

MACARIUS MAGNES, A NEGLECTED APOLOGIST.

I

NEVER has an early Christian writing had a more chequered history than the *Apocritica* of Macarius Magnes. The author's name, date, and country have always been a matter of doubt. Nor has his work fared better. The method of its composition is a cause of dispute, and twice it has disappeared for centuries.

The first time that it was recovered from oblivion, it was quoted, or rather garbled, in order to support one side of a bitter controversy, and was therefore coldly received by a patriarch of Constantinople. After seven more centuries of neglect, it became the weapon of a Jesuit controversialist. When his opponents clamoured for a sight of this unknown authority, the only MS had meanwhile disappeared. Lost for another two centuries, it was found in another country, and collated by a young scholar, who died before it could be published. When the baldest of editions had been followed by a single short treatise of appreciation, a series of German scholars arose and forthwith strangled it. Since then, other scholars have quietly followed their suggestions. Thus depreciated, and consigned to a date which reduces its contents to a mere imitation of earlier writings, it has once more sunk into an oblivion which makes the only edition increasingly difficult to obtain.

In spite of the failure of earlier attempts to resuscitate the *Apocritica*, I venture to add another word. If the theories of its origin which follow are accepted, it is a work of real value, and deserves far more attention than it has received.

Very little detailed information is available in a compendious form, but a long article by Dr Salmon will be found in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, and Duchesne has written a short treatise 'De Macario Magnete et scriptis eius'.¹ To these I must refer for the earlier history of the work, contenting myself with a brief mention of the theories which have been held concerning it. The adverse German criticism will be best discussed when the view which it controverts has been set forward. It may be well to recall at the outset that the book is in the form of a dialogue between a heathen philosopher and a Christian, the former propounding six or seven questions in succession, and the latter then proceeding to answer them. The dialogue is supposed to take place on five successive days, but the MS only contains the second, third, and fourth books, and even of these the end of each is mutilated. The

¹ Klincksieck, Paris 1877.

questions are mostly objections to selected verses of the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles, but one or two concern the Old Testament, and a few are purely doctrinal. The obvious title of *Apocritica* is an alternative to that of *Μορογενής*, about which little has been said.

The disappearance of a book containing long quotations from a heathen opponent is not surprising. A casual glance at the *Apocritica*, with its pages of anti-Christian blasphemy, might well condemn it to destruction under the edict of Theodosius II or Justinian I. If a copy was brought to light at the beginning of the ninth century, it may possibly have owed its preservation to the fact that it had as frontispiece a portrait of the author in ecclesiastical vestments. When the Iconoclasts garbled a quotation from it in their controversy with Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, the latter had some difficulty in finding out anything about it. What he says is only derived from internal evidence, and is therefore of little value.¹ But he gives the title as *Βίβλος Μακαρίου Ἱεράρχου*, and quotes a fragment from Book I which would otherwise have been completely lost. He brands the book as inclined towards heresy, but though he is right as to its Origenism, he is unjust, as we shall see, in hinting at Manichaeism and Nestorian tendencies.

Scarcely any further mention of the *Apocritica* is found until the latter part of the sixteenth century, when it was one of the favourite weapons in the patristic armoury of the Jesuit Franciscus Turrianus (de la Torre). He quotes from all the extant books,² and his important quotation from the lost fifth book will claim fuller attention later on. He considers the author's name to have been Magnetes, and places his date soon after 150 A.D. De la Torre's Protestant opponents in the Eucharistic controversy in which he was engaged ridiculed it as a fictitious authority,³ and when search was made for the MS in the Library of St Mark's at Venice it was nowhere to be found, though still mentioned in the catalogue. Later critics had to write without the work before them. The chief of them are Boivin of Paris, who considers the author to have been a *subaequalis* of Athanasius, and Magnus Crusius, a Göttingen professor.⁴ The latter, who does not think that either of the author's appellations is necessarily his proper name, places him at the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth. He

¹ See Nicephori *Antirrhethici Libri*, ap. Pitra *Spicilegium Solesmense* tom. i p. 303 et seq.

² See F. Turrianus *Adversus Magdeburgenses*, Colon. 1573, ii 3, p. 165; i 5, p. 21, and ii 13, p. 208.

³ e.g. Edm. Albertinus *De Sacram. Euchar.* 1654, lib. ii p. 420, 'fictitius prorsus auctor est'.

⁴ See Migne *Patr. Graec.* x p. 1343 et seq. His opinions are summarized by Pitra *Spicil. Solesm.* i p. 545.

believes the opponent to have been no other than Porphyry the Neoplatonist.

