

THE WORK OF PORPHYRY AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS, AND ITS RECONSTRUCTION.

I

A PROFOUND interest naturally attaches to the attacks made upon Christianity during the early centuries. Not only are they interesting in their relation to modern attacks, but they also help to explain the attitude and the purpose of those who replied to them in defence of the Christian faith. Among such hostile writings, the champions of the faith in the generations which succeeded are unanimous in their verdict that the deadliest and the most powerful was the treatise of Porphyry in fifteen books against the Christians. Unfortunately the work is lost to us, and indeed it is not likely that anything so harmful to the Christian cause would be preserved. It is equally unfortunate that all the treatises in which it was subsequently answered have likewise perished. Jerome refers to these answers in terms which indicate the greatness of our loss, and the magnitude of the controversy in which their authors were involved. He mentions Methodius among those whose treatises against Porphyry were long and weighty.¹ Concerning Eusebius he gives the information that he wrote in thirty books, only twenty of which were known to himself.² About Apollinarius he tells us that his thirty books against Porphyry were still extant, and were considered the best of his writings.³ And the minuteness of the controversy may be gathered from his statement that Eusebius devoted no less than three of his thirty volumes to answering the attack which Porphyry had made on the book of Daniel.⁴ The many references which Jerome himself makes to Porphyry's arguments testify to the lasting influence of that great adversary's attack.

It is strange therefore that little attempt has been made to collect and study what remains to us of the lost fifteen books against the Christians. A new interest has recently been given to the subject by the publication of a book by Dr Harnack in which he tries to prove that we possess a part of the treatise in the form of the objections, brought by a heathen philosopher, which are quoted and answered by Macarius Magnes in his *Apocriticus*.⁵ He is obliged to limit his

¹ Jer. *Ep.* 48. 13 and 70. 3.

² Jer. *De Viris Illustr.* 81. 3.

³ *Ibid.* 104. 4.

⁴ Jer. *Comment. in Dan.* Prolog.

⁵ *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts (Die im Apocriticus des Macarius Magnes enthaltene Streitschrift)* von Adolf Harnack; Leipzig 1911. *Texte und Untersuchungen* &c. xxxvii 4.

conclusion by the further assumption that these objections are only excerpts from the original work, made by another writer; but he nevertheless suggests that they may be used as the basis of an edition.¹

This theory, which is by no means new, for it was advanced by a Göttingen professor in the eighteenth century² and more recently approved by Wagenmann³ and Neumann,⁴ is now supported by many new arguments. If it can be accepted, it only remains for some one to collect the fragments of Porphyry and references to his arguments which are preserved in other writers, and piece them together with the fifty objections contained in what remains to us of the *Apocriticus*, and we shall thus advance some way in our knowledge of Porphyry's work, and may claim that we again possess a good deal of his actual language. I have attempted to do this myself, and my purpose is to set down the result.

But I must state at the outset that I have been brought to the conclusion that Dr Harnack's theory is untenable as it stands, and that in the *Apocriticus* we possess the words, not of Porphyry, but of Hierocles, who copied his arguments but not his language. If this be the case, the actual words of the opponent of Macarius Magnes cease to be of such importance, but his arguments still furnish us with much information about Porphyry's work. Dr Harnack has contented himself with reproducing the actual words and giving a rendering of them in German. It appears to me more useful simply to take the attacks which they express and fit them in as far as possible with the other references which we have to Porphyry's book.⁵ And although we cannot thus claim to have recovered so much of his actual language, we may by this means claim to have reached what is in some sense more important, namely, the method of his attack, and the kind of weapons which he used.

I therefore propose to set out at length the quotations and references to Porphyry's book which I have collected from the writings of Eusebius, Methodius, Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Theophylact, and Severian of Gatala, with a few brief comments on them. The next step will be to try to reproduce as far as possible the contents of the *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν* in order, adding the arguments which are contained

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 144 'Baustein für die zukünftige Ausgabe'.

² Magnus Crusius. See Migne *P. G.* x pp. 134 ff. His opinions are summarized by Pitra *Spicil. Solesm.* i p. 545.

³ *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theol.* Bd. xxiii pp. 269-314, 1878.

⁴ C. I. Neumann *Iuliani Imp. Libr. contra Christ. quae supersunt*, Leipzig 1880.

⁵ According to my own theory, there will be nothing difficult about the fact that the objections in the *Apocriticus* are in an order completely different from the sequence of Porphyry's book as we know it from other sources; but it is a most serious objection to Dr Harnack's view.

in the *Apocriticus*, and probably in most cases borrowed from Porphyry. This will lead to sundry deductions in conclusion.

But this part of my subject must be postponed to a subsequent article, for I must not attempt to overthrow the theory which Dr Harnack's book was written to substantiate without a careful and detailed consideration of his arguments. And this forms in itself a matter of considerable importance. It is true that it is a disappointment if we cannot say that we have got back to the words of Porphyry himself. But it is scarcely less valuable if we find ourselves possessed of the greater part of the shorter treatise of Hierocles, an opponent of the faith of whom we otherwise know but little. It will be remembered that he was not only a Neoplatonic philosopher, but also an imperial governor, who attacked the Christians with both sword and pen at the beginning of the fourth century, and was one of the authors and instigators of the last of the persecutions. It was Duchesne who originally suggested Hierocles as the opponent of Macarius,¹ and I followed him in what I wrote before on the subject.² It is true that he was little more than an imitator in his literary efforts, but Porphyry himself was an imitator of Plotinus. And Hierocles, with his double rôle of philosopher and persecutor, is almost unique in the struggle between paganism and Christianity, and we are the gainers if we can feel that we know more about him.

I will first state and examine Dr Harnack's position. He does not content himself with the negative attitude of the objector in his biting attacks upon the apostles of the New Testament generally; he skilfully reconstructs from the objections the positive attitude of the man who brought them, concluding for instance from his indignation at the sad fate of Ananias and Sapphira, and of the Gadarene swine, that he was humane, and opposed to all violence.

It is an interesting argument, but it may nevertheless have its limitations, for one fears that it is not always safe to construct the morals and beliefs of an opponent of the Christian faith merely from the methods of his attack. And in this case Dr Harnack allows that much is said merely for the sake of argument (*διαλεκτικῶς*). But, if used with caution, it may reveal the practical position of a Neoplatonic philosopher. The question, however, remains whether that philosopher must needs be Porphyry. The whole argument is summed up at the end of the book by means of eleven propositions, and the conclusion drawn from them is that the objector is Porphyry. I will proceed to give and briefly discuss them in order.

¹ Duchesne *De Macario Magne et scriptis eius*. Klincksieck. Paris 1877.

² *J.T.S.* viii 413 (April 1907).

The agreement with Porphyry is found by Dr Harnack in—

1. His religious philosophy.

Certainly this corresponds in general outline with Neoplatonic ideas, but there is nothing whatever in it of the nature of deep philosophy, and, if it can easily come from one who is not himself an original thinker, it may just as well belong to Hierocles as to Porphyry.

2. His humane disposition and dislike of all violence.

This is certainly a point, but Dr Harnack himself greatly weakens his argument by what he says elsewhere. For he shews that it does not follow that, because the philosopher objected to violence and had a humane and moral feeling with regard to such things as martyrdom, he was therefore a Christian; and then he adds that *many other* heathen were affected in the same way.¹

3. His belief in a heaven and an earth which will not pass away, in a God who is omnipotent and unchangeable, and in the lower gods, or demons.

But such beliefs were not peculiar to Porphyry, nor even to the Neoplatonic School.

4. His favourable disposition towards Judaism and the Old Testament, as opposed to Christian lawlessness.

Even if this points to Porphyry, a study of the passages which suggest such a disposition leaves us doubtful whether Judaism was meant to be more than an engine in the attack upon Christianity. But how did Porphyry favour Judaism?

5. The time that he wrote corresponds with the writing of Porphyry's great work against the Christians.

But the work of Porphyry against the Christians was written *c.* A.D. 270, and there are several indications in the words of the opponent of Macarius that he is writing a little later. Not only does the latter go back to Hadrian in order to give an instance of a *μονάρχης*,² but in speaking of his own ay he says *πολλοὶ ἄρχουσι τοῦ κόσμου*,³ which is explained at once if we refer it to the fourfold division of the empire. But this took place in the reign of Diocletian, some twenty years after Porphyry's book was written.

Again, reference is made to the great size of the Christian churches (*μιμούμενοι τὰς κατασκευὰς τῶν ναῶν, μεγίστους οἴκους οἰκοδομοῦσιν*).⁴ Eusebius describes the substitution of large churches for small ones *ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις* just before the outbreak of the persecution in A.D. 303. But could it be said at a date more than thirty years before it?

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 98 n. 1 'Aber so waren nachweisbar auch viele andere Heiden gesinnt'.

² *Apocr.* iv 26, p. 212, l. 8.

³ *Ib.* ii 15, p. 24.

⁴ *Ib.* iv 21, p. 201, l. 5.

6. His being a Greek, and yet knowing the local traditions of the Roman Church,¹ evidently as the result of residence there.

This certainly suits well with Porphyry, who joined Plotinus in Rome in A. D. 263, and wrote his treatise in Sicily. But a somewhat similar apparent linking of East and West occurs also in Macarius himself. He likewise displays a knowledge of local Roman traditions,² and yet Dr Harnack definitely decides that he was of Asia Minor.³ We may add that he does not explain why a Christian of Asia Minor should so emphatically point his opponent to Christian communities further East.⁴ A reasonable solution would be that the opponent was himself connected with that part of the world. But though this would be exactly true of Hierocles, a Roman official who was moved from Palmyra to Bithynia, it does not suit with Porphyry, who soon removed westwards from Tyre and pursued his studies at Athens.

7. His use of a Western text and canon of the New Testament.

But this may be equally true of one who followed Porphyry and took the same passages of Scripture as the object of his attack.

8. His method of overthrowing the Church by shewing the inconsistencies of the Evangelists and Apostles.

But this was exactly the method that the Neoplatonic school seem to have adopted, and Lactantius, in a passage to which we must refer again, describes Hierocles as trying to overthrow scripture 'tanquam sibi esset tota contraria; nam quaedam capita, quae repugnare sibi videbantur, exposuit'.⁵ And indeed Dr Harnack himself allows this in speaking of the work of Eusebius against Hierocles, saying of such contradictions 'findet sich bekanntlich bei Porphyrius, sie findet sich auch bei Hierocles'.⁶

9. His method of controversy, his learning and penetration.

In any case the method of Porphyry must have been the result of his being an enthusiastic disciple of Plotinus. But the extraordinary skill with which the objector marshals his attacks on Christianity suggests the clever use of existing philosophic arguments, combined with a full knowledge of the Christian writings, more than the actual language of one who was himself an abstruse thinker and profound philosopher. The method could therefore equally well be that of some other and shallower thinker who followed Plotinus. This fact is supported by Dr Harnack's own admission, to which we shall come presently, that in any case the work with which Macarius dealt was an abridged and popularized form of Porphyry's book, edited by some other man.⁷

¹ See *Apocr.* ii 22, p. 102, I. 11.

