, for Greece at leaſt. And [o] there is another law, dated

φιγε. Συνειλεκται δε αυτω το βιβλιον εκ πολλων και διαφορων ιστοριων και γραμματων. Cod. 161. p. 337.

[k] Ibid. p. 344. [l] Zoz. l. 4. p. 735. ſub in. [m] .... αφ' εσιας ωσπερ αρξαμενος, τας νυκτερινας εκαλυε θυσιας επιτελεισθαι· τοις μυσαρως μεν αν πραττομενοις εμποδων, δια τε τοιωδε νομε γινεσθαι βελομενος. Επει δε Πραιτεξτατος, ο της Ελλαδος την ανθυπατον εχων αρχην, ανηρ εν πασαις διαπρεπων ταις αρεταις, τουτον εφη τον νομον αβιωτον τοις Ελλησι καταστησειν τον βιον, ει μελλοιεν κωλυεσθαι τα συνεχοντα το ανθρωπειον γενος αγιωτατα μυστηρια κατα θεσμον επιτελειν, επιτρεψεν, αργοντος τε νομε· πραττεσθαι δε παντα κατα τα της αρχης πατρια. p. 735, 736. [n] Ne quis deinceps nocturnis temporibus, aut nefarias preces, aut magicos apparatus, aut ſacrificia funeſta celebrare conetur: detectum atque convictum competenti animadverſione mactare perenni auctoritate cenſemus. Cod. Theod. lib. 9. Tit. 16. l. 7. p. 126. Tom. 3. [o] Haruſpicinam ego nullum cum maleficiorum cauſſis habere conſortium indico: neque ipſam aut aliquam praterea conceſſam a Majoribus religionem genus eſſe arbitror criminis. Teſtes ſunt leges a me in exordio Imperii mei datæ, quibus, 'unicuique, quod animo 'imbibiſſet colendi libera facultas tributa 'eſt.' Nec haruſpicinam reprehendimus, ſed nocenter exerceri vetamus. Ibid. l. 9. p. 128, 129. T. 3. Conf. Gothofredi Notas, et Tillemont. L'Emp. Valentinien. art. 11.

May

May 29, in the year 371, where the practice of ſoothſaying and other rites of the Gentile religion are allowed of, provided nothing magical or hurtful was done.

And Ammianus Marcellinus commends the moderation of Valentinian, in [p] that he did not diſturb men upon account of their religion, but let every man do as he pleaſed, without interpoſing his authority: as was alſo obſerved formerly † from the ſame hiſtorian.

Zoſimus acknowledgeth that Theodoſius was a good ſoldier, and ſkilful in the art of war; but he chargeth him with great luxury and expenſiveneſs in his way of living, I do not tranſcribe him here. It is ſufficient briefly to mention this, and [q] make a reference to what he ſays.

But by way of balance to his invectives, I would refer to the panegyric of Pacatus, pronounced before the ſenate of Rome, and as ſome think in the preſence of Theodoſius himſelf, ſoon after the defeat of the uſurper Maximus, in the year * 391, as ſome think, or rather ** in the year 389, and to the younger Victor, who †† flouriſhed in the time of Arcadius and Honorius, and publiſhed a compendious hiſtory of the Roman emperors from Auguſtus to Theodoſius, with whom his hiſtory concludes. His honourable character ‡‡ of Theodoſius is § truly remarkable.

11. Still, at the beginning of that reign, about the year 379, he ſays: 'Under [r] theſe afflictions, however, the people made 'ſupplications to the Deity, entreating deliverance from ſo great 'calamities. For as yet they had the privilege of frequenting 'the temples, and appeaſing the anger of the gods, according to 'the method of the ancient inſtitutions.'

12. And ſoon after, about the year 380 or 381: [s] 'Moreover, '[t] Theodoſius attacked the temples of the gods in the cities, and 'in the country. And all were in the utmoſt danger who be-

[p] Ammian. l. 30. cap. ix. † vol. viii. ch. li. n. 11, 16. [q] Lib. 4. p. 754, 755, et p. 758. m. * La Baune ad Paneg. Vet. p. 308. Fabric. Bib. Lat. T. 2. p. 772.

** Tillem. L'Emp. Theod. i. art. 47. p. 631. and the Univerſal Hiſtory. vol. 16. p. 425. †† Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. l. 2. cap. xv. ‡‡ Fuit autem Theodoſius moribus et corpore Trajano ſimilis.... Illa tamen, quibus Trajanus aſperſus eſt, vinolentiam et cupidinem triumphandi, uſque eo deteſtatus eſt, ut bella non moverit, ſed invenerit, &c. Vict. Epit. cap. 48. § Vide Baſnag. ann. 379. iii. Tillem. L'Emp. Theodoſe. art. 85.

[r] Ετι γαρ ην αυτες αδεια τε φοιταν εις τα ιερα, και τα θεια κατα τες πατριες θεσμες εκμειλιττεσθαι. l. 4. p. 755.

[s] Soon after that, Theodoſius begun to take up his reſidence at Conſtantinople. See Tillemont Theodoſ. i. art. 17. p. 710, 711.

[t] Ετι δε και τα των θειων ειδη κατα πασαν επολιορκει πολιν και χωραν. Κινδυνος τε πασιν επικειτο τοις νομιζεσιν ειναι θεες, η ολως εις τον εραιον αναβλεπεσι, και τα εν αυτω φαινομενα προσκυνεσι. Ib. p. 758.

lieved

'lieved there were any gods; or who at all looked up to heaven, 'and worſhipped the things that ſhine in it.'

13. He gives this account of Gratian's refuſing the title of high-prieſt, or pontifex maximus: 'Numa Pompilius [u] firſt had this 'title: and ever after thoſe called kings [Reges], and after them 'Octavianus [Auguſtus], and other Roman emperors who ſuc-'ceeded him. For at the ſame time that they received the 'ſupreme government, a prieſtly veſtment was brought to them 'by the pontifices [prieſts ſo called by the Romans], and imme-'diately he was called pontifex maximus. And all the other 'emperors always appeared to be pleaſed with that honour, and 'have uſed that title. And even Conſtantine, although he for-'ſook the true religion and embraced the faith of the Chriſtians, 'and others his ſucceſſors, particularly Valentinian and Valens, 'did the ſame. When therefore the pontifices brought the veſt-'ment to Gratian, he rejected their requeſt, thinking it to be an 'unlawful habit for a Chriſtian. The [x] veſtment being returned 'to the prieſt, it is ſaid that the chief of them ſaid: "Since the "emperor will not be called pontifex, there will ſoon be a pon-"tifex maximus."

There is a point in this laſt expreſſion: The meaning is, Maximus ſhall ſoon be pontifex.

Upon this paragraph of Zoſimus ſome remarks muſt be made.

1. Firſt of all, it is not allowed that Conſtantine, and other Chriſtian emperors after him, did receive the title of pontifex maximus. It is ſtrongly argued [y] by divers of our moſt learned modern eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, that they did not. This title, they ſay, may be given them in ſome inſcriptions, and medals ſtill extant. But that will not amount to a proof that any Chriſtian emperors did accept of it and take it upon them.

2. It is unknown when Gratian rejected the pontifical veſtment, there being no authentic account of it in ancient authors.

Other learned men are willing to allow the truth of what Zoſimus here ſays, that [z] Gratian refuſed the title of pontifex, and that he was the firſt who refuſed it, and conſequently, that it was accepted by all preceding Chriſtian emperors.

3. If the prieſtly veſtment was refuſed by Gratian at the time of his acceſſion in the year 367, or ſoon afterwards, I may take

[u] P. 761. [x] Τοις τε ιερευσι της στολης αναδοθεισης, φασι τον πρωτον εν αυτοις τεταγμενον, ειπειν, Ει μη βουλεται Ποντιφιξ ο βασιλευς ονομαζεσθαι, ταχυ γενησεται Ποντιφιξ Μαξιμος. Ibid. [y] Vide Pagi ann. 312. n. xvii. &c. Tillem. L'Emp. Conſtantin. art. 28. [z] See Bletterie, Vie de l'Emp. Julien. liv. 3. p. 232. the ſecond edition. Who refers to a Diſſertation of M. de la Baſtie, which is inſerted in Les Memoires de l'Academie des Inſcriptions, et de belles lettres. Tom. xv.

th:

the liberty to ſay that, the prediction concerning Maximus's uſurpation in the year 382, was invented afterwards. And we muſt do ſo much juſtice to Zoſimus, as to obſerve that he puts the credit of it upon a φασι only, *it is ſaid.*

14. 'Theodoſius,' [a] he ſays, 'ſent Cynegius præfect of the 'Prætorium into Ægypt, with orders to prohibit all worſhip of 'the gods, and to ſhut up the temples. Which orders Cynegius 'punctually executed, and ſhut up the doors of the temples all 'over the Eaſt, and in all Ægypt, and in Alexandria itſelf; and 'prohibited the ſacrifices which had been ever practiſed hither-'to, and every branch of the ancient religious rites. And what 'has been the fate of the empire from that time to this, will ap-'pear from the following relation of the things that have hap-'pened.'

Here is no mention made of the demolition of the temples. All that Zoſimus ſays is, that they were ſhut up: this was done in the year 386, or before, as is ſuppoſed: and Cynegius, now præfect of the Prætorium in the Eaſt, who was employed in this commiſſion, died in his conſulſhip, in the year [b] 388.

15. Soon afterwards he ſays, 'Gerontius [c] a general of great 'valour and conduct, commanded in Tomas in Scythia. Having 'been inſulted by ſome barbarians in that country, he ſallied 'out upon them, and having with difficulty overcome them, they '[d] who had eſcaped, fled to a building highly honoured by the 'Chriſtians, and eſteemed an aſylum.' This alſo is ſuppoſed to have happened [e] in the year 386.

16. Having related how Arbogaſtes and Eugenius were over-come, he proceeds: 'Things [f] thus ſucceeding with Theodoſius, 'when he came to Rome [in the year 394] he declared his ſon 'Honorius emperor, and appointed Stilicho general of the 'legions in thoſe parts, and left him to be guardian to his ſon; 'and aſſembling the ſenate, who ſtill adhered to the ancient re-'ligion of their country, and had not yet choſen to join them-'ſelves to thoſe who had fallen into contempt of the gods, he 'made a ſpeech to them, and exhorted them to leave the error, '(as he called it) which they had been yet in, and to embrace 'the faith of the Chriſtians, the great promiſe of which is the 'forgiveneſs of every ſin, and every impiety. But none follow-'ed his advice, nor conſented to forſake the rites of their coun-

[a] .... ωτε και Κυνηγιω, τω της αυλης υπαρχῳ, πεμπομενῳ κατα την Αιγυπτον, προστεταγμενῳ τε πασι την εις τα θεια θρησκειαν απαγορευσαι, και κλειθρα τοις τεμενεσιν επιθειναι....Lib. 4. p. 762. [b] Vide Baſn. ann. 388. num. vii. Tillemont. Theod. i. art. xix. [c] L. 4. p. 764, 765.

[d] Τους δε αποδραντας εδεχετο παρα χριστιανων τιμωμενον οικοδομημα, νομιζομενον ασυλον. p. 765. [e] Vide Tillem. L'Emp. Theodoſ. i. art. 28. [f] Lib. iv. p. 779.

'try, which had been delivered to them from the foundation of 'the city, or to make an unreaſonable choice of others in their '* room. For they ſaid that, in the obſervation of them, they 'had poſſeſſed the city unconquered for almoſt twelve hundred 'years; but what might happen, if they ſhould change them for 'others, they knew not. Theodoſius then told them, that the 'public was burdened with the expenſes of the temples, and ſa- 'crifices, and that for the future they ſhould not be allowed, 'for he did not approve of that kind of expenſe. And beſides, 'the neceſſities of the army required more money. The ſenate 'anſwered, that the worſhip of the gods could not be rightly per- 'formed but at the public charge: and then from that time the 'public ſacrifices ceaſing, and all other things received from 'ancient tradition being neglected, the Roman empire has gra- 'dually declined, till it is become the habitation of barbarians, 'or rather is almoſt deſtitute of inhabitants; and the form of it 'is ſo altered, that it is not eaſy to find the places where cities 'once ſtood. Theodoſius now aſſigned Italy, Spain, Gaul, and 'Africa, to his ſon Honorius, and died ſoon afterwards. His 'body having been embalmed was carried to Conſtantinople, and 'there interred in the imperial ſepulchres.'

That is the concluſion of the fourth book of this hiſtory. There is no neceſſity that I ſhould ſtay to make many remarks. But I think it eaſy to ſuppoſe that the great unanimity of the ſenate in adhering to the old religion is here magnified. The complaints before made are here renewed, and with aggravations: for I preſume the ancient cities were ſtill to be found in their old places, and were moſt of them as well peopled as in former times. If ſome had been ruined by wars, or earthquakes, other cities had riſen up in their room, and others were more populous, and more ſplendid, than in former times. This, particularly, was the caſe of Byzantium, now called Conſtantinople.

17. Ruſinus, who had many honours under Theodoſius, and had been ſome while præfect of the Prætorium, and conſul in the year 392, and who, after the death of Theodoſius, (which happened in the beginning of the year 395) was for a ſhort time prime miniſter to Arcadius, was killed at Conſtantinople, or near it, before the end of the year [g] 395, and his body miſerably abuſed, as Zoſimus and others write. Zoſimus then adds: 'The 'wife [h] of Rufinus fearing that ſhe likewiſe ſhould periſh with 'her

* So writes Zoſimus. On the contrary, Prudentius ſays that about this time many ſenators of the beſt families were converted, and embraced the Chriſtian religion. Contr. Symm. l. i. ver. 545, &c.

[g] Vide Baſnag. ann. 395. iv. Tillem. L'Emp. Arcade. art. iv.

[h] Της δε Ρουφινε γαμετης συν τη θυγατρι τη των χρηματων

'her husband, fled with her daughter to a church of the Christians. And Eutropius, then in favour with Arcadius, assured 'her of her life, and gave them leave to sail to the city of Jerusalem, formerly inhabited by the Jews, but since the reign of 'Constantine, adorned with buildings by the Christians. Here 'they spent the rest of their days.

18. And we meet with the end of Eutropius in the [i] year 399. The accounts given of it by Zosimus, is to this purpose: 'Arcadius [k] hearing of these things, sent for Eutropius, and having 'taken from him all his honours, let him go. Whereupon he 'fled to a church of the Christians, which had been made an 'asylum by himself. But Gainas,' as Zosimus says, 'insisting 'that Tribigildas would make no concession, unless Eutropius 'were taken off, contrary to the privilege of asylum given to 'churches, they took him thence, and sent him to Cyprus, to be 'kept a close prisoner. Afterwards he was brought thence to 'Chalcedon, and there put to death: thus [l] eluding the oath 'they had given him, and pretending that they had only promised he should not die at Constantinople.' So Zosimus.

19. Gainas, a Gothish prince, for some while general under Arcadius, revolted: 'And [m] Gainas,' as Zosimus says, 'demanded a conference with Arcadius at a place near Chalcedon, 'where was a martyrdom, dedicated to a religious woman, named 'Euphemia, who had this honour done to her because of her devotion to Christ.'

20. Again, of Gainas. He attempted to take the city of Constantinople, in which he had already a great number of Gothish soldiers, but was defeated. This was in the year 400. 'The [n] city,' says Zosimus, 'having thus escaped that danger, 'the barbarians, which were shut within the city, to the number 'of seven thousand, took to a church of the Christians near the 'palace, seeking that as a sanctuary for their safety. But the 'emperor commanded them to be killed even there, not allowing that place itself to secure them from the just punishment 'due to them. That was the emperor's command: but none 'dared to lay hands on them to take them thence for fear of a

την εκκλησιαν προσφαμενους, δει τε μη συναπολεσθαι τω αιδρι, πιστιν ους ο Ευτροπιος, εδωκει αυταις εις την κατα Ιεροσολυμα πολιν εκπεμψαι, παλαι μεν οικητηριον Ιουδαιων ουσαν, απο δε της Κωνσταντινου βασιλειας, υπο χριστιανων τιμωμενην οικοδομημασιν. Εκειναι μεν ουν αυτοθι τον λειπομενον τω βιω διετριψαν χρονον. l. 5. p. 785, 786. [i] Basn. ann. 399. iii. Pagi 399. i. et ii. [k] Zos. l. 5. p. 793, 794. [l] .... σοφιζομενοι τον ορκον οι τα περι βασιλεα διατιθεντες. p. 794. in.

[m] Και πως τουτο δη του βασιλεως ειδοντος, εγινετο μεν η συνοδος εν τινι προ της Χαλκηδονος τοπω, καθ' ον οσιας Ευφημιας, μαρτυριον οικοδομητο, τιμης δια την περι χριστον θρησκειαν αξιωθεισης. l. 5. p. 794 fin.

[n] Ib. p. 796. in.

'desperate resistance. It [o] was therefore judged proper to break 'open the roof, which was over the table called the altar. Which 'having been done, lighted wood was thrown down upon them, 'till they were all burnt to death: by this means all the barba-'rians were killed. But [p] the zealous Christians thought this to 'be a horrid crime committed in the midst of the city.'

21. Gainas fled into Thrace, and then to Chersonesus, with an intention to return through the streights of the Hellespont into Asia. 'At [q] the same time the emperor and senate, with 'common consent, made choice of Frajutus for general to act 'against him; a man who in regard to his native country was a 'barbarian; but in disposition, and manners, and religion, a 'Greek; and who had upon divers occasions shewn himself to 'be a good general. He came to an engagement with Gainas, 'and obtained a victory over him: but for some reasons did 'not pursue him; upon which account he was censured, and 'suspected to favour him as being his countryman. But [r] Fra-'jutus, not being conscious of any fault, returned to the emperor 'in high spirits for the victory which he had obtained, and 'openly ascribing it to the gods whom he worshipped. For he 'was not ashamed to own in the presence of the emperor him-'self, that he worshipped and honoured the gods according to 'the ancient custom, and that he could not persuade himself to 'follow the multitude therein. The emperor received Frajutus 'graciously, and appointed him consul.'

So writes Zosimus. These things were done in the year 400, and Frajutus, or Fravitta, was consul in 401.

But though Gainas escaped then, he afterwards fell into the hands of Uldas, prince of the Huns, as Zosimus [s] proceeds to relate, who fought with him, and overcame him, and slew him, and then sent his head to Arcadius. All [t] which was done before the end of the year 400.

The history of Gainas, but with somewhat different circumstances, may be seen in our ancient ecclesiastical [u] historians.

[o] Εδοκει τοινυν, την υπερκειμενην της τραπεζης τȣ λεγομενȣ θυσιαστηριȣ στεγην γυμνωθεισαν....Ibid. [p] Εδοξε δε παρα τοις σφοδρα χριστιανιζȣσι, μεγα μυσος εν μεσῃ τετολμησθαι τῃ πολει. Ibid.

[q] Οντος δε εν τȣτοις αυτȣ, κοινη ψηφῳ βασιλευς τε και η γερȣσια στρατηγον επι τω κατα Γαινην αιρȣνται πολεμῳ Φραιȣτον, ανδρα βαρβαρον μεν το γενος, Ελληνα δε αλλως ȣ τροπω μονον, αλλα και τῃ προαιρεσει και τῃ περι τα θεια θρησκειᾳ. Τȣτω τοινυν, ηδη πολλαις διαπρεψαντι στρατηγιαις,...παραδεδωκασι τας δυναμεις... p. 796.

[r] ȣδεν τοιȣτον εαυτῳ συνεπισταμενος, επανηει προς τον βασιλεα, μεγα φρονων επι τῃ νικῃ, και μετα παρρησιας τοις παρ' αυτȣ τιμωμενοις ταυτην ανατιθεις. Ουδε γαρ ῃσχυνετο, και αυτȣ τȣ βασιλεως ακουοντος, ομολογειν, οτι σεβοιτο και τιμαῃ θεȣς κατα τα πατρια, και ουκ ανεξεται κατα τȣτο τοις απο τȣ πληθȣς ακολουθησαι. Φραιουτον μεν ȣν αποδεξαμενος ο βασιλευς, υπατον ειναι κατεστησε. Zos. p. 798. [s] Ib. p. 798, 799.

[t] Vide Basnag. ann. 400. n. iii....v.

[u] Socrat. l. 6. c. 6. Sozom. l. 8. c. 4. Theod. l. 5. c. 32, 33. Philostorg. l. xi. p 531.

Nor

Nor is Fravitta or Frajutus omitted by them: they have mentioned him in a very honourable manner. Socrates particularly says, that[x] though he was a Goth by nation, he was faithful to the Romans, and in that war performed very valuable services, for which reason he was honoured with the consulship in the following year. And Philostorgius says, Fravitta[y] was a Goth by nation, a Greek by religion, faithful to the Romans, and a great general.

May we not then observe that here is an example of moderation and generosity in a Christian emperor, and of fidelity in a heathen general, who were of different sentiments from each other in things of religion?

22. I shall be now led to transcribe a long passage[z] of this historian concerning the differences between the empress, wife of Arcadius, and John Chrysostom, in the years 403 and 404.

'Hence,' says[a] this heathen historian, 'was increased the 'empress's hatred against John, bishop of the Christians [at 'Constantinople,] who was before greatly incensed against him, 'because he had been wont to revile her in his homilies deli-'vered in the public assemblies. But at that time, after the 'return of John and some others, she openly shewed her 'resentment. And doing all things according to her own plea-'sure, she stirred up all the bishops every where to remove 'John; the[b] principal of whom was Theophilus bishop of A-'lexandria in Ægypt, who first began the attack upon the tem-'ples, and the rites established from the beginning of time. 'When the consultation was appointed, and John saw that the 'cause would not be decided equitably, he left Constantinople 'of his own accord. The people being exceedingly disturbed 'at this; for he was very skilful in governing the irrational mul-'titude; the city was filled with confusion, and the church of 'the Christians was seized by the monks. These are men who 'reject lawful marriage, and fill numerous colleges in cities and 'villages with unmarried men, fit neither for war nor any other 'service of the state: except that, increasing in a long course 'of time, they have got possession of a large part of the earth, 'and under pretence of giving all to the poor, they have reduced 'almost all mankind to poverty. These men having seized 'the churches, obstructed the people from coming to the usual

[x] Socrat. l. 6. cap. vi. p. 309.

[y] Πεμπεται στρατηγος κατ' αυτου Φραυιτης, Γοτθος μεν το γενος, ελλην δε την δοξαν, πιστος δε ουν Ρωμαιοις, και τα πολεμια κρατιστος. Philost. l. xi. p. 531. D.

[z] Zos. l. v. p. 799, 800.

[a] Εντευθεν ηυξηθη τη συνοικουση τῳ βασιλει το κατα Ιωαννου του των Χριστιανων επισκοπου μισος, χαλεπαινησης προτερον μεν αυτῳ, κωμωδειν ειωθοτι κατα τας συνοδους αυτην εν ταις προς το πληθος ομιλιαις. p. 799. fin.

[b] Ibid.

'prayers: at which many of the people, as well as the soldiers, 'were greatly provoked; and they desired leave to chastise the 'audaciousness of those men. Having obtained a grant for 'that purpose, they set about the work with a good will, and 'killed all whom they found without distinction, till they had 'filled the church with corpses; and pursuing those who had 'escaped, they slew all whom they met with in black coats: by 'which means many perished who happened to be so dressed, 'either for mourning or on some other account. But John return-'ing again, went on in his old way, making the like disturbances 'in the city as formerly.' Here are inserted some reflections upon the public management under a weak prince and his imperious wife, governed by eunuchs and women. 'And as if 'all these disorders were not sufficient, a terrible calamity befel 'the city of Constantinople, which was occasioned in this man-'ner: John, as I said just now, being returned after his flight, 'again excited the people in the wonted solemnities of religion 'against the empress. But being soon after deprived of the 'episcopal see, and also banished the city, he took shipping and 'went away. At which time they who favoured him, desirous 'that no other person should be bishop in his room, resolved to 'set fire to the city; they therefore threw some combustible ma-'terials into the church privately in the night, and early in the 'morning left the city; whereby they were unknown. But when 'it was day the city appeared to be in the utmost danger, for the 'church was all in flames, and at length was burnt down to the 'ground, as were also the adjoining houses, especially on that side 'where the wind drove the flames. The fire also seized the house 'in which the senate used to meet, which was near the palace, and 'was adorned with statues of excellent artifice, and marble of 'beautiful colours, such as are not now to be found any where. 'And it is said that at that time were consumed those images 'which had been formerly dedicated to the muses in Helicon, 'and were a part of the many sacrileges committed in the time 'of Constantine, and had been set up in this place: whereby 'was evidently intimated the general disaffection to the muses 'which now began to prevail among men. However, at that 'time there happened a kind of miracle which ought not to be 'buried in silence: for the temple of the senate, for the sake of 'which I mention these things, had before the doors of it the 'statue of Jupiter and Minerva, standing upon stone pedestals 'as they do at this time; and they say that of Jupiter is Jupiter

[a] ....σαφεστερον πως την καθεξουσαν απαντας αμουσιαν μηνυοντα. p. 801.

Dodonæus,

'Dodonæus, and that of Minerva is the ſame that was formerly 'ſet up at Lindus. When therefore the temple was conſumed 'by the fire, the lead alſo upon the roof was melted, and ran 'down upon the ſtatues; and the ſtones likewiſe, which could 'not reſiſt the force of the fire, fell alſo upon them; till at laſt, 'when the beauty of the building was all turned into a heap of 'rubbiſh, it was the common opinion that thoſe two images were 'reduced to aſhes: but afterwards when the place was cleared 'and ready to be rebuilt, the ſtatues of thoſe deities, and they 'only, appeared, having eſcaped the univerſal deſtruction. 'Which [d] gave all men of a liberal mind good hopes concern-'ing the city, and that thoſe deities would ever favour it with 'their protection. But let that be as God pleaſeth.'

I have thus largely tranſcribed this paragraph for more fully ſhewing the temper of this learned and polite writer.

23. In the year 408, the ſenate of Rome, with the advice of Stilicho, conſented to pay Alarich the Goth four thouſand pounds in gold. 'However, [e] it was not with the approbation of all. 'And in the debates about that matter,' as Zoſimus ſays, 'Lam-'padius, one of the ſenators, and a man of great eminence for 'his family and ſtation, ſaid in the Latin tongue: Non eſt iſta 'pax, ſed pactio ſervitutis, "that is not the bond of peace but "of ſlavery." But when the ſenate was riſen, fearing he might 'ſuffer for that freedom of ſpeech, he fled to a neighbouring 'church of the Chriſtians.'

24. We may take this opportunity to obſerve of Stilicho, that he was much in favour with Theodoſius the firſt, who gave him in marriage his niece Serena, and left him, when he died in the year 395, the charge of his ſon Honorius, and under him the care of the empire in the Weſt. Honorius married two of Stilicho's daughters, firſt one, and after her death the other. He was conſul in the years 400 and 405: but his ruin ſoon followed after the concluſion of the contract abovementioned; for he was put to death in the month of Auguſt in that ſame year 408.

25. At this time news was brought of the death of Arcadius. Honorius had a mind to go into the Eaſt, to ſecure the empire for young Theodoſius: but Stilicho endeavoured to diſſuade him from it. 'Thus [f] acted Stilicho,' ſays Zoſimus, 'conſcious 'of no miſbehaviour, or ill deſign againſt the emperor, or the 'ſoldiers. But Olympius, who came from the Euxine ſea, and

[d] Οπερ απασι τοις χαριεστεροις αμεινους επι τη πολει δεδωκεν εχειν ελπιδας, ως δη των θεων τουτων εχισθαι της υπερ αυτης αει βουλευομενων προνοιας. Αλλα ταυτα μεν, οπη τω θειω δοκει, παντα προιτω. p. 802. init. [e] ....των πλειονων ου κατα προαιρεσιν, αλλα στελεχωνος φοβω, τουτο ψηφισαμενων· κ. λ. p. 806. in. [f] p. 808. in.

'had been advanced to a high military poſt in the palace, and 'who, [g] under an appearance of Chriſtian piety concealed a 'great deal of wickedneſs, and pretended to the emperor a 'world of candor and moderation, vented againſt Stilicho, as 'the poet expreſſeth it, words exciting anger: for he ſaid that 'Stilicho contrived the taking a journey into the eaſt, with a de-'ſign to make away with the young Theodoſius, and then ſecure 'the empire for his own ſon Eucherius.'

26. 'Olympius [h] being now maſter of the emperor's counſels, 'ſent imperial letters to the ſoldiers at Ravenna, ordering Stili-'cho to be taken into cuſtody, but to be kept at large. When 'Stilicho knew that, he went to a church of the Chriſtians 'which was near at hand, in the night time....As ſoon as it was 'day the ſoldiers entered into the church, and, in the preſence 'of the biſhop, made oath that they were ordered by the empe-'ror only to take him into cuſtody, but not to kill him. When 'he was come out of the church and was in the hands of the 'ſoldiers, another letter was produced by him who brought the 'firſt, commanding Stilicho to be put to death for his crimes 'againſt the ſtate. His ſon Eucherius eſcaped for the preſent 'and went to Rome. Thus died Stilicho, being beheaded: the 'moſt modeſt of all the men in power at that time: for he had 'married the niece of the elder Theodoſius, and had been en-'truſted with the care of both his ſons; and in the three-and-'twenty years that he had governed the army, it never appeared 'that he ſold any places for money, or converted any part of 'the pay of the ſoldiers to his own uſe. His death happened 'when Baſſus and Philip were conſuls, in the ſame year that the 'emperor Arcadius died, on the tenth day of the calends of 'September:' that is, the twenty-third day of Auguſt, in the 'year 408.

27. 'Stilicho's ſon, Eucherius, [i] was ſought for to be put to 'death: but finding that he had fled to one of the churches at 'Rome, they let him alone out of reverence for the place.' However, afterwards, he alſo was put to death by order of [k] Honorius.

28. Zoſimus likewiſe gives an account of the death of Serena, which he ſays was a juſt judgment upon her. 'She [l] ſuffered,' he ſays, 'this puniſhment worthy of her impiety, as I ſhall 'now relate. When Theodoſius the elder, after having van-'quiſhed the tyrant Eugenius, came to Rome, and endeavoured

[g] ....εν δε τη φαινομενη των Χριστιανων ευλαβειᾳ πολλην αποκρυπτων εν εαυτω πονηριαν. Ibid, [h] p. 810, &c. [i] p. 811. [k] p. 813. [l] p. 814.

'to form in all a contempt of the ſacred rites, and refuſed to al-
'low the public expenſes for the ſacrifices, and the prieſt and
'prieſteſſes were driven away, and the temples were left deſtitute
'of the ſacred offices and miniſtrations there performed: at that
'time Serena derided thoſe things, and would herſelf ſee the
'temple of the mother of the gods. And when ſhe ſaw there
'the necklace upon the image of Rhea, an ornament ſuited to
'that divine religion, ſhe took it off from the image and put it
'upon her own neck. And when one of the elder of the veſtal
'virgins, that were yet left and ſtood by, reproved her for her
'impiety, ſhe abuſed her, and ordered her to be had away by
'her ſervants. She then, as ſhe was going, imprecated to Se-
'rena and her huſband and her children, every thing worthy
'of her impiety.' He there goes on to ſay likewiſe that [m] Stili-
cho had brought down the divine vengeance upon himſelf, by
taking away the gold which was upon the doors of the capitol
at Rome. So he is now pleaſed to ſay, though ſome while ago
he commended Stilicho for his faithful ſervices, and diſintereſted
behaviour in the high offices which he had borne.

29. Alarich, after the death of Stilicho, came again to Rome,
before the end of the year 408, the ſtipulated conditions, as is
ſuppoſed, not having been performed. 'The city was then in
'great ſtraits; and,' as Zoſimus ſays, 'the [n] people were made
'ſenſible that theſe calamities had befallen them becauſe they had
'neglected the ancient rites. Whilſt they were thinking after
'this manner,' as he goes on to ſay,' 'Pompeianus, præfect of
'the city, met with ſome Tuſcans lately come to Rome; they
'propoſed the performing ſome rites, by which, as they ſaid,
'they had ſaved another place called Narnia, when in great dan-
'ger, for they had brought down thunder and lightning which
'drove the barbarians away. Whereupon Pompeianus reſolved
'that the ſame rites ſhould now be performed: but [o] conſidering
'what was the prevailing opinion, that what he intended might
'be done with the greater ſecurity, he communicated the whole
'affair to the biſhop of the city. This was Innocent. He
'preferring the ſafety of the city to his own opinion, gave them
'leave to do what they pleaſed, only privately. But they ſaid
'that thoſe rites could be of no benefit to the city unleſs they
'were done publicly, after the appointed manner, the ſenate
'aſcending to the capitol, and there, and in the markets of the
'city, performing what was fit to be done. This being the caſe,

[m] Ibid. [n] p. 816. [o] Επει δε την κρατησαν κατα νυν ελαμβανε δοξαν, κρειττον εθελων πραξαι το σπουδαζομενον, ανατιθεται παντα τω της πολεως επισκοπω. Η. ὁ Ιννοκεντιος. κ. λ. Ibid.

'none

'none dared to partake in the ſacred rites, and the propoſal of 'the Tuſcans was rejected. They therefore diſmiſſed the Tuſ- 'cans, and reſolved to come to an agreement with the barbarians: 'and after treating with them, it was agreed that the city ſhould 'pay to Alarich five thouſand pounds of gold, and thirty thou- 'ſand pounds of ſilver, four thouſand ſilk garments, three thou- 'ſand ſkins of purple dye, and three thouſand pounds of pepper. 'But the treaſury was empty, and it was difficult to get ſo much 'money from private perſons. Some of the ſenators therefore 'who had good eſtates, undertook the collection by way of aſ- 'ſeſſment: but in vain. And [p] that wicked dæmon, which then 'governed human affairs, carried thoſe who were appointed over 'this buſineſs to the perfection of impiety; for they determined 'to make up the ſum that was wanting with the ornaments of the 'images. The taking away which things, ſet up with the ſo- 'lemn rites of conſecration, and in a like manner covered with 'becoming ornaments, for ſecuring perpetual proſperity to the 'city, was nothing elſe than rendering them inanimate and in- 'ſignificant. And becauſe every thing was to conſpire to ac- 'compliſh the ruin of the city, they not only ſtript the images 'of their ornaments, but they alſo melted down ſome of the 'images which were of gold and ſilver; among which was the 'image of Fortitude, which the Romans call Virtue: which be- 'ing deſtroyed, whatever fortitude or virtue had remained among 'the Romans till that time, was now extinguiſhed: and that 'this would be the event was then foretold by thoſe who were 'ſkilful in divine things.'

I am not concerned to juſtify the conduct of thoſe officers. But I ſuppoſe that no men of ſenſe can now believe that thoſe images were of any advantage to the ſafety of the city. However we have here another proof that the change of religion was continually, upon all occaſions, repreſented as hazardous to the ſtate. And we may farther obſerve, that no religion can be ſo abſurd and unreaſonable, eſpecially when it has been eſtabliſhed, and of a long time, that will not find men of good abilities, not only to palliate and excuſe, but alſo to approve and juſtify and recommend it's greateſt abſurdities.

Zoſimus ſays that Innocent, biſhop of Rome, conſented to the propoſal of Pompeianus, provided the ancient rites were performed privately. This [q] Baronius calls a calumny upon In-

[p] ....επι τον κολοφωνα των κακων ο τα ανθρωπινα λαχων αλιτηριος δαιμων, τα πραγματα πραττοντας ηγαγε....ων ην και το της ανδρειας, ην καλεσι Ρωμαιοι υιρτυτεμ. Ουπερ διαφθαρεντος, οσα της ανδρειας ην και αρετης παρα Ραμαιοις, απισθη. Ibid. p. 817.

[q] Baron. ann. 109. num. vi. vii. &c.

nocent;

nocent; the rather becauſe the ſame affair is related by Sozomen, the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, who ſays nothing of Innocent. It may be not improper therefore for us to obſerve Sozomen's account. Speaking of this ſiege of Rome by Alarich in the year 408, he ſays: 'when [r] the ſiege had been prolonged, and 'the city laboured under both famine and peſtilence, and many 'of the ſlaves had gone away to Alarich; the ſenators who ad-'hered to the Greek religion, were of opinion that it was needful 'to offer ſacrifices at the capitol, and the other temples; and 'that there then were with the præfect of the city ſome Tuſcans 'who engaged to drive away the barbarians by thunder and 'lightning; and they boaſted that they had already done the 'ſame at Narnia, a city of Tuſcany; whereupon Alarich paſſed 'by that place, when he came to Rome, and never beſieged it. 'But the event ſhewed that thoſe things could be of no benefit 'to the city.'

Sozomen therefore ſeems to ſay that theſe rites were performed but were ineffectual. Perhaps ſome ſacrifices were offered according to the ancient cuſtoms, but not openly, and at the public expenſe, as Zoſimus intimates. And whether [s] Innocent conſented, or was abſent at that time, as Baronius thinks, may be doubtful. It may be beſt to leave ſome things in uncertainty concerning this hiſtory, for want of better information.

31. 'Heliocrates, præfect of the treaſury, was appointed to 'ſeize the effects of Stilicho, and of thoſe who were ſuppoſed to 'be concerned with him. But [t] he uſed great lenity, and was 'far from being ſtrict in making inquiries after their effects. 'Being therefore,' as Zoſimus ſays, 'judged to be a man of no 'worth, he was ſent to Ravenna, to be there puniſhed for his 'humanity to the unfortunate; and would have been put to 'death, but that he took refuge in a church of the Chriſtians.'

32. In the year 409, [u] as is computed, Generidus was appointed general of the forces in Dalmatia, as well as in Pannonia, Noricum, and Rhætia [x]. Of him Zoſimus ſpeaks in this manner: 'This [y] Generidus was a barbarian by origin, but of an ex-

[r] ...αναγκαιον εδοκει τοις ελληνιζουσι της συγκλητου, θυειν εν τῳ καπιτωλιῳ και τοις αλλοις ναοις· θυσκοι γαρ τινες επι τουτο μεταλληθεντες παρα του υπαρχου της πολεως, υπισχνουντο σκηπτοις και βρονταις απελασειν τους βαρβαρους· ηυχουν δε τοιουτον αυτοις ειργασθαι και περι λαρνιαν πολιν της θουσκιας, ην παριων Αλαριχος επι την Ρωμην ουχ ειλεν· αλλα τουτων μεν ουδεν οφελος εσεσθαι τη πολει, η αποβασις εδειξε. Soz. l. 9. c. vi.

[s] Vide Baſnag. ann. 408. n. x. Tillem. Emp. Honoré. art. 32.

[t] p. 819.

[u] See Tillem. L'Emp. Honoré. art. 34. p. 1228.

[x] Soſ. l. 5. p. 820. l. 30, &c.

[y] Ην δε ο Γενεριδος βαρβαρος μεν το γενος, τον δε τροπον εις παν αρετης ειδος ευ πεφυκως, χρηματων τε αδωροτατος. Ουτος, ετι τοις πατρῳοις εμμενων, και της εις θεους θρησκειας εκστηναι ουκ ανεχομενος, επειδαν νομος εισηχθη τοις ουκ ουσι Χριστιανοις ζωνην εν τοις βασιλειοις εχειν απαγορευων, τουτου του νομου τεθεντος, αρχης εν τῃ Ρωμῃ στρατιωτικης προεστως ο Γενεριδος, εμεινεν επ' οικου, την ζωνην αποθεμενος. κ. λ. Zoſ. l. 5. p. 820.

'cellent

'cellent diſpoſition for every kind of virtue, and not to be 'tempted by money. He ſtill adhered to the ancient rites, and 'could not be perſuaded to relinquiſh the worſhip of the gods: 'though there was a law enacted which forbade all who were not 'Chriſtians to wear a girdle at court. When that law was pub-'liſhed, Generidus, who had a conſiderable military poſt at 'Rome, ſtaid at home, laying aſide his girdle. When the em-'peror called for him, expecting his attendance at court in the 'duty of his office, he anſwered there was a law forbidding him 'to wear a girdle, and that any ſhould be ſo much as numbered 'among officers, who were not of the Chriſtian religion. The 'emperor replied, that law was binding to all others, but not to 'him, who had run ſo many hazards for the ſtate. He anſwer-'ed, that he could not receive that honour with the injury of 'ſo many others, who by that law were deprived of their mili-'tary poſts. Nor would he diſcharge his office till the emperor, 'compelled by ſhame and neceſſity, repealed that law, and gave 'leave to all of the ſame opinion with him to bear civil and mi-'litary offices. Whereupon Generidus accepted the office pro-'poſed to him, and acted therein with diligence and zeal.'

By the law, 'forbidding all but Chriſtians to wear a girdle,' probably Zoſimus intends the [z] law of Honorius, dated the fourteenth of November, in the year 408, which 'forbids all but 'catholics to bear any military offices.' I do not ſee any law expreſsly repealing that juſt mentioned; though there may be ſome references to it. And, as Gothofred [a] ſays, 'in the latter part of 'the year 409, and in the beginning of the year 410, Honorius 'ſhewed uncommon mildneſs to heretics, and particularly to 'Donatiſts, in which the pagans may have ſhared. For Zoſi-'mus ſays that the law which forbade all who were enemies to the 'catholic faith, (which includes both pagans and heretics) to 'bear military offices, (meaning that above-mentioned,) had 'been repealed, and about this time.' Tillemont [b] likewiſe may be conſulted.

33. I proceed no farther in my extracts of this kind out of Zoſimus. Alarich ſtill continued in Italy; and Honorius not

[z] Eos qui catholicæ ſectæ ſunt inimici, intra palatium militare prohibemus. Cod. Theod. lib. 16. Tit. v. l. 42. de Hæreticis. Tom. 6. p. 163.

[a] Honorius ſcilicet et extremis ſuperioris anni, 409. et primis hujus anni menſibus, in hæreticos remiſſior fuerat, ac nominatim Donatiſtas, quorum depravatos animos ad correctionem mitius invitandos crediderat, ut ipſemet ſuperiore loco ait. Quinimo et in Paganos. Nam et Zoſimus lib. 5. p. 821. legem, quâ catholicæ ſectæ inimici (id eſt, ut hæretici ita et pagani) intra palatium militare prohibiti fuerant, (et ſic l. 42. ſupr.) eo quo dixi tempore, abrogatam teſtatur. Gothofred. Cod. Theod. T. 6. p. 171.

[b] See L'Emp. Honoré. art. 31. et 34.

having

having performed the conditions insisted upon, Alarich came again to Rome, besieged it, and took it, in the year 410. But Zosimus has not written the history of that siege, and the event of it; or if he did, it is now wanting.

34. In the extracts already made, we have seen many proofs of the credulity and superstition of this great man. Nevertheless I am disposed to put together here some other instances hitherto omitted.

35. After having made great complaints of the extent and grandeur of the city of Constantinople, he says: 'I [bb] have often 'wondered, since the city of Byzantium has grown so great, 'that our ancestors had no divine prophecy about it. And 'having long employed my thoughts about it, and having turn-'ed over a great many historians, and collections of oracles, 'and having spent a good deal of time in endeavouring to un-'derstand them, I at length met with an oracle, which is ascribed 'to Sibylla Epythræa, or Phaello. It is to this effect.....'

36. About the time of the death of Valentinian, which happened in November 375, or soon after, 'there [c] fell a thunder-'bolt,' he says, 'upon Sirmium, which consumed both the pa-'lace and the market-place, which by good judges was esteemed 'a bad omen to public affairs. There also happened earthquakes 'in some places. Crete was violently shaken, as also Pelopon-'nesus, and all the rest of Greece; so that many cities were de-'stroyed, except only the city of the Athenians and others in 'Attica. That, as is said, was saved in this manner: Nestorius '[d] who was hierophantes, (or high-priest) had a dream, in which 'he was admonished that the hero Achilles ought to be ho-'noured with public honours, for that would be for the welfare 'of the city. When he communicated that vision to the chief 'men of the city, they thought he doted, as being an old man, 'and therefore did nothing that was required. However, [e] con-'sidering with himself what ought to be done, and being like-'wise instructed by divine illuminations infused into his mind, 'he made an image of the hero in a small house, and then put 'it under the image of Minerva, which is in the Parthenion. 'And as often as he offered sacrifices to the goddess, he at the 'same time performed what was due to the hero. By this means, 'having fulfilled the intention of the dream, the Athenians were

[bb] lib. 2. p. 689, 690. [c] l. 4. p. 745.

[d] Νεστοριος, εν εκεινοις τοις χρονοις ιεροφαιτειν τεταγμενος, οναρ εθεασατο παρακελευσαινοι χρηναι τον Αχιλλεα τον ηρωα δημοσιαις τιμασθαι τιμαις· εσεσθαι γαρ τουτο τη πολει σωτηριον. p. 745. fin.

[e] ....αυτος καθ' εαυτον λογισαμενος το πρακτεον, και ταις θεοειδεσιν εννοιαις παιδαγωγουμενος, εικονα του ηρωος εν οικῳ μικρω δημιουργησας, υπεθηκε τω εν παρθενωνι καθιδρυμενῳ της Αθηνας αγαλματι. κ. λ. l. 4. p. 746. in.

'saved,

'ſaved; and all Attica partook of the benevolence of the hero. 'The truth of all which may be learned from the hymn which 'the philoſopher Syrianus compoſed in honour of the hero upon 'that occaſion. This relation I have thought not improper to 'inſert in this place.'

Beſide other things which may be taken notice of, we may obſerve, here are proofs that at this time, about the year 375, and afterwards, Gentile people did practiſe the ancient rites upon divers occaſions: nor do we ſee that they met with much moleſtation therein. And Zoſimus, now in 420, or later, ſpeaks of them with a great deal of freedom.

37. Valens had war with the Goths. And in the year 378, the year in which he died, he came from Antioch to Conſtantinople. 'When [f] the army ſet out thence to go into Thrace, and 'the emperor with them,' as our hiſtorian ſays, 'they ſaw a 'prodigy, or ſtrange ſight; the body of a man lay in the road 'quite motionleſs, who looked as if he had been whipped from 'head to foot, only his eyes were open, and ſeemed to ſtare at 'all who came near him. When he was aſked who he was, and 'whence he came, and from whom he had ſuffered that treatment, 'he made no anſwer to any; which they thought to be very ſtrange. 'And they ſhewed him to the emperor as he paſſed by; and 'though he put the ſame queſtions to him he remained ſpeechleſs. He could not be thought a living creature, becauſe his 'whole body was void of motion; nor yet quite dead, becauſe 'his eyes ſeemed well. At length he vaniſhed on a ſudden. 'Which when the ſtanders-by ſaw, they could not tell what to 'think. But they who were ſkilful ſaid, it portended the future 'ſtate of the empire: that it ſhould look as if it had been beaten, 'and whipt, and like thoſe who are juſt expiring, till by the bad 'management of magiſtrates and governors, it ſhould be quite 'deſtroyed. And if we conſider every thing this prediction will 'appear to have been very true.'

38. I ſhall tranſcribe no more of theſe things at length, and add only a paragraph of Dr. Bentley in his Remarks [g] upon a late Diſcourſe of Free-thinking; where this laſt-mentioned, and ſeveral other like things are ſummarily rehearſed: 'Zoſimus, a 'poor ſuperſtitious creature, (and conſequently, as one would 'gueſs, an improper witneſs for our free-thinker) who has filled 'his little hiſtory not more with malice againſt the Chriſtians, 'than with bigotry for the pagans: who treats his readers with

[f] Zoſ. l. 4. p. 748.

[g] Remarks, &c. num. xlii. p. 167.

'oracles

'oracles of the Palmyrenes, and Sibyls; with annual miracles 'done by Venus, where gold and silver swam upon the water; 'with presages and dreams of old women; with thunders and 'earthquakes, as if they were prodigies; with a dead body 'vanishing in the middle of an army; with omens and predic-'tions from entrails of beasts; with an apparition of Pallas and 'her gorgons, and with a spectre of Achilles; with wooden idols 'that fire could not burn; with a necklace of the goddess Rhea 'that executed divine vengeance: who imputes the taking of 'Rome by Alarich to the omission of pagan sacrifices; and the 'decay of the Roman empire to Constantine's neglecting the 'Ludi Seculares: this wise and judicious author is brought in 'for good evidence. And our avowed enemy to superstition, 'connives at all this trumpery for the sake of one stab at the 'reputation of Constantine, and the honour of Christianity.'

III. Some may think that I have been too prolix in my extracts from this author. Nevertheless I have not thought it expedient to abridge more than I have done. There is somewhat entertaining in those histories, as I believe will be owned by most of my readers. And these extracts are authentic monuments of the ancient heathen superstition and credulity, and of the zeal with which the rites of Gentilism were upheld and defended by all sorts of persons, learned as well as unlearned; and by men of high stations, as well as by people of low condition. They did all that lay in their power to check or stop the progress of Christianity. They would gladly have recovered and restored ancient Gentilism. Here are many reflections upon Christian emperors, and especially upon Constantine and Theodosius. And the work is even filled with complaints of the badness of the times, and the declension of the Roman empire: all owing, as insinuated, to the change of religion, and the non-performance of the rites of Gentilism, according to the ancient custom.

CHAP.

CHAP. LIX.

HIEROCLES of Alexandria.

His time, hiſtory and works, with remarks.

HIEROCLES,[a] ſtyled by Bayle a Platonic philoſopher of the fifth century, I place at the year[b] 450.

'Hierocles,' ſays[c] Suidas, 'an Alexandrian philoſopher, was 'a man of a great mind, and of ſuch eloquence, as to attract the 'admiration of all his hearers. He had a diſciple named Theo- 'ſebius, who, beyond any man known to us, was able to look 'into the minds of men. This Theoſebius aſſured us, that 'Hierocles in ſome of his lectures ſaid, that the diſcourſes of 'Socrates were like dies; for fall which way ſoever they would, 'they were always right. Hierocles's great and generous mind 'was diſcovered in adverſity; for[d] coming to Byzantium, he 'offended the people of the prevailing religion,' meaning the Chriſtians, 'and being brought into court, he was there beaten 'and wounded: the blood then running down, he took ſome of 'it in the hollow of his hand and threw it at the judge, ſaying to 'him at the ſame time, "You, Cyclops, here, drink wine, ſince "you have devoured human fleſh." And being baniſhed thence 'he came to Alexandria, where, after his former manner, he 'taught philoſophy to thoſe who reſorted to him. His good 'ſenſe may be ſeen in his writings; in his Commentary upon 'the golden Verſes of Pythagoras, in his book of Providence, 'and in many other works: by all which he appears to have 'been a man of an exalted mind, as well as of extenſive know- 'ledge.'

1. It is allowed, and is particularly obſerved by his[c] annotator,

[a] Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 2. c. xii. Tom. i. p. 469...473. Bayle, Hierocles Philoſophe Platonicien. Pearſoni Prolegom. et Needham Præfatio. [b] ...atque adeo circa medium ſeculi poſt Chriſtum natum quinti floruiſſe. Fabric. ubi ſupra. p. 470. [c] Ιεροκλης, φιλοσοφος Αλεξανδρευς, κ. λ. Suidas. [d] Εις γαρ τι Βυζαντιον αιελθων προσεκρουσε τοις κρατουσι, και εις δικαστηριον αχθεις ετυπτετο τας εξ αιθριων σλαγας. Ρεομενος δε τω αιματι, βαψας κοιλην την χειρα, προσραιπι τον δικαστην, αμα λεγων'

Κυκλωψ, τη, 'πι, οινοι, επι φαγες ανδρομεα κρεα.
Homer. Odyſſ. i. ver. 347. Suidas.

[c] Totum hunc articulum deſcripſiſſe Suidam ex Damaſcii Vita Iſidori philoſophi, vel ex Photio patet: apud quem in Excerptis ex illâ Vitâ, Cod. 242. p. 1057. nonnulla eorum, quæ hic de Hierocle Grammaticus noſter habet, αυτολεξει leguntur, Kuſter. in Suidæ locum.

that

that this article of Suidas is taken from the Life of Iſidorus, written by Damaſcius.

2. We may obſerve the ſtyle of this heathen writer in the ſixth century. Speaking of Conſtantinople, he calls it by it's ancient name Byzantium, rather than by that which generally obtained in his own time.

3. May not this action of Hierocles, who filled the hollow of his hand with blood, and threw it at the judge, be allowed to juſtify a like action in Ædeſius, a Chriſtian martyr mentioned * formerly?

4. I am ſorry that Hierocles was ill-treated by the Chriſtians at Conſtantinople: but I am well pleaſed to ſee that he afterwards philoſophized at Alexandria in his uſual manner. Of this we are aſſured by Damaſcius himſelf, who was not wanting in zeal for Gentiliſm. And it is, I think, a proof that the ſeverities with which the Gentile people, and particularly their learned men and philoſphers, were treated, were not extremely rigorous.

Hierocles was a married man. 'He [f] married only for the 'ſake of children. His wife,' as Damaſcius writes, 'became 'poſſeſſed. As the dæmon would not be perſuaded to depart 'by good words, his diſciple Theoſebius compelled him by an 'oath; though he did not underſtand magic nor theurgy: but 'he adjured him by the rays of the ſun, and the God of the He-'brews. Whereupon the dæmon departed, crying out that he 'reverenced the gods and him in particular.'

I need not make any remarks. But I thought it not improper to relate this ſtory of a Gentile philoſopher told by a Gentile hiſtorian.

In this article we have ſeen particular mention made of two works of Hierocles, his Commentary upon the golden Verſes of Pythagoras, which is ſtill extant; and his Diſcourſe on Providence, of which there are large extracts in [g] Photius. It conſiſted of ſeven books, and was inſcribed to Olympiodorus, well known for ſome embaſſies, and other ſervices for the empire.

Beſide theſe there are large fragments of other works preſerved in Stobæus, and generally publiſhed together with the works above-mentioned.

All theſe are valuable, tending to recommend and promote

* See Vol. viii. ch. xxxix. num. iii.

[f] Γυναικα παιδοποιον αγεται. Ως δε ουκ επειθετο το δαιμονιον της γυναικος εξελθειν λογοις ημετεροις, ορκω αυτο απηναγκαζεν ο Θεοσεβιος· καιτοι ουτε μαγευειν ειδως, ουτε θεουργιας μελετησας· ωρκιζε δε τας του ηλιου προτεινων ακτινας, και Εβραιων θεον. Ο δε απεληλατο ο δαιμων, αναχραγων, ευλαβεισθαι τους θεους, αισχυνεσθαι δε και αυτον. Ap. Phot. Cod. 242. p. 1037.

[g] Cod. ccxiv. p. 548, &c.

virtue; but not with that force which flows from revelation, enjoining every part of moral righteousness by divine authority, and with the assurance of recompenses in a future state. This is a defect common to him with other Gentile writers.

However, it is not my design to detract from Hierocles; whom I esteem as a good and useful man, and all his writings valuable. Several of the fragments are of considerable length. Some of the subjects treated of in the fragments are these: 'Our [h] duty to the gods; our duty to our country; our duty to 'parents; of brotherly love; of marriage; of our duty to relations; of œconomy, or the management of a family; where 'he treats of the different offices of the husband and the wife, or 'the master and the mistress.' The fragment on marriage, meaning [i] the society of one man and one woman, is copious, enlarging on the benefits, the pleasures, the honour of marriage, and that it is becoming in a wise man. It must be owned that here occur those expressions: 'In [k] this discourse concerning mar'riage and the procreation of children, it will be needful to say 'something concerning the increase of children: for it is agree'able to nature and marriage, that all, or however the most, 'should be preserved and brought up.'

Here seems to be a license given to parents to expose their children if they are numerous and burthensome. However, he argues against that in the next words after this manner: 'Indeed 'many [l] dislike this rule for a reason not very becoming; they 'have too great a desire of riches, and too great a dread of po'verty.' Then he observes the benefits of a numerous offspring, and says that men beget children not only for themselves, but also for their country; which cannot be upheld and prosper without a succession of men one after another.

[h] Hieroclis fragmenta apud Needham. p. 280. &c. [i] p. 300. edit. Needham.

[k] Εν δε τῳ περι τȣ γαμȣ και της παιδοποιας τοπῳ θετεος εςι και ο της πολυτεκνιας λογος. Κατα φυσιν γαρ πως και ακολȣθον τῳ γαμω τα παντα, η τα γε πλειςα, των γενομενων ανατρεφειν. Ibid. p. 308.

[l] Αλλ' εοικασιν οι πλειȣς απειθειν τῃ παραινεσει, δι' αιτιαν ου μαλα πρεπωδη· δια γαρ φιλοπλȣτιαν, και το παμμεγα κακον ηγεισθαι την πενιαν, τȣτο πασχȣσι. Ibid. p. 308.

CHAP

CHAP. LX.

PROCLUS.

Proclus, preſident of the ſchool of philoſophy at Athens, author of a treatiſe againſt the Chriſtians, and many other works.

1. PROCLUS[a] ought to be reckoned among the writers againſt the Chriſtian religion. I ſhall begin with the account given of him by Suidas in his Lexicon, and then add what may be farther needful.

2. 'Proclus[b] of Lycia,' ſays Suidas, 'ſcholar of Syrianus, a 'hearer alſo of the philoſopher Plutarch, ſon of Neſtorius, was 'a Platonic philoſopher. He preſided in the philoſophical 'ſchool at Athens. Marinus of Neapolis was his ſcholar and 'ſucceſſor. He wrote very many books, philoſophical and 'grammatical; a Commentary upon all Homer; a Commen-'tary upon Heſiod's Works and Days; of Theurgy two books; 'upon the Republick of Plato, four books; of Oracles, ten 'books.... [and others, whoſe titles are there mentioned] and 'eighteen arguments againſt the Chriſtians. This is that Pro-'clus who after Porphyry moved his impure and petulant 'tongue againſt the Chriſtians. Againſt him wrote John, called 'Philoponus, who admirably confuted his eighteen arguments, 'and likewiſe ſhewed his ignorance and unſkilfulneſs in the 'Greek learning, upon which he ſo much valued himſelf. Pro-'clus alſo wrote a book concerning the mother of the gods, 'which if any perſon take into his hands he will ſee that the 'philoſopher did not without divine impulſe explain the the-'ology of that goddeſs; ſo that men need not any longer be 'diſturbed about the lamentations which are heard in that ſo-'lemnity.'

This laſt part of the article Suidas had from Marinus, as we ſhall ſee preſently.

[a] Cav. Hiſt. Lit. Tom. i. p. 552. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 18. Tom. 8. p. 455. &c. et Prolegom. in Procli vitam a Marino ſcriptam. Vid. et Phot. Cod. 239. p. 982.

[b] Πρόκλος, ὁ Λύκιος, μαθητὴς Συριανῦ, ἀκροατὴς δὲ καὶ Πλυτάρχυ τυ Νεςορίυ, τυ φιλοσόφυ· καὶ αὐτὸς φιλόσοφος Πλατωνικός. Οὗτος προέςη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις φιλοσόφυ σχολῆς· καὶ αὐτῦ μαθητὴς καὶ διάδοχος χρηματίζει Μαρῖνος ὁ Νεαπολίτης. Ἔγραψε πάνυ πολλὰ, φιλοσοφά τε καὶ γραμματικά. Ὑπόμνημα εἰς ὅλον τὸν Ὅμηρον· Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὰ Ἡσιόδυ Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέρας. Περὶ Χρησομαθίας βιβλία γ. Περὶ ἀγωγῆς β...Περὶ τὰ Λόγια, βιβλία ι. Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὁμήρῳ Θεῶν. Ἐπιχειρήματα κατὰ Χριςιανῶν ιη. Οὗτος ἐςὶ Πρόκλος, ὁ δεύτερος μετὰ Πορφύριον κατὰ Χριςιανῶν τὴν μιαρὰν καὶ ἐφιβριςὴν αὐτῶ γλῶσσαν κινήσας.... Suid.

3. Suidas ſays he was of Lycia: and Marinus, [c] in his Life of Proclus, ſays that his father Patricius, and his mother Marcella, were both of Lycia; but that Proclus was born at Byzantium. He lived in the fifth century, being born, as Fabricius [d] has computed, in the year of Chriſt 412, and dying when he was about ſeventy-five years of age in the year 485. I have placed him at the year 464, when he was above forty years of age; at which time it may be reaſonably ſuppoſed he was ſettled in his preſidentſhip in the ſchool at [e] Athens, and had been the author of ſeveral works.

4. Proclus's book againſt the Chriſtians is not extant by itſelf; and many learned men have ſuppoſed that John Philoponus's anſwer to him was alſo loſt: but Fabricius [f] ſhews this to be a miſtake. And he obſerves likewiſe, that the eighteen arguments of Proclus are preſerved in the eighteen books of Philoponus againſt him.

It ſhould be alſo obſerved, that thoſe eighteen arguments of Proclus were not againſt the Chriſtian religion in general, but only, or chiefly, againſt that one opinion of the Chriſtians, that the world had a beginning.

5. I add nothing farther here; but I intend to make extracts in the next chapter out of the Life of Proclus, written by his ſcholar Marinus; in which, as ſeems to me, there are not a few things deſerving our notice.

[c] Marini Proclus. cap. 6. p. 11. edit. Fabric. [d] Hæc genitura....docet, Proclum, qui Byzantinus fuit, et citra controverſiam ſeculo poſt Chriſtum natum 5, floruit, natum eſſe Anno Chriſti 412, die 8 Februarii...Ex ejuſdem iterato teſtimonio ſcimus, Proclum vixiſſe annos quinque et ſeptuaginta, (lunares nempe, quibus uſi Græci) ut adeo mortuus ſit Athenis Anno Chriſti Juliano 485, die 17 Aprilis. Fabric. Prolegom. in Marini Proclum. p. vi. Vid. et Bib. Gr. ubi ſupr. p. 456. [e] Athenas autem venit Proclus circa A. D. 463 aut 464, ſi Lambecii judicio ſtandum ſit. Pet. Needham. in Præf. ad Hieroclem. ſub fin.

[f] Equidem hoc Philoponi adverſus Proclum opus non minus quam Procli ipſius argumenta intercidiſſe putat Caveus, vir doctiſſimus in Hiſtoria Literaria...ratus a Proclo, ad Celſi, Juliani, Porphyrii denique exemplum, ut ex Suidæ verbis male collegit, univerſam Chriſtianam Religionem illis xviii. argumentis impugnatam fuiſſe. Enimvero duodeviginti επιχειρηματα directa ſunt potiſſimum adverſus unum dogma Chriſtianorum de mundo non æterno, et etiamnum exſtant in Johannis Philoponi libris duodeviginti de æternitate mundi contra Proclum, quod hoc ipſum opus eſt tantis a Suida celebratum laudibus. Fabric. de Procli Scriptis editis, ad calcem Marini Procli. p. 80.

CHAP.

CHAP. LXI.

MARINUS.

Marinus, successor of Proclus in the chair of the school of philosophy at Athens, author of the Life of Proclus. Extracts out of that Life. Where also of Syrianus, predecessor of Proclus.

1. Marinus, of † Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, scholar of Proclus, and his successor in the chair of the school of philosophy at Athens, wrote the Life of Proclus, who died in the year 485, soon [a] after his master's death.

2. In this Life are two passages which have a reference to the Christians: if I transcribe them at length there will appear some other things deserving our regard. And afterwards I shall transcribe several other passages.

3. 'If [b] I should allow myself to enlarge here,' says Marinus, 'I might relate very many theurgic operations of this blessed 'man. One, however, out of innumerable, I shall mention, and 'it is wonderful to hear. Asclepigenia, daughter of Archiades 'and Plutarcha, and wife of Theagenes, to whom we are much 'indebted when she was yet but a young maiden, and lived with her 'parents, was seized with a grievous distemper, incurable by the 'physicians. Archiades, as all the hopes of his family depended 'upon her, was much grieved and afflicted. All help from the 'physicians failing, as in other cases, so now in this also, he 'applied to the sheet anchor, that is, to the philosopher, as his 'good saviour, earnestly entreating him to pray for his daughter, 'whose condition was not unknown to him. He therefore 'taking with him Pericles of Lydia, who also was a philoso-'pher, and worthy of that name, went [c] to the temple of Æscu-'lapius, intending there to offer up his prayers to the god for the 'afflicted young woman. For the city [Athens] was then hap-'py in him, and enjoyed the temple of the saviour entire and 'undemolished. Whilst he was praying after the ancient man-

† The origin of Marinus shall be more particularly related by and by in an article taken from Damascius, in chap. lxii.

[a] Hinc merito videor mihi colligere hanc vitam a Marino scriptam editamque non diu a Procli obitu, certe anno nondum integro post illum elapso, quia de Eclipsi hac ut futura loquitur. Fabric. not. in Marini Proclum, cap. 37. p. 76.

[b] Marini Proclus. chap. 29. p. 58. &c.

[c] .... ανηει εις το Ασκληπειον, προσευξομενος τῳ Θεῳ υπερ της καμνουσης. Και γαρ ηυτυχει τουτου η πολις τοτε, και ειχεν ετι απορθητον το του σωτηρος ιερον. Ευχομενου αυτου τον αρχαιοτερον τροπον, αθροα μεταβολη περι την κορην εφαινετο, και ραστωνη εξαιφνης εγιγνετο. Ρεια γαρ ο Σωτηρ ως τε Θεος ιατο. Ib. p. 60.

'ner,

'ner, the young woman immediately perceived an alteration for 'the better, and recovered. For the ſaviour, as being god, 'healed her eaſily. The ſacred rites being performed Proclus 'went to Aſclepigenia, and found her freed from her diſtemper, 'and in the enjoyment of health. However, this whole affair 'was tranſacted privately without the knowledge of any others, 'and without giving any occaſion to make inquiries. And this 'was the more eaſily ſo tranſacted, his habitation being near to 'the temple; which was one of the felicities of this man, that 'he had a very convenient houſe, which his father Syrianus, 'and his grandfather Plutarch (for ſo he called[d] them), had 'lived in, and which was near to the temple of Æſculapius.'

4. Preſently afterwards he ſpeaks of the favours which Proclus received from Minerva. 'And,'[e] ſays he, 'how dear he was to 'the goddeſs, preſident of philoſophy, appeared from the great 'progreſs which he made in that ſtudy, to which he had been 'directed by the goddeſs herſelf. And ſhe alſo manifeſted her 'great regard for him when her image, which had been hitherto 'placed in the Parthenion (or temple of Minerva), was taken 'away by thoſe who move ſuch things as ought not to be moved: 'for when that was done a woman of excellent beauty appeared 'to him in a dream, who bid him preſently put his houſe in or-'der. For,' ſays ſhe, "the lady Minerva intends to come "and live with you." And,' as Marinus goes on to ſay in the words next following, 'how much he was favoured by the 'god Æſculapius is evident from what was before related by us: 'and was farther apparent from the preſence of the god with 'him in his laſt ſickneſs. For, when he was between ſleeping 'and waking, he ſaw a dragon creeping about his head, which 'occaſioned ſome remiſſion of his diſtemper. By that viſion 'there was an abatement made in his ſickneſs. And it is eaſy to 'believe that were it not for his preparedneſs for death, and his 'deſire of it, he might have recovered if he had been more 'careful about his health.'

We may ſuppoſe that when Marinus ſpeaks of the taking away the ſtatue of Minerva out of her temple, he ſhews ſome caution

[d] He calls Syrianus his father, as he had been inſtructed by him: and Plutarch his grandfather, as he had inſtructed his maſter. Pater, non qui genuerat, ſed qui inſtituerat: et avus pro magiſtro præceptoris. Fabric. in loc.

[e] Ὁπως δε αυτος και τη φιλοσοφω Θεω προσφιλης εγενετο, παρεστησε μεν ινανως και αιρεσις τυ εν φιλοσοφια βιυ, τοιαυτη γενομενη, οιαν ο λογος υπεδειξε. Σαφως δε και η Θεος εδηλωσε, νικα το αγαλμα αυτης το εν Παρθεωνι τεως ιδρυμενον υπο των τα ακινητα κινεντων μετεφερετο. Εδοκει γαρ τω φιλοσοφω ωρα, φοιταν παρ' αυτον ευσχημων τις γυνη, και απαγγελλειν, οτι χρη ταχιστα την οικιαν προπαρασκευαζειν· η γαρ κυρια Αθηναις ιδρυσθαι παρα σοι μενειν εθελει. Ibid. cap. 30. p. 61.

and

and modeſty, out of reſpect to the times in which he lived, ſaying in thoſe ſoft terms that, 'they moved ſuch things as ought 'not to be moved.' For he muſt have eſteemed it ſacrilege, and the utmoſt profaneneſs.

5. I have tranſcribed more of both thoſe paſſages than might be thought needful: but I was willing to ſhew the credulity of thoſe philoſophers, a weakneſs very common to men of all characters; and therefore we ought to be upon our guard againſt it, and exerciſe our reaſon and our ſenſes; which certainly God has beſtowed upon us for ſome good purpoſes, beſide procuring the immediate comforts of life.

6. I ſhall add a few more like things for ſhewing how much the thoughts of this great philoſopher Proclus, and of his diſciple Marinus, were engaged in theſe ſuperſtitions, and the fables on which they were founded.

7. 'But,' ſays [f] Marinus, 'if I ſhould go over all the like 'things, and relate his friendſhip with Pan, ſon of Mercury, 'and the many favours and bleſſings which he received from this 'god at Athens; and particularly the many advantages conferred 'upon him by the mother of the gods, upon which he highly 'valued himſelf; I ſhould perhaps ſeem to the reader to ſay 'things very unlikely, and even incredible: for indeed there 'were very many, and almoſt innumerable inſtances of the fa'vour of this goddeſs toward him, and more than I can myſelf 'now recollect. However, if any are deſirous to have a full 'knowledge of them, he may conſult his book of the mother of 'the gods. By which he will perceive that it was not without 'divine aid that he was able to bring to light all the theology 'concerning that goddeſs, and the ſeveral things which are myſ'tically ſaid and done by her and Attis. All which he has phi'loſophically explained; ſo that men need no longer to be diſ'turbed about the lamentations, and other myſteries of that ſo'lemnity.'

8. And in a preceding chapter, among other ſuperſtitions of Proclus, Marinus informs us that, 'once [g] a month he purified 'himſelf according to the rites of the mother of the gods.'

Nor can we forbear to recollect here that the mother of the gods was a ſubject, which employed the fine pen of the emperor Julian, [h] who compoſed a long oration to recommend and explain her myſteries.

[f] Cap. 32. p. 69. [g] Τας δε μητρωακας παρα Ρωμαιοις, η και προτερον ποτε παρα Φρυξι, σπεδαζθεισας αγιστιας εκαστω μηνος ηγνευεν. Cap. 19. p. 36. [h] Or. V. ap. Spanhem. p. 158. &c.

9. Marinus ſays that, 'Proclus [i] died in the hundred and 'twenty-fourth year after the reign of Julian.'

Which ſhews that the memory of Julian was ſtill dear to the heathen people, of whoſe reign they were willing to make an epoch.

He was buried in the ſame ſepulchre with his maſter [k] Syrian.

10. In a place before cited, we ſaw how, Marinus ſays, that [l] beſide other felicities, Proclus had an advantage in the ſituation of his houſe, which was near the temple of Æſculapius. And Marinus [m] has ſeveral times aſſured us that Proclus abounded, and even overflowed in the goods of fortune. This has occaſioned Fabricius to refer to a paſſage in the extracts of Photius from Damaſcius; which indeed appears to me very curious: where it [n] is ſaid, 'the revenues of the ſchool were not then ſuch as they 'were in the time of Plato, as ſome imagine: for Plato was poor, 'and had only one garden, which was in the academy, and a 'ſmall revenue of three crowns. But in the time of Proclus the 'revenue was a thouſand crowns, or more, many having left 'handſome legacies to the ſchool.'

And I ſhall alſo place below the note of [o] Fabricius. Undoubtedly ſuch an annual revenue was very comfortable. And I cannot but think that this ſhews the good temper of the Chriſtian magiſtracy at that time: for Proclus, and the other preſidents of the philoſophical ſchool at Athens, were heathens. To me it ſeems alſo that the large catalogue of the works of Proclus in Suidas, is another argument of the freedom which the Gentile people then enjoyed. Proclus could not have publiſhed ſo many works of philoſophy and literature, if the diſcouragements under which the Gentiles lay had been very ſtrict and rigorous: and I have therefore tranſcribed above the more of that catalogue, that my readers might be the better ſenſible of this. And one of thoſe books was againſt the Chriſtians, as others were in favour of the myſteries of Gentiliſm. This Life of Proclus, written by Marinus, muſt be reckoned another example of freedom of ſpeech,

[i] Ετελευτησε δε τω δ' και κ' και ρ' απο Ιθλιανου βασιλειας. Cap. 36. p. 73.

[k] Cap. 36. p. 74. [l] See before, p. 70. [m] Ουδ' αυ παλιν την προς των πολλων υμνουμενην ευποτμιαν, ει και αυτη παλιν εκ τυχης αυτω ευπαρεσκευασο, ει τω αλλω ανθρωπων. Κεχορηγητο γαρ αφθονως απασι τοις εξωθεν λεγομενοις αγαθοις. Cap. 2. p. 3, 4. Vid. et cap. 34. p. 71.

[n] Η των διαδοχων ουσια, ουχ ως οι πολλοι νομιζουσι, Πλατωνος ην το ανεκαθεν. Πενης γαρ ην ο Πλατων, και μονον τον εν ακαδημια εκεκτητο κηπον· η δε προσοδος νομισματων τριων. Η δε της ουσιας ολης Χιλιων η και πλειονων υπηρχεν επι Πρoκλου, πολλων των αποθνησκοντων κτηματα τη σχολη καταλιμπανοντων. Phot. Cod. 242. p. 1057.

[o] Marinus ſupra dixerat, Proclum bonis fortunæ undique affluiſſe et abundaſſe. Cui adde quod Photius ex Damaſcio refert p. 536. redditus ſcholæ, cui Proclus præfuit, ex variis legatis non mediocriter auctos fuiſſe, ita ut ſumma mille amplius nummûm, hoc eſt thalerorum, inde quotannis philoſophus fieret ditior. Fabric. annot. ad Marini Procl. cap. 29. p. 61.

owing

owing to the privileges which thoſe diſſenters and nonconformiſts then enjoyed.

11. It may be thought that I have already concluded this chapter; nevertheleſs I have a word or two more to add.

The works of Proclus were very numerous and voluminous, as we have ſeen. Fabricius [p] has enlarged in his account of them very much to the ſatisfaction of learned and curious readers.

In Photius [q] are extracts out of a work of Proclus, entitled χρηστομαθια, in two books, which is alſo in the catalogue of Suidas. The work itſelf is loſt. But from the extracts of Photius it appears to have been a work filled with ancient learning. He therein diſcourſed of the ſeveral ſorts of poetry. 'He [r] obſerved 'that among epic poets the moſt excellent were Homer, Heſiod, 'Piſander, Panyaſis, and Antimachus. And he there repre-'ſented, ſo far as he could learn, their families, their countries, 'and works.' Upon which part of Photius's extract I place below an obſervation of [s] Fabricius.

12. Syrianus likewiſe who was of Alexandria, and was maſter of Proclus, and his predeceſſor in the ſchool at Athens, was author of divers works. There is a catalogue of them under his name in Suidas; though [t] poſſibly there may be in it ſome miſtakes. And ſome things may be aſcribed to Syrianus which were written by Proclus. Syrianus is ſuppoſed to have died about [u] the year of Chriſt 450.

It may be thought by ſome that I have enlarged too much in my account of this life of Proclus by Marinus; nevertheleſs I have not fully gratified myſelf: if I had, inſtead of making extracts, I ſhould have made a tranſlation of the whole work, as I did of Libanius for the temples: it affording, as ſeems to me, a genuine and curious ſpecimen of heatheniſh credulity and ſimplicity. I believe that Marinus was an honeſt man; at leaſt I ſee nothing to the contrary. I am glad that he lived ſo comfortably, though he was not of the prevailing religion.

[p] Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 26. T. 8. p. 455. &c. [q] Cod. 239. p. 981. &c.

[r] Γεγονασι δε τε επες ποιηται, κρατιςος μεν Ομηρος, Ησιοδος, Πισανδρος, Παινασις, Αντιμαχος. Διηρχεται δε τετων, ως οιον τε εν, γενος τε και πατριδας, και τινας επιμιξεις [al. επιμετρησεις] πραξεις. Phot. p. 981. init. m.

[s] Hinc non temere conjicio brevem vitam Homeri, quam ſub Procli nomine edidit Leo Allatius in libro de Homeri vita, et V. C. Joſua Barneſius præclaræ ſuæ Homeri editioni præmiſit, ex priore Chreſtomathias hujus libro decerptam eſſe. Fabr. ut ſupra. p. 522.

[t] Vide Fabric. ib. p. 450.

[u] .... diem obiit circa annum Chriſti, ut conjicio, 450. Fabric. ibid. p. 449.

CHAP.

CHAP. LXII.

DAMASCIUS.

I. *His time and works.* II. *Extracts from his works in Photius.* III. *Divers passages from his works in Suidas.*

I. DAMASCIUS is mentioned by Cave in his Historia Literaria of Ecclesiastical Writers. He [a] reckons him among Gentile authors, who in the sixth century had reflected upon the Christian religion. He placeth him as flourishing in the year [b] of Christ 540.

The account which Suidas gives of Damascius is to this purpose: 'He [c] was a stoic philosopher of Syria, intimately acquainted with Simplicius and Eulalius, who were Phrygians. 'He flourished in the time of Justinian: he wrote commentaries 'upon Plato, of Principles, [d] and a Philosophic History.'

Suidas says he flourished in the time of Justinian, who [e] reigned from the year 527 to 565. But Damascius himself, in his Life of Isidorus, says, that [f] at that time Theodoric was king of all Italy. Theodoric [g] died in 526. We might therefore, perhaps, place Damascius as flourishing somewhat sooner than Cave has done: and Fabricius says he [h] presided in the school of philosophy at Athens in the time of Theodoric. However, [i] Pagi relies upon Suidas, who placeth him as flourishing in the time of Justinian. And we shall see proofs of it in the chapter of Simplicius, which will follow this.

They who desire to know more of Damascius may consult the writers [k] mentioned below.

II. Of this author there are large extracts in Photius; and in Suidas, under divers articles of his Lexicon, several passages are

[a] Scriptores Gentiles Christianam Religionem hoc seculo perstringentes. H. L. T. i. p. 552. [b] Damascius, patria Damascenus, secta Stoicus, aliis Peripateticus,....claruit circa ann. 540. Id. ib.

[c] V. Δαμασκιος. p. 506. Kuster.

[d] Και περι αρχων. That work is said to be still in several libraries of Europe, Wolfius published from the public library of Hamburg the beginning, and large extracts from it, in his Anecdota Græca, Sacra et Profana. Tom. 3. p. 195. &c.

[e] Vid. Pagi ann. 565. n. iii.

[f] Ο δε ην Βαλεμερις Θεοδεριχου πατηρ, ος νυν το μεγιστον εχει κρατος ιταλιας απασης. ap. Phot. p. 1041. in. [g] Vide Pagi ann. 526. n. iv. ix. x. et conf. ibid. A. 475. n. vi. [h] De Damascio hoc Damasceno, qui regnante in Italia Theodorico Athenis in schola Platonica floruit, plura Photius,...nec non Suidas. Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. 13. p. 784.

[i] Damascius autem Justiniani Imp. temporibus floruit, ut docet Suidas in voce Δαμασκιος; qui hæc ideo scire potuit. Pagi 470. n. iii. [k] Voss. Hist. Gr. l. 2. cap. 22. Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. 9. p. 416, 437. Pagi ann. 470. num. i.

quoted

quoted from him. I intend firſt of all to obſerve ſome remarkable things in Photius: afterwards I ſhall put down divers paſſages collected out of Suidas.

1. In Photius are three articles concerning this author; the firſt at Code cxxx. the ſecond at clxxxi. the third at ccxlii.

2. In the firſt Photius ſays: 'We [l] read the four books of Damaſcius, of which the title of the firſt is, Concerning ſtrange and wonderful things, in three hundred and fifty-two chapters; the ſecond, Wonderful ſtories concerning dæmons, in two-and-fifty chapters; the third, Wonderful ſtories concerning ſouls which appeared after death, in ſixty-three chapters; the fourth, Of other wonderful things, in a hundred-and-five chapters. In all which are many impoſſible and incredible things, and fooliſh and ill-contrived ſtories of falſehoods, and truly worthy of the irreligion and impiety of Damaſcius; who, when the light of religion illuſtrated the whole world, ſlept in the thick darkneſs of idolatry.' However, of the ſtyle Photius ſays it is compendious, elegant, and conſpicuous, ſuited to ſuch relations.

3. In the ſecond article Photius gives a general account of the Life of Iſidorus. 'We [m] read,' ſays he, 'the Life of the philoſopher Iſidorus, written by Damaſcius of Damaſcus, a large work, dedicated to Theodora, alſo a zealous Greek as to religion, and well inſtructed in philoſophy....deſcended likewiſe from anceſtors noted for their zeal for the impiety of idolatry....As to religion this author is altogether impious, and often reviles our holy religion, though ſomewhat cautiouſly.'

Some of thoſe paſſages, in the very words of Damaſcius, would have been entertaining to us now; and could not have perverted any.

Near the end of this article of Photius is an account of our author's maſters. 'In rhetoric [n] Theon was his maſter, under whom he ſtudied three years. Afterwards Damaſcius himſelf preſided in the ſame ſchool nine years. Geometry, and arithmetic, and other parts of mathematics, he learned from Mari-

[l] Ανεγνωσθησαν Δαμασκιυ λογοι τεσσαρες, ων ο μεν πρωτος επιγραφην εχει περι παραδοξων ποιηματων κεφαλαια τνβ. Ο δε δευτερος, παραδοξων περι δαιμονιων διηγηματων κεφαλαια· ξε. Ο δε τριτος περι των μετα θανατον επιφαινομενων ψυχων παραδοξων διηγηματων φεφαλαια ξγ· Ο δε τεταρτος.... Εν οις απασιν αδυνατα τε και απιθανα, και κακοπλαστα τερατολογηματα, και μωρα, και ως αληθως αξια της αθεοτητος και δυσσεβειας Δαμασκιυ· ος και τω φωτος της ευσεβειας τον κοσμον πληρωσαντος, αυτος υπο βαθει σκοτω της ιδωλολατρειας εκαθευδε. κ. λ. Cod. 130. p. 312.

[m] Γραφειν δε τον Ισιδωρυ βιον προθεμενος, Θεωδωρα τινι το συνταγμα προσπεφωνηκει, ελληνα μεν και αυτη θρησκειαν τιμωση,...Εχι δε την μεν περι τα θεια δοξαν εις ακρον δυσσεβης....Διο και της ' ζας ημων, ει και δειλιωση και λαθραιοτερα ν κοφροσυνη, ουως υκ ολιγακις καθυλακτων υσεβειας. Cod. 181. p. 403.

[n] p. 4

nus,

'nus, and Harmonius ſon of Hermias of Alexandria. Logic 'he learned from Iſidorus, whoſe life he wrote, and whom he 'highly commends.'

Suidas, as before ſeen, ſays, that Damaſcius wrote a philoſophic hiſtory. I ſuppoſe he means the Life of Iſidorus, which, according to Photius, was [o] a large work. Or elſe this Life of Iſidorus was one part of that hiſtory. Even the extracts of that Life in Photius are large, and exhibit a great variety of matters.

I ſhall tranſcribe below the account which Fabricius has given of this article of [p] Photius.

4. In the third article [q] of Photius concerning this author, are large extracts from his Life of Iſidorus the philoſopher. Several of which will be tranſcribed by me.

5. Here [r] is a ſtory concerning the celebrated Alexandrian philoſopher Hierocles, and his wife: which I do not take now, becauſe I have made a diſtinct article of Hierocles, and have placed that ſtory * there.

6. 'He ſays that [s] Marinus, ſucceſſor of Proclus, came from 'Neapolis in Paleſtine, near the mountain Garizin. This wri-'ter then blaſphemouſly adds, in which mountain is a moſt 'ſacred temple of the moſt high Jupiter, in which Abram, the 'father of the ancient Hebrews, was prieſt, as Marinus himſelf 'ſays: Marinus, therefore, who was originally a Samaritan, for-'ſook their doctrine, as being a novelty derived from the 'Abramic religion, and embraced the Greek religion.'

7. Damaſcius mentions Peter Mongus, the Arian biſhop of Alexandria, in this manner: 'But [t] he who was biſhop of the

* .... πολυστιχον. p. 408. lin. 35.

[o] Cod clxxxi. Damaſcii Damaſceni De Vita Iſidori Philoſophi, liber prolixus in capita lx. diviſus, variaque refertus jucunda de aliis etiam illius ætatis philoſophis notitia, ſed jam pridem deperditus, ex quo uberiora excerpta dabit Photius infra Cod 242. Hoc ſcriptum Damaſcius, ſuperſtitione Ethnica imbutus ſcriptor, et Chriſtiana ſacra ſubinde laceſſens, dicavit Theodoræ, eruditæ feminæ, quam ipſe et Iſidorus inſtituerant, filiam Cyrinæ et Diogenis, qui patre Euſebio, avo Flaviano natus, (iiſdem, quos celebrat Macrobius,) genus referebat ad Lampſigeranum, Monimumque, a quibus et ſuam Jamblichus duxerat originem. Damaſcium in oratoria facultate per triennium inſtituerat Theon, in mathematices diſciplinis Marinus, in Philoſophia Athenis alter cum Marino Procli ſucceſſor, Zenodotus, et Alexandriæ Ammonius Hermiæ, Platonem et Ptolomæi aſtronomica ipſi interpretatus. In dialecticis denique is ipſe, cujus vitam deſcribendam ſuſcepit, Iſidorus. Fabr. Bib. Gr. Tom. 9. p. 437.

[q] Cod. 242. p. 1028. &c. [r] Ibid. p. 1037. infr. m. * See here, p. 65.

[s] Οτι ο διαδοχος Προκλυ, φησιν, ο Μαρινος, γενος ην απο της εν Παλαιστινη πολεως προς ορει κατωκισμενης, τω αργαριζω καλουμενω. Ειτα βλασφημων ο δυσσεβης φησιν ο συγγραφευς, εν ω Διος Υψιστου αγιωτατον ιερον, ω καθιερατο Αβραμος, ο των παλαι Εβραιων προγονος, ως αυτος ελεγεν ο Μαρινος. Σαμαρειτης ων το απαρχης ο Μαρινος γεγονως, απεταξατο μεν προς την εκεινων δοξαν, απο εις καινοτομιαν απο της Αβραμ θυσιας απορρυεισαν, τα δε ελληνων ηγαπησεν. κ. λ. p. 1056. m. [t] Ο δε των κρατουντων της πολιτειας ηγεμων την δοξαν επισκοπειν ειληχως, ονομα Πετρος, ανηρ ιταμος ων και περιποιητος. κ. λ. p. 1057. fin.

'prevailing

'prevailing religion, being an impudent and wicked man, be-'haved thus.' Peter [u] was ordained biſhop in the year 477, and died in the year 490; Valeſius, in his notes upon Euſebius, has quoted this paſſage. He has obſerved divers others in which heathen writers, after the converſion of Conſtantine, call the Chriſtian religion, the 'prevailing opinion,' and the Chriſtians the 'prevailing [x] party.'

8. Damaſcius ſays that, 'Marcellinus, [y] count of Dalmatia, was of the Greek-religion:' that is, in the time of the emperor Zeno, near the end of the fifth century.

9. In another place, as obſerved by Photius, 'Damaſcius 'ſays that [z] Anthemius the Roman emperor was of the Greek 'religion, and of the ſame opinion with Severus, who was an 'idolater, and whom he appointed conſul; and that they ſecretly 'conſulted together about reſtoring the execrable worſhip of ido-'latry.' He ſays likewiſe that 'Illus, and Leontius whom he 'ſet up to be emperor with Zeno, were of the ſame opinion, and 'had the ſame deſign in favour of impiety, Pamprepius leading 'them that way. He relates the vain pretences of Pamprepius, 'and his unfaithfulneſs to his friends, and his violent death in 'the ſame manner that others do. Pamprepius was an Ægyp-'tian, and by profeſſion a grammarian.'

We might have been well pleaſed to ſee Damaſcius's own words in this place. But we muſt be content with the extracts in Photius.

Anthemius was emperor from the year 467 to 472. That he was a Gentile there [a] is no proof, but the contrary. Severus [b] was appointed conſul at Rome by Anthemius in the year 470. 'Damaſcius [c] in another place tells a ſilly ſtory of a horſe of this 'Severus, of which he was very fond, and which, when ſtroked, 'emitted large ſparks of fire, which alſo portended his maſter's 'conſulſhip.' Illus and Leontius were two great officers, who together began a rebellion againſt Zeno in the year 482, and were put to death [d] in the year 488, or about that time. As to Pamprepius, we have here a general account of him from Photius. More may be ſeen of him in an article * in Suidas, ſup-

[u] Vid. Pagi ann. 477. x. 490. xxiv.

[x] Not. p. 62. ad Euſeb. H. E. l. 4. cap. 7.

[y] Ὁ δὲ Μαρκελλινος της Δαλματων ην χωρας αυτοδεσποτος ηγεμων, ελλην την δοξαν. p. 1048. in.

[z] p. 1049. infr. m.

[a] Verum conſilium de reſtituenda idololatria, non niſi per calumniam Anthemio adſcribi poteſt, ut liquet ex Annal. Eccl. Pagi ann. 470. num. i.

[b] Coſſ. Severus et Jordanes....Prior occidentalis, ut liquet ex Damaſcio in Vita Iſidori Philoſophi, &c. Pagi ibid.

[c] Τουτω τοινυν ο ιππος, ω τα πολλα εχρητο, ψηχομενος σπινθηρας απο σωματος πολλας τε και μεγαλας ηφιει, εως αυτῳ το τερας εις την υπατικην αρχην εν Ρωμη καταινυσθαι. Ibid. p. 1040. fin.

[d] Vid. Pagi ann. 482. n. xviii. et 488. vi.

* V. Παμπρεπιος.

poſed

poſed to be taken from Malchus, mentioned by Photius, Cod. lxxviii. p. 172, [c] a Greek hiſtorian, and a Chriſtian; who wrote an hiſtory from the time of Conſtantine to Anaſtaſius, who ſucceeded Zeno in the year 491.

10. Before I proceed any farther I ſhall tranſcribe here another like paſſage from theſe extracts of Photius: 'Damaſcius,' ſays [f] Photius, 'reckoning up thoſe who have oppoſed our holy 'and inviolable faith unwillingly, and as it were compelled by 'the force of truth, writes thus: "The emperor Julian likewiſe "attempted it, but he did not ſucceed four years. And a good "while afterwards Lucius, captain of the guard at Byzantium "under the emperor Theodoſius, attempted the ſame thing; "who intending to kill the emperor, was got into the palace, "and after thrice endeavouring to draw his ſword, was affrighted "from executing his deſign: for at the ſame time he ſaw a wo-"man of a large and terrible countenance at the back of Theo-"doſius, embracing him. After that, the great general in the "Eaſt aimed at the ſame thing, but was prevented by a violent "death. For falling from his horſe he broke his leg, and died "by that accident. Then, ſays he, in our time Severianus, "our fellow citizen, together with divers others: but he nar-"rowly eſcaped with his life, through the unfaithfulneſs of thoſe "who were with him, and perhaps of others, and of Ameri-"chus, who diſcovered the conſpiracy to Zeno. And, beſide "theſe, Marſus and Illus; of whom Marſus died of a diſ-"temper in the very inſurrection; and Illus was apprehended "and beheaded: after which his head was thrown from a rock "into the enemies camp. Ammonius [g] being a ſordid wretch, "and aiming at nothing but money, came to an agreement with "a biſhop of the prevailing religion."

So writes Damaſcius; who, as it ſeems, approved of any attempts againſt Chriſtians, and the Chriſtian religion. Upon theſe ſtories may be ſeen ſome remarks of Cave in his introduction, p. lxv.

11. In another place [h] he juſt mentions Athanaſius alſo with the ſame character of 'a biſhop of the prevailing religion.' He means Athanaſius, who ſucceeded Peter Mongus at Alexandria, in the year [i] 490.

[c] Vide et Voſſ. de Hiſtor. Gr. l. 2. cap. xxi. [f] Ibid. p. 1072. [g] Ὁ δὲ Ἀμμωνιος αισχροκερδης ων, και παντα ορων εις χρηματισμον ουτιναουν ομολογιας τιθεται προς τον επισκοπουντα το τηνικαυτα την κρατουσαν δοξαν. Ib. p. 1072. [h] Προς τον επισκοπουντα το τηνικαυτα την κρατουσαν δοξαν Αθανασιον. p. 1060. ver. 20. [i] Vide Pagi A. D. 490. num. xxiv.

12. He

12. He complains of ſome who [k] privately broke down and deſtroyed ſacred images.

13. I do not know whether it would be excuſed, if I ſhould forbear to take notice of ſome of this writer's ſtories of incredible things.

He ſays expreſsly, that 'in [l] a battle fought near Rome with 'the Scythians commanded by Attila in the time of Valentinian '[the third] who ſucceeded Honorius [in the year 425], the 'ſlaughter on both ſides was ſo great, that none on either ſide 'eſcaped, except the generals, and a few of their attendants. 'And, which is very ſtrange, he ſays, when the bodies were fal-'len the ſouls ſtill ſtood upright, and continued fighting three 'whole days and nights, nothing inferior to living men, either 'for the activity of the hands or the fierceneſs of their minds. 'The images of the ſouls therefore were both ſeen and heard, 'fighting together, and claſhing with their armour.' He moreover endeavours to confirm the truth of this by other relations of a like kind.

Of himſelf this writer ſays, that 'ſometimes, [m] when he pulls 'off, or puts on his clothes, great ſparks fly out, and ſometimes 'with a noiſe; that at other times his clothes are all over of a 'flame, and yet not hurt.'

He ſays that, 'Hierius, [n] ſon of Plutarch, and ſcholar of Pro-'clus, had ſeen a human head no larger than a pea: which yet 'was a complete human head with hair, eyes, a face, and a 'mouth, that had a voice as loud as a thouſand men together.'

Certainly the learned heathen ſophiſts and philoſophers of that time did not reject the Chriſtian religion for want of credulity. They received many incredible things; and yet would not attend to the credible relations in the hiſtorical books of the Old and New Teſtament.

III. I now proceed to the paſſages in Suidas.

1. 'Ammonianus [o] the grammarian, was related to Syrianus, 'whom he reſembled in body and mind, being both of them 'tall and handſome. They agreed very much in temper and 'manners. But Syrianus was deareſt to God, and a philoſopher 'indeed; whilſt the other employed his time in correcting the 'Greek poets, and putting out correct editions of them. This 'is Ammonianus who had an aſs that was ſtudious of wiſdom.'

[k] Τινες δε ελαθον το ιερωμα καταξαντες, και διαφθειραντες. κ. λ. p. 1044. ſub in.

[l] p. 1040. m. [m] p. 1041. in.

[n] ibid. p. 1045. fin. [o] Αμμωνιανος, Γραμματικος, κοσμουμενος τη συγγενεια Συριανου, αλλ' ο μεν θεοφιλεστερος ην ο Συριανος, και τω οντι φιλοσοφος. Ο δε ηγαπα την επι ποιητων εξηγησει και διορθωσει της ελληνικης λεξεως καθειμενην τεχνην. Ουτος ην Αμμωνιος, ω κεκτησθαι συμβεβηκεν οιον σοφιας ακροατην. Suidas.

This

This article is plainly taken from Damaſcius; as may be collected from Photius's extracts of that author, where a good part of it ſtill appears. There it is thus expreſſed: 'This [p] is Ammonianus, who had an aſs, which, as is ſaid, when he attended 'the lectures upon poetry, often neglected his food when laid 'before him, though at the ſame time he was hungry. So much 'was the aſs taken with the love of poetry.'

Kuſter, in his notes upon Suidas, puts the queſtion whether Damaſcius wrote this ſeriouſly: and thinks he [q] muſt be reckoned an aſs, who believed there ever was ſuch an aſs. Nevertheleſs, I think it cannot be denied that the philoſophers of that time delighted in ſuch ſtories.

2. In the article of Seberianus, or Severianus, is another paſſage fairly concluded to be taken from Damaſcius, foraſmuch as a part of it is found in Photius's extracts of that [r] author, as Kuſter has obſerved in his notes upon Suidas. It is here ſaid that, 'Severianus was of Damaſcus, a man of a good family, 'deſcended from Roman anceſtors who had lived at Alexandria. 'He ſays Severianus was perfectly free from covetouſneſs, but al- 'lows that he was of a ſtiff and rigid temper. He [s] was ex- 'tremely devout, and zealous for the Greek religion: unhappy 'man, not moved by ſufferings, or threatenings....To him the 'emperor Zeno offered the higheſt government next to himſelf, 'if he would be one of the prevailing religion; but neither ſo 'did he perſuade him, nor would he be perſuaded: he ſhewed 'us the letter containing thoſe offers; but it did not affect him.'

So writes Damaſcius; and there are other things in that article as it ſtands in Suidas, which may deſerve notice; for I have tranſcribed but a ſmall part of it: however, as much as is needful for my deſign.

3. Under the name Hypatia is another paſſage in Suidas, which with good reaſon is ſuppoſed to be taken from Damaſcius.

'Hypatia, [t] daughter of Theon the geometrician and philo- 'ſopher of Alexandria, herſelf a philoſopher, and well known, 'wife of Iſidorus the philoſopher. She flouriſhed in the time of 'Arcadius. [Then he mentions her writings.] She was torn to 'pieces by the Alexandrians, and her body with the greateſt 'ignominy was dragged through the whole city. This ſhe ſuf-

[p] Ap. Phot. p. 1040. in.

[q] Serione hæc an joco ſcripſiſti, Damaſcie? Certe aſinis accenſendum eum puto, qui talem unquam aſinum exſtitiſſe credat. Kuſter.

[r] Ap. Phot. pag. 1057.

[s] Ιερωτατος δ' ην εις υπερβολην, και Ελλην, και υπο πολλων απειλων και φοβων ουκ ανεδωκεν ο αλιτηριος....τουτω καταπηγγειλατο Ζηνων βασιλευς ει γενοιτο των κρατουντων, την μετα βασιλεα μεγιστην αρχην. Αλλ' ουδε ως επειθεν, ουδε εμελλε πεισειν. Και ημιν δε υπαινιττω την επαγγελλομενην επιστολην, και μη πειθησαν. Suid. V. Σεβηριανος.

[t] Suid. V. Υπατια.

'fered

'fered, because she was envied for her excellent wisdom, and 'especially for her skill in astronomy. Her death some ascribed 'to Cyril, others to the seditious and tumultuous temper of the 'Alexandrians: for so they have served several of their own 'bishops, particularly George and Proterius. She was born, 'bred, and educated in Alexandria. Having a genius superior 'to her father, she was not contented with the mathematical 'learning which she had received from him, but studied also the 'other parts of philosophy to good advantage. And though a 'woman, habiting herself in a cloak, she went about the city, 'and publicly explained Plato, Aristotle, and the other philoso-'phers, to all who desired it of her. Nor was she learned only. 'She arrived likewise at the highest eminence in virtue, chaste, 'and always a virgin; and so very fair and beautiful, that one of 'her scholars fell in love with her. And not being able to govern 'his passion, he made it known to her: [however [u] a cure was 'wrought upon the young man by music, or some other method, 'for it is differently related.] Hypatia being such a person, so 'knowing in words and things, and so chaste and discreet in her 'behaviour, she was beloved and admired to a great degree by 'the whole city in general. And the magistrates of the highest 'dignity waited first upon her at their arrival, as is done at Athens. 'For though the thing itself was lost, the name of philoso-'phy still seemed august and venerable to those who possessed 'the chief posts in the state. It happened that [x] Cyril, bishop of 'the opposite sect, passing by the house of Hypatia, saw a 'great crowd at her door, on foot and horseback; some coming, 'some going, and the house full of people. When he asked, 'what those people were, and what was the reason of such a 'crowd at that house, he was answered by his attendants that they 'were paying their respects to the philosopher Hypatia, and that 'was her house. Whereupon he became so possessed with envy 'that he contrived a murder, the most villanous of all murders. 'For, as she was one day coming out of her house, she was set 'upon by a number of brutal wretches, of accomplished wick-'edness, who fearing neither the judgment of God or men, killed 'this philosopher, bringing thereby the utmost guilt and re-'proach upon their country. The emperor was extremely pro-'voked at this action, and would have punished it, if Ædesius [y] 'had not by bribes corrupted those about him. So he pardoned

[u] Suid. p. 533 [x] Ηδη γεν ποτε συνεβη των επισκοπευντα την αντικειμενην αιρεσιν Κυριλλον, παριοντα δια τε οικε της Υπατιας, κ. λ. Ibid. p. 534. [y] Ædesius, was a monk at Constantinople, agent for the bishop Cyril of Alexandria.

'the murderers, but brought down vengeance upon himſelf and 'his family.'

Other things follow in that article which deſerve notice. But I have propoſed to take nothing but what relates to Hypatia.

This is the account of Damaſcius, a learned Gentile. It may not be amiſs to ſee how this ſtory is told by Socrates, a Chriſtian, who likewiſe is earlier, he having written his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory about the year 440.

Having in ſome preceding chapters taken notice of a miſunderſtanding between Oreſtes governor of Ægypt, and Cyril biſhop of Alexandria, he goes on: 'There [z] was a woman at 'Alexandria, by name Hypatia, daughter of Theon the philoſopher: ſhe was ſo eminent for learning, that ſhe excelled all 'the philoſophers of her time: ſhe had ſucceeded in the Platonic ſchool, and explained all the branches of philoſophy to 'thoſe who came to hear her: and from all parts ſuch as were 'ſtudious of philoſophy reſorted to her. And by reaſon of the 'authority which ſhe had gained by her diſtinguiſhed knowledge, ſhe often had acceſs to the magiſtrates with ſingular 'modeſty: nor was ſhe aſhamed to appear in a public aſſembly 'of men; foraſmuch as all admired and revered her for her 'uncommon virtue. Nevertheleſs envy laid hold of her: for 'becauſe ſhe often was with Oreſtes, the Chriſtian populace admitted a calumny againſt her, that ſhe was the perſon who obſtructed a reconciliation between Oreſtes and the biſhop. Some 'perſons therefore of a fierce diſpoſition, headed by Peter, a 'reader, conſpired againſt her. They waited for her as ſhe was 'returning home from ſome place; and pulling her out of her 'chariot, they dragged her to the church called Cæſarium; 'where they ſtript her naked, and killed her with ſharp ſhells. 'And when they had torn her to pieces, they carried all her 'members to a place called Cinaron, and conſumed them with 'fire. This action brought no ſmall diſgrace upon Cyril, and 'the church of Alexandria. And indeed,' ſays Socrates, 'murders and fightings, and all ſuch things, are altogether foreign 'to the Chriſtian principles. Theſe things were done in the 'fourth year of the epiſcopate of Cyril, in the tenth conſulſhip 'of Honorius, and the ſixth of Theodoſius, in the month of 'March, in the time of Lent. That is the year of Chriſt 415.'

This chapter of Socrates is tranſcribed by Nicephorus [a] almoſt word for word, with very little alteration.

Syneſius, made biſhop of Ptolemais in Libya, about the year

[z] Socrat. H. E. lib. 7. cap. xv. p. 352. [a] Lib. 14. cap. 16. p. 469.

410, was her scholar, and ever retained a high respect for her. Several of his letters are sent to her, and inscribed in this manner: 'To [b] the philosopher,' or 'to [c] the philosopher Hypatia.' And in one of them, written after he was bishop, he calls her [d] his mother, his sister, his mistress, and his benefactress. In another [e] he says she had a most divine soul. In [f] another to Herculian, he mightily congratulates himself that, 'by a journey 'with him to Alexandria, he had made him know what he could 'not believe upon the report of fame, till he saw and heard that 'extraordinary person who set open the door of the mysteries of 'true philosophy.'

One thing in the preceding history may create a difficulty in the minds of some of my readers. Hypatia is there said to have been always a virgin, and yet she was wife of [g] Isidorus. But those things are not [h] inconsistent: for in those times some people, both Christians and others, married without intending to cohabit together. However, I think that this circumstance of her marriage must be understood to aggravate the indiscretion of the young man, her scholar, who fell in love with her.

Du Pin, having related the story of Hypatia's death, adds: 'It [i] is not Socrates only who relates this history. It is also at-'tested by Damascius, who, in the Life of the philosopher Isido-'rus, describes the tragical death of this illustrious lady, and 'accuseth Cyril of being the author of it. But we are not to 'give credit to that historian. Cyril had no hand in that mur-'der. They were some seditious people who laid hold of the 'occasion of the difference which there was between him and 'Orestes, to commit that assassination.' So says Du Pin. But does not Socrates deserve some regard, if Damascius be entitled to none?

[b] Τῇ φιλοσοφῳ. Ep. 15. p. 172.

[c] Τῇ φιλοσοφῳ Ὑπατιᾳ. Ep. 10. p. 170.

[d] .... μητερ, και αδελφη, και διδασκαλε, και δια παντων τουτων ευεργετικη. Ep. 16. p. 173. [e] .... της θειοτατης σου ψυχης. Ep. 10. p. 170. [f] Ep. 136. p. 272.

[g] Isidori Philosophi conjux, sed ita ut conjugii usu abstineret. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 5. cap. 22. § x. T. 8. p. 220.

[h] Hinc erat, cur celeberrima hujus sectæ philosopha, Hypatia, maritum quidem haberet Isidorum, at corpus tamen castum et inviolatum servaret. Mosheim. Dissertation. § 49. p. 214. not. z.

[i] St. Cyril. d'Alex. Bibliotheque. Tom. 3. P. 2. p. 41.

CHAP. LXIII.

SIMPLICIUS.

His time, hiſtory, and works, with remarks; where alſo of Agathias, and Procopius.

SIMPLICIUS is well known for his Commentary upon the Enchiridion of Epictetus, of which there have been ſeveral editions in Greek and Latin, and ſome tranſlations into modern languages, particularly French and Engliſh; of him I muſt give ſome account. And I think it not improper firſt to take ſome notice of Agathias, from whom that account muſt be taken.

In his Commentary upon Epictetus, Simplicius has an argument againſt the [a] Manichees; and for that reaſon may be juſtly placed among my witneſſes to Chriſtianity. But if there were no ſuch thing, Simplicius could not be omitted by me, his hiſtory being connected with the Chriſtian affairs in the time in which he lived.

Agathias [b] has himſelf informed us who he was. His [c] native place was Myrina in Aſia, which was a colony of the ancient Æolians. His father's name was Memnonius, and by profeſſion he was a lawyer; but he has not told us where [d] he pleaded, though we know from himſelf that [e] for a while he ſtudied the law at Alexandria.

He appears to have been a very ingenious man, author of many ſhort poems, and [f] a hiſtory of the reign of the emperor Juſtinian in five books. It is a kind of ſupplement to Procopius, who concluded [g] at the twenty-ſixth year of Juſtinian, the year of Chriſt 552. He did not begin to write his hiſtory till [h] after the death of Juſtinian, in the year 565, and the acceſſion of Juſtin the younger in the ſame year. Pagi [i] ſuppoſeth him to

[a] In Epictet. cap. 34. p. 163. &c.

[b] Vide Voſſ. de Hiſt. Gr. l. 2. cap. xxii. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 5. cap. v. Tom. 6. p. 260. &c.

[c] Ἐμοὶ Ἀγαθίας μὲν ὄνομα, Μυρίνα δὲ πατρὶς, Μεμνόνιος πατὴρ, τέχνη δὲ τὰ Ῥωμαίων νόμιμα, καὶ οἱ τῶν δικαστηρίων ἀγῶνες. Agath. l. i. p. 3. fin.

[d] Falluntur qui Smyrnæ cauſſas in foro peroraſſe Agathiam colligunt ex Suidæ loco, Vulcanius, Voſſius, Heidenreichius. Nam licet patronum cauſſarum fuiſſe certum eſt, atque ipſe non uno in loco hoc tradit, tamen qua in urbe id fecerit, numquam declarat. &c. Fabric. ut ſupr. p. 260. in notis.

[e] Agath. l. 2. p. 48.

[f] Agathiæ Hiſtorici et Poëtæ eximii, [aliter ſcholaſtici] De Imperio et Rebus geſtis Juſtiniani Imperatoris Libri quinque.

[g] Agath. l. i. p. 6.

[h] Agath. ib. p. 4.

[i] Ex morte interim Choſroes ab Agathia memorata colligo, Agathiam ante currentem annum Hiſtoriam ſuam, quam ad uſque Chriſti 559. tantum perduxit non publicaſſe, nec abſolviſſe. Pagi ann. 579. num. v. conf. eundem ad ann. 552. n. xiv. xv.

have

have finiſhed his work about the year 579; Fabricius [k] ſays not before the year 593.

Voſſius and others have ſuppoſed Agathias to have been a Gentile; but [l] Pagi ſays he was a Chriſtian, and Fabricius [m] has ſhewn it more at large.

However, he was a man of candour and moderation. 'The [n] 'Germans,' he ſays, 'had a multitude of deities, and practiſed 'cruel ſacrifices, but by converſing with the Franks, they were 'growing more polite. However,' as he adds, 'they who are 'in error are rather objects of commiſeration, than of contempt 'and hatred: for all men aim at truth; if they are in error, it 'is not the fault of their will but of their judgment, they be-'ing attached to opinions once embraced by them.'

And in the introduction to his work, he laments that [o] wars and battles are ſo much the ſubjects of poems and hiſtories; 'which,' as he ſays, 'he cannot aſcribe to the ſtars, nor to fate, 'as ſome do: for if the world were governed by fate, there 'would be an end of choice, and there would no longer be 'virtue among men, nor any room for inſtruction or improve-'ment in arts and ſciences. Nor are wars and contentions 'agreeable to the mind of God, who is ſupremely good: 'they muſt therefore be aſcribed to the avarice and ambition 'of men.'

Fabricius has obſerved, that 'Procopius, [p] predeceſſor of Aga-'thias in the hiſtory of Juſtinian, was a Chriſtian, and that he 'did not approve of the fierce contentions which there were 'among Chriſtians upon abſtruſe and difficult points; and that 'he blamed Juſtinian for his ſeverity againſt heretics, ſtripping 'them of their goods, and inflicting upon them other puniſh-'ments.' By which we can be aſſured that there have been in all times, among Chriſtians, men of learning and good ſenſe,

[k] ... compoſuit poſt Juſtiniani Auguſti, A. C. 566. defuncti fata, neque ante ann. 593 edidit, de ejus Imperio ſive de rebus ipſo imperante geſtis libros v. initio ſumpto ab ejus XXVI. Chriſti 553, ubi deſinit Procopius Cæſareenſis, uſque ad cladem Hunnorum in ſe ipſos inſtigante Juſtiniano arma vertentium anno ejus XXXII. Chriſti 559. Fabr. T. 6. p. 261.

[l] Ann. 379. num. 5. [m] Ubi ſupr. p. 261. et in notis. Vid. et Spanheim. Tom. i. p. 1167, 1168. [n] Agath. l. i. p. 13. m. [o] Καὶ ἐν μεγῃ μὲν ἡ κτησις, πλήρης δὲ ξυμπασα ἱστορια πολέμων τε καὶ παρατάξεων. Ag. l. i. p. 6.

[p] Procopius, ex Cæſarea Palæſtinæ Rhetor, ſive Cauſſarum patronus, ac fortaſſe ſophiſta, hoc eſt, eloquentiam profeſſus Conſtantinopoli. Hunc licet Paganis adſcribere non dubitent Eichelius, et Mottanus Vayerus. Chriſtianum utique et Catholicum fuiſſe ſcripta ipſius perſpicue teſtantur, cum vero qui ſubtiles et acres de religione concertationes neutiquam probaret, nedum eas putaret, Hiſtoriæ ambitioſe inſerendas eſſe; quique reprehendat Juſtinianum, quod hæreticos ſpoliandos bonis et ſuppliciis afficiendos duxit. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 6. p. 248. Vid. et Spanhem. Tom. i. p. 1166.

who did what lay in their power to recommend moderation, and ſecure the peace of the world.

I now proceed to the paſſage of Agathias, for the ſake of which I have given this account of him: divers philoſophers are here mentioned, but I aim principally at Simplicius.

'Not [q] long before this,' ſays Agathias, 'Damaſcius the Syrian, Simplicius of Cilicia, Eulamius of Phrygia, Hermias and Diogenes of Phœnicia, and Iſidorus of Gaza, who all were, as I may ſay, the very top and pinnacle of the philoſophers of our time, not approving the doctrine concerning the deity which prevailed among the Romans, and imagining the Perſian government to be much better, they were diſpoſed to a removal; and beſides, not being allowed by the Roman laws to act according to their own ſentiments, they went into that ſtrange country, intending to live there for the future. But when they were come into Perſia, things did not anſwer their expectations. The king was not ſuch a philoſopher, or ſo wiſe a man, as he had been reported to be. The nobles were proud and arrogant; and among the common people of Perſia, as well as among the Romans, fraud and rapine prevailed greatly. They were likewiſe offended at the practice of polygamy; which nevertheleſs did not ſecure againſt adultery. Upon thoſe accounts theſe philoſophers were filled with much concern of mind, and repented of their removal out of their own country. The king had a reſpect for them, and was deſirous to detain them. Nevertheleſs they determined to return home, and there ſpend the remainder of their days, though the greateſt honours ſhould be propoſed to them: and this benefit they reaped from their extraordinary journey that henceforward they lived very contentedly and comfortably. At that time the Romans and Perſians made a truce with each other: and one of the conditions in that agreement was, that theſe men, upon their return home, ſhould [r] be allowed to live quietly, and not be conſtrained to any thing which they did not approve of, nor to alter their opinion concerning the ancient religion. Upon this condition Choſroes inſiſted, and would not conſent to the truce otherwiſe.'

I have thought it beſt to tranſcribe this paragraph of Aga-

[q] Ου πολλω γαρ εμπροσθεν Δαμασκιος ο Συρος, και Σιμπλικιος ο Κιλιξ, Ευλαμιος τε ο Φρυξ, και Ερμειας τε, και Διογενης, οι εκ Φοινικης, και Ισιδωρος ο Γαζαιος: ουτοι δε απαντες, το ακρον αυτον, κατα την φοιησιν, των καθ' ημας χρονω φιλοσοφησαντων, επειδη αυτους η παρα Ρωμαιοις κρατησα επι τω κρειττονι δοξα ουκ αρεσκεν, οιοτο τε την Περσικην πολιτειαν πολλω ειναι αμεινονα....κ. λ. Agath. l. 2. p. 65, 66.

[r] Ibid. p. 66.

thias

thias at length, in which ſo eminent a man as Simplicius is concerned. The ſame is almoſt word for word in [s] Suidas.

Baronius ſpeaks of this tranſaction at the year of Chriſt [t] 554. Fabricius [u] placeth the return of thoſe philoſophers at the year 549. Mr. Moſheim [x] ſeems to incline to the year 533; when according to our beſt chronologers [y] a truce was concluded with the Perſians. However, there was another truce with the Perſians afterwards in the [z] year 545 or [a] 546, in the ſame reign of Juſtinian, and afterwards [b] in 556.

Fabricius has collected from his own writings that [c] Simplicius, who was of Cilicia, was diſciple of Ammonius ſon of Hermias, and of Damaſcius the Syrian and ſtoic philoſopher, and friend of Eulamius, or Eulalius, the Phrygian.

As therefore I have placed Damaſcius at the year 540, I place his ſcholar Simplicius at the year 550. Moreover Fabricius has obſerved, from a work of Simplicius, that [d] it was written by him after the death of Damaſcius. In Suidas [e] Damaſcius is called friend of Simplicius and Eulalius; and undoubtedly they were contemporaries: but we have now found that Simplicius ſurvived Damaſcius.

Agathias ſays nothing of the works of Simplicius; but Fabricius has given an account of them. He ſpeaks particularly of theſe following: A Commentary upon the eight Books of Ariſtotle's Phyſics; A Commentary upon the Categories or Predicaments of Ariſtotle; A Commentary upon the four Books of Ariſtotle concerning the Heavens; A Commentary upon the Enchiridion of Epictetus.

Fabricius [f] eſteems his works a valuable treaſury of ancient philoſophy,

[s] V. Πρισκος. [t] A. D. 554. n. xiv.

[u] Simplicius....unus ex illis Philoſophis, qui cum pertinaticer Ethnicisſino adhærerent, rebus ſuis ſub Juſtiniani imperio parum fidentes, profecti ſunt cum Areobindo ad Regem Perſarum Coſroën, ſed ſpe ſuâ fruſtrati Athenas reverterunt, poſtquam in induciis Romanorum cum Perſis anno Chriſti 549 cautum eſſet, ut illis tuto redire in ſedes ſuas, et arbitratu ſuo vivere liceret, nec avita ſacra mutare a Chriſtianis cogerentur. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. 8. p. 621.

[x] Ex quâ licet dein redirent provincia, poſtquam pacem cum Perſis inierat Imperator, quod an. 533. factum eſſe nuper contendit vir eruditus Petrus Weſſelingius. Obſervationum Variar. libr. i. cap. 28. p. 120, 121. Moſhem. De turbata per Platonicos Eccleſia. § xi. p. 115.

[y] Vide Pagi, an. 533. v. Baſn. an. 533. i.

[z] Pagi 545. v. [a] Baſn. ann. 546. i.

[b] Pagi 556. xx. Baſn. 556. num. i. ii.

[c] Simplicius, patriâ Cilix, Ammonii (Hermiæ) et Damaſcii Syri Stoici Philoſophi diſcipulus, et Eulamii Phrygis familiaris. &c. Fabr. ib. p. 620.

[d] Damaſcius itidem ὁ καθηγεμων, et ὁ ημετερος Δαμασκιος a Simplicio appellatur, qui poſt eum defunctum ſcripſiſſe ſe in Phyſica Ariſtotelis innuit. p. 184. Fabr. ib. p. 620. [e] Δαμασκιος...Σιμπλικιω και Ευλαλιω των Φρυγων ομιλητης. V. Damaſcius.

[f] ...quod ex ſcriptis ejus etiamnum apparet, quæ ætatem tulerunt, cum non pauciora interciderint. Sed hæc quæ exſtant tamquam theſaurus quidam veteris philoſophiæ, magni merito facienda, exiſtimo tum ob inſigne Simplicii ipſius judicium, tum

ligion, in [c] the reign of Tiberius, when Pontius Pilate was procurator in Judea, and to many other facts of the evangelical hiſtory; to the perſecutions endured by the Chriſtians in the times of Nero, Domitian, Trajan, and Marcus Antoninus, and to the patience and fortitude of the Chriſtians under them, and to the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion, notwithſtanding thoſe diſcouragements; to the innocence and inoffenſiveneſs of their principles, worſhip, and manners, and to their remarkable mutual love, and readineſs to perform good offices to each other, when under difficulties. Adrian's [d] letter to Servianus, his brother-in-law, bears teſtimony to the great number and influence of the Chriſtians in Ægypt in the year 134. His [e] Reſcript to Minucius Fundanus, proconſul of Aſia, and Titus Antoninus's [f] edict, and letters to the ſtates of Aſia, and to the Lariſſeans, Theſſalonians, Athenians, and other Greeks, are very favourable to the Chriſtians. In the letter of Pliny to Trajan, and Trajan's reſcript, and in the extracts from the fragments of the work of Celſus, are too many things worthy of obſervation to be here rehearſed. I muſt therefore refer my readers to the ſummaries of thoſe [g] articles, and to the reflections there made upon them. And if I may here deliver my own opinion, theſe early teſtimonies of heathen writers, in the firſt two centuries, are very material and highly valuable; and as important a part as any, if not the moſt important part of this work. I would likewiſe here refer my readers to the chapter [h] entitled, 'the concluſion of the ſecond 'century.'

We now proceed to the third volume of the firſt edition, in which are the teſtimonies of heathen writers of the third century, and to the converſion of Conſtantine.

In Diogenes Laertius, [i] about the year 210, is a hiſtory which gives great light to St. Paul's diſcourſe at Athens, when he put the Athenians and their learned philoſophers in mind of an altar of theirs with an inſcription, 'To the unknown God.'

From Lactantius [k] we learn that the great 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, probably, with a deſign to let the proconſuls ſee how they might treat the Chriſtians: and the connexion in Lactantius leads us to think there were in that work of Ulpian not only laws of princes, but alſo decrees of lawyers,

[g] See Tacitus, vol. vii. p. 253. Celſus, vol. viii. p. 27....36. Lucian, p. 71.
[d] Vol. vii. p. 363, 364. [e] p. 359, 360. [f] p. 390...395.
[g] For Pliny and Trajan, ſee p. 338....344. and for Celſus, vol. viii. p. 57....69.
[h] Vol. viii. p. 91...97. [i] p. 111...119. [k] p. 124, 125.

which

which were prejudicial to the Chriſtians. And, as was formerly obſerved, if this work of Ulpian ſhould ever be found, it would be a very great curioſity, and afford us a diſtinct knowledge of ſome things which we now know only imperfectly.

In Dion Caſſius's noble work, the Hiſtory of the Romans, publiſhed about the year 230, we have ſeen [l] another valuable teſtimony to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the overthrow of the Jewiſh people in Judea by Veſpaſian and Titus. In him alſo we have ſeen another teſtimony [m] to Domitian's perſecution of the Chriſtians, and ſeveral circumſtances of it. From him alſo we learn [n] Nerva's favourable regard to them. And by him, or by Xiphilinus his abridger, we are aſſured that [o] Marcia, concubine of the emperor Commodus, bore good will to the Chriſtians, and did them good offices, ſhe having a great aſcendency over Commodus.

In Amelius, [p] a Platonic philoſopher, who wrote about the year 263, we have ſeen a very diſtinct and honourable teſtimony to St. John's goſpel.

That eminent critic, Longinus, about the year 264, in his work, Of the Sublime, has [q] made very honourable mention of Moſes, the Jewiſh lawgiver, and commends the ſtyle in which he repreſents the creation of the world. There is alſo a fragment aſcribed to him, in which the apoſtle Paul is mentioned to advantage [r]; but I do not think it genuine.

The ſaying of [s] Numenius, 'What is Plato but Moſes in 'Greek?' is well known, and is recorded by divers ancient writers; but the time of Numenius is uncertain: nor is it clear that he has at all referred to the affairs of the Chriſtians, or their ſcriptures.

In the ſix writers of the Auguſtan Hiſtory, who flouriſhed about the year 306, in their Lives of the ſeveral Roman emperors, we have met with divers things concerning the Chriſtians deſerving of notice.

Spartian., in his Life of the emperor Septimius Severus, has recorded the ſubſtance and the time of his edict againſt the Chriſtians more particularly than any of our own writers. 'In [t] 'his journey through Paleſtine he enacted ſeveral laws: he for- 'bade, under a ſevere penalty, that any ſhould become Jews; 'he alſo publiſhed a like edict againſt the Chriſtians:' which determines the beginning of that perſecution to the tenth year of

[l] p. 128...132. [m] p. 132...135. [n] p. 135. [o] p. 136.
[p] p. 161...163. [q] p. 166. [r] p. 166, 167. [s] p. 168, 169.
[t] p. 305.

the

the reign of Severus, the year of Chriſt 202; when he and his ſon Caracalla were conſuls together.

The ſame writer in the life of Caracalla, eldeſt ſon of Severus, has given an account of [u] ſome childiſh behaviour of his when ſeven years of age, which, compared with ſome things ſaid by Tertullian, leads us to think, that Severus and his family were well acquainted with the Chriſtians; to whom alſo, as we evidently perceive, Severus was favourable in the former part of his reign.

Ælius Lampridius, in his life of Antoninus Heliogabalus, who reigned from the year 218 to 222, lets us know, that that wild [x] emperor 'erected a temple upon mount Palatine, near 'the imperial palace, to the god Elagabalus, intending to bring 'into that temple every object of the veneration of the Romans. 'He ſaid likewiſe, that the religion of the Jews and of the Samaritans, and the devotion of the Chriſtians, muſt be transferred 'thither, that the prieſthood of Elagabalus might comprehend 'in it the myſteries of all religions.' Which manifeſtly ſhews that the Chriſtian religion was then well known in the world.

The ſame writer, in his life of Alexander Severus, who reigned thirteen years from March 222 to March 235, ſays, he [y] maintained the 'privileges of the Jews; he tolerated the Chriſtians.' He alſo ſays that 'this [z] emperor had two private chapels, one 'more honourable than the other; and that in the former were 'placed the deified emperors, and alſo ſome eminent good men, 'and among them Abraham, Chriſt, and Orpheus.' He has ſeveral other paſſages concerning that emperor [a] which are very honourable to the Chriſtians, which have been tranſcribed by us with remarks; and the reader is now referred to them.

Flavius Vopiſcus, in his life of the emperor Aurelian, gives an account of a [b] letter of his to the ſenate of Rome, probably written in the beginning of his reign, in the year 270 or 271, where the Chriſtians are expreſsly mentioned. And it ſhews that they and their diſtinguiſhing principles, and the worſhip in their religious aſſemblies, were well known in the Roman empire, and to men of quality, and of the higheſt rank, as well as to others.

The emperor Philip, whoſe reign began in the year 244, has by ſome been reckoned a Chriſtian: that [c] queſtion therefore has been carefully conſidered by us in it's proper place.

Beſide all the above mentioned writers who have occaſionally

[u] p. 101. [x] p. 250. [y] p. 121. [z] Ibid.
[a] p. 121....124. [b] 172, 173. [c] p. 138....144.

mentioned

mentioned the Chriſtians or their affairs, or who have afforded elucidations to ſome parts of our ſcriptures, we have in this period met with three learned men, who exerted their talents, in writing againſt the Chriſtians.

One of whom is Porphyry, [d] who flouriſhed about the year 270, a diſciple of Plotinus, a man of great abilities, who publiſhed againſt the Chriſtians a large work in fifteen books. His objections againſt Chriſtianity were in eſteem with Gentile people for a long while; and the Chriſtians were not inſenſible of the importance of his work; as may be concluded from the ſeveral anſwers made to it by Euſebius, and others in great repute for learning, and from the violent, though ill judged attempts of Chriſtian magiſtrates to have them deſtroyed. His enmity to the Chriſtians and their principles was very great. Nevertheleſs from the remaining fragments of his work againſt the Chriſtians, and from his other writings, we may reap no ſmall benefit.

He [e] appears to have been well acquainted with the books of the Old and New Teſtament. We have obſerved in him plain references to the goſpels of Matthew, Mark, and John, and the Acts of the apoſtles, and the epiſtle to the Galatians; and, in his remarks upon that epiſtle, probable references to the other epiſtles of St. Paul. 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. In [f] a fragment of his work againſt the Chriſtians he has theſe expreſſions: '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 benefit from the gods.' And again, in [g] his Life of Plotinus, he ſays there were then 'many Chriſtians.' But the work entitled, 'The Philoſophy of Oracles,' which has been ſometimes quoted as his, I reckon to be [h] ſpurious.

At [i] the beginning of Dioclefian's perſecution, about the year 303, as we learn from Lactantius, another work was publiſhed againſt the Chriſtians by a learned man, who was by profeſſion a philoſopher. It conſiſted of three books, and therefore muſt have been a large volume; but we do not know his name nor much of the contents of his work.

About the ſame time another work was written againſt the

[d] See p. 176, &c. [e] p. 219. [f] p. 220, where, and at p. 332, 333, remarks upon that paſſage. [g] p. 225. and ſee likewiſe p. 332. [h] See p. 226....248. [i] p. 252...254. See alſo p. 331.

Chriſtians,

Chriſtians, in two books, by Hierocles [k] a man of learning, and a perſon of authority and influence as a magiſtrate. He was well acquainted with 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. He mentions * Peter and Paul by name, and caſts reflections upon them. He did not deny the truth of our Saviour's miracles; but in order to overthrow 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, as we have largely ſhewn.

In that volume is 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 end of Diocleſian's perſecution, in the year 313; when [l] Conſtantine and Licinius, publiſhed an edict in favour of the Chriſtians, and gave leave to them, and to all men in general, to worſhip God in the way moſt agreeable to their own judgment. After which [m] we have made ſome remarks upon the ſtate of Chriſtianity under heathen emperors. And it was ſhewn that during that time Chriſtianity was always in a ſtate of perſecution, and that nevertheleſs it greatly prevailed; which is honourable to the religion of Jeſus, and to the profeſſors of it at that time.

We now proceed to the fourth and laſt volume of the former edition of this work, containing the teſtimonies of heathen writers in the fourth, fifth, and ſixth centuries of the Chriſtian æra.

The firſt witneſs here alleged is Chalcidius, [n] a Platonic philoſopher, about the year 330, who bears teſtimony to the appearance of an extraordinary ſtar at the time of our Saviour's nativity; thereby plainly confirming the hiſtory which is in the ſecond chapter of St. Matthew's goſpel.

Alexander of Lycopolis in Egypt, [o] about the year 350, ſpeaks honourably of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and his religion, or the Chriſtian philoſophy as he calls it; and which he commends, as 'plain and ſimple, and deſigned to reform the manners of men of all ranks.' And he has ſome references to the 'ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament.

Praxagoras [p] an Athenian, about the year 350, publiſhed ſeveral

[k] p. 254...263. and ſee p. 331, 332. * See p. 255 and 238. [l] p. 319...321.
[m] p. 334, &c. [n] 348. [o] p. 351...353. [p] p. 354.

works

works of hiſtory, and wrote alſo the hiſtory of Conſtantine the great, in two books, and gives that emperor a great character.

Bemarchius [q] of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, ſophiſt, about the ſame time wrote the hiſtory of Conſtantine, in ten books. Nothing of that hiſtory now remains, but it was a large work; and there is reaſon to belive that it was favourable to that emperor.

Next follows the emperor [r] Julian, who ſucceeded Conſtantius in the year 361. In writing his hiſtory we have endeavoured to exhibit the moſt material and remarkable parts of it; his conduct in early life, and after his acceſſion to the empire; his behaviour toward the Chriſtians, and his regard for the Jewiſh people: and we perſuade ourſelves that we have repreſented his character impartially. We have alſo made large extracts [s] out of his work againſt the Chriſtians, and out [t] of his orations and epiſtles.

In his work againſt the Chriſtians he [u] has borne a valuable teſtimony to the hiſtory, and to the books of the New Teſtament. He allows that Jeſus was born in the reign of Auguſtus, at the time of a taxing made in Judea by Cyrenius: that the Chriſtian religion had it's riſe, and began to be propagated in the times of the Roman 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 the early date of the goſpels, and even argues for it. He quotes, or plainly refers to the Acts of the apoſtles, as already ſaid, to St. Paul's epiſtles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, and to the Galatians. He does not deny the miracles of Jeſus Chriſt, but allows him to have 'healed the blind, and the lame, and dæ-'moniacs, and to have rebuked the winds, and to have walked 'upon the waves of the ſea.' He endeavours indeed to diminiſh thoſe 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 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 he acknowledgeth that beſide men-ſervants, and maid-ſervants, Cor-

[q] p. 355. [r] p. 355, &c. [s] p. 394...411. [t] p. 411...423.
[u] See p. 394...411.

nelius,

nelius, 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.

There follow in this volume teſtimonies of Himerius, Themiſtius, Libanius, Eutropius, Ammianus Marcellinus, Vegetius, Eunapius, Claudian, Macrobius, Rutilius, Olympiodorus, Zoſimus, Hierocles of Alexandria, Proclus, Marinus, Damaſcius, Simplicius, men of great note in their times: ſome in the fourth, others in the fifth, and ſome in the ſixth century; ſophiſts, hiſtorians, poets, philoſophers, and ſome ſenators, and magiſtrates; all of ſome uſe to us, none of whom could be omitted in a collection of ancient teſtimonies to the truth of the Chriſtian religion.

To be a little more particular in rehearſing the teſtimonies of ſome of thoſe eminent men laſt mentioned.

Themiſtius [x] has a good argument for 'allowing to all men 'full liberty to worſhip the Deity according to their own ſenti-'ments.' The principles of toleration were agreeable to the judgment of the emperor Jovian. Themiſtius applauds him for it; and ſupports that determination by divers reaſons and conſiderations of no ſmall weight. Libanius [y] pleads the cauſe of Gentiliſm with great freedom in the preſence of Theodoſius himſelf. In Ammianus Marcellinus [z] are many paſſages deſerving attentive regard, too many to be brought up here in a general review. Eunapius, [a] a zealous Gentile, has entertained us with many curious hiſtories of learned ſophiſts and philoſophers, and honourable magiſtrates, all zealous likewiſe for Gentiliſm, though not without ſome marks of candour and moderation. In all which we have ſeen the true ſpirit, and the genuine principles of Gentiliſm. Claudian [b] bears witneſs to the memorable victory of Theodoſius over Arbogaſtes and Eugenius in the year 394. Macrobius [c] at about the year 400, bears teſtimony to Herod's ſlaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, ſoon after the nativity of our Saviour. Rutilius [d] at the year 418, ridicules monkery, and laments the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion. In [e] Zoſimus, about the year 425, we have ſeen many invectives againſt Con-

[x] 248, &c. [y] p. 440, &c. [z] 464, &c. [a] in this vol. p. 1, &c.
[b] p. 17. &c. [c] p. 23....26. [d] p. 26, 27. [e] 31, p. 32.

ſtantine

ſtantine and Theodoſius, which have given us occaſion to ſet ſome things in a clearer light. He alſo loudly complains of the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion: at the ſame time he is himſelf ſo ſuperſtitious, and ſo credulous in receiving and recording ſilly fables and fictions, as to expoſe rather than recommend the ancient religion to which he adhered.

But among all the teſtimonies to Chriſtianity which we have met with in the firſt ages, none are more valuable and important than the teſtimonies of thoſe learned philoſophers who wrote againſt us. All know whom I mean: Celſus in the ſecond century; Porphyry and Hierocles, and the anonymous philoſopher of Lactantius in the third, and Julian in the fourth century. Theſe may be ſeemingly againſt us, but are really for us: they are not come down to us entire; but we have large and numerous fragments of ſome of them; which bear a fuller and more valuable teſtimony to the books of the New Teſtament, and to the facts of the evangelical hiſtory, and to the affairs of Chriſtians, than all our other witneſſes beſides. They propoſed to overthrow the arguments for Chriſtianity. They aimed to bring back to Gentiliſm thoſe who had forſaken it, and to put a ſtop to the progreſs of Chriſtianity, by the farther addition of new converts; but in thoſe deſigns they had very little ſucceſs in their own times. And their works, compoſed and publiſhed in the early days of Chriſtianity, are now a teſtimony in our favour, and will be of uſe in the defence of Chriſtianity to the lateſt ages.

One thing more which may be taken notice of is this: That the remains of our ancient adverſaries confirm the preſent prevailing ſentiments of Chriſtians concerning thoſe books of the New Teſtament which we call canonical, and are in the greateſt authority with us. For their writings ſhew that thoſe very books, and not any others, now generally called apocryphal, are the books which always were in the higheſt repute with Chriſtians, and were then the rule of their faith as they now are of ours.

The State of Gentiliſm under Chriſtian Emperors.

Sect. I. *Imperial laws concerning Gentile people and their worſhip.* II. *A conſultation and divination of heathen people in the time of Valens, about the year* 373. III. *The petition of the Roman ſenate to Valentinian the younger in the year* 384, *that the Altar of Victory which had been removed by Gratian might be reſtored.* IV. *The correſpondence between Maximus of Madaura and Auguſtine in the year* 390. V. *The demolition of the temple of Serapis at Alexandria, and other temples in Ægypt, and ſome other temples elſewhere, in the year* 391. VI. *A pretended heathen oracle in the year* 398 *foretelling the period of the Chriſtian religion.* VII. *The demolition of the temple of the goddeſs Cœleſtis at Carthage in the year* 399. VIII. *An image of Hercules deſtroyed by the Chriſtians at Suffecta in Africa in the year* 399. IX. *A diſturbance at Calama in Numidia in the year* 408. X. *The overthrow of Radagaiſus the Goth in the year* 405. XI. *Rome beſieged, taken, and ſacked by Alaric the Goth in the year* 410. XII. *The correſpondence between Auguſtine and Voluſian in the year* 412. XIII. *The correſpondence between the people of Madaura and Auguſtine*: time uncertain. XIV. *The correſpondence between Auguſtine and Longinian*: time uncertain. XV. *Obſervations of Oroſius and Auguſtine upon the treatment given to the Gentiles by Chriſtian magiſtrates.* XVI. *Concluding obſervations upon the State of Gentiliſm, under Chriſtian emperors.*

Sect. I. Imperial Laws concerning Gentile People and their Worſhip.

I. *Laws of Conſtantine.* II. *Laws of his ſons Conſtans and Conſtantius.* III. *Julian.* IV. *Laws of Jovian, Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian.* V. *Laws of Theodoſius* I. *and his ſucceſſors.*

I. That is a neceſſary article in this work. And in ſhewing what it was, I preſume it will be proper to begin with the laws and edicts of Chriſtian emperors concerning Gentile people and their worſhip. In doing this I ſhall have aſſiſtance not only from the Theodoſian code, and James Gothofred's annotations upon it, but alſo from divers modern writers of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. Cave in particular, at the beginning of his ſecond volume of the Lives of the Primitive Fathers, has a long introduction concerning the ſtate of Paganiſm in the reign of Conſtantine, and under

under the reigns of the ſucceeding emperors, till the end of the reign of Theodoſius the firſt, or the great, and his ſons Arcadius and Honorius, and then of Theodoſius the younger. Of this I ſhall make good uſe, not neglecting the obſervations which may be found in other writers who have treated of the ſame argument.

The third volume of this work concluded with ſome obſervations upon the ſtate of Chriſtianity under Gentile [a] emperors: wherein it was ſhewn, that all along, during that time, Chriſtianity had been in a ſtate of perſecution. We ſhall now be able to judge whether under Chriſtian emperors Gentiliſm was not all along in a ſtate of perſecution; however, I would hope not ſo ſevere and rigorous as that of the Chriſtians in the foregoing period of near three hundred years.

Here the thing to be firſt taken notice of is the law or edict of Conſtantine and Licinius in the year 313, giving liberty to all men, Chriſtians and others, to follow that way of worſhip which ſhould be moſt agreeable to them: which was tranſcribed by us at length [b] formerly. The ſubſtance of which may be reckoned to be compriſed in theſe words, a part of it: 'Theſe [c] 'things we have thought proper to ſignify to you, in order to 'your perceiving that we have given free and full liberty to 'thoſe ſame Chriſtians to follow their own religion. And you 'may perceive that as we have granted 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 every one 'ſhould have liberty to chuſe and follow the worſhip of that 'Deity which he approves. This we have determined, that it 'may appear we do not forbid or reſtrain any religion, or way 'of worſhip whatever.'

In order to form a right judgment of the conduct of Conſtantine in the treatment given by him to Gentile people, it will be of uſe to us to diſtinguiſh his reign into two periods, the firſt preceding the final defeat and death of Licinius, the other after thoſe events.

In the year 313 thoſe two emperors were at Milan, when Conſtantine gave to Licinius his ſiſter Conſtantia in marriage. At the ſame place, and in the ſame year, was publiſhed the edict above mentioned. In that law, as has been often obſerved already, Licinius joined with Conſtantine. But their friendſhip

[a] Vol. viii. ch. xli. ſect. ii. [b] Ch. xl. ſect. x. [c] Ibid.

did not laſt long without interruption. In [d] the year 314 broke out a war betwixt them, which was concluded in the ſame year. Afterwards there was another war between them, which began in the year 323, and was concluded in the year 324, when Licinius was reduced to a private condition. And though his life was then granted him, at the requeſt and interceſſion of Conſtantia, he was put to death in the year 324 or 325. From that time Conſtantine was ſole emperor both of the Eaſt and the Weſt till the time of his death, on the day of Pentecoſt, May 22, in the year 337.

About the year 319 aroſe a great coldneſs between Conſtantine and Licinius; and from that time Licinius began to treat the Chriſtians and their miniſters very hardly, till he proceeded to an open perſecution of them: of which accounts may be ſeen in [e] Euſebius. In ſo much that as that hiſtorian ſays: 'If [f] you 'divide the Roman empire into two parts, that in the Eaſt was 'covered with thick darkneſs, whilſt that in the Weſt enjoyed a 'bright day.' A war between the two emperors then became unavoidable.

I formerly [g] cited three laws of Conſtantine relating to ſoothſayers, enacted in the year 319 and 321, forbidding them to go to private houſes, and appointing that all divinations ſhould be made in the temples, or at public altars only, and requiring that the reſult of thoſe conſultations ſhould be ſent to him if they related to the public. It may be allowed that thoſe laws laid ſome reſtraints upon the practice of ſoothſaying; but I do not think that they were any infringement of the edict of liberty to all, before taken notice of. A heathen emperor might publiſh ſuch laws for his own ſafety, or for the ſecurity of the [h] public.

Euſebius, ſpeaking of things, when Conſtantine was in poſſeſſion of the whole empire: 'And [i] now,' ſays he, 'after that, 'the emperor proceeding to act with great vigour, gave the go- 'vernment of the provinces chiefly to Chriſtians. And [k] when 'any Gentiles were made governors, they were prohibited to 'ſacrifice. Which law comprehended not only preſidents of 'provinces, but alſo higher officers, and even the Prætorian præ-

[d] Et tamen primum illud bellum anno 314 et inchoatum et abſolutum. Perſecutio anno 319 a Licinio excitari cœpta, ultimumque Conſtantini cum Licinio bellum non niſi anno 323 motum, ac ſubſequenti continuatum. Pagi a.n. 316. n. vi. Vid. et 317. iv. et vi. 318. ii. Conf. Baſn. ann. 319. ii. iii. iv.

[e] H. E. l. 10. cap. 8. De V. C. l. i. cap. 49....56. [f] De V. C. l. i. cap. 49. p. 432. D. [g] See before, p. 36, 37.

[h] Sed et contra Tiberius, ut memorat Suetonius. l. 3. cap. 63. Haruſpices ſecreto ac ſine teſtibus Conſuli vetuit. Publica igitur permiſit. Gothofred. in Cod. Theod. Tom. 3. p. 115.

[i] De Vita Conſtantin. l. 2. cap. 44. p. 464. [k] Οσοι δ' ελληνιζειν εδοκουν, τουτοις θυειν απειρητο.

'ſects,

'ſects. If they were Chriſtians, they were required to act ac-
'cording to their principles. If they were otherwiſe diſpoſed,
'ſtill the practice of idolatrous rites was forbidden.'

Euſebius goes on to ſay in the very next chapter: 'And [l] ſoon
'after that, were two laws publiſhed at one and the ſame time,
'one prohibiting the deteſtable rites of idolatry hitherto prac-
'tiſed in cities and country places: and that for the future none
'ſhould erect ſtatues to the gods, nor perform the vain arts of
'divination, nor [m] offer up any ſacrifices. The other law was
'for enlarging Chriſtian oratories and churches, or for rebuilding
'them more grand and ſplendid.'

The firſt of thoſe two laws, as I apprehend, muſt be explained with ſome reſtrictions. Conſtantine, I preſume, did not now abſolutely forbid divination. What Euſebius ſays here muſt be underſtood agreeably to the laws relating to ſoothſayers before cited. He forbade private but not public divination. Nor is it to be ſuppoſed that ſacrifices were univerſally forbidden, and every where. They were allowed of at Rome and Alexandria long after this, as appears from Libanius's oration for the temples in the time of Theodoſius, as is alſo obſerved by Valeſius in his annotations upon this chapter of [n] Euſebius. Cave expreſſeth himſelf differently: I cannot ſay that he is in the right; but I ſhall place below [nn] what he ſays. However, there is another way of ſolving this difficulty. Conſtantine may have forbid ſacrificing every where; but at the acceſſion of Julian his laws were abrogated, by which means the Gentiles obtained the liberty of ſacrificing; which may have continued at Rome and Alexandria till the time of Libanius.

Afterwards, ſtill lower in the life of Conſtantine, comparing him with former emperors, Euſebius ſays: 'They [o] commanded
'the temples to be magnificently adorned; he demoliſhed them

[l] Cap. 45. p. 464. [m] .... μητε μην θυειν καθολω μηδενα. [n] .... μητε μην θυειν καθολω μηδενα.] De privatis ſacrificiis hæc Euſebii verba intelligenda ſunt. Nam Conſtantinus Magnus lege lata vetuit, ne quis Gentilium privatum domi ſacrificaret, ut docet lex prima codice Theodoſ. de Paganis. Itaque aruſpices ſacrificii cauſſa domum evocare prohibuerat. Hi enim victimarum extа inſpiciebant. Publica vero templa adire ſacrificandi cauſſa, ibique aruſpicum operâ uti non vetuit Conſtantinus, ut teſtatur lex prima codice Theod. de Maleficis. Vide Libanium in oratione pro templis. p. 10. et quæ ibi notavit Gothofredus. Valeſ. in loc.

[nn] 'In ſhort, by ſeveral laws he forbade 'to offer ſacrifices, or to erect any images 'to the gods, or to conſult their prieſts and 'oracles, or to exerciſe any of their myſte-'rious rites. And though Libanius more 'than once affirms, [pro templis. p. 9, 20, '21, 22.] that their temples were left 'open, and ſacrifices permitted at Rome 'and Alexandria, yet was it no otherwiſe 'than as they could do it by ſtealth, or by 'connivance, not by any public allow-'ance, or conſtitution of the empire, &c.' Cave Introd. p. xv. [o] .... ὁ δε εκ βαθρων καθηρει τυτων αυτων, τα μαλιστα παρα τοις δεισιδαιμοσι πολλα αξια. De V. C. l. 3. c. 1. p. 483. B.

'to the foundation, eſpecially ſuch as were moſt reſpected by 'ſuperſtitious people.'

And in ſome following chapters [p] Euſebius has given a particular account of the demoliſhing ſeveral heathen temples by Conſtantine's order, beſide depriving many others of their richeſt and moſt reſpected ornaments; as a temple dedicated to Venus in a grove at Aphæa in Phœnicia. Euſebius ſays it was a kind of ſchool for lewdneſs, and all manner of vice, where no grave or modeſt people came; the emperor ordered it to be totally demoliſhed; which was done by the ſoldiers. A temple of Æſculapius, at Ægis in Cilicia, was in like manner deſtroyed by the military power at the emperor's command. Euſebius does not ſay that any lewdneſs was practiſed there. But that temple was the means of ſeducing many people, and it was much reſpected by the philoſophers. Beſide theſe another temple of Venus, a place of much lewdneſs, was deſtroyed at Heliopolis in Phœnicia, and a ſpacious church was erected in the room of it.

Theodoret, reflecting upon the conduct of the ſeveral Roman Chriſtian emperors to his own time, ſays: 'That [q] the excellent 'Conſtantine abſolutely forbade ſacrificing to dæmons; never-'theleſs he did not demoliſh their temples, he only ordered them 'to be ſhut up:' which from what we have ſeen, appears to be not very accurate. Eunapius ſays: 'That [r] Conſtantine in the 'time of his reign deſtroyed the moſt magnificent temples, and 'erected Chriſtian ſtructures in their room.' The general account of Conſtantine's conduct in this matter, in Jerom's Chronicle, at the year 333, or thereabout, and after the dedication of the city of Conſtantinople, is, 'that [s] by an edict of Conſtantine the temples of the Gentiles were thrown down.' Oroſius, after mentioning the building of the city of Conſtantinople, ſays that 'Conſtantine [t] then apppointed by an edict, that the temples of 'the Pagans ſhould be ſhut up, but without putting any of them 'to death.'

This may ſuffice for an account of the treatment given by Conſtantine to Gentile people. It appears hence very plainly that this firſt Chriſtian emperor did not ſtrictly obſerve his edict, publiſhed in the year 313. All men were not permitted to follow

[p] De V. C. l. 3. cap. 55....58.

[q] .... και την οικεμενην ετι μεμηνιαν ορων; το μεν δαιμοσι θυειν παντα πασιν απηγορευσε, τους δε τουτων ναους ου κατελυσεν, αλλ' αβατους ειναι προσεταξε. Theod. l. 5. c. 21. p. 226. [r] Κωνσταντινος γαρ εβασιλευσε, τα απ των ιερων επιφανεστατα καταστρεφων, και τας των χριστιανων αιτιας οικηματα. Eunap. Vit. Ædeſ. p. 33.

[s] Edicto Conſtantini Gentilium templa everſa. Chr. p. 181. [t] Tum deinde primus Conſtantinus juſto ordine et pio vicem vertit edicto, ſiquidem ſtatuit, citra ullam hominum cædem Paganorum templa claudi. Oroſ. l. 7. c. 28. p. 540.

that

that way of worſhip which they approved. Some things, juſt taken notice of, muſt be reckoned inconſiſtent with that edict of general toleration. And ſome reflections were made upon it by us [u] formerly: adding alſo the judgments of divers learned and judicious writers, to which I now only refer; for hereafter may be another occaſion to obſerve upon the treatment given to Gentiles, not only by Conſtantine, but alſo by ſucceeding Chriſtian emperors. For the preſent I add nothing more here, beſide an obſervation of Mr. Moſheim: 'After [x] the final defeat of Licinius, Conſtantine was ſole emperor to the time of his death. 'And according to the utmoſt of his power, by various methods, 'by laws, inſtitutions, rewards, and encouragements, he endeavoured to root out the ancient religions, and to promote 'the Chriſtian doctrine. The emperor appears to have been 'fully convinced by the wars and intrigues of Licinius, that 'neither he nor the Roman empire could be ſafe, ſo long as the 'ancient ſuperſtition ſubſiſted. Henceforward therefore he openly 'oppoſed the gods, and their worſhip, as dangerous to the public welfare.' We now proceed.

II. The ſecond ſection in Cave's Introduction [y] is thus entitled: 'The Condition of the Gentiles under the reign of Conſtantine 'Junior, Conſtantius, and Conſtans.'

Conſtantine [z] died in the year 337, and was ſucceeded by his ſons, between whom the whole empire was divided. Conſtantine the eldeſt had Britain, Spain, Gaul, and part of Africa. Conſtans the youngeſt had Italy, Illyricum, Macedonia, Greece, and the parts that border upon the Euxine ſea, and the remainder of Africa. Conſtantius, the ſecond ſon, had Myſia, Thrace, Aſia, the Eaſt, and Ægypt. Conſtantine had reigned ſcarcely three years, when quarrelling with his brother Conſtans about the diviſion of the empire, he marched with his army as far as Aquileia to encounter him, where he was ſlain near the end of April in the year 340. In the year 350 Conſtans was killed by the procurement of the uſurper Magnentius, who in the year 353 was overthrown by Conſtantius, and then killed by himſelf, to prevent falling alive into Conſtantius's power, and to avoid a lingering death, after he had reigned three years and a half. Conſtantius died in the year 361, and was ſucceeded by Julian.

[u] Vol. iv. p. 179—184.

[x] Poſt hanc de Licinio victoriam, ſolus regnabat ad obitum Conſtantinus, et quantum poterat, conſiliis, inſtitutis, præmiis nitebatur, ut veteres religiones ſenſim deſtrueret, Chriſtianaque ſacra per orbem Romanum proferret. Intelligebat ſine dubio Imperator ex Licinii bellis et machinationibus, neque ſe, neque Romanorum imperium, ſalva veteri ſuperſtitione, ſalvum eſſe poſſe, atque hinc ab eo tempore aperte deos, eorumque religionem, tanquam rei-publicæ noxiam oppugnabat. Moſhem. Inſt. p. 146. [y] Introd. p. xviii.

[z] Ibid. p. xix.

Now therefore we are to recite the laws of Conſtantine's ſons, relating to the Gentile religion.

1. The [a] firſt is a law of Conſtans, with whom Conſtantius is to be ſuppoſed to have joined in the year 341, directed to Madalian, vice-prætorian præfect.

'Let ſuperſtition ceaſe; let the madneſs of ſacrificing be abo-'liſhed. For whoever ſhall preſume contrary to the conſtitution 'of our father, a prince of bleſſed memory, and contrary to this 'command of our clemency, to offer ſacrifices, let a proper and 'convenient puniſhment be inflicted, and execution preſently 'done upon him.'

Here is a reference to ſome law of Conſtantine againſt ſacrifices which is not extant. But we may depend upon the truth of what is here ſaid, as it is agreeable to what is ſaid by Euſebius, and Theodoret before quoted, as well as other Chriſtian writers, that Conſtantine did forbid ſacrificing. But as the law is not extant, we cannot ſay exactly what it was, and how it was conceived. It is here enacted, that they who act contrary to this law, 'ſhould undergo a proper and convenient puniſhment, 'and that execution ſhould be preſently done.' But it is not ſaid what puniſhment, whether that of death, or ſome other.

2. This law is followed by [b] another law of Conſtans in the next year, 342, directed to Catulinus, præfect of the city, againſt demoliſhing temples, which ſtood without the walls of the city of Rome.

'Although all ſuperſtition ought to be utterly rooted up, yet 'our pleaſure is, that the temples without the walls ſhould not 'be deſtroyed nor defaced. For upon ſome of them is founded 'the origin of the Circenſian, and other ſports and games, which 'ought not to be ſuppreſſed, that the Roman people may ſtill 'partake in the ancient ſolemnities and entertainments.'

Some may be apt to think it to be herein implied, that temples in the city might be deſtroyed, and that the law is deſigned for the ſecurity of ſuch only as were without the walls. Nevertheleſs the law is not ſo underſtood by learned men. 'Of thoſe

[a] Conſtantis Imp. Lex adverſus ſacrificia. Ad Madalianum agentem vicem. PF. P. Ceſſet ſuperſtitio. Sacrificiorum aboleatur inſania. Nam quicumque contra Legem Dei Principis Parentis noſtri, et hanc noſtræ manſuetudinis juſſionem, auſus fuerit ſacrificare, competens in eum vindicta, et præſens ſententia exeratur. Ap. Cod. Theod. lib. 16. Tit. x. l. 2. Tom. 6. p. 261.

[b] Conſtantis Imp. Lex, de templis extra muros Urbis Romæ poſitis non exſcindendis. Ad Catulinum. P. U. Quamquam omnis ſuperſtitio penitus eruenda ſit, tamen volumus, ut ædes Templorum, quæ extra muros ſunt poſitæ, intactæ incorruptæque conſiſtant. Nam cum ex nonnullis, vel Ludorum, vel Circenſium, vel Agonum origo fuerit exorta, non convenit eâ convelli, ex quibus Populo Romano præbeatur priſcarum ſolemnitas voluptatum. l. 3. ubi ſupr. p. 261.

'within

'within the walls,' ſays Cave, 'there ſeems to have been no 'queſtion, they being ſpared, as highly conducing to the ſplendor 'and ornament of the city.' So likewiſe ſays [c] Gothofred.

Many of the public feſtivals were in honour of the gods, and they were annually celebrated in memory of the origin, or dedication, of the temples conſecrated to them, as is obſerved by [d] Lactantius. The emperor, therefore, it ſeems, was willing that the people ſhould enjoy their uſual diverſions and entertainments, but without ſuperſtition.

It has been obſerved by Cave [e] and other learned men that, encouraged by theſe laws, Julius Firmicus Maternus wrote about this time, [that is, between the years 340 and 350,] his book De Errore profanarum religionum, which he dedicated to the two brother emperors; wherein, after having expoſed the follies and abſurdities of Paganiſm, he addreſſeth thoſe emperors that they would go on to make a perfect reformation, and by ſevere laws cut off what did yet remain, that the Roman world might be no longer infected with ſuch pernicious errors and * impieties.

From ſome things in that work of Julius Firmicus it may be concluded, that [f] before that time many temples had been deſtroyed.

3. The fourth law in the title of the Theodoſian Code concerning Pagans, and ſacrifices, and temples, and the firſt law of Conſtantius relating thereto, is directed 'to [g] Taurus, præfect of 'the Prætorium, for ſhutting up the temples, and for prohibiting 'ſacrifices.'

'We ordain that in all places, and in all cities, temples be imme-'diately ſhut up, and that all men being forbidden to enter there-'in, all occaſion of offending may be taken away from deſperate 'men. Our pleaſure likewiſe is that all abſtain from ſacrifices: 'if any tranſgreſs they are to be put to death, and their 'eſtates are to be confiſcated to the treaſury. In like manner

[c] De templis igitur extramuranis tantum ſpecie hujus legis 3 quærebatur, utrum hæc ſaltem demolienda eſſent. Nam de intramuranis quæſitum non fuit: nempe quod in his decor civitatis conſiſteret. Gothof. Ib. p. 263.

[d] Nam ludorum celebrationes, Deorum feſta ſunt. Siquidem ob natales eorum, vel templorum novorum dedicationes ſunt inſtituti. Lact. l. 6. c. 20.

[e] As before, p. xx. * An account of that work of J. Firmicus, with divers obſervations upon it, may be ſeen. Vol. iv. p. 297, 298. [f] Poſt excidia templorum in majus Dei eſtis virtute provecti. J. F. p. 463. edit. Gronov. And ſee in this work, vol. iv. p. 297.

[g] Conſtantii prima hoc titulo Lex de Templis occludendis, et ſacrificiis prohibendis. Ad Taurum. PF. P. Placuit, omnibus locis atque urbibus univerſis claudi protinus templa, et acceſſu vetitis omnibus licentiam delinquendi perditis abnegari. Volumus etiam cunctos ſacrificiis abſtinere. Quod ſi quis aliquid forte hujuſmodi perpetraverit, gladio ultore ſternatur. Facultates etiam perempti fiſco decernimus vindicari: et ſimiliter adfligi Rectores Provinciarum, ſi facinora vindicare neglexerint. Cod. The. l. 16. Tit. x. l. 4. Tom. 6. p. 263.

'are

'are to be puniſhed governors of provinces, if they neglect to 'puniſh ſuch tranſgreſſors.'

This law is placed by Gothofred in the year 353.

Agreeable to this Sozomen ſays: that 'not [h] only Conſtantine, 'but his ſons likewiſe forbade ſacrifices, and ordered the temples 'to be ſhut up every where in the cities, and in country places:' probably referring to this law.

Gothofred thinks that [i] as this law was directed to Taurus, who was præfect of the Prætorium for Italy, it ſhould be underſtood to reach no farther: but that does not appear clear to me: for about this time ſome temples were deſtroyed in other places and countries. Nor is it, I think, very likely that Sozomen ſhould take ſuch particular notice of a law, which had no effect out of Italy.

4. The [k] ſecond law of Conſtantius of this kind, and alſo to be placed in the year 353, is directed to Cerealis, præfect of the city.

'Let nocturnal ſacrifices be aboliſhed which had been allowed 'by Magnentius.'

This law undoubtedly was iſſued ſoon after the death of Magnentius, who, as is ſuppoſed, had relaxed the rigour of the laws againſt the Gentiles: now therefore nocturnal ſacrifices were prohibited at Rome.

Gothofred is of opinion that [l] this law was enacted at the requeſt of Cerealis, who was a zealous Chriſtian, as he collects from ſome things ſaid of him by Jerom.

5. The third law of Conſtantius is againſt ſacrifices, and the worſhip of images, ſuppoſed to be publiſhed in the year 356.

'We [m] appoint capital puniſhment to ſuch as are convicted of 'performing ſacrifices or worſhipping images.'

6. In another book and title of the Code we find [n] three laws of the ſame emperor publiſhed in the years 356 or 357, with the penalty

[h] .... ναὺς δὲ τὺς πανταχῃ κειμένυς εν πολεσι καὶ αγροις κεκλεισθαι προσεταξαν. Soz. l. 3. c. 17. p. 329. B.

[i] Atqui hæc lex data eſt ad Taurum PP. Italiæ ſcilicet, et ad Italiæ præfecturam pertinet: omnia, ſcilicet, loca atque urbes hac lege ſunt, quæ per eam præfecturam, non omnia, quæ Romano Imperio gubernantur, quod nonnemo prodidit. Nempe ad inſcriptiones ſuas coarctandæ ſunt ita, et ex iis explicandæ leges....Quamquam non nego, hoc ipſum per Ægyptum a Conſtantio factum. Goth. in l. 5. p. 264.

[k] Conſtantii ſecunda adverſus nocturna ſacrificia Romæ. Ad Cerealem P. U. Aboleantur ſacrificia nocturna, et nefaria deinceps licentia repellatur. Eod. Tit. l. 5. p. 265.

[l] Illud ultimum notari cupio, datam hanc legem ad Cerealem Præfectum Urbis, proculdubio ad ejus ſuggeſtionem, quem Chriſtianæ Religioni addictiſſimum fuiſſe credere licet. Sane id ſatis indicat ea quæ de Cereali hoc memorat Hieronymus ep. 16. Tom. i. ambitioſius petente Marcellam viduam in uxorem. Gothof. ib. p. 266.

[m] Pœnæ capitis ſubjugari præcipimus eos, quos operam ſacrificiis dare, vel colere ſimulachra conſtiterit. Eod. Tit. l. 6. p. 266.

[n] Nemo haruſpicem conſulat, aut mathematicum, nemo hariolum. Augurum et vatum

penalty of death againſt all who conſulted any of the maſters of divination, who are here reckoned up under their ſeveral titles of haruſpices, mathematicians, chaldæans, harioli, augures, vates, magicians.

Theſe laws, as is ſuppoſed, were occaſioned by ſome inquiries of Pagans, inconſiſtent with the public quiet, and the ſafety of the prince.

Theſe are laws of Conſtantine's ſons and ſucceſſors; and it muſt be allowed that there is in them a good deal of ſeverity.

III. We now come in courſe to the reign of Julian: but his hiſtory has been already written by us, in which we have ſufficiently ſhewn his zeal for Gentiliſm, and the treatment given by him to the Chriſtians.

And I ſuppoſe that at his acceſſion all the laws of preceding Chriſtian emperors againſt Gentiliſm, and it's rites, were made void, and abrogated; and that they remained without force, unleſs they were renewed, or revived by imperial authority.

IV. The fourth ſection in Cave's introduction is thus entitled: 'In what caſe Gentiliſm ſtood under the reigns of Jovian, Va-'lentinian, and Valens.'

Here it is obſervable that Gothofred, [o] in the title of Pagans, ſacrifices, and temples, puts not down any laws of theſe three emperors, nor of Gratian, againſt Gentiliſm. And, including Julian, this he computes to be the ſpace of five-and-twenty years from Conſtantius to Theodoſius.

Thoſe emperors were Chriſtians, and they encouraged their people in the profeſſion of the Chriſtian religion, and protected them in the enjoyment of the privileges conferred upon them by Conſtantine. And Sozomen ſays, particularly of Jovian, that 'he [p] recommended to all his ſubjects throughout the empire the 'Chriſtian religion, as the only true religion. And he wrote

vatum prava confeſſio conticeſcat. Chaldæi ac magi, et cæteri, quos maleficos ob facinorum multitudinem vulgus appellat, nec ad hanc partem aliquid moliantur. Sileat omnibus perpetuo divinandi curioſitas. Etenim ſupplicium capitis. foret gladio ultore proſtratus, quicunque juſſis obſequium denegaverit. Cod. Theod. lib. 9. Tit. xvi. de Maleficiis. l. 4. Vid. et l. 5. et l. 6. Tom. 3. p. 119....124.

[o] Ad Theodoſii Magni conſtitutiones, quæ ſex numero hoc titulo occurrunt, puta 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, a Conſtantio Imp. magno principum et annorum hiatu, [25. ſc.] nunc provehimur: nullis Juliani Joviani, Valentiniani, Valentis, Gratiani, adverſus Paganos et Sacrificia hunc in titulum relatis....Hujus vero rei cauſſa hæc eſt: Quia (verba ſunt Symmachi in Relatione at Valentinianum, hanc in rem ſingularia:) 'ſi numerentur hi' (quos modo dixi) 'Principes utriuſque ſectæ, utriuſque 'ſententiæ, proximus eorum ceremonias 'patrum,' (id eſt, Gentilium) coluit, recentior non removit. Diſſimulationem ideo et conniventiam horum poſteriorum principum Symmachus laudat: memorat et Ambroſius, lib. 1. et 2. adverſus Symmachum. Gothof. ibid. i. T. 6. p. 267.

[p] .... εγραψε τοις ηγεμοσι των εθνων, εν ταις εκκλησιαις αθροιζεσθαι, και το θειον επιμελως θεραπευειν, και μονην ειναι σεβας τοις αρχομενοις την των χριστιανων πιστιν. Soz. lib. 6. cap. 3. p. 640.

'letters

'letters to the governors of the provinces, that they ſhould give 'them full liberty to frequent the churches, and worſhip God 'devoutly there.' But, as it ſeems, there were now no new laws iſſued againſt Gentile people, and their ſacrifices.

In proof of this Gothofred obſerves ſeveral things: one thing alleged by him, is a paragraph of Symmachus, in his petition to the younger Valentinian, where he ſays: 'Certainly [q] if we reckon 'up the princes of each ſect, and of each opinion, one of your 'near anceſtors [meaning Julian] favoured the rites of our fa- 'thers: another ſtill nearer in time, [meaning Valentinian the 'firſt] did not receive them. If the piety of the former does 'not afford an example to be imitated, however ſtill let the con- 'nivance of the latter be of ſome weight.'

But to be ſomewhat more particular:

Jovian publiſhed a law of univerſal toleration, for which he was commended by Themiſtius, as we ſaw ſome while [r] ago.

Of Valentinian, Ammianus [s] ſays, as we have alſo ſeen [t] already, 'that he was remarkable for the moderation of his government, 'and that he ſtood neuter among all the diverſities of religion, 'and was troubleſome to none. He did not require any to fol- 'low either this or that; nor did he ſtrive by edicts to bend the 'necks of his ſubjects to his own way of worſhip, but left things 'untouched in the condition in which he found them.' A ſtrong teſtimony of moderation!

And in a law againſt ſoothſaying, publiſhed by him in the year 371: 'he [u] forbids it no otherwiſe than as it might be hurtful, 'and openly declares that from the beginning of his govern- 'ment, it had been his maxim to let all men follow that way of 'worſhip which was beſt approved by them.' Which law con- 'ſpires completely with the teſtimony of Ammianus juſt men- 'tioned, and abundantly confirms it.

And we may here recollect what we formerly ſaw in [x] Zoſimus, 'that Valentinian had forbid nocturnal ſacrifices, with a 'view of preventing thoſe enormities which are ſometimes com- 'mitted in thoſe ſeaſons; but upon the remonſtrance of Præ- 'textatus,' as he ſays, 'the emperor was perſuaded to let that 'law lie dormant, as to Greece at leaſt.'

[q] See before, note [o]. [r] See before, vol. viii. ch. xlviii. ſect. ii.

[s] Amm. l. 30. cap. ix. p. 660.

[t] See vol. viii. ch. li. ſect. ii. 16.

[u] Haruſpicinam ego nullum cum maleficiorum cauſſis habere conſortium judico: neque ipſam, aut aliquam præterea conceſſam a Majoribus religionem, genus arbitror eſſe criminis. Teſtes ſunt leges a me in exordio imperii mei datæ, quibus 'unicuique, quod animo imbibiſſet, colendi 'libera facultas' tributa eſt. Nec haruſpicinam reprehendimus, ſed nocenter exerceri vetamus. Cod. Th. lib. 9. Tit. 16. De Maleficiis et Mathematicis &c. l. ix. T. 3. p. 128.

[x] See before, p. 46.

And

And agreeably to our preſent argument, Cave [y] ſays: 'the 'Gentiles for the main had enjoyed the peaceable exerciſe of 'their religion for many years, having met with little or no in- 'terruption in it, ſince the times of Conſtantius. And for the firſt 'two years of Theodoſius, almoſt wholly taken up with wars, 'their temples were open, and they had the freedom of their 'rites and ceremonies.'

It may be alſo not improper to put down here the general obſervations of Pagi upon this period, and the ſtate of Gentiliſm at this time. 'During [z] the reign of Conſtantine,' ſays he, 'the 'Gentiles had liberty, either in whole or in part, to celebrate 'publicly the rites and ſolemnities of their religion. And upon 'the reſtoration of the Chriſtian religion after Julian, in the time 'of Valentinian the elder, the Pagans enjoyed great liberty. 'They ſtill had their own opinion, their own rites, their temples, 'and the ſolemnities belonging to them. And in the beginning 'of the reign of Theodoſius, for ſome while they enjoyed the 'privilege of ſacrificing till the year 391, in which Valentinian 'the younger, with the advice of Theodoſius, forbade at Rome 'and Italy the offering of victims and ſacrifices, entrance into 'temples, and the worſhip of Images: as may be ſeen in the 'eleventh law in the Theodoſian Code concerning Pagans, which 'was iſſued at Milan.'

So Pagi. But inſtead of the eleventh law in that title, I ſuppoſe he meant the tenth: for the eleventh law in that title relates to Ægypt.

V. We are now in the next place to obſerve the laws of Theodoſius and ſucceeding emperors againſt the Gentiles.

1. In the year 381 was iſſued a law of Theodoſius, with the joint authority of Gratian, and the younger Valentinian, againſt apoſtates: 'that [a] they who apoſtatiſed from Chriſtianity to Paganiſm 'ſhould loſe the power of making a will.'

This, as Gothofred [b] ſays, is the firſt law of the kind that ever was

[y] See his Introduction, as before, p. lix. where he alſo refers to Zoſimus, l. 4. p. 455.

[z] Imperante Conſtantino Magno licuit adhuc Gentilibus ſua ſolemnia vel in totum vel in partem publice agitare. Reparata dein poſt Julianum Apoſtatam Chriſtiana religione ſub Valentiniano ſeniore, ſua quoque Paganis ſententia, ſui ritus, templaque et templorum ſolennia relicta fuere. Theodoſio demum imperante, et ſacrificia aliquandiu exercere licuit, ad annum Chriſti 391, quo Valentinianus junior Theodoſii M. conſilio Romæ et in Italia ſacrificia hoſtiarum ſeu victimarum, templorumque ingreſſum et ſimulachrorum cultum prohibuit. Lege xi. Cod. Theod. De Paganis, eo anno Mediolani emiſſa, et in Annalibus a Baronio memorata. Pagi ann. 386. num. vii.

[a] His qui ex Chriſtianis Pagani facti ſunt, eripiatur facultas juſque teſtandi. Omne defuncti, ſi quod eſt teſtamentum, ſubmota conditione reſcindatur. Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. Tit. vii. De Apoſtatis, l. 1. Tom. 6. p. 203.

[b] Inquies, nullæne ergo ante Theodoſium Magnum in hoc genus apoſtatarum, qui ex Chriſtianis Pagani facti fuiſſent ab Imperatoribu

was enacted by a Chriſtian emperor. However, this law [c] was afterwards ratified, and followed by other laws of Theodoſius the great, Valentinian the younger, Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodoſius the ſecond, with the addition of other clauſes, ſo that the friends and kindred of apoſtates might have no benefit of inheritance.

2. In the ſame year with the firſt law before mentioned [that is in the year 381], and by the ſame authority of Gratian, Valentinian the younger and Theodoſius, was enacted 'a law [d] forbidding all ſacrifices in the way of divination, either by day or by night, either in the temples or elſewhere, upon the pain of proſcription. And it is there added: "that God is to be worſhipped with pure and chaſte prayers, not with profane charms and incantations.'

It is allowed by [e] Cave, and other learned men, that by this law no other ſacrifices are forbidden, but ſuch as were performed in the way of divination, and for diſcovering futurities, and eſpecially ſuch as related to the ſtate, and public affairs.

However, upon occaſion of this, and perhaps ſome other like ſubſequent laws, Zoſimus complained that 'the [f] temples in the city and the country were attacked, and that men might no longer lift up their eyes to heaven, or pay their devotions to the things therein without danger of their heads.'

3. In the year 382 was publiſhed another law of Theodoſius, 'concerning [g] a magnificent temple in the province of Oſrhoene, or Edeſſa, as is ſuppoſed, which was adorned with many ſtatues, and of curious workmanſhip, allowing that it ſhould be open, and be frequented, provided no ſacrifices were performed there.'

It is ſuppoſed that [h] this temple had been ſhut up, but now, at

Imperatoribus conſtitutiones promulgatæ fuerunt? Nullæ, inquam, mihi occurrunt. Et Theodoſius Magnus, ni fallor, primus Imperatorum Chriſtianorum eos conſtitutionibus infectatus eſt &c. Goth. T. 6. p. 203.

[c] Vid. lib. xvi. Tit. vii. de Apoſtatis l. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

[d] Si quis vetitis ſacrificiis, diurnis nocturniſque, velut væſanus ac ſacrilegus incertorum conſultorum, inmiſerit, fanumque ſibi aut templum ad hujuſmodi ſceleris excuſationem adſumendum crediderit, vel pulſaverit adeundum, proſcriptioni ſe noverit ſubjugandum: cum nos juſta inſtitutione moneamus, caſtis Deum precibus, non diris carminibus profanandum. lib. 16. Tit. x. l. 7. Tom. 6. p. 266.

[e] Introduction. p. lx.

[f] Vid. Zoſ. l. 4. p. 758.

[g] Ædem olim frequentiæ dedicatam, cœtui etiam, populoque communem, in quâ ſimulachra feruntur poſita, artis pretio quam divinitate metienda, jugiter patere, publici conſilii auctoritate decernimus....Experientia tua, omni votorum celebritate ſervatâ, auctoritate noſtri itr patere templum permittat oraculis, ne illic prohibitorum uſus ſacrificiorum, hujus occaſionis aditus permiſſus eſſe credatur. Lib. 16. Tit. x. l. 8. Tom. 6. p. 268.

[h] De quo tamen in conſilio ejus [nempe Theodoſii] dubitatum fuerat: nonnullis contendentibus, occludi oportere, duobus argumentis....Verum contra contendentibus aliis, ac nominatim Gentilibus, quorum magnus tum in palatio ſeu comitatu Theodoſii Magni numerus erat. Goth. T. 6. p. 268.

the

the earneſt requeſt of ſome, and for avoiding too much offence, it was allowed to ſtand open.

However, this temple, as it ſeems, had been deſtroyed before Libanius compoſed his oration for the temples. It is ſuppoſed that [i] he complains of it in one part of his oration.

4. In the year 385 was [k] publiſhed another law of Theodoſius, 'forbidding ſacrifices, eſpecially ſuch as were made in the way 'of divination, and for diſcovering futurities, upon pain of 'death.'

This law is addreſſed to Cynegius, præfect of the Prætorium in the Eaſt. And it muſt be underſtood to prohibit ſacrifices in Ægypt, at leaſt in the way of divination.

Libanius may refer to this law, when he ſays in the above-mentioned oration that ſacrifices were forbidden, but not incenſe; which was done ſoon after this, in a law publiſhed in the year 392, as we ſhall ſee preſently.

5. In the year 391 'was [l] publiſhed a law of Theodoſius, in 'which all ſacrifices of innocent victims, and acceſs to the tem-'ples, and the worſhip of ſenſeleſs images, are prohibited.'

This law was particularly deſigned for Rome and Italy. This is the law to which Pagi referred in the paragraph cited from him ſome while ago. It is allowed by Gothofred [ll] alſo, that all theſe things are here abſolutely forbidden by this law of Theodoſius, and the younger Valentinian. And [m] it is conſidered by him, as well as by Pagi, as the firſt law of the kind ſince Conſtantius.

6. In the ſame year, 391, a like [n] law was publiſhed by Theodoſius for Ægypt, 'forbidding ſacrifices and acceſs to tem-'ples.' The execution of this law is referred to Euagrius præ-

[i] Vide pro Templis. Or. p. 27. &c.

[k] Si quis mortalium ita faciendi ſacrificii ſumat audaciam, ut inſpectione jecoris, extorumque præſagio vanæ ſpem promiſſionis accipiat, vel quod eſt deterius futura execrabili conſultatione cognoſcat. Acerbioris etenim imminebit ſupplicii cruciatus eis, qui contra vetitum, præſentium vel futurorum explorare temtaverint veritatem. Lib. 16. Tit. x. l. 9. T. 6. p. 270.

[l] Nemo ſe hoſtiis polluat, nemo inſontem victimum cædat, nemo delubra adeat, templa perluſtret, et mortali opere formata ſimulacra ſuſpiciat: ne divinis atque humanis ſanctionibus reus fiat. Ibid. l. x. T. 6. p. 27.

[ll] Sacrificia hoſtiarum ſeu victimarum, templorumque ingreſſus, ſimulacrorum denique cultus hac conſtitutione, anno D. 391, prorſus inhibentur. Goth. T. 6. p. 272.

[m] Ergo hâc primun. poſt Conſtantinum, Conſtantem, et Conſtantium, Valentiniani Jun. conſtitutione ſacrificiæ Romæ atque in Italia prohibita. Quæ paullo ante hanc legem Romæ ſtetiſſe Libanius diſerte teſtatur in oratione, quam edidi ὑπερ των ιερων, quæ ſcripta eſt A. D. 387. [forte 391.) Goth. ibid.

[n] Theodoſii M. quinta hoc titulo lex per Ægyptum: Quo ſacrificia, adituſque templorum interdicuntur. Euagrio PF. Aug. et Romano Com. Ægypt. Nulli ſacrificandi tribuatur poteſtas: nemo Templa circumeat, nemo delubra ſuſcipiat, intercluſos ſibi noſtræ legis obſtaculo profanos aditus recognoſcant: adeo ut, ſi quis vel de Diis aliquid, contra vetitum, ſacriſque molietur, nullis exuendum ſe indulgentiis recognoſcat. &c. Eod. Tit. l. xj. T. 6. p. 272.

fect,

fect, and Romanus count of Ægypt. Soon after which followed the demolition of the temple of Serapis at Alexandria.

7. In the year 392 was publiſhed a ſevere law of Theodoſius, directed to Rufinus præfect of the Prætorium, forbidding to men of all ranks every kind of heatheniſh worſhip.