In 1867 a MS of the *Apocritica* was discovered at Athens, and on the death of C. Blondel it was finally published by his friend Foucart.¹ It is to this edition that reference is made when page and line of the work are quoted. In the next year Duchesne produced the dissertation already referred to. His chief contributions to the subject may be summarized as follows. He believes the Athens MS to be identical with the one which was lost at Venice, and he is probably right, though some of his arguments are unconvincing. He chooses unfortunate examples when he says the quotations in Turrianus agree with the new MS, even in such obvious errors as *σπεύδοντες* for *σπένδοντες* and *πεπηρωμένοι* for *πεπωρωμένοι*. For the latter word is too uncertain to found an argument upon, and Turrianus seems to have really used the reading *σπένδοντες*, as he renders it in Latin by *libarent*. And when he adds that *all* the quotations in Turrianus are found in the Athens Codex, he has forgotten the fragment from Book V.

About the second part of the author's name he is uncertain, but does not think it likely that he was a bishop of Magnesia. He places him between 300 and 350 A. D., and in his later conjectures inclines towards the latter date. His country he locates as near Edessa, following Tillemont.² But his brilliant contribution to the subject lies in his argument that Macarius's opponent was the well-known Hierocles, who at the beginning of the fourth century wielded the sword as well as the pen in his opposition to Christians. He first adduces the statement of Lactantius³ that there was in his time in Bithynia a certain judge and instigator of the persecution of 303 A. D., who wrote two books *non contra Christianos sed ad Christianos*. These books Lactantius describes as containing just what we find in Macarius's opponent, and he gives their title as *Φιλαλήθεις Λόγοι*. But the author of that work is known to have been Hierocles, as Lactantius states elsewhere.⁴ An inscription found at Palmyra suggests that he was also at some time governor of Phoenicia. It is quoted by Duchesne, and contains the words 'Sossiano Hieroclete Praes. Provinciae'.⁵ But he finally decides that the language of Macarius concerning the Trinity⁶ is post-Nicene, and therefore the book cannot represent an actual dialogue.

The tendency of subsequent writers on the subject has been to admire Duchesne's conjecture that the opponent was Hierocles, but

¹ *Macarii Magnetis quae supersunt, ex inedito codice edidit C. Blondel*. Klincksieck, Paris 1876.

² *Histoire des Empereurs* iv p. 307.

³ *Lact. Div. Instit.* v 2.

⁵ *Corpus Inscript. Lat.* t. iii 183.

⁴ *Id. De Mort. Persec.* ch. 16.

⁶ *Apocr.* iv 25.

to come to the final conclusion that the work must be dated, not in the fourth century, but in the beginning of the fifth. It is claimed that the author must be identified with the Macarius, Bishop of Magnesia, who was at the Synodus ad Quercum in 403 A. D. (according to the testimony of Photius), and came forward as one of those who accused Heraclides of Ephesus of heresy. Kurtz, for example, simply states it as a fact,¹ and Dr Salmon, in the article already alluded to, traces it no further back than Schürer's *Theol. Lit.-Zeit.* 1877, p. 521. The writer of that notice was Möller, and in the following year Zahn² and Wagenmann³ reiterated his view. As a matter of fact, the theory credited to Germans at the end of the nineteenth century had already been expressed by a Frenchman at the beginning of the eighteenth. For Le Quien, in reference to a likeness in Eucharistic phraseology between Macarius and Johannes Damascenus, had made the same suggestion.⁴ Also Magnus Crusius had mentioned it as a theory to be rejected.

The arguments on which this view is based by its modern supporters consist chiefly in the production of passages in the *Apocritica* which indicate a late date. These I prefer to deal with later on among the objections to the theory which I am about to set forth. But in the meantime I would point out three things. In the first place, attractive as the identification may sound, it is not proved by the fact that the Macarius of 403 was bishop of Magnesia, for there is no certainty that our Macarius was a bishop. It is true that when Nicephorus said he was *ιεράρχης* it shewed that he himself thought so, and this is possibly borne out by the portrait on the MS which he describes as *στολήν ιερέως ἀμπεχόμενον*, but not by such slight internal evidence as the *Apocritica* affords.⁵ Still less can it be proved that the name Magnes shews him to have been bishop of Magnesia. And in the second place, two at least of the critics do not seem to have thoroughly studied their author. Möller naïvely confesses that he has not found either the passage where the word 'parasang' occurs,⁶ or any reference to the non-eternity of punishment.⁷ And Wagenmann, when he asserts that the words of the opponent are not those of Hierocles, but of Porphyry himself, has forgotten the passage where the objector actually quotes a book of

¹ Kurtz *Ch. Hist.* vol. i § 47. 6 (Eng. tr.).