² *Apocr.* iv 15. See also *D. C. B. Art. 'Linus'* vol. iii p. 728.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 16.

⁴ *Apocr.* ii 7 and I. 6.

⁵ *Lact. Div. Instit.* v 2.

⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 112.

⁷ *Op. cit.* p. 141 sq.

10. The identity of his polemic with that of Porphyry is shewn in many concrete instances throughout the work.

At the risk of being wearisome, it will be necessary to consider these detailed instances one by one, for this is naturally where the real weight of the argument lies. I venture to think that only one or two of them are of real importance in pointing to the work as being the individual words of Porphyry; the rest only prove conclusively that it comes from one of the same school of thought. In the cases where I refrain from comment, the reason is either that they do not seem sufficiently important, or that the point has already been dealt with above.

Apocr. ii 7 and 10. Greek philosophy as seen in Porphyry could not bear Christ's words, 'not peace, but a sword', nor His hard treatment of the father of the lunatic boy, and of the multitude.

ii 12 and 13. In the discrepancies in the account of Christ's death, the blame is laid, not on Him, but on His disciples. Dr Harnack's final proposition of the eleven which we are considering is to the effect that there is throughout a remarkable absence of attack on the Founder of Christianity Himself, which well accords with the attitude of Porphyry. Of this we must speak later, but it is sufficient to say concerning this particular passage that, after referring to Porphyry, Dr Harnack in the same breath strangely quotes a parallel from Hierocles.¹

ii 13. The reading *ἀνείδισας* in Mark xv 34 shews the use of a Western text (but *v. sub 7 supra*).

ii 14. Christians are said to be punished as *μύθους ἀλλοκότους ἀναπλάττοντες*, and in Porph. *ap.* Euseb. *H.E.* vi 19. 7 occurs the phrase *ὄθνεῖοι μύθοι*, the same word *ὄθνεῖος* being found in another of the objections (*Apocr.* iii 31).

It is true that *ὄθνεῖος* is not a very common word, but in the passage referred to it is applied, not to a thing but to a person, St Paul being called *ὄθνεῖος καὶ πολέμιος*.

ii 16. The devil is defended in a way which suggests a believer in demons.

But even if the personification of evil be identified with Porphyry's lesser gods, is this defence to be taken seriously as more than a weapon of argument? And did not every one believe in demons?

iii 1. In contrast with Christ's allowing Himself to be seized and crucified, is mentioned the case of Apollonius of Tyana, who disappeared from Domitian's judgement seat.

It is quite true that Porphyry used Apollonius by way of contrast with Christ, but Dr Harnack himself allows that the verbal parallel is with Hierocles, whose remaining fragment must be studied at length later on.²

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 112.

² *Op. cit.* p. 114.

iii 3. The great antiquity of Moses is conceded, as it was by Porphyry; but as this very point was made an objection to the theory of his authorship by Geffcken,¹ it is too disputed to be of weight.

Geffcken is here following Schrader, and he adduces the statement which is afterwards refuted by Macarius, that the books of Moses were written by Ezra, 1180 years after Moses lived.² This does not agree with the place which Porphyry assigns to the age of Moses in the words quoted from him in Euseb. *Praef.* x 9, 12.

iii 4. The destruction of the swine is objected to, and a high morality such as Porphyry possessed is revealed by the saying that the 'unsaved become the accusers of the saved'.

iii 5. The saying that the kingdom is for the poor must be by some poor woman, and not by Christ, εἴ γε τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας παρέδιδον κανόνα. Such an attitude of uncertainty with regard to Christ is thought to be like that of Porphyry (*v. sub* 11 below).

iii 6 (and 4). The objection to the evangelists' description of the lake as if it were a sea, is one that we know to have been made by Porphyry, for we are told (Jerome *Quaest. in Genes.* 1, 10) 'Frustra Porphyrius evangelistas . . . pro lacu Genezareth Mare appellasse calumniatur'.

This is the first parallel of real importance, but it will be shewn later on not to be a verbal one, and it proves no more than that Porphyry's arguments were being copied, which is my own contention.

The occurrence of the words in this passage ἐγνώκαμεν σκηπὴν σεσοφισμένην εἶναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is taken as shewing that the author had once been a Christian. But others who attacked the faith besides Porphyry were perverts from it, such as Theotecnus, the reputed author of the *Acta Pilati*, and it was Hierocles's knowledge (*cf.* ἐγνώκαμεν) of the Scriptures which made Lactantius suggest that he also had been a Christian.

iii 15. The statement about cannibalism is said to correspond with the ideas of Porphyry, but (as in iii 3) Geffcken's objection makes the point too uncertain to form an argument.

The objection brought by the philosopher to the allegorical sense of eating Christ's flesh is thought to correspond with Porphyry's attitude in the third book of his treatise, in blaming Origen for applying allegory to such things as Jewish and Christian myths (Euseb. *H.E.* vi 19). But Geffcken (*loc. cit.*) notes the mild language in which Macarius's opponent excuses such human feasts as that of Thyestes, and the action of the Potidaeatae, who were forced to it by necessity; whereas

¹ J. Geffcken *Zwei griechische Apologeten.* Leipzig 1907, p. 302 n. 1.

² *Apocr.* iii 3 and 10.

Porphyry, in his *Περὶ Ἀποχρῆς Ψυχῶν*, stigmatizes the Bassari as cannibals,¹ and holds up the Massagetæ and Derbikes to reprobation.²

iii 16, 17. The weakness of Christians is contrasted with the sayings and precepts of Christ, suggesting again that they and not He were the chief objects of attack.

iii 19. Christ first calls Peter 'Satan' and then blesses him. Such inconsistency is an instance of a form of attack used by Porphyry, for we are told 'Latrat Porphyrius, inconstantiae ac mutationis Iesus accusat' (Jer. *adv. Pelag.* ii 17). This is again a point of contact, but it establishes no more than iii 6 above.

The abuse of Peter in this same passage in the *Apocriticus* is indicated as another link with Porphyry (Jer. *Ep.* 112. 6), but this argument may be used as well concerning Hierocles, and I shall have more to say concerning it later on.

iii 21. Peter is accused of having wrongfully put to death Ananias and Sapphira. There is a plain reference to this in the statement 'Apostolus Petrus nequaquam Ananiae et Sapphirae imprecatur mortem, ut stultus Porphyrius calumniatur' (Jer. *Ep.* 130. 14). But as a matter of fact in iii 21 there is no suggestion of 'imprecatur mortem', and a careful study suggests that the opponent of Macarius combined and somewhat confused Porphyry's arguments about St Peter.³

iii 22. On the subject of St Peter's escape from prison, the statement that he only lived a few months in Rome, which is apparently a local tradition, suits well with Porphyry's sojourn in that city.

iii 30. The attack on St Paul begins with a condemnation of his attitude towards the law, which suggests an author who favoured Judaism (*v. sub 4 supra*).

iii 32. The philosopher is indignant with St Paul for saying 'Doth God take care of oxen?', and his own care for oxen is to be compared with that of Porphyry in his treatise *De Abstinencia* ii 31. But surely the author of that strange work would have spoken far more strongly than by simply proving from Scripture that God's interest extends even to the fish, and therefore must certainly include the oxen.

iv 7. Christ's words about heaven and earth passing away &c. contradict Moses and the prophets. This relative acceptance of the Old Testament is said to be natural 'in a Neoplatonic philosopher, especially in Porphyry'.⁴ True, but not *only* in Porphyry.

iv 10. On the subject of our Lord's words about calling the sick and

¹ *Op. cit.* ii 8.

² *Ib.* iv 21 (καταθύουσιν καὶ ἐσθίονται τῶν φιλάτων τοὺς γεγρακότας).

³ *v. infra* p. 36. Geffcken (*op. cit.* p. 301 n. 2) notes that the opponent of Macarius does not here call the apostles sorcerers, as Porphyry does.

⁴ Harnack *op. cit.* p. 124.

not the whole, the philosopher asks why Christ did not come to call them sooner, for there were 'sick' among our ancestors. In both Jerome and Augustine Porphyry is represented as asking 'Why did not Christ come sooner?'. But the pass again Augustine suggests that the argument of Porphyry in his *Karà Xριστιανῶν* was a prominent one, much longer in form, and not a side issue with regard to the 'sick'. The words there quoted do not correspond with those of iv 10, viz. 'Si Christus se salutis viam dicit, gratiam et veritatem, in seque solo ponit animis sibi credentibus reditum, quid egerunt tot saeculorum homines ante Christum?'¹ One can well understand how one who borrowed arguments from Porphyry would utilize his predecessor's question in a shorter form as *part* of his attack on one of the sayings of Christ.

iv 19. For the relative acceptance of the law, *v. sub* iv 7 *supra*.

iv 20. If the supreme God is called a monarch, it must mean that there are other gods for Him to rule over.

This is certainly quite in accord with Porphyry, but not with him only.

iv 21. The doctrine of angels is used by the objector as a proof of polytheism, and the first in the list of gods is Athene-Minerva (suggesting a link with Rome). Also the objection to churches because 'the Lord hears everywhere' is quite in the spirit of Porphyry.

iv 22. It is a purer idea that the gods live in statues than that Christ lived in Mary's womb. Porphyry's Epistle *ad Marcellam* ch. 17 f is quoted as akin to this and to iv 21, but the connexion is not very obvious.²

iv 24. It is urged against the Resurrection that it is impossible for bodies to be restored which have been once destroyed. Aug. *Ep.* 102. 2 is cited as shewing that this argument was in Porphyry. But this is another case where Geffcken has used the opposite argument,³ and it is therefore too uncertain to build a proof upon. And again the connexion is not a verbal one.

It will be seen that among some two dozen instances of likeness as given above, the great majority do no more than suggest a connexion with the school to which Porphyry belonged. Others suggest such circumstances (e.g. the connexion with Rome) as may well accord with what we know of Porphyry. Only some seven or eight contain

¹ Aug. *Sex Quaestiones c. Paganos* ii, Migne 23 p. 373 (*Ep. ad Deograt.*).

² Harnack *op. cit.* p. 126 n. 1.

³ Geffcken *op. cit.* p. 303 n. He speaks of Porphyry's clever treatment of the resurrection, and then notes that Macarius's opponent brings again the well-worn objection to it which Porphyry seems to have avoided, viz. that the bodies of the dead may be eaten by beasts &c.

any individual link of a detailed or verbal kind, and none of them is convincing by itself. They lose most of their force if it can be shewn, first, that similar parallels are to be found in the case of another kindred writer who followed him, and secondly, that many of them can be used to support *his* authorship as well as Porphyry's. This is what I intend to try and shew; but first we must return to the final argument among Dr Harnack's eleven propositions, for we have not yet dealt with it.

11. The author seems once to have been near Christianity, and then to have left it, a fact which is affirmed of Porphyry by Socrates and Augustine.

Allusion has already been made to the fact that he attacks Christianity rather than its Founder, and speaks from a remarkably intimate knowledge of the Scriptures. Also Dr Harnack traces a tone of bitter regret in the saying that it is no use flying to Jesus (*οὐκ ἀσφαλές τούτῳ προσφεύγειν καὶ σῶζεσθαι Apocr. iii 4*), and considers that the tense of *ἐγνώκαμεν* (in iii 4) shews that he has found out later the falsity of the gospels he once believed in.¹ I must confess that these passages do not appear to me to convey so much. It seems that the Christian sympathies of the objector have been exaggerated, and I would urge the consideration of two things on the other side.