'Let[o] no man, of what order, rank, or quality ſoever he may 'be——preſume in any place, or any city to offer but an harm-'leſs ſacrifice to ſenſeleſs images, or pay any adoration to his 'genius, or houſehold gods, by offerings of wine, ſetting up 'lights, burning frankincenſe, hanging up garlands to them. 'And if any man ſhall dare to offer a ſacrifice, or conſult the 'reeking entrails, let it be lawful for any one to accuſe him, and 'being found guilty, let him receive ſentence accordingly, as in 'caſes of high treaſon, although it ſhould appear that he did not 'herein conſult any thing againſt the life of his prince, or make 'any inquiries at all about it. For it is enough to aggravate 'the greatneſs of his crime, that he would reſcind the laws of 'nature, ſearch into things unlawful, diſcloſe what is ſecret, at-'tempt what is prohibited, inquire into another's fate, and give 'hopes of his death or ruin. But if any man ſhall burn in-'cenſe to a corruptible image, the work of men's hands, and by 'a ridiculous example honour that which himſelf has juſt now 'framed, and ſhall by crowning the ſtock with garlands, or by

[o] Nullus omnino, ex quolibet genere, ordine hominum, dignitatum, vel in poteſtate poſitus, vel honore perfunctus, ſive potens ſorte naſcendi, ſeu humilis genere, conditione, fortuna, in nullo penitus loco, in nulla urbe, ſenſu carentibus ſimulacris, vel inſontem victimam cædat: vel ſecretiore piaculo, Larem ignem, Genium, Penates nidore veneratus accendat lumina, imponat thura, ſerta ſuſpendat. II. Quod ſi quiſpiam immolare hoſtiam ſacrificaturus audebit, aut ſpirantia exta conſulere, ad exemplum Majeſtatis reus, licita cunctis accuſatione, delatus, excipiat ſententiam conpetentem, etiamſi nihil contra ſalutem Principum, aut de ſalute quæſierit. Sufficit enim ad criminis molem, naturæ ipſius leges velle reſcindere, inlicita perſcrutari, occulta recludere, interdicta temptare, finem quærere ſalutis alienæ, ſpem alieni interitus polliceri. III. Si quis vero mortali opere facto, et ævum paſſura Simulachra impoſito thure venerabitur, ac (ridiculo exemplo metuens ſubitoque ipſe ſimulaverit) vel redimita vittis arbore, vel erecta effoſſis ara ceſpitibus vanas imagines, humiliore licet muneris præmio, tamen plenâ religionis injuriâ, honorare temptaverit, is, utpote violatæ religionis reus, eâ domo ſeu poſſeſſione multabitur, in quâ eum Gentilitia conſtiterit ſuperſtitione famulatum. Namque omnia loca, quæ thuris conſtiterit vapore fumaſſe, (ſi tamen ea in jure fuiſſe thurificantium probabuntur) fiſco noſtro adſocianda cenſemus. IV. Sin vero in templis faniſve publicis, aut in ædibus, agriſve alienis, tale quiſpiam ſacrificandi genus exercere temptaverit, ſi ignorante domino uſurpata conſtiterit, xxv. librarum auri multæ nomine cogetur inferre: conniventem vero huic ſceleri par ac ſacrificantem pœna retinebit. Quod quidem ita per Judices ac Defenſores, et Curiales ſingularum urbium, volumus cuſtodiri, ut illico per hos comperta in Judicium deferantur: per illos delata plectantur. Si quid autem ii tegendum gratiâ, aut incuriâ prætermittendum eſſe crediderint, commotioni Judiciariæ ſubjacebunt. Illi vero moniti, ſi vindictam diſſimulatione diſtulerint, xxx librarum auri diſpendio multabuntur: Officiis quoque eorum damno pari ſubjugandis. Dat. vi. Id. Nov. CP. Arcadio A. II. et Rufino Coſſ. [392.] Eod. Tit. l. xii. T. 6. p. 273, 274.

'erecting

'erecting an altar of turfs, do what he can, though but in a mean 'way, yet a way highly injurious to religion, to pay worſhip to 'ſenſeleſs images; let him, as a perſon guilty of the violation 'of religion, be puniſhed with the loſs of that houſe or field 'wherein it ſhall be proved that he practiſed ſuch Pagan ſuper-'ſtition. For it is our judgment that all places wherein it ſhall 'appear that incenſe has been burned (provided they be legally 'proved to be the perſons that did it), ought to be confiſcated 'to our treaſury. But if it ſhall ſo happen that the place where 'ſuch a kind of ſacrifice has been performed be a public temple, 'or conſecrated chapel, or another man's houſe or ground, if it 'appear that it was done without the knowledge of the owner, 'let him be fined in the ſum of xxv pounds of gold: and let 'him that connives at it, and conceals it, be fined in the ſame 'ſum with him who ſacrificeth. And our pleaſure is, that this be 'ſo obſerved by the judges, defenſors, and curiales of every city, 'that the officers having diſcovered any fact, ſhall immediately 'bring it before the judges: and they ſhall forthwith ſee to the 'execution of the penalty. But if the defenſors and curiales 'ſhall conceal any thing through favour, or careleſſneſs, they 'ſhall be puniſhed by the judges: and if the judges, after infor-'mation received from the officers, ſhall take no notice of it, or 'defer puniſhment, they ſhall be fined in the ſum of xxx 'pounds of gold; and their officers ſhall be liable to the ſame 'penalty.' 'Given at Conſtantinople, the eighth day of No-'vember: Arcadius being the ſecond time, and Rufinus con-'ſuls:' that is, in the year 392.

That is a prolix edict; I once intended to abridge it, and make remarks: but now I have tranſcribed it at length, almoſt entire, that my readers may themſelves make remarks. This law of Theodoſius is inſerted at length in an Engliſh verſion by Cave in his [p] Introduction: of which verſion I alſo have made ſome uſe.

8. In the year 399 was publiſhed by Arcadius a law for deſtroying temples in country places.

'If [q] there are any temples in the fields, let them be deſtroyed 'without noiſe and tumult. For theſe being thrown down, and 'taken away, all occaſion of ſuperſtition will be removed.'

I do not take all the imperial laws iſſued about this time, relating to Gentile worſhip. I omit ſeveral.

[p] p. lxvii. lxviii. [q] Si qua in agris templa ſunt, ſine turba ac tumultu diruantur. His enim dejectis atque ſublatis, omnis ſuperſtitionis materia conſumetur. Ecd. Tit. l. 16. Tom. 6. p. 283.

9. By a law of Theodoſius the younger, in the year 316: 'They [r] who are polluted with the profane error of Gentiliſm are 'excluded from military power, and judicial authority.'

10. In the year 423 is a law of the ſame Theodoſius to this purpoſe: 'Let [s] the laws already enacted have their full force 'upon the Pagans that remain: though we rather think that 'there are none left.'

11. Again, in the ſame year: 'If [t] any of the Pagans that re- 'main are found offering execrable ſacrifices to dæmons, let 'them be puniſhed with baniſhment and confiſcation of goods, 'though they ought to ſuffer capital puniſhment.'

12. In the year 426 was promulgated another law of the ſame Theodoſius, and very ſevere: 'forbidding [u] all Pagan oblations 'and ſacrifices, ordering their chapels, temples, and conſecrated 'places, if any yet remained, to be deſtroyed by the authority 'of the magiſtrate: or that they ſhould be expiated by placing 'in them the venerable ſign of the Chriſtian religion. And if 'any are convicted before a competent judge of having ſacri- 'ficed contrary to this law, they are to ſuffer death.'

Theodoret, who lived in the time of this emperor, and concluded his hiſtory at the year of Chriſt 429, ſays that, 'he [x] com- 'manded all the temples of idols which yet remained to be 'deſtroyed to the foundation, that they who ſhall live after 'us may not ſee ſo much as the traces of the former ancient 'error.'

13. Nevertheleſs after all, Gentiliſm ſtill ſubſiſted, though their temples, for the moſt part, had been long ſince ſhut up, or deſtroyed. For there is a ſevere law of Valentinian the third, and Marcian, in the year 451: 'forbidding [y] all heathen ſacri- 'fices, and oblations of frankincenſe and wine, and adorning

[r] Qui profano Pagani ritus errore ſeu crimine polluuntur, hoc eſt, Gentiles, nec ad Militiam admittantur, nec adminiſtratoris vel judicis honore decorentur. Eod. Tit. l. 21. T. 6. p. 293.

[s] Paganos, qui ſuperſunt, quanquam jam nullos eſſe credamus, promulgatarum legum jamdudum præſcripta compeſcant. Eod. Tit. l. 22. T. 6. p. 294.

[t] Paganos, qui ſuperſunt, ſi aliquando in exſectandis dæmonum ſacrificiis fuerint comprehenſi, quamvis capitali pœna ſubdi debuerint, bonorum proſcriptione et exilio coerceri. Eod. Tit. l. 23. T. 6. p. 294.

[u] Omnibus ſceleratæ mentis Paganæ, exſecrandis hoſtiarum immolationibus, damnandiſque ſacrificiis, cæteriſque antiquarum ſanctionum auctoritate prohibitis, interdicimus. Cunctaque eorum fana, templa, delubra, ſi qua etiam nunc reſtant integra, præcepto magiſtratuum deſtrui, conlocationeque venerandæ Chriſtianæ religionis ſigni expiari præcipimus: ſcientibus univerſis, ſi quem huic legi apud competentem Judicem idoneis probationibus inluſiſſe conſtiterit, eum morte eſſe multandum. Eod. Tit. l. 25. T. 6. p. 296.

[x] Τυτο δε ενικα και αυτα των ειδωλων σηκων τα λειπομενα, εκ βαθρων ανασπασθηναι προσεταξεν, ωστε τους μετ' ημας ισομενους μηδε ιχνος της προτερας εξαπατης θεασασθαι. Theod. l. 5. cap. 37. p. 243.

[y] Ap. Baron. ann. 451. num. 161, 162.

'images

'images with garlands, and all the rites of the ancient ſuperſti-'tion in general.' I put below [2] Pagi's obſervations upon this law.

I recite here no more laws of Chriſtian emperors relating to Gentiliſm. It is a dull part of my work: but I thought it incumbent on me not to omit it entirely, that my readers may be able to judge for themſelves concerning this point, as well as others. Some more like laws may come before us hereafter, and be mentioned occaſionally.

And now ſome will be diſpoſed to make obſervations upon what we have juſt ſeen.

1. The period of twenty years, or five-and-twenty years, as it is ſometimes called by learned men, from the death of Conſtantius, to the acceſſion of Theodoſius, or thereabout, when the Gentiles were treated with much mildneſs, and few laws were iſſued againſt them, is remarkable.

2. Poſſibly we here ſee the ground of the great animoſity of Zoſimus, and other Gentile writers, againſt Conſtantine and Theodoſius above all other Chriſtian emperors. Conſtantine was the firſt of the Roman emperors who forſook Gentiliſm, and embraced Chriſtianity. And in the latter part of his reign divers heathen temples were deſtroyed, and ſacrifices were forbidden: which law againſt ſacrificing ſubſiſted in force under his ſons; who likewiſe iſſued divers ſevere laws againſt the Gentiles. And again, after the interval of the reign of Julian, and a ſeaſon of great mildneſs and moderation under his immediate ſucceſſors, in the reign of Theodoſius old laws againſt Gentiliſm were revived, and more added to them. And the conduct of Theodoſius was imitated by his ſons, and their ſucceſſors after them. Theſe things may have occaſioned the great animoſity of Gentile writers againſt the two fore-mentioned emperors.

3. I think it muſt be allowed that the laws againſt Gentiliſm which I have juſt rehearſed, were not rigorouſly executed. But of this we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more fully hereafter.

[2] Denique Gentiliſmi reliquiæ in totum ſuppreſſæ anno 451 edicto Valentiniani III. et Marciani, ut legere eſt eo anno in Annalibus numero ult. Pagi ann. 389. xv.

Sect. II. A Conſultation and Divination of Heathen People in the time of Valens, about the year 373.

I. *An account of it from Ammianus and other writers.* II. *Remarks upon their accounts, and a vindication of Valens from the charge of exceſſive cruelty.* III. *The hiſtory and character of the philoſopher Maximus, favourite of the emperor Julian, who now ſuffered death.*

I. In the year [a] 373 or [b] 374, whilſt Valens was at Antioch, a diſcovery was made of a conſultation which ſome Gentiles had together, for finding out the name of the perſon who ſhould ſucceed the emperor: there are accounts of it in ſeveral of our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, and in divers heathen authors, particularly Ammianus Marcellinus, who is the fulleſt of all, and was then in the Eaſt, and poſſibly at Antioch.

'When [c] the affair was brought before Modeſtus, præfect of 'the prætorium, Palladius being put upon the rack,' as Ammianus ſays, 'declared that Fiduſtius, who had been in the office 'of a preſident, and Pergamius and Irenæus had tried by ſe'cret arts to find out the name of him who was to ſucceed Va'lens in the empire. Fiduſtius happened to be preſent; and 'being laid hold of he did not deny the charge, but confeſſed 'that he, with Hilary and Patritius, both well ſkilled in the art 'of divination: moreover Hilary had a military poſt at court, 'had inquired after a ſucceſſor in the empire. They ſoon diſ'covered that he would be an excellent prince, and that his name 'was Theodorus, meaning him who was then ſecond in the ſe'cretaries office; and was a perſon of a good family, well edu'cated, and commendable for many virtues.'

The confeſſions made by Patritius and Hilary, upon farther

[a] Pagi ann. 370. n. xxxi. Vid. et 371. iii. 372. vi. Baſn. ann. 373. n. ii.

[b] Tillem. Valens. art. xiv. xv.

[c] ...et Antiochiam Imperator Romanus ingreſſus. Qui dum ibi moratur ſecurus interim hoſtium externorum, inteſtinis pene perierat fraudibus, ut aperiet ſeries relata geſtorum...Juſſuſque Palladius docere fidenter quæ noverat, rudentem explicuit immenſum: adfirmans, Fiduſtium Præſidialem, et cum Irenæo Pergamium nomen Imperaturi poſt Valentem deteſtandis præſagiis didiciſſe ſecretim. Et correptus Fiduſtius illico (namque aderat forte) occulteque inductus, viſo indice, nulla inſitiatione adumbrare jam publicata conatus, rei totius calamitoſum aperit textum: abſolute confeſſus, ſe cum Hilario et Patritio vaticinandi peritis, quorum Hilarius militaverat in palatio, de imperio conſuluiſſe futuro: motaſque ſecretis artibus ſortes, et nuncupationem principis optimi, et ipſis conſultoribus luctuoſos exitus prædixiſſe. Atque cunctantibus, quiſnam ea tempeſtate omnibus vigore animi antiſtaret, viſus eſt aliis omnibus excellere Theodorus, ſecundum inter notarios adeptus jam gradum. Et erat revera ita ut opinati ſunt. Namque antiquitus claro genere in Galliis natus, et liberaliter educatus, &c. Ammian. l. 29. cap. i. p. 596, 597. ed. Gronov. 4to. 1693.

examinatio[n]

examination, are particularly related by Ammianus after this manner:

'A [d] tripod made of laurel was artificially prepared, and con-'secrated with certain preſcribed ſecret charms and invocations. 'It was then placed in the middle of a room, perfumed with 'Arabian ſpices. The charger upon which it was ſet had upon 'it's utmoſt brim the four-and-twenty letters of the alphabet, 'neatly engraved, and ſet at due diſtances from each other: 'then a perſon, clad in linen veſtments with linen ſocks upon 'his feet, and a ſuitable covering upon his head, came in with 'laurel branches in his hands, and after ſome myſtic charms per-'formed, ſhaked a ring hanging at a curtain about the edge 'of the charger, which jumping up and down fell upon ſuch and 'ſuch letters of the alphabet where it ſeemed to ſtay; the prieſt 'alſo then compoſing certain heroic verſes in anſwer to the inter-'rogatories that had been propoſed. The letters which the ring 'pointed out in this caſe were four; ΘΕΟΔ, which being put 'together compoſed theſe two ſyllables, THEOD, whereupon 'one that ſtood by preſently cried out that the oracle plainly 'intended Theodorus. Nor did we make any farther inquiries, 'being all well ſatisfied that he was the perſon intended.'

Ammianus then adds, that 'when the whole affair had been 'thus diſtinctly laid before the judges, the deponent Hilary ſub-'joined that Theodorus himſelf had no concern in it, being to-'tally ignorant of this proceeding.'

[d] Inducti itaque Patritius et Hilarius, ordinemque explicare juſſi geſtorum, cum inter exordia variarent, fodicatis lateribus, inlato tripode quo utebantur, adacti ad ſummas anguſtias, aperiunt negotii fidem ab ipſis exordiis replicatam. Et prior Hilarius: Conſtruximus, inquit, magnifici judices, ad cortinæ ſimilitudinem Delphicæ diris auſpiciis de laureis virgulis infauſtam hanc menſulam quam videtis: et imprecationibus carminum, ſecretorum, choragiiſque multis ac diuturnis ritualiter conſecratam movimus tandem. Movendi autem, quoties ſuper rebus arcanis conſulebatur, erat inſtitutio talis. Collocabatur in medio domus emaculata odoribus Arabibus undique lance rotunda pure ſuperpoſita, ex diverſis metallicis materiis fabrefacta: cujus in ambitu rotunditatis extremo elementorum viginti quattuor ſcriptiles formæ incitæ perite, disjungebantur ſpatiis examinare dimenſis. Hac linteis quidam indumentis amictus, calceatuſque itidem linteis ſoccis, torulo capiti circumflexo, verbenas felicis arboris geſtans litato conceptis carminibus numine præſcitiorum auctore, ceremoniali ſcientia ſuperſtitit: cortinulis, penſilem annulum librans, ſartum ex Carpathio filo perquam levi, myſticis diſciplinis initiatum: qui per intervalla diſtincta retinentibus ſingulis literis incidens ſaltuatim, heroas efficit verſus interrogantibus conſonos, ad numeros et modus plene concluſos: quales leguntur Pythici, vel ex oraculis editi Branchidarum. Ibi tum quærentibus nobis, qui præſenti ſuccedet imperio, quoniam omni ex parte expolitus fore memorabatur, et adſiliens annulus duos perſtrinxerat ſyllabas ΘΕΟ, cum adjectione literæ poſtrema, exclamavit præſentium quidam, Theodorum præſcribente fatali neceſſitate portendi. Nec ultra negotio eſt exploratum. Satis enim apud nos conſtabat, hunc eſſe qui poſcebatur. Cumque totius rei notitiam ita ſignate ſuper oculis judicum ſubjeciſſet, adjecit benevole, id Theodorum penitus ignorare. Ammian. ibid. p. 601, 602.

I have taken [e] Cave's tranſlation of this depoſition, making but little alteration in it. The words of Ammianus are at the bottom of the page, to be read by ſuch as are ſo diſpoſed. An exact literal tranſlation would be very difficult. But certainly this hiſtory is very curious, and well deſerving to be attended to.

Zonaras [f] gives a different account of the method of divination now made uſe of. He ſays, that 'the four-and-twenty 'letters of the alphabet were written upon the ground, and at 'each one was placed a grain of wheat or barley: then, after 'ſome myſtic forms, a cock was let out which picked up ſuch 'grains as lay at thoſe four letters.' But it is much more reaſonable to rely upon Ammianus, who was contemporary, and likely to be well informed. His account alſo is agreeable to that in [g] Sozomen, and [h] Zoſimus, who have both mentioned the tripod.

All the ancient writers who ſpeak of this tranſaction, repreſent the public executions made upon this occaſion as very ſevere and cruel. Ammianus has mentioned ſeveral of the ſufferers. 'Eutropius, [i] proconſul of Aſia, was accuſed as an accomplice,

[e] See his Introduction, as before, p. liv.

[f] Zon. Ann. T. 3. p. 28.

[g] Sozom. l. 6. cap. 35. p. 693. C.

[h] Zoſ. p. 743. in.

[i] Quibus poſt hæc cognita ſequeſtratis, Eutropius Aſiam proconſulari tunc obtinens poteſtate, ut factionis conſcius arceſſitus in crimen, abſceſſit innocuus...His acceſſit philoſophus Simonides, adoleſcens ille quidem, verum noſtra memoria ſeveriſſimus. Qui cum audiſſe negotium per Fiduſtium deferretur, et cauſſam non ex veritate, ſed ex unius nutu penſari vidiſſet, didiciſſe ſe dixit prædicta, et commiſſa pro firmitate animi tacuiſſe...Ducti univerſi flebiliter jugulantur, præter Simonidem: quem ſolum ſævus ille ſententiæ lator efferatus ob conſtantiam gravem juſſit flammis exuri. Qui vitam ut dominam fugitans rabidam, ridens ſalitas momentorum ruinas, immobilis conflagravit. Peregrinum illum imitatus, Protea cognomine, philoſophum clarum: qui cum mundo digredi ſtatuiſſet, Olympiæ quinquennali certamine ſub Græciæ conſpectu totius, adſcenſo rogo, quem ipſe conſtruxit, flammis abſumtus eſt. Et poſt hunc diebus ſecutis omnium fere ordinum multitudo, quam nominatim recenſere eſt arduum....Deinde congeſti innumeri codices, acervi voluminum multi conſpectu judicum concremati ſunt, ex domibus eruti variis, uti illiciti, ad leniendam cæforum invidiam: cum eſſent plerique liberalium diſciplinarum indices variarum, et juris. Neque ita multo poſt Maximus ille philoſophus, vir ingenti nomine doctrinarum, cujus ex uberrimis ſermonibus ad ſapientiam copioſus Julianus exſtitit Imperator, oraculi ſupra dicti verſus vidiſſe inſimulatus: ſeque comperiſſe adſenſus, ſed reticenda profeſſionis conſideratione non effudiſſe, verum ultro prædixiſſe, conſultores ipſos ſuppliciis pœnalibus perituros: Epheſum ad genuinam patriam ductus, ibique capite truncatus, ſenſit docente periculo poſtremo, quæſitoris iniquitatem omnibus eſſe criminibus graviorem. Conſtrictus etiam Diogenes laqueis impiæ falſitatis, vir nobili proſapia editus, ingenio, facundia forenſi, ſuavitateque præſtans, dudum Bithyniæ rector, ut opimum patrimonium ejus diriperetur, capitali eſt pœna adfectus. Ecce autem Alypius quoque ex Vicario Britanniarum, placiditatis homo jucundæ poſt otioſum et repoſitam vitam (quoniam hucuſque injuſtitia tetenderat manus) in ſqualore maximo volutatus, ut veneficii reus citatus eſt, cum Hierocle filio, adoleſcente indolis bonæ, urgente Diogene quodam et vili et ſolo, omnique laniena excruciato, ut verba placentia Principi, vel potius arceſſitori, loqueretur: quo cum pœnis non ſufficerent vivo exuſto, ipſe quoque Alypius poſt multationem bonorum exſulare præceptus, filium miſerabiliter ductum ad mortem, caſu quodam proſpero revocatum excepit. Ammian. l. 29. c. 1. p. 604, 605.

'but

'but at length was acquitted....The perſon next mentioned by 'Ammianus is Simonides, whom he calls a philoſopher. He 'ſays he was a young man of ſtrict virtue: when he was accuſed 'he acknowledged that he had been acquainted with the con-'ſultation, but did not think himſelf obliged to betray a ſecret 'with which he had been entruſted: however, he was condemned 'to be burnt alive: whoſe fortitude in undergoing that death is 'here extolled and celebrated by Ammianus, in a high degree. 'And he is compared to Peregrinus, a well known philoſopher, 'who had burnt himſelf at the Olympic games in the ſight of 'all Greece. After him many others were put to death in a cruel 'manner, and in different ways. And heaps of books were 'brought forth and conſumed in the fire, which had been ſought 'for, and collected from many houſes, as illicit; though many 'of them were works relating to the liberal ſciences, and others 'were law-books: but they were brought out and burnt in pub-'lic view, in the preſence of the judges, to mollify the reſent-'ment of people at ſo numerous executions. And not long after, 'the philoſopher Maximus, who was ſo celebrated for his learn-'ing, by whom the emperor Julian had been inſtructed, and 'from whom he had received much improvement, was accuſed 'of having been acquainted with the above-mentioned oracle: 'which he did not deny, but ſaid he did not think himſelf 'obliged to divulge it. However, he had told the perſons con-'cerned, that they would all ſuffer exquiſite puniſhments. He 'was ſent to Epheſus, his native place, and was there beheaded; 'and now found, by his own experience, what it is to fall into 'the hands of an unjuſt judge. Diogenes was falſly accuſed, 'who ſome while before had been governor of Bithynia. He 'was a man of a noble family, ingenious, ſkilful in the law, a 'good pleader, and of a mild temper: he was condemned to 'die for the ſake of his great eſtate. Then Alypius, vicar of 'Britain, who had now lived long in a private ſtation, and was 'a man of an amiable character, was taken up, and with his ſon 'Hierocles, a youth of an excellent diſpoſition, was accuſed of 'magical practices. But it was upon the ſole teſtimony of one 'Diogenes, a very mean perſon. However Alypius, after hav-'ing been firſt deprived of his eſtate, was only baniſhed: the 'ſon, when they were having him out to death was happily ſaved.' So writes Ammianus.

Zoſimus likewiſe has briefly given an account of the conſulta-tion with the tripod, which pointed out Theodorus as ſucceſſor to Valens. 'The cauſe, 'he ſays, 'was brought before Mo-

'deſtus, præfect of the prætorium [k]. Many were accuſed; the 'priſons were full; and great numbers of people fled from their 'habitations. The emperor was greatly provoked; he became 'ſuſpicious of all who profeſſed philoſophy, or were at all diſ-'tinguiſhed for literature, or had places at court. At this time 'was put to death that great philoſopher Maximus, as alſo Hi-'lary of Phrygia, as having given a clearer explication of an 'obſcure oracle; Simonides, Patritius of Lydia, Andronicus of 'Caria; who were all eminent for learning, and ſuffered rather 'through envy, than for any juſt accuſation brought againſt 'them.'

Eunapius likewiſe complains of the great numbers of men who were then put to death promiſcuouſly, innocent and guilty: and among them the great philoſopher Maximus, who had been told of the conſultation, and did not divulge it. 'But [l] at the 'ſame time that he was informed of it, he told them that they 'had thereby ruined him. He foretold alſo the death of the con-'ſpirators, and many others, and alſo the death of the emperor 'himſelf, and that it ſhould be in an uncommon manner, and 'without burial: all which came to paſs. As for Maximus he 'was ſent for, and brought to Antioch, where the emperor was. 'But not thinking fit to puniſh him there, they ſent him to 'Epheſus, where was Feſtus, the governor of Aſia, a man of a 'moſt cruel diſpoſition, who after executing many others, guilty 'and innocent, put to death alſo the great Maximus.'

Of this alſo Libanius complains, ſaying, they [m] would not wait for the death of Maximus till diſtemper put an end to his life.

Socrates, the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian, having given an account of this convention and divination, ſays: 'And [n] the emperor 'neglecting the precepts of Chriſtianity, for which he profeſſed 'great zeal, put many to death, whom he ſuſpected of a deſign 'to ſeize the empire. And now were deſtroyed many who went 'by the name of Theodorus, Theodotus, Theodoſius, Theodu-'lus, and others, whoſe names had a like beginning; among 'them was one Theodoſiolus, a worthy man, of a good family 'in Spain: and at that time many changed their names, and re-'jected the names given them by their parents, becauſe of the 'imminent danger they were in.'

Tillemont, giving an account of this tranſaction, remarks

[k] Zoſ. l. 4. p. 743, 744.

[l] Eunap. de Vita Maximi. p. 88.

[m] ...δεισαντα μετα ταυτα υστερον, μη φθασαι τον εκεινα σιδηρον η νοσος απενεγκασα τω Μαξιμον. Liban. de Vita ſua. p. 52.

[n] Socrat. l. 4. cap. 19.

upon

upon Socrates after this manner: 'Socrates [o] ſays that this was 'the occaſion of the death of Theodoſiolus, or Theodoſius, a no- 'bleman of Spain, and a man of virtue. It is hard to believe 'that he did not intend the count Theodoſius, unjuſtly executed 'at Cartharge in the year 376. It was indeed for other reaſons: 'but the people who are always making conjectures, and often- 'times wrong, may have believed that it was for having aſpired 'to empire, and becauſe of his name; which would be ſufficient 'ground for adding afterwards all the reſt.' Valeſius himſelf, [p] in his notes upon Socrates, has the ſame thought; though he does not make it out ſo clearly as Tillemont. Pagi [q] was of the ſame opinion, and has ſhewed it as clearly as Tillemont; and there- fore he alſo may be conſulted.

Sozomen, giving an account of the ſame conſultation, and the great diſpleaſure of the emperor thereupon, ſays that [r] 'throughout the whole empire almoſt all who were eminent for 'philoſophy were deſtroyed, and not only they, but many other 'men of letters likewiſe; ſo that it was dangerous for any to 'wear a fringed garment. And ſuch was the madneſs of the 'emperor, that he ſeemed to think he could kill his ſucceſſor; 'and therefore not only they were put to death who had con- 'ſulted the oracle, but they alſo about whom the conſultation 'was made; inſomuch that, as is ſaid, he ſpared not thoſe whoſe 'names began with thoſe four letters, ΘΕΟΔ, of which there were 'many others, and men of great eminence in the empire.'

Sozomen therefore ſpeaks not quite ſo poſitively as Socrates, and yet allows himſelf to harangue upon it: but the truth of this I ſuppoſe may be called in queſtion. Tillemont obſerves, and as ſeems to me, both candidly and judiciouſly, that 'ſince [s] neither 'Ammianus nor Zoſimus accuſe Valens of ſo unreaſonable and 'odious a cruelty, there is at leaſt reaſon to doubt whether he 'was guilty of it.'

And again, afterwards: 'If [t] indeed he did put to death ſe- 'veral perſons becauſe they bore the name Theodorus, or other 'names reſembling it, nothing is more unjuſt, nor leſs reaſon- 'able.' I would add, that not only Ammianus and Zoſimus, but Eunapius alſo, and Libanius, are ſilent about this particular.

[o] Tillem. Valens. art. xv. p. 183, 184.

[p] Quiſnam ſit hic Theodoſius, incertum eſt. Neque enim Theodoſium illum exiſtimo, Theodoſii Imperatoris patrem, de quo Ammianus Marcellinus loquitur paſſim in libris ſuis....Verba tamen illa, quæ addit Socrates, ανηρ γενναιος εκ των ευπατριδων Ισπανιας, optime illi conveniunt. Valeſ. in Socratis locum.

[q] A. D. 373. num. v.

[r] Παραπλησιως δε δια την αυτην αιτιαν διεφθαρησαν και οι ανα πασαν την αρχομενην λαμπρως φιλοσοφουντες. κ. λ. Sozom. l. 6. cap. 35. p. 694. A.

[s] L'Emp. Valens, art. xv. p. 183.

[t] Ibid. p. 386.

And

And farther, among the many perſons whom they or others mention, as put to death or as accuſed upon this occaſion, there is not one whoſe name begins with theſe letters, excepting only Theodorus himſelf, the principal perſon † concerned: there is no ground therefore for the obſervation of Sozomen, and divers others of late times, who have ridiculed Valens as if he aimed to kill his ſucceſſor.

II. I have already enlarged in this hiſtory, and, as ſome may think, to prolixity: and yet it remains that I make ſome farther remarks upon what appears to me a very curious relation; and I the rather think myſelf obliged to it, becauſe it is placed by me in 'The State of Gentiliſm under Chriſtian Emperors.' And I have here an opportunity to ſhew the temper and principles of Gentile people at this time; and particularly the principles of their learned men, as well as others.

1. In the firſt place then, it ſeems to me ſomewhat ſtrange that neither Ammianus, nor Zoſimus, nor any other ancient writer, ſhould exactly mention the place or the time of this conſultation, which made ſo much noiſe in the world. Valens, as is obſerved by ſeveral of thoſe writers, was at Antioch when the diſcovery was made; and there the criminals were tried before Modeſtus, and other magiſtrates: but none have ſaid that the conſultation was at Antioch, or at ſome other place not far from it. Nor is the time exactly mentioned; poſſibly, it was not long before the diſcovery: and yet it ſeems to have been known to ſeveral before the judicial proceedings were begun, or any inquiries made about it by the magiſtrates.

2. To me it ſeems that the cruelty of the proceedings upon this occaſion has been much aggravated.

[r]. There is no ground, as has been already ſhewn, to charge Valens with having put to death many perſons, whoſe names began with thoſe two ſyllables, Theod. That therefore is an unjuſt aggravation, without reaſon made by Socrates, and Sozomen, and other eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians, who have followed them. Sozomen's expreſſions likewiſe muſt be reckoned hyperbolical, if not extravagant, when he ſays, that 'at [u] that time almoſt all 'the Greek philoſophers were taken off.' And again, that 'al-'moſt [x] all throughout the whole empire who were eminent for 'philoſophy, were deſtroyed.' Whereas, I preſume, theſe executions were confined to that part of the empire which was under Valens.

† There is one exception only, which is Theodoſiolus, by miſtake mentioned by Socrates, as has been ſhewn. [u] Των δε ελληνιζων μικρω παντες κατ' εκεινο καιρω διεφθαρησαν. Soz. l. 6. c. 35. p. 693. C. [x] Ibid. p. 694. A. et vide ſupra, not. [r].

But

But when I ſpeak of aggravations of the cruelty of theſe proceedings, I chiefly intend Ammianus Marcellinus, from whom we have the moſt particular account of this tranſaction. Ammianus is generally a fair and impartial hiſtorian: but here, as ſeems to me, he [y] has not acted up to that character. I ſhall therefore obſerve ſeveral things ſaid by him, and refer my obſervations to the conſideration of my readers.

2. Ammianus enlargeth mightily in the commendation of Theodorus. 'For [z] when the perſons preſent at the conſultation 'conſidered with themſelves who ſhould be the perſon intended 'by the letters Theod, they were,' as he ſays, 'ſoon led to think 'it muſt be Theodorus, who was the ſecond in the ſecretaries 'office, a man of a diſtinguiſhed excellence, as indeed he was, 'being of a good family in Gaul, well educated from his child-'hood; modeſt, prudent, humane, agreeable, learned; who al-'ways appeared ſuperior to the poſt in which he was; acceptable 'to all men, high and low; careful of his words, and never ex-'ceeding beyond truth and reaſon.'

This high character of Theodorus was the firſt thing that led me to ſuſpect Ammianus of partiality, and awakened my attention to other things in this narrative.

For Ammianus himſelf has acknowledged that [a] this Theodorus had formed deſigns upon the empire: it appeared from letters written by him to Hilary above mentioned. Ammianus alſo acknowledgeth that [b] deſigns had been at ſeveral times entered into againſt the emperor's life, and that it had been more than once in imminent danger from conſpiracies.

[y] Tillemont ſeems to have been ſenſible of this. I put down what he ſays in his own words, and in his own language. Ammien, qui ce ſemble eſtoit alors à Antioche, ou au moins en l'Orient, le decrit fort amplemont, rendant les plus odieuſes qu'il peut et les informations qu'on fit pour decouvrir les coupables, et la punition tant de Theodore que de ſes Companions. L'Emp. Valens. art. xiv. p. 180.

[z] Atque cunctantibus, quiſnam ea tempeſtate omnibus vigore animi antiſtaret, viſus eſt aliis excellere Theodorus, ſecundum inter Notarios adeptus jam gradum. Et revera erat ita ut opinati ſunt. Namque antiquitus claro genere in Gallia natus, et liberaliter educatis a primis pueritiæ rudimentis, modeſtiâ, prudentiâ, humanitate, gratiâ, literis ornatiſſimus, ſemper officio locoque quem retinebat, ſuperior videbatur, altis humilibuſque juxta acceptus. Soluſque pene omnium erat, cujus linguam non infrenem, ſed diſpicientem quæ loqueretur, nullius claudebat periculis latus. Amm. l. 29. c. i. p. 597.

[a] Deinde hæc eadem Euſerio ſub cruenta quæſitione confeſſo; confutabant Theodorum literæ ſuæ, per ambages obliquas ad Hilarium ſcriptæ: quibus ſpe jam firma concepta ex varibus, de re non cunctabatur, ſed tempus patrandæ cupidinis quæritabat. Ib. p. 603. [b] Et quia fallere non minus videtur qui geſta præterit ſciens, quam ille qui numquam facta fingit: non abnuimus, (neque enim ambigitur,) ſalutem Valentis et antea ſæpius per ocultas coitiones, et tunc in extrema demerſam: ferrumque ad jugulum ejus prope adactum a militaribus, fato reflectente depulſum, quem lacrimoſis in Thracia diſcriminibus deſtinarat. Id. l. 29, c. i. p. 598.

Moreover

Moreover Zoſimus ſays that 'Theodorus [c] was indeed of a 'good family, and well educated, but he was yet young; and 'being in the heat of youth was eaſily miſled by flatterers.' He adds, 'that he ſuffered the juſt puniſhment of his raſhneſs.' However, it muſt be owned that [d] Sozomen gives Theodorus the character of a worthy man, though a Gentile.

3. Ammianus is the principal hiſtorian of this tranſaction. Let me then obſerve farther that, according to him, all who ſuffered now were men of excellent characters, or, if I may ſay ſo, more than excellent, even extraordinary: ſuch are Theodorus, Simonides, Maximus, Diogenes formerly governor of Bithynia, Alypius and his ſon Hierocles. The accuſers, according to him, are mean people; and the judges are all ſevere and cruel. Are not theſe ſtrong ſymptoms of partiality?

Simonides, the only perſon condemned to be burnt alive, is greatly commended by Ammianus, as a philoſopher, and a young man of ſingular virtue. [His acceſſit philoſophus Simonides, adoleſcens ille quidem, verum noſtra memoria ſeveriſſimus.] And his fortitude is greatly extolled.

4. Then he ſays, 'numerous books, and heaps of volumes 'were burnt in the preſence of the judges, as illicit, which had 'been brought together from many houſes, the more to mollify 'the reſentment of the people againſt ſo numerous executions; 'when at the ſame time,' as he ſays, 'a great part of them 'were law books, and ſyſtems of liberal arts and ſciences.' Which, as ſeems to me, are the expreſſions of a man determined to give an invidious turn to the tranſactions of which he is writing. For, I pray, was any thing more natural, after ſuch a conſultation as Ammianus has himſelf deſcribed, than to give orders for inquiries after books containing myſtic arts and incantations? It is very likely that there ſhould be an order of court for producing ſuch books, and with threatenings of puniſhment in caſe of concealment. Such an order might occaſion the producing a large number of volumes capable of making ſeveral large heaps, to be conſumed in the preſence of the judges. For, I preſume, there were many ſuch books in the poſſeſſion of heathen people; and there was no need to join with them volumes of liberal arts and ſciences, to make a large heap and a good ſhow. Chryſoſtom [dd], who was a young man at this time, has

[c] Ην τις Θεοδωρος τοις βασιλικοις υπογραφευσιν εναριθμουμενος. Τουτον εν μεν γεγοιοτα τι και τραφεντα, νεον δε ετι και τω της ηλικιας θερμω ραδιως κολακων θωπειαις επι τα χειρω καλευομενον...Και αυτος μεν αξιαν εδιδυ της εγχειρησεως δικην. Zoſ. l. 4. p. 742, 743.

[d] ...ανδρα των εν ταις βασιλειοις επισημως πρατευομενον, ελληνισην και ελλογιμον. Soz. p. 673. D.

[dd] Chryſ. in Act. Ap. hom. 38. Tom. 9. p. 293. Bened.

told

told a ſtory repreſenting the great danger which all were in, who then concealed any books of this ſort.

5. I cannot but think likewiſe, that the cruelty of Feſtus then proconſul of Aſia, by whoſe order Maximus was beheaded, is much aggravated upon this occaſion; for Ammianus himſelf has acknowledged, that [e] when governor of Syria he gave proofs of mildneſs and lenity; though he will have it that afterwards he was altered and acted very differently.

Before we proceed I muſt take notice that we have in the Latin tongue, [f] 'A Breviary of the Hiſtory of the Roman people by 'Sextus Rufus,' who is ſuppoſed by divers learned men [g] to be Rufus Feſtus, who was proconſul of Aſia in the year 374. The argument for that opinion is ſo well expreſſed in a note of Valeſius upon [h] Ammianus, that I have placed a large part of it below. He had paſſed through divers offices, till he arrived at that high ſtation of proconſul of Aſia: as is obſerved by the ſame [i] Valeſius, in another note upon Ammianus.

This Breviary, in manuſcripts and editions, is inſcribed to Valentinian: but it is now the general opinion of learned men that it ſhould be ſaid Valens, and written after his war with the Goths, near the end of the year 369 at the ſooneſt.

I ſee not in this Breviary any marks of a diſpoſition to cruelty. And it ſeems to me that all the bitter reflections upon Feſtus, as a cruel man, which are in Ammianus, and Zoſimus, and other heathen writers, are owing to the part which he acted as a magiſtrate in the condemnation of Maximus and others, who had expoſed themſelves to the juſt diſpleaſure of the emperor.

[e] Feſtus quidam Tridentinus ultimi ſanguinis et ignoti, in nexum germanitatis a Maximino dilectus ut ſodalis et contogatus, decernentibus fatis ad Orientem tranſgreſſus eſt: ibique adminiſtrata Syria, Magiſterioque Memoriæ peracto, bona lenitudinis et reverentia reliquit exempla. Unde regere Aſiam proconſulari poteſtate exorſus, velificatione tranquilla, ut aiunt, ferebatur ad gloriam. Ammian. l. 29. c. ii. p. 613. [f] Sexti Rufi V. C. Dictatoris, Magiſtri militum, Rerum geſtarum Pop. Rom. ad Valentinianum Auguſtum. Tom. i. p. 637, &c. Sylburg.

[g] Vide Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. l. 2. c. viii. et ix. Fabric. Bib. Lat. T. i. p. 610, 611. Tillem. Valens art. viii. et Cellarius. p. 556. ex edit. Havercamp.

[h] Hic eſt, ut opinor, Rufus Feſtus, V. Cl. qui Breviarum ſcripſit ad Valentem Aug. non autem ad Valentinianum, ut habent vulgatæ editiones, et ſcripti codices. Annon enim hæc libri ejus clauſula Valentem reſpicit? 'Ut ad hanc in gentem de 'Gothis, etiam Babylonicæ tibi palma 'pacis accedat.' Accedit, quod in duobus mſſ. antiquiſſimis. Feſti Dictatoris Breviarium exaratum eſt, ut in notis ad Victoris Epitomen teſtatus eſt Andræas Schottas. Eſt autem dictator, qui ad memoriam dictat qui et Ἀντιγραφεὺς Græce dicitur, ut notatum eſt a Cl. Salmaſio ad Vopiſcum in Caro. Cum igitur Marcellinus Feſtum Magiſtrum fuiſſe memoriæ prodat, et reliqua egregie conveniunt, nihil vetat, quo minus hunc Feſtum eundem cum Hiſtorico eſſe credamus. Valeſ. ad Ammian. l. 29. c. ii. not. [l]. p. 812.

[i] Sic in lib. 29. Feſtus quidam ex Advocato Conſularis Syriæ, ex Conſulari magiſter memoriæ, deinde Proconſul Aſiæ fuiſſe dicitur. Idem. ad Ammian. l. 20. cap. x. not. [r]. p. 276.

[6], I muſt

6. I muſt obſerve farther, that neither Ammianus, nor any other hiſtorians of this tranſaction, have complained of the executions of the wives or children of any of thoſe who were now put to death.

Chryſoſtom [k] ſpeaks of the widow of one Theodorus, who for a while was favoured by his prince, and then rebelled againſt him, and was beheaded. It is true ſhe was poor; but ſhe was ſtill living: that ſhe was the widow of Theodorus, the principal in this conſpiracy, is the opinion of [l] Valeſius and [m] Tillemont, and appears to me very probable. And the ſame Theodorus had a ſon [n] named Icarius, who [o] was count of the Eaſt in the time of the emperor Theodoſius: who therefore was not involved in his father's danger, and I ſuppoſe he was ſtill a heathen.

The only perſon whoſe ſon was accuſed, as mentioned by Ammianus, is Alypius: nevertheleſs he was not involved in his father's guilt. They were both accuſed: Alypius, after confiſcation of his eſtate, was baniſhed; and his ſon, Hierocles, when led to execution, was happily ſaved, as Ammianus obſerves, without ſaying how. The means of his eſcape is ſuppoſed to be related by Chryſoſtom, though he does not mention him by name. In an oration, or homily, ſhewing the power of the united prayers of many, he allegeth this example: 'Ten [p] years 'ago,' ſays he, 'ſome were apprehended, as endeavouring to 'ſet up a tyranny, as you well know: at that time a perſon in 'the magiſtracy was convicted as an accomplice in the conſpi-'racy; and when they were dragging him away to be put to 'death, the whole city ran to the Hippodromus, and gathering 'together a great number of artificers and others, they reſcue a 'man not at all deſerving of pardon. Thus,' ſays Chryſoſtom, 'when you are deſirous to appeaſe the diſpleaſure of an earthly 'prince, you can join together with your wives and children:' and what follows.

The perſon here intended is ſuppoſed to be Hierocles, ſon of Alypius. And it is obſervable that Chryſoſtom, who cannot be ſuppoſed to have been partial to Valens, ſays, 'he was not 'worthy of pardon.'

Theſe obſervations I ought to ſubmit to the judgment of candid and inquiſitive readers. But to me it has appeared, that in the accounts of this tranſaction, there are many aggravations of the ſeverity of the proceedings upon this occaſion. Theodorus,

[k] Chr. ad viduam juniorem. T. i. p. 343. [l] Annot. ad Ammian. l. 29. c. i. p. 597. not. g. [m] L' Emp. Valens. art. xiv. et not. xiv. [n] Δυσα δε ημιν αρχοντα αγαθον αντι κακου τον Θεοδωρου του ου δικαιως αποθανοντος. Liban. de Vita ſua, p. 69. A. [o] See Tillemont. Valens. art. xiv. et Theodoſ. i. art. xvi.
[p] De Incompreh. Dei Nat. hom. 3. T. i. p. 470. Bened.

as Ammianus acknowledgeth, was convicted of a design to subvert the government of Valens. I presume that none of those who were concerned in the consultation of the oracle, were innocent; yea, as seems to me, they were guilty of treason: for [pp] such it must be to make inquiries by divination concerning the life and death of princes. And were not they who were acquainted with this consultation, obliged to discover it to the magistrates? If they did not, might they not be reasonably considered as accomplices? Zosimus says that 'Hilary [q] of Phrygia suffered for having given an explication of an obscure oracle:' that is, he had been consulted about this oracle, to know whether indeed it intimated that Theodorus was to succeed Valens in the empire: and as he did not make a discovery of this, I suppose the judges were of opinion he had forfeited his life: the capital sentence pronounced upon him therefore was legal. This likewise was the case of Maximus. They [r] who had been concerned in the consultation, being desirous of some farther elucidations upon the answer received, went to Maximus, persuaded of his ability to give them satisfaction; and as Maximus did not disclose the consultation to the magistrates, he might, I suppose, be reckoned an accomplice, and be judged legally obnoxious to punishment.

Zosimus complains grievously that the great philosopher Maximus, and several others eminent for learning, were put to death; and truly it is a sad case: but what shall we say? If learned men are guilty of treason, they expose themselves to public resentment, and may justly suffer. Nothing can save them but mercy; which I wish they had experienced, or at least some of them, particularly Maximus: as he had been spared so long and had now survived his great master ten years or more, and was now of a great age; I cannot but wish that his fault had been connived at, though the sentence pronounced upon him was just.

Some innocent men may have suffered upon this occasion: but many must have been guilty. Nor can it be thought very strange that heathen writers should shew some favour to their

[pp] Majestatis crimen contrahit, quisquis super Principis genesi vel fato scrutatur, ut de Lepida ait C. Tacitus Annal. 3. c. 22. cui inter alia crimina hoc quoque objectum fuit, quod per Chaldæos in domum Cæsaris quæfivisset. Rationem reddit Tertullianus Apologet c. 35. 'Cur 'opus est perscrutari super Cæsaris salute, 'nisi a quo aliquid adversum illam cogi'tatur, vel optatur, aut post illam spera'tur, et sustinetur.' Unde Paulus J. C. Sent. lib. v. Tit. 21. 'Qui de salute 'Principis, vel summa Reipublicæ, ma'themeticos, hariolos, haruspices, vatici'natores consulit, cum eo qui responderit, 'capite punitur.' Lindenburg. annot. ad Ammian. l. 29. c. 2. not. 5. p. 613.

[q] ....ως δη χρησμον τινα λοξον, εις το σαφεστερον ερμηνευσας. Zos. l. 4. p. 744. in.

[r] χρησμω τινες εκπεσοντος ασαφεστερου τον χρησμον επι τον Μαξιμον ανηνεγκαν, το μεν πραγμα ουχ ομολογησαντες· ως δ' εν αυτω χρησαντος, τι σαφεστερον βουλομενοι μαθειν. Eunap. Maxim. p. 87.

friends.

friends. Libanius [s] says that Theodorus was unjustly put to death; and yet Ammianus has acknowledged his guilt; and Zosimus allows that he suffered the just punishment of his rashness, as does also [t] the younger Victor.

And when Libanius says that [u] Valens hoped to have had him also accused as one of the conspirators, I take it to be a mere flourish; he was willing to make a merit of some danger with the rest of his friends, though really he was safe enough. So likewise was Ammianus, I believe, though zealous for the rites of Gentilism: and in like manner many others, who approved themselves by their conduct to be quiet and peaceable subjects, and had neither been concerned in this traiterous consultation, nor had been advised with about it and still concealed it.

3. I have still one observation more to be mentioned here, and suited to the point we are considering, 'the State of Gentilism 'under Christian Emperors,' which is this: that such consultations by way of divination, for discovering beforehand changes in the empire, or the name of the person who should succeed the reigning prince, must have tended to alienate the minds of Christian princes from heathen people, and induce them to lessen their privileges as such, and lay restraints upon their worship.

Sozomen, beginning his account of this transaction which has occasioned all these observations, says: 'At [z] that time almost all 'the Greek philosophers were destroyed. For some who were 'eminent for philosophy, being uneasy at the great progress of 'Christianity, were desirous to know who should succeed Valens 'in the empire: for this end they tried all sorts of divination, 'and constructed a wooden tripod, which they consecrated with 'solemn rites of invocation.'

Sozomen's conjecture concerning the occasion of this consultation must be allowed to be very probable. Indeed I do not believe that the heathen people after the conversion of Constantine, were so good subjects as the primitive Christians, who had lived and suffered so much under heathen emperors before that period. Ammianus, beside what he says of this particular transaction, acknowledgeth that the life of Valens had been in danger several times. The conduct of heathen people at this time may be reckoned the more unreasonable, because Valens has been sup-

[s] See before, note [n], p. 126.

[t] Qua cognitione principii deceptus Theodorus, cum sibi imperium præsumeret, scelestæ cupidinis supplicia persolvit. Victor. Epit. cap. 48.

[u] Δοξα τε ην παρα τῳ Βαλεντι, φθονȣ την δοξαν πεποιηκοτος, παντως εις ελεγχον με πεσειν δι' ενος γȣ τȣτων υπο την βασαιον αγομενων. κ. λ. De Vita sua, p. 56.

[z] ....Τινες γαρ των αλλων οι εν φιλοσοφιᾳ προεχειν ενομιζοντο, προς την επιδοσιν τȣ χριστιανισμȣ δυσφορȣντες, εβȣλευσαντο μαθειν τον εφεξης Ουαλεντι Ρωμαιων ηγησομενον, μαντειαις τε παντοδαπαις περι τȣτȣ εχρησαντο. κ. λ. Soz. l. 6. c. 35. p. 693.

posed

posed to be very favourable to them. 'As [a] Theodoret says, 'Valens allowed all others to worship in their own way. He 'waged war with none but those who held the apostolical (meaning 'the homoüsian) doctrine. During the whole time of that reign 'the fire burned upon the altars. The Gentiles offered incense 'and sacrifices to their idols, and held their feasts publicly in 'the market-places. They who were initiated in the rites of 'Bacchus ran about, covered in goat-skins, tearing dogs to pieces, 'with the wild fury usual in the solemnities of Bacchus.'

Undoubtedly, at that season, the Gentiles enjoyed a good deal of liberty, as was shewn by us [b] not long ago; though they were laid under some restraints.

Our writers of Universal History, speaking of Valens, say, 'all [c] the ecclesiastical writers agree, that he allowed to the many 'sects which then prevailed, nay even to the Jews and Pagans, 'the free exercise of their religion: but persecuted the catholics 'with the utmost cruelty.'

III. I have done with this consultation. But before I proceed to any other article, I think it not improper to insert here the history of the philosopher Maximus. I have said little of him in my chapter of Julian: but he may not be omitted. A man who was so favoured by Julian, and so highly esteemed afterwards by heathen people, must have a place in this work.

We have lately seen with what tokens of high respect he is mentioned by Ammianus, whom we have placed at the year 380, though his work was not finished till some while afterwards. Eunapius, when he gives the account of their going to Maximus for an explication of the oracular answer which they had received, speaks [d] of him as an oracle, and more than an oracle, and better acquainted with the mind of the gods than the oracle itself. And proceeding to relate his death, he says: 'they [e] sent 'for him to come to Antioch, where the emperor was: but he 'so clearly shewed the falsehood of the things laid to his charge, 'and how every thing foretold by him had come to pass, that 'they were ashamed to put him to death there; thinking it 'no less a crime than to kill the deity, who dwelt in him. They 'therefore sent him to Festus, the cruel governor of Asia, who 'readily obeyed their orders, putting to death guilty and inno-

[a] Ο δε Ουαλης πασι μεν τοις αλλοις επετρεπε θρησκευειν η βουλοιτο. και τα θρησκευοντα θεραπευειν. κ. λ. Theod. l. 8. c. 21. p. 226.

[b] See p. 108, 109.

[c] Vol. xvi. p. 350.

[d] Eunap. Max. p. 87, 88.

[e] .... αισχυνθεντες δε αυτω φονον, ως παντα επι της κρισεως ηλεγχθη, και οτι κατηγων των εγχειρησαντων, και οτι προειπεν ακριβως απαντα, καθαπερ εν τω Μαξιμω σωματι, θειον τινα κολαζοντες.... πολλους μεν γαρ προκατακοψας αιτιους και αιταιτιους, και τον μεγαν Μαξιμον αυτοις επεσφαξε. Eunap. Max. p. 88, 89.

'cent, and among them the great Maximus.' Such is the way in which these writers speak of Maximus.

Maximus now suffered death in the year 374. He had met with a great difficulty not long after the death of Julian. The reign of Jovian was short; he therefore had no leisure to prosecute the friends or ministers of Julian. But upon the accession of Valentinian, and then of his brother Valens, the two philosophers Priscus and Maximus were sent for to come to Constantinople. Against[f] Priscus no accusations were received. After examination he was allowed to be a good and innocent man, and as such was honourably dismissed to go and live in Greece.

'But against Maximus,' as[g] Zosimus says, 'Valentinian was 'much provoked, he having represented him to Julian, not only 'as zealous for Christianity, but likewise injurious to the rites 'of Gentilism.' Eunapius says that, 'Maximus[h] was then im-'prisoned, and grievously racked, with a view of extorting from 'him a large sum of money, which he was supposed to have 'hoarded up. But at length he was dismissed with a fine only, 'which he should pay hereafter. The torture inflicted on him 'was so grievous, that,' as Eunapius says, 'Maximus sent his 'wife to procure some poison, that he might put an end to his 'life; but when it was brought, he declined taking it. How-'ever, his wife took a part of it, and died, and was buried by her 'friends.' After that, as I suppose, Maximus lived quietly, till the time of the consultation above mentioned.

That Maximus was in great favour with Julian, all know. The account which Eunapius gives of his going to court, upon the accession of that emperor, is to this purpose: 'Soon[i] after 'his arrival at Constantinople, and after the death of Constan-'tius, Julian sent a messenger with letters to Maximus and 'Chrysanthius, inviting them to come to him. They thought 'proper to ask counsel of the gods. But the tokens which they 'received were discouraging; whereupon Chrysanthius plainly 'told Maximus: "there can be no thoughts of going to seek "preferment. We must stay where we are; perhaps it may be "needful for us to hide ourselves." On the contrary, Maximus 'urged, We[k] are not to content ourselves with a single refusal; 'we ought rather to force the gods, till they give us a favourable 'answer, suited to our wishes. Chrysanthius replied, that he

[f] Αλλ' ο μεν Πρισκος ουδεν υποστας κακον, αλλα και προσμαρτυρηθεις αγαθος ειναι, και γεγενησθαι κατα τον καιρον εκεινον, επανηλθεν εις την ελλαδα. Eunap. Max. p. 82.

[g] Zos. l. 4. p. 735. in. See above, p. 46.

[h] Vita Max. p. 83, 84.

[i] Eunap. Max. p. 77....79.

[k] ....μη παντως εικειν τοις πρωτως απαντησασιν, αλλ' εκβιαζεσθαι την του θειου φησιν, αχρις αν επικλινοις προς τον θεραπευοντα. Ibid. p. 78.

'dared

'dared not to disobey the first admonitions which had been re-'ceived, and went away. Maximus[l] renewed his inquiries till 'he obtained such an answer as he wanted.'

'And then he set out for Constantinople. And all the people 'of Asia, magistrates, and men of every rank, accompanied him 'with their good wishes and acclamations. The women were as 'assiduous in their respects to his wife, entreating to be remem-'bered by her: with all which she seemed much pleased, and 'highly exalted. Thus Maximus went to court with the good 'wishes of all Asia.'

'Maximus,'[m] as Eunapius owns, 'had not been long at 'court, before he appeared much elevated in mind by his exal-'tation. His dress was more costly and splendid than became 'a philosopher! He became difficult of access, and did many 'things of himself without the knowledge of the emperor.'

Upon this account my readers may now make such remarks as they see good: only remembering that it is not the account of a Christian, but of Eunapius, a zealous Greek, and great admirer of Maximus. To me it appears highly probable that a man, who went to court with such a temper as Maximus did, must have been guilty of many things whilst he was there which were offensive and disagreeable. And if Maximus had been taken off by Jovian, or Valentinian, soon after the death of Julian, I believe it would not have been reckoned a very extraordinary proceeding, but agreeable to the political maxims, which have often prevailed in the courts of princes. But Maximus was then spared: and there appears to have been a judgment of equity and mildness; for soon after the accession of Valentinian, Priscus and Maximus were sent for, as we have seen; and after examination it was allowed that Priscus, though he also had been a favourite of Julian, had done nothing amiss, and was honourably dismissed; which shewed a disposition in the reigning prince to judge equitably. And, if Maximus had been as innocent, he might and would have been dismissed, and set at liberty in like manner.

And though his conduct, when at court in the time of Julian, had not been unexceptionable, nor now afterwards in the time of the above-mentioned consultation, but justly liable to censure and punishment, I cannot but wish he had been spared; I think

[l] Ο μεν Μαξιμος επεμεινεν απαντα πραττων, εστε ετυχεν ων εβουλετο, και κατεπεθυμει· ο δε Χρυσανθιος ακινητοτερος επεμεινε ανδριαντος....p. 78. [m] Ενταυθα ο μεν Μαξιμος βαρυς ην ηδη περι τα βασιλεια, στολην τε αβροτεραν η κατα φιλοσοφον περιχεομενος, και προς εντευξεις ων χαλεπωτερος και δυσχερεστερος· ο δε βασιλευς ηγνοει τα πραττομενα. ibid. p. 79.

he might have been deſpiſed and ſlighted; which would have been more honourable to a Chriſtian prince than an act of ſtrict juſtice.

I beg leave to conclude with this obſervation: That though Maximus was greatly reſpected, and much admired by the emperor Julian, and many learned heathens, as a great philoſopher, and was alſo reputed to have commerce with the gods, I do not think he was a wiſe man.

SECT. III. The Petition of the Roman Senate to Valentinian the younger in the year 384, that the Altar of Victory which had been removed by Gratian might be reſtored.

I. *The hiſtory of this Altar in ancient times, and of the ſeveral removals of it by Chriſtian emperors.* II. *A tranſlation of the petition preſented by Symmachus in the name of the ſenate.* III. *The anſwers, made by Ambroſe of Milan, and Prudentius.* IV. *Two queſtions relating to this matter conſidered.* V. *The hiſtory and character of Symmachus.*

I. There was at Rome, in the ſenate houſe, or at the entrance into it, an [a] altar of Victory. It was portable, and wherever the ſenate aſſembled, there it was [b] placed. We meet with ſome accounts of this altar in ancient times. By Suetonius we are informed that [c] the ſenate, the more to adorn the funeral of Auguſtus, ordered that the image of Victory, which ſtood in the ſenate houſe, ſhould be carried in proceſſion before the body. It is mentioned alſo by Lampridius [d] in his Life of Alexander Severus, and by Herodian [e] in his Hiſtory of Antoninus Heliogabalus.

The emperor Conſtantius [f] when he was at Rome in the year 356, or 357, ordered this altar of Victory to be removed. But that order was not long in force. The altar was reſtored by Julian in 361, or 362. Here it continued a good while. For we know not of any order about it in the reign of Valentinian the firſt, who died in 375. He did not think of it, or from a principle of moderation he tolerated it, and was unwilling to diſoblige his Gentile ſubjects.

[a] Cave ſays, it was placed upon a triumphal chariot, and ſtood in the entrance or portico of the capitol. Introd. p. xxii.

[b] Ex Suetonio colligimus....Victoriæ simulachrum in Senatu poſitam fuiſſe, quod transferebatur in quamcumque ædem pro ratione loci, in quo habitus Senatus. Chamillard ad Prudent. l. i. p. 533.

[c] Senatus et in funere ornando, et in memoria honoranda, eo ſtudio certatim progreſſus eſt, ut inter alia complura certamina quidem funus triumphali porta ducerent, præcedente Victoria, quæ eſt in curia. Sueton. lib. 2. c. 101.

[d] Mater ejus pridie quam pareret, ſomniavit, ſe purpureum dracunculum parere. Pater eadem nocte in ſomniis vidit, alis ſe Victoriæ, quæ in Senatu, ad cœlum vehi. Lamprid. Alex. Sever. c. 14. p. 899.

[e] Herod. lib. v. p. 567.

[f] Conſtantius auguſtæ memoriæ, nondum ſacris initiatus myſteriis, contaminari ſe putavit, ſi aram illam videret. Juſſit auferri, non juſſit reponi. Ambroſ. Ep. 18. num. 32. p. 841. Seu de non reſtituenda ara Victoriæ libellus 2. ap. Symmachum. p. 329.

In

In the year 382, Gratian ordered the altar of Victory to be removed, and seized the lands allotted to maintain the priests and the sacrifices. This [g] law of Gratian is referred to by Honorius, and confirmed by him. Gratian likewise abrogated the privileges of the vestal virgins, which were very considerable. Hereupon the senate sent a deputation to the emperor, but were not admitted into his presence: complaints of which we shall see presently. But in the year 384, not long after the death of Gratian, the senate sent another deputation, with Symmachus præfect of the city at their head, to Valentinian the second, or the younger, who was not then more than fourteen years of age. The address or petition presented at that time will be recited by us by and by at length. It is addressed [h] to Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius, according to the Roman custom: but it was intended for Valentinian, and is addressed to him in particular, as we shall see presently.

As soon as Ambrose bishop of Milan heard of this deputation, he wrote a letter to the emperor, containing such advice as appeared proper at that time, and suited to fortify his resolutions. Afterwards he procured a copy of the petition, and answered it more fully; this we know from the introduction [i] to the second book, or argument of Ambrose, of which we shall take particular notice hereafter. It is also mentioned by Paulinus [k] in his Life of that bishop.

In the year 388, [l] as is supposed, there was another attempt made by the Gentiles for restoring the altar of Victory, or at least the revenues which Gratian had taken away. A part of the senate, as [m] Ambrose says, by their deputies made this demand of Theodosius, then at Milan. Symmachus now also lent them

[g] Omnia etiam loca, quæ sacris error veterum deputavit, secundum Divi Gratiani constituta, nostræ rei jubemus sociari. &c. [Dat. Ann. 415.] Cod. Theod. lib. 16. tit. x. l. 20. T. 6. p. 290.

[h] D. D. D. Valetiniano, Theod. Arcod. semper. Aug. &c. ap. Symm. l. x. ep. 54.

[i] Cum vir clarissimus, Præfectus Urbis Symmachus, ad clementiam tuam retulisset, ut ara, quæ de urbis Romæ curia sublata fuerat, redderetur loco...eodem quo comperi puncto, libellum obtuli.... quo licet comprehenderim, quæ suggestioni necessaria viderentur, poposci tamen exemplum mihi Relationis dari. Ambr. Ep. 18. p. 833.

[k] Sed egresso Theodosio de Italia, et Constantinopoli constituto, Valentiniano intra Gallias posito, directa legatio est sub nomine Senatus a Symmacho tunc Præfecto Urbis, de repetenda Ara Victoriæ, et sumptibus cæremoniarum. Sed ubi comperit Sacerdos, misso libello ad Imperatorem postulavit, ut ad se Relationis exemplaria dirigerentur, quibus ipse pro partibus suis responsurus esset. Quâ Relatione accepta, præclarissimum libellum conscripsit, ut contra nihil unquam audiret Symmachus vir eloquentissimus respondere. Vit. Ambr. num 26. p. vii.

[l] Vide Baron. ann. 388. n. 93. Tillem. L'Emp. Theodos. art. 46. Ancient Univ. Hist. Vol. xvi. p. 424.

[m] Postea etiam clementissimo imperatori Theodosio coram intimavi, atque in os dicere non dubitavi, cui intimata Senatus legatione hujusmodi, licet non totus Senatus poposcerit, insinuationi meæ tantam adsentionem detulit....&c. Ambr. ad Eugen. ep. 57. p. 1011. in.

a helping hand, and [n] in a panegyric on Theodoſius dexterouſly inſinuated a requeſt to that purpoſe. But the emperor, as is ſaid, was ſo provoked, that he preſently ordered him to come down, and to be that inſtant put into a chariot, in order to be conveyed into baniſhment, forbidding him under ſevere penalties to come any more within a hundred miles of Rome; but it was not long before he was pardoned.

Afterwards, when Theodoſius was gone back to Conſtantinople, the ſenate ſent another requeſt in favour of this altar to Valentinian, then in Gaul, but without effect. We are aſſured of this from [o] Ambroſe. This muſt have been in the year 392, and the beginning of it, and not long before the death of Valentinian.

And in the ſame year, 392, after the death of Valentinian, [p] Eugenius reſtored the altar of Victory. This alſo is particularly mentioned by Paulinus in the words next following the quotation before made from [q] him. Moreover we have a letter of Ambroſe to Eugenius, where he gives him the title of emperor and Auguſtus, and reproves him for iſſuing ſuch an order, contrary to his profeſſion as a Chriſtian: though, [r] as it ſeems, that order was not granted till after divers reiterated requeſts. And indeed Rufinus, who alſo was contemporary, informs us, that [s] the expectations of Gentile people were greatly raiſed at that time, and victims were then multiplied at Rome, and all kinds of divination were practiſed; and Flavianus, then præfect of Rome, and reckoned very ſkilful in thoſe rites, encouraged Eugenius with ſtrong aſſurances of ſucceſs and victory.

[n] Cui [Theodoſio] Symmachus ille, mirabili eloquio et ſcientiâ præditus, tamen Paganus, præconio laudum in conſiſtorio recitato, ſubtili arte quâ valuit, Aram Victoriæ in Senatu reſtitui, Chriſtiano, ut noverat, Principi, intimavit. Quem ſtatim a ſuis aſpectibus pulſum, in centeſimo lapide, rhedæ non ſtratæ impoſitum ea die manere præcepit. Proſper. de Promiſſ. l. 3. cap. 38.

[o] Iterum Valentiniano auguſtæ memoriæ principi legatio a Senatu miſſa intra Gallias, nihil extorqueri potuit: et certe aberam, nec aliquid tunc ad ipſum ſcripſeram. Ambr. ibid. p. 104.

[p] Vide Baron. ann. 392. ii. iii. Pagi ann. 392. ii. [q] Sed poſtquam auguſtæ memoriæ Valentinianus in Viennenſi civitate....vitam finivit: Eugenius ſuſcepit imperium, qui ubi imperare cœpit, non multo poſt, petentibus Flaviano tunc præfecto, et Arbogaſte comite, Aram Victoriæ, et ſumtus cæremoniarum, quod Valentinianus auguſtæ memoriæ, adhuc in junioribus annis conſtitutus, petentibus denegaverat, oblitus fidei ſuæ conceſſit. De Vita Ambroſ. ubi ſupra.

[r] Te imperante, petierunt legati, ut templis redderes, non feciſti. Iterum alteri poſtulaverunt, reniſus es: et poſtea ipſis, qui petierunt, donandum putaſti. Ad Eugen. Ep. 57. n. 6. p. 1011.

[s] At Pagani, qui errores ſuos novis ſemper erroribus animant, innovare ſacrificia, et Romam funeſtis victimis cruentare, inſpicere exta pecudum, et ex fibrarum præſcientia ſecuram Eugenio victoriam nunciare: ſuperſtitioſius hæc agente, et cum omni animoſitate Flaviano tunc præfecto, cujus aſſertionibus (magna enim erat ejus in ſapientia prærogativa,) Eugenium victorem fore pro certo præſumſerant, &c. Rufin. H. E. l. 2. cap. 33.

The

The altar of Victory, undoubtedly, was not reſtored by Valentinian. Ambroſe's interceſſions muſt have prevailed againſt it, if the emperor had been diſpoſed to it, which I do not think he was. Nor can it be thought that Theodoſius allowed it to remain there after it had been ſet up by Eugenius. Nevertheleſs Pyrrho, from ſome lines of Claudian [t] upon the ſixth conſulſhip of Honorius, in the year 404, deſcribing the rejoicings after the victory obtained over Alaric at Pollentia, is much inclined to think that [u] the altar of Victory was not removed, as Ambroſe deſired, or elſe was reſtored afterwards; but I do not think thoſe lines can be reckoned a good proof of this; for by Victory may be there meant the goddeſs Victory, who was worſhipped in many temples, not the image of Victory ſtanding in the ſenate houſe.

II. Having now, as I preſume, ſaid what may be ſufficient in the way of preface, I proceed to allege the petition itſelf, which was preſented to Valentinian in the year 384, in the name of the ſenate, by Symmachus: which I ſhall tranſlate entire from the beginning to the end, placing alſo the original at the bottom of the pages; all may be ſenſible that ſuch performances are attended with ſome difficulty; but Cave [x] has already publiſhed an Engliſh tranſlation, from which I have had ſome aſſiſtance.

'To [y] our lords the emperors, Valentinian, Theodoſius, and 'Arcadius, Symmachus, præfect of the city.' [z]

'As [z] ſoon as the moſt illuſtrious, and your ever loyal ſenate 'had taken cognizance that the vices of the times were ſubdued 'by the laws, and that the infamy of late ages had been expi-'ated by the piety of our preſent princes, they, following ſo good 'an example, have laid hold of this occaſion to expreſs their 'long

[t] .... Agnoſcunt proceres, habituque Gabino
Principis, et ducibus circumſtipata togatis
Jure paludatæ jam curia militat aulæ.
Adſuit ipſa ſuis ales Victoria templis
Romanæ tutela togæ: quæ divite pompâ
Patritii reverenda fovet ſacraria cœtus,
Caſtrorumque eadem comes indefeſſa tuorum,
Nunc tandem fruitur votis, atque omne futurum
Te Romæ ſeſeque tibi promittit in ævum.
Claudian. Carm. 28. ver. 594....601.

[u] Hinc patet, Victoriæ ſimulachrum, aut non ſublatum, ut ſuadebat Ambroſius, aut ſtatim repoſitum. Pyrrho ad ver. 597.

[x] See the life of St. Ambroſe, p. 377. &c. among the lives of the moſt eminent fathers of the church, who flouriſhed in the fourth century.

[y] D. D. D. Valentiniano, Theod. et Arcad. ſemper Augg. Symmachus Præf. Urbis. Ap. Symm. l. x. ep. 54. p. 287. &c. et ap. Ambroſ. Tom. 2. p. 828. &c. edid. Bened.

[z] Ubi primum Senatus ampliſſimus, ſemperque veſter, ſubactor legibus vitia cognovit, et a Principibus piis vidit purgari famam proximorum temporum: boni ſeculi auctoritatem ſecutus, evomuit diu preſſum dolorem, atque iterum me querelarum

'long ſuppreſſed grief, and again to employ me as the meſſen-
'ger of their complaints. For though they were by bad men
'denied the privilege of an audience, they are perſuaded that
'the preſent emperors will do them juſtice.

'I therefore in a double capacity, as your præfect, intruſted
'with the public concerns, and as deputy of the citizens of
'Rome, recommend their requeſt. In this we are all agreed,
'foraſmuch as men are at length grown ſo wiſe as not to eſpouſe
'the factions of courtiers, when they are divided only about their
'own private intereſts. For to be loved, to be honoured, to be
'reſpected, is more deſirable than any grandeur. And who can
'bear to think that private quarrels ſhould obſtruct the intereſts
'of the commonwealth? The ſenate juſtly diſdains thoſe men,
'who prefer the gratification of their own ambition to the ho-
'nour of their prince.

'Indeed our great concern is to behave as the guardians of
'your ſafety and credit. For when we keep and defend the inſti-
'tutions of our anceſtors, the laws and appointments, and as it
'were the fate of our country, what do we but advance the glory
'of the times? which is never greater than when you think
'nothing lawful to be done, which is contrary to the cuſtoms of
'our fore-fathers. We therefore requeſt that ſtate of religion
'may be reſtored which for long time has been profitable to the
'republic. Certainly, if we reckon up the princes of each per-
'ſuaſion, one of your near anceſtors favoured the rites of our
'fathers [meaning Julian], another, ſtill nearer in time [Valen-
'tinian the firſt] did not remove them. If therefore the piety of
'the more ancient does not make out a ſufficient example, let the
'connivance of the lateſt be attended to.' Meaning, probably, Valentinian the firſt, and Valens.

'Who is there ſo much a friend to the barbarians as not to
'deſire

relarum ſuarum juſſit eſſe legatum. Cui ideo Divi Principis denegata eſt ab improbis audientia, quia non erat juſtitia defutura, domini imperatores, Valentiniane, Theodoſi, et Arcadi inclyti, victores actriumphatores, ſemper auguſti.

2. Gemino igitur functus officio, et ut Præfectus veſter geſta publica proſequor, et ut legatus civium mandata commendo. Nulla eſt hic diſſenſio voluntatum: quia jam credere homines deſierunt aulicorum ſe ſtudio præſtare, ſi diſcrepent. Amari, coli, diligi, majus imperio eſt. Quis ferat, obfuiſſe Reipublicæ privata certamina? Merito illos Senatus inſequitur, qui potentiam ſuam famæ principis prætulerunt.

3. Noſter autem labor pro clementia veſtra ducit excubias. Cui enim magis commodat, quod inſtituta majorum, quod patriæ jura et fata defendimus, quam temporum gloriæ? quæ tum eſt major, cum vobis contra morem parentum intelligitis nil licere. Repetimus igitur religionum ſtatum, qui reipublicæ diu profuit. Certe numerentur Principes utriuſque ſectæ, utriuſque ſententiæ. Proximus eorum cœremonias patrum coluit, recentior non removit. Si exemplum non facit religio veterum, faciat diſſimulatio proximorum.

4. Quis ita familiaris eſt Barbaris, ut aram Victoriæ non requirat? Cauti in poſterum ſumus, et triſtium rerum oſten-

ta

'deſire that the altar of Victory may be reſtored. We are careful for poſterity, and would dread all prognoſtics of calamities. 'If the Deity is not duly reverenced, yet let the appearance of 'religion be preſerved. Your majeſties are already very much, 'and will be more, indebted to Victory. Let them ſlight this 'power, who have no benefit by it. Do not you deſpiſe a patronage which may produce triumphs. This power is deſirable to all. Let not any man deny that to be fit to be worſhipped, whoſe favour he profeſſeth to wiſh for. And if the 'Deity is not duly reſpected, let the ornaments of the ſenate 'houſe be left untouched.

'We beg of you, that we may be permitted now we are old, 'to leave to poſterity thoſe things in which we were educated 'when young. The affection for cuſtom is very great. The 'proceeding of the bleſſed Conſtantius was deſervedly of ſhort 'duration. And all ſuch proceedings are to be avoided which 'you know to have been ſoon diſliked. We aim to perpetuate 'your renown and credit, and deſire that nothing may be done 'which poſterity ſhall judge needful to be reformed.

'And, (if this altar be removed) where ſhall we ſwear to obſerve your laws and ordinances? What will then remain to awe 'the profligate, and terrify them from perjury? It is true, God 'is every where. Nor is there any place where the perfidious 'can be ſafe. Nevertheleſs the outward ſolemnity of religion is 'of great uſe to reſtrain men from evil. That altar is the band 'of unity to all, and the pledge of fidelity to every individual. 'Nor is there any thing which ſo effectually ſecures authority to 'our determinations, as that all the proceedings are managed 'by ſenators ſworn at this altar. Shall this ſeat be open to be 'profaned by perjuries? And ſhall that be approved by our ex-

'cellent

ia vitamus. Reddatur tantum nomini honor, qui numini denegatus eſt. Multa Victoriæ debet æternitas veſtra, et adhuc plura debebit. Averſentur hanc poteſtatem, quibus nihil profuit. Vos amicum triumphis patrocinium nolite deſerere. Cunctis potentia iſta votiva eſt. Nemo colendam negat, quam profitetur optandam.

5. Quod ſi numinis [al. hujus ominis] non eſſet juſta curatio: ſaltem ornamentis Curiæ debuit abſtineri. Præſtate, oro vos, ut ea quæ pueri ſuſcepimus, ſenes poſteris relinquamus. Conſuetudinis amor magnus eſt. Merito Divi Conſtantii factum diu non ſtetit. Omnia vobis exempla vitanda ſunt, quæ mox remota didiciſtis. Æternitatem curamus famæ et nominis veſtri, ne quid futura ætas inveniat corrigendum.

6. Ubi in leges veſtras et verba jurabimus? Qua religione mens falſa terrebitur, ne in teſtimoniis mentiatur? Omnia quidem deo plana ſunt, nec ullus perfidis tutus eſt locus. Sed plurimum valet ad metum delinquendi, etiam præſentia religionis urgeri. Illa ara concordiam tenet omnium, illa ara fidem convenit ſingulorum. Neque aliud magis auctoritatem facit ſententiis noſtris, quam quod omnia quaſi juratus noſter ordo decernit. Patebit ergo ſedes profana perjuriis, et hoc incliti Principes probabile judicabunt, qui ſacramento publico tuti ſunt?

7. Sed

'cellent princes, whoſe perſons and government are ſecured by 'the public oath of their people?

'But it will be ſaid: It is nothing more than was done by the 'bleſſed Conſtantius. Let us rather imitate the other actions of 'that prince, who never would have attempted ſuch a thing, if 'any one before him had ſo miſtaken in the meaſures of govern-'ment. For miſcarriages of former princes are leſſons of in-'ſtruction to their ſucceſſors: and any one eaſily amends when 'he has been warned by the evil example of thoſe who went be-'fore him. That prince, your majeſty's predeceſſor, was not 'aware of the diſcontent which would be occaſioned by that in-'novation. But will that defence be of any advantage to us, if 'we ſhould imitate what we know to have been diſliked?

'Let your auguſt majeſties take pattern from other actions of 'the ſame prince, which are more worthy to be imitated. He 'did not diminiſh the privileges of the ſacred virgins: he con-'ferred the prieſthood upon the nobility: and he allowed out of 'the treaſury the expenſes of the Roman ſacrifices, and other 'religious obſervances. And when he was at Rome, being at-'tended by the ſenate through the ſtreets † of the immortal city, 'he caſt his eyes with a pleaſed countenance upon the temples, 'read in their frontiſpiece the names of the gods to whom they 'were dedicated, made inquiries after the original of the tem-'ples, and admired the munificence of the founders. And 'though he was of another religion, he never thought of aboliſh-'ing the religion of the empire. For every man has his own 'rites, and his own manner of worſhip. The ſupreme Deity, 'who governs the world, has aſſigned different guardians to 'every city. As to every man is given a ſoul at his birth, ſo has 'every nation a particular genius allotted to it.

'To

7. Sed divus Conſtantius idem feciſſe dicitur. Cætera potius illius Principis æmulemur: qui nihil tale eſſet aggreſſus, ſi quis ante ſe alius deviaſſet. Corrigit enim ſequentem lapſus prioris, et de reprehenſione antecedentis exempli naſcitur emendatio. Fas fuit, ut parens ille clementiæ veſtræ in re adhuc nova non caveret invidiam. Num poteſt etiam nobis eadem defenſio convenire, ſi imitemur quod meminimus improbatum?

8. Accipiat æternitas veſtra alia ejuſdem Principis facta, quæ in uſum dignius trahat. Nil ille decerpſit ſacrarum Virginum privilegiis, replevit [al. decrevit] nobilibus ſacerdotia, Romanis cæremoniis non negavit impenſas: et per omnes vias æternæ Urbis lætum ſecutus Senatum, vidit placido ore delubra, legit inſcripta faſtigiis Deûm nomina, percontatus eſt templorum origines, miratus et conditores. Cumque alias religiones ipſe ſequeretur, has ſervavit Imperio. Suus enim cuique mos, ſuus cuique ritus eſt. Varios cuſtodes urbibus cunctis mens divina diſtribuit: Ut animæ naſcentibus, ita populis fatales genii dividuntur. Accedit utilitas, quæ maxime homini Deos adſerit. Nam cum ratio omnis in operta ſit, unde rectius quam de memoria atque documentis

† They who are curious, may compare this with Ammianus's account of the viſit made by Conſtantius at Rome, in the year 356, or 357. Ammian. l. 16. cap. x.

'To theſe conſiderations ought to be added the utility of reli-
'gion. For ſince all reaſonings are obſcure and uncertain, whence
'can we better derive the knowledge of the Deity, than from the
'remembrance and documents of former proſperity? If then an-
'tiquity be ſufficient to give authority to religion, we ought to
'preſerve that faith which has ſubſiſted for ſo many ages, and to
'follow our parents, who have happily followed theirs.

'Let us imagine Rome herſelf to be now preſent, and plead-
'ing her cauſe with you in this manner: O you beſt of princes,
'the fathers of your country, revere my great age, to which theſe
'rites of religion have brought me, and let me ſtill follow the
'ancient obſervances. Nor do I repent of ſo doing. Let me
'live in my own way. I am free, and have a right to do ſo. This
'way of worſhip has brought all the world into obedience to my
'laws. Theſe rites drove Hannibal from my walls, and the
'Gauls from the capitol. And have I lived ſo long to be cor-
'rected in old age? Let me know what this new inſtitution is. Sure
'I am, to reclaim old age is an unſeaſonable and diſhonourable
'undertaking.

'We therefore aſk of you ſecurity for the gods of our country,
'which have been long worſhipped by us. It is but reaſonable
'to think, that whatever Deity men adore, it is but one only. We
'look up to the ſame ſtars, the heaven is common to all, and the
'ſame world encloſeth us. What matters it in what method
'men inquire after truth? it is not one path only that leads to ſo
'great a ſecret. But it will be ſaid that theſe are the diſcourſes
'of men who are much at leiſure. No, it is not ſo; we do
'not aim to enter into diſpute, we only tender requeſts.

Conſider what benefit has accrued to your treaſury, by taking
'away the privileges of the veſtal virgins. Under the moſt libe-
'ral emperors that is denied, which the moſt parſimonious al-
'lowed.

documentis rerum ſecundarum cognitio venit numinum? Jam ſi longa ætas auctoritatem religioni facit, ſervanda eſt tot ſeculis fides, et ſequendi ſunt nobis parentes, qui ſecuti ſunt feliciter ſuos.

9. Romam nunc putemus aſſiſtere, atque his vobiſcum agere ſermonibus: optimi Principes, patres patriæ, reveremini annos meos, in quos me pius ritus adduxit. Utar cerimoniis avitis: neque enim me pœnitet. Vivam more meo, qui libera ſum. Hic cultus in leges meas orbem redegit. Hæc ſacra Annibalem a mœnibus, a Capitolio Senonas repulerunt. Ad hoc ergo ſervata ſum, ut longæva reprehendar? Videro, quale ſit quod inſtituendum putatur. Sera tamen et contumelioſa eſt emendatio ſenectutis.

10. Ergo Diis patriis, Diis indigetibus pacem rogamus. Æquum eſt, quicquid omnes colunt, unum putavi. Eadem ſpectamus aſtra, commune cœlum eſt, idem nos mundus involvit. Quid intereſt, quâ quiſque prudentiâ verum inquirat: uno itinere non poteſt perveniri ad tam grande ſecretum. Sed hæc ocioſorum diſputatio eſt. Nunc preces, non certamina offerimus.

11. Quanto commodo ſacri ærarii veſtri Veſtalium Virginum prærogativa detracta eſt? Sub largiſſimis Imperatoribus denegatur quod parciſſimi præſtiterunt.

'lowed. The honour is the chief reward of their chaſtity. As 'their fillets are the ornament of their head, ſo one of the en- 'ſigns of their prieſthood is to be exempt from all offices; which 'exemption is little more than a name, ſince their poverty ex- 'cuſeth them from great expenſes.

'But poſſibly it will be ſaid that they advance their reputation, 'who leſſen their revenue. For virginity conſecrated to the pub- 'lic good, gains in merit as it loſeth in it's reward.

'But let not ſuch ſaving methods be practiſed to increaſe your 'revenue which ſhall rob it of it's glory. The treaſury of good 'princes is not to be augmented by the ruins of the prieſts, but 'by the ſpoils of enemies. Nor would the greateſt gain make 'amends for the envy with which it would be attended. But 'becauſe covetouſneſs is a fault to which you are ſtrangers, this 'makes their caſe the more deplorable, who have loſt their for- 'mer ſubſiſtences. But whatever is alienated under thoſe princes 'who have conquered the love of riches, and never practiſed 'rapine and extortion, only turns to the detriment of him who 'is the loſer, without gratifying the appetite of him who 'ſeizeth it.

'And now the treaſury detains alſo thoſe lands which were 'given to the veſtals and their officers by the will of our dying 'progenitors. But let me beſeech you, and the miniſters of 'your juſtice, that they may enjoy the private legacies be- 'queathed to the holy uſes of the city. Let men then ſecurely 'make their laſt wills, and let them be aſſured that they have not 'to do with covetous princes, but with ſuch as will ratify what 'they bequeath. Let it be a pleaſure to you to make the world 'thus happy. This one thing creates diſquiet to all dying per- 'ſons. And does not the religion of the Romans come under the

runt. Honor ſolus eſt in illo velut ſtipendio caſtitatis. Ut vittæ earum capiti decus faciunt, ita inſigne ducitur ſacerdotii, vacare muneribus. Nudum quodammodo nomen immunitatis requirunt quoniam paupertate a diſpendio tutæ ſunt. Itaque amplius laudi earum tribuunt qui aliquid rei detrahunt. Siquidem ſaluti publicæ dicata virginitas crescit merito, cum caret præmio.

12. Abſint ab ærarii veſtri puritate iſta compendia. Fiſcus bonorum Principum non ſacerdotum damnis, ſed hoſtium ſpoliis augeatur. Ullumne lucrum compenſat invidiam? At quia avaritia in veſtros mores non cadit, hoc miſeriores ſunt, quibus ſubſidia vetera decerpta ſunt. Etenim ſub Imperatoribus, qui alieno abſtinent, qui reſiſtunt cupiditati, ad ſolam detrahitur amittentis injuriam, quod deſiderium non movet auferentis.

13. Agros etiam virginibus et miniſtris deficientium voluntate legatos fiſcus retentat. Oro vos, juſtitiæ ſacerdotes, ut urbi veſtræ ſacris reddatur privata ſucceſſio. Dictent teſtamenta ſecuri, et ſciant, ſub Principibus non avaris ſtabile eſſe quod ſcripſerint. Delectet vos iſta felicitas generis humani. Cœpit cauſſæ hujus exemplum ſollicitare morientes. Ergo Romanæ religiones ad Romana jura non pertinent? Quod nomen accipiet ablatio facultatum, quas nulla lex, nullus caſus fecit caducas? Capiunt legata liberti, ſervi

'the protection of the Roman laws? By what name ſhall we call 'an alienation of rights which no laws or circumſtances of 'things, ever juſtified? Freedmen receive legacies: nor are 'ſlaves deprived of the privilege of receiving what is left by 'wills. They are only the noble veſtals, and the attendants on 'the ſacred rites upon which the public welfare depends, who 'are deprived of the privilege of receiving eſtates, legally be-'queathed to them. What avails it to vow virginity for the 'ſafety of the republic, and to call in the aid of heaven to per-'petuate your empire, to aſſiſt your armies and legions with 'friendly powers, to offer up ardent and effectual prayers for the 'welfare of all, and at the ſame time to be denied the privileges 'common to all? Would it not at this rate be better to ſerve 'men than the gods? Thus we injure the commonwealth, 'which has no intereſt to be ungrateful.

'Let no man think that I am pleading the cauſe of religion 'only; to ſuch actions as theſe are owing all the calamities which 'have befallen mankind. Our anceſtors honoured the veſtal 'virgins, and the miniſters of the gods, with laws providing for 'them a competent maintenance, and ſuitable privileges. And 'thoſe donations continued inviolable to the time of ſome dege-'nerate bankers, who have converted the revenues of ſacred 'chaſtity into a ſtipend for the vileſt porters. Immediately there 'followed a general famine, and all the countries were diſap-'pointed in the hopes of a plentiful harveſt. The fault was not 'in the ground; nor do we charge it upon the ſtars; nor did ruſt 'conſume the grain, nor did weeds choak it: it was the ſacri-'lege that made the year barren: and how could men expect 'bread when religion was robbed of it's due?

'Verily if there be any other inſtance of ſuch a calamity, let 'us

vis teſtamentorum juſta commoda non negantur. Tantum nobiles virgines, et fatalium ſacrorum miniſtri excluduntur prædiis hæreditate quæſitis. Quid juvat, ſaluti publicæ caſtum corpus dicare, et Imperii æternitatem cœleſtibus fulcire præſidiis: armis veſtris, aquilis veſtris, amicas applicare virtutes, pro omnibus efficacia vota ſuſcipere, et jus cum omnibus non habere? Itane melior eſt ſervitus quæ hominibus impenditur? Rempublicam lædimus, cui numquam expedit, ut ingrata ſit.

14. Nemo me putet, ſolum cauſſam religionis tueri. Ex hujuſmodi facinoribus orta ſunt cuncta humani generis incommoda. Honoraverat lex parentum Veſtales virgines ac miniſtros Deorum victo modico, juſtiſque privilegiis. Stetit hujus muneris integritas uſque ad degeneres trapezitas, qui ad mercedem vilium bajulorum ſacræ caſtitatis alimenta verterunt. Secuta eſt fames publica, et ſpem provinciarum omnium meſſis ægra decepit. Non ſunt hæc vitia terrarum. Nihil imputamus aſtris. Nec rubigo ſegetibus obfuit, nec avena fruges necavit. Sacrilegio annus exaruit. Neceſſe enim fuit perire omnibus, quod religionibus negabatur.

15. Certe ſi eſt hujus mali exemplum, imputemus tantam famem vicibus annorum. Gravis hanc ſterilitatem aura conſtrinxit. Silveſtribus arbuſtis vita producitur,

'us impute this great famine to the viciſſitudes of the ſeaſons. 'There was a dry wind which produced barrenneſs, and men 'now eat the buds of trees; and the poorer ſort of country peo- 'ple are again reduced to feed upon acorns. Did our foreſa- 'thers ever lye under ſuch a calamity, when the miniſters of re- 'ligion were maintained by an honourable allowance out of the 'public treaſury? When were men compelled to ſhake the oak 'for food, or to ſuſtain themſelves with the roots of herbs? 'When did it happen that the wants of one country were unſup- 'plied by the plenty of another, whilſt the allowed proviſion of 'corn was diſtributed in common to the people, and to the 'ſacred virgins? For the proviſions made for the prieſts were a 'primary cauſe of the fertility of the earth: and what was given 'to them was rather a benefit than an expenſe. Can it be doubted 'whether what was beſtowed upon them was for the benefit of 'all, when the taking it away has been avenged by ſcarcity to 'all?'

'But it will be ſaid there is no reaſon that the expenſes of 'another religion ſhould be borne by the public. Let not ſuch 'thought find place in the minds of our excellent princes, that 'what has been given to ſome to hold in common, may be juſtly 'ſeized by the treaſury: for ſince the republic conſiſts of ſingle 'perſons, whatever proceeds from it is the property of indivi- 'duals. You, as we acknowledge, govern all things: never- 'theleſs you give every man his due, and juſtice ſways with you 'more than licentiouſneſs. Do but conſult your own generous 'minds, and you will not think that thoſe things belong to the 'public, which you have already appropriated to the uſe of 'others.

'Whatever

ducitur, et rurſus ad Dodonæas arbores plebis ruſticæ inopia convolavit. Quid tale proavi pertulerunt, quum religionum miniſtros honor publicus paſceret? Quando in uſus hominum concuſſa quercus? Quando vulſæ ſunt herbarum radices? Quando alternos regionum defectus deſeruit fecunditas mutua, quum populo et virginibus ſacris communis eſſet annona? Commendabat enim terrarum proventus victus antiſtitum, et remedium magis quam largitas erat. An dubium eſt ſemper pro copia omnium datum quod nunc inopia omnium vindicavit?

16. Dicet aliquis, ſumptum publicum denegatum alienæ religionis impendiis. Ablit a bonis Principibus iſta ſententia, ut quod de communi quibuſdam tributum eſt, in jure fiſci eſſe videatur. Nam cum reſpublica de ſingulis conſtet, quod ab ea proficiſcitur, fit rurſus proprium ſingulorum. Omnia regitis, ſed ſuum cuique ſervatis, pluſque apud vos juſtitia quam licentia valet. Conſulite certe munificentiam veſtram, an hæc publica velit exiſtimari, quæ in alios tranſtuliſtis. Semel honori Urbis delata compendia deſinunt eſſe tribuentium. Et quod a principio beneficium fuit, uſu atque ætate fit debitum. Inanem igitur metum divino animo veſtro tentat incutere, ſi quis aſſerit conſcientiam vos habere præbentium, niſi detrahentium ſubieritis invidiam.

17. Faveant clementiæ veſtræ ſectarum omnium arcana præſidia, et hæc maxime, quæ majores veſtros aliquando juverunt,

'Whatever revenues have been once devoted to the honour 'of the city, ceaſe thenceforward to belong to the donors. And 'what was originally a largeſs, by cuſtom and uſe becomes a 'debt. That man therefore endeavours to diſturb your ſacred 'minds with vain fears, who inſinuates that you become acceſ-'ſary with the donors, unleſs you incur the envy of cancelling 'ſuch grants.'

'May all the unknown guardians of all ſects, and more eſpe-'cially thoſe powers which in times paſt were ſo propitious to your 'anceſtors defend you; and may they be worſhipped by us! We 'aſk for no other ſtate of religion, than that which ſecured the 'empire to your bleſſed father [Valentinian the firſt], and gave 'him the happineſs of a legitimate iſſue to ſucceed him. That 'elder bleſſed prince looks down from heaven, and beholds 'the tears of the prieſts, and conſiders the breach of their pri-'vileges, which he kept inviolable, as a reflection upon himſelf.'

'Shew alſo this reſpect to your bleſſed brother [Gratian], and 'rectify that which was done rather by the counſels of others, 'than his own. Cover an action which he was not aware was 'ſo diſpleaſing to the ſenate: for it now appears that the depu-'tation ſent by us was debarred acceſs to him, that the ſenſe of 'the public might not come to his knowledge. It will be to the 'honour of paſt times, that you make no ſcruple to aboliſh that 'which has been ſhewn to be no act of that prince.'

That is the petition of the ſenate, preſented to the younger Valentinian by Symmachus. I have tranſlated it entire. It is my province to collect and tranſcribe heathen authors, and let my readers ſee what they ſay favourable to us, or againſt us. Here Symmachus pleads the cauſe of Gentiliſm. We may be aſſured that here are the beſt arguments that could be alleged. Symmachus was a man of great abilities; he exerts himſelf to the utmoſt; and he ſpeaks with great freedom; nothing to the advantage of his cauſe is ſuppreſſed: he ſpeaks in the name of the ſenate and of Rome itſelf; and is under no reſtraints either of fear or favour.

III. I do not think it needful to be ſo particular in my accounts of what was ſaid by Ambroſe, or others, in the way of

ieverunt, vos defendant a nobis colantur. Fum religionum ſtatum petimus, qui Divo parenti culminis veſtri ſervavit imperium, qui fortunato Principi legitimos ſufficit heredes. Spectat ſenior ille divus ex arce ſiderea lachrymas ſacerdotum, et ſe culpatum putat more violato, quem ipſe ſervavit.

18. Præſtate etiam Divo fratri veſtro alieni conſilii correctionem. Tegite factum, quod Senatui diſplicuiſſe neſcivit. Siquidem conſtat ideo excluſam legationem, ne ad eum judicium publicum perveniret. Pro æſtimatione eſt temporum ſuperiorum, ut non dubitetis abolere, quod probatum eſt, Principis non fuiſſe.

confutation,

confutation, or to induce the emperor not to comply with the demands of the ſenate; but I ſhall take ſome notice of it.

I begin with an account of the ſecond letter of Ambroſe ſent to Valentinian.

'Three[z] things,' ſays Ambroſe, 'the moſt excellent præfect 'of the city has inſiſted on in his addreſs, and which he thinks 'of great weight: that Rome deſires the privilege of her old 'way of worſhip; that the uſual allowances ought to be made 'to her prieſts and veſtal virgins; and that, when thoſe allow-'ances were taken away, a general famine preſently enſued.'

Ambroſe's anſwer is prolix and verboſe. I muſt contract it; and yet I will allege ſomething relating to theſe three articles.

With regard to the firſt he ſays, 'It[a] is never too late to be 'wiſe. It is no reproach to any age to repent and reform, to 'amend faults, or correct errors. He likewiſe obſerves that[b] 'Rome did not in late times worſhip the ſame gods which ſhe 'worſhipped at the beginning; for they had multiplied their 'gods, and adopted the deities of the nations, which had been 'conquered by them; and had received rites to which they had 'been long ſtrangers.'

'With[c] regard to the veſtal virgins, of which they boaſted ſo 'much, they were no more than ſeven. Great honours and 'privileges had been conferred upon them. But virginity, which 'muſt be paid for and rewarded, is of little value. Virgins 'were numerous among the Chriſtians, more than could be re-'warded with great privileges; nor did they deſire any ſuch 'thing.'

Nor had the heathen people, he thinks, any good reaſon to complain of withdrawing the ancient allowances from the prieſts:

[z] Tria igitur in Relatione ſua vir clariſſimus Præfectus Urbis Symmachus propoſuit, quæ valida putavit. Quod Roma veteres, ut ait ſuos cultus requirat: et quod Sacerdotibus ſuis, Virginibuſque veſtalibus emolumenta tribuenda ſint: et quod emolumentis Sacerdotum negatis fames ſecuta publica ſit. Ambroſ. libellus ſecundus contra Relationem Symmachi. Apud Symm. p. 322. et Ambroſiii Epiſtola 18. p. 833. edit. Bened.

[a] Non erubeſco cum toto orbe longæva converti. Verum certe eſt, quia nulla ætas ad perdiſcendum ſera eſt. Erubeſcat Senectus, quæ emendare ſe non poteſt. Non annorum canities eſt laudanda, ſed morum: nullus pudor eſt ad meliora tranſire. Ap. Symm. p. 323. ap. Ambroſ. p. 834.

[b] Si ritus veteres delectabant, cur in alienos eadem Roma ſucceſſit?....Quid, (quod de ipſo reſpondeam quod queruntur,) captarum ſimulachra urbium, victoſque deos et peregrinos ritus ſacrorum, alienæ ſuperſtitionis æmuli receperunt. Ap. Symm. p. 328. ap. Ambroſ. p. 840.

[c] 'Habeant,' inquit, Veſtales virgines immunitatem 'ſuam....'Quot tamen illæ virgines præmia promiſſa fecerunt? Vix ſeptem veſtales capiuntur puellæ. En totus numerus, quem infulæ vittati capitis, purpuretarum veſtium murices, pompa lecticæ miniſtrorum circumfuſa comitatu, privilegia maxima, lucra ingentia, præſcripta denique pudicitiæ tempora coegerunt. Non eſt virginitas, quæ pretio emitur, non virtutis ſtudio poſſidetur. &c. Ap. Symm. p. 324, 325. ap. Ambr. p. 836.

for

for [d] by imperial laws, [e] not long ſince publiſhed, Chriſtian miniſters were forbidden to receive legacies from rich widows, and others; referring to a law of Valentinian and Valens made in the year 370; of [f] which Jerom alſo takes notice. This therefore had been done before the law of Gratian relating to heathen prieſts; which law likewiſe, as I imagine, ſeized [g] only the lands which had been ſettled upon the prieſts, and did not deprive them of the privilege of receiving preſents and legacies of moveable goods.

What is ſaid by Symmachus of the famine in the year 383, Ambroſe treats as a trifling argument. There [h] is no reaſon, he thinks, to conſider that as a judgment of heaven which may be imputed only to the viciſſitude of ſeaſons, which has been common in all times; and now plenty was returned, though the altar of Victory was not reſtored, nor had the laws which had ſeized the lands of the prieſts been abrogated. He ſays, moreover, that the famine in the year 383 was not general; there was enough and abundance in Gaul, and Pannonia, and other countries ſubject to the Roman empire.

So argues Ambroſe.

Prudentius likewiſe wrote two books entitled, Againſt Symmachus, or Againſt the Oration of Symmachus. They were not written before the year 403. What was the particular reaſon of his confuting Symmachus again eighteen or almoſt twenty years after Ambroſe, does not, I think, clearly appear; but they who are ſo diſpoſed may conſult the firſt note of Chamillard upon the firſt book of Prudentius.

The firſt book of Prudentius is a confutation of Gentiliſm; the ſecond is an anſwer to Symmachus's oration, paragraph by paragraph. I ſhall take notice of a few things in this ſecond book.

[d] Sacerdotibus ſuis et miniſtris quæruntur alimenta publica non præberi. Quantus hinc verborum tumultus increpitat? Contra, nobis etiam privatæ ſucceſſionis emolumenta recentibus legibus denegantur, et nemo conqueritur. Non enim putamus injuriam, quia diſpendium non dolemus. &c. Ap. Symm. p. 325. ap. Ambr. p. 836. [e] Vid. Cod. Theod. lib. 16. tit. 2. Tom. 6. p. 48. [f] Pudet dicere, ſacerdotes idolorum, mimi et aurigæ, et ſcorta, hereditates capiunt. Solis clericis et monachis hac lege prohibetur: et prohibetur non a perſecutoribus, ſed a principibus Chriſtianis. Nec de lege conqueror, ſed doleo cur meruimus hanc legem. Hieron. ad Nepot. ep. 34. al. 2. T. 4. p. 260. f. [g] Nemo tamen donaria delubris, et legata haruſpicibus denegavit: ſola ſublata ſunt prædia, quia non religioſe utebantur iis, quæ religionis jure defenderent. Ambroſ. lib. ſecund. Ap. Symm. p. 326. ap. Ambroſ. p. 837.

[h] Quis ergo tam novus humanis uſibus, ut vices ſtupeat annorum? Et tamen ſuperiore anno pleraſque novimus provincias redundaſſe frugibus. De Galliis quid loquar ſubito ditioribus? Frumentum Pannoniæ, quod non ſeverant, vendiderunt. Et Fœcunda Rhetia fertilitatis ſuæ movit invidiam....Ergo nec ille ſacrilegio annus exaruit, et ille fidei fructibus annus efloruit. Ap. Symm. p. 327. ap. Ambroſ. p. 838.

Symmachus argues for the Roman religion from antiquity: 'If [i] length of time,' ſays he, 'be of weight in things of religion, we ought to preſerve that faith which has ſubſiſted for ſo many ages, and to follow our parents, who have happily followed theirs.' To which Prudentius anſwers chiefly two things: firſt, 'If [k] the manner of living in the firſt ages ought to be preferred, we muſt renounce all the conveniences of life which have been invented or improved in ſucceeding times. We muſt tread under foot all the improvements of arts and ſciences, and return to the barbariſm of the age of Saturn.' Secondly, 'Since [l] the beginning of the republic the religion of the Romans had been much altered; and [m] ſince the time of Romulus the number of the gods had been greatly increaſed, and new rites and ceremonies of the conquered nations had been adopted.'

Symmachus complained that [n] the public allowances to the veſtal virgins had been withdrawn. This gave occaſion to Prudentius to ſay ſeveral things which perhaps ought not to be paſſed over by me without notice. He obſerves that 'they [o] were choſen

[i] Jam ſi longa ætas auctoritatem religionibus faciet, ſervanda eſt tot ſeculis fides, et ſequendi ſunt nobis parentes, qui feliciter ſecuti ſunt ſuos. Ap. Prudent. p. 611.

[k] Si quicquid rudibus mundi naſcentis in annis
Mos habuit, ſancte colere et ſervare neceſſe eſt;
Omne revolvemus ſua per veſtigia ſeclum,
Uſque ad principium: placeat damnare gradatim
Quicquid poſterius ſucceſſor repperit uſus. &c.
Contr. Symm. l. 2. ver. 277, &c.

[l] Roma antiqua ſibi non conſtat, verſa per ævum,
Et mutata ſacris, ornatu, legibus, armis:
Multa colit, quæ non coluit ſub Rege Quirino,
Inſtituit quædam melius, nonnulla refugit. Ibid. ver. 303, &c.

[m] Sed quia Romanis loquimur de cultibus, ipſum
Sanguinis Hectorei populum probo, tempore longo
Non multos coluiſſe deos, rariſque ſacellis
Contentum, paucas poſuiſſe in collibus aras.
Innumeros poſt deinde Deos, virtute ſubactis
Urbibus, et claris peperit ſibi Roma triumphis,
Inter fumantes templorum armata ruinas
Dextera victoris ſimulachra hoſtilia cepit,
Et captiva domum, venerans ceu numina vexit. Ver. 342....350.

[n] Quanto commodo ſacri ærarii veſtri, Veſtalium virginum prærogativa detracta eſt? ſub largiſſimis Imperatoribus denegatur, quod parciſſimi præſtiterunt. Symm. ap. Prud. p. 658.

[o] Quæ nunc veſtalis ſit virginitatis honeſtas,
Diſcutiam:.....
Ac primum parvæ teneris capiuntur in annis.

Ant

'choſen when young, before they came to ſlight the lawful bond 'of marriage, or could be animated with a love of religion and 'virtue: they conſecrate their chaſtity at the altars againſt 'their wills: they are deprived of a pleaſure which they do 'not deſpiſe. If they are chaſte in body they are not ſo in 'mind: they have no reſt in their beds, where the inviſible 'wound makes them ſigh for the nuptial torches.' However, after a while they might marry: which alſo he ridicules, [p] though perhaps he ſhould not.

The [q] veſtal virgins were at firſt in number four, but were afterwards increaſed to ſix or ſeven. None might be choſen under ſix nor above ten years of age; they were to live thirty years in virginity: in the firſt ten years they were taught the myſteries of the prieſthood; in the next ten years they practiſed the rites and ceremonies of their order; in the third they taught them to others. The period of thirty years would expire before they were forty years of age, when they might marry, but few did.

The prieſthood of the veſtal virgins was always in great eſtimation; and I ſuppoſe they were generally choſen out of the beſt families. Julius Cæſar [r] gave his laſt will into the cuſtody of the eldeſt veſtal.

It may be thought ſtrange that theſe virgins ſhould be preſent at the cruel combats of gladiators; yet it was one of their privileges to have an honourable and conſpicuous place in the theatre allotted to them: we are aſſured of it by [s] Suetonius; nor has Prudentius failed to mention this cuſtom, and make free re-

> Ante voluntatis propriæ quam libera ſecta,
> Laude pudicitiæ fervens, et amore Deorum,
> Juſta maritandi condemnat vincula ſexus.
> Captivus pudor ingratis addicitur aris.
> Nec contempta perit miſeris, ſed adempta voluptas
> Corporis intacti: non mens intacta tenetur:
> Nec requies datur ulla toris, quibus innuba cæcum
> Vulnus, et amiſſas ſuſpirat femina tædas.
> Contr. Symm. lib. 2. ver. 1063....1074.

[p] Nubit anus veterana, ſacro perfuncta labore,
Deſertiſque focis, quibus eſt famulata juventus.
Transfert emeritas ad fulcra jugalia rugas,
Diſcit et in gelido nova nupta tepeſcere lecto. Ib. ver. 1081...1084.

[q] Vid. Dionyſ. Hal. Antiq. Roman. T. 2. p. 122. ed. Hudſon.

[r] Poſtulante ergo L. Piſone ſocero, teſtamentum ejus aperitur....Quod Idibus ſeptembribus proximis in Lavicano ſuo fecerat: demandaveratque Virgini Veſtali maximæ. Sueton. l. i. cap. 83.

[s] Feminis, ne gladiatores quidem, quos promiſcue ſpectari ſolenne olim erat, niſi ex ſuperiore loco ſpectare conceſſit. Solis virginibus Veſtalibus locum in theatro ſeparatim, et contra Prætoris tribunal, dedit. Sueton. Aug. cap. 44.

marks upon it [t]. I may add by the way that Arnobius [u] alſo in his books againſt the Gentiles has made ſome reflections upon this cuſtom.

Prudentius [x] alſo anſwers very largely to the complaints of Symmachus relating to the famine in the year 383, as Ambroſe had done before. But I do not think it needful to tranſcribe him; I only refer to him.

About this time one of the veſtals ſuffered herſelf to be corrupted; and Symmachus himſelf called upon the proper officer to take care that both ſhe and the man with whom ſhe had been familiar, ſhould be properly puniſhed. We have two letters of Symmachus written upon that [y] occaſion.

As Ambroſe takes no notice of this in his anſwer to the petition of Symmachus, Baronius [a] thought that it muſt have happened afterwards: but neither has Prudentius touched upon this matter, though his argument was compoſed much later. Why they take no notice of it I cannot ſay; for learned moderns [b] obſerve upon it as a remarkable event, and very mortifying to the intereſts of Gentiliſm.

[t] Interea, dum torta vagos ligat inſula crines,
Fataleſque adolet prunas innupta ſacerdos,
Fertur per medias, ut publica pompa, plateas.

. . . . . .

Inde ad confeſſum caveæ pudor almus, et expers
Sanguinis it pietas, hominum viſura cruentos
Congreſſus, morteſque, et vulnera vendita paſtu
Spectatura ſacris oculis . . . . . .

Ib. lib. 2. ver. 1085....1110.

[u] Sedent in ſpectaculis publicis ſacerdotum omnium, Magiſtratuumque collegia, Pontifices Maximi, et Maximi Curiones....Sedent Augures, interpretes divinæ mentis et voluntatis: nec non et caſtæ virgines, perpetui nutrices et conſervatrices ignis. Arnob. l. 4. p. 151.

[x] Ultima legati defleta dolore querela eſt....

. . . . . .

Hinc ait et ſteriles frugeſcere rarius agros,
Et triſtem ſævire famem, totumque per orbem
Mortales pallere inopes, ac panis egenos.

Prud. l. 2. ver. 909....915.

[y] More inſtitutoque majorum, inceſtum Primigeniæ, dudum apud Albam Veſtalis antiſtitis, collegii noſtri diſquiſitio deprehendit: quod et ipſius quæ contaminavit pudicitiam ſacram, et Maximi, cum quo nefandum facinus admiſit, confeſſionibus claruiſſe Geſta teſtantur. Reſtat, ut in eos, qui ceremonias publicas abominando ſcelere polluerunt, legum ſeveritas exeratur. Symm. l. 9. ep. 118. vid. et ep. 119.

[a] Baron. ann. 384. num. xiii.

[b] Non ſine numine quidem contigit illo ipſi anno, quo Veſtalium caſtitatem præconio ſuo commendabat Symmachus, ac ereptis ſtipendiis mala urbis aſſignabat, quod Primigenia apud Albam Veſtalium antiſtes a Maximo corrupta fuerit. &c. Baſnag. ann. 384. num. v. Vid. et Baron. ubi ſupra, num. xi.

IV. Here

IV. Here may now ariſe two queſtions: firſt, where were the Chriſtian ſenators when the ſenate deputed Symmachus to Valentinian, deſiring that the altar of Victory might be reſtored? Secondly, it may be inquired, whether theſe proceedings of the Chriſtian emperors were juſt and reaſonable?

The firſt queſtion is, where were the Chriſtian ſenators when the ſenate deputed Symmachus with a requeſt to Valentinian that the altar of Victory, which had been taken away, might be reſtored? Were there no Chriſtian ſenators to interpoſe? or did they acquieſce in the determination of the reſt?

In anſwering this queſtion, I ſuppoſe we may have ſome aſſiſtance from the firſt letter or remonſtrance which Ambroſe ſent to Valentinian, before he had obtained a copy of the petition of Symmachus; there he ſeems to ſay that [c] the majority of the ſenate were Chriſtians; and he ſays, 'it [d] ought not to be ſuppoſed 'that this preſent petition came from the ſenate. No: a few 'Gentiles take upon them the name of the body.' And he ſays that two years before, when a like petition was attempted, Damaſus, biſhop of Rome, aſſured him that 'at that time he re-'ceived a letter from Chriſtian ſenators, and ſigned by very 'many of them, who complained and ſaid that they never de-'ſired any ſuch thing, nor could join in ſuch a petition: nor 'was it fit that the emperor ſhould grant ſuch petitions to Gen-'tiles. They alſo made complaints privately and publicly, and 'ſaid that they would not come to the ſenate if ſuch a petition 'was granted.'

So writes Ambroſe. However, it ſeems to me, if I rightly underſtand him, that the Chriſtian ſenators had not interpoſed when this petition to Valentinian was drawn up in the ſenate. He ſeems to allow that no Chriſtian ſenators were then preſent. 'It [e] will be aſked,' ſays he, 'why they were not preſent in the 'ſenate, when the petition was drawn up?' He anſwers, 'their 'mind was ſufficiently known though they were not pre-

[c] ....cum Curia majore jam Chriſtianorum numero ſit refertus. Ambroſ. lib. primus. ap. Symm. p. 319. fin. ap. Ambroſ. p. 825. fin. [d] Sed abſit, ut hoc Senatus petiſſe dicatur. Pauci Gentiles communi utuntur nomine. Nam et ante biennium ferme, cum hoc petere tentarent, miſit ad me ſanctus Damaſus Romanæ eccleſiæ ſacerdos, judicio Dei electus, libellum, quem Chriſtiani Senatores dederunt, et quidem innumeri, expoſtulantes, nihil ſe tale mandaſſe: non congruere Gentilium iſtiuſmodi petitionibus vos præbere conſenſum. Queſti etiam publice privatimque, ſe non conventuros ad Curiam, ſi tale aliquid decerneretur. &c. ap. Symm. p. 320. ap. Ambroſ. p. 826. m.

[e] Si fortaſſe dicatur: Cur dudum, non inter fuerant Senatui, cum iſta peterentur? Satis loquuntur quid velint, qui non interfuerunt: ſatis loquuti ſunt, qui apud Imperatorem loquuti ſunt. ap. Symm. p. 320. ap. Ambr. p. 826.

'sent: it was sufficient that their mind was known to the em-
'peror.'

Ambrose therefore supposeth that Christian senators were then very numerous, though he does not say that any of them were present in the senate when this petition was agreed upon. And Tillemont, relying upon Ambrose, says, that [f] 'even in the time of Gratian the Christian senators were very numerous: but Frederick Spanheim thought that 'the [g] majority of the senate were 'Gentiles in the time of Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius.' For certain there were from early times some Christians in the senate. Tertullian in his Apology, written before the end of the second century, speaks as [h] if there were some considerable numbers of Christians in the senate. And in another work, written some few years afterwards, he says that 'the [i] emperor 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:' by 'men and women of the first 'quality,' probably meaning senators and their wives. After which time the number of Christian senators may have increased, before the conversion of Constantine and afterwards. It may be difficult for us to determine exactly the proportion between the number of Christian and Gentile senators; however I do not think that the Christians were the majority of the Roman senate in the time of Valentinian, when this petition was presented by Symmachus.

Secondly, it may be inquired whether those proceedings were just and reasonable? 'Did the Christian emperors act justly and 'rightly in removing the altar of Victory, which had long stood 'in the senate-house? And did they act justly and rightly in 'seizing the estates and revenues, which had been long since 'settled by public authority, for the maintenance of vestal vir-'gins, and other priests, and for performing sacrifices for the 'welfare of the public?'

[f] Et des le temps de Gratien il y avoit un nombre comme infini de Senateurs Chrêtiens. L'Emp. Theodos. art. 48.

[g] Paganæ superstitionis tenaces manserunt adhuc Gentes plurimæ, et permixti Christianis Populi, Cives, Magistratus, Judices, Senatores, Consules, Proconsules, Vicarii, ac Præsides provinciarum. Quinimo sub Valentiniano, Theodosio, Arcadio, Senatum Romanum adhuc fuisse maximâ ex parte Gentilem, patet ex epistolis Symmachi. Spanhem Hist. Christian. T. i. p. 839.

[h] Hesterni sumus, et, et vestra omnia implevimus, ...decuriæ, palatium, senatum, forum. Sola vobis relinquimus templa. Apol. cap. 37.

[i] Sed et clarissimas feminas, et clarissimos viros, Severus sciens hujus sectæ fuisse, non modo non læsit, verum testimonio ornavit, et populo furenti in os pal... restitit. Ad Scap. cap. 4. p. 87.

To

To me it ſeems that Chriſtian emperors acted rightly in removing the altar of Victory, and in refuſing to reſtore it after it had been taken away: I think this might be rightly done, even ſuppoſing that the number of Chriſtian ſenators was much inferior to the Gentiles; for that there were ſome ſuch none can deny. Let us only recollect what Symmachus ſaid, that 'at the 'altar of Victory the ſenators ſwore fidelity to the emperor, and 'in all their votes in the ſenate to determine according to the 'beſt of their knowledge.' But was that fit to be done by Chriſtians? At this altar the ſenators took an oath, when firſt choſen and introduced, or annually; and uſually, if not always, at their entrance into the ſenate they offered incenſe at this altar, or gave ſome other token of reſpect; and frequently ſacrifices were offered at this altar. But was it fit that ſuch things ſhould be done by Chriſtians, or joined in by them? or that they ſhould be compelled to them? By no means. Nevertheleſs all ſuch things would be expected of them by the Gentile ſenators, ſo long as the altar of Victory ſtood there; and, as I apprehend, compulſion was unavoidable; but that would be perſecution. Somewhat [k] of this kind is intimated by Ambroſe in his firſt letter to Valentinian. There was therefore a neceſſity that the altar of Victory ſhould be removed by Chriſtian emperors; and it was reaſonably done.

It remains that we conſider the ſeizing of the lands which had been allowed for the maintenance of the veſtals, and for performing the ſacrifices offered by them, and by other prieſts for the public welfare.

Here I ſuppoſe none can think that Chriſtian emperors were obliged to maintain the veſtals, and other prieſts, and their ſacrifices out of the public revenue. They might have allowed theſe things to be done by the Gentiles; that is all that can be expected from principles of moderation, extended to the utmoſt; and this might have been done. And certainly there ſtill were Gentile people enough at Rome, among their ſenators and other opulent families, to maintain ſix or ſeven veſtals, and other prieſts, and to provide for the proper ſacrifices. But this pri-

[k] Totus hic Chriſtianorum periclitatur Senatus. Si hodie Gentilis aliquis Imperator (quod abſit) aram ſtatueret ſimulachri, et eo convenire cogeret Chriſtianos, ut ſacrificantibus intereſſent, ...et in eâ Curiâ ſententiam dicerent, ubi jurati ad aram ſimulachri ſententiam rogarentur: (propterea enim interpretantur aram locatam, ut ejus ſacramento unuſquiſque conventus conſuleret in medium:) cum Curia majore jam Chriſtianorum numero ſit referta, perſecutionem eſſe crederet Chriſtianus, qui cogeretur tali optione ad Senatum venire: quod ſit plerumque. Nam etiam injuriis convenire coguntur. Ambroſ. libellus primus: ap. Symm. p. 319. ad. Ambroſ. p. 815. Vide iterum ap. Symm. p. 321. fin. ap. Ambroſ. p. 828. in.

vilege would not ſatisfy. It would not be accepted of by Symmachus, and other rigid and ſuperſtitious Gentiles: they would have ſaid, that all public ſacrifices offered for the benefit of the ſtate muſt be allowed by public authority, and out of the public treaſury, with the conſent of the ſupreme powers: all their virtue and efficacy depended upon that; and without it they were of no value. Conſequently when thoſe lands were ſeized, and other revenues were withheld, there would be an end of all thoſe ſacrifices, and they would fall to the ground, and no longer be performed: the moſt free and extenſive toleration would not uphold them: their ſubſiſtence depended upon the encouragement of public authority; which, I think, could not be reaſonably granted, nor expected from Chriſtian magiſtrates.

I ſhall juſt obſerve here, that Ambroſe, in his letter to Eugenius, then emperor, written in the year 392 or 393, tells him that [l] thoſe revenues had not been taken away by his advice, but he adviſed that they ſhould not be reſtored.

V. Before we conclude this article ſomewhat ſhould be ſaid of Symmachus himſelf, who in the year 384, was deputed to the emperor by the ſenate, and preſented their petition to him.

His hiſtory may be ſeen in [m] Tillemont, who has been copied by [n] our writers of Univerſal Hiſtory; and [o] in other authors.

His name at length was Quintus Aurelius Symmachus, ſon of L. Aurelius Avianius Symmachus, who was præfect of Rome in the year 364. He had one ſon only, named Quintus Fabius Memmius Symmachus. He was [p] grand pontiff of paganiſm, quæſtor, prætor, and corrector of Lucania and the Prutians in the year 365 or 368, proconſul of Africa [q] in the year 370 or 373, præfect of Rome in the year 384, and ordinary conſul in the year 391: by his intereſt his ſon was made queſtor in the year 392, and prætor in the year 397, or, as ſome think, in the year 401; and it appears that young Symmachus was proconſul of Africa in the year 415, and præfect of Rome in the year 419: ſome have thought him to have been conſul in the year 424, but that is now ſuppoſed to be a miſtake.

Symmachus was in great reputation for eloquence as an ora-

[l] Dedi libellos Imperatoribus duos, quibus ſignificarem, ſumptus Chriſtianum virum non poſſe reddere: et non fuiſſe me auctorem, cum tollerentur: auctorem fieri, quo minus decernerentur: deinde, quia dare eos ipſis ſimulachris videretur, non reddere. Ad Eugen. ep. xv. al. lvii. p. 1010. [m] L'Emp. Theodoſe. i. art. 91. [n] Vol. xvi. p. 448, &c.

[o] Vid. Voſſ. De Hiſt. Latin. lib. 3. Gothofred. Proſopogr. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 347. Fabric. Bib. Latin. lib. 3. cap. xiv. Tom. i. p. 632. [p] Vide Symm. l. i. ep. 41. et alibi. [q] Me dudum Proconſularem virum, cedentem jam diu potentium moribus, ante capere magiſtratum quam expectare voluiſtis. l. x. ep. 16.

tor,

tor, but none of his orations are preſerved. We have however a collection of his epiſtles, which had been kept by his ſecretary, and a friend named Elpidius; which were publiſhed by his ſon after his death, in ten books, the laſt containing his letters to the emperors: thus imitating the edition of Pliny's Letters, both in the number of the books, and order of the epiſtles; and they are much commended by [r] Macrobius.

Whilſt Symmachus was præfect of the city in the year 384, and Prætextatus præfect of the prætorium, there * were ſome reflections made upon both of them, as if they had treated ſome Chriſtians very injuriouſly; Symmachus, in particular, was charged with [s] having taken ſome Chriſtians out of churches to put them to torture; and with having impriſoned ſome biſhops, fetched by him from diſtant countries, others from neighbouring places. At hearing of this, the emperor [t] was ſo provoked as to ſend an edict addreſſed to the people, in which Symmachus was reproved very ſharply. Symmachus then wrote to the emperor, vindicating himſelf from thoſe calumnies, and ſent him a particular account of what had been done in the execution of his office, and with the depoſitions of the officers of juſtice, bearing witneſs to his innocence. He alſo received a letter from Damaſus biſhop of Rome, in which he declared that the præfect had not been guilty of any injury to the Chriſtians. He farther ſays, he was aſſured by his officers that among all the perſons ſhut up in priſons, charged with various crimes, there was not one Chriſtian.

Symmachus appears to have been much chagrined by theſe calumnies, as any honeſt man might well be. And in his letter to the emperor, he could not forbear to expreſs a deſire to reſign an office which [u] he had not ſought, but had been put into it by the emperor's own choice and deſignation.

I hope it will not be diſagreeable to any of my readers, if I conclude this ſection with an [x] Inſcription upon a monument

[r] ....pingue et floridum: in quo Plinius ſecundus quondam, et nunc nullo veterum minor noſter Symmachus luxuriatur. Macrob. l. 5. cap. i.

* See Tillem. L'Emp. Theodoſ. i. art. 22. [s] Quid enim non audeant, quidve intentatum relinquant, qui in arce terrarum, Chriſtianæ legis injuriis vindicata profana finxerunt? Flevit credo ſcenæ iſtius fabricator, cum eccleſiæ penetralibus raptæ ad tormenta ſimularet, cum de longinquis ac de finitimis urbibus duci Antiſtites in vincula deſcriberet. Lib. 10. ep. 34.

[t] Neque enim ſerenum clementiæ veſtræ animum ſine his argutiis compuliſſet ſacro edicto populum convenire: ut aſperioribus quam pietati veſtræ mos eſt liberis Præfectum, quem ſine ambitu legiſtis, argueret....Reſpondeat literis Epiſcopi Damaſi, quibus aſſectatores ejuſdem religionis negavit ullam contumeliam tuliſſe. &c. Ibid. [u] Qui Præfecturam ſine ambitu meruimus, ſine offenſione ponamus. Ibid. Vid. et not. [r]. [x] Vide Macrob. Sat. l. 5. cap. i. in notis. et Tillemont. Theodoſ. art. 91. p. 808.

erected

erected to the honour of Symmachus by his ſon, where the ſeveral offices diſcharged by him are particularly mentioned.

Q. AURELIO. SYMMACHO. V. C.
QUÆST. PRÆT. PONTIFICI
MAJORI. CORRECTORI
LUCANIÆ. ET. BRITTIORUM
COMITI. ORDINIS. TERTII
PROCONS. AFRICÆ. PRÆT.
URB. COS. ORDINARIO
ORATORI. DISERTISSIMO
Q. FAB. MEM. SYMMACHUS
V. C. PATRI. OPTIMO.

Sect. IV. The Correſpondence between Maximus of Madaura and Auguſtine.

I shall now obſerve the correſpondence between Auguſtine and Maximus, a grammarian of Madaura in Africa, which is placed about the year 390, by [a] thoſe who have carefully digeſted the hiſtory of Auguſtine, that is, before he was preſbyter, and whilſt the rites of Gentiliſm were openly practiſed in that country. And Tillemont obſerves that this letter of Auguſtine is placed by Poſſidius at the head of his epiſtles againſt the pagans. Moreover it is ſuppoſed that Auguſtine was now at Tagaſte, the place of his nativity, not far from Madaura.

'I [b] am always pleaſed with your converſation,' ſays Maximus to Auguſtine, 'with which you have ſometimes favoured me; 'and I ſhould be glad to have it oftener renewed. I now take 'notice of ſome difficulties which not long ſince, though with-'out breach of friendſhip, and in a pleaſing manner, you pro-'poſed, relating to my ſentiments. And I the rather do it leſt 'ſilence ſhould be taken for an acknowledgment of conviction. 'And I entreat you not to ſlight what I ſay, becauſe I am in 'years, as if it proceeded from dotage. The Greeks, among 'their other fables, tell us, but without proof, that the moun-'tain Olympus is the habitation of the gods: but we ſee and 'know

[a] Benedictini de Vita Auguſtin. l. 3. cap. iii. num. 5. Tillemont S. Auguſtin. art. 57. et note 13. [b] Avens crebo tuis alfatibus lætificari, et inſtinctu tui ſermonis, quo me paullo ante jucundiſſime ſalva caritate pulſaſti, paria redhibere non deſtiti, ne ſilentium meum pœnitudinem appellares. Sed quæſo, ut ſi hæc quaſi ſeniles artus eſſe duxeris, benignarum aurium indulgentia proſequaris. Olympum montem deorum eſſe habitaculum ſub incerta fide Græcia fabulatur. At vero noſtræ

'know that in the forum of our city we have the preſence of the 'good gods our protectors; and that there is one ſupreme God, 'without beginning, and without any natural iſſue, the great and 'glorious father of all, none denies, or doubts, it being a moſt 'certain truth. His powers diffuſed throughout the mundane 'ſyſtem we invoke under many names, becauſe we do not know 'what is his proper name; for the word God is a name com-'mon to all objects of worſhip: and in this way preſenting ſe-'verally many ſupplications to his powers, as to his members, 'we think we worſhip God entire.

'But indeed I cannot diſſemble that I am quite out of pa-'tience with the error which is now getting ground among us. 'For who can bear to think that Mygdo ſhould be preferred to 'Jove the thunderer, and Sanae to Juno, Minerva, Venus and 'Veſta; and, horrible to think, that the arch-martyr Nymphanio 'ſhould be preferred to the immortal gods! To omit now the 'names of innumerable others, hateful to gods and men, guilty 'of the greateſt extravagances, and adding one crime to an-'other, who under the appearance of a glorious death, have 'ſuffered, execrable as they were, an end well worthy of their 'evil deeds. And truly, now fools frequent their ſepul-'chres, forſaking the temples, and forgetting all reſpect to their 'venerable anceſtors. So that I ſeem to ſee fulfilled the un-'welcome preſage of the poet, "Rome in the temples of the "gods ſwearing by ſhadows." And at this time I ſee again, 'as it were renewed, the Actiac war, and Ægyptian monſters 'contending with the gods of the Romans, but I hope without 'ſucceſs.

noſtræ urbis forum ſalutarium numinum frequentia poſſeſſum nos cernimus, et probamus. Equidem unum eſſe Deum ſummum ſine initio, ſine prole naturæ, ſeu patrem magnum atque magnificum, quis tam demens, tam mente captus neget eſſe certiſſimum? Hujus nos virtutes per mundanum opus diffuſas multis vocabulis invocamus, quoniam nomen ejus cuncti proprium ignoramus. Nam Deus omnibus religionibus commune nomen eſt. Ita fit, ut dum quaſi quædam membra carptim variis ſupplicationibus proſequimur, totum colere profecto videamur.

Sed impatientem me eſſe tanti erroris, diſſimulare non poſſum. Quis enim ferat, Jovi fulmina vibranti præferri Mydonem: Junoni, Minervæ, Veneri, Veſtæque Sanaem, et cunctis, proh nefas, diis immortalibus archimartyrem Nymphanionem, inter quos Lucitas etiam haud minore cultu ſuſcipitur, atque alii interminato numero (diis hominibuſque odioſa nomina) qui conſcientia nefandorum facinorum ſpecie glorioſæ mortis, ſcelera ſua ſceleribus cumulantes, dignum moribus factiſque ſuis exitum maculati repererunt. Horum buſta, ſi memoratu dignum eſt, relictis templis, neglectis majorum ſuorum manibus, ſtulti frequentant, ita ut præſagium vatis illius indigne ferentis emineat.

Inque Deûm templis juravit Roma per umbras.

Sed mihi hac tempeſtate propemodum videtur bellum Actiacum exortum, quo Ægyptia monſtra in Romanorum deos audeant tela vibrare, minime duratura.

'But

'But I beſeech you, great Sir, that laying aſide your eloquence, 'by which you are become ſo famous, and the ſubtle arguments 'of Chryſippus, your uſual weapons, and logic, which ſerves 'only to make all things appear alike probable, you will indeed 'ſhew us who is the God whom you Chriſtians claim as peculiar 'to yourſelves, and whom you think you ſee preſent with you 'in obſcure places. For we worſhip the gods in the light, 'openly and before all men, and offer up our ſupplications in 'the hearing of all, and by acceptable ſacrifices render them 'propitious to us; and our deſire is that theſe things ſhould be 'ſeen and approved by all.

'But it is high time for ſuch an old man as I am to conclude 'the argument, and ſay with the Mantuan orator, "Every man "has his fancy." And now, good Sir, who have forſaken our 'way of worſhip, I make no doubt this letter is to be deſtroyed 'by fire, or ſome other way; if it ſhould be ſo, it is only the loſs 'of ſo much paper; the argument ſhall be kept for the uſe of 'all pious men. May the gods preſerve you, through whom 'we, and all people whom the earth bears, in a thouſand dif-'ferent ways, with an agreeing diſcord, worſhip and praiſe, the 'common Father of all men!'

That is the genuine letter of a zealous Gentile grammarian. He was apprehenſive it would be deſtroyed: but it has been preſerved and kept ſafe among Auguſtine's papers. It has alſo been handed down to us; and we read it without much offence, and without any danger of being perverted by it. We are pleaſed with his acknowledgment of one ſupreme Deity creator of all, and with the marks of civility to a learned and ingenious Chriſtian, then eminent for his abilities, though as yet he was only between thirty and forty years of age. But we cannot but think there appears ſome diſtruſt of the goodneſs of his cauſe when he deſires

3. Sed illud quæſo, vir ſapientiſſime, uti remoto facundiæ robore atque exploſo, quâ cunctis clarus es, omiſſis etiam quibus pugnare ſolebas Chryſippeis argumentis, poſtpoſita paullulum dialectica, quæ nervorum ſuorum luctamine nihil certi cuiquam relinquere nititur, ipſa re approbes, quis ſit iſte deus, quem vobis Chriſtiani, quaſi primum vindicatis, et in locis abditis præſentem vos videre componitis. Nos etenim deos noſtros luce palam ante oculos, atque aures omnium mortalium piis precibus adoramus, et per ſuaves hoſtias propitios nobis efficimus, et a cunctis hæc cerni et probari contendimus.

4. Sed ulterius huic certamini me ſenex invalidus ſubtraho, et in ſententiam Mantuani rhetoris libenter pergo: Trahit ſua quemque voluntas. Buc. Eclog. 3. Poſthac non dubito, vir eximie, qui a mea ſecta deviaſti, hanc epiſtolam aliquorum furto detractam flammis, vel quolibet pacto perituram. Quod ſi acciderit, erit damnum chartulæ, non noſtri ſermonis, cujus exemplar penes omnes religioſos retinebo. Dii te ſervent, per quos et eorum atque cunctorum mortalium communem patrem, univerſi mortales, quos terra ſuſtinet, mille modis concordi diſcordia veneramur et colimus. Ap. Auguſtin. Ep. 16. al. 43. T. 2.

his

his correſpondent, in his anſwer, to lay aſide the advantage to be made by eloquence, acute reaſoning, and logic. Moreover, he bears teſtimony to the great progreſs of Chriſtianity in the world, which too had been very much owing, as here intimated, to the ſteady and patient perſeverance of Chriſtians in the profeſſion of thoſe principles which they ſuppoſed they had received upon good grounds. But we muſt think it hard and unequitable that the Chriſtians, who ſome time ſince had died as martyrs for their religion at Madaura, or other places in Africa, ſhould be charged with extravagances, and repreſented as 'criminals unworthy to 'live upon earth.' At the ſame time we muſt ſuppoſe this to be the true ſpirit of Gentiliſm: and thoſe eminently good men, whoſe lives had been unjuſtly taken from them, muſt forever have ſuffered in their memories, if Gentiliſm had continued to prevail. So that the change which had been made in the world in favour of Chriſtianity, not only gave liberty to it's preſent profeſſors, but alſo reſtored and ſecured the credit of thoſe who had ſuffered in former times. For certainly there never were better ſubjects, nor more innocent and virtuous men, than the Chriſtians who lived in the firſt ages, before the converſion of Conſtantine.

Auguſtine, in his anſwer to this letter, [c] treats it as ludicrous, and unſuitable to ſo ſerious a ſubject, and therefore not deſerving a particular reply. He wonders that [d] Maximus an African, living in Africa, and writing to a native of the ſame country, ſhould ridicule the African names of ſome Chriſtian martyrs as harſh and abſurd, when the Romans had like names among them for their prieſts, and for their gods and goddeſſes. He [e] forbears to upbraid him with thoſe rites, which were concealed from all but a few; or the rudeneſs and extravagance of the Bac-

[c] Seriumne aliquid inter nos agimus, an jocari libet? &c. Ep. 17. al. 44. init.

[d] Nam quod nomina quædam Punica mortuorum collegiſti, quibus in noſtram religionem feſtivas (ut tibi viſum eſt) contumelias jaciendas putares, neſcio utrum referre debeam, an ſilentio præterire.... Miror, quod nominum abſurditate commoto, in mentem non venerit habere tuos et in ſacerdotibus Eucaddires, et in numinibus Abaddires. Non puto ego iſta cum ſcriberes in animo non fuiſſe...quanta in veſtra ſuperſtitione ridenda ſunt. Neque enim uſque adeo teipſum obliviſci potuiſſes, ut homo Afer ſcribens Afris, cum Romæ utrique in Africa conſtituti, Punica nomina exagitanda exiſtimares....Verum tamen ſi ridere delectat, habes apud vos magnam materiam facetiarum: deum Stercutium, deam Cloacinam, Venerem calvam....Ibid. num. 2, 3.

[e] Quod autem dicis, eo noſtris veſtra ſacra præponi, quod vos publice colitis deos, nos autem ſecretioribus conventiculis utimur: primo, abs te quæro, quomodo oblitus ſis Liberum illum, quem paucorum ſacratorum oculis committendum putatis. Deinde tu ipſe judicas nihil aliud te agere voluiſſe, cum publicam ſacrorum veſtrorum celebrationem commemorares, niſi ut nobis decuriones et primates civitatis per plateas veſtræ urbis bacchantes ac furentes, ante oculos quaſi ſpectacula poneremus: in qua celebritate, ſi numine inhabitamini, certe videtis quale illud ſit, quod adimit mentem. num. 4.

chanalian

chanalian feſtivals, when the greateſt magiſtrates of their city ran about the ſtreets like furies and madmen. He defers to enter farther into the debate till Maximus is more ſerious. However, he puts him in mind that [f] there is in his city a church of catholic Chriſtians by whom no dead men are adored, nor any being worſhipped as a deity who had been made by God, but only the one God himſelf, who made and formed all things.

I have one remark to add which perhaps is not quite needleſs. Maximus by this letter bears teſtimony not only to the progreſs of Chriſtianity in his own time, and that there were then many Chriſtians at Madaura, and in other parts of Africa; but he is alſo a witneſs that Chriſtianity had been received there long before. He ſpeaks of many martyrs in Africa, who muſt have ſuffered before the converſion of Conſtantine. And my readers may remember that in the writings of Apuleius alſo of Madaura, who flouriſhed about the year 263, in the times of the two Antonines, we ſaw good proofs of his knowledge of the Chriſtians and their principles, and his diſlike of [g] them.

Sect. V. The Demolition of the Temple of Serapis at Alexandria, and other Temples in Ægypt in the year 391, and ſome other Temples elſewhere.

I. *The hiſtory of the demolition of the temple of Serapis.* II. *Learned men concerned in the defence, or in the demolition of the temple of Serapis: Olympius, Helladius, Ammonius, heathens: Theophilus, biſhop of Alexandria.* III. *Other temples deſtroyed in Syria and Phœnicia.*

I. That the temple of Serapis at Alexandria was demoliſhed by order of Theodoſius the firſt, is allowed. But learned men are not entirely agreed about the time when it was done; ſome placing [a] it in the year 389, others in the year 391. Tillemont [b] is for the year 389: but he acknowledgeth that the opinion is not

[f] Ad ſummam tamen, ne te hoc lateat, et in ſacrilega convitia imprudentem trahat, ſcias a Chriſtianis catholicis, quorum in veſtro oppido etiam eccleſia conſtituta eſt, nullum coli mortuorum, nihil denique ut numen adorari, quod ſit factum et conditum a Deo, ſed unum ipſum Deum, qui fecit et condidit omnia. Differentur iſta latius, ipſo vero et uno Deo adjuvante, cum te graviter agere vel-le cognovero. Ibid. num. 5.

[g] See Vol. vii. p. 460....462.

[a] Baron. ann. 389. num. 76, &c. Ancient Univ. Hiſtory, Vol. xvi. p. 427, &c.

[b] L'Emp. Theodoſ. art. li. lii. &c.

without

without difficulties. Pagi [c] after [d] Gothofred, argues ſtrongly for the year 391, with whom Baſnage [e] agrees. Frederick Spanheim [f] likewiſe is for the year 391.

Accounts of this tranſaction may be ſeen in [g] our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians. And ſome notice is taken of it by [h] Eunapius, who expreſſeth himſelf with great diſlike and reſentment.

A large deſcription of the temple of Serapis at Alexandria may be ſeen in [i] Rufinus, which I need not tranſcribe. Ammianus Marcellinus, who wrote whilſt it was yet ſtanding, ſays it [k] was inferior to none, except the capitol at Rome. And in [l] Macrobius, another heathen writer, may be ſeen a deſcription of the image of Serapis. Rufinus ſays, 'it [m] was monſtrouſly 'large, it's arms reaching from one wall of the temple to the 'other; and ſays it was compoſed of all ſorts of metals and 'woods. The opinions of the pagans concerning the origin of 'this image, he ſays, were various. Some ſaid it repreſented 'Jupiter, and were of opinion that the buſhel upon it's head 'denoted that he governed all things in weight and meaſure; 'or it ſignified the plenty of the fruits of the earth by which 'mortals are nouriſhed. Others ſaid it denoted the river Nile, 'by the waters of which Ægypt is enriched. Some there were 'who ſaid that the image was ſo formed in honour of our Joſeph, 'by whoſe wiſe diſtribution of corn the land of Ægypt had 'been provided for in time of a famine. Others gave different 'accounts.'

The occaſion of the demolition of the temple of Serapis is related in this manner: 'There [n] was a large old building which

[c] Pagi ann. 389. num. xii. xiii.
[d] Cod. Theod. de Paganis. Tom. vi. p. 273. [e] Baſnag. ann. 391. num. ix.
[f] Spanhem. Hiſt. Chriſt. ſec. iv. p. 950.
[g] Rufin. H. E. l. 2. c. 27...30. Socrat. l. 5. cap. 16, 17. Sozom. l. 7. cap. xv. Theod. l. 5. c. 21, 22. [h] Eunap. in vita Ædeſ. p. 60, 62, 63. [i] Ruf. ib. cap. 23. [k] His accedunt altis ſublata faſtigiis templa, inter quæ eminet Serapëum, quod licet minuatur exilitate verborum, atriis tamen columnariis ampliſſimis, et ſpirantibus ſignorum figmentis, et reliqua operum multitudine ita eſt exornatum, ut poſt Capitolium, quo ſe venerabilis Roma in æternum attollit, nihil orbis terrarum ambitioſius cernat. Ammian. l. 22. c. xvi. p. 373. [l] Macrob. Saturn. l. i. cap. 20. p. 298, 299.
[m] In hâc Simulachrum Serapis ita erat poſitum, ut dextra unum parietem alterum læva perſtringeret. Quod monſtrum ex omnibus generibus metallorum lignorumque compoſitum ferebatur...De cujus origine diverſa fertur opinio Paganorum. Alii Jovem putant, cujus capiti modius ſuperpoſitus: vel quia cum menſura modoque cuncta indicet moderari, vel vitam mortalibus frugum largitate præberi. Alii virtutem Nili fluminis, cujus Ægyptus opibus et fœcunditate paſcatur. Quidam in honorem noſtri Joſeph formatum perhibent ſimulachrum, ob diviſionem frumenti, quâ famis tempore ſubvenit Ægyptius. Alii, &c. Rufin. ib. cap. 23.
[n] Baſilica quædam publici operis, vetuſta atque admodum neglecta fuit, quam Conſtantius imperator donaſſe epiſcopis perfidiam ſuam prædicantibus ferebatur. Quæ longâ incuriâ nihil validum præter parietes habebat. Viſum epiſcopo, qui per idem tempus gubernabat eccleſiam, hanc ab Imperatore depoſcere, ut creſcentibus fidelium populis, orationum quoque creſcerent loca. Rufin. c. 22.

'had

'had been a temple of [o] Bacchus: it was now much neglected
'and almoſt in ruins: it is ſaid to have been given by Conſtan-
'tius to ſome Arian biſhops. This building Theophilus, biſhop
'of Alexandria, begged of the emperor, with a deſign to erect
'a church there for the accommodation of Chriſtians, whoſe
'number had been greatly increaſed. In [p] clearing the rubbiſh,
'and opening the vaults under ground, were found ſome obſcene
'figures, which the biſhop, the more to diſparage the Gentile
'ſuperſtition, ordered to be brought forth and expoſed to pub-
'lic view; at which the Gentile people, and eſpecially the phi-
'loſophers, were greatly offended; and from angry and re-
'proachful words they proceeded to take up arms. The Chriſ-
'tians were then obliged to return blow for blow. They were
'the more numerous. Nevertheleſs few Gentiles were killed,
'of the Chriſtians a great number, and many were wounded:
'after which the Gentiles retreated to the temple of Serapis, as
'to a fortreſs, taking along with them, as captives, ſome Chriſ-
'tians, whom they compelled by various tortures to ſacrifice.
'The contention continued very ſharp for ſome while. At
'length the Gentiles choſe for their leader Olympius, who had
'taught philoſophy at Alexandria, and now told them that they
'ought [r] not to neglect the religion of their country, but be
'willing to die for it if needful. At that time Euagrius was
'præfect of Egypt, and Romanus general of the ſoldiery. They
'exhorted the Gentiles to be peaceable, and put them in mind
'of the laws, and [s] at length ſent to the emperor an account of
'what had happened. Who extolling the virtue, and envying
'the happineſs of thoſe who had died in defence of their reli-
'gion, conſidered them as martyrs, and would not allow that
'vengeance ſhould be taken of thoſe who had put them to death.
'However, he ſent orders that the temples at Alexandria ſhould
'be demoliſhed, putting the execution of thoſe orders into the
'hands of Theophilus, who was to be aſſiſted therein by the

[o] Sozom. p. 723. C.

[p] Τα δε τυ Σαραπιδος και των αλλων, γελωτος εδεικνυ μεγα, τυς φαλλυς φερεσθαι κελευσας δια μεσης της αγορας. Ταυτα υτω γεγομενα οφωντες οι κατα την Αλεξανδρειαν ελληνες, και μαλιστα οι φιλοσοφειν επαγγελλομενοι, την λυπην εκ πιεγκαν. Socrat. l. 5. c. 16. p. 274. D. Conf. Sozom. l. 7. c. xv. p. 723. D. [q] Verum hæc per dies ſingulos primo cum motu, deinde cum fiducia et deſperatione gerere, atque intra templum clauſi, rapto et præda vivere. Ad poſtremum graſſantes in ſanguine civium ducem ſceleris audaciæ ſuæ deligunt Olympium quendam, nomine, et habitu philoſophum, quo antefignano arcem defenderent, et tyrannidem tenerent. Rufin. [r] Sozom. p. 724. B.

[s] ....res geſta ad Imperatorem refertur. Ille qui ingenita mentis clementia errantes mallet emendare quam perdere, reſcribit, illorum quidem vindictam, quos ante aras ſanguis effuſus martyres effecit, non eſſe poſcendam, in quibus dolorem interitus ſuperaverit gloria meritorum. Rufin.

'præfect

'præfect Euagrius, and the count Romanus. When the em-
'peror's reſcript was received the Gentiles were filled with con-
'ſternation. They then abandoned the temple and diſperſed;
'ſome retiring privately to their own houſes, others withdrawing
'from the city, and either concealing themſelves in neighbour-
'ing places, or flying into diſtant countries. Olympius [t], de-
'ſerting his friends, withdrew ſecretly, taking the opportunity
'of a ſhip which was ſailing to Italy. Among [u] thoſe who re-
'tired from Alexandria, Socrates particularly mentions two
'grammarians, Helladius and Ammonius, under whom, ſays he,
'I ſtudied when very young at Conſtantinople. Helladius was
'prieſt of Jupiter, Ammonius of the Ape. He adds: "And
"Helladius was wont to boaſt in the company of ſuch with
"whom he could be free, that in the late contention he had ſlain
"nine men with his own hands."

'The tumultuous part of the Gentiles being withdrawn, [x]
'Theophilus, with the aſſiſtance of the people and the ſoldiery,
'ſoon accompliſhed his deſign. It was a prevailing opinion
'among the Gentiles, that if any man ſhould offer to touch the
'image of Serapis ſomewhat very extraordinary would happen.
'Nevertheleſs, one of the ſoldiers, whoſe faith,' as Rufinus ſays,
'was not at all inferior to his courage, with all his might ſtruck
'it on the cheek with a halbert, and cut off part of it. Imme-
'diately there aroſe a great cry of all ſorts of people, both
'Chriſtians and Gentiles: but neither did the heavens fall, nor
'the earth open itſelf to ſwallow up the bold tranſgreſſor: and
'repeating his blows, it was all broken to pieces. The ſeveral
'parts of it were then carried in triumph through the ſtreets of
'the city, and at length were thrown into a huge fire, kindled

[t] και λαθων παντας, εξεισε τω σεραπειω, και πλοιω τυχων, εις ιταλιαν ανηχθη. Soz. p. 725. A. [u] Πολλοι δε και εκ της Αλεξανδρειας εφυγον, κατα τας πολεις μεριζομενοι· ων ησαν οι δυο γραμματικοι, Ελλαδιος και Αμμωνιος, παρ' οις εγω κομιδη νεος ων εν τη Κωνσταντινω πολει εφοιτησα. Ελλαδιος μεν ιερευς τε Διος ειναι ελεγετο, Αμμωνιος δε Πιθηκε. κ.λ. Socrat. l. 5. c. 16. p. 275.

[x] Verum, ut dicere cœperam, reſcripto recitato, parati quidem erant noſtrorum populi ad ſubvertendum erroris auctorem. Perſuaſio tamen quædam ab ipſis Gentilibus fuerat diſperſa, quod ſi humana manus ſimulachrum illud contigiſſet, terra dehiſcens illico ſolveretur in chaos, cœlumque rueret in præceps. Quæ res paullulum ſtuporem quendam populis dabat. Cum ecce unus ex militibus, fide magis quam armis munitus, correptum libennem inſurgens omni niſu maxillæ veteratoris illidit. Clamor attollitur utrorumque populorum. Neque tamen aut cœlum aut terra deſcendit. Inde iterum atque iterum repetens putris ligni fumoſum genu cædit, quod ejecto, igni adhibito tam facile quam lignum aridum conflagravit. Poſt hoc revulſum cervicibus et depreſſo modio trahitur caput, tunc pedes aliaque membra cæſa ſecutibus, et rapta funibus detrahuntur, ac per ſingula loca membratim in conſpectu cultricis Alexandriæ ſenex veternoſus exuritur. Ad ultimum truncus qui ſuperfuerat in amphitheatro concrematur. Vanæque ſuperſtitionis et erroris antiqui Serapis hic finis fuit. Rufin. c. 23. Conf. Theodoret. l. 5. c. 22.

'for that purpose in the amphitheatre, and there consumed to 'ashes. At the same time the temple was demolished, and no- 'thing left but the foundation,' as [y] Eunapius says, 'which was 'too heavy to be removed. According [z] to Rufinus, instead of 'the temple of Serapis were erected on one side of it a church, 'and on the other side a martyrdom.

'The [a] whole city of Alexandria was full of busts and small 'images of Serapis, which were set up in niches or other places 'in every house: but they were now all destroyed without leav- 'ing any.'

Sophronius, [b] Jerom's friend, wrote a distinct account of the demolition of the temple of Serapis; but that work has not reached us. However, it may have been read by Rufinus, or some other of our ecclesiastical historians. Indeed Rufinus may be reckoned a contemporary; for which reason I have made the more use of him: though I have not thought it needful or safe to take every thing without examination.

The cubit by which the rising of the Nile in Ægypt was measured, had been usually lodged in the temple of Serapis. His statue and temple having been demolished, it was given out by the Gentile people, that the Nile would no longer overflow. Nevertheless it rose the following year to an uncommon height. Constantine [c] had before removed that cubit into a church of the Alexandrians; but by Julian's order it had been replaced in the temple of Serapis: now it was again restored to the Christians.

Theophilus, and other bishops, went on to destroy all the temples of the gods at Canopus, near one of the mouths of the Nile, a few leagues below Alexandria, and in all other cities throughout Ægypt. Says Socrates: 'the [d] temples were thus destroy- 'ed, but the images of the gods were melted down, and con- 'verted into utensils for the church of Alexandria, the emperor 'having given them for the benefit of the poor.' To this, very probably, Eunapius refers, when he says that 'the [e] Roman offi-

[y] Vit. Ædes. p. 64. [z] Nam et Serapis sepulchro profanis ædibus complanatis, ex uno latere martyrium, ex altero consurgit ecclesia. Rufin. cap. 27.

[a] Sed et illud apud Alexandriam gestum est, quod etiam thoraces Serapis, qui per singulos domos, in parietibus, in ingressibus, in postibus etiam, et fenestris erant, ita abscissi sunt omnes et abrasi, ut ne vestigium quidem usquam remaneret. Rufin. cap. 29. [b] Sophronius, vir apprime eruditus, laudes Bethlehem, adhuc puer, et nuper de subversione Serapis insignem librum composuit. Hieron. De V. I. c. 134.

[c] Vid. Socrat. H. E. l. 1. cap. 18. in.

[d] Τα μεν ουν ιερα κατεστρεφετο· τα δε αγαλματα των θεων μετεχωνευετο εις λεβητια και εις ετερας χρειας της Αλεξανδρεων εκκλησιας, του βασιλεως χαρισαμενου τους θεους εις δαπανηματα των πτωχων. Socrat. l. 5. c. 16. p. 275. C. [e] ...και ταξις ην αυτοις πολεμικη, το αφελομενον λαθειν... Vit. Ædes. p. 64.

'cers

'cers at Alexandria demoliſhed the temple of Serapis, and laid 'violent hands upon the images and ſacred offerings, no man 'daring to withſtand them. They not only obtained a complete 'victory, but got alſo a rich booty: having among them an or-'der, ſtrictly obſerved, to keep concealed whatever they gained 'by robbery.' Nor need it be doubted that there is ſome truth in what he ſays. He adds, 'And [f] *now monks* are placed at 'Canopus, who introduced the dried bones of men called mar-'tyrs, but really the worſt of criminals, to be there honoured as 'gods, and as miniſters and ambaſſadors to convey the prayers 'of Chriſtians to heaven.'

Socrates ſays that 'Theophilus [g] broke in pieces, or melted 'down all the images of the gods in Ægypt, except one only, 'which he preſerved, and had it ſet up in a public place, leſt, 'as he ſaid, the Gentiles ſhould hereafter deny that they had 'worſhipped ſuch gods. And I know,' ſays Socrates, 'that 'Ammonius, the grammarian, was much offended at this. He 'ſaid the religion of the Greeks had been horribly abuſed; and 'that one image only had been preſerved, with no other view 'than to expoſe them to ridicule.'

What image that was, does not, I think, clearly appear. But it is generally ſuppoſed to have been an image of the Ape: which Lucian [h] reckons among the gods worſhipped by the Ægyptians, or, as his expreſſion is, which were raiſed from Ægypt to hea-ven. And here Ammonius is ſaid by Socrates to have been a prieſt of the Ape.

II. We ſhould now take ſome farther notice of the learned heathens which have been mentioned in this hiſtory of the deſtruction of the temple of Serapis in Alexandria. One of theſe is Olympus, or Olympius; the other two are Ammonius and Helladius, to whom may be added Theophilus.

Socrates, [i] as we have ſeen, ſays, 'that when Theophilus, 'biſhop of Alexandria, expoſed ſome obſcene figures found in 'the heathen temples, the Gentiles, and eſpecially the philoſo-'phers, were greatly provoked, and could not bear it without

[f] Τυς δε μοναχυς τυτυς και εις Κανωβον καθιδρυσεν,....οστεα γαρ και κεφαλας των επι πολλοις αμαρτημασιν εαλωκοτων συναλιζοντες, ως το πολιτικον εκολαζε δικαστηριον. ....κ. λ. Ib. p. 65.

[g] Παντας μεν τυς θεους συντριψας ο Θεοφιλος, εν αγαλμα τυδε τυ θεου αχωνευτον τηρεισθαι κελευσας, δημοσια προεθηκεν, ινα, φησι, χρειαν προιοντος μη αρνησωνται οι ελληνες τοιυτυς προσκεκινηκεναι θεους. Επι τυτο παυ ανεωμενον οιδα Αμμωνιον τον γραμματικον, ος ελεγε δεινα πεποιθεναι την ελληνων θρησκειαν, ινα μη και ο εις ανδριας εχωνευθη, αλλ' επι γελωτι της ελληνων θρησκειας φυλαττηται. Socrat. p. 275. [h] Lucian. Deor. Conviv. p. 713. Tom. 2. Grav.

[i] Socrat. l. 5. cap. 16. p. 274. D. And ſee here, note [g].

'resentment.' By Rufinus[k] we are assured, that when the Gentiles took up arms against the Christians, and betook themselves to the temple of Serapis, as a citadel, they chose Olympius for their leader, who had the habit and character of a philosopher. Sozomen says that 'Olympius,[l] who was there with them, and 'wore the habit of a philosopher, told them, that they ought not 'to neglect the religion of their country, and that they ought to 'be willing to die for it if there was occasion; and when he saw 'them concerned for the destruction of the images, he exhorted 'them not to be discouraged, for they were made of corruptible 'materials, and were images only, and therefore were liable to 'be destroyed. But they were inhabited by certain powers 'which fled away to heaven. Thus,' says Sozomen, 'he harangued to the multitude of Greeks, which were with him at 'the temple of Serapis. Nevertheless, soon after the arrival of 'the emperor's rescript,' as the same Sozomen says, 'this zealous, 'and courageous philosopher, withdrew from the Serapeum pri'vately, and taking shipping, sailed away to Italy.' Olympius therefore was with the other Gentiles at the temple of Serapis, when they fought with the Christians; and he acted with them and animated them as a general, and as a heathen philosopher: after which he left Alexandria, and went by ship to Italy.

I see no reason to doubt the truth of any of these things, about which there is great agreement in our ecclesiastical historians. But there is somewhat more to be added concerning Olympius from an ancient heathen writer. It is an article in Suidas, supposed to be taken by him from Damascius; of which therefore I shall here give a literal version at length:

'Olympius,[m] brother of Generosa. He came from Cilicia to 'Alexandria to worship Serapis. He was in all respects an ad'mirable person, tall, and well made, of a beautiful and liberal 'countenance, affable, and agreeable to all in conversation, and 'of such wisdom as to be useful to all who were disposed to 'hearken to his counsels. Nor could any man be of so hard and 'inflexible a temper as not to be swayed by the words that pro'ceeded out of his mouth. Indeed the charms of his speech

[k] Ad postremum grassantes in sanguine civium ducem sceleris et audaciæ suæ deligunt Olympum quendam, nomine et habitu philosophum, quo antesignano arcem defenderent, et tyrannidem tenerent. Ruf. l. 20. 22.

[l] Επειτα δε και Ολυμπιος τις εν φιλοσοφου σχηματι συνων αυτοις, και πειθων χρηναι μη αμελειν των πατριων, αλλ' ει δεοι υπερ αυτων θνησκειν· καθαιρουμενων δε των ξοανων, αθυμουντας ορων, συνεβουλευε μη εξιστασθαι της θρησκειας, υλην φθαρτην και ινδαλματα λεγων ειναι τα αγαλματα, και δια τουτο αφανισμον υπομενειν· δυναμεις δε τινας ενοικησαι αυτοις, και εις ουρανον αποπτηναι. Και ν μεν, τοιαδε εισηγουμενος και πληθυν ελληνων εχων περι αυτον, εν τω σεραπειω διετριβεν. Sozom. l. 7. c. 15. p. 724, 725.

[m] Vide Suid.

'were

'were ſuch, that they might be juſtly reckoned rather divine 'than human. For all which reaſons he was appointed by the 'Alexandrians maſter of the ſacred rites, and at a time when 'the affairs of the ſtates were going down like a torrent. He 'therefore, as he had opportunity, inculcated to all the ancient 'legal inſtitutions, and the great happineſs which all who ob-'ſerved them exactly might expect from the Divine Being. 'Such was Olympius, who was full of god, inſomuch that he 'foretold to his friends that Serapis was about to forſake his 'temple: which alſo came to paſs.'

That article, as before ſaid, is ſuppoſed to be taken by Suidas from [n] Damaſcius. Indeed the name of Olympius does not appear in Photius's extracts from Damaſcius. Nevertheleſs a large part of this paragraph is there word for word: and Suidas might take this article from Damaſcius himſelf; which to me does not appear improbable. Valeſius thought that [o] this article in Suidas was taken from Eunapius; but the other account is more likely.

This earneſt and affectionate commendation of Olympius deſerves our notice. The Gentile people did all they could to uphold their religion. Their philoſophers, and other learned men, encouraged them by their example and exhortations; and the people reverenced their leaders. This character of Olympius appears to me much ſtudied, and highly finiſhed; I have tranſlated it as well as I can, but I refer alſo to the original Greek in Suidas; for I do not think I have done it juſtice in my tranſlation.

Beſide Olympius, we have ſeen in Socrates mention made of two other learned men, very zealous for their religion, both whilſt they were at Alexandria, and when they afterwards lived at Conſtantinople. At this laſt place Socrates, when young, ſtudied under them: whence it may be argued, that they alſo were young men when the temple of Serapis was deſtroyed at Alexandria in the year 391. He calls them grammarians; but they were alſo prieſts: Helladius was prieſt of Jupiter, Ammonius of Simias, or the Ape. We cannot forbear to obſerve that many heathens who were eminent for their learning, and upon other accounts, were alſo

[n] Totus hic articulus ex Damaſcio ſumptus eſt. Apud Photium enim in Excerptis ex Damaſcio pag. 1036, 1037. omnia iſta verba....vix ſyllaba vel vocula aliqua mutata leguntur. Unde facile conjicias, et reliqua, quæ Suidas hic habet, ex eodem Damaſcio excerpta eſſe. Kuſter. in loc. [o] Et Suidas in voce Ολυμπος. Ubi luculentum affert fragmentum de hoc Olympo ex Hiſtoria Romana Eunapii Sardiani, ut ex Stilo conjicere licet. Valeſ. ann. in Sozom. l. 5.

prieſts to their gods. Here we have two inſtances. The younger Pliny alſo, as we ſaw [p] formerly, was augur. It was a prieſthood upon which he ſet a great value. Arrian, who publiſhed the Diſcourſes of Epictetus, and was the author of many works, and a man of the firſt rank among the Romans, was [q] prieſt of Ceres and her daughter. All the Roman emperors, as I ſuppoſe, upon ſeating themſelves on the throne, took upon them the character of high prieſt, or pontifex maximus. Marcus Antoninus [r] was introduced by Adrian into the college of the prieſts called Salii, at the age of eight years; and Marcus made himſelf complete maſter of all the rules of that order, ſo as to be able to diſcharge himſelf all the functions of that prieſthood. And now, as may be ſuppoſed, he gained, in childhood, a deep tincture of ſuperſtition, which grew up with him, and was retained by him ever afterwards. And this early prieſthood may be added to the [s] other cauſes and reaſons of his diſaffection to Chriſtians and their principles. Olympius, as it ſeems, was not a prieſt: he was a philoſopher. But he had a great zeal for the Greek religion, as moſt of the philoſophers then had, and he was ſo ſkillful in the rites of it as to be qualified to be a teacher of them to others.

There is ſtill one perſon more to be taken notice of before we leave this ſtory. It is Theophilus, biſhop of Alexandria, who was a principal agent in the deſtruction of the temple of Serapis at Alexandria, and other temples all over Ægypt. He was a zealous and active man; but was blameable upon many accounts, as was obſerved [t] formerly. Cave, [u] who computes his epiſcopacy from the year 385 to 412, ſays, 'he ſtrenuouſly oppoſed the Gentile ſuperſtition, and not only deſtroyed the temples of idols to the foundation, but alſo expoſed the frauds of the prieſts, by which they had deceived the people.' As Tillemont ſays, 'he [x] ſhewed a great deal of zeal againſt idolatry, and in building churches and erecting monaſteries.' But he allows that upon divers occaſions he betrayed pride and ambition, and practiſed injuſtice. He [y] even admits the truth of the character of this biſhop, which is in Iſidore of Peluſium. Eunapius, as quoted above, accuſed ſome of making a rich booty, when the images of the gods were deſtroyed. Tillemont ſuppoſeth that [z] Theophilus himſelf was intended in that charge.

[p] See vol. vii, p. 332, 333. [q] p. 351, 352. [r] p. 396. [s] p. 407, 408.
[t] Vol. v. p. 10. [u] Hiſt. Lit. Tom. i. p. 279. [x] Theophile. art. vi. Tom. xi. p. 452. [y] Il ſeroit difficile, comme on a dit, de recuſer ſur cela S. Iſidore de Peluſe. l. i. ep. 152. Ibid. [z] Eunape l'accuſe d'avoir profité ſecrettement des richeſſes dont il depouilloit leurs temples. Ibid. art. vii. p. 457.

I add

I add no more, but I refer to Tillemont's ſixth and ſeventh articles in the hiſtory of Theophilus.

III. Other heathen temples were deſtroyed about this time. I ſhall recite here a ſtory or two from our eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians; and I ſhall recite them in their own words. If they betray credulity and ſuperſtition, yet I ſhall recite them fairly as they are; for it muſt be acknowledged that they have mixed error and falſehood together with the truth of the Chriſtian religion. It cannot be denied, and we and they muſt take the ſhame of it. The emperor Theodoſius, as Theodoret [a] ſays, reſolved to extirpate Gentiliſm, and gave orders for pulling down their temples. 'Marcellus, [b] an excellent man in all reſpects, was the firſt biſhop 'who undertook to deſtroy the temples of the place in which he 'preſided, truſting more to the help of God, than to any aſſiſtance 'from men. John, biſhop of Apaméa, formerly mentioned, 'was dead; this Marcellus had been ordained in his room, a 'man truly divine, and *fervent in ſpirit*, according to the direc-'tion of the apoſtle; (Rom. xii. 11.) There came to Apaméa 'the præfect of the Eaſt [Cynegius], having with him two tri-'bunes with the ſoldiers under their command. The people 'were quiet through fear of the ſoldiers. He endeavoured to 'deſtroy the temple of Jupiter, which was very large and mag-'nificent. But ſeeing that the ſtructure was very firm and ſolid, 'and that the ſtones were of extraordinary ſize, and cemented 'with lead and iron, he judged it impoſſible to remove them by 'any human power. Marcellus ſeeing the timidity of the præ-'fect, ſent him away to other cities. Himſelf made his ſuppli-'cation to the Deity for directions how to accompliſh his deſign. 'In the morning there came to him, of his own accord, a man 'who was neither a carpenter, nor a maſon, nor ſkilful in any 'employment, but only had been wont to carry wood and ſtones 'upon his ſhoulders. He aſſured Marcellus that he could 'eaſily pull down the temple if he would but allow him pay for 'two workmen, which was readily promiſed him. He then pro-'ceeded in this manner: the temple was built upon an eminence, 'ſurrounded by a portico on all the four ſides, with large pil-'lars reaching up to the top of the temple. The pillars were 'ſixteen feet in circumference, of a very firm ſtone, not eaſy to 'be pierced by the iron inſtruments of the maſon. The work-'men dug round each pillar, going from one to another, and 'laid wood of olives under them. In that manner he had un-

[a] Theodoret. l. v. cap. 21. p. 226,...228.

[b] Πρωτος μεντοι των αλλων αρχιερεων Μαρκελλος. κ. λ. p. 226. D.

'dermined three of the pillars, and then ſet fire to the wood. 'But [c] a black dæmon appeared and hindered the operation of 'the fire. This was done ſeveral times. Seeing then that they 'were not able to advance, they came to Marcellus when he was 'aſleep at reſt in the afternoon, and told him of it. Whereupon 'he went to the divine temple, and put water under the divine 'altar; and proſtrating himſelf with his face to the ground, he 'entreated the merciful Lord to reſtrain the influence of the 'dæmon, and at once to manifeſt his weakneſs, and his own 'power, leſt the unbelieving ſhould take occaſion to harden 'themſelves yet more and more. Having finiſhed his prayer, 'he ſigned the water with the ſign of the croſs, and gave it to 'his deacon Equitius, who was full of faith and zeal; and bade 'him go preſently and ſprinkle the place with the water, and 'then put fire to it, truſting in the power of God. Which being 'done, the dæmon, not enduring the force of the water, fled 'away. The fire then kindling the water, like oil, burnt with 'fierceneſs. The wooden props were preſently conſumed, and 'the three pillars by which they had been ſupported fell to the 'ground, and the other twelve pillars with them. The ſide of 'the temple which adjoined to them fell likewiſe. The ſound 'was heard throughout the whole city. When they heard how 'the dæmon had been put to flight, all the Chriſtians in the 'place lift up their voices in hymns to the God of the univerſe. 'That divine man deſtroyed all the other temples thereabout; 'and there are many other wonderful things that might be ſaid 'of him; for he wrote letters to the invincible martyrs, and 'received letters from them; at length he alſo obtained the 'crown of martyrdom. But I forbear to proceed any farther, 'that I may not be tedious to the readers.'

What has been omitted by Theodoret, we may find in [d] Sozomen, to whom therefore we now proceed. He ſays that, 'in 'many [e] places the Greeks defended their temples, and fought 'for them. This was the caſe of the people of Petra and Are-'opolis in Arabia; of Rapha and Gaza in Paleſtine; of Helio-'polis in Phœnicia, and particularly of the Syrians in Apaméa, 'near the river Axius; who, as I have been informed, did 'ſeveral times call in to their aſſiſtance the Galileans, and peo-'ple of other villages near mount Libanus. At length their 'audaciouſneſs proceeded ſo far as to kill Marcellus biſhop of

[c] .... δαιμων τις φαινομενος μελας, και κωλυων της φλογος την ενεργειαν. κ. λ. p. 227. D.
[d] Sozom. l. 7. cap. xv. p. 725, 726. [e] Εισετι δε κατα πολεις τινας προθυμως υπηρ-μαχοντο των ιδιων οι ελληνισαι. p. 725. B. C.

'the

'the place. For[f] perceiving that they were not otherwiſe to be 'brought off from their old way of worſhip, he was very intent 'upon deſtroying their temples in the cities and villages. And 'when he heard that there was a large temple in Aulonis, which 'was in the territory of the Apaméans, taking with him ſome 'ſoldiers and gladiators, he went thither: but when he came 'near, he ſtaid at a place out of the reach of darts; for he was 'lame in his feet, and was unable to fight; nor could he purſue 'or flee. When the ſoldiers and gladiators were employed in 'pulling down the temple, ſome of the Greeks underſtanding 'that he was alone, in a place quite out of the battle, they went 'thither; and coming upon him all on a ſudden, they laid hold 'of him, and threw him into the fire, where he died. For a 'while this was a ſecret. But afterwards, when the authors were 'known, the ſons of Marcellus were deſirous to have the death 'of their father avenged: but a ſynod of that country forbade it, 'ſaying, it was not fit that vengeance ſhould be taken for ſuch a 'death, for which they had cauſe to be thankful, both he that 'had died, and alſo his kindred and friends, as having been 'thought worthy to die for God.'

Theſe two ſtories are joined together by * Nicephorus, and told by him in connexion, placing them in the ſame order that I have done, firſt rehearſing the hiſtory in Theodoret, and then that from Sozomen.

And now upon theſe accounts we may make ſome remarks.

1. In the firſt place it muſt appear ſomewhat ſtrange to all, that ſo learned a man as Theodoret ſhould ſpeak of a dæmon of 'a black colour,' and aſcribe to him the interruption which Marcellus met with in accompliſhing his deſign. It is alſo very ſtrange that he ſhould aſcribe the downfal of the temple of Jupiter at Apaméa to a miraculous interpoſition. The demolition of that temple was effected by natural means, as well as the demolition of the other temple at Aulonis, mentioned by Sozomen. The workman who offered his ſervice to Marcellus was not an architect, but he had laboured under good architects. When he came to Marcellus, he aſſured him that he could eaſily overthrow the temple, if he would allow him pay for two helpers under him. And doubtleſs he ſo undermined the pillars and wall of the temple, that all fell to the ground, when he had ſet fire to the wooden props, which he had ſet up to ſupport them

[f] Λογισαμενος γαρ ως ουκ αλλως αυτοις ραδιον μετατεθηναι της προτερας θρησκειας, τους απο της πολιν και τας κωμας ναους κατεσκευαζετο. Πυθομενος δε μεγιστον ειναι ναον εν τω Αυλωνι, κλιμα δε τουτο της Απαμεων χωρας, στρατιωτας τινας και μονομαχους παραλαβων επι τουτο ηει. p. 725. C. D. * Niceph. l. 12. c. 17. p. 276....278.

for

for a while, that they might not fall till he and his under workmen were withdrawn.

2. The firſt of theſe temples, that at Apaméa, if not alſo the other, at Aulonis, was demoliſhed by Marcellus, before there were any imperial edicts for pulling down heathen temples.

This, I think, may be well argued from Theodoret's introduction to the ſtory told by him. For it was done ſoon after that the præfect of the Eaſt came to Apaméa, meaning Cynegius, as Valeſius alſo ſuppoſed. But Cynegius died in 388, when there were yet no orders from Theodoſius for pulling down of temples. By Zoſimus we are aſſured that [g] the commiſſion of Cynegius, who was now going to Egypt was only to forbid ſacrifices, and ſhut up the temples. Which is agreeable to the ſentiment of James Gothofred in his [h] notes upon the oration of Libanius for the temples.

3. The zeal of Marcellus is indeed very extraordinary, and I humbly conceive unjuſtifiable. He acted without imperial authority. And if he had ſuch authority, I cannot ſay that ſuch laws are equitable. I think that the biſhops ſhould neither have demoliſhed heathen temples themſelves, nor adviſed the emperor to ſhut them up and pull them down. Is it not an extraordinary thing, to ſee a biſhop of the Chriſtian rite leave the place of his reſidence, and go into the country with a troop of ſoldiers and * gladiators at his heels, to demoliſh a beautiful and magnificent edifice, which might in time be converted into a temple for the worſhip of the living God? Whether he acts upon his own private judgment only, or with imperial authority, it makes no great difference. The duty of Chriſtian miniſters is to *preach the word, to be inſtant in ſeaſon, and out of ſeaſon, to exhort with all long ſuffering and doctrine*; 2 Tim. iv. 2. And they ſhould have adviſed the Chriſtian emperors to tolerate and protect all peaceable ſubjects of every denomination: puniſhing all, and only thoſe who diſturbed the peace by a riotous behaviour. There can be no queſtion made, but in this way truth would have prevailed,

[g] Zoſ. l. 4. p. 762. The words of Zoſimus are tranſcribed above, at p. 49. note [z]. [h] Quo tempore etiam paſſim in oriente, et quidem in Syria, templa per Monachos, Epiſcopos, et Clericos, diruebantur, vel ut diruerentur, iidem agebant. Quales ſane hoc tempore exſtitere Joannes Chryſoſtomus, tum preſbyter Antiochenus, ab. A. D. 386 ad 398, ut vitæ eius ſcriptores edocent: item Marcellus Apamææ epiſcopus, de quo Theodoretus l. 5. cap. 21. cum nulla adhuc conſtitutio a Theodoſio M. de Templis occludendis diruendiſve promulgata fuiſſet, quod Libanius hac oratione exerte teſtatur. Gothofred. in Liban. Orat. p. 39, 40. See alſo Tillem. L'Emp. Theodoſ. art. 58. p. 672. in the notes.

* For μονομαχες, gladiators, I have had a mind to put μοναχες, monks. But it is the ſame reading both in Sozomen and Nicephorus. Otherwiſe I ſhould have choſen the latter out of reſpect to Marcellus; though either is bad enough.

vailed, and much more, and better than by the injurious proceedings of the biſhops and clergy of this time. I preſume that the apoſtle Paul had a true zeal for his lord and maſter Jeſus Chriſt, and that he knew, as well as any others, the beſt way of propagating his religion in the world: who ſays, *the ſervant of the Lord muſt not ſtrive,* [fight, μαχεσθαι] *but be gentle to all men, apt to teach, patient: in meekneſs inſtructing them that oppoſe themſelves, if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth;* 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25.

Finally, therefore, the ſynod of that country was much in the right to determine that the death of Marcellus ought not to be avenged. He had brought it upon himſelf by his violent proceedings againſt his neighbours, who indeed were erroneous, but nevertheleſs were quiet and peaceable, ſo far as appears, and therefore ſhould not have been diſturbed nor provoked.

Nor would the emperor Theodoſius, as we may remember, allow [i] them to be avenged, who had ſuffered death from heathen people, in their attempts to demoliſh the temple of Serapis at Alexandria.

Sect. VI. *A pretended Heathen Oracle foretelling the Period of the Chriſtian Religion.*

Auguſtine, in his work of the City of God, tells us that, 'ſome [a] Gentiles uneaſy at the long duration of the Chriſtian re-'ligion, publiſhed ſome Greek verſes, as received from an oracle 'which ſome perſon had conſulted, wherein it was declared that 'it ſhould ſubſiſt for three hundred and five and ſixty years, and 'then fall to the ground: where alſo Chriſt is repreſented as in-'nocent, and it is ſaid that Peter, by his magical arts, had brought 'it about that Chriſt ſhould be worſhipped ſo long.'

Upon this oracle Auguſtine makes divers obſervations. He alſo conſiders when the beginning of this period ſhould be dated: 'He [b] thinks not from the nativity of Jeſus, but from his reſur-'rection,

[i] See before, p. 160.

[a] Sed hæc quia evangelica ſententia eſt, mirum non eſt ea repreſſos fuiſſe deorum multorum falſorumque cultores, quo minus fingerent dæmonum reſponſis, quos tanquam deos colunt, definitum eſſe quanto tempore manſura eſſet religio Chriſtiana. Cum enim viderent, nec tot tantiſque perſecutionibus eam potuiſſe conſumi, ſed his potius mira incrementa ſumſiſſe, excogitaverunt neſcio quos verſus Græcos, tanquam conſulenti cuidam divino oraculo effuſos, ubi Chriſtum quidem ab hujus tanquam ſacrilegii crimine faciunt innocentem, Petrum autem maleficiis feciſſe ſubjungunt, ut coleretur Chriſti nomen per trecentos ſexaginta quinque annos, deinde completo memorato numero annorum ſine mora ſumeret finem. De Civ. Dei l. 18. cap. 53.

[b] Sed quoniam prius quam paſſus eſſet, et reſurrexit a mortuis, nondum fides omnibus fuerat definita,....melius in hac quæſtione ſolvenda inde initium ſumimus,

'rection, or the pouring out of the Holy Ghoſt upon the diſ-
'ciples, when the revelation of the goſpel was completed, and
'men were every where called upon to believe in Jeſus Chriſt
'crucified, and riſen from the dead. According to this com-
'putation, and in his way of reckoning, that period of three
'hundred and five and ſixty years, would expire in the conſul-
'ſhip of Honorius and Eutychianus, the year of Chriſt 398.
'And, in the next, in the conſulſhip of Manlius Theodorus,
'according to the oracle of dæmons, or the fiction of men, the
'Chriſtian religion would ceaſe to be any where. But in that
'very year, without inquiring what was done in other parts of
'the earth, he ſays the counts Gaudentius and Jovius, by order
'of the emperor Honorius, deſtroyed the temples, and broke the
'images of falſe gods in Carthage, the principal city of Africa.
'Since which time, now for the ſpace of almoſt thirty years, the
'Chriſtian religion has ſpread and flouriſhed, and many have
'been converted to the faith, ſeeing the evident falſehood of that
'pretended oracle on which they had for a while relied.'