² *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* B. ii p. 450 et seq. 1878.

³ *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theol.* B. xxii p. 141. 1878.

⁴ *Animadv. ad Ioann. Damasc.* lib. iv p. 271. Paris 1712.

⁵ See below, p. 421, and note 3 on same page, and also note 1 on p. 406. Lumper (ap. Migne *Patr. Lat.* v p. 343) suggests that our author was confused with the Macarius at the Oak, and 'hinc fortasse sive fraude, sive ignorantia, Episcopi titulum: addiderit librarius, Magnetis vetustioris opus exscribens'.

⁶ See *Apocr.* iii. 40, p. 138 ll. 21, 22.

⁷ See *Apocr.* iii. 42, p. 145 l. 25.

Porphry, and thus shews that he was himself a distinct person.¹ The assertion is repeated by Neumann a little later.² The last-named author would place the *Apocritica* later still, viz. after 410 A. D., and as his argument stands alone it may best be dealt with in this place. The sole proof of his theory is founded on the statement of Macarius that Babylon had lately been destroyed by the Persians.³ From it he argues as follows. Babylon was originally destroyed in Trajan's time, but afterwards common language confused Ctesiphon with Babylon. We learn from Andri that Achaeus bishop of Ctesiphon was employed by Iezdegerdes 'ad componenda magni momenti dissidia', and 'negotium pro quo legatus fuerat, ex sententia expedit'. Now Achaeus was bishop from 411 to 416, and Ctesiphon was still intact in 410. From these slender premises the conclusion is drawn that Macarius wrote after 410! It is needless to point out that more than one part of the argument rests on mere supposition. Setting aside the question of Macarius's identification of Ctesiphon with Babylon, there is not the slightest proof that these 'dissidia' involved the destruction of the city, or anything like it. The only fact that is certain is that Ctesiphon was still standing in 410. And although Macarius speaks of the second destruction of Babylon as in his own times, his words shew that it had happened long enough ago to make it obvious that its overthrow was final.⁴ This really proves too much, and suggests a date for the treatise which other considerations shew to be too late.

But there is a third point on which I would here lay stress, with regard to the identification of our author with the Macarius at 'the Oak'. The latter was one of those who accused Heraclides of heresy. But of what heresy? All have to admit that the doctrinal part of the charge was nothing more nor less than Origenism. And yet nearly every page of the *Apocritica* is steeped in Origenism! We may safely challenge the production of any other author who has drunk more deeply of the spirit of Origen. The one certain charge that Nicephorus could bring against him was that he was a follower *τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς καὶ ἀποπλήκτου Ὀριγένους*. I shall refer to this again in speaking of the theology of the book. But meanwhile I would urge that this fact in itself vitiates the theory that he is to be identified with the accuser of Heraclides.⁵ It is not enough for its supporters to say that he was

¹ See *Apocr.* iii 42, p. 145 l. 25.

² C. I. Neumann *Juliani Imp. Libr. contra Christ. quae supersunt*. Lips. 1880. Harnack and other recent writers take the same view.

³ *Apocr.* iv 11, p. 170 l. 14.

⁴ Loc. cit. *τέλος ἐρημωθείσα οὐδ' ἔχνος τῆς παλαιᾶς εὐδαιμονίας σώζει*. The tenses of *σώζει*, and of *ἀπώλεσε* in the sentence before are worth noting.

⁵ It is true that Socrates, *HE.* vi 17, says that Theophilus, another accuser, was

accused on other grounds also. They must bring new and convincing arguments before we can accept a theory which has so serious a drawback. Such arguments I am quite unable to find.¹