(a) The author's 'hidden high esteem for Jesus' (er hat für Jesus eine verborgene Hochschätzung übrig)² is not merely limited by some startling exceptions, such as when he charges Him with being either drunk or dreaming when He said certain words.³ It seems to have been forgotten that we are dealing with a mutilated work. The whole of Book I is lost, and Book II attacks certain sayings of Jesus before proceeding to attack the inconsistencies of the Evangelists &c. The only clue to the contents of Book I lies in the fragment of chapter vi once quoted by Nicephorus,⁴ which treats of the miracle of the woman with an issue of blood. This suggests that the author began by attacking the *deeds* of Christ. In the case of His words it was possible for Christians to misunderstand them, but in dealing with His actions the natural object of attack is the Doer, and there is nothing to shew that the first book did not consist of attacks on the Founder of Christianity Himself. This is the more likely, in that in the later books *some* of His deeds are attacked along with the sayings, the chief blame going to the disciples or evangelists.⁵ This perhaps suggests that at the beginning of his work the objector attacked Christ Himself through His deeds. Never in the history of anti-Christian polemic has the abuse of the

¹ Harnack *op. cit.* p. 137.

² *Op. cit.* p. 137.

³ *Apocr.* iii 19.

⁴ Nicephori *Antirrhetica* in *Spicil. Solesm.* i p. 332.

⁵ e.g. *Apocr.* iii 4 and 6.

Person of Christ formed the bulk of the attack. It has always been easier to prove men bad Christians than Christ a bad man. It is not surprising if in an onslaught on Christianity only one-fifth or less is devoted to this particular line of argument; and yet it is probable that, if it formed part of a series which was to end in the exposure of apostolic doctrine, it would come first. But if this be the case, we cannot regard the author as in such sympathy with Christ as Dr Harnack has suggested, and his argument therefore loses some of its force.

Besides this, we may turn to Macarius for his evidence. And apart from his impression of the book as a cruel attack on his Master, the fact that he gives his own work the mysterious title of *Μονογένης* suggests that 'God only begotten' has been attacked. We have been told that the title is perhaps explained in the lost first book; that book may also contain the full force of the attack on Him whom Macarius defended.

(b) It must also be remembered that in every age the attempts to discredit Christianity sometimes involve the affectation of a higher standard on the part of the objector in order to lower that of Christians or to prove it inconsistent. If it be freely conceded that in many cases in this treatise a position is often assumed for the sake of argument (*διαλεκτικῶς* or *disputando*, as Dr Harnack frequently terms it), may not the objector be adopting this method when he says that if Christ had appeared to His judges after the Resurrection all would have been well?¹ And does the objector really presume that the Saviour of the world must suffer, as long as all is done in a noble and worthy way, as in the case of Socrates?² As a matter of fact this is far more than he actually says, for these are his words: ὁ δέ γε Χριστὸς εἰ καὶ παθεῖν εἶχε κατ' ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐχρῆν μὲν ὑπομεῖναι τὴν τιμωρίαν, οὐ μὴν ἀνεπαρρησίας ὑποστήναι τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ σπουδαῖά τινα καὶ σοφὰ διαφθέγγασθαι πρὸς Πιλάτον (iii 1). Surely these words, which only put the case hypothetically, do not warrant the positive conclusion which Dr Harnack has drawn from them. If in one attack (ii 16) he actually undertakes a defence of the devil against the Christian standpoint (*ὀφθῆσεται καὶ αὐτὸς μηδὲν ἡδικηκῶς ὁ διάβολος*), may he not be using a similar device in some of the cases where he seems to defend the Saviour?

It may be added here (as I have hinted already) that, in the case of a bitter adversary like this, who is ready to assume any position in order to use it as a vantage-ground against the Christians, it is somewhat precarious to assume as fully as Dr Harnack has done that we may

¹ *Apocr.* ii 14.

² See Harnack *op. cit.* pp. 135-137. Also p. 129 'Auch dass die Weltheilande, die Gottesmänner, leiden müssen, setzt er voraus (iii 1), aber beim Leiden muss alles adelig und würdig zugehen (wie bei Sokrates)'.

construct from his words his own positive theology, and infer from his negations the philosopher's own religious standpoint.

Thus may end our survey of the eleven propositions in proof that Porphyry was the author.

But it is full time that we came to the concluding section of his book. It contains the theory, already suggested by Wagenmann,¹ that the attacks preserved in Macarius are 'an anonymous excerpt from the work of Porphyry against the Christians'.² This remarkable limitation of the main theme of the book, which several considerations make absolutely necessary, is shewn by the aid of three arguments.

1. In one passage (iii 43) Macarius actually refers his opponent to a work of Porphyry, telling him to study his words about oracles in 'Ἡ ἐκ λόγιων φιλοσοφία. He was not therefore himself aware that he was dealing with a work of Porphyry. Such ignorance may be accounted for by the suppression of that philosopher's work by Constantine.

This explanation is most ingenious, but to me at least it does not commend itself as probable, but seems to be somewhat of a last resource when all other explanations fail. The reference of Macarius to Porphyry seems much more easily explainable if we think of him as answering one with whom Porphyry's opinions would be of special weight. It is especially noteworthy that it is not his habit to refer to heathen writings, and in choosing out Porphyry in this unique fashion he clearly indicates that he had some knowledge of that philosopher's writings. With regard to the suppression of the particular treatise against the Christians, Dr Harnack himself admits in a foot-note that the suppression was not strictly carried out.³

2. A comparison of the questions in Macarius with what we know of the fifteen books of Porphyry's treatise shews at once that the two works cannot be identical, and that the former must be merely an excerpt.

Dr Harnack relegates to a foot-note⁴ a summary of what we know about the contents of Porphyry's work; but it so completely reverses the order of the attacks as given in Macarius, as to make the excerpt theory most difficult to accept. It is worth while to tabulate and compare their respective contents.

Of Porphyry's fifteen books, Book I treated of the differences of the Apostles (e. g. Gal. ii); Book III contained a long reference to Moses which makes it probable that it dealt with the Pentateuch; Book IV

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 288. He raises the question whether Macarius used the fifteen books of Porphyry directly, or only indirectly and by way of extracts, perhaps in the excerpts made by Hierocles or some one else.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 141-143.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 142 n. 1.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 142 n. 2.

treated of Old Testament history; of Books V–XI we know nothing; Books XII–XV contained attacks on Jewish Christian eschatology.

Of the five books with which Macarius deals, Book I contains attacks on the miracles of Christ; Book II is concerned with His words and deeds and the contradictory accounts of them. Book III 1–20 continues the same subject; Book III 21–43 exposes the contradictory and immoral character of Peter and Paul; Book IV exposes the immoralities of the apostolic teaching; and Book V probably continues the same subject.

It will be seen that the order is quite different. The excerpt would have begun later than Book IV of Porphyry, and then would have returned subsequently to the contents of the beginning of that treatise.

The differences between the apostles, contained in Book I of Porphyry, seem to have been the subject of the almost forgotten fragment from Book V about faith and works (which is to be found in the works of De la Torre (Turrianus), the sixteenth-century Jesuit.¹

3. The tone of the polemic is somewhat more excited and accentuated in the book before us than in the work of Porphyry.

Dr Harnack leaves this statement without further explanation. But surely, if it is true, we are not dealing merely with a man who has made selections from various places and in different order out of Porphyry's book, but with one who has actually altered his language, imparting more force into the arguments and adapting them to a controversy of his own. And if this be so, we are not dealing with actual fragments of Porphyry, which may be used as the basis of an edition,² but with another opponent of the faith, who, instead of using original arguments, appropriated those of Porphyry.

After these three proofs of the excerpts theory, Dr Harnack proceeds by way of statement to set forth the probability that some plagiarist compiled about one hundred questions from Porphyry's book for the purpose of another controversy, turning his unwieldy and learned treatise into a popular handbook, which was now made to consist of only two books. He suggests that this may have taken place just before Constantine, most likely in the time of Maximin Daza, when endeavours were made to overthrow the Church by various literary means.

The point that seems to me of particular interest, as providing a possible clue which may aid further investigation, is that this shorter work consisted of *two* books. Dr Harnack gives proof of this earlier in his book,³ so it is sufficient to say here that he recognizes a distinct break after iii 20, so that of the two sections, the first part contains $x + 10 + 13$ questions, and the second part $9 + 16 + x$.⁴ The division

¹ See *J. T. S.* viii 558 (July 1907).

² *Op. cit.* p. 144 'Baustein für die zukünftige Ausgabe'.

³ *Ib.* p. 103 sq.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 105 n. 1.

occurs at the place where Peter begins to be attacked (in iii 21), and it has been quite obscured by Macarius.¹

One wonders why a mere excerpt should thus be divided into two parts, on so completely different a system from the original work. But one is led also to look for some known attack on the Christians at that period which actually contains two books. We shall return later to the fact that such a book is to be found in the *Φιλαληθείς Λόγοι* of Hierocles.

But it would be unfair to pass over a point which Dr Harnack elaborates in the earlier part of this book,² though he makes no reference to it at the end. Some of the objections are in sequence, and the subject of one naturally leads on to the next, while with others the sequence is broken. But further, there are occasional indications that something has dropped out, as for example where in ii 14, the philosopher begins *ἔστι καὶ ἕτερος λόγος δυνάμενος σαθρὰν ταύτην ἐλέγξαι τὴν δόξαν ὁ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως*, but in ii 13 there is nothing of the kind. This seems to me the best argument which is adduced to prove that the questions were compiled by a process of selection from a larger work. But the question still remains whether they were actually a mere excerpt, or whether another author has borrowed clumsily from the work of Porphyry.

But we may take the matter a step further on. This strong argument in favour of the theory of an excerpt from Porphyry rests entirely upon the assumption that Macarius is absolutely to be trusted, and that he has reproduced without a single omission every attack which he found in the book before him. It does not seem to have occurred to Dr Harnack that Macarius himself may have made the excerpts, and that, if so, the discovery of omissions counts for nothing in favour of the theory it is adduced to support.

Is his own view of the compilation of the *Apocriticus* such as to make this unlikely? Quite the contrary. I myself tried to shew the likelihood that there was a real five days' debate behind the book, and that Macarius lived about A.D. 300 and actually faced the philosopher whose attacks he reproduces. But Dr Harnack has followed the view of other German scholars, and placed him 100 years later, rending in pieces some of the arguments I had used.³

The theory which he supports is as follows:—

A Christian of about A. D. 400 wishes to defend the Scriptures against the arguments which heathen philosophy has brought against them. He works up his theme by means of a realistic but imaginary dialogue, using for his purpose a book of heathen objections, which he probably

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 105.

² *Ib.* pp. 105, 106.