We may hence ſee that the Gentiles did all they could to uphold their falling religion. But fictions, when detected and expoſed, in the end weaken the cauſe for the ſake of which they are contrived.

Sect. VII. *The Demolition of the Temple of Cœleſtis at Carthage in the year* 399.

The demolition of the temple of the goddeſs Cœleſtis at Carthage is alſo ſpoken of at the year 399 by ſeveral of our [a] eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians. The hiſtory of this event is taken from the book of Promiſes and Predictions, ſometimes aſcribed to Proſper

mus, præſertim quia tunc datus eſt Spiritus Sanctus....Ibi ergo exorſus eſt hujus nominis cultus, ut in Chriſtum Jeſum, qui cruciſixus fuerat, et reſurrexerat, crederetur....Ac per hoc colligitur etiam dies, ex quo annus ipſe ſumſit initium, ſcilicet quando miſſus eſt Spiritus Sanctus, id eſt, per Idus Maias. Numeratis proinde Conſulibus trecenti ſexaginta quinque anni reperiuntur impleti per eaſdem idus conſulatu Honorii et Eutychiani. Porro ſequenti anno, Conſule Manlio Theodoro, quando jam ſecundum illud oraculum dæmonum, aut figmentum hominum, nulla religio Chriſtiana, quid per alias terrarum partes forſitan factum ſit, non fuit neceſſe perquirere. Interim quid ſcimus in civitate notiſſima et eminentiſſima Carthagine Africæ Gaudentius et Jovius comites Imperatoris Honorii, quarto-decimo Kalendas Aprilis falſorum deorum templa everterunt, et ſimulachra fregerunt. Ex quo uſque ad hoc tempus per triginta ferme annos quis non videat, quantum creverit cultus nominis Chriſti, præſertim poſtea quam multi eorum Chriſtiani facti ſunt, qui tanquam vera illa divinatione revocabantur a fide, eamque completo eodem annorum numero inanem ridendamque viderunt? Id. ib. cap. liv. [a] Pagi 399. xi. xii. Baſnag. 399. viii. Tillem. Honoré, art. xiii.

of

of Aquitain, but not his, and probably written by [b] an African. This Cœleſtis is by ſome ſuppoſed to be the ſame as Aſtarte, the goddeſs of the Sidonians.

'At [c] Carthage in Africa,' ſays that writer, 'there was a magnificent temple of prodigious magnitude, encompaſſed alſo by 'temples of all the gods. The place was ſurrounded with beautiful walls, the ſtreets well paved with ſtones, and adorned with 'pillars; the whole in compaſs not much leſs that two miles. 'It having been ſhut up ſome while before, and after that neglected, was grown over with thorns and thiſtles. And when 'the Chriſtians propoſed to apply it to the uſes of their own religion, the Gentile people exclaimed againſt it, crying out, that 'there were dragons and aſps which guarded the temple, ſo 'that it would be dangerous to come near But the Chriſtians, inſtead of being terrified thereby, were the more animated 'with a deſire to clear the ground, and conſecrate the place to 'the truly heavenly king, their Lord. It was now time of 'Eaſter; and in the preſence of a great multitude of people, 'when that great prelate, and father of many prieſts, placed his 'chair in the ſeat of the goddeſs Cœleſtis, and took poſſeſſion of 'it, I myſelf,' ſays the writer, 'was there with my friends and 'companions; and rambling about with curious eyes, as young 'people are apt to do, we ſaw an inſcription in large braſs letters 'in the front of the temple: THE PONTIFF AURELIUS DEDICATED THIS TEMPLE. When we obſerved it, we could not 'but admire the diſpoſal of Providence, which had afforded a 'prophetical intimation of this event, and that this temple ſhould 'be now conſecrated by the prelate Aurelius:' meaning him who was then biſhop of Carthage.

This temple had been ſhut up for ſome while, ever ſince the

[b] See vol. v. p. 214.

[c] Apud Africam Carthagini Cœleſtis ineſſe ferebant templum nimis amplum, omnium deorum ſuorum ædibus vallatum. Cuius platea lithoſtrata, pavimento ac pretioſis columnis et mœnibus decorata, prope in duobus fere millibus paſſuum protendebatur. Cum diutius clauſum incuriâ, ſpinoſa virgulta circumſeptum obruerent, velletque populus Chriſtianus uſui veræ religionis vindicare, dracones, aſpideſque illic eſſe ob cuſtodiam templi, Gentilis populus clamitabat. Quo magis Chriſtiani fervore ſuccenſi, ea facilitate omnia amoverunt illæſi, quâ templum vero Cœleſti Regi ac Domino conſecrarent. Nam cum ſancta Paſchæ ſolennis ageretur feſtivitas, collecta illic et undique omni curioſitate etiam adveniens multitudo, Sacerdotum multorum pater, et dignæ memoriæ nominandus antiſtes Aurelius, cœleſtis jam patriæ civis, Cathedram illic loco Cœleſtis et habuit, et ſedit. Ipſe tunc aderam cum ſociis et amicis, atque, ut ſe adoleſcentium ætas impatiens circumquaque vertebat, dum curioſi ſingula quæque pro magnitudine inſpicimus, mirum quoddam et incredibile noſtro ſe ingeſſit aſpectui, titulus æneis grandioribuſque literis in frontiſpicio templi conſcriptus: AURELIUS PONTIFEX DEDICAVIT. Hunc legentes populi mirabantur, Præſago Spiritu acta, quæ præſcius Dei ordo certo iſto fine concluſerat. De Promiſſ. et Prædict. Dei. Part. 3. Cap. 38.

year

year 391, or thereabout, as is ſuppoſed, agreeable to ſome law of Theodoſius about that time for ſhutting up the Gentile temples.

The inſcription here referred to is ſuppoſed by learned men to have been upon a pedeſtal, over which was placed the image of the goddeſs Cœleſtis.

To the Invincible
Cœleſtis
Aurelius Oneſimus
Dedicates this Image.

INVICTÆ
COELESTI
AUR. ONESI
MUS: D. D.

SECT. VIII. *An Image of Hercules deſtroyed by the Chriſtians at Suffecta in Africa.*

About the ſame time * a temple of Hercules was attacked by the Chriſtians at Suffecta, a Roman colony, and the image of Hercules was deſtroyed; but the Gentiles reſiſted, and killed at leaſt ſixty Chriſtians. Upon this occaſion Auguſtine wrote a ſhort but ſevere letter to the magiſtrates and principal men of the colony. He tells them that, 'they [a] had loſt all regard for the 'Roman laws, and caſt off the fear and reverence due to the em- 'perors.' He tells them that 'for a ſum of money they could pur- 'chaſe for them another Hercules. There is no want of metal, 'or ſtone, or fine marble; and artificers may be had. Another 'Hercules may be procured as well turned and beautiful as the 'other; but they were not able to reſtore the ſouls of thoſe whom 'they had deſtroyed.'

So writes Auguſtine: he ridicules them handſomely; but I

[d] Vide Pagi 399. xii.

* Vide Pagi 399. xiii. Tillem. L'Emp. Honoré. art. xiv.

[a] Immanitatis veſtræ famoſiſſimum ſcelus, et inopinata crudelitas terram concutit, et percutit cœlum, ut in plateis ac delubris veſtris eluceat ſanguis, et reſonet homicidium. Apud vos Romanæ ſepultæ ſunt leges, judiciorum rectorum calcatus eſt terror. Imperatorum certe nulla veneratio, nec timor. Apud vos LX numero fratrum innocens effuſus eſt ſanguis, et ſi quis plures occidit, functus eſt laudibus, et in veſtram curiam tenuit principatum. Age nunc, principalem veniamus ad cauſſam. Si Herculem veſtrum dixeritis, porro reddemus. Adſunt metalla, ſaxa nec deſunt. Accedunt marmorum genera, ſuppetit artificum copia. Cæterum Deus veſter cum diligentia ſculpitur, tornatur, et ornatur. Addimus et rubricam, quæ pingit ruborem, quo poſſint veſtra ſacra ſonare. Nam ſi veſtrum Herculem dixeritis, collatis ſingulis numinis ab artifice veſtra emimus Deum. Reddite igitur animas, quas manus veſtra contorſit: et ſicuti a nobis veſter Hercules redhibetur, ſic etiam a vobis tantorum animæ reddantur. Aug. Ep. 50. al. 238.

ſee

ſee no threatenings of ſevere vengeance. However, he charges them ſtrongly with violation of the Roman laws, and diſreſpect to the authority of the emperors; and I ſuppoſe, leaves the puniſhment to the imperial officers.

SECT. IX. *A Diſturbance at Calama in Numidia in the year* 408.

The Gentile ſuperſtition, as [a] Pagi ſays, was deſtroyed gradually. Firſt of all ſacrifices were forbidden, then other rites, and laſtly, feaſts and other ſolemnities.

I ſhall therefore now take notice of a diſturbance that happened at Calama, a Roman colony in Numidia, as related by Auguſtine, and placed by ſome in the year [b] 408, by others in 409. It followed ſoon after a law enacted by Honorius in the year 407 or 408, in which the ſolemnities of the Gentiles are expreſsly prohibited.

The diſturbance is particularly related by Auguſtine in one of his letters: 'On [c] the firſt day of June, in contempt of laws 'lately enacted, the Pagans celebrated one of their ſacrilegious 'ſolemnities, without prohibition from any, paſſing through the 'ſtreets, and dancing before the church in an inſolent manner, 'not practiſed even in the times of Julian. And when ſome ec-'cleſiaſtics attempted to interrupt them, they threw ſtones againſt 'the church.'

'About eight days after, when the biſhop put the chief men 'of the city in mind of the laws, of which they were not before 'ignorant, and when they were going to take ſome care of the

[a] Ex his liquet, quibuſnam gradibus Gentilium ſuperſtitio peſſundata fuerit. Primo quidem ſacrificia tantum prohibita: mox et alii ritus gentilitii: tandem etiam et convivia ſolemnitateſque aliæ vetitæ. Pagi. ann. 399. num. ix.

[b] Vide Pagi. A. D. 399. xiv. Tillem. St. Auguſtin. art. 171.

[c] Contra recentiſſimas leges, Calendis Junii feſto Paganorum ſacrilego ſolemnitas agitata eſt, nemine prohibente, tam inſolente auſu, et quod nec Juliani temporibus factum eſt, petulantiſſima turba ſaltantium in eodem prorſus vico ante fores tranſiret eccleſiæ. Quam rem illicitiſſimam et indigniſſimam clericis prohibere tentantibus, eccleſia lapidata eſt. Deinde poſt dies ferme octo, cum leges notiſſimas epiſcopus ordini replicaſſet, et dum ea quæ juſſa ſunt, velut implere diſponunt, iterum eccleſia lapidata eſt. Poſtridie noſtris ad imponendum perditis metum quod videbatur apud Acta dicere volentibus publica jura negata ſunt. Eodemque ipſo die, ut vel divinitus terrerentur, grando lapidationibus reddita eſt: qua tranſacta continuo tertiam lapidationem, et poſtremo ignes eccleſiaſticis tectis et hominibus intulerunt: unum ſervum Dei, qui oberrans, occurrere potuit, occiderunt, cæteris partim ubi poterant latitantes, partim qua potuerant fugientes: cum interea contruſus atque coarctatus quodam loco ſe occultaret epiſcopus, ubi ſe ad mortem quærentium voces audiebat, ſibi increpantium, quod eo non invento gratis tantum perpetraſſent ſcelus. Geſta ſunt hæc ab hora fere decima uſque ad noctis partem non minimam. Nemo compeſcere, nemo ſubvenire tentavit illorum, quorum eſſe gravis poſſet auctoritas,....&c. Aug. Ep. 91. al. 202. § 8.

'affair,

'affair, as the laws directed, thoſe inſolent people again threw 'ſtones at the church. The next day the eccleſiaſtics, in order 'to reſtrain thoſe people by the dread of the laws, went to the 'magiſtrates, deſiring to enter a proceſs againſt them; but were 'refuſed. On the ſame day, as if the Divine Being had inter-'poſed to fill them with terror, there fell a heavy hail in return 'for their ſhower of ſtones. But as ſoon as it was over they 'began the third time to throw ſtones, and alſo ſet fire to ſome 'of the dwellings of the eccleſiaſtics: and they actually killed 'one ſervant of God [meaning, as I ſuppoſe, a monk], whom 'they met with, the reſt hiding themſelves where they could, or 'running away to be out of danger. The biſhop [Poſſidius, 'Auguſtine's friend] hid himſelf in a private place, where he 'heard the noiſe of thoſe who were ſearching for him with in-'tent to kill him, and ſaying among themſelves that they had 'yet done nothing till they could find him.' Auguſtine goes on, complaining, that the magiſtrates all this while were very negligent, though Chriſtians, as it ſeems.

Nectarius, a Pagan, native of Calama, and a man of diſtinction in the place, and now in years, hearing of this diſturbance, and apprehenſive of the conſequences, wrote a reſpectful letter to Auguſtine, earneſtly entreating for mercy. 'He acknow-'ledges [d] that the offence was great; but he hopes that the 'reſentment might be mitigated. He is pleaſed,' as he ſays, 'to think that he is writing to a man of ſo good underſtanding as 'Auguſtine: tells him, how becoming tenderneſs muſt be in the 'epiſcopal character. He reminds him that it is the place of his 'nativity, for which he juſtly has a great affection, and wiſhes 'to leave it when he dies in a flouriſhing condition. Damages, 'he ſays, may be repaired: other puniſhment might be forborne. 'Above all let not innocent men ſuffer with the guilty.'

To that letter Auguſtine preſently wrote an anſwer. It is the letter out of which the foregoing extracts have been made, as

[d] Sed quoniam creſcit in dies ſingulos dilectio et gratia civitatis, quantumque ætas fini proxima eſt, tantum incolumem ac florentem relinquere patriam cupimus. Idcirco gaudeo primum, quod apud inſtructum diſciplinis omnibus virum mihi hic eſt ſermo inſtitutus. In Calamenſi colonia multa ſunt, quæ merito diligamus, vel quod in ea geniti ſumus, vel quod eidem magna contuliſſe videmur officia. Hæc ergo, domine preſtantiſſime et merito ſuſcipiende, non levi populi ſui erratu prolapſa eſt. Quod quidem ſi juris publici rigore metiamur, debet plecti ſeveriori cenſura. Sed epiſcopum fas non eſt, niſi ſalutem hominibus impertire, et pro ſtatu meliore cauſſis adeſſe, et apud omnipotentem Deum veniam aliorum mereri delictis. Quamobrem quanta poſſum ſupplicatione depoſco, ut ſi defendenda res [non] eſt, innoxius defendatur, ab innocentibus moleſtia reparetur....De damnis facilis poteſt haberi taxatio, tantum ſupplicia deprecamur. Ad Auguſt. Nectarii Ep. 90. al. 201.

Auguſtine

Auguſtine there relates diſtinctly the behaviour of the people of Calama.

With regard to the petition of Nectarius, in favour of them, his anſwer is in general to this purpoſe: 'That [c] he and other 'biſhops are diſpoſed to ſhew all the gentleneſs which becomes 'Chriſtians. At the ſame time it was fit to inflict ſuch puniſh-'ment as might be ſufficient to deter others from following a 'bad example.'

That letter was afterwards anſwered by Nectarius, to which Auguſtine alſo made a reply. But I do not think it needful for me to make any more extracts, or to take any farther notice of thoſe letters now.

Sect. X. *The Overthrow of Rhadagaiſus, a Gothic Prince, in the year* 405.

In the year [a] 405 or 406, whilſt Alaric was ſtill in Italy, or hovering over it, there appeared another very formidable enemy againſt the Romans, a Gothic prince likewiſe, named Rhadagaiſus, or Rhodogaiſus, not a Chriſtian, as Alaric was, but a Pagan, and a Scythian, as he is ſometimes called, for his fierceneſs and barbarity.

I begin my accounts of this affair with Zoſimus, who writes to this purpoſe: 'Whilſt [b] Alaric was intent upon thoſe things, 'Rhadagaiſus came into Italy with a vaſt number of men, not 'leſs than four hundred thouſand, conſiſting of Gauls and Ger-'mans from the other ſide the Rhine and the Danube. At the 'very firſt tidings of which all were filled with great conſterna-'tion. When all the other cities, and Rome itſelf, were ſo ap-'prehenſive of the extreme danger they were in, that they almoſt 'deſpaired of ſafety; Stilicho taking with him all the forces 'which were at Ticinum in Liguria, to the number of about 'thirty thouſand, together with ſuch auxiliaries of the Alans and 'Huns as were at hand, without waiting for the approach of the 'enemy, ſuddenly croſſed the Arn: by [c] which means he came 'upon the barbarians before they were aware, and cut them all 'off with an univerſal deſtruction, excepting a very few, whom 'he afterwards incorporated with his own forces.'

[c] Nobis itaque cordi eſt, neque Chriſtianam amittere manſuetudinem, neque perniciоſum cæteris imitationis exemplum in illa civitate relinquere....Ep. 91. al 202. num. 6.

[a] Baron. A. D. 406. Baſnag. A. 405. n. iv. Tillem. L'Emp. Honoré, art. xxii. xxiii. A. 405.

[b] Zoſ. l. v. p. 803.

[c] Και τοις βαρβαροις απροσδοκητοις επιπεσων, απαν το πολεμιον παναλεθρια διεφθειρεν· ωστε μηδενα σχεδον εκ τουτων περισωθηναι, πλην ελαχιστους, οσους αυτος τη Ρωμαιων προσεθηκε συμμαχια. Ibid.

The ſame ſtory is in Olympiodorus, another Gentile hiſtorian. He does not mention the number of the men, but he ſays that [d] the Goths, who were with Rhodogaiſus, had twelve thouſand chiefs or generals.

Chriſtian hiſtorians have enlarged more in their accounts of Rhadagaiſus, and with good reaſon. 'Oroſius [e] who calls him a 'Goth, and a Scythian, ſpeaks of him as the moſt cruel and ter- 'rible enemy the Romans ever had. On a ſudden he overrun 'almoſt all Italy. He had in his army more than two hundred 'thouſand men. The Pagans at Rome, and every where, were 'very tumultuous. The city, they thought, could by no means 'withſtand ſuch an enemy, who had the aſſiſtance of the gods, to 'whom he ſacrificed every day. The city muſt ſoon fall into his 'hands. They had none to help them, now the gods and their 'rites were baniſhed. In ſhort, the Chriſtian religion, they ſaid, 'had quite ruined the ſtate, and brought them into this miſera- 'ble condition. Nevertheleſs this formidable enemy was over- 'come, and his numerous army deſtroyed. The victory was 'complete and eaſy, and almoſt miraculous. The city did af- 'terwards fall into the hands of another enemy: but he was a 'Chriſtian, and ſhewed mercy to Chriſtians, in which the 'Pagans alſo ſhared.'

[d] Οτι των μετα Ροδογαισου Γοτθων οι κεφαλιωται, Οπτιματοι εκαλειτο, εις δωδεκα συντεινοντες χιλιαδας. κ. λ. Ap. Phot. Cod. 80. p. 180.

[e] Rhadagaiſus omnium antiquorum præſentiumque hoſtium longe immaniſſimus, repentino impetu totam inundavit Italiam. Nam fuiſſe in populo ejus pluſquam ducenta millia Gothorum ferunt. Hic ſupra hanc incredibilem multitudinem indomitamque virtutem paganus et Scytha erat: qui, ut mos eſt barbaris hujuſmodi gentibus, omnem Romani generis ſanguinem diis ſuis propinare devoverat. Hoc igitur Romanis arcibus imminente, fit omnium Paganorum in Urbe concurſus: hoſtem adeſſe cum utique virium copia, tum maxime præſidio deorum potentem: urbem autem ideo deſtitutam et mature perituram, quia deos et ſacra perdiderit. Magnis querelis ubique agitur, et continuo de repetendis ſacris celebrandiſque tractatur. Fervent tota urbe blaſphemiæ, vulgo nomen Chriſti tanquam lues aliqua præſentium temporum opprobriis gravatur....Duo tunc Gothorum populi cum duobus potentiſſimis regibus ſuis per Romanas provincias bacchārentur: quorum unus Chriſtianus, propiorque Romano, et, (ut res docuit) timore Dei mitis in cæde, alius Paganus, barbarus, et vere Scytha....Sed non ſinit Deus rem potentiæ ſuæ, virtutem hominum et maxime hoſtium videri. Conterritum divinitus Rhadagaiſum in Fœſulanos montes cogit: ejuſque (ſecundum eos qui parciſſime referunt) ducenta millia hominum, inopum conſilii et cibi, in arido et aſpero montis jugo, urgente undique timore concludit....Parum hoc eſt, niſi captum et catenatum ac ſubjugatum ſciant, quem timuere Romani, illumque idololatram ſuum, cujus ſacrificia ſe magis pertimeſcere quam arma fingebant, ſine prælio victum ac vinctum ſub jugo cateniſque deſpiciant. Igitur rex Rhadagaiſus, ſolus ſpem fugæ ſumens, clam ſuos deſeruit atque in noſtros incidit, a quibus captus, ac pauliſper retentus, deinde interfectus eſt. Tanta vero multitudo captivorum Gothorum fuiſſe fertur, ut viliſſimarum pecudum modo, ſingulis aureis paſſim greges hominum venderentur. Sed nihil ſupereſſe Deus de eodem populo ſinit. Nam illico cunctis qui emebantur morientibus, quod improbi emtores eorum non impenderunt turpiter pretiis, expenderunt miſericorditer ſepulturis. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 37.

'Auguſtine

'Auguſtine [f] was at Carthage when Rhadagaiſus overrun 'Italy, and drew near to Rome with his numerous army. The 'Pagans made no doubt but Rhadagaiſus would overcome, who 'ſacrificed daily to the gods whom the Romans had now diſ-'carded, and ſo far from worſhipping them had forbidden under 'penalties the offering any ſacrifices to them.'

Undoubtedly the danger was imminent. And if thoſe barbarians and Pagans had beſieged and taken Rome, which they had already devoured in their thoughts, the ruin would have been great and terrible. 'But as Auguſtine obſerves, more than a 'hundred thouſand of thoſe Goths and barbarians were deſtroyed 'in one day, whilſt the Roman army ſuffered little or nothing. 'Rhadagaiſus fled: he and his ſons were put to death. And it 'manifeſtly appeared that the ſacrifices, on which the Pagans 'ſet ſo high a value, were not neceſſary for the ſafety of the city 'and empire.'

'Auguſtine ſays there were many, (meaning I ſuppoſe Pa-'gans) who were deſirous that this event, if poſſible, ſhould be 'forgotten and buried in oblivion: but he was of opinion that 'this deliverance which had lately happened, and was known 'to all, and which God had ſo very wonderfully and ſo very 'mercifully vouchſafed, ſhould be thankfully remembered.'

I ſhall now place below the account of this event, as given in the [g] Chronicle of Marcellinus.

[f] Quod tamen noſtra memoria recentiſſimo tempore Deus mirabiliter et miſericorditer fecerit, non cum gratiarum actione commemorant: Sed quantum in ipſis eſt, omnium, ſi fieri poteſt, hominum oblivione ſepelire conantur. Quod a nobis ſi tacebitur, ſimiliter erimus ingrati. Cum Rhadagaiſus rex Gothorum agmine ingenti et immani jam in Urbis vicinia conſtitutus, Romanis cervicibus immineret, uno die tanta celeritate ſic victus eſt, ut ne uno quidem non dicam exſtincto, ſed vulnerato Romanorum, multo amplius quam centum millium proſternerentur ejus exercitus, atque ipſe cum filiis mox captus pœna debita necaretur. Nam ſi ille tam impius cum tantis et tam impiis copiis Romam fuiſſet ingreſſus, cui pepercifſet? Quibus honorem locis Martyrum detuliſſet? In qua perſona Deum timeret? Cujus non ſanguinem fuſum, cujus pudicitiam vellet intactam? Quas autem iſti pro diis ſuis voces haberent quanta inſultatione jactarent, quod ille ideo viciſſet, ideo tanta potuiſſet, quia quotidianis ſacrificiis placabat, atque invitabat deos, quod Romanos facere Chriſtiana Religio non ſinebat? Nam propinquante jam illo his locis, ubi nutu ſummæ majeſtatis oppreſſus eſt, cum ejus fama ubique crebreſceret, nobis apud Carthaginem dicebatur, hoc credere, ſpargere, jactare Paganos, quod ille diis protegentibus et opitulantibus, quibus immolare quotidie ferebatur, vinci omnino non poſſet ab eis qui talia diis Romanis ſacra non facerent, nec fieri a quoquam permitterent....Ita verus Dominus, gubernatorque rerum, et Romanos cum miſericordia flagellavit, et tam incredibiliter victis ſupplicatoribus dæmonum, nec ſaluti rerum præſentium neceſſaria eſſe ſacrificia illa monſtravit. Aug. De Civ. Dei l. 5. cap. xxiii.

[g] Rhadagaiſus Paganus et Scytha cum ducentis millibus ſuorum totam Italiam inundavit. Huldin et Sarus Hunnorum Gothorumque reges Rhadagaiſum continuo devicerunt, ipſius capite amputato, captivos ejus ſingulis aureis diſtrahentes. Marcellin. Chr. p. 37. edit. Scalig.

And I beg leave to ſay that we have ſeen the teſtimonies of two heathen writers concerning it. They bear witneſs to the character, and the number of this Gothiſh prince and his army, and the ſuddenneſs and completeneſs of the victory obtained over him. Nor have the Chriſtians magnified beyond them. But the obſervations are their own; and it is referred to the reader to conſider whether they are not juſt.

Auguſtine has mentioned this event in another [h] place, in a ſermon to the people, where he tells the ſtory over again, and makes a good improvement of it.

SECT. XI. *Rome beſieged, taken, and ſacked by Alaric the Goth in the year* 410.

I muſt not entirely omit the hiſtory of Alaric; but I am deſirous to be as brief as poſſible, for which reaſon I ſhall mention principal things only, omitting the reſt.

His ſtory may be ſeen in [a] Olympiodorus, and [b] Zoſimus, and [c] Claudian, heathen writers, as well as in divers Chriſtian [d] hiſtorians.

Alaric was a Goth, and therefore called a barbarian. But he was a man of a great and a generous mind, and a Chriſtian of the Arian denomination. He had ſerved as a general under Theodoſius among the barbarians, who had joined themſelves to him in the expedition againſt Eugenius and Arbogaſtes in the year 394. But not being well uſed afterwards as he thought, he became an enemy to the Romans, and after waſting Greece, and Theſſaly, and Macedonia, and committing many acts of hoſtility, he came into that part of Italy which is called Liguria, where [e] was fought in the year 402 or 403, the difficult battle of Pollentia, now Pollenza, and where Stilicho was conqueror. After which it has been thought that with [f] good management Alaric

[h] Serm. 105. cap. x. Tom. v. Bened.
[a] Ap. Phot. cod. 80. p. 178. &c.
[b] Zoſ. l. 5. p. 783. &c.
[c] Claud. Carm. 26. de Bello Getico. et Carm. 24. De Sexto Conſulatu Honorii.
[d] Socrat. l. 7. cap. x. p. 346. Soz. l. 9. cap. vi. vii. viii. Philoſtorg. l. 12. p. 532. &c. Vid. et Oroſ. et Auguſtin.

[e] O celebranda mihi cunctis Pollentia ſeclis!
O meritum nomen felicibus apta triumphis!
Virtutis fatale ſolum, memorabile buſtum
Barbariæ!
Claudian. Carm. 26. de Bello Get. p. 635....638.

[f] Taceo de Alarico rege cum Gothis ſuis ſæpe victo, ſæpe concluſo, ſemperque dimiſſo. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 37. in. Quamobrem Alaricum, cunctamque Gothorum gentem pro pace optima et quibuſcumque ſedibus ſuppliciter ac ſimpliciter

Alaric might have been quite ſubdued, [g] or reconciled, upon reaſonable terms; and might have been ever after a firm and uſeful friend and ally of the Roman empire.

But however that may be, we find that in the beginning of the year 408, Alaric made an attempt upon Rome itſelf, as we were informed by [h] Zoſimus ſome while ago; when the ſenate agreed to pay Alaric the ſum of four thouſand pounds in gold, though it was not approved of by all. In the ſame year, in the month of Auguſt, Stilicho was put to death: and before the end of the year Alaric came before Rome, and beſieged it again, ſome of the ſtipulated conditions, as is ſuppoſed, not having been performed. At which time, as we were alſo told before by [i] Zoſimus, the city being reduced to great ſtraits, they agreed to pay Alaric five thouſand pounds of gold and thirty thouſand pounds of ſilver, four thouſand ſilk garments, three thouſand ſkins of purple dye, and three thouſand pounds of pepper. But theſe, or ſome other conditions of peace, not having been duly performed, Alaric came before Rome again the ſecond or the third time, and beſieged it, and took it in the month of Auguſt, in the year 410, as is ſuppoſed. This calamity, however, was attended with ſome favourable circumſtances, owing to the generoſity of Alaric, and his profeſſion as a Chriſtian. For, as Oroſius [k] ſays, when he gave his ſoldiers leave to plunder and make a prey of the city, he commanded them to ſpare the lives of men as much as poſſible. He likewiſe gave ſtrict orders that no injury ſhould be done to thoſe who fled to Chriſtian churches, and eſpecially to the churches of the apoſtles Peter and Paul; which were particularly mentioned by him becauſe they were the largeſt, (ſo likewiſe ſays [l] Auguſtine;) which orders were

pliciter orantem, occulto fœdere fovens, publice autem et belli et pacis copia negata, ad terendam terrendamque Rempublicam reſervavit. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 38. ſub init.

[g] Vide Baſnag. ann. 403. num. ii.

[h] Above, at p. 55...57

[i] .... at p. 57, 58.

[k] Adeſt Alaricus, trepidam Romam obſidet, turbat, irrumpit. Dato tamen præcepto, [prius] ut ſi qui in ſancta loca, præcipueque in ſanctorum Apoſtolorum Petri et Pauli baſilicas confugiſſent, hos in primis inviolatos ſecuroſque ſinerent. Tum deinde, in quantum poſſent prædæ inhiantes, a ſanguine temperarent. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 39. in.

[l] Teſtantur hoc Martyrum loca, et baſilicæ Apoſtolorum, quæ in iſta vaſtatione Urbis ad ſe convenientes ſuos et alienos receperunt....Sic evaſerunt multi, qui nunc Chriſtianis temporibus detrahunt, et mala quæ illa civitas pertulit, Chriſto imputant. Aug. De Civ. Dei. l. 1. cap. 1.

Quicquid ergo Vaſtationis, trucidationis, deprædationis, concremationis, afflictionis, in iſta recentiſſima Romana clade commiſſum eſt, fecit hoc conſuetudo bellorum. Quod autem more novo factum eſt, quod inuſitata rerum facie immanitas barbara tam mitis apparuit, ut ampliſſimæ baſilicæ implendæ populi cui parceretur, eligerentur et decernerentur, ubi nemo feriretur, unde nemo raperetur, quo liberandi multi a miſerantibus hoſtibus abducerentur,....hoc Chriſti nomini, hoc Chriſtiano tempori tribuendum, quiſquis non videt, cæcus: quiſquis videt, nec laudat, ingratus: quiſquis laudanti reluctatur, inſanus eſt. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. i. cap. vii.

obſerved by the ſoldiery. And hereby the lives of ſome Pagans alſo were preſerved: for all who fled to thoſe privileged places were ſafe. So writes Oroſius and Auguſtine, who were contemporaries.

It was indeed a great calamity. But, as Oroſius ſays, Alaric of his own accord, left the city after three [m] days. And, as he thinks, Rome had ſuffered as much before ſeveral times, particularly when the city was invaded by the Gauls, and when it was ſet on fire by the emperor Nero. Auguſtine ſays the ſame. Marcellinus, in his Chronicle, ſays that [n] Alaric left Rome on the ſixth day after he had taken it

When Alaric left Rome he ravaged Campania, and other places of Italy, going toward Sicily, and thence intending, as is ſuppoſed, to invade Africa. Philoſtorgius ſays that [o] Alaric died in Campania. But Olympiodorus ſays he went as far as [p] Rhegium: which is more probable. However, they both agree in ſaying that Alaric died by [q] diſtemper.

This event was reckoned very opprobrious to the Roman name. And many reflections were caſt upon the Chriſtians by the Gentiles, who imputed this diſaſter to the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion, and the neglect of the ancient rites, in the uſe of which the Roman empire had long flouriſhed. Thoſe reflections were the occaſion [r] of Auguſtine's writing his work of the City of God. They were alſo the occaſion [s] of Oroſius's writing his ſeven books of Hiſtory againſt the Pagans; often called his [t] Hormiſta, or Mundi Chronicon. Of which word, to mention it now by the bye, I never ſaw a good account, though ſome good critics have attempted it. I have long been of opinion that Hor-

[m] Tertia die barbari, quam ingreſſi fuerant Urbem, ſponte diſcedunt, facto quidem aliquantarum ædium incendio, ſed ne tanto quidem, quantum ſeptingentesimo conditionis ejus anno, caſus effecerat. Nam ſi exhibitam Neronis Imperatoris ſui ſpectaculis inflammationem recenſeam, proculdubio nulla comparatione æquiparabitur ſecundum id, quod excitaverat laſcivia principis, hoc quod nunc intulerat ira victoris. Neque vero Gallorum meminiſſe in hujuſmodi collatione debeo &c. Oroſ. l. 7. cap. 39. p. 575.

[n] Alaricus trepidam urbem Romam invaſit, partemque ejus cremavit incendio, ſextoque die quam ingreſſus fuerat depræda urbe egreſſus eſt. Marcell. Chr. p. 38.

[o] .... Αλαριχος τα κατα καμπανιαν ελητζετο, κα'κει νοσω φθειρεται. Philoſt. p. 534. B.

[p] Ap. Phot. p. 181. ſub fin.

[q] .... ὁτι Αλαριχᾳ νοσω τελευτησαντι κ. λ. Ap. Phot. p. 180.

[r] Interea Roma Gothorum irruptione, agentium ſub rege Alarico, atque impetu magnæ cladis everſa eſt, cujus everſionem deorum falſorum multorumque cultores, quos uſitato nomine Paganos vocamus, in Chriſtianam religionem referre conantes, ſolito acerbius et amarius Deum verum blaſphemare cœperunt. Unde ego exardeſcens zelo domus Dei, adverſus eorum blaſphemias, vel errores, libros De civitate Dei ſcribere inſtitui. Aug. Retract. l. 2. cap. 13.

[s] Adverſus Paganos Hiſtoriarum libri ſeptem. Vid. ibid. lib. i. in Proœm.

[t] Hormiſtam, id eſt, mundi Chronicon. Vide Teſtimonia de Oroſio, apud Havercamp. et alibi.

miſta

miſta is a corruption of theſe two words, Orbis Geſta, a very proper title for Oroſius's work.

But though the taking of Rome by Alaric was the occaſion of many reflections upon the Chriſtians; and thoſe two learned authors did thereupon very reaſonably undertake a vindication of Chriſtianity; I ſuppoſe this event was very prejudicial to the intereſts of Gentiliſm, and conſequently conducive to the progreſs of the Chriſtian religion.

Sect. XII. *The Correſpondence between Auguſtine and Voluſian, in the year* 412.

I now intend to give an account of the correſpondence between Auguſtine and Voluſian in the year 412.

It is ſuppoſed, though I do not perceive it to be certain, that [a] he was uncle to the younger Melania by the mother's ſide. Who or what his father was I do not find. His mother was a pious Chriſtian woman, who was deſirous of her ſons converſion to Chriſtianity; but I do not ſee her name any where.

The name Voluſian muſt have been common among the Romans. Rufinus Voluſianus [b] was ordinary conſul in the year 311 and 314. There [c] were in the ſame fourth century ſeveral eminent men of this name, and in ſome of the higheſt offices of the empire. This Voluſian was a man of great diſtinction. It has been ſuppoſed that Rutilius [d] in his poem mentions him as proconſul of Africa; which is not certain; however it is allowed that [e] he was præfect of Rome in the year 421.

I ſuppoſe Voluſian to have been now at Carthage. Auguſtine's letter to him is to this purpoſe: 'He [f] aſſures him that he 'ſincerely wiſheth him proſperity in this world, and that he 'ſhould

[a] Benedictin. Not. ad Auguſtin. ep. 132. [b] Vide Pagi ann. 314. num. 1.
[c] Vid. Gothofred. Proſop. p. 391, 392.

[d] . . . . . .
Rexerat ante puer populos pro Conſule Pœnos.
Æqualis Tyriis terror, amorque fuit.
Rutil. ver. 167. &c.

[e] Gothofred. ibid.

[f] De ſalute tua, quam et in hoc ſeculo, et in Chriſto eſſe cupio, ſanctæ matris tuæ votis ſum fortaſſe etiam ipſe non impar. Unde meritis tuis reddens ſalutationis obſequium, hortor ut valeo, ut literarum vere certeque ſanctarum ſtudio & curam non pigeat impendere....Præcipue Apoſtolorum linguas exhortor ut legas. Ex his enim ad cognoſcendos Prophetas excitaberis, quorum teſtimoniis utuntur Apoſtoli. Si quid autem vel cum legis, vel cum cogitas, tibi oritur quæſtionis, in quo diſſolvendo videar neceſſarius, ſcribe ut reſcribam. Magis enim hoc forte Domino adjuvante potero, quam præſens

'ſhould be glad to ſee him a Chriſtian, agreeably to the wiſhes 'of his pious mother, at whoſe requeſt he writes to him. He 'earneſtly recommends to him the ſtudy of the ſacred ſcriptures, 'and eſpecially the epiſtles of Chriſt's apoſtles, who often quote 'the writings of the ancient prophets; and thereby he will be 'led to the underſtanding of them alſo. If any doubts and dif-'ficulties ariſe in his mind, he might ſend them to him in 'writing, and he would anſwer them as he is able. He thinks 'that to be preferable to converſing together, which may not 'ſuit the many engagements of either of them; and it may be 'difficult to find a ſeaſon when both ſhall be at leiſure.' Which may be ſuppoſed to imply that Volufian had now ſome important poſt in the government; but what it was cannot be ſaid.

Volufian in his anſwer to that letter treats Auguſtine very reſpectfully, and ſays, 'he [8] ſhall be very willing to commit him-'ſelf to his inſtructions: for no man ought to think himſelf too 'old to learn; and he thanks him for the favour of allowing him

'to

præſens talia loqui tecum, non ſolum propter occupationes varias et meas et tuas, (quoniam non cum mihi vacat, occurrit ut et tibi vacet) verum etiam propter eorum irruentem præſentiam, qui plerumque non apti tali negotio, magiſque linguæ certaminibus, quam ſcientiæ luminibus delectantur....Aug. Ep. 132. al.

[8] Petis me, vir probitatis juſtitiæque documentum, ut aliqua ex ambiguis lectionis peritæ diſcenda perconter. Amplector gratiam muneris imperati, meque libenter in diſciplinas tuas offero, veteris ſententiæ auctoritatem ſecutus, quæ nullam ad perdiſcendum abundare credit ætatem....Domine ſancte, ac merito venerabilis pater, eſt operæ pretium cognoſcere habitam inter nos proxime confabulationem. Quibuſdam amicorum conventibus aderamus. Frequentes proferebantur illic pro ingeniis ſtudiiſque ſententiæ. Erat tamen ſermo rhetorica partitio. Apud agnoſcentem loquor. Nam etiam iſta paullo ante docuiſti....Alii rurſus poëticam elevabant faventes. Ne hanc quidem eloquentiæ partem tacitam aut inhonoram relinquis!....Tunc ad familiarem tuam philoſophiam ſermo deflectit, quam ipſe Ariſtotelico more tanquam Iſocraticam fovere conſueveras. Quærebamus et quid egerit præceptor ex Lyceo: quid Academiæ multiplex et continuata cunctatio: quid ille diſputator ex porticu: quid Phyſicorum peritia: quid Epicureorum voluptas: quid inter omnes infinita diſputandi libido, tuncque magis ignorata veritas, poſtquam præſumptum eſt quod poſſit agnoſci.

Dum in his confabulatio noſtra remoratur, unus e multis, Et quis, inquit eſt ſapientia ad perfectum Chriſtianitatis imbutus, qui ambigua in quibus hæreo poſſit aperire, dubioſque aſſenſus meos vera vel veriſimili credulitate firmare! Stupemus tacentes. Tunc in hæc ſponte prorumpit: Miror, utrum mundi Dominus et rector intemeratæ feminæ corpus impleverit, pertulerit decem menſium longa illa faſtidia mater, & tamen virgo enixa ſit ſollemnitate pariendi, et poſt hæc virginitas intacta permanſerit. His et alia ſubnectit: Intra corpuſculum vagientis infantiæ latet, cui par vix putatur univerſitas, patitur puerilitatis annos, adoleſcit, juventute ſolidatur: tam diu a ſedibus ſuis abeſt ille regnator, atque ad unum corpuſculum totius mundi cura transfertur. Deinde in ſomnos reſolvitur, cibo alitur, omnes mortalium ſentit affectus. Nec ullis competentibus ſignis tantæ majeſtatis indicia clareſcunt, quoniam larvalis illa purgatio, debilium curæ, reddita vita defunctis: hæc, ſi et alios cogites Deo parva ſunt. Intervenimus ulterius inquirenti, ſoluto-que conventu, ad potioris peritiæ merita diſtulimus, ne dum incautius ſecreta temerantur, in culpam deflecteret error innocuus. Accepiſti, vir totius gloriæ capax, imperitiæ confeſſionem: quid a partibus veſtris deſideretur, agnoſcis. Intereſt famæ tuæ, ut quæſita noverimus. Utcumque abſque detrimento cultus divini

'to communicate his doubts to him. He then tells him, that in 'the conversations of some friends the discourses had run upon 'various topics and questions, according to the different tempers 'and studies of the persons present, relating to rhetoric, poetry, 'philosophy, and the various opinions of the several philoso-'phers and their followers, with all which you are well acquaint-'ed. At length one of the company, and he no mean person, 'but one among many, rose up, and said: "Who is there here "who is well acquainted with the Christian doctrine, and able to "solve my doubts, and give me reasonable satisfaction upon "them." At which we were all suprized, and quite silent for a 'while. After which he went on and said; "I cannot conceive "that the lord and governor of the world should be lodged in "the body of a virgin, and lie there ten months, and then be "brought forth without prejudice to the virginity of his mother." 'To which he added divers other things, saying, "it was very "strange that he should lie hid in the body of an infant, whom "the whole universe cannot contain. Then he grows up, and "passeth through childhood and youth to manhood. And all "this while the governor of the world is absent from his throne, "and concerned for one small body. Moreover, he sleeps, is "nourished by food, and endures all the sensations of other mor-"tals. Nor are there any sufficient indications of his greatness. "For dispossessing dæmons, healing sick people, and raising dead "men to life, are small matters to be performed by the Deity." 'Here we interrupted him, and put a stop to his objections, and 'broke up the company, thinking it better to refer the inquiries 'to a more competent judge, and fearing lest venerable mys-'teries should be violated, and error, once innocent, should de-'generate into presumption. You see, honoured Sir, a con-'fession of ignorance; and you may discern what is expected 'from you, and suitable to your great reputation. Ignorance 'may be tolerated in other bishops without detriment to reli-'gion: but when we come to the prelate Augustine, we con-'clude that what he does not know is no part of the Christian 'law. May the supreme Deity ever preserve you in safety!'

We must hence conclude that Volusian was a man of great ingenuity and learning. And whatever may be thought of his objections, it must be acknowledged that the letter is polite. And, when Marcellinus, in a letter to be presently taken notice of,

vini in aliis sacerdotibus toleratur insciti, at cum ad antistitem Augustinum venitur, legi deest quidquid contigerit ignorari. Incolumem venerationem tuam divinitas summa tueatur, Domine vere sancte ac merito venerabilis pater. Augustin. Ep. 135. al. 2.

calls

calls him 'the illuſtrious Voluſian,' he may be ſuppoſed to have a reſpect to his mental qualifications as a gentleman and ſcholar, as well as to his high birth and honourable ſtation in the world. And indeed he tells Auguſtine that [h] he believes he was ſenſible Voluſian's letter was well written.

We are therefore now, in the next place, to take notice of that letter to Auguſtine written by Marcellinus, a man of great eminence, who had been the emperor's commiſſioner * at the conference of the catholics and Donatiſts at Carthage in the year 411; a zealous Chriſtian, whoſe excellent character may be ſeen in ** Auguſtine's letters, and † elſewhere.

He begins with telling Auguſtine that 'Voluſian [i] had ſhewed 'to him, and to others, the letter which he had received from 'him. Marcellinus expreſſeth great ſatisfaction in Auguſtine's 'letter, and in his readineſs to become an inſtructor to Voluſian. 'He alſo tells Auguſtine that, at the requeſt of his mother, he 'had often viſited Voluſian, and had been viſited by him. He 'did his beſt to ſolve his doubts. But he requeſts the farther 'and better aſſiſtance of Auguſtine; intimating, that there were 'many who were willing enough to cheriſh his difficulties, and 'deſirous to keep him ſtill with them. And he tells Auguſtine 'that Voluſian would have ſaid more, if he had not been afraid 'to be troubleſome by prolixity. The doctrine of the Lord's 'incarnation, upon which Voluſian had touched in his letter, was 'indeed a ſubject of common diſcourſe, and was much diſliked, 'and cenſured by many. Auguſtine therefore would do well to 'clear

[h] Sed tamen ſatis, ſicut ipſe probare dignaberis, culto accuratoque ſermone, et Romanæ eloquentiæ nitore perſpicuo, aliqua ſibi exſolvi impendio poſtulavit. Marcellin. ep. 136.

* Vid. Breviculum Collationis cum Donatiſtis, primæ diei, ſub in. ap. Auguſtin. Tom. ix. ** Auguſtin. Ep. 151. al. 259. § 8. Tom. 2. † Vid. Hieron. lib. 3. adv. Pelagian. T. 4. p. 546.

[i] Vir illuſtris Voluſianus beatitudinis tuæ mihi literas legit, immo me cogente pluribus legit, quæ ſcilicet omnia quæ a te dicuntur, cum vere miranda ſint, uſquequaque miratus ſum....Hinc enim plurimum placuit, quod hominis greſſus aliquanto titubantes boni propoſiti exhortatione ſtatuere et firmare contendis. Eſt enim nobis cum eodem quotidiana pro viribus noſtris, et pro ingenii paupertate diſputatio. Sanctæ quidem matris ejus precatione compulſus cura mihi eſt eum frequentius ſalutandi gratia convenire, licet vicem in hac parte reddere etiam ipſe dignetur. Accepta autem venerabilitatis tuæ epiſtola, homo qui a veri Dei ſtabilitate, multorum quorum in hac urbe copia eſt, perſuaſione revocatur, ita motus eſt, ut ſi, quantum ipſe confirmat, literarum prolixitatem minime formidaſſet, omne beatitudini tuæ quod habere poteſt inſinuaſſet ambiguum.....Quæ quidem quæſtio uſquequaque detrita eſt, et eorum ſuper hac parte ſatis nota calliditas, qui diſpenſationem dominicæ incarnationis infamant. Sed tamen etiam ego in hac parte, quia plurimis quicquid reſcripſeris profuturum eſſe confido, precator acceſſerim, ut ad ea vigilantius reſpondere digneris, in quibus nihil amplius Dominum quam alii homines facere potuerunt, geſſiſſe mentiuntur. Apollonium ſiquidem ſuum nobis, et Apuleium, alioſque magicæ artis homines in medium proferunt, quorum majora contendunt extitiſſe miracula.

Ipſe

'clear it up. But there were also other things very proper for 'his consideration; for there were many who falsely asserted that 'our Saviour had done no more than other men; and he earnestly 'desires that this may be carefully considered by Augustine, 'and that he will fully answer that difficulty. For they are con- 'tinually talking of their Apollonius and Apuleius, and other 'magicians, whose miracles, they say, were greater than our Sa- 'viour's. But supposing him to receive satisfaction upon the 'doctrine of the incarnation, there are still other difficulties of 'which the same illustrious person desires to see some solution. 'For, as he says, the God of the New Testament is supposed to 'be the God also of the Old Testament. But how could the same 'God reject the old sacrifices, and institute a new way of worship. 'For nothing that has been once rightly done can be afterwards 'altered. Beside, that this would shew inconstancy, which is alto- 'gether unworthy of the Deity. Then he said that the doctrine 'of the New Testament was inconsistent with good order among 'men, and the welfare of society. For, as is generally said, these 'are precepts of the Christian law, *Recompense to no man evil for 'evil:* (Rom. xii. 17.) *and whosoever shall smite thee on one cheek 'turn to him the other also: and if any man will take away thy cloak 'let him have thy coat also, and whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile 'go with him two*; (Matt. v. 39....41:) all which are inconsistent 'with the public welfare. For who can bear to be robbed by an 'enemy? and who is there that must not be willing to oppose, 'by force of arms, an invader of the Roman territories? and 'more to the like purpose, which your reverence can easily ap- 'prehend. Insomuch, that as he intimated, though he was shy 'of

Ipse autem vir illustris, superius memoratus, multa esse dixit præsentibus aliquantis, quæ huic possent jungi non immerito quæstioni, si, ut ante dixi, non ab ejus partibus epistolaris considerata brevitas fuisset. Quæ tamen licet scribere noluerit, tacere non est passus. Dicebat enim, quod etsi hodie incarnationis dominicæ ratio redderetur, reddi vix ad liquidum possit, cur hic Deus, qui et Veteris Testamenti Deus esse firmatur, spretis veteribus sacrificiis delectatus est novis. Nihil enim corrigi posse asserebat, nisi quod ante factum non recte probaretur, vel quod semel recte factum sit, immutari nullatenus debuisse. Recte enim facta dicebat mutari nisi injuste non posse: maxime quia ista varietas inconstantiæ Deum possit arguere. Tum deinde, quod ejus prædicatio atque doctrina reipublicæ moribus nulla ex parte conveniat: utpote, sicut a multis dicitur, cujus hoc constet præceptum, ut nulli malum pro malo reddere debeamus, et percutienti aliam præbere maxillam, et pallium dare persistenti tunicam tollere, et cum eo qui nos angiare voluerit, ire debere spatio itineris duplicato. Quæ omnia reipublicæ moribus asserit esse contraria. Nam quis tolli sibi ab hoste aliquid partiatur, vel Romanæ provinciæ deprædatori non velit belli jure reponere? et cætera quæ dici ad reliqua posse intelligit venerabilitas tua. Hæc ergo omnia, ipsi posse adjungi æstimat quæstioni, in tantum ut per Christianos Principes, Christianam religionem maxima ex parte servantes, tanta (etiamsi ipse de hac parte taceat) reipublicæ mala evenisse manifestum sit.

Unde, sicut beatitudo tua mecum dignatur

'of enlarging, it was manifeſt that great damage had accrued 'to the ſtate by means of Chriſtian princes, who in the main 'governed according to the Chriſtian religion.'

'To all theſe things, as your reverence will readily acknow-'ledge with me, a clear and full anſwer is wanting; and the 'rather becauſe what you ſhall write will come into many hands. 'Conſidering alſo, that at the time of thoſe diſcourſes there was 'preſent a perſon of great diſtinction and a poſſeſſor of a large 'eſtate in the country of Hippo, who indeed beſtowed com-'mendations upon your reverence, but it was in the way of irony: 'and ſaid that whenever theſe things had been talked of he 'never received ſatisfaction concerning them. I muſt there-'fore put you in mind of your promiſe, to conſider all theſe 'things, and compoſe ſome treatiſe upon them, which, I am 'perſuaded, may be of ſignal advantage to the church of Chriſt, 'eſpecially at this time.'

I have tranſcribed theſe letters largely. I preſume my readers will make proper obſervations. We ſee here what was then the ſtate of things at Carthage. Chriſtianity was the prevailing religion: but there were alſo many Gentiles. The merits of the Chriſtian doctrine were debated. The men of learning and eminence among the Gentiles had their doubts and difficulties which they openly propoſed. Nor were they unknown to men of lower rank; the vulgar alſo argued upon them in their way. And though many were greatly prejudiced againſt the Chriſtian religion, ſome were open to conviction. They propoſed their difficulties with a view of obtaining ſatisfaction. Such an one was the illuſtrious Voluſian. This liberty of debate appears highly agreeable. Nor could a Chriſtian biſhop better employ his time than in ſolving thoſe difficulties, and clearing them up to the ſatisfaction of inquirers of all ſorts. For this Auguſtine was as well qualified as any man of his time; and in this ſervice he laboured with great diligence, as his large work Of the City of God, and other writings, teſtify. And if this freedom of debate had ſtill continued and been openly allowed and encouraged, and the arguments for Chriſtianity had been propoſed with mildneſs, it would have been honourable to the Chriſtian reli-

natur agnoſcere, ad hæc omnia (quoniam multorum manibus ſine dubio tradetur ſanctitatis tuæ deſiderata reſponſio) plenus debet et elucubratus ſolutionis ſplendor oſtendi: maxime quia cum iſta gererentur, eximius Hipponenſis regionis poſſeſſor et dominus præſens aderat, qui et ſanctitatem tuam ſub ironiæ adulatione laudaret, et ſibi, cum de his quæreret, minime ſatisfactum eſſe contenderet. Ego vero ad hæc omnia promiſſionis non immemor ſed exactor, libros confici deprecor, Eccleſiæ, hoc maxime tempore, incredibiliter profuturos. Ap. Aug. ep. 136.

gion,

gion, and it's farther progress would have been more advanced than by any external force and violence whatever.

Those letters just mentioned were the occasion of two more from Augustine: one to Volusian, in which he considers the difficulties proposed by him: another to Marcellinus, in which he answers those other objections which had been mentioned by him.

In that to Volusian he begins with his objections relating to the incarnation, and tells him: 'The [k] Christian doctrine does 'not teach that God was so united to a body born of a virgin 'as to neglect the care and government of the universe, and 'contract his concern to that body only....When [l] we say that the 'word of God, by whom all things were made, took upon him 'a body born of a virgin, and appeared therein to men, we do 'not suppose that he lost his immortality, or changed his eter-'nity, or lessened his power, or deserted the government of the 'world, or that he left the bosom of the father, in which he al-'ways is.'

'He [m] was refreshed by sleep, and nourished by food, and 'had the other innocent infirmities of the human nature, by 'which it appeared that he was really a man: that is indeed the 'truth. But some among us whom we call heretics, from a 'mistaken regard to his honour, and the more to extol his 'power, as they think, refuse to acknowledge this: and, by de-'nying his humanity, subvert the mercy of God by which we

[k] Veniendum potius est ad rem quam requiris. Ubi primum te scire volo, non hoc habere Christianam doctrinam, quod ita sit Deus infusus carni, qua ex virgine nasceretur, ut curam gubernandæ universitatis vel deseruerit vel amiserit, vel ad illud corpusculum quasi contractam materiam collectamque transtulerit. Ad Volusian. ep 137. al. 3. num. 4.

[l] Et putamus nobis de omnipotentia Dei incredibile dici aliquid, cum dicitur Verbum Dei, per quod omnia facta sunt, sic assumsisse corpus ex virgine, et sensibus apparuisse mortalibus, ut immortalitatem suam non corruperit, ut æternitatem non mutaverit, ut potestatem suam non minuerit, ut administrationem mundi non deseruerit, ut a sinu Patris, id est, a secreto, quo cum illo et in illo est, non recesseret. Ibid. num. 6.

[m] Jam illud, quod in somnos solvitur, et cibo alitur, et omnes humanos sentit affectus, hominem persuadet hominibus, quem non consumsit utique, sed assumsit. Ecce sic factum est, et tamen quidem hæretici, perverse mirando laudandoque ejus virtutem, naturam humanam in eo prorsus agnoscere noluerunt, ubi est omnis gratiæ commendatio, quâ salvos facit credentes in se, profundos thesauros sapientiæ et scientiæ continens, et fide mentes induens, quas ad æternam contemplationem veritatis incommutabilis provehat. Quid si Omnipotens hominem ubicumque formatum non ex materno utero exarat, sed repentinum inferret aspectibus? Quid si nullas ex parvulo in juventam mutaret ætates, nullos cibos, nullos caperet somnos: nonne opinionem confirmaret erroris, nec hominem verum suscepisse, ullo modo crederetur. Et dum omnia mirabiliter facit, auferret quod misericorditer fecit? Nunc vero ita inter Deum et homines Mediator apparuit, ut in unitate personæ copulans utramque naturam, et solita sublimaret insolitis, et insolita solitis temperaret. Ibid. num. 9.

'are

'are ſaved. If the Almighty ſhould create a man, not formed 'of a woman, but ſuddenly brought into the world and ſet be- 'fore us: ſuppoſing him not to paſs through the ſeveral ſtages 'of childhood and youth, never to eat nor ſleep, would it not 'be reckoned that he was not really a man? this would be won- 'derful. But the mercy of God would not be ſo apparent as 'now it is. For in this way, being really a man, and the divi- 'nity being united to him, he is fitly qualified to be the media- 'tor between God and men.'

But [n] it is farther objected that, 'there were not ſufficient 'evidences of his greatneſs. For diſpoſſeſſing dæmons, healing 'ſick people, and raiſing men to life, which ſome others have 'done, are only ſmall matters to be performed by the Deity.' 'Well,' ſays Auguſtine, 'we alſo acknowledge that the pro- 'phets did ſuch things: And what can be a greater miracle 'than raiſing the dead? This was done by Elijah, and alſo by 'Eliſha....Farther, Moſes and the prophets, who were men of 'great truth, propheſied of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and aſcribed 'great glory to him, and ſpoke of him not only as equal to 'themſelves, and ſuperior to them, in the ſame power of work- 'ing miracles, but as the Lord and God of all, and made man 'for the ſake of men. And he did the ſame miracles they had 'done. But there were ſome other things peculiar to him, his 'nativity of a virgin, his reſurrection from the dead, and aſcen- 'ſion to heaven; he who can think all this a ſmall matter to be 'performed by the Deity I know not what farther can be ex- 'pected.'

'But [o] ſome perhaps may demand other things which 'ought

[n] 'Sed, nulla, inquiunt, competentibus 'ſignis claruerunt tantæ majeſtatis in- 'dicia: quia larvalis illa purgatio, debili- 'um curæ, reddita vita defunctis, ſi et alii 'conſiderentur, Deo parva ſunt.' Fate- mur quidem et nos talia quædam feciſſe Prophetas. Nam in tuis ſignis quid ex- cellentius, quam mortuos reſurrexiſſe? Fecit hoc Elias, fecit hoc etiam Eliſæus.... Sed et ipſe Moyſes, et cæteri Prophetæ vera- ciſſimi Dominum Chriſtum prophetave- runt, et gloriam magnam ei dederunt, hunc non tanquam parem ſibi, nec in eadem miraculorum potentia ſuperiorem, ſed plane Dominum Deum omnium et homi- nem propter homines factum venturum prænuntiaverunt. Qui propterea et ipſe talia facere voluit, ne eſſe abſurdum, quæ per illos fecerat, ſi ipſe non faceret. Sed tamen et aliquid proprium facere debuit; naſci de virgine, a mortuis reſurgere, in cœlum adſcendere. Hoc Deo qui parum putat, quid plus exſpectet, ignoro. Ibid. § 13.

[o] Arbitror enim talia flagitari, qualia gerens hominem facere non debuit. Nam in principio erat Verbum, et Ver- bum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Ver- bum, et omnia per ipſum facta ſunt. Num homine aſſumpto, alium mundum facere debuit, ut eum eſſe crederemus, per quem factus eſt mundus? Sed nec major mun- dus, nec iſti æqualis in hoc mundo fieri poſſet. Si autem minorem faceret infra iſtum, ſimiliter hoc quoque parum puta- retur. Quia ergo non oportebat, ut no- vum faceret mundum, nova fecit in mun- do. Homo enim de virgine procreatus, et a mortuis in æternam vitam reſuſcita- tus, potentius fortaſſe opus eſt quam mundus. Hic forte reſpondent ſe fac- tum

'ought not to be done. They may urge that another world 'might be created by him: which indeed is a great absurdity. 'But though it was not fit that a new world should be made by 'him, he did new things in this world already made. He was 'born of a virgin, and raised from the dead to eternal life, and 'is exalted above the heavens, which may be reckoned more 'than making a world. Here perhaps they will say this we do 'not believe. What then shall be done to men who despise 'little things and will not believe greater? They believe that 'dead men have been raised to life, because others have done it, 'and it is a small matter to be done by God. But that a man 'has been made of a virgin, and raised from the dead to eternal 'life above the heavens, they will not believe, because no other 'has done the like, and it is worthy of God....I entreat you be 'not like to such men.'

'I[p] have answered the difficulties in your letter, and yet must 'proceed; for, permit me to say, who can forbear his assent to 'truths so attested by a perpetual order and connexion of things 'from the beginning of time: former events confirming the 'present, and later events confirming those which are past and 'old? By the divine wisdom one man is chosen from among the 'Chaldeans, a man of steady virtue and piety to whom the pro-'mises of God are delivered, which were to be fulfilled in a long 'succession of ages yet to come, and in whom all the nations of

tum hoc esse non credere. Quid ergo fiat hominibus, qui minima contemnunt, majora non credunt? Reddita vita defunctis, ideo creditur, quia fecerunt alii, et parum est Deo. Caro propria de virgine creata, et a morte in æternam vitam super cœlos levata, ideo non creditur, quia nemo fecit, et competit Deo....Noli eis esse similis, obsecro te. Ibid. § 14.

[p] Disputantur hæc latius, et omnes quæstionum necessariarum sinus perscrutati discussique panduntur....quem non moveat ad credendum tantus ab initio ipse rerum gestarum ordo, et ipsa connexio temporum, præteritis fidem de præsentibus faciens, priora posterioribus et recentioribus antiqua confirmans? Eligitur unus ex gente Chaldæorum, pietate fidelissima præditus, cui promissa divina post tantam seculorum seriem novissimis temporibus complenda prodantur, atque in ejus semine omnes gentes habituræ benedictionem prænuntiantur. Hic unum Deum verum colens universitatis creatorem, gignit filium senex, de conjuge, quam ipse pariendi penitus destitutam sterilitas ætasque jam fecerat. Propagatur ex illo numerosissimus populus, multiplicatus in Ægypto, quo illam stirpem ex orientalibus partibus, promissis effectisque crebrescens dispositio divina transmiserat. Educitur ex Ægypti servitute gens valida, horrendis signis atque miraculis, pulsisque impiis gentibus in terram promissionis perducta et constituta, regno etiam sublimatur. Deinde prævalescente peccato, sacrilegis ausibus Deum verum, qui eis tanta beneficia contulerat, sæpissime ostendens, variisque flagellata cladibus, et prosperitatibus consolata, usque ad Christi incarnationem declarationemque perducitur. Quem Christum, Dei Verbum, Dei Filium, Deum in carne venturum, moriturum, resurrecturum, in cœlum ascensurum, præpollentissimo suo nomine, in omnibus gentibus dicatos sibi populos habiturum: inque illo remissionem peccatorum, salutemque æternam futuram esse credentibus, omnia gentis illius promissa, omnes prophetiæ, sacerdotia, sacrificia, templum et cuncta omnino sacramenta sonuerunt, num. 15.

'the

'the earth were to be bleſſed. This perſon, a worſhipper of the 'one true God, the creator of the univerſe, when old begat a 'ſon born of his wife, who alſo had been long barren, and was 'now in years, and without hopes of bearing children. From 'him proceeds a numerous people, which is greatly multiplied 'in Ægypt, even under grievous oppreſſion. From that ſtate 'of ſervitude they are delivered, and by manifold ſigns and 'wonders they are brought into the promiſed land, and eſta-'bliſhed there, the impious inhabitants being driven out of it, 'and they are made a kingdom. After that, tranſgreſſions pre-'vailing among them and God being offended, they ſuffer many 'calamities, and having humbled themſelves they are delivered, 'and after a great variety of events they are upheld to the coming 'of Chriſt.

'Well,[q] in due time Chriſt came, and in his birth, his life, 'his words, his works, his ſufferings, his death, reſurrection and 'aſcenſion, all the predictions of the prophets are fulfilled. 'He ſends down the Holy Spirit, and fills the faithful met toge-'ther in one houſe, expecting the promiſed gift. Being filled 'with the Holy Spirit, they on a ſudden ſpeak in the languages 'of all nations, boldly confute error, preach the ſaving truth, 'exhort to repentance of all paſt offences, and aſſure of for-'giveneſs through the divine favour. Signs and miracles ac-'company the preaching of this doctrine of true religion and 'virtue. Great oppoſition is raiſed againſt them. They endure 'the evils that had been foretold, they truſt in the promiſes that 'had been made, and they continue to teach the precepts which

'had

[q] Venit et Chriſtus, complentur in ejus ortu, vita, dictis, factis, paſſionibus, morte, reſurrectione, adſcenſione, omnia præconia Prophetarum. Mittit Spiritum Sanctum, implet fideles una in domo congregatos, et hoc ipſum promiſſum orando atque deſiderando exſpectantes. Impleti autem Spiritu ſancto, loquuntur repente linguis omnium gentium, arguunt fidenter errores, prædicant ſaluberrimam veritatem, exhortantur ad pœnitentiam præteritæ culpabilis vitæ, indulgentiam de divina gratia pollicentur. Prædicationem pietatis veræque religionis ſigna congruentia et miracula conſequuntur. Excitatur adverſus eos ſæva infidelitas, tolerant prædicta, ſperant promiſſa, docent præcepta. Numero exigui per mundum diſſeminantur, populos facilitate mirabili convertunt, inter inimicos augentur, perſecutionibus creſcunt, per afflictionum anguſtias uſque in terrarum extrema dilatantur. Ex imperitiſſimis, ex abjectiſſimis, ex pauciſſimis illuminantur, nobilitantur, multiplicantur, præclariſſima ingenia, cultiſſima eloquia: mirabileſque peritias acutorum, facundorum atque doctorum ſubjugant Chriſto, et ad prædicandum viam pietatis ſalutiſque convertunt....Atque inter hæc omnia contra Eccleſiam Chriſti impiarum gentium infidelitas fremit. Evincit illa patiendo, et inconcuſſam fidem inter obſiſtentium ſævitiam profitendo. Revelatæ veritatis, quæ diu promiſſis myſticis velabatur, ſacrificio ſuccedente, illa ſacrificia, quibus hoc figurabatur, templi ipſius everſione tolluntur. Reproba per infidelitatem gens ipſa Judæorum a ſedibus exſtirpata, per mundum uſquequaque diſpergitur, ut ubique portet codices ſanctos, ac ſic prophetiæ teſtimonium, qua Chriſtus et Eccleſia prænunciata eſt, nè ad tempus a nobis fictum exiſtimaretur,

ab

'had been delivered to them. Being few in number they are 'dispersed over the whole world, and with amazing success they 'convert the people, are multiplied among enemies, increase 'by persecutions, and, under the pressures of afflictions, they are 'spread to the utmost ends of the earth. By the most unskilful, 'by the most contemptible, by a very few, the greatest wits and 'the most learned men are enlightened, ennobled, multiplied: 'men of the greatest abilities, and the most celebrated for learn-'ing and eloquence, are subdued, and brought under the disci-'pline of Christ, and induced to preach the way of piety and 'salvation to others....Still the church endures the persecutions 'of infidel people. But she overcomes by suffering, and by 'professing the uncorrupted truth amidst the unrelenting cruelty 'of opposers. The truth having been revealed which had 'been concealed under prophetic mysteries, those sacrifices by 'which it had been prefigured have ceased, the temple itself 'being destroyed where they were to be offered. And the Jewish 'nation, which has been cast off for their unbelief, and removed 'from their own country, are dispersed all over the world, that 'they might carry every where the volumes of the sacred scrip-'tures; and so the testimony of prophecy, in which Christ and 'the church are foretold, being produced by our adversaries, 'there might not be any the least suspicion that they had been 'forged by us to serve a purpose. And in them their unbelief 'also is foretold. The temples and images of dæmons, and 'their sacrilegious rites are gradually, and one after another, 'overturned agreeably to the predictions of the prophets. He-'resies contrary to the name of Christ, but under his name, 'spring up as they have been foretold. All these things, as we 'read them foretold we see fulfilled, and by all these so many 'and so great things already come to pass, the expectation of 'what is still to come is confirmed. What mind desirous of 'immortality, and convinced of the shortness of the present life, 'can resist the light and evidence of this divine authority!

'Indeed [r] I must say that in the Christian doctrine is every 'thing

ab ipsis adversariis proferatur: ubi etiam ipsos prædictum est non fuisse credituros. Templa et simulachra dæmonum, ritusque sacrilegi paullatim atque alternatim secundum prædicta prophetica subvertuntur. Hæreses adversus nomen Christi, sub velamento tamen nominis Christi ad exercendam doctrinam sanctæ religionis, sicut prænuntiatæ sunt, pullulant. Hæc omnia sicut leguntur prædicta, ita cernuntur impleta, atque ex his jam tot et tantis quæ restant, exspectantur implenda. Quæ tandem mens avida æternitatis, vitæque præsentis brevitate, permota, contra hujus divinæ auctoritatis lumen cultumque contendat? num. 16.

[r] Quæ disputationes, quæ literæ quorum libet philosophorum, quæ leges quarum libet civitatum, duobus præceptis, ex quibus Christus dicit totam Legem prophetasque

'thing valuable, and in the higheſt perfection. What diſ-
'courſes, what writings of any philoſophers, what laws of any
'republics have any rules comparable to thoſe two precepts, on
'which Chriſt ſays, depend all the law and the prophets, *Thou*
'*ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul,*
'*and with all thy mind; and thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf!*
'Here alſo the welfare of the public is conſulted. For a city
'cannot be founded and eſtabliſhed but by the ground and
'bond of faith, and by concord: when the common good is
'choſen, the chiefeſt and trueſt of which is God; and in him
'men love ſincerely themſelves and one another, and for his
'ſake, to whom alone it is known in what manner they love.

'The[s] ſtyle of the ſcripture is ſuch as is ſuited to all ſorts of
'perſons, and to the things delivered. Bad tempers are cor-
'rected, weak minds are cheriſhed, and the greateſt wits are en-
'tertained. He only can be an enemy to this teaching, who
'knows not what is wholeſome, or, in his ſickneſs, loaths the
'proper medicine.'

'Auguſtine[t] then concludes his letter to Valuſian in a moſt
'affectionate manner, ſaluting him and his pious mother, and
'ſending to him ſalutations from Poſſidius, who was then with
'him; and encouraging Voluſian, if he pleaſed, to write again,
'and ſend him all his objections, if any difficulties yet re-
'mained.'

It has been obſerved, that[u] this letter is a kind of abridgment of Auguſtine's large work of the City of God. Indeed I think it to be an excellent letter, and a good argument for the truth of the Chriſtian religion. I perſuade myſelf that many of my

prophetaſque pendere, ullo modo ſint comparandæ, 'Diliges Dominum Deum 'tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota ani-'ma tua, et ex tota mente tua: et diliges 'proximum tuum tanquam teipſum!' Hic phyſica, quoniam omnes omnium naturarum cauſſæ in Deo creatore ſunt. Hic ethica, quoniam 'Vita Bona et Ho-'neſta' non aliunde formatur, quam cum ea quæ diligenda ſunt, quemadmodum diligenda ſunt, diliguntur, hoc eſt Deus et proximus. Hic etiam laudabilis rei publicæ ſalus. Neque enim conditur et cuſtoditur optime civitas, niſi fundamento et vinculo fidei, firmæque concordiæ: cum bonum commune diligitur, quod ſummum ac veriſſimum eſt Deus, atque in illo invicem ſinceriſſime ſe diligunt homines, cum propter illum ſe diligunt, cui, quo animo diligant occultare non poſſunt. Ib. § 17.

[s] Modus autem ipſe dicendi, quo ſancta Scriptura contexitur, quam omnibus acceſſibilis, quamvis pauciſſimis penetrabilis....His ſalubriter et prava corriguntur, et parva nutriuntur, et magna oblectantur ingenia. Ille huic doctrinæ inimicus eſt animus, qui vel errando eam neſcit eſſe ſaluberrimam, vel odit ægrotando medicinam. num. 18.

[t] Incolumem feliciorem[que] miſericordiſſima Dei omnipotentia tueatur, Domine illuſtris et merito inſignis, ac præſtantiſſime fili. Sanctam et in Chriſto dignitſſime honorandam matrem, cujus pro te Deus preces exaudiat, pro meritis veſtris officiociſſime ſaluto. Sanctus frater et coepiſcopus meus Poſſidius præſtantiam veſtram multum ſalutat. num. 20.

[u] See Tillemont. St. Auguſtin. art. 224. num. T. 13. p. 594.

readers

readers will be of the ſame opinion, and will attend to it, and receive ſatisfaction from it. For certain we have now ſeen the genuine difficulties and objections of heathen people at that time, and Auguſtine's ſolutions and anſwers to them.

What [x] was the reſult of this correſpondence is not known: all that can be ſaid is, that if Voluſian was uncle to Melania, he was not converted to the Chriſtian faith till near the time of his death, in the year 436.

There follows, as before [y] intimated, a letter of Auguſtine to Marcellinus, [z] in which the other difficulties mentioned by Marcellinus are particularly conſidered, and well anſwered. But I am willing to ſuppoſe that my readers are themſelves well able to ſolve thoſe difficulties. I therefore need not tranſcribe nor abridge that letter, but only refer the more curious to it. Moreover the objections of that letter are partly anſwered in this letter of Auguſtine to Voluſian.

Sect. XIII. *The Correſpondence between the People of Madaura and Auguſtine.*

It will not, I think, be improper to ſubjoin here, in the next place, Auguſtine's correſpondence with the people of Madaura. The time is not exactly known, and theſe letters are put by the Benedictines in the claſs of ſuch letters, of which the date is uncertain.

The people of Madaura recommended Florentine to Auguſtine, deſiring his aſſiſtance in an affair to be tranſacted at Hippo, where Auguſtine was. Their letter is not in being: but we ſee ſome parts of it in the anſwer which Auguſtine wrote to them. It [a] was inſcribed, 'To our father Auguſtine eternal ſalvation 'in the Lord.' And the ſubſcription was: 'We wiſh you, 'honoured Sir, that God and his Chriſt may grant you a 'long and happy life amidſt your clergy.' When Auguſtine read

[x] Ibid. p. 595. [y] See p. 189.

[z] Auguſtin. Ep. 138. Tom. 2.

[a] Num 2. Quod enim ſcripſiſtis, 'Patri Auguſtino in Domino æternam ſalutem,' cum legerem, tanta ſpe ſubito erectus ſum, ut crederem vos ad ipſum Dominum, et ad ipſam æternam ſalutem, aut jam eſſe converſos, aut per noſtrum miniſterium deſiderare converti. Sed ubi legi cætera, refriguit animus meus. Quæſivi tamen ab epiſtolæ portatore, utrum jam vel eſſetis Chriſtiani, vel eſſe cupere-tis. Cujus reſponſione poſtea quam comperi, nequaquam vos eſſe mutatos, gravius dolui, quod Chriſti nomen, cui jam totum orbem ſubjectum eſſe conſpicitis, non ſolum a vobis repellendum, ſed etiam in nobis irridendum eſſe credidiſtis. Et ſi eſſet hinc aliqua de interpretatione veſtræ ſententiæ dubitatio, ſubſcriptione epiſtolæ tolleretur, ubi aperte poſuiſtis, 'optamus 'te Domine in Deo et Chriſto ejus, per 'multos annos ſemper in clero tuo gau-'dere.' Quibus omnibus perlectis atque diſcuſſis

read the inſcription, he was filled with joy, thinking they had already embraced the Chriſtian religion; or at leaſt that they were deſirous to be brought to it by his means. But what followed in the letter damped all his hopes. However, he inquired of the bearer of the letter, if they were not already Chriſtians, or deſirous to be ſo. 'When he told me that you 'were not at all changed, it gave me great concern to think 'that when you ſee the whole world ſubject to Chriſt, you 'ſhould not only reject him, but alſo deride his name in me. 'For when I read thoſe things in your letter what could I, or 'any other man think, but that you had written ſincerely or 'deceitfully. If ſincerely, what ſhould hinder you from being 'Chriſtians? If deceitfully, how could you expect that I ſhould 'undertake your buſineſs, when you inſulted the name of Chriſt 'in me?'

However, Auguſtine fails not to lay hold of this opportunity to recommend the Chriſtian religion to them. At the ſame time awakening their conſideration, by telling them that their condemnation would be aggravated, if his arguments and exhortations ſhould be without effect. He then goes on in his argument; which, perhaps, my readers will obſerve to have a reſemblance with that in his letter to Voluſian before tranſcribed.

'Be perſuaded then, my friends, to attend. In the ſacred 'ſcriptures may be found recorded all thoſe things concerning 'true religion, which our anceſtors have delivered down to us, 'as tranſacted in former times, relating to the human race; and 'likewiſe all thoſe things which we now ſee, and which we deli-'ver down to poſterity. And all things are now done as they 'were

diſcuſſis, quid mihi aliud occurrere potuit, aut cuilibet homini poteſt, niſi aut veridico aut fallaci ſcribentium animo hæc eſſe conſcripta? Sed ſi veridico animo iſta ſcribitis, quis vobis ad hanc veritatem intercluſit viam?....ſi autem fallaciter atque irridenter hæc ſcribitis, itane tandem mihi negotia veſtra curanda imponitis, ut nomen ejus per quem aliquid poſſum, audeatis non veneratione debita adtollere, ſed inſultatione adulatoria ventilare?

3. Sciatis me, cariſſimi, cum ineffabili pro vobis tremore cordis hæc dicere. Novi enim quanto graviorem et pernicioſiorem cauſſam, ſitis habituri apud Deum, ſi fruſtra vobis hæc dixero. Omnia quæ præteritis temporibus erga humanum genus majores noſtri geſta eſſe meminerunt, nobiſque tradiderunt; omnia etiam quæ nos videmus, et poſteris tradimus, quæ tamen pertinent ad veram religionem quærendam et tenendam, divina ſcriptura non tacuit: ſed ita omnino cuncta tranſeunt, ut tranſitura eſſe prædicta ſunt. Videtis certe populum Judæorum avulſum a ſedibus ſuis, per omnes fere terras diſſeminatum, atque diffuſum. Et origo ejus populi, et incrementa, et regni amiſſio, et per cuncta diſperſio, ſicut prædicata ſunt, ita facta ſunt. Videtis certe ex ipſo populo verbum Dei legemque prodeuntem per Chriſtum, qui ex ipſis mirabiliter natus eſt, omnium gentium fidem occupaſſe et tenuiſſe. Ita hæc omnia prænuntiata legimus, ut videmus. Videtis certe multos præciſos a radice Chriſtianæ ſocietatis, quæ per ſedes Apoſtolorum et ſucceſſiones epiſcoporum certa per orbem propagatione

'were foretold to be done. Certainly you ſee the people of the 'Jews removed from their own country and ſcattered, and 'dwelling in almoſt every part of the earth. And the riſe and 'increaſe of that people, and then the loſs of their kingdom, and 'their diſperſion, as they were foretold they have been exactly 'ſo done. You likewiſe ſee the word and law of God, which 'was taught by Chriſt, who was wonderfully ſprung from them; 'this law, I ſay, you ſee to be received and maintained by all 'nations. All theſe things we read foretold as we now ſee them 'done. You likewiſe ſee others glorying indeed in the Chriſtian 'name, but are really withered branches, who have departed 'from the doctrine delivered by tradition from the apoſtles, 'whom we call heretics and ſchiſmatics. Theſe alſo were fore-'ſeen, foretold, and recorded beforehand. You alſo plainly ſee 'the temples of images in part fallen and lying in ruins, partly 'deſtroyed, partly ſhut up, partly converted to other uſes; and 'the images themſelves either broken to pieces or burnt, or ſhut 'up in the temples, or deſtroyed; and the powers of this world, 'which formerly perſecuted Chriſtian people out of reſpect to 'images, now conquered and ſubdued, not by rebellions but 'by dying Chriſtians: who now have turned their power and 'the edge of the laws againſt images, for which they had killed 'Chriſtians: and the emperors themſelves bowing their crown-'ed heads and humbly praying at the tomb of Peter a fiſher-'man.'

'All theſe things the divine ſcriptures, which are now in the 'hands of all men, foretold long ago. And we the more firm-'ly believe theſe things, and the more cordially rejoice in their 'fulfilment, becauſe we find them ſo recorded and foretold in 'the holy ſcriptures, which are in great authority. And, I pray, 'ſhall not the Divine judgment upon all men, good and bad, and

propagatione diffunditur, de ſola figura originis, ſub Chriſtiano nomine, quaſi aliena ſarmenta gloriari, quæ hæreſes et ſchiſmata nominamus: prævisa, prædicta, ſcripta ſunt omnia. Videtis certe ſimulachrorum templa, partim ſine reparatione collapſa, partim diruta, partim clauſa, partim in uſus alios commutata: ipſaque ſimulachra vel confringi, vel incendi, vel includi, vel deſtrui: atque ipſas hujus ſeculi poteſtates, quæ aliquando pro ſimulachris populum Chriſtianum perſequebantur, victas et domitas, non a repugnantibus, ſed a morientibus Chriſtianis, et contra eadem ſimulachra, pro quibus Chriſtianos occiderunt, impetus ſuos legeſque vertiſſe et imperii nobiliſſimi eminentiſſimum culmen ad ſepulchrum piſcatoris Petri ſubmiſſo diademate ſupplicare.

4. Hæc omnia ſcripturæ divinæ, quæ in manus omnium jam venerunt, ante longiſſima tempora futura eſſe teſtatæ ſunt. Hæc omnia tanto robuſtiore fide lætamur fieri, quanto majore auctoritate prædicata eſſe in ſanctis literis invenimus. Num quidnam, obſecro vos, numquidnam ſolum judicium Dei, quod inter fideles atque infideles futurum eſſe in eiſdem literis legimus, cum illa omnia, ſicut prædicta ſunt, venerunt, numquidnam ſolum judicium Dei venturum non eſſe putabimus? Immo veniet, ſicut illa omnia venerunt.

'that alone which is alſo foretold as future in the ſame ſcriptures, 'ſhall not that come to paſs? Yes it will come, as all the other 'things have come.'

Auguſtine goes on to ſay: 'Chriſt [b] had no worldly kingdom, 'nor worldly riches, nor other worldly ſplendor. It was Chriſt 'crucified who was preached all over the earth. A few believed 'then, and now all people in general. For when Chriſt crucified was preached, the lame were made to walk, the dumb to 'ſpeak, the deaf to hear, the blind to ſee, and the dead were 'raiſed. So God was glorified and the pride of man ſubdued.'

'Awake [c] then at length, ye people of Madaura, my brethren, 'and my parents; God has given me this opportunity of writing 'to you, which I could not but cheerfully embrace. According to the beſt of my abilities I have aſſiſted my brother Florentine, by whom you wrote to me, in the buſineſs which he 'had to tranſact here. Nor was there any great difficulty in it; 'for Florentine has many friends at Hippo.'

'And now, my honoured and beloved brethren, may the 'one true God convert you to himſelf, and deliver you from the 'vanity of this world!'

That is a large part of Auguſtine's letter to the people of Madaura; it ſhews the truly Chriſtian zeal of this biſhop; and it is written with good temper. He calls the people of Madaura his 'brethren and parents,' and Florentine 'his brother,' though he was a Gentile.

It is ſuppoſed that [d] Auguſtine ſo calls the people of Madaura, becauſe he had ſtudied literature there in his youth.

[b] 6. Itaque non Chriſtus regno terreno decoratus, nec Chriſtus terrenis opibus dives, nec Chriſtus ulla terrena felicitate præfulgens: ſed Chriſtus crucifixus, per totum terrarum orbem prædicatur. Quod riſerunt prius populi ſuperborum, et adhuc rident reliquiæ. Crediderunt autem prius pauci, nunc populi: quia tunc ad fidem paucorum, et contra irriſionem populorum, cum Chriſtus crucifixus prædiceretur, claudi ambulabant, muti loquebantur, ſurdi audiebant, cæci videbant, mortui reſurgebant. Sic tandem animadvertit terrena ſuperbia, nihil in ipſis terrenis eſſe potentius humilitate divina.

[c] 7. Expergiſcimini aliquando, fratres mei, et parentes mei Madaurenſes. Hanc occaſionem ſcribendi vobis Deus mihi obtulit. Quantum potui quidem in negotio fratris Florentini, per quem literas miſiſtis, ſicut Deus voluit, adfui et adjuvi. Sed tale negotium erat, quod etiam ſine operâ meâ facile peragi poſſet. Prope omnes enim domus ipſius homines, qui apud Hipponem ſunt, noverunt Florentinum, et multum ejus orbitatem dolent.... Deus unus et verus vos ab omni hujus ſeculi vanitate liberatos convertat ad ſe, Domini prædicabiles, et dilectiſſimi fratres. Ep. 232. al. 42. Tom. 2.

[d] So the Benedictines in a note upon the place, and Tillemont S. Auguſtin. art. 105. p. 271.

Sect. XIV. *The Correſpondence between Auguſtine and Longinian.*

What follows next is the correſpondence between Auguſtine and Longinian. 'Auguſtine[a] had before ſome converſation with 'him, by which he perceived Longinian to be a man of good 'underſtanding, and well diſpoſed. He therefore now invites 'him to write to him, and let him know his thoughts concerning 'God and Chriſt, and the beſt way of attaining to happineſs.'

To that letter Longinian wrote an anſwer, treating Auguſtine in a very reſpectful manner. He[b] calls him the beſt of the Romans. 'He declares that "he[c] had never known or heard of "more than one, who had ſo diligently applied himſelf to the "knowledge of the true God, or was ſo likely to attain to him "and to true happineſs, by the purity of his heart, and a diſ-"engagement from all worldly impediments."

'By way of anſwer to the queſtions which had been put to 'him, Longinian ſays, he 'would[d] ſpeak his opinion ſo far as 'he had been able to learn from pious antiquity. "The beſt way "of going to God is that in which a good man goes to the one "true God, the incomprehenſible, ineffable, unchangeable crea-"tor of the univerſe, even by good words and good works, ac-"companied and aſſiſted by the powers of God, whom you call "angels.

[a] Proinde quia videor inſpexiſſe tamquam in ſpeculo ſermocinationis mecum tuæ nihil te eſſe malle quam virum bonum; Deum, quo nihil eſt melius, et unde humanus animus haurit ut bonus ſit, quonam modo colendum credas, audeo percontari. Nam quod eum colendum credas, jam teneo. Quæro etiam, quid de Chriſto ſentias. Quod enim eum non parvi pendas, adverti. Sed utrum eâ et ſolâ viâ, quæ ab illo demonſtrata eſt ad vitam beatam perveniri poſſe, exiſtimes, et aliqua ex cauſſa non eam negligas ire, ſed differas: an et aliam vel alias ad tam opimam et præ omnibus appetendam poſſeſſionem vias eſſe arbitreris, et aliquam earum jam te ingredi credes, noſſe cupio, ut opinor, non impudenter. Aug. Ep. 233. al. 20. [b] Romanorum vir vere optime. Ep. 234. al. 21. § 1.

[c] Siquidem adhuc poſt hominum memoriam....adhuc audierim, legerim, viderim neminem, aut certe poſt unum, nullum, quod Deo teſte, bono periculo certoque dixerim, niſi te, Deum conniti ſemper agnoſcere, et poſſe puritate animi, corporiſque projecta gravedine ſectari facillime, et ſpe perfectæ conſcientiæ non dubia credulitate tenere. Ib. num. 1.

[d] Verum quod traditum ſancte atque antiquitus teneam atque cuſtodiam, ut potuero, paucis edicam. Via eſt ad Deum melior, quâ vir bonus, piis, puris, juſtis, caſtis, veris dictis factiſque ſine ulla temporum mutatorum cantata jactatione probatus, et deorum comitatu vallatus, Dei utique poteſtatibus emeritus, id eſt, ejus unius et univerſi et incomprehenſibilis et ineffabilis infatigabiliſque Creatoris impletus virtutibus, quos, ut verum eſt, angelos dicitis, vel quid alterum poſt Deum vel cum Deo, aut in Deo, aut in Deum intentione animi mentiſque ire feſtinat. Via eſt, inquam, qua purgati antiquorum ſacrorum piis præceptis expiationibuſque puriſſimis, et abſtemiis obſervationibus decocti, animo et corpore conſtantes deproperant. num. ii.

3. De Chriſto autem tuæ jam credulitatis carnali, et Spiritu Dei, per quem in illum ſummum, beatum, verum, et patrem omnium ire ſecurus es, Domine pa-

" angels. In this way, and when purified by expiations accord-
" ing to the pious directions of the ancients, and practiſing ab-
" ſtemiouſneſs and ſelf-denial in body and mind, good men have
" eaſy acceſs to God."

" As for Chriſt, in whom you believe, and the ſpirit of God,
" through whom you, my honoured father, hope to go to the
" ſupreme, bleſſed, true God, and father of all, I dare not nor
" am I able to expreſs what I think. And indeed it is very diffi-
" cult to define what a man does not underſtand. But I have
" the higheſt reſpect for your virtues."

With that letter Auguſtine ſeems to be well pleaſed, and writes an anſwer to it, which is to this effect: ' I [c] cannot diſlike your ' caution in not denying, or affirming any thing concerning ' Chriſt. It is a modeſt reſerve, not unbecoming in a Pagan. ' I am very willing to afford you the aſſiſtance which you deſire. ' But I muſt entreat the ſolution of ſome queſtions. You ſay that, " when good men are purified by expiations according to the " pious directions of the ancients, they have eaſy acceſs to God.' ' In which words, as ſeems to me, you ſay, that in order to go ' to God, it is not ſufficient, that by pious, juſt, pure, chaſte, true ' words and works, a good man approve himſelf to the gods, in ' whoſe company he may go to God the ſupreme creator of all, ' unleſs he be purified according to the pious directions of the ' ancients. Wherefore I deſire to know of you, what there is ' which needs to be purified by ſacred rites, in him, who by ' piety, juſtice, purity, and ſincerity, has approved himſelf to ' the gods, and by them to him who is the one God of gods. ' For if he is ſtill to be purified by ſacred rites and expiations, he

ter percolende, non audeo, nec valeo quid ſentiam exprimere: quia quod neſcio difficillimum credo definire. Ut autem me cultorem tuarum virtutum dignatus es. ....num. iii.

[c] Unde jam video exortum et exorſum inter nos magnæ hac de re magna diſputationis quaſi ſementem: Hoc eſt quod volebam prius, deinde quod adhuc volo, Deus adjuvabit....Proinde quod de Chriſto nihil tibi negandum vel affirmandum putaſti, hoc in Pagani animo temperamentum non invitus acceperim....Sed prius opus eſt eliquare quodammodo, perſpicuam ſumere ſententiam tuam de antiquis ſacris....Quæ verba ex epiſtola tua recognoſces, cum addidiſti, et aiſti: ' Via eſt, ' inquam, quâ purgati antiquorum ſacro- ' rum piis præceptis, expiationibuſque ' puriſſimis, et abſtemiis obſervationibus ' decocti, anima et corpore conſtantes de- ' properant.' Ep. 235. al. 22. num. 1. 2. In his verbis ſentio, ni fallor, videri tibi non ſufficere ad viam quâ itur ad Deum, uti vir bonus piis, juſtis, puris, caſtis, veris dictis factiſque promereatur deos, quorum comitatu vallatus in illum ſummum Deum omnium Creatorem ire feſtinet, niſi etiam ſacrorum antiquorum piis præceptis expiationibus purgetur. Quamobrem velim ſcire, quid arbitreris eſſe per ſacra purgandum, in eo, qui pie, juſte, pure, veraciter vivendo promeretur Deos, et per eos unum illum deorum Deum. Si enim adhuc ſacris purgandus eſt, utique mundus non eſt. Et ſi mundus non eſt, pie, juſte, pure, caſteque non vivit. Si enim ita vivit, jam mundus eſt. Porro jam mundum atque purum, quid opus eſt, ſacris expiando purgari? &c. Ibid. num. 2.

'is not clean; and if he is not clean, he does not live piously, 'justly, purely, chastly. For what need can he have to be puri-'fied by sacred expiations who is already clean? This is wanting 'to be cleared up before we proceed.'

By all which Augustine seems to intimate that sincerely good and virtuous men are pure, and clean, and acceptable to God, and need no other purifications or expiations whatever.

That is the sum of this correspondence. There are no other letters between Augustine and Longinian. Who Longinian was we do not know exactly. I do not see that he was priest or pontiff, as some have [f] imagined; but he was a learned man. In the contents of the epistle, as represented by the Benedictines, he is called 'a Pagan philosopher.' Says Tillemont, 'We [g] know 'not what was the issue of this conference. Possidius mentions 'no more than two letters to Longinian against Paganism. 'There was one of this name in the time of Honorius, who was 'præfect of Italy, and was killed in the year 408 as a friend of 'Stilicho. I see no difficulty in allowing that this is the same 'person.'

Sect. XV. *Observations of Orosius and Augustine upon the Treatment given to the Gentiles by Christian Magistrates.*

Orosius, who finished his history in the year [a] of Christ 417, or thereabout, speaks to this purpose near the conclusion of it: 'Constantine,' [b] says he, 'was the first Christian emperor ex-'cepting Philip who was a Christian for a very few years only, 'and, as seems to me, for this purpose, that the thousandth 'year of Rome might be consecrated to Christ rather than to 'idols. From Constantine to this time all the emperors have 'been Christians excepting Julian, who lost his life when he 'was meditating, as it has been said, evil things, [that is against 'the Christians, and intending their extirpation.] This has been

[f] Le Saint ayant eu un entretien avec Longinien, qui étoit payen, et apparemment pontife du paganisme. Tillem. Augustin. art. cv. T. 13. p. 271.

[g] Tillem ib. p. 272. [a] See Tillemont St. Augustin. art. 266. Mem. Tom. xiv. [b] Igitur mortuo, ut dixi, Constantio in Britanniis, Constantinus Imperator est creatus, primus Imperatorum Christianus, excepto Philippo, qui Christianus annis admodum pauciſſimis, ad hoc tantum constitutus fuisse mihi visus est, ut Millesimus Romæ annus Christo potius quam idolis dicaretur. A Constantino autem omnes Christiani Imperatores usque in hodiernum diem creati sunt, excepto Juliano, quem impia, ut aiunt, machinantem, exitiabilis vita deseruit. Hæc est lenta illa paganorum pœna, sed certa. Hinc sani insaniunt, hinc non vulnerati compunguntur, hinc ridentes gemunt, hinc viventes deficiunt, hinc secreto excruciantur, quos nemo persequitur: hinc jam pauciſſimi remanserunt, qui nunquam aliquo persequente puniti sunt. Oros. lib. 7. cap. 28. p. 537.

'their

'their ſlow but ſure ruin. For which reaſon they are continu-
'ally complaining, and though not hurt, they ſmart, and though
'they live much at eaſe, they gradually decline; ſo that now
'there remain very few of them, though they have never been
'perſecuted by any.'

Oroſius was not unacquainted with the imperial laws concerning the Gentiles and their worſhip; and yet he ſpeaks as if they had never been perſecuted. I think it may be hence argued that few Gentiles had ſuffered in their perſons by thoſe laws. So, as before quoted by us, he ſaid that, 'Conſtantine [c] by edict or-
'dered the temples of the Pagans to be ſhut up, but without
'putting any of them to death.'

Auguſtine was contemporary with Oroſius, but ſurvived him. Let us now obſerve ſome things which we meet with in his writings.

In his firſt book againſt Parmenian, a Donatiſt biſhop, he puts him in mind that 'there [d] were imperial laws not only againſt
'heretics, but alſo againſt Pagans, and that their images had
'been ordered by late laws to be thrown down and broken to
'pieces; and that their ſacrifices had been forbidden upon pain of
'death.' So writes Auguſtine, and with too evident tokens of
'approbation. That book is ſuppoſed to have been written in
'the year of Chriſt 400.

In his letter to Vincentius he ſays, that many had been induced to forſake Gentiliſm by the terror of the imperial laws. His words are theſe: 'The [e] Pagans may reflect upon us for the
'laws which Chriſtian emperors have enacted againſt the wor-
'ſhippers of idols; nevertheleſs many of them have been con-
'verted, and ſtill are daily converted to the one living and true
'God.' That letter is ſuppoſed to have been written about the year 408.

In a ſermon to the people he deſcants upon the words of Pſalm cxli. 6. which he reads thus, agreeably to the verſion of the ſeventy: *They ſhall hear my words becauſe they have prevailed.* He there compares the timidity and unſteadineſs of Gentile people with the reſolution and fortitude of the martyrs, who were

[c] See before, p. 102.

[d] ....Nec ſolum hæreticis quoquo modo, Chriſtiano nomine dealbatis, ſed etiam ipſis Paganis. Nam utique et ipſi falſa religione ſunt impii: quorum ſimulachra everti atque conſtringi juſſa ſunt recentioribus legibus, inhiberi etiam ſacrificia terrore capitali. Contr. Epiſt. Parmen. lib. i. cap. ix. Tom. 9.

[e] Pagani vero magis nos blaſphemare poſſunt de legibus, quas contra idolorum cultores Chriſtiani Imperatores tulerunt: et tamen ex eis multi correcti, et ad Deum vivum verumque converſi ſunt, et quotidie convertuntur. Ad Vincent. Rogatiſt. Ep. 93. al. 48. num. 26. Tom. ii.

exalted

exalted above the fear of death. 'How [f] then did they prevail? 'who of the Pagans has been found ſacrificing, ſince ſacrifices 'have been prohibited by the laws, and did not deny it? Who 'of them has been found worſhipping an idol, and did not cry 'out, I have done no ſuch thing, dreading to be convicted! 'On the other hand the diſciples of Chriſt by his words, and by 'his example in dying and riſing again, have been raiſed above 'the fear of death. The words of the Lord therefore have pre-'vailed, becauſe they were preached by thoſe who were void of 'fear. They were not afraid of exile, loſs of goods, death it-'ſelf, nor even the death of the croſs, than which nothing is 'more terrible.'

All this may be true: for I do not ſuppoſe that Gentile people, by their principles, were ſo well qualified to be martyrs as the Chriſtians were: nevertheleſs I cannot but think it pity that they were brought to this trial by Chriſtians; and it muſt ſeem ungenerous to triumph over them for their weakneſs. However, I now allege this paſſage only to ſhew what was the ſtate of things at that time; and with it I put an end to the collections of this kind.

Sect. XVI. *Concluding Obſervations upon the State of Gentiliſm under Chriſtian Emperors.*

We are now to make remarks upon the accounts which we have ſeen of the ſtate of Gentiliſm in the times of Chriſtian emperors.

1. Conſtantine, and divers other Chriſtian emperors, acted contrary to the edict which was publiſhed by him and Licinius in the year 313.

I ſuppoſe my readers to be well acquainted with that edict, which was tranſcribed by us [a] formerly at length, in it's proper place and time. Moreover the ſubſtance of it was rehearſed by us again, not long ago, in this [b] volume.

Several of the imperial laws above recited, concerning the

[f] 'Audiunt verba mea, quoniam præ-'valuerunt.' Unde prævaluerunt? Quis eorum comprehenſus eſt in ſacrificio, cum his legibus iſta prohiberentur, et non negavit? Quis eorum comprehenſus eſt adorare idolum, et non clamavit, Non feci, et timuit ne convinceretur. Unde autem prævaluerunt verba Domini?...Et quid eſt factum de tot mortibus Martyrum, niſi ut ipſa verba prævalerent, et tanquam irrigata terra ſanguine teſtium Chriſti, pullularet ubique ſeges Eccleſiæ?.... 'Unde 'prævaluerunt?' Jam diximus, cum prædicantur a non timentibus. Quid non timentibus? Nec exilia, nec damna, nec mortem, nec crucem. Non enim nec mortem ſolam, ſed nec crucem, qua morte nihil videbatur exſecrabilius. Enarr. in Pſ. cxl. al. cxli. n. 20. Tom. 4.

[a] Vol. viii. ch. xl. ſect. x. [b] See here, p. 99.

Gentile

Gentile people and their worſhip, plainly break in upon the liberty there granted. All people were not now allowed to chuſe and obſerve that way of worſhip which they approved of. The way of worſhip choſen by the Gentiles was forbidden and reſtrained. The ſhutting up or demoliſhing their temples, and the removing and breaking to pieces their images, were alſo inconſiſtent with that edict of general toleration.

Le Clerc, in his account of Pagi's Critique upon Baronius, which was publiſhed complete in four volumes, at Geneva, in the year 1705, ſpeaking of affairs in the reign of Honorius, near the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century, expreſſeth himſelf after this manner: 'Thus [c] it was that the Chriſtians continued to return to the Pagans what they had ſuffered 'from them during the firſt three centuries, inſtead of gaining 'them by patience and mildneſs, which they had ſo much re-'commended when they were the weakeſt. This conduct was 'proper to make the Pagans more obſtinate, by teaching them 'that the Chriſtians affected to ſpeak of humanity and modera-'tion from intereſt only, and not from a principle of religion, 'as they pretended. At leaſt it is certain that thereby they loſt 'the right to complain of the manner in which the Pagans had 'treated them in times paſt, or to boaſt of the mildneſs of their 'religion, which they effectually diſparaged by thoſe perſecu-'tions. The laws againſt the Pagans may be ſeen in the Theo-'doſian code, at the title De Paganis, ſacrificiis, et templis.'

'We ought not to imagine that the penalties laid by Chriſ-'tians upon the Pagans were light. If [d] a ſacrifice was offered 'in a private place, with the knowledge of the proprietor, the 'place was confiſcated; if not, they were to pay a fine of twenty 'pounds of gold, and as much if it had been done in a temple. '....And in ſome caſes the penalty of death was appointed....We 'may look into the Oration of Libanius for the temples, where 'that orator ſuſtains the ſame character before Theodoſius as 'the Chriſtians had formerly done before the Pagan emperors. 'I muſt acknowledge that this phenomenon, if I may ſo call it, 'gives me pain: for I could wiſh that they who defended the 'truth had preſerved to themſelves the honour of being the only 'perſons that were perſecuted for religion.'

So writes Le Clerc. Some other like things were ſaid by us formerly in the chapter of Conſtantine; where [e] alſo we took the

[c] Bib. choiſie. Tom. viii. p. 276. &c. [d] Le Clerc there refers to the law of Theodoſius in 392, which was recited by us ſome while ago, at p. 112. [e] Vol. iv. p. 180.

liberty

liberty to conſider the treatment given in that reign to men of different denominations, catholics, heretics, and Gentiles.

2. There were as yet no laws of Chriſtian emperors reſtraining freedom of ſpeech in Gentile people, or the freedom of writing and conference in things of religion.

Such laws have been made ſince; but I ſee nothing of that kind in any of the imperial laws or edicts above recited. Porphyry's books againſt the Chriſtian religion, as we are [f] informed, were ordered to be deſtroyed; but I do not recollect any laws of Chriſtian princes, in thoſe early times, reſtraining freedom of ſpeech in Gentile people, or fredom of writing and conference concerning things of religion. Auguſtine [g] has informed us of a pretended oracle about the year 398, foretelling the period of the Chriſtian religion: but he does not ſay that the publiſhers of it were called to an account, or puniſhed for it. And we are aſſured from his letters to Gentiles, and from their letters to him, that all did then freely debate the merits and the evidences of the Chriſtian doctrine; and he encouraged, and invited men to propoſe to him their difficulties and objections. We alſo know that [h] Proclus, in the fifth century, wrote againſt the Chriſtians: but we do not know that he was puniſhed for ſo doing.

3. There were then no laws or edicts of Chriſtian princes requiring men to frequent the religious aſſemblies of Chriſtians, or to embrace and profeſs the Chriſtian religion, upon the pain of any inconvenience or ſuffering either in their perſons or their properties.

We have not yet met with any ſuch laws; and very probably there were none. Libanius is a good witneſs that there was no ſuch law in his time. For in his oration to Theodoſius he ſays: 'You [i] might have enacted ſuch a law as this: Let all preſent 'themſelves at the places where I worſhip, and join in the rites 'there performed: and whoever tranſgreſſeth this law, let him 'be put to death. It was eaſy,' ſays he, 'for you to publiſh ſuch 'a law: but you have not done it: nor have you in this mat-'ter laid a yoke upon the ſouls of men.'

4. I think it muſt be ſuppoſed and allowed, that the laws againſt Gentiliſm, above recited by me, were not rigorouſly executed.

There muſt have been many inſtances of connivance and forbearance in Chriſtian people, and in Chriſtian magiſtrates of

[f] See vol. viii. p. 2. and 182. [g] See here, p. 171. [h] See p. 67. [i] See before, vol. viii. ch. xlix. § iv. near the end of the oration.

every

every rank, ſupreme and ſubordinate. For, as we have evidently ſeen, many who were zealous for Gentiliſm lived very quietly and comfortably.

The writers alleged by me in the former part of this volume were all zealous Gentiles, who lived in the times of Chriſtian emperors, excepting Julian, who was himſelf an emperor. And I have occaſionally written the hiſtory of divers other learned men, ſome of them authors of voluminous works: Anatolius, Oribaſius, Olympius, Helladius, Ammonius. And one view which I have had in enlarging ſo much as I have done in their hiſtory, and in an account of their works, has been, that I might the more convincingly ſhew the lenity of the Chriſtian government under which they lived. And there are ſome others, hitherto omitted, which, for the ſame reaſon, I am much diſpoſed to bring in here.

Ælius Donatus [k] flouriſhed in the time of Conſtantius, and taught rhetoric, and polite literature at Rome with applauſe [l] in the year 356 and afterwards; about which time Jerom, who [m] has ſeveral times mentioned him as his maſter, ſtudied grammar under him. Jerom [n] ſpeaks of his commentaries upon Terence and Virgil. And in his own commentary upon the firſt chapter of the book of Eccleſiaſtes, ver. 9, he [o] quotes a verſe out of Terence's comedies, and then an obſervation of his maſter Donatus upon it; which obſervation, however, does not now appear in the notes of Donatus upon Terence. Perhaps it never was there, but Jerom [p] heard it from Donatus at his lectures.

Servius [q] is one of the learned men who have a part in the converſations of Macrobius's Saturnalia, about the year 400. He [r] is ſuppoſed to have then but newly begun to teach polite literature at Rome. He is called a grammarian, and is deſcribed to be a man of great learning and amiable modeſty. He daily read lec-

[k] Ælius Donatus temporibus Conſtantii Imperatoris in pretio fuit. G. J. Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. l. 3. cap. ii.

[l] Victorinus Rhetor, et Donatus Grammaticus meus, Romæ inſignes habentur. Chron. p. 184. [m] Dum adhuc eſſem puer, et in Grammaticæ ludo exercerer, &c. In Abac. cap. iii. T. 3. p. 1636. Vide et in Ezech. cap. xi. T. 3. p. 979.

[n] Puto, quod puer legeris Aſperi in Virgilium et Salluſtium commentarios, Vulcatii in orationes Ciceronis, Victorini in dialogos ejus, et in Terentii Comœdias Præceptoris mei Donati, æque in Virgilium, et aliorum in alios. Adv. Rufin. l. i. Tom. 4. p. 367. [o] Huic quid ſimile ſententiæ Comicus ait; 'Nihil eſt 'dictum, quod non ſit dictum prius.' Unde Præceptor meus Donatus, quum iſtum verſiculum exponeret, Pereant, inquit, 'qui ante nos noſtra dixerunt.' Hieron. in Eccl. Tom. 2. p. 720.

[p] Vide Martianay in loc.

[q] Hos Servius inter Grammaticos doctorem recens profeſſus, juxta doctrinam mirabilis, et amibilis verecundiæ, terram intuens, ac velut latenti ſimilis ſequebatur. Macrob. Sat. lib. 1. cap. 2. p. 194.

[r] Sed nunc dicat volo Servius, quæ in Virgilio notaverit ab ipſo figurata.... Quotidie enim Romanæ indoli enarrando eundem vatem neceſſe eſt habeat hujus annotationis ſcientiam promptiorem. Sat. l. 6. c. 6. p. 556. Vid. et cap. 7. p. 560.

tures

tures upon Virgil to the Roman youth; and is the perſon who is introduced in thoſe converſations to make critical obſervations upon that poet.

His commentary upon Virgil is ſtill extant, but it is not complete; and perhaps may be only extracts out of his commentary rather than the entire work.

In his comment upon the eightieth verſe of the third book of Virgil's Æneid is a remarkable obſervation: 'In [s] the time of our 'anceſtors, kings were always reckoned prieſts and pontiffs: 'hence it has come to paſs, that to this very day we call the em-'perors pontiffs.'

For this obſervation I am indebted to Pagi. He is arguing that [t] the Chriſtian emperors did not take to themſelves the title of Pontifex Maximus: nevertheleſs, as he ſays, it was often given them by the Gentiles, in their inſcriptions, and otherwiſe. And he inſtanceth in Servius, who, as he obſerves, was a Gentile, and flouriſhed in the times of Arcadius and Honorius. And agreeably to him others alſo ſay that [u] Servius flouriſhed about the year 412.

Here then is another Gentile who lived near the end of the fourth and in the beginning of the fifth century, who taught grammar at Rome, and was applauded and encouraged after the times of moſt of the imperial laws againſt the Gentiles, which have been above recited by me.

And from the extracts formerly made in the chapters of Proclus, Marinus, Damaſcius, Simplicius, it appears that in the fifth and ſixth centuries the chairs of rhetoric and philoſophy at Athens, were generally filled by profeſſors who were zealous for Gentiliſm. Jonſius [x] has a liſt of them.

There were likewiſe ſchools of philoſophy at Alexandria, and other places, where the profeſſors were Gentiles. Hierocles [y] taught philoſophy at Alexandria as low as the middle of the fifth

[s] Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phœbique Sacerdos.

Sane majorum hæc erat conſuetudo, ut Rex eſſet etiam Sacerdos et Pontifex. Unde hodieque Imperatores dicimus Pontifices.

Serv. ad Æneid. l. 3. ver. 80.

[t] Magna quidem, quæ ex vetuſtis Inſcriptionibus deſumitur fides et auctoritas. Sed, ut recte notat Gothofredus citatus, duo hic notanda ſunt. Primo quidem non Imperatores ipſos hunc ſibi titulum in illis vindicare, verum a Gentilibus tributum ibi exhiberi: quo ſenſu Servius, qui Gentilis erat, quique Arcadii et Honorii temporibus floruit, in tertio Æneidos, p. 268. ſcripſit: unde hodieque Imperatores dicimus Pontifices. Pagi. ann. 312. num. xxii. [u] A. 412. Servius Honoratus claruit, qui in Virgilium commentatus eſt. B. Fabr. Indic. Hiſtor. Chronol. [x] Ecce Philoſophorum Athenienſium ſucceſſionem. Jonſ. de Scriptoribus Hiſt. Philoſophicæ p. 301, 302.

[y] See here, in this volume, p. 64.

century.

century. The philoſopher Hypatia [b] loſt her life at Alexandria, near the beginning of that century; but it was not by order of the magiſtrates, nor by virtue of any imperial laws; but was owing to a mob ſtirred up by an eccleſiaſtic of the lower order: though, perhaps, not without ſome encouragement from the biſhop. Ammonius and Helladius, learned grammarians, who taught the polite arts at Alexandria, till the year 391, when the temple of Serapis was demoliſhed, afterwards taught the ſame publicly at Conſtantinople.

Says Mr. Moſheim, [c] ſpeaking of the ſtate of things in the ſixth century: 'Though it had been enacted by the imperial laws, 'that none who did not abjure the worſhip of the gods ſhould 'be admitted into any public office; yet there were many men 'of learning and gravity who ſtill adhered to the ancient re-'ligion. Tribonian himſelf, the illuſtrious compiler of the civil 'law, is thought by ſome to have been averſe to the Chriſtian 'religion. The ſame is ſuppoſed by many to have been the 'caſe of the celebrated hiſtorian Procopius. It is ſtill more evi-'dent that Agathias, a pleader of cauſes at Smyrna, and alſo a 'writer of hiſtory, was a worſhipper of the gods: ſo it often 'happens in life, the rigour of the laws falls upon ſuch only as 'have no rank, nor riches, nor favour with great men to ſecure 'them.'

'And, [d] which is ſtill more wonderful, the Platonic philoſo-'phers, whom all men know to be enemies to the Chriſtian doc-'trine, were allowed publicly to teach the youth in Greece and 'Ægypt the tenets of their ſect, though altogether oppoſite to 'our principles. Theſe men indeed affected a great deal of mo-'deſty, that their notions of the gods might not appear too dif-'ferent from the Chriſtian doctrine, as we ſee in Chalcidius, and 'Alexander of Lycopolis. Nevertheleſs there were ſome of 'them who had the aſſurance to aſperſe the Chriſtian religion. 'Damaſcius, in the Life of his maſter Iſidorus, caſts many ig-'nominious aſperſions upon the Chriſtians. Simplicius, in his 'illuſtrations of the Ariſtotelian Philoſophy, may be perceived 'ſometimes to reflect upon our doctrines. The eighteen Epi-'cheiremata of Proclus againſt the Chriſtians were in every 'body's hands, and therefore were confuted by John Philoponus. 'Thoſe [e] men would not have enjoyed all this liberty, if there

[b] See here, p. 80....83. [c] Inſtitut. H. E. ſec. vi. P. i. cap. ii. p. 235, 236.
[d] Illud magis mirandum eſt....Ibid. [e] Tantum his hominibus licentiæ haud conceſſum fuiſſet, niſi inter magiſtratus multi ſpecie potius, quam re, Chriſtiani fuiſſent. Ibid.

'had

'had not been many among the magiſtrates who were Chriſtians 'rather in appearance than reality.

Upon all which I muſt make ſome remarks. 1. It is very true, as Mr. Moſheim ſays, that the Platonic philoſophers were allowed to teach the tenets of their ſect in Greece and Ægypt. 2. Mr. Moſheim ſeems to think that a reproach upon the Chriſtian magiſtrates: whereas I cannot but think it honourable to them and the Chriſtian religion. 3. Procopius and Agathias were not Gentiles but Chriſtians, as has been ſhewn by me in the chapter of Simplicius. 4. Moreover, though Agathias was a pleader of cauſes, it is not known that he pleaded at Smyrna. 5. All the reſt here mentioned Chalcidius, Alexander of Lycopolis, Damaſcius, Simplicius, Proclus, as I ſuppoſe, were Gentiles, and as ſuch have been alleged among my witneſſes, except Tribonian, of whom I have as yet ſaid nothing.

He had a main hand in compoſing Juſtinian's Code [f] publiſhed in the year of Chriſt 533. His [g] character is doubtful. He is in Suidas: who ſays that 'he [h] was a Gentile, and im-'pious, altogether averſe to the Chriſtian religion. However, 'he was a man of great abilities; but covetous.' This I let paſs; for I have nothing to ſay to clear up the character of Tribonian; nor is it material.

Beſide the learned men and philoſophers, who enjoyed a great deal of liberty in the times of Chriſtian emperors, there were many Gentiles admitted into civil offices of great truſt and profit. Libanius, [i] in his oration for the temples, owns that Theodoſius had conferred the higheſt offices upon thoſe who were Gentiles. Prudentius, [k] in his firſt book againſt Symmachus, celebrates the moderation of Theodoſius, and intimates, that he preferred indifferently Gentiles and Chriſtians to places of truſt and honour. Young Symmachus was proconſul of Africa in

[f] Vide Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 12. p. 353, 356. Bib. Lat. T. i. p. 835.

[g] De Triboniano ambigua fama eſt. Baſnag. ann. 529. n. ii. Vid. et Spanhem. H. Chriſtian. p. 1155.

[h] Ουτος ο Τριβωνιανος ελλην υπηρχε, και αθεος, αλλοτριος κατα παντα της των χριστιανων πιστεως· κολαξ δε κ. λ. Suid.

[i] See before Vol. viii. p. 455.

[k] Denique pro meritis terreſtribus æqua rependens
Munera ſacricolis ſummos impertit honores
Dux bonus, et certare ſinit cum laude ſuorum.
Nec pago implicitos per debita culmina mundi
Ire viros prohibet: quoniam cœleſtia numquam
Terrenis ſolitum per iter gradientibus obſtant.
Ipſe magiſtratum tibi Conſulis, ipſe tribunal
Contulit, auratumque togæ donavit amictum,
Cujus Religio tibi diſplicet, ô pereuntum
Aſſertor Divûm. Prudent. contr. Symm. lib. i. ver. 617....626.

century. The philoſopher Hypatia [b] loſt her life at Alexandria, near the beginning of that century; but it was not by order of the magiſtrates, nor by virtue of any imperial laws; but was owing to a mob ſtirred up by an eccleſiaſtic of the lower order: though, perhaps, not without ſome encouragement from the biſhop. Ammonius and Helladius, learned grammarians, who taught the polite arts at Alexandria, till the year 391, when the temple of Serapis was demoliſhed, afterwards taught the ſame publicly at Conſtantinople.

Says Mr. Moſheim, [c] ſpeaking of the ſtate of things in the ſixth century: 'Though it had been enacted by the imperial laws, 'that none who did not abjure the worſhip of the gods ſhould 'be admitted into any public office; yet there were many men 'of learning and gravity who ſtill adhered to the ancient re-'ligion. Tribonian himſelf, the illuſtrious compiler of the civil 'law, is thought by ſome to have been averſe to the Chriſtian 'religion. The ſame is ſuppoſed by many to have been the 'caſe of the celebrated hiſtorian Procopius. It is ſtill more evi-'dent that Agathias, a pleader of cauſes at Smyrna, and alſo a 'writer of hiſtory, was a worſhipper of the gods: ſo it often 'happens in life, the rigour of the laws falls upon ſuch only as 'have no rank, nor riches, nor favour with great men to ſecure 'them.'

'And, [d] which is ſtill more wonderful, the Platonic philoſo-'phers, whom all men know to be enemies to the Chriſtian doc-'trine, were allowed publicly to teach the youth in Greece and 'Ægypt the tenets of their ſect, though altogether oppoſite to 'our principles. Theſe men indeed affected a great deal of mo-'deſty, that their notions of the gods might not appear too dif-'ferent from the Chriſtian doctrine, as we ſee in Chalcidius, and 'Alexander of Lycopolis. Nevertheleſs there were ſome of 'them who had the aſſurance to aſperſe the Chriſtian religion. 'Damaſcius, in the Life of his maſter Iſidorus, caſts many ig-'nominious aſperſions upon the Chriſtians. Simplicius, in his 'illuſtrations of the Ariſtotelian Philoſophy, may be perceived 'ſometimes to reflect upon our doctrines. The eighteen Epi-'cheiremata of Proclus againſt the Chriſtians were in every 'body's hands, and therefore were confuted by John Philoponus. 'Thoſe [e] men would not have enjoyed all this liberty, if there

[b] See here, p. 80,...83. [c] Inſtitut. H. E. ſec. vi. P. i. cap. ii. p. 235, 236.
[d] Illud magis mirandum eſt....Ibid. [e] Tantum his hominibus licentiæ haud conceſſum fuiſſet, niſi inter magiſtratus multi ſpecie potius, quam re, Chriſtiani fuiſſent. Ibid.

'had

'had not been many among the magiſtrates who were Chriſtians 'rather in appearance than reality.

Upon all which I muſt make ſome remarks. 1. It is very true, as Mr. Moſheim ſays, that the Platonic philoſophers were allowed to teach the tenets of their ſect in Greece and Ægypt. 2. Mr. Moſheim ſeems to think that a reproach upon the Chriſtian magiſtrates: whereas I cannot but think it honourable to them and the Chriſtian religion. 3. Procopius and Agathias were not Gentiles but Chriſtians, as has been ſhewn by me in the chapter of Simplicius. 4. Moreover, though Agathias was a pleader of cauſes, it is not known that he pleaded at Smyrna. 5. All the reſt here mentioned Chalcidius, Alexander of Lycopolis, Damaſcius, Simplicius, Proclus, as I ſuppoſe, were Gentiles, and as ſuch have been alleged among my witneſſes, except Tribonian, of whom I have as yet ſaid nothing.

He had a main hand in compoſing Juſtinian's Code [f] publiſhed in the year of Chriſt 533. His [g] character is doubtful. He is in Suidas: who ſays that 'he [h] was a Gentile, and im-'pious, altogether averſe to the Chriſtian religion. However, 'he was a man of great abilities; but covetous.' This I let paſs; for I have nothing to ſay to clear up the character of Tribonian; nor is it material.

Beſide the learned men and philoſophers, who enjoyed a great deal of liberty in the times of Chriſtian emperors, there were many Gentiles admitted into civil offices of great truſt and profit. Libanius, [i] in his oration for the temples, owns that Theodoſius had conferred the higheſt offices upon thoſe who were Gentiles. Prudentius, [k] in his firſt book againſt Symmachus, celebrates the moderation of Theodoſius, and intimates, that he preferred indifferently Gentiles and Chriſtians to places of truſt and honour. Young Symmachus was proconſul of Africa in

[f] Vide Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. 12. p. 353, 356. Bib. Lat. T. i. p. 835.

[g] De Triboniano ambigua fama eſt. Baſnag. ann. 529. n. ii. Vid. et Spanhem. H. Chriſtian. p. 1155. [h] Ουτος ο Τριβωνιανος ελλην υπηρχε, και αθεος, αλλοτριος παντα πανυ της των χριστιανων πιστεως· κολαξ δε κ. λ. Suid.

[i] See before Vol. viii. p. 455.

[k] Denique pro meritis terreſtribus æqua rependens
Munera ſacricolis ſummos impertit honores
Dux bonus, et certare ſinit cum laude ſuorum.
Nec pago implicitos per debita culmina mundi
Ire viros prohibet: quoniam cœleſtia numquam
Terrenis ſolitum per iter gradientibus obſtant.
Ipſe magiſtratum tibi Conſulis, ipſe tribunal
Contulit, auratumque togæ donavit amictum,
Cujus Religio tibi diſplicet, ô pereuntum
Aſſertor Divûm. Prudent. contr. Symm. lib. i. ver. 617....626.

415, and præfect of the city in 419. Oreſtes was præfect of Alexandria in the beginning of the fifth century. And indeed, as [m] Spanheim obſerves, many Gentiles ſtill enjoyed ſome of the higheſt offices, both civil and military. In the year 408 a law was enacted by Honorius, excluding all but catholic Chriſtians from military poſts. But, as we are aſſured by [n] Zoſimus, he repealed that law, or diſpenſed with it, for the ſake of Generidus, an honourable and worthy man, though a pagan and a barbarian.

I mention theſe things as proofs of the moderation of Chriſtian magiſtrates, which cannot be gainſayed.

5. Our bleſſed Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt gave not any directions to his diſciples to propagate his religion by external force and violence.

The goſpel, or the religion of Jeſus Chriſt, is the doctrine of univerſal virtue and piety toward God and men, in heart and life, with the aſſurance of rewards and puniſhments to all, according to their conduct here; of which he is himſelf appointed the arbiter and diſpenſer; with the promiſe of the forgiveneſs of all ſins upon ſincere repentance; without annexing any temporal rewards (beſide inward peace and comfort) to thoſe who ſhould embrace his doctrine, or worldly pains and penalties to ſuch as reject it.

Indeed it is altogether incredible, and even impoſſible, that the founder of a religion who was himſelf crucified, and then raiſed from the dead and exalted to heaven, in confirmation of the truth of his doctrine, and as an example of fidelity to God, patience, reſignation, and fortitude, and to raiſe the thoughts of his diſciples and followers to things heavenly and divine: I ſay, it is impoſſible that ſuch a teacher of religion ſhould give any directions to his apoſtles and miniſters to propagate his religion by force and violence.

Julian [o] chargeth the Chriſtians 'with having killed ſome 'who perſiſted in the ancient religion, and not only them, but 'alſo others equally deceived with themſelves, who were in 'ſome reſpects in different ſentiments,' meaning heretics. But then he adds: 'Theſe are your own inventions; for Jeſus has 'no where directed you to do ſuch things; nor yet Paul.' We may therefore take this for a clear point; nor need I to ſay any thing more to prove it.

[m] Oreſtes, Alexandriæ Præfectus, tempore Cyrilli Alexandriæ Præfectus, tempore Cyrilli Alexandrini....Alii innumeri vel militari, vel Palatina poteſtate inſtructi, quales adhuc Præf. Prat. Vicarii, Proconſules, Magiſtri militum, officiorum, &c. Spanhem. p. 1050. [n] See before, p. 60. [o] See vol. viii. p. 402.

Nevertheleſs

Nevertheleſs I beg leave to inſert here ſome obſervations of the excellent prelate who now adorns the ſee of Canterbury, which are upon both natural and revealed religion. 'Moved [p] 'by this recital of the dreadful evils which religious intolerance 'hath committed and attempted, ſome perhaps may accuſe re- 'ligion itſelf as hurtful to ſociety. And undoubtedly falſe no- 'tions of it may be detrimental, and ſometimes even perni- 'cious. But ſo may falſe notions of parental affection, conjugal 'tenderneſs, gratitude, and every motive to action. Yet this 'was never thought an argument againſt the principles them- 'ſelves. And if any thing be fitted to do good and no harm on 'earth, true religion certainly is. Natural religion is univerſally 'acknowledged to be mild and humane. Chriſtianity indeed 'ſome have done their utmoſt to pervert. But let either the 'bittereſt zealot, or the moſt bigotted infidel, ſhew, if they can, 'one inſtance in which the goſpel gives the leaſt pretence for 'pious cruelty. Every where it breathes mildneſs, patience, 'forbearance: enjoins Chriſtians, of ever ſo different opinions, 'to receive one another in mutual charity; and even thoſe who 'are no Chriſtians it permits us not to judge hardly, much leſs 'to uſe them unmercifully. If then ſome who profeſs this 'faith will act in defiance to it, let them bear their condem- 'nation: but to charge their guilt upon Chriſtianity, would be 'like cenſuring the legal conſtitution of any government, becauſe 'they who rebel againſt it behave unjuſtifiably. For indeed 'the ſpirit of perſecution is rebellion againſt Chriſt, under a 'pretence of a commiſſion from him: It is *the man of ſin ſitting* '*as God in the temple of God*, 2 Theſſ. ii. 3, 4. And where it is 'not deſigned impiety, it is the groſſeſt ignorance both of the 'attributes of our Maker, and the precepts of our Redeemer, 'as the words of the text declare: *Theſe things will they do unto* '*you, becauſe they have not known the Father nor me*, John xvi. 3.'

6. All wiſe and underſtanding men, of every ſect and religion, recommend moderation, and condemn force and compulſion in things of religion. This is true both of Chriſtians and Gentiles.

Says Tertullian, in his book to Scapula: 'It [q] is not the part 'of religion to force religion, which muſt be taken up freely, 'not upon compulſion.'

And Lactantius: 'Such [r] is the nature of religion that it can

[p] A Sermon preached on the fifth of November, 1758, p. 354, 355.

[q] Nec religionis eſt cogere religionem, quæ ſponte ſuſcipi debet, non vi. Ad. Scap. cap. 2. [r] Non eſt opus vi, et injuria, quia religio cogi non poteſt. Verbis, potius quam verberibus, res agenda eſt, ut ſit voluntaria. Inſt. l. 5. c. 19. p. 518, &c.

'be upheld by reason and persuasion only, not by power and 'authority, that it may be free and voluntary.' 'Truth [s] and 'compulsion, religion and cruelty, are incompatible, and can 'have no fellowship with each other:' and [t] a great deal more to the like purpose. And says Athanasius: 'Truth [u] is not to 'be propagated by swords and darts, nor a military power, 'but by reason and argument. But where is reason when there 'is the dread of an emperor?' 'And what room is there for ar-'gument and choice when he who refuseth to assent is threat-'ened with banishment or death?' Again: 'It [tt] is the property 'of religion not to compel but to persuade, as I said just now. 'Our Lord himself does not use violence, but leaveth men to 'the freedom of their own choice. Speaking to all, he says, *If* '*any will come after me.* And to the disciples, *Will ye also go* '*away?*'

And we can proceed still farther. For to Christian writers we can add Christian emperors who were of the same sentiment: particularly Constantine, whose edict [uu] in the year 313, gives full liberty to all men to act according to the best of their judgement in things of religion. And if his future conduct cannot be reconciled with his edict, we must say that some circumstances of affairs induced him to act contrary to his better sentiments, and juster determination. Jovian, upon his accession, after the death of Julian, published an edict [x] of universal toleration, for which he was applauded by Themistius. His successor Valentinian, was of the same sentiment, and was a great example of moderation to all men; as we learn from [y] Ammianus Marcellinus, and [z] otherwise.

The same has been the sentiment of many learned Gentiles. Among these must be mentioned in the first place the emperor Julian, whose avowed principle and open declaration was, that [a] all men should worship God in their own way without any molestation from him. And, if at any time he bore hard upon the Christians as such, it must have been contrary to his professed judgment and opinion. Themistius argued strongly for allowing to all men liberty to worship God according to their

[s] Longe diversa sunt carnificina et pietas. Nec potest aut veritas cum vi, aut justitia cum crudelitate conjungi. Ibid. p. 519.

[t] See Vol. iv. p. 52....56. and here, p. 459.

[u] Ου γαρ ξιφεσιν, η βελεσιν, ουδε δια στρατιωτων η αλαθεια καταγγελλεται, αλλα πειθοι και συμβουλια. Ποια ουν πειθω, ενθα βασιλεως φοβος; η ποια συμβουλια, εν η αντιλογως το τελος εξορισμον εχει και θανατον. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. c. 33. p. 363.

[tt] Θεοσεβειας μεν γαρ ιδιον, μη αναγκαζειν, αλλα πειθειν, ωσπερ ειπαμεν. κ. λ. Ibid. n. 67. p. 384. C.

[uu] See Vol. viii. p. 319....321, and here, p. 99.

[x] See Vol. viii. p. 428.

[y] p. 476.

[z] In this vol. p. 108.

[a] Vol. viii. p. 370, 421, 422.

own

own ſentiments: firſt in [b] his conſular oration to Jovian, and again, afterwards, in [c] an oration to Valens. Libanius [d] often pleads the cauſe of religious liberty. Ammianus Marcellinus was in the ſame ſentiment, as is apparent from [e] his condemning the law of Julian, wherein he forbade the Chriſtians to teach grammar and rhetoric; and from his commending [f] the emperor Valentinian for not interpoſing his authority in things of religion.

7. We cannot juſtify the laws and edicts of Chriſtian emperors, which prohibited the practice of the religious rites of Gentiliſm upon heavy pains and penalties, ſuch as confiſcation of goods, baniſhment, or death, or excluſion from civil and military offices.

This muſt be a neceſſary corollary and inference from the two foregoing obſervations: for, if Jeſus Chriſt gave no orders to propagate his religion by external force and violence; and if all wiſe and underſtanding men of every ſect, condemn compulſion in things of religion; it muſt evidently follow, that they who practiſe ſuch methods in things of religion are not to be juſtified.

Nevertheleſs, poſſibly, ſome pleas may be here offered which may deſerve conſideration. For, firſt, it may be ſaid that Gentile people were not, and could not be good ſubjects to Chriſtian emperors. Secondly, their practice of divination was of dangerous conſequence.

Firſt, It may be pleaded that Gentile people were not good ſubjects to Chriſtian emperors.

To which ſeveral things may be anſwered. For if they were guilty of any actions contrary to the peace of ſociety, or inconſiſtent with allegiance to the ſupreme magiſtrate, or any other magiſtrates, they were juſtly liable to puniſhment by the laws of the empire, and of every other civil government whatever. But farther, great allowances were due to their prejudices. For the ſuperſtitions of Gentiliſm had long been the religion of Rome, and of all mankind in general; and they ſhould have been treated with great mildneſs and gentleneſs, patience, and long-ſuffering. The beſt reaſons and arguments were to be propoſed to them; and they ſhould have been repeated again and again; by which means error would have been gradually ſubdued, and overcome, and rooted out. There never were before, and never will be again, ſuch ſubjects as the primitive Chriſtians,

[b] p. 428....430. [c] p. 431, 432. [d] p. 438, 439, 449, 455.
[e] p. 470. [f] p. 476.

who prayed for their perſecutors. The Chriſtians themſelves, after having enjoyed a ſhort ſunſhine in the times of Conſtantine and his ſons, were not ſo meek and patient under Julian as they had been before. Once more, and finally, the Gentiles were good ſubjects to the Chriſtian emperors. Otherwiſe ſo many of them would not have been employed in the higheſt offices of truſt and honour. I ſay from principle, or intereſt, for love or fear, they generally were good ſubjects: but if they had been protected and indulged in the practice of their rites, they would have been more cheerful and hearty in their allegiance and ſubjection to Chriſtian emperors and other Chriſtian magiſtrates.

Secondly, It may be pleaded that all Gentile people in general were fond of divination, which muſt have been of dangerous conſequences; for they thereby endeavoured to pry into futurity, and aimed to know beforehand the ſucceſſion of princes, and other events.

To which I anſwer, that Chriſtian miniſters, and other underſtanding Chriſtians, might by reaſons and arguments ſhew the folly and abſurdity of that practice. And Chriſtian magiſtrates might juſtly lay it under reſtraints, and might either aboliſh it and abſolutely forbid it by law, or reduce it into ſuch order, and put it under ſuch regulations as were expedient for the public ſafety. We formerly alleged ſome ſuch laws of Conſtantine, to which the reader is now referred if he [g] pleaſeth.

Upon the whole then, we do not juſtify all the laws and edicts of Chriſtian emperors before recited. And we are of opinion that Gentile people might, and ought to have been protected in the exerciſe of the rites and ceremonies of their religion: provided nothing was done contrary to good manners, or inconſiſtent with the peace of ſociety, and allegiance to magiſtrates. But we do not ſay that Chriſtian magiſtrates were obliged to encourage Gentiliſm. Far from it. Upon this point we have already ſaid what is ſufficient in the third ſection of this article: where it was ſhewn that [h] Chriſtian emperors were under no obligation to continue the allowances, which had been hitherto made out of the public treaſury, for maintaining the Gentile prieſthood or their ſacrifices. When thoſe allowances were withdrawn Gentiliſm would ſink of itſelf; and the reaſons and arguments of underſtanding Chriſtians, calmly propoſed, would complete the downfal and overthrow of the ancient ſuperſtitions, and much better than any methods of external force and compulſion. And if there had been ſtill ſome remains of the an-

[g] See before, p. 57 and 100.

[h] p. 150....152.

cient

cient ſuperſtitions of Greece and Rome, it could have been of no bad conſequence; for Chriſtianity to this very day has it's adverſaries; and, perhaps, always will have; and by them Chriſtians are tried and improved.

8. The Chriſtian religion is able to uphold and recommend itſelf without worldly encouragements, and without the aid of external force and compulſion.

It is manifeſt that it is able ſo to do, becauſe it ſpread and was propagated in the world for a good while, without ſuch aids and ſupports, and under external diſcouragements of every kind: and it muſt be always able ſo to do. The ground and reaſon of this is, that it is in itſelf reaſonable and excellent, and approves itſelf to the unbiaſſed reaſon and judgment of mankind. And it's high original, as a divine revelation, has been atteſted by works of divine power, performed by Jeſus Chriſt, and his apoſtles after him, whom he entruſted with the preaching of his religion. The miracles performed by them, (not now to inſiſt on any other conſiderations,) are a good proof that they had a divine commiſſion.

9. Once more, and laſtly, having now ſeen in ancient Jewiſh and heathen writers ſo many teſtimonies to the accompliſhment of our Saviour's predictions concerning the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and to the books of the New Teſtament, and to the facts of the evangelical hiſtory, and therein to the truth of the Chriſtian religion; muſt we not be hereby induced, not only cordially to embrace it, but likewiſe to recommend it to others, according to the beſt of our ability?

The religion of Jeſus was intended to be univerſal. It has in it no reſtrictive precepts or ordinances, limiting it to any one place or people. And as our Lord himſelf ſaid in his conference with the woman of Samaria: *The hour cometh when ye ſhall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jeruſalem, worſhip the Father, ...But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in ſpirit and in truth:* John iv. 21...23. And after his reſurrection, renewing his commiſſion to his apoſtles, he tells them that *repentance and remiſſion of ſins ſhould be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jeruſalem:* Luke xxiv. 47, and ſee Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. St. Peter, when delivered from Jewiſh prejudices, ſays: *Of a truth I perceive that God is no reſpecter of perſons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteouſneſs, is accepted of him.* And ſaith St. John: *We have ſeen and do teſtify that the Father ſent the ſon to be the Saviour of the world:* 1 John iv. 14.

The goſpel then is deſigned for all: and it is a great bleſſing

upon many accounts, which need not be here enumerated. St. Paul therefore ſays: *It is a faithful ſaying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Chriſt Jeſus came into the world to ſave ſinners;* 1 Tim. i. 15.

If we are diſpoſed to communicate this bleſſing, and recommend the Chriſtian religion to others, there are two or three obſervations which may be mentioned here as deſerving our regard.

1. Let us take care to form right conceptions of it, and underſtand it, as it is in truth.

For otherwiſe, poſſibly, we may lead men into error, and pervert inſtead of improving them. And if we miſrepreſent the Chriſtian doctrine, we may expoſe it, and obſtruct the progreſs of it, and occaſion invincible prejudices in the minds of ſome who are well diſpoſed. Would it not be a melancholy caſe if ever we ſhould meet with a Malabarian Braman, or other Indian prieſt, hitherto unacquainted with revelation, ſpeaking more juſtly of the powers of human nature, and of the divine perfections than a Chriſtian miſſionary?

The Chriſtian religion can be learned with certainty from the books of the New Teſtament only; which are the authentic records of the doctrine taught by Chriſt, and his apoſtles. And there are in it ſome texts eſpecially, which, if attended to, will at once aſſure us of it's great deſign: ſuch as theſe and divers others: Mark xii. 28....34. *A ſcribe came to our Lord and aſked him, which is the firſt commandment of all? And Jeſus anſwered him: The firſt of all the commandments is, Hear, O Iſrael, the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy ſtrength. This is the firſt commandment. And the ſecond is like, namely this: Thou ſhalt love thy neighbour as thyſelf. There is none other commandment greater than theſe. The ſcribe ſaid unto him: Well, maſter, thou haſt ſaid the truth: for there is one God, and there is none other but he; and to love him with all the heart, and with all the ſoul....and to love his neighbour as himſelf, is more than all whole burnt offerings and ſacrifices. And when Jeſus ſaw that he anſwered diſcreetly, he ſaid unto him: Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.* And ſays St. Paul: Tit. ii. 11....15. *The grace of God, which bringeth ſalvation, has appeared unto all men, teaching us that, denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, we ſhould live ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly, in this preſent world: looking for that bleſſed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity,*

and

and purify to himſelf a peculiar people zealous of good works. By all which we learn that the Chriſtian religion is not a ſpeculative ſcience, but a plain and ſtrict and comprehenſive rule of life.

Agreeably hereto ſays Euſebius of Cæſarea: 'What [i] elſe does 'the name of Chriſtian denote, but a man, who by the know-'ledge and doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt is brought to the practice 'of ſobriety, righteouſneſs, patience, fortitude, and the religious 'worſhip of the one and only God over all?' Nor can it be taken amiſs, if I here refer to the philoſopher Alexander of Lycopolis, my ſecond witneſs in this fourth volume, who alſo appears to have had juſt apprehenſions concerning 'the Chriſtian 'philoſophy, as [k] intended by plain precepts, without nice diſ-'quiſitions, and intricate reaſonings, to promote virtue among 'all men, and even the lower ranks and common people.'

2. We ought to live according to the rules of our holy religion, and endeavour to excel in mutual love, and every other virtue.

This is incumbent upon both the teachers and the profeſſors of the Chriſtian religion; and it will be the moſt effectual recommendation of it to others. Says our Lord, John xiv. 21, *He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me*....Again, xiii. 34, 35: *A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another: as I have loved you, that ye love one another. By this ſhall all men know that ye are my diſciples, if ye have love one to another.* And ſays the apoſtle Paul: *Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt depart from iniquity:* 2 Tim. ii. 19.

3. I cannot but think it may be of uſe to promote learning and knowledge.

When Jeſus Chriſt came, and when his apoſtles preached the goſpel, it was an age of learning and politeneſs. Arts and ſciences flouriſhed greatly; and the Greek learning was ſpread all over the Roman empire, of which Judea was a part. Men muſt be rational and civilized before they can be Chriſtians. Knowledge has a happy tendency to enlarge the mind, and encourage generous ſentiments. Hereby we may hope to deliver men from ſuperſtition, bigotry, and perſecution, which have been ſome of the greateſt blemiſhes in the human conduct. As arts and ſciences are now in a flouriſhing condition, in a great part of the world, we may hope it will have a kindly influence, and contribute to the advancement of Chriſtianity in it's genuine

[i] Euſeb. H. E. l. i. cap. 4, p. 15 et 16. And ſee in this work Vol. iv. p. 216.
[k] See Vol. viii. p. 352.

purity

purity and perfection. Not[1] many years since was published by a pious and learned author, though he concealed his name, a small tract, entitled, Five several Schemes of Christian Religion: the last of which is summarily represented by him in these terms: 'In the next period of time we hope Christianity 'will be piety and virtue, with an improvement from the 'Greek and Roman moralists, corrected and perfected by the 'gospel.'

And here I put an end to my long work, hoping, and praying that it may be of some use to promote good learning, and true religion.

[1] In the year 1738. The Tract has been ascribed to Dr. Jeffery, Archdeacon of Norwich.

END OF THE FOURTH AND LAST VOL. OF JEWISH AND HEATHEN TESTIMONIES.

THE

HISTORY OF THE HERETICS

OF THE

TWO FIRST CENTURIES AFTER CHRIST:

CONTAINING

AN ACCOUNT OF THEIR TIME, OPINIONS, AND TESTIMONY

TO THE

BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TO WHICH ARE PREFIXED

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING HERETICS.

PUBLISHED FROM THE MANUSCRIPT OF THE LATE REVEREND AND LEARNED

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D.D.

WITH LARGE ADDITIONS BY JOHN HOGG.

[FIRST PUBLISHED IN MDCCLXXX.]

PREFACE.

THE following work is part of that ſcheme which the learned Dr. Lardner had planned, in order to give a full and comprehenſive view of the Credibility of the Goſpel Hiſtory. The world hath been long in poſſeſſion of the greater number of thoſe treatiſes which were intended to complete it; comprehending The Teſtimonies to the occaſional Facts mentioned in the New Teſtament: The Teſtimonies of Chriſtian writers to the Books of the New Teſtament: and alſo, The Teſtimonies of Jews and Heathens to the Books and principal Facts. The remaining part, as the Doctor himſelf informs us, [a] was intended to contain The Teſtimonies of Chriſtian Writers to the principal Facts of the New Teſtament: and alſo, The Hiſtory of the Heretics of the two firſt Centuries.

This hiſtory is now laid before the public. It was chiefly drawn up by the Doctor himſelf, and lay by him ſeveral [b] years. Some parts of it were completely fitted for the preſs, having received his laſt corrections. In other parts, only a few hints were written, [c] which I have endeavoured to follow with fidelity and exactneſs. Thoſe paſſages of ancient authors which, from any ſcattered obſervations or looſe papers, it appeared the worthy author intended to inſert, I have attentively peruſed and chiefly regarded, in drawing up what was neceſſary to complete each article.

The additions in ſome of the chapters of the ſecond book are very conſiderable. Under the articles of Baſilides and Marcion they are more than half. The chapter of Leucius, is almoſt entirely new, as there were but two pages written by Dr. Lardner. And the chapter of the Elceſaites is alſo new after the end of the third ſection.

I have publiſhed nothing concerning any heretic, but where the learned writer had either drawn up part, or left ſome hints or references. At firſt I intended to have begun the ſecond book with the hiſtory of Simon Magus, and to have added a ſhort

[a] See Preface to The Credibility, &c. Part II. Vol. v. p. 342. [b] Ibid.
[c] This was the caſe with a great part of the 8th and 9th ſections of Book I. with the whole 10th ſection, and with all the ſections in that book after the 11th.

chapter

chapter concerning Menander, his ſcholar and ſucceſſor. But after I had read ſeveral authors with that view, I found I ſtill wanted many, which I could not eaſily procure, and without peruſing which, it appeared improper to publiſh any thing on ſo obſcure and intricate a ſubject. Beſides, upon further conſideration, it ſeemed moſt adviſeable to give to the public this work of Dr. Lardner's by itſelf. For though there are in it many and large additions of my own, yet they are all founded either on ſome hints, or references in the Doctor's papers, or on paſſages of thoſe very authors which he himſelf ſo frequently quotes in this and other parts of his Credibility.

Mr. Joſeph Jennings, the nephew and executor of Dr. Lardner, committed to me in the year 1769, the papers relative to the preſent hiſtory; deſiring me to peruſe them, and to requeſt the aſſiſtance of my late worthy and learned friend the Rev. Samuel Merivale, in order to their being prepared for the preſs. Mr. Merivale declined undertaking any thing further than carefully examining the articles after they were put in order, and fitted for the preſs. Accordingly, as ſoon as each article was finiſhed, the manuſcript was delivered to him, and I have the ſatisfaction to ſay, met with his approbation. All, except the two chapters of Baſilides and Leucius, were completed before his death.

I am ſenſible of many imperfections attending this publication, which would have been avoided had the worthy author lived to have completed it himſelf: it is however hoped that even in it's preſent form it deſerves the attention of the public.

As to the additions I muſt intreat the world to judge of them with candour; for I am very ſenſible they are far inferior to thoſe parts which were finiſhed by Dr. Lardner himſelf.

I cannot conclude this preface without making my acknowledgments to a worthy clergyman in this neighbourhood, who kindly requeſted for me the uſe of ſeveral books from the cathedral library in this city, which was immediately granted.

JOHN HOGG.

EXETER, JUNE 5, 1779.

HISTORY OF HERETICS, &c.

BOOK THE FIRST.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING HERETICS.

SECT. I. *The Meaning of the Word Hereſy.*

HERESY, in Greek, ſignifies [a] election or choice, and is uſed [b] for any opinion which a man chuſeth as beſt, or moſt probable.

Hereſy and heretic are often uſed by ancient writers as words of indifferent meaning. And [c] the ſeveral ways of philoſophizing were called ſects or hereſies [d].

Inſtances of the innocent meaning of the word hereſy occur in the New Teſtament, Acts v. 17. *Then the high-prieſt roſe up, and all they that were with him, which* [dd] *is the ſect of the ſadducees.* Ch. xv. 5. *Then* [e] *roſe up certain of the ſect of the phariſees, which believed.* xxvi. 5. *After* [f] *the ſtricteſt ſect of our religion I lived a phariſee.*

Joſephus, in like manner, ſpeaking of the phariſees, ſadducees, and eſſenes, calls them [g] ſects or hereſies, without any mark of cenſure. They [h] were the ſeveral ways of philoſophizing among the Jews [i].

[a] Αιρεσις autem græcè ab electione dicitur: quod ſcilicet eam ſibi unuſquiſque eligat diſciplinam, quam putat eſſe meliorem. Hieron. ad Galat. cap. v. Tom. 4. P. i. p. 302. Conf. Suicer. V. Αιρεσις, et Cleric. H. E. An. 83. n. ii. iii.

[b] Αιρεσις η λεγω τινι κατα το φαινομενον αυτῳ δοκουσα, η δοκησα ακολουθειν. Suid. Vid. et Diog. Laert. lib. i. proœm. § 19, 20.

[c] Ιωσηφος δε...επειτα φησιν αιρεσεις ειναι τ.. φιλοσοφων και, αγωγας. Suid. et Diog. Laert. ibid. Opiniones omnium philoſophorum, qui ſectas varias condiderunt.... lex non parvis voluminibus quidam Celſus abſolvit. Auguſtin. de Hær. in Præf.

[d] Cato autem perfectus Stoicus, et ea Latiè, et in ea eſt hæreſi, &c. Cicero. Parad. Intro. Ed. Verbrug. pars 10. Tom. 15. p. 3820.

[dd] Η αυτα αιρεσις των σαδδυκαιων.

[e] Τινες των απο της αιρεσεως των Φαρισαιων.

[f] Κατα την ακριβεστατην αιρεσιν της ημετερας θρησκειας.

[g] Ηξαμην τε πολιτευεσθαι τη Φαρισαιων αιρεσει κατακολουθων, η παραπλησιος εστι τη παρ ελλησι γνωμη λεγομενη. Joſeph. Vit. n. 2. ....γενος δε σφοδρα λαμπρε, της δε Φαρισαιων αιρεσεως. Ib. n. 38. Κατα δε τον χρονον τουτον τρεις αιρεσεις των ιουδαιων ησαν...ων η μεν Φαρισαιων ελεγετο, η δε σαδδυκαιων, η τριτη δε εσσηνων. Antiq. Jud. l. 13. c. v. n. 9.

[h] Τρια γαρ παρα ιουδαιοις εισι φιλοσοφεινται, και του μεν αιρετισαι Φαρισαιοι, του δε σαδδυκαιοι, τριτον δε, ο δη και δοκει σεμνοτητα ασκειν, εσσηνοι καλουνται. De B. I. l. 2. c. 8. n. 2. Ιουδαιοις φιλοσοφιαι τρεις ησαν. Antiq. l. 18. c. i. n. 2.

[i] Of the Jewiſh ſects may be ſeen more at large in this work, Vol. i. p. 118...131.

In

In several places of the epistles of the New Testament, as 1 Cor. xi. 19. Gal. v. 20. 2 Pet. ii. 1. Tit. iii. 10. the words heresy and heretic are used in a bad sense. Nor is it, I apprehend, void of reproach in Acts xxiv. 5. where Tertullus, the orator, pleading before Felix, says of Paul: *We have found this man a pestilent fellow,...and* [k] *a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes.* Nor does the meaning appear quite innocent in Acts xxviii. 22. *As* [l] *concerning this sect we know that it is every where spoken against.* Nor in chap. xxiv. 14. *But this I confess unto thee, that* [m] *after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the* [n] *prophets.* Where the apostle honestly owns before Felix that he was a Christian, or of that way which most of the Jewish people called heresy, or a sect, a new sect or heresy. At the same time he intimates, (though without being very solicitous to avoid the imputation) that the scheme and principles professed and taught by him, was so agreeable to the law and the prophets, that there hardly was sufficient reason to call it heresy, or to reckon the followers of it a new and distinct sect.

Among Christians these words are very frequently taken in a bad sense: the reason of which seems to lie in what Tertullian says, with a view to the primary meaning of the word heresy, viz. a chosen opinion and doctrine: [o] that there should be no heresies among Christians, and that [p] a heretic forfeits the character of a Christian, forasmuch [pp] as there is nothing left to their invention. They ought all to adhere to the doctrine taught by, and received from Christ and his apostles, who have delivered all the principles of true religion.

[k] ....πρωτοστατην τε της των ναζωραιων αιρεσεως. [l] Περι μεν γαρ της αιρεσεως ταυτης. κ. λ. [m] ...κατα την οδον, ην λεγουσιν αιρεσιν. [n] The reader, if he thinks fit, may see what was said formerly upon this text, Vol. i. p. 190, 191.

[o] Sed et in omni penè epistola de adulterinis doctrinis fugiendis inculcans, hæreses taxat, quarum opera sunt adulteræ doctrinæ: hæreses dictæ Græca voce ex interpretatione electionis, quâ quis sive ad instituendas, sive ad suscipiendas eas utitur. Nobis vero nihil ex nostro arbitrio inducere licet, sed nec eligere quod aliquis de arbitrio suo induxerit. Apostolos Domini habemus auctores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio, quod inducerent, elegerunt; sed acceptam a Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus adsignaverunt. De Præscr. Hær. c. 6. p. 232. B. p. 202. Ed. Fran. [p] Si enim hæretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt, non a Christo habendo quod de sua electione sectati hæreticorum nomina admittunt. Ib. cap. 37. p. 245. p. 212. Ed. Fran.

[pp] Si propheta es, prænuntia aliquid: si apostolus, prædica publicè: si apostolicus, cum apostolis senti: si tantum Christianus es, crede quod traditum est. Si nihil istorum es, merito dixerim, morere. Nam et mortuus es, qui non es Christianus, non credendo quod creditum Christianos facit. Id. de Carne Chr. cap. 2. p. 358. p. 298. Ed. Fran. Unde autem extranei et inimici apostolis hæretici, nisi ex diversitate doctrinæ, quam unusquisque de suo arbitrio adversus apostolos aut protulit, aut recepit? De Præscr. Hær. c. 37. p. 212. Ed. Fran.

Therefore

Therefore he says that [q] Marcion is plainly convicted to be a heretic, because he had chosen a faith different from what he had received in the catholic church. And [r] Adam, he says, may be called a heretic, because he made a choice contrary to the divine order.

And with regard to the presumption of those men who introduced new opinions, he pleasantly says that [s] invention is an heretical privilege, and that [t] heretics, as well as poets and painters, have a certain license allowed them.

And it is no uncommon thing for catholic writers to blame those called heretics, who took to themselves a particular denomination from some one man or leader. So particularly [u] Justin Martyr. And we have seen upon divers occasions, how the [x] most rational and understanding Christians disclaimed all names but that of their master Jesus Christ.

We may here take notice of an observation of some learned moderns, that [y] though in Christian writers heresy is often used as equivalent to opinion, and particularly a wrong opinion, or false doctrine; yet that is not the most ancient sense of the word, but sect or party. And indeed it must be so understood in several passages alleged at the beginning of this article.

I may just add, that Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, whose words are cited by Suicer, [z] do not by heretics, in 1 Cor. xi. 19, understand wrong opinions, but contentions and divisions.

[q] Marcion Deum quem invenerat, extincto lumine fidei suæ, amisit. Non negabunt discipuli ejus, primam illius fidem nobiscum fuisse, ipsius literis testibus: ut hinc jam destinari possit hæreticus, qui deserto quod prius fuerat, id postea sibi elegerit, quod retro non erat, &c. Adv. Marc. l. i. c. i. p. 431. A. p. 350. Ed. Fran.

[r] Aut quis dubitabit, ipsum illud Adæ delictum hæresin pronunciare, quod per electionem suæ potius quam divinæ sententiæ admisit?....Rudis admodam hæreticus fuit. Non obaudiit. Non tamen blasphemavit Creatorem, &c. Adv. M. l. 2. c. 2. p. 454. C. D. p. 368. Ed. Fran.

[s] Licuit et Valentino, ex privilegio hæretico, carnem Christi spiritalem comminisci. Quidvis eam fingere potuit, quisquis humanam credere noluit. De C. C. cap. 15. p. 370. p. 306. Ed. Fran.

[t] .... si forte poetica, et pictoria licentia, et tertia jam hæretica. Adv. Marc. l. i. c. 3. in. p. 431. p. 351.

[u] Και εισιν αιτοι, οι μεν τινες καλουμενοι μαρκιανοι, οι δε ουαλεντιανοι, οι δε βασιλειδιανοι, οι δε σατορνιλιαιοι, και αλλοι αλλω ονοματι, απο τυ αρχηγετυ της γνωμης εκαστος ονομαζομενος· ου τροπον και εκαστος τωι φιλοσοφειν νομιζοντων...απο τυ πατρος τυ λογυ το ονομα της φιλοσοφει φιλοσοφιας ηγειται φερειν. Dialog. cum Tr. p. 253, 254. Paris, 1636.

[x] See Vol. iv. p. 282, 319, 515.

[y] Postea etiam hæreses dictæ vulgo apud Christianos opiniones ipsæ, æquo a recta doctrina abhorrentes, et hæretici vocati, qui eas tuebantur: quamvis peculiarem nullam sectam, quæ seorsim a cæteris Christianis ageret, condere adgrederentur. Quo tamen sensu in Apostolorum scriptis non occurrunt. Cleric. H. E. An. 83. n. iii.

[z] Diximus vocem αιρεσεως hac tertia significatione sumi, 1 Cor. xi. 19. Hic tamen dissimulandum non est, veteres non intelligere doctrinam orthodoxiæ contrariam, sed contentiones, &c. Suicer. V. Αιρεσις. p. 119, 120.

Sect. II. *It is difficult to define what is Heresy, or who is an Heretic.*

But though so much has been said for settling the meaning of the word, it is not easy to shew by an exact definition what is heresy, or who is an heretic. Thus much is acknowledged by Augustine, who says that [a] every heresy is an error, but every error is not an heresy. In another place he says, It [b] seems to him that heresy is, when a man for the sake of glory or power, or other secular advantages, either invents, or embraces and follows new and false opinions: and he thinks there is a great difference between such a one, and another who is deluded by him under the specious appearances of truth or piety. This will acquit many from the charge of heresy, or very much abate their guilt.

However, for better understanding this matter we may farther observe, that it is generally allowed that [c] a heretic is one who professeth to be a Christian, but is not supposed to be of the church, having [d] either separated himself from it, or been ex-

[a] Non enim omnis error hæresis est: quamvis omnis hæresis, quæ in vitio ponitur, nisi errore aliquo hæresis esse non possit. Quid ergo faciat hæreticum, regulari quadam definitione comprehendi, sicut ego existimo, aut omnino non potest, aut difficillime potest. Quod in processu hujus operis declarabitur. De Hæresib. pr. Tom. 8. Tom. 6. f. 3. D. Vene. 1570.

[b] Nunc vero, cum inter hæc duo plurimum interfit: quandoquidem hæreticus est, ut mea fert opinio, qui alicujus temporalis commodi, et maxime gloriæ principatusque sui gratia, falsas ac novas opiniones vel gignit, vel sequitur. Ille autem, qui hujusmodi hominibus credit, homo est imaginatione quadam veritatis ac pietatis illusus. De Util. Cred. c. i. in. Tom. 8. T. 6. 29. E.

[c] Παντες οι απο τουτων ορμωμενοι, ως ἐφημεν, χριστιανοι καλουνται. Just. M. Ap. ii. p. 70. B. ....τουτους ειναι αιρεσεις, ομολογουντας εαυτους ειναι χριστιανους, και τον σταυρωθεντα ιησουν ομολογειν, και κυριον και χριστον, και μη τα ανθρωπινα διδαγματα διδασκοντας. Dial. cum. Tryph. p. 253. A. Vid. ib. E. Itaque ille hæreticus, siquidem de his nobis sermo est, qui se Christianos dici volunt. Aug. de util. cred. c. 14. n. 30. in. T. 8. T. 6. 35. E. Insidiantur hæretici pallio velati nominis Christiani. Enarr. in PS. LX. p. 5. T. 4. T. 8. 202. F. Et vos, et omnes hæretici, qui quoquo modo Christiani appellantur. Contr. Faust. l. 20. c. x. sub fin. T. 8. T. 6. 117. M. Et quoniam quoquo modo Christianum se videri cupit. Contr. Adverf. L. et Pto. l. i. c. i. T. 8. T. 6. 188. M.

[d] Qui ergo in ecclesia Christi morbidum aliquid pravumque sapiunt, si correpti, ut sanum rectumque sapiant, resistunt contumaciter, finaque pestifera et mortifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defensare persistunt, hæretici fiunt, et foras exeuntes habentur in exercitibus inimicis. Aug. De Civ. Dei. l. 18. c. 51. T. 7. T. 5. 184. A. Extolluntur inde, et superbiunt inde, et videntur sibi sapientes. Hoc autem contigit omnibus hæreticis. Qui cum essent animales et carnales defendendo sententias suas pravas, quas falsas esse non potuerunt videre, excluſi sunt de catholica. Ejusd. Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. c. 9. T. 4. T. 8. 502. A. Baptizatum autem posse separari ab Ecclesia quis dubitavit? Inde quippe omnes hæreses exierunt, quæ vocabulo Christiano decipiunt. Id De Baptism. Contr. Donat. l. 5. c. 15. n. 20. T. 9. T. 7. 142. K. Statim enim ut unaquæque heresis existebat, et a congregatione catholicæ communionis exibat... Ib. cap. 19. n. 24. T. 7. 143. E.

cluded

cluded from it by others. Such deſcriptions of heretics are very common in Auguſtine, and Tertullian, who ſays that [c] heretics have no communion with other Chriſtians, but are ſtrangers without the church.

But whether they were allowed by others to be Chriſtians or not, they always called themſelves Chriſtians, and laid claim to that character. What is ſaid of the Valentinians by ſo ancient a writer as Irenæus is very obſervable. When [f] the eccleſiaſtical (or orthodox) Chriſtians refuſed to converſe with them, they complained of it as hard uſage, ſince they held the ſame or like doctrine with them. Lactantius ſays that [g] all heretics affirmed that they were the beſt Chriſtians and the catholic church. To the like purpoſe Salvian: they [h] believe what they profeſs to be true; and they think themſelves to be orthodox. As they are heretics in our eſteem, ſo are we in theirs. And as for thoſe of the two firſt centuries who called themſelves Chriſtians, and profeſſed faith in Jeſus, what good reaſon can there be to diſpute their veracity and integrity? The profeſſion [i] of the Chriſtian name was not then the way to honour, profit, or pleaſure.

Jerom ſays that 'hereſy [k] is an opinion different from the 'right interpretation of ſcripture. He therefore who holds 'ſuch an opinion may be a heretic, though he is not ſeparated 'from the church.' Nay [l] he ſuppoſeth that paſtors of the church may teach hereſy.

Elſewhere he ſpeaks of [m] heretics being excluded from the

[c] Hæretici autem nullum habent conſortium noſtræ diſciplinæ, quos extraneos utique teſtatur ipſa ademptio communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoſcere quod mihi eſt præceptum, quia non idem Deus eſt nobis et illis, nec unus Chriſtus, id eſt, idem, ideoque nec baptiſmus unus, quia non idem. De Baptiſm. c. 15. p. 262. D. p. 224. Ed. Fran. [f] Qui etiam queruntur de nobis, quod cum ſimilia nobiſcum ſentiant, ſine cauſa abſtineamus nos a communicatione eorum, et cum eadem dicant, et eandem habeant doctrinam, vocemus eos hæreticos. Iren. l. 3. c. xv. n. 2. p. 203. p. 237. Ed. Grab. Ox. 1702. [g] Sed tamen quia ſinguli quique cœtus hæreticorum ſe potiſſimum Chriſtianos, et ſuam eſſe catholicam eccleſiam putant, ſciendum eſt, &c. Inſtit. l. 4. c. ult. p. 450. p. 519. Ed. Walchii Lipſ. 1715. [h] Hæretici ergo ſunt, ſed non ſentes. Denique apud nos ſunt hæretici, apud ſe non ſunt. Nam in tantum ſe catholicos eſſe judicant, ut nos ipſos titulo hæreticæ appellationis infament. Salvian De Gub. l. 5. p. 100. p. 153. Ox. 1633.

[i] Nihil enim cauſæ erat, cur Valentiniani videri vellent Chriſtiani, a cujus nominis ſocietate iis temporibus nil commodi ſperari poterat, ſed potius mala omnia. Heuman. ap. Act. Lipſ. Menſ. April. 1712. p. 176. [k] Αἵρεσις autem Græcè ab electione dicitur. Quicumque igitur aliter ſcripturam intelligit, quam ſenſus Spiritus Sancti flagitat, quo conſcripta eſt, licet de Eccleſia non receſſerit, tamen hæreticus appellari poteſt: et de carnis operibus eſt, eligens quæ pejora ſunt. Hieron. in Gal. c. 5. T. 4. P. i. p. 302. [l] Poſſumus autem hoc juxta tropologiam et de Eccleſiæ principibus intelligere, qui tamen non dignè regunt oves Domini...Perdunt oves paſtores, qui docent. In Jerem. c. xxiii. T. 3. p. 634. [m] Omnis enim hæreticus naſcitur in Eccleſia, ſed de Eccleſia projicitur: et contendit, et pugnat contra Eccleſiam. In Jerem. cap. xxii. p. 631.

church. At other times he says that [n] heretics withdraw and separate themselves from the church; as does Cyprian also in a passage cited [o] by us formerly.

Origen seems to have supposed that [p] great errors only ought to be reckoned heresies, such as those of Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides, and some others, who did not believe the same God to have been the God of the Old and New Testament.

Sect. III. *Of the Causes of Heresies.*

We need not solicitously inquire into the causes of heresies or the moving principles of heretics. It is well known that heresies have been often ascribed to [q] pride, a [r] love of preeminence, [s] envy, revenge, [t] disappointed ambition, love of

[n] Propterea vero a semet ipso dicitur damnatus, quia fornicator....et cætera vitia, per sacerdotes de Ecclesia propelluntur. Hæretici autem in semetipsos sententiam ferunt, suo arbitrio de Ecclesia recedentes. Quæ recessio propriæ conscientiæ videtur esse damnatio. Inter hæresim et schisma hoc esse arbitrantur, quod hæresis perversum dogma habeat. Schisma propter episcopalem dissentionem ab Ecclesiâ separetur, &c. Id. ad Tit. iii. T. 4. p. 439. Conf. eund. in Js. c. xxii. T. 3. p. 196. [o] See Vol. iii. p. 188.

[p] Quid vero sit hæreticus homo, pro viribus nostris secundum quod sentire possumus, describamus. Omnis qui se Christo credere profitetur, et tamen alium Deum Legis et Prophetarum, alium Evangeliorum Deum dicit, et Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, non eum dicit esse, qui a Lege et Prophetis prædicatur, sed alium nescio quem ignotum omnibus....Huiusmodi homines hæreticos designamus.... sicut sectatores Marcionis, et Valentini, et Basilidis, et ii qui se Ethnianos appellant.. sed et Apelles... Pamph pro Orig. Apol. ap. Hieron. Tom. v. p. 226.

[q] Omnes tument, omnes scientiam pollicentur. Ante sunt perfecti catechumeni, quam edocti. Ipsæ mulieres hæreticæ, quam procaces! Tertullian. De Pr. Hær. cap. xli. 111. 213. Fran. Quis enim hæreticorum non superbus est? Qui ecclesiasticam despiciens simplicitatem, ita habeat Ecclesiæ homines quasi bruta animalia, et in tantum superbiæ injuriæque tumore erigitur, ut contra ipsum Creatorem armat os suum. Hieron. in Is. cap. xvi T. 3. p. 171. Hæretici matrem habent iniquitatis suæ superbiam, dum semper altiora scire se jactitant, et in Ecclesiæ contumeliam debaschantur. Id. in Osee. cap. v. p. 1266. Et quia semper hæretici tumentes superbiâ, et incidentes in laqueum diaboli, magna sibi promittunt. Id. in Amos. cap. iv. p. 1402. Vide hæreticos, in dialectica sibi et rhetorica, et et omium sophismatum dogmatibus applaudentes, contemnere Ecclesiæ rusticitatem, &c. In Sophon. ib. p. 1664. Egenum et pauperem intellige ecclesiasticum virum, qui veritatis simplicitate contentus, hæreticorum supellectilem, et eloquentiæ fulgorem, argumentorumque divitias, non requirit. Id. in Amos. cap. iv. p. 1398. Omnes enim hæreticorum principes intumescunt superbiâ, &c. In Amos cap. ii. 1383. Quis enim hæreticorum non in superbiam extollitur, Ecclesiæ simplicitatem parvi pendens, et fidem, imperitiam reputans. Id. in Abd. c. i. p. 1458. fin.

[r] Ουτος [μονταιος] οισηθεις εξειν φιλαρχιας παρακλητον εαυτον προσηγορευσε. Theod. H. F. l. 3. c. 2.

[s] Ζηλωσας λοιπον, και εις μεγαν αξιωθηναι και υπεροφθηναι, το σχισμα εργαζεται ο τοιουτος, εαυτω την αιρεσιν προσηγαμενος, και ειπων. Εγω σχισω της εκκλησιας τους και βαλω σχισματα εις την αιρεσιν. Epiph. contr. Marcion. H. 42. n. 2. D

[t] Huic, ut et multis aliis hæreticis, effrænis ambitio, si Tertulliano fides, ruinæ occasio fuit. 'Speraverat,' inquit, adv. Valentin. cap. 4. 'episcopatum Va-'lentinus, quia et ingenio poterat et elo-'quio. Sed alium ex Martyrii prærogati-'va loci positum indignatus, de ecclesiæ 'authenticæ regulæ abrupit, ad expugnandam conversus veritatem.' Maffuet. Diss. Pr. ad. Iren. p. xvi.

sensuci

ſenſual [u] pleaſure, a deſire to be wiſe and knowing above others, and curioſity to ſearch out the reaſon of all things, and to other faulty cauſes and principles: which indeed may have very much contributed to the great variety of opinions which there has been among Chriſtians; from which thoſe who are called catholics, and who have been generally eſteemed orthodox, have not been always free.

One cauſe already hinted, of no ſmall effect in this affair, may have been an eager curioſity to pry into and know every thing. Too [x] curious inquiries into the origin of evil ſeem to have miſled many men. The queſtion was difficult, and they went into ſeveral opinions, ſome of which were wrong and abſurd. Their prejudices and their arguments upon this head occur in [y] Tertullian, [z] Epiphanius, [a] Jerom, and others, as we ſhall ſee more particularly hereafter.

Lactantius, accounting for the numerous ſects and diviſions among Chriſtians, mentions ſeveral cauſes: a [b] love of this world, and a deſire of pre-eminence. When ſuch men failed of attaining thoſe advantages in the church, which they had in view,

[u] Nulla enim hæreſis, niſi propter gulam ventremque conſtruitur, ut ſeducat mulierculas oneratas peccatis. Hieron. in Jerem. cap. iv. T. 3. p. 543. fin.

[x] Eadem materia apud hæreticos et philoſophos volutatur, idem retractatus implicantur. Unde malum, et quare? et unde homo, et quomodo? Tertull. Pr. cap. vii. p. 232. D. 203. Fran.

[y] Languens enim (quod et nunc multi, et maxime hæretici) circa mali queſtionem: Unde malum? Tertull. adv. Marc. l. i. cap. 2. p. 431. p. 351. Fran.

[z] Ἐχει δε η αρχη αυτης της κακης προφασις την αιτιαν απο του ζητειν, και λεγειν πόθεν το κακον. Epiph. contra Baſilid. H. 24. n. vi. vii. [a] Dicat hæc Marcion, et omnes hæretici, qui Creatoris operibus illudunt. Veſtrum decretum huc uſque perveniet, ut dum ſingula calumniantur, manum injiciant Deo, cur ſolus ſit Deus, cur invideri creaturis, ut non omnes eadem polleant majeſtate. Adv. Pelagian. lib. i. p. 496. m. Tom. 4. ...Detrahatur ergo illi, cur diabolum eſſe permiſerit, cur malus ſit, et hucuſque patiatur quotidie aliquid in mundo mali fieri. Quærit hoc Marcion, et omnes hæreticorum canes, qui Vetus laniant Teſtamentum, et hujuſcemodi ſyllogiſmum texere conſueverunt: Aut fecit Deus, hominem in paradiſo poſſum prævaricaturum mandatum illius, aut neſcivit, &c. Id. ib. l. 3. p. 536. m.

[b] Sed quoniam multæ hæreſes exſtiterunt, et inſtinctibus dæmonum populus Dei ſciſſus eſt...Ante omnia ſcire nos convenit, et ipſum, et legatos eius prædixiſſe, quod plurimæ ſectæ, et hæreſes haberent exiſtere, quæ concordiam ſancti corporis rumperent, ac monuiſſe, ut ſumma prudentia caveremus...Quorum plerique immemores, deſerto itinere cœleſti, vias ſibi devias per anfractus et præcipitia condiderunt: per quas partem plebis incautam, et ſimplicem, ad tenebras, mortemque deducerent. Quod quatenus acciderit, exponam. Fuerunt quidam noſtrorum vel minus ſtabilita fide, vel minus docti, vel minus cauti...Sed ii, quorum fides lubrica, cum Deum noſſe ſe, et colere ſimularent, augendis opibus, et honori ſtudentes, affectabant maximum ſacerdotium: et a potioribus victi ſecedere cum ſuffragatoribus ſuis maluerunt, quam eos ferre præpoſitos, quibus concupierant ipſi ante præponi. Quidam vero non ſatis cœleſtibus literis eruditi, cum veritatis accuſatoribus reſpondere non poſſent, obicientibus vel impoſſibile, vel incongruens eſſe, ut Deus in uterum ſe mulieris includeret: nec cœleſtem illam majeſtatem ad tantam infirmitatem potuiſſe deduci, ut hominibus contemptui, deriſui, contumeliæ, et ludibrio eſſet: poſtremo etiam cruciamenta perferret, atque execrabili patibulo figeretur...depravati ſunt ab itinere recto... Lact. Inſtit. l. 4. cap. ult. p. 516. 518.

they formed parties. Another cauſe aſſigned by him is unacquaintedneſs with the ſcriptures, and the reaſon of things; inſomuch that meeting with difficulties and objections againſt the right doctrine, which they could not anſwer, they embraced a leſs reaſonable opinion. Theſe laſt-mentioned may be ſuppoſed to have been honeſt men, though weak, and of little knowledge and underſtanding.

Sect. IV. *Many Miſtakes in the Writings of thoſe who have publiſhed the Hiſtory of Hereſies accounted for.*

There are, as it ſeems, not a few miſtakes in the ancient writers of hereſies, Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philaſter, and others. Many learned [c] moderns have been ſenſible of it; and it may be eaſily and fully accounted for [d]. It was a large and difficult undertaking to write the hiſtory of a great number of hereſies, and their authors; and the notions of ſome of them might be very obſcure and intricate; it might be difficult to get a ſight of their works, or to procure information otherwiſe. Irenæus [e] himſelf

[c] S. Irenée a été, ſi je ne me trompe, le premier auteur Chrêtien, qui ait entrepris de faire connoitre à l'Egliſe les erreurs de tous les heretiques, qui s'etoient élevez juſqu'a ſon tempus, et les refuter. Mais, quêlqu'habile que fût ce Pere, l'entrepris étoit bien grande á cauſe du nombre des ſectes, et de l'obſcurité, dont quelques-unes affectoient d'enveloper leurs ſyſtêmes. Il falloit lire beaucoup dans un temps, ou les livres n'étoient gueres communes: et lire avec une grande attention, examines bien quels étoient les vrais ſentimens des ſectaires, pour ne leur en pas attribuer qu'ils n'avoient point, ne pas diſſimuler leurs raiſons et leurs difficultez, et ne donner point legerement créance à des bruits faux ni incertains. Il fallois ſurtout ſe defendre contre le prejugé et la partialité, &c. I. Beauſobre Hiſt. de Manich. l. 4. c. i. ii. iii. T. 2. p. 4. Unum fortaſſe caput in hac Diſſertatione [Maſſueti] deſiderabunt lectores nonnulli, quo fides Irenæi hiſtorica ſub examine revocata ſit. Vulgus quidem hiſtoriæ lectorum non conſiderat, quanto locorum ac temporum intervallo disjunctus ſit auctor aliquis ab eo de quo ſcripſit. At prudentiores ſcire avent, imprimis in hiſtoria de adverſariis ſcripta, an ſcriptor notitiam habuerit undiquâque certam, eamque ſine affectu expoſuerit. Non ignoramus, Irenæum a Tertulliano vocari 'omnium doctrinarum 'curioſiſſimum exploratorem.' Sed an vera ſit hæc laus, dubitare in mentem venit, poſtquam videmus, ipſum Maſſuetum longe doctius de origine Gnoſticorum errorum judicare, quam Irenæum. Heumann. Recenſio Iren. opp. a Maſſuet. edit. apud Act. Lipſ. Menſ. Apr. 1712. p. 178. Meo quidem judicio, eum, qui omnia quæ in hæreticos dixit Irenæus, apte et ſolide dicta eſſe demonſtrare vult, totam hominum illorum diſciplinam conturbare, et ſententiis eorundem vim afferre oportet. I. L. Moſhem. Inſtit. H. E. Majores. p. 323. Vid. ib. p. 321.

[d] We ſhould not truſt too much to the repreſentations which Chriſtians, after the apoſtolical age, have given of the heretics of their times. Proper abatements muſt be made for credulity, zeal, reſentment, miſtake, and exaggeration. And as you deſcend from the middle of the ſecond century, the deſcriptions of this kind grow leſs fair and conſiſtent, and more partial and improbable, till, at laſt, very little credit is due to them. Jortin's Diſcourſes concerning the truth of the Chriſtian Rel. p. 72. 3d. ed. [e] Quapropter hi qui ante nos fuerunt, et quidem multo nobis meliores, non tamen ſatis potuerunt contradicere his qui ſunt a Valentino, quia ignorabant regulam ipſorum. Iren. Præf. lib. 4. p. 227, 274. Grabe.

obſerves

observes that some good men, who before him had written against the Valentinians, were not fully acquainted with their doctrine, and therefore could not confute them in a right manner. Moreover, wise and understanding persons are liable to prejudices. Almost all are too averse to men of different sentiments. I have already made an apology [f] for the mistakes observed in the writings of ancient Christians. I shall still endeavour to maintain an impartial regard to all, without [g] aggravating the supposed errors of those who have been defamed as heretics, or [h] the mistakes, oversights, inaccuracies, and misrepresentations of those who have written their history, or have argued against them. I likewise intend to avoid too great exactness and particularity in matters which are either plainly absurd, or very abstruse and metaphysical, and not necessary to be generally known in these times; following [i] herein the example of other ecclesiastical historians of good credit. And I suppose that the history of the Manichees, formerly written, may be of some use here. Indeed one reason of indulging myself in so copious and particular an account of this sect was, that I hoped thereby to shorten the history of the more ancient heresies, and to render it more easy and intelligible to my readers.