I therefore pass on to the conclusions that a study of the *Apocritica* has suggested, and I will then proceed to set forward the evidence on which they are based. I believe that the date of the book may be placed as far back as the end of the third century, in the years between 293 and 302 A. D. The author's name was Macarius, but he was not necessarily bishop of Magnesia. He may have come from a city of that name in Asia Minor, but there is no means of determining whether it was Magnesia ad Sipylum or ad Maeandrum. In any case he moved further East, into the province of Syria. His opponent is to be accepted as Hierocles, Duchesne's surmise having further arguments to support it. But the *Apocritica* is not a work of later days, based merely on Hierocles' book, but is in some sense at least the reproduction of an actual dialogue, which took place in the neighbourhood of Edessa, when Hierocles was governor of that region. Its theological value is by no means inconsiderable. Macarius develops much that has already been suggested by Origen, shewing a marked expansion of such Origenistic ideas as Christ's deception of the devil. At the same time he is the precursor of much of the theology of Athanasius and the Cappadocians, and in such things as Trinitarian dogma he shews that the ideas underlying post-Nicene formulae were already in the minds of theologians in an earlier generation. Nor is the *Apocritica* wanting in apologetic value. The questions supply a lack in our knowledge of the Neoplatonist attacks of third-century paganism, and the answers (though occasionally crude) shew some able exegesis and lofty idealism.

The Questions and the Answers by separate authors.

That there is a real distinction of persons between Macarius and his opponent, is my first proposition. It will lead on to a second.

1. It is worth mentioning that the answers are often unsatisfactory, and sometimes miss the point of the question. This is of course inconclusive in itself, but it may form part of a cumulative argument. And it is a point which no time need be spent in proving, as it is one which most critics have conceded. It is true that in one case the defence seems to follow the attack in thinking that δύο δαίμονες are

rebuked afterwards for continuing to read Origen, but a comparison of Theophilus with our author is as absurd as it is insulting.

¹ As the *Apocritica* was so little known in early centuries, it is not impossible that the unknown Macarius of Magnesia had by Nicephorus's time become confused with the better known Macarius of 403. This might account for his being called *επάρχης*. See note 5 on p. 404 supra.

spoken of in St Matth. viii 28 instead of δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι.¹ But this is only for a moment, and in order to meet an opponent on his own ground. For a second explanation is soon substituted, in the course of which it is plainly stated ὁ δ' εἶπεν δύο δαιμονώντας εἶναι.²

2. That there is a *difference of style* between the questions and answers is also a recognized fact. But can it really be accounted for by the greater care bestowed by Macarius on his answers than on the objections which he himself clothes in words? The opponent's language is consistently terse and pointed, while the author's is rhetorical and diffuse, with a wealth of simile and illustration. And a study of the book reveals certain differences of detail. The answers shew a fondness for certain abstract nouns which seldom or never appear in the questions, e. g. λαμπηδών³, ἀλγηδών⁴, λεπτότης⁵, κατόρθωμα⁶. The questions in like manner use certain favourite epithets, e. g. χυδαῖος⁷.

3. Had Macarius had the choosing or arranging of the objections himself, we cannot conceive that he could be at the same time so skilful in feigning at every turn that his adversary was a real one, and so clumsy in the haphazard arrangement of the questions, which is very unsatisfactory from the Christian standpoint. The attacks suggest some one hitting out freely wherever he thinks he can get in a blow, not the apologist working up to a climax of conviction. And surely an imaginary foe would be made less and less terrible as the argument proceeded, until at length he gave in with a good grace. This is certainly not the case in the *Apocritica*, where the author shews fear and diffidence which do not decrease, and his adversary goes on hitting with undiminished vigour. Equally unsatisfactory from the Christian standpoint is the combination of several questions in one attack before an answer can be given. But from the pagan point of view this was a clever way of glossing over refutations. We must not ignore the fact that apparently Christian phrases have been found in the questions. But if the author of them be Hierocles, which I shall shortly try to demonstrate, then this is exactly what we should expect from one concerning whom Lactantius testified that he was so well versed in the Scriptures that it almost seemed as if he had been a Christian himself.⁸ And indeed the passages which have been quoted in this connexion do not imply that their author had the heart, but only the knowledge of a Christian. This objection is therefore found in no way to affect the issue.

¹ See art. Mac. in *D. C. B.*

² *Ibid.* p. 178. 8; 186. 5; 226. 19.

³ *Ibid.* p. 29. 14; 172. 7; 192. 32; 207. 25.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 1. 7; p. 33. 4; 149. 19; 207. 32.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 52. 10; 166. 7.

⁶ *Apocr.* p. 76 l. 20.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 183. 17; 196. 17.

⁸ *Lact. Div. Instit.* v 2 'ex eadem disciplina'.

4. When we look at the *blasphemous tone* and language of some of the objections, we can hardly believe that a Christian could have brought himself to write such profane questions, even though he was going to answer them. For example, could a Christian use such words of eating Christ's flesh as παντός θηριώδους τρόπου θηριωδέστερον κτλ. (iii 15), or gratuitously describe Christ as either drunk or dreaming when He uttered certain words?¹ If the very publication of such blasphemies was forbidden by Theodosius II and Justinian, and was probably a cause of the *Apocritica* being so little known in the next centuries, can we believe that a Christian originally published them on his own account?