³ *Ib.* p. 10 n. 1 and p. 14 n. 1.

possesses in an anonymous form. He is therefore under no obligation to deal exhaustively with the book; there is no need to inscribe his own effort *contra Porphyrium* or *Hieroclem* or any one else. He is free to use just as much of it as suits his purpose. Indeed, although he finds it in two books he conceals the place where they are divided (so Dr Harnack expressly tells us in spaced type).¹ Also he alters just so much as he thinks is necessary in order to keep up the illusion that a dialogue is in progress, adding brief introductions or a few words of conclusion to the attacks,² and occasionally changing a word, as when he alters '200 years' into '300', to suit a later period.³

If he takes over the *ipsissima verba* of an opponent with these few alterations, there is absolutely no reason why he should not make omissions. If, for example, he is concerned in defending the resurrection and decides to do so after ii 13, it is perfectly natural, if somewhat clumsy, that he should content himself with selecting the *second* of two attacks which he found in the book, and yet set it down *verbatim* in ii 14 as *καὶ ἕτερος λόγος . . . ὁ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως*. *Some one* has blundered, there is no doubt about that. Why should it be the unknown writer of excerpts in whose existence we are asked to believe? Why should it not be Macarius, who shewed such clumsiness a few years later at the Synodus ad Quercum (for Dr Harnack would have us identify him with the Macarius who figured then in such undesirable company),⁴ and came forward to accuse another man of the Origenism with which he himself is permeated?

The above considerations seem to me to remove all the point from the evidence of omissions with which we have been dealing.

Dr Harnack's arguments have now been set forth *seriatim*. But one point remains, which seems to have been almost completely overlooked, and yet appears to me to be of great importance. We are asked to accept the view that we have recovered the actual words of Porphyry. But although much that he wrote is lost, many treatises still remain. Can we find such similarity⁵ of style and language as to point to unity of authorship? Except for a few words in a foot-note, Dr Harnack is strangely silent on this point, presumably because so little is to be said in support of his view. Besides the few instances of likeness (such as *ὀθνεῖος*) already mentioned above,⁵ he only refers to the fondness of the author for certain forms in *-μα*, and says that these forms are also

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 105 'Der Hauptabschnitt . . . ist in der Gegenschrift des Macarius—durch die Bucheinteilung und sonst—halb verwischt und verdeckt'.

² See how Dr Harnack (*op. cit.*) prints words in brackets in *Apocr.* ii 12, iii 1, 7, 15, 30, iv 1 and 19.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 109. 22.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 16.

⁵ See under 10 *supra*.

frequent in Porphyry.¹ He adds that the style is a mixed one (bunt-scheckig) and modelled on Plato, Plutarch, and Diodorus.

He proceeds to give a list of rare words, without any reference to Porphyry, and six that appear to be unique. One would have thought that unity of authorship was too large an assumption unless a great deal more than this could be said. In view of the fact that I have discovered some remarkable parallels with the language of the brief fragment of Hierocles which remains to us (as I shall proceed to shew later), I feel that the identification with the language of Porphyry is very unsatisfactory. A study of the works of the latter has confirmed that opinion.

There is one thing which Dr Harnack has most strangely omitted to do. Enough of Porphyry's fifteen books is known to us through quotations and references to enable us to collect these remains and set them side by side with the questions preserved in Macarius. I propose in a subsequent article to gather the former together, and meanwhile the result of my investigation may be stated as follows. Four undoubted fragments remain, and forty-two references, which are sufficient in each case to shew Porphyry's line of argument. Of these forty-two references about ten are quite possibly his actual words rendered into Latin, which, when added to the four fragments mentioned above, would raise the total of quotations to fourteen.

Apart from these, exactly fifty objections are preserved in Macarius Magnes. There may thus be said to remain ninety-six references in all to Porphyry's words. But a careful comparison of the fifty in Macarius with the forty-six found elsewhere reveals only *four* plain parallels, and in none of these is there any verbal similarity. On the contrary there is something in each case to disprove identity. The four parallels are as follows:—

1. The fact of St Peter and St Paul being at variance. But as Jerome gives it, in his commentaries both on Galatians and on Isaiah liii 12, the objection is aimed at St Paul as well as St Peter, whereas in *Apocr.* iii 22 it is simply St Peter who is attacked as unfit to hold the keys of heaven. In fact, it is part of a series of attacks on the latter apostle, who is also accused of having had a wife and therefore being among those concerning whom St Paul said 'Such are false apostles'.

2. St Peter's treatment of Ananias and Sapphira. But whereas Jerome quotes Porphyry as saying that he *invoked* (imprecatur) death against them, this is not quite the same complaint as is brought in

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 97 n. 1. It may be noted that one of them *κατόρθωμα* only occurs once in the questions, but is a favourite word in the answers.

Apocr. iii 21. There he is blamed for killing them if they were innocent, and not forgiving them if they were guilty.

3. Jerome quotes Porphyry as saying that the Evangelists called the lake a 'sea', so as to suggest a miracle to the ignorant. In *Apocr.* iii 6 the small size of the lake is the main objection to Christ's walking on the water, and in iii 4 it is introduced in the last sentence of the objection against the miracle of the swine. But although it is stated that the intention of the exaggeration was to introduce a miracle, there is no suggestion such as is contained in Jerome's words 'ad faciendum ignorantibus miraculum'.

4. Jerome, in his Epistle to Ctesiphontes, briefly mentions Porphyry's objection to the fact that God allowed the heathen for ages before Christ's coming to be without a knowledge of His laws. Were this the only reference, it might well be a real link with the brief objection stated in *Apocr.* iv 10. But Augustine, in his Epistle to Deogratias, gives the same objection in a diffuse and detailed form, including reference to the fact that Rome itself remained in ignorance until the time of Caius Caesar.

This indicates that the questions given by Macarius represent a very much abbreviated version, and not the lengthy wording of the author from whom they were borrowed.

We are thus led to the conclusion that the objections of the *Apocriticus* cannot possibly have been by Porphyry himself.

I believe that their authorship is to be attributed to Hierocles. This is not a new suggestion, but I am not aware that any attempt has yet been made to study all the evidence in the way I now propose. I may state at the outset the remarkable fact that Dr Harnack's arguments in favour of Porphyry's authorship may be shewn to favour equally that of Hierocles. But we will study first what is known of the latter's work, and compare it with what we find in the *Apocriticus*.

There are two sources from which we may draw information with regard to the treatise of Hierocles. One is Lactantius, who in the *Divine Institutes* gives considerable information about the treatise in two books of one who was also a persecutor ('qui auctor imprimis faciendae persecutionis fuit').¹ It is generally agreed² that he is to be identified with the persecutor mentioned by name as Hierocles in the *De Mortibus Persecutorum* ('qui auctor et consiliarius ad faciendam persecutionem fuit').³ The other source of information is Eusebius, whose extant work *Contra Hieroclem* ought to be of considerable use in determining the question.

¹ Lact. *Div. Instit.* v 2.

² See e.g. A. J. Mason *Persecution of Diocletian* p. 59.

³ Lact. *De Mort. Persec.* xvi.

I will begin with Lactantius.

The passage is contained in *Div. Instit.* v 2 and 3 and may be summarized as containing the following facts, each of which will be seen to have some point of contact with the heathen opponent of Macarius.

1. He wrote in two books, which were written to the Christians, and bore the ambiguous title of *Φιλαληθεῖς Λόγοι*.¹ Dr Harnack has proved that the treatise Macarius dealt with was in two books, a point which seems to me greatly to help my own contention. And from the double title of Macarius's work a suggestion has occurred to me which I take this opportunity of mentioning. The Athens MS of Macarius gives the strange name of *Ἀποκριτικὸς ἢ Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἑλληνας*. The mystery of this title has not yet been solved. Dr Harnack thinks it possible (but not probable) that *Μονογενὴς* has been substituted by mistake for some other word. Could that word have been *Φιλαληθής*? But apart from this, I would suggest that the sub-title of the *Apocriticus* is explained at once if we think of *Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἑλληνας* as an answer to a work entitled *Φιλαληθής πρὸς Χριστιανούς*. In answer to the mere 'Friend of truth' he puts Him who is Himself the truth, even the 'Only-begotten'. It must be noted that in Eusebius *contra Hieroclem* the book is spoken of in the singular as *Φιλαληθής*,² not as *Φιλαληθεῖς Λόγοι*, almost as if the word was personified. The likeness of termination in *Φιλαληθής* and *Μονογενὴς* would help to make the one a suitable substitute for the other.

2. Not only did he try to allure Christians by the title of his work, but his attack is a bitter one, and yet he pretends to be giving kindly advice.³

We can infer for ourselves, and Macarius frequently tells us, how bitter and yet how subtle is the attack he is repelling. His opponent makes an appeal in the cause of truth, shewing a more excellent way, and yet he heaps scorn upon the Church, its Scriptures, and its faith. If there be as little direct attack upon Christ Himself as Dr Harnack suggests, this makes the assault the more cunning.

3. He proved the Scriptures false by setting forth those parts which seemed inconsistent.⁴

This is an accurate description of what we find in the *Apocriticus*, a large proportion of the questions being modelled on this form of attack.

¹ 'Compositus enim libellos duos, non contra Christianos, ne inimice insectari videretur, sed ad Christianos . . . ausus est libellos suos nefarios ac Dei hostes *Φιλαληθεῖς* annotare.'

² Euseb. *c. Hier.* chh. 1 and 2.

³ 'Ut humane ac benigne consulere putaretur.'

⁴ 'Ita falsitatem scripturae sacrae arguere conatus est, tanquam sibi esset tota contraria : nam quaedam capita, quae repugnare sibi videbantur, exposuit.'

4. In this he shewed such intimate knowledge of the faith as to make it likely that he had been a Christian himself.¹

Dr Harnack has used this as an argument for the authorship of Porphyry, and therefore his discovery of a tone of regret in some of the questions (with which I do not find myself wholly in agreement) would hold good here also.

5. His chief attack was on the disciples, Peter and Paul being mentioned by name.²

This is absolutely true of the *Apocriticus*, especially in Books III and IV, but also in Book II, and according to Dr Harnack in Book V also.

6. His twofold and contradictory charge against them was of fraud combined with ignorance.³

Many examples of both can be found in the *Apocriticus*; e.g., their fraud is shewn in the abuse of Paul as γόης and ψεύστης, and the charges against Peter for his behaviour to Ananias and Sapphira⁴; and their ignorance in the ἀπαίδευσία with which he explicitly charges both Peter and Paul as well as the writers of the Gospels.⁵

7. He tried to disparage Christ by saying that His rejection by the Jews was followed by His becoming a robber with nine hundred followers.

Such a statement may well have come in the lost Book I. If he is perverting the life of Christ throughout, and not directly contradicting it, he might naturally alter the story of the robbers at Calvary. The revolts which took place in Palestine during the period which succeeded the crucifixion used frequently to be connected wrongly with Christianity. One can recall not only Judas and Theudas and the Egyptian, for whom St Paul was mistaken, but the familiar saying of Suetonius at a later time about the Jews at Rome 'assidue tumultuantes impulsore Chresto'. Some such tradition may be at the back of this calumny of Hierocles.