Sect. V. *The Number of Heresies hath been augmented without sufficient Reason.*

The ancient heresies have been unreasonably multiplied. The [k] number in Epiphanius is eighty: that is, twenty before

[f] See Vol. iii. p. 539. [g] Il est juste d' effacer des perjugez, qui viennent moins d' ignorance que d'une aversion mal entendue pour les heretiques. Clement d' Alexandrie a fort bien dit, que toutes les opinions des sectaires ne sont ni Mauvaises, ni vaines et meprisables. Παμπολλα γαρ των παρα ταις αιρεσεσι δοξαζομενων ευροιμεν αν, οσαι μη τελεον εκκεκωφηνται. κ. λ. Clem. Str. l. i. p. 298. B. Beausobre Hist. Manich. l. 3. c. 9. n. v. T. i. p. 573. [h] De hereticis quibusdam agemus, qui hæc ætate prava dogmata sparsisse dicuntur. De quibus tamen, cum nullos habemus æquales testes, nec quidquam proferre possimus ex eorum scriptis, quæ interciderunt, nec supersit nobis eorum historia, nisi in infensissimorum proxime sequentis seculi, aut etiam posteriorum adversariorum testimoniis, nihil ferme quasi prorsus exploratum proferre possumus. Absit tamen, ut mendacii datâ operâ confecti quemquam insimulatum velimus, e recte sentientibus Christianis! sed fieri potest, ut de iis, quibus merito infensi erant, multa facilius æquo crediderint, aut ut mentem eorum non satis adsequi uti sint, utque falsa de iis imprudentes prodiderint, non quidem mero nocendi aut mentiendi studio sed adfectu nonnullo præpediti. Quod et ex hodiernis Christianorum controversiis intelligere licet. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 76. n. i. p. 481. [i] Itaque hic nimiam adhibere diligentiam puderet. Id. A. D. 121. n. viii. p. 583. [k] It is very uncommon (says Du Pin) for writers of heresies to lessen their number or forget any one, but to multiply them is a common fault. Bib. Eccle. T. 2. p. 244. dans Philastre. He has many good remarks concerning Philaster, and the heresies in him.

Christ, and sixty afterwards, down to his own time. We formerly saw some reason to doubt whether [l] there ever were such sects or heresies as the Valesians, Angelics, and Apostolics, or even such Origenists as Ephiphanius speaks of. And if the Nicolaitans were no distinct sect, and if the Simonians, and the Cainites, the Ophites or Ophians, and the Sethians, were not by profession Christians, but unbelievers and enemies of Jesus, as some think, they ought not to be reckoned heretics. But of this more particularly hereafter. The numbers in Epiphanius might be still farther reduced by other considerations.

In Philaster are now one hundred and fifty: but Augustine [m] computed in him twenty-eight heresies before Christ, and one hundred and twenty-eight afterwards. Our copies of Philaster therefore seem to be defective; for we have in him no more after our Lord's coming than one hundred and twenty-two. But many of Philaster's heresies are exceeding trifling: Augustine [n] was sensible of it, and in one part of his work passeth over at once [o] fourteen or fifteen articles in Philaster. One of the heresies in Philaster [p], taken too by Augustine, is that [q] there are more worlds than one. Another heresy, but omitted by Augustine, is of those who [r] had given names to stars beside those named in scripture. A common opinion of the ancient Christian writers concerning the fall of some of the angels is with [s] Philaster a heresy. He has [t] four or five different heresies about the version of the Seventy, and other Greek translations of the Old Testament. His Rhetorians [u] are not a little whimsical; that [x] article

[l] See Vol. iii. c. 17...25. [m] Vid. Augustin. Pr. ad Quodvult deum, et libr. de Har. cap. 41. [n] Has hæreses putavi...in hoc opus meum de Philastri opere transferendas. Et alias quidem ipse commemorat, sed mihi appellandæ hæreses non videntur. Aug. de Hær. cap. 80. [o] Vid. Philast. H. 98. et Fabricii Annot. p. 188. Apud alios 49 Between the seventy-sixth and seventy-seventh heresies of Austin there are in Philaster fifteen which Austin has omitted, as he has also seven others, which are inserted by Philaster, between those which answer to the seventy-seventh and seventy-eighth heresy of Austin.

[p] Alia est hæresis, quæ dicit mundos esse infinito et innumerabiles, secundum philosophorum quorundam inanem sententiam, cum scriptura mundum unum dixerit. H. 113. p. 233. Edid. Fabr. Her. 65. p. 34. Tom. 4. La Bigne Bib. Patrum. Par. 1624. [q] Aug. H. 77.

[r] Alia est hæresis, quæ secundum Paganorum vanitatem syderum diversa nomina profitetur...Qui Cometas, et Pogonias, et Hyadas, et Hædos, et talia hujusmodi adserunt nomina delirantes, cum Scriptura pauca nomina syderum dixerit, dicente Job propheta...Qui fecit Pleiades, et Arcturum, &c. Phil. H. 103. p. 197. H. 55. p. 27. [s] Alia est hæresis, quæ de gigantibus adserit, quod angeli miscuerint se cum feminis ante deluvium, et inde esse natos gigantes suspicatur. H. 107. p. 108. H. 59. p. 29.

[t] Vid. H. 138...142. aliis 90...94.

[u] Alii sunt...a Rhetorio quodam, qui omnes laudabat hæreticos, dicens omnes bene sentire, et neminem errare ex iis, sed ambulare bene omnes illos, et male eos non credere sentiebat. H. 91. aliis 43.

[x] A Rhetorio quodam exortam hæresim dicit nimium mirabilis vanitatis, quæ omnes hæreticos recte ambulare, et vera dicere affirmat: quod ita est absurdum, ut mihi incredibile videatur, Aug. H. 72.

was

was not thoroughly approved by Augustine. I put in the margin a [y] conjecture of Fabricius upon it. There was no occasion to make a distinct chapter [z] of such as held three modes in the Deity, after the mention of Noetus and Sabellius: and yet Augustine [a] has copied that article. And there are many others altogether needless. So that the number of heresies in that writer might be greatly reduced; and indeed in Augustine likewise. Epiphanius [b] and Augustine [c] make two different articles of Montanists or Cataphrygians, and Pepuzians; but Theodoret more judiciously one [d] only, they being different denominations of one and the same sect or people.

It may be worth observing in this place that the Christian writers, Justin Martyr, [e] Hegesippus, [f] and Epiphanius, [g] reckon six or seven sects among the Jews; and as they do not all mention the same but different, they make in all ten or twelve at least. Whilst Josephus, whose authority must certainly be preferred, computes [h] but three, or at most four Jewish sects: but on this I shall not enlarge. I only refer to the curious Dissertation of Rhenford upon the subject [i],

Sect. VI. *Most Heresies of the two first Centuries may be reduced to two kinds.*

The greatest part of the heresies of the two first centuries may be reduced to two kinds. This was done by so ancient a writer as Theodoret, whose words in the preface to his five books of heresies I shall here transcribe, as giving some authority to this observation. 'The [k] first book of heretical fables,' says he, 'shall contain the account of those who assert another maker 'of the world, and deny that there is one principle of all things, 'who also say that the Lord was man in appearance only. The

[y] Suspicor, sub Rhetorio hoc rhetorem latere Themistium, qui oratione duodecima ad Valentem, p. 159, et quinta ad Jovinianum, p. 69, docet varietate illa opinionum de rebus divinis adeo non offendi Numen, ut etiam delectetur. In eandem sententiam Symmachus apud Prudentium. ii. 772. Fabric. ad loc. Philast.

[z] Hæresis Triformem Deum faciens. H. 93. p. 177. al. H. 45. p. 24.

[a] Aug. H. 74. [b] H. 48, 49.

[c] H. 26, 27. [d] H. Fab. l. 3. c. 2.

[e] Just. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 307. A.

[f] Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 22.

[g] Epiph. l. i. p. 31, &c.

[h] See the First Part of this Work, b. i. ch. iv. and ch. ix. and x.

[i] De fictis Judæorum Hæresibus.

[k] Και το μεν πρωτον των μυθων εκεινων την διηγησιν δεξεται, ων οι πατερες δημιουργον μεν ανεπλασαν ετερον, την δε μιαν των ολων αρνηθεντες αρχην, αρχας ετερας ουκ ουσας υπεθεντο, δοκησει δε φανηναι τον κυριον εις ανθρωπους εφασαν...το δε δευτερον τους τ' αναντια τουτοις επιδειξει τε θρησκευκοτας οι μιαν μεν αρχην ειναι των ολων συνωμολογησαν, χιλον δε ανθρωπον τον κυριον προς ηγορευσαν. Ταυτης δε της αιρεσεως ηξε μεν εβιων. κ. λ. H. F. T. iv. p. 188.

'first

'first of these is Simon the magician, of Samaria; the last Manes, 'of Persia. The second book will shew those of a contrary way 'of thinking, who allow one principle of all things, but say our 'Lord was a mere man, from Ebion down to Marcellus and 'Photinus, though in somewhat different forms. The third 'book will contain others between these.' But of these there are but six, the Nicolaitans, the Montanists, Noetus, the Quartodecimans, Novatus, and Nepos; three of which, Noetus, Novatus, and Nepos, are of the third century, and the Montanists and Quartodecimans in the latter part of the second century. 'In the fourth book,' he says, 'he will place later heresies, that 'of Arius, Eunomius, and others. The fifth book is to contain 'a representation of the true evangelical doctrine.' So that the most ancient heresies, at the beginning of the second century, are chiefly of two sorts. And what Theodoret says in the place now cited, may be compared with the account he gives in another [l] work. Tertullian [m] speaks of only two heresies in the times of the apostles, Docetæ and Ebionites.

Some learned moderns have spoken in the like manner; so [n] Vitringa; nor does Mr. Turner much differ [o] from this account: and says Tillemont: 'The [p] church was disturbed from 'the beginning with two opposite heresies, each of which pro- 'duced several sects. Of one of these Simon was the first au- 'thor. Their capital doctrines are that there are two gods, and 'two principles, the Creator, and another above him: and that 'our Saviour was man in appearance only. These are called 'by the general names of Gnostics and Docetæ, and compre- 'hend almost all the sects of the two first ages. The other he- 'resy opposite to this came from the Jews, who embraced

[l] Σιμων, και μενανδρος, και μαρκιων, και βαλεντινος, και βασιλειδης, και βαρδεσανης, και κερδων, και μανης, ηρεθησαν αντικρυς την ανθρωποτητα τυ χριστυ. Αρτεμων δε και θεοδοτος, και σαβελλιος, και παυλος ο σαμοσατευς, και μαρκελλος, και φωτεινος εις την εναντιαν εκ διαμετρυ βλασφημιαν κατεπεσον· ανθρωπον γαρ μονον κηρυττουσι τον χριστον, την δε προ των αιωνων υπαρχουσαν αρνουνται θεοτητα. Αρειος δε και ευνομιος. κ. λ. Dial. 2. p. 52. c. T. iv.

[m] At in epistola eos maxime, antichristos vocat, qui Christum negarent in carne venisse, et qui non putarent Jesum esse filium Dei. Illud Marcion, hoc Hebion vindicavit... Hæc sunt ut arbitror, genera doctrinarum adulterinarum, quæ sub apostolis fuisse, ab ipsis apostolis discimus. De Pr. cap. 33, 34. p. 244. B. p. 210, 11.

[n] Recte itaque episcopus Cestriensis Vind. Ign. P. 2. c. i. p. 344. Duæ potissimum hæreses, ait, de natura Christi ea tempestate obtinebant....Quarum altera Docetarum fuit a Simonianis ortorum, humanæ naturæ veritatem in Christo despuentium, altera Ebionitarum, divinam prorsus naturam et æternam generationem negantium, legisque cæremonias urgentium. Vitring. Obs. Sacr. l. 5. cap. 12. p. 155, 156.

[o] The primitive heretics were not by far so numerous as has been represented. The erroneous tenets propagated by the primitive heretics are reducible to a few heads; and, strictly speaking, there were not above three or four heresies, for the first two hundred years. Calumnies upon the primitive Christians, p. 190, 191.

[p] Mem. Ec. T. 2. L'hérésie des Cerinthiens. init.

'Christianity,

'Christianity, but not in all it's perfection. They owned one 'principle, and one God, and the reality of Christ's human na- 'ture. But they believed him to be no more than a man, denied 'his divinity, and retained the ceremonies of the law with so 'much zeal, as to diminish the liberty and glory of the gospel.'

Agreeable to this two different opinions concerning the person of Christ have been before spoken of [q]. There is no need therefore to enlarge further on this head at present.

Sect. VII. *Heretics have been often treated with great Acrimony.*

Heretics have been often treated with much harshness, and great severity of expression. I have already had occasion [r] to allege some instances of this. It is hard to forbear making some additions here. St. Jerom scruples not to say, they are worse [s] than heathens, the [t] worst of all men; and if they are free from all reproach in their lives, yet [u] they have only the shadow and appearance of virtue, not the truth. Cyril of Jerusalem says of the Montanists that they [x] are called Christians, but falsely. Epiphanius's introduction to his account of Ebionitism, must be allowed to be a remarkable instance of harshness, not to say railing. It is [y] with him a many headed monster, and has in it at once the profaneness and impurity of the Samaritans, the name of Jews, the errors of the Nazarenes and Cerinthians, and the wickedness of the Carpocratians, with the denomination of Christians. And he [z] is in doubt whether he should not consider Arianism as infidelity; but corrects himself, and adds, or rather wrong faith: which surely is rightest. Passion may suggest the former: but reason will plead for the latter.

Indeed there are many considerations that may lead men to

[q] See Vol. iii. p. 541, 542.

[r] Ibid. p. 389, 390, and 411.

[s] Multo quippe pejori conditione sunt hæretici quam gentiles. Hier. in Matt. cap. xiii. T. iv. p. 51. f. ...et impietatem superant Ethnicorum...Nullus enim ecclesiasticorum tantum habet studii in bono, quantum hæretici in malo: et in eo se lucrum putant consequi, si alios decipiant, et ipsi perditi cæteros perdant. In Is. cap. xviii. p. 180. m. T. 3.

[t] Hoc significat, quod impietate sua omnes vincant hæretici. Verbi gratia: Dicit Epicurus, non esse providentiam, et voluntatem maximum bonum. Comparatione hujus sceleratior Marcion, et omnes hæretici, qui vetus lacerant testamentum. In Is. cap. xviii. p. 179. f.

[u] Porro hæretici imaginem tantum habentes umbramque virtutum, et non ipsam veritatem, absque fructu operum, verborum folia pollicentur. In Is. cap. v. p. 50. m.

[x] Ψευδως μεν, ομωνυμως δε καλεισθαι χριστιανους. Cat. 16. n. 8.

[y] ....πολυμορφον τερας....πολυκεφαλω υδρας...Σαμαρειτων μεν γαρ εχει το βδελυρον, Ιουδαιων δε το ονομα...Ναζωραιων την γνωμην, Κηρινθιων το ειδος, Καρποκρατιανων την κακοτροπιαν, και Χριστιανων βουλεται εχειν την προσηγοριαν. H. 30. n. 1.

[z] ...Ως ειθε και η του αρειου εμβεβροντημενη πιστις μαλλον δε απιστια. εστι δι μαλλον κακοπιστια. H. 69. n. ii. fin.

moderation

moderation one toward another, upon occaſion of different ſentiments, eſpecially in matters which have in them ſome abſtruſeneſs and difficulty. One conſideration of no ſmall moment is, that we are in danger of the ſame treatment which we give to others. It was formerly obſerved that [a] Methodius bore hard upon Origen: but he himſelf has ſince been ſuſpected of divers errors. Philaſter, who wrote a long treatiſe of hereſies, and condemns ſome of them with ſeverity, has not been thought orthodox by all, but has fallen under the charge or ſuſpicion of hereſy. He [b] ſpeaks of man's free-will in terms, that would be diſliked by many of late times. Moreover he thought the ſoul [c] to be created before the body. And as he has no article of Origeniſts, or followers of Origen, he is ſuppoſed to have favoured that great man in ſome of his peculiarities. The millennium, which has been a favourite doctrine of ſome ages, and has had the patronage of the learned, as well as the vulgar, among Chriſtians; at other times, and by other writers, has been exploded and ridiculed. And notwithſtanding the allowed piety of ſome of it's patrons, it is placed by Philaſter among his [d] hereſies. This is certain, that as bad things were ſaid of the primitive Chriſtians by Jews and heathens, as ever were ſaid of the ancient heretics by catholics. Modern reformers have been treated juſt in the ſame manner. And no wonder, ſince there have in every age been men ſo ſtrongly attached to their preſent intereſt as to value the emoluments connected with old eſtabliſhments, however erroneous, more than truth. Such men will always repreſent every attempt towards a reformation, as proceeding from wicked and impious diſpoſitions, and will cry down the promoters of it, as heretics, and as men of the moſt abandoned and profligate principles.

This muſt be the caſe whenever men think themſelves privileged to neglect the rules of candour and moderation, in the judgment they form concerning each other. For though truth is one and unchangeable, orthodoxy and hereſy are as variable as the opinions of fallible and inconſtant, of prejudiced and ignorant men.

[a] See Vol. iii. p. 304, 305. [b] Quia arbitrii ſui eſt omnis homo, quod velit ut eligat facere, permitente Deo. H. 26. p. 49. p. 7. E. Par. 1624. [c] Vid. H. 97. p. 26. Ibid. [d] H. 59. p. 119. p. 15. C. Par. 1624.

SECT.

Sect. VIII. *Heretics have been greatly calumniated.*

Some seem to have reckoned that they had a right to say the worst things of heretics which they could; and others have thought themselves obliged to believe all the evil that has been reported of them. I have already, at several times, had occasion to confute some grievous charges against such as were called heretics, particularly the impure [e] Origenists, if ever there were such a sect, and [f] the Manichees. Some other things are now to be taken notice of relating to more ancient heretics, who appeared near the end of the first, or in the former part of the second century.

One thing laid to the charge of many of those heretics is magic.

Marcus or Marc, from whom the Marcosians were denominated, is often [g] called a magician and impostor. Irenæus says, the [h] Basilidians had invocations, inchantments, and all kinds of curious and magical practices. And, according to Epiphanius, Basilides [i] would never be persuaded to leave off magical arts. In like manner Irenæus also speaks of the [k] Carpocratians. And Eusebius says of these last, [l] as upon the authority of Irenæus, that they practised magic not secretly, but openly, more openly than Simon himself.

Nevertheless some learned moderns have doubted of this, and have made a question, Whether it was any more than a popular charge against men who studied mathematics, and particularly astronomy? In this manner thought so grave a writer as [m] Vitringa.

[e] See Vol. iii. p. 23, 25.

[f] Ibid. p. 408....411.

[g] ...μαγικης υπαρχων τελειας εμπειροτατος. Iren. l. i. c. xiii. n. i. c. viii. p. 56. Grab. &c. ix. p. 56, 59. Gr.

[h] Utuntur autem et hi magia...et incantationibus et invocationibus, et reliqua universa periergia. L. i. cap. xxiv. n. v. cap. xxiii. p. 98. Gr.

[i] ου μην δε αλλα και μαγγανικαις μηχανηαις προσαιειν αυτον ουκ επαυσατο, και περιεργιαις ο απατεων. II. 24. n. ii. p. 69. D.

[k] Artes enim Magicas operantur et ipsi, et incantationes, philtra quoque et charitesia, et paredros, et oniropompos, et reliquas malignationes. Ib. c. xxv. n. iii. c. xxiv. 100.

[l] Γραφει δε και ειρηναιος συγχεασαι τελεως καταφρονησαι τε της των γνωστικων επικλησεως πατερα· οι και τα σιμωνος ουχ ως εκεινος κρυβδην, αλλ ηδη και εις φανερον τας μαγειας παραδιδοναι ηξιουν. Eus. H. E. l. iv. c. vii. p. 120.

[m] Veteres enim omnes fere Pythagoricæ et Platonicæ Philosophiæ illustriores doctores de Magia suspectos habuerunt: tum quod mystice fere omnia, et per numeros et formulas, quasi arcana quædam et secretior vis in iis recondita esset, tradiderint: tum quod vere illi apud suos auditores hanc suscitarint et foverint credulitatem, quasi secretius sibi cum diis commercium esset...Nec alio pertinet, quod Irenæus Menandrum, Marcum aliosque Gnosticæ disciplinæ auctores passim fœdi Magiæ criminis insimulat. Vitring. Observ. Sacr. l. v. cap. xii. n. ix. p. 160.

I may

I may hereafter examine the charge againſt Marc. As Beauſobre has conſidered this matter very particularly, ſo far as relates to the Baſilidians, I ſhall repreſent his thoughts here as conciſely as I can.

As [n] for the charge of magic, it appears to be very doubtful. For, firſt, it is really atteſted by Irenæus only, his work being the ſource from which all others have borrowed. Secondly, Tertullian, his moſt ancient copyiſt, ſays nothing of it. Thirdly, Clement of Alexandria too is ſilent here, as alſo Origen, though he omits no opportunity to reprehend Baſilides, Valentinus, and Marcion. Fourthly, the ancient fathers perpetually confound aſtronomy and aſtrology with magic. Mathematician and magician are with them the ſame things. All this is ſufficient to render the magic of theſe men doubtful. Nevertheleſs I do not abſolutely deny that the Baſilidians had ſome ſuperſtitious practices among them, which are a natural conſequence of ſuppoſing the ſtars to be animated, and that the ſpirits which reſide in them, and conduct them, do govern alſo this lower world; with an exception however to the wills of men, which the philoſophers never ſubjected to the power of the ſtars. I ſay, I do not poſitively deny that they had ſome ſuch ſuperſtitions; and yet I would not be underſtood to affirm it.

Theſe are ſuperſtitions which have indeed ſome reſemblance to magic; but yet cannot be ſo termed without manifeſt injuſtice. When men make uſe of rites and ceremonies which are in themſelves criminal, or when they propoſe to obtain the aſſiſtance of dæmons, this is magic. Magicians, ſays [o] Clement of Alexandria, boaſt that they have dæmons to aſſiſt them, and that by ſome certain enchantments they can compel them to ſerve them. This is what makes a magician....But the followers of Baſilides did no leſs deteſt dæmons than other Chriſtians did; and poſſibly made uſe of no other preſervative againſt them than baptiſm, faith, and the name of Jeſus. The Valentinians at leaſt, with whom theſe had a great agreement, were of opinion that baptiſm in the name of Jeſus was ſufficient to deliver a Chriſtian from ſubjection to the ſtars and dæmons, and to enable him [p] to tread on ſcorpions and adders, that is, all malignant powers.

More follows there to the like purpoſe, to which the reader is referred. And this laſt-mentioned obſervation may clear others, particularly Saturninus, who in Theodoret is the third after

[n] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2. p. 46, 47.

[o] Μαγοι δε ηδη ασεβειας της σφων αυτων υπηρετας δαιμονας αυχησιν, οικετας αυτους εαυτοις καταγραψαντες, της καταναγκασμενης δηλως ταις επαοιδαις πειθοινκοτες. Clem. A. Adm. ad Gent. p. 39. C.

[p] Vid. Eclog. Theod. § 74. et ſeq. apud Clem. Alexan. Ed. Par. 1641. p. 800, 1.

Simon,

Simon, and taught, that [q] whereas evil dæmons assist bad men, Christ came to succour good men against such dæmons.

Another thing often laid to the charge of heretics is lewdness, and all manner of wickedness, and likewise teaching it: so says Theodoret in the preface to his work of Heretical Fables. He seems to represent this as general among them, though perhaps not as universal. The [r] lewdness both taught and practised by them, according to him, was such that even stage-players were too modest to describe it, or to hear it described; and he asserts that they had exceeded and gone beyond the greatest proficients in wickedness.

But surely this must be exaggeration. It is improbable that these men should have exceeded all others in vice. Neither can it be to the honour of Christians, or their religion, to multiply sects and divisions among them, or to aggravate and magnify their faults. In all bodies of men, which are numerous, there will be some lewd and profligate persons; but that whole sects and parties should practise and teach wickedness is very unlikely, and ought to be well attested before it is believed.

Eusebius says of the Carpocratians [s] that they gave occasion to the Gentiles to reproach the gospel, and to form a disadvantageous opinion of all Christians, as if they had been generally such as they were; and that to them it was chiefly owing that Christians were charged with promiscuous lewdness, and other crimes in their assemblies. Irenæus has somewhat of this kind, but not so full and strong. He says that [t] these men seem to have been formed by Satan on purpose that we might be slandered; but he does not positively say that other Christians had been reproached upon their account, or that for their sake the common stories about Christian assemblies had been credited.

Here then are two things: first the wickedness of the ancient

[q] Των δε πονηρων δαιμονων τοις πονηροις συμπραττοντων, ηλθε, φησιν, ο σωτηρ επαμυναι τοις αγαθοις. H. Fab. l. i. c. iii.

[r] Την δε και νενομοθετημενην παρ' αυτων και πραττομενην λαγνειαν, ουδε των εν σκηνη τις τεθραμμενων ανασχοιτο αν η φρασαι, η λεγοντων αλλων ακουσαι· τοσουτον απολειπει και τους επισημους της ασελγειας εργατας. H. Fab. in Pr. T. 4. p. 188.

[s] Τοις δε απιστοις εθνεσι πολλην παρειχεν κατα του θειου λογου δυσφημιας περιουσιαν· της εξ αυτων φημης εις την του παντος χριστιανων εθνους διαβολην καταχεομενης. Ταυτη δ' αν επιπλειστον συνεβαινε την περι ημων παρα τοις τοτε απιστοις υποτοιαν δυσσεβη και ατοπωτατην διαδιδοσθαι· ως δη αθεμιτοις τε μητερας και αδελφας μιξεσιν, ατοσιαις τε τροφαις χρωμενων. Euſ. L. IV. cap. vii. p. 120. D.

[t] Qui et ipsi ad detractionem divini ecclesiæ nominis, quemadmodum et gentes, a Satana præmissi sunt, ubi secundum alium et alium modum, quæ sunt illorum audientes homines, et putantes omnes nos tales esse, avertant aures suas a præconio veritatis: aut et [f. ut] videntes quæ sunt illorum, omnes nos blasphement, in nullo eis communicantes, neque in doctrina, neque in moribus, neque in quotidiana conversatione. Iræn. lib. i. cap. xxv. n. iii. al. c. xxiv. p. 100. Gr.

heretics,

heretics, particularly the Carpocratians: Secondly, that their exceſſes were the occaſion of the diſrepute which other Chriſtians, their aſſemblies eſpecially, lay under.

It is this ſecond particular that I propoſe to conſider at preſent: and ſhall hereafter, in the hiſtory of the ſeveral heretics who are accuſed of ſo much extravagance, have an article concerning their manners and moral principles; ſaying nothing more relative to that point at this time, than may be needful for clearing the preſent queſtion.

I. Then I obſerve, there is no ſmall agreement between the charges brought againſt the firſt Chriſtians [u] in the beginning of the ſecond century, and the charges againſt the heretics in later authors; which may create a ſuſpicion that theſe laſt were formed upon the model of the former, and conſequently are without ground. What the crimes were which were laid to the charge of the primitive Chriſtians we know from divers writers, Greek and Latin. I ſhall put in the margin paſſages of [x] Juſtin Martyr, [y] Athenagoras, [z] Theophilus of Antioch, [a] Minucius Felix, and [b] Tertullian, from whom it appears that, beſide atheiſm, or impiety towards the eſtabliſhed deities, they were charged with having their wives in common, with promiſcuous

[u] Quæ nocturnis congregationibus, et jejuniis, ſolemnibus, et inhumanis cibis. Min. Fel. cap. viii. p. 72. Lug. 1672. Occultis ſe nobis et inſignibus noſcunt, et amant mutuo pæne antequam noverint: paſſim etiam inter eos quædam libidinum religio miſcetur: ac ſe promiſcue appellant fratres et ſorores, ut etiam non inſolens ſtuprum interceſſione ſacri nominis fiat inceſtum. Ib. c. ix. p. 81, 2. Lug. 1672.

[x] Ει δε και τα δυσφημα εκεινα μυθολογουμενα εργα πραττουσι, λυχνιας μεν ανατρεπειν, και τας αιδημονας μιξεις, και ανθρωπειων σαρκων βορας, α γινωσκομεν. J. M. Ap. i. p. 70. B. C. ...μη και υμεις ωσπιστευκατε περι ημων, οτι δη εσθιομεν ανθρωπους, και μετα την ειλαπιστην αποσβεννυντες τας λυχνους αθεσμοις μιξεσιν εγκυλιομεθα; Dialog. Tr. p. 227. B. [y] Τρια επιφημιζουσιν ημιν εγκληματα, αθεοτητα, θυεστεια δειπνα, οιδιποδειους μιξεις. Athen. Leg. p. 4. c. Ed. Par. No. iv. p. 15, 16. Ox. 1706. Ετι δε, και τροφας και μιξεις λογοτοιουσιν αθεως καθ' ημων, ινα τε μισειν νομιζοιεν μετα λογου. Ib. p. 34. d. No. xxvii. p. 123. Ox.

[z] Φασκοντων, ως κοινας απαιτων ουσας γυναικας ημων, και διαφορω μιξει, ξυιοντας, ετι μην και ταις ιδιαις αδελφαις, συμμιγνυσθαι, και το αθεωτατον και ωμοτατον πασων σαρκων ανθρωπινων εφαπτεσθαι ημας. Theoph. ad Aut. l. iii. p. 119. B.

[a] Jam de initiandis tirunculis fabula tam deteſtanda, quam nota eſt. Infans farre contectus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur ei qui ſacris imbuatur. Is infans a tirunculo farris ſuperficie, quaſi ad innoxios ictus provocato, cæcis occultiſque vulneribus occiditur. Hujus, proh nefas, ſitienter ſanguinem lambunt: hujus certatim membra diſpertiunt...Et de convivio notam eſt. Paſſim omnes loquuntur... Ad epulas ſolemni die coëunt, cum omnibus liberis, ſororibus matribus, ſexus omnis homines, et omnis ætatis. Illic poſt multas epulas, ubi convivium caluit, et inceſtæ libidinis fervor ebrietate exarſit, canis qui candelabro nexus eſt, jactu oſſulæ...ad impetum et ſaltum provocatur. Sic everſo et exſtincto conſcio lumine, impudentibus tenebris nexus infandæ cupiditatis involvunt perincertum ſortis. Et ſi non omnes opera, conſcientia tamen pariter inceſti; quoniam voto univerſorum appetitur, quicquid accidere poteſt in actu ſingulorum. Min. Fel. cap. ix. p. 86...90. [b] Dicimur ſceleratiſſimi, de ſacramento infanticidii, et pabulo inde, et poſt convivium inceſto: quod everſores luminum canes, lenones ſcilicet, tenebras, tum et libidinum impiarum inverecundiam procurent. Tertul. Ap. cap, vii. in. p. 8...24.

lewdneſs

lewdneſs in their aſſemblies, with inceſt, and eating human fleſh, eſpecially young children, whom they firſt killed, and then ate at their nocturnal meetings, where perſons of each ſex, and every age, were preſent.

II. Theſe ſcandalous reflections were caſt upon the Chriſtians before the appearance of the Carpocratians, who were not known till the time of Adrian. Mr. Turner ſays theſe [c] calumnies ſeem to have begun with Chriſtianity itſelf. There are proofs of their being very early. Tacitus, ſpeaking of the Chriſtians in the time of Nero, ſays they [d] were generally hated for their wickedneſs; that is, they lay under a bad character with the people. And, as Mr. Turner obſerves [e], Melito of Sardis, [f] an apologiſt for the Chriſtian religion about the year 170, lays the foundation of theſe lying accuſations in the reigns of Nero and Domitian. I ſhall tranſcribe largely at the bottom of the page [g] a paſſage of Mr. Turner upon this ſubject. For certain theſe accuſations were in being and prevailed before Juſtin became a Chriſtian; for he aſſures us [h] that in the time of his heatheniſm he thought it impoſſible that the Chriſtians ſhould ſuffer with ſuch conſtancy and reſolution as they did if they had been meneaters, and had been addicted to lewdneſs.

III. Notwithſtanding Euſebius [i] mentions the Carpocratians as the heretics on whoſe account the primitive Chriſtians were ſlandered, yet the ancient writers are not all agreed in this point. Epiphanius indeed joins with Euſebius in ſaying that the Car-

[c] The calumnies upon the primitive Chriſtians accounted for, p. 2. London, 1727. [d] Quos, per flagitia inviſos, vulgus Chriſtianos appellabat...Repreſſaque in præſens exitiabilis ſuperſtitio rurſus erumpebat. Tacit. Ann. l. xv. c. xliv. Amſ. Elz. 1762. p. 1059, 60. [e] Ib. p. 4.

[f] ...τον καθ' ημας εν διαβολη καταστησαι λογον ηθελησαν Νερων και Δομετιανος· αφ' ων και το της συκοφαντιας αλογω συνηθεια περι τους τοιουτους ρυηναι συμβεβηκε ψευδος. Ap. Euſeb. l. iv. c. xxvi. p. 148. B.

[g] I can by no means allow that the lewdneſs of Carpocrates, Epiphanes, and their followers, gave the firſt occaſion for accuſing the Chriſtians of promiſcuous and inceſtuous luſt. For it is generally agreed that Carpocrates began to be a heretic in Adrian's reign, about the ſame time that Juſtin became a convert to Chriſtianity, A. D. 130. And therefore the imputation of lewdneſs and inceſt was prior to Carpocrates. For Juſtin, whoſe authority is undeniably good, acquaints us, that the Chriſtians were accuſed of abominable uncleanneſs before he was a convert. Nay, he dates the three original calumnies of inceſt, infanticide, and atheiſm, from our Lord's aſcenſion, or very ſoon after. If Carpocrates had given the firſt handle for aſperſing Chriſtians, how could Juſtin be ignorant of it, who lived at the ſame time? And eſpecially, ſince he wrote a confutation of all heretics; and therefore muſt be preſumed to be tolerably acquainted with their errors and immoralities. As before, p. 31, 32. See him again, p. 51, 52.

[h] Και γαρ αυτος εγω τοις πλατωνος χαιρων διδαγμασι, διαβαλλομενους ακουων χριστιανους, οραν δε αφοβους προς θανατον και παντα τα αλλα νομιζομενα φοβερα, ενενουν, αδυνατον ειναι εν κακια και φιληδονια υπαρχειν αυτους· τις γαρ φιληδονος, η ακρατης, και ανθρωπιων σαρκων βοραν αγαθον ηγουμενος, δυναιτο αν θαναιον ασπαζεσθαι...Ap. ii. p. 50. A. B.

[i] Vid. ſupra, not. [a], p. 25.

pocratians [k] were principally the cause of this: but Cyril [l], the deacon, lays it on the Montanists; and Touttee [m] on the Ophians or Ophites, and quotes Origen for it; who indeed says, in more places than one [n], that Celsus objected against the Christians holding several absurd and impious tenets, peculiar to the Ophians, called otherwise Cainites: but these, he [o] adds, were no Christians, for they hated Jesus no less than Celsus himself did; and admitted no one into their society unless he would abjure him. But I shall speak of this hereafter under the chapter assigned to them.

IV. Justin Martyr, in his second Apology, expressly says that [p] he did not know whether those scandalous things, which were commonly laid to the charge of the true Christians, were done by the heretics or not. That apology was written, as some think, in the year 145, or about 140 at the soonest. The Valentinians, Carpocratians, and other heretics, were in being before that time; and Justin had written against all heretics in general; and yet he freely owns he did know them to be guilty of the crimes so much talked of at that time.

V. The most ancient Christian apologists do generally ascribe the calumnies then cast upon the Christians to other causes, and not to the wickedness of any among them called heretics. Justin Martyr, as was formerly observed [q], says that their accusers themselves scarcely believed the charges brought against them: and [r] where these had in some measure been credited it arose from the wickedness of the heathens, which disposed them to believe such things of other people as they practised themselves. Tatian [s] and Theophilus of Antioch [t] speak of these calumnies

[k] Εισι δε εκ τȣ Σατανα παρασκευασμενοι και προβεβλημενοι εις ονειδος και σκανδαλον, της τȣ Θεȣ εκκλησιας. επεθεντο γαρ εαυτοις επικλην Χριςιανοι προς το σκανδαλιζεσθαι την της αγιας τȣ Θεȣ Εκκλησιας ωφελειαν. κ. τ. λ. Epi. Hær. xxvii. n. iii. p. 104. B. C. [l] Διο μεχρις πρωην εν τω διωγμω, τȣτο ποιειν υποπτευομεθα. δια το κακεινȣς τȣς μονταινȣς, ψευδως μεν, ομωνυμως δε κλεισθαι Χριςιανȣς. Cat. xvi. n. viii. p. 247.

[m] Id dedecus contra Ophitas suggessit Origines. Toutee, x. [n] Δοκει δε μοι ο Κελσος εγνωκεναι τινας αιρεσεις μηδε τȣ ονοματος τȣ Ιησȣ κοινωνȣς ημιν. ταχα γαρ περιηχετο περι των καλȣμενων Οφιανων και των Καιανων, και ει τις αλλη τοιαυτη εξ ολων αποφοιτησασα τȣ Ιησου συνεςη γνωμη. πλην ȣδεν τȣτο προς το εγκλητον ειναι τον Χριςιανων λογον. Contra Celsum. l. iii. p. 119. l. xx. Ed. Spenceri. Δοκειν δε μοι και εκ τȣτων εκπαρακȣσματων ασημοτατης αιρεσεως Οφιανων οιμαι εκτεθεισθαι τα τȣ διαγραμματος απο μερις. κ. τ. λ. Ib. l. vi. p. 291. l. xlv. Τι ȣν ειη αν ηλιθιωτερον η μανικωτερον, ȣ μονον των απο τȣ οφεως...αλλα και Κελσȣ νομισαντες κατα Χριςιανων ειναι κατηγοριας τας κατα των Οφιανων. Ibid. l. vi. p. 294. [o] Και Οφιανοι δια τȣτο καλȣμενοι τοσȣτον αποδεȣσι τȣ ειναι Χριςιανοι, ωςε ȣκ ελαττον Κελσȣ κατηγορειν αυτȣς τȣ Ιησȣ, και μη προτερον προσεισθαι τινα επι τι συνεδριον εαυτων, εαν μη αρας θηται κατα τȣ Ιησȣ. Ibid. l. vi. p. 294. [p] Vid. supra, not. [x]. p. 240. [q] Vid. ibid.

[r] Ap. ii. p. 70. B. C. 71. A. Vid. Credibility, V. ii. p. 317, notes [d], [e].

[s] Παρ ημιν ȣκ εςιν ανθρωποφαγια, ψευδομαρτυρες οι επιτηδευομενοι γεγονατε. Oratio ad Græcos. No. 42. p. 90. Ed. Worth. Ox. 1700. p. 162. D. Par. 1636. Cred. V. ii. p. 317, note [f]. [t] Ad Au. l. iii. p. 119. B. C. Vid. supra, note [z]. p. 240. et Ad. Aut. l. iii. p. 126. D. 127. A. Vid. Cred. V. ii. p. 317. note [g].

without

without making heretics the occaſion of them. Athenagoras plainly ſays [u] that the general wickedneſs of the heathen people was the ground of their charging ſuch baſe practices upon the Chriſtians, who were exemplarily virtuous: and exactly in the ſame manner ſpeaks the pretended Sibyl [x]. Irenæus likewiſe, in a place before cited, hints [y] at this cauſe, as does alſo Minutius Felix [z], and Tertullian [a]. Sometimes Juſtin Martyr ſays [b] that the Jews had raiſed and ſpread theſe vile reports concerning the firſt Chriſtians: and Tertullian ſpeaks [c] to the like purpoſe. Origen [d], in a ſtill ſtronger manner, brings home this charge to the Jews. Heraldus long ago obſerved [e] that the ancient apologiſts, who confuted theſe calumnies, did not charge the heretics with the like crimes.

[u] Legat. p. 4. C. et p. 34. D. ad fin. Vid. ſupra, note [y]. p. 240. Ει δε λογοποιαι ταυτα και διαβολαι εισι (φυσικω λογω προς την αρετην της κακιας αντικειμενης, και πολεμιων αλληλοις των εναντιων θειω νομω) και το μηδεν τουτων αδικειν υμεις μαρτυρες. Ibid. p. 4. D. p. 16, 17. Ox. Αλλα οι τοιουτοι (ω τι αν ειποιμι τα απορρητα) ακουομεν τα της παροιμιας, η κορνη την σωφρονα ...ουτοι δε ασυνισασιν αυτοις, και τους ασφετερους λεγουσιν θεους....ταυτα ημας λοιδορουντες· κακιζοντες οι μοιχοι και παιδεραστας τους ευνουχους και μονογαμους. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. p. 37. C. D. No. 29. p. 131, 2. Ox.

[x] Ολβιοι ανθρωπων κεινοι κατα γαιαν εσονται,
Οσσοι δη στερξουσι Θεον μεγαν ευλογεοντες
Πειν πιεειν φαγεειν τε πεποιθοτες ευσεβιησιν·
. . . . . .
Ων τροπον ευσεβιην τε, και ηθεα αιερες αλλοι
Ουποτε μιμησονται, αναιδειην πεθεοντες
Αλλ, αυτως χλευην τε γελωτιτε μυχθιζοντες,
Νηπιοι αφροσυνησιν επιψευσονται εκειοις,
Οσσ' αυτοι ρεξουσιν, ατασθαλα και κακα εργα.
Lib. iv. p. 287. Paris 1599. V. i. p. 142. Orthodoxogr. Baſil 1569.

[y] Vid. ſup. p. 239. note [c].

[z] Hæc enim potius de veſtris gentibus nata ſunt. Min. Fel. c. xxxi. in. p. 303.

[a] Hæc quo magis refutaverim a vobis fieri oſtendam partim in aperto, et partim in occulto. Per quod forſitan et de nobis creditis. Ap. c. ix. in.

[b] ...Αλλα ανδρας εκλεκτους απο Ιερουσαλημ εκλεξαμενοι τινες, εξεπεμψατε εις πασαν την γην, λεγοντες αιρεσιν αθεον Χριστιανων πεφηνεναι καταλεγοντες ταυτα απερ καθ ημων οι αγνοουντες ημας παντες λεγουσιν. Dial. cum Try. p. 334. E. ....Κατειποντες δεδιδαχεναι και ταυτα απερ κατα των ομολογουντων Χριστον... παντι γενει ανθρωπων αθεα, και ανομα, και κακα λεγετε. Ib. p. 335. C. D.

[c] Et credidit vulgus Judæo. Quod enim aliud genus ſeminarium eſt infamiæ noſtræ. Ad. Nat. L. i. p. 59. D.

[d] Και δοκει μοι παραπλησιον Ιουδαιοις πεπονθεναι, τοις κατα την αρχην του Χριστιανισμου διδασκαλιας κατασκεδασασι δυσφημιαν του λογου, ως αρα καταθυσαντες παιδιον μεταλαμβανουσι αυτου των σαρκων. και παλιν, οτι οι απο του λογου, τα του σκοτους πραττειν βουλομενοι, σβεννυουσι μεν το φως, εκαστος δε τη παρατυχουσῃ μιγνυται. Con. Celſum. l. vi. c. xxvii. p. 651. Bened. p. 293. Spen.

[e] Calumnia iſta (de initiandis tirunculis) omnibus Chriſtianorum apologiis confutata. Nec inventus quiſquam eſt, qui ejus immanitatis ſectam ullam hæreticorum vel leniſſima ſuſpicione aſperſerit; ut exiſtimem quæ de Gnoſticis et Quintilianis Epiphanius et alii nonulli poſtea tradiderunt, ea omnia falſa eſſe, et in odium ſectarum illarum ab hominibus perverſe religioſis conficta. Num enim id tacuiſſent Apologeticorum ſcriptores? Num tanta confidentia horrendam illam calumniam, tanquam commentum vere diabolicum confutaſſent?...Quæ igitur poſterioribus ſeculis de hæreticis tradita ſunt ejuſmodi, ea non dubitamus falſa eſſe. Heraldus ad Minutium, c. ix. p. 86. Lud. Bat. 1672.

VI. It appears from Tertullian [f] that, in his time, it was not known that any among Christians were guilty of such crimes as were imputed to them by their adversaries. The only ground of these charges, according to him, was common fame, and uncertain report [g], without any proof. Whereas if such things had been done by any assuming the name of Christians, and known to have been done by them, his plea would have been that, though indeed there were instances of such abominable practices among heretics, yet there was no instance of any thing of the kind among genuine Christians. Since, therefore, he absolutely denies the charge without any such distinction, it is plain he knew of no heretics who were guilty of such abominations Theophilus of Antioch likewise says [h] that these reproaches had no other support than common fame. Nor was it known to the martyrs of Jesus [i] that the heretics, or any men whatever, were guilty of the vices then laid to the charge of the Christians.

VII. Another argument against the truth of these accounts is that they are incredible. Trypho the Jew being asked by Justin whether [k] he believed the common reports concerning the Christians, readily answers, they were incredible; for human nature was not capable of such things. This is also largely shewn by [l] Minutius Felix and [m] Tertullian, who sometimes appeal to the

[f] Dicimur sceleratissimi de Sacramento infanticidii, et pabulo inde et post convivium incesto; quod eversores luminum canes, lenones scilicet, tenebras, tum et libidinum impiarum inverecundiam procurent. Dicimur tamen semper, nec vos quod tamdiu dicimur eruere curatis. Apol. c. vii. p. 8. Bene autem quod omnia tempus revelat, testibus etiam vestris proverbiis atque sententiis, ex dispositione naturæ quæ ita ordinavit ut nihil diu lateat, etiam quod fama non distulit. Merito igitur fama tam diu sola conscia est scelerum Christianorum. Hanc indicem adversus nos profertis, quæ, quod aliquando jactavit, tantoque spatio in opironionem corboravit, usque adhuc probare non valuit. Ibid. p. 9. Initio.

[g] Ideo et credunt de nobis quæ non probantur, et nolunt inquiri ne probentur non esse. Ibid. c. ii. p. 4. B. Quid aliud negotium patitur Christianus, nisi suæ sectæ? quam incestam quam crudelem, tanto tempore nemo probavit. Ad Scap. c. iv. p. 87. Fin.

[h] Και φημη πειθεσθαι...στοματων αθεων ψευδως συκοφαντουντων ημας...φασκοντων ως κοινας απαντων ουσας τας γυναικας ημων, και διαφορω μιξει ξυνοντας, ετι μην και ταις ιδιαις αδελφαις συμμιγνυσθαι, και το αθεωτατον και ωμοτατον παντων, σαρκων ανθρωπινων εφαπτεσθαι ημας. Ad. Aut. l. iii. p. 119. B. p. 381. Bened.

[i] Κατεψευσαντο ημων θυεστια δειπνα και Οιδιποδειους μιξεις, και οσα μητε λαλειν μητε ιδειν θεμις ημιν, αλλα μηδε πιστευειν ειτι τοιουτο πωποτε παρα ανθρωποις εγενετο. Euse. Eccl. Hist. lib. v. cap. i. p. 156. D.

[k] Τουτο δε εστιν ο λεγω, μη και υμεις πεπιστευκατε περι ημων οτι δη εσθιομεν ανθρωπους, και μετα την ειλαπινην αποσβεννυντες τους λυχνους, αθεσμοις μιξεσιν εγκυλιομεθα...Περι δε ων οι πολλοι λεγουσιν, (εφη ο Τρυφων) ου πιστευσαι αξιον· πορρω γαρ κεχωρηκε της ανθρωπινης φυσεως. Dial. cum Try. p. 227. B.

[l] Illum jam velim convenire, qui initiari nos dicit, aut credit de cæde infantis et sanguine. Putas posse fieri, ut tam molle, tam parvulum corpus fata vulnerum capiat? ut quisquam illum rudem sanguinem novelli, et vix dum hominis cædat, fundat, exhauriat? Nemo hoc potest credere, nisi qui possit audere. Minut. Fel. cap. xxx. p. 288-9.

[m] O quanta illius præsidis gloria, si eruisset aliquem, qui centum jam infantes comedisset. Ap. c. ii. p. 2. D. Ut fidem naturæ

the heathen people, whether they were able to do the like things as they charged upon the Christians, with the same circumstances attending them: and at other times ridicule the credulity of those who believed them of others, when they themselves were unable to do the like. In this last argument Tertullian appears to triumph beyond control. With a peculiar energy of expression he challenges any one of the heathen to come into Christian assemblies and try whether he could perform such an action himself, or even bear to be present while it was perpetrated by others. He enters minutely into the particular parts of the heinous charge; and proves, by a direct appeal to the human heart, that no creature, constituted as we are, can possibly be guilty of such abominations. On the subject of infanticide he shews the [n] utter incredibility of a charge, directly inconsistent with some of the distinguishing tenets of the Christians of those days, who would not at their entertainments make use of blood mixed with any eatables; and who abstained from things strangled, and that died of themselves, lest they should be defiled.

The same arguments will serve for the heretics, for they are [o]

naturæ ipsius appellem adversus eos, qui talia credenda esse præsumunt. Ecce proponimus horum facinorum mercedem, vitam æternam. Repromittunt. Credite interim? De hoc enim quæro, an et qui crediderit, tanti habeas ad eam tali conscientia pervenire? Veni, demerge ferrum in infantem, nullius inimicum, nullius reum, omnium filium. Vel si alterius officium est, tu modo assiste morienti homini ...excipe rudem sanguinem: eo panem tuum satia; vescere libenter. Interea discumbens dinumera loca, ubi mater, ubi soror. Nota diligenter, ut cum tenebræ ceciderint caninæ non erres...Talia initiatus et consignatus, vivus in ævum. Cupio, respondeas, sit tanti æternitas? Aut si non, ideo non credenda. Etiam si crediderit, nego te velle. Etiam si volueris, nego te posse. Cur ergo alii, si vos non potestis. Cur non possitis, si alii possunt? Alia nos opinor natura, Cynophanes aut Sciapodes: alii ordines dentium, alii ad incestam libidinem nervi? Qui ista credis de homine, potes et facere. Homo es et ipse, quod Christianus. Qui non potes facere, non debes credere. Homo est enim et Christianus, et quod et tu. Ib. cap. viii. [n] Erubescat error vester Christianis, qui ne animalium quidem sanguinem in epulis esculentis habemus, qui propterea quoque suffocatis et morticinis abstinemus, ne quo modo sanguine contaminemur, vel intra viscera sepulto...Porro quale est, ut quos sanguinem pecoris horrere confiditis, humano inhiare credatis. Ib. c. ix. [o] Εαν δε εγκυμονηση η γυνη,...καταστραντες το εμβρυον εν ολμω τινι κοπτουσιν υπερω, και εγκαταμιξαντες μελι και πιπερι και αλλα τινα αρωματα, και μυρα τοσος το μη γευσιαν αυτης ...μεταλαμβανουσιν εκαστος τω δακτυλω απο του κατακοπεντος παιδιου, και ουτως την ανθρωποθοριαν απεργασαμενοι ευχονται λοιπον τω Θεω...και δηθεν τουτο το τελειον πασχα αγουσι. Epiph. Hær. xxvi. No. v. p. 87. B. C. I give the English of this in Mr. Turner's words: 'The Gnostics,' says Epiphanius, 'by some violent method or 'other, used to draw a child out of it's 'mother's womb, and beat it to pieces in 'a mortar, and lest this odd sort of food 'should be nauseous to a squeamish stomach, they mixed it with honey and 'pepper, and other spices: when this was 'done they all tasted of it; and this they 'called a perfect passover. Upon this 'monstrous and incredible story I observe,' &c. &c. Calumnies upon the Primitive Christians, p. 54, 55. The like things were also said of the Montanists, as we shall see hereafter.

charged by later writers with the same things which were before [p] imputed to the primitive Christians [q].

If then they are incredible with regard to the one, they are so likewise with regard to the other. Besides, there are some things related of the Gnostics by Epiphanius [r] and Theodoret [s], which in all probability were never practised by any individuals, not even the most vicious and abandoned; much less were they the rites or sacraments of any religious sect. When all this is considered, I cannot help thinking that there is too much justice in Mons. Bayle's satire; who, having given an account of the five crimes charged on the Cainites, adds: 'When [t] we read these 'things in the fathers of the church, one can scarce forbear 'thinking that the case was the same with them in respect to 'heretics, as with the heathens in respect to Christianity. The 'heathens imputed to Christianity an hundred extravagances 'and abominations that had no foundation. The first who 'forged these calumnies were undoubtedly guilty of the blackest 'malice; but the greatest part of those who vented them abroad, 'after they had been so maliciously sown, were only guilty of 'too much credulity; they believed common fame, and never 'troubled themselves to dive into the bottom of it. Is it not 'more reasonable to believe that the fathers did not, with all the 'patience requisite, thoroughly inform themselves of the real 'principles of a sect, than it is to believe that those very men, 'who held that Jesus Christ by his death was the saviour of man-

[p] Vid. supra, p. 240. note [a]. The English part of that quotation I shall give in the words of Mr. Turner. 'They,' the primitive Christians, 'were charged 'with infanticide, or murdering infants, 'and with eating them. A very young 'sucking infant was brought covered over 'with paste, lest any one should be shocked 'at the intended barbarity. Then the 'child was pricked all over with pins or 'bodkins, and as soon as it was dead, they 'cut the body in pieces and ate it. This 'was said to be the Christian method of 'initiation.' Calumnies, p. 10.

[q] Τουτους (τους Καρποκρατιανους) φασι και τινας αλλους ζηλωτας των ομοιων κακων, εις τα δεινοτατα αθροιζομενους. ω γαρ αγαπην ειποιμι αν εγωγε την συνελευσιν αυτων. ανδρας ομου και γυναικας, μετα δη το κορεσθηναι εν πλησμονη της κυπρισι φασι...εκποδων ποιησαμενους φως τη του λυχνου περιτροπη, μιγνυσθαι οπως εθελοιεν αις βουλοιντο. Clem. Alexan. Strom. l. iii. p. 430. C. D. Αυτην γαρ την συναξιν αυτων εν αισχροτητι πολυμιξιας φυρσεσιν εσθιοντες και παραπτομενοι και ανθρωπινων σαρκων και ακαθαρσιων. ουκ ετι τολμησω το παν εξειπειν. κ. τ. λ. Epiphan. Hær. xxvi. No. iii. p. 84. D.

[r] Και ο μεν αιμη την γυναικος υποχωρησαι φασκει λεγων τη εαυτου γυναικι, οτι αιματα λεγων, ποιησον την αγαπην μετα του αδελφου. οι δε ταλανες μιγεντες αλληλοις, και ως επι αληθειας αισχυνομαι ειπειν τα παρ' τοις αυτοις αισχρα πραττομενα. Ep. Hæ. xxvi. No. iv. p. 86. A. B. see also No. viii. ix. xi. &c. where a multitude of incredible things are related of them to the last degree shocking and absurd.

[s] Οι γαρ τοιουτοι την σαρκικην και τοι συνουσιαστικην κοινωνιαν ιερουργουσι, και ταυτην οιονται εις την βασιλειαν αυτους αναγειν του χριστου...ειεν δε αν εν ταις μειζοσιν ταις αυτοις ελπισιν αι προεγωσαι του τειχους πεφυκασιν ειδειν, ενδεχομεναι τους βουλομενους απαντας; ...τοιαυτα δε οι...ψευδωνυμως γνωστικοι σφας αυτους αναγορευοντες δογματιζουσιν. Hær. F. lib. i. No. vi. Tom. iv. p. 197. D.

[t] Bayle's Dict. Vol. ii. article Cainites.

'kind,

'kind, should at the same time hold that the beastliest pleasures 'are the ready way to paradise?'

Sect. IX. *The ancient heretics believed the unity of God.*

The ancient heretics believed one God only. So say several learned and judicious moderns, who have made diligent search into the opinions of these men, and are far from sparing them, or shewing them favour. Massuet, in particular, observes that [u] Irenæus, in his long and particular arguments with Valentinus and other Gnostics, does not charge them with polytheism, or multiplying gods: but says they did not think rightly of God. And he shews that the world was made by the one supreme God the Father. Nor does he, in his discourses with them at any time, make use of the common arguments for the unity of God.

They supposed the creator of the world, that is, of this visible material world [x], not to be God, but an angel. They may sometimes call him God. Nevertheless they plainly shew that they use the word improperly, and that they do not take him to be God truly and by nature. So Massuet, chiefly from Irenæus.

To the like purpose Beausobre, discoursing of the Marcionites.

[u] Tantum abest, ut Valentinus Dei unitatem negaret, quin potius, Irenæo teste, aperte profiteretur. 'Omnes enim,' inquit, lib. i. cap. xxii. n. i. 'fere quot-'quot sunt hæreses deum quidem unum 'dicunt, sed per sententiam immutant.' Non ait 'multiplicant,' sed 'immutant.' ...alium a supremo omnium Patre mundi conditorem constituentes....Et hoc ipsum explicat Irenæus, lib. iv. c. xxxiii. n. 3. 'Judicabit autem et eos qui sunt a Va-'lentino omnes, quia lingua quidem con-'fitentur unum Deum Patrem, et ex hoc 'omnia: ipsum autem qui fecerit omnia 'defectionis sive labis fructum esse dicit.' Aperte igitur professus est Valentinus unum Deum. Et certe abhorret a verosimili, aut priores Gnosticos,....aut Valentinum, eosque omnes, qui spreta Gentilium superstitione Christianam religionem amplexi fuerant, omnes aliquam saltem evangelio fidem habere se confessos, profanum exsecrandumque Christianis omnibus polytheismum ab interitu excitare, aut immensum personarum divinarum numerum profiteri voluisse. Nec tantum nefas inultum abire sivisset Irenæus, qui hominum figitia omnia, et errorum portenta detegenda, et pro merito castiganda, sibi suscepérat. Is vero, licet sæpius arguat, quod mundi conditorem a supremo Patre dividerent, unumque et eundem esse rerum opificem ac supremum patrem demonstret, ...numquam tamen ut πολυθεες, aut divinarum personarum numerum supra modum augentes traducit, argumentari conquirit, quibus patres Dei unitatem persuadere solebant....Quod cum non præstiterit,...eos non sensisse sues æonas totidem veros deos aut personas divinas fuisse, pro certo æstimare possumus, quamvis deos nominare solerent. Mass. Diss. Præv. in Iren. p. xxxiii. n. 52.

[x] Ab his fontibus effluxit communis Gnosticorum omnium sententia, angelis tum creandi tum regendi mundi munus impositum fuisse. Nec secus sensere Valentiniani. Quamvis enim demiurgum deum et patrem interdum nominarent, revera tamen intra naturæ angelicæ limites concludebant. 'Demiurgum et ip-'sum angelum esse dicunt, Deo similem,' inquit Irenæus, l. i. cap. v. n. 2. et l. ii. cap. viii. n. 3. Nec minus aperte scribit, l. iv. c. i. n. 1. hanc esse Valentinianorum mentem, 'Demiurgum naturaliter neque 'deum, neque patrem, esse, sed verbo te-'nus dici, eo quod dominetur conditioni.' Id. ib. p. xliii. n. 62.

But [y] though they might hold two or three principles, yet it ought not to have been thence concluded that they admitted two or three gods, if thereby we underſtand three equal and independent beings. Never any heretic denied the fundamental article of the unity of God, as I have ſhewn elſewhere. This may be ſeen in the dialogue aſcribed to Origen. 'Your three [z] principles,' ſays the orthodox diſputant, 'are they equal in power?' 'Far be it,' ſays the Marcionite, 'they are not equal.' 'Which then is the 'moſt excellent?' replies the orthodox. 'It is the principle of 'good that is the moſt powerful,' anſwers the Marcionite. 'The 'others are ſubject to him,' ſays the orthodox. The heretic acknowledges they are ſo. The orthodox ſtill argues: 'If ſo, 'the inferior principles do nothing but according to the will of 'the more excellent.' The Marcionite anſwers, 'When they 'do ill they do not act according to his will: nevertheleſs he is 'infinitely more powerful than they. So when Chriſt came, he 'vanquiſhed the devil and aboliſhed the religion of the creator.' It is therefore very wrong to accuſe the Marcionites of holding two or three ſupreme gods, All that can be reaſonably ſaid is, that they did not think the title of God to be an incommunicable title, nor that it expreſſed the nature and perfections of the Supreme Being; for which reaſon they did not ſcruple to give it to the Creator. As for the devil, in calling him a god, they ſaid they only followed the ſtyle of ſcripture, where [a] he is called the god of this world; for they knew very well that [b] he was no more than an angel, as Tertullian expreſsly ſays.

In another place the ſame learned writer ſhews [c] that though Bardeſanes held two principles, one good the other evil, he never admitted two gods. Therefore the Bardeſianiſt, in the dialogues aſcribed to Origen before quoted, proteſts that [d] he believed but one God, and he good. He held that [e] this one God had all perfections; he alone is immortal, all powerful, infinite, containing all things, governing [f] all things, ſo that no being in heaven or on earth can withdraw from his dominion.

[y] Hiſt. de Manich. T. ii. p. 90.

[z] Ισοσθενεις εισιν αι τρεις αρχαι, η ατερα θατερας διεπτοχε,..Μη γενοιτο· ουκ εισιν ισοι. ...Η τω αγαθω ισχυροτερα...υποκεινται.... ουκουν κατα βουλησιν του κρειττονος αι ηττονες αρχαι, παντα πραττουσιν;...Ου κατα βουλησιν αυτου εισι τα ποιηρα πραττουσιν· απαξ δε ισχυροτερος αυτων εστιν· και γαρ ο ελθων χριστος και τον διαβολον ενικησε, και τα του δημιουργου δογματα ατεγξιψεν. Dialog. contr. Marcion. p. 6. Baſ. 1674.

[a] Θεος του αιωνος τουτου. 2 Cor. iv. 4.

[b] ...ſi non eum ſatanam ſignificaret, quem et nos et Marcion angelum novimus. Adv. Marc. l. v. c. xii. p. 600. B. p. 469.

[c] Hiſt. de Manich. T. ii. p. 133.

[d] Θεον καγω ενα φημι ειναι, ως και αυτοι, p. 71. Εγω ενα θεον οιδα αγαθον. p. 83.

[e] Εγω φημι, τον θεον αφθαρτον μονον. ib. p. 78. παντοκρατορα φημι. p. 83. Δηλον, οτι περιεχει, και ο περιεχεται. ib.

[f] Εκ ποιας δυναμεως περιεχεται, και συγκρατειται, ο αερ, η η γη, η η θαλασσα, η ο συμπας κοσμος; υπο τινος περιεχεται, και περικρατειται;...Δηλον, οτι υπο θεου. Ibid.

Tertullian

Tertullian says in general of the [g] heretics, who denied the Father to be creator of the world, that is, of this material visible world, that they held it to be made by angels.

The author of the additions to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions, says, of Saturninus, that, [h] like Simon and Menander, he held the eternal God to live above, and this lower world to have been made by angels much inferior to him.

He speaks to the like purpose of Basilides, that [i] he did not allow the god of the Jews to be truly God, but only an angel. According to his account then the unity [k] was an article strongly maintained by the heretics. Hippolytus [l] observes, that after all their shifts and evasions, Valentinus, Marcion, Cerinthus, and the rest, were all obliged to recur to one God, who made all things according to his will.

Dr. Cudworth seems to have viewed this matter in a light somewhat similar to the foregoing representation. For having endeavoured to prove that the heathen philosophers did not believe all their gods to be so many unmade self-existent deities, he proceeds in the following manner: 'The [m] next considerable 'appearance of a multitude of self-existent deities, seems to be 'in the Valentinian thirty gods, and æons, which have been 'taken by some for such; but it is certain that these were all of 'them, save one, generated; they being derived by that fan-'tastic deviser of them, from one self-originated deity, called 'Bythos. For thus Epiphanius [n] informs us: "This (Valen-"tinus) would also introduce thirty gods, and æons, and "heavens, the first of which is Bythos."

Having afterwards allowed that there were some who really asserted a duplicity of gods; he however, in the conclusion,

[g] .... præstruens adversus conjecturas hæreticorum, qui mundum ab angelis et potestatibus diversis volunt structum: et ipsum creatorem aut angelum faciunt, aut ad alia quæ extrinsecus, ut opera mundi, ignorantem quoque subornatum. Adv. Praxeam. c. xix. p. 650. B. p. 504. Fr.

[h] Secutus est post hæc et Saturninus, et hic similiter dicens, innascibilem virtutem, id est Deum, in summis et illis infinitis partibus, et in superioribus permanere; longe autem distantes ab hoc angelos inferiorem mundum fecisse. De Præscrip. c. xlvi. p. 249. D. p. 214. Fr.

[i] In ultimis quidem angelis, et qui hunc fecerunt mundum, novissimum ponit Judæorum Deum, id est, Deum legis et prophetarum: quem Deum negat, sed angelum dicit. Ibid. p. 250. A. p. 214. Fr.

[k] Postea Basilides hæreticus erupit: hic esse dicit summum Deum...ex quo mentem creatam...inde verbum. Ex illo providentiam, ex providentia virtutem et sapientiam. Ex ipsis inde principatus et potestates, et angelos factos, &c. Ibid. p. 250. A. p. 214. Fr.

[l] Και γαρ παντες απεκλεισθησαν εις τουτο ακοντες ειπειν, οτι το παν εις ενα ανατρεχει. Ει ουν τα παντα εις ενα ανατρεχει, και κατα Ουαλεντινον, και κατα Μαρκιωνα, Κηρινθοντε, και πασαν την εκεινων φλυαριαν, και ακοντες εις τουτο περιεπεσαν, ινα τον ενα ομολογησωσιν αιτιον των παντων, ουτως ουν συντρεχουσιν και αυτοι μη θελοντες, τη αληθεια ενα Θεον λεγειν ποιησαντα ως εθελησεν. Contra Noet. c. xi. p. 14. Ed. Fab.

[m] Intellectual System, p. 212, 213. Lond. 1678.

[n] Τριακοντα γαρ και ουτος Θεους και Αιωνας και Ουρανους βουλεται παρεισαγειν, ων ο πρωτος εστι Βυθος. Hær. xxxi. No. ii. p. 164. C.

adds:

p. 46.

adds: 'Wherefore [o] as these ditheists, as to all which is good in 'the world, held a monarchy, or one sole principle and original, 'so it is plain, that had it not been for this business of evil '(which they conceived could not be salved any other way) 'they would never have asserted any more principles or gods 'than one.'

Sect. X. *They made great use of the Scriptures.*

The ancient heretics paid a regard to the scriptures. It will hereafter more properly fall in my way to shew what parts of the sacred writings they severally used. At present I only observe in the general, that they endeavoured to support their particular sentiments [p] by an appeal to these inspired books. To me indeed it appears very certain, that [q] all who build upon revelation must have recourse either to scripture or tradition; that is, either to written or to oral tradition, provided they happen to live after the first promulgation of the revelation which they profess to receive. Jerom therefore justly [r] blames those who depended too much upon their own reason, in determining matters of pure revelation.

Irenæus has the following passage in his large work against heresies: 'Such [s] is the certain truth of our gospels that the 'heretics themselves bear testimony to them, every one of them 'endeavouring to prove his particular doctrines from thence. 'But the Ebionites may be confuted from the gospel of Mat-

[o] In Syn. p. 213. [p] Sed ipsi et de scripturis agunt et de scripturis suadent. Aliunde scilicet loqui possent de rebus fidei, nisi ex literis fidei. Tertul. de præs. hæret. c. xv. p. 236. C. p. 205. Fr. Nec periclitor dicere, ipsas quoque scripturas sic esse ex Dei voluntate dispositas, ut hæreticis materias subministrarent, cum legam; oportere hæreses esse, quæ sine scripturis esse non possint. Ibid. c. xxxix. p. 246. p. 212. Fr. [q] Ipsi quoque hæretici cum Christianum cogitantur habere nomen, et sacramenta Christiana, et scripturas, et professionem, magnum dolorem faciunt in cordibus piorum. Aug. de civit. Dei. l. xviii. c. li. n. ii. Ben. vol. v. p. 184. 3. Venet. [r] Quis enim philosophorum, quis gentilium, quis hæreticorum, non judicat Christum, ponentium ei leges nativitatis, et passionis, resurrectionisque suæ substantiæ. In Jerem. c. xv. T. iii. p. 601. In.

[s] Tanta est autem circa evangelia hæc firmitas, ut ipsi hæretici testimonium reddant eis, ut ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam. Ebionæi etenim eo evangelio, quod est secundum Mattheum, solo utentes, ex illo ipso convincuntur non recte præsumentes de Domino. Marcion autem id quod est secundum Lucam circumcidens, ex his quæ adhuc servantur penes eum blasphemus in solum existentem Deum ostenditur. Qui autem Jesum separant a Christo, et impassibilem perseverasse Christum, passum vero Jesum dicunt, id quod secundum Marcum est præferentes evangelium, cum amore veritatis legentes illud corrigi possunt. Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Johannem plenissime utentes, ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum ex ipso detegentur, nihil recte dicentes, quemadmodum ostendimus in primo libro. Cum ergo hi qui contradicunt, nobis testimonium perhibeant, et utantur his firma et vera est nostra de illis ostensio. Iren. lib. iii. c. xi. n. vii. p. 189, 190. Mass. p. 220. Gr.

'shew,

'thew, which alone they receive. Marcion uſeth only the goſ-
'pel of Luke, and that mutilated. Nevertheleſs, from what he
'retains, it may be ſhewn that he blaſphemes the one only God.
'They who divide Jeſus from Chriſt, and ſay that Chriſt always
'remained impaſſible whilſt Jeſus ſuffered, prefer the goſpel of
'Mark. However, if they read with a love of truth, they may
'thence be convinced of their error. The Valentinians receive
'the goſpel of John entire, in order to prove their pairs of æons,
'and by that goſpel they may be confuted, as I have ſhewn in
'the firſt book of this work. Since therefore perſons of different
'ſentiments agree with us, in making uſe of this teſtimony, our
'evidence for the authority of theſe goſpels is certain and un-
'queſtionable.'

Many paſſages may be alleged from other writers to ſhew that the ancient heretics endeavoured to ſupport themſelves by the words of the ſcriptures, either of the Old or the New Teſtament, or both; and that they who rejected the Old inſiſted on the authority of the New.

Origen is a good witneſs here, on account of his antiquity and probity, as well as vaſt knowledge; and in particular his extenſive acquaintance with the doctrines of heretics [t]. He obſerves that they endeavoured to impoſe upon people by alleging texts of ſcripture for their particular tenets, though they quoted them [u] in a very unfair and mutilated manner; and that they appealed to them becauſe they were the only writings whoſe authority was univerſally allowed. Even thoſe of them, who would not believe the giver of the law and the inſpirer of the prophets, to be the ſupreme Lord of the univerſe, or the father of Jeſus Chriſt; ſtill acknowledged the divine authority of ſome parts of the New Teſtament, and received it's declarations as authentic and deciſive. In ſome places he imputes the riſe of hereſies [x] to the too literal interpretation of ſcripture. An anonymous

[t] Τουτω δε ηκολουθησε, διαφορως εκδεξαμενοις τας αμα πασιν πιστευθεντας ειναι θειας γραφας, το γενεσθαι αιρεσεις. Contr. Celſ. l. iii. p. 188. Can. Εφωσαν εν εν ημιν οι μη τον αυτον λεγοντες τω Ιουδαιων Θεω Θεον· αλλα ει τι γε παρα τουτο κατηγορηται οι απο των αυτων γραμματων αποδεικνυντες. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. l. v. p. 271. Can.

[u] Scis quia ſi de aliis ei voluminibus loqui volueris, non decipies, neque habere poterunt auctoritatem aſſertiones tuæ. Sic legit ſcripturas Marcion, ut Diabolus: Sic Baſilides, ſic Valentinus, ut cum Diabolo dicerent ſalvatori. Scriptum eſt Ex Prog. Stro. T. i. Bened. Primum ſuppli-citer ſentientes armemur adverſus impios hæreticos qui dicunt non eſſe conditorem patrem Jeſu, neque Deum legis, nec prophetarum. Erubeſcant Valentiniani audientes Jeſum inquientem. In his quæ ſunt patris mei oportet me eſſe. Erubeſcant omnes hæretici qui evangelium recipiunt ſecundum Lucam, et quæ in eo ſunt ſcripta contemnunt. Ibid.

[x] Hæreſes quoque magis de carnali ſcripturæ intelligentia, quam de opere carnis noſtræ, ut plurimi eſtimant, &c. Ibid. T. i. p. 41. Bened. Confer. l. iv. p. 164.

author [y] who lived about the year 212, and who is largely cited by Eusebius, speaks [z] of some heretics in his time, who rejected the law and the prophets, under a pretence of grace. These persons despised the ancient dispensation unreasonably; nevertheless they received the gospel, and greatly respected the scriptures of the New Testament. Epiphanius has given a large and particular account of the manner in which Marcion mutilated the scriptures; yet he says [a] his heresies may be confuted even from what he retains of the gospel and epistles. Of all heretics, he indeed seems to have taken the greatest liberty in altering and curtailing the writings of the New Testament. Nevertheless, after a long argument against him, Tertullian clearly shews [b] that the principal and most important doctrines of the gospel remained equally certain as before, even in his mutilated copy. The same writer says, in another place, [c] that it was the usual custom with heretics to insist upon a text or two without regarding the general tenor of the scriptures. Augustine often blames heretics [d] for perverting scripture in favour of their errors; and makes their fault to lie in this, not that they rejected or despised the scriptures, but that they misunderstood them, and put wrong interpretations upon them [e].

All heretics, he says, endeavour to defend their false opinions [f] by the authority of the divine scriptures. Nevertheless, the scriptures ought not to be reckoned the occasion of these errors. He also speaks of some [g] who, though they rejected the Old

[y] He is particularly spoken of before, c. xxxii. vol. ii. p. 379...385.

[z] Αλλ απλως αρνησαμενοι τοτε νομον και τους προφητας, ανομω και αθεω διδασκαλιας, προφασει χαριτος. Eus. Ec. H. l. v. cap. xxviii. p. 198. B. [a] Εξ ὑπερ χαρακτηρος τω παρ αυτω σωζομενω, τοτε ευαγγελιω και των επιστολων τω αποστολω, δειξαι αυτον εν Θεω ἐχομεν απατεωνα και πεπλανημενον, και ακροτατα εξελεγξαι. Epiph. Hær. 42.

[b] Misereor tui Marcion, frustra laborasti. Christus enim Jesus in evangelio tuo, meus est. Ad. Mar. lib. iv. c. xliii. sub fin. p. 575. B. p. 451. Fr.

[c] His tribus capitulis totum instrumentum utriusque testamenti volunt cedere, cum oporteat secundum plura intelligi pauciora, sed proprium hoc est omnium hæreticorum. Adv. Prax. c. xx. p. 651. C. 505. Fr. [d] Omnes enim hæretici qui eas in auctoritate recipiunt, ipsas sibi videntur sectari, cum suos potius sectentur errores: ac per hoc, non quod eas contemnant, sed quod eas non intelligant hæretici sunt. Ep. cxx. c. iii. n. xiii. al. ep. 222. T. 2. Sine dubio enim hoc ipsum quod perverse et impie sentiunt, aliquibus testimoniis divinarum scripturarum conantur adstruere: in quibus eis ostendendum est, quam non recte intelligant literas sacras conscriptas ad fidelium salutem. Ep. cclxiv. [al. cxli] n. iii. T. ii. p. 200.

[e] Et quoniam multi hæretici ad suam sententiam, quæ preter fidem est catholicæ disciplinæ, expositionem scripturarum divinarum trahere consueverunt, &c. De Gen. ad lit. lib. Im. c. i. In. T. iii. p. 158. 4. Venet. [f] Quandoquidem nec ipsis sanctis divinorum librorum auctoritatibus, ullo modo quisquam tribuerit tam multos et varios errores hæreticorum: cum omnes ex iisdem scripturis falsas atque fallaces opiniones suas conentur defendere. De Trin. l. i. c. iv. n. vi. T. 8.

[g] Et quoniam quoquo modo Christianum se videri cupit, unde ex evangelio et ex apostolo ponit aliqua testimonia: etiam ex scripturis ad Novum Testamentum pertinentibus refellendus est: ut ostendatur in reprehensione veterum inconsideratius quam versutius insanire. Con. Adv. Leg. et prop. l. i. c. i. T. vi. p. 188. 4. Venet.

Testament,

Teſtament, attempted to prove their opinions from the goſpels and epiſtles.

In like manner St. Jerom ſays, [h] if heretics reject the Old Teſtament, they may be confuted from the New, which they own. The ſame author ſometimes complains [i] that heretics ſtrive to ſupport their doctrines by quotations of ſcripture that have no connexion together; and ſays [k] that neither heretics, nor the leſs knowing among the faithful, underſtand the ſcripture in a manner becoming it's majeſty. The ſame learned ancient father adds [l] that, heretics corrupt the truth of the goſpel by wrong interpretations. They are miſerable wine coopers; they turn wine into water. In his comment upon Jerem. xiii. 23, he ſays that [m] the heretics, who hold two natures, allege that text againſt the church. And he ſpeaks elſewhere [n] as if all Chriſtian heretics endeavoured to ſupport their errors and falſehoods, by paſſages of ſcripture; informing us that [o] it was cuſtomary for them to argue from every part of ſcripture, from the Old and the New Teſtament, from the prophets, the apoſtles, and the evangeliſts. Tertullian ſpeaks much to the ſame purpoſe, that [p] heretics endeavour to ſupport their erroneous notions by wrong interpretations of ſcripture; and he further adds, [q] that they might be confuted from ſcripture, if they would abide by it's determinations, and attend to them alone. Ambroſiaſter's [r] definition or

[h] Sin autem ſcandalizatur hæreticus, qui vetus non recipit teſtamentum, quod 'dominus miſcere,' dicatur erroris vel 'vertiginis ſpiritum,' audiat ſcriptum in apoſtolo, hoc eſt, in Novo Teſtamento: 'Tradidit eos Deus in deſideriis cordis ſui 'in immunditiem.' (Præm. i. 24.) In Iſ. cap. xix. p. 184. f. Tom. 3.

[i] Neque enim utuntur hæretici teſtimoniis ſcripturarum ſibi cohærentibus, ſed conturbant omnia. In Ezek. cap. xxxii. p. 926. fin. Noſtra autem Jeruſalem quæ interpretatur viſio pacis ab hæreticis ſcinditur quando unum et alterum teſtimonium ſcripturarum de propriis carpentes locis, conantur aſſuere his, quibus non queunt coaptare. Ibid. cap. xvi. p. 793. f.

[k] Referri poteſt ad hæreticos et ad ſimplices quoſque credentium, qui non ita ſcripturam intelligunt ut illius convenit majeſtati. In Iſ. c. xxxiii. p. 271. M.

[l] Hæretici quoque evangelicam veritatem corrumpunt prava intelligentia, et ſunt caupones peſſimi facientes de vino aquam. Ad. Iſ. c. i. v. xxii. p. 18. in T. 3.

[m] Hoc teſtimonio utuntur adverſus eccleſiam, qui diverſas cupiunt aſſerere naturas et tantam dicunt eſſe nigridinem peccatorum,,,ut in candorem tranſire non poſſint. In Jer. c. xiii. p. 594. In.

[n] Hoc faciunt omnes hæretici ſub Chriſtiano nomine fornicantes, et erroribus ſuis atque mendaciis obtendentes teſtimonia ſcripturarum. In Amos, c. ii. p. 1384. In. [o] Sic hæretici aſſumunt teſtimonia ſcripturarum de veteri et Novo Teſtamento: et furantur verba ſalvatoris unuſquiſque proximo ſuo, prophetis et apoſtolis et evangeliſtis. In Jerem. c. xxiii. p. 640. fin. [p] Nihil autem mirum ſi et ex ipſius inſtrumento captantur argumenta, cum oporteat hæreſes eſſe, quæ eſſe non poſſent, ſi non et perperam ſcripturæ intelligi poſſent. De Reſur. Car. c. xli. p. 408. B. c. xl. p. 333. Fran. Scripturas obtendunt et hac ſua audacia ſtatim quoſdam movent. In ipſo vero congreſſu, firmos quidem fatigant, infirmos capiunt, medios cum ſcrupulo dimittunt. De Præſ. Hær. c. xv. p. 236. C. p. 205. Fran. [q] Auſer denique hæreticis, cum ethnicis ſapiunt, ut de ſcripturis ſolis queſtiones ſuas ſiſtant, et ſtare non poterunt. De Res Car. ciii. p. 381. B. p. 315. Fr. [r] Concerning the author of theſe commentaries on thirteen epiſtles of St. Paul. See before, Vol. iii. p. 155. and Vol. iv. p. 496, 497.

deſcription

description of heretics is, that [s] they are men who endeavour to support their opinions by ſcripture, putting their own ſenſe upon the divine word, and attempting to defend their errors by the authority of the ſacred writings. Vincentius Lirinenſis teſtifies the ſame thing, informing us that ſome in his days, who were called heretics, made great uſe of ſcripture, and continually anſwered their adverſaries and calumniators by quotations [t] from the ſacred writings. He indeed ſays, 'It [u] is the devil who puts 'theſe arguments into their mouths and ſpeaks by them.' From which probably ſome will conclude that many of their arguments from ſcripture were ſuch as their adverſaries could not anſwer. However, the beſt way of confuting theſe diabolical arguments would have been by ſhewing that the meaning they put upon the texts was not their genuine ſenſe: and by producing more numerous paſſages in confutation of their doctrines. In many caſes indeed they certainly argued with little ſtrength, conſiſtency, or regard to the general tenor of the ſacred writings. It would be endleſs to enter into particulars; ſuffice it to mention one inſtance: they argued againſt the reſurrection of the [x] body from St. Paul's words: 1 Cor. xv. 50.

Sect. XI. *Some of them alſo uſed Apocryphal Books.*

Hegesippus, as we are informed by Euſebius, ſpeaking [y] of the books called Apocryphal, ſays that ſome of them were forged by ſome heretics in his time. Irenæus affirms that [z] they quoted an innumerable multitude of apocryphal and ſpurious books, which they had themſelves forged.

Amphilochius is ſaid [a] to have publiſhed a book concerning the

[s] Hæretici hi ſunt, qui per verba legis legem impugnant: proprium enim ſenſum verbis adſtruunt legis, ut pravitatem mentis ſuæ, legis auctoritati commendent. Ad. Tit. c. iii. v. 10, 11.

[t] Ac ſi quis interroget quempiam hæreticorum ſibi talia perſuadentem: unde probas?.....Statim ille: 'Scriptum eſt 'enim.' Et continuo mille teſtimonia, mille exempla, mille auctoritates parat, de lege, de pſalmis, de apoſtolis, de prophetis. Comment. c. xxxvii. Baluz. p. 359.

[u] Non dubium eſt, quin auctoris ſui callida machinamenta ſectentur: quæ ille nunquam profecto comminiſceretur, niſi ſciret, &c. See the whole of this paſſage before, Vol. v. p. 222.

[x] Sed caro, inquis, et ſanguis regnum Dei hæreditate poſſidere non poſſunt. Scimus hoc quoque ſcriptum, ſed de induſtria diſtulimus hucuſque. Tert. de Reſur. Carn. c. xlviii. p. 416. A. B. p. 339. Fr.

[y] Και περι των λεγομενων δε αποκρυφων διαλαμβανων, επι των αυτα χρονων προς τινων αιρετικων αναπεπλασθαι τινα τυτων ιστορει. Euſeb. l. iv. c. xxii. p. 143. B.

[z] Προς δε τυτοις αμυθητον πληθος αποκρυφων και νοθων γραφων, ας αυτοι επλασασαν, παραισφερυσιν εις καταπληξιν των ανοητων, κ. λ. Iren. l. i. c. xx. [al. 17.] n. i.

[a] Περι των ψευδεπιγραφων παρα τοις αιρετικοις liber: cujus verba quædam adducit ſynodos ſeptima. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 253. in Amphilochio.

Conſ.

the ſpurious writings forged by heretics, though it is not mentioned by Jerom [b] in his account of Amphilochius.

We cannot therefore acquit the heretics of this charge. It ſeems to be ſupported by ſufficient evidence in the teſtimony of the writers juſt quoted. I have already had occaſion to mention ſeveral compoſitions of this kind: one is the goſpel of Peter, cenſured [c] by Serapion, forged by one of the Docetæ. I have taken notice elſewhere [d] of ſeveral pieces aſcribed to Leucius, who was of the ſame opinion. The reader may likewiſe be pleaſed to conſult the chapter of Euſebius. Perhaps none of the ſects were free from this fault. There were ſome books that may be called apocryphal, compoſed by the Unitarians or Ebionites, that is, ſuch as maintained one principle: others by thoſe who held two principles, and were Docetæ.

With regard to this, however ſeveral things may be obſerved:

I. Moſt of theſe apocryphal pieces, whether goſpels, or acts, or circuits and travels, or revelations, went under the names of apoſtles [e], or apoſtolical men; and, in the general, bear teſtimony to the tranſcendent excellence of Jeſus and his doctrine, and the truth of the main things concerning him.

II. It does not clearly appear what degree of credit was given to theſe writings; or that they were equally reſpected by any, with the genuine and undiſputed books of the New Teſtament; for which, as we have already ſeen, and may ſee further hereafter, heretics had a great eſteem, and endeavoured to prove their doctrines by them.

III. The catholics themſelves are not free from this charge. There were ſeveral books forged by them, and aſcribed to perſons who were not their real authors. Among theſe may be reckoned the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Sibylline Poems, the books aſcribed to Hydaſpes, Hermes Triſmegiſtus, and divers others; as much has been owned by ſeveral learned writers, [f]

Conf. Fabr. Bib. T. vii. p. 505. Le vii. concile rapporte quelques endroits d'un diſcours du meſme ſaint ſur les écrits ſuppoſez aux apôtres, dont les hæretiques ſe ſervoient. Tillem. Mem. T. ix. Amphil. note v.

[b] Vid. de Viris Illus. c. cxxxiii..

[c] See Vol. ii. of this work, ch. xxvi. p. 247.

[d] See Vol. iii. p. 533....535.

[e] Quæ [evangelia] a diverſis auctoribus edita, diverſarum hæreſeon fuere principia: ut eſt illud juxta Ægyptios, et Thomam, et Matthiam, et Bartholomæum, duodecimque apoſtolorum. Hier. Pr. in Matt.

[f] Poſtremo illud quoque me vehementer movet, quod videam primis eccleſiæ temporibus quam plurimos exſtitiſſe, qui facinus palmarium judicabant cæleſtem veritatem figmentis ſuis ire adjutum: quo facilius videlicet nova doctrina a gentium ſapientibus admitteretur. Officioſa hæc mendacia vocabant, bono fine excogitata. Quo ex fonte dubio procul ſunt orti libri fere ſexcenti, quos illa ætas et proxima viderunt, ab hominibus minime malis, (nam de hæreticorum libris non loquimur:) ſub nomine etiam domini Jeſu et apoſtolorum, aliorumque ſanctorum publicatos. Caſaub. Ex. i. in Baron. n. x, p. 54.

particularly

particularly Isaac Casaubon. Mr. Mosheim, [g] many years since, published a dissertation shewing the reasons and causes of suppositious writings in the first and second century; and all own that Christians of all sorts were guilty of this fraud. Indeed we may say it was one great fault of the times; for truth needs no such defences, and would [h] blush at the sight of them: she only desires to be shewn in open light, and to appear without disguise.

IV. Nevertheless, in all probability, these spurious and suppositious writings have not been of any very bad consequence. Few of them have come down to us; which shews that they were not much esteemed. All did not approve of such methods. The author of the Acts of Paul of Thecla underwent a censure soon after his book was published. What notice has been taken of these things by the ancient writers that remain, I have shewn as we passed along [i]. By some writers these books are quoted very sparingly; and when quoted, it is with some diminishing token, shewing that they were not of authority. It may indeed be supposed that forgeries of all sorts were despised by some of every denomination, catholics and heretics.

Sect. XII. *They respected the Apostles and apostolic Traditions.*

This appears in part from the two last particulars, their making use of the scriptures of the New Testament, and forging books (if they forged any) in the names of the apostles, or of apostolical men. It has been often observed by learned moderns, that Basilides pretended to have received his peculiar sentiments from Glaucias, a companion of Peter; and Valentinus from Theodas, a disciple of Paul [k].

Tertullian, writing against the heretics, assures [l] us that they

[g] Universe quidem inde hanc pestem natam esse novimus, quod Christiani, tam recte quam perverse sentientes, opinionibus suis majorem auctoritatem, plureſque sectatores acquirere se posse crediderunt, si sanctissimos viros, et ipsum Christianæ religionis conditorem, illis favisse ostenderent. J. L. Mosheim Diss. de Caussis suppositorum librorum inter Christianos primi et secundi sæculi. n. i. p. 221. edit. 2da. 1733. [h] Nostræ columbæ etiam domus simplex, in editis semper et apertis et ad lucem...Nihil veritas erubescit, nisi solummodo abscondi. Tertull. adv. Valent. cap. iii. p. 284. A. 243. Fr.

[i] See Vol. ii. p. 285, 286, and Vol. iv. p. 348...356. [k] Καθαπερ ο βασιλιδης, και Γλαυκιαν επιγραφηται διδασκαλον, ως αυχουσιν αυτοι, του Πετρου ερμηνεα· ως αυτως δε και Ουαλεντινον Θεοδαδι ακηκοεναι φασιν. Clem. Strom. l. vii. p. 898. ed. Potter. p. 764. D. ed. Paris.

[l] Sed, ut diximus, eadem dementia est; cum confitentur quidem nihil apostolos ignorasse, nec diversa inter se predicasse; non tamen omnia volunt illos omnibus revelasse: quædam enim palam, et universis: quædam secreto, et paucis demandasse. De Pr. Hær. c. xxv. p. 240. A. B. Fran. 205.

could

could not deny, and even owned, that the apostles knew all the doctrines of the gospel, and agreed with one another in what they taught. The most they could presume to assert in favour of their peculiarities was, that the apostles did not declare the whole truth to all. But this will appear more particularly in the history of the several heretics. I shall here only mention two or three general things to prove that the apostles and apostolic traditions were regarded by them.

Ptolemæus, a Valentinian, in a letter to Flora, having observed [m] that the ceremonial and typical laws of the Pentateuch were disannulled by the appearing of the truth, adds, 'These 'things the other disciples of Christ taught, and also the apostle 'Paul.' After which he tells Flora, 'he will explain to her 'the particulars of that doctrine he had just been mentioning [n], 'by the help of tradition received from the apostles, and handed 'down to them.' But he adds: 'All must be tried by, and 'made to square with, the doctrine of the Saviour himself, which 'was to be the rule.'

Tertullian, speaking [o] of heretics in the general, challenges them to produce men who held the same opinions with themselves from the apostles' days down to the present time; and says, 'Though all heretics endeavour to shew that their opinions are 'derived from the apostles, yet they are very far from being 'able to prove this; or to make it appear that they were either 'held by the apostles, or are handed down from them.'

Ptolemæus, the forecited Valentinian, in the passage just quoted [p], makes mention of the apostolic tradition, and speaks of it as received from the apostles themselves, in a continued succession, down to the time in which he lived. From all which it plainly appears that the authority of the apostles was regarded by these men, especially those writings which were universally believed to be theirs; since even traditions, which could with

[m] Παχυσης δε της αληθειας, τα της αληθειας δει ποιειν, η τα της εικονος. Ταυτα δε και οι μαθηται αυτυ και ο αποστολος εδειξε Παυλος. κ. λ. In appen. ad Iren. p. 360, 361. Vel ap. Grab. Spi. Pat. vol. ii. p. 77, 78. [n] Μαθησι γαρ, Θευ διδοντος, εξης και την τυτυ αρχηντε και γενησιν, αξιωμεν της αποστολικης παραδοσεως, ην εκ διαδοχης και ημεις αφειληφαμεν, μετα και τυ καταισαι παντας τυς λογυς τη τυ Σωτηρος διδασκαλια. Ibid. p. 361. vel ap. Grab. ibid. p. 80. [o] Cæterum si quæ audent interferere se ætati apostolicæ, ut ideo videantur ab apostolis traditæ, quia sub apostolis fuerunt; possumus dicere: edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum: evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, &c.... Ita omnes hæreses ad utramque formam a nostris ecclesiis provocatæ, probent se quaqua putant apostolicas. Sed adeo nec sunt, nec probare possunt quod non sunt: nec recipiuntur in pacem et communicationem ab ecclesiis quoque modo apostolicis. De Pr. H. c. xxxii. p. 243. Fr. 210. [p] Αξιωμεν της αποστολικης παραδοσεως, ην εκ διαδοχης και ημεις παρειληφαμεν. Ap. Grab. Spi. Pat. vol. ii. p. 80.

probability be traced back to them, were treated with great reſpect.

Sect. XIII. *The ancient Hereſiarchs were generally Men of Letters, and are ſaid to have borrowed moſt of their peculiar notions from ſome of the Sects of Philoſophers.*

Some, if not all the ancient hereſiarchs, or leaders of ſects, were men of letters. This is an obſervation of Jerom, who ſays[q] as much of all of them in general, but particularly of Valentinus, Marcion, and Bardeſanes. The ſame thing is aſſerted[r] by Auguſtine.

It hath been often affirmed, both by ancient and modern writers, that the earlier Chriſtian heretics borrowed from the heathen philoſophers. The thing is indeed very likely in itſelf; for ſome learned converts, whether from Judaiſm or Gentiliſm, would naturally bring along with them many of their former prejudices and peculiarities of ſentiment.

Tertullian very frequently utters his complaints[s] againſt heretics, for mixing philoſophy with Chriſtianity, and interpreting divine doctrines by philoſophical notions.

Some are ſaid to have borrowed from one, ſome from another ſect of philoſophy. According to Tertullian, Hermogenes[t] and Marcion[u] borrowed from the Stoics, and Valentinus from the Platoniſts. And the tenets of all the different ſects of phi-

[q] Nullus enim poteſt hæreſim ſtruere niſi qui ardentis ingenii eſt, et habet dona naturæ, quæ a Deo artifice ſunt creata. Talis fuit Valentinus, talis Marcion, quos doctiſſimos legimus. Talis Bardeſanes, cujus etiam philoſophi admirantur ingenium. In Oſ. c. x. p. 1301. In.

[r] In ipſis poſtremo erroribus et falſitatibus defendendis, quam magna claruerint ingenia philoſophorum atque hæreticorum, quis æſtimare ſufficiat? Aug. De Civit. Dei. l. xxii. c. xxiv. n. iii. vel T. v. p. 238. 2. D. Venet. 1570.

[s] Niſi quod ſolus eam Hermogenes cognovit, et hæreticorum patriarchæ philoſophi. Adv. Hermog. c. viii. p. 269. D. 231. Fran. Dolco bona fide Platonem omnium hæreticorum condimentarium factum. De Anima, c. xxiii. p. 325. B. 275. Fr. Ea eſt enim materia ſapientiæ ſecularis, temeraria interpres divinæ naturæ et diſpoſitionis...Eadem materia apud hæreticos et philoſophos volutatur, iidem retractatus implicantur. Unde malum, et quare? Et unde homo, et quomodo? De Pr. Hær. c. vii. p. 232. D. 203. Fr. Quid ergo Athenis et Hieroſolymis? quid academiæ et eccleſiæ?.....Viderint qui ſtoicum et Platonicum et dialecticum Chriſtianiſmum protulerunt. Nobis curioſitate opus non eſt poſt Chriſtum Jeſum, nec inquiſitione poſt evangelium. De Pr. c. vii. viii. p. 233. B. 203. Fr.

[t] A Chriſtianis enim converſus ad philoſophos, de eccleſia in academiam et porticum, inde ſumpſit a ſtoicis materiam cum Domino ponere, quæ ipſa ſemper fuerit, neque nata, neque facta, nec initium habens omnino nec finem, ex qua Dominus omnia poſtea fecerit. Adv. Herm. c. i. p. 265. D. 229. Fr.

[u] Ubi tunc Marcion Ponticus Nauclerus ſtoicæ ſtudioſus? Ubi tunc Valentinus Platonicæ ſectator. De Pr. Hær. c. xxx. p. 242. A. 209. Fr.

loſophers

losophers [w] were understood by them to be inconsistent with a belief of the resurrection of the body.

In some of their peculiar tenets he supposed them to be influenced by the principles of Zeno and Heraclitus [x], and in others by those of Epicurus and Plato.

Origen [y], who often mentions together Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, charges all three with contemning the Christian religion, by introducing philosophical schemes.

Epiphanius says that [z] all heresies in general had arisen out of heathenish fables. But it hath been disputed among the moderns from what philosophy chiefly the heretics borrowed. The origin of the Valentinian æons in particular has been the subject of no small debate, and has afforded matter for the diligent inquiries of learned men.

Some have supposed that these notions were derived from the Jewish Cabbala; this, however, Massuet strongly opposes [a], and asserts that Valentinus [b] and his followers borrowed from the Gentile poets and philosophers.

[w] At cum monet cavendum a subtililoquentia et philosophia et inani seductione, longum est quidem et alterius operis ostendere, hac sententia omnes hæreses damnari: quod omnes ex subtililoquentiæ viribus, et philosophiæ regulis constent. Sed Marcion principalem suæ fidei terminum de Epicuri schola agnoscat, Dominum inferens hebetem, ne timeri eum dicat; collocans et cum Deo Creatore materiam de porticu Stoicorum; negans carnis resurrectionem, de qua proinde nulla philosophia consentit. Cujus ingeniis tam longe abest veritas nostra, ut et iram Dei excitare formidet, et omnia illum ex nihilo protulisse confidat, et carnem eandem restituturum repromittat, et Christum ex vulva virginis natum non erubescat, ridentibus philosophis et hæreticis et ethnicis ipsis. Adv. Mar. lib. v. cap. xix. p. 613. D. 477. Fr.

[x] Ipsæ denique hæreses a philosophia subornantur. Inde æones et formæ nescio quæ, et trinitas hominis apud Valentinum: Platonicus fuerat. Inde Marcionis Deus melior de tranquillitate: a Stoicis venerat. Et ut anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur. Et ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium philosophorum schola sumitur. Et ubi materia cum Deo æquatur, Zenonis disciplina est: et ubi aliquid de igneo Deo allegatur, Heraclitus intervenit. De Pr. Hær. c. vii. p. 232. D. 203. Fr.

[y] Hoc fecit infelix Valentinus, et Basilides. Hoc fecit et Marcion. Furati sunt isti linguas aureas de Jericho, et philosophorum nobis non rectas in ecclesias introducere conati sunt sectas, et polluere omnem ecclesiam Domini. In Lib. Jes. Nave. Hom. vii. p. 414. D. T. ii. Bened.

[z] Ex γαρ ελληνικων μυθων πασαι αι αιρεσεις συνεξασαι εαυταις την πλανην κατεβαλον. Hær. xxvi. n. xvi. p. 98. D.

[a] Valentinianorum placita ex philosophia Hæbreorum Kabbalistica inferi, autoribus id gratis supponere placuit; quod ab ipso limine probandum erat, Kabbalam primo et secundo post Christum natum seculo notam fuisse....Et certe quisquis de Kabbala mystica conscriptos libros adierit, aut peritiores e Rabbinis consuluerit, e vestigio deprehendet admodum recentes esse, vixque ante annos quingentos aut sexcentos exarari potuisse. Massuet in Iren. præ. p. xx. n. 21.

[b] Idem in Iren. lib. ii. cap. 14.

Sect. XIV. *This variety of Opinion is no just Objection against the Truth of the Christian Religion.*

No good argument can be drawn from the number of different opinions among Christians, to invalidate the truth of their common religion. Yet Celsus made this an objection, to which Origen has [c] given a good reply.

He observes, 'There never was any thing important in itself, 'or promising great advantages to those who pursued it, but 'different sentiments were formed about it. This is the case 'with physic, which is useful, and even necessary to mankind; 'but considered either as a matter of science or practice, there 'are many different opinions concerning it. The same is the 'case with philosophy, which proposes to lead us to truth, and 'to teach us to live well; yet even here men differ very widely 'from one another. The same is the case with Judaism, out of 'which hath sprung a great variety of sects. No wonder there-'fore that Christianity, a matter of such infinite importance, 'could excite the speculations of many, and cause different men 'to form different opinions concerning some of it's doctrines 'and discoveries. But as he would not be reckoned a prudent 'man who totally rejected the use of physic, when sickness 'made it necessary, because there were some differences in 'opinion about the theory of his disease; nor he a wise man 'who abjured all philosophy, because philosophers disagreed 'among themselves; so neither would it be a mark of good 'sense to reject the writings of Moses and the prophets, or to 'abjure Christianity, because of some differences in opinion 'among their adherents.'

We may perceive from many ancient catholic writers that they themselves saw this difficulty, but they answered it very reasonably in the following manner: that these divisions were

[c] Προς τουτο φησομεν, οτι υδεις πραγματος, ε μη σπουδαια εστιν η αρχη και τω βιω χρησιμος, γεγονασιν αιρεσεις διαφοραι. επει γαρ ιατρικη χρησιμος και αναγκαια τω γενει των ανθρωπων,...αιρεσεις εν ιατρικη ευρισκονται πλειους.....επει φιλοσοφια αληθειαν επαγγελλομενη...πως δει βιων...αιρεσεις συνεστησαν πλειους...και Ιουδαισμος προφασιν εσχε γενεσεως αιρεσεων....ουτω τοινυν χριστιανισμος....αλλ' ουτ' ιατρικη ευλογως αν τις ψευγοι δια τας εν αυτη αιρεσεις· ουτε φιλοσοφιαν τις αν μισοι, ουτως ουδε καταγνωσεται των Μωυσεως και των προφητων ιερων βιβλιων.... ο δ' εγκαλων τω λογω (ημετερω) δια τας αιρεσεις, εγκαλεσει αν και τη Σωκρατους διδασκαλια. κ. τ. λ. Contra Cels. l. iii. p. 118. ed. Cantab. T. i. p. 454, 455. Bened. Ειπερ δε το ειναι αιρεσεις πλειους εν Χριστιανοις, κατηγοριαν οιεται Χριστιανισμου ειναι· δια τι ουχι και φιλοσοφιας κατηγορια. ...εν ταις αιρεσεσι των φιλοσοφουντων διαφωνια, η περι μικρων, και των τυχοντων, αλλα περι των αναγκαιοτατων; αρα δε και ιατρικην κατηγορεισθαι δια τας εν αυτη αιρεσεις. Ibid. lib. v. p. 271. ed. Cantab. T. i. p. 624. Bened.

foretold

foretold by Chriſt [d] himſelf and his apoſtles; and that differences of opinion had ariſen about certain matters in the times of the apoſtles and even of Chriſt himſelf. They further obſerved that [e] when the refuſe or chaff ſhould be ſeparated from the wheat the church would become more pure; and, though ſome of thoſe in high ſtations ſhould fall away, the rule of faith was the ſame, and remained equally [f] firm and ſtable as before: ſince, even in the mutilated copies of heretics [g], the moſt important doctrines ſtill continued untouched.

The ancient apologiſts for Chriſtianity ſometimes affirmed that theſe differences of opinion were in the event ſerviceable to the intereſt of truth, and promoted the Chriſtian cauſe. I formerly quoted [h] divers paſſages to this purpoſe from Auguſtine; I ſhall now add a few more from him and ſome other writers.

He, in particular, having ſpoken of Marcion and ſome other heretics, obſerves [i] that this diſagreement in opinion was of advantage to the catholic cauſe, ſince by means of this oppoſition between different ſects, the truth was more fully cleared, better underſtood and defended. In another place, where the title of the chapter is that the catholic faith is ſtrengthened by the

[d] Vid. Juſ. Mar. Dial. cum Tryp. p. 253. B. C. ed. Paris. p. 207...209. ed. Thirl. Ante omnia ſcire nos convenit et ipſum et legatos ejus prædixiſſe, quod plurimæ ſectæ et hæreſes haberent exiſtere, quæ concordiam ſancti corporis rumperent, &c. Lac. l. iv. c. xxx. p. 448. Min. 516.

[e] Avolent quantum volent paleæ levis fidei, quocunque afflatu tentationum, eo purior maſſa frumenti in horrea Domini reponetur. Nonne ab ipſo Domino quidam diſcentium ſcandalizati deverterunt? Nec tamen propterea cæteri quoque diſcedendum a veſtigiis ejus putaverunt: ſed qui ſcierunt illum vitæ eſſe verbum, et a Deo veniſſe, perſeveraverunt in comitatu ejus uſque ad finem: cum illis, ſi vellent et ipſi diſcedere, placide obtuliſſet. Minus eſt ſi et apoſtolum ejus aliqui Phigellus, et Hermogenes, et Philetus, et Hymenæus reliquerunt. Ipſe traditor Chriſti de apoſtolis fuit. Miramur de eccleſiis ejus, ſi a quibuſdam deſeruntur:...Quin potius memores ſimus, tam Dominicarum prænuntiationum, quam apoſtolicarum literarum, quæ nobis et futuras hæreſes prænuntiarunt, et fugiendas præfinierunt, &c. Tert. de Pr. Hær. cap. iii. iv. p. 231. Fran. 202.

[f] Solent quidem iſti infirmiores etiam ex quibuſdam perſonis ab hæreſi captis offendi in ruinam: quare ille vel ille fallitiſſimi, prudentiſſimi, et uſitatiſſimi in Eccleſia, in illam partem tranſierunt? Ib. c. iii. p. 230. D. Fran. 201. Quid ergo ſi epiſcopus, ſi diaconus, ſi vidua, ſi virgo, ſi doctor, ſi etiam martyr lapſus a regula fuerit, ideo hæreſes veritatem videbuntur obtinere? Ex perſonis probamus fidem, an ex fide perſonas? Nemo ſapiens eſt niſi fidelis. Ibid. c. iii. p. 231. A. Fran. 201.

[g] Miſereor tui, Marcion, fruſtra laboraſti; Chriſtus enim Jeſus in evangelio tuo meus eſt. Idem Adv. Mar. lib. iv. cap. xliii. ad finem. p. 451. Fr.

[h] Vol. iii. p. 543. Notes [o] and [p].

[i] Illa vero batilla ærea, id eſt hæreticorum voces, ſi adhibeamus ad altare Dei, ubi divinus ignis eſt, ubi vera Dei prædicatio, melius ipſa veritas ex falſorum comparatione fulgebit. Si enim, ut verbi gratia dicam, ponam dicta Marcionis, aut Baſilidis, aut alterius cujuſlibet hæretici, et hæc ſermonibus veritatis, et ſcripturarum divinarum teſtimoniis velut divini altaris igne contuleris: Nonne evidentior eorum ex ipſa comparatione apparebit impietas? Nam ſi doctrina ſimplex eſſet, et nullis extrinſecus hæreticorum dogmatum aſſertionibus cingeretur, non poterat tam clara et tam examinata videri fides noſtra. Sed idcirco doctrinam catholicam contradicentium obſidet oppugnatio ut fides noſtra non otio torpeſcat, ſed excercitiis elimaretur. Aug. in Num. Hom. vii. T. ii. p. 296. C. D. T. x. ſer. 98. p. 270. Ven.

dissentions of heretics, he observes [k] that this, though an evil in itself, yet turned out in the end to be advantageous to the faithful, by exercising their patience, and increasing their wisdom. It also gave occasion to the clearing up those points [l] which were not so well understood before [m].

Clemens of Alexandria had long before met with this objection, taken from the variety of opinions among Christians, and urged by both Jews and Gentiles as a sufficient reason against embracing the gospel. The sum of what he says, which the reader will find at large in the note [n] below, is to this purpose: 'That among the Jews there were several sects. And among 'the Greeks the followers of their most admired philosophers 'were split into a variety of opinions. That our Lord himself 'had foretold that tares should grow up among the wheat; and 'that corruptions will always creep into the best things. Among 'physicians also there are divers prescriptions and opinions, and 'different methods of cure; yet no sick person would on this

[k] Etiam sic quippe veris illis catholicis membris Christi malo suo prosunt. Inimici enim omnes ecclesiæ quolibet errore cæcentur, vel malitia depraventur, si accipiant potestatem corporaliter affligendi, excercent ejus patientiam, si tantummodo malè sentiendo adversantur, exercent ejus sapientiam. De Civ. Dei. T. v. l. xviii. cap. li. p. 184. Venet.

[l] Etenim hæreticis asserta est Catholica Ecclesia, et ex his qui male sentiunt, probati sunt qui bene sentiunt. Multa enim latebant in scripturis, et cum præcisi essent hæretici, questionibus agitaverunt ecclesiam Dei. Aperta sunt quæ latebant, et intellecta est voluntas Dei...Ergo multi qui optime poterant scripturis dignoscere et pertractare, latebant in populo Dei; nec asserebant solutionem quæstionum difficilium, cum calumniator nullus instaret. Num quid enim perfecte de Trinitate tractatum est, antequam oblatrarent Arriani? Nunquid perfecte de pœnitentia, antequam obsisterent Novatiani? Sic non perfecte de baptismate tractatum est antequam contradicerent foris positi rebaptizatores. Ejusdem Enar. in Ps. liv. T. iv. p. 22. vel T. viii. p. 177. 3. Venet.

[m] Multi enim sensus scripturarum sanctarum latent, et paucis intelligentioribus noti sunt, nec asseruntur commodius et acceptabilius, nisi cum respondendi hæreticis cura compellit. Tunc enim etiam qui negligunt studia doctrinæ, sopore discusso, ad audiendi excitantur diligentiam, ut adversarii refellantur. Denique quam multi scripturarum sanctarum sensus de Christo Deo asserti sunt contra Photinum? Quam multi de homine Christo contra Manichæum? Quam multi de trinitate contra Sabellium? Quam multi de unitate trinitatis contra Arrianos, Eunomianos, Macedonianos, &c. Ejusdem Enar. in Ps. lxvii. T. iv. p. 39. vel T. viii. p. 236.

[n] Επειδαν δε ακολουθον εςι προς τα υπο Ελληνων και Ιουδαιων επιφερομενα ημιν εγκληματα απολογησασθαι....Πρωτον μεν αυτο τουτο προσαγουσιν ημιν, λεγοντες, μη δειν πιςευειν, δια την διαφωνιαν των αιρεσεων; παρατεινει γαρ και η αληθεια, αλλων αλλα δογματιζοντων. προς ους φαμεν, οτι και παρ' υμιν τοις Ιουδαιοις, και παρα τοις δοκιμωτατοις των παρ' Ελλησι φιλοσοφων, παμπολλοι γεγονασιν αιρεσεις. Και ου δηπου φατε δειν οκνειν, ητοι φιλοσοφειν η Ιουδαιζειν, της διαφωνιας ενεκα της προς αλληλας των παρ' υμιν αιρεσεων. Επειτα δε επισπαρησεσθαι τας αιρεσεις τη αληθεια, καθαπερ τω πυρω τα ζιζανια προς του Κυριου προφητικως ειρηται, και αδυνατον μη γινεσθαι το προειρημενον εσεσθαι. και τουτου η αιτια, οτι παντι τω καλω μωμος επεται...Ηδη δε και ως εν πλατει χρωμενοις τηδε τη απολογια, ενεςι φαναι προς αυτους, οτι και οι ιατροι εναντιας δοξας κεκτημενοι, κατα τας οικειας αιρεσεις, επ' ισης εργω θεραπευουσιν· μητι ουν καμνων τις το σωμα και θεραπειας δεομενος, ου προσιεται ιατρον, δια τας εν τη ιατρικη αιρεσεις; ουκ αρα ουδε ο την ψυχην νοσων και ειδωλων εμπλεως ενεκα γε του υγιαιναι, και εις Θεον επιςρεψαι, προφασισαιτο ποτε τας αιρεσεις. κ. λ. Strom. lib. vii. p. 753. B. C. D. 754. A. p. 886, 887. edit. Potteri.

'account

'account decline the uſe of phyſic, when his health could be 'thereby reſtored.' He therefore concludes with aſſerting, 'That it was very weak and abſurd to urge ſuch objections as 'theſe againſt embracing thoſe truths which tend to correct and 'purify the bad diſpoſitions of the ſoul.'

There are two obſervations which ſeem naturally to ariſe from the matters treated of in this ſection. The firſt is, hereſies were ſo far from being really detrimental to the cauſe of Chriſtianity, that they proved of great ſervice to it. For thoſe alterations which Marcion and Apelles, and ſome others, made in their copies, in order to ſuit them to their ſeveral opinions, muſt have put the catholic Chriſtians early upon their guard, and induced them to preſerve, with the greateſt care, their copies genuine and entire, in order to ſhew the falſity of thoſe notions which their oppoſers had embraced, and the ſiniſter arts they made uſe of, by corrupting and mutilating the ſacred writings, the better to conceal the erroneouſneſs of their opinions, and their inconſiſtency with the genuine dictates of divine revelation. A practice thus repreſented as baſe in their opponents, and continually held up to public view in all their treatiſes againſt heretics as moſt vile, they themſelves would be ſure to avoid with the greateſt caution.

Secondly, The many heretics which we now hear of, and the number and variety of diviſions which there were of old among Chriſtians, may ſerve to ſatisfy us that the religion of Jeſus had made great progreſs in the world. Beſides the more regular and orthodox profeſſors, there were divers others who made a ſhift to form ſocieties, and to create trouble to the main body of Chriſtians. This may convince us that altogether they muſt amount to a very great number. At the ſame time, this diverſity of opinion is ſo far from overthrowing the truth of the Chriſtian religion, that it greatly confirms it. For it is to be obſerved that all theſe, though cordially hating one another on account of their mutual oppoſition, and though differing from each other in a multitude of more minute circumſtances, ſtill agreed in the main points, as is very apparent from ſeveral preceding articles.

Sect. XV. *Curioſity and an Inquiſitiveneſs of Mind were Diſpoſitions frequently indulged by Heretics.*

Heretics were in the general men of a curious and inquiſitive turn of mind, and greatly indulged this diſpoſition, which led

led them to ſpeculate upon many points of doctrine, concerning which the ſcriptures had afforded little or no light; which, however, according to the philoſophy then in vogue, and with which their minds were but too deeply tinctured [o], were eſteemed matters of importance, and points that would lead them to many curious and ſublime ſpeculations. By giving way to theſe they imbibed a ſet of notions which were dignified with the name of wiſdom, and which they regarded as true; and unhappily ſet about engrafting theſe on the religion of Jeſus, to which they were by no means ſuitable. When the ſcriptures were in ſome caſes plainly inconſiſtent with theſe notions, they were for making them yield to their philoſophical opinions [p]. Thus the ſimplicity of truth was baniſhed, and endleſs diviſions aroſe. Though in many caſes their curioſity and inquiſitiveneſs were carried to an improper extent; yet they ſet out with juſt views in order to have a rational and firm foundation for their faith: and they called upon the catholic Chriſtians to examine, that they might alſo be well eſtabliſhed in their belief. This is teſtified by Tertullian [q] in a great variety of places.

The catholics ſaid that they likewiſe were for inquiry and examination into the foundation of their faith [r]. But when once they

[o] Hæ ſunt doctrinæ hominum et dæmoniorum, prurientibus auribus natæ de ingenio ſapientiæ ſecularis, quam Dominus ſtultitiam vocans, ſtulta mundi in confuſionem etiam philoſophiæ ipſius elegit. Ea eſt enim materia ſapientiæ ſecularis, temeraria interpres divinæ naturæ et diſpoſitionis. Ipſæ denique hæreſes a philoſophia ſubornantur. Inde æones et formæ, neſcio quæ, et trinitas hominis apud Valentinum, &c. Ter. De Pr. H. c. vii. p. 232. D. Fran. p. 203. Vid. ſup. p. 259, note [x].

[p] This will plainly appear hereafter in the inſtance of Marcion, and ſome others, who rejected many particular paſſages in the New Teſtament, as well as three of the goſpels, and the whole Old Teſtament, in order the better to eſtabliſh their peculiarities.

[q] Cum enim quærunt adhuc, nondum tenent: cum autem non tenent, nondum crediderunt: cum autem nondum crediderunt, non ſunt Chriſtiani. At cum tenent quidem et credunt, quærendum tamen dicunt, ut defendant: antequam defendant, negant quod credunt; confitentes ſe nondum credidiſſe dum quærunt. De Pr. Hær. c. xiv, p. 236. B. Fran. 205. Cæterum ſi quia et alia tanta ab aliis ſunt inſtituta, propterea in tantum quærere debemus, in quantum poſſumus invenire, ſemper quæremus, et nunquam omnino credemus. Ubi enim erit finis quærendi? Ubi ſtatio credendi? Ubi expunctio inveniendi? Apud Marcionem? Sed et Valentinus proponit, Quærite et invenietis. Apud Valentinum? Sed et Apelles hac me pronuntiatione pulſabit, et Ebion, et Simon, et omnes ordine non habent aliud quo ſe mihi inſinuantes me ſibi addicant. Ibid. cap. x. p. 234. C. D. Fran. 204. Venio itaque ad illum articulum, quem et noſtri prætendunt ad ineundam curioſitatem, et hæretici inculcant ad importandam ſcrupuloſitatem. Scriptum eſt, inquiunt, Quærite et invenietis. Ibid. c. viii. p. 233. B. Fran. 203. Notata ſunt etiam commercia hæreticorum cum magis quam pluribus, cum circulatoribus, cum aſtrologis, cum philoſophis, curioſitati ſcilicet deditis. Quærite et invenietis, ubique meminerunt. Ibid. c. xliii. p. 248. B. Fran. 213. Nam et mathematici plurimum Marcionitæ: nec hoc erubeſcentes de ipſis etiam ſtellis vivere creatoris. Adv. Mar. l. i. c. xviii. 442. B. Fran. 358.

[r] Omnibus dictum ſit, Quærite et invenietis...Sed in primis hoc propono, unum utique et certum aliquid inſtitutum eſſe a Chriſto, quod credere omni modo debeant nationes,

they had received the Chriſtian religion as coming from God, they thought they ought to be ſatisfied, and to ſuppreſs all further inquiries; becauſe it did not appear to them a right method to mix philoſophical ſpeculations with the plain facts and important diſcoveries of the goſpel.

Sect. XVI. *Heretics were not in general ſolicitous about little Matters, and were moderate towards thoſe who differed from them.*

Things which related to external order[s] and church diſcipline, were not the things which greatly drew the attention of thoſe called heretics; they regarded theſe as matters of rather a trifling nature; ſuch, for inſtance, as not keeping up regular orders[t] and different claſſes among the ſeveral members of the churches; ſuch as admitting catechumens to be preſent[u] while the Lord's ſupper was adminiſtering, and permitting even heathens to remain in their churches[x] while theſe religious ſervices were carrying on. This, it ſhould ſeem, was contrary to the cuſtom of the catholic Chriſtians. They alſo formed churches[y],

nationes, et idcirco quærere, ut poſſint cum invenerint credere. Unius porro et certi inſtituti infinita inquiſitio non poteſt eſſe: quærendum eſt donec invenias, et credendum ubi inveneris: et nihil amplius niſi cuſtodiendum quod credidiſti: dum hoc inſuper credis, aliud non eſſe credendum, ideoque nec requirendum, cum id inveneris et credideris, quod ab eo inſtitutum eſt, qui non aliud tibi mandat inquirendum quam quod inſtituit. De Pr. Hær. c. ix. p. 234. Fr. 204. Nobis curioſitate opus non eſt poſt Chriſtum Jeſum, nec inquiſitione poſt evangelium. Cum credimus nihil deſideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non eſſe quod ultra credere debeamus. Ibid. c. viii. p. 233. Fran. 203. Fides in regula poſita eſt...Cedat curioſitas fidei, cedat gloria ſaluti. Certe aut non obſtrepant, aut quieſcant. Adverſus regulam nihil ſcire, omnia ſcire eſt. Ib. c. xiv. p. 236. Fr. 205.

[s] Non omittam ipſius etiam converſationis hæreticæ deſcriptionem, quam futilis, quam terrena, quam humana ſit; ſine gravitate, ſine auctoritate, ſine diſciplina, ut fidei ſuæ congruens. In primis quis Catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum eſt. Pariter adeunt, pariter audiunt, pariter orant. Ter. De Pr. Hær. cap. xli. p. 247. Fran. 213.

[t] Nunc neophytos conlocant, nunc ſeculo obſtrictos, nunc apoſtatas noſtros, ut gloria eos obligent, quia veritate non poſſunt. Nuſquam facilius proficitur, quam in caſtris rebellium, ubi ipſum eſſe illic promereri eſt. Itaque alius hodie epiſcopus, cras alius: hodie diaconus, qui cras lector: hodie preſbyter, qui cras laicus. Nam et laicis ſacerdotalia munera injungunt. Ibid. Simplicitatem volunt eſſe proſtrationem diſciplinæ, cujus penes nos curam lenocinium vocant. Ibid.

[u] Μυστηρια δε θηθεν παρ' αυτω επιτελειται, των κατηχεμενων ορωντων. Epipha. Hær. xlii. n. iii. p. 304. B.

[x] Etiam ethnici ſi ſupervenerint, ſanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras, jactabunt. Ter. De Pr. H. cap. xli. p. 247. Fran. 213.

[y] Cæterum neç ſuis præſidibus reverentiam noverunt...A regulis ſuis variant inter ſe, dum unuſquiſque proinde ſuo arbitrio modulatur quæ accepit, quemadmodum de arbitrio ſuo ea compoſuit ille qui tradidit....Idem licuit Valentinianis quod Valentino, idem Marcionitis quod Marcioni, de arbitrio ſuo fidem innovare. Denique penitus inſpectæ hæreſes omnes, in multis cum auctoribus ſuis diſſentientes deprehenduntur. Plerique nec eccleſias habent, ſine matre, ſine ſede, orbi fide, extorres ſine lare vagantur. Ibid. c. xlii. p. 248. A. B. Fran. 213.

each according to his own plan, both as to discipline and doctrine: and this variety the catholics unreasonably objected to as a mark of error [z]; forgetting that the very same arguments which they used against the heathens might be retorted upon themselves with equal force by the heretics. They however [a] bear witness to the moderation and charity which these people manifested in their religious differences with each other; whilst they ascribe this good temper, very uncharitably, to their desire of making an united opposition to the truth.

Sect. XVII. *Pernicious Consequences supposed to arise from some of their Doctrines, were charged upon them, though they did not admit them.*

One of the calumnies thrown out against some of the ancient heretics by their enemies was [b] that they considered themselves as bound by no law, and therefore gave themselves a license to sin. This their adversaries pretended to have a sufficient foundation for, because Marcion and his followers had said [c] that God needed not to be feared, meaning the good God. Though Tertullian declaims vehemently against this principle, especially if it should be considered by any as [d] affording a ground on which to

[z] Nihil enim interest illis licet diversa tractantibus, dum ad unius veritatis expugnationem conspirent. Omnes tument, omnes scientiam pollicentur. Ante sunt perfecti catechumeni, quam edocti. Ipsæ mulieres hæreticæ quam procaces, quæ audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan et tingere. Ordinationes eorum temerariæ, leves, inconstantes. Ibid. cap. xli. p. 247. Fran. 213. [a] Schismata apud hæreticos fere non sunt: quia cum sint, non patent schismata: est enim unitas ipsa. Ibid. cap. xlii. Pacem quoque passim cum omnibus miscent. Nihil enim interest, &c. Ibid. cap. xli.

[b] Negant Deum timendum, itaque libera sunt illis omnia et soluta. Ter. De Pr. H. cap. xliii. p. 248. B. Fran. 213. Sic enim neque æmulatur, neque irascitur, neque damnat, neque vexat, utpote qui nec judicem præstat; non invenio quomodo illi disciplinarum ratio consistat....Quale est enim ut præcepta constituat non executurus? ut delicta prohibeat non vindicaturus? quia non judicaturus: extraneus scilicet ab omnibus sensibus severitatis et animadversionis. Cur enim prohibet admitti, quod non defendit admissum?...Immo et permisisse directo debuit, sine causa prohibiturus, ut non defensurus. Ejusdem adv. Mar. l. i. c. xxvi. p. 449. D. Fran. 363. Aut si hoc erit divinæ virtutis, sive bonitatis, nolle quidem fieri, et prohibere fieri, non moveri tamen si fiat. Ibid. Atquin nihil Deo tam indignum, quam non exequi quod noluit et prohibuit admitti. Ibid. p. 450. Sed judicat plane malum nolendo, et damnat prohibendo: dimittit autem non vindicando, et absolvit non puniendo. Ibid. cap. xxvii. p. 450. Fran. 364.

[c] Atque adeo præ se ferunt Marcionitæ, quod Deum suum omnino non timeant. Malus autem inquiunt timebitur, bonus autem diligetur. Ibid. c. xxvii. p. 450. Fr. 364. Nisi quod Marcion Deum suum timeri negat, dicens bonum non timeri, sed vindicem tantum apud quem ira æstuat. Ibid. p. 510. Fran. 424. Sane nominatur mitissimus Deus quia nec judicat nec irascitur. Ib. l. iv. c. xix. p. 509. Fr. 423.

[d] Audite peccatores, quique nondum hoc estis, ut esse possitis: Deus melior inventus

to build the impious conſequences before mentioned: yet it appears from the very place [e] where he is arguing againſt it, as held by Marcion, that thoſe conſequences drawn from it in favour of a licenſe for ſinning, were never allowed by him, and were contrary to his avowed opinion and ſettled practice; for Tertullian's view is to prove the abſurdity of the principle from the virtue and integrity of Marcion's own conduct. It ſhould therefore ſeem probable in this inſtance, as well as in ſome others, that the true import and meaning of his principles were either miſtaken or miſrepreſented by his adverſaries.

Sect. XVIII. *The Seeds of theſe Hereſies were ſown in the Days of the Apoſtles.*

Several of the ancient fathers [f] underſtand the apoſtle Paul as referring to ſome appearances of this kind, when he exhorts [g] the primitive Chriſtians to avoid philoſophy, and queſtions about endleſs genealogies, and oppoſitions of ſcience falſely ſo called.

Euſebius relates that Ignatius, [h] in his way from Antioch to

ventus eſt, qui nec offenditur, nec iraſcitur, nec ulciſcitur, cui nullus ignis coquitur in Gehenna; cui nullus dentium frendor horret in exterioribus tenebris; bonus tantum eſt. Denique prohibet delinquere, ſed in literis ſolis. In vobis eſt, ſi velitis, illi obſequium ſubſignare, ut honorem Deo habuiſſe videamini: timorem enim non vult. Ibid. lib. i. cap. xxvii. p. 450. Fran. 364.

[e] Age itaque qui Deum non times quaſi bonum, quid non in omnem libidinem ebullis?...Quid non frequentas tam ſolennes voluptates circi furentis, et caveæ ſævientis, et ſcenæ laſcivientis? Quid non et in perſecutionibus ſtatim oblata acerra animam negatione lucraris? Abſit, inquis, abſit. Ergo jam times delictum, et timendo probaſti illum timeri, qui prohibet delictum. Ibid. p. 450. Fr. 364.

[f] Hinc illæ fabulæ et genealogiæ interminabiles, et quæſtiones infructuoſæ, et ſermones ſerpentes velut cancer, a quibus nos apoſtolus refrænans, nominatim philoſophiam conteſtatur caveri oportere ſcribens ad Coloſſenſes. Ter. De Pr. Hær. c. vii. p. 233. A. Fran. 203. Adhibeo ſuper hæc, ipſarum doctrinarum recognitionem, quæ tunc ſub apoſtolis fuerunt, ab iiſdem apoſtolis demonſtratæ...Paulus in prima ad Corinthios epiſtola notat negatores et dubitatores reſurrectionis. Hæc opinio propria Sadducæorum: partem ejus uſurpat Marcion, et Apelles, et Valentinus...Ad Galatas ſcribens invehitur in obſervatores et defenſores circumciſionis et legis. Hebionis hæreſis eſt. Timotheum inſtruens nuptiarum quoque interdictores ſuggillat: ita inſtituunt Marcion, et Apelles ejus ſecutor...Et cum genealogias indeterminatas nominat, Valentinus agnoſcitur...Joannes vero in apocalypſi idolothyta edentes et ſtupra committentes jubetur caſtigare. Sunt et nunc alii Nicolaitæ. Caiana hæreſis dicitur. Ib. c. 33. p. 243. D. 244. A. Fran. 210. Επι την αληθειαν παραπεμπομενοι τινες, εισαγουσι λογους ψευδεις και γενεαλογιας ματαιας, αι τινες ζητησεις μαλλον παρεχουσι, καθως ο αποστολος φησιν, η οικοδομην Θεου την εν πιστει. κ. τ. λ. Iren. adv. Hær. lib. i. præ. in. Dubitabitne idem pronuntiare, has eſſe fabulas et genealogias indeterminatas, quas apoſtoli ſpiritus, his jam tunc pullulantibus ſeminibus hæreticis, damnare prævenit. Tert. Adv. Valen. c. iii. p. 284. Fran. 284.

[g] Col. ii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 20. ch. i. 4. 2 Tim. ii. 16, 17. Tit. iii. 9.

[h] Εν πρωτοις μαλιστα προφυλαττεσθαι τας αιρεσεις, αρτι τοτε πρωτον αναφυεισας και επιπολαζουσας παρηνει. Hiſ. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. xxxvi. p. 130. ed. Reading.

Rome, exhorted the churches to beware of the hereſies which were then ſpringing up, and which would increaſe; and that he afterwards wrote his epiſtles in order to guard them againſt theſe corruptions, and to confirm them in the faith.

This opinion that the ſeeds of theſe hereſies were ſown in the times of the apoſtles, and ſprang up immediately after, is an opinion probable in itſelf, and is embraced by ſeveral learned moderns; particularly by Vitringa [i], and by the late Rev. Mr. Brekel of Liverpool [k].

[i] Ita enim ubi Paulus in ep. 1ma. ad Tim. c. vi. 20. dehortatur ab αντιθεσεσι της ψευδωνυμου γνωσεως, 'oppoſitis paral-'leliſmis ſcientiæ falſo ſic dictæ, et a fa-'bulis et γενεαλογιαις απεραντοις ſucceſ-'ſionibus infinitis.' 1 Tim. i. 4. non eſt ideo quo illud commodius referri queat quam ad ſubtiliſſimas diſputationes de divinitate ejuſque variis emanationibus, quibus ſe Judæi, aliique Platonicæ et Pythagoricæ philoſophiæ ſtudioſi occupatos habebant, et in quibus arcanæ et ſublimioris ſcientiæ maximam conſtituebant partem. Quo modo etiam Irenæus et Tertullianus Pauli mentem accepiſſe, et mihi recte quidem accepiſſe videntur. Vid. Ter. De Pr. Hær. c. xxxiii. p. 244. A. Et Iren. adv. Hær. l. i. in præ. in. Vitringæ obſ. in Tit. iii. 9. Tom. ii. p. 161.

[k] In his anſwer to Mr. Deacon, againſt the pretended purity of the three firſt centuries, he obſerves that if this point were thoroughly examined, it would appear that the Chriſtian church preſerved her virgin purity no longer than the apoſtolic age, at leaſt if we may give credit to Hegeſippus. Vid. Euſ. H. E. lib. iii. c. 32. Another ancient writer, Paphias by name, ſpeaks of ſome perſons in his time, who inculcated other precepts than thoſe that were delivered by the Lord, and proceeded from the truth itſelf. Ap. Eu. Ibid. c. xxxix. p. 111. A. To mention the corruptions and innovations in religion of the four firſt centuries, is wholly ſuperfluous; when it is ſo very notorious, that even before the reign of Conſtantine there ſprang up a kind of heatheniſh Chriſtianity, which mingled itſelf with the true Chriſtian religion. Socr. H. Ec. lib. i. cap. 22. Brekel's MS.

HISTORY

HISTORY OF HERETICS, &c.

BOOK THE SECOND.

CHAP. I.

Of SATURNINUS.

SECT. I. *Of his Opinions as given us by Irenæus.*

IRENÆUS having given ſome account of Simon and Menander, proceeds: 'From [a] theſe Saturninus of Antioch, and Baſilides of Alexandria, took occaſion to form different ſchemes. 'Saturninus, like Menander, held one Father, unknown to all, 'who made angels, archangels, principalities and powers. He 'ſaid that the world and all things therein were made by cer'tain (ſeven) angels: man too was made by them. The Sa'viour he taught to be unbegotten, and incorporeal, and that he 'was man in appearance only. The God of the Jews,' he ſays, 'was one of the angels. And becauſe all the principalities op'poſed his Father, Chriſt came to the overthrow of the God of 'the Jews, and for the ſalvation of thoſe who believe in him, 'which are ſuch as have in them the ſpark of life. For this perſon

[a] Ex iis Saturninus, qui fuit ab Antiochia ea, quæ eſt apud Daphnen, et Baſilides, occaſiones accipientes, diſtantes doctrinas oſtenderunt: alter quidem in Syria, alter vero in Alexandria. Saturninus quidem, ſimiliter ut Menander, unum Patrem incognitum omnibus oſtendit, qui fecit angelos, archangelos, virtutes, poteſtates. A ſeptem autem quibuſdam angelis mundum factum, et omnia quæ in eo. Hominem autem angelorum eſſe facturam, deſurſum a ſumma poteſtate lucida imagine apparente...Salvatorem autem innatum demonſtravit et incorporalem, et ſine figura, putative autem viſum hominem. Et Judæorum Deum unum ex angelis eſſe dixit. Et propter hoc quod diſſolvere voluerint patrem ejus omnes principes, adveniſſe Chriſtum ad deſtructionem Judæorum Dei, et ad ſalutem credentium ei; eſſe autem hos qui habent ſcintillam vitæ ejus. Duo enim genera hic primus hominum plaſmata eſſe ab angelis dixit, alterum quidem nequam, alterum autem bonum. Et quoniam dæmones peſſimos adjuvant, veniſſe ſalvatorem ad diſſolutionem malorum hominum, et dæmoniorum, ad ſalutem autem bonorum. Nubere autem et generare, a Satana dicunt eſſe. Multi autem qui ſunt ab eo et ab animalibus abſtinent, per fictam hujuſmodi continentiam ſeducentes multos. Prophetias autem quaſdam quidem ab iis angelis, qui mundum fabricaverint, dictas, quaſdam autem a Satana: quem et ipſum angelum adverſarium mundi fabricatoribus oſtendit, maxime autem Judæorum Deo. Iren. l. i. c. 24. al. xxii. n. i. ii. p. 100, 101.

'firſt

'first taught that there are two kinds of men made by the angels, some good others bad. And because dæmons assisted the 'worst, the Saviour came to the condemnation of bad men and 'dæmons, and to the salvation of good men. He says that mar- 'riage and generation are of Satan. And many of his followers 'abstain from animal food, by such a feigned temperance de- 'ceiving many. They will have it that some prophecies came 'from the angels who made the world; others from Satan, whom 'they also reckon an adversary to the Maker of the world, espe- 'cially to the God of the Jews.'

Sect. II. *He was an obscure person, and had probably but few followers.*

I have thought it not amiss to transcribe this article of Irenæus, hoping that we may make some good use of it in the chapter of Basilides. For I do not intend to enlarge on the history of Saturninus, because he was a very obscure person, and his opinions were so much like those of Basilides.

Beausobre observes that [b] Clement of Alexandria makes no mention at all of Menander and Saturninus. For which reason he concludes that they made very little figure in the world, and had but few followers.

Saturninus, however, called by some Saturnilus, is in most writers of heresies. Epiphanius makes very little addition to Irenæus; and at the beginning of his article uses an expression denoting [c] his obscurity. Theodoret [d] seems to transcribe Irenæus. And the accounts of [e] Philaster and [f] Augustine are so much like the rest, that I shall only refer to them. It will be proper just to mention in this place the order of the most early heretics. In Irenæus [g] they stand thus: Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates. In Epiphanius: Simon, Menander, Saturnilus, Basilides, the Nicolaitans, the Gnostics, the Carpocratians; which order is also observed by Augustine. Theodoret's is the same with that of Irenæus. In Philaster it is Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Nicolaitans.

[b] Hist. Manich. T. ii. p. 1. fin. [c] Μετα τουτον σατορνιλος της αιρεσ. H. xxiii. cap. i. in. [d] H. Fab. lib. i. cap. iii. [e] Cap. xxxi. [f] Aug. cap. iii. [g] Lib. i. cap. xxiii.....xxv.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of BASILIDES.

SECT. I. *Of his Time.*

I PROCEED to Basilides, who, in all the writers quoted in the last chapter, is the third in order among Christian heretics, and next after Saturninus. Epiphanius expressly says that these two were fellow-disciples [h]. And Eusebius, agreeably to Irenæus, as before transcribed, and possibly to other ancient writers whom he had read, says that, 'from [i] Menander, successor of Simon, 'proceeded two leaders of heresies, Saturninus of Antioch, and 'Basilides of Alexandria, who set up schools of their hateful 'doctrine, one in Syria, the other in Ægypt.' And I before gave an account from Eusebius of a work of Agrippa Castor against Basilides, supposed to have been written about the year 132, or some short time after.

Though learned moderns may not exactly agree about the time of Basilides, the difference between them is not very great. Tillemont thinks Basilides [k] left the church in the time of Trajan, and appeared chiefly in the time of Adrian. Basnage [l] speaks of him at the year 121. Mill [m] supposeth him to have flourished about the year 123; Cave [n] about the year 112, or soon after. Grabe says, 'Basilides [o] began to spread his notions 'in the time of Trajan, but chiefly under Adrian, and probably 'did not die before the beginning of the reign of Antoninus 'the Pious.' Which account cannot be much amiss. It is plain from the order of the most early heresies before taken notice of, that Basilides must have lived near the times of the apostles; as is also observed by the ancient author of [p] the Acts of Archelaus. And by Clement of Alexandria we are informed

[h] Δυο γαρ ȣτοι εγενοντο συσχολαςαι, βασιλειδης και σατορνιλος. H. xxiii. n. i. in.

[i] Απο γȣν τȣ μενανδρȣ, ον διαδοχον τȣ σιμωνος ηδη προτερον παραδεδωκαμεν, αμφιςομος ωσπερ και δικεφαλος οφιωδης τις προελθȣσα δυναμις, δυειν αιρεσεων διαφορων αρχηγȣς κατεςησατο. H. E. l. iv. c. vii. p. 147. ed. Reading.

[k] Mem. Ecc. Sub Tra.

[l] Vid. Basnag. ann. 121. n. vi.

[m] Proleg. n. 264.

[n] Claruit circa ann. 112. juxta alios aliquanto serius. Vixit præcipue sub Hadriano, et sub imperii ejus extrema, saltem ineunte principatum ejus successore, obiisse videtur. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 49.

[o] Cœpit enim hæresin condere sub Trajano, et propagavit sub Hadriano, uti prolixe contra Dallæum probavit Pearsonius. P. 2. Vindic. Ignat. cap. vii. Imo et tunc mortuum esse idem vult. Ast quicquid hujus rei sit, id certum est sub Hadriano maxime floruisse infelicem illam plantam. Grab. Spic. T. ii. p. 36.

[p] Fuit...Basilides antiquior, non longe post nostrorum Apostolorum tempora. Arch. p. 101.

that

that [q] Basilides, or his followers, boasted that he had been taught by Glaucias, a disciple of St. Peter: where likewise Clement supposeth that Basilides arose in the time of Adrian, and reached to Antoninus the Pious, who did not begin his reign before the year 138. Theodoret says that Menander was master to Saturninus and Basilides, and that [r] both were in the time of Adrian.

Sect. II. *The Account of him as given by Irenæus and other ancient Authors.*

Having said thus much concerning the time of Basilides, I return to Irenæus, who, immediately after the above cited passage relating to Saturninus, inserted in the foregoing chapter, proceeds: 'But 'Basilides, that he might appear to have a more 'sublime and more probable scheme, went much farther, and 'taught that from the self-existent Father was born Nus or Un-'derstanding; of Nus Logos; of Logos Phronesis, Prudence or 'Providence; of Phronesis Sophia and Dunamis, Wisdom and 'Power; of Dunamis and Sophia, Powers, Principalities and 'Angels, whom they call the superior angels, by whom the first 'heaven was made; from these proceeded other angels and 'other heavens, to the number of 365, both angels and heavens; 'and therefore there are so many days in the year answerable to 'the number of the heavens. Farther they say that the angels 'which

[q] Κατω δε, περι τους αδριανου του βασιλεως χρονους οι τας αιρεσεις επινοησαντες γεγοιασι, και μεχρι γε της αντωνινου του περισσοτερου διετειναν ηλικιας, καθαπερ ο βασιλειδης, καν γλαυκιαν επιγεγραφηται διδασκαλον, ως αυχουσιν αυτοι, του πετρου ερμηνεα. Cl. Str. p. 764. D. [r] Αμφω δε επι αδριανου του καισαρος εγενοντο. H. F. l. i. c. 3. p. 193. D.

[s] Basilides autem, ut altius aliquid et verisimilius inveniisse videatur, in immensum extendit sententiam doctrinæ suæ, ostendens Nun primo ab innato natum Patre, ab hoc autem natum Logon, deinde a Logo Phronesin, a Phronesi autem Sophian et Dunamin, a Dunami autem et Sophia Virtutes, et Principes, et Angelos, quos et primos vocat, et ab iis primum cœlum factum. Dehinc ab horum derivatione alios autem factos, aliud cœlum simile priori fecisse....aliud tertium deformasse cœlum, et a tertio deorsum descendentium quartum, et deinceps secundum eum modum alteros et alteros Principes et angelos factos esse dicunt, et cœlos cccLxv. Qua propter et tot dies habere annum, secundum numerum cœlorum. Eos autem qui posterius continent cœlum angelos, quod etiam a nobis videtur, constituisse ea quæ sunt in mundo omnia, et partes sibi fecisse terræ, et earum quæ super eam sunt gentium. Esse autem principem ipsorum eum, qui Judæorum putatur esse Deus. Et quoniam hic suis hominibus, id est Judæis, voluit subjicere reliquas gentes, reliquos omnes principes restitisse ei, et contra egisse. Innatum autem et innominatum patrem videntem perditionem ipsorum misisse primogenitum Nun suum (et hunc esse qui dicitur Christus) in libertatem credentium ei a potestate eorum qui mundum fabricaverunt. Et gentibus ipsorum autem apparuisse cum in terra hominem, et virtutes perfeciisse. Quapropter neque

passum

'which uphold the lower heaven, ſeen by us, made all things 'in this world, and then divided the earth among themſelves. 'And the chief of theſe, they ſay, is he who is thought to be the 'God of the Jews. And becauſe he would bring other nations into 'ſubjection to the Jews, the other princes oppoſed him, and other 'nations oppoſed that people. But the ſelf-exiſtent and ineffa-'ble Father ſeeing them in danger of being ruined, ſent his 'firſt begotten Nus, who alſo is ſaid to be Chriſt, for the ſalva-'tion of ſuch as believe in him, and to deliver them from the 'tyranny of the makers of the world; and that he appeared on 'earth as a man and wrought miracles; but he did not ſuffer; 'for Simon of Cyrene being compelled to bear the croſs, was 'crucified for him; he was transformed into the likeneſs of 'Jeſus, and Jeſus took the ſhape of Simon, and ſtood by look-'ing on, and laughing at the error and ignorance of thoſe who 'thought they had him in their power; after which he aſcended 'to heaven. They who underſtand theſe things are to be de-'livered from the princes of this world. They alſo hold that 'men ought not to confeſs him who was crucified, but him who 'came in the form of man, and was ſuppoſed to be crucified, 'and was called Jeſus, and was ſent of the Father, that by this 'diſpenſation he might deſtroy the works of the makers of the 'world. He likewiſe taught that the ſoul only would be ſaved, 'for the body is in it's own nature corruptible, and incapable of 'immortality. He moreover ſays that the prophecies are from the 'princes, makers of the world, and that the law was given by the 'chief of them who brought the people out of the land of Ægypt. 'They make light of things offered to idols, and partake of 'them without ſcruple. And all other actions, and all kinds of 'lewdneſs are looked upon by them as indifferent. They prac-

paſſum eum, ſed Simonem quendam Cyrenæum angariatum portaſſe crucem ejus pro eo: et hunc ſecundum ignorantiam et errorem crucifixum, transfiguratum ab eo, qui putaretur ipſe eſſe Jeſus: et ipſum autem Jeſum Simonis accepiſſe formam, et ſtantem irriſiſſe eos. Quoniam enim virtus incorporalis erat, et Nus innati Patris, transfiguratum quemadmodum vellet, et ſic adſcendiſſe ad eum qui miſerat eum. Et liberatos igitur eos, qui hæc ſciant, a mundi fabricatoribus principibus: et non oportere confiteri eum, qui ſit crucifixus, ſed eum qui in hominis forma venerit, et putatus ſit crucifixus, et vocatus ſit Jeſus, et miſſus a Patre, uti per diſpoſitionem hanc opera mundi fabricatorum diſſolveret. Animæ autem ſolæ eſſe ſalutem: corpus enim natura corruptibile exſiſtit. Prophetias autem et ipſas a mundi fabricatoribus fuiſſe ait principibus, proprie autem legem a principe ipſorum, qui eduxerit populum de terra Ægypti. Contemnere autem idolothyta, et nihil arbitrari, ſed ſine aliqua trepidatione uti iis: habere autem et reliquarum operationem uſum indifferentem, et univerſæ libidinis. Utuntur autem et hi magia, et incantationibus. Trecentorum autem ſexaginta quinque cœlorum locales poſitiones diſtribuunt, ſimiliter ut mathematici. Illorum enim theoremata accipientes in ſuum characterem doctrinæ tranſtulerunt: eſſe autem principem illorum Abraxas, et propter hoc cccLxv. numeros habere in ſe. Iren. lib. i. cap. 24. [al. cap. 22, 23.] p. 101, 102.

'tiſe magic alſo, and incantations. They have diſtributed the 'local poſitions of the three hundred and ſixty-five heavens, juſt 'as the mathematicians do. For they have adopted their theo-'rems, and introduced them into their ſcheme; the prince of 'which they call Abraxas, that name having in it the number 'three hundred and ſixty-five.'

Euſebius, agreeably to what Irenæus ſays at the beginning of this article, obſerves, as from him, that 'Saturninus 't contented 'himſelf with the ſcheme he had received from Menander; but 'Baſilides aimed at farther innovations.' And to the like pur-poſe [u] Theodoret. And perhaps for this reaſon Origen calls his ſcheme a long ſtory or heap of fictions.

Sect. III. *An Examination of ſeveral of the Opinions attributed to him.*

Let us now go over the ſeveral particulars in Irenæus, ſome ſlightly, others more diſtinctly; for I do not intend to inſiſt on their account of the creation of the world, or the formation of man, or their doctrines concerning two natures and election. Theſe laſt eſpecially are abſtruſe and intricate notions. After all I could ſay, I might not give a right explication of them. I therefore content myſelf with referring to Beauſobre, who hath beſtowed great pains in examining theſe points [x].

Clement of Alexandria has ſeveral times hinted theſe things.

Baſilides believed that there is one God, ſelf-exiſtent, and ineffable, or without a name.

He likewiſe ſuppoſed that there were ſeveral æons, or emanations from the eternal Father. But it has been obſerved that [z] the account of Irenæus, and the authors who follow him, is defective; for Clement of Alexandria mentions two more, Juſtice and Peace. I ſhall place in the note a part of Philaſter's [a] arti-

[t] Τα μεν ην πλειστα των σατορνιλου τα αυτα τω μεναιδζω ψευδολογησαι ο ειρηναιος δηλονοτι προσχηματι δε αποῤῥητων του βασιλειδην εις το απειρον τεινει τας επινοιας. κ. λ. H. E. lib. 4. cap. 7. p. 119. D.

[u] Tab. lib. i. cap. iv. vii.

[x] See Hiſt. de Manich. T. ii. 32, 37.

[y] Vid. Str. lib. 2. p. 363, 409. lib. 3. p. 473. lib. 4. 540. D. lib. 5. p. 545. D.

[z] Ita Irenæus, Epiphanius, Theodoretus. At Baſilidis genealogiam integram non referunt. Nam ex Clemente Alex. l. 4. Str. p. 539. Βασιλειδης αποστατικας ...δικαιοσυνην δε και την διαπεμψαι αυτης την ειρηνην υπολαμβανει εν ογδοαδι μενειν ενδιατεταγμενας. Nec dubium quin in prima ſua coniugatione Επινοιαν ſeu Σιγην habuerit, maſculoſque cum feminis in ogdaode copulaverit. Maſſuet. Diſſ. Iren. p. lxi. n. 116.

[a] De innato et ſolo Deo natum fuiſſe intellectum, de intellecto verbum, de verbo ſenſum, de ſenſu autem et virtute ſapientiam, de virtute autem et ſapientia principatus et poteſtates et angelos factos diverſos. H. 32. p. 65, 66.

cle

cle of Basilides, to shew how that Latin author represented his æons.

SECT. IV. *Concerning his Notion of three hundred and sixty-five Heavens.*

BASILIDES is said by Irenæus and others to have believed that there were three hundred and sixty-five heavens, according to the number of the days of the Ægyptian year; which account is generally admitted by moderns, as true. Perhaps it is not needful for us to make any particular inquiries into this point. For if this was only an error in philosophy, and not brought into their religious or theological scheme, we are little concerned about it. But Beausobre [b] does not give credit to it. He thinks that Irenæus must have made some mistake. The absurdity is so great that it ought not to be ascribed to a learned astronomer, as Basilides was. Moreover Irenæus says that herein Basilides followed the mathematicians. But were there ever any astronomers of this opinion from whom he could take it? Whence this supposition proceeded it is not easy to guess. But possibly Basilides said that there were three hundred and sixty-five angels who presided each over one day of the year; a notion which seems to have been entertained by some in the East. The same learned writer farther argues in this manner: 'Clement of Alex-'andria was well acquainted with the Basilidian theology.' And in one of his remaining works he treats the question, [c] whether there are more heavens than one. He cites some words of the prophet Zephaniah, though not in our Hebrew copies, where mention is made of a fifth heaven; and the words of St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 2. where he speaks of a third heaven. He likewise takes notice of the opinion of some philosophers, who spake of seven heavens below the sphere of the fixed stars. How could he here omit so uncommon an opinion as that of three hundred and sixty-five heavens, if held by the Basilidians; especially when he lays hold of every opportunity to confute them, because this heresy had then many followers at Alexandria?

[b] Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 9, 10.

[c] Ποτερον ουν ορθως ενα ουρανον ειρηκαμεν, η πολλους και απειρους. Str. lib. v. p. 586. B.

SECT. V. *He believed the World was made by Angels, the chief of whom presided over the Jews.*

BASILIDES supposed this lower world to have been made by angels. This is an opinion which many went into out of respect, though a false respect for the Deity. They [d] thought it below the Supreme Being to meddle with matter in order to give it form and beauty. They judged it to be unworthy of him to make perishing and mortal beings. Above all, they could not endure the supposition that God was the author of the many evils that are in this world. If God had made this world they argued it would have been perfect. But as there are in it many imperfections it cannot be the work of God, infinitely perfect, and infinitely good.

They chose therefore to ascribe this world to angels; who seeing matter which was eternal, agitated in a tumultuous and disorderly manner, determined to reduce it to order; and having in their mind the world of spirits, to which they belonged, and which served as a model to them, they would make one like it in matter. God, who knew their design, did not interpose to prevent it. Our world therefore was made by angels with the tacit consent of the Supreme Being. This opinion of theirs concerning the formation of the world, was opposite to the opinion of the orthodox or catholic Christians. For, as Beausobre [e] observes, 'they always endeavoured to preserve the unity of the creating 'principle; but the philosophers who made profession of Chris-'tianity obstinately maintained the contrary error.' Their design was to justify providence, and to represent the material principle as the cause of all evil. The intention was commendable, but the execution was bad; for the systems they formed did not solve, but only palliate, these difficulties. And in their very first principles they directly opposed the divine authority of Moses and the prophets, and consequently in the end the divine authority of Jesus Christ: but they denied this consequence, and always maintained a high veneration for the Son of God. Wherefore it is unjust to attribute to them impious sentiments which they never held, but in their whole conduct disavowed.

By some Basilides is said to have ascribed the formation of this world to the inferior angels. But that, I think, is not clear; for

[d] See Beausobre, as before, p. 10, 11. [e] Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 2. No. 1.

if

if he did, he herein differed from Saturninus, who, according to Ireneæus, ſeems to have taught that the world was made by ſeven angels, whom he does not repreſent of an inferior rank, but rather of the firſt order; as next to the æons, or firſt emanations from the eternal and ineffable Father. Moreover in Clement of Alexandria, who did not write upon hearſay reports, but who has given us the very words of Baſilides himſelf, he is ſpoken of as maintaining honourable thoughts of the angel creator, or the chief of the angels who made the world. For he ſaid that [f] the creator formed the world for the honour of the inviſible God, whoſe image and prophet he was; and that the creator [g] was worthy to be praiſed, and a very great God.

When a diſtribution was afterwards made of things, the chief of the angels, creators, had the people of the Jews particularly to his ſhare. A doctrine which, in the main, was received by many ancients, and is in part founded upon Deut. xxxii. 8. which, according to the verſion of the Seventy, is to this purpoſe: 'When the Moſt High divided the nations, and ſeparated 'the ſons of Adam, he ſet the bounds of the people according 'to the number of the angels of God.' And this opinion they endeavoured to ſupport by Dan. x. 13, 21....xii. 1.

SECT. VI. *His Opinion concerning the Perſon of Chriſt.*

WE proceed to the account which Irenæus gives of their doctrine concerning the perſon of Chriſt. 'The eternal Father, 'ſeeing the ruin of the world, ſent his firſt-begotten Nus, or 'Underſtanding, for the ſalvation of them that believe in him, 'and to deliver them from the power of the angel creators. 'He appeared as man, and wrought many miracles; but he 'was not crucified, the Jews having through miſtake crucified 'Simon the Cyrenian in his ſtead.'

Here it is fit to obſerve what Baſilides ſaid to the honour of Jeſus. He ſuppoſed him to be the firſt-begotten of the Father, and to have come into this lower world for the ſalvation of men, and with an expreſs order and commiſſion from the Father. He likewiſe ſuppoſed Jeſus to have wrought here many miracles.

But he did not think Jeſus to be really man, but in appearance

[f] Ου γαρ αυθεντικως ευρεθη μορφη, αλλα το σωμα επληρωσαν το υστερησαν εν πλασει, συνιςγει δε και το τυ θευ αορατον εις πιςιν τυ πεπλασμενυ· τον μεν γαρ δημιυργον, ως θειν και πατερα κληθεντα, εικονα τυ αληθινυ Θευ, και προφητην προσειπεν, ζωγραφον δε την σοφιαν, ης το πλασμα η εικων, εις δοξαν τυ αορατυ. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. iv. p. 509. D. [g] Τον μεγιςον και προς αυτων ανυμνυμενον Θεον. Ib. l. ii. p. 376. B.

only. So say many ancient [h] writers: insomuch that it is difficult to deny or contest this; and yet perhaps we may presently see somewhat that may make us hesitate about it. 'For,' as Beausobre [i] says, 'undoubtedly Basilides did not believe the incarnation, or the hypostatic union of the Son of God with flesh; but then he never denied that Jesus was a real person, in whom the Understanding, or Son of God, displayed his power, whom he filled with his gifts and illuminations, and invested with extraordinary influence.'

Sect. VII. *Of the Story of Simon the Cyrenian, and whether he believed that Christ suffered.*

As for Jesus taking the shape of Simon the Cyrenian, and transforming Simon into his own, it is so absurd a story that I must confess it appears to me incredible. It must certainly be a misrepresentation founded in some mistake, possibly upon the consequences drawn by others from some opinions of theirs, which consequences they did not allow.

Beausobre too says plainly, 'the [k] ridiculous comedy of Simon transformed into Jesus, and crucified in his stead, is a fable, which Irenæus found I know not where. And,' as the same acute writer observes, 'Massuet [l] perceived that this account is contradicted by Clement of Alexandria: but he chose to correct Clement by Irenæus, rather than Irenæus by Clement. But,' says [m] Beausobre, 'I cannot be of that mind. The testimony of Clement appears to me vastly more valuable than that of Irenæus, because he knew the Basilidians, and had read their books and cites them: especially is his testimony preferable here upon this occasion, as it is not so much Clement that speaks as Basilides himself.'

The argument is this: Basilides acknowledged that the attributes of goodness, holiness, and righteousness belong to God,

[h] ...in ipsa prius carne ejus erraverunt: aut nullius veritatis contendentes eam secundum Marcionem et Basilidem: aut propriæ qualitatis, secundum hæreses Valentini, et Apellem. Tertull. de Res. Car. cap. 2. p. 379. D. p. 314. 29. Και αυτος περι χριστου, ως δοκησει πεφηνοτος, ομοιως δοξαζει· ειναι δε φησιν αυτον φαντασιαν εν τω φαινεσθαι, μη ειναι δε αιθερωτον, μηδε σαρκα εληφεναι. Epiph. H. 24. n. iii.

[i] Ib. p. 25. n. vi.

[k] Ib.

[l] Ad eam distinctionem...haud satis attendisse videtur Clemens Alex. dum scripsit. lib. iv. Strom. quod Basilides 'hominem peccandi potestate præditum ausus esset dicere Dominum:' quod falsum videtur, si ad verum Christum referatur, quem hominem quidem esse fatebatur: utcumque ferri potest, si de ementito Christo, nempe Simone Cyrenæo intelligatur, qui sub Christi specie ac figura cruci affixus fuit. Mass. Diss. Iren. p. lxi. n. 117.

[m] Hist. de Manich. T. ii. p. 25. n. vi.

As

As good, he can never do evil to any one; as holy, he cannot but hate sin, of which he never is the author; as righteous, he may and will correct sinners; but for the same reason he never will permit the innocent to be punished. The orthodox acknowledged the same divine attributes; but they did not approve of the consequences which Basilides drew from them. They believed God to be righteous, and yet supposed that he might permit innocent beings to suffer. As a proof of this, they instanced in the martyrs delivered up to the most grievous pains, for the exercise of their virtue, and the confirming the gospel. Basilides answered[n] that, 'martyrs are not perfectly innocent, 'forasmuch as there is no man without fault: and if any suffer, 'God punisheth in them evil desires, or actual sin, though secret 'and unknown to others; or sins which the soul had been guilty 'of in some other body. God, who knows all things the most 'secret, never punishes any who have not deserved it. The 'favour shewn to martyrs lies in this, that their pains appear to 'have an honourable cause, though they are indeed the punish-'ment of their sins, committed either in this life or in a pre-'existent state.'

For overturning this notion, which must tend to discourage martyrdom, and lessen the virtue of it, the catholics alleged the example of Jesus Christ, who had undergone the pain of the cross, and whose innocence Basilides could not contest. This argument reduced him to great distress; for it was difficult for him to extricate himself without blasphemy. However, Clement thus represents his manner of evading it: 'Basilides,[o] speaking 'of our Lord as a man, explains himself openly in these terms: "If without attending to what I have said, and in order to throw "me into confusion, you allege certain persons: for example, "this person has suffered, therefore he has sinned; you "must allow me to answer, in the first place, that he has not "sinned, but he has suffered like infants. If you still press me, "I will add, of whatever man you can mention, that he is man, "and God is just. For there is no man free from spot, as one

[n] Αλλα τω βασιλειδη η υποθεσις προαμαρτησασαι φησι την ψυχην εν ετερω βιω, την κολασιν υπομενειν ενταυθα· την μεν εκλεκτην επιτιμως δια μαρτυριου· την αλλην δε, καθαρομενην οικεια κολασει. Clem. Al. Strom. p. 506. D. 507.

[o] Ουτωσι δε και τον αναμαρτητον ον λεγω, εαν ιδω πασχοντα, και μηδεν η κακον πεπραχως, κακον ερω τω θελειν αμαρτανειν. Παντ' ερω γαρ μαλλον, η κακον το προνοουν ερω. Ειθ' υποβας, και, περι του κυριου αντικρυς, ως περι ανθρωπου λεγει. Εαν μεντοι παραλιπων τουτους απαντας τους λογους, ελθης επι το δυσωπειν με, δια προσωπων τινων, ει τυχοι, λεγων· Ο δεινα ουν ημαρτεν· επαθεν γαρ ο δεινα· εαν μεν επιτρεπης ερω· ουχ ημαρτεν μεν, ομοιος δε ην τω πασχοντι νηπιω. Ει μεν τοι σφοδροτερον εκβιασαιο τον λογον, ερω, ανθρωπον, οντιν' αν ονομασης, ανθρωπον ειναι, δικαιον δε τον θεον. καθαρος γαρ ουδεις ωσπερ ειπε τις, απο ρυπου. Ibid. lib. 4. p. 506. C. D.

" ſays. And I would ſay any thing rather than cenſure Provi-
" dence." Clement confutes this opinion, [p] and concludes in this manner: 'Muſt we not reckon that man profane, who dares 'to ſay that the Lord was a ſinner, or capable of ſinning!'

All this, as Beauſobre [q] farther argues, is inconſiſtent with what is ſaid by Iræneus. If we rely upon him, Baſilides taught that Jeſus did not ſuffer, and was not crucified; but Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in his ſtead; and the Lord triumphed over the Jews, who thought they had crucified him. But if that had been the ſentiment of Baſilides, what ground had the catholic writers to inſtance in the ſufferings of the Lord Jeſus. If they did, his anſwer was eaſy: What do you mean? Did I ever ſay that Jeſus ſuffered? Do not all know that my opinion is that the Lord was not a man, and that Simon, a miſerable ſinner, ſuffered in his ſtead. Having been called to bear the croſs, providence put him in the room of the Saviour. So, to refer to an ancient hiſtory, providence formerly ſubſtituted a ram in the place of Iſaac.

Since therefore Baſilides, as appears from his own words cited by Clement, was greatly preſſed by the example of the Lord inſiſted on by the catholics, we are led to conclude that he ſuppoſed Jeſus to have really ſuffered, and that ſome how or other Irenæus has been miſtaken.

Sect. VIII. *Beauſobre's View of the Sentiments of Baſilides concerning Chriſt.*

After this argument Beauſobre ſums [r] up the ſentiment and doctrine of Baſilides concerning the Saviour: 1. According to him Jeſus was a real true man ſince he ſuffered: but whether he believed Jeſus to be born of a virgin does not appear. 2. The Divine Underſtanding, Nus, which is the ſame as the Son of God, deſcended into this man, and made uſe of him as an inſtrument, to give to mankind the knowledge of the true God and the means of ſalvation. By him he publiſhed his doctrine, and wrought great miracles in confirmation of it. 3. The exact manner in which he conceived of the union of the divine intelligence with the human nature of Jeſus, we cannot ſay; but he did not think him to partake of any of the infirmities of the human nature, or to be ſo united as to ſuffer. 4. Jeſus being a

[p] Πως δε ουκ αθεος...ανθρωπον αμαρτητικον τολμησας ειπειν τον κυριον. Ib. p. 507. B.
[q] Ibid. p. 27. n. vii. [r] Ibid. p. 28. n. viii.

man

man only, though a most excellent man, in whom the first-begotten of the Father chose to dwell, it may be said without blasphemy, not that he ever sinned, but that it is not impossible that he might. And it is better to make this supposition than to allow providence to be the cause of any evil, as it would be if an innocent person suffered. 5. If Jesus committed any fault (which Basilides did not affirm) it must have been before the Christ or the Spirit descended upon him at his baptism. 6. The ministry of the Saviour being finished, Jesus was taken and crucified, but not the Christ, or the first-begotten of the Father, who was no farther united to Jesus than was necessary for the functions of his charge. The Jews therefore fastened to the cross a man only, who for some time had been the organ of the divinity. 7. From whence it might possibly be concluded by some, that Basilides did, or would, say, as Irenæus tells us, that we ought not to believe in him that was crucified. For the Son of God is the only object of faith, not a man, who was only his instrument during the course of his ministry. 8. As Basilides believed the death of Jesus, though not of the Son of God, probably he believed his resurrection: that is, that his soul ascended to heaven, and the body was left to lie in the grave, or was dissipated into the air, and among the elements of which it was composed. As the ancient catholic writers do not particularly say that he denied the resurrection of Jesus, though they assure us he and his followers denied the resurrection of the body; it is not unlikely that he admitted the resurrection, or the advancement and glorification of the soul of Jesus.

SECT. IX. *He believed the Baptism of Jesus.*

THE examining what Irenæus says of the substituting Simon the Cyrenian in the room of Jesus, has carried us a great way. But we must not forget to observe that Basilides believed the fact of the baptism of Jesus. Clement says that [s] his followers celebrated the day of his baptism as a festival, spending the whole preceding night in reading, and very likely in prayers. They placed it on the fifteenth day of the Ægyptian month Tubi, which answers, as is supposed, to the ninth or tenth of our January, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. It is probable that this was with them the time of the coming of the Son of God

[s] Οι δε απο βασιλειδȣ και τȣ βαπτισματος αυτȣ την ημεραν εορταζȣσι προδιανυκτερευοντες αναγνωσεσι. κ. λ. Str. lib. i. p. 340. B.

into

into the world: then Jesus was consecrated by baptism; then the Christ or Spirit descended, and took up his abode in Jesus, filled him with abundance of gifts, and qualified him for teaching his doctrine and working miracles. The same Clement informs us that [t] the Valentinians supposed the dove at Christ's baptism to have been the Spirit himself; but the Basilidians the minister of the Spirit.

There is a passage of Basilides concerning our Lord's baptism, quoted by Clement of Alexandria, [u] upon which Beausobre has [x] made curious remarks.

Sect. X. *He is said to have partaken of Things offered to Idols, and to have denied the Necessity or Reasonableness of suffering Martyrdom.*

Irenæus, in the place above cited, says they make light of things offered to idols, and partake of them without scruple. But how far they did so we cannot certainly say. St. Paul forbids eating of them at some times, and upon some occasions only, and undoubtedly he enjoins this agreeably to the directions of the council of Jerusalem.

Basilides is supposed by some to have denied the necessity or reasonableness of our suffering martyrdom for Jesus. Irenæus is thought to point at his followers, [y] when he speaks of some heretics, who had a like opinion; and he may be supposed also to intend the same thing when he says they make no scruple to eat of things offered to idols. Origen too informs us [z] that at least they detracted from the honour of martyrdom. The author of the additions to Tertullian's Prescriptions [a] plainly says they denied the necessity of it; as [b] doth Philaster and Epiphanius, [c] who all probably copied one from another. However, I do not think that we ought hence to conclude that there were no martyrs among the Basilidians; or that they thought themselves

[t] ...ἡ οἱ μὲν τὸ ἁγιον πνευμα φασιν. οἱ δὲ απο βασιλειδου τον διακονον. Οἱ δε απο ουαλεντινου το πνευμα της ενθυμησεως του πατρος. κ. λ. Exc. Theod. n. xvi.

[u] Str. lib. 2. p. 315.

[x] Hist. Manich. T. ii. p. 31, 32.

[y] Et cum hæc ita se habeant, ad tantam temeritatem progressi sunt quidam, ut etiam martyres spernant, et vituperent eos qui propter Domini confessionem occiduntur. Iren. lib. 3. cap. 18. n. 4.

[z] Basilidis quoque sermones detrahentes quidem iis qui usque ad mortem certant pro veritate, ut confiteantur coram hominibus Jesum. Ir. Matt. Tom. iii. p. 856. F. Bened.

[a] Martyria negat esse facienda. De Pr. c. 46. p. 250. D. 215. 3.

[b] Prohibet etiam pati martyrium homines pro nomine Christi, dicens ita: Ignoras, quid desideras. Non enim natus est, inquit Christus, neque crucifixus est. Philast. H. 32.

[c] Διδασκει δε...μη δειν μαρτυρειν. Epiph. H. 24. n. iv. p. 71.

excused

excuſed from ſuffering for the truth's ſake. But we perceive from the notion of Baſilides before taken notice of, that he might be reaſonably ſaid to have detracted from the honour of the martyrs. And ſome might be willing to conclude that he denied martyrdom to be a duty, or that confeſſing Jeſus in times of danger was required of us. But this is a conſequence drawn for him by others, from ſome of his opinions, and not what he himſelf allows. For it appears from ſeveral paſſages before quoted from Clement, that he eſteemed martyrdom an honourable ſuffering, though ſome ſins were therein accounted for.

SECT. XI. *He believed that only the Soul would be ſaved.*

IRENÆUS alſo aſſures us [d] that Baſilides taught that the ſoul only would be ſaved; but the body is in it's nature corruptible, and incapable of immortality. And here undoubtedly we may rely upon Irenæus. All in general who held two principles, and had a diſadvantageous opinion of matter, as evil in itſelf, and the cauſe of all evils in this ſublunary world, denied the reſurrection of the fleſh, or the body [e]. And poſſibly this too was one reaſon why ſome ſaid that Baſilides diſcouraged martyrdom, and denied that we ought to confeſs the name of Jeſus in times of danger. For to deny that the body which ſuffered ſhould have any ſhare in future recompenſes, was to diſcourage martyrdom, and to take away one motive for engaging men to ſubmit to death in the cauſe of Chriſt.

SECT. XII. *He is falſely accuſed of believing that Actions are indifferent in their own Nature.*

IRENÆUS farther ſays of the Baſilidians [f] that all actions whatever, and all kinds of lewdneſs are looked upon by them as indifferent. To the like purpoſe ſome other ancient writers, as Philaſter [g] and Epiphanius [h].

[d] Vide note [f], in p. 272, 273. [e] Carnis reſurrectionem graviter impugnat, negans ſalutem corporibus repromiſſam. Tertull. Pr. cap. 46. p. 250. B. p. 215. 3. περιηθη δε και ητος της σαρκος την αναστασιν. The. H. F. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 195. C.

[f] Habere autem et reliquarum operationum uſum indifferentem et univerſæ libidinis. Iren. ubi Sup. l. 1. c. 23. 98. Gr.

[g] Hic etiam male permittit vivere, et dat licentiam vitiis ſecularibus adhærere. Philaſt. H. 32. p. 69. [h] Πασαν επιτηδευσιν κακομηχανιας και ασελγειας επιτρεπει τοις αυτω μαθηματευομενοις επιτελειν, ανδρας μετα γυναικων πολυμιξιαν. Epiph. H. 24. n. iii. p. 71. B.

On

On this last assertion of Irenæus, from whom the others copied, it is proper to observe,

1. That the making no difference in things, or saying that all actions are indifferent, is absolutely inconsistent with the notions of Basilides concerning the Deity, expressed in the passage before cited, that no evil thing was to be imputed to providence: and his great aversion to allow what seemed to be the consequence of his doctrine, relating to martyrs, farther confirms this. Certainly such an one could not esteem all actions alike, or make no difference between virtue and vice, righteousness and unrighteousness. No; he thought that the one ought to be inviolably adhered to, and the other to be abhorred. Moreover in the article of Saturninus, from whom Basilides, it is likely, did not differ on this head, Irenæus expressly says that it was his opinion that the Saviour came for the condemnation of bad men and dæmons, and for the salvation of good men; and that many of his followers practised great temperance. Therefore there are good and bad actions from which men are denominated; and God approves those who do the one, and dislikes those who do the other.

2. There are still in Clement of Alexandria remaining passages of Basilides, wherein he shews that he had right sentiments concerning these matters, and condemns the thought and intention of evil, as well as the outward action. In the passage which I refer to [i] he seems to have an eye to our Lord's words in Matt. v. 21....28. and his doctrine is the same. In another place Clement represents [k] the comment of Basilides and his followers upon Matt. xix. 10....15, to be to this purpose: 'Some,' say they, 'have a natural aversion for women. They who have 'this constitution, do well not to marry. These,' say they, 'are 'such as are eunuchs from their birth. Others are so out of 'necessity, as they who exercise in the theatre, who for the sake 'of glory practise continence. Some have been mutilated by 'some accident, and are also eunuchs by necessity, not by choice. 'Finally, there are some who make themselves eunuchs for the 'kingdom of heaven's sake, who, though they have a desire of 'marriage, decline it, fearing the incumbrances of that state.'

Whereupon Beausobre observes: 'Here [l] we see the true sen-'timents of Basilides upon the subject of continence, about

[i] ωσ γαρ ο μοιχευσαι θελων μοιχος εστι, καν τω μοιχευσαι μη επιτυχη· και ο ποιησαι φονον θελων, ανδροφονος εστι, καν μη δυνηται φονευσαι. κ. λ. Str. l. 4. p. 506. C.

[k] Οι δε απο βασιλειδου, πυθομενων φασι των αποστολων μη ποτε αιρετον εστι το μη γαμειν, αποκρινασθαι λεγουσι τον κυριον....οι δε εικα της αιωνιου βασιλειας ευτουχισαντες εαυτους, δια τα εκ του γαμου φασι συμβαινοντα, Strom. lib. 3. p. 426. A. B.

[l] Hist. Manich. T. ii. p. 43.

'which

'which men thought differently at that time. Some made it a 'necessary virtue, and condemned marriage as a work of the 'flesh. Others exalted continence as the most sublime virtue, 'though they did not condemn marriage as evil and sinful. 'Others considered it not as a virtue in itself, but as a state of 'life which had it's usefulness and convenience, especially in 'times of persecution, because it delivered a Christian from the 'cares and concerns inseparable from a marriage state. This 'last seems to have been the sentiment of Basilides. He did not 'esteem continence a virtue in itself. If there were two honest 'and faithful men, he did not give the preference to him who 'continued single above the other who lived in lawful marriage. 'He was willing that all should follow the condition to which 'they were called by nature. He despised an affected and hypo-'critical continence. He set no value upon forced virginity, 'or upon those who made ostentation of it, that they might be 'preferred to others; but he approved of that continence which 'was pure, free, and chosen for the kingdom of heaven's sake. 'There needs no great penetration to discern that all the fault 'of Basilides lay in not extolling continence to the heavens, in 'not giving it the preference above honest marriage, in not pro-'mising particular crowns and thrones to such as made profes-'sion of it. This too was the fault of Jovinian. And the man-'ner in which Jerom treated him gives just ground to think 'that he treated Basilides no better for an opinion that was very 'right, at least very innocent. Few persons of antiquity thought 'justly of marriage and continence, and abstinences in general, 'and all that is called the ascetic life.' So Beausobre.

3. Finally, Clement of Alexandria has borne testimony to the moral principles of Basilides and his son Isidore. There were Basilidians at Alexandria that were vicious. Having put down the passage before taken notice of, and some others from Isidore, 'I have alleged [m] these passages,' says Clement, 'to confound 'those Basilidians who live ill; for the first authors of their sect 'did not allow them to do so.' I cannot help observing farther that there is another passage of Basilides in Clement of Alexandria, expressing great strictness, if not severity, which must surely shew that he did not favour corruption of manners: for he held that [n] of sins committed even before faith, or baptism,

[m] Ταυτας παρεθεμην τας φωνας εις ελεγχον των μη βιουντων ορθως βασιλιδιανων·...επει μηδε ταυτα αυτοις πραττειν συγχωρουσιν οι προπατορες των δογματων. Str. lib. 3. p. 427. C. ed. Paris. p. 510. ed. Potteri.

[n] Πλην ουδε πασας ο βασιλειδης φησι, μονας δε τας ακουσιους, και κατα αγνοιαν, αφιεσθαι. Str. lib. 4. p. 536. B.

those

those only would be forgiven which were involuntary, and done through ignorance.

Sect. XIII. *A probable Account of the Foundation of this Charge.*

It may be here asked, if this be so, how came it to pass that Irenæus and others charge Basilides and his followers with immoral doctrines and practices.

I answer, this may have proceeded from divers causes. Men are too susceptible of wrong impressions to the prejudice of such as are of different sentiments, and whom they think to be in error; and if some professors of it are bad, they are ready to infer that all are so, or that they act upon principle. Besides, some of the ancient heretics did hold principles which were liable to be abused, and their adversaries might possibly conclude that they actually were abused by those who maintained them. The Basilidians [o] and some others [p] had a notion that God was not to be feared, but loved only. Tertullian indeed represents it as the common opinion of heretics [q] that God was not to be feared; and thence he infers that they were given up to all kinds of licentiousness. I therefore intirely agree with Beausobre, who [r] thinks it to be highly probable, that this induced many to impute licentiousness of manners to the Basilidians and other Gnostics. Another principle liable to be abused was the doctrine concerning two natures, one good in itself, the other bad; which was the opinion of Saturninus, and with which agreed the Basilidian doctrine concerning election. Clement seems to have thought that possibly some of the Basilidians did abuse this last mentioned doctrine, and reckoned themselves licensed to sin; but then he assures us that their first leaders did not allow of this consequence, or encourage their followers to act as these corrupt ones did. Nor does Clement impute this to them as what was really their opinion. He only says of those who did not live well, that 'they lived [s] as if they had liberty to sin, because of

[o] Vid. Clem. Str. 375. C. D. ed. Paris. p. 448. ed. Potteri. [p] Ναι, φησιν, ου χρη θεον φοβεισθαι, αλλα αγαπαν.... Αλλ ο φοβος εκπλησσει την ψυχην. Simon ap. Hom. Clem. 17. n. xi. p. 735.

[q] Negant Deum timendum. Itaque libera sunt illis omnia et soluta. De Præs. Hær. c. 43. p. 248. B. p. 213. 43. See also many quotations to the same purpose under the chapter of Marcion.

[r] Il est bien vraisemblable, que c'est la ce qui fit attribuer aux Basilidiens, et aux autres Gnostiques, de mœurs impures et profanes. Que doit on penser de gens, qui font profession de ne point craindre Dieu. Hist. Manich. T. ii. p. 32. n. 2.

[s] Ως ητοι εχοντων εξουσιαν και τω αμαρτειν δια την τελειοτητα, η παντως γε σωζομενων φυσει, και νυν αμαρτωσι δια την εμφυτον εκλογην. Clem. Strom. l. 3. p. 427. C. ed. Paris. p. 510. ed. Potteri.

their

'their perfection, or as if they must certainly be saved by na-
'ture, and through election, however they sin now.

SECT. XIV. *He is also accused of using Magic and Incantations.*

IRENÆUS farther says, the Basilidians make [t] use of magic, and incantations, and invocations, and other curious arts. It should be observed here that Tertullian, the most ancient copier of Irenæus, says nothing of this kind; and as we have only a Latin translation of this chapter of Irenæus, and various readings even in that, [u] it is not unlikely that this may be a corrupted place; especially, as neither Clement of Alexandria, nor Origen, who omit no opportunity of reproaching the Basilidians, lay any thing of this kind to their charge. It may be farther remarked that the ancient fathers perpetually confound astronomy and astrology with magic; mathematician and magician are with them the same. All these considerations make me very doubtful about the truth of this accusation. I would not however be understood to deny their using some superstitious practices, in order to deliver themselves from certain maladies. Others, even orthodox Christians, did this at Antioch, long after the Basilidian heresy was extinct, as will appear in the sequel. The notion of dæmons, or the souls of dead men having power over living men, was universally prevalent among the heathens, and was believed by many [x] Christians. The Valentinians [y] said that baptism in the name of Jesus was sufficient to deliver Christians from the power of these. Perhaps the Basilidians, who resembled the Valentinians in many respects, might be of the same opinion. Many of the fathers were believers in the efficacy of certain names to expel dæmons. Justin Martyr [z], in his dispute with Trypho the Jew, assures us that 'all dæmons submit to 'the name of Jesus; but when you use any other name, either 'of kings, righteous men, prophets, or patriarchs, they will not

[t] Utuntur autem et hi magia, et incantationibus, et invocationibus, et reliqua universa periergia. Ad. Hær. lib. i. cap. 23. p. 98. Gr. [u] Massuet reads magia et imaginibus. Feuardentius has rejected imaginibus, and so has Grabe. Epiphanius and Theodoret have only magic. See Beauf. H. M. T. ii. p. 45. n. 18. Grabei not. in loc. [x] Δαιμονας αψυχους νεκρων ειδωλα καμοντων. Sibyllinor. l. 8. p. 684. ed. Gallæi. See also p. 27. note A, under the article Lucius. C. H. § 10.