5. The relation of the *Apocritica* to the *Contra Celsum* of Origen has an indirect bearing on the present argument, and may therefore be best discussed here. There is nothing in Macarius which he seems to have borrowed from Origen's defence of the faith, and indeed he was very far from remembering Origen's determination, expressed in that very book, to choose simple explanations, rather than allegorical, in argument with a pagan.² But the arguments of Macarius's opponent are not so different from those of Celsus as some have supposed,³ and it is worth while to collect the chief similarities. The four plainest likenesses are as follows:—

(1) Both mock at Christ's conduct in Gethsemane, and His prayer that His Passion should pass away from Him (*c. Cels.* ii 24 and *Apocr.* iii 2).

(2) Both object to His meekness during the Passion, and ask why He did not shew His Divinity then (*c. Cels.* ii 35 τί οὐ . . . θεῖόν τι ἐπιδείκνυται; and *Apocr.* iii 1 τίνος ἔνεκεν . . . οὔτε ἄξιόν τι σοφοῦ καὶ θείου ἀνδρὸς ἐφθέγγετο;).

(3) Both declare that He ought to have appeared to His judges, and to credible witnesses generally, after His Resurrection (*c. Cels.* ii 63 et seq. ἐχρήν . . . τῷ καταδικάσαντι καὶ ὅλως πᾶσιν ὀφθῆναι; and *Apocr.* ii 14 τίνος χάριν οὐκ ἐμφανίζεται . . . τῷ κολάσαντι; κτλ.).

(4) Both discuss the absurdity of the resurrection of men's bodies, and introduce at the same moment the Christian plea 'all things are possible with God', which they proceed to refute by similar arguments (*c. Cels.* v 14 et seq. καταφεύγουσιν εἰς ἀτοπωτάτην ἀναχώρησιν, ὅτι πᾶν δυνατὸν τῷ θεῷ. Ἄλλ' οὔτι γε τὰ αἰσχροῦ ὁ θεὸς δύναται, οὐδὲ τὰ παρὰ φύσιν βούλεται κτλ. *Apocr.* iv 24 ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς μοι τοῦτο τῷ θεῷ δυνατὸν, ὅπερ οὐκ ἀληθές . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ κακὸς ὁ θεός, εἰ καὶ θέλει, δύναται γενέσθαι ποτέ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀγαθὸς ὢν τὴν φύσιν ἀμαρτῆσαι δύναται' ἄν κτλ.).

¹ *Apocr.* iii 19.

² *Contra Cels.* ii 37, in a comment on the vinegar and the gall.

³ Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 22 'Celsianis toto caelo distant'.

Such passages are significant in two ways. In the first place, it is noteworthy that the first three are objections to the same part of the Gospel, and are found close together both in the *Apocritica* and in the *Contra Celsum*. And in the second place, in each case, the defence of Macarius is entirely different from that of Origen, and in most particulars sufficiently inferior to shew that he had not the *Contra Celsum* before him for his guidance. For instance, with regard to Christ's conduct in Gethsemane, Origen says the whole passage must be studied, to see Christ's ready obedience and true humanity, adding that perhaps He mourned for the sake of those on whose heads His death would be. But Macarius gives the answer (quite in keeping with what Origen says elsewhere) that He only acted thus in order to deceive the devil. Such considerations seem to point to the fact that, on the one hand, the questions in the *Apocritica* are occasionally modelled on the objections of Celsus (and nothing is more likely than that these latter would be known to a heathen objector at the end of the third century), and, on the other hand, the answers make no use of the *Contra Celsum*. If this be so, it furnishes us with an additional reason for believing that the questions and the answers in the *Apocritica* are by different authors.

6. Once again, there ought to be some weight in the graphic and determined way in which the writer keeps before us the personality of a very real opponent, and his own inner feelings in what he gives us to understand was to him a life-and-death struggle.

These six lines of argument certainly bring us to the conclusion that the questions are the work of a real pagan opponent. But a further question remains, to which I believe the foregoing considerations have already suggested an answer. Did Macarius take the objections out of an adversary's book, or is the *Apocritica* the elaboration of a genuine dialogue, and the questions not necessarily based on a book at all? All scholars have preferred the former alternative, so it is with some diffidence that I proceed to argue in favour of the latter.