8. He aimed at discrediting the miracles without actually denying them.⁶

Dr Harnack would certainly consent to this description of the opponent of Macarius; it is entirely the case with the few miracles that are mentioned, such as that of the demons and the swine and the walking on the lake.⁷

9. One method of dealing with the miracles was to shew the superiority

¹ 'Adeo intima enumerans ut aliquando ex eadem disciplina fuisse videatur.'

² 'Praecipue tamen Paulum Petrumque laceravit, ceterosque discipulos.'

³ 'Tanquam fallaciae seminatores; quos eosdem tamen rudes et indoctos fuisse testatus est.'

⁴ *Apocr.* iii 31 and 21.

⁵ *Ib.* iv 6, iii 34, iii 2, 4, &c.

⁶ 'Cum facta eius mirabilia destrueret nec tamen negaret.'

⁷ *Apocr.* iii 18 and 6.

of those of Apollonius of Tyana. The latter in particular shewed his greater cleverness by disappearing from Domitian when he intended to punish him, unlike Christ, who was seized and crucified. This accords exactly with *Apocriticus* iii 1, where this very reference and comparison is found, thus forming the plainest link that we have yet seen. The two passages are as follows. Lactantius says: 'Si magus Christus, quia mirabilia fecit, peritior utique Apollonius, qui (ut describis) cum Domitianus eum punire vellet, repente in iudicio non comparuit, quam ille, qui et comprehensus est, et cruci affixus.' The words of *Apocr.* iii 1 are as follows: ἡνέσχετο καλάμῳ τύπτεσθαι . . . καὶ μὴ καθάπερ Ἀπολλώνιος μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ αὐτοκράτορι λαλήσας Δομητιανῷ τῆς βασιλικῆς αὐλῆς ἀφανῆς ἐγένετο.

As the one extant fragment of Book I refers to the defence of a miracle, and it is presumed that the deeds of Christ formed the subject of that book, it is perfectly natural to suppose that the other references to Apollonius would be contained in that part of the work.

10. He claimed for himself and his school a superior wisdom in avoiding such credulity as the belief in the Divinity of Christ the miracle-worker.¹

The *Apocriticus* contains abundant instances of such a claim, as for example where the philosopher speaks of his superior knowledge that the Gospels are mere inventions, or points out the futility of flying to Jesus, or tries to turn the Christians from their churches by the broader claim that God is everywhere.²

11. He adopted an intermediate position between polytheism and monotheism, believing in lesser gods, and accepting the divinities of Greece and Rome. But at the end of his work, as Lactantius mockingly points out,³ he accepted the supreme God so fully as to reduce all the others to a state of subjection.

Here the parallel is very remarkable, and it seems to me to provide a most important argument. The language of the last sentences of Lactantius's words should be carefully compared with that of *Apocr.* iv 20, where, after saying τὸ μέντοι περὶ τῆς μοναρχίας τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πολυαρχίας τῶν σεβομένων θεῶν διαρρήδην ζητήσωμεν, the philosopher concludes θεὸς μονάρχης οὐκ ἂν κυρίως ἐκλήθῃ, εἰ μὴ θεῶν ἦρχε, and

¹ 'Ut appareat nos sapientiores esse, qui mirabilibus factis non statim fidem divinitatis adiunximus, quam vos, qui ob exigua portenta Deum credidistis.'

² See *Apocr.* iii 6; iii 4; and iv 21 fin. (τοῦ κυρίου δηλονότι πανταχόθεν ἀκούοντος).

³ *Loc. cit.* 'Assertor deorum, eos ipsos ad ultimum prodidisti. Prosecutus enim Summi Dei laudes, quem regem . . . confessus es, ademisti Iovi tuo regnum, eumque summa potestate depulsum in ministrorum numerum redigesti. Epilogus itaque te tuus arguit stultitiae, vanitatis, erroris. Affirmas deos esse; et illos tamen subiicis et mancipas ei Deo cuius religionem conaris evertere.'

suggests that the supreme God is king of other gods, as Hadrian was of other men. Does not this accord exactly with what Lactantius derides? And it occurs at the end of the fourth book, which is sufficiently near the conclusion to warrant the remark 'Affirmas deos esse; et illos tamen subiicis et mancipis ei Deo cuius religionem conaris evertere. *Epilogus* itaque te tuus arguit stultitiae'.¹

As we leave the evidence of Lactantius, we may feel that each fact which it reveals concerning the treatise of Hierocles, helps to link it with the work which we are considering.

We now come to the evidence of the treatise of Eusebius *contra Hieroclem*. Naturally it is to be expected that considerable fresh proofs one way or the other will be obtainable from it. And if this is not wholly the case, there is some compensation in the fact that a quotation is made from the actual words of Hierocles. It will be well to give it before considering its value as a piece of evidence.

The following sentences are given by Eusebius as occurring verbatim in the *Philalethes* of Hierocles²: 'Ἀνὸ δὲ καὶ κάτω θρυλοῦσι σεμνύοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὡς τυφλοῖς ἀναβλέψαι παρασχόντα, καὶ τινα τοιαῦτα δράσαντα θαυμάσια . . . Ἐπισκεψώμεθά γε μὴν ὅσῳ βέλτιον καὶ συντετώτερον ἡμεῖς ἐνδεχόμεθα τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ ἦν περὶ τῶν ἐναρέτων ἀνδρῶν ἔχομεν γνώμην . . . Ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν Νέρωνος βασιλείαν Ἀπολλωνίους ἤκμασεν ὁ Τυανεύς, ὃς ἐκ παιδὸς κομιδῇ νέου, καὶ ἀφ' οὐπερ ἐν Αἰγείας τῆς Κιλικίας ἱεράσατο τῷ φιλανθρωποτάτῳ Ἀσκληπιῷ, πολλὰ καὶ θαυμαστὰ διεπράξατο· ὧν τὰ πλείω παρεῖς, ὀλίγων ποιήσομαι μνήμην . . . Ἦνος οὖν ἔνεκα τούτων ἐμνήσθην; ἵνα ἐξῆ συγκρίναι τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀκριβῆ καὶ βεβαίαν ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ κρίσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν κουφότητα, εἴπερ ἡμεῖς μὲν τὸν τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκότα οὐ θεὸν ἀλλὰ θεοῖς κεχαρισμένον ἄνδρα ἠγοούμεθα, οἱ δὲ δι' ὀλίγας τερατείας τινὰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν θεὸν ἀναγορεύουσι . . . κἀκεῖνο δὲ λογιῶσθαι ἄξιον, ὅτι τὰ μὲν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος τε καὶ Παῦλος καὶ τινες τούτοις παραπλήσιοι κεκομπάκασιν (οἱ κεκόμπασιν), ἄνθρωποι ψεύσται καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι καὶ γόγυτες· τὰ δὲ Ἀπολλωνίου Μάξιμος ὁ Αἰγιωτῆς, καὶ Δάμις ὁ φιλόσοφος ὁ συνδιατρίψας αὐτῷ, καὶ Φιλόστρατος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος παιδείσεως μὲν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἦκοντες, τὸ δ' ἀληθῆς τιμῶντες, διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν ἀνδρὸς γενναίου καὶ θεοῦ φίλου πράξεις μὴ βουλόμενοι λαθεῖν.

If any of this fragment were to be found in the *Apocriticus*, further argument would be unnecessary. But such is not the case. However, this is not to be expected, for it has already been pointed out that the probable place for a comparison of the deeds of Christ with those of Apollonius is in Book I, which seems to have dealt with that part of our Lord's life. To this Dr Harnack would doubtless agree, for he suggests as the probable contents of that lost book 'the absurd miracles,

¹ Lact. *Div. Instit.* v 3.

² Migne *P. G.* xxii pp. 797-800 ch. 2.

which are attributed to Jesus in the Gospels'.¹ The fact that in Book III (iii 1), where the trial of Christ is contrasted with the escape of Apollonius, the latter is introduced simply without any comment or the addition of his title ὁ Τυανεύς, seems to indicate that he had already been introduced earlier in the treatise. If a contrast is made when Christ's Passion is reached, it is natural that a similar contrast should have been made in the case of the miracles, seeing that it was as a *miraculous* hero that the 'Life' by Philostratus had revealed him to the admiring heathen world. One may refer here to the suggestion that in this 'Life' a tacit attack was made on the Christian faith, by providing a rival hero whose miracles were manufactured as a result of studying the Gospels.²

But the fragment may be used as an entirely different form of evidence. Is it long enough to enable us to decide whether the language agrees with an identity of authorship or whether it bears testimony against it? The number of words which are at all distinctive or unusual is unfortunately quite small, and the list can scarcely be extended beyond the following: θρυλῶ, σεμνῶ, ἐνάρετος, ἀκμάζω, κομιδῆ, κουφότης, τερατεία, κομπάζω, ψεύστης, ἀπαίδευτος, and γόης. I venture to think that it is a point of great importance that no less than seven of these eleven words are to be found (either exactly, or in corresponding adjective or noun) in the treatise we are considering, some of them occurring several times, and one of them (κομπάζω) being placed by Dr Harnack among the author's rarer words.³ The detailed results of the investigation are as follows:—

1. The fragment begins with ἀνὼ καὶ κάτω θρυλοῦσι. This word is found more than once in the *Apocriticus*. In ii 14 περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ τῆς πανταχοῦ θρυλουμένης; and in iii 7, of those who saw the alabaster broken by the woman, τὴν ἀκαιρίαν θρυλοῦντων. Again in iii 15 the attack on the words 'Except ye eat the flesh &c.' begins with πολυθρύλητον ἐκεῖνο τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐστίν. It will be noted how exactly the use accords with that of Hierocles in the first and the third instances.

2. The fragment speaks of τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν κουφότητα, in contrast with the better sense of the heathen. This is just the spirit in which the corresponding adjective is used in iv 22, which begins with the hypothesis, εἰ δὲ καὶ τις τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὕτω κούφος τὴν γνώμην.

3. But a more striking parallel is found in the rarer word κομπάζω. Hierocles declares that τὰ μὲν Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος τε καὶ Παῦλος καὶ τινες τούτοις παραπλήσιοι κεκόμπασιν (MSS κεκομπάσασιν).

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 104.

² See Elsee *Neoplatonism in relation to Christianity* p. 83 ff.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 97 n. 1.

The word is used in iii 36 of Christian virgins, who ὡς μέγα τι κομπάζουσι. Again in iv 7 it is said of a saying of Christ, ἀπὸ τερατώδους καὶ τοῦτο ψευδολογίας καὶ ὑπερφουῶν ἀλαζονείας κεκόμπαται τό ὁ οὐρανὸς κτλ. Also in iv 2, πολλὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῆς ἀλαζονείας ὁ κόμπος, where it is worth noting that the saying is one of St Paul.

4. The apostles are charged with being ἄνθρωποι ἀπαιδευτοί, and the same two apostles come in for similar criticism in the *Aprocriticus*. In iii 34 St Paul is spoken of as ταύτην ἀναλαβὼν τὴν ἀπαιδευτον γνώμην. Again in iv 6 concerning the foolishness of a saying in the Apocalypse of Peter, οὐδεὶς δὲ οὕτως ἀπαιδευτος, κτλ. The noun also occurs more than once; in iii 2 a saying of Christ is called μεστὸν ἀπαιδευσίας, and in iii 4 comes the exclamation φεῦ τῆς ἀπαιδευσεως.