[y] In Eclo. Theod. § 74 et seq. See before, B. 1. [z] Κατα γαρ τε ονοματος αυτε τετε τε υιε τε Θεε...παν δαιμονιον εξορκιζομενον νικαται, και υποτασσεται· εαν δε κατα παντες ονοματος των παρ' υμιν γεγενημενων, ο βασιλεως, η δικαιων, η προφητων, η πατριαρχων εξορκιζητε υμεις, ουκ υποταγησεται ουδεν των δαιμονιων· αλλ ει αρα εξορκιζοι τις υμων κατα τε Θεε Αβρααμ,....ισως υποταγησεται. κ. τ. λ. Just. Mar. Dial. 2. p. 320, 1. ed. Thirlby.

'submit: but if any one adjure them by the God of Abraham, of 'Isaac, or of Jacob, they perhaps will obey. Wherefore your 'exorcists use some certain arts, as well as those of the Gentiles 'in adjuring them, together with certain fumes and ligatures.' Irenæus [a] himself says that the Jews even now use this invocation, the name of God, to drive away dæmons. Origen [b] likewise informs us that the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, joined to the name of God, have such power that not only the Jews use them in their prayers to God, and in casting out dæmons, but also all other exorcists. And he in another place asserts [c] that 'many use this expression, the God of Abraham, to 'cast out dæmons, without knowing who Abraham was.' If therefore Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Origen, believed the use of certain names to be thus powerful in expelling dæmons, it is not at all improbable that the Basilidians, who undoubtedly were filled with the same notions of dæmonism which had over-run the whole world, should use the name of Jesus to deliver those whom they supposed to be possessed from the power of dæmons; or should regard baptism and faith as sufficient preservatives against their influence. But they ought not on this account to be accused of magic. Superstitious and faulty they undoubtedly were, but not more so than many of the catholics. 'The ma-'gicians,' says Clement of Alexandria, 'boast [d] that they have 'dæmons as ministers of their impiety, and, as it were, enrolled 'in the number of their domestics; and that they force them to 'become their servants by their incantations.' But this is very different from believing that baptism in the name of Jesus, or invoking him, will deliver them from the power of dæmons, when they think themselves possessed; or be a preservative against such influence. The former is in a high degree criminal, and what no consistent Christian could ever comply with. The latter was the general sentiment of Christians for many centuries.

[a] Et propter hoc Judæi usque nunc hac ipsa adfatione dæmonas effugant. Iren. lib. 2. cap. 5. p. 123. ed. Grabe.

[b] Ωι τοσουτον δυνατει τα ονοματα συναπτομενα τη του Θεου προσηγορια, ως ο μονον τους απο του εθνους χρηθαι εν ταις προς Θεον ευχαις, και εν το κατεπαδειν δαιμονας, τω, ο Θεος Αβρααμ και ο Θεος Ισαακ, και ο Θεος Ιακωβ· αλλα γαρ σχιδον και παντας τους τα των επωδων και μαγειων πραγματευομενους. Con. Cel. lib. 4. p. 183, 4. ed Spenceri. Opp. Tom. 1. p. 526. n. 33. ed. Bened.

[c] Παραλαμβανουσι την, Θεος Αβρααμ, λιξιν, ουκ επισαμενοι δε τις εστιν ο Αβρααμ. Ib. lib. 1. p. 17. ed Spenceri. Opp. Tom. 1. p. 339. n. 22. Bened.

[d] Μαγοι δε ηδη, ασεβειας της σφων αυτων υπηρετας δαιμονας αυχουσιν, οικειτας αυτους εαυτοις καταγραψαντες του κατηναγκασμενους, δουλους ταις επαοιδαις πεποιηκοτες. Coh. ad. Gentes p. 39. C. ed. Paris. p. 52. ed. Potteri.

SECT.

SECT. XV. *Of the Meaning of Caulacau, and his Definition of Faith and Hope.*

THE Basilidians use the word Caulacau, [c] and apply it to a person: Theodoret says [f] to the Saviour of the world. It is taken from Isaiah xxviii. 10, [g] where we have translated it, *line upon line*, but the Seventy render it, 'hope upon hope,' ελπιδα επ ελπιδι. The only meaning that can be drawn from which, if understood in the sense of the Seventy, is, that they regarded our Saviour as the foundation and support of all their hopes; a sentiment becoming Christians, though expressed in an affected, enigmatical manner.

I would just observe farther concerning the opinions of Basilides, that he defines faith to be [h] an assent of the soul to the truth of things which are not perceivable by the senses, because they are not present, and hope he calls an expectation of good.

[c] Quemadmodum et mundus nomen esse, in quo dicunt descendisse et ascendisse salvatorem, esse Caulacau. Igitur qui hæc didicerit, et angelos omnes cognoverit, et causas eorum, invisibilem et incomprehensibilem eum angelis et potestatibus universis fieri, quemadmodum et Caulacau fuisse. Iren. l. 1. c. 23. p. 98, 99. ed. Grabe. Beausobre would amend this, which Grabe says is corrupted, by changing mundus into mundi, and leaving out the first esse. But this he owns will not agree with the following sentence, where Caulacau is attributed to a person, and is not the name of the world. This is agreeable to what Theodoret says. I think a sense may be made out by reading in connection with the preceding context, as follows: Et deinceps nituntur 365 ementitorum cœlorum nomina, et principia, et angelos et virtutes exponere, quemadmodum et mundi nomen; in quo dicunt descendisse et ascendisse salvatorem, qui est Caulacau. The meaning then will be, they endeavour to explain the names, elements, angels, and virtues of these 365 feigned heavens, as also the name of this world, (that is, the name assigned it in their system of astronomy,) into which the Saviour descended, and then ascended from it again, who himself was called Caulacau: and that he who knows all these angels, and can explain their origin and causes, will himself become invisible and incomprehensible to all these angels and powers, as Caulacau or the Saviour himself was.

[f] Τον δε σωτηρα και Κυριον Καυλακαυαν ονομαζουσι. Hær. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 195. D.

[g] The words in the original are קו לקו. If we consider this as derived from קוה to stretch out, it may metaphorically refer to the stretching of the mind towards an object, and therefore may signify hope or expectation. Thus the Seventy understood it. And as the Basilidians were most prevalent in Ægypt, they undoubtedly used this translation, and would therefore naturally understand the words in the sense there given. If understood in that sense, and applied as a name to our Saviour, it seems to imply what is asserted above.

[h] Ορίζονται γαρ οι απο βασιλειδου την πιστιν, ψυχης συγκαταθεσιν προς τι των μη φαινομενων αισθησιν, δια το μη παρειναι. Ελπις δε προσδοκια κτησεως αγαθου. Clem. Strom. lib. 2. p. 371. A. B. ed. Paris. p. 443. ed. Potter.

Sect. XVI. *Of the Name Abraxas, which he is said to have given to the Prince of the Heavens.*

We come now to what Irenæus says farther, that 'they[i] call 'the prince of the heavens Abraxas, that name having in it the 'number three hundred and sixty-five.' The very same thing is said by Theodoret, who seems to have copied him[k].

Upon this occasion we are led to consider a common notion among the moderns, that the Basilidians had amulets, or preservatives, or magical figures, with certain inscriptions. There are in the cabinets of the curious great numbers of stones or gems, which are usually ascribed to them. When I read the account of these things in Montfaucon's Antiquity explained, where the collection is very large, I thought they were too numerous, too costly, and too heathenish, to be remains of any Christian sect.

Sect. XVII. *Of the Number, Costliness, and heathenish Origin of those Gems called Abraxæi.*

They are, I say, very numerous. The collections that have been made of these things are very large; and many more may be in being, not yet discovered; and others undoubtedly totally lost. The costliness appears in the number and in the materials. They are indeed too considerable to have been the production and possession of all the Christians of the first three centuries, though they had all taken delight in such things. That they are heathenish and Ægyptian, is obvious at first sight. And truly Montfaucon was in the right to let his plates of Abraxas follow his Ægyptian deities. I put in the margin[l] some passages from him

[i] Esse autem principem illorum (cœlorum) ἀβρασαξ, et propter hoc cccLxv. numerum habere in se. Iren. lib. 1. cap. 23. p. 99. ed. Grabe. [k] Εἶναι δὲ τὸν ἀρχοντα αὐτῶν φησιν Ἀβρασαξ. ἡ γὰρ ψηφος τῦ ὀνόματος τῶν. τ. ξ. ε. θεαίων σημαινει τὸν ἀριθμον. H. F. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 195. D.

[l] I. Quis putaret portentosam illam religionem a viris Christianam religionem profitentibus adoptandam, et cum sacris ejus mysteriis commiscendam fore? Quis illam de diis ineptam monstrosamque opinionem nationis omnium superstitiosissimæ cum arcanis sanctissimisque veræ religionis mysteriis conjungendam unquam credidisset? Illud tamen secundo ecclesiæ sæculo fecere Gnostici, Basilidiani et Valentiniani. Irenæus, Epiphanius, Hieronymus, aliique patres, hæreticæ hujusmodi impietatis ceu specimen tantum dederunt: monumenta ab illis hæreticis relicta, quæ ad usque nostram ætatem devenerunt, multa nos docent, quæ, iis indiciis destituta, in æternam inducta oblivionem fuissent. II. Musæa multa per Europam innumeras pene insculptas gemmas subministrant, ubi cum nominibus sacris Iao, quod idem est atque Jehova Sabaoth, Adona-

him, acknowledging all theſe three particulars, their numbers, coſtlineſs, and heatheniſh origin. For, he ſays, there are in the cabinets of Europe almoſt innumerable engraved gems of this kind; and they have on them the figures or images of the cock, the dog, the lion, the ape and the ſphinx, all well known to be ſymbols of heathen deities, ſome of one god, ſome of another. They have alſo on them, beſide Iao, Adonai, and Abraxas, the names and images of Iſis, Oſiris, Serapis, Harpocrates, Canopus, Scarabæus, and every kind of thing which the Ægyptians placed among their gods. Of theſe figures Montfaucon has ſix-and-thirty plates well filled. They are ſo numerous that he found it needful, for the ſake of order and perſpicuity, to divide them into ſeveral claſſes, ſeven in number, which I place in the margin [m].

SECT. XVIII. *Of the Derivation and Meaning of the Word Abraxas, and to what the Baſilidians applied it.*

BEFORE I proceed any farther in this argument, I would obſerve concerning the word Abraxas, that many learned men have enquired into it's derivation and meaning. Beauſobre, in whom the opinions of ſome others may be ſeen, hath given a probable ſolution [n] of it, which I ſhall notice hereafter.

I muſt alſo premiſe that many learned moderns affirm that the [o] Baſilidians uſed to call the ſupreme god Abraxas. For this they have the authority of Jerom [p], and of the author of the additions

donai, frequentius cum nomine Abraxas, figuræ viſuntur ſive galli, ſive canis, leonis, item ſimiæ, ſphingis. In iis etiam conſpiciuntur Iſis, Oſiris, Serapis, Harpocrates, Canopus, Scarabæus, et quicquid Ægyptii in deorum numerum retulerant. Illud autem docent gemmæ illæ, quæ ideo Abraxas vocantur, quia illud nomen frequentius quam alia nomina, ibi occurrit. Montf. Antiquité expliquée. Lib. iii. cap. 1. Tom. 2. P. ii. p. 353.

[m] Ex iſta, ut videtur, officina diffuſus eſt ille ingens lapillorum numerus, qui in multis Europæ muſeis viſuntur, quorumque copia in dies nova eruitur. Pluſquam ſexaginta in hoc cœnobio ſunt. c. 3. n. i. p. 357. Alia hujuſmodi bene multa variis ex locis amuleta corraſimus. Hæc cum iis conjuncta, quæ Chiffletus in editione libelli Joannis Mæcarii publicavit, et cum iis quæ aliis in libris ſunt emiſſa, amplam efficient collectionem, quam ſeptem in claſſes diſtribuimus. Prima claſſis eſt Abraxæorum ſchematum cum capite galli: ſecunda eorum, quorum vel caput vel corpus leonis eſt, quorum inſcriptio ſæpe eſt Mithras: tertia eorum, quæ vel inſcriptionem, vel figuram Serapidis habent: quarta eorum quæ vel Anubim vel Scarabæos, vel ſerpentes aut ſphingas, aut ſimias præferunt: quinta eorum, quæ figuras exhibent humanas, vel alatas, vel alis carentes: ſexta eſt inſcriptionum abſque figuris, et inſcriptionum Hebræarum: ſeptima eorum quæ inſolitam, portentoſioremque formam præ ſe ferunt. Ibid. n. ii. p. 358. [n] Hiſtoire de Manich. T. ii. p. 55, 56 [o] Ibid. T. ii. p. 52...54. See alſo Grabe's *notes upon Irenæus*, on the word Abraxas, p. 99.

[p] Tunc Baſilides ſummum Deum Abraxas cum 365 Æonibus commentatus eſt. Adv. Lucif. p. 304. In. Ut Baſilides, qui omnipotentem Deum appellat Abrax-

ditions to Tertullian's book [q] of Prescriptions. But these writers are mistaken, as we may conclude from Irenæus, whose authority is much better. From him we learn their opinion was [r] that the Father of all was ineffable, or without a name. He also assures us that Abraxas [s] was the first of their three hundred and sixty-five heavens, or the prince of the angels that resided in them. Indeed I think if Abraxas had been their name for the Supreme Deity, Irenæus would have mentioned it at the beginning of his article, and not at the end, in his account of their notion about the heavens.

Epiphanius seems to say they [t] place the power or prince Abrasax at the head of their powers or principalities. Philaster has not one word about Abraxas in his article of Basilides, though it be longer than usual. Augustine only says, [u] it was with them a sacred name, because it contained in it the number three hundred and sixty-five. Tillemont says little of the meaning of Abraxas, because he found I suppose but little of it in the ancient authors which he perused. I have inserted in the note below [x] all that he says of the Basilidians; likewise [y] what he further mentions concerning this name.

Sect. XIX. *It probably referred to their philosophical Arcana.*

If the Basilidians made use of the word Abraxas, as it appears from Irenæus [z] they did; it is very probable they applied it to

as, et eundem secundum Græcas literas, et annui cursus numerum dicit in solis circulo contineri: quem ethnici, sub eodem numero aliarum literarum, vocant Mythram. In Os. c. iii. p. 1392.

[q] Postea Basilides hæreticus erupit: hic esse dicit summum Deum nomine Abraxan, a quo mentem creatam, quam græce νοῦν appellat. De Præs. c. 46. p. 214. 41. Fran. 1597. [r] Innatum autem et innominatum patrem. Iren. lib. 1. cap. 23. p. 98. Gr. [s] Vid. p. 290, note [i].

[t] Λεγει δε την υπεραγω τουτων δυναμιν ειναι, και αρχην Αβρασαξ. κ. τ. λ. Hær. 24. n. vii.

The name is found written both ways in ancient authors, Abraxas and Abrasax. Il est vrai que on lit Abrasax et Abraxas, en mettant un X (Ξ) pour une S (Σ) mais outre qu'il l'a falu, afin que les lettres numerales fissent le nombre de trois-cens soixante-cinq, c'est qu'il est assez ordinaire aux Grecs de Mettre le ξ pour Σιγμα un X pour une S. Les examples en sont frequens dans Platon. Les Atheniens en particulier faisoient. Beausobre His. de Manich. Tom. ii. p. 56.

[u] Quod trecentos sexaginta quinque cœlos esse dicebat, quo numero dierum annus includitur. Unde etiam quasi sanctum nomen commendabat, quod est αβρασαξ: cujus nominis literæ, secundum Græcam supputationem, eundem numerum compleut. Hær. iv. T. vi. p. 4. Venet. 1570.

[x] S. Jerome contoit apparement ces cieux imaginaires lorsqu'il dit, que Basilide avoit inventé 365 eons ou siecles avec un soverain Dieu Abraxas. Car a cause que ce mot d' Abraxas ou Abrasax selon d'autres contient dans le chiffre Grec le nombre de 365. Les Basilidiens faisoient un nom sacre. Mem. Eccle. Basilid. Tom. ii. p. 220. [y] Abraxas ou Abrasax noms superstitieux parmi les Basilidiens, et peut etre leur Dieu. H. p. 220. [z] Vid. p. 290, of this chap. note [i].

the

the arcana of their philoſophy, and not to their theology. Jerom aſſures us [a] that it is the ſame with Mythras. Now Mythras is the deity which the Perſians worſhip, or the Sun. This at once explains why Abraxas is ſaid to be the chief of the three hundred and ſixty-five heavens, or angels who reſide in them, and rule over the three hundred and ſixty-five days of the year. For the ſun being the fountain of light, and the immediate cauſe of day, may with great propriety be ſaid to preſide over all the days of the year. He may alſo, in the hieroglyphical language, be ſaid to contain in himſelf the parts of which the year is compoſed, and to rule over it. The word Abraxas is made up of thoſe elements of the Greek alphabet, which in numeration [b] have the value of three hundred and ſixty-five. It is therefore a technical term, and is much in the ſpirit of the cabbaliſtic or oriental philoſophy; this, joined with that hieroglyphical turn for which the Ægyptians were remarkable, will account for the emblematical figures that appear on ſeveral of thoſe gems and ſtones called by Montfaucon, [c] Abraxæi. There is, however, no ſufficient evidence to prove that all his claſſes are entitled to that name, becauſe on very many that word is not found; and there is ſtill leſs proof that they belonged to the Baſilidians.

[a] Ibid. p. 291, note P.

[b] α=1 β=2 ρ=100 α=1 ξ=60 α=1 σ=200 1+2+100+1+60+1+200=365. Μιθρας eundem numerum valet. Vid. Spanh. Hiſ. Ecc. ſecundi ſeculi de Baſilidianis.

[c] Extra ſeriem vulgarium, quæ in nummis et marmoribus adhibentur, formarum ponimus eas, quæ in amuletis, vulgo Taliſmans, uſurpantur. Amuleta autem hujuſmodi, in gemmis et lapillis variæ formæ et magnitudinis inſculpta, Abraxas etiam vocantur, et magno numero viſuntur in muſeis variis, in noſtroque nominatim non pauca, portentoſis figuris, præſtigiis characteribuſque non vulgaribus oppleta....Hi vero Baſilidiani, a Baſilide parente nuncupati, virtutes et angelos multos eſſe putabant; quorum primum et præcipuum, atque, ut ait Epiphanius, ſuperiorem angelorum virtutem ac principium, Abraſax nuncupabant: quia hæ literæ, ſi numerice accipiantur, τξε, id eſt, 365, conficiunt, quot ſcilicet diebus ſol curſum abſolvit....totidemque virtutes numerabant...His itaque 365 virtutibus totidem anni dies deſignabant; vel ſingulas ſingulis diebus præeſſe ſomniabant: quibus omnibus præfici ac dominari Abraxam ſuum, ſive ſolem, opinabantur. Hinc eſt, quod hanc virtutem Αβρασαξ, (frequenter item Αβραξας conſcribunt) cum radiis aliiſque ſolaribus ſymbolis depingant: videlicet, in lapillis et gemmis....His porro omnibus ſolem ſubindicant. Nam Gallus Gallinaceus, utpote ſolis prænuntius, ſolis ſymbolum eſt. Flagellum autem, equis ſolaribus agitandis inſtrumentum: unde in multis hujuſmodi Abraxæis gemmis equorum quadriga præfertur, aurigante juvene radiato, videlicet ſole....Leo item, maxime radiatus ſolem deſignat, ſtelliſque ſtipatur: ut ſubindicetur, quemadmodum Leo inter animalia, ſic ſolem inter aſtra, principem obtinere locum. Eſt ubi etiam ad typum Leonis Μιθρας, aliquando Μιθραξ, inſcribitur; quo nomine ſolem gentiles vocabant. Hic vero cultus à Perſis ad Romanos et Græcos emanaverat. Montfaucon. Palæogra. Græc. l. 2. c. 8. p. 177, 178.

Sect. XX. *The Gems called Abraxæi were used by the Heathens as Charms.*

Every one knows that, in the system of ancient mythology, Apollo and the sun were the same; Apollo was also the god [d] of healing. On this account, in the true spirit of hieroglyphics and mythology, these gems were undoubtedly used by the heathens, and probably were used by some superstitious Christians, who being but lately converted, still retained a relish for their former absurdities, as amulets or charms, to drive away agues and other diseases. It is not unlikely that such were found among the orthodox as well as among the Basilidians. For Montfaucon acknowledges it, and indeed proves it [e] by a quotation from Chrysostom, that long after the Basilidian heresy was extinct, the Christians at Antioch used to bind brass coins of Alexander the Great about their feet and heads, to keep off or drive away diseases. It is nothing wonderful then if in Ægypt, a country over-run with superstition, some of the new converts to Christianity should weakly join with the heathens in the use of charms and amulets.

Sect. XXI. *The Christians accused of worshipping Serapis.*

This appears to be fact from a letter of the emperor Adrian, preserved by Vopiscus [f]. A common report was, it seems, then spread in Ægypt, that the Christians worshipped Serapis. The letter [g] goes so far as to say that the Jews, the Samaritans, and the

[d] Inventum medicina meum est; opiferque per orbem
Dicor: et herbarum subjecta potentia nobis.
Ovid. Met. lib. 1. v. 521, 2.

[e] Consuetudo illa superstitiosa gestandi numismata Alexandri Magni, ac si vim quandam opitulandi habuissent, apud Christianos Antiochenos vigebat. In quem vere damnandum morem sic invehitur Chrysostomus in catacheli secunda ad populum Antiochenum: Quid de illis dicatur inquit, qui incantationibus et ligamentis utuntur, quique capiti pedibusque suis nummos Æneos Alexandri Macedonis alligant. Hæccine spes nostra? An post crucem et mortem servatoris in regem profanæ religionis spem nostram habebimus? Montfaucon's Antiq. Expl. p. 373. Jam supra vidimus in multorum lapillorum inscriptionibus, eos ad morbos curandos fuisse datos. Hujusmodi præstigiæ in omnibus pene Christianismi seculis usurpatæ sunt. Ibid. 377, 8.

[f] Hist. August. Script. T. ii. p. 719. et seq. ed. Lug. Bat. 1671.

[g] In Ægypto orta fama et calumnia est, Christianos Serapin colere. Unde Hadrianus in epistola sua apud Vopiscum hæc habet: Ægyptum, quam mihi laudabas, Serviane carissime, totam didici levem, pendulam, et ad omnia famæ momenta volitantem. Illi, qui Serapin colunt, Christiani.

the Christians, that even the chief master of the synagogue, the Christian presbyters and bishops, and even the patriarch himself, worshipped Serapis, as well as Christ. Had this accusation been confined to a part of the Christians or Jews, or had any particular sort of heretics been mentioned, one might have thought it possible; but the charge is so general that it can never be true. We must therefore seek for something in the customs of those times which will account for the rise of such a calumny. And I think the use of amulets, which it is not improbable prevailed among some of the Christians in Ægypt, as we are sure it afterwards did at Antioch, will account for it. The emperor makes no mention of the Basilidians, but charges the Christians at large with the crime. It may therefore as well be attributed to the catholics as to them. The truth of the matter seems to be this: the emperor knew very little about the Christians, and took up this opinion from common report. He very probably heard that some Christians did use such kind of amulets, on which, among other things, the name of Serapis was engraved: and as the heathens, in a like situation, would pay a particular regard to the god from whom they expected the cure, and were continually in the use of joining together the worship of all sorts of deities; to him it would appear a very natural conclusion, that the Christians who used these amulets worshipped Serapis as well as Christ.

SECT. XXII. *An Examination of Montfaucon's Figures.*

BY an examination of particulars, as given by Montfaucon himself, I shall clearly prove that these gems are of heathenish origin. Many of the figures and inscriptions on them are to the last degree obscene and idolatrous, and consequently could not be the production of any Christian sect whatever; they must be pagan, and for the most part Ægyptian. 'It appears to me,' says [h] Beausobre, 'altogether incredible that a sect which made 'profession of Christianity, should have adopted the monsters 'adored by the Ægyptians; or that a man, who boasted of de-'riving his doctrine from Matthias, and from an interpreter of 'St. Peter, and who received the gospels and the epistles of St.

Christiani sunt, devoti sunt Serapidi, qui se Christi episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archi-synagogus Judæorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum Presbyter; non Mathematicus, non Aruspex, non Alypites. Ipse ille Patriarcha, cum Ægyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum. Montfaucon Palæo. Græ. p. 178.

[h] Hist. Manich. T. ii. cap. iv. p. 51.

'Paul, ſhould make images of the Deity, at a time when Chriſ-
'tians had the moſt exceſſive averſion to all ſorts of images,
'even the moſt innocent.'

The firſt claſs of figures in Montfaucon is of ſuch as have at the top a cock's head, which refers to the Sun [i], or his influences, as he himſelf owns. The figures in this claſs are thirty-ſix, and are all after the Ægyptian manner. Notwithſtanding therefore the word Abraxas be found on ſome of theſe, it is no proof that they were the productions of the Baſilidians, ſince they refer to no doctrine of Chriſtianity, nor to any of their peculiar notions. It may be rather conjectured from hence, with ſome degree of probability, that the word was of heatheniſh origin, perhaps invented and uſed by the oriental cabbaliſts, from whom they adopted it, together with other philoſophical arcana.

His ſecond [k] claſs is of ſuch as have the head, or body, of a lion. The inſcription on theſe is moſt commonly Mythras. The lion we know to be an Ægyptian hieroglyphic for ſtrength, and alſo for the vehement heat of the ſun; from the figure being radiated, there can be no doubt but it refers to the ſun; this joined with the inſcription Mythras, ſhews that it is of heatheniſh and Ægyptian origin.

His third claſs is of thoſe ſtones, which either have [l] the figure of Serapis, or his name, inſcribed on them. One of theſe repreſents, on one ſide, Iſis ſitting on a lotus naked, with the moon placed on a radiated head; her right hand is raiſed up, and in

[i] Abraxas cum galli capite triginta ſex numero proferimus....Gallus ſine dubio ſymbolum ſolis eſt, qui flagellum tenet, quaſi concitandis equis. Aliquando etiam ſol vocatur. Huic galli caput tribuitur, quia hæc avis ſolem prænuntiat: ubi obſervandum, ſchemata hæc omnia Abraxæa vel ad ſolem, vel ad ejus operationes referri, quemadmodum et aliæ pene omnes Ægyptiacæ figuræ. Mon. ubi ſup. p. 358.

[k] Abraxæa ſecundæ claſſis ſchemata frequentiſſime occurrunt, variiſque modis. Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 4. n. 1. p. 360. Aliquando item leonem deſignant modo ſtellis ſtipatum, modo radiis fulgentem. Sæpe figuram radiatam effingunt capite leonino, ſerpentino corpore. Pal. Græ. p. 178. See alſo p. 291 of this chapter, note [m] Secunda Claſſis, and p. 293, note [c].

[l] In aliqua vero gemma Capelliani Muſæi,...Iſis loto inſidens nuda, cum luna impoſita capiti radiato dexteram erigit, ſiniſtra flagellum tenet: in conſpectu vero ejus, ſimia erecta cum ithyphallo. Circum autem inſcribitur, Εις Ζευς Σεραπις unus Jupiter Serapis. Ab altera vero gemmæ facie altera inſcriptio legitur, ubi Abraxas memoratur. Ibid. p. 178. In tabula ſequenti alia D. Capelli Senatoris Veneti Iſidem repræſentat flori loti inſidentem, ante quam ſimia eſt aut cercopithecus cum inſcriptione, Εις Ζευς Σεραπις...In poſticæ partis inſcriptione nihil intelligitur uſque ad nomen Abraxas....Alia imago Serapidem repræſentat victoriam manu tenentem...Serapis hic canem Cerberum trino capite ad pedes habet, quo confirmabatur id, quod ſupra dicebamus, nempe, Serapidem pro Plutone habitum fuiſſe. Antiq. Ex. p. 362. In aliis lapillis Iſis loto inſidens, vel Apis ſtipatus ſtellis conſpicitur. Eſt ubi videas ranas inſculptas, cancros, monſtra varia ex animalibus compoſita. Obſcenæ paſſim figuræ, inter hujuſmodi ſymbola deprehenduntur; Phalli, ithyphalli, et ſimilia: quæ omnia qua mente cum Chriſtianis myſteriis homines illi, qui ſeſe Chriſtianos mentiebantur, admiſcuerint, quis divinare poſſit? Pal. Gr. p. 179.

her

her left hand ſhe holds a whip; before her ſtands an ape, or cercopithecus, in a very obſcene poſture. The inſcription is, 'Serapis is the one Jupiter.' This, and ſeveral others in the ſame plate, are extremely obſcene; and though the word Abraxas is found there, yet from ſeveral of the ſymbols it plainly appears that they are pagan, and the god to whoſe honour they were conſecrated was Bacchus, as will be more apparent from ſome under the next claſs. The ſituations of ſome of the figures, which are particularly mentioned in the quotations, together with the introducing Serapis, Cerberus, and Apis, demonſtrate plainly that theſe ſtones are monuments of pagan Ægyptian ſuperſtition.

On the gems of the fourth claſs[m] are ſphinxes, apes, and other animals of that ſort. He particularly deſcribes one having on it a winged ſphinx, with a ſerpent placed juſt before it. The head of the ſerpent is ornamented with thoſe inſignia which are appropriated to Ægyptian deities; and on the reverſe is this inſcription, 'To the honour of father Bacchus.' From which inſcription, conſidered in connection with the ſymbols which we have mentioned as belonging to this claſs, it plainly appears that Bacchus was the deity in honour of whom theſe gems were wrought. And as Macrobius[n] hath informed us that Apollo and Bacchus are the ſame deities, the conjecture and obſervations of Beauſobre[o] are confirmed, that Abraxas, or Abraſax, is derived

[m] Sphinges atque ſimiæ ſimiliter in hiſce lapillis occurrunt. Quæ ex muſeo ſanctæ Genovefæ eſt imago, ſphingem exhibet alatam, quæ ſerpentem coram ſe poſitum habet, et ornatum capitis geſtat, Ægyptiacis numinibus proprium. In poſtica parte circa uvam legitur hæc inſcriptio, Hon. Pat. Bib. quæ ſignificat, ut R. P. Molinetus putat, Honori Patris Biberi aut Liberi. Ibid. p. 364.

[n] Ariſtoteles, qui theologumena ſcripſit, Apollinem, et Liberum patrem unum eundemque Deum eſſe, cum multis argumentis aſſerit, &c...Euripides in Licymnio Apollinem Liberumque unum eundemque Deum eſſe ſignificans ſcribit, Δεσποτα φιλοδαφνε, Βακχε, Παιαν, Απολλον, ευλυρε. Nulla ex his dubitatio ſit Solem ac Liberum patrem ejuſdem numinis habendum. Abſolute tamen hoc argumentis liquidioribus adſtruetur. In ſacris enim hæc religioſi arcani obſervatio tenetur, ut ſol cum in ſupero, id eſt, in diurno hemiſphærio eſt, Apollo vocitetur: cum in infero, id eſt nocturno, Dionyſus, qui eſt Liber pater, habeatur....Solem Liberum eſſe, manifeſte pronuntiat Orpheus hoc verſu:

Ηλιος ον Διονυσον επικλησιν καλεουσιν. Macrobii Sat. l. i. c. 18. p. 199, 200, 202.

[o] Je croi donc qu' Abraxas ou Abraſax eſt compoſé de deux mots Grecs. Le premier eſt Αξιος qui a diverſes ſignifications, mais entre autres celles de Beau, de Magnifique. C'eſt une epithete ou un attribut du Dieu appellé Iao. Comme on le voit dans cet oracle d'Apollon de Claros:

Χειματι μεν τ' Αϊδηϊ, Διι δε ειαρος αρχομενοιο
Ηελιον δε θεζει, μετοπωρῳ δ' αξιον Ιαω.

...Mais αξιος ſignifie auſſi Beau ſuperbe Majeſtueux; de là vient αξιαβανειν de Euripide, pour dire une demarche ſuperbe Majeſtueuſe....Dans les vers que je viens d'alleguer Iao eſt Bacchus. Mais Bacchus eſt le Soleil....αξιος eſt une epithete

derived from two Greek words, which signify Magnificent Saviour. For the epithet αβρος, the first part of Abrasax is particularly applied to Apollo and to Bacchus. No objection can be framed against this from the name Serapis being so often used in those of the former class; for Serapis is there said to be the one Jupiter. On other gems, as Montfaucon asserts [p], he was considered as the same with Pluto. It seems therefore that the attributes and insignia of Apollo and Bacchus may with propriety, in the Ægyptian mythology, be also given to him. This appears to have been really the case; for the further back we trace the Greek theogony, which undoubtedly owed it's origin to the Ægyptian and oriental mythology, the more clearly we see that Jupiter, Pluto, Sol, and Bacchus, are the same [q]. It is to the present purpose to observe, that αβρος is an epithet applied to the god Ιαω, [r] which is a name frequently found on these gems, and even joined with Abraxas.

This name is frequently found on the gems of Montfaucon's fifth class. On these also there are human figures, and joined with the name Iao, are the names [s] Sabaoth, Adonai, Eloai, &c. It is from hence that the strongest argument hath been drawn to prove that these gems belonged to some Christian sect, because these are the names of the true God in the Old Testament. But an observation of Origen in his answer to Celsus, [t] will set aside the force of this. He says they who framed these incantations

thete du Soleil. Le second mot Grec dont Abrasax est composé est ou celui de Σαω qui est souvent employé dans Homere, et qui veut dire, 'sauver, guérir;' ou celui de Σα qui signifie 'salut, santé.'....Et ce qui confirme encore cette conjecture c'est la figure LXIX. de Chifflet dont l'inscription commence par les mots Grecs, Αγω σα Σαω α A. Ω. Ces paroles sont prononcees par Abraxas dont le nom vient aussi-tot apres. C'est moi, dit il, qui vous conduis vous et tout ce qui vous regarde. C'est moi, qui vous conserve, ou qui vous sauve. Je suis Alpha et Omega. Il y a du dessous de l'inscription un serpent qui tient sa queue dans sa gueule, et dans le cercle qu'il decrit ces trois lettres Greques ΤΞΕ qui font le nombre 365. Le serpent qui est d'ordinaire un embleme de l'eternité est ici celui du soleil et le ses revolutions. Hist. de Manich. Tom. ii. p. 55, 56. n. viii.

[p] Serapis hic canem Cerberum trino capite ad pedes habet: quo confirmabatur ad quod supra dicebamus, nempe Serapidem pro Plutone habitum fuisse. Mont. An. Ex. p. 362.

[q] Εις Ζευς, εις Αδης, εις Ηλιος, εις Διονυσος. Hujus versus auctoritas fundatur oraculo Apollinis Clarii. Macrob. Sat. l. i. c. 18. p. 202.

[r] See p. 297, note [o].

[s] Quinta eorum, quæ figuras exhibent humanas vel alatas vel alis carentes. Mont. An. Ex. p. 358. Voces Ιαω, σαβαωθ, αδωναι, αβραξας, μιθρας frequentissime occurrunt. In aliquo lapide jaspide ejusdem Capelliani musei, ubi ab altera gemmæ facie figura visitur humano corpore galli gallinacei capite, cruribus et tibiis in serpentum capita desinentibus, quæ dextra flagellum sinistra scutum tenet, voce Ιαω inscriptum barbaris aliis circumpositis nominibus. Pal. Græ. p. 179.

[t] Οτι οι ταυτα συνταξαμενοι, ωτε τα μαγειας ιωησαντες, ωτε τα των θειων γραφων διαιρουντες, παντ' εφυγαν απο μιν μαγειας τον Ιαλδαβαωθ, και τον Αγραφαιν, και τον αρχιον. απο δε των Εβραικων γραφων, τον Ιαωια παρ' Εβραιοις ονομαζομενον, και τον Σαβαωθ, και τον Αδωναιον, και τον Ελωαιον. κ. τ. λ. Contra Cels. l. 6. p. 297. Cantab. Opp. T. i. p. 656. D. E. Bened.

being

being neither well skilled in magic, nor rightly understanding the sacred scriptures, have mixed together things of different sorts. Thus from magic they have got Jaldabaoth, Astaphæus, and Horæus. From the Hebrew scriptures they have taken the Hebrew names Iao, Sabaoth, Adonai, Eloai. Wherefore Origen esteemed it no proof that these incantations belonged to Christians, because the Hebrew names of the true God were mixed with others. On the contrary, he asserts [u] that they belonged not to any Christian sect, but to those who were aliens from our common salvation, and who never would give the title of Saviour, or God, or Master, or Son of God, to Jesus. One of the gems of this fifth class which hath Iao on the face, [x] is inscribed on the reverse with these words: 'Grant me favour and victory 'because I have uttered thy hidden and ineffable name.' This is founded on a superstitious notion which was entertained among some of the Jews, that whoever could rightly pronounce the name Jehovah, had great favour with God, and could even work miracles. This then is more likely to be the work of some magician, than an amulet belonging to any Christian sect. Montfaucon mentions [y] two under this class with the name Alexander on each of them. These are undoubtedly of heathenish origin, and were probably intended for the same purpose as those mentioned before, which the people of Antioch used in order to drive away diseases.

In the sixth class is inserted the description of a costly [z] mo-

[u] ως ȣ χριστιανων λογȣς, αλλα παντη αλλοτριων σωτηριας, και ȣδαμως επιγραφομενων Ιησȣν, η Σωτηρα, η Θεον, η διδασκαλον, η υιον Θεȣ. Con. Cels lib. 6. p. 296. Cantab. Opp. Tom. i. p. 654. D. Bened.

[x] Ab altera gemmæ facie ita legitur, Δος μοι χαριν νικην οτι ειρηκα σȣ το κρυπτον και αλιχωφνον ονομα. reliqua ignota et barbara sunt. Eorum vero sensus est. 'Da 'mihi gratiam et victoriam, quia occul-'tum et ineffabile nomen tuum pronun-'tiavi.' Illud autem ineffabile nomen in altera gemmæ facie expressum est. Ιαω apud Græcos, veteres autem יהוה exprimunt. Vocem Αλιχωφνον barbaram, forte pro ανεκφωνητον positam, ineffabile vertimus. Pal. Græ. p. 179.

[y] In alia ejusdem. (Capelliani Musei) δος χαριν Αλεξανδρȣ 'da gratiam Alex-'andri.' In alia vero gemma legitur Αλεξανδρα. Quo pertineat autem Alexander vel Alexandra ignoramus. Pal. Græc. p. 179.

[z] En duo Abraxæa schemata...Ambo in lapide nigro Ægyptiaco quem vocant Basalten. Primum est quinque pollicum longitudine, latitudineque trium. In sublimiore lapidis parte est quadratum oblongum et fastigiatum ut frontispicium templi. In fastigio autem Ιαω descriptum est....et nomen Abrasax. Ad dextram et ad sinistram frontispicii illius hinc et inde duo cercopitheci manus efferentes versus Ιαω quasi venerabundi hoc gestu, και τη τȣ αιδοιȣ εγερσει honorare videntur. Sub frontispicio illo vir cujus caput ornatu Ægyptiaco distinguitur, alas et caudam avis habet...Hic etiam stupendus τη τȣ αιδοιȣ εγερσει....In hoc item schemate Osiris conspicitur. Isis loto insidens et aliquot aves...Sequens schema non minus singulare, ejusdem circiter atque præcedens magnitudinis est, ex lapide nigro quem Basalten vocant, qui lapis ad utramque partem insculptus est. In altera facie Osiris, insolitam habens formam, qui duobus pedibus, duorum crocodilorum capitibus insistit. Capite gestat caput aliud suo majus, cui imponitur calathus Serapidis symbolum frequens. An. Ex. p. 370. Pl. 167.

nument,

nument, with the word Abraxas on it. The figures are exceedingly obscene, and undoubtedly heathenish. In the same plate is another, with an Osiris treading upon the heads of two crocodiles. Can any thing be more plainly pagan and Ægyptian?

Sect. XXIII. *These Gems were all undoubtedly heathenish.*

These and many others are so clearly of pagan origin that it is somewhat wonderful Montfaucon could make such large collections, and yet not perceive this. And it is more wonderful still that a learned writer of our own, who is sometimes sufficiently cautious, especially with respect to charges brought against heretics, should approve of such explications. His opinion of the Basilidians must be very low indeed, to think that they who professed themselves Christians, could adopt the Roman and Ægyptian deities into their worship, and even be the means of transmitting the Ægyptian idolatry to the Romans. He carelessly quotes a passage from Prudentius as if to prove this; [a] when it is most evident that Prudentius is inveighing against the heathen Ægyptians and Romans, on account of that multiplicity of senseless stupid objects, which they adored as gods. Are the Basilidians to be blamed because the Romans adopted the Ægyptian deities? It is well known they had done this before Basilides was in being, with respect to other nations as well as Ægypt.

Sect. XXIV. *From hence came the superstitious Custom of using Abrasadabra as a Charm.*

It is not improbable that from this word Abrasax came the superstitious custom of writing the word Abrasadabra [b] upon a slip of paper, in order to cure a semitertian ague. The most

[a] Hæc Basilidis figmenta ex Ægypto Romam migrasse constat. Nam in gemmis hisce Basilidianis, Romanorum interdum Deorum figuras ex una parte, et vocabula illa Abraxæa ex altera; atque in nonnullis, Deorum simul Latinorum Ægyptiorumque symbola commixta cernimus: ad quod Prudentius sane alludere videtur:

> Isis enim et Serapis et grandi simia cauda,
> Et crocodilus, id est, quod Juno, Laverna, Priapus.
> Hos tu Nile Deos colis, et tu Tybris adoras.
>
> Contra Symmach. l. 2. v. 868. Middleton Antiq. p. 76.

[b] On ecrit ordinairement Abraçadabra, mais il faut ecrire Abrasadabra. Le C dans les inscriptions Grecques est un S comme tout le monde le sait. Beauf. Hist. M. p. 56. note.

ancient

ancient writer, who ſpeaks of this, is Serenus Samonicus, [c] preceptor to the younger Gordian. He certainly did not make profeſſion of Chriſtianity; and from hence there is a collateral probability that it was a heatheniſh charm. Notwithſtanding this Montfaucon, for what reaſon I do not know, unleſs becauſe he was determined to father every thing ſuperſtitious upon the Baſilidians, makes [d] him one of that ſect.

SECT. XXV. *Beauſobre's Obſervations on Chifflet, and Arguments againſt theſe Gems being Chriſtian.*

I HAVE argued from the figures given us by Montfaucon. Beauſobre, whoſe remarks are directed principally againſt Chifflet, is much of the ſame opinion; and though he gives due commendation to Chifflet's performance, yet he [e] aſſerts, in oppoſition to him, that the engravings on theſe ſtones are evidently Ægyptian figures of the Sun, of Mercury, of Bacchus, of Hecate or the Moon, of Iſis, Serapis, and other deities worſhipped in Ægypt. And he argues againſt theſe gems being the invention of the Baſilidians.

Firſt, from the incredibility of the thing in itſelf, that a profeſſor of the religion of Jeſus, and a philoſopher, ſhould make images of the Deity, at a time when Chriſtians had an unconquerable averſion to ſuch figures; and eſpecially, that he ſhould make ſuch monſtrous and obſcene ones.

Secondly, he further argues from the ſilence of the fathers, who wrote againſt and confuted the Baſilidians. Iræneus ſays not a word of ſuch uſages. But ſhould it be ſaid Irenæus wrote in the weſt, and therefore might not be ſo well acquainted with their cuſtoms; he obſerves that Clement, who lived at Alexandria, in the very center of the Baſilidian hereſy, would certainly have taken notice of, and reproached them for ſuch impurity and

[c] Mortiferum magis eſt, quod Græcis hemitritæum
Vulgatur verbis, hoc noſtra dicere lingua
Non potuere ulli, puto, nec voluere parentes.
Inſcribis Chartæ, quod dicitur Abraçadabra,
Sæpius et ſubter repetis, ſed detrahe ſummam,
Et magis atque magis deſint elementa figuris
Singula, quæ ſemper rapies, et cætera figes,
Donec in anguſtum redigatur litera conum
His lino nexis collum redimire memento, &c.
Serenus Samonicus de Medic. N. 53. p. 1598, Fol. Mattaire.

[d] Quod inventum Quintus Serenus Samonicus Baſilidianus (Medecin Baſilidien. Gal.) in carminibus ſuis poſuit, ubi ſuadet ut in charta deſcribatur. Ann. Ex. p. 377.
[e] Hiſt. de Man. Tom. ii. p. 50, 51, 57.

groſs

groſs idolatry, if it had prevailed among them. Beſides, as moſt of theſe antiquities are precious ſtones, they were not uſed merely as amulets, but as ſeals or rings. Clement therefore would have had occaſion to ſpeak of ſuch things in his Pædagogue. For he mentions, [f] and inveighs againſt ſuperfluous ornaments, particularly pearls and precious ſtones. The figures attributed to the Baſilidians are engraved on ſuch kind of ſtones. As he never inveighs againſt theſe, or accuſes the Baſilidians of uſing them, it is moſt certain they were not accuſtomed to have ſuch. To which may be added, that in his treatiſe of the beſt manner of living, [g] where he lays down rules concerning the rings, which Chriſtians may wear conſiſtently with their profeſſion, he ſtrictly forbids their having on their ſtones, or ſeals, the repreſentation of idol deities; becauſe they are objects on which a Chriſtian cannot even look without ſin. He earneſtly warns them againſt every repreſentation which was contrary to decency and modeſty. Could he then omit cautioning the faithful at Alexandria againſt the uſe of thoſe abominable figures which are now aſcribed to the Baſilidians; eſpecially as he ſcruples not, on all fair occaſions, to attack the followers of this ſect? Theſe figures have every characteriſtic of the things which he abſolutely forbids: they are idolatrous, they are immodeſt, they are to the laſt degree obſcene.

To Clement ſucceeded Origen. But Origen, ſo curious to dive into the ſentiments and practices of heretics, ſays not one word either about the Abraxas of Baſilides, or the magic and obſcene figures of his followers, though he had the faireſt opportunity to have done it, when treating at large about the oriental cabbaliſtic philoſophy, and the magic of others in his anſwer to Celſus.

Euſebius, Cyril of Jeruſalem, St. Jerom, and Theodoret, who all lived in the Eaſt, are equally ſilent on this head; and yet certainly there muſt at that time have been a very great number of theſe precious ſtones; ſince after the lapſe of ſo many ages ſuch quantities are every where found in the cabinets of the curious.

[f] Λιθυς δε πελιυς η χλωρυς...μειρακιωδες εςι τεθηπεναι. επι γαρ τα διαυγη των λιθιδιων ...ιεσθαι...υδεν αλλ' η ανοητων εςιν ανθρωπων ...τελεως δε ηγνοηκοτων το θελημα τυ Θευ. κ. τ. λ. Clem. Pædag. lib. 2. cap. 12. p. 206. B. C. 207. B. ed. Paris. p. 241, 242. ed. Potteri.

[g] Ου γαρ ειδωλων προσωπα εναποτυπωτεον· οις και το προσεχειν απειρηται...η κυπελλα τοις σωφρονυσιν· πολλοι δε των ακολαςων, γεγυμνωμενυς εχυσι τυς ερωμενυς, η τας εταιρας· ως μηδε εθελησασιν αυτοις, ληθην ποτε εγγενεσθαι δυνηθηναι των ερωτικων παθηματων, δια την ενδελεχη της ακολασιας υπομνησιν. Clem. Alex. Pæd. lib. 3. cap. 11. p. 247. A. Paris. p. 289. Potteri.

SECT.

SECT. XXVI. *Further Obſervations on Chifflet.*

BEAUSOBRE, after a particular examination of many of the figures in Chifflet, obſerves, that they rather overthrow than confirm the ſyſtem advanced by that writer; becauſe it evidently appears from the figures themſelves that they are pagan, and of Ægyptian origin, and could not belong to any ſect of Chriſtians. He mentions one of theſe engravings,[h] which repreſents the figure of a man carrying a ſheep on his ſhoulders, the idea of which he thinks might be taken from the parable of the good ſhepherd; and he imagines it might belong to the Simonians; ſince the impoſtor Simon, in imitation of our Saviour's expreſſion in that parable, ſaid that his Helena[i] was the wandering ſheep, which he, the good ſhepherd, was come to ſeek and to ſave.

Beauſobre proceeds to ſhow that thoſe gems which have the names of Abraham, or Iſaac, or Jacob on them; or the God of either of theſe patriarchs; or which have the words Sabaoth, or Adonai, or Eloai, are the inventions of the cabbaliſts, or of the Ægyptian magicians. Whoever reads him with attention, will plainly ſee the ſame concluſion following from his obſervations on Chifflet's figures, which I have drawn from thoſe of Montfaucon.

SECT. XXVII. *Of the Names of Angels found on thoſe Gems.*

As to the names of angels, which Montfaucon[k] aſſerts were in uſe among the Baſilidians, it is evident that thoſe which he mentions were derived from the Ophites, as Origen plainly[l] informs us. This is confirmed by the fifteenth figure in Chifflet,

[h] On y voit un homme nud, mais ſans aucune marque immodeſte, qui charge avec beaucoup de peine une Brebis ſur ſon epaule. Cela a tout a fait l'air de la parabole du Bon Paſteur...Le fameux impoſteur Simon avoit imitè la penſée du ſeigneur, et diſoit, que ſon Helene, qui n'eſt autre choſe que l'Ame, etoit la Brebis garee, qu'il etoit venu chercher et ſauver. Je ne doute pas que cette figure XC ne ſoit des Simoniens. Hiſt. de Manich. Tom. ii. p. 60. N. IX. 5.

[i] Τουτο γαρ εστιν το γεγραμμενον εν τω Ευαγγελιω, το προβατον το πεπλανημενον. Epi. Hær. XXI. No. 3. p. 58. A.

[k] Totidemque (365) virtutes numerabant. Virtutum autem hujuſmodi nomina quædam in gemmis Abraxæis expiſcamur nempe nota iſta Μιχαηλ, Γαβριηλ, Ραφαηλ, Ουριηλ, hæc etiam ignota Αναηλ, Προσοραιηλ, Κυριηλ, Συριηλ quibus addas Satouiel ut Latine in gemma quadam legitur. Pal. Græ. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 177.

[l] Μηδαμως μεν υπο χριστιανων ονομαζομενων, οιμαι δε υπο Οφιανων παραλαμβανομενων. κ. τ. λ. Con. Cel. lib. 5. p. 295. ed. Cantab. Opp. 1, p. 653. D. Bened.

and

and by Beausobre's observations, [m] to which I refer for particulars.

Sect. XXVIII. *Conclusions drawn from the foregoing Observations.*

Upon a review therefore of the whole of this long discourse, concerning the Abraxas of the Basilidians, and the figures which have been attributed to them, I cannot help concluding, very much in the words of Beausobre: 1. That Abraxas was not the god of the Basilidians. 2. That this name signifies nothing but the sun, which was never worshipped by them. 3. That the figures both in Chifflet and Montfaucon are, for the most part, Ægyptian. 4. That there is no kind of proof that any of them belonged to the Basilidians. 5. That those which have Iao, Sabaoth, &c. upon them, were the works of magicians, who never made any profession of Christianity. 6. That some of these figures derived their origin from the Simonians and Ophites, who were not Christians either in belief or profession.

Sect. XXIX. *Of the Scriptures received by Basilides.*

I shall finish this article by giving an account of the scriptures which were received by Basilides.

According to Irenæus [n] he must have disregarded the Old Testament; or at least he could not give the same authority to that, as he did to the New: because he asserted that the prophecies in the Old Testament were given by those angels who were the makers and princes of the world; and that the law in particular was promulgated by their chief, by him who brought the people of Israel out of the land of Ægypt. Since therefore Jesus Christ, according to him, came to deliver the human race from the power of the princes of the world, and to destroy their works, there must be a kind of opposition between the law and the gospel. As a Christian therefore he could pay no great regard to it. But he looked upon the law [o] as a proper rule, established

[m] Hist. de Manich. Tom. ii. n. xiii. p. 64, 65.

[n] Prophetias autem et ipsas a mundi fabricatoribus fuisse ait principibus, proprie autem legem a principe eorum, eum qui eduxerit populum de terra Ægypti....Patrem misisse Nun suum (et hunc esse qui dicitur Christus) in libertatem credentium ei a potestate eorum qui mundum fabricaverunt...Et liberatos igitur eos a mundi fabricatoribus. Ad. Hær. lib. 1. cap. 23. p. 98.

[o] Esse autem principem ipsorum (angelorum) eum qui Judæorum putatur esse Deus. Et quondam is suis hominibus id est Judæis voluit subjicere reliquas gentes, &c. Ibid.

by

by the Creator, for the direction of the people of Iſrael; and though he did not believe it to come from the true God, the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, yet he conſidered it as a revelation given by an angel, of whom he ſpoke with reſpect.

As to the New Teſtament it doth not appear but he received the whole, or at leaſt [p] the greater part of it.

Jerom indeed ſays [q] that 'both Marcion and Baſilides were 'not content with rejecting the Old Teſtament, but that they 'alſo diſputed ſome parts of the New, corrupting the goſpels, 'and cutting off from St. Paul the two epiſtles to Timothy, 'the epiſtle to Titus, and the epiſtle to the Hebrews.' But Jerom frequently wrote with precipitation and paſſion when he was reproaching heretics. It ought alſo to be obſerved that Marcion and Baſilides were very different in their opinions on many points. Marcion [r] received only the goſpel of St. Luke. Baſilides certainly received the goſpel of St. Matthew; for there are ſeveral references to it in his explanations of doctrines or practices, which are given us by Clement of Alexandria, [s] and there is no proof that he rejected the other three. Neither Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, or Theodoret, accuſe him of this, or of rejecting any of St. Paul's epiſtles. On the contrary, there is poſitive evidence from the ſame Clement that Iſidore, his ſon, [t] received the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians. And there is from Origen a clear proof to the contrary of what Jerom lays to his charge, when he ranks Baſilides with Marcion as a corrupter of the goſpel; for the former writer, in his anſwer to Celſus, who accuſed the Chriſtians in general of corrupting the ſcriptures, ſays that 'he [u] knew of no Chriſtians who had altered 'the text of the goſpel, except the followers of Valentinus and 'Marcion, and perhaps thoſe of Lucan.' This confirms the explanation hereafter given of that paſſage of Origen, where mention is made of the goſpel of Baſilides; that Origen means nothing more by that expreſſion than his commentaries upon the goſpel. Ambroſe and Jerom copied from Origen.

[p] Beauſobre Hiſt. de Manich. Tom. ii. l. 1. n. iv. p. 5. c. iv. n. iii. p. 51.

[q] Marcionem loquor et Baſilidem...qui vetus laniant teſtamentum: tamen eos aliqua ex parte ferremus ſi ſaltem in novo continerent manus ſuas; et non auderent vel evangeliſtas violare, vel apoſtolos.... Nonnullas (epiſtolas) integras repudiandas crediderunt: ad Timotheum videlicet utramque, ad Hebræos, et ad Titum. Hieron. in ep. ad Tit. in Proem. Vol. 4. p. 407. Martiaraynay.

[r] Μονῳ δε κεχρηται τουτῳ τῳ χαρακτηρι τῳ κατα λουκαν Ευαγγελιῳ. Epi. ad Hær. 42. p. 309. D. Ουτος εκ μεν των ευαγγελιων το κατα λουκαν εδεξατο μονον. Theo. Hær. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 24. p. 210. D.

[s] Strom. lib. 4. p. 506. C. & lib. 3. p. 426. A. B. See p. 283, 284, of this chapter notes [i] and [k].

[t] Strom. lib. 3. p. 427. A. & D.

[u] Contra Celſ. lib. 2. p. 77. Can. p. 411. Ben. See the paſſage at length under Lucian, p. 5. note 2.

That Basilides paid great respect to the gospel, is evident from his writing commentaries [x] upon it, which he divided into twenty-four books. Two fragments of these may be seen in Grabe, [y] one taken from the thirteenth, the other from the twenty-third book of these commentaries.

He also certainly received the epistle to the Romans, as appears from Origen's commentary upon the fifth chapter, where he quotes the words of chap. vii. 9, *when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.* Upon this he observes that 'Basilides [z], 'without attending to the sense and connection, endeavoured to 'deduce from the former part of the verse, viz. *I was alive* '*without the law once,* his absurd and nonsensical notion of a 'Pythagorean metempsychosis;' therefore he must have allowed the authority of this epistle; and as he is not accused of rejecting any other of the books of the New Testament, except by St. Jerom, and this in a cursory manner, his name being joined with that of Marcion, there is reason to believe that he received the whole New Testament as authentic, though he perverted the meaning of many places, and drew from many others very absurd and foolish consequences.

Sect. XXX. *Of the Gospel of Basilides.*

There is mention made in Origen's Commentary [a] on Luke of a gospel of Basilides. Ambrose has spoken [b] of the same, as hath Jerom [c] also. The two last undoubtedly copied it from Origen. The most probable opinion is, that the twenty-four books of Commentaries which Agrippa Castor speaks of, [d] were the very gospel of Basilides. This is the opinion of Beausobre [e],

[x] Φησιν αυτον εις μεν το Ευαγγελιον τεσσαρα προς τοις εικοσι συνταξαι βιβλια. Eus. Ecc. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 7. p. 120. A.

[y] Spicileg. Tom. ii. p. 39, &c.

[z] Ego inquit (Paulus) mortuus sum, cœpit enim mihi jam reputari peccatum. Sed hæc Basilides non advertens de lege naturali debere intelligi, ad ineptas et impias fabulas sermonem apostolicum traxit in Pythagoricum dogma: id est, quod animæ in alia atque alia corpora transfundantur ex hoc apostoli dicto conatur adstruere. Orig. Com. in Epis. ad Rom. cap. 5. Tom. ii. p. 530. Basil. 1571. Vid. etiam Grab. Spici. T. ii. p. 43.

[a] Ausus est Basilides scribere Evangelium et suo illud nomine titulare. Homil. in Luc. l. 1. in init.

[b] Ausus est etiam Basilides scribere quod dicitur, secundum Basilidem. Ambro. Præf. in Com. in Luc, init.

[c] Hæresium fuere principia ut est illud...Basilidis atque Apellis, &c. Hieron Præf. in Comm. in Mat.

[d] Eus. Hist. Ecc. lib. 4. c. 7. p. 120. A.

[e] Origine apelle ce livre l'Evangile de Basilide...Mais S. Clement d'Alexandrie ne nous permet pas de douter, que ce ne fut simplement un Commentaire sur l'Evangile qu'Origene a jugé à-propos d'appeller l'Evangile de Basilide. Hist. Man. T. ii. n. 2. p. 3, 4. On parle d'une Evangile de Basilide, c'etoit un Commentaire sur les Evangiles. Ibid. Tom. i. p. 454, and p. 39.

of

of Fabricious [f], and of Mr. Jones [g]. It indeed appears improbable that he ſhould compoſe an apocryphal hiſtory of our Saviour, and give it his own name, when he received the other authentic goſpels.

SECT. XXXI. *Of the Prophets Barcabbas and Barcoph.*

As to the prophecies of the prophets Barcabbas and Barcoph, or Parchor [h], they were undoubtedly ſome oriental books which Baſilides met with in his journey into the Eaſt, and brought with him to Alexandria; and not forgeries of his own, as Euſebius would have us believe.

SECT. XXXII. *Of the Odes of Baſilides.*

CAVE [i] makes him, on the authority of Origen, the author of ſome odes. Grabe ſeems to doubt the exactneſs of the reference, [k] but he afterwards ſays that he found in a manuſcript copy ſome words of Origen to this purpoſe, that 'they,' the heretics, 'repeat the hymns of Valentinus and the odes of Baſilides.'

SECT. XXXIII. *Theſe Things prove the Authenticity and wide Spread of the Scriptures of the New Teſtament.*

FROM this whole chapter it appears that the writings of the New Teſtament were early ſpread abroad among Chriſtians, and that commentaries and expoſitions were very ſoon written on different parts of them, particularly on the goſpels. This would tend to make the knowledge of them more general, and to keep them uncorrupted; for by this means thoſe who might attempt to falſify them in any reſpect would be the ſooner and the more eaſily detected.

[f] Sed potuit etiam Origines hos libros Commentariorum in Evangelium, appellare Evangelium Baſilidis. Cod. Ap. N. T. Tom. i. p. 343.

[g] Canon of the N. T. V. 1. p. 217, 18.

[h] Προφητας δε εαυτω ονομασαι Βαρκαββαν και Βαρχωφ, και αλλους ανυπαρκτους τινας εαυτω συγγραμμενον. Euſ. Hiſt. Ecc. lib. 4. cap. 7. p. 120. A. Ισιδωρος τε ο βασιλειδου υιος αμα και μαθητης εν τω πρωτω των προφητη Παρχωρ εξηγετικων, και αυτος κατα λεξιν γραφει. Clem. Strom. lib. 6. p. 641. C.

[i] Hiſ. Lit. Baſilides, p. 31. Geneva.

[k] Spici. Pat. Tom. ii. p. 38.

CHAP. III.

Of CARPOCRATES and his Followers.

SECT. I. *Some Account of Carpocrates and Epiphanes from Clement of Alexandria and other ancient Authors.*

WE come now to the Carpocratians. I ſhall obſerve their hiſtory and time, their principles in general, their moral principles and manners, and, laſtly, their teſtimony to the ſcriptures.

Clement of Alexandria ſays of them in theſe very words: 'The [a] followers of Carpocrates and Epiphanes think that 'women ought to be common; from whom much reproach has 'been derived to the Chriſtian name.' He informs us that Epiphanes, whoſe works alſo are extant, was the ſon of Carpocrates, who was an Alexandrian: his mother's name was Alexandria, born in the iſland of Cephalene. He lived to be ſeventeen years of age only; and after his death was honoured as a god at Sama, in the afore-mentioned iſland. There they erected to him a temple made of ſtone, with altars, a grove, and a muſæum. And every new moon, on the day when Epiphanes was conſecrated, the Cephalenians met together, and celebrated that birth-day of his with hymns, libations, ſacrifices and feaſtings. He was [b] inſtructed by his father in the whole circle of ſciences, particularly the Platonic philoſophy. He was the author of the monadic ſcience, from whom aroſe the hereſy of the Carpocratians. Clement then proceeds to quote a long paſſage out of a book of Epiphanes, entitled, Of Juſtice, or Righteouſneſs; which paſſage Clement ſuppoſes to teach licentiouſneſs, contrary to the doctrine of the goſpel.

Theodoret too ſays that [c] Carpocrates was an Alexandrian: but Epiphanius [d] calls him a Cephalenian, probably by miſtake, his wife having been of that country. Epiphanius gives the like account that Clement does of the worſhip paid to Epiphanes by the Cephalenians; and ſays that 'his vaſt learning was a great 'inducement to that people to pay him ſuch honour.'

May I be permitted to queſtion the truth of this? Surely it could not be a Chriſtian to whoſe honour theſe idolatrous rites

[a] Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Καρποκράτους καὶ Ἐπιφανοῦς ἀκόλουθοι, κοινὰς εἶναι τὰς γυναῖκας ἀξιοῦσι. Strom. lib. 3. p. 428. A. [b] Ἐπαιδεύθη μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν τε ἐγκύκλιον παιδείαν, καὶ τὰ Πλατωνικά. Καθηγήσατο δὲ τῆς μοναδικῆς γνώσεως. κ. λ. Ibid. C.

[c] H. F. lib. i. cap. 5. in. [d] H. 42, n. iii. p. 210. D.

were

were practised; nor could they be Christians that performed them; that temple must have been raised by heathens. Probably therefore the Epiphanes to whom those honours were given, was some other person, and not Epiphanes the son of Carpocrates, the Christian heretic. Theodoret takes no notice of these things in his chapter of Carpocrates; though Epiphanes is there mentioned; and of whom he says that 'he [e] amplified or improved upon his father's doctrine.' Nor does Irenæus say any thing of this matter. Indeed Epiphanes is but once mentioned, or occasionally referred to by [f] Irenæus. Nor is he at all mentioned by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History; though he has twice mentioned the Carpocratians; and in one of those places, beside Jewish and Samaritan heresies, all these following, the [g] Menandrians, the Marcionites, the Carpocratians, the Valentinians, the Basilidians, and Saturnilians. I might add that it was not customary for Christians to erect temples in the former part of the second century, in which time Epiphanes is supposed to have died.

That I may at once take in the chief things relating to Epiphanes, I would now farther observe that [h] Epiphanius speaks of Epiphanes in the chapter of Secundus the Valentinian. And it is now common with learned [i] moderns, to consider him as a Valentinian; whether rightly or not, I cannot stay to inquire.

SECT. II. *Of the Time in which Carpocrates lived.*

BARONIUS speaks of the Carpocratians at the year 120; Basnage at the year 122; Tillemont [k] thinks they might appear about the year 130; Dodwell conjectures that [l] Epiphanes died about the year 140; Irenæus says that [m] Marcellina came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, which Dodwell [n] computes to have been about the year 142; Massuet [o] about the year 160; Theodoret expressly placeth [p] Carpocrates and Epiphanes in the reign of Adrian. By all ancient writers of heresies in general, the Carpocratians are reckoned an early heresy; for they are the twenty-seventh in Epiphanius, or the seventh Christian heresy.

[e] Και επιφανης δε τουτου παις δια πλατωνικης γυμενος παιδειας την τουτου μυθολογιαν επλατυνεν. Ibid. p. 197. B.

[f] Vid. l. i. c. xi. [al. v.] p. 52. Mass. p. 51. Gr. et conf. Epiph. H. 32. n. vii.

[g] Lib. 4. cap. 22. p. 142, 143. Conf. cap. 7. p. 120.

[h] Vid. H. 32.

[i] Diss. Iren. p. xlvii. xlviii.

[k] Mem. E. T. 2. Les Carpocratiens.

[l] Diss. Iren. iv. n. 25, 26.

[m] Unde et Marcellina, quæ Romam sub Aniceto venit, multos exterminavit. l. 1. c. 25. [al. 24.] p. 104. Gr. 101.

[n] Ib. n. 26.

[o] Diss. Iren. p. lxii.

[p] Αδριανου δε ουτοι Βασιλευοντος τας πονηρας αιρεσεις εκρατυναν. H. F. lib. 1. cap. 5. p. 197. B.

The order is the same in Augustine, who follows Epiphanius. They are supposed by some to have been mentioned [q] by Celsus; but that is not certain. How long they subsisted I do not know: but they are continually spoken of by Irenæus, as in being in his time.

Sect. III. *Of the Principles of the Carpocratians concerning the Creation.*

The Carpocratians are often mentioned by Irenæus; but there are only two or three passages of his containing divers particulars relating to them, on which I shall chiefly insist.

He there assures us that [s] Carpocrates and his followers say the world was made by angels, much inferior to the eternal Father. To the like purpose [t] Theodoret: and Epiphanius, that 'he [u] held one supreme principle, the Father of all, un-'known and unnamed, or incomprehensible; and that the world, 'and the things therein were made by angels, much inferior to 'the unknown Father.' The author of the Additions to Tertullian's Book of Prescriptions does not much differ [x] from the authors already quoted.

Sect. IV. *Of their Opinion concerning the Person of Jesus Christ.*

Irenæus immediately proceeds to say what they thought of the person of Jesus: that 'he [y] was born of Joseph, and was

[q] Κελσος μεν ουν οιδε....αφορμαται ενθεν απο καλομης. Orig. c. Cels. l. v. p. 272. Sp. 626. Ben. [r] Et adversus eos qui sunt a Saturnino, et Basilide, et Carpocrate, et reliquos Gnosticorum, qui eadem similiter dicunt, idem dicatur. lib. 2. cap. 31. al. 56. p. 164. Mass. 185. Gr. Super hæc arguentur qui sunt a Simone, et Carpocrate, et si qui alii virtutes operari dicuntur. Ibid. Mass. p. 186. Gr. Si itaque et nunc nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi beneficia præstat,...sed non Simonis, neque Menandri, neque Carpocratis. Ibid. cap. 32. al. 57. p. 166. Mass. p. 189. Gr.

[s] Carpocrates autem, et qui ab eo, mundum quidem, et ea quæ in eo sunt, ab angelis multo inferioribus ingenito patre factum esse dicunt. lib. i. cap. 25. al. 24. p. 103. Mass. p. 39. Gr.

[t] υπο μεν των αγγελων και αυτος κτισιν εφησε γεγενησθαι. p. 196. B.

[u] H. 27. n. ii. p. 102. C. D.

[x] Carpocrates præterea hanc tulit sectam. Unam esse dicit virtutem in superioribus principalem: ex hac prolatos angelos, atque virtutes: quos distantes longe a superioribus virtutibus mundum istum in inferioribus partibus condidisse. De Pr. cap. 48. p. 252. A. 216. 7. Fran.

[y] Jesum autem e Joseph natum, et cum similis reliquis hominibus fuerit, distasse a reliquis secundum id, quod anima ejus firma et munda cum esset, commemorata fuerit quæ visa essent sibi in ea circumlatione, quæ fuisset ingenito Deo: et propter hoc ab eo missam esse ei virtutem, uti mundi fabricatores effugere posset, et.... ascenderet ad eum: et eas, qui similia ei amplecterentur, similiter. Jesu autem dicunt animam in Judæorum consuetudine nutritam contemsisse eos, et propter hoc virtutes accepisse, per quas evacuavit quæ fuerunt in pœnis passiones, quæ ineraut hominibus. Ibid. p. 203.

[z] like

'like other men, except that his soul was more firm and pure, 'and that he remembered what he had seen with the eternal 'Father: that he was educated among the Jews, and obtained 'power to surmount his sufferings, and after that ascended to the 'Father: and that those souls who believed in him should do 'so likewise;' that is, only as to their souls. Epiphanius says, 'their [z] opinion concerning Christ was that he was born of Jo-'seph and Mary; but excelled other men in temperance, and 'the holiness and virtue of his life.' He also speaks of their supposing the mind of Christ to have had a wonderful strength, or firmness, and to have remembered what he saw in his pre-existent state, and the like. Theodoret's account likewise is 'that they [a] believed Jesus to have been a man, born of Joseph 'and Mary, like other men: but that he excelled in virtue; and 'having a pure soul, he remembered his conversation with the 'eternal Being.' With these accounts agree [b] Philaster, and the [c] author of the additions to Tertullian, whom I transcribe largely at the bottom of the page.

SECT. V. *They are accused of saying, that some may excel Jesus.*

MOREOVER, as Irenæus proceeds, 'some [d] of them have the 'vanity to think that they may equal, or in some respect exceed, 'Jesus himself, or at least Peter and Paul, and the other apostles; 'and that if any one did more completely despise all things here 'below than he did, he might be better than he.' So also says

[z] Ιησουν δε τον κυριον ημων απο ιωσηφ λεγει γεγενησθαι, καθαπερ και παντες ανθρωποι, εκ σπερματος ανδρος και γυναικος,...βιω δε διενηνεχεναι, σωφροσυνη τε και αρετη και θεοσεβειοσυνης. Επειδη δε, φησιν, ευτονον εχει ψυχην παρα τους αλλους ανθρωπους, κ. λ. H. 27. n. ii. p. 102. D.

[a] αρετη δε αυτον διαπρεψαι, και καθαραν εσχηκοτα ψυχην, και μεμνημενην της μετα τα ανεινητου διαγωγης. p. 196. B.

[b] Christum autem dicit non de Virgine Maria, et divino spiritu natum, sed de semine Joseph hominem natum arbitratur...Qui post passionem, inquit, melior inter Judæos vita integra, et conversatione inventus est, cujus animam in cœlum susceptam prædicat. Carnem vero in terram dimissam æstimat. Animique salutem solum, carnis autem non fieri salutem opinatur. Hær. 35. al. 7. post Christum.

[c] Christum non ex Virgine Maria natum, sed ex semine Joseph, hominem tantummodo genitum: sane præ cæteris justitiæ cultu, vitæ integritate meliorem: hunc apud Judæos passum: solam animam ipsius in cœlo receptam, eo quod et firmior et robustior cæteris fuerit. Ex quo colligeret, tentata animarum sola salute, nullas corporis resurrectiones. Pr. c. 48. p. 252. B. 216. 20.

[d] Quaptopter et ad tantum elationis provecti sunt, ut quidam quidem similes sese dicant Jesu: quidam autem adhuc et secundum aliquid illo fortiores, qui sunt distantes amplius quam illius discipuli, ut puta quam Petrus et Paulus, et reliqui apostoli.....Siquis autem plus quam ille contemserit ea quæ sunt hic, posse meliorem quam illum esse. Ibid. Gr. 100.

Epiphanius, that 'some [e] of them thought, they might excel 'Jesus. Others, who went not so far, yet supposed they might 'excel Peter, Andrew, Paul, and the other apostles.' Theodoret in like manner says that 'if [f] any man had a purer soul than that 'of Jesus, he might excel the son himself.' Tertullian [g] too speaks of this notion of theirs: though, perhaps, after all, it is only a consequence drawn by some from their opinion concerning Christ, that he was a mere man. At least there may be reason to apprehend that their notion is not expressed to advantage. At the utmost, it seems not to be a positive assertion, but a case put: supposing a man to have a very pure soul, and that he despise this world and the things of it, and be steadily virtuous in very trying circumstances, he might equal, and in some respect excel, Christ and his apostles. And that it is only made for argument sake is evident from hence, because they thought Jesus much excelled all men in capacity and firmness of mind, and holiness of life: though others may resemble him, as all good Christians will allow.

Sect. VI. *And are said to have used magical Arts.*

Irenæus next [h] says, and Eusebius, [i] as from him, that 'they 'were magicians, and put in practice all the methods of such peo-'ple.' Epiphanius [k] and [l] Theodoret join in this charge: which I shall not now concern myself about, having in other places said what is sufficient.

Sect. VII. *Of marking their Disciples and incensing the Pictures of Christ and others.*

Irenæus says farther, that 'they [m] mark their disciples on the 'back part of one of their ears: then, that Marcellina came to 'Rome

[e] Εαυτȣς προκριτεȣς ηγȣνται και αυτȣ τȣ ιησȣ. Αλλοι δε εξ αυτων, ȣκ ιησȣ φασιν, αλλα πετρȣ και ανδρεȣ και παυλȣ και των λοιπων αποςολων εαυτȣς υπερφερεςερȣς ειναι δια την υπερβολην της γνωσεως, και το περισσοτερον της διαπραξεως διαφορων διεξοδων. H. 27. n. ii. p. 103. D.

[f] Ει δε και καθαρωτεραν τις σχοιη ψυχην, υπερβησεται, φησι, και τȣ υιȣ την αξιαν. p. 196. B.

[g] Sed et Carpocrates tantundem sibi de superioribus vindicat, ut discipuli ejus animas suas jam et Christo, nedum apostolis, et peræquent, et cum volunt, præferant: quas perinde de sublimi virtute conceperint, despectrice mundi potentium principatuum. De anim. c. 23. p. 325. B. p. 275. 5.

[h] Artes enim magicas operantur et ipsi, et incantationes, philtra quoque, &c. Ib. p. 103. Gr. 100.

[i] L. 4. c. 7. p. 120. B. C.

[k] Epiph. ubi supra. n. iii. p. 104. A.

[l] p. 196. C.

[m] Alii vero ex ipsis signant, cauteriantes suos discipulos in posterioribus

'Rome in the time of Anicetus, biſhop of that city.' He moreover ſays that 'they call themſelves Gnoſtics, and that they have 'pictures and images of Chriſt and his apoſtles, and alſo of Py-'thagoras, Plato, and Ariſtotle, and other eminent perſons; and 'that they crown them, and honour them with rites of the Gentile-'ſuperſtition.' Epiphanius too ſays that 'they have pictures of 'Jeſus, and Paul, and alſo of Homer, Pythagoras, and other phi-'loſophers: and that they honour them with incenſe and worſhip.' But then it is obſervable that, both in his [n] ſummary, and his larger work, he [o] ſays 'it was in private that they had or honoured 'theſe images or pictures, and in private only.' Perhaps therefore this ſtory is not true: or, however, not the whole of it. If they had pictures of the philoſophers as well as of Jeſus, it is likely a ſuperior regard was paid to him: and as for what is ſaid of incenſing them, and other ſuperſtitious rites, it may be all mere fiction.

SECT. VIII. *A general view of what they believed.*

FROM all which we now perceive that the Carpocratians believed one God, eternal and incomprehenſible, who made angels and powers of different orders. By ſome of theſe was made this lower and viſible world. They ſaid that Jeſus was the ſon of Joſeph and Mary: in whom was a moſt pure ſoul, of great capacity and underſtanding, who retained the remembrance of the things which he had ſeen with the Father, which [p] alſo he here revealed to men: that he wrought miracles, and excelled in the holineſs of his life, and all virtue: that he lived among the Jews, and ſuffered death: after which his ſoul aſcended to heaven, and returned to God. We perceive likewiſe that they believed the pre-exiſtence of human ſouls: that they expected the ſalvation of the ſoul only, and not the reſurrection of the body.

poſterioribus partibus extantiæ dextræ auris. Unde et Marcellina, quæ Romam ſub Aniceto venit, cum eſſet hujus doctrinæ, multos exterminavit. Gnoſticos ſe autem vocant. Et imagines quaſdam quidem depictas, quaſdam autem et de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicentes formam Chriſti factam a Pilato, illo in tempore quo fuit Jeſus cum hominibus. Et has coronant, et præponunt eas cum imaginibus mundi philoſophorum....Pythagoræ, et Platonis, et Ariſtotelis, et reliquorum. Et reliquam obſervationem circa eas, ſimiliter ut gentes, faciunt. Ibid. p. 104, 105. Gr. 101, 102.

[n] Εικονας δε ποιησας εν κρυφη ιησυ, και παυλε, και ομηρε,....ταυταις εθυμια και προσκυνει. p. 53.

[o] Κρυβδην δε τας τοιαυτας εχουσιν εικονας. κ. λ. H. 27. n. 6. p. 108.

[p] Ελεγε δε τον ιησυν ψυχην ιδιαν ειληφεναι ειδοτα δε τα ανω εκειθεν καταγγελλειν. Id. ib. p. 53.

I now

I now proceed to observe the accounts of their moral principles and manners.

Sect. IX. *They are accused of asserting there is no Difference in the Nature of Things.*

Irenæus says,[q] 'they lived a voluptuous and luxurious life, 'and justified it by their principles. For they said, that there is 'no difference in things: that they are not good or evil in them-'selves, but only according to the judgment and opinion of men.' He adds, that[r] 'such things are done by them as I should not 'believe, if it were not made evident from their writings. For 'they affirm that Christ told his disciples privately that nothing 'is necessary to salvation but faith and love; and that all other 'things are indifferent, being good or evil only in the judg-'ment or opinion of men, not in their own nature.'

In another place Irenæus, speaking of some heretics, and particularly the Carpocratians, and having recited our Lord's excellent precepts of sublime virtue, goes on: 'Since[s] then he 'whom they glory in as their master, and say that he had a 'much better and firmer mind than other men, with great 'earnestness required the doing of some things as good and ex-'cellent, and the forbearing other things as hurtful and wicked: 'I say, when they allow that their master was better and greater 'than other men, how can they teach things manifestly contrary 'to his doctrine, and not be ashamed! How can they say there 'is nothing good or evil, righteous or unrighteous, but in the

[q] Sed vitam quidem luxuriosam, sententiam autem impiam ad velamen malitiæ ipsorum nomine abutuntur....Et in tantam insaniam effrænati sunt, uti et omnia quæcumque sunt irreligiosa et impia in potestate habere, et operari se dicant. Sola enim humana opinione negotia mala et bona dicant. Ib. p. 103, 104. Gr. 100. [r] Και ει μεν πρασσεται παρ αυτοις τα αθεμα, και εκθεσιμα, και απειρημενα, εγω ουκ αν πιστευσαιμι. Εν δε τοις συγγραμμασιν αυτων αναγεγραπται, και αυτοι ουτως εξηγηνται, τον ιησουν λεγοντες εν μυστηριω τοις μαθηταις αυτου και αποστολοις κατ' ιδιαν λελαληκεναι, και αυτους αξιωσαι τοις αξιοις και τοις πιστοις ταυτα παραδιδοναι· Δια πιστεως γαρ και αγαπης σωζεσθαι· τα δε λοιπα αδιαφορα οντα, κατα την δοξαν των ανθρωπων, τη μεν αγαθα, τη δε κακα γινεσθαι, ουδεμιαν φυσιν εχοντα υπαρχοντος. Ib. p. 104. Gr. 101. [s] Quando igitur ille, quem illi magistrum gloriantur, et cum multo meliorem et fortiorem reliquis animam habuisse dicunt, cum magna diligentia quædam quidem jussit fieri quasi bona et egregia, quibusdam autem abstinere non solum operibus, sed etiam his cogitationibus,...quasi malis et nocivis, et nequam: quemadmodum magistrum talem fortiorem et meliorem reliquis, deinde quæ sunt contraria ejus doctrinæ manifeste præcipientes, non confundantur? Et si quidem nihil esset mali, aut rursus boni, opinione autem sola humana, quædam quidem injusta, quædam autem justa putarentur, non utique dixisset dogmatizans: justi autem fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris eorum: injustos autem, et qui non faciunt opera justitiæ, mittet in ignem æternum, ubi vermis ipsorum non morietur, et ignis non extinguetur. L. 2. c. 32, al. 56. p. 165. Mass. p. 187. Gr.

'opinion

'opinion of men; when he said in his doctrine, *Then* [t] *shall the* 'righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father: and 'that he shall bid the unrighteous, and those who do not works 'of righteousness, *to* [u] *depart into everlasting fire,* [x] *where their worm* 'dies not, *and the fire will not be quenched.*

SECT. X. *And of practising the grossest Impurity in their Assemblies.*

CLEMENT of Alexandria, at the beginning of this article, said that 'Carpocrates and Epiphanes maintained the commu-'nity of women.' And, having quoted a passage out of the book of righteousness there mentioned, he adds, 'of [y] these, 'and others of like sentiments, it is said, that they have a sup-'per (for I cannot call it a love-feast) where men and women 'meet, and, having eat plentifully, the candles are put out, and 'they mix together promiscuously.'

Tertullian at once calls [z] Carpocrates 'magician and forni-cator.'

What Eusebius says of the Carpocratians was observed long ago.

Epiphanius takes a part of what Irenæus says, of their living a voluptuous course of life, and adds, that [a] 'they practise un-'natural uncleanness in the most shameful manner, as well as 'magic.'

Theodoret says that [b] 'impurity was a law with them, so far were they from concealing it.'

I proceed no farther in these quotations, supposing that here may be sufficient to give my readers light into this matter. One thing I have omitted, for the sake of brevity, which may be seen by the curious in Irenæus and Epiphanius, relating to the Carpocratian doctrine of transmigrations, and the design of them, as they are represented by those writers.

[t] Matt. xiii. 43. [u] Matt. xxv. 41.
[x] Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.
[y] Τινες φασι και τινας αλλας ζηλωτας των [illegible] και, εις τα δειπνα αθροιζομενους αν-[illegible] και γυναικας, μετα δη το κορεσθη-[illegible] τας λυχνιας την κατω φασι, το κατα-[illegible] αυτων την κοινην ταυτην δικαιοσυ-[illegible] των ποιουμενων φως τη τε λυχνια [illegible], μιγνυσθαι, οπως εθελοιεν, αις δυ-[illegible]. Strom. 3. p. 430. D.
[z] Inde etiam Carpocrates utitur, pariter magus, pariter fornicarius. De Anim. c. 35. p. 338. B. [a] τι δε αλλο τι πασαν αρρητουργιαν και αθεμιτου πραξιν, ην ο θεμιτον επι σωματος φερειν ετοι πραττουσι; και παν ειδος ανδροδασιων, και λαγνιστερων ομιλιων προς γυναικας, εν εκαστω μελει σωματος. H. 27. n. iv. p. 105. B.
[b] την δε ασελγειαν συγκαλυπτειν ουκ ανεχομενοι, αλλα νομον την ακολασιαν ποιουμενοι. p. 196. C.

SECT.

Sect. XI. *The utter Improbability of these Accusations shewn from a Variety of Considerations.*

Now after all this, what can be said? The Carpocratians are in so much discredit, that it must be hazardous to say any thing tending to mitigate the censures that have been passed upon them.

Nevertheless I believe there are persons in the world of so much candour, as to be willing to hear what may be offered.

1. I presume then that what was formerly said for shewing that the heretics were not the occasion of the calumnies cast upon the primitive Christians, must abate the persuasion of the certain truth of the things charged upon the Carpocratians.

2. I have not observed any blot in the personal characters of Carpocrates or Epiphanes. Carpocrates was a very learned man, who had a wife and one son: him he educated himself; and he proved a wonderful person for learning.

3. Whereas we are told that they said there was no difference in things; there are considerations which may satisfy us this is not a true account. For it is inconsistent with their opinion concerning Christ, who, as they said, excelled in virtue and holiness of life, and had a much better and firmer mind than any other man. And some of them said, that supposing any man to have a purer soul, and to despise the world more than he did, he might exceed him. Which shews that they set a high value upon virtue. Moreover, according to Irenæus, they said Christ had taught that nothing is necessary to salvation, but faith, love, or charity. These therefore were necessary. Consequently they did not say that all things were indifferent, or alike, neither good nor evil in their nature. It is plain, I think, that the passage, alleged by Irenæus, does not prove what he brings it for. And in faith and love they seem to have comprehended every branch of moral righteousness. When they added, that Christ said all other things were indifferent, it is likely they meant particularly the positive rites of the law of Moses; which were neither good nor evil in themselves previous to the divine appointment: and the abrogation of which Christ did not speak of so clearly and publicly, as of other things that were necessary, about which therefore the primitive Christians formed very different notions.

4. Clement

4. Clement and others ſay that Carpocrates and Epiphanes taught the community of women. And as a proof, he quotes a paſſage of Epiphanes. But poſſibly Clement miſtook him. There is ſome reaſon to think he did, for the paſſage is obſcure. And preſently afterwards Clement obſerves, that Plato is thought by ſome to teach the ſame doctrine; but they who are of that opinion, he ſays, miſtake him. He only ſays that [c] women are common before marriage; ſo that men may make choice out of them, and ſeek whom of them they pleaſe in marriage. If this ſenſe may be put upon Plato's words, why may not ſome ſuch ſolution acquit Epiphanes? That ſome paſſages of the ancient heretics were obſcure and liable to be miſunderſtood, may appear from a paſſage of Iſidore, cited by Epiphanius, [d] which according to his interpretation contains execrable looſeneſs of principle, teaching men to commit lewdneſs, and then to ſay they have received no damage from it. Whereas it is a very honeſt paſſage, containing firſt, a recommendation of marriage, and then chaſtity in a ſingle life, with directions for obtaining it, if a man has not a good opportunity of marrying. Clement [e] quoted the ſame paſſage as containing ſound and uſeful inſtructions. And Grabe [f] approves of it, and has given a fine explication of it. That paſſage is taken out of a book of Iſidore, called his morals. This paſſage, and another quoted by [g] Clement from another book of Iſidore, are both brought by Epiphanius to prove that Carpocrates and Epiphanes held the community of women: as they are not at all to the purpoſe, all evidence of what he would prove fails him. Epiphanius ſuppoſed, and in another place [h] expreſsly ſays, that Epiphanes made uſe of Iſidore's morals in ſupport of his ſentiments. Whether that be true or not, it is certain that the paſſages alleged by him, for ſhewing that the Carpocratians taught the community of women, contain no ſuch doctrine.

5. Irenæus ſaid 'he ſhould not have believed the truth of 'the things reported of them, if their writings did not ſhew it. 'Therefore he had no evidence of thoſe facts from credible wit'neſſes. And that the paſſage of their writings, quoted by him, 'does not prove what he brings it for, I ſuppoſe to have been 'ſhewn to ſatisfaction.'

[c] Δοκει δε μοι και τȣ πλατωνος παρακηκοεναι εν τη πολιτεια, φαμενȣ κοινας ειναι τας γυναικας παντων· κοινας μεν τας προ τȣ γαμȣ των αιτεισθαι μελλοντων, καθαπερ και το θεατρον κοινον των θεωμενων, φασκοντος. Str. 3. p. 450. D. [d] H. 32. n. iv. p. 24. 212. [e] Str. L. 3. p. 427. [f] Iſta et emendatione et explicatione egent, qua allata patebit hæc verba bonum habere ſenſum. Spic. T. 2. p. 66. [g] Str. L. 3. p. 426. [h] Vid. H. 33. n. i. Conf. H. 32. n. iii. Et. vid. Gr. Spic. T. 2. p. 64. et Maſſ. Diſſ. Iren. p. xlviii.

6. Nor

6. Nor had Clement of Alexandria any good assurance of their practising lewdness in their assemblies. He only mentions the thing as report: 'it is said,' or 'they say' so of them.

Upon the whole, it seems to me that the immoral principles and immoral practices laid to their charge are not proved. The supposition therefore, probably, is owing to mistake or prejudice, or in part to both. There might be loose and wicked men among the Carpocratians, as there were in other sects. But that they were countenanced by Carpocrates and Epiphanes, or by the principles they taught, does not appear to be probable.

Sect. XII. *What Scriptures they received.*

The article of their testimony to the scriptures will be short. Epiphanius in his summary says, 'they [i] rejected the Old Testament;' perhaps they did: but I do not know that to be certain. Possibly, however, the fact was only this, they did not respect the instructions of Moses and the prophets, equally with those of Christ and his apostles.

Tillemont says 'they [k] received the gospel of St. Matthew,' and refers to Epiphanius, who says that 'Cerinthius [l] and Carpocrates endeavoured to prove from the beginning of that gospel, that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary.' Irenæus says 'they [m] endeavoured to pervert those words of our Lord, which are in Matt. v. 25, 26. Luke xii. 58.' But I apprehend that they received not that gospel only, but the other gospels likewise, and all the other books of the New Testament, as they were received by other Christians in their time. For Irenæus says 'they gloried in Christ as their master. They believed that 'he came from God, or that, having taught the will of God on 'earth, and died, he ascended to heaven.' They appear, from passages before quoted, to have respected Peter and Paul, and all the apostles of Jesus. It is likely, therefore, that they received their writings. It is manifest from Irenæus's arguments with them, as above taken notice of, that they did not designedly contradict Christ's doctrine, but greatly respected it. And he largely sets [n] before them our Lord's excellent precepts, as recorded in the gospels. His collections may indeed be reckoned to be chiefly taken from what is called our Saviour's sermon on

[i] τον τε νομον συν τη των γενεων αιτιασει απηγορευεν. p. 53. [k] Mem. Ecc. T. 2. Les Carpocratiens. [l] H. 32. c. 14. p. 138. D. [m] L. 1. c. 25. al. 24. p. 104. Gr. 101. [n] Vid. L. 2. c. 32. al. 56, p. 165. Gr. 187. And see p. 314, 315, of this chapter.

the

the Mount, recorded by St. Matthew. But he does not drop any intimation of his being reſtrained to any one part of the New Teſtament, as particularly received by them, whilſt they rejected the reſt.

CHAP. IV.

Of CERINTHUS.

SECT. I. *Ancient Authors who ſpeak of Cerinthus.*

THE time of Cerinthus being uncertain, I ſhall immediately tranſcribe the paſſages of divers authors concerning him, beginning with Irenæus, for the ſake of his antiquity.

And [a] Cerinthus in Aſia taught that the world was not made by the ſupreme God, but by a certain power ſeparate from him, much below him, and ignorant of him. Jeſus he ſuppoſed not to be born of a virgin, which to him appeared impoſſible, but to be the ſon of Joſeph and Mary, born altogether as other men are; but he excelled all men in virtue, knowledge, and wiſdom. At his baptiſm the Chriſt came down upon him, from him who is over all, in the ſhape of a dove: and then he declared to the world the unknown Father, and wrought miracles. At the end the Chriſt left Jeſus; and Jeſus ſuffered and roſe again; but the Chriſt being ſpiritual was impaſſible.

Again he ſays, 'And [b] there are ſome who have heard Polycarp ſay that John the diſciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Epheſus, and ſeeing Cerinthus already in the bath, came out again in haſte, ſaying to thoſe who were with him, let us flee hence, leſt the bath ſhould fall while Cerinthus the enemy of truth is within.' This ſtory I have examined in another [c] place;

[a] Et Cerinthus autem quidem in Aſia, non a primo deo factum eſſe mundum docuit, ſed a virtute quadam valde ſeparata et diſtante ab ea principalitate, quæ eſt ſuper univerſa, et ignorante eum qui eſt ſuper omnia deum. Jeſum autem ſubjecit, non ex virgine natum; (impoſſibile enim hoc ei viſum eſt,) fuiſſe autem eum Joſephi et Mariæ filium, ſimiliter ut reliqui omnes homines, et plus potuiſſe juſtitia, prudentia, et ſapientia, ab hominibus. Et poſt baptiſmum deſcendiſſe in eum ab ea principalitate quæ eſt ſuper omnia Chriſtum figura columbæ, et tunc annuntiaſſe incognitum patrem, et virtutes perfeciſſe: in fine autem revolaſſe iterum Chriſtum de Jeſu, et Jeſum paſſum eſſe, et reſurrexiſſe: Chriſtum autem impaſſibilem perſeveraſſe, exiſtentem ſpiritalem. l. i. c. 26. al. 25. p. 105. Gr. 102.

[b] L. 3. c. 3. p. 177. Gr. 204.

[c] Vol. ii. p. 86, 87.

and

and ſhall now add nothing to what was then ſaid, except it be that [d] Baſnage, [e] Miſſuet, and ſome others, as it ſeems to me, do not repreſent it rightly. For they ſuppoſe Irenæus to ſay that he himſelf had received that account from Polycarp; whereas I think Irenæus ſays no more than this, that there were ſome who had heard it from Polycarp.

In another place Irenæus ſays 'they [f] who ſeparate Jeſus 'from the Chriſt, and ſay that the Chriſt was always impaſſible, 'whilſt Jeſus ſuffered, preferring the goſpel according to Mark, 'may be confuted by it, if they have a love of truth.' Grabe [g] thinks this to be ſaid of the Cerinthians. Maſſuet diſputes this; but perhaps his arguments are of no great moment; however, it is not eaſy to conceive any reaſon why theſe perſons ſhould prefer Mark before the other evangeliſts. And moreover it is generally allowed that they received St. Matthew's, if not the other goſpels, alſo. Nevertheleſs Mr. Lampe [h] is entirely of the ſame opinion with Grabe.

Once more, that learned and pious ancient ſays that 'John [i] 'the diſciple of the Lord wrote his goſpel to confute the doctrine 'lately taught by Cerinthus, and a great while before by thoſe 'called Nicolaitans, a branch of the Gnoſtics, and to ſhew that 'there is one God who made all things by his word: and not, as 'they ſay, that there is one the Creator, and another the Father 'of our Lord: and one the ſon of the Creator, and another, even 'the Chriſt, who deſcended from above upon the Son of the 'the Creator, and continued impaſſible, and at length returned 'to his pleroma or fulneſs.' St. Jerom [k] has ſomewhat to the like purpoſe concerning the occaſion of St. John's writing his goſpel.

[d] Ann. An. 101. Vol. 2. p. 6. No. 11.

[e] Diſſ. Iren. p. lxiv. n. vi. de Cerintho.

[f] Qui autem Jeſum ſeparant a Chriſto, et impaſſibilem perſeveraſſe Chriſtum, paſſum vero Jeſum dicunt, id quod ſecundum Marcum eſt præferentes Evangelium, cum amore veritatis legentes illud corrigi poſſunt. L. 3. c. xi. p. 190. Maſſ. Gr. 220, 12.

[g] Cerinthum ejuſque ſequaces indicat: adeo ut hos Marci evangelium recepiſſe conſtet. Gr. ad loc. p. 220.

[h] Cerinthianos procul dubio intelligit, quando ait, 'Qui autem Jeſum ſeparant 'a Chriſto.' Unde ſaltem patet, quod Marci quoque Evangelio locum fecerint. Lampe Prol. in Johan. p. 135.

[i] Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes domini diſcipulus, volens per evangelii enuntiationem auferre eum qui a Cerintho inſeminatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ, qui ſunt vulſio ejus quæ falſo cognominatur ſcientia; ut confunderet eos, et ſuaderet, quoniam unus deus, qui omnia fecit per verbum ſuum, et non quemadmodum illi dicunt, alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem patrem domini, et alium quidem fabricatoris filium, alterum vero de ſuperioribus Chriſtum, quem et impaſſibilem perſeveraſſe, deſcendentem in Jeſum filium fabricatoris, et iterum revolaſſe in ſuum pleroma. L. i. c. xi. p. 188. Maſſ. p. 218. Gr.

[k] Noviſſimus omnium ſcripſit evangelium—Adverſus Cerinthum, alioſque hæreticos, et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma conſurgens, qui aſſerunt Chriſtum ante Mariam non fuiſſe, &c. De V. I. c. ix.

Let

Let us now take Epiphanius's account. His ſummary is to this purpoſe: the [l] Cerinthians, called alſo Merinthians, are Jews, (or of Jewiſh extract) valuing themſelves upon circumciſion. They ſay, that the world was made by angels, and that Jeſus by increaſe of virtue came to be Chriſt.

In his larger work he ſays that, 'like [m] the Carpocratians, they 'ſay Jeſus was born of Joſeph and Mary, and that the world 'was made by angels. Indeed they differ little or nothing from 'them, except that they [n] are for obſerving the Jewiſh rites, in 'part at leaſt. They ſay that the law and the prophets pro-'ceeded from angels, and that he who gave the law was one of 'the angels that made the world. This Cerinthus lived in Aſia, 'and there firſt publiſhed his doctrine. He ſaid [o] that when 'Jeſus was grown up, the Chriſt, that is, the Holy Spirit, came 'down upon him at Jordan, in the ſhape of a dove from the ſu-'preme Deity: and revealed to him, and by him to others, the 'unknown Father. Whereupon when that power had come 'down upon him from above, he wrought great miracles. He 'likewiſe ſaid that Jeſus ſuffered and roſe again, but the Chriſt 'that came down upon him from above was always impaſſible: 'and that when Jeſus ſuffered, the Chriſt left him. This ſame 'man is one of thoſe, who, in the time of the apoſtles, cauſed a '[p] diſturbance; when James [q] and they that were with him ſent 'letters to the diſciples at Antioch: ſaying, *Foraſmuch as we 'have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you 'with words.* And he was alſo one of thoſe who *contended with 'Peter*, when he was returned to Jeruſalem, after he had been 'at the houſe of Cornelius by the direction of the Holy Ghoſt, 'ſaying, [r] *thou wenteſt in to men uncircumciſed, and didſt eat with them.* 'But this [s] was before he preached his doctrine in Aſia. This 'ſame [t] falſe apoſtle Cerinthus was alſo with thoſe who made a 'ſedition at Jeruſalem, when Paul came thither with Titus, 'ſaying, [u] *that he had brought uncircumciſed men into the tem-'ple, and had defiled that holy place.*' Epiphanius adds, 'they

[l] ιουδαιοι τινες την περιτομην αυχουντες. ιησουν δε κατα προκοπην χριστον κεκλησθαι. p. 53. [m] H. 28. p. 110, &c.

[n] εν τω προσεχειν τω ιουδαισμω απο μερους. H. C. [o] ανωθεν δε εκ του αιωθεν μετα το αδρυνθηναι τον ιησουν. κατεληλυθεναι τον χριστον εις αυτον, τουτ' εστι το πνευμα αγιον εν ειδει περιστερας εν τω ιορδανη, και αποκαλυψαι αυτω, και δι' αυτου τοις μετ' αυτον τον αγνωστον πατερα, και δια τουτο, επειδη ηλθεν η δυναμις εις αυτον ανωθεν, δυναμεις επιτελεκεναι. πεποιθοτα δε τον ιησουν, και παλιν εγηγερμενον, χριστον δε του ανωθεν ελθοιτα εις αυτον απαθη αιαπταιτα. Ib. p. 110. D. 111. A. [p] P. 111. B. C. [q] Acts xv. 24. [r] Acts xi. 22, 23.

[s] Εποιησε δε τουτο κηρυθεις, πριν η εν τη ασια, κηρυξαι το αυτου κηρυγμα, και εμπεσειν εις το περισσοτερον της εαυτου απωλειας εκαθεζον. p. 111. C. [t] Ib. n. iv. p. 112. C. D. [u] Acts xxi. 28.

'use [x] the gospel of Matthew, though not entire; but they prefer this on account of the genealogy which relates properly to his flesh. They also endeavour to bring proofs from this gospel in favour of circumcision, arguing from another part, *It [y] is enough for the disciple that he be as his master.* Christ was circumcised and kept the law, and why should not you likewise. As for Paul [z] they quite reject him, because he was against circumcision, and says, *they [a] who are justified by the law, are fallen from grace:* and *if ye are circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.*' He afterwards says that [b] the same people are also called Merinthians; but he does not know whether Cerinthus was also called Merinthus, or whether there was another called Merinthus, who was joined with him. But, as we have already said, he often [c] opposed the apostles not only at Jerusalem but in Asia also, both he and his adherents.

This is Epiphanius's account, who, as we see, makes additions to Irenæus, saying that 'he opposed the apostles in Judea, 'and out of it, early and late.'

Let us now see what Theodoret says: 'About the same time,' he had before mentioned the Ebionites and Nazarenes, 'Cerinthus was the author of another heresy or sect. Having 'been a long while in Ægypt, and studied philosophical learning; at length he came into Asia, and gathered disciples, 'which he called after his own name. He taught that there is 'one [d] God over all; nevertheless he did not make the world, 'but some other powers separate from him, and ignorant of him. 'He said, as the Jews generally do, that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, but that he excelled other men in wisdom,

[x] χρωνται γαρ τω κατα ματθαιον ευαγγελιω απο μερους, και ουχι ολω, αλλα δια την γενεαλογιαν την ενσαρκον. H. F. lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 219. [y] Matt. x. 25. [z] Τον δε παυλον αθετουσι δια το μη πειθεσθαι τη περιτομη. Ib. n. v. p. 113. C. [a] Gal. v. 2, 4. [b] Ibid. n. 8. p. 115. D. [c] Οτι ου μονον αυτος εν ιεροσολυμοις πολλακις αντειπε τοις αποστολοις, αλλα και οι συν αυτω εν ασια. N. 8. p. 116. [d] ενα μεν ειναι τον των ολων θεον. τον ιησουν δε, τοις εβραιοις καθαπλησιως, εφησε κατα φυσιν εξ ανδρος γεγενησθαι και γυναικος τω ιωσηφ και της μαριας, σωφροσυνη δε, και δικαιοσυνη, και τοις αλλοις αγαθοις διαφερειν. Τον δε χριστον εν ειδει περιστερας ανωθεν εις αυτον κατελθειν, και τηνικαυτα τον αγνωμενον κηρυξαι θεον, και τας αναγραπτας επιτελεσαι θαυματουργιας. Κατα δε τον του παθους καιρον αποστηναι μεν τον χριστον, το δε παθος υπομειναι τον ιησουν. Ουτος αποκαλυψεις τινας ως αυτος τεθεαμενος επλασατο, και απειλων τινων διδασκαλιας συνεθηκε, και τω κυριω την βασιλειαν εφησεν επιγειον εσεσθαι. H. T. lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 219.

'temperance,

'temperance, righteousness, and all virtues; that the Christ de-'scended upon him from above in the shape of a dove, and 'then he preached the unknown God, and performed the mi-'racles which are recorded of him; that at the time of his 'passion the Christ withdrew from him, and that Jesus only suf-'fered. He forged some revelations as seen by himself, adding 'certain woes and threatenings. He said that the kingdom of 'our Lord is terrestrial, or that he would reign on this earth; 'for he dreamed of eating and drinking, and marriage, and sa-'crifices, and festivals to be accomplished at Jerusalem, and to 'last for a thousand years: for so long he thought the kingdom 'of the Lord would endure. Against him wrote not only the fore-'mentioned authors, but Caius also, and Dionysius bishop of 'Alexandria. And it is said that the divine evangelist John, 'going to bathe, and seeing Cerinthus, said "Let us flee "hence, lest the bath should fall upon Cerinthus, and we share "in the same ruin."

SECT. II. *Observations relative to the Time of Cerinthus.*

I NOW proceed to make remarks. Other authors have spoken of Cerinthus; but I hope to bring in their accounts under the following observations.

One thing is very observable, that these three learned writers vary very much. Epiphanius and Theodoret say divers things of Cerinthus, which Irenæus, the most ancient, takes no notice of. That I may omit no particular of moment, I shall consider the time and history of Cerinthus, then his sentiments, next his manners, and, lastly, the scriptures received by him.

Baronius speaks of Cerinthus at several years of the first century, not very long after our Saviour's ascension; Le Clerc at the year 80; Basnage at the year 101, in their several ecclesiastical histories. By some he is esteemed a heretic of the first, by others of the [e] second, century. It is reckoned to be observable that Epiphanius placeth the Cerinthians after the Carpocratians. And Irenæus intimates that the doctrine of the Cerinthians had been long before taught by the Nicolaitans. Theodoret, in a place not yet quoted, says, 'it [f] was reported that Cerinthus

[e] Non disputo nunc de Cerinthi ætate, quæ saltem quoad erroris propalationem Joanne recentior videtur, uti infra indicabitur. Lamp. Proleg. p. 69. in. Cerinthum veto seculo demum secundo, et quidem non ante Hadrianum, vel Antoninum Pium emersisse, vix dubitamus. Id. ib. p. 182. Vid. et p. 184, 186.

[f] Και κηρινθον δε φασιν, ιωαννου του πανευφημου του το θειον συγγραψαντος ευαγγελιον ετι περιοντος, τα της οικειας αιρεσεως παρασπειραι ζιζανια. H. F. l. 2. Pr. p. 216. C.

'sowed the seeds of his principles whilst the excellent evan-'gelist John was still living:' which implies that Cerinthus did not arise in the early days of the apostles, but only some short time before the death of St. John, who was the longer liver of them. And in the appendix to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions, it is expressly said that [g] Cerinthus arose after the Carpocratians, as it is [h] in Philaster likewise. I might add that [i] Jerom also has this order, Saturninus, Carpocrates, Cerinthus and Ebion, whom he calls his successor. However, I cannot say that all this is sufficient to fix the time of Cerinthus with any certainty or exactness.

Sect. III. *Observations tending to illustrate his History.*

As for his history, there is scarce any one thing in which the three forementioned writers of heresies agree, except in this, that he was of Asia, or that he lived there chiefly. Epiphanius says that the Cerinthians were Jews, but neither of the other two says so expressly. Epiphanius speaks much of the opposition made by Cerinthus to the apostles upon the point of circumcision, of which the other two say nothing. And the truth of this is disputed by some learned moderns, particularly [k] Basnage, and [l] Lampe. They say there wanted not any particular leader in that affair. The prevailing sentiments of the Jewish people, especially of the pharisees, would incline many to insist upon circumcision as necessary. If Cerinthus had been at the head of all the disturbances raised at Jerusalem upon that account in the time of the apostles, why should he not have been named as well as Simon Magus, Alexander, Hymenæus, and Philetus? Farther, they say that Cerinthus did not appear in the world till afterwards. They think these considerations sufficient to overthrow a story that relies almost entirely upon the credit of Epiphanius, [m] and is not mentioned by more early writers.

Sect.

[g] Post hunc Cerinthus hæreticus erupit, similia docens. Pr. cap. 48. p. 252. A. p. 216, 14. [h] H. 36. See note P, p. 325.

[i] Ad eos venio hæreticos, qui evangelia laniaverunt: Saturninum quemdam, et Ophitas, et Cainæos, et Setthoitas, et Carpocratem, et Cerinthum, et huius successorem Ebionem. Adv. Lucif. Tom. 4. p. 304. M.

[k] Non nobis unquam Epiphanii probari sententia potuit qui Cerinthum illis præficit qui de disciplinæ Mosaicæ observandæ necessitate ingentes in Ecclesia Antiochena turbas commovere, quibus sedandis concilium apostolorum Hierosolymis convocatum est. Ann. ad An. 101. No. xi. p. 6. vol. 2. Vid. etiam ejusd. Exercit. Hist. Criti. p. 358. 367. [l] Prolegom. ubi supra. [m] However it is likewise mentioned by Philaster, who says: Hic sub apostolis quæstionem seditionis commovit, dicens debere circumcidi homines: cujus

SECT. IV. *Of his Principles and Sentiments.*

WE come now to his principles: what they are ſaid to have been we have ſeen; but the accounts are not without their difficulties. Tillemont therefore at the beginning of his [n] article of the Cerinthians ſays not much beſide the purpoſe. The church was from the beginning diſturbed with two oppoſite hereſies, which produced each one divers ſects. One, which had Simon for it's author, held two principles, and ſaid that our Saviour was man in appearance only, who are generally called Gnoſtics and Docetæ. The other hereſy oppoſite to this is that of the Jews, who embraced the Chriſtian faith, but not in all it's extent. They acknowledged one principle, and one God, and the reality of the human nature in Jeſus Chriſt. But they denied his divinity, and were fond of the ceremonies of the law. Nevertheleſs, however contrary theſe opinions are to each other, as well as to truth, the devil found means to join them, in order to form the monſtrous body of the doctrine of the Cerinthians.

Cerinthus accordingly is reckoned by not [o] a few moderns a Gnoſtic; and yet he is no where ſaid to have held the eternity of matter; nor was he a Docete, for he aſſerted the real humanity of Jeſus. Moreover he is placed by Theodoret in the ſecond book of his heretical tables among thoſe who held one principle.

However, let us go over particulars. And in one thing all the forementioned writers agree, that Cerinthus taught one ſupreme God, but that the world was not made by him, but by angels.

Concerning the perſon of Jeſus likewiſe, their accounts agree in the main; that he ſaid Jeſus was a man born of Joſeph and Mary, and that at his baptiſm the Holy Ghoſt, or the Chriſt, deſcended upon him, after which he wrought the miracles recorded of him, and in the end died and roſe again; but that the Chriſt was impaſſible. And much to the ſame purpoſe we may obſerve [p] in

cius cauſa contra illum, et hæreſim ejus receperunt in ſuis Actibus apoſtoli ſententiam, non debere jam homines judaiſmo, id eſt, circumciſioni, aliiſque talibus ſuperſtitionis vanæ parere carnalibus, qui ex gentibus venientes credebant in Chriſtum dominum noſtrum ſalvatorem. H. 36.

[n] Mem. Ec. Tom. 2.

[o] Cerinthus enim, quatenus nobis ex hiſtoria vetere innotuit, vere fuit Gnoſticus, et ex diſciplina Gnoſticorum, ſui petiit ſubſidia erroris. Lampe. Prol. in Johan. Vid. etiam Clerici Hiſt. Ecc. An. 80. p. 493. 1. Rectius cum Gnoſticis componitur Cerinthus. Moſh. H. Ecc. Seculum 1. pt. 11. c. 3. § 15. p. 66. Helms. 1755.

[p] Cerinthus ſucceſſit huius (Carpocratis) errori, et ſimilitudini vanitatis, docens de generatione itidem ſalvatoris, deque creatura angelorum. in nullo diſcordans

in Philaſter, Auguſtine [q], and the author of the Appendix to Tertullian, the [r] remainder of whoſe article concerning Cerinthus I now tranſcribe at the bottom of the page.

But perhaps it may be queſtioned whether the opinion of the Cerinthians be rightly repreſented. They might ſpeak of Jeſus as a man only, though they thought him to be born of a virgin. That they allowed this, may be argued with a good deal of force, if they received St. Matthew's genealogy, as it perhaps may appear afterwards that they did. The opinion that Jeſus was born of Joſeph and Mary was not only wrong, but likewiſe unpopular among Chriſtians. And I apprehend that this is falſely aſcribed to ſome who ſpoke of Jeſus as a man only, till the Holy Ghoſt came down upon him. Epiphanius, in his article of the Alogians, having obſerved Matthew's account of our Lord's being born of a virgin, and that he was deſcended from David and Abraham, ſays, 'hence [s] Cerinthus and Ebion argue that Jeſus 'was a mere man, as do alſo Merinthus and Cleobius, or Cleo-'bulus, and Claudius, and Demas and Hermogenes.' But what reaſon has Epiphanius to aſcribe to all theſe, particularly to Demas and Hermogenes, the ſame opinion that he ſometimes aſcribes to Cerinthus, that Jeſus was born as other men are? However, if they received the genealogy in Matthew, as he ſays they did, [t] they might argue that Jeſus was truly a man, but muſt allow that he was born of a virgin.

They allowed the Holy Ghoſt to have deſcended upon Jeſus at his baptiſm; which is agreeable to our goſpels. But by the Holy Ghoſt probably they did not mean a perſon but a power, as Epiphanius expreſſeth it. And as to what is ſaid that the Holy Ghoſt, or the Chriſt, was impaſſible, and left Jeſus to ſuffer alone, their real opinion may have been only and no more than this, that the divine nature in Jeſus, or the power that came

diſcordans ab eo, niſi quia ex parte ſolum legi conſentit, quod a deo data ſit, et ipſum dominum Judæorum eſſe æſtimat, qui legem dedit filiis Iſrael. Docet autem circumcidi, et ſabbatizare, et Chriſtum nondum reſurrexiſſe a mortuis, ſed reſurrecturum annunciat. H. 36.

[q] Mundum ab angelis factum eſſe dicentes, et carne circumcidi opertere, atque alia hujuſmodi legis præcepta ſervari. Jeſum hominem tantummodo fuiſſe, nec reſurrexiſſe, ſed reſurrecturum aſſeverantes. H. 8.

[r] Poſt hunc (Carpocratem) Cerinthus hæreticus erupit ſimilia docens. Nam et ipſe mundum inſtitutum eſſe ab illis dicit: Chriſtum ex ſemine Joſeph natum proponit, hominem illum tantummodo ſine divinitate contendens, ipſam quoque legem ab angelis datam perhibens. Judæorum deum non dominum, ſed angelum promens. Pr. cap. 48. p. 252. A. p. 216, 14.

[s] Ενθεν γαρ οι περι κηρινθον φιλον τον ανθρωπον κατεσχον... Αντιλεγοντες γαρ τοις τω κυριω μαθηταις κατ' εκεινο καιρω, απο της κατα τον αβρααμ, και δαβιδ γενεαλογιας, την αυτων αιωιαν επειρωντο παριςαν. Ep. Her. 51. p. 427. C. D.

[t] Ο μεν γαρ Κηρινθος και Καρποκρας τω αυτω χρωμενοι δηθεν παρ αυτοις Ευαγγελιω απο της αρχης τω κατα Ματθαιον Ευαγγελιω, Δια της γενεαλογιας Βυλονται παριςαν εκ σπερματος Ιωσηφ και Μαριας ειναι τον χριςον. Ad Hær. 30. No. 14. p. 138. C. D. See alſo the quotation, note [r].

down

down upon him at baptism, and by which he wrought miracles, did not suffer.

Irenæus and Epiphanius, in passages before cited, said expressly that Jesus rose again after he had suffered; which is not denied by Theodoret. Nevertheless, in another place he says, 'they [u] supposed that Christ, or rather Jesus, who suffered and 'was crucified, was not risen, but would rise again in the general 'resurrection of the dead.' And so likewise say [x] Philaster and Augustine. What they mean by this I cannot tell; but I take the former account to be right, that they said Jesus was risen. However, we have here a farther proof that these people believed the resurrection of the dead; in which too they differed from those called Gnostics.

He was zealous for circumcision, and the rights of the Mosaic law, as Epiphanius says again and again; though no notice is taken of this by Irenæus or Theodoret. And it is somewhat strange that he should be so zealous for the law, if he taught that the world was made by angels, and that the God of the Jews, by whom the law was delivered, was not the supreme God, but an angel only. According to Jerom this was the principal error of Cerinthus, that [y] he was for joining the law with the gospel.

Once more, Cerinthus is supposed to have been a Millenarian; so says Theodoret, though neither Irenæus, nor Epiphanius make any mention of it. What Theodoret says must have been taken from the works of Caius, and Dionysius, or the extracts out of them in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History: of which we gave a large account [z] formerly. This is also mentioned [a] by Augustine. But Philaster, and the author of the Appendix to Tertullian, are silent upon this head; and Le Clerc [b] seems scarcely convinced that this error is rightly imputed to him.

[u] χριστὸν πεπονθέναι καὶ ἐσταυρῶσθαι, μηπω ἐγηγερθαι μέλλειν δὲ ἀνίστασθαι, ὅταν ἡ καθόλου γένηται νεκρῶν ἀνάστασις. H. 28. n. 6. p. 113. D. [x] See p. 325, n. p, and 326, n. q.

[y] Si hoc verum est, in Cerinthi et Ebionis hæresim delabimur, qui credentes in Christo propter hoc solum a patribus anathematizati sunt, quod legis cæremonias Christi evangelio miscuerunt: et sic nova confessi sunt, ut vetera non amitterent. Ep. 74. al. 89. p. 623. M.

[z] See vol. ii. p. 377, 378, and vol. iii. p. 103, &c. See also the quotation below.

[a] Mille quoque annos post resurrectionem in terreno regno Christi, secundum carnales ventris et libidinis voluptates, futuros fabulantur. Unde etiam Chiliastæ sunt appellati. H. 8. [b] Caius qui sub finem secundi aut initio tertii seculi floruit, prodidit in dialogo cujus locum profert Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 28. Cerinthum qui per revelationes quasi a magno apostolo scriptas portenta finxerat, velut ab angelis sibi ostensa, intromisisse hanc doctrinam; qua affirmat, post resurrectionem regnum Christi in terris futurum, et rursus cupiditatibus et voluptatibus carnem Jerosolimæ versantem servituram. Quin et dixisse inimicum illum scripturarum divinarum, fallere volentem, in nuptialibus festis mille annorum spatium transactum iri. Cujus erroris etiam Dionysius Alexandrinus eum incusabat, ut eodem loco docet Eusebius. 'Quod si 'verum sit,' Chiliastarum hic conditor haberi possit. Clerici. H. E. § 1. p. 493. II. See the original of this passage, p. 329, note [n].

Sect. V. *Of his Morals.*

I should have had no occasion to have said any thing of Cerinthus's manners, if some learned moderns [c] had not represented him as a vicious person; for which I can see no good ground. They build upon some expressions of Dionysius of [d] Alexandria: but they are only words of course in the way of controversy. And the catholics, who expected a Millennium, [e] had the same notion of it that he is said to have had. There was nothing unlawful in either, though it was low and mean. And what may satisfy us that Cerinthus was not a bad man, is this; that nothing of that kind is said of him by the writers of heresies: not by Irenæus, nor Epiphanius, nor Theodoret, nor the rest.

Sect. VI. *What Scriptures he received.*

Cerinthus received the scriptures of the Old Testament. Of this I think there can be no doubt: for it is not denied by any; and it is plainly supposed by those writers, who speak of his zeal for the peculiarities of the law of Moses.

1. He received the gospel of St. Matthew, as Epiphanius says expressly in the place at first quoted from him; though not entire,

[c] Non erant Cerinthi mores doctrinâ suâ sanctiores teste Dionysio Alexandrino: Hæc enim fuit illius opinio: regnum Christi terrenum futurum. Et quarum rerum cupiditate ipse flagrabat utpote voluptatibus corporis obnoxius, carnisque addictus, in iis regnum dei situm fore somniavit, in ventris et earum quæ infra ventrem sunt partium explenda libidine; hoc est in cibo et potu, ac nuptiis: atque ut honestiori vocabulo ejusmodi voluptates velaret, in festis, et sacrificiis, et hostiarum mactionibus. Basnag. Annales. An. 101. XI.

[d] Κηρινθον δε τον και την απ' εκεινου κληθεισαι Κηρινθιανην συστησαμενον αιρεσιν, αξιοπιστον επιφημισαι, θελησαντα τω εαυτου πλασματι ονομα. τουτο γαρ ειναι της διδασκαλιας αυτου το δογμα, επιγειον εσεσθαι την του χριστου Βασιλειαν και ων αυτος ωρεγετο φιλοσωματος ων και πανυ σαρκικος, εν τουτοις ονειροπολειν εσεσθαι. γαστροις και των υπο γαστερα πλησμοναις τουτεστι σιτιοις και ποτοις και γαμοις και δι' ων ευθυμοτερον ταυτα ωηθη πορισεσθαι, εορταις και θυσιαις και ιερειων σφαγαις. Eus. Ecc. Hist. Lib. 7. C. 25. p. 273. A. B. Vid. Credib. vol. iii. p. 104, 105.

[e] Νεπως Επισκοπος....Ιουδαικωτερον τας επηγγελμενας τοις αγιοις εν ταις θειαις γραφαις επαγγελιας αποδοθησεσθαι διδασκων, και τινα χιλιαδα ετων τρυφης σωματικης επι της ξηρας ταυτης εσεσθαι υποτιθεμενος. Ibid. C. 23. p. 270. D. 271. A.

Την δε του συνγραμματος τουτου διδασκαλιαν ως μεγα δη τι και κεκρυμμενον μυστηριον κατεπαγγελομενων, και τους απλουστερους αδελφους ημων ουδεν εωντων υψηλον και μεγαλειον φρονειν ουτε περι της ενδοξου και αληθως ενθεου του Κυριου ημων επιφανειας, ουτε της ημετερας εκ νεκρων αναστασεως, και της προς αυτον επισυναγωγης και ομοιωσεως· αλλα μικρα και θνητα και οια τα νυν ελπιζειν αναπειθοντων εν τη Βασιλεια του Θεου. Ibid. cap. 24. p. 271. D. Cred. vol. iii. p. 112, 113.

tire, as he there mentions. But he did not, as is ſuppoſed by many to be the meaning of that paſſage, reject the firſt, or the firſt and ſecond chapters of St. Matthew. For it ſeems to me,[f] that he does there plainly ſay they received the goſpel, and were fond of it on account of the genealogy. Moreover in the article of the Ebionites he[g] ſays, it is allowed by all that Cerinthus made uſe of the beginning of St. Matthew's goſpel, and from thence endeavoured to prove that Jeſus was deſcended in a natural way from Joſeph and Mary. And another paſſage, cited not long ago[h] from his article of the Alogians, deſerves to be here taken into conſideration.

2. If the paſſage of Irenæus before quoted[i] relate to the Cerinthians, (as ſome think) they preferred the goſpel of St. Mark to the reſt; but it does not therefore follow that he received no other; for he certainly received St. Matthew's, if not all the goſpels: but it is by no means clear that that paſſage does refer to them.

3. If there be any truth in the accounts of his being a Millenarian, it is highly probable that he reſpected the apoſtle John, if the Revelation be a work of that apoſtle. Several writers, who did not like the Millenarian doctrine received by many catholics, affirmed the book of the Revelation, upon which they chiefly built, to be a work not of St. John, but of Cerinthus. So did Caius, as is allowed by Grabe and Mill, in paſſages formerly quoted in this[k] work. I put down here another paſſage of[l] Mill. Beauſobre[m] was clearly of the ſame opinion. And Theodoret in the paſſage cited above ſays, that Cerinthus forged ſome revelations, as ſeen by himſelf: probably meaning thoſe in the book of the Revelation, which we have. Caius's words are, 'Cerinthus[n] alſo, who by revelations, as written by

[f] See the obſervation on the quotation, p. 322, note [x].

[g] Ο μεν γαρ κηρινθος και καρποχρας τω αιτω χρωμενοι δηθεν παρ' αυτοις ευαγγελιω, ετοτας αρχης τε κατα ματθαιον ευαγγελιε δια της γενεαλογιας δεδονται παριεναι εκ σπερματος ιωσηφ και μαριας ειναι τον χριστον. H. 30. n. 14. p. 138. D.

[h] See before note [x]. p. 322.

[i] See before, p. 320. note [f].

[k] See vol. ii. p. 378, 379. vol. iii. p. 104, 116.

[l] Sin autem apoſtoli hujus haud fuerit Apocalypſis, cujus obſecro? Cerinthi. Id enim affirmabat Caius in diſputatione habita coram Zephyrino, &c. Mill. Prol. n. 167.

[m] On fait mention d'une Apocalypſe de Cerinthe, ſuppoſée ſous le nom de S. Jean; et l'on ſe figure deux Apocalypſes, l'une et l'autre attribuées á cet Apôtre. On ſe fonde ſur un paſſage de Caius, Prêtre de Rome, allegué par Euſebe. Mais on peut s'aſſurer, que Caius parle de l'Apocalypſe de S. Jean. Hiſt. Manich. T. i. p. 455.

[n] Αλλα και Κηρινθος ο δι' Αποκαλυψεων ως απο Αποστολε μεγαλε γεγραμμενων, τερατολογιας ημιν ως δι' αγγελων αυτω δεδειγμενας ψευδομενος, επεισαγει λεγων, μετα την αναστασιν επιγειον ειναι το Βασιλειον τε Χριστε. και παλιν επιθυμιαις και ηδοναις εν Ιερουσαλημ την σαρκα πολιτευομενην δελευειν. και εχθρος υπαρχων ταις γραφαις τε Θεε, αριθμον χιλιονταετιας εν γαμω εορτης θελων πλαναν λεγει γενεσθαι. Euſ. H. E. L. 3. C. 28. p. 100. A.

'a great

Sect. V. *Of his Morals.*

I should have had no occasion to have said any thing of Cerinthus's manners, if some learned moderns [c] had not represented him as a vicious person; for which I can see no good ground. They build upon some expressions of Dionysius of [d] Alexandria: but they are only words of course in the way of controversy. And the catholics, who expected a Millennium, [e] had the same notion of it that he is said to have had. There was nothing unlawful in either, though it was low and mean. And what may satisfy us that Cerinthus was not a bad man, is this; that nothing of that kind is said of him by the writers of heresies: not by Irenæus, nor Epiphanius, nor Theodoret, nor the rest.

Sect. VI. *What Scriptures he received.*

Cerinthus received the scriptures of the Old Testament. Of this I think there can be no doubt: for it is not denied by any; and it is plainly supposed by those writers, who speak of his zeal for the peculiarities of the law of Moses.

1. He received the gospel of St. Matthew, as Epiphanius says expressly in the place at first quoted from him; though not en-

[c] Non erant Cerinthi mores doctrinâ suâ sanctiores teste Dionysio Alexandrino: Hæc enim fuit illius opinio: regnum Christi terrenum futurum. Et quarum rerum cupiditate ipse flagrabat utpote voluptatibus corporis obnoxius, carnisque addictus, in iis regnum dei situm fore somniavit, in ventris et earum quæ infra ventrem sunt partium explenda libidine; hoc est in cibo et potu, ac nuptiis: atque ut honestiori vocabulo ejusmodi voluptates velaret, in festis, et sacrificiis, et hostiarum mactionibus. Basnag. Annales. An. 101. XI.

[d] Κηρινθον δε τον και την απ' εκεινου κληθεισαν Κηρινθιανην συστησαμενον αιρεσιν, αξιοπιστον επιφημισαι, θελησαντα τω εαυτου πλασματι ονομα. τουτο γαρ ειναι της διδασκαλιας αυτου το δογμα, επιγειον εσεσθαι την του χριστου Βασιλειαν και ων αυτος ωρεγετο φιλοσωματος ων και πανυ σαρκικος, εν τουτοις ονειροπολειν εσεσθαι. γαστροις και των υπο γαστερα πλησμοναις τουτεστι σιτιοις και ποτοις και γαμοις και δι' ων ευθυμοτερον ταυτα ωηθη πορειεισθαι, εορταις και θυσιαις και ιερειων σφαγαις. Eus. Ecc. Hist. Lib. 7. C. 25. p. 273. A. B. Vid. Credib. vol. iii. p. 104, 105.

[e] Νεπως Επισκοπος....Ιουδαικωτερον τας επηγγελμενας τοις αγιοις εν ταις θειαις γραφαις επαγγελιας αποδοθησεσθαι διδασκων, και τινα χιλιαδα ετων τρυφης σωματικης επι της ξηρας ταυτης εσεσθαι υποτιθεμενος. Ibid. C. 23. p. 270. D. 271. A.

Την δε του συγγραμματος τουτου διδασκαλιαν ως μεγα δη τι και κεκρυμμενον μυστηριον κατεπαγγελομενων, και τους απλουστερους αδελφους ημων ουδεν εωντων υψηλον και μεγαλειον φρονειν ουτε περι της ενδοξου και αληθως ενθεου του Κυριου ημων επιφανειας, ουτε της ημετερας εκ νεκρων αναστασεως, και της προς αυτον επισυναγωγης και ομοιωσεως· αλλα μικρα και θνητα και οια τα νυν ελπιζειν αναπειθοντων εν τη Βασιλεια του Θεου. Ibid. cap. 24. p. 271. D. Cred. vol. iii. p. 112, 113.

tire,

tire, as he there mentions. But he did not, as is supposed by many to be the meaning of that passage, reject the first, or the first and second chapters of St. Matthew. For it seems to me,[f] that he does there plainly say they received the gospel, and were fond of it on account of the genealogy. Moreover in the article of the Ebionites he[g] says, it is allowed by all that Cerinthus made use of the beginning of St. Matthew's gospel, and from thence endeavoured to prove that Jesus was descended in a natural way from Joseph and Mary. And another passage, cited not long ago[h] from his article of the Alogians, deserves to be here taken into consideration.

2. If the passage of Irenæus before quoted[i] relate to the Cerinthians, (as some think) they preferred the gospel of St. Mark to the rest; but it does not therefore follow that he received no other; for he certainly received St. Matthew's, if not all the gospels: but it is by no means clear that that passage does refer to them.

3. If there be any truth in the accounts of his being a Millenarian, it is highly probable that he respected the apostle John, if the Revelation be a work of that apostle. Several writers, who did not like the Millenarian doctrine received by many catholics, affirmed the book of the Revelation, upon which they chiefly built, to be a work not of St. John, but of Cerinthus. So did Caius, as is allowed by Grabe and Mill, in passages formerly quoted in this[k] work. I put down here another passage of[l] Mill. Beausobre[m] was clearly of the same opinion. And Theodoret in the passage cited above says, that Cerinthus forged some revelations, as seen by himself: probably meaning those in the book of the Revelation, which we have. Caius's words are, 'Cerinthus[n] also, who by revelations, as written by

[f] See the observation on the quotation, p. 322, note [x].

[g] Ο μεν γαρ κηρινθος και καρποχρας τω αυτω χρωμενοι δηθεν παρ' αυτοις ευαγγελιω, ἀπο της αρχης τȣ κατα ματθαιον ευαγγελιȣ δια της γενεαλογιας βȣλονται παριςαν εκ σπερματος ιωσεφ και μαριας ειναι τον χριςον. H. 30. n. 14. p. 138. D.

[h] See before note [x]. p. 322.

[i] See before, p. 320. note [f].

[k] See vol. ii. p. 378, 379. vol. iii. p. 104, 116.

[l] Sin autem apostoli hujus haud fuerit Apocalypsis, cujus obsecro? Cerinthi. Id enim affirmabat Caius in disputatione habita coram Zephyrino, &c. Mill. Prol. n. 167.

[m] On fait mention d' une Apocalypse de Cerinthe, supposée sous le nom de S. Jean; et l'on se figure deux Apocalypses, l'une et l'autre attribuées á cet Apôtre. On se fonde sur un passage de Caius, Prêtre de Rome, allegué par Eusebe. Mais on peut s'assurer, que Caius parle de l'Apocalypse de S. Jean. Hist. Manich. T. i. p. 455.

[n] Αλλα και Κηρινθος ο δι' Αποκαλυψεων ως απο Αποςολȣ μεγαλȣ γεγραμμενων, τερατολογιας ημιν ως δι' αγγελων αυτω δεδειγμενας ψευδομενος, επεισαγει λεγων, μετα την αναςασιν επιγειον ειναι το Βασιλειον τȣ Χριςȣ. και παλιν επιθυμιαις και ηδοναις εν Ιερȣσαλημ την σαρκα πολιτευομενην δȣλευειν. και εχθρος υπαρχων ταις γραφαις τȣ Θεȣ, αριθμον χιλιονταετιας εν γαμω εορτης θελων πλαναν λεγει γενεσθαι. Eus. H. E. L. 3. C. 28. p. 100. A.

'a great

'a great apostle, imposeth upon us monstrous relations of things 'of his own invention, as shewn him by an angel, says that, after 'the resurrection, there shall be a terrestrial kingdom of Christ. 'This, I think, may be reckoned a strong argument for the anti-'quity of the Revelation. And if there be any truth in what is 'said of Cerinthus being a Millenarian, it is probable he made 'use of our book of Revelation, ascribed to John, upon which 'all the Millenarian schemes were founded. But whether he 'wrote the book himself in the name of John, or only appealed 'to it in support of his opinions, it is a proof he respected that 'apostle. And if he did, it is probable that he received his gos-'pel and the epistle generally ascribed to [o] him.'

4. Philaster says that 'Cerinthus [p] did not receive the apostle 'Paul, but honoured the traitor Judas. That he received only 'the gospel of Matthew, rejecting the other three gospels, and 'the Acts of the apostles.' But what Philaster says, in which he is not supported by others, I apprehend needs not to be much minded.

Epiphanius however, as before quoted, says that 'the [q] Ce-'rinthians reject Paul.' Nevertheless, there may be some reason to question the truth of this, from what Epiphanius himself says elsewhere. For [r] he informs us there was a tradition, that when some of them had died without baptism, others were baptized for them, lest at the time when they should be hereafter raised up at the general resurrection, they should be punished for that omission. And it was supposed that St. Paul refers to it in 1 Cor. xv. 29. But he says there is another and better interpretation of that text. And he afterwards [s] argues against them from Isaiah, and from St. Luke's and St. John's gospels, which seems to imply that they respected these parts of scripture, as well as the gospel of Matthew, some part of St. Paul's writings, and the Revelation of St. John. Upon the whole then, it appears highly probable that Cerinthus flourished in the latter end of the first, or very early in the second century. And it is certain, that the Old Testament, and several of the books of the New Testament, were received by him.

[o] Vid. Lampe Pro. in Johan.

[p] Apostolum Paulum non accipit. Judam traditorem honorat. Evangelium secundum Matthæum solum accipit. Tria Evangelia spernit. Actus Apostolorum abjicit. H. 36. p. 79, 80.

[q] Hær. 28. n. vi. p. 113. C. See before, p. 322, note [z].

[r] Εν οις και τι παραδοσεως πραγμα ηϑεν εις ημας, ως τινων μεν παρ' αυτοις προφθανοντων τελευτησαι ανευ βαπτισματος, αλλους δε αντι αυτων εις ονομα εκεινων βαπτιζεσθαι.... και τουτου ενεκα η παραδοσις η ελθουσα εις ημας φησι τον αυτον αγιον αποστολον ειρηκεναι, ει ολως νεκροι ουκ εγειρονται. κ. τ. λ. Ep. Hær. 28. n. vi. p, 114. B. C.

[s] Ibid. 11. vii. p. 115. A. B.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of Prodicus and his followers.

Sect. I. *Of the Account of him from Clemens Alexandrinus.*

Prodicus is wanting in Irenæus, the additions to Tertullian's prescriptions, Eusebius, and Philaster. He is mentioned by Tertullian and Theodoret, as we shall see distinctly hereafter. But our chief intelligence must come from Clement of Alexandria, by whom he is spoken of several times.

In one place he says that 'the [a] followers of Prodicus boasted 'of having the secret books of Zoroaster.' By which, as also by some other passages of Clement, we perceive that there was a sect or heresy called after Prodicus.

In another place, having spoken of some loose principles ascribed to the Carpocratians, or others, he says, 'like [b] things 'to these are the doctrines taught by the followers of Prodicus, 'who falsely call themselves Gnostics. They say they are by 'nature the children of the supreme Deity: but they dishonour 'their high birth and freedom: for they live as they chuse; 'and they chuse to live in pleasure. They scorn to be con-'trouled, as being lords of the sabbath, and the king's chil-'dren; and kings are above laws: nevertheless they do not 'every thing they will, being restrained by the laws; and what 'they do they do not as kings, but as the vilest slaves: for 'they practise uncleanness, but privately, fearing punishment, 'and guarding against discoveries. But how is this consistent 'with freedom, when the apostle says, *he that committeth sin, is* '*the servant of sin.* And how, when they do these things, which 'are despised and prohibited by the Gentiles, that is, when they 'are covetous, unrighteous, intemperate, impure, can they say 'that they only know God? And if we say, as John in his epis-'tle, that *we have fellowship with him, and we walk in darkness, we* '*lie and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the*

[a] Βιβλους αποκρυφους τ' ανδρος του δε οι την προδικου μετιοντες αιρεσιν αυχουσι κεκτησθαι. Str. i. p. 304. B.

[b] Τοιαυτα και οι απο προδικου, ψευδωνυμως γνωστικους σφας αυτους αναγορευοντες, δογματιζουσιν. υιους μεν φυσει του πρωτου θεου λεγοντες αυτους, καταχρωμενοι δε τη ευγενεια και τη ελευθερια, ζωσιν ως βουλονται, βουλονται δε φιληδονως. Κρατηθηναι υπ' ουδενος νενομικοτες, ως αν κυριοι του σαββατου, και υπερ απαντος γενους πεφυκοτες βασιλειοι παιδες. Λαθρα γαρ μοιχευουσιν, και αλοναι δεδιοτες, και το καταγνωσθηναι εκκλινοντες. Ποθεν ουν κρειττους εισι των κοσμικων, οι τοιαυτα πρασσοντες, και τοις χειριστοις των κοσμικων ομοιοι; Str. 3. p. 438, 439.

'*light,*

'*light, we have fellowſhip with him, and the blood of Jeſus Chriſt his* '*ſon cleanſeth us from ſin*; (1 John i. 6, 7.) And how are they 'better than the men of the world, who do theſe things, and are 'like to the worſt men in the world?'

SECT. II. *Of Theodoret's Account of him, in which he is far from being exact.*

THEODORET's article of Prodicus following that of Carpocrates is to this purpoſe: 'Prodicus[c] ſucceeding to him, inſti-'tuted the ſect of the Adamites. He made this addition to the 'doctrine of Carpocrates, that men ſhould commit lewdneſs 'openly: for he ordained that women ſhould be common,'[d] and what follows. For proof of which he partly quotes, and partly refers to the afore-cited, and another paſſage of Clement of Alexandria. Nor does it appear that Theodoret had any authority for what he ſays here, or elſewhere, very much to the diſparagement of Prodicus and his followers, but that of Clement of Alexandria; upon whom therefore I ſhall make the following remark, leaving others after all, to judge as they ſee good.

[c] H. T. l. i. c. 6. p. 177.

[d] What Theodoret further ſays will be conſidered when we come to ſpeak of the Adamians. In proof of what he here advances, he refers to Clement of Alexandria, from whom he has inſerted two quotations, which however related to the conduct of ſome other heretics, and not at all to that of Prodicus. In the laſt part of what he ſays concerning him, he inſerts the beginning of the paſſage which I have before tranſcribed at large, viz. "Such "things the followers of Prodicus teach, "falſely calling themſelves Gnoſtics," &c. The whole of what he had before quoted from Clement, belongs to the Carpocratians or ſome others, and not to Prodicus; to whom it can be made to refer only by way of implication. What I have here taken notice of, hath been long ago obſerved by Bayle, whoſe words under the article Prodicus are theſe; "I ought to "add, that with regard to another cir-"cumſtance, Theodoret was not ſo exact "as he ſhould have been, in quoting from "Clement of Alexandria. He makes "him ſay of Prodicus what is properly "and directly ſaid of ſome others, and "cannot be applied to him but in gene-"ral, and by means of ſeveral indirect ar-"guments." In another place, § he joins Prodicus with Carpocrates, the Cainites, and ſome others, and ſays, "They taught, "that ſouls were ſent into this world, to "practiſe all manner of ſenſuality and "iniquity, and by ſuch purſuits, to pay "homage to the angels who had created "the world." It is very apparent then that the authority of Theodoret is not additional to that of Clement; for what he ſays concerning Prodicus he takes from him, and doth not even quote him fairly.

§ II. F. L. v. C. 9. p. 273. D. C. 20. p. 297. B. Compare C. 27. p. 311. D, 312. A.

SECT.

SECT. III. *Observations on the Account given us by Clemens Alexandrinus, which renders it probable they were not such licentious Livers as they are there said to have been.*

1. IT is hard to think that men should be quite so bad as there intimated, who boasted of serving God; and who made a profession of excelling Gentiles and men of the world. It does not seem to me that men could be totally abandoned to all excess, with whom Clement would think to argue so mildly, but strongly, as he does from the words of St. Paul and St. John, and likewise of our Lord, which I have in the forecited passage omitted. He seems to me to have been of opinion that these men would be affected by this argument; which is more than could be hoped of men openly or determinedly wicked and profligate.

2. It is somewhat probable, that Clement did not certainly know they allowed themselves in the practice of those things which are generally agreed to be evil. For he only says they did them in private, and endeavoured to conceal the knowledge of it from the world.

3. The case seems to me to be this. These men had some principles, and used some expressions which might be abused, or which Clement thought might be abused, and understood to countenance the practice of wickedness. But they, it is likely, did not see that consequence: nor intended that any such deductions or conclusions should be drawn from their doctrine. If there were nothing more to be alleged in favour of this than what hath been said already, this observation might be reckoned to have some degree of probability.

But there are divers other things by which this observation may be supported. For having cited some expressions of Carpocrates, or of some of that sect, he says, 'if[e] these, like the 'Valentinians, intended spiritual communions, possibly some 'might receive their opinion: but to make carnal communion 'a mean to prophecy or inspiration, must be the sentiment of 'those only who despair of salvation.' Then follows the passage above cited. The like things say also the followers of Prodicus. But I imagine that Clement may be here mistaken: and

[e] Ει γαρ και ουτοι, καθαπερ και οι απο Ουαλεντινου, πνευματικας ετιθεντο κοινωνιας, ισως τις αυτων την υπολημψιν επεδεξατο· σαρκικης δε υβρεως κοινωνιαν εις προφητειαν αγιαν αναφερειν απεγνωκοτος εστι την σωτηριαν. Τοιαυτα και οι προδικου κ. λ. St. 3. p. 438. B.

that

'*light, we have fellowſhip with him, and the blood of Jeſus Chriſt his ſon cleanſeth us from ſin*; (1 John i. 6, 7.) And how are they better than the men of the world, who do theſe things, and are like to the worſt men in the world?'

SECT. II. *Of Theodoret's Account of him, in which he is far from being exact.*

THEODORET's article of Prodicus following that of Carpocrates is to this purpoſe: 'Prodicus[c] ſucceeding to him, inſtituted the ſect of the Adamites. He made this addition to the doctrine of Carpocrates, that men ſhould commit lewdneſs openly: for he ordained that women ſhould be common,'[d] and what follows. For proof of which he partly quotes, and partly refers to the afore-cited, and another paſſage of Clement of Alexandria. Nor does it appear that Theodoret had any authority for what he ſays here, or elſewhere, very much to the diſparagement of Prodicus and his followers, but that of Clement of Alexandria; upon whom therefore I ſhall make the following remark, leaving others after all, to judge as they ſee good.

[c] H. T. l. i. c. 6. p. 177.

[d] What Theodoret further ſays will be conſidered when we come to ſpeak of the Adamians. In proof of what he here advances, he refers to Clement of Alexandria, from whom he has inſerted two quotations, which however related to the conduct of ſome other heretics, and not at all to that of Prodicus. In the laſt part of what he ſays concerning him, he inſerts the beginning of the paſſage which I have before tranſcribed at large, viz. "Such "things the followers of Prodicus teach, "falſely calling themſelves Gnoſtics," &c. The whole of what he had before quoted from Clement, belongs to the Carpocratians or ſome others, and not to Prodicus; to whom it can be made to refer only by way of implication. What I have here taken notice of, hath been long ago obſerved by Bayle, whoſe words under the article Prodicus are theſe; "I ought to "add, that with regard to another circumſtance, Theodoret was not ſo exact "as he ſhould have been, in quoting from "Clement of Alexandria. He makes "him ſay of Prodicus what is properly "and directly ſaid of ſome others, and "cannot be applied to him but in gene"ral, and by means of ſeveral indirect ar"guments." In another place, § he joins Prodicus with Carpocrates, the Cainites, and ſome others, and ſays, "They taught, "that ſouls were ſent into this world, to "practiſe all manner of ſenſuality and "iniquity, and by ſuch purſuits, to pay "homage to the angels who had created "the world." It is very apparent then that the authority of Theodoret is not additional to that of Clement; for what he ſays concerning Prodicus he takes from him, and doth not even quote him fairly.

§ II. F. L. v. C. 9. p. 273. D. C. 20. p. 297. B. Compare C. 27. p. 311. D, 312. A.

SECT.

SECT. III. *Observations on the Account given us by Clemens Alexandrinus, which renders it probable they were not such licentious Livers as they are there said to have been.*

1. IT is hard to think that men should be quite so bad as there intimated, who boasted of serving God; and who made a profession of excelling Gentiles and men of the world. It does not seem to me that men could be totally abandoned to all excess, with whom Clement would think to argue so mildly, but strongly, as he does from the words of St. Paul and St. John, and likewise of our Lord, which I have in the forecited passage omitted. He seems to me to have been of opinion that these men would be affected by this argument; which is more than could be hoped of men openly or determinedly wicked and profligate.

2. It is somewhat probable, that Clement did not certainly know they allowed themselves in the practice of those things which are generally agreed to be evil. For he only says they did them in private, and endeavoured to conceal the knowledge of it from the world.

3. The case seems to me to be this. These men had some principles, and used some expressions which might be abused, or which Clement thought might be abused, and understood to countenance the practice of wickedness. But they, it is likely, did not see that consequence: nor intended that any such deductions or conclusions should be drawn from their doctrine. If there were nothing more to be alleged in favour of this than what hath been said already, this observation might be reckoned to have some degree of probability.

But there are divers other things by which this observation may be supported. For having cited some expressions of Carpocrates, or of some of that sect, he says, 'if [e] these, like the 'Valentinians, intended spiritual communions, possibly some 'might receive their opinion: but to make carnal communion 'a mean to prophecy or inspiration, must be the sentiment of 'those only who despair of salvation.' Then follows the passage above cited. The like things say also the followers of Prodicus. But I imagine that Clement may be here mistaken: and

[e] Ει γαρ και ουτοι, καθαπερ και οι απο Ουαλεντινου, πνευματικας ετιθεντο κοινωνιας, ισως τις αυτων την υπολημψιν επεδεξατο· σαρκικης δε εξεως κοινωνιαν εις προφητειαν αγιαν αναγειν απιγνωστος εστι της σωτηριας. Τοιαυτα και οι προδικου κ. λ. St. 3. p. 438. B.

that

that the expressions which he quotes, and at which he is so much offended, may be understood in the same way, as he himself interpreted some expressions of the Valentinians. I might add, that Clement himself was not quite certain [f] that the Carpocratians were the authors of this book, from which he took these words. Another thing leading to this apprehension is in the midst of the passage above quoted. But, says Clement, [g] shall any one sin wilfully, and attempt to establish a doctrine for licensing and encouraging adultery, and such like offences? When any sin unwillingly, we pity them; but this is a different case; all which joined with what Clement says, of their practising lewdness in private, about which perhaps he had no certain information, makes me think that he only suspected them, without any clear proof, and that this suspicion was founded on their doctrine or expressions misunderstood, and not on their conduct. However, after all, let every one judge as the evidence appears to him.

Sect. IV. *They are accused of believing the uselessness of Prayer.*

I proceed to another passage. Clement is discoursing of prayer. 'Some,' says he, [h] have appointed times of prayer, 'the third for instance, the sixth, and the ninth hour of a day. 'But a Gnostic prays his whole life. Here,' says he, 'I [i] recollect some of another opinion, particularly the sect of Prodicus, 'who say we need not pray at all. This then is another opinion 'of these people, that prayer is needless.' Clement immediately adds, 'nor let them boast of this impious opinion, as if it 'were new, and their own invention. It was before them the 'opinion of the Cyrenaic philosophers.' Tillemont says, [k] they learnt it from the Cyrenaic philosophers, but that does not appear to be Clement's meaning. What was their error does not, I think, clearly appear. Clement proceeds to argue upon the point; but he does not argue as if he thought them wicked and abandoned men. Their opinion, whatever it was, seems to have

[f] Ερρυη δε ουτως το δογμα εκ τινος αποκρυφυ. και δη παραθησομαι την λεξιν την της τυτων ασελγειας μητερα. Και ειτε αυτοι της βιβλυ συγγραφεις, κ. λ. Str. 3. p. 437. D. 438. A. [g] Εκων δε τις αμαρτανειν βυλεται, και δογμα τιθησι μοιχευειν και καθηδυπαθειν—, οπυγε και τυς αλλυς ακοντας αμαρτανοντας ελευμεν. Ib. p. 438. D.

[h] Ει δι τινες και ωρας τακτας αποιεμυσιν ευχη,...αλλ'υν γε ο γνωστικος παραπολον ευχεται τον βιον. Str. 7. p. 722. C.

[i] Ειταυθα γενομενος, υπεμνησθην, των περι τυ μη δειν ευχεσθαι....τυτεστιν των αμφι την προδικυ αιρεσιν.....μαθετωσαν προειληφθαι μεν υπο των κυρηναικων λεγομενων φιλοσοφων. Ib. D. [k] Ce qu'ils avoient tiré des philosophes Cyrenaiciens. Les Carpocrat. Mem. Ecc. F. 2.

been

been deduced from ſome notions of the divine goodneſs, and from a miſapplication of ſome texts of ſcripture; as if good men needed not to aſk, but might hope for all neceſſary things without particular petitions, or expreſs requeſts for them. Wherefore Clement argues after this manner: 'It[1] is allowed on all 'hands, that God fully knows thoſe who are worthy of receiving 'good things, and thoſe who are not; from whence it follows, 'that God gives to all what is fit, therefore he gives not to bad 'men though they aſk often, and is ever ready to give to the 'good. Nevertheleſs prayer is not uſeleſs, though he ſhould 'give good things without being aſked. On which account 'thankſgiving and petition well becomes a Gnoſtic: and in par-'ticular he may pray for the converſion of others. Our Lord 'himſelf prayed. And even that faith whereby we believe we 'ſhall receive, is a kind of mental prayer becoming a Gnoſtic.'

SECT. V. *From the arguments uſed about them by Clement, it appears they reſpected Chriſt and the Scriptures.*

CERTAINLY I think it muſt be acknowledged that the men with whom Clement ſo argues, reſpected our Lord and the ſcriptures, and were not void of the fear of God. They hoped, or ſuppoſed themſelves to be good men, and that they ſhould receive good things from God. And their omitting prayer, or not performing it exactly, as ſome others did, was founded probably upon ſome reaſonings about the divine perfections, though wrong, and upon ſome texts of ſcripture, but miſinterpreted. Clement's expreſſions perhaps may lead us to ſome texts, by which they were aſſerted, particularly Matt. xxi. 22. Mark xi. 24. John xvi. 26. 1 John iii. 22. But even theſe texts do overthrow the doctrine which they are reported to have held.

[1] Καθολω γαρ ο Θεος οιδεν τους τε αξιους των αγαθων, και μη οθεν τα προσηκοντα εκαστοις διδωσιν. Διο πολλακις μεν αιτησασιν αναξιοις ουκ αν δοιη· δοιη δε αξιοις δηλονοτι υπαρχουσιν. Ου μην παρειλκει η αιτησις, καν χωρις αξιωσεως διδοται τα αγαθα....και τοι και η πιστις τε ληψεσθαι ειδος ευχης εστοχασμενης γινεται. Ib. p. 723. A. B.

SECT.

Sect. VI. *They are accused of denying the Necessity of suffering for Religion.*

Tertullian says that 'Prodicus [m] was against men's exposing themselves to danger in the profession of religion.' He there joins Valentinus with him, as he does also in another [n] place, upon a different account, as if the followers of Prodicus and Valentinus agreed in their notions about the divine government. But perhaps we need not rigorously understand Tertullian, [o] who, when a Montanist, was against flight in persecution.

Sect. VII. *Of the Time and general Character of Prodicus and his followers.*

Having seen all these passages, we may perhaps form some conjecture about the time and general character of this sect, the followers of Prodicus, though we have not very exact accounts of their particular principles. They are not mentioned by any original writers, except by Clement and Tertullian. For as to Theodoret, he has no authority but Clement, and is inaccurate in that article. Prodicus and his followers are generally supposed to be successors of the Carpocratians, or followers of them. Theodoret says so expressly. But when what is observed above is duly considered, that Theodoret is not exact in his quotations from Clement, and that he lays hold of whatever he can against them, the conclusion is not certain. Tertullian has joined them with the Valentinians: which is perhaps as material a passage as any. As for the time in which he lived, it seems to me, that Clement never intimates Prodicus to be living in his days. He speaks only of the sect or followers of Prodicus. Prodicus himself probably had been dead some while before, and he may be reckoned an early heretic, near the time of Valentinus, possibly about the year 120, or between that and the

[m] Quod si jam tunc Prodicus aut Valentinus adsisteret, suggerens, non in terris esse confitendum apud homines; minus vero, ne Deus humanum sanguinem sitiat Scorp. c. 15. p. 633. D.

[n] Quum alius deus infertur adversus creatorem. Tunc male, quum plures, secundum Valentinos et Prodicos: tunc in monarchiæ eversionem quam in creatoris destructionem. Adv. Prax. c. 3. p. 636. C.

[o] Quum igitur fides æstuat, et ecclesia exuritur de figura rubi, tunc Gnostici erumpunt et tunc Valentiniani proserpunt, tunc omnes martyriorum refragatores ebulliunt, calentes et ipsi offendere, figere, occidere. Scorp. c. 1. p. 616. C.

year

year 130. Baronius [p] ſpeaks of him under the year 120, and places him next to Valentinus.

We ſhould obſerve farther, that Tertullian has not any where dropt any expreſſion repreſenting Prodicus and his followers as wicked and irreligious men.

Finally, from Clemens Alexandrinus, [q] we may conclude, that Prodicus and his followers did not ſeparate themſelves from the other Chriſtian Churches: nor is any thing to the contrary expreſsly ſaid by any other author.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Adamians or Adamites.

SECT. I. *The Accounts of theſe People from Epiphanius and Auſtin.*

'THE Adamians,' ſays [a] Epiphanius in his Summary, 'meet 'together, men and women, naked as they were born: and ſo 'perform readings, prayers, and other acts of religious worſhip. 'They are a kind of monks, [b] and reject marriage. They call 'their church paradiſe.'

I immediately tranſcribe in the margin [c] a part of Auguſtine's article, who follows the above Summary.

In his larger work Epiphanius ſays, 'he had no certain ac-'count of theſe people: which we ſhall more particularly ob-'ſerve by and by.' After which, and ſome other things in his introduction, he proceeds: 'Their [d] churches are ſtoves, made 'warm for the reception of company by a fire underneath. 'When they come to the door they pull off their clothes, both 'men and women, and enter naked into the place of meeting. 'Their preſidents and teachers do the ſame, and they ſit toge-'ther promiſcuouſly. And ſo they perform their readings and 'other parts of worſhip naked. They have among them per-'ſons who make profeſſions of celibacy and virginity, and boaſt

[p] His Valentini diſcipulis enumeratis haud placet inter eos ab aliis recenſeri Prodicum. A. 175. p. 33. Vid. ad an. 120. n. 38.

[q] Strom. L. 3. p. 438. B.

[a] P. 397.

[b] Δηθεν μοναζοντες τε και ὑποκριτευομενοι οιτες. Ib.

[c] Adamiani ex Adam dicti, cujus imitantur in paradiſo nuditatem, quæ fuit ante peccatum. Unde et nuptias averſantur. Nudi itaque mares feminæque conveniunt, nudi lectiones audiunt, nudi orant, nudi celebrant ſacramenta. Et ex hoc paradiſum ſuam arbitrantur eccleſiam. H. 31.

[d] Εν υποκαυσεσις οικοδομεισθαι. H. 52. n. 2. p. 459. B.

'of it. When [c] any are guilty of faults, they are rejected, and 'cast out of the society: like as Adam, when he had transgressed 'in eating the forbidden fruit, was cast out of paradise. For [f] 'they reckon their church an emblem of paradise, and them-'selves imitators of Adam and Eve. When they go out of the 'place of meeting they clothe themselves again.'

Sect. II. *Considerations tending to prove there never were such heretics.*

These are the Adamites; and that there never were any such people, I apprehend, will appear from these considerations.

1. They are not mentioned by any ancient writer before Epiphanius that I remember: not by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Eusebius, Philaster, or any other.

2. Epiphanius had no certain knowledge of them, or account of them, as he expressly owns again and again. He had [g] heard of them from many; but he had never been himself acquainted with any of them; nor had he met with any account of them in writing. Again, he [h] did not know whether there were any such people then in being, nor whether the account or description that had been given him of them was true. But he thought it to be the safest way to relate what he had heard, lest he should be guilty of a faulty omission in not recording it.

Is not this sufficient to satisfy us there never were any Adamites? For what reason can there be to believe it, when the first, and almost only reporter, owns that he did not know whether there were any such people then in being, nor whether there ever had been any such men, as were described to him: and that he had not found any account of them in any writers before him. Nor does he give any the least intimation of the time when this sect sprung up, nor of the country where they had appeared.

[c] Εἰδὲ δοξειε, τινα, ως και τυτο λεγεσιν, εν παραπτωματι γενεσθαι, εκετι τυτον συναγεσι. p. 459. C.

[f] Ηγενται γαρ την εαυτων εκκλησιαν ειναι τον παραδεισον, και αι τες εισι της περι αδαμ και εναν. Ib. D.

[g] Τυτο δε απο ακοης αιδρων πολλων ακηκοστες φαμεν, ου γας εν συγγραμμασιν ηυραμεν, η περιετυχομεν τοις τισι. p. 458. C.

[h] Ειτε γαρ εστιν η τοιαυτη, ειτε μη εστι, πολλων λεγοντων ακηκοστες, ασφαλειας χαριν, και περι αυτης ειπειν ευλογον μοι πεφηνε, και μη παραλειψαι, εαν τε καταλυεται, και εκετι υπαρχη· ου γαρ ασφαλως επισταμαι, ει εστι εστιν, η μη εστι. p. 459. A.

SECT. III. *An Objection taken from the Practice of the Gnostics, and Answers.*

IT may be here objected, that in another place Epiphanius says 'the [i] Gnostics prayed naked:' therefore there had been people who might be called Adamites.

To which I answer, 1. That the Gnostics and the Adamites are not the same sect or people. According to Epiphanius the Gnostics were a vicious people, and practised lewdness in their assemblies. But he does not lay any such thing to the charge of those whom he calls Adamians. These, as he represents them, endeavoured to imitate Adam and Eve, not only in the nakedness, but likewise in the innocence of their original states.

Another thing which fully shews that Gnostics and Adamians are quite different is, that Epiphanius had never met with any written accounts of these last, nor known any of them; whereas he had personally known some Gnostics, if he may be relied on, and certainly had met with accounts of them in many ancient writers whom he had read.

2. What Epiphanius says of the Gnostics is not true. To take here the words of Beausobre, Clement [k] of Alexandria was well acquainted with the Gnostics, especially those of Ægypt. He often confutes them in his works; but never upon any occasion reproacheth them with nakedness in any respect. And when he mentions the reports that went about of the impure worship of the Carpocratians and others, (for they were but reports) he allows them some remains of modesty; for he says that 'before [l] committing their secret abominations they extinguished the lights, which might have made them blush.' This does not suit the impudence of men who affected perfect nakedness in divine service.

SECT. IV. *An Objection taken from Theodoret's Assertion, that Prodicus instituted the Sect of the Adamites, answered.*

STILL it may be objected that [m] Theodoret says, 'Prodicus 'instituted the sect of the Adamites.' To which I answer, that Theodoret had no knowledge of Prodicus but what he received

[i] Ἐγρήγορται γυμνὸς ὅλῳ τῷ σώματι. H. 26. n. v. p. 87. C.
[k] Diss. sur les Adamites, Vol. ii. p. 356. [l] Str. 3. p. 430. D.
[m] Τὴν τῶν καλουμένων ἀδαμιτῶν συνέστησατο αἵρεσιν. H. F. p. 197. B.

from Clement of Alexandria, who ſays not any ſuch thing of him. Nor could Prodicus be the author of the Adamian cuſtom of praying naked, if he was againſt praying at all, as it is ſaid. The Adamians, as we have plainly ſeen from Epiphanius, were never mentioned by ancient authors. Theodoret probably learned the name and account of them from Epiphanius; and raſhly and haſtily, and groundleſsly ſays of Prodicus that he was the author of this ſect. And I humbly conceive that Theodoret is to be blamed for this inaccuracy.

I may therefore conclude that the Adamians are an imaginary ſect, invented upon ſome ſlight pretext, and received without examination. I apprehend likewiſe that I have reaſon to ſay others are more to blame than Epiphanius: he reports only hearſay; and he over and over declares it was no more; and that he had never any acquaintance with any of them, nor had met with any account of them in any of the authors whom he had read. And are not men to be blamed who believe and relate again as certain what is reported to them upon no better grounds than this?

With regard to ſtories that have been in the world of ancient and modern Adamites, I would refer to Beauſobre's diſſertation at the end of [n] Lenfant's hiſtory of the war of the Huſſites, and to [o] ſeveral articles in Bayle's Dictionary.

CHAP. VII.

Of MARC and his Followers, called Marcoſians.

SECT. I. *Of his Time, his Country, and the Sect from which he ſprang.*

I BELIEVE I ſhould ſcarce have thought it needful to take particular notice of the Marcoſians had it not been for Irenæus, who has not only left a long account of them in his firſt [a] book, tranſcribed by [b] Epiphanius, but in his preface to his ſecond book, reviewing what he had done in the former, he [c] ſpeaks again of that account as ſomewhat of no ſmall importance.

[n] At Amſterdam, 1731. 4to. [o] Adamites. Picards. Prodicus.
[a] Lib. i. ad cap. 13. [al. 8.] p. 59. ad cap. 21. [al. 18.] p. 98. [b] H. 34.
[c] Et Marci quoque magi ſententiam, cum ſit ex his, cum operibus ejus omni diligentia expoſuimus, lib. 2. Pr. p. 115.

The

The order in Epiphanius and Auguſtine is Marc, Colorbaſus or Colarbaſus, and Heracleon. In Philaſter, and the Additions to Tertullian, Heracleon, Marc, Colorbaſus. But [d] Dodwell and [e] Maſſuet are of opinion that Colorbaſus [f] preceded Marc.

Maſſuet computes that [g] Marc appeared about the year 160. As Euſebius ſeems to have underſtood [h] Irenæus to ſay that Marc appeared about the ſame time with Valentinus; Baſnage [i] ſpeaks of him at the year 127.

Many learned moderns are of opinion that [k] Marc belonged to the Valentinian ſchool, only making ſome alterations in the ſchemes of Valentinus, and Ptolomy, and Colorbaſus, his immediate predeceſſors and maſters; and they ſeem to have reaſon for ſo doing from [l] Irenæus himſelf, and from [m] Tertullian. Nor needs Jerom to be reckoned to diſſent, though he calls [n] Marc a Baſilidian Gnoſtic. Nevertheleſs [o] Rhenford and [p] Beauſobre ſay the Marcoſians were Jews, or Judaizing Chriſtians; and Grabe [q] likewiſe owns that they were of Jewiſh extract.

It may be argued that Marc was an Aſiatic; becauſe Irenæus ſpeaks of his having ſeduced the wife of a catholic deacon in that part of the world [r].

We might be apt to conclude from Irenæus's manner of writing, that Marc himſelf had come into Gaul, and made many converts there; and ſo Jerom [s] underſtood him. Nevertheleſs learned moderns [t] think that they were only diſciples of Marc, who came into that country near where Irenæus reſided, of whom, [u] in one place, he makes particular mention.

[d] Diſſ. Iren. iv. n. 19.

[e] Diſſ. Præ. Iren. p. xlix. n. 84.

[f] Vid. Iren. lib. i. c. 14. [al. 10.] init.

[g] Ibid. p. 51. n. 86.

[h] H. Ec. l. 4. c. xi. p. 124. C. D.

[i] Annal. ad. an. 127.

[k] Dodw. Diſſ. Iren. iv. n. 18. Maſſ. Diſſ. Pr. Iren. p. 50. n. 86. Baſn. Ann. 127. n. ii. Tillem. Les Marcoſiens in Mem. E. T. 2. [l] L. i. c. 13 et 14.

[m] Cui[ſ]idem veteris opinionis ſemen nactus (Valentinus) Colarbaſo viam delineavit. Eam poſtmodum Ptolomæus inſtravit, nominibus et numeris æonum diſtinctis in perſonales ſubſtantias....Deducit et Heracleon inde Pamites ſuos, et ſecundus et magus Marcus. Adv. Valent. c. 4. p. 284. D. [n] Refert Irenæus...quod Marcus quidam de Baſilidis Gnoſtici ſtirpe deſcendens, primum ad Gallias venerit: et eas partes, per quas Rhodanus et Garumna fluunt, ſua doctrina maculaverit, maximaque nobiles feminas, quædam in occulto myſteria repromittens, hoc errore ſeduxerit: magicis artibus et ſecreta corporum voluptate, amorem ſui concilians. Ep. 53. al. 29. Tom. 4. p. 581. M. Conf. eund. ad. If. cap. lxiv.

[o] Cum itaque Marcoſii et Heracleonitæ vel Judæi origine eſſent, quod quidem ex doctrina et lingua facile conjeceris, vel certe Judæorum morem ſequerentur. Rhendf. de Redemp. Marcoſ. &c. n. xxiii. p. 201. Sed quicquid ſit, nobis non dubium eſt, quin Marcus et Heracleon Ebionitæ fuerint, id eſt, ex Judæis Chriſtiani. Ibid. n. lxv. p. 224. et paſſim.

[p] Une branche de Chretiens Judaizans, quoiqu' on les mette dans la claſſe des Gnoſtiques. Hiſt. Manich. T. i. p. 368.

[q] Sed et alia huius vocabuli [redemtionis] notio inter iſtos hæreticos, origine, niſi fallor, Judæos, obtinuit. Grab. in Iren. c. 21. al. 18. [r] Lib. i. c. 13. al. 8. p. 63. [s] See before note [n].

[t] Vid. Maſſ. p. li. n. 87.

[u] Τοιαυτα δε λεγοιτες και πραττοντες, και εν τοις καθ' ημας κλιμασι της ροδανουσιας, πολλας εξηπατηκασι γυναικας. Ibid. cap. 13. p. 65.

Sect. II. *He is accused of being a Magician.*

I now intend to take notice of what Irenæus relates: but his account being long, and obscure in several parts, it must be abbreviated.

Marc, he says, deceived not a few persons of both sexes, improving upon the schemes of the forementioned Ptolomy and Colorbasus, and pretending to great discoveries above all others. He was exceeding skilful in all magical arts, whereby he had great success, persuading men to hearken to him as most knowing [x].

Not only Irenæus, but Tertullian [y] likewise, and [z] Theodoret, call Marc a magician. However, several of the writers of heresies, whom I generally quote, say nothing particularly of that matter: as Philaster, Augustine, and the author of the Additions to Tertullian.

Several instances Irenæus gives of the magical arts of Marc: one may be supposed to have a relation to the Eucharist. Consecrating [a] a cup with wine, and using a long invocation, he makes the wine red or purple, to persuade them the grace from above causeth his blood to distil into it: he also puts cups into the hands of women that they may consecrate and do the like. He also gives them a smaller cup, he holding another of a larger size in his own hands; and when they empty their cup into his, though it be larger, it is filled, and even overflows. But I apprehend that such things as these, if really done, are not proofs of magic; they are only slight-of-hand tricks, by which heedless spectators, especially if they are willing to be deceived, may be imposed upon.

[x] γυναικι και ανδρας υπ' αυτου πεπλανημενα τε και πεπλανημενους επηγαγετο....μαγικης υπαρχων κυβειας εμπειροτατος...προσεχειν αυτω ως γνωσικωτατω, και δυναμιν την μεγιστην απο των αρρητων και ακατονομαστων τοπων εχοντι. * cap. 13. [al. 8.] in. p. 59.

[y] See before note [m], p. 341.

[z] Ο δε μαρκος, και γοητειαν ησκηθη, και τινα παραδοξα δια μαγγανειας επιτελων, πολλους μεν εκαλωσατο ηπατησεν. H. F. l. i. p. 201.

[a] Ποτηρια οινου κεκραμενα προστιθεμενος ευχαριστειν, και επι πλειστον εκτεινων του λογου της επικλησεως, πορφυρια και ερυθρα αναφαινεσθαι ποιει· ως δοκειν την απο των υπερ τα ολα χαριν το αιμα το εαυτης σταζειν εν τω εκεινου ποτηριω. Ib. p. 60, 61.

* The chapter from whence this is quoted, which is the eighth in Grabe's edit. of Irenæus, is in Latin. Grabe, in the notes, has quoted from Epiphanius all the words from μαγικης to the end. The passage in Irenæus is, Alius vero quidam ex iis qui sunt apud eos magistri, emendatorem se esse glorians, (Marcus est autem illi nomen,) Magicæ impostura peritissimus, per quam et multos viros et non paucas faminas seducens ad se convertit velut ad scientissimum et perfectissimum et virtutem maximam ab invisibilibus et ab inenarrabilibus locis habentem fecit. Irenæus ap. Grabe, cap. 8. p. 56. Ox. 1702. Vid. Grab. not. in locum.

Sect.

SECT. III. *He is said to have had an assisting Dæmon, and to have used various arts of deceiving.*

IRENÆUS adds; 'It [b] seems likely that he has an assisting 'dæmon, whereby he himself appears to prophesy, and enables 'others, especially women, to prophesy likewise: for he is very 'assiduous in his respects to the female sex, especially the rich 'and handsome, and well dressed; by which means he has se-'duced many women, both in body and mind, and has got 'much wealth. He also makes use of philters [c] and love-potions, 'to gain the affections of women. His disciples [d] do the like, and 'have corrupted many women in the country near the Rhone.'

SECT. IV. *Some Observations upon these Accusations.*

UPON all which I beg leave to say that possibly it might not be true. For first, such things as these are given out of course concerning almost all heretics, whether these be good reasons for them or not. Secondly, Irenæus, as it seems, was not fully acquainted with these people; which may appear more particularly by and by. Thirdly, of these things nothing is said by Tertullian, or the author of his Additions, nor by Theodoret or Philaster. Though Epiphanius, undoubtedly, who transcribes Irenæus, has the same. Fourthly, Irenæus has inserted in his work a character of Marc in eight verses, written, as he says, by some grave and pious person of his time [e]; wherein Marc is called idolater, astrologer, and magician, and his impious and erroneous notions are reflected on, without saying any thing of his, or his disciples debaucheries; which ought not, and could not, have been omitted by the versifier, if such things had been common among these people, and generally known in the world.

[b] Εικος δε αυτον και δαιμονα τινα παρεδρον εχειν, δι' ου και αυτος τε προφητευειν δοκει, και τους αλλους ποιειται μετοχους της χαριτος αυτου. Προφητευειν ποιει. Μαλιστα γαρ περι τας γυναικας ασχολειται, και τουτων τας ευπαρυφους, και πλουσιωτατας... και χρηματα πολλους πολυ συνεσηκεν. Iren. p. 61, 62.

[c] οτι δε φιλτρα και αγωγιμα προς το και τους σωμασι αυτων επιτριζειν, ενποιει ο μαρκος. κ. λ. p. 63.

[d] Ibid. p. 63, 64.

[e] Ο θειος προφητης, και κηρυξ της αληθειας εμμετρως επιδεδωκε σοι, ειπων ουτως ...Και ταυτα ο θεοφιλης προφητης. Ibid. cap. 15. [al. 12.] p. 80. 76. Grabe.

Sect. V. *The Marcosians are said to have regarded the Letters of the Alphabet as mysterious.*

These people are said to have placed a great deal of mystery in the letters of the alphabet, and thought that they were very useful for finding out the truth; of which many instances, and a long account may be seen in Irenæus, who must be consulted by those who are desirous to know particulars. However, I shall place in the margin what Theodoret [f] says of this matter, and the whole article [g] of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions. I shall give but one instance: they said that 'Jesus [h] had in him all numbers; and therefore is said to be 'Alpha and Omega,'

Sect. VI. *They are falsely accused of holding two Principles, and being Docetæ.*

Here I would observe, that by the just mentioned author, and [i] some others, they are spoken of as holding two principles, and as if they were Docetæ, and denied the resurrection of the body; of which things I see no clear evidence in Irenæus, notwithstanding the length of his account, nor in Theodoret.

[f] Ουτος και τοις τετταρσι και εικοσι στοιχειοις τας αιωνας απεικασε, και τας μεν αφωνους, τας δε ημιφωνους, τας δε φωνηοντας προσηγορευσεν. Ibid. p. 201.

[g] Non defuerunt post hos Marcus quidam et Colarbasus novam hæresin ex Græcorum alphabeto componentes. Negant enim veritatem sine istis posse literis inveniri: immo totam plenitudinem et perfectionem veritatis in istis literis esse dispositam. propter hanc enim causam Christum dixisse; ego sum A et Ω. Denique Jesum Christum descendisse, id est, columbam in Jesum venisse quæ Græco nomine quum περιστερα pronuntietur, habeat secundum numerum DCCCI. Percurrunt isti ω, ψ, χ, φ, υ, τ, totum usque ad Alpha Beta, et computant ogdoadas et decadas,....Alterum deum fingunt præter creatorem. Christum in substantia negant carnis fuisse. Negant carnis resurrectionem futuram. De Pr. cap. 50. p. 253.

[h] δεικνυοντα....τον εκ παντων συνεστα των αριθμων. κ. λ. Iren. c. 15. [al. 12.] p. 76. in.

[i] Christum autem putative dicit apparuisse, et passum fuisse quasi per umbram, non tamen vere passum corpore arbitratur. Philast. cap. 42. p. 92. Marcus etiam nescio quis heresim condidit, negans resurrectionem carnis, et Christum non vere, sed putative passum asseverans. Duo quoque opinatus est ex adverso sibi esse principia, quiddam tale de Æonibus quale Valentinus affirmans. Aug. H. 14. Vid. et Epiph. Indicul. Hæres. Tom. i. p. 229.

Sect.

SECT. VII. *They continued in the Practice of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt.*

WE ſaw before ſome reaſon to think they had an Euchariſt. That they baptized alſo is apparent from [k] Irenæus and Theodoret [l]. And if they had been able to have given rightly their form of baptiſm, it is highly probable, in my opinion, that it would have appeared to be very agreeable to that recorded at the end of St. Matthew's goſpel.

SECT. VIII. *Of their Opinion concerning Jeſus Chriſt.*

THEIR opinion concerning Jeſus Chriſt is largely repreſented by Irenæus, to whom I [m] refer; for his account is ſcarce intelligible: at beſt it is too prolix and too obſcure to be inſerted here. However, they ſeem to have had a notion of [n] the great dignity and excellence of his perſon, or his ineffable generation. And according to them he [o] was born of Mary, a virgin, and the word was in him. When he came to the water the ſupreme power deſcended upon him; and [p] he had in him all fulneſs: for in him [q] was the word, the Father, truth, the church, life. They ſaid that [r] the Chriſt, or the Spirit, came down upon the man Jeſus.

He [s] made known the Father, and deſtroyed death, and called himſelf the ſon of man. For [t] it was the good pleaſure of the

[k] Οι δε αγεσιν εφ' υδωρ, και βαπτιζοντες ουτως επιλεγουσιν· εις ονομα αγνωστου πατρος των ολων, εις αληθειαν μητερα παντων, εις τον καταβαντα εις ιησουν, εις ενωσιν, και απολυτρωσιν, και κοινωνιαν των δυναμεων. Iren. lib. i. cap 21. [al. 18.] p. 95.

[l] H. F. lib. i. p. 201. C.

[m] Vid. cap. xv. [al. xii.] p. 75, 78.

[n] Ο δε ιησους ταυτην εχει, φησι, την αρρητον γενεσιν. κ. λ. p. 75. n. 2. in.

[o] Τοι δε εκκλησιας τοπον η παρθενος επεδειξε· Ουτως τε ο κατ' οικονομιαν δια της μαριας γενεσιυργειται προς' αυτω ανθρωπος· ον ο πατηρ των ολων διελθοντα δια μητρας εξελεξατο δια λογε εις επιγνωσιν αυτε. Ελθοντος δε αυτε εις υδωρ καταβηναι εις αυτον ως περιστεραν. κ. λ. p. 77.

[p] Καταβηναι εις αυτον ως περιστεραν. κ. τ. λ. Subintellige ſervatorem ſive Chriſtum, ex omnium Æonum collatione compoſitum, de quo p. 33. Lin. 1. hac habentur. και εις τουτον επι τε βαπτισματος καταβηναι εκεινον τον απο τε πληρωματος εκ παντων σωτηρα εν ειδει περιστερας. Grabe in Irenæum, cap. 12. p. 73. not. 9. Ox. 1702.

[q] εχον εν εαυτω και τον πατερα, και τον υιον, την τε δια τουτων γινωσκομενην αιωνομαρον δυναμιν της σιγης, και τους απαντας αιωνας. p. 77. infr. M. εσχηκεναι αυτον τε τον ανθρωπον, αυτον τε τον λογον, και τον πατερα, και τον αρρητον, και την σιγην, και την αληθειαν, και εκκλησιαν, και ζωην. p. 78. in.

[r] Το γαρ βαπτισμα τε φαινομενε [conſpicui] ιησε, αφεσεως αμαρτιων· την δε απολυτρωσιν τε εν αυτω χριστε κατελθοντος εις τελειωσιν, c. 21. [al. 18.] p. 94. in.

[s] Και τουτ' ειναι το πνευμα το λαληθεν δια ιησε, το ομολογησαν εαυτον υιον ανθρωπε, και φανερωσαντα τον πατερα...Και καθειλε μεν τον θανατον. p. 77. infr. M.

[t] Τεθεληκεναι γαρ τον πατερα των ολων λυσαι την αγνοιαν, και καθελειν τον θανατον. Αγνοιας δε λυσις η επιγνωσις αυτε εγινετο. p. 76. ſub fin.

Father

Father of all that he should banish ignorance and destroy death. And the acknowledgment of him is the overthrow of ignorance. By all which, I think, it appears that these men had honourable apprehensions of Jesus, and the design of his coming.

Sect. IX. *Of their Rites of Redemption, and the Meaning of them as given by Rhenford.*

They had some rites of redemption, which Irenæus [u] speaks of as very strange and absurd; and he seems to ridicule them. But probably Irenæus did not thoroughly understand them.

Rhenford says that, 'by [x] the word redemption these people 'meant a form of confession, or form of prayer.' And Grabe owns himself [y] convinced by what Rhenford has said upon this obscure subject.