A Genuine Dialogue underlying the Apocritica.

1. In this case I may put first the direct evidence of the author and his opponent. Is the whole plan of the book a mere device of an ingenious author, a means of rousing interest in his doctrines and getting a hearing? Parallels for a fictitious dialogue, for the use of a more or less dramatic setting to their work, may be found in other Christian writers. But are they actually on a level with the present one? Do they tell of so many fightings and fears which one can scarcely think are a mere literary device?¹ And may we not at least

¹ Badenhewer *Patrologie*, 1894, p. 553, refers for a similar fictitious dialogue to

begin with the supposition that the author, whose eager words seem to come straight from his heart, is telling the truth, until the case is proved to the contrary? But the point on which I would lay most stress is this: If he is simply handling the objections he has found in a book, how comes it that there are indications that a dialogue is in process even in the questions themselves? That such is the case may be shewn by such sentences as that in which he says *Εἰ γε οὖν τεθάρρηκας ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτήμασι καὶ τρανά σοι γέγονε τὰ τῶν ἀπορουμένων, φράσον ἡμῖν πῶς ὁ Παῦλος λέγει κτλ.*¹ And if it be urged that, in a work 'ad Christianos', he is only addressing an imaginary and impersonal Christian, there is a passage where Christians as a body are distinguished from the individual addressed:—*φέρει δέ σοι κάκεινην ᾧδε τὴν λέξιν εἴπωμεν . . . εἰ γάρ, ὡς φάτε, κτλ.* Nor are these isolated instances. This is a point of such importance that it is worth studying it in detail, and so I append other suggestive passages.

In iii 14 (p. 93) Macarius challenges an answer. In iii 15 (p. 94) his opponent mocks at him for wanting to run the race again. Later on (pp. 124, 125) Macarius offers to explain anything else. He is told at once that he is like one thinking of a second voyage before the first is over. Certainly there are traces that Macarius compiled and published his dialogue *afterwards*, but his references to the time of the encounter seem naturally to suggest its reality, e. g. he begins iv 11 (p. 169) with the prefix *τοῦτο δ' ἦν τὸ περὶ τοῦ σχήματος τοῦ κόσμου καὶ πῶς παράγει*, meaning 'The following *was* what *I said* about', &c.

In iv 24 (p. 204. 21) the opponent anticipates a possible answer with 'Ἄλλ' ἐρεῖς μοι ὅτι κτλ. But he begins the next paragraph (p. 205. 3)

the works of Hieronymus, presbyter of Jerusalem. But a study of these (see Migne *P.G.* xl 847-866) shews them to be not the least like the *Apocritica*. There are no introductions, no attempt at reality, no attempt to do more than put the instruction in a catechetical, and therefore interesting form. In the *De Trinitate* 'Ο Ἰουδαῖος and ὁ Πιστός alternate, while the *De Effectu Bapt.* is simply a catechism marked *ἐρώτημα* and *ἀπόκρισις*, and the short fragment *De Cruce* has similarly *ἐρώτησις* and *ἀπόκρισις*. No exact parallel has been adduced to such a lifelike dialogue as the *Apocritica*. The tone of the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix is quite different. There the elaborate setting and picturesque introduction in Platonic style are obviously intended to create interest in the argument that follows. The way that the heathen Caecilius shifts his ground, and finally gives in with a good grace before a single lengthy speech of Octavius, while the mere proselyte Minucius himself acts as umpire, is obviously unnatural. And if the Dialogue of Justin with Trypho the Jew be adduced, it has yet to be proved that that dialogue was not founded on fact. Kurtz sums up other opinions by saying 'it is probably a free rendering of a disputation which actually occurred' (*Ch. Hist.* Eng. trans. vol. i p. 146).

¹ *Apocr.* iii 30, p. 125 l. 6.

with a *plural* σκέψασθε δὲ κάκεινο πηλίκον ἐστὶν ἄλογον κτλ. where he may perhaps be appealing to the audience.

The objection remains that Macarius may have cleverly simulated a dialogue by interspersing such personal touches in order to make it seem real. But if we study passages such as iv 19 (p. 198) we find that the personal introduction gradually shades off into the words of the objection, so that if a book underlay the objection it would be hard to say where its words began, whereas if the whole is *reported* the language is perfectly natural. Nor are the brief occasional introductions alien in language to the rest of the author's part of the book. A characteristic expression throughout the answers is Ὁ Σωτήρ (which is used twenty-three times), and the same designation of our Lord occurs in the *Introduction* to iii 23.