5. Corresponding to the epithet ψεύσται, given also to the apostles, comes in iii 31 the abuse of St Paul as ψεύστης καὶ τοῦ ψεύδους ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ σύντροφος.

6. Along with the above two epithets, Hierocles also calls the apostles γόητες. And in iii 31, because St Paul first called himself a Jew and then a Roman, he was said to be τέχνη γοητείας τοὺς εὐχερεῖς δουλούμενος. These words occur only a few lines from the passage above containing the word ψεύστης, and not far from the place where ἀπαιδευτος occurs.¹

7. Although the word τερατεία, usgd by Hierocles of the miracles, does not occur in the *Aprocriticus*, yet the verb, adjective, and a kindred noun are all found, viz. τερατεύεσθαι, τερατώδης, and τερατολογία (iv 6; iii 4, iv 5 and 7; and ii 15).

It may be added that when Hierocles speaks of Apollonius as θεοῖς φίλος, it suggests the same acceptance of the heathen deities as is seen in Macarius's opponent, as for example when he says (iv 20) περὶ μὲν τοῦ εἶναι θεοῦ καὶ δεῖν τιμᾶσθαι αὐτοὺς ἄλλοις.

There is yet another verbal parallel which may be added to those given above. Although the fragment does not contain the word εὐχερής or εὐχέρεια, Eusebius himself makes it quite plain that the Christians have been charged by Hierocles with εὐχέρεια καὶ κουφότης (see ch. iv p. 513). A parallel with the latter word has already been found. But εὐχέρεια and εὐχέρης occur no less than four times, in *Aprocr.* ii 16, iii 15, 19, and 31, being in each case applied in some sense to Christians.

It will thus be seen that the actual language of Hierocles, little as we know of it, contributes a striking piece of evidence with regard to identity of authorship. It has already been stated how little this is the case with Porphyry. It now remains to study the rest of the treatise of Eusebius.

¹ Cf. also the comment in iv 2 on the words in 1 Thess. about the resurrection; ὑπέρογκον τὸ ψεύσμα.

The first chapter (p. 511) gives us *Φιλαληθής* as the title of the work, and the way its contents are spoken of as *ἐν τῷ φιλαληθεῖ* (instead of *φιλαληθέσι λόγους*) helps the suggestion I have already made that *Μονογενής* was intended for a rival title to *Φιλαληθής*.¹

The same chapter contains a very clear statement of the plagiarism of Hierocles, declaring that his material was *μὴ αὐτοῦ ἴδια τυγχανόντα, σφόδρα δὲ ἀναιδῶς ἐξ ἐτέρων οὐκ αὐτοῖς μονονουχὶ νοήμασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥήμασι καὶ συλλαβαῖς ἀποσεσλημένα*. Eusebius proceeds to instance Celsus as the source of his borrowing,¹ but it is quite certain from what is known and has been already set forth about his attacks on the contradictions of Scripture (including so many passages from St Paul, whom Celsus does not mention), that Celsus cannot be the *chief* source. This latter remains a mystery, until we mark the parallels, already detailed by Dr Harnack,² with Porphyry's fifteen books against the Christians. When we consider the extreme likelihood that the recent treatise of Porphyry would be the best and readiest source for him to seize upon, the probability of borrowing grows stronger, and there seems the less necessity for the theory of an 'anonymous excerpt'. If the plagiarism extended, as Eusebius says, even to verbal imitation, we may claim the scanty verbal and detailed links with what we know of Porphyry's work (the use of which by Dr Harnack has been already shewn), as possible of application to the treatise of an imitator like Hierocles.

Eusebius almost immediately proceeds to discuss the comparison instituted by Hierocles with Apollonius of Tyana (ch. ii p. 513) after dealing only briefly with the inconsistencies and other charges brought in the words of his opponent, which I have already given verbatim as quoted by him. Practically the whole of the rest of the treatise is taken up with Apollonius.

From these facts writers have attempted to reconstruct the contents of the *Philalethes*, but I venture to think they have been led astray. For example, we are told, 'His book seems to have consisted of two parts, a series of biblical questions similar to those answered by Origen in his writings against Celsus, and an elaborate attempt to shew that Apollonius, the god-like man of paganism, is greater than Jesus, the Christian God.'³

Certainly this would seem to be the case, if the treatise of Eusebius

¹ In *J.T.S.* April 1907 I have shewn the probability that the opponent of Macarius knew Celsus, and have noted arguments which he seems to have borrowed from him.

² He freely concedes at the end of his book that Hierocles did copy largely from Porphyry, p. 143. 'Allerdings hat auch er den Porphyrius reichlich ausgeschrieben.'

³ Elsee *Neoplatonism in relation to Christianity* p. 66 n. 2.

were our only source of information. And the result would be that the identification that I am seeking to substantiate would become an impossible one. But the passage in Lactantius has already shewn us that such is not the case.¹ How then is Eusebius's treatment of the book to be explained? It seems to me that he had before him a work in which the chief attack was through the contradictions of Scripture. This he states at the outset (ch. i p. 511), but he refrains from dealing with this part of the book, contenting himself with saying that Origen has already answered similar objections, when brought by Celsus. It may possibly be that he shirks this part of the controversy himself, as a matter which was either uncongenial, or unnecessary, or with which he did not feel himself competent to deal. But since the time of Origen there had appeared the mythical 'Life' of Apollonius, which formed a most dangerous indirect attack on Christianity by setting up a rival hero, whose story was suggested to the author by that of the God-man Himself.² It is absolutely certain that this was seized upon by Hierocles and turned into a direct attack upon Christ and His miracles.³ This popularizing of the life by Hierocles was an even more serious matter for Christians than the writing of it by Philostratus. If Eusebius felt this strongly, it was perfectly natural that he should take hold of this part of the *Philaletes* and deal with it at length. In any case it must be admitted that in ch. ii he goes off at a tangent and proceeds for the rest of his treatise to speak exhaustively concerning the 'Life'. Hierocles is lost sight of, he is really answering the work of Philostratus. It is an intentional digression from which he never returns. The above explanation of his treatise reconciles it with the statements of Lactantius and supports the theory which we are putting to the test.

Having completed our study of the original authorities, and having found them in agreement with our theory, we may now proceed to set forth other briefer arguments in its favour, some of them suggested by Dr Harnack's own lines of argument. In fact, we may now try and conclude our survey by summarizing *all* the arguments in favour of the authorship of Hierocles. If I imitate Dr Harnack by enumerating them by means of *eleven* propositions it will be the easier to weigh them against his own.

¹ It is sufficient to recall the statement (Lact. *Div. Instit.* v 3) that at the end of his work Hierocles dealt with the relation of the supreme God to the lesser ones. This suits exactly with the end of Book iv of the *Apocriticus*, but it has nothing whatever to do with Apollonius.

² See Elsee *op. cit.* pp. 86-88 for the ingenious method of discrediting Christianity thus adopted by Plotinus and the rest of the Neoplatonic school.

³ See e.g. Lact. *op. cit.* ch. iii.

1. Hierocles wrote in two books, and our author seems to have done the like. He called his work *Φιλαληθής πρὸς Χριστιανούς*, which would explain the answer being entitled *Μονογενής πρὸς Ἕλληνας*.

2. Eusebius says he was an absolute plagiarist, and his objections go back to Celsus. Several of the questions in the *Apocriticus* may be similarly traced back. In ii 4 he raises the same objection, that Christ ought to have appeared to His judges, as Celsus puts.¹ In iii 1 he asks why He did not shew His Divinity during the Passion, instead of displaying such meekness.² In iii 2 he mocks at His conduct in Gethsemane, and His prayer that His passion should pass away from Him.³ And in iv 24, in discussing the absurdity of the resurrection of the body, he notices the same Christian plea as Celsus notices, viz. that 'all things are possible with God', and proceeds to refute it by similar arguments.⁴

3. Hierocles goes much further than Celsus, and the chief source of his attacks is really Porphyry. Many links with this philosopher are to be found in the *Apocriticus*, to whom Macarius actually refers his opponent. Most of the arguments which Dr Harnack uses to support the authorship of Porphyry may also be used to substantiate that of Hierocles, the plagiarist who so unhesitatingly 'plundered' the very words of Porphyry.

4. We have only a small fragment of the language of Hierocles preserved independently, but of the only eleven distinctive words which it contains, no less than seven have parallels in the philosopher of the *Apocriticus*, and there are other likenesses besides.⁵

5. The main theme of Hierocles's book was to prove the Scriptures false by adducing their contradictions. This is exactly the attack which Macarius had to face.

6. The time and place of the two writings are in accord as far as they are known to us. Hierocles appears to have written before the persecution began⁶ or at all events at the very beginning of the fourth century. This period suits the opponent of Macarius best of all, and Dr Harnack suggests that the unknown compiler of the 'excerpt' made it in the time of Maximin Daza.

Hierocles was an imperial officer, who before moving to Bithynia in A. D. 304 was governor of Palmyra.⁷ Now Macarius, Dr Harnack

¹ Orig. c. Cels. ii 63.

² Cf. *ib.* ii 35.

³ Cf. *ib.* ii 24.

⁴ Cf. *ib.* v 14 sq.

⁵ This is very different from the relation of our author to the many extant works of Porphyry. Here Dr Harnack can do no more than point to a few words in -μα, which are characteristic of both, *op. cit.* p. 97 n. 1.

⁶ Mason *op. cit.* p. 61 n.

⁷ *Corpus Inscript. Lat.* t. 3, no. 133 ap Duch. *op. cit.* p. 2c.

tells us, is certainly to be connected with Asia Minor. How then are we to account for the fact that he persistently points his opponent to the region of Palmyra? Duchesne indicated such plain references as Berenice having become queen of Edessa,¹ and the philosopher being told to go to Antioch to look for the effects of Christianity.² And I myself added the suggestion³ that the recent history of Palmyra and its queen Zenobia may be referred to in the exclamation *πόσαι βασιλίδες γυναικες ἀπώλοντο*,⁴ and noted his reference to Bardesanes of Edessa.⁵ I am quite aware that the full force of this evidence depends on the theory that Macarius's words were written less than 100 years after his opponent. But even when we place him at the later date, it is easily conceivable that the lost first book (where one of the local references is to be found) contained such a plain allusion to locality that, in order to maintain the realism of a dialogue, he felt constrained to make further reference to it in his answers.

One difficulty however remains. The philosopher also shews knowledge of a totally different part of the world, for he knows local traditions about the Church of Rome.⁶ Dr Harnack uses this as a link with Porphyry, who wrote after a long sojourn at Rome itself. And it must be admitted that there is no connexion with Rome in the case of Hierocles, though our knowledge of his career is so scanty that there is no reason why, as an imperial officer, he should not have been connected at some time with that city. Nor is it certain that the writer's knowledge must have been acquired on the spot. But we may add that there is a similar difficulty with regard to Macarius himself in his answers. Everything seems to connect him with Asia Minor, and his list of heretics is drawn entirely from the East⁷; and yet, when he comes to speak of the heroes of the Church, it is to the West that he turns, and to such names as those of Fabian and Cyprian,⁸ while he too displays a knowledge of local Roman traditions, different from those mentioned by his opponent.⁹ And yet he speaks of the Romans as *βάρβαρον ἔθνος*. In his case therefore the argument concerning Rome is an uncertain one. Nor does the problem seem much simpler in the case of his opponent.