Irenæus speaks as if they had divers of these things; but it seems that they were chiefly two: one at baptism, when the [z] minister made an exhortation, or proposed a form of confession to the person to be initiated or baptized. Then the person to be baptized made a confession of faith, and the by-standers or spectators wished peace or happiness to all on whom that name rested. The other was performed [a] in the near approach of death, or upon occasion of dangerous sickness. The confessions and prayers were in the Hebrew or Syriac language, which was much used by them, as Theodoret [b] says. And Irenæus not understanding that language, nor any one else giving him a right interpretation of their forms, his translations are not just. Rhenford is persuaded [c] that if we could attain to the true reading of the redemptions in Irenæus, they would represent a pious and truly Christian meaning. His rendering one of them used at baptism, as it seems, is to this purpose: 'The Messias [d] and re-'deemer, who has redeemed me from this world, and all things

[u] Cap. 21. al. 18. p. 93, 98.

[x] Adeo ut per redemtionem, quam hoc illove modo edisserunt, nihil nisi formula intelligi possit, qua fidem suam de redemtione, vel redemtore, profiteantur. De Redem. Marcos. &c. p. 34. n. 207.

[y] Per redemtionem, quam hic et paulo post memorat, certam orationis formulam intelligendam esse, non modo ipse Irenæi contextus...ostendit, sed et Judaici ritus ratio plane confirmat, quam ex viri docti Jacobi Rhenfordii disputatione...explicatam dabo. Grab. ad Iren. c. 13. [al. ix.] p. 61.

[z] Vid. Iren. p. 95, 96.

[a] Ibid. p. 97. Conf. Rhenford. n. xlvi. &c. p. 213, 216.

[b] Αναμιγνυουσι δε και εβραικα ονοματα, δεδιττομενοι τους τελουμενους, ων επιμνησθηναι περιττον ηγησαμην. H. F. p. 201.

[c] Quo facto spondere ausim fore, ut genuinus horum verborum sensus et præclara ac homine Christiano atque orthodoxo dignissima sententia eluceat. Ubi supr. n. vi. p. 196. Conf. n. xlii. p. 210.

[d] Vid. Rhenf. n. xvii. xviii. Ib. p. 199. et Conf. Iren. p. 95.

'therein,

'therein, in the name of Jao, (or according to the will of Je-'hovah) and has atoned for us with the price of his ſoul, is Jeſus 'of Nazareth: or Jeſus of Nazareth is the Chriſt the redeemer, 'who has redeemed me from this preſent world with the price 'of his own life.' And he thinks that [e] whereas the Jewiſh nation in general looked for a temporal and worldly deliverance by their Meſſiah, theſe men, Jews by birth, heartily embraced the ſpiritual ſalvation propoſed by Jeſus.

Irenæus ſays that 'as [f] many doctors as they have, ſo many 'redemptions are there among them.' 'In which,' as Rhenford ſays, 'if [g] theſe people were originally Jews, there is nothing 'ſtrange, it having been cuſtomary for their maſters to deliver 'each one for himſelf particular forms to their diſciples, in 'ſomewhat different expreſſions, though in ſenſe they all agreed 'in the main.'

SECT. X. *They believed the Facts recorded in the Goſpels.*

IF there be any credit to be given to Irenæus's account of this people, they believed the facts recorded in the goſpels, and they received moſt or all the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament.

Some of the facts obſervable in Irenæus's account are theſe: that Jeſus was born of a virgin, before taken notice of; that [h] John preached the baptiſm of repentance for the forgiveneſs of ſins; that [i] Jeſus was baptized, and that a dove appeared; that he revealed the Father, or taught the will of God, as before; that he went [k] up into the mount with three of his diſciples, where he was glorioufly transformed, and Moſes and Elias ap-

[e] Cum vero Judæi in genere deum redemtorem ſuum confiteantur, et corporalem ſolam vel præcipue liberationem ejus ſive præteritam celebrent, ſive futuram prædicentur: hi hæretici, (ut ingenium hominum mireris!) Jeſum Nazarenum hunc redemtorem eſſe celebrant, et mundanis beneficiis relictis, in ſola ſpirituali et æterna ejus redemtione acquieſcunt, hanc ſolam deprædicant. Jeſus Nazarenus (Arguite aures hæreticorum maſtyges, et confeſſionem hanc demiremini!) inquiunt, eſt Jeſus et liberator, qui vindicavit animam noſtram ab hoc ſeculo vel mundo, et ab omnibus quæ in eo ſunt, in nomine Jao, et expiavit nos lytro animæ ſuæ. Iren. lib. i. n. xxiv. p. 201, 202. Vid. et n. xiii. p. 210, 211.

[f] διὰ τὸ ἐν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, καθὼς αὐτοὶ βέλονται, παραδίδοσθαι αὐτήν. Ὅσοι γὰρ εἰσι ταύτης τῆς γνώμης μυσταγωγοὶ, τοσαῦται καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεις. p. 93. ſub fin.

[g] Sed formulæ confeſſionis optime quadrat; quam alii aliis verbis conceperint atque pronuntiarint, etſi rem eandem omnes dicebant. Nempe ita olim moris erat apud Judæos, ut qui ſcholis aut ſynagogis præerant, alii alias precum formulas auditoribus ſuis dictarent...quemadmodum apud Cl. Lightfootum videri poteſt ad Matt. vi. 9, &c. Ib. n. xxxiii. p. 207.

[h] Iren. lib. i. p. 94.

[i] p. 71. n. 6.

[k] ἐκεῖνον τὸν μετὰ τὰς ἓξ ἡμέρας τεταρτον ἀναβαίνοντα εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ μεταμόρφωσιν ἔχοντα. Ibid. p. 71. n. 6. Conf. Matt. xvii. v. 3.

peared;

peared; that [l] he was nailed to the croſs at the ſixth hour of the day; not [m] to mention the hiſtory of the perſon who came to Chriſt, ſaying, *Good maſter, what good ſhall I do to inherit eternal life*; nor [n] the petition of the ſons of Zebedee for the firſt places in his kingdom; or, that [o] the apoſtles of Chriſt were twelve in number.

Sect. XI. *They received the Scriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament.*

It is exceeding manifeſt that the Marcoſians received the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament. As the firſt book of Irenæus is now divided, there are two chapters which ſhew what [p] texts or paſſages of Moſes and the prophets they alleged in favour of their hypotheſis or ſcheme; and a third [q] giving an account of their forged apocryphal ſcriptures, and what texts of the goſpel or New Teſtament they abuſed. And, in the preface to the ſecond book, Irenæus, reviewing the firſt book and the contents of it, obſerves particularly, that [r] he had taken notice of the ſcriptures made uſe of by them.

Sect. XII. *A particular Enumeration of the Books of the New Teſtament uſed by them.*

I ſhall ſhew ſomewhat particularly the texts and books of the New Teſtament made uſe of by them.

As they believed Jeſus to have been born of the Virgin Mary, it is likely, they received the firſt chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, as well as other parts of theſe goſpels.

They argued from [s] Matt. xviii. 10. [t] xi. 28. and other places not needful to be referred to; from [u] Luke ii. 49. [x] xix. 42. [y] xv. throughout, [z] Matt. xi. 25, and Luke x. 21. It may be concluded that they received St. John's goſpel, and his firſt epiſtle, from their talking ſo much of the *word* and *life*. They had in particular an argument from the latter part of the [a] twentieth

[l] Καὶ τὴν ἑκτην ὥραι, ἐν ᾗ προσηλώθη τῷ ξύλῳ. p. 71. f. Conf. Joh. xix. 14.

[m] p. 92. n. 1. [n] p. 94. n. 2.

[o] p. 89. n. 4. [p] cap. 18 et 19. [al. c. 15 et 16.] [q] cap. 20 [al. 17.]

[r] Et Marci quoque magi ſententiam, omni diligentia expoſuimus: et quanta ex ſcripturis eligentes, adaptare conantur fictioni ſuæ, diligenter retulimus. Ib. p. 115.

[s] Iren. l. i. c. 14. [al. 10. p. 67.]

[t] cap. 20. [al. 17.] p. 92. fin.

[u] p. 92. in. [x] Ibid. ſub fin.

[y] cap. 16. [al. 13.] p. 80, 81.

[z] p. 93. in. [a] cap. 18. [al. 15. p. 89.

chapter

chapter of St. John's goſpel; they received [b] St. Paul's epiſtles; they [c] ſeem to have received the firſt epiſtle of St. Peter; they received alſo the [d] book of the Revelation. And as Irenæus doth not find fault with them for rejecting any books of ſcripture, we may ſuppoſe they differed little or nothing from other Chriſtians upon this head.

SECT. XIII. *Of their apocryphal Books.*

'MOREOVER, ſays [e] Irenæus, 'they have an innumerable 'multitude of apocryphal and ſpurious writings, which they 'have forged. Particularly they make uſe of that fiction con-'cerning the child Jeſus, that when his maſter bid him ſay Alpha, 'the Lord did ſo. But when the maſter called upon him to ſay 'Beta, he anſwered: "Do you firſt tell me what is Alpha, and "then I will tell you what Beta is."

Theodoret too ſays they [f] had a multitude of ſpurious books, though he does not name them.

I apprehend that when men uſe ſuch hyperbolical expreſſions, as an innumerable multitude, abatement ought to be made if we would think agreeable to truth. As that ſtory concerning Alpha Beta is found in the goſpel of the infancy of Jeſus Chriſt, ſtill in being; ſome are of opinion that this goſpel was compoſed by the Marcoſians: ſo [g] Beauſobre, who has divers curious obſervations relating to that hiſtory.

[b] Και τον παυλον ἑκτως φασκουσι την εν χριστω ιησου απολυτρωσιν πολλακις μεμνυσθαι. κ. λ. c. 21. [al. 18.] p. 94. ſub fin.

[c] Ibid. p. 88. infr. m.

[d] Και δια τουτο φησιν αυτον Α και Ω, ινα την τριετιαν μηνυση, τουτον εχοντος τον αριθμον τουτο ορειν. c. xv. [al. 12.] p. 75. in. Και δια το Α και Ω ονομαζεσθαι αυτον, την εκ παντων γενεσιν σημαινον τα. Ibid. p. 76. in. Conf. Apoc. i. 8, 11. xxi. 6. xxii. 13. Et vid. ſupra.

[e] Προς δε τουτοις αμυθητον πληθος αποκρυφων και νοθων γραφων, ας αυτοι επλασαν, παρεισφερουσιν....Προσπαραλαμβανουσι δε εις τουτο κακεινο το ραδιουργημα, κ. λ. cap. 20. [al. 17.] p. 91.

[f] H. F. p. 201.

[g] Hiſt. Manich. Tom. i. p. 368.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of HERACLEON.

SECT. I. *Ancient Writers who ſpeak of him and of the Time when he lived.*

HERACLEON's country is unknown. Irenæus mentions him [a] and Ptolomy in his arguments againſt the Valentinians. Clement ſpeaks of him as one [b] of the moſt conſiderable of Valentinus's followers. Origen ſays he was reckoned a diſciple [c] of Valentinus: yet his time is not eaſily determined. Grabe is perſuaded he [d] was contemporary with Valentinus. Baſnage ſpeaks of him [e] at the year 125; and Cave placeth [f] him at the year 126. Maſſuet profeſſeth himſelf not able [g] to ſettle his time exactly. In Epiphanius the order is, Valentinus, Secundus, Ptolomy, Marc, Colobarſus, Heracleon: and he ſuppoſeth [h] Heracleon to borrow from the Marcoſians, or to agree with them in ſeveral things. In Philaſter [i] the order is Valentinus, Ptolomy, Secundus, Heracleon, Marc, Colobarſus. In Theodoret, Valentinus, Secundus, and others; in which [k] chapter he briefly mentions Coſſianus, Theodotus, Heracleon, Ptolomy, Marc, as ſpringing out of the Valentinian hereſy. Then follows a chapter concerning Marc the magician. Auguſtine's order is that of Epiphanius. The author of the Additions to Tertullian has a [l] different order. He placeth Marc and Colobarſus

[a] Antiquius autem et multo ante exiſtens et honorificentius reliquis æonibus ipſius Ptolomæi et Heracleonis, et reliquis omnibus, qui eadem opinantur. lib. 2. cap. 4. p. 119. Maſſ. p. 120. Gr.

[b] Ηρακλεων, ο της Ουαλεντινου σχολης δοκιμωτατος. Str. 4. p. 502. B.

[c] Τον Ουαλεντινου λεγομενον ειναι γνωριμον ηρακλεωνα. In Jo. p. 60. E. Huet.

[d] Spicil. Tom. 2. p. 69 et 80.

[e] A. 125. n. 111.

[f] H. L. Tom. 1. p. 53.

[g] Diſſ. in Iren. p. lii.

[h] Ηρακλεων τοινυν ουτος, και οι απ' αυτου Ηρακλεωνιται, ως προειπον, ομοιως Μαρκω και τισι των προ αυτου περι την Ογδοαδα φασκει, της ανω φημι και της κατω. κ. τ. λ. Hær. 36. n. ii. p. 263. B.

[i] De Hær. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, p. 11. La Bigne, vol. 4. 1624.

[k] Και αλλοι δε μυριοι ειτευθεν αιρεσεως αρχηγοι, Κοσσιανος, Θεοδοτος, Ηρακλεων, Πτολεμαιος, Μαρκος, διαφορα ξενοεπινοησαντες δογματα. Hær. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 8. p. 201. A. B.

[l] Extitit præterea Heracleon alter hæreticus, qui cum Valentino paria ſentit, ſed novitate quadam pronuntiationis vult videri alia ſentire. Introducit enim in primis illud fuiſſe quod pronuntiat, et deinde ex illa monade duo, ac deinde reliquos Æonas, deinde introducit totum Valentinum. Non defuerunt poſt hos Marcus quidam et Colobarſus, novam hæreſim ex Græcorum alphabeto componentes. Præf. adv. Hær. cap. 49, 50. p. 216. 49. et 217.

barſus

barsus after Heracleon. But then he differs from [m] Tertullian himself.

SECT. II. *He was a Follower of Valentinus, with whose Opinions his Sentiments nearly corresponded.*

WE need not scrupulously examine this person's opinions. He is, as we have seen, reckoned a Valentinian by several. The author last quoted supposeth him to have made but little alteration in that scheme. Epiphanius too says, 'he [n] followed his 'predecessors in most matters; only making a few alterations 'that he might have a party of his own.' His summary is to this purpose: 'The [o] followers of Heracleon too have their og-'doads; but somewhat different from Marc, and Ptolomy, and 'Valentinus, and others. They redeem dying persons with oil, 'and balsam, and water, as the Marcosians do; saying over the 'head of the redeemed persons some expressions in the Hebrew 'language.' That Heracleon had Æons in his scheme of the creation, is evident from divers of his passages quoted by Origen [p].

[m] Valentinus * Colorbarso viam delineavit. Eam postmodum Ptolomæus instravit.....deduxit et Heracleon inde tramites quosdam, et Secundus, et magus Marcus. Adv. Valent. c. 4. p. 284. D.

[n] Ηρακλεων τις τουτον τον Κολορβασον διαδεχεται, αφ ουπερ οι Ηρακλεωνιται καλουμενοι, ουδεν ηττον της παρα τουτον κενοφωνιας ησκημενοι. και οσα μεν εκεινοι λεγουσιν, και ουτος ορίζεται, κατα παντα τροπον....περισσοτερον δε δηθεν υπερ εκεινους εν εαυτω ανατυπωσαμενος τινα, βουλεται εκεινους υπεραιρειν, ινα και εαυτω συναγωγην ποιησηται των ηπατημενων. Hær. 36. No. I. 262. C. D.

[o] Ηρακλεωνιται. Και αυτοι τη των Ογδοαδων φερονται μυθολογια. ετερως δε παρα τον Μαρκον, και Πτολεμαιον, και Ουαλεντινον, και τους αλους. αλλα και προς τη τελευτη τους παρ' αυτοις τελευτωντας ομοιως τω Μαρκω λυτρουνται δι' ελαιου, υπο βαλσαμου, και υδατος, επικλησεις τινας Εβραικαις λεξεσιν επιλεγοντες επι τη κεφαλη του δηθεν λυτρουμενου. Ana. lib. 1. Tom. iii. p. 229. C.

[p] Επι πασι το· Επιστευσεν αυτος και η οικια αυτου ολη, διηγησατο επι της αγγελικης ειρησθαι ταξεως, και ανθρωπων των οικειοτερων αυτω. Ζητεισθαι, δε φησιν, περι τινων αγγελων ει σωθησονται, των κατελθοντων επι τας των ανθρωπων θυγατερας. Και των ανθρωπων δε του δημιουργου την απωλειαν δηλουσθαι νομιζει εν τω· Οι υιοι της βασιλειας εξελευσονται εις το σκοτος το εξωτερον. κ. τ. λ. Ori. Tom. 18. apud Huet. T. 2. p. 256. B. C. Νυνι δε δηλος εστιν ομοιουσιους τινας τω διαβολω λεγων ανθρωπους, ετερας, ως οιονται οι απ' αυτου ουσιας τυγχανονται, παρ' ους καλουσι ψυχικους η πνευματικους. Ibid. T. 21. apud Eun. p. 308. C. See also Grabe's notes, Spic. Pat. vol. 2. p. 238. note on p. 93. l. 16. and p. 96. l. 22. and p. 240. note on p. 107. l. ult.

* Some copies read 'Veteris opinionis 'semini actu Colubroso.' This reading makes one part of Tertullian more agreeable to the other. Though then Secundus is here placed after Heracleon whereas in the forecited chapter he is placed before him. Post hunc (scilicet Valentinum) extiterunt Ptolomæus et Secundus hæretici qui cum Valentino per omnia consentiunt. Extitit præterea Heracleon alter hæreticus, &c. De Præ. cap. 49. p. 216. From this passage it rather appears that this author considered Heracleon as contemporary with Ptolomy and Secundus; whereas Tertullian himself considers Ptolomy as his predecessor, and Secundus and Marc as his successors.

SECT.

Sect. III. *Commentaries written by him on several Parts of Scripture.*

Heracleon seems to have written Commentaries upon several parts of the New Testament. Clement of Alexandria having quoted the words of Matt. x. 32, or Luke xii. 8, 11, 12. says, that [q] Heracleon explaining this place, has these very words: 'There is a confession made by faith and a suitable conversation, another by word of mouth. This is made before the powers, which many look upon as the only confession that is necessary; in which they do not judge rightly: for that confession may be made by hypocrites. Nor is it universally applicable; for not all who are saved have made this confession, and accordingly suffered martyrdom; among whom is Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others. For there is a general and a particular confession. The general is made in works and actions, agreeable to right faith. The other, which is made before the magistrates, will follow this, if there be occasion. For there can be no question but he will make a right confession in words, who hath before made confession in the tenour of his life.' And what follows.

There is another short passage [r] out of Heracleon's Commentary upon St. Luke.

Origen in his Commentary upon St. John's gospel often cites Heracleon. The passages of Heracleon's Commentary upon that gospel are collected by [s] Grabe; and from him have been also placed by Massuet in his appendix to Irenæus. The passages of Heracleon quoted by Origen are above forty in number, and some of them long. Origen informs us that [t] in John iv. 18. where we have, *Thou hast had five husbands*; Heracleon reads 'six husbands.'

Sect. IV. *Containing Remarks on the foregoing Passages, particularly concerning what Parts of Scriptures be received.*

I now make some remarks. 1. By Levi Heracleon means [u] Lebbeus, called also Judas and Thaddeus.

[q] Τουτον εξηγουμενος τον τοπον Ηρακλεων... κατα λεξιν φησιν. Ομολογιαν ειναι, την μεν εν τη πιστει και πολιτεια. την δε εν φωνη.... καθολικη δε ην νυν λεγει, την εν ρ' εργοις και πραξεσι καταλληλοις της εις αυτον πιστεως. κ. λ. Str. iv. p. 502. A. D.

[r] Vid. Ecl. Proph. ap. Clem. A. p. 804.

[s] Ibid p. 85...117.

[t] Παρα δε Ηρακλεωνι ευρομεν· εξ αιδας εσχες. Ap. Orig. Huet. p. 207. B.

[u] Grabe ib. p. 234. Vid. et Cotel. note ad Const. Ap. l. 2. c. 63. et l. 8. c. 22.

2. According

2. According to Heracleon, several of the apostles did not suffer martyrdom. He particularly mentions Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi; and possibly he had an eye to John likewise, though he does not mention him by name. Grabe says: 'This 'passage [x] of Heracleon deserves particular notice, who says of 'all these apostles that they did not die martyrs; to whom, 'though an heretic, greater regard ought to be had, on account 'of his early age, than to the fabulous accounts of modern 'writers, who make all the apostles to have suffered violent 'deaths.' Beausobre approves this observation of Grabe; and says, 'the [y] testimony of this writer is worthy of credit in a 'thing of this nature, since it is no part of his heresy, consider-'ing his learning, and that he lived near the times of the apos-'tles;' nor does Clement contradict him.

3. The author of Prædestinatus imputes to Heracleon this doctrine; that 'a [z] baptized person, whether righteous or not, 'is a saint; and that whatever sins a man is guilty of after bap-'tism, they do not hurt him.' Basnage has well observed, that 'the [a] forecited excellent passage of Heracleon confutes this ac-'count.' And besides, Grabe says, that 'Prædestinatus [b] deserves 'no credit in what he writes of Heracleon.'

4. Heracleon owned the authority of the apostles of Christ. This may be concluded from the mention he makes of several of them in the forecited passage, and from his Commentaries upon the gospels of St. Luke and St. John. Many of which are given us by Origen, particularly his observations [c] upon Matt. viii. 12. and Is. i. 2. and his comment upon [d] John iv. 50. And it might be argued that he admitted the authority of [e] St.

[x] Apprime vero notandum testimonium Heracleonis, asserentis ex sanctis apostolis Matthæum, Philippum, Thomam, et Levi sive Lebbæum, Jacobi fratrem, citra martyrium mortem obiisse. Cui, licet hæretico, sed apostolorum ætati perquam vicino, in hac re historica majorem fidem habendam puto, quam fabulosis recentiorum scriptorum narrationibus de cruenta laudatorum apostolorum morte. Grabe Spic. vol. 2. p. 234. note to p. 84. l. 4.

[y] Remarques sur le Nouveau Test. p. 171.

[z] Baptizatum hominem, sive justum sive peccatorem, loco sancti computari docebat: nihilque obesse baptizatis peccata memorabat: dicens, sicut non in se recipit natura ignis gelu, ita baptizatus non in se recipit peccatum. Præd. II. 16.

[a] Fit quoque falsissimum Heracleonem sententiæ fuisse ejusmodi, hominum qui baptismum adeptus fuerit, sive justum, sive peccatorem, in sancti loco ducendum esse. Prædestinati figmentum refellunt verba Heracleonis quæ ex Clemente et Alexandrino protulimus. An. in Ann. 105. No. III. p. 58.

[b] Sed nullum iste auctor meretur fidem in his quæ de Heracleone tradidit, quod tempora nullatenus congruant. Grabe Spic. Pat. vol. 2. p. 81, 82.

[c] δηλουσθαι νομιζει εν τω· οι υοιοι της βασιλειας εξελευσονται εις το σκοτος το εξωτερον· και περι τουτων τον ησαιαν προφητευειν το· υιους εγεννησα, και υψωσα· αυτοι δε με ηθετησαν. Originis Commen. in Johan. Tom. 2. p. 256. Huet.

[d] See the passage at large, p. 351, n. p.

[e] Ap. Orig. in Joh. Tom. 2. p. 211. E. Huet.

Peter from his quoting the preaching ascribed to § him. He likewise received St. Paul and his writings; for he quotes [f] the beginning of the twelfth chapter to the Romans. Moreover Origen gives us Heracleon's [g] interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.

5. It is highly probable that Heracleon received all the books of the New Testament as other Christians did: at least we have no reason to doubt it. He seems likewise to have received the Old Testament, as may be argued from his quotation of Isaiah, before taken notice of.

6. Heracleon's Commentaries upon St. Luke and St. John are an early evidence of the respect shewn to the scriptures of the New Testament. And it is reasonable to think that others beside Heracleon, both catholics and heretics, published Commentaries upon some of the books of scripture about the same time.

7. Finally, Heracleon's Commentaries bear testimony to the antiquity and genuineness of St. John's introduction to his gospel; forasmuch as several of his passages in Origen contain remarks upon it.

CHAP. IX.

Of Cerdon.

Sect. I. *Of his Time.*

Irenæus twice says that 'Cerdon [a] came to Rome in the 'time of Hyginus, the ninth bishop of Rome after the apostles.'

§ I formerly referred to that passage in a note, vol. 2. p. 240. Nevertheless it is wanting in Grabe's collection of Heracleon's Fragments: as is also another short quotation a little before it, and nearer the beginning of the fourteenth of some of Origen's Commentaries upon St. John, &c. Grab. Spic. T. ii. p. 99. As they are wanting in Grabe, so likewise in Massuet; which shews that some things may escape the observation of the most diligent.

N. B. Even Dr. Lardner, though so diligent, has not been sufficiently attentive here: for Grabe has inserted the first of these passages in vol. 1. p. 64. as a fragment of the preaching of Peter, and has given his reasons for inserting it in that place, in his notes at the end of vol. 2. p. 239. note on p. 99. l. 18. If the other passage is in Grabe, it has escaped me. H.

[f] καθ' ὁ καὶ ὁ ἀποστολος διδασκει λεγων λογικην λατρειαν την τοιαυτην θυσθαι. Ibid. p. 217. C. [g] Και εκ αθλιατον γε ειναι ηγειται την ψυχην ο Ηρακλειων, αλλ' επιτηδειας εχουσαν προς σωτηριαν, αυτην λεγων ειναι το ενδυομενον αφθαρσιαν φθαρτου και αθανασιαν θνητον οντα, οταν κατεποθη ο θανατος αυτης εις νικος. Ibid. Tom. 2. p. 255. D. [a] Lib. i. c. 27. [al. 28.] n. 1. Gr. 103. lib. 3. cap. 4. n. 3. Gr. 206. Conf. Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 11.

Eusebius

Eusebius in his Chronicle supposes [b] Valentinus and Cerdon to have come to Rome together in the time of Hyginus, in the third year of the emperor Antoninus the Pious, and the year of Christ 141.

Pagi was of opinion that [c] Cerdon came to Rome in the year 140, or sooner, in the latter part of the time of Hyginus. Massuet [d] placeth him in the year 141. Basnage speaks of him [e] as flourishing under Hyginus, in the time of Adrian, about the year 125. And Spondanus [f] speaks first of him under the year 146, and again under the year 155.

SECT. II. *Of his Opinions.*

HE taught, as Irenæus informs us, that 'the [g] God declared 'in the law and the prophets is not the Father of our Lord Jesus 'Christ. For he was well known, the latter unknown: more-'over, he was just, this good.'

Epiphanius's summary is to this purpose: 'that [h] Cerdon 'learned his doctrine from Heracleon; making however some 'additions of his own: that he came from Syria to Rome, and 'there spread his notions in the time of Hyginus. He held two 'contrary principles: he said that Christ was not born. He 'denied the resurrection of the dead, and rejected the Old Tes-'tament.' In his larger article Epiphanius writes that 'Cerdon [i] 'succeeded Heracleon, and came from Syria to Rome in the 'time of Hyginus, the ninth bishop after the apostles: that, like 'many other heretics, he held two principles, and two gods; 'one good and unknown, the Father of Jesus: the other the 'Creator, evil, and known, who spake in the law, appeared 'to the prophets, and was often seen. He taught moreover, 'that Jesus was not born of Mary, and that he had flesh in ap-'pearance only. He denied the resurrection of the body, and 'rejected the Old Testament. He said that Christ descended 'from the unknown Father, that he came to overthrow the 'empire and dominion of the Creator of the world; as many 'other heretics do, and having been a short time at Rome, he 'transmitted his venom to Marcion, who succeeded him.'

[b] Sub Hygino Romanæ urbis episcopo, Valentinus hæresiarches et Cerdo magister Marcionis, Roman venerunt. Chr. p. 168.
[c] In Baron. Ann. 144. n. ii.
[d] Diss. Iren. p. lxvii. n. 134.
[e] Ann. 125. n. ii.
[f] Annales Eccles. p. 149, 151.

[g] Εδιδαξε, τον υπο τη ιομε και προφητων κεκηρυγμενον θεον μη ειναι πατερα τε κυριε ημων ιησε χριστε. Τον μεν γαρ γνωριζεσθαι, τον δε αγνωτα ειναι· και τον μεν δικαιον, τον δε αγαθον υπαρχειν. Iren. l. i. c. 27. n. 1. Vid. et Euseb. l. iv. c. 11. inf.
[h] Epiph. p. 230. [i] H. 41. n. 1. p. 300.

Theodoret's account of Cerdon is to this effect: 'he [k] was in 'the time of the first Antoninus. He taught that there is one 'God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, unknown to the pro- 'phets; another, the Maker of the universe, the giver of the 'Mosaic law: and this last is just, the other good. For [l] he in 'the law orders, *that an eye should be given for an eye, and a tooth* '*for a tooth:* but the good God in the gospels [m] commands, that '*to him who smiteth thee on the right cheek, turn the other also:* and 'that to him who would take away thy coat, thou shouldest 'give thy cloak also. He in the law directs to love a friend, 'and hate an enemy: but the other to love even our enemies. 'Not observing,' says Theodoret, 'that in the law it is directed, [n] 'that if *a man meet his enemies ox going astray, he should bring him* '*back: and not forbear to help his beast when lying under his burden:* 'and that he who according to him is alone good, threatens [o] '*hell-fire to him who calls his brother fool:* and shewing himself to 'be just, said: [p] *with what measure ye mete, it shall be meted to you* '*again.*"

I insert [q] Philaster's account intire; and put in the margin [r] the greater part of Augustine's article concerning this person.

Sect. III. *He was an admirer of Virginity, and is said to have recanted his Errors.*

Cerdon too, as well as Marcion, though this is not often mentioned, was a great admirer of virginity, and recommended it to his followers, as we learn from [s] Theodoret.

[k] Hær. Fab. l. i. c. 24. p. 209. C. D.

[l] See Matt. v. 38, 40. and Luke vi. 29.

[m] Ο δε αγαθος εν τοις ευαγγελιοις κελευει. Ib. p. 209. D.

[n] See Exod. xxiii. 4. [o] Matt. v. 22.

[p] Matt. vii. 2. and Luke vi. 38.

[q] Cerdon autem quidam surrexit post hos, pejus suis doctoribus prædicans, qui cum venisset Romam de Syria, ausus est dicere duo esse principia, id est unum Deum bonum, et unum malum: et Deum quidem bonum, bona facere, et malum mala. Jesum autem Salvatorem non natum asserit de Virgine, nec apparuisse in carne nec de cælo descendisse, sed putative visum fuisse hominibus, qui non videbatur inquit, vere, sed erat umbra: unde et putabatur quibusdam pati, non tamen vere patiebatur. C. 44. Ed. Fab. p. 11. C. 16. La Bigne.

[r] Qui duo principia sibi adversantia dogmatizavit; Deumque Legis et Prophetarum non esse Patrem Christi, nec bonum esse, sed justum: Patrem vero Christi bonum: Christumque ipsum nec natum ex femina, neque habuisse carnem: nec vere mortuum, vel quidquam passum, sed simulasse passionem. Quidam vero in duobus principiis suis duos deos ita eum dixisse perhibent, ut unus eorum esset bonus, alter autem malus. Resurrectionem mortuorum negat, spernens etiam Testamentum Vetus. Aug. de Hær. c. 21.

[s] Κερδων μεν ουν, και μαρκιων, την παρθενιαν ενομοθετησαν.... κ. λ. Theod. H. F. l. v. c. 24. in.

Irenæus

Irenæus says [t] that 'when Cerdon was at Rome he several 'times renounced his errors, and was received. But at length 'for returning to them again, or for teaching them in a clan-'deſtine manner, he was finally excluded from the church.' That paſſage, as well as others from Irenæus, is tranſcribed by Euſebius in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. [u] And Valeſius in his notes upon the place of Euſebius, argues that Cerdon was not rejected, but ſeparated himſelf from the church.

Tertullian in his [x] Preſcriptions tells a like ſtory of Marcion. But it is generally ſuppoſed by learned men that Tertullian was miſtaken. Rigaltius [y] has made this obſervation, and Beauſobre [z] is clearly of opinion that Tertullian confounded Marcion with Cerdon. Tillemont is alſo of the ſame [a] ſentiments.

SECT. IV. *What Scriptures were received by him.*

THE authors before cited inform us that Cerdon rejected or deſpiſed the Old Teſtament. As they ſay nothing of his rejecting any of the books of the New Teſtament, we ought to conclude that he received them, as other Chriſtians did.

Indeed the author of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Preſcriptions ſays, that 'Cerdon [b] received only the goſpel of 'St. Luke, and that not entire: that he did not receive all St. 'Paul's epiſtles, nor the whole of thoſe of them which he did 'receive. And that moreover he rejected the Acts of the

[t] Κερδων δε...εις την εκκλησιαν ελθων, και εξομολογημενος, ωτως διετελεσε, ποτε μεν λαθριδιδασκαλων, ποτε δε παλιν εξομολογημενος, ποτε δε ελεγχομενος εφ' οις εδιδασκε κακως, και αθισαμενος της των αδελφων συνοδιας. Iren. l. 3. c. 4. n. 3.

[u] Tandem vero Cerdon convictus quod poſt toties iteratam exomologeſim, peſtiferum virus erroris ſui occulte ſpargeret, penitus ſe ab Eccleſia removit. Id enim ſonant Irenæi verba, quæ Rufinus et Chriſtophoſonus perperam meo judicio interpretati ſunt. Neque enim Cerdonem ex eccleſia ejectum fuiſſe dicit Irenæus, ſed ipſum ſe ab Eccleſia penitus ſegregaſſe. Ex quo apparet, Cerdonem ſuo ipſius judicio condemnatum, prævenisſe Eccleſiæ ſententiam. Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 11. Ini. et Annota. in eundem p. 65.

[x] Nam conſtat illos (Valentinum et Marcionem)....in Catholicam primo doctrinam credidiſſe apud Eccleſiam Romanam, donec ob inquietam ſemper eorum curioſitatem, qua fratres quoque vitiabant, ſemel et iterum ejecti....Poſtmodum Marcion pœnitentiam confeſſus, cum conditioni datæ ſibi occurrit—morte præventus eſt. C. 30. p. 242. or 209. ed. 1597.

[y] Non ſolet Septimius exactiſſime reddere quæ ab auctoribus ſumit. Rigalt. in Not. ad Lib. de Præſ. C. 30.

[z] En effet quand j'ai comparé ce qu'il dit de Marcion avec ce que S. Irenee dit de Cerdon, je me ſuis apperçe qu'il a confondu Marcion avec Cerdon. C'eſt ce dernier qui fut repris plus d'une fois á cauſe de ſes Erreurs, et plus d'une fois reconcilié á l'Egliſe à la faveur d'une penitence ſimulée. Hiſt de Manich. T. 2. n. 6. p. 77.

[a] Mem. Ecc. T. 2. P. 2. p. 514.

[b] Accedit his Cerdon quidam....Hic prophetias et legem repudiat.....Solum Evangelium Lucæ, nec tamen totum recipit. Apoſtoli Pauli neque omnes, neque totas epiſtolas ſumit. Acta Apoſtolorum et Apocalypſin quaſi falſa rejicit Præſcr. c. 51. p. 253. al. 217.

'Apoſtles, and the Apocalypſe.' But ſince Irenæus and other ancient authors are totally ſilent about this, it may be reckoned not to be true. This was Marcion's ſentiment: and, probably, it is one of thoſe things in which he is ſaid to have exceeded all that went before him.

CHAP. X.

Of MARCION and his Followers.

SECT. I. *Some general Account of him from Irenæus.*

As we are now come to Marcion, it may be beſt to take a paſſage of Irenæus at length, as a ſummary account to be afterwards commented upon.

'Marcion [a] of Pontus, ſucceſſor of Cerdon, added to his doctrine with greater aſſurance; blaſpheming him who is declared to be God by the law and the prophets; who, as he ſays, appears to be author of evil, delighting in war, inconſtant, and contrary to himſelf. But Jeſus,' he ſays, 'came from the

[a] Succedens autem ei Marcion Ponticus ampliavit doctrinam impudorate blaſphemans eum, qui a Lege et Prophetis annuntiatus eſt deus: malorum factorem, et bellorum concupiſcentem, et inconſtantem quoque ſententia, et contrarium ſibi ipſum dicens. Jeſum autem ab eo Patre, qui eſt ſuper mundi fabricatorem Deum, venientem in Judæam temporibus Pontii Pilati Præſidis, qui fuit procurator Tiberii Cæſaris, in hominis forma manifeſtatum his qui in Judæa erant, diſſolventem Prophetas et legem, et omnia opera ejus Dei, qui mundum fecit, quem et Coſmocratorem dicit. Et ſuper hæc, id quod eſt ſecundum Lucam Evangelium circumcidens, et omnia que ſunt de generatione Domini conſcripta, et de doctrina ſermonum Domini multa auferens, in quibus manifeſtiſſime conditorem hujus univerſitatis ſuum patrem confitens dominus conſcriptus eſt—non Evangelium, ſed particulam Evangelii tradens eis. Similiter autem et Apoſtoli Pauli epiſtolas abſcidit, auferens quæcunque manifeſte dicta ſunt ab Apoſtolo de eo Deo, qui mundum feçit, quoniam hic pater domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, et quæcumque ex Propheticis memorans Apoſtolus docuit prænuntiantibus adventum domini.

Salutem autem ſolum animarum eſſe futuram earum, quæ ejus doctrinam didiciſſent: corpus autem, videlicet quoniam a terra ſit ſumtum, impoſſibile eſſe participare ſalutem. Super blaſphemiam autem, quæ eſt in Deum, adjecit et hoc....Cain, et eos qui ſimiles ſunt ei, et Sodomitas et Ægyptios, et ſimiles eis, et omnes omnino gentes, quæ in omni permixtione malignitatis ambulaverunt, ſalvatas eſſe a Domino, cum deſcendiſſet ad inferos, et accurriſſent ei, et in ſuum aſſumſiſſe regnum. Abel autem et Enoch, et Noe, et reliquos juſtos, et eo qui ſunt erga Abraham Patriarcham, cum omnibus Prophetis, et his qui placuerunt Deo, non participaſſe ſalutem. Quoniam enim ſciebant, inquit, Deum ſuum ſemper tentantem eos, et tunc tentare eum ſuſpicati, non accucurrerunt Jeſu, neque crediderunt annuntiationi ejus. Et propterea remanſiſſe animas eorum apud inferos dixit. Iren. l. i. c. 27. [al. 29.] p. 106.

'Father,

'Father, who is ſuperior to the God that made the world. He 'came into Judea in the time of Pontius Pilate, governor under 'Tiberius Cæſar. He appeared to them in the form of a man, 'diſſolving the law and the prophets, and all the works of him 'that made the world. Moreover, he mutilated the goſpel ac- 'cording to Luke, ſtriking out all that relates to our Lord's 'nativity, and taking away many other things from our Lord's 'diſcourſes, eſpecially where he ſpeaks of the Creator of this world 'as his Father; thus delivering to his diſciples not the goſpel, 'but a ſcrap of it. In like manner he curtails the epiſtles of the 'apoſtle Paul, taking away thoſe paſſages where the apoſtle 'plainly ſpeaks of the Creator of the world, as the Father of our 'Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and alſo his quotations from the prophetical 'writings, that foretel the coming of the Lord. He held that 'the ſoul only will be ſaved; as for the body, it being taken from 'matter, it is, with him, incapable of ſalvation. Beſide all theſe 'blaſphemies, he maintained that Cain and the people of So- 'dom, and the Ægyptians, and all the nations in general, though 'they had lived in all manner of wickedneſs, were ſaved by the 'Lord when he deſcended into hell (or the inviſible world, the 'receptacle of departed ſpirits): for they came to him, and he 'took them up into his kingdom. But that Abel, and Enoch, 'and Noah, and the patriarchs, and the prophets, and other righ- 'teous men, who walked with God, and pleaſed him, did not ob- 'tain ſalvation. For,' ſays he, 'they knew their God had been 'wont to tempt or try them: and they ſuſpected that now a 'temptation was laid in their way. Therefore they would not 'come to Jeſus, nor believe in him; for which reaſon,' as he ſays, 'their ſouls remained in hell.'

So Irenæus. This paſſage of ſo early a writer will be of great uſe to us; but I need not obſerve his order in all things.

It will be proper for us firſt to obſerve Marcion's time and hiſtory, and then his principles or opinions.

SECT. II. *Of the Time in which he lived.*

IT is not eaſy to ſettle exactly Marcion's time. Cave ſuppoſeth that [b] he came to Rome in the year 127; and about the year 130 became a follower of Cerdon, and an open heretic. Mill too, [c] who likewiſe follows Pearſon as to the early time of Hyginus, is of much the ſame opinion. Pagi [d] placeth the ſpread-

[b] Hiſt. Lit. in Marcion. T. i. p. 55. [c] Proleg. n. 307. [d] Crit. in Baron. 144. n. 3.

ing of Marcion's hereſy in the year 144. But he thinks that this hereſy, as is common in other caſes, may be ſaid to have had ſeveral beginnings, according to divers computations. Marcion, according to him, came to Rome ſoon after the death of Hyginus, which, he ſays, cannot be deferred beyond the year 141. But he had before that broached his opinions in Syria, and probably had begun to do ſo in the reign of Adrian, or at leaſt in the beginning of the reign of Antoninus the Pious. Coming to Rome, preſently after the death of Hyginus, when the ſee was vacant, and the preſbyters of that church not receiving him, he returned into Aſia, and ſpread his principles with greater zeal and openneſs, about the year 144, where, as he ſays, Tertullian placeth Marcion. Petavius was very much of the ſame opinion, whoſe [e] words I place ſomewhat at length in the margin.

Let us now obſerve ſome particulars in the ancients. Irenæus, who, as we have ſeen, ſays that 'Cerdon was at Rome in 'the time of Hyginus, and makes Marcion his diſciple or im-'mediate ſucceſſor,' ſays likewiſe, in another place, that 'Mar-'cion [f] acted chiefly under Anicetus, who was the tenth in the 'ſucceſſion of the biſhops of Rome.'

Clement of Alexandria [g] ſpeaks of Baſilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, as being all in the reign of Adrian, and the firſt, or elder Antoninus, much about the ſame time, though this laſt was ſomewhat after the other two.

Tertullian ſpeaks of Marcion as [h] the firſt who had taught a different God, and ſuperior to the Creator; and often mentions the time in which he lived, but never with exactneſs, as if he

[e] Poſtremum, atque omnium difficillimum eſt, quod de Marcione nobis [ex J. M. Apologia] objicitur. Quem, ut conſentanea loquamur, affirmandum eſt non Antonino demum imperante, ſed ſub Adriano cœpiſſe. Atque haud ſcio an duo illius diſtinguenda ſint tempora, ut in pleriſque hæreſibus accidit: ita ut ſub Adriano primum eruperit, poſtea vero ſub Antonino longe lateque propagatis erroribus celebre ſibi nomen pepererit....Hygini obitus confertur in annum Antonini xviii. ante quod tempus Marcionem hæreſim ſuam diſſeminaſſe neceſſe eſt; cum Juſtinus, qui Antonino, et quidem imperii ejus initio, Apologiam obtulit, Marcionis meminerit. Quare duplex, uti conjiciebamus, Marcionitarum ortus eſſe debet. Nam primum in Ponto Aſia duntaxat nefarium dogma prædicavit, idque Adriano imperante. Poſtea ſub Antonino majores trahens ſpiritus vehementius in eoſdem errores cœpit incumbere. Hygino vero demum mortuo primitus dogma Cerdonis interpolaſſe Marcionem nullo modo cenſeo. Petav. Animad. ad H. 46. Epiph. p. 83. [f] Marcion autem illi ſuccedens invaluit ſub Aniceto decimum locum epiſcopatus obtinente. Iren. l. 3. c. 4. n. 3. 206. [g] Strom. l. 7. p. 764. C. D.

[h] Nemo alterum Deum auſus eſt ſuſpicari. Facilius de Filio quam de Patre hæſitabatur: donec Marcion præter Creatorem alium Deum ſolius bonitatis induceret. Præſcr. Hær. cap. 34. p. 344. B.

Quum igitur ſub Antonino primus Marcion hunc Deum induxerit, ſicut probavimus....atque ita non a Chriſto revelatum, quem conſtet a Marcione primum predicatum. Adv. Marcion. l. 1. c. 19. p. 443. A.

had

had any certain information about it. He once ſpeaks [i] of Marcion and Valentinus together, as both flouriſhing in the time of Antoninus, and in the epiſcopate of Eleutherius. In another place he ſpeaks of Marcion as certainly being a heretic of Antoninus's time, [k] but in what year his hereſy aroſe, he was not ſolicitous to know.

Celſus, who might write about the year 150, mentioned the Marcionites, as we learn from [l] Origen.

But perhaps Juſtin Martyr's works may lead us nearer the time of Marcion than any thing elſe. He wrote againſt Marcion. That work is mentioned by [m] Irenæus, as well as by [n] Euſebius. And it is reckoned [o] to be different from his work againſt all hereſies, mentioned by himſelf in his [p] firſt apology: in which [q] he twice ſpeaks of Marcion as ſtill living. That apology was written in the time of the elder Antoninus, in the year 140, or not long after. Conſequently, it is reaſonable to think that Marcion had appeared in the year 130, or very ſoon after; for Marcion had many followers when Juſtin wrote that apology. And when he ſays that Marcion was ſtill living, it is implied that he had made a figure for ſome time.

SECT. III. *The Hiſtory of him as given by Epiphanius.*

THE common account of Marcion, taken from Epiphanius, [r] is to this purpoſe: that 'he was born at Sinope in Pontus, where 'his father was biſhop. For ſome while,' as he ſays, 'Marcion 'lived a retired life, in ſtrict continence. But having admitted

[i] Ubi tunc Marcion, Ponticus nauclerus, Stoicæ ſtudioſus? Ubi Valentinus, Platonicæ Sectator? Nam conſtat illos, neque (alio) olim fuiſſe, Antonini fere principatu, et in Catholicæ primo doctrinam credidiſſe, apud Eccleſiam Romanenſem, ſub epiſcopatu Eleutherii benedicti. De Pr. cap. 30. p. 242. A.

[k] Quoto quidem anno Antonini majoris de Ponto ſuo exhalaverit aura canicularis, non curavi inveſtigare. De quo tamen conſtat, Antonianus hæreticus eſt, ſub Pio impius, &c. Adv. Marcion, l. 1. c. 19. p. 443. A. [l] Εμνησθη δ' ο κελσος και μαρκιωνιστων, προισταμενων μαρκιωνα. Contr. Celſ. l. 5. c. 62. p. 676. Bened. 272. lan.

[m] Και καλως ιουστινος εν τω προς μαρκιωνα συνταγματι φησιν. Iren. l. 4. c. 6. [al. 14.] p. 233. [n] Vid. Euſeb. l. 4. c. 11. p. 125. B. et. c. 18. p. 141. A.

[o] Sed et contra Marcionem inſignia volumina....et alius liber contra omnes hæreſes. Hier. de V. I. c. 23.

[p] Εςι δε ημιν και συνταγμα κατα πασων των γεγενημενων αιρεσεων. Ap. 1. p. 70. C.

[q] ος και νυν ετι εςι διδασκων τους πειθομενους....ος κατα παν γενος ανθρωπων....πολλους πεποιηκε βλασφημιας λεγειν. Ap. p. 70. A.

Και νυν διδασκει ω πολλοι πεισθεντες. Ib. p. 92. A. Conf. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 253. D. [r] Τον δε πρωτον αυτου βιον παρθενιαν δηθε νησκει· μοναζων γαρ υπηρχε...εξευται της εκκλησιας υπο του ιδιου πατρος...,Πολλα δηθεν ο μαρκιων καθικετευσας και αιτησας μετανοιαν ουκ ειληφε παρα του ιδιου πατρος....και ανεισιν εις την ρωμην αυτην....ζηλω λοιπον επαρθεις, ως ουκ απειληφε την προεδριαν τε και εισδυσιν της εκκλησιας. H. 42. n. 1. p. 302. B. C. D.

'an affection for a young woman, and having been guilty of un-
'cleanneſs with her, he was excommunicated by his father; who
'would never after receive him, though Marcion earneſtly en-
'treated him, and made profeſſions of ſincere repentance. Be-
'ing uneaſy under the reproaches which he met with in his own
'country, he went abroad, and arrived at Rome ſoon after the
'death of Hyginus. Here he attempted to be received to com-
'munion, and moreover aimed to be made biſhop. But, being
'diſappointed in both thoſe attempts, the preſbyters of that
'church rejecting him, he was exaſperated. Whereupon he
'joined himſelf to Cerdon, who, a little before, had begun to
'ſpread his peculiar opinions in the city of Rome.'

That Marcion was a native of Pontus is allowed by all. So ſaid Irenæus at the beginning of the long paſſage before tranſcribed from him. And, in like manner, many other ancient authors. He is called a ſailor, or mariner, by Rhodon in [s] Euſebius, and very often by [t] Tertullian: but for what reaſon is not [u] certain. Nor is it likely that a biſhop's ſon, and a learned man, as Marcion was, ſhould ever have followed ſuch an occupation. Perhaps thoſe authors refer only to his country as bordering upon the ſea, or his native city, a ſea port.

SECT. IV. *The Story of his deceiving a young Woman held doubtful by many.*

THE ſtory told by Epiphanius, of Marcion's deceiving a young woman, is alſo in the Appendix to Tertullian's Preſcriptions. [x] But it may be called in queſtion. I ſee that [y] the learned and excellent Ittigius doubted the truth of it.

I think that there are in Epiphanius's account ſome particulars that give the whole an appearance of improbability. For

[s] *καθως και ο ναυτης μαρκιων.* Ap. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 13. p. 177. B.

[t] Ubi tunc Marcion, Ponticus nauclerus, ſtoicæ ſtudioſus. De Pr. c. 30. p. 242. A. Scilicet nauclero illi non quidem Rhodia lex, ſed Pontica caverat. Adv. M. l. 3. cap. 6. p. 480. C. Quamobrem, Pontice nauclere, ſi nunquam furtivas merces in acatos tuas recepiſti, &c. Adv. M. l. 5. cap. 1. p. 515. D.

[u] Nautam vocat Rhodon....nauclerum Tertullianus: an quod artem nauticam primitus exercuerit? an quod uterque ludens in voce Pontus, Marcionis patriæ nomine, quæ et Aſiæ regionem, et Mare ſignificat, illum nautam aut nauclerum vocet, quaſi marinum hominem, in mari natum. Maſſ. Diſſ. Iren. p. 68.

Je ne ſaurois regarder ce mot, que comme une raillerie fondé ſur ce que Sinope étant ville maritime; elle étoit remplie des gens de mer. Beauſ. Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2. p. 70. [x] Marcion....epiſcopi filius, propter ſtuprum cujuſdam virginis ab eccleſiæ communicatione abjectus. De Pr. cap. 51. p. 253. D. [y] Etſi ipſe Tertullianus in prolixis quos contra Marcionem ſcripſit libris ejus rei nuſpiam meminerit, Ittig. de Hær. p. 128.

why

why ſhould Marcion's father refuſe to receive him into communion upon confeſſion and repentance, which ſeem to have been ſincere, if indeed he had ſo fallen as is ſaid? And his future conduct appears to have been free from reproach. Moreover his attempt to be received at Rome, and even to obtain the biſhopric of the church, is inconſiſtent with the ſuppoſition of ſo ſhameful a fall as that imputed to him by Epiphanius.

SECT. V. *Several Obſervations tending to ſhew its Incredibility.*

BEAUSOBRE [z] has a long argument upon this point, taken from the ſilence of ancient writers, and conſiſting of many particulars. I ſhall abridge it:

1. Irenæus appears to have been totally unacquainted with this affair. But is it poſſible that he who had been at Rome ſhould be ignorant of it, if true? or, if he had known it, could he have avoided the mention of it? Moreover he writes againſt a heretic that condemned marriage as a ſtate not ſufficiently pure. How could he forget to ſay that this ſame perſon had been guilty of fornication if he knew it?

2. Tertullian wrote five books againſt Marcion. He did not neglect any occaſion to decry his adverſary; nevertheleſs he ſays nothing of this ſcandalous adventure.

3. After having ſpoken of Marcion, Tertullian proceeds to his diſciple Apelles: who, he ſays, having [a] committed a fault with a woman, and thus apoſtatized from the Marcionite continence, did no more dare to ſhew himſelf before his holy maſter, and therefore retired to Alexandria. The ſame thing is mentioned [b] in the Additions to Tertullian's Preſcriptions. We may take another opportunity to conſider what the fault of Apelles was. But whether it were marriage or adultery, or fornication, here was a fair occaſion for Tertullian to mention a fault of Marcion of the like kind, if he had known of any ſuch thing. Tillemont [c] inquiring into the author of the Additions to Ter-

[z] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2. p. 77. &c.

[a] Sed lapſus in feminam, deſertor continentiæ Marcionenſis, ab oculis ſanctiſſimi magiſtri Alexandriam ſeceſſit. De Pr. c. 30. p. 242. B.

[b] Poſt hos ſubſequitur Apelles, diſcipulus Marcionis, qui poſteaquam in carnem ſuam lapſus eſt, a Marcione ſeparatus eſt. Pr. cap. 51. p. 254. A.

[c] Ce qu' il y a encore d'embaraſſant, et à quoy je ne ſai s'il eſt aiſé de trouver aucune reponſe raiſonnable, c'eſt, que dans tout ſon grand ouvrage contre Marcion, fait aprés ce catalogue, s'il en eſt l'auteur, il ne luy reproche jamais une faute ſi grande et ſi honteuſe. Il n'eſtoit pas homme à lui epargner ce reproche. Mem. Ec. T. 3. note vii. ſur Tertullien.

tullian's

tullian's book of Prescriptions, appears to have been very sensible of this difficulty.

4. The silence of the beforementioned writers, Irenæus and Tertullian, adds Beausobre, appears to me an invincible proof of Marcion's innocence: at least it is a proof of their unacquaintedness with that scandalous affair. Let us however shew that neither was it known in the East: forasmuch as Clement of Alexandria and Origen say nothing of it, though they do not spare Marcion. Clement in particular fills up almost all his third book of Stromata in rehearsing and confuting the arguments of Marcion and other Encratites against marriage. If these men had not observed the rules of chastity: if Marcion, who is mentioned more than twenty times in that book, had transgressed these rules in a scandalous manner, and had been, on that account, excommunicated by his own father, is it conceivable that St. Clement should say nothing of it? These proud men, says Clement, [d] boast of imitating our Saviour, who never married, and possessed nothing in this world. But they should know that God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble. Here he should by all means have mentioned the fall of Marcion, and unquestionably would have done so if he had known any thing of the matter.

5. Eusebius informs us of many authors who had written against Marcion: Justin Martyr, Dionysius of Corinth, Theophilus of Antioch, Philip of Gortyna, Modestus, Melito, and Apollinaris. He had read their writings. Nevertheless he makes no mention of this scandalous action of our heresiarch; which must be allowed to be a certain proof that it was not taken notice of in those works.

6. Jerom says [e] that Marcion sent before him to Rome a woman, to prepare the minds of people for his heresy. It is not known whence he had that particular. But he does not say that Marcion had seduced her or any other woman: which would have been so much to his purpose, that it cannot be imagined Jerom would have omitted it, if he had known any thing of it: since he omits not even conjectures and the slightest reports that tend to blacken the reputation of a heretic.

7. From the Greeks and Latins let us pass to the Syrians. St. Ephrem lived at Edessa, which was not very far from Sinope. There were many Marcionites in that country, which induced him

[d] Μιμεισθαι δ' αυτες οι μεγαλαυχοι φασι τον κυριον, μητε γημαντα, μητε τι εν τω κοσμω κτησαμενον· κ. λ. Clem. Str. l. 3. p. 446. C. [e] Marcion Romam præmisit mulierem, quæ decipiendos sibi animos præpararet. Ad Ctesiph. T. iv. p. 477. M.

him to write againſt them. His hymns againſt divers heretics, particularly againſt Marcion, are ſtill in being. As Marcion had miſled many by his auſterities, Ephrem endeavours to undeceive them. He ſays [f] that Marcion's apoſtles were wolves, but they had ſheep's cloathing: and that the devil put a cowl upon him, that he might deceive the children of light. And afterwards: Marcion imitated the ſerpent, and recommended faſting. How comes it about that Ephrem does not here unmaſk the man, and ſhew his hypocriſy; that, at his very firſt ſetting out, he had ſhamefully fallen, and violated that virtue which was the glory of his ſect, and by which many people were impoſed upon?

SECT. VI. *Some Reaſon to ſuſpect it was the Invention of Epiphanius.*

BUT what then ſhall we ſay to Epiphanius? One knows not well what to ſay; but if he had any authority for it, it muſt have been ſlight. We may be apt to ſuſpect it was an invention of his own. Philaſter and he ſeem to have drawn from the ſame ſource. They both ſay [g] that Marcion was of Sinope, and that he propoſed to explain to the preſbyters of Rome, our Lord's parable concerning old bottles and old garments. I do not remember to have read theſe particulars in any authors more ancient than theſe, who lived much about the ſame time: which makes me conjecture that they copied one and the ſame original. Nevertheleſs the ſtory of Marcion's fall is not in Philaſter; which ſhews that he never knew it, and that it was not in the author whom he made uſe of; which may lead perſons a little ſuſpicious to miſtruſt that Epiphanius himſelf is the author of the ſtory.

[f] Ex hoc hymno diſcimus, Marcionem auſterioris vitæ ſpeciem affectaſſe,...abſtinentiam et cælibatum ſimulaſſe, ſuiſque ſymmiſtis indixiſſe. 'Lupos Diabolus Apoſtolorum vice Marcioni dedit. Ut illos operiret, agnorum veſtimenta ſurripuit.' Et infra: 'Saccum Marcioni accommodavit, ut filios lucis infuſcaret.' Et paucis interjectis: 'Marcion anguem imitatus, jejunium amavit.' Aſſeman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 119.

[g] Marcion,...genere Ponticus, de civitate Sinope, urbem Romam devenit, ibique degens ſceleratam hæreſim ſeminabat, atque interrogans preſbyteros ſanctos eccleſiæ catholicæ ſenſus ſui eis errorem mortiferum propinabat, dicens ita: quid eſt quod in Evangelio, dicente Domino, ſcriptum eſt: Nemo pannum rudem mittit in veſtimentum vetus, neque vinum novum in utres veteres...? Et iterum: non eſt arbor bona, quæ faciat malum fructum, neque, arbor mala, quæ faciat bonum fructum, &c. Philaſt. H. 45. p. 94, 95. Conf. Epiph. Hær. 42. n. 2. p. 303.

SECT. VII. *He began to propagate his Errors in his own Country, for which he was expelled by his Father.*

BEAUSOBRE therefore concludes, from all these proofs, that the scandalous adventure of Marcion is, at the most, only a false report which Epiphanius had met with; and that the crime of this heresiarch, for which his father expelled him from the church, was his errors, which he had begun to publish in his own country.

Beausobre is not the only person who thinks that Marcion had published his notions in his own country: though many of the ancients reckon him a disciple of Cerdon, with whom he first became acquainted at Rome.

SECT. VIII. *His Way of Life was very unsettled.*

MARCION came to Rome soon after the death of Hyginus, whilst that see was vacant; and not meeting with much encouragement there, in a short time he went again into Asia. But he must have returned to Rome, if it was there that Polycarp saw him. Marcion's unsettled and wandering course of life is reflected upon by Tertullian and St. Ephrem [h]. Marcion was once a catholic, as Tertullian often says [i], and thence argues the novelty of his opinion.

SECT. IX. *He had a great Number of Followers.*

MARCION had many followers. Epiphanius says that [k] he deceived multitudes of people, and that his heresy still subsisted in his time at Rome, in Italy, Ægypt, Palestine, Arabia and Syria, in Cyprus, Thebais, Persia, and other places.

Justin intimates that [l] he had perverted many of all ranks in divers places.

[h] Tradit S. Epiphanius, Marcionem, e patrio solo expulsum, Romam profugisse, atque subinde alia ex aliis loca mutasse. Quapropter eundem Caino comparat S. Ephræm. 'Quoniam vero Marcion suum 'conditorem ejuraverat, mundum sibi 'ubique infestum habuit fremens.' Quamobrem a Tertulliano 'Hamaxobio insta-'bilior,' dictus est. Lib. i. c. 1. Asseman. B. O. Tom. i. p. 119.

[i] Te quidem plane non amasti, cum ab ecclesia et fide Christi recessisti. De Carn. Xti. cap. 4. p. 360. C. Sicut et ipse confiteris in quadam epistola: et tui non negant, et nostri probant. Ibid. cap. 2. p. 359. A.

[k] H. 42. n. 1. [l] Ος κατα παν γενος ανθρωπων.... πολλους πεπαικε βλασφημιας λεγειν, κ. λ. Ap. p. 70. A. Vid. Ib. p. 92. A.

Tertullian

Tertullian having mentioned Apelles, Valentinus, and Marcion, ſpeaks [m] as if there were a greater number of the followers of theſe than of the other heretics.

Theodoret converted [n] about a thouſand Marcionites in his dioceſe. In his preface to his ſecond book of Heretical Fables he ſays, 'a [o] few only remained ſcattered in divers cities of Syria, 'followers of Valentinus, Marcion, and Mani:' which he thinks a reproach to the paſtors of thoſe times, who were not vigilant enough to root out the ſmall remains of theſe hereſies.

Tertullian [p] ſpeaks of the deſerters of Marcion, that is thoſe who ſtill followed him in divers points, but differed from their maſter in ſome others.

Rhodon, of whom we ſpake formerly, [q] as flouriſhing about the year 190, ſays that 'in [r] his time the Marcionites were di-'vided into ſeveral parties:' the leaders of whom he makes to be Apelles, Potitus, Baſilicus, and Syneros.

The great number of books publiſhed againſt him in the ſecond century, and afterwards, ſhew the prevalence of this doctrine. In enumerating the works of my authors, as I have gone along, doubtleſs the reader has obſerved this; and in the Index at the end of this work, [s] are references to divers of thoſe writings.

Irenæus [t], whoſe words are likewiſe cited by Euſebius, ſays [u] that Polycarp, when he came to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, converted many followers of Valentinus and Marcion; which is alſo taken notice of by Jerom [x] in his article of Polycarp: which ſeems to ſhew that though Marcion met with no encouragement from the preſbyters of Rome, as Epiphanius ſays, yet he made converts there of other people.

His followers are ſuppoſed to have had him in great veneration; but then, when blamed for calling themſelves Marcionites, after their leader; they anſwered, that others called themſelves catholics, [y] though that name was not given to Chriſtians in ſcripture. And when aſked [z] whom they moſt reſpected, Paul or

[m] Hos ut inſigniores et frequentiores adulteros veritatis nominamus. De Præſ. cap. 30. p. 242. C.

[n] Ep. 113. Tom. 3. p. 986. D.

[o] H. F. lib. 2, Tom. 4. p. 218. C.

[p] Nam et Philumene illa magis perſuaſit Apelli cæteriſque deſertoribus Marcionis. Con. Mar. lib. 3. cap. 11. p. 486. A.

[q] Vol. ii. p. 304. [r] Apud Euſ. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 13. p. 177. B. C.

[s] See there Marcion.

[t] Iren. l. 3. c. 3. n. 4. p. 177. 203-4.

[u] H. E. l. 4. c. 14. p. 128. Æ.

[x] Hic ſub imperatore Antonino Pio, eccleſiam in Urbe regente Aniceto, Romam venit, ubi plurimos credentium, Marcionis et Valentini perſuaſione deceptos, reduxit ad fidem. De V. I. cap. 17.

[y] Ου γαρ χριστιανος σιομαζει, αλλα μαρκιωνιστης...Και υμεις της καθολικης λεγεσθε. ουκ εστε ουν χριστιανοι, ατε υμεις. Dialog. contr. Marcionit. p. 12. [z] Τις μειζων ην, μαρκιων η παυλος;...Παυλος....Μαρκιωνιστης μη ην. Ibid. p. 13.

Marcion;

Marcion; they answered, 'Paul was an apostle, Marcion their 'bishop only.'

Sect. X. *Of his Opinions and the Number of Principles which he held.*

This may suffice for Marcion's time and history; we proceed to his opinions.

Theodoret says that [a] Marcion held four principles, or unbegotten substances, as his expression is; one the good God, and unknown, whom he also calls the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the Creator, called by him just, and sometimes evil; and beside these matters, and the evil one that governs it. But if ever the Marcionites called the devil god, I suppose it was only figuratively, and in conformity to scripture; where he is sometimes called the god of this world, and is said to rule in the children of disobedience.

Some ascribe to Marcion and his followers the doctrine of three principles; so [b] Epiphanius and [c] Cyril of Jerusalem: but Augustine says that [d] Marcion held two principles; and maintains that to be the true account, against such as spoke of his holding three principles. And, in like manner, that ancient writer [e] Rhodon, who wrote against Marcion; and [f] the dialogue ascribed to Origen. Tertullian often says that [g] Marcion believed two gods, though not both equal [h].

It is likely that, according to different ways of speaking, men may be said to believe in more or fewer principles. But I ap-

[a] Τετταρας γαρ αγεννητους ουσιας τω λογω διεπλασε. Και τον μεν εκαλεσεν αγαθον τε και αγνωστον, ον και πατερα προσηγορευσε τω κυριω· τον δε δημιουργον τε και δικαιον, ον και πονηρον ωνομαζε· και προς τουτοις την υλην κακην τε ουσαν, και υπ' αλλω κακω τελουσαν. H. Fab. l. i. c. 24. p. 210. A. B.

[b] λεγων τρεις ειναι αρχας, μιαν μεν την ανω ακατονομαστον και αρρητον· ην και αγαθον θεον βουλεται λεγειν, μηδεν δε εν τω κοσμω κτισασαν· αλλον δε ειναι ορατον θεον, και κτιστην και δημιουργον·...Τον δε κτιστην και δημιουργον, και ορατον θεον ειναι ιουδαιων, ειναι δε αυτον κριτην· H. 42. n. 3. p. 304. A.

[c] Ο πρωτος τρεις θεους ειπων. Cyr. Cat. 16. c. 7. p. 246. Vid. et ib. c. 4. p. 244. D. Cat. 6. c. 16. p. 97. A. Ed. Bened.

[d] Marcion quoque, a quo Marcionitæ appellati sunt, Cerdonis secutus est dogmata de duobus principiis: quamvis Epiphanius cum tria dicat asseruisse principia, bonum, justum, pravum. Sed Eusebius [l. v. c. 13.] Sinerum quemdam, non Marcionem, trium principiorum atque naturarum scribit auctorem. De Har. cap. 22. Tom. 6. Venet.

[e] Ετεροι δε καθως και αυτος μαρκιων δυο αρχας εισηγουνται. Ap. Eus. l. 5. cap. 13. p. 177. B.

[f] Εγω οριζομαι, ου τρεις αρχας ειναι, αλλα δυο. Dial. p. 43. in.

[g] Duos Ponticus deos adfert:...quem negare non potuit, id est, creatorem, id est, nostrum: et quem probare non poterit, id est, suum. Adv. Marcion. lib. 1. c. 2. p. 431. B.

[h] Sic adhuc videmur disputare quasi duos pares constituat.... Alioquin certi Marcionem dispares Deos constituere: alterum judicem ferum bellipotentem: alterum mitem placidum et tantummodo bonum atque optimum. Adver. Mar. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 433, 434.

prehend

prehend that Marcion believed in only two eternals; the ſupreme God the Father who was Good, and Matter. For, according to him, the Creator was from the Father; and the devil, ſome how or other, ſprang out of Matter. That he thought Matter eternal is unqueſtionable [i]; it was the opinion of the ancient heathen philoſophers, and of the heretics that followed them.

In the dialogue which is aſcribed to Origen, [k] the word principle ſeems to be uſed both by Adamantius the orthodox diſputant, and by Megethius the Marcionite, as equivalent to lord and governor.

In anſwer therefore to the queſtion of Adamantius, over whom the three principles are governors? Megethius anſwers: that 'the good principle governs the Chriſtians; the creating prin-'ciple the Jews, and the evil principle the heathens.' But in the ſenſe of unbegotten, all-ſufficient, and independent, Marcion could hold but two, as is aſſerted before.

SECT. XI. *His Notion of the Creator, and the World formed by him; and the God ſuperior to him.*

IRENÆUS, at the beginning of the long paſſage before tranſcribed, ſays that 'Marcion blaſphemed the Creator, and ſaid 'that Jeſus came from the Father, who is ſuperior to the God 'that made the world.' In another place he ſays 'the [l] Mar-'cionites have two gods very different from each other, one 'much better than the other.' In another place that 'they [m] 'divide the Deity into two, one good, the other ſevere.

Juſtin, in like manner, ſays that 'Marcion [n] taught men to 'believe in another God, ſuperior to the Creator, and who was 'the ſupreme God the Father. He was, according [o] to them, 'inviſible, inacceſſible, and perfectly good.'

The

[i] Et materiam ei ſubjicit utique innatam et infectam et hoc nomine æternam. Adv. Mar. lib. 1. cap. 15. p. 441. A.

[k] ΑΔ. Αρχη γαρ μοι δοκει λεγεσθαι, δια το αρχειν τινος· ωσπερ και κυριος λεγεται, δια το κρατειν τινων. τινος τοινυν αρχουσιν αι τρεις αρχαι; αποκρινου. ΜΕΓ. Η αγαθη αρχει των Χριστιανων αρχειν· η δε δημιουργικη των Ιουδαιων· η δε πονηρα των Εθνικων. Dial. Contr. Marci. ſec. 1. p. 4. Baſil. 1674.

[l] Et quidem hi qui a Marcione ſunt ſtatim blaſphemant fabricatorem, dicentes eum malorum factorem:...duos naturaliter dicentes Deos, diſtantes ab invicem, alterum quidem bonum, alterum malum. Iren. lib. 3. c. 12. n. 12. p. 198. Duos Deos infinita diſtantia ſeparatos ab invicem. lib. 4. cap. 33. n. ii. p. 270.

[m] Marcion igitur ipſe dividens Deum in duo, alterum quidem bonum, et alterum judicialem dicens, ex utriſque interimit Deum. Id. l. 3. c. 25. n. iii. p. 224.

[n] αλλον τινα νομιζειν μειζονα του δημιουργου θεον. Ap. C. p. 70. A. Vid. et p. 92. A.

[o] Igitur quæcunque exigitis Deo digna, habebuntur in patre inviſibili, incongreſſibilique, et placido, et (ut ita dixerim) philoſophorum Deo. Adv. M. lib. 2. cap.

The Creator, the God of the Jews, according to Marcion and his followers, [p] made this lower and visible world. The supreme God the Father, had also a world of his making, but better than this, immaterial and invisible. Justin says that 'according [q] to Marcion the supreme Deity had made greater 'and better things than the Creator of this visible world.' To the like purpose Tertullian, whose words I place at the bottom of the page [r]; so also [s] Jerom.

Some ancient writers say that the Marcionites held two gods, one good, the other evil. But, as at other times, they represent them, as calling one good, the other a judge or severe; this must be their meaning.

On this account it may be proper to observe passages of several ancient authors relating to this matter.

Jerom says that 'Marcion [t] taught Jesus to be the son of the 'good God, that is, not of the same God spoken of in the pro-'phets, who,' they say, 'is there represented as cruel, righteous, 'just, a judge, and the like.'

To the same purpose also Clement of Alexandria, who, I apprehend may be relied upon. The [u] Marcionites say that nature, or the world, is evil, because it is made of matter, which is evil in itself; and that the world was made by the Creator who is just. They therefore are spoken of as having but low thoughts of this world on account of it's being very imperfect, and not

cap. 27. p. 475. A. Sic adhuc videmur disputare, quasi duos Marcion pares constituat:...alioquin certi Marcionem dispares Deos constituere: alterum judicem, ferum, bellipotentem: alterum mitem, placidum et tantummodo bonum atque optimum, &c. Adv. M. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 434. A. B. [p] Certe Deum confiteris Creatorem? Certe inquis, &c. Adv. Mar. lib. 2. cap. 16. p. 466. B. Creatorem autem et Marcion, Deum non negat. Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 7. p. 588. D.

[q] Αλλον δε τινα, ως ονται μειζονα, τα μειζονα παρα τουτον ομολογειν πεποιηκεναι. p. 70. B. [r] Quum dixeris esse et illi conditionem suam, et suum mundum, et suum cœlum. Jam nunc de loco quæstio est, pertinens et ad mundum illum superiorem, et ad ipsum Deum ejus. Ecce enim, si et ille habet mundum suum infra se, supra Creatorem, in loco utique fecit eum. Adv. Marc. lib. 1. cap. 15. p. 440. B. C. Non comparente igitur mundo alio, sicut nec Deo ejus, consequens est, ut duas species rerum, visibilia et invisibilia, duobus auctoribus Deis dividant, et ita suo Deo invisibilia defendant. Id. ibid. cap. 16. p. 441. B. [s] Si de Marcionis arguereris hæresi, quæ alterum bonum, alterum justum Deum inferens: illum invisibilium, hunc visibilium asserit Creatorem. Ad. Pammach. cap. 38. [al. 61.] p. 315. f. [t] Denique Marcion hæreticus boni Dei Filium, hoc est, alterius, putat esse Christum, et non justi, cujus prophetæ sunt: quem sanguinarium, crudelem, et judicem vocat. Com. in Is. c. 8. p. 68. ad fin. Confundetur Marcion, duos deos intelligens, unum bonum et alium justum, alterum invisibilium, alterum visibilium conditorem. In Is. c. 44. p. 334. B. Vid. eundem in Ezek. cap. 9. p. 751. in. et fin. An ignoramus, Marcionem, et cæteros hæreticos, qui vetus laniant Testamentum, contemto Creatore, id est, justo Deo, alium quemdam bonum Deum colere et adorare, quem de suo corde finxerunt. In Ezek. cap. 9. p. 751. in. [u] Οι απο μαρκιωνος φυσιν κακην, εκ τε της ὑλης κακης και εκ δικαιου γενεσιν δημιουργου. Str. lib. 3. p. 431. B.

worthy

worthy of the ſupreme Deity: and yet, as Tertullian [x] ſays, they reſpected the Creator.

SECT. XII. *The Marcionite Idea of the Difference between good and juſt.*

THE account given by Origen of the ſentiments of thoſe who held a different God from the Creator, is ſimilar to the above repreſentation. He ſays [y] this laſt was juſt, the God above him good; and Jerom himſelf ſays the ſame in the place juſt quoted.

But what is the difference between good and juſt? Beauſobre [z] gives this account of it: 'Bardeſanes, dividing men into three 'ſorts, ſays; "ſome [a] are like ſcorpions and adders, who hurt "unprovoked: others do evil to thoſe only who do evil to "them; they are ſatisfied with revenging the injuries they re-"ceive: others, finally, are mild and gentle as lambs; and ren-"der not evil for evil. The firſt [b] are called wicked, the ſecond "juſt, the laſt good. According to theſe definitions, the good "God is he who never does evil to any: the juſt is he who "treateth men according to their deſerts; he puniſheth the "guilty: the evil one is he who does evil, even to the in-"nocent."

SECT. XIII. *The good God was the Maker of Beings ſpiritual and inviſible.*

GOD the Father, according to Marcion, was the maker of beings ſpiritual, inviſible, and happy, as is allowed. And yet Tertullian [c] frequently repreſents Marcion's deity as idle, indolent, happy in his eaſe and tranquillity, and the like.

Poſſibly

[x] Narem contrahentes impudentiſſimi Marcionitæ convertuntur ad deſtructionem operum Creatoris: nimirum, inquiunt, grande opus et dignum Deo mundus. Numquid ergo Creator minime Deus? Plane Deus. Ad. M. l. 1. c. 13. p. 438. D. At quum et animalia irrides minutiora, quæ maximus artifex de induſtria ingeniis aut viribus ampliavit...imitare, ſi potes, apis ædificia, formicæ ſtabula, araneæ retia, bombycis ſtamina...Poſtremo, te tibi circumtor, intus ac foris conſidera hominem. Placebit tibi vel hoc opus Dei noſtri, quod tuus dominus ille Deus melior adamavit. Ibid. cap. 14. p. 439. D.

[y] Οι δε ετερον θεον φασκοντες παρα τον δημιουργον, δικαιον μεν αυτον ειναι θελουσι, και ου αγαθον. Orig. in Ex. p. 17, 18. Huet. Tom. 2. p. 112. A. Bened. Τους δε απο των αιρεσεων...δικαιον μεν ειναι τον δημιουργον, αγαθον δε τον του χριστου πατερα. Id. in Joh. p. 38. A. B. Huet.

[z] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2. p. 91.

[a] Ap. Euſeb. Præ. Ev. lib. 6. cap. 10. p. 274. [b] Οι μεν λεγονται αγαθοι, οι δε κακοι, οι δε δικαιοι. Ibid.

[c] Inde Marcionis Deus melior de tranquillitate. A Stoicis venerat. De Pr. cap. 7. p. 232. D. Si aliquem de Epicuri ſchola Deum adfectavit Chriſti nomine titulare,

Possibly one reason of this is, that [d] Marcion's god was good only, never offended with, or punished evil doers.

But besides this there appear to be other reasons of this charge. For Tertullian argues that [e] none of his works were visible or known; and therefore there was no reason to believe in him, as it did not appear that he had made any thing. Moreover, though he saw the disorders of this world of the Creator, he did not interpose, nor take any step to amend things, till at last [f], after a long space of time, he sent his son. But except this, [g] he never did any kind of good which men were ever sensible of, or by which he might be known to be what they called him, a God made up entirely of goodness and benevolence. In short, he there shews that there was no proof of any Deity different from, or superior to, the Creator of the visible world.

titulare, ut quod beatum et incorruptibile sit, neque sibi, neque alii molestias præstet, (hanc enim sententiam ruminans Marcion, removit ab illo severitatem, et judiciarias vires) aut in totum immobilem et stupentem Deum concepisse debuerat. Ad. Mar. Lib. 1. cap. 25. p. 449. A.

[d] In ipso præconio solitariæ bonitatis, qua nolunt ii adscribere ejusmodi motus animi, quos in Creatore reprehendunt: si enim neque æmulatur, neque irascitur, neque damnat, neque vexat, ut pote qui nec judicem præstat. Ibid. l. 1. c. 26. p. 449. D. —— Donec Marcion præter Creatorem alium Deum, solius bonitatis induceret. De Præscr. c. 34. p. 244. B. Deus autem Marcionis et quia ignotus non potuit offendi quia nescit irasci. Ad. Marci. l. 5. c. 5. p. 584. A.

[e] Unam saltem circulam Deus Marcionis propriam protulisse debuerat....Aut exhibe rationem Deo dignam, cur nihil condiderit. Adv. M. l. 1. c. 11. p. 437. D. Hoc ipso nemo debeat credere Deum et illum qui nihil condidit, nisi ratio forte proferatur. Ib. p. 438. A. Nam et quale est, ut Creator quidem ignorans esse alium super se Deum, ut volunt Marcionitæ,.... tantis operibus notitiam sui ammoverit. ille autem sublimior, sciens inferiorem Deum tam instructum, nullam sibi prospexerit agnoscendo paraturam: quando etiam insigniora et superbiora opera debuisset condidisse, ut Deus cognosceretur secundum Creatorem: et ex honestioribus potior et generosior Creatore. Ibid. p. 418. B. Non comparente igitur mundo alio, sicut nec Deus ejus—Quis autem poterit inducere in animum, nisi spiritus hæreticus, ejus esse invisibilia, qui nihil visibile præmiserit: quam ejus qui visibilia operatus, invisibilium quoque fidem fecerit: quum justius multo sit aliquibus exemplariis adnuere, quam nullis. L. 1. c. 16. p. 444. A.

[f] His compressi erumpunt dicere, sufficit unicum hoc opus Deo nostro, quod hominem liberavit summa et præcipua bonitate sua. Ad. Mar. Lib. 1. c. 17. p. 441. D. Exhibe perfectam quoque bonitatem ejus....Non enim omnes salvi fiunt, sed pauciores omnibus et Judæis, et Christianis Creatoris. Pluribus vero pereuntibus, quomodo perfecta defenditur bonitas?....Sed malitia perfectior. Sed nolo jam de parte majore pereuntium. Imperfectum bonitatis arguere Deum Marcionis, sufficit ipsos quos salvos facit, imperfectæ salutis inventos. Ibid. Lib. 1. c. 24. p. 447, 448. Conf. Lib. 1. c. 25. p. 449. A. Lib. 4. c. 25. p. 542. B. 543. A. Lib. 5. c. 4. p. 581. B. et Lib. 5. c. 4. p. 581. B. et Lib. 5. c. 16. p. 601. A.

[g] Sed quis iste suavis, qui ne cognitus quidem usque adhuc? quomodo suavis, a quo nulla beneficia processerant. Adv. M. l. 4. c. 17. p. 528. B. Sed et cur apud Dominum optimum, et profusæ misericordiæ, alii salutem referunt, credentes crucem, virtutem et sapientiam Dei: alii perditionem quibus Christi crux stultitia reputatur. Ibid. l. 5. c. 5. p. 584. B.

Jam nunc de loco quæstio est, pertinens et ad mundum illum superiorem, et ad ipsum Deum ejus. Ecce enim, si et ille habet mundum suum infra se, supra Creatorem, in loco utique fecit eum. L. 1. cap. 15. p. 440. C.

SECT. XIV. *The Marcionites erroneous in dividing the Deity.*

IN dividing the Deity, Marcion and his followers were undoubtedly in the wrong. They ſeem however to have gone into this opinion out of reſpect to his attributes. For they thought, if a good god had made the world, there would have been neither ſin, nor miſery, but all men would have been both holy and happy. Their reaſonings upon this point are given us by Tertullian, [h] as alſo ſome other arguments [i] which they brought from the law, and other parts of the Old Teſtament, to prove the being from whom that was derived, different from the ſupreme or good God.

The Marcionites, [k] in the dialogue aſcribed to Origen, frequently uſe the ſame ſort of reaſonings, taken from ſome actions of inſpired men, and from ſome commands under the law, which

[h] Si Deus bonus, et præſcius futuri, et avertendi mali potens, cur hominem—paſſus eſt labi de obſequio legis in mortem, circumventus a diabolo. Si enim et bonus, qui evenire tale quid nollet, et præſcius, qui eventurum non ignoraret: et potens qui depellere valeret, nullo modo evenîſſet quod ſub his tribus conditionibus divinæ majeſtatis evenire non poſſet. Adv. Marci. Lib. 21. cap. 5. p. 456. C. Languens enim circa mali quæſtionem: unde malum? et obtuſis ſenſibus ipſa enormitate curioſitatis, inveniens Creatorem pronuntiantem, Ego ſum qui condo mala—et ita in Chriſto quaſi aliam inveniens diſpoſitionem, ſolius et puræ benignitatis ut diverſæ a Creatore, facile novam et hoſpitam argumentatus eſt divinitatem in Chriſto ſuo revelatam, modicoque exinde fermento totam fidei maſſam hæretico acore decepit. Quo facilius duos Deos caci perſpexiſſe ſe exiſtimaverunt. Unum enim non integre viderant. Alterum igitur Deum quem confiteri cogebatur, de malo infamando deſtruxit. Alterum quem commentari connitebatur de proferendo conſtruxit. Ibid. Lib. 1. c. 2. p. 431. B. C.

[i] Magnum argumentum Dei alterius permiſſio obſoniorum adverſus legem, quaſi non et ipſi confiteamur legis onera dimiſſa; ſed ab eo qui impoſuit, qui novationem repromiſit. Ibid. l. 5. c. 7. p. 589. D. Olim duplicem vim Creatoris vindicavimus, et judicis et boni, littera occidentis per legem, ſpiritu vivificantis per evangelium. Non poſſunt duos Deos facere, quæ etſi diverſa apud unum recenſeri pervenerunt. Si ideo ut claritatem majorem defenderet (Apoſtolus) novi Teſtamenti, quod manet in gloria, quam veteris, quod evacuari habebat; hoc et meæ convenit fidei præponenti evangelium legi, et vide ne magis meæ. Ibid. Lib. 5. c. 11. p. 591. A. B. An ignoramus Marcionem et cæteros hæreticos qui vetus laniant Teſtamentum contempto Creatore i. e. juſto Deo, alium quemdam bonum Deum colere et adorare, quem de ſuo corde finxerunt. Hieron. in Ezek. c. 9. p. 751. In. Blaſphemare vel Teſtamenti veteris Deum, irridere et contemnere. Ibid. fin.

[k] Δεικνυω, οτι ο Δημιουργος αλλα ενομοθετησι, και ο χριστος αλλα εναιτια τουτω. Dial. Con. Marc. Sec. 1. p. 14. Οτι ο χριστος ανετρεψε τα του δημιουργου, και δεικνυμι οτι ανετρεψεν. κ.τ.λ. Ibid. p. 16, 17.

Ο Προφητης του Θεου της γενεσεως, πολεμου συσαντος προς τον λαον, αναβας επι την κορυφην του ορους εξετεινε τας χειρας αυτου προς τον Θεον ινα πολλους τω πολεμω ανελη. Ο δε Κυριος ημων αγιος ων, εξετεινε τας χειρας αυτου ουχι του ανελειν τους ανθρωπους αλλα του σωσαι. Τι αν ομοιον, ο μεν δια της εκτασεως των χειρων αναιρει, ο δε σωζει. Ibid. p. 19.

Ο εν τω νομω Κυριος λεγει, Αγαπησεις τον αγαπωντα σε, και μισησεις τον εχθρον σου. Ο δε Κυριος ημων αγαθος ων λεγει, Αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων, και ευχεσθε υπερ των διωκοντων υμας. Ibid. p. 20. Vid. etiam. p. 21, 23, 24, 25, &c.

they considered opposite to the conduct and commands of Christ and his apostles, under the gospel.

With respect to that argument which they drew from the goodness of God, to prove that he could not be the Creator of this world, it only removed the difficulty one step further back. As Beausobre therefore justly observes,[l] the system of these men was liable to as great objections as that of the catholics. For the same perfections which rendered it unlikely that the supreme being should make such a world as ours, would also have obliged him to hinder[m] the Creator from making it; or would have led him to have directed him in his works of creation, and to have over-ruled him so as to prevent the bad effects which his operations might have otherwise produced.

Sect. XV. *They were Believers in a future Judgment, and in the Necessity of Human Actions.*

Though in some instances, according to several passages already quoted from Tertullian and others, they seem to blame justice, calling it by the name of severity,[n] and representing it as inconsistent with the character of goodness in God; and for that reason feigning to themselves another God,[o] different from the Creator, a God of unmixed goodness; yet they[p] allowed that there would be a future judgment. But then the Creator[q] was to

[l] Histoire de Mani. tom. 2. p. 93. in.

[m] MET. Η τȣ αγαθȣ (αρχη) εσχυροτερα. Dia. Con. Mar. sec. 1. p. 6. απαξ δε ισχυροτερος αυτων εστιν. Ibid.

[n] Quanta itaque perversitas vestra erga utrumque ordinem creatoris? Judicem eum designatis, et severitatem judicis secundum merita causarum congruentem pro sævitia exprobatis. Deum Optimum exigitis, et lenitatem ejus benignitati congruentem, pro captu mediocritatis humanæ dejectius conversatam ut pusillitatem depreciatis. Nec magnus vobis placet, nec modicus, nec judex, nec amicus. Adv. Mar. Lib. 2. cap. 27. p. 475. A. B.

[o] Qui idcirco alium Deum somniasti solummodo bonum, quia non potes judicem: quamquam et illum ut judicem ostendimus. Aut si non judicem, certe perversum ac vanum disciplinæ non vindicandæ id est non judicandæ constitutorem. Non reprobas autem Deum judicem, qui non judicem Deum probas?— Porro quum cogeris injustitiam de pessimis pronuntiare, eodem jugo urgeris justitiam de optimis censere. Igitur quanto malum injustitia, tanto bonum justitia. Ibid. Lib. 2. c. 11. p. 462. D. 3. A.

[p] Videte quomodo audiatis. Non audituris minabatur. Si a Deo Marcionis dabitur et ab eo auferetur. Ibid. Lib. 4. cap. 19. p. 531. D. Ergo jam times delictum, et timendo probasti, illum timeri, qui prohibet delictum. Ibid. Lib. 1. cap. 27. ΑΔ. Κριτης εστι δικαιος ο Θεος, η ου; ΜΑΡ. Κριτης δικαιος ο Θεος εστιν. ΑΔ. Τινα κρινει. ΜΑΡ. κρινει τον διαβολον και τȣς αγγελȣς αυτȣ, και ανθρωπȣς, τȣς πεισθεντας αυτω. Dial. Con. Ma. sec. 3. p. 81. Bas. 1674.

[q] Quoquo tamen nomine comminatur ablationem, non erit ejus Dei qui nescit comminari, quia non novit irasci. Ibid. Lib. 4. c. 19. p. 531. D. Multo adhuc vanius cum interrogati quid fiet peccatori cuique Dei illorum respondent abjici illum quasi ab oculis. Nonne et hoc judicio agitur? Judicatur

to be the judge, whose justice they represented to be so strict as [r] to approach near to severity.

From a passage in Tertullian, [s] and also from the manner in which the dispute is carried on with the Marcionite, in the dialogue before [t] referred to, it seems to appear that they did not allow the freedom of human actions, but were believers in a kind of necessity.

SECT. XVI. *They thought the Souls, but not the Bodies of the Virtuous would be happy in a future State.*

THEY thought that the virtuous would be put in possession of eternal happiness, [u] after their departure out of this world, and that the place of their enjoyment would be where the presence of the good God [x] was, and where Christ their Saviour should also reside: but they did not allow that the body [y] would be a partaker in this happiness, or at least they denied the resurrection [z]

dicatur enim abiiciendus et utique judicio damnationis. Et quid erit abjici nisi amittere id quod erat consecuturus si non abiiceretur, id est salutem.—Exitus autem illi abjecto quis? Ab igne inquiunt Creatoris deprehendetur. Ibid. Lib. 10, 27, 28. Τον δε κτισην και δημιουργον και οριατον Θεον ειναι των Ιουδαιων, ειναι δε αυτον κριτην. Ep. Hær. 42. p. 304. A.

[r] Quem sanguinarium crudelem et judicem vocant. Hieron. in Isai. c. 7. p. 68.

Alterum judicem Ferum bellipotentem. Ad. M. Lib. 1. c. 6. [s] Inesse autem nobis το αυτεξουσιον naturaliter jam et Marcioni ostendimus et Hermogeni. De Anima. c. 21. p. 324. C.

[t] Μαρ. Αυτεξουσιος εστι και ο διαβολος κατα σε. Το δε αυτεξουσιον και αυτοφυες και αυτογενητον. Αυτεξουσιον φης και τον διαβολον και των αιδιον. κ. τ. λ. Dia. Adv. Mar. sec. 3. p. 79. 83. [u] Immo inquis ipsum ab illo (quod et ipsum faciat ad testimonium diversitatis) regnum Dei æternum et cœlestis possessionis. Ad. Mar. Lib. 3. c. 24. p. 499. A. [x] Sed Marcion aliorsum cogit, scilicet utramque mercedem creatoris, sive tormenti, sive refrigerii apud inferos, determinat eis positam qui legi et prophetis obedierint. Christi vero et Dei sui cœlestem definit sinum et portum. Eam itaque regionem, sinum scilicet Abrahæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat, tunc apparitura cœlesti promissione quam Marcioni suo vindicat, quasi non a creatore vindicatam. Ad quam ascensum suum Christus ædificat in cœlum utique suis ubi est et locus æternus. Ibid. L. 4. c. 34. p. 559. C. D. [y] Si plena est gratia et solida misericordia quæ soli animæ salutaris est plus præstat hæc vita qua toti et integri fruimur. Cæterum ex parte resurgere multari erit non liberari. Ib. L. 1. c. 24. p. 448. Si caro negatur nec de resurrectione constabit. Ita resurrectione Christi non consistente auferetur et mortuorum resurrectio. Ib. l. 3. c. 8.

Marcion enim in totum carnis resurrectionem non admittens et soli animæ salutem repromittens. Ib. l. 5. c. 10. p. 504. B. C. Nemo carnem suam odio habet, nisi plane Marcion solus.—At tu solus eam odisti auferens illi resurrectionem, Ib. L. 5. c. 18. p. 610. B. C. Τι της σαρκος αθετει αναστασιν. Ep. Hær. 42. p. 304. B. [z] ΜΑΡ. Β τουτο το σωμα λεγει ανιστασθαι, αλλα ετερον απο του λεγειν ο δε Θεος διδωσιν αυτω σωμα καθως θελησει.... αλλα ορας, οτι λεγει Β το γενησομενον σωμα σπειρεις αλλα γυμνον κοκκον σιτου. Dia. Con. Mar. sec. 5. p. 143. Ba. 1674.

of the ſame body; for which reaſon Tertullian [a] impeaches this perfectly benevolent God of the Marcionites, as deficient in goodneſs, not only for not ſaving all men, but likewiſe for conferring happineſs on but one part of the nature of thoſe whom he did ſave: and often [b] blames them for impoſing ſuch heavy burdens on the body, without affording it any hopes of recompenſe in the reſurrection.

Sect. XVII. *The Belief of a Tranſmigration aſcribed to them by Epiphanius.*

If Epiphanius [c] gives us a true account of the opinions of Marcion, he taught the tranſmigration of ſouls from one body to another. This opinion of his is taken little or no notice of by any other writer. On the contrary, there is a paſſage in Clemens Alexandrinus, [d] which implies that this was not the opinion of the Marcionites. For he there informs us, that though the Marcionites had taken their notions about the evil of generation from ſome philoſophers whom he had before mentioned, yet they differed from them in ſome particulars relative to this point. For theſe philoſophers aſſerted, that matter was not evil in itſelf, but only when conſidered as the priſon of the ſoul. The ſoul, they aſſerted, was divine in it's nature, and was thruſt into this world as into a place of puniſhment; and that ſuch ſouls as were embodied in theſe circumſtances, needed purification. This, he expreſsly ſays, was not a ſentiment embraced by the followers of Marcion, but rather the opinion of thoſe, who held that ſouls were thruſt into bodies, and tied to them, and poured from one to another, as if from veſſel to veſſel. In this therefore, Clemens aſſerts, that the Marcionites did not hold the tranſmigration of ſouls. And Epiphanius, who knew that

[a] Sufficit ipſos, quos ſalvos facit, imperfectæ ſalutis inventos, imperfectam bonitatem ejus oſtendere. Scilicet anima tenus ſalvos, carne deperditos, quæ apud illum non reſurgit. Quid enim tam perfectæ bonitatis quam totum hominem redigere in ſalutem? Ad. Mar. L. 1. c. 24. p. 448. [b] Et in hoc totum ſalutis ſacramentum carnem mergit exortem ſalutis. Proinde cum tantam ſive ſarcinam ſive gloriam infirmiſſimæ aut indigniſſimæ carni imponit ſanctitatem—quid non ſalute remunerat—quam onerat vel exornat? quid fraudat mercede operis, non rependens carni ſalutem? quid et honorem ſanctitatis in illa mori patitur? Ibid. L. 1. c. 28. p. 451. D. [c] Και μεταγγισμους ομοιως των ψυχων και μετενσωματωσεις απο σωματων εις σωματα φασκει. Epi. Hær. 42. p. 305. C.

[d] Οι φιλοσοφοι δε παρ' ων την γενεσιν κακην ειναι, ασεβως εκμαθοντες οι απο Μαρκιωνος....κατακλειεσθαι γαρ ενταυθα την ψυχην θειαν ουσαν, καθαπερ εις κολαστηριον του κοσμου, αποκαθαιρεσθαι δε τας ενσωματουμενας ψυχας προσηκει κατ' αυτους. και εστι το δογμα τουτο ουκ εν τοις απο Μαρκιωνος ετι, τοις δε ενσωματουσθαι και μετενδεισθαι και μεταγγιζεσθαι τας ψυχας αξιουσιν, οικειον. Strom. Lib. 3. p. 432.

they

they borrowed ſome of their notions concerning matter from philoſophers, who believed the tranſmigration of ſouls, might too haſtily conclude that they agreed with them alſo in that point.

SECT. XVIII. *Some Account of their Notion that Chriſt delivered the Wicked and left the Good.*

IRENÆUS in the paſſage afore [e] cited, to which I now only refer, without tranſcribing it again at large, ſays, 'Marcion 'taught that when Chriſt deſcended to hell, he delivered many 'wicked people, but left there the patriarchs, and many other 'good men of the Old Teſtament.'

Epiphanius [f] too ſays that, according to Marcion, 'the Lord 'deſcended to hell and ſaved Cain, and Corah, and Dathan, and 'Abiram, and Eſau, and all the nations, who did not worſhip 'the God of the Jews; but that he left there Abel, Enoch, 'Noah, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob, and Moſes, and David, 'and Solomon.' To the like purpoſe Theodoret, that 'Cain [g] 'and the people of Sodom, and other wicked people, came to 'the Lord Jeſus in hell, obtained ſalvation, and were taken by 'him into his kingdom: but Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and 'the patriarchs, and the prophets, were not delivered, becauſe 'they would not come to him.' Tertullian alſo has a plain reference to [h] this matter.

Upon which Beauſobre [i] has made obſervations which will be readily admitted by moſt, as giving a probable explication of this notion of Marcion.

1. 'It was,' ſays he, 'a very general opinion that Jeſus 'Chriſt went to Hades, and preached there, and brought thence 'all that believed in him. The ancients being of opinion that 'eternal life is not to be obtained but through faith in Jeſus 'Chriſt; and that God is too merciful to let men periſh for 'not having heard the goſpel; ſuppoſed that the Lord preached 'alſo to the dead, that they might have the ſame advantage with 'the living.

2. 'In the language of Marcion, and the fathers likewiſe, 'hell does not neceſſarily mean the place of the damned: in 'that ſpace is Tartarus, the place of torment, and paradiſe, or 'the boſom of Abraham, a place of reſt and refreſhment. In 'that part of Hades Jeſus found the juſt men of the Old Teſta-

[e] Adv. Hær. lib. 1. cap. 27. [al. 29.] p. 105. [f] H. 42. n. iv. p. 305.
[g] H. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 24. p. 211. Adv. M. lib. 3. cap. 24. p. 499. A. [h] O Deum etiam ad inferos miſericordem.
[i] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 2. p. 111, 113.

'ment.

'ment. They were not miſerable, but were in a place of com-
'fort and pleaſure. "For," as Marcion ſays in Tertullian,
"your [k] Chriſt promiſeth the Jews after this life reſt in Hades,
"even in the boſom of Abraham."

3. 'Chriſt preached the goſpel to thoſe juſt men; but they
'having never heard of the inviſible or ſupreme Deity, who,
'as Marcion ſaid, "was unknown before the coming of Chriſt,
"they ſuſpected that the Creator deſigned to tempt them, which
"hindered them from believing in Chriſt." Marcion very
'probably took this thought from thoſe places of the Old Teſta-
'ment, where God forewarns the Iſraelites not to hearken to
'prophets that preached another God, though they wrought
'ſigns and wonders; foraſmuch as in ſuch a caſe they might
'know that Jehovah, whom they ſerved, only tried them to
'prove their fidelity.

4. 'The Lord having preached to thoſe juſt men in Abra-
'ham's boſom, and they not receiving him, he went to Tarta-
'rus, the place of the damned, where were confined by the
'Creator, Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, and the people of So-
'dom and Gomorrah, and other wicked men; and made a tender
'of mercy to thoſe miſerable ſouls who had been ſuffering for
'many ages the puniſhment of their crimes. They embraced
'his offer and repented, and he took them with him into his
'kingdom.' All which is not a little countenanced by what Irenæus ſays. There is ſtill more upon this ſubject in Beauſobre, to whom I refer, which may be read by the inquiſitive.

Sect. XIX. *Marcion's Opinion about the Perſon of Chriſt, that he was not a real Man.*

Marcion was ſo far from believing that our Saviour was born of a virgin, that he did not allow [l] he was born at all. He thought the Son of God took the exterior form of a man [m], and appeared as a man [n]; and [o] without being born, or gradually

[k] Cæterum veſter Chriſtus priſtinum ſtatum Judæis pollicetur, ex reſtitutione terræ, et poſt decurſum vitæ apud inferos in ſinu Abrahæ refrigerium. Adv. M. lib. 3. cap. 24. p. 499. A.

[l] Sed et virginem inquit parere, natura non patitur. Adv. Mar. l. 3. c. 13. p. 487. D.

[m] Cum propterea nec corporis ſuſceperit veritatem...Qui corpus non habuit, ungui omnino non potuit: qui ungui omnino non potuit Chriſtus vocari nullo modo potuit. Ib. c. 15. p. 490. B.

[n] Sic enim et Marcion phantaſma eum maluit credere, totius corporis in illo dedignatus veritatem. De Anima. cap. 17. p. 319. D.

[o] Non fuit inquis ordo ejuſmodi neceſſarius, quia ſtatim ſe et filium, et miſſum, et Dei Chriſtum rebus ipſis eſſet probaturus per documenta virtutum. Adv. Mar. l. 3. c. 3. p. 478. A.

growing

growing up to the full ſtature of a man, he ſhewed himſelf at once in Galilee as a man grown. Is is thought that his goſpel of St. Luke began with theſe words: 'In [p] the fifteenth year of 'Tiberius, God deſcended into Capernaum, a city of Galilee.' At leaſt Tertullian ſeems to intimate this; and Epiphanius [q] ſays what amounts to near the ſame. That it was the doctrine of the Marcionites that Chriſt firſt appeared in the fifteenth of Tiberius, is evident from many [r] paſſages in ancient authors, but particularly from Tertullian. They alſo ſuppoſed [s] that at the firſt moment of his appearance in this world, he was completely fitted to enter on his great work; and that he immediately aſſumed the character of a Saviour.

Irenæus in like manner, in the paſſage tranſcribed from him at the beginning of this article ſays, [t] Marcion taught that Jeſus came into Judea in the time of Pontius Pilate, and appeared to the Jews in the form of a man.

Tertullian informs [u] us that, according to the doctrine of the Marcionites, Chriſt had the appearance of a human body, though not the reality; he appeared to have fleſh, though he really had not. They thought they had a ſufficient foundation [x] on which to ground this opinion, becauſe angels had appeared under the Old Teſtament in bodily ſhapes, and had converſed with men, and yet were not really men. They alſo endeavoured to prove the ſame points from Philip. ii. 6, 7, 8, [y] becauſe they obſerve, the apoſtle ſays, *being in the form of God*, he emptied himſelf,

[p] Anno decimo quinto principatus Tiberiani proponit Deum deſcendiſſe in Civitatem Galilææ Caphernaum. Ibid. l. 4. c. 7. p. 506. D. [q] Ταυτα παντα σιγησας απεπηδησε και αρχην τω Ευαγγελιω εταξε ταυτην εν τω πεντεκαιδεκατω ετει και τα εξης. Epip. Hær. 42. p. 312. A.

[r] Καθως περιεχει το Ευαγγελιον οτι επι Τιβεριου Καισαρος επι των χρονων Πιλατου. Dia. Con. Mar. ſec. 2. p. 45. Vid. p. 46. Anno XV. Tiberii Cæſaris Chriſtus Jeſus de cœlo manare dignatus eſt ſpiritus ſalutaris. Adv. Mar. lib. 1. c. 19. p. 443. A. Vid. etiam. lib. 4. c. 7. p. 506. D.

[s] Non novem menſium cruciatu deliberatus, non ſubita dolorum concuſſione per corporis cloacam effuſus ad terram,...nec moleſtus uberibus, diu infans, vix puer, tarde homo, ſed de cœlo expoſitus, ſemel grandis, ſemel totus, ſtatim Chriſtus, ſpiritus et virtus et Deus tantum. Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 21. p. 536. B. C.

[t] Vid. p. 377, note [c], of this account.

[u] Cujus Chriſtus etſi non induit veritatem, ut huic hæreſi viſum eſt, imaginem tamen ejus ſubire dignatus eſt. Adv. Mar. lib. 1. cap. 24. p. 448. B.

[x] In iſta queſtione qui putaveris nobis opponendos eſſe Angelos creatoris quaſi et illi in phantaſmate putativæ utique carnis egerint apud Abraham et Loth et tamen vere ſint et congreſſi, et paſti, et operati quod mandatum eis fuerat. Dehinc ſcito nec illud concedi tibi, ut putativa fuerit in angelis caro, ſed veræ et ſolidæ ſubſtantiæ humanæ. Meus autem Deus ...æque potuit ex quacunque materia Angelis quoque adſtruxiſſe carnem, qui etiam mundum ex nihilo in tot ac talia corpora, et quidem verbo, ædificavit. Adv. Mar. lib. 3. cap. 9. p. 484. B. C.

[y] Plane de ſubſtantia Chriſti putant et hic Marcionitæ ſuffragari apoſtolum ſibi quod Phantaſma carnis fuerit in Chriſto quum dicit, quod in effigie Dei conſtitutus exhauſit ſemetipſum accepta 'effigie' ſervi non 'veritate:' et in 'ſimilitudine' hominis non 'in homine:' et 'figura' inventus hominis, non 'ſubſtantia,' i. e. non 'carne.' Ibid. l. 5. c. 20. p. 614. D.

and

and *took the form of a servant*, the appearance not the reality; so also, being in the *likeness* of man, not truly man; and again, being found in the *figure* of a man, not in the substance, that is not in the flesh.

That Marcion denied Christ's nativity [z] appears from many passages of Tertullian, several of which I place in the note [a]. Some of my readers will be pleased to see them collected together.

Sect. XX. *Tertullian's Arguments against this Notion.*

As Christ, according to this account, had the appearance of a body, but not the reality, Tertullian [b] often charges Marcion with making Christ deceitful; alledging that he could not be Christ if he had no body to be anointed: he asserts therefore [c] that he must have taken the name of Christ, only because it was a popular title and character, without which the Jews would not have been disposed to have received him.

This deceitfulness of Jesus, according to the doctrine which Marcion held, Tertullian endeavours to make out in many dif-

[z] Totas istas præstigias putativæ in Christo corpulentiæ, Marcion illa intentione susceptit, ne ex testimonio substantiæ humanæ, nativitas quoque ejus defenderetur, atque ita Christus Creatoris vindicaretur, ut qui nascibilis, ac per hoc, carneus annuntiaretur. Ibid. l. 3. c. 11.

[a] Marcion ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem; aut ut nativitatem negaret, negavit et carnem....Plane nativitas a Gabriele annuntiatur....Odit moras, qui subito Christum de cœlis deferebat. Aufer hinc, inquit, molestos semper Cæsaris census, et diversoria angusta, et sordidos pannos, et dura præsepia ...Servent potius pecora pastores, et Magi ne fatigentur de longinquo...Sed nec circumcidatur infans, nec ad templum deferatur: nec in manus tradatur Simeoni. ...Taceat et anus illa...His opinor consiliis, tot originalia instrumenta Christi delere, Marcion ausus es, ne caro ejus probaretur. De Carne Christi. cap. 1, 2. p. 358. B. C. D. Venimus nunc ad constantissimum argumentum omnium qui Domini nativitatem in controversiam deferunt. Ipse, inquiunt, contestatur, se non esse natum, dicendo, quæ mihi mater, et qui mihi fratres? Vid. Luc. 8, 19, 22. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 19. Desiderantes rationem qua non putaveris natum esse Christum necesse est quatenus hoc putas arbitrio tuo licuisse, ut aut impossibilem, aut inconvenientem Deo existimaveris nativitatem. De Carne Christi. c. 3. p. 359. A. B. Sunt plane et alia tam stulta quæ pertinent ad contumelias et passiones Dei. Aut prudentiam dicant Deum crucifixum. Aufer hoc quoque Marcion, immo hoc potius. Quid enim indignius Deo? Quid magis erubescendum? Nasci an mori? Carnem gestare an crucem? Circumcidi an suffigi? Educari an sepeliri? In præsepe deponi, an in monumenta recondi? ...An ideo passiones a Christo non rescidisti, quia ut phantasma vacabat a sensu earum. Diximus retro æque illum et nativitatis et infantiæ imaginariæ vacua ludibria subire potuisse, De Carne Christi. cap. 5. p. 364. B. C.

[b] Si et mentitum alicubi dicis creatorem, longe majus mendacium est in tuo Christo cujus corpus non fuit verum. Ad. Mar. lib. 2. cap. 28. p. 475. D.

[c] Si enim Christus unctus est, ungui utique corporis passio est. Qui corpus non habuit ungui omnino non potuit. Christus vocari nullo modo potuit. Sed quomodo inquit irreperet Judæorum fidem nisi per solemne apud eos et familiæ nomen. Adv. Mar. l. 3. c. 15, 16. p. 490. B. C.

ferent

ferent ways, and in a great variety of paſſages, too long and too numerous to be here inſerted: two of [d] them only are given below.

However, ſome of the followers of Marcion [e] believed Chriſt to have had real fleſh, though they would not allow that he was born: this ſeems to have been the opinion of Apelles.

SECT. XXI. *Marcion believed there were to be two Chriſts.*

MARCION acknowledged Jeſus to be Chriſt, but not the [f] Chriſt foretold by the Jewiſh prophets. He could not deny that a Chriſt or Meſſiah was there ſpoken of, but he ſaid a [g] perſon different from our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was thereby meant. 'He allowed,' as Tertullian expreſſeth it, 'that [h] the prophets 'of the Creator had promiſed a Saviour to the Jewiſh nation, 'who ſhould deliver them out of the hands of their enemies, and 'reſtore them to freedom.' But he pretended that this deliverer was not the ſon of God; and that the oracles of the Old Teſtament did not agree to Jeſus Chriſt. 'So that this man,' as Tertullian obſerves, 'who [i] was ſo averſe to Judaiſm, did him-'ſelf Judaize in the moſt ſhameful manner.' 'Marcion,' ſays

[d] Quid dimidias mendacio Chriſtum? totus veritas fuit. Maluit, crede naſci, quam ex aliqua ſe parte mentiri, et quidem in ſemetipſum. Ut carnem geſtaret ſine oſſibus duram, ſine muſculis ſolidam, ſine ſanguine cruentam, ſine tunica veſtitam, ſine fame eſurientem, ſine dentibus edentem, ſine lingua loquentem, ut phantaſma auribus fuit ſermo ejus per imaginem vocis. De Carne Chriſti. cap. 5. p. 362. A. B. Ecce fallit et decipit et circumvenit omnium oculos, omnium ſenſus, omnium acceſſus et contactus. Ergo jam Chriſtum non de cœlo deferre debueras, &c. Ibid. cap. 5. p. 362. C.

[e] Sed quidam diſcentes Pontici illius, ſupra magiſtrum ſapere compulſi, concedunt Chriſto carnis veritatem,...dum omnino non natam....Pervenimus igitur ex Marcione ad Apellem qui.....ſolidum Chriſti corpus ſed ſine nativitate ſuſcepit ...prædicans ut Angelus quidem illius Philumenes. De Carne Chriſti. cap. 6. p. 362. C. D.

[f] Quum igitur hæretica dementia eum Chriſtum veniſſe præſumeret, qui nunquam fuerat annuntiatus; ſequebatur ut eum Chriſtum nondum veniſſe contenderet, qui ſemper fuerat prædicatus: atque ita coacta eſt cum Judaico errore ſociari, et ab eo argumentationem ſibi ſtruere, quaſi Judæi certi, et ipſi alium fuiſſe qui venit non modo reſpuerint eum ut extraneum, verum et interfecerint eum ut adverſarium. Adv. Mar. lib. 3. c. 6. p. 480. B. C.

[g] Sic nec illam injectionem tuam potes ſiſtere ad differentiam duorum Chriſtorum: quaſi Judaicus quidem Chriſtus populo ſoli ex diſperſione redigendo deſtinetur a Creatore: veſter vero omni humano generi liberando collatus ſit a Deo optimo. Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 21. p. 496. A. Certe ſi nondum venit Chriſtus Creatoris, propter quem hæc paſſuri prædicantur....Redde ſtatum Judeæ quem Chriſtus Creatoris inveniat et alium contende veniſſe. Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 23. p. 498. D.

[h] His quum accedunt et ſui Chriſti: alter qui apparuit ſub Tiberio, alter qui a Creatore promititur. Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 15. p. 441. A.

[i] Nunc quia cum Judæis negas veniſſe Chriſtum eorum; recognoſce et exitum ipſorum quem poſt Chriſtum relaturi prædicabantur ob impietatem, qua eum et deſpexerunt et interemerunt. Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 20. p. 497. D,

that

that [k] writer, 'is for two Chriſts, one who appeared in the time of 'Tiberius, for the ſalvation of all nations; and another the re-'ſtorer of the Jewiſh ſtate, who is yet to come.'

This doctrine of two Chriſts is alſo aſſerted by the Marcionite in [l] the dialogue aſcribed to Origen. In a work alſo ſaid to be written by Athanaſius [m] we are informed that Marcion ſuppoſed, as Jeſus came from the good god, ſo there was to be another from the juſt god; becauſe each of them was to be the father of a Chriſt peculiar to himſelf; the good god of one, the juſt god of another.

Sect. XXII. *He alſo allowed the Truth of our Saviour's Miracles.*

Marcion allowed the truth of our Saviour's miracles. He aſſerted that he thereby ſhewed himſelf to be the Son of God, and to be ſent from the Father, and that theſe were ſufficient evidences, without prophecies; ſo ſays Tertullian [n]. And that this was his opinion appears further from Tertullian's manner of arguing with him; for he is pleaſed to aſſert [o] that this proof is inconcluſive, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt has aſſured his diſciples that ſome would ariſe who ſhould work falſe miracles. We need not examine this reaſoning: it ſhews that Marcion allowed the reality of Chriſt's miracles, and thought them a ſufficient foundation for believing in him. But Tertullian by way of oppoſition, and in the heat of controverſy, raſhly does what he can to weaken one very ſtrong, if not the ſtrongeſt argument for the truth of the Chriſtian religion.

[k] Conſtituit Marcion alium eſſe Chriſtum qui Tiberianis temporibus a Deo quondam ignoto revelatus ſit in ſalutem omnium gentium: alium qui a Deo Creatore in reſtitutionem Judaici ſtatus ſit deſtinatus, quandoque venturus. Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 6. p. 506. C.

[l] Δεικνυται εν τον δια νομε και προφητων χριστον μηδεπω εληλυθεναι. Dial. Con. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 35. Ενεργεσερα μοι εστιν αποδειξις τε μη ειναι υιον τε δικαιε τον χριστον; Ο γαρ τε νομε ηπω εληλυθει. Ibid. p. 34.

[m] Αυτη Μαρκιωνος η δυσσεβεια, Θεον λεγοντος δικαιον ιδιε χριστε πατερα, και Θεον ετερον αγαθον ιδιε χριστε πατερα. Contra Sabelli. Tom. 2. p. 42. A. Bened.

[n] Non fuit, inquis, ordo neceſſarius; quia ſtatim et filium et miſſum et Chriſtum Dei rebus ipſis probabatur per documenta virtutum. Adv. Mar. l. 3. c. 3. p. 478. A.

[o] At ego negabo, ſolam hanc illi ſpeciem ad teſtimonium competiſſe, quam et ipſe poſtmodum exauctoravit. Siquidem edicens multos venturos, et ſigna facturos et virtutes magnas edituros...temerariam ſignorum et virtutum fidem oſtendit, ut etiam apud pſeudochriſtos facillimarum. Ibid. p. 478.

Sect.

SECT. XXIII. *And of his Death.*

THE Marcionite doctrine concerning our Saviour was, [p] that out of his love to the human race, and for their ſakes, he deſcended into this world, [q] and ſubmitted to great humiliation. Though from Tertullian's arguments, [r] and from their not acknowledging him to have had real fleſh, it may be ſuppoſed they did not allow him to have truly ſuffered. However that be, they believed he was betrayed by [s] the Jews, at the inſtigation of their God the Creator, that he died [t] and was buried. Yea, they even ſaid that the death of the Meſſiah was neceſſary for the ſalvation of men, [u] though they did not ſuppoſe it to be an expiatory ſacrifice.

SECT. XXIV. *And Reſurrection.*

THEY muſt likewiſe have believed our Lord's reſurrection. [x] For they had in their goſpel the account of his addreſſing himſelf to the apoſtles after that event, 'Why [y] are ye troubled: ſee 'my hands and my feet, for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones, as

[p] Hanc venerationem naturæ Marcion deſpuis—Certe Chriſtus dilexit hominem. —Propter eum deſcendit, propter eum prædicavit, propter eum omni ſe humilitate dejecit uſque ad mortem, et mortem crucis: amavit utique quem magno pretio redemit. De Carne Chriſt. c. 4. p. 360. B. [q] Si enim Deus, et quidem ſublimior, tanta humilitate faſtigium majeſtatis ſuæ ſtravit, ut etiam morti ſubjiceretur, et morti crucis; cur non putetis noſtro quoque Deo aliquas puſillitates congruiſſe, tolerabiliores tamen judaicis contumeliis et patibulis et ſepulchris. Adv. Mar. l. 2. c. 27. p. 475. C. Vid. etiam. l. 3. c. 11. p. 486. C. [r] Sceleſtiſſime hominum, qui, interemptores excuſas Dei. Nihil enim ab eis paſſus eſt Chriſtus, ſi nihil vere eſt paſſus. De Carne Chriſti. c. 5. p. 361. Sic nec paſſiones Chriſti eius fidem merebuntur, nihil enim paſſus eſt, qui non vere eſt paſſus: vere enim pati phantaſma non potuit. Adv. Mar. L. 3. c. 8. p. 483. D.

[s] Atquin Chriſtum inquam alterius Dei dicitis, a Creatoris virtutibus et poteſtatibus ut ab æmulis in crucem actum. Ibid. l. 3. c. 23. p. 498. C.

[t] Deus meus aliquem juſſit occidi: tuus ſemetipſum voluit interfici; non minus homicida in ſemetipſum, quam in eum a quo vellet occidi. Ibid. Lib. 2. c. 28. p. 475. D. [u] Ο Δημιουργος ιδων τον αγαθον λυοντα αυτου τον νομον επεβουλευσεν αυτω, μη ειδως οτι ο θανατος του αγαθου σωτηρια ανθρωπων εγενετο. Dial. Con. Mar. ſec. 2. p. 53. fin. [x] Fuit itaque phantaſma etiam poſt reſurrectionem cum manus et pedes ſuos diſcipulis inſpiciendos offerret: aſpicite inquit quod ego ſum, quia ſpiritus oſſa non habet, ſicut me habentem videtis. Quomodo hanc vocem interpretaris Marcion, qui a Deo optimo et ſimplici et bono tantum, infers Jeſum? Ecce fallit et decipit, &c. De Carne Chriſt. c. 5. p. 362. B. [y] Και ειπεν αυτοις τι τεταραγμενοι εστε, και διατι διαλογισμοι αναβαινουσιν εν ταις καρδιαις υμων; Ιδετε τας χειρας μου, και τους ποδας μου, οτι αυτος εγω ειμι. Ψηλαφησατε με και ιδετε· οτι πνευμα σαρκα και οστεα ουκ εχει, καθως εμε θεωρειτε εχοντα. Luc. 24, 38, 39.

'ye

'ye see me have.' But they seem to have turned it [z] in this manner: 'A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see I have not.'

That they firmly believed our Saviour's miracles is hence evident, because Tertullian in arguing with them [a] shews, that by denying his having a body, and really suffering, they weakened the evidence of all his works of power; for if our senses might be mistaken about the one, they might be so likewise about the other: but as he knew they allowed the reality of these, he made use of this medium to lead them to a belief of the other also. Indeed from very many of his arguments to prove the reality of Christ's body, it appears they admitted the reality of his miracles, for he argues [b] thus: 'without his having a real body, his 'miracles, and all his actions were deceitful, and only in appear-'ance, and his example what we have no concern with:' which conclusions were absurdities and falsehoods in their esteem, therefore they admitted the truth of the miracles.

In the dialogue before referred to, [c] the Marcionite expressly says, that Christ had opened the eyes of many that were blind.

SECT. XXV. *And of the principal Facts related concerning him.*

FROM all these testimonies, and from the arguments alleged by Tertullian as here represented, as also from others which he introduces to prove the excellency [d] and worth of man, and the certainty

[z] De corporis autem veritate quid potest clarius? Quum hæsitantibus eis ne phantasma esset, immo phantasma credentibus: quid turbati estis inquit, et quid cogitationes subeunt in corda vestra? Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ego ipse sum: quoniam spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me habentem videtis. Et Marcion quædam contraria sibi, illa credo industria eradere de evangelio suo noluit.—Vult itaque sic dictum, quasi, spiritus ossa non habet sicut me videtis habentem, ad spiritum referatur, sicut me videtis habentem, id est non habentem ossa sicut et spiritus Adv. Mar. L. 4. c. 43. p. 374. D. 375. A.

[a] Non diceretur homo Christus sine Carne.—Sicut nec Deus, sine spiritu Dei, nec Dei filius, sine Deo patre. Ita utriusque substantiæ census, hominem et Deum exibuit: hinc carneum, inde spiritalem, hinc infirmum, inde præfortem, hinc morientem inde viventem. Quæ proprietas conditionum, divinæ et humanæ, virtutes spiritum Dei, passiones carnem hominis probaverunt. Si virtutes non sine spiritu, proinde et passiones non sine Carne. Si caro cum passionibus ficta, et spiritus ergo cum virtutibus falsus, &c. De Car. Chris. c. 5. p. 362. A. B.

[b] Caro nec caro, homo nec homo: proinde Deus Christus, nec Deus. Cur enim non etiam Dei phantasma portaverit. An credam ei de interiore substantia, qui sit de exteriore frustratus?—Jam nunc quum mendacium deprehenditur Christi caro, sequitur ut et omnia quæ per carnem Christi gesta sunt, mendacio gesta sunt; congressus, contactus, convictus, ipsæ quoque virtutes. Si enim tangendo aliquem liberavit a vitio, vel tactus ab aliquo, quod corporaliter actum est, non potest vere actum credi sine corporis ipsius veritate. Putativus habitus, putativus actus: imaginarius operatur, imaginariæ operæ. Adv. Mar. Lib. c. 3. 8. p. 483. C. D.

[c] Ὁ δὲ κυριος ἡμων αγαθος ων πολλων τυφλων ηνοιξεν οφθαλμους. Dia. Con. Mar. sec. 1. p. 29. fin.

[d] Postremo te tibi circumfer, intus et foris considera hominem. Placebit tibi vel hoc opus Dei nostri, quod tuus

certainty of his being a creature of the ſupreme God, it appears that the Marcionites believed the whole hiſtory of our Saviour's appearance in a human form, and of his death on the croſs. They alſo believed that he was crucified between two malefactors.[e] But the circumſtance of his garments being divided by the ſoldiers, was expunged by Marcion from his goſpel, becauſe it was foretold by the Pſalmiſt, Pſ. xxii. 18. They moreover allowed the truth of the miraculous[f] earthquake and darkneſs at the time of his crucifixion. They acknowledged[g] his having twelve apoſtles, and that one of them was a traitor. The truth of the appearance of Moſes[h] and Elias on the Mount was alſo aſſented to by them; and the reality of that voice from heaven which ſaid, this is my beloved ſon, hear him.

SECT. XXVI. *The Manners of the Marcionites were virtuous, and they had many Martyrs.*

WITH reſpect to the manners of the Marcionites, they are not charged by their adverſaries with being vicious; for Tertullian, in the very place[i] where he is upbraiding them with that tenet of theirs which repreſents God as not the object of fear,

tuus dominus ille Deus melior adamavit: propter quem in hæc pauperrima elementa de tertio cœlo deſcendere laboravit: cujus cauſa in hac cellula creatoris etiam crucifixus eſt. Adv. Mar. Lib. 1. c. 14. p. 439. D.

[e] Et Barrabas quidem nocentiſſimus, vita ut bonus donatur. Chriſtus vero juſtiſſimus, ut homicida morti expoſtulatur. Sed et duo ſceleſti configuntur illi, ut inter iniquos ſcilicet deputaretur. Veſtitum plane ejus militibus diviſum, partim ſorte conceſſum, Marcion abſtulit, reſpiciens Pſalmi prophetiam. Aufer igitur et crucem ipſam. Ibid. Lib. 4. c. 42. p. 573. A.

[f] Ecce autem et elementa concutiuntur, Dominus enim patiebatur ipſorum. Cæterum adverſario læſo, cœlum luminibus floruiſſet, magis ſol radiis inſultaſſet, magis dies ſtetiſſet, libenter ſpectans pendentem in patibulo Chriſtum Marcionis. Ib. D.

[g] Væ ait per quem traditur filius hominis. Ergo jam væ conſtat imprecationis et comminationis inclamationem intelligendam, et irato et offenſo deputandam, niſi ſi Judas impune erat tantum ſceleris relaturus. Porro, ſi ſciens paſſus eſt hominem, quem ipſe comitatui ſuo aſciverat, in tantum ſcelus ruere, &c. Ibid. Lib. 4. c. 41. p. 571. D. Vid. Dia. Cont. Marc. ſec. 1. p. 8. πρῶτος απεστειλεν ιβ.

[h] Nam et hoc vel maxime erubeſcere debuiſti, quod illum cum Moyſe et Elia in ſeceſſu montis conſpici pateris, quorum deſtructor advenerat. Hoc ſcilicet intelligi voluit vox illa de cœlo; hic eſt filius meus dilectus, hunc audite. Id eſt, non Moyſem jam et Heliam. Ergo ſufficiebat vox ſola ſine oſtentatione Moyſi et Heliæ. Ibid. L. 4. c. 22. p. 556. D.

[i] Age itaque, qui Deum non times quaſi bonum, quid non in omnem libidinem ebullis? ſummum, quod ſciam, fructum vitæ omnibus qui Deum non timent; quid non frequentas tam ſolennes voluptates circi furentis, et caveæ ſævientis, et ſcenæ laſcivientis? Quid non et in perſecutionibus ſtatim oblata acerra animam negatione lucraris? Abſit, inquis, abſit. Ergo jam times delictum, et timendo probaſti illum timeri qui prohibet delictum. Aliud eſt ſi quem non times obſervas. Adv. Mar. Lib. 1. c. 27. p. 451. A. See alſo what follows to the end of the chap.

shews from his way of arguing with them, that they had a respect to the will of God, and were desirous of obtaining his favour as the greatest good.

The whole drift of his reasoning takes it for granted, that they did not comply with the vicious pursuits of the heathens, but, like other Christians, avoided being present at the savage spectacles of the circus, and the licentious games of the theatre; and did not allow themselves in indulging carnal desires, though their adversaries said that their principles led directly to the gratifying them.

In short, it is evident that these people were in general strictly virtuous; that they dreaded sin as the greatest evil, and had such a real regard for Christ, as to undergo martyrdom rather than offer incense to idols. They seem indeed to have had a great number of martyrs. Asterius Urbanus, [k] or some other ancient author, who wrote against the Montanists about the year of Christ 232, in answer to their boasts of the number of their martyrs, observes, that the Marcionites and other heretics were known to have had a great many martyrs. This passage is given us by Eusebius without being contradicted; which makes it probable that this was really the case. Clemens Alexandrinus [l] also blames some heretics, who, from his expressions, appear to be Marcionites, for offering themselves to martyrdom in a foolish and rash manner.

Sect. XXVII. *They contemned Marriage, and highly extolled Virginity.*

In some parts of their conduct indeed they were superstitiously scrupulous; such as in many cases in [m] contemning, and in some in absolutely forbidding, [n] marriage; and in advising [o]

[k] Και γαρ των αλλων αιρεσεων τινες πλειστους οσους εχουσι μαρτυρας—και πρωτοι γε οι απο της Μαρκιωνος αιρεσεως μαρκιωνισται καλουμενοι, πλειστους οσους εχειν Χριστου μαρτυρας λεγουσιν. Apud Euseb. Lib. 5. c. 16. p. 182. D.

[l] Λεγομεν δε και ημεις τους επιπηδησαντες τω θανατω, εισι γαρ τινες ουκ ημετεροι μονου του ονοματος κοινωνοι, οι δη αυτους παραδιδοντες σπευδουσι, τη προς τον δημιουργον απεχθεια οι αθλιοι θανατουντες. Strom. Lib. 4. p. 481. C.

[m] Sequitur de nuptiis congredi, quas Marcion constantior Apostolo prohibet. Et enim Apostolus etsi bonum continentiæ præfert, tamen conjugium et contrahi permittit, et usui esse. Et magis retineri quàm disjungi suadet. Marcion totum connubium auferens, &c. Adv. Mar. L. 4. c. 7. p. 588. B. C. Vid. etiam. Lib. 1. c. 29. p. 452. A. Si nec ipsi Marcionitæ fœminas appetunt. Ibid. c. 8. p. 590. B.

[n] Unde jam dicam Deum Marcionis cum matrimonium ut malum et impudicitiæ negotium reprobat, adversus ipsam facere sanctitatem cui videtur studere. Ibid. L. 1. c. 30. p. 452. C. See also l. 5. c. 15. p. 605. A. B. Where Tertullian draws an argument against them, for forbidding marriage, from 1 Thess. iv. 3. because the apostle there doth not command us to abstain from marriage, but from fornication.

[o] Παρ αυτω δε τω Μαρκιωνι και παρθενια κηρυσσεται. Epi. Hær. 42. No. 3. p. 304 A.

and

and paſſing high encomiums upon virginity. On this account Jerom [p] often ranks Marcion with Tatian, Mani, and other Encratites, who rejected marriage. They ſeem [q] to have conſidered the connubial ſtate not merely as leſs perfect, but even as ſinful, impure, and odious, in the eyes of their [r] God; whom they call a hater of marriage. If Tertullian has not miſrepreſented them, [s] they appear to have admitted none to baptiſm but unmarried perſons, or ſuch as promiſed to live as unmarried in the marriage ſtate.

Clement [t] ſuppoſeth them to abſtain from marriage, that they might not people the world of the Creator; which is a reaſon ſimilar to that which he aſſigns, [u] for their offering themſelves voluntarily to martyrdom, viz. out of hatred to the Creator. Somewhat like this is a hint in Tertullian, [x] where he ſays that none were admitted to baptiſm, or the euchariſt, unleſs they had taken an oath againſt having any children, as if they meant it againſt the Creator. Though, as Clement obſerves, [y] whatever hatred they bore to him, they partook of his food, and breathed his air.

[p] Neque enim nos Marcionis et Manichæi dogma ſectantes nuptiis detrahimus. Nec Tatiani principis Encratitarum errore decepti omnem coitum ſpurcum putamus, qui non ſolum nuptias ſed cibos quoque quos Deus creavit ad utendum, damnat et reprobat. Ad. Pamm. Ep. 30. [al. 50.] T. 4. p. 230. in. [q] Quis enim tam caſtrator, carnis caſtor quam qui nuptias abſtulit. Adv. Mar. Lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 430. D. Timotheum inſtruens nuptiarum quoque interdictores ſuggillat. Ita inſtituunt Marcion et Apelles ejus Secutor De Præſ. c. 30. p. 243. D. See alſo Adv. Mar. Lib. 4. c. 34. p. 558. D. et c. 17. p. 528. A. Deum ſuum intuens deteſtatorem nuptiarum. Adv. Mar. L. 4. c. 29. p. 552. A. [r] Jam nunc Deus Marcionis qui connubium adverſatur, quomodo videri poteſt parvulorum dilector, quorum tota cauſa connubium eſt? Qui ſemen odit fructum quoque execretur neceſſe eſt. Næ ille ſævior habendus Ægyptio rege. Nam Pharao educari non ſinebat infantes. Ille nec naſci, auferens vitam illis etiam decem menſium. Adv. Mar. L. 4. c. 23. p. 540. A.

[s] Non tinguitur apud illum caro, niſi virgo, niſi vidua, niſi cælebs, niſi divortio baptiſma mercata, quaſi non etiam ſpadonibus ex nuptiis nata. Sine dubio ex damnatione conjugii inſtitutio iſta conſtabit. Ibid. L. 1. c. 29. p. 451. D. Nec alibi conjunctos ad ſacramentum baptiſmatis et euchariſtiæ admittens, niſi inter ſe conjuraverint adverſus fructum nuptiarum, ut adverſus ipſum creatorem. Ibid. Lib. 4. c. 34. p. 558. B. Nuptias non conjungit, conjunctas non admittit: neminem tinguit niſi cælibem aut ſpadonem. Morti aut repudio baptiſma ſervat. Ibid. Lib. 4. c. 11. p. 516. B.

[t] Αλλα οι μεν απο Μαρκιωνος—μη βουλομενοι τον κοσμον τον υπο τω δημιουργω γενομενον συμπληρουν, απεχεσθαι γαμου βουλονται. Strom. L. 3. p. 431. B.

[u] Vid. note (3) No. 14. p. 2. Strom. l. 4. p. 481. C. [x] Vid ſupra note [s]. [y] Ει και μη γαμειν εθελουσιν, αλλα τροφαις χρωνται ταις κτισαις, και του αερα του δημιουργου αναπνευσιν. Strom. Lib. 3. p. 431. C. D.

Sect. XXVIII. *They fasted on the Sabbath.*

Another of their institutions was fasting, [z] especially on the sabbath or seventh day, [a] which had been a day of rest to the Creator, or God of the Jews, whom they despised. This day therefore they kept as a fast, because they were inclined to do every thing contrary to what would shew the least respect for him.

Sect. XXIX. *They celebrated Baptism and the Eucharist, but were somewhat irregular in the Administration.*

They kept up the ordinances of baptism and the eucharist, [b] as appears from the last passage of Epiphanius, and from several of the foregoing quotations out of Tertullian and others. Though they were somewhat irregular in the administration, permitting women [c] to baptize, and using [d] only water in the cup.

Epiphanius also [e] blames them for celebrating the eucharist in the presence of Catechumens, and represents them [f] as repeating baptism several times upon the same person, if he happened to commit any sin after he had had this rite administered to him. His meaning I suppose is, that those of them who had been guilty of great crimes, were restored by repentance and baptism.

[z] Sol et Marcionem designat et Tatianum et cæteros hæreticos qui abstinentiam indicunt perpetuam. Hieron. ad Jovin. L. 2. Tom. 4. p. 210. in.

[a] Νηστειαν δε και το Σαββατον κηρυτλει—υδατι δε μονος εν τοις μυστηριοις χρηται. το σαββατον δεσποτευει δια τοιαυτην αιτιαν, επειδαν φησι το Θεος των Ιουδαιων εστι η αναπαυσις της πεποιησεως του κοσμου, και εν τη εβδομη ημερα αναπαυσασθαι· ημεις νηστευομεν ταυτην, ινα μη το ναδικον του Θεου των Ιουδαιων εργαζωμεθα. Epiph. Hær. 42. No. 3. p. 304. A. B.

[b] Cui enim rei baptisma quoque apud illum exigitur.—Signat igitur hominem tunquam apud se reignatum. Lavat hominem, nunquam apud te coinquinatum et in hoc totum salutis sacramentum, negat carnem extorrem salutis. Adv. Mar. L. 1. c. 28. p. 451. C. D. Non putem impudentiorem, quam qui in alienâ aquâ alii Deo tinguitur—Super alienum panem alii Deo gratiarum actionibus fungitur. Ibid. Lib. 1. c. 23. p. 447. C.

[c] Διδωσι και επιτροπην γυναιξι βαπτισμα διδοναι. Epiph. Hær. 42. No. 4. p. 305. B. [d] Vide supra note [a].

[e] Μυστηρια δε δηθεν παρ αυτω επιτελειται των κατηχουμενων ορωντων. Hær. 42. No. 3. p. 304. B. Παρ αυτοις γαρ παντα χλυης εμπλεα και θυειν ετερον οποτε και τα μυστηρια εωπτιον κατηχουμενων επιτελειν τολμωσιν. Ibid. No. 4. p. 305. B.

[f] Ου μιον δε παρ αυτω εν λυτρον διδοται, αλλα και εως τριων λυτρων.—ως περ πολλων πεπτωκοτα—τουτεστι τριων βαπτισμων εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων, ινα ει τις παραπεσεν εις το πεμπτον λαβη δευτερον μετανοησας και τριτον ωσαυτως εαν εν πτερυγιωματι μετα το δευτερον γενηται. Ibid. p. 304. B. C. D.

SECT. XXX. *They had Churches for stated public Worship.*

FROM these passages it might be strongly argued that they had churches, in which they performed the various parts of public worship. The matter however is evident from the testimony of several ancient authors, particularly Tertullian, from whom [g] I shall give some passages at the bottom of the page, which fully ascertain this point.

SECT. XXXI. *Marcion rejected the Old Testament.*

SOME little notice has several times [h] been already taken of the parts of scripture which Marcion received, and of those parts also which he rejected. The Old Testament was altogether set aside by him, [i] as proceeding from the Creator who was, in his estimation, void of goodness, and the author of all that sin and misery which is in the world. His followers [k] moreover argued, that the law and the gospel could not come from the same being, because there are, in their opinion, several things contained in the former inconsistent with many in the latter. They said the Creator is represented as ignorant, or imperfect, in knowledge; when he called to Adam [l] and asked where he was. That he is mutable [m] in having contradictory commands; and inconstant because

[g] Habet plane et illud (Evangelium) ecclesias sed suas tam posteras quam adulteras—Marcione scilicet conditore vel aliquo de Marcionis examine. Faciunt favos vespæ, faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitæ Adv. Mar. Lib. 4. c. 5. p. 505. C.

Quoniam ab ortu solis usque in occasum nomen meum glorificatum est in nationibus, et in omni loco sacrificium nomini meo offertur, et sacrificium mundum, gloriæ scilicet relatio, et benedictio, et laus, et hymni. Quæ omnia quam in te quoque deprehendantur, et signaculum frontium at ecclesiarum sacramenta, et munditiæ sacrificiorum debes jam erumpere, uti dicas, spiritum creatoris tuo Christo prophetasse. Ad. Mar. Lib. 3. c. 22. p. 447. D. Confer. Lib. 4. c. 1. p. 502. B. [h] Vol. ii. p. 161, 256..... 259. 263, 265. 276....278. 522. vol. iii. p. 495. [i] ΜΑΡΚ'—ταις γαρ Ιουδαικαις φωναις ου πειθομαι, και γαρ αλλου εισι Θεου.—Ου γαρ υπακουω ουτε Νομω ουτε Προφηταις. Dia. con. Mar. sec. 2. p. 54

ΜΑΡΚ' Ημεις προφητας και νομον ου δεχομεθα· ουδε γαρ εισι του ημετερου Θεου. Ibid. sec. 2. p. 57. [k] See several passages from the foregoing dialogue against the Marcionites inserted at large, sec. 14. p. 373. note [k]. [l] ΜΕΓ. Ο Δημιουργος ουδε ηδει που εστιν ο Αδαμ, λεγων, που ει. Dia. adv. Mar. sec. 1. p. 27. Jam nunc ut omnia ejusmodi expediam, ad cæteras pusillitates et infirmitates et incongruentias, interpretandas purgandasque pertendam. Inclamat Deus, Adam ubi es? Scilicet ignorans ubi esset: et causato nuditatis pudore, an de arbore gustasset interrogat, scilicet incertus. Ter. adv. Mar. Lib. 2. c. 25. p. 474. D. or 380. 40.

[m] Sic et in cæteris contrarietates præceptorum ei exprobas ut mobili et instabili, prohibentis sabbatis operari; et jubentis arcam circumferri per dies octo; i. e.

becauſe he is ſaid to have repented [n] that he made Saul king, and alſo that he created man: [o] all of whom, in conſequence of the wickedneſs which ſo generally prevailed, he deſtroyed; all, except Noah and his family. Such puniſhment, according to them, manifeſted a change, and conſequently an imperfection in the divine mind, as well as a deficiency in goodneſs.

They alſo argued from Iſ. xlv. 7. where God ſays, [p] *I make peace, and create evil*, that this could not be the good or ſupreme God.

Sect. XXXII. *He alſo objected to the Appointment of Sacrifices.*

They objected to the appointment of ſacrifices, [q] and to the diſtinction of meats [r] into clean and unclean, and were alſo diſpleaſed with the orders given to the Jews, [s] to ſpoil the Ægyptians. In ſhort Tertullian ſays, they brought ſuch, and ſo many ob-

i. e. etiam ſabbato in expugnatione civitatis Hiericho. Ad. Mar. Lib. 2. cap. 21. p. 469. D. 378. 40. [n] Si et pœnitentiam apud illum prave interpretaris quaſi proinde mobilitate vel improvidentia, immo jam ex delicti recordatione pœniteat: quoniam quidem dixerit, pœnituit quod regem fecerim Saul. Ibid. Lib. 2. c. 24. p. 471. B. 379. 41.

[o] ΜΕΓ. Ουτος κατ' ιδιαν εδημιουργησε τους ανθρωπους. Μεταμελημαι γαρ φησιν οτι εποιησα τον ανθρωπον. Μετενοησεν ουν κακους δημιουργησας και εβουλησεν τουτους καταφθειραι και απολεσαι. Ο ουν αγαθος ουκ συνεχωρησεν αλλ ηλεησε το γενος των ανθρωπων. Dia. ad. Mar. ſec. 2. p. 49.

[p] Ego ſum qui condo mala, &c. Ecce ego emitto in vos mala non peccatoria ſed ultoria, quorum ſatis diluimus infamiam. Ter. ad. Mar. Lib. 2. c. 24. p. 472. A. or 380. 13. De his Creator profitetur malis quæ congruunt judici. Ibid. Lib. 2. cap. 14. p. 375. 14. Ego inquit percutiam, et ego ſanabo. Ego inquit occidam et ego vivificabo; condens ſcilicet mala et faciens pacem. Qua enim ſoles illum mobilitatis quoque et inconſtantiæ nomine reprehendere, prohibentem quæ jubet et jubentem quæ prohibet. Ib. Lib. 4. c. 1. 502. C. or 404. 35.

[q] Diximus de ſacrificiorum rationali inſtitutione, avocante ſcilicet ab idolis ad Deum officia ea quæ ſi rurſus ejecerat dicens; quo mihi multitudinem ſacrificiorum veſtrorum? Hoc ipſum voluit intelligi, quod non ſibi ea proprie exegiſſet. Ad. Mar. Lib. 2. c. 22. p. 470. B. C. or 379. 11. Sacrificiorum quoque opera, et operationum et oblationum negotioſas ſcrupuloſitates nemo reprehendat, quaſi Deus talia ſibi proprie deſideraverit, qui tam manifeſte exclamat, quo mihi multitudinem ſacrificiorum veſtrorum? Et quis exquiſivit iſta ex manibus veſtris? Sed illam Dei induſtriam ſentiat, qua populum pronum in idololatriam et tranſgreſſionem ejuſmodi officiis religioni ſuæ voluit aſtringere, quibus ſuperſtitio ſeculi agebatur, ut ab ea avocaret illos, ſibi jubens fieri quaſi deſideranti, ne ſimulacris faciendis delinqueret. Ib. c. 18. 467. D. 375. 28. [r] Et ſi lex aliquid cibis detrahit, et immunda pronuntiat animalia quæ aliquando benedicta ſunt, concilium exercendæ continentiæ intellige, et frænos impoſitos illi gulæ agnoſce, quæ quum panem ederet angelorum, cucumeres et pepones Ægyptiorum deſiderabat. Ibid. Lib. 2. c. 18. 467. D. 377. 20.

[s] Sed et per iſtas caligines ſequemur nequitiam, et in lucem extrahemus ingenia tenebrarum, objicientia creatori vel maxime fraudem illam et rapinam auri et argenti, mandata abillo Hebræis in Ægyptios: Ib. L. 2. c. 20. 469. A. B. 378. 18.

ΜΕΓ. Ο Θεος της γενεσεως ειτεταλται Μωυσει εκβαινοντι εκ γης Αιγυπτου, λεγων· Ετοιμοι γενεσθε την οσφυν εζωσμενοι, τας ποδας υποδεδεμενοι, τας ραβδους εν ταις χερσιν υμων, τας πηρας εχοντες εφ εαυτων, χρυσον και αργυρον και παντα παντα απενεγκασθε των Αιγυπτιων. ο δε Κυριος ουκ ωμισθος· κ. τ. λ. Dia. Con. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 16.

jections

jections againſt the law and the prophets, that they looked more like the objections of heathens [t], than of perſons who embraced Chriſtianity, though ever ſo heretical in their notions.

Againſt theſe, and many others of the ſame ſort too numerous to mention, Tertullian defends the Old Teſtament by very good anſwers, as may be ſeen at large in his ſecond book againſt Marcion, where he ſhews [u] the moral laws to be excellent, and certainly derived from God, as it is related by Moſes, who was prior to the famous heathen lawgivers, Lycurgus, Solon, &c. and who therefore could borrow from none of them.

SECT. XXXIII. *He mutilated the New Teſtament wherever it contained Quotations from the Old.*

THEIR averſion to the Old Teſtament was indeed ſo great, that on this account they mutilated many paſſages in the new, in thoſe books which they admitted, rejecting [x] all which related to the law and the prophets, or which were quoted from thence, as plainly foretelling the coming of Jeſus Chriſt, or which ſpoke of his Father as the Creator of the world.

[t] De iſto pluribus retractarem ſi cum Ethnicis agerem, quamquam et cum hæreticis non multo diverſa congreſſio ſtet. Ad. Mar. Lib. 2. c. 27. 474. B. 382. 47.

[u] Veni denique ad inſpectationem doctrinarum, diſciplinarum, præceptorum, conciſionumque ejus. Dices forſitan hæc etiam humanis legibus determinari. Sed ante Lycurgos et Solonas omnes, Moyſes et Deus. Nulla poſteritas non a primordiis accipit. Tamen non a tuo Deo didici Creatorem meum præſcribere; non occides, non adulterabis, non furaberis, &c. —Ad hæc innocentiæ, pudicitiæ, juſtitiæ et pietatis principalia conſulta, accedunt etiam humanitatis præſcripta. Non enim inimicæ mutuo excercendæ licentiam fecit, ſed in totum cohibendæ violentiæ tropicit, &c. Ibid. Lib. 2. c. 17, 18. 467. B. C. 377. 1.

[x] Et ſuper hæc id quod ſecundum Lucam evangelium circumcidens et omnia quæ ſunt de generatione Domini conſcripta auferens, et de doctrina ſermonum Domini multa auferens in quibus manifeſtiſſime conditorem hujus univerſitatis ſuum patrem confitens, Dominus conſcriptus eſt.—Non evangelium ſed particulam Evangelii tradens eis. Similiter autem et Apoſtoli Pauli epiſtolas abſcidit, auferens quæcunque manifeſte dicta ſunt ab Apoſtolo de eo Deo qui mundum fecit, quoniam hic Pater Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, et quæcunque ex propheticis memorans apoſtolus docuit prænuntiantibus adventum Domini.

In quibus manifeſtiſſime conditorem, &c. Reſpicere precipue videtur hæc verba ſervatoris, Luc. x. 21. 'Confiteor 'tibi, pater, Domine Cæli et Terræ,' quæ Marcion corrupit demens vocem *pater*, et omittens *terræ*. Vid. Grabei notas in hunc Irenæi locum, p. 104. note 5. Ox. 1702.

Sect. XXXIV. *He framed Antitheſes to ſhew the Oppoſition of the Law to the Goſpel.*

This Creator, or God of the Jews, they conſidered as of a character very different from [y] the good God, or the father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and therefore they aſſerted that Chriſt came to deſtroy the law given by him, becauſe it was oppoſite [z] to the goſpel. To eſtabliſh this laſt point was the deſign of thoſe Antitheſes, which were framed by [a] Marcion, and which Tertullian [b] ſo frequently mentions. Though, as he rightly obſerves, it would be no difficult matter to form rival [c] Antitheſes againſt him, by ſhewing many glaring contradictions, between one part and another of his opinions. To eſtabliſh this ſame point, the contrariety of character between the God of the Jews and the God of the Chriſtians, and the oppoſition between the law and the goſpel, is the direct intent of a great part of the objections brought by the Marcionite, in the dialogue aſcribed to Origen; [d] ſome of which have already been quoted at large. [e] Some others of the more remarkable I ſhall here tranſcribe, referring

[y] ΜΕΓ. Εκ τουτου δεικνυται μη ων αγαθος ο δημιουργος. Dia. Ad. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 23.

ΜΕΓ. Η αγαθη αρχη των χριστιανων αρχει. Ibid. ſec. 1. p. 4.

[z] ΜΕΓ. Δεικνυω οτι ο Δημιουργος αλλα ενομοθετησε. και ο χριστος αλλα εναντια τουτω—Εαυτω θελεις ποτε εναντιουται θελ αντικειται ωσπερ αντικειται το Ευαγγελιον τω νομω. Ibid. ſec. 1. p. 14. ΜΕΓ. Οτι ο χριστος ανετρεψε τα του Δημιουργου. και δεικνυμι οτι ανετρεψεν. Ibid. p. 16.

ΜΕΓ. Δειξω οτι εναντιουται το Ευαγγελιον τω Νομω. Ibid. p. 23.

[a] Separatio legis et Evangelii proprium et principale opus eſt Marcionis.—Nam hæ ſunt Antitheſeis Marcionis, i. e. contrariæ oppoſitiones quæ conantur diſcordiam Evangelii cum lege committere, ut ex diverſitate ſententiarum utriuſque inſtrumenti diverſitatem quoque argumentur Deorum. Ad. Mar. Lib. 1. c. 11. p. 359. 10. [b] Cæterum ipſas quoque Antitheſeis Marcionis cominus cæſidiſſem, ſi operoſiore deſtructione earum egeret defenſio Creatoris, tam boni quam et judicis.—Compendio interim poſſum Antitheſeis retudiſſe, geſtientes ex qualitatibus ingeniorum, ſive legum, ſive virtutum diſcernere, atque ita alienare Chriſtum a Creatore, ut optimum a judice, et mitem a fero, et ſalutarem ab otioſo. Ad. Mar. Lib. 2. c. 29. p. 476. A. D. p. 382, 3. Certe enim totum quod elaboravit etiam Antitheſeis præſtruendo in hoc cogit ut veteris et Novi Teſtamenti diverſitatem conſtituat proinde Chriſtum ſuum a Creatore ſeparaturus ut Dei alterius, alienum legis et prophetarum. Ibid. Lib. 4. c. 6. p. 506. B. p. 407. 13.

[c] Nunc et de puſillitatibus, et malignitatibus, cæteriſque notis, et ipſe adverſus Marcionem Antitheſeis æmulas faciam.—Mutavit ſententias ſuas Deus noſter, proinde qua veſter, qui enim genus humanum tam fero reſpexit, eam ſententiam mutavit qua tanto ævo non reſpexit. Ibid. Lib. 2. c. 28. p. 475. B. C. D. p. 382. 36.

[d] See ſec. 14. of this chap. p. 373. n. [k]. Sec. 23. p. 383. n. [u]. Sec. 31. p. 389. n. i. p. 390. n. [o]. Sec. 32. p. 390. note [t], and in this page, notes [y] and [z].

[e] ΜΕΓ. Ο Προφητης του Θεου της γενεσεως πολεμω συναπτος προς τον λαον, αναβας επι την κεφυφην του ορους, εξετεινε τας χειρας αυτου προς τον Θεον, ινα πολλους των πολεμιων ανελη. Ο δε Κυριος ημων αγιος ων, εξετεινε

τας

ferring [f] only to ſeveral of the remaining ones, becauſe they are [g] too many to be all inſerted.

But this argument, as Tertullian juſtly obſerves, [5] may be eaſily refuted, ſince ſuch contrarieties as he produces will never prove that the being who gave the Jewiſh law is not the ſame with the God of the Chriſtians. For thoſe precepts and injunctions of the ceremonial law, produced by Marcion, as directly oppoſite to the goſpel, were rightly calculated for that people to whom they were given, though they would be improper for thoſe who are placed in very different circumſtances under the goſpel: and this temporary [h] diverſity, and ſeeming oppoſition, only make manifeſt the wiſdom of that God who ſuits himſelf to the different circumſtances of things; which very juſtly require an alteration of conduct.

SECT. XXXV. *Marcion received but eleven Books of the New Teſtament, and of the Goſpels only that of Luke, and this mutilated.*

MARCION received only eleven books of the New Teſtament, and theſe ſtrangely curtailed and altered. He divided them into

τας χειρας αυτου, αχι το ανελειν τον ανθρωπον αλλα του σωσαι. Dia. Ad. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 19. ΜΕΤ. Ο εν τω νομω Κυριος λεγει, Αγαπησεις τον αγγαπωντα σε, και μισησεις τον εχθρον σου. Ο δε Κυριος ημων, αγαθος ων, λεγει· Αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων, και ευχεσθε υπερ των διωκοντων υμας. Ibid. ſec. 1. p. 20. ΜΕΤ. Ο Προφητης του Θεου της γενησεως, ινα πολεμω πλειονας ανελη, εγνωσε τον ηλιον, του μη δυσαι, μεχρι συντελεση αναιρων τους πολεμιους προς τον λαον· Ο δε Κυριος αγαθος ων λεγει, Ο ηλιος μη επιδυετω επι τω παροργισμω υμων. Ib. p. 22.

[f] Vid. Dia. Adv. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 36, &c.

[g] Omnem ſapientiam et omnem paraturam impii atque ſacrilegi Marcionis, ad ipſum jam Evangelium ejus provocamus, quod interpolando ſuum fecit. Et ut fidem inſtrueret, dotem quandam commentatus eſt illi, opus ex contrarietatum oppoſitionibus, Antitheſeis cognominatum et ad ſeparationem legis et Evangelii coactum, qua duos Deos dividens, proinde diverſos, alterum alterius inſtrumenti, (vel quod magis uſui eſt dicere) Teſtamenti, ut exinde Evangelio quoque ſecundum Antitheſeis credendo patrocinaretur. Sed et iſtas proprio congreſſu cominus—Cæcidiſſem, ſi non multo opportunius in ipſo et cum ipſo Evangelio, cui procurant, retunderentur. Quanquam tam facile eſt præſcriptive occurrere, et quidem ut accepto eas faciam, ut rato habeam, ut nobiſcum facere dicam, quo magis de cæcitate auctoris ſui erubeſcant noſtræ jam Antitheſeis adverſus Marcionem. Atque adeo confiteor alium ordinem decucurriſſe in veteri diſpoſitione apud creatorem, alium in nova apud Chriſtum. Non nego diſtare documenta eloquii, præcepta virtutis, legis diſciplinas, dum tamen tota diverſitas in unum et eundem Deum competat. Ad. Mar. L. 4. c. 1. p. 501. A. B. C. p. 403. 36.

[h] Auſer titulum Marcionis, et intentionem atque propoſitum operis ipſius, et nihil aliud præſtat, quam demonſtrationem ejuſdem Dei Optimi et judicis, quia hæc duo in ſolum Deum competunt. Nam et ipſum ſtudium in eis exemplis opponendi Chriſtum Creatori ad unitatem magis ſpectat. Quia nec mirum erat diverſitas temporalis ſi poſtea Deus mitior pro rebus edomitis, qui retro auſterior pro indomitis. Ita per Antitheſeis facilius oſtendi poteſt ordo Creatoris a Chriſto reformatus. Ibid. L. 2. c. 29. p. 476. D. p. 383. 7.

two

two parts, calling the one the Goſpel, [i] and the other the Apoſtolicon. The former contained only one of the four goſpels, viz. that of St. Luke, [k] and this mutilated and altered, and even interpolated [l] in a great variety of places. He would not allow it to be called the goſpel of St. Luke, [m] eraſing the name of that evangeliſt from the beginning of his copy. Some of his followers conſidered it as written partly by Chriſt himſelf, and partly by the apoſtle Paul. Marcion retrenched the firſt and ſecond chapters entirely, and began his goſpel at the firſt verſe of the third chapter, [o] and even read this different from our copies, viz. that 'in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæſar 'God deſcended into Capernaum, a city of Galilee.'

[i] ΜΕΓ. Δειξω οτι εν εστι το Ευαγγελιον. Dial. con. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 12. ΜΕΓ. τω σω φαλσω ε πιστευω Αποστολικω. ΑΔΑΜ. Προστεγκε το αποστολικον σε. Ibid. p. 8. ΜΑΡΚ. τω εμω αποστολινω πειθομαι. ΑΔΑΜ. Εχω το αποστλικον σε. Ibid. p. 47. ΜΑΡΚ. Ημεις πλειον τω Ευαγγελιω, και τω Αποστολικω ε δεχομεθα. Ibid. p. 58. Αυτας δη τας τω προειρημενω βιβλους ας κεκτηται μετα χειρας λαβων, το τε παρ αυτων λεγομενον Ευαγγελιον, και Αποστολικον καλουμενα. Epi. Adv. Hær. 42. p. 310. C. D.

[k] Μονω δε κεχρηται τουτω τω χαρακτηρι των κατα Λουκαν Ευαγγελιων. Ib. p. 309. D. Ουτος εκ μεν των Ευαγγελιων το κατα Λουκαν εδεξατο μονον. Theo. H. F. lib. 1. c. 24. p. 210. D. Nam ex iis commentatoribus quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegiſſe quæ cæderet. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 2. p. 405. 8. Itaque de his Marcion flagitandus quod omiſſis eis Lucæ potius inſtiterit. Ibid. cap. 5. p. 406. 40. Et alia multa quæ...a Luca dicta...quibus et Marcion et Valentinus utuntur...Non enim conceditur eis...quædam quidem recipere ex his quæ a Luca dicta ſunt.... quædam vero refutare. Iren. Adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 14. p. 236. 20. Ox. See alſo Dia. con. Mar. § 1. from p. 6...12.

[l] Et ſuper hæc id quod eſt ſecundum Lucam Evangelium circumcidens et omnia quæ ſunt de generatione Domini conſcripta auferens. Iren. Ad. Hær. lib. 1. 27. [al. 29.] p. 104. Ox. Ελευσομαι δε εις τα υπ αυτω γεγραμμενα, μαλλον δε εξαδιεξεπμενα. ουτος γαρ εχει Ευαγγελιον μονο το κατα Λουκαν, περικεκομμενον απο της αρχης, δια την του Συντηρος συλληψιν, και τη εισαρκον αυτου παρουσιαν. η μουον δε την αρχην απετεμεν ο λυμηναμενος εαυτον ηπερ το Ευαγγελιον, αλλα και το τελος και των μεσων πολλα περιεκοψε των της αληθειας λογων, αλλα δε παρα τα γεγραμμενα προτιθησι. Epi. Ad. Hær. 42. No. 9. 309. C. D.

[m] Contra Marcion, Evangelio ſcilicet ſuo, nullum adſcribit auctorem. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 2. p. 405. 5. De Titulo quoque funis ducendus eſt contentionis....Ego meum dico verum Marcion ſuum. Ibid. c. 4. p. 405. 45.

[n] ΜΕΓ. Δειξω εν ειναι Ευαγγελιον. ΑΔΑΜ: τις εστι ο γραψας το Ευαγγελιον τουτο ο εφης ειναι ει; ΜΕΓ. Ο Χριστος. ΑΔΑΜ. αυτος ο κυριος εγραψεν οτι εσταυρωθη και ανεστη τη τριτη ημερα; ουτω γραφει. ΜΕΓ. Ο αποστολος Παυλος προσεθηκεν. ΑΔΑΜ. παλαι γαρ Παυλος εν τω σταυρωθηναι τον χριστον; ΜΕΓ. αυτος εγραψεν το Ευαγγελιον απλως. Dia. con. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 12. Nam et Lucæ digeſtum Paulo aſcribere ſolent. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 5. p. 406. 39. [o] Anno quinto decimo principatus Tiberiani proponit Deum deſcendiſſe in civitatem Galileæ Capharnaum. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 7. p. 407. 31. Και αρχην τω Ευαγγελιω εταξε ταυτην, εν τω πεντεκαιδεκατω ετει Τιβεριου Καισαρος, και τα εξης. Epi. Ad. Hær. 42. No. 11. p. 312. A.

SECT. XXXVI. *He rejected the Genealogy and Baptism of our Saviour.*

ACCORDING to Irenæus [p], Epiphanius [q], and Theodoret [r], he also rejected the genealogy and baptism of Christ. If we compare this with a passage of Tertullian [s], it seems not unlikely that he connected that part of the first and second verses of the third chapter which he retained, with the thirty-first verse [t] of the fourth chapter; because, in that passage, Tertullian upbraids Marcion with introducing Jesus into the synagogue, immediately upon his descent from heaven. If this was really the case, then there is some incorrectness in the account given by Epiphanius of the passages which were omitted, or mutilated, or altered by Marcion. For he says, he began his gospel [u] at the first verse of the third chapter, and gives no particular passage, as altered or omitted by him, till he comes to the fourteenth verse [x] of the fifth chapter. This, however, according to his own account, is somewhat inaccurate, for, in the passage quoted before, [y] he himself had said that he rejected the genealogy and the baptism of our Saviour; the account of both which is in the latter part of the third chapter: for this reason one may the more readily admit the assertion of Tertullian in the sense above explained.

[p] Et omnia quæ sunt de generatione Domini conscripta auferens. Iren. Adv. Hær. l. 1. c. 27. [al. 29.] p. 104. Ox.

[q] Ο μεν γαρ χαρακτηρ τȣ κατα Λȣκαν σημαινει το Ευαγγελιον, ως δε ηκρωτηριασται μητε αρχην εχων, μητε μεσα, μητε τελος, ιματιȣ βεβρωμενȣ υπο πολλων σητων επεχει τον τροπον. ευθυς μεν γαρ εν τη αρχη παντα τα απ αρχης τω Λȣκα πεπραγματευμενα, τȣτ' εστιν ως λεγει· επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν και τα εξης. και τα περι της Ελισαβετ, και τȣ Αγγελȣ ευαγγελιζομενȣ την Μαριαν παρθενον, Ιωαννȣ τε και Ζαχαριȣ και της εν Βεθλεεμ γενησεως, γενεαλογιας, και της τȣ Βαπτισματος υποθεσεως. ταυτα παντα περικοψας απεπηδησε. Epi. Hær. 42. No. 11. p. 311. D. 312. A.

[r] Και την γενεαλογιαν περικοψας τα πλειστα. Theod. H. F. l. 1. c. 24. p. 210. D.

[s] Jam eum prophetatum incipimus agnoscere, ostendentem in primo ingressu venisse se, non ut Legem et Prophetas dissolveret, sed ut potius adimpleret. Hoc enim Marcion, ut additum, erasit. Sed frustra negabit Christum dixisse, quod statim fecit ex parte. Prophetiam enim interim de loco adimplevit. 'De cœlo statim ad Synagogam.' Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 7. p. 408. 1. Et tamen quomodo in Synagogam potuit admitti, tam repentinus, tam ignotus, cujus nemo adhuc certas, de tribu de populo, de domo. Ibid. p. 409. 10.

[t] Anno quinto decimo principatus, &c. Initium Evangelii hujus sic inchoavit Marcion resectis capitibus precedentibus, junctoque principio hoc capitis tertii cum commate 31mo capitis 4ti. Millii. Test. in locum.

[u] Vide supra, note [o].

[x] Εντευθεν ȣν ȣτος αρχεται, και ȣ καθ ειρμον παλιν επιμενει, αλλα τα μεν ως προειπον παρακοπτει, τα δε προστιθησιν ανω κατω, ȣκ ορθως βαδιζων, αλλα ερραδιȣργημενως παντα περινοστευων, και εστιν, Απελθων δειξον σεαυτον τω Ιερει, και προσενεγκε περι τȣ καθαρισμȣ σȣ, καθως προσεταξε Μωυσης. ινα η μαρτυριον τȣ το υμιν, ανθ ȣ ειπεν ο Σωτηρ, εις μαρτυριον αυτοις. Epi. Hær. 42. p. 312. B. See Luke v. 14.

[y] See note [q].

SECT.

Sect. XXXVII. *He also rejected the History of the Temptation.*

If Marcion expunged the history of the temptation, it might be on the same account that some others rejected the lamentation of Christ over Jerusalem, and the relation of his agony in the garden, and of the angel strengthening him; as we are informed by Epiphanius [z] and Hilary [a]: they did this lest they should attribute too much [b] of human weakness to our Saviour.

That the Marcionites did not admit the history of the temptation, seems very probable from a passage in Epiphanius [c], who gives an account of a dispute which he had with a certain follower of Marcion. When he produced this passage of scripture to prove that Christ was a real man, he received from him the following answer: that 'it was impossible for Satan to tempt Christ, 'who was truly God, and, according to the opinion of Epi-'phanius, his Lord and Sovereign.'

The other story contained in this fourth chapter, of Christ's going into the synagogue at Nazareth, and reading out of the prophet Esaias, was also rejected. It appeared to them too favourable to the Jewish religion; and because it established the truth of this prophet's prediction; for our Saviour says, *this day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.* There can therefore be no doubt but they expunged this, and all after, to the end of the 30th verse.

Sect. XXXVIII. *An Account of many other Alterations made by him in St. Luke's Gospel.*

We will proceed with the account as given us by Epiphanius, of the alterations, or omissions, or interpolations, which Marcion

[z] Και ενλαυσε κειται εν τω κατα λουκαν Ευαγγελιω εν τοις αδιορθωτοις αντιγραφοις. Epi. in Ancor. n. 31. Copies which have not been corrected. See Fa. Simon's Criti. Hist. of the N. T. p. 1. c. 12. p. 111. Vide etiam Mill. N. T. in locum.

[a] Nec sane ignorandum nobis est, et in Græcis et in Latinis codicibus complurimis vel de adveniente Angelo vel de sudore sanguineo nihil scriptum reperiri. Hil. Lib. 10. de Trin.

[b] Ορθοδοξοι δε αφειλοντο το ρητον, φοβηθεντες και μη ητησαι της αυτε το τελος και το ισχυροτατον. Epi. Ibid. Hæc erasa videntur a quibusdam, qui verebantur Christo tribuere tam insignia humanæ infirmitatis argumenta. Jansen. Gand. Com. Evan. cap. 137.

[c] Και γαρ ποτε διαλεγομενος τισι των αυτε μαθητων Μαρκιωνιστη τινι, και λεγων ως εν τω Ευαγγελιω εχει, οτι παρελαβεν αυτον εις την ερημον το πνευμα πειρασθηναι υπο τε διαβολε, ηκουσα παρ αυτε, οτι πως ηδυνατο Σατανας τον ονται Θεον, και μειζονα αυτε υπαρχοντα, και κυριον αυτε, ως υμεις λεγετε, πειρασαι, τον Ιησεν τε αυτε δεσποτην. Epi. Har. 42. p. 342. D. A. Ελεγξ.

and

and his followers made in St. Luke's goſpel. It appears from the paſſage before quoted, [d] that where we read, *for a teſtimony unto them:* Luke v. 14, Marcion read, 'that this may be a teſ-'timony unto you. In verſe 24th he tranſpoſed [e] the words επι της γης, making them follow αμαρτιας, inſtead of ανθρωπε, as they do in our preſent copies: this is ſo trifling a variation, that it probably aroſe rather from his finding it ſo in ſome copy than from any deſigned alteration. The next paſſage quoted by Epiphanius, [f] chapter vi. 5, is read both here, and in the repetition of it prefixed [g] to his refutation of Marcion from this text, exactly as in our preſent copies. The reaſon of his introducing this text could not be to point out a variation in Marcion's goſpel, [h] but from hence to prove that the ſabbath, an inſtitution of the God of the Jews, was not oppoſite to what Chriſt came to eſtabliſh; and that his calling himſelf the ſon of man, was on account of his having aſſumed human fleſh. Theſe are the only points which Epiphanius aſſerts againſt Marcion in his refutation of him, following this paſſage [i].

I would here obſerve, once for all, that there are many paſſages in Epiphanius which Marcion read the ſame as we do in our preſent copies; though perhaps upon a compariſon with the preſent readings, ſome ſlight variation may appear, either in his making uſe of other words with the ſame meaning, or in placing them in a different order. This aroſe partly from Epiphanius's quoting them by memory, and partly from his giving an abridgment of theſe paſſages. The reaſon of his introducing theſe, in which there is no variation from our preſent copies, was as in the inſtance juſt produced, to found arguments on them [k] againſt the tenets of the Marcionites.

[d] See p. 395. note [x]. Epiphanius in his refutation of Marcion, as drawn from this paſſage, ſeems to have read το δωρον in his copy after προσενεγκε. which however is not in our preſent copies. Epi. ib. p. 322. D.

[e] ...Ο υιος τε ανθρωπε αφιεναι αμαρτιας επι της γης. Epi. ib. 312. B. γ.

[f] Epi. ibid. 312. B. δ.

[g] Epi. ibid. 323. B. Σχολ. γ.

[h] δυο εισιν εν τουτω, και υιον ανθρωπε, και κυριον Σαββατε εαυτον ο Σωτηρ ομολογει, διδασκων ινα μη το Σαββατον αλλοτριον της αυτα ποιησεως νομιζηται. και το ισχατον των ανθρωπε απο της ενσαρκε παρουσιας νοειν. Epi. ibid. 323. B. C. Ελεγ. γ.

[i] There are two MSS. mentioned by Dr. Mill, which have the following clauſe inſerted between the 5th and 6th verſes. Τη αυτη ημερα θεασαμενος τινα εργαζομενον τω Σαββατω, ειπεν αυτω, ανθρωπε, ει μεν οιδας, τι ποιεις, μακαριος ει, ει δε μη οιδας, επικαταρατος και παραβατης ει τε νομε. Vid. Millii. Teſt. in locum. There can be no doubt but theſe words are ſpurious, notwithſtanding theſe two MSS. are ſaid to be very ancient; for they are inconſiſtent with our Saviour's purpoſe, and contrary to his uſual manner. Grotius therefore thinks they were added by ſome Marcionite. But it is certain they were not in the Marcionite goſpel in the time of Epiphanius, becauſe he takes no notice of them, as he undoubtedly would if they had been there, ſince he mentions the very place. Neither is it eaſy to ſee how they will ſerve the cauſe of the Marcionites. Vid. Groti. in loc.

[k] See at large his liſt of the paſſages of ſcripture, and his ſcholia and refutations drawn from them. Epi. ibid. p. 311..374.

The

The fourth instance of an alteration is from Luke vi. 17, where Marcion read εν αυτοις instead of μετ' αυτων [l]. The sense however is here the same with one particle as with the other; for εν may be only a Hebraism, and may signify with, as well as μετ'.

In chap. viii. 19, Marcion expunged [m] η μητηρ αυτυ, και οι αδελφοι αυτυ from this verse. Tertullian speaks in such a manner as would lead one to think, that Marcion had made an addition to the gospel of St. Luke, by inserting from the gospel of Matthew that answer of our Saviour which we find related by Matthew, chap. xii. 48; *who is my mother, and who are my brethren?* For he represents Marcion, [n] as well as all [o] the other heretics, who deny the nativity, as making use of these words, for their most common and favourite argument. But Marcion might use these words against those who allowed the authenticity of Matthew's gospel, without inserting them in his gospel, or Tertullian might quote by memory, and think that to be in Luke, which was only in Matthew, as he has done at least in three instances [p].

Chap. ix. 40, is read [q] somewhat more concisely by Marcion than in our present copies; but the sense is fully preserved: 'I besought thy disciples, but they could not cast him out; and 'he said unto them, O faithless generation, how long shall I 'suffer you?'

In chap. x. 21, he omitted [r] the first πατερ, and the words και της γης, that he might not allow Christ to call his Father the Lord of earth, or this world. He retained πατερ in the latter part of the verse.

In chap. xi. 29, he omitted the last words of that verse, con-

[l] Κατεβη μετ αυτων, εχει, κατεβη εν αυτοις. Epi. ibid. 312. B. δ. In our present copies it is καταβας.

[m] Epi. ibid. 1. B.

[n] Venimus ad constantissimum argumentum omnium qui domini nativitatem in controversiam deferunt. Ipse inquiunt contestatur, se non esse natum, dicendo, quæ mihi mater et qui mihi fratres. Ita semper hæretici, &c. Adv. Mar. l. 4. c. 19. p. 531. D. vel p. 423. 43. Fr. 1597.

[o] Sed quoties de nativitate contenditur, omnes qui respuunt eam...ipsum Deum volunt negare esse natum quod dixerit, quæ mihi mater et qui mihi fratres. Audiat igitur et Apelles quid jam responsum sit a nobis Marcioni...Licet propterea abstulerint hæreses ista de Evangelio, quod et creditum patrem ejus Joseph fabrum, et matrem Mariam, et fratres et sorores ejus optime notos sibi dicebant. De Carne Christi. cap. 7. p. 364, 365. vel 302. 9. Fr. 1597.

[p] Non ut legem et prophetas dissolveret sed ut potius adimpleret. Hoc enim Marcion ut additum erasit. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 7., p. 408. 2. Fr. 1597. But this text is not in Luke but in Matt. v. 17. Detrahe voces Christi Mei res loquentur. Ecce venit in synagogam certe ad oves perditas Israelis. Ibid. p. 408. 7. This text also is not in Luke, but in Matt. xv. 24. For the third instance see sec. 253. p. 620. Note [d] in this section.

[q] Εδεηθην των μαθητων σε. ειχε δε παρα το, και εδυνηθησαν εκβαλειν αυτο. και προς αυτυς, ω γενεα απιστος εως ποτε ανεξομαι υμων. Epi. ib. p. 313. B. ib.

[r] Ινα μη πατερα αυτυ υποδειξης Μαρκιων, τον χριστον λεγοντα τον δημιουργον. Epi. ibid. 329. B. Elεγ. κβ.

cerning

cerning the sign of Jonas the prophet [s]. He likewise left out all the 30th, 31st, and 32d verses. In verse 42d he read κλησιν vocation, [t] instead of κρισιν judgment. The instance from verse 47 [u] is introduced not on account of any variation but to found an argument thereon in favour of the law and the Old Testament. He rejected out of his copy [x] the 49th, 50th, and 51st verses of this chapter, because it related to the prophets, and so clearly established their authority. He entirely omitted [y] the 6th verse of the 12th chapter. In the 8th verse [z] he read, 'before God,' instead of, *before the angels of God.* He seems [a] to have left out the whole 28th verse. He expunged υμων [b] from the 30th and 32d verses, reading only πατερ. In the 38th verse, instead of the [c] *second or third watch*, he read, 'the evening watch.' In the 46th and 50th verses, [d] though quoted by Epiphanius, there is no variation. He entirely [e] omitted the first five verses of the 13th chapter. In the 28th verse of the same chapter, where we read *When ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out*; he read [f] by altering, adding, and transposing: 'When ye 'shall see all the just in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves 'rejected, and bound without, there shall be weeping and gnash-'ing of teeth.' He likewise [g] omitted all the remaining verses of this chapter. He excluded from his gospel [h] all of the 15th

[s] Περικεκοπται το περι Ιωνα τυ Προφητυ. ειχε γαρ η γενεα αυτη, σημειον υ δοθησεται αυτη. υκ ειχε δε περι Νινευη και Βασιλισσης Νοτυ και Σαλομονος. Ibid. 313. D. κε.

[t] Ibid. p. 313. D. κε.

[u] υκ αλλοτριοι αυτυ ησαν οι προφηται, αλλα δηλοι και προετοιμαζαι της εισαρκυ αυτυ παρουσιας. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. p. 332. D. Ελεγ. νε.

[x] υκ ειχε δια τυτο ειπειν η Σοφια τη Θευ αποστελω εις αυτυς Προφητας, και περι αιματος Ζαχαριυ, και Αβελ και των Προφητων οτι εκζητηθησεται εκ της γενεας ταυτης. Epi. ibid. p. 313. D. κη.

[y] υκ εχει δε υχι πειτε γρηθια. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. p. 314. A. κϛ.

[z] Διτι τυ, ομολογησει εμπροσθεν των αγγελων τυ Θευ, εμπροσθεν τυ Θευ λεγει. Ibid. 314. A. λ.

[a] υκ εχει τα, ο Θεος, αμφιεννυσι τον χορτον. Ibid. p. 314. A. λα.

[b] Διτι τυ ο πατηρ υμων, ο πατηρ ειχεν. Ibid. 314. B. λδ.

[c] Διτι τυ δευτερα η τριτη φυλακη, ειχει εσπερινην φυλακην. Ibid. 314. B. λε.

[d] Ibid. 314. B. λϛ. λζ.

[e] Η παρακεκομμενοι απο τυ, ηλθον τινες απαγγελλοντες αυτω περι των Γαλιλαιων ων το αιμα συνεμιξε Πιλατος μετα των θυσιων αυτων, ητις, οτε λεγει περι των εν τω Σιλωαμ δεκα οκτω αποθανοντων εν τω πυργω, και οτι μη μετανοησητε. και εως της παραβολης της συκης, περι ης ειπεν ο γεωργος, οτι σκαπτω και βαλλω κοπρια και εαν μη ποιηση, εκκοψον. Ibid. 314. C. λη. et p. 336. B. C. Ελεγ. λη.

[f] παρεκοψε παλιν τοτε οψεσθε· Αβρααμ, κ. τ. λ...αντι δε τυτυ εποιησεν. οτε παντας τυς δικαιυς ιδητε εν τη βασιλεια τυ Θευ, υμας δε εκβαλλομενυς. εποιησε δε κρατυμενυς εξω. και εκει εστι ο κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος των οδοντων. Ib. 314. D. μ.

[g] Παρεκοψε παλιν το· ηξυσιν απο ανατολων και ανακλιθησονται εν τη βασιλεια. και το, οι εσχατοι εσονται πρωτοι. και το, προσηλθον οι Φαρισαιοι λεγοντες εξελθε και πορευυ, οτι Ηρωδης σε θελει αποκτεινναι. και το· ειπε, πορευθεντες ειπατε τη αλωπεκι ταυτη. εως οτυ ειπεν· υκ ενδεχεται προφητην απολεσθαι εξω Ιερυσαλημ. και το Ιερυσαλημ, Ιερυσαλημ, η αποκτεινυσα τυς προφητας, και λιθοβολυσα τυς απεσταλμενυς... κ. τ. λ. Ib. 314, 315. D. A. μα· Vide p. 337. C. D.

[h] Παλιν απεκοψε την παραβολην πασαν των δυο υιων, τυ ειληφοτος το μερος των υπαρχοντων, και τυ αλλυ. Ibid. p. 315. A. μβ.

chapter

chapter after the 10th verse, in which was contained the parable of the prodigal son. In the 10th verse of the 17th chapter he omitted [i] all from the word *say*, to the end of the verse. He made several alterations and expunged [k] many things from the story of the ten lepers; particularly he left out part of the 12th, the whole 13th verse, and altered the 14th, reading thus: 'There 'met him ten lepers, and he sent them away saying, shew your-'selves to the priest.' After this he inserted a clause from chap. iv. 27; 'That there were many lepers in the days of Eliseus the 'prophet, and none of them was cleansed, but Naaman the Sy-'rian.' It it also probable, from the manner in which [l] Epiphanius expresseth himself, that he mutilated and altered other parts of this story.