Nor should it count for nothing that in the Proem to Book IV he says it was with the help of Theosthenes—the man to whom he dedicated his book (σοῦ συνναιρομένου)—that he gave his answers. In one passage Macarius says he is answering what he *remembered* of his opponent's objections, πάντων δὲ τῶν λεχθέντων ἀπομνημονεύσαντες εἶπομεν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἀρξάμενοι πείσεως. But of course it is in the *questions* that references to a dialogue are of greatest value, and we may conclude with one which in itself seems to shew that Macarius has not merely taken six or seven objections at a time out of an opponent's book, but that the objections themselves were originally made several at a time, in the expectation that a corresponding set of answers would be given. At the conclusion of seven questions about St Paul the objector says,² Ἄλλ' ἡμεῖς ἔτι λέγειν κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου παυσόμεθα, γνόντες αὐτὸν καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τοιαύτην γυγνομαχίαν καθοπλίσαντα· εἰ δ' ἀποκριθῆναι σοὶ τις περιουσία πρὸς ταῦτα καθέστηκε, μηδὲν ἀναβαλλόμενος ἀπόκριναι.

2. The difference of style between the questions and the answers has been already referred to. But a remarkable feature is that, whereas Macarius represents the language of his opponent as full of eloquence and power, and trembles before his 'Attic oratory',³ as a matter of fact the eloquence and the polish all lie with himself. But does not this point to the fact that he is not writing down the words of a book, but reporting, as best he could, and only so far as his memory served, what had doubtless been spoken with greater force and fullness when the dialogue was held? And here we may take the opportunity of dealing with Dr Salmon's objection that 'it would be inconsistent to copy all the heathen speeches verbally from a well-known work'. Quite so, but it is all explained if Macarius is quoting, not the written work, but the spoken word, of his opponent.

¹ *Apocr.* p. 63 l. 10.

² *Ibid.* p. 131 l. 9.

³ *Ibid.* Proem of Bk. III.

3. Further evidence that the origin of the book is to be found in a verbal encounter, and not in a deliberately written apologetic, is supplied by the mode of quoting the Scriptures, in both questions and answers. The casual nature of the quotations, which is most disappointing from a critical and textual point of view, strongly suggests that they were made from memory.¹

4. We have already seen that Macarius does not appear to have used the *Contra Celsum* of Origen. And yet he must have known his work. Possibly this is another indication that the answers were originally given on the spur of the moment.

5. Another point remains, which however is not on the same level as others, for it depends on the concession that the opponent was Hierocles. If that is the case, and Macarius had thus answered his *book*, such an answer would have been known to Lactantius and Eusebius, or at least to one of them. But Lactantius, so far from mentioning it, implies that the book was still unanswered, from his way of answering it himself.² He begins discussing one passage with the words 'I might refute'.³ Eusebius is still more definite on the point. Not only does he write a treatise against Hierocles himself, but he

¹ The following typical instances of the method of quotation seem sufficient to prove the above contention. There are passages where the opponent quotes wrongly, and his mistake is either ignored or repeated by Macarius. In ii 12 the opponent notes the difference of *εις τι ἀνείδισάς με*; in St Mark xv 34 from *με ἐγκατέλιπες* in St Matth. The answer does not repeat the words, but does not contradict them. Evidently the reading of Codex Bezae has been used here, but in the same passage St John xix 29 is given with *σκεῦος* for *σπόγγον*, and *προσθήσαντες* for *περιθέτες*. These errors are repeated by Macarius in ii 17, p. 29 l. 6, with a further mistake. But there are places, on the other hand, where he tacitly corrects his opponent, though he does not always give the right words himself. In the same passage of ii 12 St Mark xv 36 had been misquoted as *σπόγγον τις ὄξους πληρώσας προσένεγκεν*. In the answer (ii 17) it is *σπόγγον ὄξους πλήσαντες προσήνεγκεν αὐτῷ*. And sometimes he rightly corrects the order of the words, as in ii 18, where he alters rightly from *λόγῃ ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν*. See also the quotation from I Cor. vi 11 in iv 19 and 25. Macarius is often at fault on his own account, as in ii 10, where he gives a combination of all three synoptists in the words *ὦ γενεὰ ἀπιστος, ἕως ποτε ἔσομαι μεθ' ἡμῶν*; Elsewhere they are both wrong, but make a different mistake. In iii 5 the opponent quotes St Matth. xix 24 as *διὰ βαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν*. In iii 12 the answer seems to take the passage from St Luke xviii 35, and gives *διὰ βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν*. Both, however, have *βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν* and not *τοῦ θεοῦ*. In iv 13 Macarius recognizes that his opponent has abbreviated St Matth. xxiv 14, for he repeats the quotation as *ἐν συντόμῳ ὧδε*. But he uses the same phrase *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ* instead of *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*. In iv 4 the answer makes a mistake where there has been none in the question. St Luke v 31 has been correctly quoted. In the answer, iv 18, it is mistaken for St Matth. ix 12 (which has *οἱ ἰσχύοντες, not ἰγμάνοντες*), for the next verse is added and stress is laid on the aorist in *οὐκ ἤλθον καλέσαι δικαίους*, where St Luke has *οὐκ ἐλήλυθα*.