7. The tone of Hierocles was one of lofty superiority. His attack was cruelly bitter, but he claimed to counsel the Christians for their good, and to point them to something higher, writing to and not against

¹ *Apoct.* i 6.

² *Ib.* ii 7.

³ *J.T.S.* viii 414 (April 1907).

⁴ *Apoct.* iv 11.

⁵ *Ib.* iv 15.

⁶ *Ib.* ii 22.

⁷ *Ib.* iii 43 and iv 15.

⁸ *Ib.* iii 24. I am indebted to Professor Burkitt for an interesting parallel. Fabian is also mentioned in the Syriac Acts of Bar-Samya c. 370.

⁹ *Ib.* iv 15.

them. This same tone is discernible in the *Apocriticus*, and many instances of it may be given.¹

8. We may use wording similar to that of Dr Harnack in his corresponding proposition, and say that the chief method of attack in both authors is to shew the perversion of the faith by the followers of Christ.

9. Hierocles simply sought to discredit Christ, without denying His work and His miracles, but only shewing that those of Apollonius were greater. His chief denial was of His Divinity. Dr Harnack has very plainly shewn this to be the case with the author of the questions. Also there remains one explicit comparison with Apollonius (even though the part which dealt with the miracles is lost to us), the object of this comparison being to shew the inferiority of Christ.

10. We may again follow the corresponding proposition in favour of the Porphyrian theory, and say that a similarity may be found by means of a number of concrete instances. These have already been discussed, and it is sufficient to recall two of special importance, namely the reduction of the lesser gods to a state of servitude at the *end* of the book, and the introduction of Apollonius.

11. The final proposition may stand as Dr Harnack's, namely that the author seems to have been near to Christianity and then to have broken away from it, and that he displays throughout an accurate knowledge of the Scriptures. This is just what Lactantius says about Hierocles, stating that his knowledge was so intimate, that he may have been 'ex eadem disciplina'.

I must leave it to others to weigh these rival propositions. But in comparing them, the fact must not be forgotten that about half Dr Harnack's arguments for Porphyry may be claimed as supporting Hierocles also. Indeed they may nearly *all* refer to the plagiarist as well as to the man who supplied him with his material. But on the contrary, of my arguments for Hierocles, the majority belong to the individual man and to no one else, and therefore can have no reference to Porphyry.

It is a possible ground of objection to my theory, that I have tried to shew successively that the language of the questions² is unlike that

¹ e.g., *Apocr.* iii 4, iii 6, and iv 20, iv 21 fin., &c.

² I take this opportunity of alluding to a previous statement of mine *J.T.S.* viii 411 (April 1907), that, whereas Macarius characterizes his opponent's language as 'Attic oratory', as a matter of fact the eloquence and the polish all lie with himself. Dr Harnack quotes this and makes merry over it (p. 10 n. 1). Yet he himself says later (p. 96) that the heathen speaks in language short, sharp, and cutting, but the Christian apologist diffusely, pompously, in oratorical pathos (in *rednerischem* Pathos) often with varying repetitions. This agrees with Duchesne's words 'Ab eo genere mirum est quantum differat Macarii facundia gravis et ornata,

of Porphyry, that it has striking similarities with that of Hierocles, and yet that Hierocles copied from Porphyry. But it is impossible to estimate the extent of such copying, and the fact that Eusebius speaks of Celsus and not Porphyry as the ultimate source of his attacks, shews that he is not making a mere transcription from the earlier and greater Neoplatonist.

The time has come to pass on to the attempt to reconstruct the work of Porphyry, using the treatise we have been considering as a subsidiary help. But first, as I have been dealing somewhat fully with Dr Harnack's book, I cannot refrain from adding something to the present article by way of appendix, on the kindred subject treated of in the rest of it, namely the origin and authorship of the *Apocriticus*. And indeed, the question of the identity of the heathen philosopher who is answered therein can scarcely be satisfactorily discussed and concluded without some consideration of the disputed origin of the book itself.

It remains therefore to say something about Dr Harnack's theory with regard to Macarius Magnes himself. In his introductory chapter he gives strong support to the view that the author was the Macarius Magnes, Bishop of Magnesia, who is known to us as having accused Heracleides of Origenism at the Synod of the Oak in A. D. 403.

He begins with the statements which Macarius puts in the mouth of his opponent, that it is 300 years or more since Christ's death, and again, that 300 years have passed since the writing of 1 Thessalonians. These statements suggest a date well on in the fourth century, and other considerations make it probable that the *Apocriticus* must be placed as late as A. D. 395-400. The four arguments which Dr Harnack gives in support of this date are as follows:—

1. The *Apocriticus* reveals a battle between heathenism and Christianity, which is only a literary one.
2. Monasticism has spread everywhere in the East.
3. The Manichees have also spread everywhere.
4. The Trinitarian doctrine belongs to a period subsequent to A. D. 370, and the absence of reference to the Arians among heretics compels a date subsequent to A. D. 381.

Therefore it is certainly not a real dialogue, but the author has seized on a work just a hundred years old, being an excerpt, probably anonymous, from the lost work of Porphyry against the Christians, which is itself some thirty years older still. This excerpt he has embodied complete, without omissions, only in a few cases adding the briefest of introductions, or a word or two of conclusion.

repetitionibus abundans, *oratorio* plane modo se efferens'. So I do not quite understand why Dr Harnack adorns my sentence with a double interrogation mark.

Every word of this theory contradicts the view I ventured to put forth myself,¹ and Dr Harnack has honoured me by discussing and rejecting most of my arguments. I do not therefore propose to marshal the same arguments again. In some points his words have brought conviction to me that he is right. I will not here hold against him the definite view that Macarius lived 100 years earlier, and, though of Asia Minor himself, met Hierocles in the neighbourhood of Palmyra, when he was governor there, and held a public argument with him, facing the objections issued by Hierocles in his *Philalethes*, and publishing the whole afterwards as the *Apocriticus*. But I cannot help thinking that there are many difficulties which still stand in the way of the other solution of the problem. For a problem it still remains, and I cannot feel that Dr Harnack's view of the Answers is the true solution, any more than is his view of the Questions. In accepting the arguments he has given us there are obstacles in each case which must not be forgotten. I will put them in as brief a form as possible.

With regard to the direct evidence of date, it is after all strangely unsatisfactory. The mention of *τριακόσια ἔτη*, coming as it does in the words of the *opponent* of Macarius, is extremely difficult. Dr Harnack guesses that it was altered by Macarius from *διακόσια*, but this is not a very convincing suggestion, as the author of the *Apocriticus* has made no attempt to bring his work up to date in other directions, as we shall see. And the other mention of *τριακόσια* is simply an emendation of the MS reading *τριακόντα*. And again, if the same antiquity be assigned to the death of Christ and the writing of St Paul's Epistles, it shews that the writer is only dealing with round numbers at best.

And now a word with regard to the other four arguments.

1. If the battle is only a literary one, and the Christian is shewing before a world in which the stigma of Christianity has been removed, how he got the upper hand, why should he cringe so towards the heathen, and represent himself as shewing such a terrified demeanour? He speaks, not with the quiet confidence of a superiority which has been already claimed before the world, but with the effort of one who represents a humble and unpopular cause. Such is the unmistakable intention of such language as is used of the heathen in ii 12, ὁ δὲ δρμύξας καὶ λίαν βλοσυρὸν εἰσαθρήσας πληκτικώτερον ἡμῖν ἔφησε νεύσας, and in the Preface to Book III, φοβερὸν ὡς εἶδον ἐπισκυνίου σόβητρον, and also of himself in iii 10, πᾶσαν τοῦ σώματος αἰσθησιν ἐταράχθημεν, ὡς μικροῦ λέγειν καὶ ἡμᾶς Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα. Is this the way to represent the relation of Christian and heathen in A.D. 400 for the edification of fellow-Christians? If this be all literary padding, why is it of this kind?

¹ *J. T. S. loc. cit.*

2. The mention of Monasticism, as having spread everywhere in the East, is certainly a very strong point in favour of a later date. And yet even here it is the earlier monastic rather than the later coenobitic life which seems to be referred to. Nor does it appear to me to be 'already a great and public evidence of Church life'. Macarius¹ is only acting on the defensive in shewing the fulfilment of Christ's saying that He came to separate a man from his father, and daughter from her mother. He speaks of daughters as cut off from *μητρικῆς πολιτείας*, and turning to the *ἄνω πολιτεία*. He adds *ἄλλαι παρθενίας καὶ ἀγνείας ἔνεκεν ἐπαινετῆς ἐρασθεΐσαι ἦθος μητέρων καὶ τρόπον ἠρνῆσαντο*. For such virginity we need not go to the end of the fourth century. Concerning sons he says *προγονικῶν νομίμων ἔθος ἀπωσάμενοι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀσκητικὴν μετέβησαν δίαιταν*. He then points to the East, Syria and specially Antioch, as shewing the diversities in the lives men lead (*μυρίαὶ μερίζονται κατορθωμάτων γνώμας*). Some marry and some refuse; some live in luxury and riches, others in fasting and poverty, *ἄλλοι ταῖς ἐταίραις συνεῖναι σπουδάξουσι, ἕτεροι ταῖς μονηρίαὶς θέλουσι συναυλιζέσθαι*. Is this last phrase sufficient to imply the *later* monasticism of the desert type? If the ascetics referred to above had really left the world for the wilderness, would not Macarius have mentioned this as most plainly fulfilling the *separation* spoken of by our Lord? Does not his pointing to those in the one city imply that they were still in touch with others? Nor are they lost to their parents, for he says *καὶ οὔτε πατέρες ταῦθ' ὀρῶντες ὀργίζονται, οὐδὲ δυσχεραίνει μήτηρ, οὐδὲ χαλεπαίνουσιν ἀδελφοί*. Such is absolutely all the evidence with regard to monasticism.

3. The influence of Manes has also spread everywhere, *ὑφέρπων τὴν οἰκουμένην* (iv 15). Certainly such a reference will suit well with the period when Titus of Bostra had attacked the vigorous growth of the Manichaeans in the East (c. 370) and Augustine was about to do so in the West. But I frankly do not understand why it should be limited to such a period. Seeing that a century earlier, in A.D. 290, Diocletian issued an edict to the Proconsul of Africa to burn the leaders of this sect with their books, and to execute its persistent adherents, I should not have thought that the language of Macarius need be much subsequent to that date. And this is borne out by the fact that it is in company with earlier heretics that the Manichaeans are mentioned (Marcionists and Dositheans in one passage, iv 15, and *Ἐγκρατηταὶ καὶ Ἀποκατῖται καὶ Ἐρημίται* in the other, iii 43).