In the 19th verse of the 18th chapter he added the word [m] 'Father;' and in the 20th verse, [n] he changed *thou knowest* into 'I know.'

He entirely omitted [o] the 31st, 32d, and 33d verses of this same chapter, in which our blessed Saviour declares that the things foretold by the prophets concerning his sufferings, death, and resurrection, should be all fulfilled. *He* expunged nineteen verses out of the 19th chapter, [p] from the end of the 27th to the beginning of the 47th, containing the history of those things which were transacted near Bethphage, of Christ's triumphant entry into Jerusalem; of his weeping over the city; and of his thrusting those out of the temple who bought and sold therein. In the 20th chapter he omitted [q] ten verses from the end of the 8th verse to the end of the 18th, in which are related the parable of the vineyard, and the reflections he made on it, to the chief priests and scribes. He rejected also [r] the 37th and 38th verses of this same chapter, in which there is a reference to

[i] Παρεκοψε το· λεγετε οτι αχρειοι δυλοι εσμεν· ο ωφειλομεν ωοιησαι ωεποιηκαμεν. Ibid. 315. B. μζ. [k] Οτε συνηντησαν οι δεκα λεπροι, απεκοψε δε ωολλα και εποιησε· απεστειλεν αυτυς λεγων· δειξατε εαυτυς τοις Ιερευσι. και αλλα αντ' αλλων εποιησε λεγων· οτι ωολλοι λεπροι ησαν εν ημεραις Ελισσαιυ τυ ωροφητυ και υκ εκαθαριστη ει μη Νεεμαν ο Συρος. Ibid. 315. B. C. μη.

[l] Και αλλα αντι αλλων εποιησε. Ibid.

[m] Εις εστι αγαθος, ωροσεθηκε το, οτι ο Πατερ. Ibid 315. C. V. Vide etiam Dia. Con. Marc. p. 3. init.

[n] Αντι τυ· τας εντολας οιδας, λεγει τας εντολας οιδα. Epi. ubi supra.

[o] Παρεκοψε το· παραλαβων τυς δωδεκα ειπεν· ιδυ αναβαινομεν εις Ιεροσολυμα και τελεσθησεται ωαντα τα γεγραμμενα εν τοις ωροφηταις ωερι τυ υιυ τυ ανθρωπυ. ωαραδοθησεται, αποκτανθησεται, και τη τριτη ημερα αναστησεται. ολα ταυτα ωαρεκοψε. Ib. 315. D. 13. [p] Παρεκοψε το κεφαλαιον της ημ, και Βηθφαγη, και το ωερι της ωολεως και τυ Ιερυ οτι γεγραμμενον ην ο οικος μυ οικος ωροσευχης· και ωοιειτε αυτον σπηλαιον λησων. Ibid. p. 315. 6. 19.

[q] Παλιν απεκοψε (την) τα τυ αμπελωνος τε εκδιδομενυ γεωργοις· και το, τι υν εστι το, λιθον ον απεδοκιμασαν οι οικοδομυντες. Ibid. A. 15. [r] Απεκοψε το, οτι δε εγειρονται οι νεκροι, Μωυσης εμηνυσε ωερι της βατυ καθως λεγει Κυριον τον Θεον Αβρααμ, και Ισαακ, και Ιακωβ· Θεος εστι ζωντων, και υκι νεκρων. Ibid. 316. A. 17.

Moses,

Moses. Marcion also [s] erased the 18th verse of the 21st chapter from his copy, and the 21st and 22d verses of the same chapter, on account of the concluding sentence [t] of the 22d, *that all things which are written may be fulfilled.* The 16th verse of the 22d chapter [u] was entirely omitted by him, as also [x] the 35th, 36th, and 37th, and the 50th and 51st verses [y] of the same, which seems to make it probable that the 38th verse, which contains what the disciples said to our Lord, that they had two swords, and the 49th verse, in which is inserted a question put by the disciples to our Lord, concerning using the sword, were in like manner omitted; because otherwise parts of incomplete sentences would be introduced, and the connection destroyed. In the 2d verse of the 23d chapter Marcion added two clauses, viz. after the words *perverting the nation*, he inserted, 'and [z] destroying the law and the prophets:' and after the words *forbidding to give tribute unto Cæsar*, he added, 'and [a] perverting the 'women and children.' He also erased the [b] 43d verse of this chapter from his copy. In the 24th chapter he [c] omitted that part of the conference between our Saviour and the two disciples going to Emmaus, which related to the prediction of his sufferings, and which is contained in the 26th and 27th verses. These two verses were wholly expunged by him, and he changed the words in the end of the 25th, ελαλησαν οι προφηται, into ελαλησα υμιν.

These are the alterations according to Epiphanius [d] which Marcion made in the gospel of St. Luke.

Dr.

[s] Παλιν παρεκοψε το, θριξ εκ της κεφαλης υμων ου μη αποληται. Ibid. 316. B. ιη.

[t] Παλιν παρεκοψε ταυτα, τοτε οι εν τη Ιουδαια...δια το επιφερομενον εως πληρωθη παντα τα γεγραμμενα. Ibid. 316. B. ιθ.

[u] Παρεκοψε το, λεγω γαρ υμιν....κ. τ. λ. Ibid. 316. C. ξγ.

[x] Παρεκοψε το, οτε απεστειλα υμας μη τινος υστερησατε; και τα εξης. δια το, και τουτο το γεγραμμενον δει τελεσθηναι, το, και μετα ανομων ελογισθη. Ibid. 316. ξδ.

[y] Παρεκοψε το εποιησε Πετρος οτε επαταξε, και αφειλετο το ους. Ibid. 316. D. ξζ.

[z] Προσεθετο μετα τουτο, τουτον ευρομεν διαστρεφοντα το εθνος, και καταλυοντα τον Νομον, και τους Προφητας. Epi. ibid. 316. C. ξθ.

[a] Προσεθηκε μετα το, κελευοντα φορους μη δουναι, και αποστρεφοντα τας γυναικας, και τα τεκνα. Ibid. 317. A. ο.

[b] Παρεκοψε το, σημερον μετ' εμου εση εν τω Παραδεισω. Ibid. 317. A. οβ.

[c] Παρεκοψε το ειρημενον προς Κλεοπαν και τον αλλον, οτε συνηντησεν αυτοις, το· ω ανοητοι και βραδεις του πιστευειν επι πασιν, οις ελαλησαν οι προφηται· ουχι ταυτα εδει παθειν; και αντι δε του, εφ οις ελαλησαν οι Προφηται, εφ οις ελαλησα υμιν. εκεγκεται δε οτι οτε εκλασε τον αρτον, ανεωχθησαν οι οφθαλμοι, και επεγνωσαν. Ibid. 317. B. C. οζ.

[d] Tertullian says, (Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 4. p. 573. A. 450. 30. Fr. 1597.) that Marcion erased the passage which gives an account of the parting of the raiment of our Saviour among the soldiers. ....Vestitum plane eius militibus divisum, partim sorte concessum, Marcion abstulit. But the reason which he assigns for it, viz. respiciens Psalmi prophetiam, shews that in this, as well as in two or three other instances, where he has accused Marcion of altering passages, his memory deceived him, by taking that to be in Luke which was only in Matthew; for the reference to the text in the Psalms is only given in Matthew, chap. xxvii. 35. Epiphanius has quoted this very passage, Luke xxiii. 34;

Dr. Mill says [e] that Marcion expunged the story about Peter's wife's mother, contained in 38th and 39th of the 4th chapter. By the mark which he puts before the 37th verse, one would naturally conclude he meant that the 37th verse also was expunged; he gives no authority for this. Whether he grounds it on Tertullian's omitting to quote this, when he has quoted every circumstance mentioned in that chapter of the 31st verse, I know not.

Sect. XXXIX. *A sufficient Number of Texts remaining to confute his Errors.*

Upon an impartial review of these alterations some appear to be trifling, others might arise from the various readings of different copies; but many of them are undoubtedly designed perversions, intended to countenance, or at least not directly contradict those absurd principles, which he and his followers espoused. There were however a sufficient number of passages left by them in their copies, as appears from the refutation of their doctrine by Epiphanius, to establish the reality of the flesh and blood of Christ, and to prove that the God of the Jews was his Father, and a being of consummate goodness. Tertullian indeed observes that 'Marcion [f] did purposely avoid erasing all 'those passages which made against him, that he might, with 'the greater confidence, deny his having erased any, or at least 'that what he had omitted was for very good reasons.'

Sect. XL. *The catholic Christians asserted the Antiquity of the mutilated Gospel.*

To shew the unauthenticity of these alterations, omissions, additions, and corruptions, the catholic Christians asserted that

34; and founded on it the following argument, &c. against Marcion, which would have been inconsistent with truth and propriety had these words been erased. Δοξα τω ελεημονι Θεω τω συνδοσαντι σε τα αγματα, ω Φαρα Μαρκιαν...πως εκ εφυγες το μεγα τυτο ρητον; πως εκ επιχειρησας κρυψαι την μεγαλην ταυτην παραγματειαν; meaning the whole transaction concerning the going to Calvary, the crucifixion, the parting the garments, and the obscuration of the sun; all which circumstances are particularly specified. Epi. ib. p. 317. A. p. 347. B. Σχολ. οα. Ελεγ. οα.

[e] Historiam hanc de Petri socru sanata amputavit Marcion. Millii Telta. in locum. See also Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 7, 8. p. 408, 9.

[f] Et Marcion quædam contraria sibi, illa credo industria eradere de Evangelio suo noluit, ut ex his quæ eradere potuit, nec erasit, illa quæ erasit, aut negetur erasisse, aut merito erasisse dicatur. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 43. p. 451. 36. Franck. 1597.

their

their [g] copies of Luke's goſpel were more ancient than Marcion's; and [h] maintained the genuineneſs and integrity of the unmutilated goſpel, in oppoſition to that which was curtailed and altered by him. The whole of Epiphanius's work, to which I have ſo often referred, proves that the ſame thing was aſſerted in his time; this, joined to the laſt quoted paſſage of Tertullian, in which he aſſerts the reception of the unmutilated goſpel, from the very times of the apoſtles, gives a continued proof of the authenticity and integrity of this ſacred book.

SECT. XLI. *Marcion rejected the Acts of the Apoſtles.*

MARCION did not admit the Acts of the Apoſtles into the canon of his New Teſtament. This appears from Epiphanius, who [i] ſays his New Teſtament conſiſted of an Evangelium or goſpel, and an Apoſtolicon. The Evangelium, as before ob-

[g] Sed enim Marcion nactus epiſtolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipſos Apoſtolos ſuggillantis, ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem Evangelii, ſimul et accuſantis pſeudapoſtolos quoſdam pervertentes Evangelium Chriſti, connititur ad deſtruendum ſtatum eorum evangeliorum, quæ propria et ſub apoſtolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apoſtolicorum, ut ſcilicet fidem, quam illis adimit, ſuo conferat. Ter. ibid cap. 3. p. 503. C. vel p. 405. 23. Fr. 1597. See this paſſage tranſlated and explained at large vol. 2. p. 256, 257. note c. Ego meum dico verum; Marcion ſuum. Ego Marcionis affirmo adulteratum; Marcion meum. Quis inter nos determinabit, niſi temporis ratio, ei præſcribens auctoritatem, quod antiquius reperietur, et ei præjudicans vitiationem, quod poſterius revincetur?.....Alioquin quam abſurdum, ut ſi noſtrum antiquius probaverimus, Marcionis vero poſterius, et noſtrum ante videatur falſum, quam habuerit de veritate materiam, et Marcionis ante credatur emulationem a noſtro expertum quam eſt editum? et poſtremo id verius exiſtimetur, quod eſt ſerius poſt tot ac tanta jam opera atque documenta Chriſtianæ religionis ſeculo edita, quæ edi utique non potuiſſent ſine Evangelii veritate, id eſt, ante Evangelii veritatem? Quod ergo pertinet ad Evangelium interim Lucæ.....Adeo antiquius Marcione eſt, quod eſt ſecundum nos, ut et ipſe illi Marcion aliquando crediderit...Certe Antitheſes non modo fatentur Marcionis, ſed et præferunt....Si enim id Evangelium quod Lucæ refertur ipſum eſt quod Marcion per Antitheſes ſuas arguit...utique non potuiſſet arguere, niſi quod invenerat ...Emendatio culpam non antecedet. Itaque dum emendat utrumque confirmat, et noſtrum anterius, id emendans quod invenit, et id poſterius, quod de noſtri emendatione conſtituens, ſuum et novum fecit. Ter. ibid. cap. 4. p. 504. C. D. vel p. 405, 406, Fr. 1597.

[h] In ſumma, ſi conſtat id verius quod prius, id prius quod et ab initio, id ab initio, quod ab apoſtolis: pariter utique conſtabit id eſſe ab apoſtolis traditum, quod apud eccleſias Apoſtolorum fuerit ſacroſanctum. Videamus; quod lac a Paulo Corinthii hauſerint; ad quam regulam Galatæ ſint recorrecti; quid legant Philippenſes, Theſſalonicenſes, Epheſii; quid etiam Romani de proximo ſonent, quibus Evangelium et Petrus et Paulus ſanguine quoque ſuo ſignatum reliquerunt. Habemus et Joannis alumnas eccleſias. Nam et ſi Apocalypſim ejus Marcion reſpuit, ordo tamen Epiſcoporum ad originem recenſus, in Joannem ſtabit auctorem, ſic et cæterarum generoſitas recognoſcitur. Dico itaque apud illas, nec ſolas jam Apoſtolicas, ſed apud univerſas quæ illis de ſocietate ſacramenti conſederantur id Evangelium Lucæ ab initio editionis ſuæ ſtare quod cum maxime tuemur: Marcionis vero, pleriſque nec notum, nullis autem notum, ut non eo damnatum. Ter. ibid. cap. 5. p. 505. B. p. 406. 24. Fr. 1597.

[i] Vid. ſec. 35. p. 394. note [i].

ſerved, contained [ii] only St. Luke's goſpel. The Apoſtolicon [k] conſiſted of ten of the [l] epiſtles of St. Paul. Theſe two books [m] were the only ones which he looked upon as canonical. The Acts of the Apoſtles is clearly excluded from his catalogue of authentic books, as given by Epiphanius. The ſame thing appears from the more ancient authority of Tertullian, who begins his fifth book againſt Marcion, [n] with ſhewing the abſurdity of his conduct in rejecting the hiſtory and Acts of the Apoſtles, and yet receiving St. Paul as the chief of the apoſtles, whoſe name is never mentioned in the goſpel with the other apoſtles; eſpecially ſince the [o] account given by Paul himſelf in the firſt and ſecond chapters of Galatians, confirms the account which we have in the Acts. But the reaſon why he rejected this book is, as Tertullian [p] ſays, very evident, ſince from it we can plainly ſhew, that the God of the Chriſtians, and the Creator, or God of the Jews was the ſame being; and that Chriſt was ſent by him, and by no other.

The arguments againſt Marcion which follow in this fifth book, are all drawn from only thoſe ten epiſtles of St. Paul, which are the ſame with thoſe mentioned by Epiphanius, and placed exactly in the ſame order, except that the epiſtle to Philemon is placed laſt in [q] Tertullian, and that to the Philippians [r] laſt in Epiphanius. The dialogue [s] againſt the Marcionites, which is commonly aſcribed to Origen, proves alſo that the Acts of the Apoſtles was rejected by the followers of this heretic.

[ii] Ibid. note [k].

[k] Μονω δε περιχηται τουτω το χαρακτηρι τω κατα Λουκαν Ευαγγελιω. εχει δε και επιστολας παρ αυτω τω αγιω αποστολω δεκα, αις μοναις κεχρηται. Epiph. Hær. 42. No. 9. p. 309. D.

[l] Nicephorus Calliſti in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, (lib. 4. cap. 28.) ſays that he received only nine of St. Paul's epiſtles, and thoſe mutilated in very many places. But ſo late an authority is of no weight againſt the expreſs teſtimony of Tertullian and Epiphanius.

[m] Ταυταις δε ταις δυσι βιβλοις κεχρηται. Epi. ibid. No. 9. p. 309. D. αυτας δη τας τω προειρημενω βιβλους, ας κεκτηται μετα χειρας λαβων, το τε παρ αυτω λεγομενον Ευαγγελιον, και Αποστολικον καλουμενον. Epi. ibid. No. 10. p. 310. C.

[n] Apoſtoli quoque Pauli originem a Marcione deſidero, novus aliquis diſcipulus, nec ullius alterius auditor...quum is mihi affirmatur apoſtolus quem in albo apoſtolorum apud Evangelium non deprehendo. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 5. cap. 1. p. 576. A. vel 458. 11. Fr. 1597. Hæc figurarum ſacramenta ſi tibi diſplicent certe acta apoſtolorum hunc mihi ordinem Pauli tradiderunt a te quoque non negandum. Ibid.

[o] Exinde, decurrens ordinem converſionis ſuæ, de perſecutore in Apoſtolum, ſcripturam Actorum apoſtolicorum confirmat, apud quam ipſa etiam epiſtolæ illius materia recognoſcitur. Ibid. l. 5. c. 2. p. 578. B. vel 455. 3.

[p] Quod ſi ex hoc congruunt Paulo apoſtolorum Acta, cur ea reſpuatis jam apparet, ut Deum ſcilicet non alium prædicantia quam creatorem, nec Chriſtum alterius quam Creatoris. Ibid. p. 578. C. vel 455. 7.

[q] Soli huic epiſtolæ brevitas ſua profuit, &c. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 5. c. 21. p. 615. D. vel 472. 13. Fr. 1597. See alſo Cred. vol. 2. p. 265.

[r] Epi. ubi ſupra. p. 310. A.

[s] ΕΥΤΡ. Διχεσθε, Μαρκε, τας των αποστολων πραξεις και μαθητων λεγομενας, η αληθη η ε; ΜΑΡΚ. Ημεις παλαι τω Ευαγγελιω, και τω Αποστολω, ε δεχομεθα. Dia. Con. Mar. ſec. 2. p. 18.

SECT.

SECT. XLII. *And received only ten Epiſtles of St. Paul, and theſe altered.*

THE ten epiſtles of St. Paul, as they are reckoned up by Epiphanius, and the order in which they are placed is as follows: The [t] firſt in Marcion's Apoſtolicon was the epiſtle to the Galatians; the ſecond, the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians; the third, the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians; the fourth was the epiſtle to the Romans; the fifth was the firſt to the Theſſalonians; the ſixth, the ſecond to the ſame church; the ſeventh, the epiſtle to the Epheſians; the eighth, the epiſtle to the Coloſſians; the ninth, the epiſtle to Philemon; and the tenth, the epiſtle to the Philippians; Epiphanius hath alſo given us ſome fragments of that which is called the epiſtle to the Laodiceans.

It appears from what the Marcionite ſays, in the dialogue attributed to Origen, that the followers of that hereſy read ſome paſſages in St. Paul's epiſtles different from the manner in which they were commonly read; for he obſerves, by way of anſwer to Adamantius the orthodox diſputant, 'I do not believe your 'falſe [u] Apoſtolicon;' and again, 'I [x] give credit to my own 'Apoſtolicon.' In oppoſition to the former of theſe aſſertions of the Marcionite, viz. that the common way of reading St. Paul's epiſtles was falſe, Adamantius declares that 'the [y] Mar-'cionite Apoſtolicon was very much mutilated.' As Epiphanius has given us a liſt of theſe alterations and omiſſions, I ſhall inſert a particular account of theſe; not only as they are enumerated by him who was our principal guide, with reſpect to the alterations of St. Luke's goſpel, but alſo as they occur in other ancient writers; proceeding in the order in which Marcion placed his epiſtles. Galatians was the firſt in his Apoſtolicon.

[t] Αι δε επιστολαι, αι παρ αυτω λεγομεναι εισι, πρωτη μεν προς Γαλατας, δευτερα δε προς Κορινθιους, τριτη προς Κορινθιους δευτερα, τεταρτη προς Ρωμαιους, πεμπτη προς Θεσσαλονικεις, εκτη προς Θεσσαλονικεις δευτερα, εβδομη προς Εφεσιους, ογδοη προς Κολωσσαεις, ενατη προς Φιλημονα, δεκατη προς Φιλιππησιους. εχει δε και της προς Λαοδικειας λεγομενης μερη. Epi. Adv. Hær. 42. No. 9. p. 310. A.

[u] τω σω φαλσω η πιστευω αποστολικω. Dia. Con. Mar. ſec. 1. p. 8.

[x] M. τω εμω αποστολικω πειθομαι. A. εχω το αποστολικον σου. Ibid. ſec. 2. p. 47.

[y] A. προσειληφε το αποστολικον σου, ει και τα μαλιστα περικεκομμενον εστι. Ibid. ſec. 1. p. 8.

SECT. XLIII. *Of the Alterations and Omissions of Marcion in the Epistle to the Galatians.*

IN chap. i. 1, Marcion [z] omitted, *and God the Father*, and assigned to αυτον *him*, the signification of εαυτου *himself*, because he would have Christ to be raised by his own power, and not by the power of the Father. The Marcionite, in the dialogue ascribed to Origen, [a] in citing the 7th verse of this chapter, inserts the words, *according to my gospel*, after the word *another*; and in the end of the verse, after the word *pervert*, instead of *the gospel of Christ*, he read 'to a gospel different from that of Christ.' These variations might be inserted from the Apostolicon of Marcion, as [b] Dr. Mill thinks; or perhaps they might not be intended as an exact quotation, but only as an argument, consisting partly of the words of the apostle in this place, and partly of what the Marcionite had before quoted; [c] which seems to be from Romans ii. 16. together with his own explanation or comment.

In chapter iii. Marcion omitted the 6th, 7th, and 8th verses, in [d] order to get rid of the mention of Abraham, and of the gospel having been preached to him; on which account he ought also to have omitted part of the 9th verse, συν τω πιστω Αβρααμ, *with faithful Abraham:* and according to Tertullian's [e] manner of stating the argument against him, this was the case. In the 15th verse of this chapter Marcion erased some things. Tertullian gives no particular account of what he left out. Dr. Mill [f] expresses himself dubiously on this head. If I may be allowed to guess from the manner in which Tertullian expresseth himself, I should imagine that Marcion erased the whole of the 3d chapter after the word λεγω in the 15th verse, and the begin-

[z] Omittebat Marcion, και Θεου πατρος in ejus Αποστολικω, volens exponere Christum non a Deo patre sed per semet ipsum suscitatum. Hieron. in locum.

[a] Μ. λεγει γαρ οτι ουκ εστι αλλο, κατα το ευαγγελιον μου· ει μη τινες εισι οι ταρασσοντες υμας, και θελοντες μεταστρεψαι εις ετερον ευαγγελιον του χριστου. Con. Mar. sec. 1. p. 9.

[b] Vide Millii Testamentum in locum.

[c] Μ. ο Αποστολος ειπε...κατα το Ευαγγελιον μου· ιδε πως λεγει εν ειναι και λεγει ει τις υμας Ευαγγελισηται παρ ο ευηγγελισαμεθα υμιν, αναθεμα εστω· Con. Marc. sec. 1. p. 9.

[d] 'Sicut Abraham credidit,' &c. Ab hoc loco usque ad eum ubi scribitur, 'qui 'ex fide sunt,' &c. Marcion de suo Apostolico erasit. Hieron. in loc. T. 4. p. 252. Ab hoc loco (καθως in v. 6.) ad v. 9. ουτοι οι εκ πιστεως, &c. Marcion omnia erasit in Αποστολικω suo teste Hieronymo in locum. Millii Test. in loc.

[e] Sed et quum adjicit, omnes enim filii estis fidei, ostenditur quid supra hæretica industria erraverit, mentionem scilicet Abrahæ, qua nos Apostolus filios Abrahæ per fidem affirmat, secundum quam mentionem hic quoque filios fidei notavit. Adv. Mar. lib. 5. cap. 3. p. 456. 25. F. 1597.

[f] Hoc loco quædam omisit Marcion in Αποστολικω suo, teste Tertul. lib. 5. Con. Mar. cap. 4. Si quidem mentem ejus recte assequar. Millii. Test. in locum.

ning

ning of the 4th chapter, till you come to the word οτε, in the 3d verſe, and then the words will be connected in the following manner, turning from the 15th verſe of the 3d chapter to the 3d of the 4th chapter: *Brethren, I ſpeak after the manner of men... when we were children, we were in bondage under the elements of the world; but when the fulneſs of time was come, God ſent forth his ſon.* This is preciſely what Tertullian's [g] argument requires, and they are the very words which he connects together. Dr. Mill [h] indeed gives the words of Tertullian, as a various reading under the 3d verſe. But from what he himſelf ſays under the 15th verſe of the former chapter, and from this various reading being found no where elſe, but in this place of Tertullian, it appears highly probable that the ſenſe before given of this paſſage of Tertullian is the true one.

In the 9th verſe of the 5th chapter Marcion read [i] δολοι, 'corrupteth,' inſtead of ζυμοι, *leaveneth*, as it is in our preſent copies. Marcion's reading is probably [k] the right one.

SECT. XLIV. *In the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians.*

IN the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, the 9th chapter, 8th verſe, where we read, [l] *or ſaith not the law the ſame alſo?* He changed it into, 'or doth not the law of Moſes ſay the ſame?' inſerting the word Moſes, as if he would thereby make the apoſtle inſinuate that it was not the law of the God of the Chriſtians.

In chapter x. 9, Epiphanius [m] accuſes Marcion of having

[g] Adhuc inquit ſecundum hominem dico, dum eſſemus parvuli, ſub elementis mundi eramus poſiti ad diſſerviendum eis. Atquin non eſt hoc humanitus dictum; non enim exemplum ſed veritas. Quis enim parvulus utique ſenſu, quod ſunt nationes, non elementis ſubjectus eſt mundi, quæ pro Deo ſuſcipit?...Erubeſcat ſpongia Marcionis, niſi quod ex abundanti retracto quæ abſtulit, quum validius ſit illum ex his revinci quæ ſervavit. Quum autem evenit impleri tempus, miſit Deus filium ſuum, utique is qui etiam ipſorum temporum Deus eſt, &c. Adv. Mar. l. 5. c. 4. p. 456. 37. Fr. 1597.

[h] 'Adhuc ſecundum hominem dico, 'dum eſſemus parvuli,' &c. Marcionis Απεστολικον, teſte Tertul. lib. 5. Contra Marcion. cap. 4. interjecto illo κατ ανθρωπον λεγω ex v. 15. præcedentis capitis. Millii Teſt. in locum.

[i] Αντι του μικρα ζυμη ολον το φυραμα ζυμοι, εποιησε δολοι. Epi. Hær. 42. p. 319. C.

[k] Epiphanius lectionem hanc Marcionis eſſe dicit. Ego certe ipſius Apoſtoli germanam eſſe nullus dubito. Vide note 1. Cor. 5, 6. Millii Teſt. in locum. Vide Simon's Crit. Hiſt. N. T. part 1. cap. 15. p. 133.

[l] Μεταλλαγμενος. αντι γαρ του, και ο νομος ταυτα ου λεγει, (in noſtris codicibus η ουχι και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει) φησι εκεινος. ει και ο νομος Μωυσεως ταυτα ου λεγει. Epi. ibid. p. 320. B. Ει is here put for η. Ει quod alibi paſſim ſcripto pro η, non autem poſito, quod vult Epiphanius, pro conjunctione tametſi, quis enim Marcionem adeo veſanum credat, ut dicat legem iſta non dicere: et tamen addat in proximo, in lege Moſaica ſcriptum ου φιμωσεις, &c. Millii Teſt. in locum.

Q. Doth not Epiphanius underſtand ει in the ſame ſenſe with Dr. Mill? Vide Epi. Hær. 42. p. 355. Ελεγ. ζ και ιε.

[m] Ο δε Μαρκιων αντι του κυριου, χριστον εποιησε. Epi. ibid. p. 358. B.

changed κυριον, 'Lord,' which, according to him, was the true reading, into χριστον, *Christ*, which is the reading in our present copies. But whatever Epiphanius thought, it is probable χριστον was the true reading; for some person who thought the sense harsh with χριστον, might change it into κυριον: but no good reason can be assigned for the contrary change. In the 19th verse of this chapter, Marcion [n] changed οτι ειδωλου τι εστιν, *that the idol is any thing*, into οτι ιεροθυτον τι εστιν, 'that what is offered in the 'temple is any thing.'

In the 14th chapter and 19th verse Marcion read [o] δια του νομου 'on account of the law,' instead of δια τυ νοος μυ, as it is in our copies, or τω νοι μυ, as Epiphanius and some very ancient Greek MSS. read, *with my understanding*.

In the 15th chapter and the 38th verse Marcion [p] substituted πνευμα, 'spirit,' instead of σωμα, *body*; and left out the latter clause of the 38th verse, and the whole 39th, 40th, and 41st verses, and the first clause of the 42d, and introduced part of the 44th verse, before the latter clause of the 42d. For thus the Marcionite, in the dialogue ascribed to Origen, says it is read in their Apostolicon; 'God giveth it a spirit as it hath pleased him. 'It is sown an animal body, it is raised a spiritual body. It is 'sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption, &c.' In the 45th verse of this chapter Marcion [q] substituted κυριος, 'Lord,' instead of Αδαμ, *Adam*, in the latter clause; and in the 47 verse he omitted [r] ανθρωπος, *man*, in the latter clause.

Sect. XLV. *In the second Epistle to the Corinthians.*

In the second epistle to the Corinthians, chap. iv. 4, Marcion understood by Θεος του αιωνος τουτου, *the god of this world*, the Creator, and considered him as here opposed to the good God, or the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was the God of the Christians.

[n] Τι ουν φησι, οτι ιεροθυτον τι εστιν, η ειδωλοθυτον τι εστιν;....προσεθετο δε ο Μαρκιων το ιεροθυτον. Epi. ibid. p. 358. D. προσετεθετο. added, because Epiphanius read in his copy only, Τι ουν φησι ειδωλοθυτον τι εστιν; [o] Πεπλανημενος ο Μαρκιων· αλλα εν Εκκλησια θελω πεντε λογους τω νοι μου λαλησαι, ετερως δε δια του νομου. Epi. ibid. 361. B. C. [p] Μ. Εν τω ημετερω Αποστολικω ουκ ουτω λεγει. Α. Αλλα πως. Μ. Ο λεγει, ο Θεος διδωσιν αυτω σωμα, καθως ηθελησεν· αλλα ο Θεος διδωσιν αυτω πνευμα, καθως ηβουλησεν· σπειρεται σωμα ψυχικον, εγειρεται σωμα πνευματικον, σπειρεται εν φθορα, εγειρεται εν αφθαρσια. Dia. Con. Mar. sec. 5. p. 144. [q] 'Novissimus Adam in 'spiritum vivificantem,' licet stultissimus hæreticus noluerit ita esse. Dominum enim posuit novissimum, pro novissimo Adam. Ter. Adv. Mar. lib. 5. cap. 10. p. 465. 46. 1597. The Marcionite cites these words in the same manner from his Apostolicon, in the dialogue. Μ. Εγενετο ο πρωτος ανθρωπος Αδαμ εις ψυχην ζωσαν· ο εσχατος Κυριος εις πνευμα ζωοποιον. Dia. Con. Mar. sec. 5. p. 150.

[r] Ο πρωτος ανθρωπος εκ γης χοικος, ο δευτερος Κυριος εξ ουρανου. Ibid. p. 150.

In

In oppoſition to this Irenæus [s], Tertullian [t], and others [u] who wrote againſt the Marcionites, were for placing a comma after Θεος, and refering αιωνος τουτου to απιστων. 'In whom God hath 'binded the eyes of the unbelievers of this world.' To us of the preſent day, who are but little intereſted in the diſpute with the Marcionites, this ſenſe appears very harſh, and is one inſtance, among many others, how far the heat of controverſy will carry men. In the 13th verſe of this ſame chapter Marcion [x] eraſed the words κατα το γεγραμμενον· επιστευσα, διο ελαλησα. *according as it is written, I believed, and therefore have I ſpoken.*

SECT. XLVI. *In the Epiſtle to the Romans.*

IN the epiſtle to the Romans, which is placed the fourth in the Apoſtolicon, Tertullian [y] informs us, Marcion had made great eraſures; but the particular paſſages mutilated by him, he ſays he ſhall not point out, intending only to mention others, which upon the ſame principle he might have expunged, becauſe they made againſt him; and which he therefore produces as inſtances of his negligence and blindneſs.

Epiphanius has given us no inſtance of any corruptions, or mutilations made by Marcion in this epiſtle; the paſſages produced by him from thence, are only intended to confute Marcion from thoſe texts which he allowed to be genuine. He finds

[s] Quod autem dicunt aperte Paulum in 2ª. ad Corinthios dixiſſe: 'In quibus 'Deus ſeculi hujus excæcavit mentes in- 'fidelium;' et alterum quidem Deum eſſe ſæculi hujus dicunt, alterum vero qui ſit ſuper omnem principatum, et initium, et poteſtatem: non ſumus nos in cauſa, ſi hi qui quæ ſuper Deum ſunt myſteria ſcire ſe dicunt, ne quidem legere Paulum ſciunt. Si enim quis ſecundum Pauli conſuetudinem, quemadmodum ex multis et alibi oſtendimus, hyperbatis eum utentem ſic legerit: 'in quibus Deus,' deinde ſubdiſtinguens, et modicum diaſtematis faciens, ſimul et in unum reliqua legerit, 'ſeculi hujus excæcavit mentes infide- 'lium,' inveniet verum; ut ſit quod dicitur, 'Deus excæcavit mentes infidelium 'hujus ſæculi.' Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 210. Ed. Ox. 1702.

[t] Hanc Marcion captavit ſic legendo, 'in quibus Deus ævi hujus' ut creatorem oſtendens Deum hujus ævi, alium ſuggerat Deum alterius ævi. Nos contra ſic diſtinguendum dicimus: 'in quibus Deus;' dehinc: 'ævi hujus excæcavit mentes in- 'fidelium.' Tertul. Adver. Marcionem, lib. 5. c. 11. p. 467. 36. 1597.

[u] Auguſ. Con. Fauſt. (lib. 21. c. 2, 9.) who mentions this but ſeems better pleaſed to underſtand Θεος του αιωνος τουτου of the devil. Quocirca in opere malo, i. e. excæcatione infidelium, ſi intelligatur et diabolus per perſuadendi malignitatem, ut ſic diſtinguatur, Deus hujus ſæculi, non mihi videtur abſurdum: hujus ſæculi, i. e. hominum improborum non niſi in hoc ſæculo florere volentium.....cujus Deus venter. cap. 9.

[x] Εχοντες δε το αυτο πνευμα της πιστεως και ημεις πιστευομεν, διο και λαλουμεν. εξεκοψε δε το κατα το γεγραμμενον. Epi. ibid. p. 367. C.

[y] Quantas autem foveas in iſta vel maxime epiſtola Marcion fecerit, auferendo quæ voluit, de noſtri teſtamenti integritate parebit. Mihi ſufficit quæ proinde eradenda non vidit, quaſi negligentias et cæcitates ejus accipere. Adv. Mar. l. 5. cap. 13. p. 469. 38. 1597.

fault

fault [z] indeed with his ranking it the fourth in his Apostolicon, and says it was because he would have nothing right. However, we are informed by Origen, or rather by Rufinus, [a] in his edition of Origen's Commentary on this epistle, that Marcion omitted the two last chapters as spurious, ending the epistle in his Apostolicon with the 23d verse of the 14th chapter.

It is also observable that Tertullian [b] quotes no passage from the 15th or 16th chapters in his confutation of Marcion, from passages contained in this epistle.

Sect. XLVII. *In the first Epistle to the Thessalonians.*

The fifth in Marcion's Apostolicon is the first epistle to the Thessalonians, which Epiphanius [c] says, 'was so entirely corrupted by him, that he had selected nothing from thence on which to found any refutations of him, or his doctrine.' Tertullian however was of a different mind. From him it appears, that though there might be alterations made by Marcion, yet sufficient was left untouched to shew the absurdity of his opinions. He [d] says, 'it will not be unprofitable to attend to the shorter epistles; for there is a savouriness in few words.' He accordingly draws arguments from the 2d, 4th, and 5th chapters of this first epistle. He says that the word *own* ιδιυς, [e] in the 15th verse of the second chapter, was an addition of this heretic. It is read in our present copies, but it is left out in some of the most ancient Greek MSS, [f] and by Origen, as well as Tertullian and some others.

Sect. XLVIII. *In the second Epistle to the Thessalonians.*

Epiphanius [g] affirms the same concerning the second epistle to the Thessalonians, the sixth in Marcion's Apostolicon,

[z] Της προς Ρωμαιους τεταρτης επιστολης. ουτως γαρ εστι παρα τω Μαρκιωνι κειμενη, ινα μηδεν ορθον παρ αυτω ειν. Epi. Ibid. p. 368. B.

[a] Vide Origen: seu potius Rufinus: Commen. in Ep. ad Rom. c. 14, 23.

[b] Vide Tert. ad. Marcion, L. 5. c. 14.

[c] Της προς Θεσσαλονικεις πεμπτης επιστολης. ουτω γαρ κειται εν τω Μαρκιωνι—τα παντα του Μαρκιωνος διεστραμμενως απ αυτης εχοντος, ουδεν εξ αυτης παρεθεμεθα. Epi. ibid. p. 371. A.

[d] Brevioribus quoque epistolis non pigebit intendere. Est sapor et in paucis. Ter. ad. Mar. L. 5. c. 15. p. 472. 5. 1597.

[e] Licet suos adjectio sit hæretici. Ibid. p. 472. 12.

[f] Vide Millii Test. in locum, et Dia. Con. Marcion, sec. 4. p. 125. et Res. ad Afric. p. 234.

[g] Της προς Θεσσαλονικεις δευτερας, εκτης δε κειμενης παρα τω Μαρκιωνι—ομοιως διαστραφεισης υπω αυτου του Μαρκιωνος, παλιν ουδεν εξεθεμεθα. Epi. Ibid. p. 371. A.

which

which he had before affirmed concerning the firſt, viz. that the reaſon why he ſelected nothing from thence was, becauſe it was entirely corrupted by Marcion. Tertullian [h] however produces ſeveral paſſages from this ſecond epiſtle to confute this heretic; and accuſes him only [i] of eraſing εν πυρι φλογος, in flaming fire, from the eighth verſe of the firſt chapter, leſt he ſhould attribute vengeance and the infliction of puniſhment to Chriſt, who was the ſon of the good God.

SECT. XLIX. *In the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, which was called by him the Epiſtle to the Laodiceans.*

THE epiſtle to the Epheſians is the ſeventh, according to the order in which Marcion has placed St. Paul's writings. Tertullian [k] ſays Marcion had entitled this the epiſtle to the Laodiceans, as if to ſhew his great diligence in inveſtigating this matter. According to Epiphanius, as before quoted, [l] he had in his Apoſtolicon ſome fragments of that which was called the epiſtle to the Laodiceans. That paſſage which he quotes from his Apoſtolicon under this title, [m] is evidently taken from Ep. iv. 5, 6, with only the inſertion of εις χριστος, 'one Chriſt,' between the words *one baptiſm* and *one God*.

Mr. Jones aſſerts, [n] that 'it does not appear Tertullian ever 'ſaw the Apoſtolicon of Marcion.' But to me it ſeems highly probable, as he gives an account of ſeveral variations which were in this Apoſtolicon, from his own copy of the epiſtles that he had ſeen, and compared it with his own. What Marcion had in his Apoſtolicon under the title of an epiſtle to the Laodiceans, is expreſsly ſaid by Epiphanius to be only μερη, parts or fragments. Poſſibly in the time of Epiphanius, ſome paſſages from the epiſtle to the Epheſians, and from other epiſtles of St. Paul, might be inſerted in the Apoſtolicon, which the Marcionites then uſed under the title of the epiſtle to the Laodiceans;

[h] Vide Ter. Adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 16. paſſim.

[i] Sed flammas et ignem delendo hæreticas extinxit, ne ſcilicet noſtratem Deum faceret. Ter. Ibid. Lib. 5. c. 16. p. 473. l. 15. [k] Eccleſiæ quidem veritate epiſtolam iſtam ad Epheſios habemus ejuſdem non ad Laodicenos, ſed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare geſtiit, quem et in illo diligentiſſimus explorator. Adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 17. p. 471. 40. Prætereo hic et de alia epiſtola quam nos ad Epheſios præſcriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodicenos. Ibid. L. 5. c. 11. p. 468. 6.

[l] Vide ſec. 42. p. 405. note t.

[m] Εις Κυριος, μια πιστις, εν βαπτισμα, εις χριστος, εις Θεος, και πατηρ παντων, ο επι παντων, και δια παντων, και εν πασιν. Συναδοντως μεν τη προς Εφεσιους, ω Μαρκιων, και ταυτας τας κατα σε μαρτυριας απο της λεγομενης προς Λαοδικειας συνηγαγες. Dia. Ibid. p. 274. B. [n] Canon of the New Teſt. vol. 2. pt. 3. c. 6. p. 50.

though

though in the Marcionite Apostolicon in the time of Tertullian, the epistle to the Ephesians bore that title. This is certain, that Tertullian [o] quotes precisely from those ten epistles of St. Paul, which Epiphanius says Marcion received, and from those only; and they are ranged in the same order in both authors, except as before said, [p] that Epiphanius places Philemon the ninth, and Philippians the last: and Tertullian Philippians the ninth, and Philemon the last. Epiphanius, by saying [q] that Marcion received but ten epistles of St. Paul, farther shews that what was added in the Apostolicon of Marcion under the title of the epistle to the Laodiceans, in those places, if any, wherein it differed from the other ten epistles, was not considered as the genuine writing of St. Paul. Might not this therefore be a forgery, later than Tertullian's days, and inserted by some Marcionite who lived after him, in the Apostolicon used in the time of Epiphanius? Because Tertullian expressly says that, in his time the epistle to the Ephesians, bore the title in Marcion's Apostolicon of the epistle to the Laodiceans. Another thing also proper to be observed is, that with respect to four of the epistles which Marcion received in his Apostolicon, [r] viz. the two to the Thessalonians, that to the Philippians, and that to Philemon, Epiphanius has asserted they were so totally corrupted, that he quoted nothing from them for that reason. Whereas Tertullian quotes several passages from the three former, which are the same as in our former copies, and which one would from thence imagine, were admitted in that genuine state by this heretic: and the variations which he accuses him of making in these three are but trifling. With respect to the epistle to Philemon he also expressly says [s] that this epistle alone has had an advantage from its brevity, for hereby it has escaped the falsifying hands of Marcion. One need not however greatly wonder that forged writings

[o] Vide adv. Mar. L. 5. passim.

[p] See sec. 42. p. 405.

[q] Εχει δε και επιστολας πας αυτω τε αγιε Αποστολε δεκα αις μοιραις κεχρηται. Epi. Ibid. p. 309. D. After this passage Epiphanius reckons them up, in the order before mentioned: adding at the end of his enumeration, εχει δε και της προς Λαοδικειας λεγομενης μερη. The critique also which he gives us, is only upon these ten epistles, and upon one passage selected from the fragment of the epistle to the Laodiceans. And yet as Mr. Jones has observed (Canon. N. T. vol. 2. p. 49.) there is a strange passage in Epiphanius, in the beginning of which he says, 'Marcion did not receive all the epistles of St. Paul into his Apostolicon.' Notwithstanding this, he immediately proceeds to enumerate all the fourteen, in a different order from what he gives in any other place, with the epistle to the Laodiceans also inserted in the middle of them, as if a complete epistle, and not μερη fragments. But this passage, upon the face of it, must appear to be in a very corrupt state. See the passage. Epi. Ibid. p. 321. C. D.

[r] See the passages which assert this, quoted this sec. 47, 48. p. 410. notes [c] and [g] and p. 414. notes [g] and [h].

[s] Soli huic epistolæ brevitas sua profuit ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 21. p. 479. 13.

in

in different ages ſhould be different, though they go under the ſame general name. For this is certainly the caſe with this very epiſtle to the Laodiceans, as it is called: ſince what is now extant under this name, [t] has not a ſingle paſſage in it like that which Epiphanius quotes from the Apoſtolicon of Marcion.

In Epheſians ii. 15, Marcion [u] eraſed the word αυτῳ *his*, that he might make the enmity to refer to fleſh, as if the apoſtle was here aſſerting that it was a carnal enmity which Chriſt deſtroyed, and not pointing out the method by which he deſtroyed it, viz. by his incarnation and death. In the 20th verſe of this chapter, he eraſed [x] the words προφητων, *prophets*, from that clauſe, built upon the foundation of the apoſtles and prophets: becauſe if our building as Chriſtians reſted in part upon that foundation, our God and the God of the Jews muſt be the ſame; which he denied. In the 9th verſe of the 3d chapter he eraſed [y] the preposition εν, *in*, in order to give a different turn to the whole ſentence; which, to coincide with his notions, muſt be thus rendered: 'And to make all men ſee by Jeſus Chriſt, what is the 'fellowſhip of the myſtery, which hath for ages been hid from 'God the creator of all things.' A conſtruction which the Greek language will by no means admit of: ſince if εν be left out it ſhould be Θεῳ, and κτισαντος. In chap. v. 31, Marcion eraſed ſome words: according to Epiphanius [z] only τη γυναικι, *unto his wife*: but Tertullian [a] quotes the text, as if he had omitted the whole clauſe, 'and ſhall be joined unto his wife:' which Dr. Mill thinks [b] was the caſe. Though in the manner in which Epiphanius repreſents it the ſenſe will be complete: *For this cauſe ſhall a man leave his father and mother, and ſhall be joined,* (to the Lord mentioned in verſe 29th) *and they two ſhall be one fleſh.*

[t] See this epiſtle at large in Jones's Canon. N. T. vol. 2. p. 3. c. 6. p. 42, &c.

[u] Sed Marcion abſtulit, ſua: ut inimicitiæ daret carnem quaſi carnali vitio, non Chriſto æmulæ. Tertul. adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 17. p. 475. 12.

[x] Abſtulit hæreticus et prophetarum, oblitus dominum poſuiſſe in Eccleſia ſicut Apoſtolos ita et prophetas. Timuit ſcilicet ne et ſuper veterum prophetarum fundamenta ædificatio noſtra conſtaret in Chriſto. Tertul. adv. Mar. Lib. 5. c. 17. p. 475. 35.

[y] Rapuit hæreticus, in, præpoſitionem, et ita legi fecit, occulti ab aevis Deo, qui omnia condidit. Ibid. l. 5. c. 18. p. 475. 32.

[z] Απο του, καταλειψει ανθρωπος τον πατερα αυτου, και της μητερα, και προσκολληθησεται τη γυναικι, και εσονται οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν, παρα το τη γυναικι.—και τε συ ω Μαρκιων παρακοψης το γυναικι. κ. τ. λ. Epi. Ibid. p. 372, 3. D. A.

[a] Laborabo ego nunc eundem Deum probare maſculi et Chriſti mulieris et Eccleſiæ, carnis et ſpiritus, ipſo apoſtolo ſententiam creatoris adhibente, immo et diſſerente: propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et erunt duo in carnem unam. Sacramentum hoc magnum eſt. Sufficit inter iſta, ſi creatoris magna ſunt apud Apoſtolum ſacramenta, minima apud hæreticos. Adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 18. p. 476. 28.

[b] Neque enim expungere vellet προς την γυναικην, niſi expunxerit una et reliquum και προσκολληθησεται. Millii Teſt. in locum.

In

In chapter vi. ver. 2, he omitted the latter clause, [c] '*which is the first commandment with promise*,' lest the Mosaic law should hereby be thought to be established.

Sect. L. *He probably did not much alter the Epistle to the Colossians.*

Colossians stands next after Ephesians, in Marcion's Apostolicon.[d] I cannot find that Marcion is accused of altering any passage in this epistle by Origen, Epiphanius, or any other ancient author, except in what follows by implication from a passage of Tertullian [e] before quoted, in which he asserts that the epistle to Philemon was the only one that had escaped his falsifying hands. 'Though I wonder,' says he, 'why he should receive this which was written to a single person, and yet reject 'the two to Timothy, and that to Titus, which treat of the government of the church. But I suppose he had a mind to alter 'even the number of the epistles.'

Sect. LI. *Nor at all that to Philemon.*

Philemon is the ninth epistle in Marcion's Apostolicon.[f] 'This epistle,' Epiphanius [g] says, 'was so entirely corrupted by 'Marcion, that he quoted nothing from it on that account.' On the other hand Tertullian asserts, 'it was the only one which remained unfalsified.'

Sect. LII. *Nor but little that to the Philippians.*

Philippians is the tenth and last of St. Paul's epistles received by Marcion in his Apostolicon.[h] 'This also,' Epipha-

[c] Obaudiant et parentibus filii. Nam etsi Marcion abstulit: hoc est enim primum in promissione præceptum. Lex loquitur honora patrem et matrem. Tert. adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 18. p. 476. 35.

[d] Της προς κολοσσεις αγαθης παρα τω Μαρκιωνι κειμενης. Epi. Ibid. 373. A.

[e] Soli huic epistolæ brevitas sua profuit ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum, duos, et unam ad Titum de Ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit. Affectavit opinor etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare. Adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 21. p. 479. 13.

[f] Προς Φιλημονα επιστολη κειται γαρ παρα τω Μαρκιωνι κειται. Epi. Ibid. p. 373. C.

[g] Ομως απο ταυτης της προς Φιλημονα ουδεν παρειθεμεθα, δια το ολοσχερως αυτην διαστροφως παρ αυτω κεισθαι. Epi. Ibid. p. 373. D.

[h] προς Φιλιππησιους δεκατη, κειται γαρ παρα τω Μαρκιωνι εσχατη και δεκατη· ωσαυτως ουδε απ αυτης δια το διαστροφως παρ αυτω κεισθαι, ουδεν εξελιξαμεθα. Ibid. 373. 4.

sniu

nius ſays, 'was ſo mutilated by him, that he did not chooſe to quote any part of it out of his copy.'

Tertullian has quoted ſeveral paſſages from this epiſtle,[i] but doth not accuſe Marcion of any particular corruptions. Nor doth any other author, that I can find, except Epiphanius.

SECT. LIII. *An Argument from hence in favour of the Authenticity of the New Teſtament.*

THUS then we have gone through what Marcion thought proper to receive into his Evangelium and Apoſtolicon, from the goſpel of St. Luke and the writings of St. Paul. In many places in the epiſtles, as well as the goſpel, he hath altered and mutilated paſſages to ſerve his own purpoſe. In others, the variations probably aroſe from the difference in copies. The teſtimony to be drawn from this view, in favour of the books of the New Teſtament, is very ſtrong. By means of this heretic's rejecting ſome books entirely, and mutilating others, the ancient Chriſtians were led to examine into the evidence for theſe ſacred writings, and to compare copies together, and on this account to ſpeak of whole books, and particular paſſages, very frequently in their works; which hath enabled us of later ages to authenticate theſe books, and to come at the genuine reading of many texts, in a better manner than we otherwiſe could have done.

CHAP. XI.

Of LUCIAN, *or* LEUCIUS.

SECT. I. *Some general Account of him from ancient Authors, with Obſervations thereon.*

THE perſon concerning whom we are now going to treat, I ſuppoſe, has been already mentioned ſeveral times. Nevertheleſs, it is fit that he ſhould appear here in his proper time and place.

[i] Adv. Mar. L. 5. c. 20. paſſim. p. 478, 9.

'Lucian

'Lucian the elder,' says Epiphanius [a] in his Summary, to distinguish him from another of a later time, 'in all things followed 'Marcion. But, by making some additions, he endeavoured to 'improve his scheme.'

In his larger work he again calls him the elder, or ancient [b] Lucian: and says he was a follower of Marcion, but separated from him, and formed a distinct sect. He held [c] one being or good God; another Creator, judge, and just; and a third evil. In this he agreed with Marcion, according to the manner in which Austin understands Epiphanius: [d] though, according to Eusebius, it was one Synerus who introduced the notion of three principles and three natures. [e]

He alleged some texts from the prophets, [f] particularly Mal. iii. 14, 15, in support of his notions concerning the Creator. He [g] rejected marriage, and commended virginity: not from a love of chastity, but from an aversion to the Creator and his works. Epiphanius, in his next article, says [h] that Apelles was his fellow disciple, under Marcion.

Augustine hath not given this Lucian any distinct place in his book of heresies. Mr. Jones indeed thinks [i] he is spoken of by him under the name of Seleucus, in the account which he gives of the Seleuciani and Hermiani, which is the 59th heresy in his catalogue. Though the names Seleucus and Leucius are different, yet it must be allowed that no sufficient argument can be drawn from thence against the identity of the persons; since names more different than these have been sometimes confounded. And this hath been the case in the present instance, as has been frequently observed. [k] The name of this very person being

[a] Λυκιανος τις αρχαιος....μαιτα κατα Μαρκιωνα εδογματισε. p. 230. D.

[b] Λυκιανος τις αρχαιος....συνεπομενος τω προειρημενω Μαρκιωνι και απο τουτου αποσχισας, και αυτος αθροισμα εαυτω ποιησαμενος, Αιρεσεως προεστη. Ibid. Hær. 43. No. 1. p. 378. B. C.

[c] Ετερον μεν τον δημιουργον, και κριτην, και δικαιον· ετερον δηθεν αγαθον ωσαυτως, και ετερον τον ποιητην. Hær. 43. n. 1. p. 378. D.

[d] Quamvis Epiphanius eum (Marcionem) tria dicat asseruisse principia, bonum, justum, pravum: sed Eusebius Synerum quendam, non Marcionem, trium principiorum atque naturarum scribit authorem. De Hær. T. 6. n. 22. f. 5. c. 3. G. Ven. 1570. [e] See more on this head in the foregoing chapter of Marcion, sec. 10. p. 368, 369.

[f] Βουλεται χρησθαι και μαρτυριαις τισι κατα του Μαρκιωνα, κατα την αυτου υποτασιν απο της των Προφητων γραφης. Φησι δε τω, ματαιος ο δουλευων Κυριω. και το ειρημενον· αντεστησαν Θεω και εσωθησαν. Epi. Hær. 43. n. 1. p. 378. D. [g] Απαρνειται του γαμου, και αγνειαν ασκει· ου δι αγνειαν, αλλ ινα αθετηση τα εργα του δημιουργου. Ibid.

[h] Απελλης....ων και αυτος συσχολαστης αυτου Λυκιανου, και μαθητης του προειρημενου Μαρκιωνος. Hær. 44. n. 1. p. 380. C.

[i] Jones's Canon. vol. 1. p. 305.

[k] Seleucus, ou Leuce, qui en est le premier Auteur. Beauf. His. de Mani. Tom. 1. L. 11. c. 11. p. 353. Cela se trouvoit sans doute, avec d' autres erreurs dans le livre de Seleucus, qui avoit écrit l' histoire de la Vierge. Ibid. p. 354. See also p. 348. See also Casau. Exercit. ad apparat.

being Seleucus in ſome printed copies of Jerom,[l] while the MSS. copies ſtill retain Leucius.[m]

A more important objection againſt Mr. Jones's opinion is, that the time is too late for Lucian. Beſides it muſt be obſerved, that Auſtin cannot mean by the Seleuciani the followers of this perſon whom we are here ſpeaking of: becauſe having given an account of the Pſalliani, and ſome others, ranked under the ſame article by himſelf and Epiphanius, he ſays[n] I ſhall now ſpeak of ſome which we find in Philaſter, but which Epiphanius has not mentioned; and the ſecond of this claſs is Seleucus and his followers. This therefore muſt be a different perſon from the Lucian who was mentioned expreſsly by Epiphanius, and placed both by him and Philaſter between Marcion and Apelles. Auſtin moreover declares[o] that he followed the order of Epiphanius, though he did not inſert the whole number of his hereſies. It is not difficult to account for the preſent omiſſion in him: for he informs[p] us that he had inſerted ſome which Epiphanius had wholly omitted, and had omitted others which he had inſerted: enlarging the accounts of ſome, and abridging thoſe of others; and reducing the ſixty hereſies after the coming of Chriſt, which we find in Epiphanius, to fifty-ſeven; conſidering thoſe as only one hereſy, when there was but a trifling difference between them, which Epiphanius had made two. In the preſent caſe therefore, as Epiphanius had himſelf ſaid that Lucian in all things followed Marcion, Auſtin, in this ſhort account which he was giving of heretics, might think it unneceſſary to ſpeak of him as diſtinct from Marcion, ſince he could find little or no difference between them.

I place at the bottom of the page the account of this perſon

rat. Baron. Annal. No. 15. p. 74, &c. et Fabritii Cod. Apoc. Nov. Teſtam. p. 137. p. 1.

[l] Sed factum eſt....a Seleuco, Epiſ. 82. Par. 2. Tract. 6. fol. 140. vel apud Hieron. Oper. T. ix. p. 203.

[m] Millii Prole. in N. T. ſec. 336. p. 37.

[n] Nunc ergo addo quas Philaſter poſuit, nec poſuit Epiphanius. Aug. ad. 9. v. Deum de Hær. 59. T. 6. fol. 8. c. 4. I. Ven. 1570.

[o] Cujus ego (ſcilicet Epiphanii Epiſcopi) in commemorandis hæreticis non modum ſed ordinem ſum ſecutus. Ibid. Hær. 57. F. 8. c. 3. H.

[p] Nam et aliqua ex aliis poſui quæ ipſe non poſuit: et aliqua non poſui, quæ ipſe poſuit: itaque alia latius quam ipſe, alia et brevius explicavi; paremque in nonnullis exhibui brevitatem, omnia moderans ſicut intentionis meæ ratio poſtulabat. Proinde ille de octoginta hæreſibus, ſeparatis viginti, quas ante domini adventum extitiſſe, ſicut ei viſum eſt computavit; reliquas poſt domini aſcenſum natas ſexaginta, breviſſimis libris quinque comprehendit, atque omnes in ſex libros totius ejuſdem ſui operis fecit concludi. Ego autem qui ſecundum petitionem tuam eas hæreſes memorare inſtitui, quæ poſt glorificationem Chriſti ſe adverſus doctrinam Chriſti, et ſub velamine Chriſtiani nominis extulerunt: quinquaginta ſeptem ex Epiphanii ipſius opere in meum tranſtuli, duas in unam referens, ubi nullam differentiam potui reperire: et rurſus ubi ille ex duabus unam facere voluit, ſub numeris ſuis ſingulas poſui. Ibid. Hær. 57. F. 8. c. 3. 4. H.

given by Philaſter, [q] and the author [r] of the Additions to Tertullian; but they call him Lucan; their order is Cerdon, Marcion, Lucan, Apelles; which ſerves to ſhew that they mean the ſame perſon whom Epiphanius calls Lucian. He is alſo mentioned by Tertullian himſelf, [s] as not allowing the reſurrection of the body. He too calls him Lucan, as doth Origen in his book againſt Celſus. The latter ſays [t] he did not know of any Chriſtians who had altered the text of the goſpel, except the followers of Valentinus and Marcion, and perhaps of Lucan.

Having thus put down the accounts of the moſt ancient writers relating to Lucan, or Lucian, or Leucius, I beg leave to refer to what hath been already ſaid ſomewhat largely concerning him in [u] another place; but I muſt reſume ſome particulars there mentioned: I ſhall repeat however as little as may be.

My method in treating of him ſhall be to conſider his time, his opinions, and his works or writings.

SECT. II. *Of the Time when he lived.*

FIRST, of his time. I formerly mentioned ſeveral [x] learned moderns, who place him in the ſecond century, viz. Grabe, Mill, and Beauſobre: to whom I now add [y] Cave. But he thinks he appeared not till about the year 180, ſuppoſing him to have been a leader of the Cataphrygians, or Montaniſts, [z] as ſome other authors alſo ſuppoſe. But in this they are evidently miſtaken. Mill [a] thinks he flouriſhed about the year 140, or ſoon

[q] Lucanus poſt iſtum quidam ſimilia Marcionis ſtatuens ac decernens, ut ille doctor ipſius Marcion eſt in omnibus ementitus. Hær. 47. p. 97. p. 12. La Prigne.

[r] Extitit poſt hunc Lucanus quidam nomine, Marcionis ſectator atque diſcipulus. Et hic per eadem vadens blaſphemiæ genera, eadem docet quæ Marcion et Cerdon docuerant. Præſ. c. 51. p. 253. D. 217. 21. Fran.

[s] Viderit unus aliquis Lucanus, nec huic quidem ſubſtantiæ parcens, quam ſecundum Ariſtotelem diſſolvens, aliud quid pro ea ſubjicit, quaſi ſit tertium quiddam reſurrecturum neque anima neque caro, id eſt non homo, ſed urſus forſitan qua Lucanus. De Reſ. Carne. c. 2. p. 380. D. p. 315. 11.

[t] Μεταχαραξαντας δε το ευαγγελιον αλλως ουκ οιδα, η τους απο Μαρκιωνος, και τους απο Ουαλεντινου οιμαι δε και τους απο Λουκιανου. Con. Cels. L. 2. p. 77. Can. p. 411. Bened.

[u] Vol. iii. p. 532....536.

[x] Ibid. p. 534. [y] Lucius rectius Leucius Charinus peſſimæ notæ hæreticus, ſecta ſive Marcionita, ſive Montaniſta, ſive ex utraque conflatus, circa annum CLXXX. vixiſſe videtur. Certe poſt exortam Montani hæreſin ſi modo Cataphrygum anteſignanus fuerit. Hiſ. Lit. ſec. 2. p. 82. vel. p. 49. Gen. 1720.

[z] Ætatem deſignat Pacianus, cum ait, illi ipſi Phryges ſe animatos mentiuntur a Leucio. Ibid. p. 83. vel. 49. Gen.

[a] Erat Lucianus Marcionis ſectator ita et Leucius. Iſte vivo adhuc magiſtro novam ſectam inſtituit vixitque adeo circa annum Chriſti 140, ſeu paulo poſtea. Prol. n. 334. p. 37.

after-

after. And Fabricius [b] nearly agrees with him, endeavouring to prove that the Leucius ſpoken of by Pacian againſt the Montaniſts, is a different perſon from him we are now treating of. Though in this I think him wrong, [c] becauſe ancient authors mention but one. It however appears to me moſt agreeable to the current of hiſtory to place him ſomewhere between the years 135 and 150.

SECT. III. *Of his Opinions.*

SECONDLY, we are to ſpeak of his opinions. What they were was ſhewn diſtinctly in the place before referred to. [d] The account there given is further confirmed by what we have quoted juſt before, and ſhall now proceed to mention.

He was a ſcholar and follower of Marcion. He believed the Creator to be different from God the Father. [e] He ſaid that the God of the Jews was an evil being, and that Simon Magus was his miniſter: but that the God whom Chriſt revealed was different from him, and was good; [f] and to him he applies the appellation of both Father and Son. He was one of the [g] Docetæ. He condemned marriage, and denied the reſurrection of the body. He alſo had a notion that the Divine Being, or an angel, appeared at a certain time in the ſhape of a beautiful boy and imitated a ſmall female voice; as we find it related at large in

[b] Sed quis præſtabit a Paciano innui Leucium? Certe Mentiri hoc Phryges ait Pacianus. Itaque Leucium iſtum non habuit ipſe pro anteſignano, verum pro viro Catholico, ad cujus conſenſum fruſtra a Montaniſtis provocaretur. Fab. Cod. Apoc. N. T. p. 42. in notis. Suſpicor autem illum a Paciano Leucium denotari quem inter Johannis diſcipulos nominat Epiphanius. Hær. 51. n. 6. p. 427. D. Id. Ibid. p. 768.

[c] Vide Beauſ. H. Man. T. 1. p. 351, 2. n. 3.

[d] Vol. iii. p. 533, 534.

[e] Vide note [c] p. 416. of this chapter.

[f] Φησι γαρ αλλον ειναι τον των Ιουδαιων Θεον, και κακον. ᾧ και Σιμωνα τον Μαγον υπηρετην καθεσταναι. αλλον δε τον Χριστον (lege Χριστῳ) ον φησιν αγαθον. και φυρων απαιτα, και συγχεων, καλει αυτον και πατερα και υιον. Pho. Cod. 114. p. 292. *

[g] Λεγει δε μηδε ενανθρωπησαι (Χριστον) αληθως αλλα δοξαι....Γαμους δε νομιμους αθετει, και πασαν γενεσιν, πονηραντε, και τω ποιητῃ λεγει. Phot. Cod. 114. p. 292.

* Photius who relates this, differs in ſome meaſure from Epiphanius. According to the former, Leucius allows but two principles, one evil and the other good, and the good one, or the God preached by Chriſt, [a] he conſiders under the characters of Father and Son. According to the latter, Leucius aſſerted there were three principles, and that one of his three, which was the Creator, was juſt and a judge. This character of the Creator is agreeable to the Marcionite doctrine, of which Leucius [b] was a follower.

[a] Fabricius has well obſerved that there is a falſe reading here, and that it ought to be τῳ χριστῳ, and not τον χριστον. Cod. Apo. N. T. T. 1. p. 771.

[b] Ουτος γαρ συνεπομενος τω προηρημενῳ Μαρκιωνι....κατα παντα μεν ουν κατα τον Μαρκιωνα δογματιζει. Epi. Hær. 43. p. 378. B. C. Vide etiam Gr. Spic. Pat. v. 1. p. 78.

the book intitled 'de Fide,' [h] among Austin's works. He also thought, according to Philaster, [i] that the souls of men were like the souls of dogs and beasts: alleging in proof of it, from the spurious acts of Andrew and Peter, that cattle and dogs, and wild beasts had been miraculously made to speak.

Sect. IV. *Some Observations on his Notion about the Souls of Brutes, and the Resurrection of them.*

This doth not seem to have been an opinion peculiar to Lucian and his followers: but was held, according to Philaster, [k] in the place before quoted, by the Manichees, Gnostics, Nicolaitans, Valentinians, and many other heretics. There is indeed no doubt but Lucian believed that the souls of men and the souls of beasts were of the same kind. For it is expressly said by Philaster to be contained in those spurious writings, which went under the names of Andrew, John, Peter, and some others of the apostles; which writings it will evidently appear were the forgeries of Lucian. This tenet is also ascribed to him by Photius, though in somewhat a different manner. He says [l] that this heretic strangely believed a most absurd and puerile kind of resurrection of dead men, and oxen, and cattle.

Photius seems here to have mistaken the meaning of the terms. It should be observed, that all the Docetæ denied the resurrection of the body, or of the flesh. [m] This was a consequence of their believing that Christ had not really a body, but only appeared to have one. However, the Marcionites talked of a resurrection, which may be called a figurative resurrection, and which [n] they

[h] Attendite in actibus Leucii, quos sub nomine Apostolorum scribit, qualia sunt quæ accipitis de Maximilla uxore Egetis, &c. .... Ibi scriptum est quod cum eadem Maximilla et Iphidamia simul issent ad audiendum Apostolum Andream, puerulus quidam speciosus, quem vult Leucius vel Deum, vel certe Angelum intelligi, commendaverit eas Andreæ Apostolo, et perrexerit ad prætorium Egetis, et ingressus cubiculum eorum finxerit vocem muliebrem, quasi Maximillæ murmurantis de doloribus sexus feminei, et Iphidamiæ respondentis. Quæ colloquia cum audisset Egetes, credens eas ibi esse, discesserit. De Fide, c. 38. Ap. Aug. T. 8. in Appen. T. 6. fol. 187, 1, 2, Venet. 1570.

[i] Unde et habent Manichæi et alii tales, Andreæ beati et Joannis actus Evangelistæ, beati et Petri similiter Apostoli, et Pauli pariter Apostoli; in quibus quia signa fecerunt magna et prodigia, ut et pecudes, et canes et bestiæ loquerentur, etiam et animas hominum tales velut canum et pecudum, similes imputaverunt esse hæretici perditi. Hær. 87. vel. Hær. Apocry. 40. p. 22. La Bigne, Par. 1624.

[k] E quibus sunt maxime Manichæi, Gnostici, Nicolaitæ, et Valentiniani, et alii quam plurimi, qui Apocrypha Prophetarum et Apostolorum, id est actus separatos habentes, canonicas legere scripturas contemnunt. Id. Ibid.

[l] Νεκρων δε ανθρωπων και βοων, και κτηνων παραλογωτατας και μειρακιωδεις τερατευει αναστασεις. Photii. Cod. 114. p. 292.

[m] Την της σαρκος δε αθετει αναστασιν καθαπερ πολλαι των αιρεσεων. Epi. ad. Hær. 42. p. 304. B.

[n] ψυχης δε Αναστασιν ειναι λεγει, και ζωην και σωτηριαν μονης. Epi. Ibid. p. 305. B.

applied

applied to souls. They considered souls as dead while they were in the body; and therefore the death of the body was the life, or, in their phraseology, the resurrection of the soul. This is agreeable to the Platonic doctrine, which represented the soul as in a prison while confined in the body. From this philosophy Docetism seems to have derived its origin: for the followers of this opinion were principally among the higher classes of men, and were chiefly those who had been converted from heathenism to Christianity. Lucian might therefore very probably be a believer in the resurrection of the souls of brutes in this sense, as well as in that of the souls of men. For it was a Marcionite tenet, to which he also undoubtedly gave his assent, that the souls of men and the souls of brutes [o] are of the same kind. Thus far then Philaster is undoubtedly right in saying that he believed the souls of men and beasts to be alike: and this is one proof, among many others, that he was a follower of Marcion, and not a Manichee, and therefore he is justly placed, as before observed, in the second century.

SECT. V. *A Belief in another kind of Resurrection, ascribed to him by Tertullian.*

TERTULLIAN indeed here ascribes to him the belief of a different kind of resurrection, for he says, 'it [p] was his opinion 'that a kind of third thing, which was neither soul nor body, 'was to be raised, and which consequently was not man, but 'might be a bear.' This Dr. Mill [q] understands as pointing out his belief in the Pythagorean transmigration of souls from one body to another, and even into the bodies of beasts; and therefore that men were endowed with the souls of other men, and that even brutes had sometimes those souls which had before resided in a human body. Epiphanius, in his refutation of Marcion on the article of eating flesh, says [r] that 'the traduction and passage 'of

[o] Νομιζει δε ο ελεεινος ουτος αμα τοις ουτω φρονουσιν, οτι η αυτη ψυχη εν τοις ανθρωποις και ζωοις υπαρχει. Epi. Ibid. p. 330. B.

[p] Omnes enim fere hæretici eam (animæ salutem) quoquo modo volunt, tamen non negant. Viderit unus aliquis Lucanus, nec huic quidem substantiæ parcens, quam secundum Aristotelem dissolvens, aliud quid pro ea subjicit, tertium quidam resurrecturus, neque anima neque caro, id est non homo, sed ursus forsitan, qua Lucanus. De Carne Christ. c. 2. p. 315.

[q] Tum vero quod prodigiosam nescio quam resurrectionem commentus sit, qua neque anima hominum resuscitanda foret, neque corpus, sed tertium quiddam, scilicet (ex Pythagorica, quam probavit, hypothesi de transmigratione animarum de corporibus in corpora hominum, nec non pecudum) homines alienis animabus præditi, ideoque nec iidem qui ante fuerant, ut et pecudes, hominum animis donatæ. Sic enim Tertulliani verba interpretor ex Photio. Millii Prole. 334. p. 37. Ox.

[r] Διδασκει γαρ ουτος εμψυχων μη μεταλαμβανειν, φασκων ενοχους ειναι τη κρισε-

'of souls from one body to another, was a common opinion 'among most of the heretics, and that Marcion and his fol- 'lowers, among whom our Lucian must be ranked, esteemed 'the souls of men and of brutes equally precious.'

SECT. VI. *Some general Account of his Writings.*

THIRDLY, I proceed to give some account of his writings. Grabe, who applied himself very particularly to these matters, hath assured us, [t] that he was the author of many forgeries under the names of the holy apostles; and [u] that he himself had found several fragments of his writings in MS. which were never yet published, but which he intended to give to the world in their proper places. Had he lived to have completed his design, perhaps many pieces would have clearly appeared to have been the forgeries of this person, about which there are now some remaining doubts. However he hath been long and justly regarded as the grand framer of apocryphal books: in which, as Photius the patriarch of Constantinople says, 'His [x] style is 'altogether unequal and various. The construction and words 'which he makes use of, though they are sometimes far from 'being mean, yet they are however for the most part very low 'and vulgar; and there are in his writings no traces of an even 'and flowing phraseology; or of a native grace, similar to that 'which we find in the style of the evangelists and apostles.' Pope Gelasius [y] hath condemned him and his works in the strongest

τȣς των κρεων μεταληπτορας, ως αν ψυχας εσθιοντας.... ȣ γαρ τα κρεα η ψυχη, αλλα εν τοις κρεασιν η ψυχη. και ȣτε ψυχην φαμεν ειναι την εν τοις ζωοις, ως την των ανθρωπων τιμιαν....νομιζει δε ο ελεεινος ȣτος αμα τοις ȣτω φρωνȣσιν. κ. τ. λ. τȣτο γαρ παρα πολλαις των πεπλανημενων αιρεσεων ματην υπολαμβανεται, και γαρ, και Ουαλεντινος, και κολοβαρσος, γνωςικοιτε παντες, και Μανιχαιοι, και μεταγγισμȣς ειναι ψυχων φασκȣσι, και μετενσωματωσεις της ψυχης. Epi. adv. Hær. 42. p. 330. B. C.

[s] See some observations on this point, in the foregoing chapter of Marcion, sec. 17. p. 376.

[t] Evangelium ejus (Petri) fuisse reor figmentum Leucii hæretici seculo secundo plura ejusmodi cudentis, eaque nominibus S. Apostolorum supponentis. Spi. Pat. T. 1. p. 58.

[u] Quos una cum aliorum Apostolorum rebus gestis composuit et publicavit Leucius, sive Lucius Marcionis successor seculi II. quosque summatim perstrinxit Photius Cod. 114. Ego vero suo loco fragmenta eorum hactenus inedita orbi erudito offeram. Ibid. p. 77, 8. Jam fateor quidem me in nullis excusis historiæ ecclesiasticæ monumentis istud S. Thomæ (scilicet Judæ) cognomen reperire potuisse, reperisse tamen in MSS. actis Græcis Thomæ in Bibliotheca Bodleiana Cod. 180. Barocc. fol. 42. p. 2. Quæ Leucium seculi II. hæreticum auctorem habere videntur. Ibid. 324.

[x] Η δε φρασις εις το παντελες ανωμαλως τε και παρηλλαγμενη. Και συνταξεσι γαρ και λεξεσι κεχρηται ενιοτε μεν ȣκ ημελημεναις, κατα δε το πλειςον αγοραιοις και πεπατημεναις. Και ȣδεν της ομαλης και αυτοσχεδιȣ φρασεως, και της εκειθεν εμφυτȣ χαριτος, καθ ην ο ευαγγελικος τε και αποςολικος διαμεμορφωται λογος ȣδ ιχνος εμφαινων. Phot. Cod. 114.

[y] Libri omnes, sub nomine Andreæ, &c. quos fecit Lentitius, seu Leucius filius Diaboli, apocryphi. Gelas. Decret. ap. Labb. Conc. T. 4. p. 1264.

terms;

terms; declaring, that all those books which go under the name of the travels of Andrew and the other apostles, were forged by Lenticius, as he is there called, or Leucius; and that all his writings are apocryphal; and he himself a disciple of the devil. It is however necessary to be observed, that all the contradictions, all the silly stories, all the vulgarisms and inaccuracies which are now in these books, are not to be imputed entirely to Leucius; since it is evident from some of the pieces themselves that they have been interpolated, as Beausobre [z] hath clearly made appear, and that they have been interpolated by several hands, and some of them extremely ignorant.

I would also further remark that this heretic is called by many names; such as Lucanus, Lucius, Leicius, Leucius, Lentitius, Leontius, Lentius, Seleucus, Leucius Charinus, and even Nexocharides, and Leonides, which mean all one and the same person, as is fully shewn by Mr. Jones [a] and Beausobre. [b] Several of the differences in these names were undoubtedly owing to the carelessness of transcribers, and some to the ignorance of those who altered and falsified these forgeries.

This being premised, I proceed to mention in brief those forgeries which are attributed to Lucian, or Leucius, as he is more frequently called. They who would see a more minute examination of particulars, with the reasons at large on which this opinion is founded, may consult Beausobre [c] and Jones. [d]

SECT. VII. *Some Observations on Mr. Jones's Assertions that Leucius was a Manichee.*

THIS latter writer has given us, in the second volume of his Canon of the New Testament, several of the spurious pieces here referred to, viz. the gospel of the Nativity, the Protevangelion, the gospel of the Infancy, and the gospel of Nicodemus.

He is, I think, greatly mistaken in making Leucius a Manichee, and in assigning him so late an æra as the latter end of the third, or the beginning of the fourth century. The only evidences which I can find for his being a Manichee, is the assertion of it in a suppositious letter found among Jerom's works, and because the opinions contained in his forgeries, are agree-

[z] Hist. De Man. T. 1. p. 371, 2. Vide etiam. p. 354. [a] Jones, Vol. 1. p. 305, 6, and 309, 10. Vol. 2. p. 419, 20. [b] Hist. De Man. T. 1. p. 348, &c. passim.
[c] Hist. De Manich. T. 1. p. 348, 407. [d] Canon of the N. T. Vol. 1. p. 284, 325, and Vol. 2. p. 419.

able to some of the Manichæan doctrines, and therefore these writings were received by the Manichees. But the oriental philosophy had infected Christians long before Manes arose; and this Leucius is very justly considered as a forerunner of him, and a source from which he and his followers derived some of their principal arguments. For he, as I have before observed, held an evil principle as well as a good one, and a just one. The Manichees therefore readily received his writings, which contained sentiments so favourable to their own. From hence it is probable the author of that epistle inserted among Jerom's works was induced to call him a Manichee. Neither Austin nor Pope Gelasius apply this name to him in those places referred to by Mr. Jones; they only say that the Manichees respected his writings. If he had been one of this sect, the place assigned him by Mr. Jones would have been right; but as he was contemporary with Marcion, and his scholar, it is undoubtedly wrong. Grabe, [c] a proper and an accurate judge in these matters, declares he was the successor of Marcion, and an heretic of the second century.

To proceed then to his forgeries.

Sect. VIII. *Leucius was the Author of the History of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary.*

He is said to be the author of a spurious book entitled The History of the Virgin: or, The History of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary. This is mentioned in a letter, [f] which is generally thought to be suppositious, from Chromatius and Heliodorus to Jerom. In the answer ascribed to Jerom it is said [g] to be written by one Seleucus, (or Leucius, according to the MS.) and he is there called a Manichee. It is also said [h] in these letters to have been written in Hebrew; and that

[c] Vide p. 423, notes [t] and [u] of this chapter. [f] Ortum Mariæ Reginæ Virginis,....in Apocryphis invenimus Libris in quibus multa contraria nostræ fidei considerantes scripta, recusanda credimus universa. Apud Hieron. Op. T. v. vel. P. 2. Trac. 2. Ep. 23. fol. 38.

[g] Sed factum est ut a Manichei discipulo nomine Seleuco (Leucio MS.) Qui etiam Apostolorum gesta falso Sermone conscripsit; hic Liber editus. Ibid. T. v. p. 445. vel. P. 2. Tra. 2. Ep. 24. fol. 38. vel. Tr. 6. Ep. 82. fol. 140.

[h] Extiterunt Viri Dei Armenius et Viritus, qui dicerent sanctitatem tuam beatissimi Matthæi Evangelistæ manuscriptum Hebraicum inveniisse in quo et Virginis Matris, et Salvatoris infantia esset scripta. Ib. Nec ipse sanctus Matthæus Apostolus et Evangelista voluit in aperto conscribi. Si enim hoc secretum non esset, Evangelio utique ipsius quod edidit addidisset: sed fecit hunc libellum Hebraicis litteris obsignatum, quem usque adeo edidit, ut ex manu ipsius liber scriptus Hebraicis literis, a viris religiosissimis habeatur, qui etiam a suis prioribus per successus temporum susceperunt, hunc autem ipsum librum, nunquam alicui transferendum tradiderunt, textum ejus aliter, atque

that there was a report current that the evangeliſt Matthew was the author of it, and that he prefixed it to the beginning of his own goſpel. This is partly contradicted by the writer of the ſecond letter, and by another letter in Jerom, which is a kind of preface to this book. In both theſe it is aſcribed to that Leucius [i] who wrote a ſpurious hiſtory of the Acts and Sufferings of the Apoſtles.

A goſpel of this kind, which was in being [k] in the ſecond century, is referred to by Epiphanius [l] and Auſtin. [m] But our preſent copies are very much altered from the ancient ones. For in that which is now extant, there is not the leaſt mention of the death of Zacharias, concerning the cauſe of which Epiphanius has produced a paſſage from the copy extant in his time, the purport of which is as follows: That Zacharias, [n] while miniſtering in the temple, ſaw a viſion, and being willing to reveal what he ſaw to the people, was ſtruck dumb. Afterwards, when he recovered his ſpeech, he declared to the Jews, that he ſaw a man ſtanding there in the form of an aſs: upon which they ſlew him.

SECT. IX. *The Writer of it not a Jew.*

THERE are Hebraiſms in the phraſeology, which induced Mr. Jones to aſcribe this piece to ſome Jew, or Helleniſt. Though he himſelf allows afterwards [o] that it might be compoſed by Leucius Charinus, or our Leucius, who borrowed from ſome former forgery, and that what we now have is different from his. For, in the fragment preſerved by Auſtin, Mary is ſaid to be of the tribe of Levi, whereas in our preſent copies

que aliter narraverunt. Sed factum eſt ut a Manichæo, &c. Ibid. Proinde ut in Hebræo habetur, verbum ex verbo tranſferre curabo: ſi quidem ſanctum Matthæum eundem libellum liquet compoſuiſſe, et in capite Evangelii ſui Hebraicis literis obſignatum appoſuiſſe. Quod an verum ſit, auctori præfationis et fidei ſcriptoris committo. Ibid. Epi. 25. F. 39.

[i] De Nativitate S. Mariæ....ideo ſcire vos volo multa in eo falſa inveniri. Quidam namque Seleucus (Leucius MS.) qui paſſiones Apoſtolorum conſcripſit hunc libellum compoſuit. Ibid.

[k] Jones's Canon. Vol. 2. p. 163.

[l] Αλλα δε μυρια παρ αυτοις πεπλασμενα γραφια τε τολμαται, γενιαν μεν γαρ Μαριας διελιον τι φασιν ειναι. κ. τ. λ. Hær. 26. n. 12. p. 94. A. Ει γαρ και η της Μαριας ιστορια, και παραδοσεις εχουσιν οτι ερριζη τω πατρι αυτης Ιωαχειμ. κ. τ. λ. Hær. 79. n. v. p. 1062. C. D.

[m] Quia eadem patrem habuerit ſacerdotem quemdam nomine Joachim. Contr. Fauſ. Mani. L. 23. c. 4. opp. T. 6. Ven.

Ac per hoc illud, quod de generatione Mariæ Fauſtus poſuit, quod patrem habuerit ex tribu Levi, ſacerdotem quendam nomine Joachim, quia non canonicum eſt, non me conſtringit. Ibid. c. 9.

[n] Τον Ζαχαριαν αποκταυθαι εν τω ναω επειδη φασι οπτασιαν εωρακε, και απο τυ φοβυ θελων ειπειν την οπτασιαν απεφραγη το στομα. ειδε γαρ φασιν ανθρωπον εστωτα ονυ μορφην εχοντα. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. p. 94. A. B.

[o] Canon of the N. T. Vol. 2. p. 175, and 207.

ſhe

ſhe is ſaid [p] to be ſprung from the royal race and family of David. Though it muſt be allowed that there are ſome Hebraiſms in this piece, and ſome alluſions to Jewiſh cuſtoms, yet it is alſo certain there are other things, which are contrary to facts well known among the Jews, and inconſiſtent with their eſtabliſhed cuſtoms, as Jones himſelf has obſerved. [q] For inſtance, that Iſſachar was the name of the high prieſt who diſcourſed with Joachim; whereas if this hiſtory be ſuppoſed to be true [r] in other reſpects, Simon the ſon of Boethus Alexandrinus was then high prieſt, and continued ſo for nineteen years. It is alſo ſaid in the hiſtory, that Mary was brought at three years old to the temple, and continued there, according to cuſtom, till ſhe was fourteen. But it is certain there were no ſuch cells or apartments in the temple at Jeruſalem, nor was there any ſuch cuſtom of keeping nuns there. Theſe appear to me ſuch deciſive proofs againſt the author's being a Jew, as the few Hebraiſms found therein are not able to countervail. The truth ſeems to be, that many of the things contained in this ſpurious piece were current traditions in the ſecond century. [s] Leucius interwove with theſe ſome paſſages from the genuine ſcriptures, and thus made up the heterogeneous maſs. The author of the pretended letter from Chromatius and Heliodorus, altered the beginning of this goſpel of the Nativity to what we now find it to contain, expunging that falſe opinion of Mary's being deſcended from Levi, and inſerting the real fact; that ſhe was of the royal race and family of David.

The inculcating the propriety of perpetual virginity ſeems to have been the deſign of the original compoſer, eſpecially in the latter part of this piece. This is entirely agreeable to the opinions of Leucius: it is therefore probable that he was the author, and that this part remains the ſame as he firſt wrote it.

[p] Beata et glorioſa ſemper virgo Maria de ſtirpe regia et familia David oriunda, in civitate Nazareth nata, Hieroſolymis in templo Domini nutrita fuit. Pater ejus Joachim, mater vero Anna dicebatur. Domus paterna ex Galilæa et civitate Nazareth. Maternum autem genus ex Bethlehem erat. Evan. Nativ. Mariæ apud Hieron. Opp. P. 2. Tr. 2. Ep. 25. fol. 39.

[q] Jones, vol. 2. p. 185, 6.

[r] Vide Joſephi Anti. Jud. L. 15. c. 12. Helvici Chronol. et Sigon. de Repub. Judæor. L. 5. c. 2. p. 220. The ſame as this is hinted by Baronius Appar. ad Annal. Eccleſ. No. 39, and Caſaub. Exerc. in eundem numerum. Jones ubi ſup. note.

[s] Canon of the N. T. V. 2. p. 169, 173, and p. 184.

Sect.

SECT. X. *The Protevangelion, or Goſpel of James, was compoſed by Leucius.*

ANOTHER forged goſpel aſcribed to Leucius is the Protevangelion, or Goſpel of James, which [s] hath been publiſhed in Greek ſeveral times. Of this goſpel there are ſeveral MS. copies now extant. It pretends to give an account of the birth of Chriſt; and contains many of the ſame things which are in the goſpel of Mary. It proceeds further indeed, and adds ſome remarkable ſtories: ſuch as Jacob's drinking the water of trial to prove whether Mary was with child by him or not; their journey to Bethlehem; the ſtanding ſtill of the clouds, birds, and all other things, at the birth of our Saviour; the affair of the midwife; the coming of the wiſe men, and many others. It alſo adds to the account given us by the former of the age of Joſeph; that he was a widower, and had ſeveral children. The ſtory of the murder of Zacharias is inſerted, though a different cauſe is here aſſigned for it, from that which Epiphanius has aſſigned in the extract before given. Here it is attributed to Herod, who put Zacharias to death, becauſe he would not diſcover where John was; when by his order the children were murdered.

SECT XI. *A current Tradition that Joſeph was a Widower and had Children by his former Wife.*

THE opinion that Joſeph was a widower and had children by a former wife when he was betrothed to Mary, was current in the primitive ages. Origen mentions it in his commentary on Matt. xiii. 55, [u] and ſays, 'many believed that the brethren of 'Chriſt there mentioned were the children of Joſeph by a for-'mer wife; and that they were induced to be of this opinion by 'ſome paſſages in the goſpel of Peter, or the book of James.' Euſebius [x] gives us the ſame reaſon why James was called the brother of Chriſt. Epiphanius [y] hath frequently mentioned this

[s] Vide Protevange. ſive Evangelium Jacobi. Baſil. 1552. Grynæi Orthodox. p. 71. Fabric. Cod. Apocry. N. T. Jones, V. 2. p. 129.

[u] Τους δε αδελφους αυτου ουκ ολιγοι τινες ειναι, εκ παραδοσεως ορμωμενοι, τα επιγεγραμμενα κατα Πετρον ευαγγελια, η την βιβλον Ιακωβου, υιους Ιωσηφ εκ προτερας γυναικος. Origen. T. xi. in Matt. vel. ex Huet. edit. T. 1. p. 223. A. B.

[x] Ιακωβον τον του κυριου λεγομενον αδελφον, οτι δη και ουτος του Ιωσηφ ωνομαστο παις. Eccl. Hiſ. L. 2. c. 1. B.

[y] Ad. Hær. 29. n. 2, 3, and 51. n. 10.

ſame

same thing. He says that, 'James was the son of Joseph by a 'former wife, and therefore called the brother of Jesus.' And again, that 'Joseph was about eighty years old when he married 'Mary, and that he had six children by a former wife.' And still more particularly in his dispute with the Antidicomarionites, he informs us [z] that Joseph was very old when he married Mary, and had been many years a widower, that he was the brother of Cleophas, and the son of James, surnamed Panther: that his first wife was of the tribe of Judah, that he had by her six children, four sons and two daughters: that James, surnamed Olbias, was his eldest son; that he was born when his father was about forty years of age: that his next son was Jose, and then Simeon and Judas: that his two daughters were named Mary and Salome: that he continued many years a widower, and when he was about eighty years old married Mary.

This same opinion was embraced by many other of the Greek fathers. [a] From this account it appears to have been an opinion generally received in the primitive ages.

Sect. XII. *Passages in Epiphanius referring to the Gospel of the Nativity and the Protevangelion.*

Mr. Jones mentions two places more in Epiphanius, where there seem to be references to the two foregoing gospels. The first is as follows: 'When [b] lots were cast for the widowers and 'unmarried of every tribe to determine who should take the 'virgins which were in the temple; (for it was the custom that 'the first born of both sexes should be devoted to the temple 'service,) he (Joseph) was obliged by the necessity of the lot 'to take the holy virgin Mary.' This is agreeable to the account given us both in the gospel of Mary and the Protevangelion. The other reference is in a tract ascribed to Epiphanius, but generally supposed not to be his. [c] The purport of it is, that Joachim and Anna were the names of the father and mother of the virgin; that Joachim retired into the wilderness, where he prayed for issue; and Anna into the garden on the same account; and that their prayers were answered by the birth of Mary. The whole of this is in the Protevangelion; and the greater part in the gospel of the Nativity of Mary.

[z] Ibid. 79. n. 7, 8. [a] Jones's Canon. N. T. p. 172. Pearson on the Creed, p. 175, ar. iii. Sixt. Senens. Biblio. Sanct. L. 6. p. 455. Annot. 64. Vales. An. in Euf. H. Ecc. L. 2. c. 1. [b] Ancoratus, V. c. 60. [c] Oratio de Laud. Vir. Mar. V. 2. p. 292.

Sect.

SECT. XIII. *Obſervations on ſome of the Contents of theſe two Goſpels.*

THE perpetual virginity of Mary, mentioned in both theſe goſpels, and pretended to be confirmed by the teſtimony of the midwife, was a favourite opinion among the ancient Chriſtians.

If we will pay any attention to what is ſaid in the letter of Pope Innocent the firſt, [d] Leucius was the author of this goſpel, as well as of that of the Nativity; for he informs us that the writings under the names of Matthew and of James the leſs, meaning thereby the goſpel of the Nativity, and the Protevangelion, were forged by Leucius. This laſt alſo was a work of the ſecond century; for it is referred to by Origen as before obſerved. [e] It is called the book of James becauſe, both at the beginning and end James is ſaid to be the author.

The ſtory of the midwife [f] was undoubtedly invented to make us believe that Chriſt was not really a man, but only one in appearance. This was a ſtory current in the ſecond century, as appears from Clemens Alexandrinus. [g] As perpetual virginity is alſo ſtrongly inculcated in this apocryphal piece, it accords entirely with the ſentiments of Leucius, and very probably he was the author.

SECT. XIV. *Leucius is thought to have interpolated the Goſpel of the Infancy.*

THE goſpel of the Infancy of our Saviour is ſuppoſed by Mr. La Croze to have been forged by ſome Neſtorians; but it is more likely to have been the work of the Gnoſtics, or rather of that ſect of them called [h] Marcoſians. Irenæus refers [i] to this goſpel,

[d] Cætera autem quæ ſub nomine Matthæi, ſive Jacobi minoris, vel ſub nomine Petri et Johannis, quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt....non ſolum repudianda verum noveris eſſe damnanda. Innocent. Ep. 3. ad Exuper. c. 7. Ap. Concil. Labb. T. 2. p. 6. 125. [e] Vide p. 427, note [u] of this chapter. [f] Και εξηλθεν η μαια απο τυ σπηλαιυ, και απηντησεν αυτη Σαλωμη και ειπεν αυτη η μαια, Σαλωμη, Σαλωμη, καινον σοι θεαμα εξηγησομαι, παρθενος εγεννησεν, ο υ χωρει η φυσις. ειπε δε Σαλωμη· Ζη κυριος ο Θεος μυ, οτι εαν μη καταισησω τη φυσιν αυτης, υ μη πιστευσω, οτι η παρθενος εγεννησεν. Ηλθε δε Σαλωμη, και ειπε η Μαια, Μαρια, σχηματισον σεαυτην, υ γαρ μικρος αγων περικειται περι συ. και εσημειωσατο Σαλωμη, και εξηραιθη η χειρ αυτης. Protevangelion. c. 19, 20. [g] Αλλα ως εοικεν τοις πολλοις, και μεχρι νυν δοκει η Μαριαμ λεχω ειναι δια την τυ παιδιυ γενεσιν, υκ υσα λεχω. και γαρ μετα το τεκειν αυτην μαιωθεισαι, φασι τινες παρθενον ευρεθηναι. Strom. L. 7. p. 756. B. C. [h] Beauſ. Hiſ. de Man. T. 1. L. 2. c. 3. No. 6. p. 368. Jones's Can. N. T. V. 2. p. 208, and 283.

[i] Προς δε τυ τοις αμυθητοις πληθος αποκρυφων και νοθων γεγραφων ας αυτοι επλασαν προσεισφερυσιν.

goſpel, and ſays it was received by them, and indeed owed it's exiſtence to their forgeries. Epiphanius has quoted this paſſage from Irenæus, [k] and therefore gives his teſtimony to the ſame. This goſpel is joined with that of the Nativity of Mary, and ranked among apocryphal books, [l] by the author of the letter from Chromatius and Heliodorus to Jerom. Dr. Mill thinks that [m] the goſpel of the Infancy was generally joined to the goſpel of the Nativity of Mary. The paſſage juſt quoted from the epiſtle of Chromatius, as far as that is to be depended on, certainly confirms it: as doth the anſwer attributed to Jerom, [n] who conſidered it as part of the taſk aſſigned him to tranſlate the account of the Infancy of our Saviour. The Doctor alſo believes, that though it was not originally a compoſition of Leucius, yet it was altered and interpolated by him, receiving from thence the addition of ſeveral idle ſtories. Mr. Jones is of opinion [o] that it was firſt forged by the Gnoſtics, in the beginning of the ſecond century; that it was frequently joined to, or conſidered as a ſecond part of the goſpel of Mary, or of the Protevangelion; that Leucius was ſo far concerned in altering, and interpolating it, that he was conſidered by ſome as it's author. There are certain things in it which are undoubtedly of later invention; ſuch as the prodigious reſpect paid to the Virgin Mary, and the attention to the preſervation of relicks. Theſe were probably added by ſome Aſiatic Chriſtians of later times, whom La Croze [p] ſuppoſes to have been the firſt authors of this book.

Sect. XV. *He was the Forger of the Goſpel of Nicodemus.*

The goſpel of Nicodemus, or the Acts of Pilate, as it is otherwiſe called, was alſo a forgery of our Leucius. There were probably ſome accounts [q] tranſmitted by Pilate to Tiberius, concerning the tranſactions relative to Jeſus Chriſt; becauſe it was always cuſtomary for the Roman governors, to ſend annually

προσεισφερουσιν....ως τω Κυριω, τα δια τω διδασκαλω αυτω φησαντος, καθως εθος εστιν, ειπε αλφα, αποκρινασθαι το αλφα. παλιν τε το βητα τω διδασκαλω κελευσαντος ειπειν αποκρινασθαι τον Κυριον συ μοι προτερον ειπε τι εστιν το αλφα και το τε σοι εγω. κ. τ. λ. Adv. Hær. L. 1. c. 17. Gr.

[k] Ad. Hær. 34. No. 18. p. 253. C. D.

[l] Ortum Mariæ Reginæ Virginis ſimul et Nativitatem atque infantiam Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, in Apocryphis invenimus Libris. Apud Hieron. Op. part 2. Tra. 2. Ep. 23.

[m] Prol. in N. T. p. 37. c. 1.

[n] Qui ad Servatores noſtri infantiam ſanctam per noſtram potuerint obedientiam pervenire. Hieron. Op. pt. 2. Tr. 2. Ep. 24.

[o] Jones's Canon. vol. 2. p. 316. 321.

[p] Crozii Epiſ. ap. Fab. Cod. Apo. N. T. T. 3. p. 421. Jones's Can. vol. 2. p. 316.

[q] Jones's Can. vol. 2. p. 404.

from

from their provinces, a relation of the moſt material tranſactions to the ſenate or emperor; eſpecially if any thing new or extraordinary happened. This Euſebius expreſsly tells [r] us was the caſe in the preſent inſtance. Juſtin Martyr, the firſt and moſt ancient apologiſt for the truth of the Chriſtian religion, appeals to theſe accounts [s] in his addreſs to the emperor Marcus Antoninus. [t] But whether ſuch accounts were really tranſmitted by Pilate or not; it is evident a report of this kind was current early in the ſecond century.

From hence the hint was taken; and to this the preſent forgery owes its origin. A great part of this piece [u] is taken up in giving an account of things ſeen in the other world by Charinus and Lenthius, and which they are ſaid to have written down. Now as Mr. Jones obſerves, [x] this is no other than Leucius Charinus. They are ſaid indeed to be the names of the two ſons of Simeon; but every one knows they are not Hebrew, but Greek or Roman names. Our Leucius ſeems therefore to have been the firſt framer of a book of this kind; but there are moſt certainly in the preſent copies interpolations or additions to what he originally compoſed; ſuch as the ſigning themſelves with the ſign of the croſs before they began to relate the things they had ſeen: the deſcent of Jeſus into hell to fetch the patriarchs thence: his addreſs to all his ſaints, commanding them to live by the wood of his croſs; and his ſigning them with the ſign of the croſs before they were led into paradiſe, and many other things of a like ſort; all of which ſtrongly ſavour of the ſuperſtition of later ages. This will account for it's being ſaid, the viſion was written down by Lenthius and Charinus. The forger who lived in after times probably took this part from a piece of that author; adding to it what appeared proper to accommodate it to his own view of things; ſo that a great part of it may be juſtly attributed to our Leucius.

From the form of expreſſion in the beginning of the 27th chapter Charinus and Lenthius ſeem to have been but one perſon, [y] though afterwards to give the air of a miraculous authen-

[r] Παλαιᾳ κεκρατηκοτος εθνος τοις των εθνων αρχεσι, τα παρα σφισι καινοτομουμενα, τω τη βασιλειον αρχην επικρατουντι σημαινειν ως αν μηδεν αυτον διαδιδρασκοι των γιγνομενων, τα περι της εκ νεκρων αναστασεως τω Σωτηρος ημων Ιησυ Χριστω εις παντας ηδη καθ' ολης παλαιστινης βεβοημενα, Πιλατος Τιβεριω βασιλει κοινουται· ως τας τε αλλας αυτω πεπομενος τερατειας, και ως οτι μετα σταυρον εκ νεκρων αναστας, ηδη Θεος ειναι παρα τοις πολλοις επεπιστευτο. Ecc. Hiſ. L. 2. p. 40. C. D. [s] Και ταυτα οτι γεγονε δυνασθε μαθειν εκ των επι Ποντιω Πιλατω γενομενων ακτων. Ap. 2. p. 76. D. Οτι τε ταυτα εποιησεν, εκ των επι Ποντιω Πιλατω γενομενων αυτω μαθειν δυνασθε. Ibid. p. 84. C. The former of theſe refers to his crucifixion, the latter to his working miracles [t] Cred. Vol. ii. p. 116.

[u] See this goſpel in Jones's Canon. v. 2. p. 322, 401. but particularly from p. 370, 396. [x] Jones's Canon. p. 418, 20. [y] Ego Charinus et Lenthius Evan. Nic. c. 27. Apud Jones. p. 394, 5.

ticity

ticity to their vision, they are multiplied into two distinct persons, each of which wrote an account of the vision on different papers, one of which was given into the hands of Annas, Caiaphas, and Gamaliel; the other into the hands of Nicodemus and Joseph; and, upon comparing them, they were found to be the same verbatim et literatim. But I forbear to enlarge on some other absurdities contained in it: since the whole may be seen in Jones, as before referred to; and both he and Beausobre [z] have made some good observations on its contents. p. 306.

Sect. XVI. *Two other Gospels ascribed to Leucius.*

There are two other gospels mentioned by Beausobre, [a] as attributed to Leucius. One of which Grabe, in his notes on Irenæus, [b] says is preserved in MS. at Oxford. This Beausobre thinks is no other than the gospel of the Infancy already spoken of. Grabe agrees with him: for the passage he quotes from thence proves it plain enough, though it varies a little from the other copy published by Sike.

The other mentioned by Beausobre is the gospel of Peter, which Grabe [c] also assures us is a forgery of Leucius. There was a spurious book under this title, which was mentioned and confuted by Serapion, as hath been already observed. [d] It is also mentioned by Origen in his Commentary on Matthew. [e] Dr. Mill [f] is of the same opinion, that Leucius was the author of it. It appears indeed very probable from Serapion's words, who says [g] that he borrowed it from some of the followers of Marcian (Marcion,) whom he calls Docetæ, and that they used it. This agrees exactly to the followers of Leucius, who was himself a follower of Marcion, and one of the chief of the Do-

[z] Jones ubi sup. p. 402, 430. Beauf. His. de Manich. vol. 1. p. 370, 375.

[a] His. Man. vol. 1. p. 375. n. 3.

[b] Nec non, licet Paulo diversum in Pseudo-Evangelio Leucii, quod MS. hic Oxonii extat in Bibliotheca C. C. C. ubi capite quomodo Jesus discendus erat literas, hæc leguntur. Et cœpit magister impiose (l. imperiose) eum docere dicendo: Dic Alpha. Jesus vero dixit ei: Tu mihi dic prius, quid sit Beta, et Ego dicam tibi quid sit Alpha; et ob hæc Magister ratus percussit Jesum, et postquam percussit eum, mortuus est. Ir. L. 1. c. 17. n. 4. p. 86.

[c] Vide p. 422. note [t] of this chapter: or Spic. Pat. T. 1. p. 58.

[d] Vol. 2. p. 247....249.

[e] Vide p. 427. note [u] of this chapter.

[f] Eidem porro adscripta sunt ab Innocentio quæ sub Petri nomine exiere. Certe in Evangelio κατα Πετρον, notatus est a Serapione, qui de Evangelio isto librum edidit, error δοκητων, cui addictum fuisse Leucium testatur Photius. Prol. p. 37.

[g] Εδυνηθημεν γαρ παρ αλλων των ασκησαντων αυτο τουτο το ευαγγελιον (Πετρου) τουτον παρα των διαδοχων του καταρξαμενου αυτου (Μαρκιωνος) ως δοκητας καλουμεν. Eus. Ec. H. L. 6. c. 12. p. 213, 4. D. A.

cetæ,

cetæ, and who it is very likely forged this piece under the name of Peter.

Pope Innocent [h] in his decree concerning the canonical books ſays that thoſe writings which go under the names of Peter and John, were compoſed by Leucius, and were apocryphal.

Theſe are all the goſpels which I can find aſcribed to Leucius, either as the author or interpolater,

SECT. XVII. *Of the Traditions of Matthias. It is rather uncertain what they were.*

THE traditions of Matthias are ſuppoſed by Grabe [i] and Mill, [k] to be the ſame with the goſpel of Matthias; and the latter [l] thinks Leucius interpolated theſe, though he did not forge them. But I cannot agree with them in this point; for I think the decree of Pope Innocent to which Dr. Mill refers, means the goſpel of the Nativity of Mary, by the writings under the name of Matthias. [m] Origen [n] and Euſebius [o] probably referred to the ſame, or to the Nazarene goſpel, when they ſpeak of the goſpel of Matthias. Ambroſe [p] alſo in all likelihood meant one or other of theſe. Jerom ſeems [q] to intend by the goſpel of Matthias the goſpel of the Nativity; and by a ſpurious one aſcribed to Matthew, [r] if really different from the former, the Nazarene goſpel, or that of the twelve apoſtles. It is mentioned by Gelaſius according to ſome copies, but his words will determine nothing in this diſpute.

[h] Vide p. 429. n. [d] of this chap.

[i] Inter Evangelia mala hæriticorum fide nominibus Apoſtolorum ſuppoſita, Matthiæ quoque adſcriptum aliquod memorat Euſebius. Lib. 3. Hiſ. Eccleſ. cap. 25. Quod idem eſſe puto cum παραδοσεσι traditionibus a Clemente Alexandrino memoratis; quia Evangelia ſcribebantur ναδας παρεδοσαν οι απ αρχης αυτοπται και υπηρεται γενομενοι τω λογω. Spic. Pat. ſec. 2. T. 2. p. 117. [k] Mihi ſane videntur παραδοσεις iſtæ ex ore Matthiæ in Judea prædicantis initio exceptæ fuiſſe a Chriſtiano quopiam, et in libellum redactæ; cui ad majorem traditionibus iſtis auctoritatem conciliandam, Apoſtoli nomen præfixerit auctor quiſquis ille fuerit. ....poſt editionem Canonicorum Evangeliorum, in deſuetudinem abiit. Prol. in N. T. ſec. 53. p. 7.

[l] Quin et παραδοσεις Matthiæ a primævorum Chriſtianorum aliquo compoſitas, quod diximus, falſis abſurdiſque narratiunculis paſſim interſperſit hic ipſe impoſtor, ut ex Innocentio colligimus. Ibid. ſec. 337. p. 37. [m] See p. 429. n. [d] of this chapter. [n] Sciq Evangelium.... quod apellatur juxta Matthiam, &c. Hom. in Luc. 1. in init. [o] Ητοι ως Πετρω και Θωμα και Ματθαια....τουτους ευαγγελια περιεσχουσας. Hiſ. Ecc. L. 3. c. 25.

[p] Præf. in Com. in Lucam in init.

[q] Quæ a diverſis auctoribus edita, diverſarum hæreſium fuere principia; ut eſt illud juxta Matthiam. Præf. in Comm. in Matthæum. [r] In Evangelio juxta Hæbræos, quod Chaldaico Syroque ſermone ſed Hebraicis literis ſcriptum eſt, quo utuntur uſque hodie Nazaræi, ſecundum Apoſtolos ſive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum. Id. Dial. ad Pelag. L. 3. Ep. 17. in init.

These traditions of Matthias are mentioned under that name by Clemens [s] Alexandrinus, and by him only. These Mr. Jones thinks [t] were only oral traditions, and not therefore to be inserted among the forgeries of Leucius, though placed to his account by Dr. Mill, who says, he at least interpolated them. Beausobre [u] mentions traditions, as spoken of by Clemens Alexandrinus, in a small piece of his on the first epistle of John; which he imagines to be part of the false or forged Acts, of which Leucius was the author, and of which I shall presently take notice. In some copies of the decrees of Gelasius mention is made of apocryphal Acts under the name of Matthias. These may be the forged Acts of Leucius, to which I proceed.

Sect. XVIII. *Leucius was the Author of the forged Acts, or Journeyings of the Apostles.*

This book was called the Acts or Journeyings of the Apostles; and, according to Mill, [x] it contained the Acts of Peter, of John, of Andrew, and of Thomas. The Acts of Peter are mentioned by Eusebius, [y] by Athanasius, [z] or whoever was the author of the Synopsis attributed to him, by Philaster, [a] by Jerom, [b] and by Epiphanius. [c] The Acts of John are mentioned by all the foregoing writers [d] except Jerom. They are also spoken of by Austin. [e] The Acts of Andrew are mentioned by most of the foregoing writers, [f] and by Gelasius in his decree. The Acts of Thomas are spoken of by several of the same persons. The Acts of Paul also are mentioned by Origen, [g] and by Eusebius, and Philaster, in the places before referred to.

These all are expressly condemned by Photius, [h] who had

[s] Grabe has inserted two fragments from Clemens. Vide Spic. Pat. sec. 2. T. 2. p. 117. Jones has added three more. Can. N. T. p. 317, 18. Beausobre has inserted another from Cotelerius, which is downright Docetism, and of which probably Leucius was the author. It is likely therefore to have been in the spurious acts or travels of John. Beaus. His. Man. T. 1. p. 383. n. 4.

[t] Jones's Can. N. T. p. 318, 23.

[u] See note [s] immediately preceding.

[x] Proleg. in N. T. p. 37.

[y] Τοιγε μην των επικεκλημενων αυτου [Πετρου] πραξεων....ουδ ολως εν καθολικοις ισμεν παραδιδομενα. Ecc. His. L. 3. c. 3. p. 72. A. [z] Περιοδοι Πετρου....ταυτα εισι.... νοθα και αποβλητα. In Synops. initio.

[a] Actus beati et Petri similiter Apostoli. Hær. 87. [b] In Catal. V. J. in Petro. c. 1.

[c] Hær. 30. n. 15. p. 139. B.

[d] Eus. H. E. L. 3. c. 25. Athan. in Synop. init. Phil. H. 87. Epi. H. 47. n. 1. p. 406. A. [e] Con. Adver. Leg. et Pro. L. 1. c. 20. T. 6. p. 195. c. 1. Opp. Venet. [f] Eus. H. E. L. 3. c. 25. Phil. Hær. 87. Epiph. Hær. 47. n. 1. 61. n. 1. 63. n. 2. [g] De Prin. L. 1. c. 2. Comm. in Joan. T. 21. opp. vel T. 2. p. 291. Huet. [h] Ανεγνωσθη βιβλιον αι λεγομεναι των Αποστολων περιοδοι, εν αις περιεχονται πραξεις Πετρου, Ιωαννου, Ανδρεου, Θωμα, Παυλου. Γεγραφει δε αυτας, ως δηλοι το αυτο βιβλιον, Λευκιος Χαρινος. Cod. 114.

perused

peruſed the books, and aſſerts, that they plainly ſpoke their author to be Leucius Charinus. Leucius is thrice ſaid to be the author of them by Auſtin.[i] Jerom[k] in the epiſtle aſcribed to him, in anſwer to Chromatius and Heliodorus, and in the preface to the tranſlation of the goſpel of Mary's Nativity ſays; Leucius was the author of the ſpurious Acts of the Apoſtles. In the three quotations from Auſtin, it is obſervable, he is called by three different names. There can therefore be no reaſon to doubt, but the ſame perſon, and the ſame books are meant in the decree of Pope Innocent, though he goes by different names.[l] As the author of the Acts of Peter and John he is called Leucius. But as the author of the Acts of Andrew, he is increaſed into two perſons, Xenocharides and Leonides, with the title philoſophers adjoined. Mr. Jones[m] hath made it appear very probable that theſe two names were a corruption of Charinus and Leucius. For as names were written contractedly in the ancient MSS. and as ξενος might be prefixed to denote his ſtrange doctrines, being uſed by the fathers in that ſenſe, an ignorant ſcribe might eaſily miſtake, and change the words ξενος and χρ'ς, the contracted way of writing χαρινος, into ξενοχαριδες. And Leonides is not further from Leucius than Leontius and Lenticius are from one another. Though the ſame perſon is undoubtedly meant in Auſtin by theſe two names.[n]

SECT. XIX. *Some Account of the Contents of this Book.*

THIS book of the Acts or Journeyings of the Apoſtles, contained a number of idle ridiculous ſtories; one of which is given in the margin[o] from Auſtin, or whoever was the author of the

[i] Attendite in actibus Leucii quos ſub nomine Apoſtolorum ſcribit. De Fid. Con. Man. c. 38. T. 6. opp. F. 186. c. 4. Ven.

In actibus conſcriptis a Lenticio (l. Leucio) quos tanquam actus Apoſtolorum ſcribit. Act. cum. Fel. Mani. L. 2. c. 6. T. 6. opp. F. 165. c. 1, 2. Ven.

In actibus etiam conſcriptis a Leontio. (l. Leucio) De Fide, &c. c. 5. The ſame perſon and the ſame book is here referred to; for exactly the ſame words are quoted from this ſpurious piece in the two laſt references.

[k] Sed factum eſt a....Leucio qui etiam Apoſtolorum geſta conſcripſit. Hieron. Op. T. 5. p. 445. Vel P. 2. Tr. 2. Ep. 24. fol. 38. Quidam namque Leucius qui paſſiones Apoſtolorum conſcripſit. Ibid. P. 25. F. 38, 39. Vel ep. 82. fol. 140.

[l] Cætera quæ ſub nomine Petri et Johannis quæ a quodam Leucio ſcripta ſunt, vel ſub nomine Andreæ, quæ a Nexocharide (l. Xenocharide) et Leonide philoſophis, non ſolum repudianda verum etiam noveris eſſe damnanda. Inno. Ap. ad Exup. 3. c. 7. Ep. Con. Lab. T. 2. p. 1256.

[m] Jones's Canon. vol. 1. p. 309, 310.

[n] See above note [i].

[o] Qualia ſint quæ accipitis de Maximilla uxore Egetis: quæ cum nollet marito debitum reddere, cum Apoſtolus dixerit uxori vir debitum reddat, ſimiliter et uxor viro, illa, ſuppoſuerit marito ſuo ancillam ſuam Eucliam nomine, exornans eam ſicut ibi ſcriptum eſt, adverſariis lenociniis et fucationibus, et eam nocte pro ſe vicariam ſupponens, ut ille neſciens cum ea tanquam cum uxore concumberet. De Fide. T. 6. opp. F. 187. 1, 2.

book de Fide. One part of this ſtory ſeems to be the interpolation of ſome one after Leucius, for he who was in ſome ſort of the ſect of the Encratites could never approve of the proſtitution of a Chriſtian ſervant to a heathen huſband, inſtead of the wife. That he might inſert ſomething concerning the ſcruples of Maximilla, is conſiſtent with his avowed principles, and therefore not improbable.

In the commentaries which go under the name of Clement of Alexandria, theſe Journeyings of the Apoſtles are probably referred to, and a paſſage cited from them, [p] which ſays that John attempting to touch the body of Chriſt, perceived no hardneſs of the fleſh, and met with no reſiſtance from it, but thruſt his hand into the inner part. This is perfectly agreeable to the opinion of Leucius, who was one of the chief of the Docetæ.

Sect. XX. *Theſe Forgeries prove the Truth of the Canonical Scriptures.*

One obvious concluſion to be drawn from this long account of the forgeries of Leucius is, that the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament, particularly the Goſpels and Acts of the Apoſtles, were then received with diſtinguiſhed reſpect, and regarded as writings of great authority; otherwiſe he would not have thought of publiſhing books under the names of the evangeliſts and apoſtles.

Beſides, theſe forged writings do not oppoſe, but confirm the general account given us in the canonical ſcriptures. They all take for granted the dignity of our Lord's perſon, and his power of working miracles; they acknowledge the certainty of there having been ſuch perſons as Matthew and the other evangeliſts; and Peter and the other apoſtles. They authenticate the general and leading facts contained in the New Teſtament. They preſuppoſe that the apoſtles received from Chriſt a commiſſion

[p] Cum quo conſentiunt fabuloſæ illæ traditiones citatæ in commentariolis quæ ſub Clementis Alexandrini nomine prodierunt ad 1 Joh. i. 1. dum in iis fertur Johannes corpus externum Chriſti tangendo, manum ſuam in profunda miſiſſe, duritia carnis nullo modo ei reluctante ſed locum manui præbente diſcipuli. Cotel. notæ in Ign. Ep. ad Smyrnæ. p. 37. n. 7. Ed. Cleric.*

* I cannot help obſerving here that this epiſtle to the Smyrneans proves that the word δαιμονια was uſed by the primitive Chriſtians for the ſouls of dead men. For Chriſt ſays after his reſurrection to Peter, and thoſe who were with him, handle me and ſee, for I am not δαιμονιον ασωματον, a human ſoul raiſed from the dead without a body. Epiſ. ad Smyr. p. 34. 5. Ed. Cleri. See before ſect. 14. p. 94....97.

to

to propagate his religion, and a ſupernatural power to enforce it's authority. And thus they indirectly eſtabliſh the truth and divine original of the goſpel.

CHAP. XII.

Of APELLES.

PART I. *His Hiſtory.*

SECT. I. *Of his Time.*

APELLES is not in Irenæus nor Clement of Alexandria. Nevertheleſs ſeveral ancient authors have ſpoken of him. He is often mentioned by Tertullian in his books againſt Marcion, and elſewhere. Tertullian publiſhed a treatiſe againſt his [a] followers; but it is not extant. Apelles is alſo mentioned ſeveral times by [b] Origen.

Apelles is ſpoken of by Baſnage [c] in the year 141. Tillemont thinks he lived about [d] the year 180. Cave placeth him [e] at the year 188. As Apelles was acquainted with Marcion, and [f] was an old man in Rhodon's time, who flouriſhed [g] about the year 190, I think we may place him at about 160.

SECT. II. *Of his Connexion with Philumene.*

APELLES was at firſt [h] a diſciple of Marcion; but he made ſome alteration in his ſyſtem, as we are aſſured by ſeveral. Ter-

[a] Et hoc ſuo loco tractavimus. Nam eſt nobis adverſus illos libellus. De Carne Chriſti. c. 8. p. 365. D. vel. 303. Fra. 1597. [b] Et Marciones quidem, et Baſilides, et Valentiniani, et Apelleiani, et Ophitæ, multum a propoſita errant via, qui omnino contraria ſapiunt veritati. Orig. Comm. in Matt. T. 3. p. 852. D.

[c] Ex ſchola Marcionis multæ ſectæ prodierunt: unius autem caput fuit Apelles, a virgine quadam Demoniaca nomine Philumene in errorem inducitur. Ann. Pol. Ecc. An. 141. n. 4. p. 88.

[d] Mem. Ec. T. 2. Les Marcionites, art. x. [e] Hiſt. Lit. T. 1.

[f] Vide Euſeb. H. E. l. 5. cap. 13.

[g] See Credib. vol. 2. p. 304.

[h] Credunt aliqui Marcioni. Sed non eſt diſcipulus ſupra magiſtrum. Hoc et meminiſſe debuerat Apelles Marcionis de diſcipulo emendator. Tertul. adv. M. L. 4. cap. 17. p. 529. A. vel 421, 50.

Quaſi non eadem licentia hæretica et ipſe potuiſſet, aut admiſſa carne nativitatem negare, ut Apelles diſcipulus, et poſtea deſertor ipſius. De Carne Chriſti. c. 1. p. 358. B. vel. 298. 18. Vide et Epiph. H. 44. n. 1..

tullian [i] and others say it was owing to instructions which he received from Philumene, a virgin, who pretended to prophetic illuminations. And it is sometimes said, particularly by Tertullian, that [k] Apelles was guilty of some act of sensuality, contrary to the strictness of the Marcionite institution; but what it was is not clearly [l] said: if it had been fornication, it would have been said plainly. We might therefore be led to think that Apelles had married, but even that is not certain; yea there is some evidence to the contrary, as may appear hereafter.

Sect. III. *No Foundation for the Story of his Incontinence.*

Beausobre says there [m] are good reasons to suspect that story to be false. One reason is the testimony given to Apelles by Rhodon in Eusebius, who says that [n] he was venerable for his age and abstemious course of life. Rhodon, who had a conference with Apelles, and confuted him, would not have spoken thus of a man who lay under the charge of shameful conduct. Secondly, in all probability the woman intended is [o] Philumene, that fanatical virgin who affected to be thought a prophetess, and who, as is said, persuaded Apelles that the Old Testament was not a divine revelation. Thirdly, St. Jerom contents himself with saying that [p] Apelles had Philumene an associate with him in sentiments; without adding any thing else dishonourable

[i] Providerat et tum spiritus sanctus futurum in virgine quadam Philumene angelum seductionis transfigurantem se in angelum lucis, cujus signis et præstigiis Apelles inductus novam hæresim induxit. De Pr. Hær. c. 6. p. 232. C. p. 202. 49.

[k] Si et Apellis stemma retractandum est, tam non vetus et ipse, quam Marcion institutor et præformator ejus. Sed lapsus in feminam, desertor continentiæ Marcionensis, ab oculis sanctissimi magistri Alexandriam secessit. Inde post annos regressus non melior, nisi quá jam tantum non Marcionites, in alteram feminam impegit, illam virginem Philumenem, quam supra edidimus, postea vero immane prostibulum et ipsam, cujus energumenate circumventus, quas ab ea didicit Phaneroses scripsit. De Pr. c. 30. p. 242. B. p. 209. 35. Pervenimus igitur....a Marcione ad Apellem, qui postea quam a disciplina Marcionis in mulierem carne lapsus, dehinc in virginem Philumenem spiritu eversus est. De C. Christi c. 6. p. 362. C. D. p. 301. 10.

[l] Hos subsequitur Apelles, discipulus Marcionis, qui posteaquam in carnem suam lapsus est, a Marcione segregatus est. App. ad Tertull. de Pr. c. 51. p. 254. A. p. 217, 23.

[m] Hist. de Manich. T. 2. p. 78, 79.

[n] Απελλης μεν ο τη πολιτεια σεμνοτατος και τω γηρα. Euf. l. 5. c. 13. p. 177. B.

[o] Tertullian speaks of another woman beside Philumene. Nevertheless Cave too understands this affair to relate to Philumene. Erat Alexandriæ puella, Philumene dicta, quæ a dæmone obsessa mira fecit, et responsa tanquam oracula reddidit....hanc puellam adamavit Apelles, et postea compressit. Cav. H. L. p. 85. I do not need to concern myself about that point. But I think I shew by the considerations which are above, that these are no sufficient proofs that Apelles was guilty of impurity with any woman whatever.

[p] Apelles Philumenem suarum habuit comitem doctrinarum. Ad. Ctes. T. 4. p. 477. Bened.

to the one or the other. In ſhort, Tertullian ſhould not have touched this ſtring. Apelles was as good as Montanus; and Philumene equal to Priſcilla and Maximilla, his propheteſſes.

I beg leave to add that Rhodon and divers other writers who give an account of Apelles, and ſpeak of Philumene as a viſionary woman, and his inſtructreſs, ſay nothing ſcandalous of either. And farther, according to Tertullian himſelf, [q] Apelles, notwithſtanding his differing from Marcion in ſome reſpects, ſtill continued to condemn marriage: which makes me think that Apelles never married; and, therefore, very probably, never did any thing worſe than marrying. Such a behaviour muſt have been loudly cenſured by all eccleſiaſtical writers in general. It could not be omitted by any. For Tertullian's hints relate to ſomething, ſuppoſed to be done after Apelles was become a ſcholar of Marcion; not ſomething done in very early life, but after mature age: which renders it leſs likely to be omitted by any writers of hereſies, if indeed any thing very ſcandalous had been done by him. What therefore is ſaid of Marcion's diſpleaſure againſt Apelles, in all likelihood ought to be underſtood of ſome difference of opinion, and of Apelles having erected a new ſect; and having drawn ſeveral of Marcion's diſciples into his ſcheme, and that by the aſſiſtance of the virgin Philumene, who is often ſpoken of as a woman pretending to inſpiration. To the paſſages already referred to, or quoted, others [r] might be added. But I do not think it proper to put down here the ſilly ſtory about her, as it is in ſome edition of Auguſtine's book of hereſies; eſpecially ſince the Benedictine editors of St. Auguſtine have openly and juſtly declared it to be wanting in the MSS. of that father's works, and a late addition.

SECT. IV. *Unjuſtly accuſed of diſcouraging Enquiry.*

IT is ſometimes ſaid that [s] Apelles was againſt all enquiries concerning things of religion: which ſeems very unlikely. And Epiphanius tells us that Apelles [t] quoted as from the goſpels,

[q] Timotheum inſtruens nuptiarum quoque interdictores ſuggillat. Ita inſtituunt Marcion et Apelles ejus ſecutor. De Pr. c. 33. p. 243. D. p. 210. 39.

[r] Et angelo quidem illius Philumenes eadem voce Apoſtolus reſpondebit....dicens: Etiamſi angelus de cœlis aliter evangelizaverit vobis, quam nos evangelizavimus, anathema ſit. De Carn. Chr. c. 6. p. 362. D. p. 301. 13. Æque—ad energema Apelleiacæ virginis Philumenes filium dirigit. Ibid. c. 24. p. 378. A. p. 311. 21. [s] Fidem denique Chriſtianam examini qualicunque ſubjici noluit. Cav. ibid. [t] Ουτως γαρ, Θησιν, εφη εν τω ευαγγελιω· γινεσθε δοκιμοι τραπεζιται. Χρω γαρ, φησιν, απο πασης γραφης αιαλεγωι τα χρησιμα. Ep. H. 43. n. 2. p. 382. B.

and, as a saying of our Saviour, that advice: *Be ye good money-changers.* Wherefore, says Apelles, we should endeavour to collect what is good from every part of scripture. And Apelles is named by Tertullian [u] among other heretics, who recommended inquisitiveness.

That charge, I suppose, is founded upon [x] Rhodon's account of his conference. The case seems to be this: Rhodon pressed Apelles very hard. Apelles answered, that the knowledge of God was a very difficult thing; that exactness in matters of an abstruse nature was not of the utmost importance. And supposing him to err in some points, yet he hoped he was not in an unsafe condition. Forasmuch as all who believed in Christ crucified would be saved, if they maintained good works. Here is plainly a testimony to the piety, and, I think, to the charitableness of Apelles's principles: though Rhodon, it must be owned, laughs at him, as believing without reason, and in him whom he did not know. Jerom does the same, speaking of [y] Rhodon: but Philaster gives a different turn to that discourse; and understands Apelles to say that [z] he was under no obligation to shew the reasons of his dissent from Marcion, in holding one principle only, whilst he held two. Nor is that interpretation altogether disagreeable to the tenor of Rhodon's account. However, it is very probable that Rhodon thought there was a confusion of ideas in the mind of Apelles.

Sect. V. *Of his Writings.*

Apelles was an author. His book, or books, if there were two, seem to have contained questions upon difficult texts of the Old Testament. This may be argued from a quotation in Ori-

[u] Ubi enim erit finis quærendi?.... Apud Marcionem? Sed Valentinus proponit: quærite, et invenietis. Apud Valentinum? Sed et Apelles hac me pronuntiatione pulsabit. De Pr. c. 10. p. 234. D. p. 204. 23.

[x] Οθεν και εφασκε, μη δειν ολως εξεταζειν τον λογον, αλλ εκαστον ως πεπιστευκε διαμενειν· σωθησεσθαι γαρ τους επι τον εσταυρωμενον ηλπικοτας απεφαινετο, μονον εαν εν εργοις αγαθοις ευρισκωνται· το δε παντων ασαφεστατον εδογματιζετο αυτω πραγμα ....το περι θεου....το δε πως εστι μια αρχη, μη γινωσκειν ελεγεν. ουτως δε κινεισθαι μονον.... μη επισασθαι, πως εις εστιν αγενητος θεος, τουτο δε πιστευειν. Εγω δε γελασας, κατεγνων αυτου· διοτι διδασκαλος ειναι λεγων, ουκ ηδει το διδασκομενον υπ' αυτου κρατυνειν. Ap. Eus. L. 5. c. 13. p. 177, 178.

[y] Apellem senem alium hæreticum a se quondam conventum, et risui habitum, eo quod Deum quem coleret, ignorare se diceret. De V. L. c. 17.

[z] Fuit Apelles discipulus ejus, similia in quibusdam Marcioni prædicans, qui interrogatus a quibusdam, quonam modo de fide sentiret, respondit, non mihi opus est discere a Marcione, ut duo principia adseram coæterna. Ego enim unum principium esse prædico. Philast. H. 47. p. 97. edit. Fabr.

gen

gen [a] relating to Noah's ark, and from another in St. Ambroſe [b] concerning the tree of life in paradiſe. And as it ſeems, he there argued againſt the divine original of the ancient ſcriptures. Both [c] Tertullian and Theodoret [d] intimate that he wrote a book entitled Philumene's Viſions, or Prophecy. The author of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Preſcriptions ſpeaks plainly [e] of two books of Apelles, the Viſions of Philumene, and another, which he calls Syllogiſms. Rhodon ſays that [f] Apelles publiſhed many, or large writings againſt the Law of Moſes.

SECT. VI. *His Country rather uncertain.*

I THINK it is not any where ſaid by Tertullian, or Epiphanius, or any other ancient writer, of what country Apelles was. He firſt became acquainted with Philumene at Alexandria. But that does not appear to have been the place either of his nativity, or ordinary reſidence. Rhodon, who had a conference with Apelles in his old age, was [g] of Aſia. I think it probable therefore that Apelles was of the ſame country likewiſe.

This may ſuffice for the hiſtory of Apelles; let us now obſerve his peculiar principles.

[a] Επιφερει τινες, ει δυναται η τηλικαυτη νεατος χωρησαι και το πολλοστον μοριον των επι γης παντων ζωων, και μαλιστα Απελλης, ο τη Μαρκιωνος γνωριμος, και γενομενος ετερας αιρεσεως παρ εκεινον πατηρ, αθετειν βυλομενος ως ουχ αγια τα μωυσεως γραμματα· τουτο επαφορησας επιφερει, το, ψευδης αρα ο λογος ουκ αρα εκ του θεου γεγραφη. Orig. in Gen. Hom. 2. Tom. 2. p. 6162.

[b] Plerique enim, quorum auctor Apelles, ſicut habes in trigeſimo et octavo tomo eius has queſtiones proponunt. Quomodo lignum vitæ plus operari videtur ad vitam, quam inſufflatio Dei? Ambr. De Paradiſo. c. 5. T. 2. p. 155. 4.

[c] Cujus energumate circumventus, quas ab ea didicit Phaneroſes ſcripſit. De Pr. cap. 30. p. 242. B. 209. 39.

[d] Βιβλιον συνθεις, Φιλουμενης προφητειαν ωνομασε. Theod. H. F. l. 1. c. 25.

[e] Habet præterea privatus, ſed extraordinarias lectiones ſuas, quas appellat Phaneroſeis cujuſdam puellæ, quam quaſi prophetiſſam ſequitur. Habet præterea ſuos libros, quos inſcripſit ſyllogiſmorum, in quibus probare vult, quod omnia quæcunque Moyſes de Deo ſcripſerit, vera non ſint, ſed falſa ſint. De Pr. cap. 51. p. 254. B. p. 217. 35.

[f] Ο γε τοι Απελλης ουτος μυρια κατα του μωυσεως ησεβησε νομου, δια πολειων συγγραμματων τους θειους βλασφημησας λογους. Ap. Euſ. p. 178. B. C.

[g] Euſ. p. 177. A.

Part II. *Of his peculiar Principles.*

Sect. VII. *He believed one first Principle, who created another inferior Deity.*

It has been already hinted that Apelles differed from Marcion in several things: for, as Rhodon says, he [h] believed one principle. Again: 'he [i] held one principle, as our religion 'teaches.'

Epiphanius says more at large: 'Apelles [k] taught that there 'is one God, perfectly good, and one principle, and one power 'ineffable, or without a name; that this holy and good God, 'who is over all, made one other god, who made heaven and 'earth and all things in this world.' I put in the margin [l] that part of Philaster's article of Apelles, which relates to this point. Tertullian often speaks of that inferior deity of Apelles who made the world, who was only a [m] glorious angel and the god of the Jewish people. Nor is that particular omitted by the author [n] of the Additions to Tertullian's Book of Prescriptions.

That inferiour deity, or angel, is spoken of by Tertullian [o] in a passage already transcribed, and by [p] Theodoret, as a fiery being.

[h] Μιαν αρχην ομολογει. Ap. Eus. p. 177. B.

[i] Ελεγε γαρ μιαν αρχην, καθως και ημετερος λογος. Ib. D.

[k] Φασκει γυν Απελλης, και οι απ αυτυ, οτι υκ εισι τρεις αρχαι υτε δυο, ως τοις περι Λυκιανον και Μαρκιωνα εδοξεν. αλλα φησιν εις εςιν αγαθος Θεος, και μια αρχη, και μια δυναμις ακατονομαςος...ο αυτος αγιος Θεος και αγαθος, ο ανωθεν Θεος και αγαθος εποιησεν ενα αλλον Θεον· ο δε γενομενος αλλος Θεος· εκτισε τα παντα υρανον και γην και παντα τα εν τω κοσμω. Hær. 44. N. 1. p. 381. A.

[l] Ego enim unum principium esse prædico, quem Deum cognosco, qui Deus fecit angelos. Fecit etiam alteram virtutem, quem Deum scio esse secundum, qui et virtus Dei est, quæ fecit illum. Hic autem Deus, qui fecit mundum, non est, inquit, bonus, ut ille qui fecit illum. Subjectus autem est Deo illi, a quo et factus est iste, qui et nutui et jussioni et præceptis paret illius in omnibus. Cujus Ariani nunc consortes sunt atque fautores, sic prædicantes atque sentientes. Ph. H. 47. p. 48.

[m] Apelles creatorem, angelum nescio quem gloriosum superioris Dei faceret Deum Legis et Israelis, illum igneum affirmans. De Pr. c. 34. p. 244. B. 211. 7. Sed quoniam et isti Apelleiani carnis ignominiam prætendunt maxime, quam volunt ab igneo illo præside mali....adstructam....Angelum quendam inclytum nominant, qui mundum hunc instituerit, et instituto eo pœnitentiam admiserit. De Carne. Chr. cap. 8. p. 365. D. 303. 15. Futile et frivolum illud corpusculum, quod malum denique appellare non horrent, etsi angelorum fuisset operatio, ut Menandro et Marco placet: etsi ignei alicujus exstructio, æque angeli, ut Apelles docet. Ter. de resur. Carn. c. 5. p. 382. B. 316. 11.

[n] Hic introducit unum Deum....hunc potestates multas, angelosque fecisse, præterea et aliam virtutem, quam dominum dicit, et angelum ponit. Hoc vult videri mundum institutum ad imitationem mundi superioris; cui mundo permiscuisse pœnitentiam, quia non illum tam perfecte fecisset, quam ille superior mundus institutus fuisset. De Pr. cap. 51. p. 254. A. 217. 25.

[o] See above note [m].

[p] Τοις τυ μαρκιωνος αγεννητοις και ετερον προςεθεικε πυριον. Theod. H. F. lib. 1. cap. 25. p. 211. D.

Sect.

SECT. VIII. *Believed that the Difference of Sex depended on the Soul.*

OF that [q] fiery angel bringing souls into bodies Tertullian speaks in a passage which I place below. He likewise affirms that [r] Apelles believed souls to have sexes, or at least that bodies derived their sexes from the souls that animated them.

SECT. IX. *Was not a Docete in Opinion concerning the Body of Christ.*

OF his opinion concerning Christ Epiphanius writes after this manner: 'He [s] also says that in the last times Christ was 'manifested, being the son of the good God and his Holy Spirit. 'He came for the salvation of those who should believe in him. 'Nor was he in appearance only, but had flesh really, though 'not from the Virgin Mary: for, as he descended from the super-'celestial places to this earth, he collected to himself a body out 'of the four elements. Having thus formed to himself a body 'he really appeared in this world, and taught men the know-'ledge of heavenly things. And he says that Jesus was really 'crucified, and afterwards shewed that very flesh to his disci-'ples. As he ascended he returned his body to the elements, 'from which he took it, and returned to heaven.'

That account is very agreeable to Tertullian, who says that 'Apelles [t] and divers of Marcion's disciples left him so far.

[q] Apelles solicitatas refert animas terrenis escis de supercœlestibus sedibus ab igneo angelo, Deo scilicet Israelis et nostro, qui exinde illis peccatricem circumfinxit carnem. De Anima. cap. 23. p. 325. B. 275. 8. See note [m] second passage.

[r] Quoniam et Apelles, non pictor, sed hæreticus, ante corpora constituens animas viriles ac muliebres, sicut ab Philumena didicit. Utique carnem, ut posteriorem, ab anima facit accipere sexum. Ibid. c. 36. p. 339. D. 284. 39.

[s] υιον οντα τȣ αιω αγαθȣ θεȣ, και το αγιον αυτȣ πνευμα...Και ελθοντα ȣ δοκησει πεφηνεναι, αλλα εν αληθεια σαρκα ειληφεναι.... εδωκεν ο χριστος εαυτον παθειν εν αυτω τω σωματι, και εσταυρωθη εν αληθεια, και εδειξεν αυτην την σαρκα τοις εαυτȣ μαθηταις. H. 44 cap. 2. p. 381, 382.

[t] Sed quidam discentes Pontici illius supra magistrum sapere compulsi, concedunt Christo carnis veritatem, sine præjudicio tamen renuendæ nativitatis. Habuerit, inquiunt carnem, dum omnino non natam. Pervenimus igitur...a Marcione ad Apellem, qui posteaquam a disciplina Marcionis in mulierem carne lapsus, dehinc in virginem Philumenem, spiritu eversus est, solidum Christi corpus, sed sine nativitate, suscepit ab ea prædicare....Confitentur vere corpus habuisse Christum. Unde materia? Unde caro, si non nata? De sideribus, inquiunt, et de substantiis superioris mundi mutuatus est carnem. Et utique proponunt, non esse mirandum corpus sine nativitate, cum et apud nos angelis licuerit, nulla uteri opera, in carnem processisse. De Carne Christi. c. 6. p. 362. C. D. 301. 10.

'They

'They allowed that Jesus Christ had flesh truly, though he was 'not born of a woman.' That opinion, as well as most other peculiarities of Apelles, is ascribed [u] to the teachings of Philumene.

He believed then that Christ was not a mere phantom, but had really a body; not born however, but composed and formed to himself out of aereal matter, as he descended from heaven. So Tertullian in the places already cited; as in like manner the [x] author of the Additions to his book of Prescriptions; and as Philaster says, 'according [y] to him Christ had flesh, and that not brought from heaven, as Valentinus, but formed out of the four elements.

In support of that opinion that Jesus was not born, Apelles, as well as others, laid hold of those words of our Lord: *Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?* As Tertullian [z] informs us, and at the same time confutes their reasonings.

In his ascension to heaven Christ restored his body to the stars, or the elements, from whence he had taken it. So Epiphanius, as before quoted and other authors. Thus we have seen the opinion of Apelles concerning Christ. Origen [a] takes notice of a particular which must have been a consequence of rejecting Moses and the ancient prophets, that Apelles said, 'Jesus was 'the only person who ever came from God.'

[u] Nam et Philumene illa magis persuasit Apelli, cæterisque desertoribus Marcionis, ex fide quidem Christum circumtulisse carnem, nullius tamen nativitatis, utpote de elementis mutuatam. Adv. Mar. l. 3. cap. 11. p. 486. A. 391. 13.

[x] Christum neque in phantasmate dicit fuisse, sicut Marcion, neque in substantia veri corporis, ut Evangelium docet. Sed eo quod a superioribus partibus descenderit, ipso descensu fideream sibi carnem et aeream contexuisse: hunc in resurrectione singulis quibusque elementis, quæ in descensu suo mutuata fuissent in ascensu reddidisse, et sic dispersis quibusque corporis sui partibus in cœlo spiritum tantum rediisse. cap. 51. p. 254. A. 217. 29.

[y] Dicit autem Christum in carne apparuisse, non tamen sicut Valentinus de cœlo carnem desumsisse....Sed de quatuor elementis. cap. 47. p. 99.

[z] Sed quoties de nativitate contenditur, omnes qui respuunt eam, ut præjudicantem de carnis in Christo veritate, ipsum Deum volunt negare esse natum, quod dixerit: Quæ mihi mater, et qui mihi fratres? Audiat igitur Apelles, quid jam responsum sit a nobis Marcioni, eo libello quo ad Evangelium provocavimus....Primo quidem nunquam quisquam adnuntiasset illi matrem et fratres ejus foris stare, qui non certus esset, et habere illum matrem et fratres, et ipsos esse quos tunc nuntiabat. De Carne Christi. cap. 7. p. 364. A. B. 302. 11.

[a] Οτι Απελλης...μυθον πυθμενος ειναι τα ιουδαιων γραμματα, φησιν, οτι μονος ουτος επιδεδημηκε τω γενει ανθρωπων....Λεγοντα μονον επιδεδημηκεναι τον ιησουν απο τυ θεου τοις ανθρωποις. Cont. Cels. lib. 5. 54. p. 619. 4. p. 267. Cantab.

SECT. X. *He denied the Reſurrection of the Body.*

EPIPHANIUS adds: 'he [b] denies alſo the reſurrection of the 'dead; and in other things he agrees with his maſter Marcion.' That Apelles denied the reſurrection of the body or the fleſh is very probable; and Tertullian [c] and others [d] confirm the account.

However, Apelles, as we have ſeen, [e] allowed that Chriſt roſe again from the dead. And he ſays [f] he ſhewed that very fleſh in which he had been crucified to his diſciples. Nevertheleſs, that is no proof of the reſurrection of the fleſh, or of the bodies of others, or that any thing beſide the human ſoul ſhould be ſaved. For, according to him, [g] Chriſt was not born, nor was his body like ours, though real and ſolid, or ſubſtantial. His body conſiſted of aereal, etherial particles, not ſuch groſs matter as that of our bodies, of which Apelles had [h] a very low opinion.

I think it worth while to tranſcribe, and place at the bottom of the page, a long paſſage of Jerom [i] relating to this point, which ſome of my readers will ſee with pleaſure.

[b] *Φαντασμα μη ειναι αναστασιν νεκρων.* Ibid. n. 4. p. 383. B.

[c] Partem ejus uſurpat Marcion, et Apelles, et Valentinus, et ii qui ab eis reſurrectionem carnis infringunt. De Pr. H. cap. 33. p. 243. D. p. 210. 37. Vide et de Carn. Chr. cap. 1. p. 358. 298.

[d] Hic carnis reſurrectionem negat.... Animarum ſolarum dicit ſalutem. De Pr. c. 51. p. 254. B. p. 217. 33. Quæ caro mundo reddidit cum ſine carne reſurgens. Auguſt. Hær. 23. Ait etiam poſt paſſionem non carnem ſurrexiſſe ſed de quatuor elementis quæ de mundo acceperat eaque in terram dimiſiſſe ipſum in cœlum ſine carne aſcendiſſe aſſerit. Philaſ. Hær. 41.

[e] See the laſt quotations from Auſtin and Philaſter.

[f] See the preceding note [5].

[g] Satis eſſe debuerat ad probationem carnis humanæ in Chriſto, per defenſionem nativitatis. Sed quoniam et iſti Apelleiaci, carnis ignominiam prætendunt maxime, quam volunt ab igneo illo præſide mali ſolidatis animabus adſtructam, et idcirco adjunctum Chriſto, et idcirco de ſideribus ſubſtantiam competiſſe, debeo illos de ſua paratura repercutere. De Carne Chriſti. c. 8. p. 365. D. p. 303. 14.

[h] Futile et frivolum illud corpuſculum, quod malum denique appellare non horrent,...etſi ignei alicujus exſtructio, æque angeli, ut Apelles docet. De Reſ. Carn. cap. 5. p. 382. B. p. 316. 11.

[i] Dicit Origenes in pluribus locis, et maxime in libro de reſurrectione quarto, et in expoſitione primi Pſalmi, et in Stromatibus, duplicem errorem verſari in Eccleſia; noſtrorum, et hæreticorum...Hæc nos innocentes et ruſticos dicere: hæreticos vero, in quorum parte ſunt Marcion, Apelles, Valentinus,...penitus carnis et corporis reſurrectionem negare, et ſalutem tantum tribuere animæ, fruſtraque nos dicere, ad exemplum domini reſurrecturos, quum ipſe quoque dominus in phantaſmate reſurrexerit: et non ſolum reſurrectio ejus, ſed et ipſa nativitas *τω δοκειν*, id eſt, putative viſa magis ait quam fuerit. Sibi autem utramque diſplicere ſententiam: fugere ſe et noſtrorum carnes, et hæreticorum phantaſmata. Ad Pamm. Ep. 38. [al. 61.] Tom. 4. p. 320. et ap. Orig. T. 1. p. 36. ed. Bened.

Part III. *What Scriptures he received.*

Sect. XI. *In other Matters he generally agreed with Marcion.*

Epiphanius says that in other things Apelles agreed with Marcion. It is therefore somewhat probable that he continued to condemn marriage, as before argued from Tertullian. Nor do I remember that any ancient writers have observed Apelles to have made any alteration in Marcion's scheme upon this head.

We now at length come to his sentiments about the scriptures.

Sect. XII. *Did not pay any great Regard to the Old Testament.*

How far Apelles rejected the Old Testament may be disputed. Rhodon in Eusebius says that [k] Philumene by her visions persuaded Apelles to reject the Old Testament. He likewise tells us [l] that Apelles said that the prophets were full of contrarieties and contradictions, and therefore confuted themselves. Origen, in his books against Celsus, says [m] much the same. But in his comments upon the epistle to Titus, as cited by [n] Pamphilus, he expresseth himself more favourably, and supposeth that there was a good harmony between the supreme God, and him who made the world, and was the god of Israel, and of the law and the prophets. Nor is Philaster [o] very different upon that head. The author of the Appendix to Tertullian's Prescriptions says [p] he rejected the law and the prophets. Moreover it appears from what was before said of the writings of Apelles, that they were designed to shew the difficulties of the Old Testament, if not totally to overthrow its authority.

[k] Τας δε προφητειας εξ αντικειμενης λεγει πνευματος πειθομενος αποφθεγμασι παρθενη δαιμονωσης, ονομα Φιλουμενης. Ap. Eus. p. 177. B.

[l] Εφη, τας μεν προφητειας εαυτας ελεγχειν, δια το μηδεν ολως αληθες ειρηκεναι. ασυμφωνοι γαρ υπαρχουσι και ψευδεις, και εαυτοις αντικειμενοι. p. 178. A.

[m] Οτι ο Μαρκιωνος γνωριμος Απελλης, αιρεσεως τινος γενομενος πατηρ, και μυθους ηγουμενος ειναι τα ιουδαικα γραμματα....κ. λ. Contr. Cels. lib. 4. cap. 54. p. 619. A. Tom. 1. Bened. p. 267. Can.

[n] Sed et Apelles, licet non omnibus modis Dei esse legem deneget et Prophetas, tamen et ipse hæreticus designatur, quoniam Deum, qui hunc mundum condidit, ad gloriam alterius ingeniti et boni Dei eum construxisse pronuntiavit: illum autem ingenitum Deum in consummatione seculi misisse Jesum Christum ad emendationem mundi, rogatum ab eo Deo qui eum fecerat, ut mitteret filium suum ad mundi sui correctionem. Pamph. pro Origin. Ap. ap. Hieron. T. 5. 226. B.

[o] See above, p. 442. note [l].

[p] Legem et Prophetas repudiat. c. 51. p. 254. A. p. 217. 29.

Sect.

SECT. XIII. *His Sentiments about the New Teſtament probably not very different from Marcion's.*

WITH regard to the New Teſtament, as Apelles was a diſciple of Marcion, and ancient writers do not take any particular notice of his diſſenting from his maſter about the canon of the New Teſtament, it may be argued that upon this head the ſentiments of both were much alike. Let us however obſerve a few particulars.

The author of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Preſcriptions ſays that 'Apelles [q] received the apoſtle Paul only, and 'him not entire.' But that muſt be a miſtake, or miſrepreſentation, and deſerves little or no regard. Apelles certainly received ſome goſpel, if not all the goſpels, as well as Paul's epiſtles; though perhaps all of them curtailed and altered after the manner of Marcion.

SECT. XIV. *It is likely that he rejected the Beginning of St. Matthew's Goſpel as well as that of St. Luke.*

As Apelles denied the nativity of Jeſus, it is likely that he rejected the beginning of St. Matthew's goſpel, if he received the other part of it, and alſo thoſe chapters from the beginning of St. Luke's goſpel that Marcion did.

Origen [r], in a letter to his friends at Alexandria, joins Marcion and Apelles together in a cenſure for altering the goſpels and the apoſtle, or both parts of the New Teſtament; though perhaps his words do not neceſſarily imply that Apelles followed Marcion in every alteration of ſcripture. However, as we have only a Latin verſion of that epiſtle, we muſt not be too nice in our remarks.

Tertullian, in a paſſage where he cenſures Marcion, Valentinus, and Apelles, for a wrong uſage of ſcriptures, ſpeaks of Apelles as [s] removing the ancient bounds; though the meaning of that expreſſion is not eaſily determined with exactneſs.

[q] Solo utitur et Apoſtolo, ſed Marcionis, id eſt, non toto. cap. 51. p. 254. B. p. 217. 34. [r] Videte, quali purgatione diputationem noſtram purgavit: tali nempe, quali purgatione Marcion Evangelia purgavit vel apoſtolum, vel quali ſucceſſor ejus poſt ipſum Apelles. Orig. Ep. Tom. 1. p. 6. B.

[s] Ad quos merito dicendum eſt: qui eſtis? quando, et unde veniſtis...Quo denique, Marcion, jure ſilvam meam cadis? Qua licentia, Valentine, fontes meos tranſvertis. Qua poteſtate, Apelles, limites meos commoves. De Pr. cap. 37. p. 245, D. p. 212. 3.

In

In their argument againſt our Lord's nativity, from his ſaying, *Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?* and in Tertullian's anſwer it is ſuppoſed that they did receive a goſpel or goſpels, where that account is recorded. Of this I took notice formerly [t].

Sect. XV. *He treated the Scriptures juſt as Marcion did, by receiving Part, and rejecting what did not ſuit his Purpoſe.*

I add here another paſſage of Tertullian [u] in the margin, relating to the ſame matter, and ſuppoſing, I think, that Apelles treated the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament much after the ſame manner that Marcion did.

Tertullian too mentions an [x] interpretation which the followers of Apelles gave of the loſt ſheep in the parable. In other places he ſuppoſes their reſpect [y] for ſome of St. Paul's epiſtles.

Epiphanius, in his hiſtory of Apelles, and in his confutation of him, quotes freely [z] St. John's goſpel, the Acts of the Apoſtles, [a] and ſeveral of St. Paul's epiſtles. He alſo refers to St. Mark's and [b] the other goſpels. At the ſame time he [c] chargeth him with taking or leaving what he liked: 'which,' he ſays, 'is 'acting like a judge, not like an interpreter of ſcripture.'

[t] See before in the account of Marcion, ſec. 37.

[u] Eodem ſenſu denique et illi exclamationi reſpondit: non matris uterum et ubera negans, ſed feliciores deſignans, qui verbum Dei audiunt. Solis iſtis capitulis, quibus maxime inſtructi ſibi videntur Marcion et Apelles, ſecundum veritatem integri et incorrupti Evangelii interpretatis, ſatis eſſe debuerat, ad probationem carnis humanæ in Chriſto, per defenſionem nativitatis. De Carn. Chriſt. cap. 7, 8. p. 365. D. p. 303. 11.

[x] Cum angelum etiam de figura erraticæ ovis interpretentur. De Carn. Chriſt. cap. 8. p. 366. A. 303. 21.

[y] Vide De Carn. Chriſt. cap. 6. p. 362. D. p. 301. 13. De Pr. H. cap. 33. p. 243. D. p. 210. 33. et paſſim.

[z] H. 44. n. 5. 384.

[a] Ibid. notes 5, 6. p. 386.

[b] Ως εχει και το τω μαρκω Ευαγγελιω, και των αλλων Ευαγγελιστων. Ibid. n. 6. p. 386. C.

[c] Ει δε και α βουλει λαμβανεις απο της θειας γραφης, και α βουλει καταλιμπανεις, αρα γαν κριτης προκαθισαι, ουχ ερμηνευτης των νομων, κ. λ. n. 5. p. 382. D. 385. A.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the SETHIANS.

SECT. I. *Some general Obſervations concerning theſe Heretics, and the Ophites and Cainites.*

TILLEMONT ſpeaks of the Cainites [a] under the article of the Nicolaitans. He joins together [b] the Ophites and Sethians. He ſays 'the heretics called Ophites deſcend, as to their doc-'trine, from the Nicolaitans and Gnoſtics.' They are reckoned not to have appeared till after the Heracleonites and ſome other branches of the Valentinians: therefore we cannot place their riſe before the year 150, nor much later, ſince they were known to Irenæus. So he.

Irenæus, at the concluſion of his firſt book, has two chapters, the firſt of Ophites and Sethians, whom he joins together; the other of the Cainites. The former is long, and he there ſeems to deſign we [c] ſhould think them all ſprung from the Valentinians; and yet in the following chapter of the Cainites, he ſpeaks as if the Valentinians had ſprung from them [d]. A large part of his long chapter of the Ophites and Sethians is very obſcure; for which reaſon I ſhall not attempt to tranſlate or tranſcribe it; but by and by I ſhall take out of it ſeveral particulars.

The [e] Cainites, or Cainiſts, and Ophians, are mentioned by Clement of Alexandria. He gives no diſtinct account of them, but ſays that 'ſome heretics are denominated from their opinions, 'or the objects of their veneration, as the Cainiſts and Ophians.'

Philaſter has three chapters of Ophites, Cainites and Sethians. They are placed by him among the hereſies before Chriſt, and are the very firſt in his catalogue. Nor has he any thing that might lead us to think them Chriſtians; except that in the article of the Sethians he ſays 'they [f] not only ſaid that the Chriſt 'deſcended from Seth, but alſo that he was Seth himſelf.'

[a] Mem. Ec. Tom. 2. p. 47. Paris.

[b] Ibid. p. 288.

[c] Tales quidem ſecundum eos ſententiæ ſunt: a quibus multiplex capitibus fere de Valentini ſchola generata eſt. lib. 1. cap. 30. [al. 34.] n. 15. p. 112. Vide et c. 31. [al. 35.] n. 3. p. 113.

[d] A talibus matribus, et patribus, et proavis, eos quia Valentino fuit, ſicut ipſæ ſententiæ et regulæ oſtendunt eos. cap. 31. n. 3. p. 113.

[e] Αι δε απο υποθεσεων, και ων τετιμηκασιν, ως καιανισται τε και οι οφιαιοι προσαγορευομενοι. Str. lib. 7. p. 765. C.

[f] De Seth autem ipſo Chriſtum Dominum genus deducere aiunt. Quidam autem ex iis non ſolum genus de eo deducere, ſed etiam ipſum Chriſtum eſſe aſſerunt atque opinantur. p. 11, 12.

In Epiphanius, and in Auguſtine, who follows him, the order is Ophites, Cainites and Sethians. The author of the Additions to Tertullian obſerves the ſame order, and has a long article of each. Theodoret joins the Sethians and Ophites, and then has a diſtinct article for Cainites.

Sect. II. *Epiphanius's Account of the Sethians.*

Having given this general view of the moſt ancient catalogues of hereſies, where theſe people are mentioned, I chooſe to begin with the Sethians; and Epiphanius's account ſhall be our text.

He ſays: 'neither the Sethians nor the former hereſy of the 'Cainites are to be met with every where.' He [g] thinks however that he had ſeen ſome of them in Ægypt; but he could not recollect in what part of it.

'The [h] Sethians,' he ſays, 'boaſt that they are deſcendants 'of Seth, the ſon of Adam, whom they mightily extol, ſaying 'that he was an example of righteouſneſs and every virtue. 'They alſo call him Chriſt, and ſay he is the ſame as Jeſus. 'They ſay that the world was made by angels, and not by the 'ſupreme power.' Let us go over theſe things.

Sect. III. *They called themſelves the Deſcendants of Seth.*

They ſaid they were deſcendants of Seth the ſon of Adam. In which there is nothing wonderful; for ſo are all men living ſince the flood. But they boaſted that they were the children of Seth; meaning thereby, probably, that they were the children or people of God, not the children of Cain, who was of the evil one, [i] nor the ſeed of the evil one, or men of the world. In this referring, it is likely, to divers texts in the books of [k] Geneſis and Numbers. For the Sethians [l] being, as ſeems pro-

[g] Ταχα δε οιμαι εν τη των αιγυπτιων χωρα συντετυχηκεναι και ταυτη τη αιρεσει· ου γαρ ακριβως την χωραν μεμνημαι, εν η αυτοις συντετυχον. H. 39. n. 1. p. 284.

[h] Ουτοι...απο Σηθ...σεμνυνονται το γενος καταγειν· αυτον δε δοξαζουσι, και εις αυτον παντα οσαπερ αρετης διαφερει. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 284. B.

[i] 1 John iii. 12.

[k] See Gen. iii. 15. iv. 25. and 26. Numb. xxiv. 17.

[l] Nempe illud 'filii Sethi,' in vaticinio Bileami Num. xxiv. 17. 'Eccleſiam vel 'fideles' notat, quos Meſſias ſuo beneficio ſit ſervaturus. Et 'veluti gallina glocitando ſub alas ſuas convocabit,' fovebitque ac defendet Meſſias 'omnes filios 'Sethi.' Ita enim hæc verba reddenda et explicanda eſſe, ex nexu et ſcopo totius orationis et ſignificatu vocis קדקד cæterarumque verſionum incommodis, Altingius ſolide atque preclare evicit in Locis Parallelis. p. 8, 9. Rhenfordi Diſſ. de Sethianis. n. 6. p. 166. Opp. Philolog. Trajec. ad Rhen. 1722.

bable,

bable, Hebrews by deſcent, and Chriſtians by profeſſion, and well acquainted with the Jewiſh ſcriptures, were oftentimes led to ſpeak of themſelves in this manner. So Rhenford underſtood this, whoſe reaſonings appear to have a great deal of probability [m].

SECT. IV. *They ſpoke of Seth in a very honourable Manner.*

THEY aſcribed all virtues to Seth; nor can any ſay that they did ſo without reaſon.

They likewiſe called him Chriſt, and ſaid he was the ſame as Jeſus. In what they ſaid of Seth it is likely they had a reference to Gen. iii. 15. and iv. 25. But here is probably ſome miſtake, or miſrepreſentation; for, as we ſhall ſee preſently, they ſay Chriſt was deſcended from Seth.

SECT. V. *They aſcribed the Creation of the World to Angels.*

THEY ſaid that the world was made by angels, and not by the ſupreme power. Rhenford is clear that [n] the Sethians, and all Ebionite or Jewiſh Chriſtians, meant no more by this than what Chriſt and his apoſtles do when they ſpeak of the prince of this world, the powers of this world, and the God of this world, and the like.

SECT. VI. *They believed that Jeſus Chriſt deſcended from Seth in an extraordinary Way.*

AFTERWARDS Epiphanius informs us they ſaid that [o] from Seth in a continued ſucceſſion deſcended Jeſus Chriſt, not in the

[m] Id ergo cum non ignorarent hi homines natione Hebræi, profeſſione Nazareni et Chriſtiani, linguæ Hebrææ Syræque callentiſſimi, Catecheſeos veterum patrum, ac ſuperiorum Caballiſticorum minime ignari, filios Sethi ſe profeſſi ſunt, id eſt illius filii et pietatis, quæ quondam in Sethi fuerat, ſtudioſos atque æmulos, id eſt vere fideles, vere Chriſtianos, illorumque beneficiorum, quæ quondam, cum ſuper, tum Num. xxiv. 17. filiis Sethi per Meſſiam promiſſa erant, participes. Ib. n. 3. p. 167.

[n] Unum illud hæreticum ac plane impium videtur, quod 'ab angelis, non a ſuperiori vi, producta eſſe dicunt omnia.' ....Cum Sethiani, cæterique ejuſdem commatis Ebionitæ, per τον δημιουργον η δημιουργος του κοσμου, conditorem conditoreſve mundi,....nihil aliud intellexerint, quam quos Chriſtus et Apoſtoli αρχοντα του κοσμου τουτου, et αρχας και εξουσιας και κοσμοκρατορας του κοσμου τουτου apellant. Ib. n. 31. p. 176. Vide et n. 37. p. 179.

[o] Απο δε του σηθ κατα σπερμα, και κατα διαδοχην γενους ο χριστος ηλθεν αυτος ιησους, ουκ κατα γενη, αλλα θαυμαστως εν τω κοσμω πεφηνως. Ibid. n. 3. p. 286. A.

ordinary way of generation, but after a wonderful manner: which shews they thought Jesus to be the Christ, and that he was born of a virgin.

This will be confirmed by Irenæus. His words are obscure; but I shall put them at the bottom of the page, and translate them as well as I can, somewhat loosely.

'They [p] believe,' says Irenæus, that Sophia, or Wisdom, spake 'by the prophets; and that their predictions were partly fulfilled 'in two men with divine commissions, one born of barren Eliza- 'beth, the other of Mary a virgin: they say that the ap- 'pearing of Jesus was foretold by John, who preached the bap- 'tism of repentance, and baptized Jesus, that the Christ, when 'he descended, might find a pure vessel. That Jesus, being 'born of a virgin by the operation of God, was wiser, more holy, 'and more excellent than all men: that Christ, the companion 'of wisdom, came down upon him, and so Jesus was made the 'Christ. This, they said, was not rightly understood by all 'Christians; and that the truth is, that Christ having come down 'upon Jesus, he immediately thereupon began to work miracles, 'and heal diseases, and preach the true God, and thus manifestly 'to shew himself to be the son of the first man (or the promised 'Messiah); at which the rulers, (or certain powers) being of- 'fended, they contrived to put him to death. And they say that 'the Christ with wisdom then forsook him, but Jesus was cruci- 'fied.

[p] Horum (prophetarum) igitur unusquisque glorificans suum patrem et Deum. Sophiam, et ipsam per eos multa loquutam esse de primo homine....et de illo Christo qui sit sursum quæ a prophetis annuntiabantur....duorum hominum factas esse emissiones: alterum quidem de sterili Elizabetha, alterum autem ex Maria virgine...Cognoscentem autem eam quæ deorsum est Sophiam, descendere ad fratrem ejus, et annuntiasse ejus adventum per Joannem, et præparasse baptismum pœnitentiæ, et ante adaptasse Jesum: uti descendens Christus inveniat vas mundum. Jesum autem, quippe ex virgine per operationem Dei generatum, sapientiorem et mundiorem et justiorem hominibus omnibus fuisse: Christum perplexum Sophiæ descendisse, et sic factum esse Jesum Christum. Multos igitur ex discipulis ejus non cognovisse Christi descensionem in eum dicunt: descendente autem Christo in Jesum tunc coincepisse virtutes perficere, et curare, et annuntiare incognitum patrem, et se manifeste filium primi hominis confiteri. In quibus irascentes principes, et patrem Jesu, operatus ad occidendum eum: et in eo cum adduceretur, ipsum quidem Christum Sophia abstitisse in incorruptibilem Æonem dicunt: Jesum autem crucifixum: non autem obtitum suum (F. eum) Christum sed misisse desuper virtutem quamdam in eum, quæ excitavit eum in corpore....Videntes autem discipuli resurrexisse eum, non eum cognoverunt, sed ne ipsum quidem Jesum, cujus gratia a mortuis resurrexit. ....Confirmare autem volunt descensionem Christi et ascensionem ex eo, quod neque ante baptismum, neque post resurrectionem a mortuis, aliquid magni fecisse Jesum dicunt discipuli....Remoratum autem eum post resurrectionem xviii. mensibus: et paucos ex discipulis suis, quos sciebat capaces tantorum mysteriorum, docuit hæc. Et sic receptus est in cœlum, Christo sedente ad dexteram patris Jaldabaoth. Iren. L. 1. c. 30. [al. 34.] n. 11, 12, 13, 14. p. 111, 112.

'fied. However, the Christ did not forget Jesus, but raised 'him from the dead. Nevertheless, when he was risen his dis- 'ciples did not (at first) know him. And they hence endeavour 'to support their opinion, that Christ came down upon Jesus, 'and then went away from him, as just mentioned: forasmuch 'as that the disciples do not relate him to have wrought mira- 'cles either before his baptism or after his resurrection. He staid 'with his disciples eighteen months: and having in that time 'sufficiently instructed them, especially some of them, he was 'received up into heaven, and Christ sat down at the right hand 'of God.

SECT. VII. *By Christ who descended upon Jesus, they probably meant the Holy Ghost.*

IRENÆUS says they believed that the Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism. It is very likely that by Christ they meant the Holy Ghost. This may be reckoned to be confirmed by Theodoret in his article of Sethians and Ophites, whose[q] words I shall place below. They also said that, upon Jesus being led away to be crucified, the Christ, or wisdom in him, went away, and that Jesus only was crucified. Their meaning probably was, that the divine nature in Jesus did not suffer. They said that Jesus staid with his disciples eighteen months after his resurrection; in which possibly there is some mistake, or misrepresentation. I think that Irenæus is the only person who mentions this: it is not in Epiphanius, or Theodoret, or other ancient writers of heresies. In the main, these Sethians appear to have been good Christians. They believed that Jesus was born of a virgin, and was a most excellent man; that John born of Elizabeth prepared the way for him, and baptized him; that the Holy Ghost descended upon Jesus at his baptism; after which he wrought miracles of healing, and taught true religion, and manifestly shewed himself to be the promised Messiah. They believed that Jesus was crucified, and was afterwards raised from the dead and received up into heaven, where he sat at the right hand of God. And if these were Jewish believers, as is reasonably supposed, it may be argued from their calling themselves by so catholic a denomination as that of Sethians, that they approved of the vocation of the Gentiles: though possibly, for themselves, they

[q] Θηλυ δε το πνευμα καλουσι, και τοις στοιχειος επιφερεσθαι· ερασθηναι δε φασι τον πρωτον [illegible], και τον δευτερον, της ωρας του πνευματος, και παιδοποιησαι φως, ο καλουσι χριστον. H. F. L. 1. p. 204. C.

obſerved circumciſion, and other rites of the law, ſo far as they could in the places where they lived.

Theodoret alſo confirms the account, that [r] they believed Jeſus to have been born of a virgin, and that the Chriſt came down upon him from heaven.

Sect. VIII. *An Account of what Books they uſed.*

Let us now ſee what books they had and made uſe of. 'They have,' ſays Epiphanius, 'certain books written by themſelves, with the names of great men affixed to them: ſeven books of Seth, and others; another of Abraham, which they call his Revelation, and others with the name of Moſes,' Afterwards Epiphanius ſpeaks [s] of other books called the Jubilees, and another book called the Little Geneſis, in which were the names of Cain's and Seth's wives.

But poſſibly the books called The Seven Books of Seth, were not aſcribed to him as the author; but only contained an account of his being the ſeed obtained after the death of Abel, and choſen to uphold religion in the world, with reflections upon the ſtate of things on this earth in his time. The books were called not from the author of them, but from their ſubject. This [u] was the opinion of Mr. Rhenford.

The book called Abraham's Revelation, probably was not aſcribed to him as the author, but rather contained only an account of his faith, [x] or the covenant made with him, and the promiſes delivered to him.

[r] Τον δε ιησουν αλλον λεγουσι παρα τον χριστον· και τον μεν ιησουν εκ της παρθενου γεγενησθαι, τον δε χριστον εξαισθεν εις αυτον καταβηναι. H. F. L. 1. c. 14. p. 205. C.

[s] Βιβλους δε τινας συγγραφουσιν εξ ονοματος μεγαλων ανδρων. Εξ ονοματος μεν σηθ επτα λεγοντες ειναι βιβλους· αλλας δε βιβλους ετερας αλλογενεις ουτω καλουσιν· αλλην δε εξ ονοματος Λαμεχαμ, ην και αποκαλυψιν φασκουσιν ειναι....ετερας δε εξ ονοματος του Μωυσεως, και αλλας αλλων. H. 39. n. 5. p. 286. C.

[t] Ως δε εν τοις ιουδαικοις ευρισκεται, τη και λεπτογενεσει καλουμενη. κ. λ. Ibid. n. 6. p. 287. B.

[u] Quid vero in eo ſit vitii, haberi libros Sethi de nomine inſcriptos. Impudentia, inquis, et mendacium, quod libros a ſe conſcriptos Setho attribuant. At unde conſtat, Setho ab illis attribui? Satis illis cauſa erat, cur libros illos Sethi et αλλογενων nomine vocarent, quod in illis de Setho, ejuſque doctrina, vita, et rebus geſtis: de ſemine item alio, de filiis Sethi eorumque civitate, jure, legibus et beneficiis ageretur: etſi libros ipſos ad Sethum tanquam ſcriptorem non referebant. Nempe facile eſt ad intelligendum, eundem qui in eccleſia ſcholave doctrinam illam de filiis Sethi tradere ſolebat, eandem etiam dignam judicaſſe, quam literis etiam conſignaret, libroſque illos, ita uti dicebat, ab ipſo argumento inſcripſiſſe, vocaſſeque libros Sethi, vel filiorum Sethi, vel αλλογενων, vel ſi qua alia ratione ipſi lubitum fuerit. Ibid. n. 43. p. 184.

[x] Eadem itaque ratione hos Sethianos, quos et divinorum oraculorum, et veterum traditionum Judaicarum callentiſſimos fuiſſe undique elucet, &c. Ibid. n. 28. p. 174.

The

The books with the names of Moſes might [y] be his Pentateuch in Hebrew, which the gentile Chriſtians did not underſtand; who likewiſe uſed and preferred the Septuagint verſion.

I can ſay nothing particularly of the book called the Jubilees, and the Little Geneſis. But it may be reaſonable to think that all theſe books, compoſed by the Sethians, who ſeem to have been Hebrew believers, contained explications of ſome parts of the books of Moſes; and were deſigned to ſupport their faith in Jeſus, and juſtify their embracing the Chriſtian revelation, by the literal or myſtical ſenſe of their ancient writings: though, poſſibly, ſome of the arguments made uſe of might be weak, and their traditions falſe and ill-grounded.

SECT. IX. *What Scriptures they received.*

THERE can be no queſtion made but the Sethians reſpected the books of the Old Teſtament. Irenæus takes particular notice of [z] it. We can likewiſe perceive by the long paſſage tranſcribed from him above, that they received the goſpels of Matthew and Luke, and particularly the firſt chapters of both: where there is an account of the birth of John the Baptiſt, and of Jeſus, and John's baptiſm and miniſtry. They received probably all the goſpels and the Acts, and moſt other books of the New Teſtament. This may be argued from the clear knowledge they appear to have had of our Lord's miracles, death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion to heaven. It is plain it was not one goſpel only that was received by them, but ſeveral; for, as Irenæus aſſures us, they inſiſted upon it that the diſciples had related none, or few miracles, done by Chriſt, before his baptiſm, or after his reſurrection: which manner of ſpeaking ſhews that they referred to more goſpels than one.

[y] Deinde vero et illud notandum, Sethianos, de quibus hactenus egimus, fuiſſe credentes ex Judæis, quibus illa exempla cum ex lectione Legis notiſſima erant, tum a ſuis maxime doctoribus, Apoſtolis, inquam, circumciſionis, de novo ſerio et ſolicite fuerant inculcata. Ibid. n. 62. p. 191.

[z] Sic autem Prophetas diſtribuunt: huius quidem Jaldabaoth Moyſen fuiſſe, et Jeſum Nave, et Amos, et Abacuc: illius autem Jaho, Samuel, et Nathan, et Jonam, et Michæam: illius autem Sabaoth, Hebiam, et Joel, et Zachariam: illius autem Adonei, Eſaiam et Ezechiel, et Jeremiam, et Daniel: illius autem Eloi, Tobiam, et Aggæum: autem Horei, Michæam, et Nahum: illius autem Aſtaphæi, Heſdram, et Sophoniam. L. 1. c. 30. n. 14. p. 3. Vide et n. 19.

CHAP. XIV.

Of the CAIANS, or CAINITES.

SECT. I. *Some Account of the Accuſations brought againſt them from Epiphanius and Irenæus.*

'THE Caians, or Cainites,' ſays [a] Epiphanius in his Summary, 'extol Cain, ſaying he was from the ſuperior power. They 'pay divine honours to Judas, Core, Dathan, and Abiram, and 'the people of Sodom.'

In his Panarium, the heretics [b] called Caians from Cain, whom they greatly reſpect and call their father, ſay that he was from the ſuperior power, Abel from the weaker. They eſteem alſo [c] Eſau, Core, and the people of Sodom, whom they call their kindred. They [d] reckon Judas likewiſe among their kindred, and aſcribe to him a wonderful knowledge of things. And they have among them a book which they call the Goſpel of Judas: they have alſo ſome other like books. And they [e] ſay that 'in 'order to be ſaved men muſt run through a courſe of all man-'ner of iniquity, like the Carpocratians.' Epiphanius proceeds to relate more [f] to the ſame purpoſe; and afterwards adds: 'they 'have [g] alſo forged a book with the name of Paul the apoſtle, 'called his Aſcenſion, filled with myſteries of iniquity.' Their pretence for it is taken from what he writes, 2 Cor. xii. 4. Afterwards: 'Judas,' they ſaid, 'was [h] induced to betray Jeſus 'from the heavenly knowledge he had obtained. The princes 'were aware that if Jeſus was crucified their power would be 'weakened; Judas therefore haſtened to betray him for our ſal-'vation: for which reaſon he ought to be honoured, becauſe 'he had procured for us the ſalvation which is by the croſs of 'Chriſt, and the heavenly knowledge obtained thereby.'

[a] Τον και δοξαζουσι...Αμα δε και ιουδαν εκθειαζουσιν, ομου τε και τους περι Κορε και Δαθαν και Αβειρωμ, αλλα και τους σοδομιτας. Anacep. [b] p. 229. D.

[c] H. 38. n. 1. p. 276. A. B. C.

[d] Και τουτον γαρ θελουσιν ειναι συγγενη εαυτων, και εν γνωσεως υπερβολη τον αυτον καταριθμουσιν· ωστε και συνταγματιον τι φερειν εξ ονοματος αυτου, ο ευαγγελιον του ιουδα καλουσι. Ibid. D. [e] Και μη δυνασθαι φασι σωθησεσθαι τινα, εαν μη δια παντων χωρησωσιν, ως και ο Καρποκρατης λεγει. Ib.

[f] Ibid. n. 2. p. 277. A. B.

[g] Ibid. C. [h] αγαθον αυτον ειπα παρεδωκε κατα την επιφανειαν γνωσιν· εγνωσαν γαρ, φησιν, οι αρχοντες, οτι εαν ο χριστος παραδοθη σταυρω, κενειται αυτων η δυναμις. Και τουτο, φασιν, γινως ο ιουδας επιστευσε, και παντα εκινησεν, ωστε παραδουναι αυτον, αγαθον εργον ποιησας ημιν εις σωτηριαν. Και δει ημας επαινειν...οτι δι αυτου κατεσκευασθη ημιν η του σταυρου σωτηρια, και η δια ταυτης υποθεσεως των ανω αποκαλυψις. Ibid. n. 3. p. 278. B. C.

Irenæus

Irenæus gives the like account of the wickedneſs of this people and of the goſpel of Judas. Epiphanius undoubtedly borrowed from him. His [i] words will be placed below.

SECT. II. *Obſervations tending to ſhew the Incredibility of theſe Accounts.*

THESE are the accounts left us of theſe men. But can they be true? It ſeems not. For, firſt, the wickedneſs aſcribed to thoſe men is incredible. It is not eaſy to conceive, that any number of men calling themſelves Chriſtians ſhould honour Cain, and Core, and Judas, and all thoſe who lie under juſt condemnation in the ſcriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament for the moſt notorious wickedneſs [k].

Secondly, the account is inconſiſtent, therefore overthrows itſelf. It is not poſſible that men ſhould be extremely wicked in practice and in principle, and at the ſame time be concerned about the ſalvation that is by the croſs of Chriſt, and honour [l] Ju-

[i] Alii autem rurſus Cain a ſuperiore principalitate dicunt, et Eſau, et Core, et Sodomitas. Et omnes tales cognatos confitentur....Et hæc Judam proditorem diligenter cognoviſſe dicunt, et ſolum præ ceteris cognoſcentem veritatem, perfeciſſe proditionis myſterium....Et confictionem proferunt hujuſmodi, Judæ Evangelium illud vocantes....Nec enim aliter ſalvari nos, niſi per omnia eant, quemadmodum et Carpocrates dixit. Et in unoquoque peccatorum et turpium operationum angelum adſiſtere, et operantem....id quod fiat ei operationi angeli nomine dicere: 'O tu, angele, abutor opere tuo: O tu, 'alia poteſtas, perficio tuam operationem.' Et hoc eſſe ſcientiam perfectam, ſine timore in tales abire operationes, quas ne nominare fas eſt. lib. 1. cap. 30. [al. 35.] n. 1, 2. p. 112, 113.

[k] Eujuſmodi vero homines, quales Epiphanius nobis hic deſcribit, unquam alicujus numero extitiſſe, et cœtum ſectamque conſtituiſſe, id adeo nullam veri ſpeciem habet, ut fidem omnem ſuperare videatur. Tametſi enim primis Chriſtianiſmi temporibus ſceleratiſſimi flagitioſiſſimique quidam homines in Eccleſiam irrepſerunt, Petro Judaque teſtibus; tamen nobis non eſt verisimile, tanta illos et tam immani impudentia fuiſſe, ut cum Chriſtiani, ſi non certe videri vellent, cum hiſtoriam Cain reliquorumque iſtorum ſcelerum noſſent,...ut inquam ſe illorum ſocios publice profiteri, et gloriari voluerint, et a bipedum omnium nequiſſimis ſimul atque miſerrimis, generis ſui atque originis deducere commendationem. Rhenf. de Sethian. cap. 61. p. 191.

[l] Nec non etiam erupit alia quoque hæreſis, quæ dicitur Cainæorum. Et ipſi quidem magnificant Cain, quaſi ex quadam potenti virtute conceptum,....procreatum...Hi qui hoc adſerunt, etiam Judam proditorem defendunt, admirabilem illum et magnum eſſe memorantes, propter utilitates quas humano generi contuliſſe jactatur. Quidam enim ipſorum gratiarum actionem Judæ propter hanc cauſam reddendam putant. Animadvertens enim, inquiunt, Judas, quod Chriſtus vellet veritatem ſubvertere, tradidit illum, ne ſubverti veritas poſſet. Et alii ſic contra diſputant et dicunt: quia poteſtates hujus mundi nolebant pati Chriſtum, ne humano generi per mortem ipſius ſalus pararetur, ſaluti conſulens generis humani, tradidit Chriſtum, ut ſalus, quæ impediebatur per virtutes, quæ obſiſtebant ne pateretur Chriſtus, impediri omnino non poſſet: et ideo per paſſionem Chriſti non poſſet ſalus humani generis retardari. Ter. de Pr. c. 47. p. 251. B. C. Simul et Judam traditorem divinum aliquid putant, et ſcelus ejus beneficium deputant: aſſerentes eum præſciſſe, quantum eſſet generi humano Chriſti paſſio profutura, et occidendum Judæis propterea tradidiſſe. Aug. H. 18.

das

das for his love of truth, and solicitous concern for the salvation of the world and the general good.

Thirdly, the rise of this denomination of the Cainites may be accounted for another way, without making a particular sect. It might arise from the Sethians [m]. They who called themselves by that name, and extolled their ancestor Seth, could not well avoid declaiming against Cain. And they might sometimes say of those in a different course of life from themselves, that they acted as if they were the children of Cain, who was of the evil one; and seemed to shew themselves kindred of Core, and Dathan, and even Judas himself.

Sect. III. *That the Denomination Cainites arose from a Way of speaking among the Sethians, rendered probable by Passages from Scripture and other Writings.*

After the same manner speak Peter and Jude in their epistles, of some wicked Christians: *cursed* [n] *children, which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness. And* [o] *woe unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.* They are also reminded by the same sacred writers of the [p] judgments on the fallen angels, the old world that was drowned by the flood, and the overthrow of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah.

This will be much confirmed from what the Sethians are represented by Epiphanius and some [q] others to have said of two men, or two sorts of men, which I shall now take somewhat at large.

[m] Cum enim Sethianorum antistites Sethum....auditoribus suis vitæ Christianæ, et pietatis virtutisque omnis exemplar ad oculos ponerent: vix fieri potuisse, quin per Antithesin Caini aliorumque impietatem, et horrendas quas passi sint pœnas exposuerint. Quemadmodum vero iidem se suosque 'Sethi filios' appellabant, quod vestigia fidei et pietatis Sethi premerent,... ita quoque eos, quos Judas 'viam Caini' ingressos ait, eodem jure 'filios Caini' dicere potuerunt...Ita et in reliquis illis exemplis fecerit, atque identidem ingeminarit: qui his illis moribus sunt, illos re ipsa declarare, et quasi publice profiteri, se non Sethi, sed Sodomæorum, Esavi, Coræ, Bileami, Judæ denique proditoris, filios, fratres, affines esse. Unde quotusquisque non perspiciat atque intelligat, quam facile illorum doctrina ab imperitis quibusdam doctoribus, maxime Gentilibus, eo accipi potuerint, quo putarint esse peculiarem quandam sectam ejusmodi,... qui professi sint, se Cainitas, Sodomitas, Esavitas esse, et si quæ alia infamia et æternis tenebris damnata nomina in sacris literis legantur. Rhenf. de Sethian. n. 63, 64, 65. p. 192, 193. V. n. 65. p. 192, 193. Vide et n. 63, 64.

[n] 2 Pet. ii. 14, 15. [o] Jude 11.

[p] 2 Pet. ii. 4, 8. and Jude v. 5, 6.

[q] Vide Iren. lib. 1. cap. 30. [al. 34.] n. 8, 9, 10.

The

'The Sethians,' says [r] Epiphanius, 'agree with the former 'hereſy of the Caians in this reſpect. They ſay there are two 'men repreſented by Cain and Abel; the latter was ſlain by 'Cain. Nevertheleſs [s] the higher power from above, which 'they call mother, prevailed. For knowing that Abel was 'killed, ſhe procured the birth of Seth, and put her power in 'him; that is, a divine [t] principle, and ſpark from above; 'whereby he became the choſen ſeed, and was diſpoſed to 'righteouſneſs and all virtue. Hereby the ſeed of Seth was 'from the beginning ſeparated from the other race. But in 'proceſs of time, they ſay, the ſeed of Cain and Abel (or Seth) 'mingling together, wickedneſs prevailed in the earth. The 'mother from above looking down and ſeeing this, ſhe deter-'mined to ſecure a holy ſeed: accordingly ſhe brought on the 'flood, and deſtroyed all mankind in general; that for the fu-'ture there might be in the world a pure, holy, and righteous 'race of men only in the family of Seth. Nevertheleſs, Ham, 'a child of the evil angels, clandeſtinely got into the ark. For 'eight ſouls were ſaved therein, ſeven of which were of the good 'race. But Ham being alſo preſerved, who was one of the 'other race, from thence ſprang error, ignorance, inconſider-'ation, and by degrees all manner of wickedneſs; till [u] at length 'the world was become as wicked and diſorderly as before the 'flood. But from Seth by a continued ſucceſſion, though not in 'the ordinary way, but in a wonderful manner, deſcended Jeſus 'the Chriſt, who dwelled among men, ſent from the mother 'above; that is, being born of a virgin, and anointed for his 'office by the Holy Spirit of God, whom the Sethians ſpoke of 'as the mother of all.' So Epiphanius; and to the like [x] pur-

[r] H. 39. n. 2, 3. p. 284, 286.

[s] Κεκρατηκεναι δε την ανω δυναμιν ην μητερα φασκουσι, και θηλειαν. p. 284. D.

[t] Και τον σηθ θειαν τινα δυναμιν ειναι φασι. Theod. p. 205. B.

[u] Και ουτως ο κοσμος εις το αρχαιον της αταξιας αυθις απεκλυσθη, και επλησθη κακων, ως εξ αρχης προ τα κατακλυσμου. Απο δε του σηθ κατα στειχ. κ. λ. p. 286. A.

[x] Sed et illo hæreſis proceſſit, quæ dicitur Sethoitarum. Hujus perverſitatis doctrina hæc eſt: duos homines ab angelis conſtitutos, Cain et Abel: propter hos magnas inter angelos contentiones et diſcordias exſtitiſſe; ob hanc cauſam illam Virtutem quæ ſuper omnes virtutes eſt, quam matrem pronuntiant, dum Abel interfectum dicerent, voluiſſe concipi et naſci hunc Seth, loco Abelis, ut evacuarentur angeli illi...Permixtiones enim dicunt angelorum et hominum iniquas fuiſſe: ob quam cauſam illam Virtutem, quam (ſicut diximus) pronuntiant matrem, ad vindictam etiam cataclyſmum inducere, ut et illud permixtionis ſemen tolleretur: et hoc ſolum ſemen, quod eſſet purum, integrum cuſtodiretur. Sed enim illos qui ſeminis illos prioris inſtituiſſent, occulte et latenter, et ignorante illa matre Virtute, cum illis octo animabus in arcam miſiſſe etiam Cham, quo ſemen malitiæ non periret, ſed cum cæteris conſervatum, et poſt cataclyſmum terris redditum, exemplo cæterorum excreſceret, et effunderetur, et totum orbem et impleret et occuparet. De Præſ. cap. 47. p. 251. C. D.

poſo

pose the author of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions, whom I transcribe largely below.

Sect. IV. *There never was a Sect of Christians who called themselves Cainites, or who professed the Principles above described.*

This then having been a common way of speaking among men, especially among the Sethians, I think it may be questioned whether there ever was a sect of Christians, or number of men, who called themselves Cainites, and professed the principles abovementioned. But some evil men were represented as children of the evil one, and as resembling Cain and other bad men mentioned in the scriptures. Hence some who were willing enough to multiply heresies took occasion, or by mistake were led, to talk of a sect with that denomination.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Ophians, or Ophites.

Sect. I. *The Ophians are said by Irenæus and Theodoret to be the same with the Sethians.*

We come next to the Ophians, which are joined with the Sethians by Irenæus and Theodoret in the same chapter, as was observed formerly. And Theodoret says at the beginning of his chapter that 'it [a] was the opinion of some that the Ophians 'were the same with the Sethians.' If so, we have already seen the opinions of these people. They believed Jesus to have been born of a virgin, and to be the Christ, and other things before spoken of the Sethians. The opinions of each are represented together by Irenæus and Theodoret, as common to both. Consequently the Ophites, according to this view of the matter, were Hebrew believers, or Jewish Christians, as well as the Sethians, and were one and the same people, or sect, under different titles and denominations; called Sethians from their frequently speaking of themselves as descendants of Seth, and the children of God; and Ophians from some other particular tenet,

[a] Οἱ δὲ σηθιανοὺς οἱ ὀφιανοὺς ἢ ὀφίτας τινὲς ὀνομάζουσιν. H. F. l. 1. c. 14. p. 204. B.

net [b], or manner of underſtanding, and explaining ſome texts, and perhaps applying them to the Meſſiah.

SECT. II. *Very different Repreſentations given of theſe People by Epiphanius and others.*

HOWEVER it muſt be acknowledged that theſe people are repreſented in a very different light by ſome authors; let us therefore ſee what other ancient writers ſay of them.

'The Ophites,' ſays [c] Epiphanius in his Summary, 'have a 'veneration for the ſerpent; they eſteem him the ſame as Chriſt, 'and keep a real ſerpent in a cheſt.'

In his Panarium itſelf he ſays that [d] the Ophites have ſprung from the Nicolaitans and Gnoſtics, and former ſects. They are called Ophites from the reſpect which they ſhew to the ſerpent. They ſaid the [e] ſerpent was the occaſion of all the knowledge which men had obtained, and therefore [f] they ſhewed him great honour. He again ſays they [g] have a real ſerpent in a cheſt; and ſpeaks of other things that ſeem not to deſerve to be mentioned. He adds that 'beſide [h] other texts of ſcripture, they 'inſiſted upon the account of Moſes erecting a brazen ſerpent, 'recorded in Numb. xxi. 8, 9. and alſo John iii. 14, 15.'

I put in the margin Auguſtine's [i] article almoſt entire; and alſo [k] a large part of the article in the Additions to Tertullian's book of Preſcriptions; where we are again aſſured that they

[b] Id quod proxima diſſertatione Ophitarum exemplo oſtendemus, qui et ipſi Sethiani fuerunt, uti quidem Theodoretus narrat: vero cum non tantum vaticinia et hiſtorias Vet. T. docte atque eleganter exponerent, ſed et typos, atque inter alios illum de ſerpente æneo, Num. xxi. ex mente Chriſti Joh. iii. 14, 15. et Cabbaliſtarum dextre interpretarentur, nomen meruerunt. Rhenf. de Sethian. c. ult. p. 193.

[c] Οφιται εισιν, οι τον οφιν δεξαζοντες, και τουτον τον χριστον κηρυσσοντες. Εχοντες δε φυσει τον οφιν εν κιστη τινι. p. 229. D.

[d] H. 37. n. 2. p. 268. A.

[e] Λεγοντες, οτι ουτος αρχη γεγονε γνωσεως τοις ανθρωποις. n. 3. p. 270. B.

[f] Δεξαζεσιν αυτον δια την τοιαυτην γνωσιν. n. 5. p. 272. A. [g] Ibid. A.

[h] Φερουσι δε και αλλας μαρτυρας λεγοντες, οτι και μωυσης εν τη ερημω τον οφιν τον χαλκουν υψωσε. κ. λ. n. 8. p. 273. C.

[i] Ophitæ a colubro nominati ſunt: hunc autem Chriſtum arbitrantur. Sed habent etiam verum colubrum aſſuetum eorum panes lambere, atque ita eis velut euchariſtiam ſanctificare. Quidam dicunt iſtos Ophitas ex Nicolaitis ſive Gnoſticis exſtitiſſe, et per eorum fabuloſa figmenta ad colubrum colendum fuiſſe perventum. Aug. H. 17. [k] Acceſſerunt his hæretici etiam illi, qui Ophitæ nuncupantur. Nam ſerpentem magnificant in tantum, ut illum etiam ipſi Chriſto præferant. Ipſe enim, inquiunt, ſcientiæ nobis boni et mali originem dedit. Hujus animadvertens potentiam et majeſtatem Moyſes, inquiunt, æreum poſuit ſerpentem. Et quicumque ipſum aſpexerunt, ſanitatem conſecuti ſunt Ipſe, aiunt præterea, Chriſtus in Evangelio ſuo imitatur ſerpentis ipſius ſacram poteſtatem, dicendo: et ſicut Moyſes exaltavit ſerpentem in deſerto, ita exaltari oportet filium hominis. Ipſum introducunt ad benedicenda euchariſtia ſua, &c. &c. De Pr. cap. 47. n. 250. C. D.

argued

argued from the forementioned places of the book of Numbers, and St. John's gospel.

Sect. III. *Origen's Account of the Ophians, with some Observations thereon.*

Let us now see what Origen says of the Ophians in his time. Of him we have hitherto made no use in our inquiries concerning this and the two foregoing heresies; but he has some things about Ophians that may by no means be overlooked.

Upon occasion of some things in Celsus, Origen says that 'they[l] who are called Ophians, are so far from being Christians, 'that they are as ready to calumniate Jesus as Celsus himself. 'Nor would they admit any one into their society without his 'first cursing Jesus.' And presently afterwards he says that 'they[m] glory in one Euphrates as their master.' In another place he says that 'so[n] far from owning Jesus for God, or Sa-'viour, they do not allow him to be master, or the Son of God.' Nevertheless, possibly Origen might be mistaken here. I choose not to lay much stress upon a passage of Origen's Latin Commentaries of St. Matthew, where[o] the Ophians are mentioned with divers Christian heretics; for it may have been added to the original by the translator, or by some body else since. But I shall take notice of several things concerning these persons in his books against Celsus. That heathen writer had objected to the Christians the divisions which there were among them. Origen answers that 'it[p] was perhaps likely Celsus had heard of 'some sects who had not the very name of Christians; as of the 'Ophians and Caians, or some such other people who had en-'tirely forsaken the Christian doctrine. But,' says he, 'that is 'no disparagement to the Christian religion.' Here Ophians are mentioned with Caians, who are generally supposed to have been Christians. And it was not uncommon with catholic writers to say of heretics that they did not agree with them so much as in name. This passage therefore might rather incline us to think they were Christians by profession, or a Christian sect.

[l] ....και μη προτερον προσιεσθαι τινα επι το συνεδριον εαυτων, εαν μη αρας βηται κατα τȣ ιησȣ. Contr. Cels. lib. 6. p. 652. A. Bened. [m] Ibid. C.

[n] Ibid. p. 654. D. [o] Et Marciones quidem, et Basilides, et Valentiniani, et Apelleiani, et Ophitæ, multum a proposita errant via. In Matt. Tom. 3. p. 852. D. Bened. [p] Δοκει δι μοι ο κελσος εγνωκειαι τινας αιρεσεις μηδε τȣ ονοματος τȣ ιησȣ κοινωνουσας ημιν· ταχα γαρ περιηχητο περι των καλȣμενων οφιανων, και των καιανων, και ει τις αλλη τοιαυτη εξ ολων αποφοιτησασα τȣ ιησȣ ανεστη γνωμη. κ. λ. lib. 3. p. 455. D.

He

He speaks of them to the like purpose in another place, saying that 'they [q] are far removed from the true Christian doctrine 'held by sound Christians.' Again: 'Celsus directs [r] his dis-'course to all Christians in general; when what he says can be 'applied to none but such as are altogether estranged from the 'doctrine of Jesus; as the Ophians, who reverence him, as we 'said before, and some others.' Which too might be said of a Christian sect that was supposed to be very erroneous. Moreover, he speaks of the Ophians as ascribing to the serpent the knowledge which men had; the same which is said of them by others, who reckoned them a Christian sect. Farther, Celsus referred to a diagram, which Origen procured; and he says he supposeth it [s] to belong to the Ophians. But in that diagram are expressions which probably belong to Christians; for they speak 'of [t] 'the Father and the Son,' and the 'living Word;' and pray again and again that the 'grace of the Father may be with 'them;' not to mention any other expressions. They are also afterwards represented by Origen as invoking seven angels, or God under seven names; most of them certainly Hebrew, and, as [u] Origen owns, taken out of the scriptures; several of which also are to be found in Irenæus's chapter of the Sethians and Ophites, as Jaldabaoth, Jao, Sabaoth, Æloæus, Adonæus, Astaphæus, Horæus; which makes me think they were Christians, but still very much attached to Judaism. And when Origen says that they would not admit any into their society without cursing Jesus, it seems to me that he then took them for unbelieving Jews; whereas they were indeed Jews by birth, or Hebrews, but Christians by religion and profession. And in divers of his passages before quoted, he seems to me to speak of them as a Christian sect, but very erroneous, and so absurd in their opinions, as not to deserve the name of Christians. However, I apprehend that Origen had a very imperfect knowledge of the sentiments of these men.

As for what is said of them by some, that they thought the serpent to be Christ, it must be a mistake. The truth is, they thought the brazen serpent in the wilderness to be a type or figure of Christ. As for worshipping the serpent, and keeping

[q] Lib. 6. p. 656. C. D.

[r] Εξης δε τοις εξετασθεισιν ο κελσος ως [illegible] παντας χριστιανους αποτεινει λογον, ον [illegible] προς τους παντη αλλοτριους της ιησου διδασκαλιας ομολογουντας ειναι ει αρα λεγειν [illegible]. Οφιαιοι γαρ (ως και εν τοις ανωτερω [illegible]) τον ιησουν εξ ολων αρνουμενοι. κ. λ. [illegible] p. 358. Cant. p. 722. C. D. Bened.

[s] Lib. 6. p. 648. C. D. 653. D.

[t] Ενθεν ειλικρινης πεμπομαι, φωτος ηδη μερος υιου και πατρος· η χαρις συνεστω μοι, ναι, πατερ, συνεστω. p. 654. D...εργοι τελειον υιω και πατρι· η χαρις συνεστω μοι, ναι, πατερ, συνεστω...λογω ζωντι. p. 653. A. B. Bened.

[u] Ibid. p. 657. A.

a living

a living ſerpent in a cheſt, and bringing him out to partake of, or conſecrate the Euchariſt, they are mere calumnies. And their having a living or real ſerpent in a cheſt, is mentioned by none but Epiphanius, and Auguſtine and Damaſcenus his followers. That ſtory is not in Irenæus, nor Philaſter, nor Theodoret, nor the Additions to Tertullian's book of Preſcriptions.

Note by the Editor of the former Edition.

THESE Ophians can ſcarce be conſidered as Chriſtian heretics. This appeared to me to be the caſe when I was completing the hiſtory of the Baſilidians. I had accordingly mentioned it as my opinion at the end of Book II, chap. 2, ſect. 27, p. 303. But, by the advice of a learned friend, I omitted it there leſt it ſhould be deemed premature; becauſe it repreſented them in a different manner from that in which Dr. Lardner himſelf afterwards conſidered them.

If they were a Chriſtian ſect, of which I am ſtill doubtful, they were certainly very erroneous in their opinions. The Simonians, who are by many regarded as Chriſtian heretics, appear to me in the ſame point of view with the Ophians.

The following quotations from Origen are the grounds of my opinion with reſpect to both theſe ſects. Dr. Lardner, however, did not conſider them in the ſame light in which they ſtrike me. Perhaps he may be right. With the utmoſt deference therefore to his ſuperior judgment, I will juſt give the ſubſtance of what I had inſerted in the place before referred to, and leave it to the reader to follow which of the two opinions appears to be beſt founded.

The Simonians, Origen tells[a] us, would never confeſs Jeſus to be the Son of God. Simon was probably an impoſtor, who wanted to overturn the whole Chriſtian doctrine. So alſo, according to him, was Euphrates, the father[b] of the Ophites or Ophians; they were ſo far from being Chriſtians, that they ſpoke againſt Jeſus as much as Celſus himſelf; and would not admit any one into their ſociety, till he had pronounced curſes againſt him.

[a] Ουδαμως τον Ιησουν ομολογουσι υιον Θεου Σιμωνιανοι. Contra Celſum. lib. 5. p. 272. Spencer. Opp. T. 1. 625. Benedict.

[b] Και Οφιανοι καλουμενοι, τοσουτον αποδεουσι του ειναι Χριστιανοι, ωστε ουκ ελαττοι Κελσου κατηγορειν αυτους του Ιησου. Και μη προτερον προσιεσθαι τινα επι το συνεδριον εαυτων, εαν μη αρας δηται κατα του Ιησου. Contra Celſ. lib. 6. p. 294. Spen. Opp. Tom. 1. p. 652. A. Bened. See alſo note [p], p. 462, of this chapter. Δοκει δε κ. τ. λ.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Of ARTEMON.

SECT. I. *Of his Opinions.*

ARTEMON, [a] called alſo Artemas, ſays Theodoret, agrees with us in acknowledging the ſupreme Deity, and owning him to be the Creator of the univerſe. But he ſaid that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was a mere man, born of a virgin, and ſuperior in virtue to the prophets. He ſaid that this was the doctrine of the apoſtles, perverting the ſenſe of the ſacred ſcriptures, and affirming that ſince the time of the apoſtles ſome had taught the divinity of Chriſt without reaſon.

SECT. II. *He founded them on Scripture, and paid a Regard to it's Authority.*

HERE we ſee at once what was Artemon's doctrine, that he founded it upon the ſcriptures, and owned the authority of the apoſtles.

I formerly [b] gave a particular account of the work of an anonymous author againſt the followers of Artemon, ſuppoſed to have been written about the year 212. Theodoret agrees mightily with him. The deſign [c] of the firſt paſſage, tranſcribed from that work, and found in Euſebius, was to ſhew the novelty of that [d] opinion, that our Saviour was a mere man: whereas they ſaid that 'all the ancients, and even the apoſtles themſelves, re-'ceived and taught the ſame things which they now held; and 'that the truth of the goſpel had been preſerved till the time of 'Victor, the thirteenth biſhop of Rome; but by his ſucceſſor 'Zephyrinus, the truth had been corrupted.'

[a] Και αρτεμων δε τις, ον τινες αρτεμαν ονομαζουσιν, τα μεν κατα τον των ολων θεον ταις απασιν ημιν εδοξασεν, αυτον ειρηκως και του παντος ποιητην· τον δε κυριον ιησουν χριστον ανθρωπον ειπε ψιλον, εκ παρθενου γεγενημενον, των δε προφητων αρετη κρειττονα. ταυτα δε και τους αποστολους ελεγε κεκηρυχεναι, παρεγμενευων τω θειων γραφων την διανοιαν, τους δε μετ εκεινους θεολογησαι τον χριστον ουκ οντα θεον. H. F. lib. 2. cap. 4. p. 220. B. C.

[b] Vol. ii. p. 379....385.

[c] Ibid. p. 381.

[d] Την γαρ τοι δεδηλωμενην αιρεσιν, ψιλον ανθρωπον γενεσθαι τον σωτηρα φασκουσαν, ου προ πολλου ο νεωτερισθεισαν διευθυνων, κ. λ. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28. p. 195. C.

Sect. III. *Several others held the same Opinions.*

That author speaks of several who seem to have been much of the same opinion with Artemas. Their names are [e] Theodotus the tanner, Asclepiades, or Asclepiodotus, and Theodotus the banker: also Hermophilus, and Apollonius, or Apollonides, not to say any thing of Natalis: that author brings some charges against these men, as corrupting the scriptures, which were considered formerly; there is no occasion to repeat what was then said, but I beg leave to refer my readers to it [f].

Eusebius himself says that [g] it was Artemon's opinion which Paul of Samosata had endeavoured to revive. The bishops of the council of Antioch speak [h] to the like purpose, as does Epiphanius [i]: all which seems to shew that Artemon was then an Unitarian of no small note; though Epiphanius has no particular article for him, and he be quite omitted by Philaster and Augustine. Artemas is mentioned by [k] Alexander bishop of Alexandria. He would have it that Arius followed him.

Sect. IV. *Of the Time when he lived.*

Tillemont thinks that [l] Theodotus the tanner or currier, preceded Artemon; and perhaps it might be so: but as they must have lived both about the same time, and Theodoret speaks first of Artemon and then of Theodotus, and as the book of the anonymous author beforementioned was entitled An Argument against the Heresy of Artemon, though he there mentions several others, I have chosen this order without designing to determine which had the precedence in time. However, it must be owned that that author says Theodotus the tanner was the author of that opinion. And possibly the reason of his entitling his work against the heresy of Artemon was, that he was then living, and had promoted the doctrine of his late predecessors

[e] Vol. ii. p. 382, 383.

[f] Ibid. p. 383....385.

[g] Τουτων εν τινος σπουδασματι κατα της Αρτεμωνος αιρεσεως πεποιημενων, ην αυθις ο εκ Σαμοσατων Παυλος καθ' ημας ανανεωσασθαι πεπειραται. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 28. p. 195. C.

[h] See before in this work, vol. iii. p. 88. and Eus. H. E. lib. 7. cap. 30. p. 282. B. C.

[i] Ibid. p. 633. and Ep. Har. 65. p. 608. A.

[k] ουκ αγνοειτε οτι η εναγχος επαιαρασα την Εκκλησιαστικην ευσεβειαν διδασκαλια Ευνομιου εστι και Αρτεμα.....τα εκεινων κεκραμενα μοσχευματα, Αρειοστε και Αχιλλας, και των συν αυτοις ποιηρεομενων συνοδος. Apud. Theodorit. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 15. B. C.

[l] See his article of the Theodotiens, et Melchisedeciens. Mem. E. Tom. 3.

with

with some remarkable success. Tillemont supposeth that Artemon arose about the year 200.

CHAP. XVII.

Of THEODOTUS.

SECT. I. *Of his Time and Opinions.*

THEODOTUS of Byzantium, called the tanner, flourished, according to Cave, about the year 192. Basnage speaks of him at the year 187. I have[a] already given a distinct account of the work of an anonymous writer against Artemon, supposed to have been published about the year 212, where this Theodotus is mentioned: he, and Eusebius who transcribes him, suppose him to have held the same opinion with Artemon, who said that [b] Jesus Christ was a mere man. And moreover that author[c] asserts him to have been the first who taught that opinion, and says[d] he was excommunicated by Victor.

SECT. II. *Passages from ancient Authors concerning him.*

EPIPHANIUS's Summary is to this effect: 'The[e] Theodotians are so called from Theodotus a tanner of Byzantium. 'He was well acquainted with Greek learning. Having been 'taken up with several others in the persecutions of that time, 'when they endured martyrdom, he alone fell. Being often 'reproached upon that account, he bethought himself to say 'that Christ was only a man, that he might be no longer charged 'with having denied God.'

What Epiphanius here says of Theodotus's learning is very suitable to what the forementioned author[f] says of this party of men in general.

[a] See Vol. ii. p. 379...385.

[b] Ψιλον ανθρωπον γενεσθαι. Eus. H. E. lib. 5. cap. 28. p. 195. C.

[c] Τοι της αιρεσεως ταυτης ευρετην. p. 196. B.

[d] Βιχτωρ απεβαλλε Θεοδοτον τον της αιρεσεως. κ. τ. λ. Ibid.

[e] Θεοδοτιανοι, οι απο τȣ Θεοδοτȣ σκυτεως τȣ απο Βυζαντιȣ, ȣτος εν παιδεια Ελληνικη γεγονεν ακρος, αμα δε αλλοις τισιν εν ημεραις τȣ τοτε γενομενȣ διωγμȣ μονος εκπεσων, εκεινων μαρτυρεσαντων, δια το ονειδιζεσθαι, επινοησας ψιλον ανθρωπον λεγειν τον χριστον, ινα μη υπο εγκλημα γενηται Θεον αρνησαμενος, ȣτως εδιδαξεν. Anac. p. 397. No. 8. B. C.

[f] Γεωμετριαν επιτηδευȣσιν...Ευκλειδης γȣν παρα τισιν αυτων φιλοποιως γεωμετρειται. Αριστοτελης δε και Θεοφραστος θαυμαζονται. Γαληνος γαρ ισως υπο τινων και προσκυνειται. κ. τ. λ. Eus. Ecc. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 28. p. 197. C.

I shall by and by have occasion to make long extracts out of the larger article of Epiphanius, which I would willingly put together. I therefore proceed immediately to transcribe some other authors.

Theodoret only says [g] that 'Theodotus the tanner of Byzan-'tium was of the same opinion with Artemas; but nevertheless 'was the leader of another party. He was excommunicated by 'Victor bishop of Rome, as corrupting the true doctrine of the 'church.' He then tells the story concerning Natalis, formerly taken [h] notice of.

I shall transcribe in the margin the article [i] of the author of the Additions to Tertullian's Prescriptions. He tells the like story that Epiphanius does of Theodotus's fall in the time of persecution. He says his opinion was that Christ was a man born of a virgin, and that he exceeded other men in the superiority of his virtue.

Philaster, [k] beside other things, gives the like account of this Theodotus's fall; as does [l] Augustine also. But he does not speak positively of it, only that it was so reported.

This Theodotus is also mentioned by Jerom [m]. We find him likewise in the fragment against Noches, ascribed to Hippolytus [n]; but he says nothing very material.

Sect. III. *He is accused of denying Christ in a Time of Persecution.*

In his larger article Epiphanius says 'he [o] does not know 'whether any of that heresy were then subsisting; but he will 'relate what he has met with in any writings concerning them.'

[g] Και Θεοδοτος δε ο Βυζαντιος ο σκυτευς ταυτα τουτω σεφρονικως, ετερας ηρησατο φατριας. τουτον δε ο τρις μακαριος Βικτωρ, ο της Ρωμαιων επισκοπος, απεκηρυξεν, ως παραχαραξαι σπειραντα της εκκλησιας τα δογματα. H. F. lib. 2. cap. 5. p. 220.

[h] Vol. ii. p. 382.

[i] Accedit his Theodotus hæreticus Byzantius, qui posteaquam Christi pro nomine comprehensus negavit, in Christum blasphemare non destitit. Doctrinam enim introduxit, qua Christum hominem tantummodo diceret, Deum autem illum negaret: ex spiritu quidem sancto natum ex virgine, sed hominem solitarium atque nudum, nulla alia præ cæteris nisi sola justitiæ auctoritate. cap. 53. p. 254. D.

[k] Post hos Theodotus quidam Byzantinus genere, denegator Christi Dei nostri in persecutione extitit Salvatoris, qui cœpit dicere, docens ita communis homo erat, ut omnes homines, Christus. Hær. 50. p. 14. Tom. 4. La Bigne. Paris 1624.

[l] Quod dicitur idem Theodotus propterea docuisse, quia in persecutione lapsus isto modo se casus sui devitare putabat opprobrium, si non Deum negasse, sed hominem videretur. H. 33.

[m] Numquid non possum tibi totam veterum scriptorum seriem commovere:.... qui adversus Ebionem, et Theodotum Byzantinum, Valentinum, hæc eadem sentientes, plena sapientiæ volumina conscripserunt? Adv. Helvid. p. 141. M.

[n] Vide Hipp. ex Ed. Fabr. P. 2. p. 7. n. 3.

[o] Και ει μεν υπαρχει η Αιρεσις επι αυτα αγνοουμεν. Hær. 54. n. 1. p. 463. A.

He

He then ſays that 'Theodotus was of Byzantium, afterwards 'called Conſtantinople, a [p] tanner by trade, but very learned.' After which he adds: 'in [q] ſome perſecution, he does not know 'what, he and many others were apprehended by the governor 'of the city. And all the reſt, when examined, bore a noble 'teſtimony to Chriſt, and obtained a heavenly crown; but he 'denied Chriſt. Not being able to endure the reproaches 'which were caſt upon him in his own country, he went to 'Rome, where meeting with ſome of his acquaintance, who 'putting him in mind of his fall, ſaying, "it was ſtrange that "a man of ſo much knowledge ſhould deny the truth:" he 'made a poor apology for himſelf, ſaying that he had only de-'nied a man. After which he always avowed that doctrine, that 'Jeſus was a mere man, born of a man.'

SECT. IV. *Two Obſervations on what Epiphanius ſays of him.*

HERE are two things obſervable, firſt, the fall of Theodotus, mentioned by him alſo before, and by ſome others: but Epiphanius did not know when it happened, or in what perſecution, nor have any others ſpecified it. This miſcarriage does not appear to have been mentioned by the anonymous author againſt Artemon, largely cited by us [r] formerly. If that ſtory had been in his work, Euſebius would certainly have taken notice of it: nor is it mentioned by Theodoret.

Secondly, Epiphanius charges Theodotus with teaching that Jeſus was born in the ordinary way, as other men are; which is not ſaid by others, and is contrary to the author of the Additions to Tertullian's Preſcriptions, who ſays his doctrine was that Jeſus was born of a virgin. Moreover, Theodoret ſays his opinion was the ſame with that of Artemon, who held that Jeſus was born of a virgin.

SECT. V. *The Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament were received by him.*

EPIPHANIUS then proceeds to obſerve ſome of the arguments by which Theodotus and his followers endeavoured to ſupport their doctrine: and here he will be of great uſe to us; he will let us know what texts they chiefly inſiſted upon, and what ſcriptures they made uſe of.

[p] Σκυτευς την τεχνην, πολυμαθης δε τω λογω. Ibid. [q] Ουκ οιδα ειπειν εν οποιω λογω. Ibid. 13. [r] Vol. ii. p. 379....385.

The first text which he mentions, is [s] John viii. 40. *But now ye seek to kill me, a man that has told you the truth, which I have heard of God.* Theodotus argued likewise, as Epiphanius says, [t] from Matt. xii. 31, 32. He also argued, says our author, [u] from what the law says of Christ in this manner, Deut xviii 15. *The Lord will raise up unto you a prophet of your brethren, like unto me.* Wherefore, says he, the Christ raised up of God was not God, but man. For he was to be one of them, and a man, as Moses was; whereby we see that Theodotus received the Old Testament. Again, he argued that Christ was a man from [x] Is. liii. 3. *A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.*

If Epiphanius may be relied upon, he argued from [y] Luke i. 35, which seems to shew that Theodotus did not think Christ was born as other men are. He also insisted upon [z] Acts ii. 22, *A man approved among you by signs and wonders:* and on [a] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

Epiphanius in his argument against this doctrine, by way of confutation, quotes and argues [b] from the beginning of St. John's gospel, and from [c] ch. viii. 56, 58; and from [d] Matt. xi. 27, and Luke x. 22, in answer to an argument brought by Theodotus from Jeremiah xvii. 9, [e] and from [f] Acts vii. 56, and from [g] Rom. i. 4. Gal. iv. 4. 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.

[s] Οτι φασιν, ο κυριος εφη· νυν δε ζητειτε με αποκτειναι ανθρωπον....ορας φησιν οτι ανθρωπος εστιν. Adv. Hær. 54. n. 1. p. 463. D. [t] Ο λεγων λογον εις τον υιον τȣ ανθρωπȣ αφεθησεται. Ibid. n. 2. p. 464. A. B. [u] Και παλιν δε ο αυτος θεοδοτος φησι· και νομος περι αυτȣ εφη· Προφητην εκ των αδελφων υμων εγερει κυριος, ως εμε. n. 3. p. 464. D. [x] Ησαιας περι αυτȣ εφε οτι ανθρωπος εστιν, ȣτως ειπον, ανθρωπος ειδως φερειν μαλακιαν, και ειδομεν αυτον εν πληγη. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. n. 5. p. 466. C.

[y] Ειτα, φησι, και αυτο το ευαγγελιον εφη τη μαρια· Πνευμα κυριȣ επελευσεται επι σε. κ. λ. n. 3. p. 465. A.

[z] Αλλα φησιν ειπον οι αποστολοι, ανδρα αποδεδειγμενον εις υμας σημειοις και τερασιν· και ȣκ ειπον, Θεον αποδεδειγμενον. Ibid. n. 5. p. 467. B.

[a] Παλιν δε προφασιζεται λεγων. οτι εφη περι αυτȣ ο Αποστολος, οτι μεσιτης Θεȣ και ανθρωπων Χριστος Ιησȣς. Ipid. n. 6. p. 467. C.

[b] Οτι δε ανωθεν εστιν ελθων ο λογος, Ιωαννης σαφηνισας την τȣ Αγγελȣ Ευαγγελικην φωνην λεγει. Εν αρχη ην. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. n. 3. p. 465. C. D.

[c] Επειδαν δε εστιν προ τȣ Δαβιδ και προ τȣ Αβρααμ....φησιν Αβρααμ γαρ, ο Πατηρ υμων επιθυμησε ιδειν την ημεραν μȣ και ειδε και εχαρη. ειτα αυτων θαυμαζοντων και λεγοντων, πεντηκοντα ετη ȣπω εχεις, και τον Αβρααμ εωρακας; ελεγχων Θεοδοτον και τȣς απιστȣς και επαρνησιθεȣς Ιȣδαιȣς εφη, αμην αμην λεγω υμιν, οτι προ Αβρααμ εγω ειμι. Ibid. n. 5. p. 467. A.

[d] Επειδαν γαρ ȣδεις οιδε τον υιον οι μη ο Πατηρ. κ. τ. λ....ȣδεις ȣν γνωσεται αυτον εαν μη αυτω αποκαλυψη. Ibid. n. 4. p. 466. B. [e] Παλιν Θεοδοτος λεγων, οτι και ο Ιερεμιας περι αυτȣ εφη, οτι ανθρωπος εστι και τις γνωσεται αυτον. Ibid. n. 4. p. 466. A.

The argument used by Theodotus is founded on a mistaken translation in the LXX. who read ואנש as if it was a substantive signifying man; whereas it is a participle, and signifies being in an incurable desperate state. But if it was a right translation, no argument to his purpose can be drawn from thence.

[f] Ελεγχη δε παλιν, ο Θεοδοτε, οτι παλιν οι αυτȣ Αποστολοι εν αυταις ταις πραξεσιν εφησαν, ως ο μακαριος Στεφανος φησιν· ιδȣ ορω τον ȣρανον ανεωγμενον, και τον υιον τȣ ανθρωπȣ εστωτα εν δεξια τȣ Θεȣ. Ibid. n. 5. p. 467. B. [g] Ει δε δι ȣ τα παντα, και ημεις εις αυτον, ȣκ αρα ψιλος ανθρωπος ειη. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. n. 6. p. 467. C. D.

From

From all which it is manifeſt that this Theodotus and his followers received the ſcriptures of the Old and the New Teſtament, as other Chriſtians did.

SECT. VI. *There were ſeveral of the ſame Name in the ſecond Century.*

THERE were in the ſecond century ſeveral others of this name:

Firſt, A Valentinian. Cave in his account of Theodotus the tanner, aſcribes to him all the opinions which he has [h] collected out of the oriental doctrine, ſubjoined to the works of Clement of Alexandria; but that is confounding things as different and oppoſite as can well be. Theodotus the tanner is reckoned among thoſe who did not allow Jeſus to have exiſted before his nativity of Mary; which is very different from the ſentiments repreſented by Cave from the above named work: and yet Fabricius [i] ſeems to have been of the ſame opinion with Cave. Tillemont perceived that [k] the Theodotus mentioned in theſe extracts was a Valentinian. Beauſobre had no doubt of it; and ſays he [l] flouriſhed about the year of our Lord 130.

Second, Theodotus, a Montaniſt, mentioned by Euſebius [m] in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

Third, Theodotus the banker, mentioned by the anonymous author largely quoted by us long ago; where he is expreſsly ſaid to [n] be a diſciple of Theodotus the tanner.

SECT. VII. *Theodotus the Banker generally ſuppoſed to be the Author of the Sect of the Melchiſedechians.*

THIS Theodotus is now [o] generally ſuppoſed to have been the author of the ſect of the Melchiſedechians. And Theodoret [p] expreſsly ſays as much. But Epiphanius [q] does not appear

[h] Hæreſis vero Theodotianæ capita (qualia in excerptis ejus hodie reperiuntur) ſumma fere hæc fuerunt. Chriſtum a Patre ante mundum conditum, creatum eſſe, &c. H. L. P. 1. p. 87. p. 52. Gen. 1720. [i] Vide Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 107. [k] Mem. Ecc. T. 3. Les Theodotiens. Init. [l] Hiſt. de Manich. T. 1. p. 420. et T. 2. p. 163.

[m] L. 5. c. 3. p. 168. A. et 16. p. 181. D.

[n] See before, Vol. ii. p. 382.

[o] See Tillem. T. 3. as before.

[p] Ἡρξε δε της αιρεσεως ταυτης αλλος θεοδοτος, αργυροπωλοιος την τεχνην. H. F. L. 2. c. 6. p. 221. [q] Μελχισεδεκιανους; παλιν ετεροι εαυτους καλουσιν, αποσπασθεντες ταχα απο των θεοδοτιανων καλουμενων. H. 55. in. p. 468. B.

to have had any knowledge of it. They both ſeem [r] to have thought thoſe whom they call Melchiſedechians a branch of the Theodotians, followers of Theodotus the tanner. Poſſibly there never was any ſuch ſet of men. But ſome Catholics, from ſome compariſons occaſionally made by the Theodotians, or others, between Jeſus and Melchiſedec, imagined a diſtinct ſect, and gave it ſuch a name as they ſaw fit.

I place at the [s] bottom of the page, the article in the Additions to Tertullian, though ſomewhat long. Auguſtine's article [t] of the Melchiſedechians is ſhort. He knew nothing of the author of this ſect, as Epiphanius had not mentioned him in his Summary. Nor indeed has Epiphanius any where mentioned Theodotus the banker: for, as obſerved above, he ſuppoſed the Melchiſedechians to be a branch of the followers of Theodotus the tanner, or ſeparated from them into a new ſect, called Melchiſedechians. Nor does Philaſter make any mention of Theodotus the banker; though he has two [u] chapters of opinions concerning Melchiſedec, and one of them longer than uſual.

Epiphanius ſays not very much diſagreeing from Theodoret, or the author of the Additions to Tertullian, that [x] the Melchiſedechians thought Melchiſedec to be a great power [y] in high places, and greater than Chriſt: becauſe Chriſt is ſaid to have been made a prieſt after the order of Melchiſedec. Pſ. cx. 4. And they endeavoured to ſupport their opinion from what is ſaid by Paul of Melchiſedec in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, vii. 3. *Without father, without mother.*

Epiphanius afterwards mentions divers opinions among Chriſtians concerning Melchiſedec. And perhaps he might as properly have made a diſtinct hereſy of each one of them, as he has done of this.

[r] Τους δε μελχισεδεκιανους τμημα μεν ειναι των Θεοδοτου Φασι, καθ εν δε μονον διαφερειν, το τον μελχισεδεκ δυναμιν τινα και θειαν και μεγιστην υπολαμβανειν, κατ εικονα δε αυτου γεγενησθαι. Theodo. Ibid. et conf. Epiph. note 5.

[s] Alter poſt hunc Theodotus hæreticus erupit, qui et ipſe introduxit alteram ſectam, et ipſum hominem Chriſtum tantummodo dicit ex ſpiritu ſancto, ex virgine Maria conceptum pariter et natum: ſed hunc inferiorem eſſe quam Melchiſedec, eo quod dictum ſit de Chriſto: Tu es ſacerdos in æternum, ſecundum ordinem Melchiſedec. Nam illum Melchiſedec præcipuæ gratiæ cœleſtem eſſe virtutem: eo quod agat Chriſtus pro hominibus, deprecator et advocatus ipſorum factus: Melchiſedec facere pro cœleſtibus angelis et virtutibus. Nam eſſe illum uſque adeo Chriſto meliorem, ut apator ſit, ametor ſit, agenealogetus ſit, cujus neque initium, neque finis comprehenſus ſit, aut comprehendi poſſit. Cap. 53. p. 254, 255. 218. 5.

[t] Melchiſedeciani Melchiſedec ſacerdotem Dei excelſi, non hominem fuiſſe, ſed virtutem Dei eſſe arbitrantur. H. 34.

[u] Vide H. 52. p. 106. H. 144. p. 312. 318.

[x] H. 55. n. 1. [y] Ειναι δε αυτον και εν ακατονομαστοις τοποις. Ibid. 468. B.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of HERMOGENES.

SECT. I. *Of his Time and Country.*

CAVE ſpeaks of Hermogenes at [a] the year 170. Baſnage [b] at 168, as does [c] Le Clerc alſo. Tillemont ſays he [d] muſt have appeared before the end of the reign of Marcus Antoninus, who died in the year 180, about which time I likewiſe chooſe to place him. Tertullian ſeveral times ſpeaks of him [e] as a late heretic, or then living; and joins one Nigidius with him.

Baronius [f] and Du Pin [g] ſay he was of Africa. On the other hand, Valeſius [h] and Pagi [i] argue that there is no more reaſon to think that Hermogenes was of Africa, becauſe Tertullian wrote againſt him, than that he was of Aſia, becauſe Theophilus did the like. Nevertheleſs Baſnage [k] is inclined to think he was of Africa; for Tertullian deſcribes [l] his employment and actions as if he was no ſtranger to him: and Philaſter [m] and Auguſtine [n] ſuppoſe that he taught in Africa. The firſt of which arguments undoubtedly is of ſome weight; for Tertullian writes, as if he was well acquainted with his way of living: but whether what Auguſtine and Philaſter ſay deſerves much notice, I cannot tell, becauſe they do not ſeem to have had an exact knowledge of Hermogenes. I put in the margin a note [o] of Fabricius upon Philaſter.

[a] H. L. T. 1. p. 74. [b] A. 168. n. 5.
[c] H. E. p. 722, 723. [d] Mem. Ec. T. 3. Hermogene. [e] Hermogenis autem doctrina tam novella eſt, denique ad hodiernum homo in ſeculo. Adv. Herm. c. 1. p. 265. 335. C. Cæterum et Nigidius neſcio quis, et Hermogenes, et multi alii, qui adhuc ambulant pervertentes vias Domini, oſtendant mihi. Præſc. c. 30. p. 222. D. p. 106. [f] A. D. 170. n. 11.
[g] Bib. T. 1. p. 98. [h] Annot. ad Euſ. L. 4. c. 24. [i] A. 168. n. 5.
[k] Ubi ſupra.
[l] Vide Adv. H. c. 1. p. 335.

[m] Unde et Sabelliani poſtea ſunt appellati, qui et Patripaſſiani et Praxiani,.... et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Africa. H. 54. p. 108.

[n] Et Hermogeniani vocari ab Hermogene potuerunt: qui Praxeas et Hermogenes eadem ſentientes in Africa fuiſſe dicuntur. H. 41.

[o] Ex Philaſtrio Hermogenem in Sabellii contubernio referunt Auguſtinus et auctor Prædeſtinati. Sed Tertullianus, qui ſingulari opere errorem Hermogenis de materiæ æternitate confutavit, de Hermogenis patripaſſianiſmo, &c. Fabric.

SECT.

Sect. II. *What Authors say of him, and by whom he is omitted.*

Hermogenes is not in Irenæus. Possibly he had not appeared when Irenæus wrote; or at least not long before: for which reason he might be totally ignorant of him. Nor is Hermogenes in Epiphanius. He is also omitted in the Appendix to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions. Nor has Philaster, or Augustine, a distinct article for him. They only speak of him in their chapters concerning Sabellius, before taken notice of. However, they mention one [p] Hermias, together with Seleucus; who by some may be thought to be the same as Hermogenes. But Philaster calls them [q] Galatians. And in Augustine these are placed in a late order, after all the heresies mentioned by Epiphanius, and are entirely taken by him from Philaster. In my account of Hermogenes therefore I shall make little or no use of those articles. Hermogenes is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerom in their accounts of the works of Theophilus of Antioch: of which I took notice [s] formerly. But our main intelligence concerning Hermogenes must be received from Tertullian.

Sect. III. *Some Account of him, and those who wrote against him*

However as a summary may be of use, I shall here put down that of Theodoret, which is to this purpose. Hermogenes [t] taught, that God made the world out of matter, which was coeternal with him; for the foolish man thought it not possible for God to make all things out of nothing. He also taught that our Lord's body was deposited in the sun, and that the devil and dæmons would be again resolved into matter. Against him wrote Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, and Origen.

We still have a treatise of Tertullian against the heresy of Hermogenes. And he refers to another work against him [u] concerning the origin of the soul, not now extant.

[p] Ap. Philast. H. 55. p. 109. 112. Ap. Aug. H. 59. [q] Quæ est hæc vanitas Galatarum, Seleuci et Hermiæ, hæreticorum? p. 109. [s] See before, Vol. ii. p. 191. [t] Ὁ δὲ....ἐξ ὑποκειμένης ὕλης καὶ συναϊδίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἔφη δημιουργῆσαι τὰ πάντα· ἀδύνατον γὰρ ὑπέλαβεν ὁ ἐμβρόντητος καὶ τῶ θεῶ τῶν ὅλων, ἐκ μὴ ὄντων δημιουργεῖν. Οὗτος τὸ κύριον τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῶ ἡλίω εἶπεν ἀποτεθῆναι· τὸν δὲ διάβολον καὶ τὰς δαιμόνας εἰς τὴν ὕλην ἀναπεθήσεσθαι. H. F. L. 1. c. 19. [u] Vide de Anima. cap. 1. p. 304. B. p. 639.

Sect.

SECT. IV. *He was ſkilled in Painting, and was originally a Chriſtian.*

WE learn from Tertullian that Hermogenes [x] was ſkilled in painting. Whether he practiſed it as a trade, or for his diverſion only, may not be quite certain from Tertullian's expreſſions; but that he was a painter by profeſſion is ſomewhat probable. It ſeems likewiſe that Hermogenes was originally a Chriſtian. For Tertullian does not ſay that he brought over his principles from heatheniſm, but that of [y] a Chriſtian he became a philoſopher and a ſtoic. We may conclude that [z] Hermogenes was not only learned and ingenious, but likewiſe virtuous. For Tertullian ſeems not able to charge him with any vice; he only inſinuates that he had more favourable ſentiments of marriage than ſome others had. He likewiſe ſeems not to like his painting. But wherein the fault lay does not clearly appear.

SECT. V. *Some Account of his Opinions concerning the Eternity of Matter.*

THEODORET informed us that Hermogenes aſſerted the eternity of matter: out of which God made the world, and not out of nothing. The chief deſign of Tertullian's book is to confute that notion, which was the opinion of the ſtoics, of which therefore Tertullian [a] ſpeaks very frequently; and he calls him and others of that opinion [b] Materialiſts. Of this [c] he ſpeaks likewiſe in another work. He alſo repreſents at large the reaſonings of Hermogenes to ſhew that God made the world out of pre-exiſtent matter. 'For,' ſays he, 'God [d] muſt have made 'the

[x] Præterea pingit illicite. Adv. Herm. c. 1. p. 265. C. p. 335. Hanc primam umbram plane ſine lumine peſſimus pictor ſuis argumentationibus coloravit. Ibid. D. Vide et cap. ult. p. 288. D. 356.

[y] A Chriſtianis enim converſus ad Philoſophos, de Eccleſia in Academiam et Porticum. Inde ſumſit a ſtoicis materiam cum Domino ponere. p. 265. D. 335.

[z] Qui loquacitatem facundiam exiſtimat.....Præterea pingit illicite.....nubit.....totus adulter, et prædicationis ſuæ ſtruis: ſiquidem et habentium contaminat. C. 1. p. 265. C. D. 335.

[a] .... nolens illum ex nihiſo univerſa .....Inde ſumſit a ſtoicis materiam cum Domino ponere, quæ ipſa ſemper fuerit, neque nata, neque facta, nec initium habens nec finem ex qua Dominus omnia poſtea fecerit. Cap. 1. p. 265. D. 335. Cum enim neget, materiam natam aut factam. Cap. 3. p. 267. B. 336. Vide et cap. 4, 5, 6. [b] Audio enim, apud Hermogenem, cæteroſque materiarios hæreticos, terram quidem illam informem et inviſibilem et rudem fuiſſe: hanc vero noſtram proinde et formam, et conſpectum et cultum a Deo conſecutum. Cap. 25. p. 278. B. 13. 346. [c] Hæc erit materia, quæ nos commiſit cum Hermogene, cæteriſque, qui Deum ex materia, non ex nihilo operatum cuncta, præſumunt. Adv. Val. c. 16. p. 297. B. 10. 394.

[d] Præſtruens, aut Dominum de ſemet ipſo

'the world out of himself, or out of nothing, or out of some-
'thing. That God should make the world out of himself is
'too manifest an absurdity to need a long confutation. And that
'God did not make it out of nothing, he argues in this manner.
'He lays it down for a certain truth that God is good, yea most
'good and excellent; he therefore cannot choose nor will evil;
'and yet there is evil in the world: consequently it was ne-
'cessary, and can be owing to nothing but matter. Moreover,
'he was always Lord. But he could not have been always Lord
'as well as God if there had not ever been somewhat subject to
'him. It follows therefore that [e] God made the world out of
'something, even matter.'

I need not enlarge any farther. But I do not see that Hermogenes argued so much from the impossibility of God's making the world out of nothing, as from the unfitness of it. If the world has been made out of nothing, he feared that the evil therein must be ascribed to the will of God, which would have been a reflection on his goodness. But matter, out of which the world was made, being inherently [f] evil, he supposed that he thereby vindicated the Divine Being.

Sect. VI. *He believed one supreme God unchangeably good.*

Tertullian says that [g] if matter be eternal there must be two gods. But Hermogenes did not allow that; he asserted

ipso fecisse cuncta, aut de nihilo, aut de aliquo....Igitur non de semetipso fecisse. Proinde ex nihilo non potuisse eum facere, sic contendit. Bonum et Optimum definiens Dominum, qui bona atque optima tam velit facere quam sit: immo nihil non bonum atque optimum et velle eum et facere. Igitur omnia ab eo bona et optima oportuisse fieri secundum conditionem ipsius. Inveniri autem et mala ab eo facta, utique non ex arbitrio nec ex voluntate.... Quod ergo non ex arbitrio suo fecerit, intelligi oportere ex vitio alicujus rei factum, ex materia esse sine dubio. Adjicit et aliud: Deum semper Deum etiam Dominum fuisse, nunquam non Deum. Nullo porro modo potuisse illum semper Dominum haberi, sicut et semper Deum, si non fuisset aliquid retro semper, cujus semper Dominus haberetur. Fuisse itaque materiam semper Deo Domino. Ad. Hermo. c. 2, 3. p. 296. A. B. C.

[e] ....cum vult eum de materia cuncta fecisse. Cap. 8. p. 269. C. Magis autem, inquit Tertullianus, eum decuit ex voluntate fecisse, quam ex necessitate, id est, ex nihilo potius quam ex materia. Cap. 14. p. 272. C.

[f] Et tamen unde nobis persuadet Hermogenes, malam esse materiam? Cap. 11. p. 270. D. 340. Age nunc malam ac pessimam credamus esse materiam, Cap. 12. p. 271. B. 340.

[g] Ita Hermogenes duos deos infert.... Innatus Deus. An non et innata materia? Ambo sine initio sine fine....Vel qua, inquit, et sic habente materia, salva sit Deo et auctoritas et substantia, quâ solus et primus auctor est, et Dominus omnium censeatur....Dicit salvum Deo esse, ut et solus sit, et primus, et omnium auctor, et omnium Dominus, et nemini comparandus. Cap. 4, 5, 6. p. 267, 268. 337.

Sicut deum bonum et optimum credimus....porro naturam certam,...quam in bono apud Deum incorruptibilem et indemutabilem. Cap. 12. p. 271. B.

one

one God ſupreme over all, maker of the world, unchangeably good, with whom no other being could be compared. Nevertheleſs, it muſt be allowed that [h] Tertullian has well enough confuted the opinion of Hermogenes; and he well obſerves that [i] the ſchemes of Hermogenes and others, for accounting for the origin of evil, are not ſatisfactory.

SECT. VII. *He aſcribed to Matter an irregular Motion, but introduced no Æons.*

HERMOGENES aſcribed to matter originally [k] an irregular and turbulent motion.

We now perceive the ſcheme of Hermogenes: he did not introduce any Æons, nor any Creator different from the one God the Father; but he ſaid that matter was eternal, and God made the world out of it. To this matter he aſcribed all the evil and all the defects which there are in any creatures. Matter had always a confuſed and irregular turbulent motion. God brought order and beauty, and proportion, out of that confuſed and indigeſted matter. [l]

[h] Addit et alias rationes non omnino malas, ſi in meliore luce collocarentur: hoc eſt, clariore dictione exprimerentur, et commodiore ordine diſponerentur. Cleric. H. E. 168. n. 14.

[i] Ergo, inquit, ex nihilo faceret, ut mala quoque arbitrio ejus imputarentur? Magna, bona fide, cæcitas hæreticorum pro hujuſmodi argumentatione. Cum ideo aut alium Deum bonum et optimum volunt credi, quia mali auctorem exiſtiment creatorem: aut materiam cum Creatore proponunt, ut malum a materia, non a Creatore deducant: quando nullus omnino Deus liberetur iſta quæſtione, ut non auctor mali videri proinde poſſit, quiſquis ille eſt, qui malum, etſi non ipſe fecit, tamen a quocunque, et unde paſſus eſt fieri. Cap. 10. p. 270. B. Ita enim ſine cauſa laboras, ne malorum auctor conſtituatur Deus; qui etſi de materia fecit, ipſi deputabuntur, qui fecit, proinde quatenus fecit. Cap. 14. p. 272. B. 341.

[k] Commune autem inter illos facis, quod a ſemet ipſis moventur, et ſemper moventur. Quid minus materiæ quam Deo adſcribis? Totum conſortium Divinitatis hoc erit, libertas et æternitas motus. Sed Deus compoſite, materia incondite movetur. Nam, ſecundum ollæ ſimilitudinem ſic erat, inquis, materiæ motus, antequam diſponeretur, concretus, inquietus, inadprehenſibilis, præ nimietate certaminis. Cap. 42, 43. p. 287. 354. B. C. Vide et cap. 45. p. 288. C. D.

[l] Audio enim, apud Hermogenem, cæteroſque materiarios hæreticos, terram quidem illam informem et inviſibilem et rudem fuiſſe: hanc vero noſtram proinde et formam, et conſpectum et cultum, a Deo conſecutam. Cap. 25. p. 278. B.

Poſtea infers: at ubi accepit compoſitionem a Deo, et ornata eſt, ceſſavit a natura. Cap. 43. p. 287. C. 22. 355.

SECT.

Sect. VIII. *No distinct Account of his Opinion concerning the Person of Jesus Christ.*

We are not distinctly informed what were the conceptions of Hermogenes concerning the person of Jesus Christ. Theodoret says he thought the body of Jesus was lodged in the sun. The same notion is ascribed to him in the extracts of the Prophets [m] at the end of Clement of Alexandria. Philaster [n] and Augustine [o] ascribe the same opinion to the followers of Seleucus and Hermias, before taken notice of.

Sect. IX. *Some other Opinions of his about the Origin of the Soul, human Liberty, the Devil, Dæmons, and a future Judgment.*

Tertullian seems to say that, according to Hermogenes, God [p] made the soul out of matter. The reason of this is assigned in one of the passages at the bottom of the page.

Tertullian asserted human liberty. And I think he [q] does not deny it to have been held by Marcion and Hermogenes.

Theodoret, as before quoted, said Hermogenes taught that the Devil and Dæmons would be again resolved into matter. In which there is nothing wonderful; since from thence they had arisen. Moreover possibly he conceived the confluence of matter, or some part of it, to be the abyss and place of torment assigned to [r] the devil and his angels at their final condemnation.

[m] P. 808. D. Paris. p. 1002. Potter.

[n] Salvatorem autem in carne negant sedere ad dexteram Patris, sed exspoliasse carnem, et posuisse in solem æstimant: quia dixit Propheta: In sole posui tabernaculum suum. H. 55. p. 111.

[o] Seleuciani sunt vel Hermiani ab auctoribus Seleuco et Hermia....Negant salvatorem in carne sedere ad dexteram Patris, sed ea se exuisse perhibent, eam que in sole posuisse, accipientes occasionem de Psalmo. H. 59.

[p] De solo censu animæ congressus Hermogeni, quatenus et istum ex materiæ potius suggestu, quam ex Dei flatu constituisse præsumsit. De Anim. cap. 1. p. 334. B. 639. Una jam congressione decisa adversus Hermogenem, ut præfati sumus: quia animam ex Dei flatu, non ex materia vindicamus. Ibid. c. 3. p. 307. A. Cæterum adversus Hermogenem, qui eam ex materia, non ex Dei flatu contendit, flatum proprie tuemur. Ille enim adversus ipsius scripturæ fidem flatum in spiritum vertit ut dum incredibile est, spiritum Dei in delictum, et mox in judicium devenire, ex materia potius anima credatur, quam ex Dei spiritu. Ibid. c. 11. p. 313. C. D. 648.

[q] Inesse autem nobis αυτεξουσιον naturaliter, jam et Marcioni ostendimus, et Hermogeni. De Anim. c. 21. p. 324. C. 658.

[r] Quod si tunc erit mali finis, cum præses ejus diabolus abierit in ignem, quem præparavit illi Deus et ejus, prius in puteum abyssi relegatus. In Herm. c. 11. p. 271. A. B. 6. 340.

Whence

Whence we are led to obſerve, that [s] this perſon believed a future judgment, and probably all the other great articles of religion. That he believed a future judgment appears from the paſſage juſt tranſcribed, and from another a little while [t] ago.

SECT. X. *He never ſet up a ſeparate Communion.*

THUS we have taken notice of all the particular opinions aſcribed to Hermogenes by the ancients; but perhaps none of the accounts need to be relied upon, except thoſe in Tertullian. And it ſeems to me ſomewhat probable that Hermogenes never formed a party, or ſet up a ſeparate communion: for Tertullian ſays nothing of his having ſeparate aſſemblies. I apprehend therefore that Hermogenes was willing to communicate with catholic Chriſtians, if they would admit him; though he indulged himſelf in ſpeculations that led him into ſome ſentiments a little out of the common road.

SECT. XI. *His Teſtimony to Scripture.*

NOTHING remains but that we conſider his teſtimony to the ſcriptures.

Le Clerc takes notice that [u] Tertullian argues with him as one who received the ſcriptures. Indeed Tertullian, in arguing with Hermogenes, quotes every part of ſcripture as received by him; particularly the books of Moſes [x] and his account of the creation. Nay Hermogenes and his friends endeavoured to ſupport the notion of God's making the world out of matter, or

[s] ....et ita nos fruſtra laboramus de auferendo malo ex nobis ipſis: tum et Deus hoc fruſtra mandat et præcipit: immo et judicium fruſtra conſtituit Deus, injuſtitia utique puniturus. Ib. p. 271. A. 340.

[t] See note [p] third paſſage in the page foregoing.

[u] Ideoque cum eo agit, quaſi cum homine, qui S. ſcripturam admitteret. H. E. p. 722. n. 13.

[x] Sed et ad originale inſtrumentum Moyſi provocabo, unde et diverſa pars ſuſpiciones ſuas ingratis fulcire conatur, ne ſcilicet non inde inſtrui videretur, unde oportet. Itaque occaſiones ſibi ſumſit quorundam verborum, ut hæreticis fere mos eſt ſimplicia quæque torquere. Nam et ipſum principium, in quo Deus fecit cœlum et terram, aliquid volunt fuiſſe quaſi ſubſtantivum et corpulentum, quod in materiam interpretari poſſit. Cap. 19. p. 275. A. Sed ex ſequentibus argumentatur, quia ſcriptum ſit: terra autem erat inviſibilis et incompoſita. Nam et terræ nomen redigit in materiam. Ibid. cap. 23. p. 277. C. Vult igitur duas proponi terras in iſta ſcriptura: unam, quam in principio Deus fecit: aliam, materiam, ex qua fecit, de qua dictum ſit: Terra autem erat inviſibilis et rudis. Cap. 25. p. 278. B.

chaos,

chaos, from that account. And he argued that [y] the ſcriptures had not expreſsly ſaid that God made the world out of nothing. Tertullian warns [z] him not to aſſert the world to have been made out of matter, without authority from ſcripture: and ſpeaks as if Hermogenes muſt have dreaded ſuch a conduct and the conſequences of it.

Sect. XII. *He received both the Old and New Teſtament.*

Tertullian refers to [a] the book of Proverbs. He quotes [b] David in the 102 Pſalm, and ſeveral of the prophets by name.

That Hermogenes and others [c] reſpected Chriſt, the prophets, and the apoſtles, is apparent. Tertullian quotes the Old and New Teſtament to him, particularly [d] St. Matthew's and St. John's [e] goſpels, and [f] Paul's epiſtles.

Upon the whole, I think it plain that Hermogenes received and reſpected the ſcriptures of the Old and the New Teſtament as other Chriſtians of his time did.

[y] Ergo, inquis, ſi tu ideo præjudicas, ex nihilo facta omnia, quia non ſit manifeſte relatum de materia præcedenti factum quid: vide, ne diverſa pars ideo contendat, ex materia omnia facta, quia proinde non aperte ſignificatum ſit, ex nihilo quid factum. Cap. 21. p. 276. C.

[z] Adoro ſcripturæ plenitudinem, qua mihi et factorem manifeſtat et facta. In Evangelio vero amplius et miniſtrum atque arbitrum rectoris invenio ſermonem. An autem de aliqua ſubjacenti materia facta ſint omnia, nuſquam adhuc legi. Scriptum eſſe doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non eſt ſcriptum, timeat væ illud, adjicientibus aut detrahentibus deſtinatum. Cap. 22. p. 277. B.

[a] Si neceſſaria eſt Deo materia ad opera mundi, ut Hermogenes exiſtimavit, habuit Deus materiam longe digniorem.... non apud philoſophos æſtimandum, ſed apud prophetas, Sophiam ſuam ſcilicet.... Quum pararet cœlum inquit, aderam ei, &c. Cap. 18. p. 274. B. C. D.

[b] Sic et David, p. 283. Sic enim et Eſaias. Cap. 29. p. 280. B. et c. 32. p. 282. B. Sic enim et Hieremias commendat. Cap. 45. p. 288. B. Apud Danielem. Cap. 44. p. 287. C. De ſpiritu æque Amos. Cap. 32. p. 282. B.

[c] Niſi quod ſolus eam (materiam) Hermogenes cognovit, et hæreticorum patriarchæ philoſophi. Prophetis enim et Apoſtolis uſque adhuc latuit, puto et Chriſto. Cap. 8. p. 269. D. Plane a philoſophis recedis: ſed tamen et a Prophetis. Cap. 44. p. 287. C. At enim Prophetæ et Apoſtoli non ita tradunt mundum factum. Cap. 45. p. 288. A. [d] Cum præſes ejus diabolus abierit in ignem, quem præparavit illi Deus et angelis ejus. Cap. 11. p. 271. B. Vide et c. 12. p. 271. C.

[e] Denique Evangelium ut ſupplementum inſtrumenti veteris adhibebo, in quo vel eo magis debuerat oſtendi Deus ex aliqua materia univerſa feciſſe, quod illis etiam per quem omnia fecerit, revelatur. In principio erat ſermo. Et ſermo erat apud Deum....omnia per ipſum facta ſunt, et ſine ipſo factum eſt nihil. Cap. 20. p. 276. A. B. Vide et cap. 18. p. 275. A. [f] Hæc autem ſunt inviſibilia ejus, quæ ſecundum Apoſtolum ab inſtitutione mundi de factis ejus conſpiciuntur, &c. Cap. 45. p. 288. C. Vide et C 11. p. 271. B. et c. 4. p. 267. C. et paſſim.

SECT. XIII. *No Account of any Writings of his.*

THERE is no account of any writings of Hermogenes, though it may be reckoned probable that he was an author. Poſſibly it might be inferred from many things in [g] Tertullian, and from the tenour of his arguments. Cave, however, at his concluſion of this article triumphs in [h] the loſs of his works, if there were any; which I am ſorry to ſee: for it appears to me below a man of letters. The notions and reaſonings of Hermogenes could have done no harm to any men of theſe times who are capable of examining. And we might have made ſome good uſe of his works, as we have done of the fragments of Heracleon and others.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the MONTANISTS.

SECT. I. *Ancient Writers who ſpeak of them.*

I HAVE already ſeveral times had occaſion to ſpeak of the Montaniſts in my accounts of ancient authors, who wrote againſt them: as [a] Miltiades, [b] Serapion, [c] Claudius Apollinaris, [d] Apollonius, [e] Caius, [f] Aſterius Urbanus. To whom may be added [g] the letters of the churches of Vienne and Lyons. And it is well known that Tertullian embraced their prophecy; which therefore obliged me to take ſome notice of them in his [h] hiſtory.

[g] Et quidem epinoëmata illius retorquebo adverſus illum. Cap. 3. p. 267. B. Nam et Hermogenes expugnat quorundam argumentationes, dicentium, mala neceſſaria fuiſſe, ad inluminationem bonorum. Cap. 15. p. 273. B. Dehinc ſubjicis....ſupra certamen motus adſcribis, hæc tarditatem....Supra dicis....Horum memor, poſtea infers. Cap. 43. p. 287. B.

[h] Verum ſcripta iſta in Deum blaſphema piorum zelus et propria impietas æternis tenebris merito damnavit. H. L. p. 74.

[a] See before, vol. ii.
[b] p. 247.
[c] p. 294, 295.
[d] p. 369, 370.
[e] p. 373, 374.
[f] p. 387....391.
[g] p. 150.
[h] p. 254, 255.

Sect. II. *Of the Time when they first sprang up.*

The rise of Montanism is generally placed by learned moderns about [i] the year 171, agreeably to Eusebius in his [k] Chronicle, who there placeth it at the eleventh of Marcus Antoninus, as he does also in his Ecclesiastical History; for, speaking of the Letters of the Martyrs at Lyons, who are supposed to have suffered in the year 177, or, at the soonest, in the year 167, he says that [l] the followers of Montanus did then but begin to be known in the world. He expresseth himself again to [m] the like purpose in his account of the books of Apollinaris against them, who flourished about the year of Christ 176.

Nevertheless [n] Pearson and [o] Beausobre are of opinion that Montanism appeared in the year 156, or 157, soon after the middle of the second century: and Barratier [p] in the year 126. But it seems to me that Eusebius could not be much mistaken, who was in general very well acquainted with ecclesiastical antiquity, and had before him the works of many ancient writers in this controversy. However, if any should be disposed to place the rise of this affair ten or fifteen years sooner, the difference would not be very great.

Epiphanius, who is not always exact in his chronology, says that [q] Montanus set up his pretensions in the nineteenth of Antoninus the Pious, or about the year of Christ 156. His reasons for that computation are assigned by Petavius in his animadversions upon him: and Tillemont should be [r] consulted.

Sect. III. *From whence they derived their Name and the Extent and Continuance of their Opinions.*

They are called [s] Montanists from Montanus; Phrygians and Cata-Phrygians from the country where they sprang up;

[i] Vide Basnag. Ann. 171. n. 2. Cav. H. L. T. 1. p. 74. Massuet Diss. Iren. p. 79. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. 2. Les Montanistes. Art. 1. et note 1.

[k] Pseudo prophetia, quæ Kata-phrygas nominatur, accepit exordium, auctore Montano, et Priscilla et Maximilla, insanis vatibus. Chr. p. 170.

[l] Των δ' αμφι τον μοντανον....περι την Φρυγιαν αρτι τοτε πρωτον....παρα πολλοις εκφερομενων. L. 5. c. 3. p. 168. A.

[m] Τοτε γεμην ωσπερ εκφυειν αρχομενης επι τω μοντανω....αρχας της παρεκτροπης ποιεμενω. L. 4. c. 26. [n] Opp. Post. p. 255. 155. [o] Hist. de Manich. T. 1. p. 350.

[p] Disquisit. Chron. p. 150.

[q] H. 48. n. 1. [r] Les Montanistes, note 1. [s] Vide Theod. H. Fab. L. 3. cap. 2. B. C.

Pepuzians

Pepuzians from a village in Phrygia, which was reſpected by them as another Jeruſalem.

Irenæus has not any where expreſsly mentioned the Montaniſts; but he is ſuppoſed to refer to them, or intend them, in [t] two places of his work againſt hereſies. They are twice mentioned plainly by [u] Clement of Alexandria. They were for a time countenanced [x] by a biſhop of Rome. But learned men are not agreed whether it was Victor or ſome other.

This people ſubſiſted a good while; for the Cata-Phrygians are expreſsly mentioned in Conſtantine's Edicts [y] againſt heretics. Epiphanius ſays they [z] were then in Cappadocia, Galatia, and Phrygia; and numerous in Cilicia and at Conſtantinople. Auguſtine, [a] and [b] Sozomen, and [c] Theodoret ſpeak of them as in being in their times. A Montaniſt endeavoured to pervert Marcella, [d] to whom Jerom writes.

SECT. IV. *Where Montanus was born, and of certain Reproaches caſt on him and his Followers.*

IT is generally ſuppoſed that Montanus was born at Ardaba, in Myſia: which was either a part of Phrygia, or lay contiguous to it. It is likewiſe ſaid that [e] he was but a new convert to Chriſtianity, when he had the vanity to ſet up for a prophet. Theſe two particulars are taken from an author in Euſebius, whom we reckon to be Aſterius Urbanus; nevertheleſs, he does not ſpeak poſitively; he only mentions them as things commonly ſaid and reported. Theodoret too ſays that [f] Montanus was of Ardaba.

I am unwilling to take notice of ſome things ſaid of Montanus. St. Jerom reproaches him with [g] being an eunuch: the reaſon

[t] L. 3. cap. 11. p. 192. L. 4. c. 33. [al. 53.] n. 6. p. 271. Maſſ.

[u] Αλλα και οι Φρυγες· ηδη γαρ και ουτοι της ιδια προφητεια μη προσεχοντας ψυχικους καλεσιν. Str. 4. p. 511. A. Vide et Str. 7. p. 765. C.

[x] Nam idem tunc Epiſcopum Romanum, agnoſcentem jam prophetias Montani, Priſcillæ et Maximillæ, et ex ea agnitione pacem eccleſiis Aſiæ et Phrygiæ inferentem, falſa de ipſis prophetis et eccleſiis eorum adſeverando, et præceſſorum ejus auctoritates defendendo, coegit et literas pacis revocare jam emiſſas, et a propoſito recipiendorum charismatum conceſſare. Tertul. adv. Prax. c. 1. p. 634. C.

[y] See before, Vol. iv. p. 169, 179.

[z] H. 48. n. 14. p. 416.

[a] Et etiam nunc in eiſdem partibus populos habent. Auguſt. de Hær. cap. 26.

[b] L. 7. c. 18. p. 733.

[c] H. Fab. L. 3. c. 2.

[d] Teſtimonia de Joannis Evangelio congregata tibi quidam Montani ſectator ingeſſit. Adv. Marc. Ep. 27. T. 4. p. 64.

[e] Κωμη τις εστι λεγεται εν τη κατα Φρυγιαν μυσια, καλουμενη αρδαβαν τ' ονομα. Ειθα φασι τινα των νεοπιστων πρωτως μοντανον εν επιθυμια ψυχης αμετρω φιλοπρωτειας, κ. λ. Ap. Euſ. L. 5. c. 16. p. 180. A.

[f] H. F. Lib. 3. cap. 2. p. 227.

[g] Abſciſſum et ſemivirum habuiſſe Montanum. Ad. Marcell. Ep. 27. [al. 54.] T. 4. p. 65.

of which is assigned by the Benedictines in a note [h] upon the place. Cyril of Jerusalem says that [i] Montanus was a man covered all over with filthiness and impurity, not fit to be mentioned. And Isidore of Pelusium affirms that [k] he was guilty of adultery. But I humbly conceive that these testimonies are too late. Neither Eusebius nor the authors quoted by him, some of which were contemporaries with Montanus, and others who lived not long after him, lay any such thing to his charge.

We formerly took notice of a report, that [l] Montanus and Maximilla laid violent hands on themselves. But the author who mentions that story did not give credit to it. We are therefore under no obligation to pay any regard to it. The manners of the sect will be considered by and by.

Sect. V. *Of his Companions and Assistants, and their Prophecies.*

Eusebius speaks of [m] Alcibiades and Theodotus as joined with Montanus from the beginning. But the persons most frequently mentioned as his assistants and propheteſſes are two women, named Prisca or Priscilla, and Maximilla. They are said to [n] have been married women, and to have forsaken their husbands. Possibly they did not mind household affairs so much as they should have done: and when once they thought themselves inspired, and that God had qualified them for extensive service to his church, they might reckon themselves to be reasonably excused from low and private concerns: still, however, without violating the regard expected from them by their husbands. By Jerom they are said to have been [o] rich and honourable women, and by their wealth to have greatly promoted the interest of the sect: but whether he may be relied upon I cannot certainly say. Cave calls them [p] two profligate women. But surely such language might have been spared. Scarce any of the ancients have expressed themselves so harshly in speaking

[h] Abscissum vocat et semivirum, quia Montanus erat ex Phrygia, ubi Cybeles sacerdotes castrari solebant.

[i] Ο αθλιωτατος, και πασης ακαθαρσιας και ασελγειας πεπλησμενος. κ. λ. Cat. 16. n. 8. p. 247. B.

[k] ....μοιχω δε φανερως εαλωκοτος. Is. L. 1. ep. 243.

[l] See vol. ii. p. 390.

[m] L. 5. cap. 3. p. 168. A.

[n] Δεικνυμεν δη αυτας πρωτας τας προφητιδας ταυτας, αφ ου το πνευματος επληρωθησαν, τους ανδρας καταλιπουσας. Apollon. ap. Eus. L. 5. c. 18. p. 184. D.

[o] Montanus, immundi spiritus prædicator, multas ecclesias per Priscam et Maximillam, nobiles et opulentas feminas, primum autem corrupit, deinde hæresi polluit. Ad. Ctesiph. T. 4. p. 477.

[p] Adscitisque sibi duabus profligatissimis mulierculis, Priscilla et Maximilla, &c. Cav. H. L. in Montan. An. 172.

of

of thoſe deluded women. And if they had, they need not be followed unleſs they appear to ſpeak with reaſon.

Though Priſcilla and Maximilla were the moſt remarkable ſupports of Montanus, there were other women ſuppoſed by them to have the gift of prophecy. Tertullian [q] ſpeaks of a ſiſter's converſe with God and angels in ſtrong terms.

Some of the prophecies of theſe perſons were publiſhed in writing. Epiphanius quotes a book called [r] the Prophecy of Montanus; and ſeveral times [s] cites his words: as alſo [t] words of Maximilla. And Theodoret [u] ſpeaks of the prophecies of Priſcilla and Maximilla. And it may be argued from Tertullian that oftentimes [x] their viſions, which they had in time of public worſhip, were taken down in writing after the aſſembly was over, by ſome of the principal of the congregation.

It is obſervable (which is related by ſeveral ancient writers) [y] that theſe people boaſted not of any prophecies among them after Montanus and his two women. Nay, Maximilla declared, [z] there would be none after her. For certain Montanus and the two forementioned propheteſſes were the pillars of the ſect.

SECT. VI. *Of his Pretenſions and Manner of Propheſying.*

MONTANUS's pretenſions are differently repreſented by ancient catholic writers. Some ſay he was called by [a] himſelf and his followers the Paraclete, or Holy Spirit. Epiphanius in one place chargeth him with ſaying: 'I [b] am not an angel, nor an 'ambaſſador, but the Lord God the Father.' Auguſtine, who in the firſt part of his article ſays 'the [c] Cataphrygians reſpected

[q] Eſt hodie ſoror apud nos revelationum chariſmata ſortita, quas in eccleſia inter dominica ſolemnia per ecſtaſin in ſpiritu patitur: converſatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum Domino, et videt et audit ſacramenta, et quorumdam corda dignoſcit, et medicinas deſiderantibus ſubmittit, &c. De Anima. cap. 9. p. 311. A. 265.

[r] Λεγει γαρ εν τη εαυτε λεγομενη προφητεια. H. 48. n. 10. p. 411. C.

[s] Ibid. n. 4. p. 405. D. n. 11. p. 412, 413.

[t] Ibid. n. 2. p. 403. D. n. 12. p. 413.

[u] Hær. Fab. L. 3. c. 2.

[x] Poſt tranſacta ſolemnia, dimiſſa plebe, quo uſu ſolet nobis renuntiare quæ videntur (nam et diligentiſſime digeruntur, ut etiam probentur:) inter cætera, inquit, extenta eſt mihi anima corporaliter, &c. De Anim. cap. 9. p. 311. B. 265.

[y] Πως ουκετι μετα μοντανον και πρισκιλλαν και μαξιμιλλαν εχουσι προφητας; Epiph. H. 48. n. 2. p. 403. B.

[z] Epiph. Ibid. D. Vide et p. 404. A.

[a] Τον μεν παρακλητον μοντανον, τας δ' εξ αυτε γυναικας, πρισκιλλαν και μαξιμιλλαν, ως αν τε μοντανε προφητιδας γεγονυιας αυχουντες. Euſeb. L. 5. c. 14. p. 178. C.

Ετολμησεν ειπειν εαυτον ειναι το αγιον πνευμα. Cyr. Cat. 16. No. 8. p. 247.

Ουτος οιστρηθεις ερωτι φιλαρχιας παρακλητον εαυτον προσηγορευσε. Theod. H. F. L. 3. c. 2. B. [b] Παλιν φησι μοντανος· οτι ουτε αγγελος, ουτε πρεσβυς, αλλα εγω κυριος ο θεος πατηρ ηλθον. Ibid. n. 11. p. 413. B.

[c] Montanus tanquam Paracletus, et duæ prophetiſſæ ipſius Priſca et Maximilla. H. 26. in.

'Montanus as the Paraclete, and Priſcilla and Maximilla as pro-'pheteſſes,' afterwards adds, 'they [d] ſuppoſed the Lord's pro-'miſe concerning the Holy Spirit to have been rather fulfilled in 'them than in the apoſtles.' And to the like purpoſe [e] Philaſter. St. Jerom ſometimes ſays they [f] believed the Holy Spirit to have been in Montanus. The truth ſeems to be that they ſuppoſed God to have made ſome additional revelations by Montanus, for the perfection of believers; for they did not deny that the Holy Ghoſt had deſcended upon the apoſtles on the famous day of Pentecoſt: but they ſuppoſed that ſome things were left to be revealed, when and to whom God pleaſed. But then they could not think this inſpiration of Montanus equal to that of the apoſtles, as it did not relate to the great articles of faith, but chiefly to matters of external order and diſcipline. [g]

Tertullian heartily embraced this new prophecy. But then he ſays: 'We [h] preach no other God nor other Chriſt: nor 'have we any other rule of faith; though we are more for faſting 'and leſs for marrying than other people.' In another place, [i] and in another work, he ſpeaks to the like purpoſe. And he ſays again, 'it [k] was impoſſible that any new revelation ſhould 'contradict the doctrine of Chriſt.' I put ſome other paſſages of his in the [l] margin, ſhewing his reſpect for this manifeſtation, and his perſuaſion that ſpiritual gifts were, in an uncommon degree, beſtowed upon Montanus and his friends; and yet aſſerting that the [m] ſtate of things among them had its foundation in the ſcriptures of the Old and New Teſtament.

The

[d] Adventum ſpiritus ſancti a Domino promiſſum, in ſe potius quam in Apoſtolis fuiſſe aſſerunt [e] Addunt etiam, plenitudinem ſancti ſpiritus non per Apoſtolos Chriſto dante fuiſſe conceſſam, ſed per illos ſuos pſeudo prophetas æſtimant impartitam. Phil. H. 49. Cataphry. p. 102, 103. 13. [f] Sicut aliæ hæreſes Paracletum in Montanum veniſſe contendunt, et Manichæum ipſum dicunt eſſe Paracletum. Adv. Vigil. T. 4. p. 285. in.

....ad extremum per ſpiritum ſanctum in Montanum, Priſcam et Maximillam inſanas feminas deſcendiſſe, et plenitudinem, quam non habuerit Paulus,....habuiſſe Montanum. Ad. Marcell. Ibid. p. 65. [g] See below note [i].

[h] Hi Paracleto controverſiam faciunt. Propter hoc novæ prophetiæ recuſantur: non quod alium Deum prædicant Montanus et Priſcilla et Maximilla: nec quod Jeſum Chriſtum ſolvant: nec quod aliquam fidei aut ſpei regulam evertant: ſed quod plane doceant, ſæpius jejunare quam nubere. De Jejun. cap. 1. p. 701. C.

[i] Paracletus autem multa habens edocere, quæ in illum diſtulit Dominus, ſecundum præfinitionem, ipſum primo Chriſtum conteſtabitur, qualem credimus, cum toto ordine Creatoris: et ipſum gloriſicabit, et de ipſo commemorabit. Et ſic de principali regula agnitus, illa multa quæ ſunt diſciplinarum revelabit. De Menog. cap. 2. p. 673, 674.

[k] An capiat, Paracletum aliquid tale docuiſſe, quod aut novum deputari poſſit adverſus Catholicam traditionem, aut oneroſum adverſus ſarcinam Domini? Ibid. cap. 2. p. 673. D.

[l] Penes nos autem, quos ſpiritales merito dici facit agnitio ſpiritalium chariſmatum.....Sed Pſychicis non recipientibus ſpiritum, ea quæ ſunt ſpiritus non placent. De Monog. cap. 1. p. 673. B. Vide eund. cap. 14. p. 686. [m] Noſtrorum bonorum ſtatus jam mergitur. Chriſtianæ pudicitiæ ratio concutitur. Quæ omnia de

cœlo

The manner of delivering their pretended prophecies was disagreeable. They seem to have been for a time deprived of the exercise of reason; [n] which induced several catholic writers, in their arguments with them to shew, that neither the prophets of the Old or New Testament prophesied in ecstasy. The thing is taken notice of by [o] Athanasius and by [p] Jerom several times. Epiphanius has a long argument upon this [q] point. Tertullian, who went into all the peculiar sentiments of this new party, calls prophecy [r] a spiritual violence.

SECT. VII. *Of the Opinions of the Montanists.*

As for the resurrection of the body and other great articles of the Christian religion, all writers of heresies bear testimony to their [s] belief of them. And, as Tertullian observes, they [t] are not weakened, but established, confirmed, and illustrated by these overflowings of the spirit.

They are however charged by some with not holding the right doctrine concerning the Trinity. Epiphanius saysha t [u] concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they agree with the catholic church. Theodoret's account is, that [x] Montanus made no innovation in the doctrine of the Trinity, or the creation of the world: but afterwards [y] some of his followers denied the hypostases, and agreed with Sabellius and Noetus. The

coelo trahit, et disciplinam per instrumentum prædicationis, et censuram per judicia ex utroque Testamento. De Pud. cap. 1. p. 715. C. [n] Πνευματοφορηθηναι τινας αφνιδιως εν κατοχη τινι και παρεκστασει γενομενους, ενθουσιαι. Ap. Eus. L. 5. cap. 16. p. 180. A. B. Vide et cap. 17. p. 183. B. C. [o] N. 3. contr. Ar. n. 47. p. 596. C. [p] Neque vero, ut Montanus cum insanis feminis somniat, Prophetæ in exstasi sunt locuti, ut nescirent quid loquerentur: et quum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent. Prol. in Is. T. 3. p. 3. Non enim loquitur, ut Montanus et Prisca Maximillaque delirant: sed quod prophetat, liber est visionis intelligentis universa quæ loquitur. Prol. in Naum. p. 1559. Vide eund in Is. cap. 1. p. 7. ini. et c. 28. p. 236. ini.

[q] H. 48. n. 3....8. [r] Hoc postea obtenit, quum in illum (Adamum) Deus clementiam immisit, spiritalem vim, qua conflat prophetia. De Anim. cap. 21. p. 324. A. [s] Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum confitentur: carnis resurrectionem expectant: quæ et Catholica Ecclesia prædicat. Philast. cap. 49. p. 101. Vide Epiph. H. 48. p. 402.

[t] De quibus luculenter et Paracletus per prophetidem Priscam. De Res. Carn. cap. 11. p. 386. B. Idcirco jam omnes retro ambiguitates, et quas volunt parabolas, aperta atque perspicua totius sacramenti prædicatione discussit, per novam prophetiam de Paracleto inundantem: cujus si hauseris fontes, nullam poteris sitire doctrinam....Resurrectionem quoque carnis usquequaque potando, refrigeraberis. Ibid. cap. ult. p. 430. A. [u] Περι δε πατρος, και υιου και αγιου πνευματος ομοιως φρονουσι τη αγια καθολικη εκκλησια. H. 48. n. 1. p. 402. D. [x] Τον δε περι της θειας τριαδος εκ ελυμηνατο λογον· και τα περι της κοσμου δημιουργιας ομοιως ημιν εδογματισεν. T. 4. L. 3. cap. 2. p. 227. B.

[y] Τινες δε αυτων τας τρεις υποστασεις της θεοτητος σαβελλιω παραπλησιως περιησαιτο, τον αυτον ειναι λεγοντες και πατερα και υιον και αγιον πνευμα παραπλησιως τω ασιανω ιοητω. Ibid. p. 227. C.

author of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions says there [z] were two parties among them, who had different sentiments about the Trinity. It must be reckoned probable that some of them were in the Sabellian or Unitarian scheme. For it is affirmed by many writers of antiquity; by [a] Jerom and [b] Isidore of Pelusium, as well as the others just mentioned.

Sect. VIII. *Of the Peculiarities in their Manners, Discipline, and Doctrine.*

We now proceed to observe their peculiarities. But after all, I suppose they esteemed themselves good catholic Christians. For though Tertullian scornfully calls the catholics sometimes animal and the like, he does not reckon them heretics, [c] but distinguishes them from such people.

In general we may say they made a profession of much strictness; [d] and therefore are not seldom mentioned together with the Novatians, and called Puritans.

One thing in which they innovated was condemning second marriages in all. [e] Whoever married a second time, though his first wife was dead, was excommunicated by them. All ancient writers agree in this account of them. And it appears in Tertul-

[z] Accesserunt alii hæretici, qui dicuntur secundum Phrygas. Sed horum non una doctrina est. Sunt enim, qui κατα Proclum dicuntur. Sunt qui secundum Æschinem pronuntiantur....Privatam autem blasphemiam illi qui sunt sunt κατα Æschinem hanc habent: qua adjiciunt etiam hoc, ut dicant Christum ipsum esse Filium et Patrem. De Pr. Hær. cap. 52. p. 254. C. [a] Primum, in fidei regula discrepamus. Nos Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum in sua unaquaque persona ponimus, licet substantia copulemus: Illi Sabellii dogma sectantes Trinitatem in unius personæ angustias cogunt. Adv. Marcell. T. 4. p. 64.

[b] Vide Isid. L. 1. Ep. 67.

[c] Hæretici nuptias auferunt. Psychici ingerunt. Illi nec semel: isti non semel nubens. De Monog. cap. 1. p. 673.

[d] Montanus et qui Novati schisma sequuntur, nomen sibi munditiæ præsumsere, pucantes secunda matrimonia ab ecclesiæ communione prohibenda. Hieron. ad Tit. T. 4. P. 1. p. 414. F. Rigidi autem sunt, non quo et ipsi pejora non peccent, &c. Ad. Marcell. T. 4. p. 65. sub in. Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic rideant, qui contendunt, non posse renovari per pœnitentiam eos qui crucifixerunt sibi Filium Dei. Id. adv. Jovin. L. 2. T. 4. p. 195. M. Facessat itaque Novatus, errantibus manus non porrigens: Montanus cum insanis feminis prosternatur, jacentes in barathrum præcipitans, ne leventur. Ad. Pamm. Ep. 38. [al. 61.] p. 307. in. Vide et ad Ocean. Ep. 84. p. 659. infr. M. [e] Nos secundas nuptias non tam appetimus, quam concedimus, Paulo jubente, ut viduæ adolescentulæ nubant. Illi in tantum putant scelerata conjugia iterata, ut quicumque hoc fecerit, adulter habeatur. Hieron. Ibid. p. 64. Εκβαλλουσι γαρ τον δευτερογαμον συναφθειτα, και αναγκαζουσι....μη δευτερογαμω συναπτεσθαι. Epiph. Ib. n. 9. p. 410. D. Secundas nuptias pro fornicationibus habent. Et ideo dicunt eas permisisse Apostolum Paulum, quia ex parte sciebat. Aug. H. 26. Vide Theodor. H. F. L. 3. cap. 2. vol. 4. p. 227. B.

lian's

lian's writings, [f] to be a part of diſcipline which they conſtantly inculcated.

They had likewiſe many rules about faſting and abſtinence.

Apollonius, in Euſebius, [g] blames Montanus for impoſing laws of faſting. Theodoret ſays that [h] Montanus appointed new faſts, beſide thoſe which were cuſtomary in the church. A paſſage of Tertullian, [i] placed in the margin, will confirm this account.

The catholics ſaid that ſuch things ought not to be *impoſed* upon men. If any thought fit to mortify themſelves they were at liberty ſo to do. But things, not commanded by Chriſt and his apoſtles, were not to be enjoined as neceſſary: ſo ſome argued, as appears from [k] Tertullian.

Jerom ſays they [l] kept three lents in the year. Perhaps this was the practice of ſome of the ſect in later times; for, as it is not mentioned by Tertullian, it may be reckoned not to have been enjoined by Montanus. In another place Jerom ſhews how the Montaniſts, and ſome others [m] likewiſe, argued from our Lord's words in Matt. ix. 15.

They did not allow the church the power to forgive great ſins after baptiſm; or that [n] they who ſo fell ſhould ever after be admitted again to full communion, [o] though they repented. Nay, Tertullian ſeems to ſay that [p] there is no ſalvation or for-

[f] Sed et ſi nubendi jam modus ponitur, quem quidem apud nos ſpiritalis ratio, Paracleto auctore, defendit, unum in fide matrimonium præſcribens. Adv. Marc. L. 1. cap. 30. p. 452. B. Unum matrimonium novimus, ſicut unum Deum. De Monog. c. 1. p. 673. B. Vide eund. paſſim. [g] Ὁ νηστειας νομοθετησας. Lib. 5. c. 18. p. 184. C. [h] Και νηστειας καινας παρα το της εκκλησιας επεισηγαγεν ἑαυτῳ. Ib. p. 227. B. [i] Arguunt nos, quod jejunia propria cuſtodiamus, quod ſtationes plerumque in veſperam producamus, quod etiam xerophagias obſervemus, ſiccantes cibum ab omni carne, et omni jurulentia, et vividioribus quibuſque pomis, ne quid vinoſitatis vel edamus, vel potemus, lavacri quoque abſtinentiam, congruentem arido victui. De jejun. c. 1. p. 701. B. C. [k] Certe in Evangelio illos dies jejuniis determinatos, putant, in quibus ablatus eſt ſponſus: et hos eſſe jam ſolos legitimos jejuniorum Chriſtianorum, abolitis legalibus et propheticis vetuſtatibus....Itaque de cætero differenter jejunam; ſum ex arbitrio, non ex imperio novæ diſciplinæ, pro temporibus et cauſis uniuſcujuſque. Sic et Apoſtolos obſervaſſe, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum, &c. De Jejun. cap. 2. p. 702. B. [l] Nos unam quadrageſimam ſecundum traditionem Apoſtolorum, toto nobis orbe congruo, jejunamus. Illi tres in anno faciunt quadrageſimas, quaſi tres paſſi ſint ſalvatores. Ad. Marcell. T. 4. p. 65. [m] Nonnulli putant idcirco poſt dies quadraginta paſſionis, jejunia debere committi; licet ſtatim dies Pentecoſtes et ſpiritus ſanctus adveniens indicent nobis feſtivitatem. Et ex hujus occaſione teſtimonii Montanus, Priſca et Maximilla, etiam poſt Pentecoſten, faciunt quadrageſimam: quod ablato ſponſo filii ſponſi debeant jejunare, &c. In Matt. cap. 9. tom. 4. p. 31. M.

[n] Illi ad omne pene delictum Eccleſiæ obſerant fores. Hieron. ad Mar. p. 65.

[o] Hoc qui ab Apoſtolis didicit, et cum Apoſtolis docuit, numquam mœcho et fornicatori ſecundam pœnitentiam promiſſam ab Apoſtolis norat. De Pudic. cap. 20. p. 741. D. [p] Audio etiam edictum eſſe propoſitum, quidem peremtorium: Pontifex ſcilicet Maximus, quod eſt epiſcopus epiſcoporum, edicit: Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta, pœnitentia functis dimitto. Abſit, abſit a ſponſa Chriſti tale præconium. De Pud. c. 1. p. 715. C. D.

giveneſs

giveneſs for ſuch perſons; and that Chriſt [q] does not intercede for them.

They were alſo againſt flight in perſecution, [r] and againſt giving money to redeem themſelves from ill uſage of perſecutors, or to procure any mitigation of affliction from them. They moreover met together openly, and in great numbers, in [s] a way that was reckoned indiſcreet by many other Chriſtians. Tertullian wrote a book upon this ſubject which may be conſulted; which leads us to obſerve that theſe [t] people had their ſeparate aſſemblies, in which every part of Chriſtian worſhip was performed. However, according to Jerom, [u] the order of their hierarchy was ſomewhat different from that of moſt others.

When Aſterius Urbanus wrote, about 232, they [x] boaſted of their having had many martyrs; which muſt be underſtood not for Montaniſm but for Chriſtianity.

They were Millenarians, as appears from [y] Tertullian.

Sect. IX. *Of their Myſteries, and Calumnies caſt upon them on this Account.*

After all theſe things that have been already mentioned, we muſt not omit the accounts of their myſteries: for, by ſeveral writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, we are informed that it

[q] In negotiis, in officiis, in quæſtu, in victu, in viſu, in auditu, quanta tentamur; ut ſi nulla ſit venia iſtorum, nemini ſalus competat. Horum ergo erit venia per exoratorem Patris Chriſtum. Sunt autem et contraria iſtis, ut graviora et exitioſa, quæ veniam non capiant, homicidium, idololatria, fraus, negatio, blaſphemia, utique et mœchia et fornicatio, et ſi qua alia violatio templi Dei. Horum ultro exorator non erit Chriſtus. Hæc non admittet omnino, qui natus ex Deo fuerit: non futurus Dei filius, ſi admiſerit. De Pud. cap. 19. p. 741. A.

[r] Et ideo Paracletus, neceſſarius deductor omnium veritatum, exhortator omnium tolerantiarum: quem qui receperunt, neque fugere proſecutionem, neque redimere noverunt. De Fuga in Perſ. cap. 14. p. 700. C.

[s] Dicitur enim, quoniam incondite convenimus et complures concurrimus in eccleſiam, quærimur a Nationibus, et timemus, ne turbentur Nationes. Ibid. cap. 3. p. 691. D. [t] Eſt hodie ſoror apud nos, revelationum chariſmata ſortita, quas in eccleſia inter dominica ſolemnia per ecſtaſin in ſpiritu patitur... Jam vero, prout ſcripturæ leguntur, aut pſalmi canuntur, aut adloquutiones proferuntur, aut petitiones delegantur, ita inde materiæ viſionibus ſubminiſtrantur. Forte neſcio quid de anima diſſerueramus, cum ea ſoror in ſpiritu eſſet. De Anim. cap. 9. p. 311. A. B. [u] Apud nos apoſtolorum locum epiſcopi tenent: apud eos epiſcopus tertius eſt. Habent enim primos de Pepuſa Phrygiæ patriarchas: ſecundos, quos appellent Cenonas. Atque ita in tertium, id eſt, pene ultimum locum epiſcopi devolvuntur. Ad Marc. p. 65.

[x] Λεγοντες, πολλους εχειν μαρτυρας. Ap. Euſ. lib. 5. cap. 16. p. 182. D.

[y] Nam et confitemur in terra nobis regnum repromiſſum: ſed ante cœlum, ſed alio ſtatu: ut pote poſt reſurrectionem in mille annos, in civitate divini operis Hieruſalem cœlo delata.....Hanc et Ezechiel novit, et Apoſtolus Joannes vidit, et qui apud fidem noſtram eſt, novæ prophetiæ ſermo teſtatur. Adv. Marc. lib. 3. cap. 24. p. 499. B. C.

was

was reported of them that they[z] took a child of about a year old, and pricked him all over with needles; the extracted blood they mixed with flour of wheat, and of this they made their[a] sacramental bread. If the child survived he was looked upon as a high-priest; if he died, he was reputed a martyr. I place at the bottom of the page passages of many authors relating to this matter; of[b] St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Isidore of Pelusium[c], Epiphanius[d], Philaster[e], Augustine[f], Theodoret[g], &c. Jerom[h].

Upon the passages of these authors it is easy to make some remarks. Augustine and some others seem to have supposed this to have been a common part of their mysteries, or eucharist. But Epiphanius and Philaster speak as if it belonged only to an annual festival about Easter. Cyril imputes lewdness as well as cruelty to their mysteries; and supposeth that they not only killed, but likewise eat infants; unless this last may be understood of their blood only, mixed with flour. Isidore of Pelusium chargeth them with magic, killing of infants, lewdness, and idolatry. He and Cyril of Jerusalem are the only writers who speak positively. Epiphanius, Philaster, and Augustine, express themselves doubtfully, and represent the matter as only report. Theodoret says there are stories about their mysteries, but they themselves do not allow the truth of them: they say they are false and nothing but calumnies. Jerom is not inclined to believe the common story, and is willing, he says, to omit the mention of it.

Undoubtedly it was a mere calumny and fiction. If there had been any such things practised by them, it would not have

[z] See Mr. Robert Turner, of the Calumnies cast upon the Primitive Christians, p. 52, 53.

[a] Augustin. Tom. 6. Her. 26. p. 5. cap. 3. ad quod V. D. Vene 1570. See the passage note [f] in this page.

[b] Αυταρκες γαρ τουτο δια δυσσημων ειπειν, των παρουσων γυναικων σεμνοτητος ενεκα. Και αθλιωτατα παιδια γυναικων μικρα σφαττων, και κατακοπτων εις αθεμιτον βρωσιν, προφασει των καλουμενων παρ αυτοις μυστηριων. Cat. 16. n. 8. p. 247.

[c] Μαγγανειαις γαρ και παιδοκτονιαις, μοιχειαις τε και ιδωλολατρειαις συντιθεται. [illegible] λ. Isid. lib. 1. Ep. 242.

[d] Δεινον τε και αθεμιτον εργον φασι γενεσθαι. Παιδα γαρ κομιδη νηπιον κατα εορτην τινα δι ολου του σωματος κατακεντωντες ραφισι χαλκαις, το αιμα αυτου προσποριζονται εαυτοις, εις επιτηδευσιν δηθεν θυσιαις. H. 48. n. 14. p. 416. C. Vide et n. 15. p. 417. C.

[e] Ubi et mysterium Cynicorum, (Scenicorum) et infantis execranda celebratur impietas. Dicunt enim eos de infantis sanguine in Pascha miscere in suum sacrificium. H. 49. p. 103, 104.

[f] Sacramenta perhibentur habere funesta. Nam de infantis anniculi sanguine, quem de toto ejus corpore minutis punctionum vulneribus extorquent, quasi Eucharistiam suam conficere perhibentur, miscentes eum farinæ, panemque inde facientes. Qui puer si mortuus fuerit, habetur apud eos pro martyre: si autem vixerit, pro magno sacerdote. H. 26. Vid. et H. 27.

[g] Περι δε των μυστηριων τινες μεν θρυλλουσι τινα. εκεινοι δε ου συνομολογουσιν, αλλα συκοφαντιαν την κατηγοριαν καλουσι. Tom. 4. p. 227. C.

[h] Prætermitto scelerata mysteria, quæ dicuntur de lactente puero, et de victuro martyre confarrata. Malo, inquam, non credere. Sit falsum omne quod sanguinis est. Adv. Marc. p. 65.

been

been omitted by Eusebius and all his authors; nor would Tertullian ever had any concern with them. The commonness and the certain falsehood of this story should teach us not to be ready in receiving accusations against any who are called heretics.

Sect. X. *Of their Testimony to the Scriptures.*

It still remains that we observe their testimony to the scriptures.

Philaster expressly says, 'they[i] receive the law and the 'prophets.' Epiphanius, in his larger work, that 'they[k] re- 'ceive all the scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament.' In his arguments with them he appeals to the scriptures, as[l] of unconteſted authority with them. His Summary is to this purpose: 'they[m] receive the Old and New Testament; but after 'the ancient prophets they bring in others, boasting of Monta- 'nus, Priscilla, and Maximilla.' Theodoret says that 'Mon- 'tanus[n] had two women propheteſſes, and called their writings 'prophecies.' Afterwards he says that 'the[o] prophecies of 'those two women were in greater esteem with the Montanists 'than the divine gospel:' which surely must be an aggravation. Caius however, as we may remember, early complained of their[p] composing new writings or scriptures, and placing them in too high authority. Athanasius[q] speaks of their respect for Montanus and Maximilla as extravagant.

Nevertheless, there can be no good reason to doubt that they received all the scriptures of the Old and New Testament which other Christians did, and with like respect. Tertullian, divers of whose remaining works were written after he was a Montanist, bears witness to it. Our collections from him made formerly[r], and some passages of his transcribed in this article, are sufficient to satisfy every inquisitive person. From the same writer it appears that they received particularly the Acts of the Apostles

[i] Isti Prophetas et Legem accipiunt. H. 49. [k] Δεχονται και αυτοι πασαν γραφην, παλαιαν και νεαν διαθηκην. H. 48. n. 2. p. 402. C. [l] Συγκρινοντες γαρ τα παρ' αυτων ειρημενα, και κατα την παλαιαν διαθηκην και καινην εν αληθεια...δοκιμασωμεν. Ibid. n. 3. p. 404. D.

[m] Οιτινες παλαιαν και νεαν διαθηκην δεχονται· ετερους δε προφητας παρεισφερουσι μετα τους προφητας, μοντανον τινα αυχουντες και πρισκιλλαν και μαξιμιλλαν. p. 396.

[n] Και τα τουτων συγγραμματα προφητικας προσηγορευσι βιβλους. p. 217. B.

[o] Αι δε της πρισκιλλης και μαξιμιλλης προφητειαι υπερ το θειον ευαγγελιον τετιμηνται παρ αυτοις. Ibid. C.

[p] See Vol. ii. p. 374.

[q] Και ωσπερ εκεινοι μαξιμιλλαν και μοντανον, ουτως ουτοι αντι του χριστου καινοτατον δεσποτην επιγραφονται. De Synod. n. 4. p. 719. [r] Article Tertullian, V. 2. p. 255, &c. and the article Marcion of this work, sec. 30. p. 389. to the end.

and

and the Revelation. Paſſages of later authors ſhew that the ſect had not altered their mind, but continued to receive [s] the book of the Acts, St. John's [t] goſpel, and [u] Revelation.

CHAP. XX.

Of PRAXEAS.

SECT. I. *Of the Time in which he lived.*

BASNAGE ſpeaks of Praxeas [a] at the year 194; Baronius under the year [b] 196; as doth Spondanus [c] in his abridgment. Tillemont ſays he [d] appeared not till after the two Theodotuſes, the moſt ancient of which is he of Byzantium, who firſt publiſhed his hereſy under Victor, or a little before; and the other Theodotus was his diſciple. So that Praxeas may have appeared alſo under Victor; and he muſt be placed under him or his ſucceſſor Zephyrinus, for he had appeared before Tertullian became a Montaniſt, which at the lateſt happened in the year of Chriſt 207.

SECT. II. *What ancient Writers ſpeak of him, and by whom he is omitted.*

THERE is no notice taken of Praxeas by Irenæus or Clement of Alexandria; he is not in Cyril of Jeruſalem, nor in Epiphanius, or Theodoret; nor has Euſebius mentioned him. Philaſter and Auguſtine have no diſtinct articles for Praxeas, but ſpeak of him in their chapters of Sabellius. He is mentioned ſeveral times among other heretics by [e] Optatus of Milevi. He is like-

[s] Quod ſi voluerint reſpondere, et Philippi deinceps quatuor filias prophetaſſe, et prophetam Agabum reperiri. Hier. ad Marc. Tom. 4. p. 64.

[t] Teſtimonia de Joannis Evangelio congregata tibi quidam Montani ſectator ingeſſit. Id. ibid.

[u] Vide Epiph. H. 48. n. 10. p. 411.

[a] Annales Pol. Ecc. An. 194. p. 206.

[b] Ad An. 196.

[c] Ad An. 196. n. 7. p. 169.

[d] Mem. Ec. Tom. 3. Praxeas, in.

[e] Marcion, Praxeas, Sabellius, Valentinus, et cæteri. lib. 1. cap. 9. p. 8. D. Du Pin. p. 37. Albaſpinæi Paris, 1631. Apud Praxeam Patripaſſianum qui ex toto filium negat et patrem paſſum eſſe contendit. Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 1. p. 80. Du Pin, p. 83. Albaſpinæi. Vide etiam Ib. lib. 4. cap. 5. p. 74. vel 79.

wiſe

wise spoken of by [f] Jerom and [g] Pacianus. Tertullian calls him a late heretic [h]. He certainly appeared not till after the Montanists. Agreeable to this the author [i] of the Additions to Tertullian's Prescriptions places him last of all after the Montanists, and after the two Theodotuses. But it is Tertullian himself who will afford us the best assistance for tracing out the history and opinions of Praxeas; he having written a treatise against him which is still in being.

Sect. III. *Of his Country.*

Philaster [k] and [l] Augustine say that Praxeas lived in Africa; and that he was some while there appears from Tertullian; though he says Praxeas came from Asia to Rome. Beausobre therefore concludes that he was a presbyter of Asia [m]. However I do not think that these expressions can determine that he was of that country. The little notice that is taken of him by Greek writers, and the frequent mention of him in Latin authors, may lead us to think he was a Latin, rather than a Greek or Asiatic.

The series of Tertullian's narration leads us to think that [n] Praxeas having been in Asia, where he saw the pretended prophecies of Montanus and his women, when he came to Rome, he informed the bishop of Rome concerning them; and gave

[f] Cum Ario adulteria committo. Feci et antea cum Praxea, cum Ebione, cum Cerintho, Novato. Adv. Lucif. Tom. 4. p. 305. M. [g] Theodotus quoque et Praxeas vestros aliquando docuere. Pac. Ep. 1. ap. Bib. 88. T. 4. p. 305. G.

[h] Hanc regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisse etiam ante priores quosque hæreticos, nedum ante Praxean hesternum, probabit tam ipsa posteritas omnium hæreticorum, quam ipsa novellitas Praxeæ hesterni. Adv. Praxeam, cap. 2. p. 635. B. p. 494. 46. Fran. 1597.

[i] De Præs. ad Hær. cap. 51. ad finem p. 218. 12. [k] Unde et Sabelliani postea sunt appellati, qui et Patripassiani et Praxeani a Praxea, et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, qui fuerunt in Africa. cap. 54. p. 108. [l] Nam et Praxeanos eos a Praxea quidam vocant: et Hermogeniani vocari ab Hermogene potuerunt: qui Praxeas et Hermogenes, eadem sentientes, in Africa fuisse dicuntur. H. 41.

[m] Hist. Manich. T. 1. p. 533.

[n] Nam iste primus ex Asia hoc genus perversitatis intulit Romæ, homo et alias inquietus, insuper de jactatione martyrii inflatus, ob solum et simplex et breve carceris tædium...Nam idem tunc episcopum Romanum, agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ....et ex ea agnitione pacem ecclesiis Asiæ et Phrygiæ inferentem, falsa de ipsis prophetis et ecclesiis eorum adseverando,...coegit literas pacis revocare jam emissas....Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, prophetiam expulit, et hæresim intulit.... Fruticaverant avenæ Praxeanæ, hic quoque superseminatæ, dormientibus multis in simplicitate doctrinæ: traductæ dehinc per quem Deus voluit, etiam evulsæ videbantur. Denique caverat pristinum doctor de emendatione sua. Et manet chirographum apud Psychicos, apud quos tunc res gesta est. Exinde silentium. Et nos quidem postea agnitio Paracleti atque defensio, disjunxit a Psychicis. Avenæ vero illæ utique tunc semen excusserant. Ita aliquandiu per hypocrisin subdola vivacitate latitavit, et nunc denuo erupit. Adv. Pr. cap. 1. p. 634. C. D. p. 494. 20.

him

him ſuch an account of them as ſatisfied him they had no real inſpiration, though before he had been inclined to countenance them. Some time after this Praxeas came over into Africa, perhaps to Carthage, where Tertullian was acquainted with him.

SECT. IV. *He ſuffered in the Cauſe of Chriſt.*

PRAXEAS had ſuffered impriſonment, if not other afflictions, during the rage of ſome perſecution, for the ſake of the Chriſtian religion. After which, upon his coming to Rome, he openly profeſſed his opinions concerning Chriſt, which were not approved of by all: this he did particularly in Africa, where he made many converts.

SECT. V. *Once confuted and ſigned a Recantation, but afterwards profeſſed again his former Principles.*

A CERTAIN perſon had a diſpute with him there upon that head, and had ſuch an advantage over him that he owned himſelf confuted; and ſigned a recantation, which was in being among the catholics, when Tertullian wrote againſt him. The diſputant who had that advantage was, very probably, Tertullian himſelf, though from a principle of modeſty he does not ſay ſo expreſsly. As that recantation was lodged with the catholics, it is fairly concluded that Tertullian was at that time among them. Indeed he expreſsly ſays he was, and that it was his afterwards taking upon himſelf to defend the Montaniſts principles, which was the cauſe of the ſeparation. What induced Praxeas to ſign ſuch a recantation is not certain, whether it was real conviction or ſome other conſideration. But, as he afterwards maintained again the ſame doctrine, it gave occaſion for people to ſay it was not ſincere.

SECT. VI. *A Believer in Baptiſm, and the general Articles of the Chriſtian Faith.*

I NEED not particularly ſhew that Praxeas and his followers practiſed [o] baptiſm, and believed the general articles of religion

[o] Et quia dixiſti, et aquam eſſe mendacem, etiam hoc diſce, ubi eam (f. veram) poteris invenire: Apud Praxeam, Patripaſſianum, qui ex toto Filium negat, et Patrem paſſum eſſe contendit? Optat. lib. 5. cap. 1. p. 80.

as other Christians did. I shall only observe what is said of those opinions of his, which were disliked by some, and then speak of his testimony to the scriptures.

And I immediately place at the bottom of the page the [p] concluding article of the Additions to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions.

Sect. VII. *A strenuous Assertor of the Divine Unity.*

He asserted the unity of God, and [q] denied a real Trinity; as Tertullian says at the beginning of his treatise against him. Again, he [r] held the Jewish doctrine, denying the distinct personality of the Son and Spirit. He contended [s] that by the Word was to be understood the wisdom, the will, the power, the voice or command of God; not a distinct personal substance, which would be introducing two gods.

Praxeas moreover said that 'the [t] man Jesus was the Son of 'God, and born of the virgin, and that [u] the Father dwelt in 'him; or that there was a union of the Deity, or Divine na-'ture with the man Jesus.' Which occasioned Tertullian and

[p] Sed post hos omnes etiam Praxeas quidam hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit. Hic Deum Patrem omnipotentem Jesum Christum esse dicit: Hunc crucifixum passumque contendit et mortuum. Prætèrea seipsum sibi fedère ad dexteram suam, cum profana et sacrilega temeritate proponit. cap. 53. p. 255. 218. 22.

[q] Vane diabolus æmulatus est veritatem ....Unicum Dominum vindicat Omnipotentem mundi conditorem, ut et de unico hæresim faciat. Ipsum dicit Patrem descendisse in virginem, ipsum ex ea natum, ipsum passum, denique ipsum esse Jesum Christum. Contr. Pr. cap. 1. p. 634. A. 498. 8. Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit. Ibid. D. p. 494. 28.

[r] Cæterum, Judaicæ fidei ista res, sic unum Deum credere, ut Filium ei adnumerare nobis, et post Filium Spiritus. Quid enim erit inter nos et illos, nisi differentia ista? Quod opus Evangelii,....si non exinde Pater et Filius et Spiritum tres crediti, unum Deum sistunt? Ibid. cap. 31. p. 663. D. p. 512. 41. Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram....Aut nunquid angelis loquebatur, ut Judæi interpretantur, quia nec ipsi Filium agnoscunt? Ibid. cap. 12. p. 643. A. p. 500. 3.

[s] Non vis enim eum substantivum habere in re per substantiæ proprietatem, ut res et persona quadam videri possit, et ita capiat secundus a Deo constitutus, duos efficere, Patrem et Filium, Deum et Sermonem. Quid est enim, dices, sermo, nisi vox, et sonus oris. cap. 7. p. 638. C. D. p. 497. 13.

[t] Ecce inquiunt ab angelo prædicatum est (Luc. 1. 35.) propterea quod nascetur sanctum, vocabitur Filius Dei: Caro itaque nata est, Caro itaque erit Filius Dei. Ad. Prax. c. 27. p. 659. D. 510. 23.

[u] Ut æque in una persona utrumque distinguant patrem et Filium, dicentes Filium carnem esse, id est hominem, id est Jesum: patrem autem Spiritum, id est Deum, id est Christum*. Ibid. p. 659. A. 510. 15.

* These two quotations confirm the account formerly given from Beausobre (See vol. iii. p. 13.) of the distinction in the Noetian or Sabellian Theology between the Word and the Son of God. The Word was the wisdom of God dwelling in the man Jesus, who was conceived in the womb of the virgin by the Holy Spirit, and was therefore called the Son of God.

others

others [x] to say of him, as also of the Sabellians, that they were Patripassians; and believed the Father to have been born, crucified, and died. That this is said without good ground has been shewn formerly [y]. They held Jesus to be a man, and said that God was with him in a superior and more intimate manner than with any other man or prophet whatever; but it was not a personal union.

SECT. VIII. *He would not allow that the Father suffered.*

WITH regard to Praxeas and his followers, we know from Tertullian himself that he did not say the Father suffered; they only allowed [z] compassion with the Son suffering. I place below a passage of Tertullian on this head [a] at length, and likewise a passage out of the Oriental doctrine, [b] where a like opinion is ascribed to Theodotus.

They were the more fully persuaded of the truth of this opinion [c] of theirs, because they thought it the surest way of maintaining the belief of one only God. For, as Tertullian [d] informs us, 'the doctrine of unity of one God the Father, Praxeas 'was persuaded must be right; and many others were of the 'same opinion, fearing the evil or danger of Polytheism.' They believed that [e] that person who was born of Mary suffered death, and was buried as the gospels relate; for no man ever allowed that proper Deity suffered. The catholics, who supposed the Son to

[x] Itaque post tempus Pater natus, et Pater passus est. Ipse Deus, Dominus omnipotens Jesus Christus prædicatur. Ib. cap. 2. p. 634. D. p. 494. 37.

[y] Vol. iii. p. 12....14.

[z] Times dicere passibilem, quem dicis compassibilem. c. 29. p. 662. B. 512. 12.

[a] Ergo nec compassus est Pater Filio: sic enim directam blasphemiam in patrem veriti, diminui eam hoc modo sperant, concedentes jam patrem et filium duos esse: Filius si quidem patitur, pater vero compatitur. Stulti et in hoc. Quid enim est compati quam cum alio pati? Porro si impassibilis Pater, utique et incompassibilis; aut si compassibilis, utique passibilis Ad. Prax. c. 29. p. 662. A. 512. 8.

[b] Εἶτα ἐκλαθόμενοι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, πάλιν αὐτὸν λέγουσιν ἀθέως. Ὁ γὰρ συνεπαθησεν ὁ πατὴρ γέγραπται ὡς τῇ φύσει, φησὶν ὁ Θεοδότειος....ἡ γὰρ συμπάθεια πάθος τινος, διὰ πάθος ἑτέρου. κ. τ. λ. Clem. Alex. p. 794. D.

[c] Maxime hæc, quæ se existimat meram veritatem possidere, dum unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si ipsum eundemque et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum dicat. Ad. Prax. c. 2. p. 635, 6. p. 495. 1. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari; se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt:....μοναρχίαν inquiunt tenemus. Ibid. 495. 14.

[d] Simplices enim quippe, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotæ (quæ major semper credentium pars est,) quoniam et ipsa regula fidei a pluribus diis seculi, ad unicum verum Deum transfert....expavescunt ad œconomiam. Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem præsumunt unitatis. Ibid. cap. 3. p. 635. D. 495. 10. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari; se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt. Ibid. c. 3. p. 635. D. p. 495. 14.

[e] Fortasse non credenda de patre, licet scripta, quem isti in vulvam Mariæ deducunt, et in Pilati tribunal imponunt, et in monumento Joseph concludunt. Ibid. c. 16. p. 649. A. p. 503. 45.

be incarnate, did not allow the Divine nature in Jesus to suffer, as Tertullian himself assures us [f]. He in the same place also informs us that the Praxeans said the like, that the Father, or the Divine nature in Jesus, did not suffer.

Sect. IX. *He received the Old Testament and the New, both Gospels and Epistles.*

Tertullian argues against them from every part of scripture, as supposing they allowed [g] the authority of it, and were obliged to acquiesce in the true sense and interpretation of it.

Having quoted the Psalms and Isaiah, he says 'it [h] is needless to produce more passages, though many others might be 'added.' Having argued a great deal from the Old Testament [i] he proceeds to the New, and alleges both gospels and epistles, quoting particularly St. John's gospel, and St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy. He has a long argument, or string of quotations, from St. John's [k] gospel, in eight or nine chapters, and as many folio pages; and in this work of Tertullian the [l] beginning of that gospel is quoted over and over; and not only St. John and St. Paul, but Matthew and Luke [m] are likewise expressly mentioned by name.

The followers of Praxeas, as well as Praxeas himself, were very fond of St. John's writings; Tertullian therefore quotes

[f] Quanquam cum duæ substantiæ censeantur in Christo Jesu, divina et humana, constet autem immortalem esse divinam, sicut mortalem quæ humana sit, apparet, quatenus eum mortuum dicat (1 Cor. xv. 3.) id est, qua carnem est hominem et filium hominis, non qua spiritum, et sermonem et Dei Filium. Dicendo denique, Christus mortuus est, id est, unctus; id quod unctum est, mortuum dicit, id est carnem. Ergo, inquis, et nos eadem ratione Patrem mortuum dicentes qua vos Filium, non blasphemamus in Dominum Deum: non enim ex divina, sed ex humana substantia, mortuum dicimus. cap. 29. p. 661. D. 662. A. p. 511. 49. 512.

[g] Probare autem tam aperte debebis ex scripturis quam nos probamus illum sibi filium fecisse, &c. Ibid. c. 11. p. 499. 10.

[h] Hæc pauca de multis. Nec enim affectamus universas scripturas evolvere. cap. 11. p. 642. D. p. 499. 46.

[i] Si hunc articulum quæstionibus scripturæ veteris non expediam, de Novo Testamento summam confirmationem nostræ interpretationis...Ecce enim et in Evangeliis et in Apostolis visibilem et invisibilem Deum deprehendo....Exclamat quodammodo Joannes: (cap. i. 18.) Deum nemo vidit unquam. Utique nec retro..... confirmat et Apostolus de Deo: (1 Tim. vi. 16.) Quem nemo vidit hominum, sed nec videre potest. cap. 13. p. 646. D. p. 502. 22.

[k] A. cap. 21. ad. cap. 27. p. 651. D. 659. p. 505. 512.

[l] Et in primis, ipsa statim præfatio Joannis Evangelizatoris demonstrat, quod retro fuerit, qui caro fieri habebat. In principio erat sermo, et sermo erat apud Deum, et Deus erat sermo, &c. cap. 21. p. 651. C. p. 50. 30.

[m] Aut nunquid mendacium Evangeliis exprobavit, dicens, viderit Matthæus et Lucas, cap. 1. p. 634. B. p. 494. 16.

his

his [n] firſt epiſtle, and his goſpel again and again. Having gone over his goſpel from the beginning to the end, he proceeds to the other goſpels, [o] and argues from the accounts of our Saviour's nativity in Matthew and Luke. Whence it appears that they drew an argument from Luke i. 35. They ſaid 'the Holy 'Ghoſt, or the Spirit of God, is God himſelf, and *the power of* '*the higheſt*, the Higheſt himſelf.'

SECT. X. *He founded his Arguments upon a great Variety of Paſſages both in the Old and New Teſtament.*

NOT only Tertullian endeavoured to confute the followers of Praxeas by ſcripture, but they themſelves argued from it; and he has happily let us know ſome of the texts on which they inſiſted.

'They were much moved,' he [p] ſays, 'by any paſſages of the 'Old or New Teſtament which ſpeak of there being one God 'only, particularly where it is ſaid, (Iſaiah xlv. 5.) *I am the* '*Lord, and there is none elſe, there is no God beſides me.* And chap. 'xliv. 24. *I am the Lord that maketh all things; that ſtretcheth* '*forth the heavens* ALONE; *that ſpreadeth abroad the earth by* '*myſelf.*'

In the New Teſtament [q] they grounded much upon the anſwer

[n] Denique inſpiciamus, quem Apoſtoli viderint. Quod videmus, inquit Joannes, (1 Ep. c. 1.) quod audivimus,...et manus noſtræ contrectaverunt, de ſermone vitæ. cap. 15. p. 647. B. p. 502. 36. Joannes autem (1 Ep. ii. 22.) etiam mendacem notat eum qui negaverit Jeſum eſſe Chriſtum: contra (1 Ep. v. 1.) de Deo natum omnem, qui crediderit Jeſum eſſe Chriſtum. cap. 28. p. 661. A. p. 511. 23.

[o] Videmus Joannis Evangelium decucurriſſe...Cæterum, ut alia Evangelia non interponam, quæ de nativitate dominica fidem confirmant, ſufficit eum qui naſci habebat ex virgine, ab ipſo annuntiari angelo, filium Dei determinatum: Spiritus Dei ſuperveniet in te, et virtus Altiſſimi obumbrabit te. Propterea quod naſcetur ex te ſanctum vocabitur Filius Dei. Volent quidem et hîc argumentari: ſed veritas prævalebit. Nempe, inquiunt, Filius (f. Spiritus) Dei Deus eſt, et virtus Altiſſimi Altiſſimus eſt. Nec pudet eos injicere, Quod ſi eſſet, ſcriptum fuiſſet. Quem enim verebatur, ut non aperte pronuntiaret, Deus ſuperveniet, et Altiſſimus obumbrabit te. cap. 26. p. 658. A. p. 506. 27.

[p] Sed hanc ſocietatem nominum paternorum in filio ne facile perſpiciant, perturbat illos ſcriptura ſi quando unicum Deum ſtatuit. cap. 18. p. 649. D. p. 504. 16. Igitur unus Deus Pater, et alius abſque eo non eſt. Inſpice ſequentia hujuſmodi.... Et invenies, fere ad idolorum factitatores atque cultores eorum pertinere, ut multitudinem falſorum deorum unio divinitatis expellat. cap. 18. 649. D. 650. A. Itaque præter ſemet ipſum non eſſe alium Deum, hoc propter idololatriam tam Nationum quam Iſraelis. Ibid. Quin et hoc dictum ejus in argumentis ſingularitatis arripient. extendi, inquit, cœlum ſolus. (Iſ. 44. 24.) cap. 19. p. 650. B. p. 504. 39.

[q] Sed argumentationibus eorum adhuc retundendis opera præbenda eſt, ſi quid de ſcripturis ad ſententiam ſuam excerpent ....Nam ſicut in veteribus nihil aliud tenent quam, Ego Deus, et alius præter me non eſt: ita in Evangelio reſponſionem Domini ad Philippum tuentur: Ego et Pater unum ſumus: et, qui me viderit, videt et Patrem: et Ego in Patre, et Pater in me. His tribus capitulis totum inſtrumentum utriuſque teſtamenti volunt cedere. cap. 20. p. 651. B. p. 505. 20.

which our Lord made to Philip, John xiv. 9, 10. They likewise insisted on [r] John x. 30. Having considered many passages in St. John's gospel, he concludes: 'wherefore [s] the texts which 'you think to be for you, are all against you.'

Praxeas received the Acts of the Apostles, and argued from that [t] book in favour of this opinion. And Tertullian endeavours to confute him by it in a great variety of instances, some of which are given below, and more might be added.

Tertullian also argues against him from St. Paul's epistles, particularly from the epistles [u] to the Romans and Galatians, and the [x] first to the Corinthians. He also endeavours to confute him from [y] the epistle to the Ephesians, and from [z] the first of Timothy, and also from the epistle [a] to the Philippians.

We have seen before that the first epistle of St. John was much regarded by Praxeas, and that Tertullian frequently quotes it against him.

He also received [b] St. John's Revelation, and argued from it, particularly from chap. i. 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*

[r] 'Ego et Pater unum sumus.' Hic ergo jam gradum volunt figere stulti, immo cæci, qui non videant: primo ego et Pater, duorum esse significationem: dehinc in novissimo sumus, non ex unius esse persona.....tum quod unum sumus, non unus sumus. cap. 22. p. 507. 18.

[s] Igitur quæcunque ex his putaveris ad demonstrationem ejusdem Patris et Filii proficere tibi posse, adversus definitivam Evangelii sententiam niteris. cap. 25. p. 657. D. p. 509. 23. [t] Sed non ita docent Acta Apostolorum in illa exclamatione Ecclesiæ ad Deum: Convenerunt enim universi, adversus sanctum Filium tuum Jesum: (Act. iv. 27.) Sic et Petrus: (Act. ii. 36.) Firmissime itaque cognoscat omnis domus Israel, quod et Dominum et Christum, id est unctum, fecerit eum Deus hunc Jesum, quem vos crucifixistis. cap. 28. p. 660. D. 661. A. p. 511. 18. 22. Altissimus, qua dextra Dei exaltatus, sicut Petrus in Actis concionatus. cap. 17. p. 649. C. p. 504. 9. Hunc videt Stephanus cum lapidaretur, ad hunc stantem ad dexteram Dei. cap. 30. p. 663. A. p. 512. 35.

[u] Sic et Paulus ubique Deum Patrem ponit, et Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum. Cum ad Romanos scribit...Cum et Galatas...Et habes tota instrumenta ejus, quæ in hunc modum pronuntiant. c. 28. p. 661. A. p. 511. 26.

[x] Nam et Apostolus non sine onere pronuntians Christum mortuum, adjecit secundum scripturas. (1 Cor. xv. 3.) cap. 29. p. 511. 47. Siquidem Apostolus scribit de ultimo fine cum tradiderit regnum Deo et patri, (1 Cor. xv. 24.) &c. cap. 4. p. 495. 5. Vide etiam cap. 1, 4, 10, 14, 15, 16, &c. &c. [y] Et cum Apostolus scribit, uti Deus Domini nostri Jesu Christi det vobis spiritum sapientiæ et agnitionis. (Ep. i. 17.) cap. 28. p. 511. 42.

[z] De Patre autem ad Timotheum, quem nemo vidit hominum nec videre potest? exaggerans amplius qui solus habet immortalitatem, &c. (1 Tim. vi. 16.) cap. 15. p. 502. 51. [a] Hic certe est, qui in effigie Dei constitutus, non rapinam existimavit esse se æqualem Deo. (Phil. ii. 6.) cap. 7. p. 497. 24.

[b] Interim, hic mihi promotum sit responsum adversus id quod et de Apocalypsi Joannis proferunt. Ego Dominus qui est, et qui fuit, et venit, Omnipotens. cap. 17. p. 649. C. p. 504. 12.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Of JULIUS CASSIANUS.

SECT. I. *Of his Time.*

JULIUS CASSIANUS, or CASSIAN, is ſuppoſed by [a] Cave to have flouriſhed about the year 174; by [b] Tillemont about the year 200: perhaps he might be as well placed between both theſe dates, at about the year 190. There is little notice taken of him by any ancient writer, beſide Clement of Alexandria. I ſhall quote all the paſſages in which Clement mentions him, in the order in which they lie, and make a few ſhort remarks.

SECT. II. *In his Writings he argued from the Old as well as the New Teſtament.*

CLEMENT aſſerts that the Hebrew philoſophy is the moſt ancient. 'This,' ſays he, 'has been well ſhewn by Tatian in his 'book againſt the Gentiles or Greeks. It is alſo ſhewn by 'Caſſian [c] in the firſt book of his Commentaries. It is not unlikely therefore that in that work Caſſian defended the truth of the Chriſtian religion. And we may conclude likewiſe, that he reſpected the Jewiſh people, and Moſes their lawgiver.

In another place Clement is arguing againſt the Encratites, who condemned marriage. He takes ſome notice of their reaſonings, and then adds: 'by [d] ſuch arguments Caſſian, a prin-'cipal defender of Docetiſm, endeavours to ſupport their doc-'trine; for thus he writes in his book of Continence.' In which paſſage Caſſian quotes and argues from Iſa. lvi. 3. and Matt. xix. 12. Here Clement obſerves that Caſſian agrees with Tatian. In this book too Caſſian argued [e] from our Lord's anſwer to a queſtion of Salome, ſuppoſed to be taken from the goſpel

[a] H. L. P. 1. p. 78.

[b] Mem. Ec. T. 2. Les Gnoſtiques, p. 51. et Les Valentiniens, p. 265.

[c] Εἰρηται δὲ καὶ κασσιωνῳ ἐν τῳ πρωτῳ τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν. Str. lib. 1. p. 320. B.

[d] Τοιαυτης ἐπιχειρεῖ καὶ ὁ τῆς δοκησεως ἐξαρχων ἰουλιος κασσιανος. Ἐν γαν τῳ περι ἐγκρατειας, ἢ περι εὐνουχιας, κατα λεξιν φησιν...Εἰ γαρ ἠν παρα θεῳ, εἰς ὃν σπευδομεν, ἡ τοιαυτη διασυρη, οὐκ ἂν ἐμακαρισεν τους εὐνουχους. κ. λ. Str. 3. p. 465. B. C. D.

[e] Διὰ τουτο τοι ὁ κασσιανὸς φησι, πειθομενης της σαλωμης, ποτε γνωσθησεται τα περι ὧν ἠρετο, ἐφη ὁ κυριος, Οταν τε της αἰσχυνης εἰδυμα πατησητε. κ. λ. Ibid. C. D.

according to the Ægyptians, of which we took notice [f] formerly.

In this same book likewise Cassian said that 'the [g] coats of 'skins, which God made for Adam and Eve to cover them, 'were bodies, Gen. iii. 21.' And it seems somewhat probable that here Cassian argued also from Eph. iv. 22...24. which therefore Clement explains in a different [h] manner from him. Upon these two last passages Beausobre has some curious observations, which [i] may be seen in his history of Manichæism.

Clement once more mentions [k] Cassian with others, and not without a good deal of indignation, on account of his Docetism and aversion to the appointment of marriage.

I should add that Theodoret [l] in the article of Secundus, whom he calls successor of Valentinus, mentions several others, leaders of parties, somewhat different from the original Valentinian scheme, and among them Cossian, perhaps meaning our Cassian.

Sect. III. *Of his Opinions, Country, and philosophical Speculations.*

By all which we perceive that Julius Cassian, who seems to have been contemporary with Clement, was a Christian, a Docete, and an Encratite. And it appears highly probable that he received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as other Christians generally did. If he quoted the gospel according to the Ægyptians, it is not certain that he shewed the same respect to it which he had for the other gospels. However, from that reference, and the particular notice taken of him by Clement of Alexandria, whilst other writers, so far as we know, have omitted to mention him, it may be argued that he was of the same country. He was learned, and may have been virtuous; for he is spoken of with great respect by Clement [m] after his confutation of him in the passage before [n] quoted: but he was mistaken in several respects, being misled, as it seems, by his philosophical speculations.

[f] See Vol. ii. p. 221, 235.

[g] Χιτωνας δε δερματινας πηγνυται κασσιανος τα σωματα. Ibid. p. 466. D.

[h] Οταν δε ο Αποστολος ειπη, ενδυσασθε τον καινον ανθρωπον τον κατα Θεον κτιζομενον, φησιν λεγει, τοις πεπλασμενοις υπο της του πανκοσμοκρατορος βουλησεως ως πεπλασμεθα· παλαιον δε ην προς γενεσιν και αναγκαιαν φησιν αλλα προς τον βιον τον τε εν παρακοη. &c. Ibid. C.

[i] Tom. 2. p. 135, 136.

[k] Οι και των καλων. Βλασφημουσι το βαπτισμα του Θεου και το μυστηριον της κτισεως την γενεσιν διαβαλλοντες. δια ταυτα η δοκησις Κασσιανω. Ibid. p. 469. C. D.

[l] Και αλλοι δε μυριοι εντευθεν ανεφυησαν αιρεσεως αρχηγοι Κοσσιανος, Θεοδοτος, &c. H. F. lib. 1. p. 201. A.

[m] Ηγειται δε ο γενναιος ουτος Πλατωνικωτερον, θειαν ουσαν την ψυχην ανωθεν επιθυμια ξενην, θειαν ουσαν την ψυχην ανωθεν επιθυμια βαλουσαν δευρο ηκειν εις γενεσιν και φθοραν. Str. lib. 3. p. 466. A.

[n] Page 501, note [c].

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the ELCESAITES, or OSSENS.

SECT. I. *The Time uncertain when they arose.*

WE have already spoken of this sect, [a] the time of the rise of which is uncertain. Epiphanius [b] places Elxai, from whom they derived their name, under the emperor Trajan. Eusebius places the appearance of it much later; for having mentioned some persons in Arabia against whom Origen disputed, he adds: 'At [c] that time also sprang up another perverse opinion, called 'the heresy of the Elcesaites, but it became extinct almost as 'soon as it appeared.'

SECT. II. *They were mentioned and written against by Origen.*

ORIGEN makes mention of it in a discourse to the people upon the eighty-second Psalm, in these words: 'There is very 'lately come among us, a person highly conceited of himself, 'supposing he should be able to defend an atheistical and 'wicked opinion, newly [d] arisen up to infest (our) churches, 'called the heresy of the Elcesaites. I will lay before you the 'evils contained in that opinion that you may not be carried 'away with it. It [e] rejects some things in every part of scrip-'ture: again, it makes use of passages out of every part of 'scripture, both of the ancient and the evangelical scripture. It 'rejects the apostle entirely; and it teaches that to deny the faith 'is an indifferent thing. He who has understood the truth ac-'cording to him, may, in a case of necessity, deny it with his 'mouth, though not with the heart. They have a book which 'they say fell down from heaven; and they who hear that and 'believe, as they affirm, shall obtain remission of sins, but a 'different remission from that which Christ bestows.'

[a] Vol. ii. p. 451. Vol. iii. p. 315. [b] Ad Hær. 19. n. 1. p. 40. A.
[c] H. E. lib. 6. cap. 38. [d] ...νεωςι επανιςαμενης ταις εκκλησιαις. Ibid. p. 233. D.
[e] Αθετει τινα απο πασης γραφης· κεχρηται ρετοις παλιν απο πασης παλαιας τε και αγγελικης· τον αποςολον αθετει. κ. λ. p. 234. A.

Sect. III. *Other ancient Authors who speak of this Sect, and of their Opinions.*

It cannot be improper to observe here what farther notice any other ancient writers have taken of a sect, which seems to lie in a good deal of obscurity.

The Helcesaites, or Elcesaites, are just mentioned by Methodius. But he [f] so dislikes them that he says they had better not be so much as mentioned.

I do not observe these people in Philaster.

Epiphanius often speaks of them. In [g] his Recapitulation he says: 'The Sampsæans, or Elcesæans, to this very time dwell 'in Arabia, in a country lying above the Dead Sea. They are 'followers of one Elxai, a false prophet. Of his family [h] there 'have been in our days two women named Marthus and Marthina, which have been worshipped by that sect as goddesses. 'They entirely agree with the Ebionites.' In the same work, in the article of the Ebionites, he had before said that 'the [i] 'Ebionites very much agree with the before-mentioned Cerinthians and Nazarenes, with [k] whom also the heresy of the Sampsæans and Elcesæans consents in part.'

In the larger work of Epiphanius these people are spoken of under three articles: first in that of the Ossens, then that of the Ebionites, and finally in that, which may be reckoned most properly the article peculiarly allotted to them, which last is to this purpose: that 'the [l] Sampsæans, called also Elcesæans, live in 'Peræa, (or beyond Jordan) beyond the Salt, otherwise called 'the Dead Sea, in the country of the Moabites, near the brook 'Arnon, and farther up in Iturea and Nabatis. They glory in 'Elxai as their master.' He here again speaks of the two forementioned women, Marthus and Marthina, and enlarges in the account of the great respect shewed to them. 'One of whom 'he had heard to be dead, the other, Marthina, might be still 'living, unless she too had died lately.' In the article of the Ossens, he had before spoken of these women; there he says that 'Marthus [m] had died a little while ago, but that Marthina

[f] Μαρκιανος γαρ και ουαλεντινω, και τον περι τον Ελκισαιον, και τους αλλους, καλον μηδε μνημονευσαι. Method. Conv. p. 113. D. Ap. Combef. Auct. Nov.

[g] Anac. p. 397. cap. 7. vol. 1. edit. Paris. 1622. [h] ε στι δυο εκ του γενους υπηρχε μαρθας και μαρθινη... Παραπλη-

σιος τοις εβιωναιοις παντα εχοντες. Ibid.

[i] Ibid. p. 53. cap. 10. C.

[k] Οις συνηφθη κατα τι η σαμψαιων τε και ελκισαιων αιρεσις. Ibid.

[l] Adv. H. 53. p. 461, 462.

[m] H. 19. Num. 2. p. 41. B.

'was

'was ſtill living.' He ſays, 'they [n] make uſe of the ſame book 'that is uſed by the Oſſens, Ebionites, and Nazarenes, as he 'had before mentioned ſeveral times. Theſe Sampſæans,' he ſays, 'are neither Chriſtians, nor Jews, nor heathens, but ſo 'compounded of each one as to be nothing at all. They [o] are 'ſaid to have another little book aſcribed to the brother of 'Elxai. They [p] profeſs to believe one God, whom they wor-'ſhip with certain waſhings or purifications. They adhere to 'the Jews in all things. Some of them abſtain from animal 'food. They are not unwilling to lay down their life for one 'of the family of Elxai. They [q] neither receive the prophets 'nor the apoſtles, and are all over in error. Water is eſteemed 'by them as if it were God and the fountain of life. They 'confeſs Chriſt in words, but they think him a creature, and that 'he has often appeared; and that he firſt formed the body of 'Adam, and that he puts it on, or clothes himſelf with it, when-'ever he pleaſeth; him they call Chriſt; and the Holy Spirit [r] 'they ſay is his ſiſter, making him a woman. And many other 'ridiculous opinions they have among them.'

SECT. IV. *Of the Oſſens, who were the ſame with the Elceſaites, called alſo Sampſæans; their Time and Opinions.*

As the ſect of the Oſſens were cloſely connected with the Elceſaites, and regarded Elxai with veneration, it will be proper to ſpeak of them in this place. They are reckoned by Epiphanius to be a Jewiſh ſect: but it will appear that they were Chriſtians, and the ſame with the Sampſæans or Elceſaites. 'The [s] Oſſens,' ſays Epiphanius, 'agree with the forementioned, (viz. the Naza-'renes). They are Jews, as well as the foregoing: they are 'ſaid to have had their original in the country of Nabatis, and 'Iturea, and Moab, and Areil, which lie beyond the valley of 'Salt. To theſe joined himſelf Elxai in the time of the em-'peror Trajan, after the coming of our Saviour. He was a 'falſe prophet. He [t] compoſed a book after the manner of a 'prophecy, as if it had been a work containing divine wiſdom.

[n] κεχρηται δε τη βιβλω ταυτη και οσσαιοι. κ. λ. p. 461. B.

[o] φασι δε και αλλο εχειν. κ. λ. Ibid.

[p] Θεον δε εια λεγουσι, κ. λ. Ibid. C.

[q] και ουτε προφητας δεχονται οι τοιουτοι, ουτε αποστολους. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. D.

[r] Καλεισθαι δε αυτον Χριστον, και ειναι το αγιον Πνευμα αδελφην αυτου θηλυνω σχηματι. Ibid. No. 1. p. 462. A.

[s] Ad. Hær. 19. No. 1. p. 39, 40. A.

[t] Συνηφθη δε τουτοις μετεπειτα ο καλουμενος Ηλξαι εν χρονοις Τραιανου βασιλεως μετα την του Σωτηρος παρουσιαν ος εγενετο ψευδοπροφητης. συνεγραψατο δε αυτος βιβλιον δηθεν κατα προφητειαν η ως κατα θειον σοφιαν. Ibid. p. 40. A. B.

'They

'They likewise say he had a brother named Jexe, or Jexeus. 'He was an impostor of the Jewish nation, and pretended to 'have a zeal for Jewish rites, but yet lived not himself accord-'ing to the law. He taught men to swear by salt, water, the 'earth, bread, and heaven, and the air, and the wind. Some-'times he speaks of seven other witnesses; namely, heaven, 'water, and spirits, and holy angels of prayer, and oil, and salt, 'and the earth. He is an enemy to virginity, condemns conti-'nency, and compels men to marry.'

'He [u] has some fancies which he recommends as a revelation. 'He teaches men to be hypocrites, and says "it is no sin to "worship idols in time of persecution, provided it be done with "the mouth only, and not with the heart." Epiphanius afterwards adds: 'he [x] therefore long ago joined himself to the 'forementioned heresy of the Ossens, of whom there are still 'remains in that same country of Nabatis and Peræa, and in 'the country of the Moabites, which are now called Sampsæans. 'He [y] forbids to pray toward the east, but says that every where 'we ought to pray looking towards Jerusalem. And yet,' as Epiphanius writes, 'he condemns sacrifices, and denies they 'were ever appointed of God. He respected water, but not 'fire, and spake of the Holy [z] Spirit as female.

Epiphanius further relates of Elxai, [a] that 'he had great re-'spect paid him by the followers of four sects, who in some 'measure borrowed from him, viz. the Ebionites, two sorts of 'Nazarenes, * and the Ossens.' He further says of him, that 'on [b] his joining himself to the Ebionites, they altered their 'opinion in some measure concerning Christ, believing him to 'be Adam, or at least that he was the former of Adam's [c] body,

[u] Φαντασιωδη δε τινα ως ανθεν απεκαλυψεν παρεισφερει. Ibid. p. 40. C.

[x] Ουτος μεν ουν αιωθεν συνηπται τη προειρημενη αιρεσει των Οσσηνων καλουμενη, ης ετι λειψανα και ονομα υπαρχει εν τη αυτη Ναβατηνη γη, τη και Περαια προς τη Μωαβιτιδι οπερ γενος νυν Σαμψαιων καλειται. Ibid. No. 2. p. 40. D. [y] Καλυει δε εις αιατολας ευχασθαι φασκων μη ουν προσεχειν ουτως, επι τα Ιεροσολυμα δε εχειν το προσωπον εκ παντων μερων. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. No. 3. p. 42. A. B. [z] Ειναι δε και το αγιον πνευμα και αυτο θηλειαν. Ibid. No. 4. p. 42. C. [a] Και νενομηται αυτω τεσσαρες αιρεσεις επειδη δεδογται τα αυτα φρονειν. Ibid. No. 5. p. 43. D.

* The latter Nazarenes, which is one of the four sects mentioned by Epiphanius, are perhaps the same with the Sampsæans, or Elcesaites. Le Clerc was of this opinion, for he says, Vult idem (Epiphanius) Elxæo magistro unas quatuor Hæreses, Ossenos, Ebionæos, Nazaræos posteriores et Sampsæos. Hist. Eccles. p. 555. No. 3. He thinks indeed that Epiphanius trifles egregiously in making two sorts of Nazarenes. Ibid. p. 538. No. 9. and p. 539. 12.

[b] Ταχα δε ειναι απο του συναφθηναι αυτοις Ηλξαιον τον ψευδοπροφητην...ως εκεινος φαντασιαν τινα περι χριστου διηγειται και περι πνευματος αγιου. Τινες γαρ εξ αυτων και Αδαμ τον Χριστον ειναι λεγουσιν...ερχεσθαι δε ενταυθα ουτε θηλεταν, ως και εν τω Αδαμ ειδε. Ad. Hær. 56. No. 3. p. 127. A.

[c] Και πρωτον μεν πεπλασθαι αυτον το σωμα τε Αδαμ και ενδεδυσθαι ουτε θηλειαν. Adv. Hær. 53. No. 1. p. 461. D.

'and

'and assumed it whenever he pleased.' From Elxai also these Ebionites are said by [d] Epiphanius 'to have learnt their silly 'notions concerning the great height, and breadth, and thick-'ness of the bodies of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit; and to 'have imbibed their doctrines [e] principally from those countries 'where Elxai and his followers flourished.'

The foregoing passages contain all which Epiphanius says of Elxai, under the Ossen and Ebionitish heresies.

In that part where Epiphanius speaks of him under the article Ossens, there occurs a vile reflection. He says [f] that 'Elxai 'calls Christ a great king;' but he adds, 'he does not know 'whether he means our Lord Jesus Christ or another;' and the reason he gives for his ignorance seems to be because Elxai forbade men to worship towards the East, and enjoined them every where to worship towards Jerusalem. A sufficient foundation truly on which to rest such a malicious insinuation, which amounts at last only to this, that the object of superstitious regard, towards which this holy father, and his heretical opponent, were to turn their faces in time of divine worship, might happen to be in opposite points of the compass.

Austin is only remarkable for the time in which he places this sect, being the [g] thirty-second in his catalogue of ninety heresies; whereas in Epiphanius it is the fifty-third, though he reckons no more than eighty in the whole. What Austin [h] says of them is copied from Epiphanius's Recapitulation. He also mentions them under the article Ebionites, [i] referring again to Epiphanius.

Theodoret [k] speaks of them in the following manner: 'the 'Elcesæans,

[d] Τȣ δε Ηλξαι την φαντασιαν ωςε νομιζειν μεν τον χριςον ειναι τι ανδροεικελον εκτυπωμα αορατον ανθρωποις μιλιων ενενηκοντα εξ το μηκος, δηθεν σχοινων εικοσιτεσσαρων, το δε πλατος σχοινων εξ μιλιων εικοσιτεσσαρων το παχος δε κατα μετρησιν αλλην τινα. κ. τ. λ. Adv. Hær. 30. No, 17. p. 141. D.

[e] Τας δε ριζας των ακανθωδων παραφυαδων ιχȣσιν απο της Ναβατεας και Πανεαδος το πλειςον Μωαβιτιδος δε. κ. τ. λ. Ibid. No. 18. p. 142. A.

[f] Αλλα και παλιν δηθεν μεν Χριςον ονοματι ομολογει, λεγων οτι Χριςος ο μεγας βασιλευς, ου μην πανυ γε κατειληφα,...ει περι τȣ Κυριȣ ημων Ιησȣ Χριςȣ υφηγησατο· ȣτε γαρ τȣτο οριζει, Χριςον δε απλως λεγει. ως εξ ων κατειληφαμεν τινα ετεροι σημαινων η προσδοκων, κωλυει γαρ εις ανατολην ευξασθαι. κ. τ. λ. Adv. Hær. 19. No. 3. p. 41. D. 42. A.

[g] Vide the Index of Heresies in the Preface to his Treatise on Heresies, vol. 6. p. 4. col. 1. Ed. Ven. 1570.

[h] Elceseos et Sampseos hic tanquam ordine suo commemorat Epiphanius quos dicit a quodam pseudopropheta esse deceptos qui vocabatur Elci, ex cujus genere duas mulieres tanquam Deas ab eis perhibet adoratas. Cætera Hebionæis tenere similia. De Hæres. vol. 6. cap. 32. p. 6. col. 1. Ed. Ven. 1570.

[i] Huic hæresi Epiphanius Sampseos et Elceseos ita copulat ut sub eodem numero tanquam una sit hæresis ponat aliquod tamen interesse significans. Ibid. cap. 10. p. 5. col. 1.

[k] Οι δε Ελκεσαιοι εκ τινος Ελκεσαι της αιρεσεως αρξαντος την προσηγοριαν λαβοντες εκ διαφορων αιρεσεων μυθȣς ερανισαμενοι την οικιαν συντεθεικασι πλανην. ...και τȣτον δε παλιν μετενσωματȣσθαι και εις αλλα ιεναι σωματα λεγει, και καθ εκαςον

καιρον

'Elcesæans, who are so called from one Elcesai, who set up 'this heresy, having borrowed divers fictions from several other 'heresies, thus formed their peculiar error:

'In their opinions concerning the principle of all things they 'agree with us, for they say there is one unbegotten Being, 'and him they call the master of all things. But they do not 'teach one Christ, but one above, and another below, and him 'they represent to have dwelled in many formerly, and at last 'to have descended. Sometimes they acknowledge that Jesus 'is from God; at other times they say he is a spirit. Some-'times they say he had a virgin for his mother; but in other of 'their writings they do not own so much as this. They believe 'him to transmigrate into other bodies, and every time to appear 'differently.

'They use songs and invocations of dæmons, and washings in 'the consecration of the elements. They profess to follow 'astrology and magic, and the mathematical error, and call 'themselves prognosticators. They have rejected the apostle 'altogether, and have composed a certain book, which they say 'fell down from heaven. He who attends to this book will re-'ceive a remission of his sins, but a remission different from 'that which Christ bestowed. Against this heresy Origen has 'written well. But Alcibiades, of Apamea in Syria, has com-'mended it.'

Thus far Theodoret, on which it may be observed that Epiphanius does not mention any thing of their teaching two Christs, one above, and another below; unless a passage concerning Elxai before referred to, [l] and introduced by him under the article Ebionites, may be thought to convey some such meaning. He had been representing Ebion as holding the opinion that Christ was born of the seed of Joseph, by ordinary generation; and his followers as differing in their sentiments concerning Christ, yet all of them entertaining some absurd and perplexed notions about him. He proceeds: 'But [m] from the time that Elxai the false 'prophet joined himself to them, who was followed by those 'that are called Sampsæans, Ossens, and Elcesaites, they have 'adopted certain fancies from him concerning Christ and the 'Holy Spirit. For some of them say that Christ was Adam,

καιρον διαφορως δεικνυσθαι, επωδαις δε και δαιμονων επικλησεσι και αυτοι κεχρηνται και βαπτισμασιν επι τη των στοιχειων ομολογια· αστρολογιαν δε και μαγικην και μαθηματικην ασπαζοντο πλανην και προγνωστικους εαυτους προσηγορευον. κ. τ. λ. Hær. Fab. lib. 2. cap. 7. p. 221, 2. vol. 4. Paris Cramoisy, 1642.

[l] Vide page 506, note [b].

[m] Ταχα δε οιμαι απο του συναφθηναι αυτοις Ηλξαιον τον ψευδοπροφητην τον παρα τοις Αμψηνοις (lege Σαμψηνοις) και Οσσηνοις και Ελκεσσαιοις καλουμενοις ως εκεινος φαντασιαν τινα περι Χριστου διηγειται. κ. τ. λ. Adv. Hær. 30. No. 3. p. 127. A. B.

'meaning

'meaning he that was firſt formed by God, and animated with 'his breath. But others among them ſay that he is from above, 'that he was created before all things, and is a ſpirit: that he is 'ſuperior to angels, that he is Lord of all, and is called Chriſt, 'and has obtained an inheritance there for ever; but that he 'comes here when he pleaſes, as he came in Adam, and as he 'appeared to the patriarchs, being clothed with a body: and 'that he who came to Abraham, and Iſaac, and Jacob, was the 'ſame who appeared in theſe laſt days; and that he aſſumed the 'very body of Adam, and that he was ſeen by men, and was 'crucified, and was raiſed from the dead, and aſcended into 'heaven. Again, when they pleaſe, they contradict all this, and 'ſay that that Spirit which was the Chriſt, came into, and 'clothed itſelf with him who is called Jeſus. Thus there is 'much obſcurity among them as to this point, ſince they ſome-'times deliver one thing, and ſometimes another, as their opinion 'about this matter.'

This paſſage alſo illuſtrates what Theodoret mentions as part of their belief, viz. that Chriſt tranſmigrates into other bodies, and every time appears differently. Perhaps this might be only the conſequence of their opinion as Unitarians, that God, or the divine power, appeared differently in the different manifeſtations of himſelf.

SECT. V. *Of the Name of the Founder of this Sect, and of ſeveral Authors who mention him.*

THEODORET calls this perſon Elceſai, whereas in the Synopſis of Epiphanius [n] he is called Elxa, and in his larger work Elxai, or Elxaios. He owns this hereſy was compoſed out of the opinion of ſeveral others, and ſpeaks of it as paſt, uſing the preter tenſe; from whence one may conclude that the hereſy was not then in being, but had become extinct long before, agreeable to what is ſaid by Euſebius. Epiphanius does not charge them with magic, though Theodoret does. But in alleviation of this accuſation, it is to be obſerved that the ancient fathers, as has been frequently mentioned, were very apt to charge thoſe with this crime, who had any thing in their doctrines or rites which they did not well underſtand. Had this charge been true, it cannot be ſuppoſed that Epiphanius, who is not backward in attributing this to the heretics he mentions, and

[n] Adv. Hær. Synop. p. 397. B. Ed. Petav.

who

who lived much nearer their times than Theodoret, would have omitted it.

Damascenus mentions [o] these under the article Ebionites; and again [p] under the article Sampsæi, and Elcesæi, saying they were called so from Elxa, which is the reading in Epiphanius's Synopsis, as observed before. He has also Marthus and Marthina, which is also the reading in Epiphanius's Synopsis; whereas the latter in every place in his larger work is Marthana. Which confirms what Cave says, that 'only [q] the 'latter part of this work of Damascenus's De Hæresibus, beginning from the Nestorians, is really his own, the other being a transcript of the Synopsis of Epiphanius *.

Nicetas Chroniates [r] speaks also of these heretics; but he plainly confounds Ossens with Essens; as Fleury also does in his Ecclesiastical History [s]. Nicetas agrees with other authors in the main; but is not to be relied on unless other authors confirm what he says.

There is still one author more referred to in Ittigius, [t] viz. Nicephorus Callisti, who mentions them in his Ecclesiastical History [u].

Sect. VI. *Of the Time when he flourished according to modern Authors.*

Baronius speaks of these Anno 249, No. vii. Pagi speaks of them Anno 247, No. xii.

Basnage places them under the year 104, No. iii. iv. v. vi. vii. viii.

Spondanus in his Epitome of Baronius places them under the year 105.

Tillemont speaks of them [x] under their proper article of the heresy of the Elcesaites. And in his table of matters there are references to some other places, besides the article itself which

[o] De Hæresibus, cap. 30. De Ebionæis.

[p] Ibid. c. 53. De Sampsæis et Elcesæis.

[q] Pars posterior (Libri De Hæresibus) a Nestorianis incipiens quæ sola Damasceno debetur. Pars enim prior nihil aliud nisi Epiphanii Anacephalæosis. Cave Hist. Liter. p. 411. Edit. Genevæ, 1729.

* The Treatise de Prædestinatione, (l. 1. c. 32.) agrees with Epiphanius's Recapitulation; it calls their leader Helchi, and a false prophet, and them Helcesæans. He concludes, hos Papias presbyter Achaiæ obtonuit; the meaning of which seems to be that he spoke or wrote against them with vehemence.

[r] Thes. Ortho. Fid. lib. 1. cap. 33.

[s] Vol. 1. B. 3. No. 2. p. 165.

[t] De Hæret. sec. 239.

[u] Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 24.

[x] Tom. 2. P. 2. p. 85.

belong

belongs to these people. Thus he says [y] that 'the Ebionites in 'joining themselves to them, altogether corrupted them in their 'manners.' Again, 'Elxai, [z] the author of the Elcesaites, made 'his appearance under Trajan.'

Fleury, in the place before referred to, [a] speaks of Elxai as joining himself to the Ossens under the reign of the emperor Trajan. He there gives a pretty large and full account of his peculiar tenets, from what Epiphanius says under the articles Ebionites and Ossens. But he speaks of the Elcesaitæ under the year 247, about the latter end of Philip's reign, [b] where he says, 'it was rather an old error new revived, than a new one, for it 'has a near affinity to that of Elxai in the reign of Trajan.'

The time and duration of this heresy is much and justly enough disputed. According to Eusebius, it died away soon after it sprang up, and it's beginning was not long before Origen preached his Homilies against the followers of this sect. For Origen's words, as before quoted from Eusebius, [c] are that 'it 'was newly sprung up [d] against the churches.' Now this could not be long before the year 244, [e] because it was not till that year that he permitted his Homilies to be taken down in writing. But Epiphanius on the other hand [f] expressly says that they were called Elcesaians from one Elxaios or Elxai; [g] and he assures us that Elxai flourished [h] and joined himself to the Ossens, under the time of the emperor Trajan, which must be some time about or before the year 120, for in that year Trajan died.

The following supposition may possibly reconcile this difference. Those who were holders of such tenets were not distinguished by the name of Elcesaites, or Elcesaians, till a little before the time when Origen preached against them, but went under the name Ossens or Ebionites; with the followers of both which sects Elxai had some connection, or at least they adopted

[y] Elcesaites, Les Ebionites en se joignant à eux se corrumpent tout a fait pour les moeurs. Tom. 2. P. 1. p. 197, 198.

[z] Elxai auteur des Elcesaites paroit sous Trajan. Ibid. p. 198.

[a] Vol. 1. B. 3. No. 2. p. 165.

[b] Vol. 1. B. 6. No. 21. p. 363, 364. See also Tillemont's Chronology added at the end of Vol. i. Anno 247.

[c] Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 38. p. 233.

[d] [illegible] επανισταμενης ταις εκκλησιαις.

[e] Ibid. cap. 36. p. 232. Credibility. Vol. ii. p. 451.

[f] Adv. Hær. 53. No. 1. p. 461. B. Edit. Petav.

[g] Either reading is indifferent, it being in the same page Ηλξαι and Ηλξαιος. The followers of him are indeed called by Eusebius and Origen Ελκεσαιτων; but Theodoret calls them Ελκεσαιων, as Epiphanius also does; and from what he says, it is evident he considered the Ελκεσαιτων of Origen and Eusebius, as the same sect with the Ελκεσαιων of Epiphanius. Though he called their founder Ελκεσαι, and not Ηλξαι or Ηλξαιος. This small difference in the reading can afford no room for a supposition that the founders, or the people were different, since the same person is called by Epiphanius Ηλξα, Ηλξαι, and Ηλξαιος.

[h] Ibid. 19. No. 1. A. p. 40.

some

ſome of his peculiar notions. Ittigius [i] ſeems to have reckoned them a hereſy of the third, rather than of the ſecond century; for it is his laſt in the ſecond, and he ſpeaks of it ſlightly.

Baſnage [k] is plainly of the ſame opinion: but he ſays he would not however depart from the Chronology of Epiphanius, becauſe it is followed by very learned men; although he ſhould rather be inclined to place this ſect in the third century. In this place Baſnage well argues that the Oſſens of Epiphanius were Chriſtians.

Tillemont had the ſame opinion of them, for he ſays 'the [l] 'heretics which we call Elceſaites, were alſo called Oſſenians, 'Sampſeans, and Amſenians.'

Baſnage [m] thinks they were called Sampſeni or Sampſeans, from Sampſa a city of Arabia. Though Le Clerc, [n] grounding upon what Epiphanius ſays, that 'the [o] Sampſeans are inter-'preted to mean people that have ſome relation to the ſun,' derives their name from a Hebrew word which ſignifies the ſun. Scaliger had done the ſame before him, but very abſurdly, as Baſnage [p] well ſhews, who obſerves that 'Epiphanius never ac-'cuſed them of worſhipping the ſun.' On the contrary, a paſſage in him plainly ſhews that the opinion and practice of Elxai their founder was directly oppoſite; for he thus introduces him inſtructing his diſciples: 'My [q] children do not draw near 'to the appearance of fire, becauſe this ſame thing is a deceit, 'and will cauſe you to wander; for when you think it near at 'the ſame time it is far off. Wherefore go not after it's ap-'pearance, but follow rather the ſound of water.' Agreeable to this he declared [r] water to be good, but fire of an oppoſite nature.

Moſheim [s] places Elxai in the ſecond century, and conſiders him as the author of the ſect of the Elceſaites. He ſays he was a Jew, meaning I ſuppoſe of Jewiſh extraction, and, with Epiphanius, ſeems to doubt whether he and his followers are to be ranked among Chriſtians.

[i] De Hær. p. 238, 239.

[k] Anno 104. No. 7.

[l] Les Hæretiques que nous appellons Elceſaites ont encore eſte nommez Oſſeniens, Sampſeans, et Ampſeniens. Tom. 2. P. 2. p. 85. The laſt of theſe names ſeems to have no other foundation than a different reading in Epiphanius, where it is Αμψηνοις in the text, and Σαμψηνοις in the margin.

[m] Anno 104. No. 6.

[n] Idque genus hominum Sampſæos vulgo dictos a voce Hebraica שמש Sol quaſi Solares. Eccleſ. Hiſ. Anno 103. p. 535. n. 2.

[o] Σαμψαιοι γαρ ερμηνευονται Ηλιακοι. Ad. Hær. 53. No. 2. B. p. 462.

[p] Ad. Ann. 104. N. 5. p. 12.

[q] Τεκνα, πορευεσθε μη προς το ειδος του πυρος, οτι πλανασθε, πλανη γαρ εστι το τοιουτον. ορας γαρ φησι αυτο εγγυτατω, και εστιν απο πορρωθεν. μη πορευεσθε δε προς το ειδος αυτου, πορευεσθε δε μαλλον επι την φωνην του υδατος. Ep. Hær. 19. No. 3. p. 42. B.

[r] Το τε πυρ ωστε θειω αλλοτριον. το τε υδωρ ειναι δεξιον. Ibid.

[s] Eccleſ. Hiſ. P. 2d. ſec. 2d. cap. 5. ſec. 5. p. 98, 99.

SECT.

SECT. VII. *Of the Duration of this Sect.*

As to the continuance of them, according to Epiphanius,[t] some of the Sampseans were still in being at the time he wrote, in Nabathis and Peræa, who regarded as divine persons two of the family of Elxai, viz. Marthus and Marthana, the latter of whom was living when he wrote, or at least had died but a little while before. This may be thought to contradict what has been quoted from Eusebius; but perhaps his words are not to be taken in their utmost extent, but may only be intended to inform us that, in consequence of the opposition it met with from Origen, this sect never spread much, and was chiefly confined to those places in the neighbourhood of Palestine, where it took it's rise at first; and that the followers of it were but few in number, and for the most part in great obscurity.

It seems indeed, from one of the passages last referred to, that their number was small; for he says 'it[u] was some of the remains of the Ossens, who were still in being and were called 'Sampseans.'

SECT. VIII. *What Parts of Scripture they received.*

It appears, by the passage quoted from Eusebius in[x] the beginning of this article, that they received the Old Testament, as well as the gospels in the New; though they rejected particular passages in several parts of these, as they did the apostle altogether. Epiphanius says[y] they made use of the same book with the Ebionites, and Nazarenes, as he had before frequently mentioned: referring undoubtedly to a copy of the gospels, in some measure differing from that in common use which these Christians had, and that they paid a regard to another book, the author of which they said was the brother of Elxai. He adds, that 'they[z] received neither the writings of the * prophets nor 'apostles.'

[t] Adv. Hær. 19. No. 2. D. p. 40. Ibid. 53. No. 1. p. 461.

[u] Ης ετι λειψανα και δευρο υπαρχει...οπερ γενος νυνι Σεμψεων (Σαμψεων) καλειται. Ibid. p. 40.

[x] Page 503. note [e].

[y] Vide page 505. notes [n], [o].

[z] Ibid. note [q].

* There seems at first sight to be some little difference between the accounts given by Eusebius and Epiphanius, with respect to the parts of the Old Testament rejected by these heretics. But it should be observed that the expression in Eusebius is general, and in Epiphanius particular, which Theodoret confirms. The words κεχρηται ρητοις παλιν απο πασης παλαιας, may therefore very well be understood consistently with their rejecting the prophets.

'apoſtles.' Theodoret confirms their [a] rejecting the apoſtle, and paying great attention to a certain book; which they ſay fell down from heaven. Upon the whole then it appears that the Oſſens as well as the Elceſaites were Chriſtians, and regarded many parts of the Old Teſtament, and the goſpels at leaſt in the New, as ſacred books; though it is probable their Chriſtianity was mixed with a number of ſuperſtitious rites and abſurd doctrines.

Sect. IX. *Explanation of a Prayer of Elxai.*

I shall only further mention a prayer, which Epiphanius ſays Elxai ordered his followers to uſe: [b] the words of which he has given us with an interpretation, in ſome part of it unintelligible. The meaning of this, after it had been in vain attempted by Petavius [c] and Scaliger, the very learned Croius has well explained, and has given a ſenſe of it very different from that of Epiphanius. The reader will no doubt be pleaſed to find the whole of this in the note [d].

phets. For Euſebius himſelf explains the next word in a manner ſimilar to this. Ευαγγελικης is uſed in him by way of diſtinction for the New Teſtament, as παλαιας is for the Old; and though he had ſaid that they quoted paſſages from every part of the New Teſtament, απο πασης γραφης ευαγγελικης, yet he immediately adds αθετει τον αποστολον. This is the ſame with ουτε αποστολους δεχονται of Epiphanius. And for this reaſon the former part of Euſebius may be underſtood in a perfect agreement with the ουτε προφητας δεχονται of the ſame author.

[a] Τον δε αποστολον παντελως ηρνηθησαν. και βιβλον δε τινα συντεθεικασιν ην εκ των υψιων εφασαν πεπτωκεναι. ταυτης τον ακηκοοτα αφεσιν αμαρτιων λαμβανειν, παρ ην ο Χριστος εδωρησατο. Hær. Fab. lib. 2. c. 7. p. 222. [b] Φασκει γαρ λεγειν, Αβαρ, Αριδ, Μωιδ, Νωχιλε, Δαασιμ, Ανη, Δαασιμ, Νωχιλε, Μωιδ, Αριδ, Αβαρ, Σελαμ. α τινα ερμηνευομενα εχει την σαφηνειαν ταυτην. παρελθετω ταπεινωσις εκ πατερων μου της καταυρισεως αυτων, και καταπατηματος αυτων, και πονων αυτων καταπατηματι εν καταχρισει δια των πατερων μου απο ταπεινωσεως παρελθουσης εν αποστολη τελειωσεως. κ. τ. λ. Ad. Hær. lib. 1. H. 19. No. 4. p. 42. D 43. A. [c] Non eſt facile ex Hebraicis hiſce verbis eam ſententiam elicere, quam ſubjecit Epiphanius. Petavii in Locum. [d] Tentavit et Scaliger ſenſum expiſcari loci difficillimi. Ego inquit 'hic eſſe nullam ευχην colligere poſ-'ſum. Sed ſtatim ut oculos in ea conjeci 'tres γνωμας agnovi,' quas vir ſummus ſententias exhibet Elenchi capite xxvii. Sed temeritate proprius abeſt negare eam orationem eſſe, quam orationem affirmat eſſe Epiphanius. (μηδεις ζητηση την ερμηνειαν, αλλ η μονον εν τη ευχη ταδε λεγετω. Ibid.) Neque hic falli potuit Epiphanius, ut pro Oſſenorum precatione haberet, quod pura puta ſententia eſt. Vigebat adhuc ſancti Patris ævo ſecta Oſſeniaca, a qua ſcire facillime potuit, num inter orandum precationem adhibuerit ejuſmodi. Quod ſi precatio eſt, totâ Scaliger erravit viâ, cum nil orationis ſit in ea ſententiâ. 'Qui 'conculcat paupertatem, conculcat frau-'dem,' &c. Noſtro quidem judicio verborum ſenſum optime aſſecutus eſt doctiſſimus ille Johannes Croius, cujus explicationi ſuffragium libentiſſime noſtrum damus. עבר עני מאבותי נהרי רשים אותי רשים נהרי מאבותי עני יעבר ואשלם Tranſivit afflictio a patribus meis: tribulationes conterunt me: conterunt tribulationes a patribus meis. Afflictio tranſeat et pace fruar. Apud Baſnagii Annales, Anno 104. p. 12, 13.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the ALOGIANS.

SECT. I. *The Account of them by Epiphanius and Philaster, as rejecting John's Gospel and the Revelation.*

'THE Alogians, so called by us,' says [a] Epiphanius in his Summary, 'who reject God, the Logos, coming from the Father, do not receive either the gospel according to John, or 'his Revelation.'

To the like purpose [b] Augustine.

In his larger work Epiphanius speaks of this heresy as arising after [c] the Cataphrygians, Quartodecimans, and others; and says that [d] he gave them the name of Alogians. 'They [e] reject,' says he, 'the writings of John, they receive neither his gospel nor 'his Revelation. If they had rejected his Revelation only, 'some apology might have been made for them; but, by rejecting his writings in general, they shew themselves to be like 'those whom holy John speaks of in his catholic epistles, and 'calls antichrists. They say they are not written by John, and 'ascribe them to Cerinthus; pretending they are not worthy to 'be received by the church.' Afterwards he says 'they argue 'after this manner, that [f] they may not seem without reason to 'reject the gospel and the Revelation of John, and perhaps his 'epistles likewise; for they are of a piece and agree together.' Once more: 'they [g] say that John's gospel ought not to be 'placed in the New Testament, because it is not of a piece with 'the other parts.'

[a] p. 396, 397. [b] Alogi propterea sic vocantur, tamquam sine verbo (λογος enim Græce verbum dicitur) quia Deum verbum recipere noluerunt, Joannis Evangelium respuentes, cujus nec Apocalypsin accipiunt, has videlicet scripturas negantes esse ipsius. H. 30.

[c] H. 51. n. 1. [d] Ibid. n. 3.

[e] αἱ [illegible] ἀποβαλλουσαν ιωαννου τας βιβλους. [illegible] ιωαννου ευαγγελιον δεχονται, ουτε [illegible] αποκαλυψιν. Και ει μεν εδεχοντο [illegible], την δε αποκαλυψιν απεβαλλοντο, [illegible] αν....οποτε δε ου δεχονται φυσει τα βιβλια τα απο του αγιου ιωαννου κεκηρυγμενα....Λεγουσι γαρ μη ειναι αυτα ιωαννου, αλλα κηρινθου· και ουκ αξια αυτα φασιν ειναι εν εκκλησια. Ibid. n. 3. p. 423, 424.

[f] ινα δοξωσι παρεκβαλλειν τα του αγιου αποστολου βιβλια, φημι δε ιωαννου το τε ευαγγελιον, και την αποκαλυψιν, ταχα δε και τας επιστολας· συναδουσι γαρ και αυται τω ευαγγελιω και τη αποκαλυψει. N. 34. p. 456. B. C. [g] Λεγουσι δε το κατα ιωαννην ευαγγελιον, επειδαν μη τα αυτα εφη. ...αδιαθετον ειναι, και μη δεχεσθαι αυτους αυτο. N. 18. p. 441. C.

Thus writes Epiphanius; so that one knows not well what he would have us to think of these men: whether that they rejected all the writings commonly ascribed to St. John, or only his gospel and the Revelation. Mill however roundly says [h] that 'they rejected all St. John's writings.' Damascenus, agreeably to Epiphanius's Summary, says 'they [i] rejected the gospel of John, and his Revelation.

Before we proceed any farther, it should be observed that Philaster too has a [k] heresy that rejected John's gospel and Revelation, and ascribed both to Cerinthus: he does not call them by any name.

Sect. II. *There never was any such Heresy.*

Having alleged all these passages, it is time to deliver my own opinion, which is, that this is a fictitious heresy, and that there never were any Christians who rejected St. John's gospel and first epistle, and yet received the other gospels, and the other books of the New Testament. There is not any notice taken of them in Irenæus, Eusebius, or any other ancient writer before Philaster and Epiphanius; nor has Theodoret thought fit to borrow any thing here from Epiphanius; he has no account of this heresy.

Sect. III. *Some Account of Epiphanius's Article of the Alogians.*

Epiphanius's article of Alogians is long, and has in it divers good remarks relating to the evangelists, and for reconciling their several histories: at the same time it has in it some confusion; for in one [l] place he mentions Porphyry and Celsus, as if he intended to consider their objections against the evangelical history. Nevertheless, the article seems to concern Christians, 'who,' as he says, 'did not receive the Logos; and who re-'jected John's gospel and the Revelation, and would not have 'them to be in the New Testament, or canonical.' Heathens

[h] Æquales horum Alogi Evangelium, cæteraque D. Joannis scripta repudiarunt, teste Epiphanio. Prol. n. 363. vel p. 40. Ox.

[i] Ο. το ευαγγελιον το κατα Ιωαννην αθετησαντες, και την αποκαλυψιν αυτου. Ap. Cotel. Monum. Tom. 1. p. 194.

[k] Post hos sunt hæretici, qui Evangelium secundum Joannem et Apocalypsim ipsius non accipiunt....ut etiam Cerinthi illius hæretici esse audeant dicere, et Apocalypsim itidem, non beati Joannis Evangelistæ et Apostoli, sed Cerinthi hæretici. H. 60. p. 120.

[l] Hær. 51. n. 8. p. 429. D.

rejected

rejected all the books of the New Teſtament, and ſome Chriſtians, we well know, rejected ſome of them: but it does not appear that there were any Chriſtians who received the other books of the New Teſtament, but rejected St. John's goſpel, or all his writings in general. I think that the authority of Philaſter and Epiphanius cannot be ſufficient to ſatisfy us concerning the exiſtence of a hereſy omitted by all ancient writers before them. Serious Chriſtians might propoſe difficulties relating to any books of the New Teſtament, with a view of diſcovering and being eſtabliſhed in the truth; and ſome of the difficulties mentioned by Epiphanius might proceed from ſuch perſons. But that there was a ſect or number of Chriſtians who rejected John's goſpel and the Revelation, and aſcribed both to Cerinthus, (whilſt they received the other books of the New Teſtament,) I do not believe, for the reaſon before-mentioned: that is, becauſe we have not ſufficient aſſurance of it from antiquity. However, if there really were ſome ſuch perſons, their opinion would be of little moment, conſidering the general teſtimony of the ancients in favour of St. John's goſpel, and his firſt epiſtle; and that all objections againſt St. John's goſpel may be eaſily anſwered.

SECT. IV. *This Hereſy was probably invented upon the Occaſion of the Controverſy with the Millenarians.*

I IMAGINE, then, that this hereſy was invented upon occaſion of the controverſy of Caius and Dionyſius, and others, with the Millenarians in the third century; ſome of whom diſputed or denied the genuineneſs of the book of the Revelation, and aſcribed it to Cerinthus. Hence ſome ſaid that thoſe enemies of the Millennium might as well reject alſo St. John's goſpel; and others ſaid that they actually did ſo, though they did not. It is obſervable that in Philaſter's catalogue this hereſy follows next after the Millenarians, or Chilionetites, as he calls them. And the order in Epiphanius leads us to the ſame time.

SECT.

Sect. V. *A groundleſs Opinion among the Moderns concerning the Unitarians of the ſecond Century.*

There has been a notion among learned moderns that the Unitarians of the ſecond century, who appeared ſoon after the apoſtles, rejected St. John's goſpel. Fabricius, in a note upon the fore-cited chapter of Philaſter, ſpeaks to the ſame [m] purpoſe. But how groundleſs that ſuppoſition is, muſt clearly appear from our accounts of Theodotus, Praxeas, and others of that principle.

[m] Alogos hoc nomine arguit Epiphanius et Damaſcenus, quos vide H. 51. Evangelium Johannis rejecerunt Ebionæi, Cerinthiani, Cerdoniani, et Theodotus Byzantinus, atque Marcion. Ap. Philaſt. p. 140.



THE END OF THE HISTORY OF HERETICS, AND OF THE NINTH VOLUME.