4. The Trinitarian teaching is the form of orthodoxy which developed after the sixth decade of the fourth century. The passage which shews this most clearly is in iv 25, where Macarius speaks of *θεὸς εἰς ἐν τρισὼν*

¹ *Apocr.* ii 7.

ὑποστάσειν, and concludes ἵνα τριῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐν οὐσίᾳ μιᾷ γνωρισθῇ τὸ ὄνομα. I suggested the possibility of this language being conceivably ante-Nicene, but in the light of what Dr Harnack now says, I am ready to retract this. My other suggestion was that the passage is an interpolation. I feel strongly the likelihood of this, for the whole of this piece of Trinitarian doctrine is contained in twenty-two lines, which are entirely different in tone, the long periods being replaced by short and disjointed theological statements, with frequent repetitions. In answering a question about the Monarchy of God, it would be absurd for the Christian apologist to set forth without any qualification or explanation the three Persons of the Christian God, when he is just engaged in maintaining monotheism against the polytheism of his opponent. But the excuse for an interpolation is obvious. The subject is the washing of Baptism, and it would be tempting to some later writer to insert a reference to the real meaning of Baptism in the name of the Trinity. Schalkhauser's discovery of an interpolation elsewhere in the treatise makes the suggestion more likely than when I made it, and it is significant that it is also in a doctrinal passage that added words have been found which were not even contained in the Athens MS. I am conscious that the suggestion that the work has been tampered with is somewhat of a last resource. But Dr Harnack himself considers that the original work of Porphyry was made more impassioned in tone by a compiler, and then further altered in some particulars by Macarius. If we add to this the fact, as mentioned above, of there being a known later interpolation in the words of Macarius himself, perhaps my suggestion becomes more reasonable. The Trinitarian language in the rest of the *Apocriticus* is less definite. I do not propose to discuss again the passages in which the word ὑπόστασις occurs¹; the use varies and the language is difficult, but I do not think that, apart from the passage quoted above, it is sufficient to place the work at the end of the fourth century, if anything else demands an earlier date. And I am emphatically of the opinion that that is the case with another part of the doctrine of the book. Dr Harnack goes on to say that the *Apocriticus* must be later than A. D. 381, because Arians are not mentioned in the list of heretics! But that it should have been written only twenty years later, and that it should fail to say a word about the most virulent and acute of the heresies and be content to go back to Dositheans and Encratites and such like, is to my mind absolutely without explanation. Nor does the author intend to confine himself to references to what was long past, for he does introduce the Manichaeans, in a way which makes Dr Harnack think that the treatise must be put

¹ See *J.T.S.* viii 554-556 (July 1907).

late for that very reason. The suggestion that Arians are really meant by the term *χριστομάχοι*¹ becomes quite indefensible when the context is studied, for they are called *Ἰουδαϊκῆς μανίας κοινωνοί*.² To my mind therefore the difficulty of accepting a date for the treatise when Arianism and its offshoots dwarfed all other heresies in men's recollection, is well-nigh insuperable.

It will be seen then that Dr Harnack's four supplementary arguments are not so convincing as they appear. But besides the omission of Arians, there remain other obstacles in the way of his theory. For example, he connects the two authors whose work is contained in our treatise with Rome and Asia Minor respectively. How is it then that it is to Syria, and especially to Antioch and Edessa, that Macarius points his opponent? And why does he, in speaking of Ethiopia, locate it in the south-west? And how is it that, although he calls the Romans *βάρβαρον ἔθνος*,³ he knows local Roman traditions,⁴ and puts Fabian among the few heroes of the Church that he mentions?⁵

I do not wish to argue here for the view that a real dialogue underlies the *Apocriticus*, but I cannot see the force of one of Dr Harnack's arguments against it. He says that it would be unnatural for the Christian to take some six objections at a time, and then answer them in turn as Macarius has done. But it seems to me that it would be an equally unnatural way of treating a *book* which Macarius is supposed to have had before him in the form of anonymous excerpts from Porphyry.

The above considerations seem to indicate that the problem involved in the book has not yet reached a solution. I attempted an answer myself, and Dr Harnack has tested and rejected it. If I have made bold to do the same thing with his own solution, it becomes the more difficult to advance another. If in conclusion I attempt to do so now, it is quite tentatively, and with the consciousness that there are plenty of obstacles in the way of it.

We have had suggested to us that the work of Porphyry was taken over and abridged by an unknown writer and used for his own purpose. A double authorship has been traced in the *questions*. But what if some explanation of double authorship underlies not the questions but the *answers*? I can imagine a work, written not far on in the fourth century, and facing, probably by name, Hierocles and the arguments his *Philaletes* had brought against the Scriptures. A real dialogue may conceivably have been the foundation of this work, but the preponderance of argument seems against this being the case. Probably it was written

¹ *Apocr.* iii 14.

² See *J.T.S.* viii 417 n. 6 (April 1907).

³ *Apocr.* ii 17 p. 29, 1. 12.

⁴ *Ib.* iv 15 (The milk that flowed when St Paul was executed).

⁵ *Ib.* iii 21 p. 109.

some years later than Hierocles in the earlier half of the fourth century. The author had been at Rome, but was living in the East, probably in Syria, and therefore naturally points the opponent, who had been governor of Palmyra, to that particular region. But he is also well acquainted with the Eastern part of Asia Minor, and knows of the spread of heresy in regions such as Lycaonia,¹ and of worthies like Aratus of Cilicia.² This writer did not belong to the School of Edessa, but was a great Origenist. He was a really great exponent of the Christian faith, and worthy to be ranked with some of the great fathers of that century.

This work was seized upon by Macarius Magnes, the Bishop of Magnesia who is heard of in 403 A.D., and worked into the form in which it is at present, being now made to consist of a five days' debate, and the original division of Hierocles's work into two books being quite obscured. Nothing leads us to expect any great originality or literary talent or powers of Catholic exegesis from this Macarius. It well accords with what we know of him, that he should simply arrange another man's work. He carefully suppresses the names of both Hierocles and the man who had answered him, and alters just enough to make it appear a work of his own time, changing '200 years' into '300', and making the Trinitarian doctrine a little more definite in places, especially where he finds the baptismal formula occurring. But he does not bring the work properly up to date, for he leaves the list of earlier heretics without the addition of those of his own century, nor does he trouble to change the locality from the East to Western Asia Minor. But in iii 24 p. 109, it is perhaps his hand which has placed before the mention of Fabian, Cyprian, and Irenaeus ten lines of detail about a local hero, Polycarp of Smyrna. He found much of the Christian explanation of the passages of Scripture which had been attacked to be allegorical and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Origen. Being himself opposed to Origenism, as he very clearly shewed by his action at the Synod of the Oak, he would not have originated such lines of argument, but he allowed them to remain in their place. Perhaps he curtailed the number of questions and answers to suit his purpose (which would explain the occasional failure of sequence in the questions to which Dr Harnack has called attention), but these omissions may have been made by the writer he is adapting.

I do not pretend that this view harmonizes with all I have said when discussing Dr Harnack's theory. But it will be seen that it satisfies a great many of the difficulties which have been noticed, so that reference need not be made to these things again. But there are one or two fresh points which I may mention here.

¹ *Apocr.* iii 43.

² *Ib.* iv 17 p. 191.

1. The work is sufficiently weighty and important to warrant its careful preservation by the Church. But if, in addition to the fact that it contained blasphemous objections to Holy Writ, it bore the name of an obscure bishop, of whom what was known was not particularly to his advantage, it can easily be understood how it sank into an oblivion from which it was only rescued by its use in the Iconoclastic controversy some centuries later.

2. The above theory helps to explain the strange double title of the work, which seems to have been Ἀποκριτικὸς ἢ Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἑλληνας.¹ As it is entirely addressed to an individual Greek it is very curious that Macarius should belie the idea of his dialogue by making the word plural. But if we suppose an earlier writer who has answered by name Hierocles's treatise Φιλαληθῆς πρὸς Χριστιανούς, and called his own reply Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἑλληνας, then we can imagine Macarius retaining this as an alternative to his own title of Ἀποκριτικὸς. The very awkwardness of this would tend to the omission of the words ἢ Μονογενὴς in some MSS, and to the addition (unless indeed it be due to Macarius himself) of the sub-title Περὶ τῶν ἀπορουμένων ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων.

3. One of the few things we know about the Macarius of A. D. 403 is that he was a bishop. But there is nothing whatever in the *Apocriticus* to suggest that it was written by a bishop. On the contrary, there is one passage at least which seems to point the other way.² In ii 16 the heathen has mockingly suggested that, if Christ's words are true, a real Christian ought to be able to drink any deadly thing without its hurting him, and that therefore this would be a good test to which to put bishops. If the reply were by a bishop, one would expect the personal note to enter. Not only is this not the case, but the author seems to differentiate himself from the leaders of the Church by speaking of them in the third person. After giving instances of great bishops of old who figuratively laid their hands on all that was round them and brought a blessing on it, he proceeds³ παρὰ δ' ἐκείνους, τοὺς νῦν ἀφηγήσομαι πόσοι χεῖρας ἐκτείνοντες εἰς εὐχὴν ἰάσαντο; πόσοι κατηχομένοι ἐν τῷ παλαίῳ πυρέττουσι τῆς ἀμαρτίας πτώματι ἢ νοσήματι χεῖρας ἐπιθέντες καλῶς ἔχειν ἐποίησαν; Can these be the words of a bishop? And yet Nicephorus calls the author *ιεράρχης*. All is explained if we think of the Bishop of Magnesia appropriating the work of one who was not himself a bishop.

4. The author of the answers is very plainly an original thinker. He is steeped in Origenism, and a master of the allegorical method of inter-

¹ v. Harnack *op. cit.* pp. 6-8.

² See my note *J.T.S.* viii 421 n. 3 (April 1907).

³ *Apocr.* iii 24 p. 109 i 31

pretation. Many of his explanations are, as far as I am aware, unique, and even when he has to answer the same difficulty as Origen in his *Contra Celsum*, he does not copy him, or take the same line of exegesis (the best example of this is seen in the explanation of Christ's conduct in Gethsemane, which Macarius explains as a deception of the devil, while Origen connects it with His obedience and humanity).¹ There are likenesses to be found in his answers to arguments used by several fathers at the end of the fourth century, especially Epiphanius, Amphilochius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Rufinus. These likenesses, however, are so few, and there is so much of the same kind of argument in which our author stands alone, that we cannot think of him as a mere imitator, with his ideas borrowed from greater men who had preceded him. In any case many of the lines of defence which occur in more than one author were doubtless the common property of Christian apologists and exegetes in the fourth century. But taking all the circumstances into account, it is very much easier to imagine an author earlier in the fourth century, an original thinker, some of whose arguments were repeated by those who followed him, than to explain the astonishing excellence and originality of the work of an obscure bishop like the Macarius of the Oak.

I therefore venture, as a new contribution to the subject, to offer the above further attempt to solve the problem presented by the *Apocriticus*.

T. W. CRAFER.

¹ *Apocr.* iii 2. *Orig. c. Cels.* ii 24. For a discussion of all the passages see *J.T.S.* viii 408-409 (April 1907).

(*To be continued.*)