² Lact. *Div. Instit.* v 3.

³ *Ibid.* v 4 init.

explains that he need not touch on many of the objections, as Origen had already replied to them in his work against Celsus. But if we suppose Macarius only verbally to have answered objections which were afterwards put into book form, we can easily understand that the *Apocritica* would not be widely known a few years later, particularly if in the meanwhile Hierocles had moved away to another governorship. But this is anticipating.

The foregoing considerations seem to me sufficient to shew that the book is founded on a real dialogue which took place with a real pagan opponent.

The Opponent is Hierocles.

The person of the opponent has already been argued by Duchesne to be *Hierocles*, and other scholars have rejected his suggestion, not on intrinsic grounds, but because other considerations stood in the way.¹ Duchesne's proofs from Lactantius² are very striking, but I venture to put forward certain subsidiary arguments which make his conclusions yet more assured.

1. The evidence of Lactantius is not exhausted by the passage in the *Institutes*. Attention has also been called to the reference to Hierocles in the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, and Dr Mason says³ there is 'not reasonable doubt of the identity of the nameless judge of the *Institutes* with the Hierocles of the *Deaths*'. But the passages deserve to be written side by side, as their wording seems to furnish conclusive proof of identity. The *Institutes* (loc. cit.) speak of one 'e numero iudicum, et qui auctor imprimis faciendae persecutionis fuit'. The passage in the *Deaths* is worth quoting in full (loc. cit.) 'Nam cum incidisses (i. e. Donatus) in Flaccinum praefectum, non pusillum homicidam, deinde in Hieroclem ex vicario praesidem, qui auctor et consiliarius ad faciendam persecutionem fuit, postremo in Priscillianum successorem eius, documentum omnibus invictae fortitudinis praebuisti'.⁴

2. Hierocles went to Bithynia in 304 A. D., just after the persecution had broken out. An inscription adduced by Duchesne suggests that he had previously been in office at Palmyra,⁵ and we may note the appropriateness of Macarius's references to that neighbourhood, if his opponent was connected with it. But others have already urged that Hierocles' work *Φιλαλήθεις Λόγοι* had been published *before* the persecution began.⁶ (And probably, though by no means certainly, he held his dialogue with

¹ It is fully accepted by Möller (*Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*, 1877, p. 521 et seq.).

² Lact. *Div. Instit.* v 2.

³ *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 59.

⁴ See *ibid.* p. 59 note, for 'ex vicario praesidem', &c.

⁵ *Corpus Inscript. Lat.* t. 3 no. 133, ap. Duch. p. 20.

⁶ Dr Mason op. cit. p. 61 note. It may be added that the '*Institutes*', in which Lactantius mentions it, is one of his early works, not far in the fourth century.

Macarius before he published his work.) Therefore it was when he was at Palmyra that the dialogue seems most likely to have taken place. But, setting this aside for a time, the indication that Hierocles was in the East and in office at Palmyra is the more significant when we find, not merely that Macarius appears to have written his book in that locality, but that he persistently points his opponent to the testimony afforded by that region. Such plain references as Berenice having become queen of Edessa,¹ and the opponent being told to go to Antioch to look for the effects of Christianity,² have already been set forth by Duchesne. But there seem to be other more indirect and uncertain references to corroborate them, as for example where he tells his adversary to note instances of cities decaying, and adds *περιττὸν ἂν εἶη λέγειν πόσαι τοπαρχαίαι καπνοῦ δίκην ἀπέπτησαν ἢ πόσαι βασιλίδες γυναῖκες ἀπόλοντο ἢ πόσων ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφανῶν συναπέβη κλέος.*³ May we not recognize in this a reference to the recent history of Palmyra itself, and to the fall of its unfortunate queen Zenobia?

3. But Duchesne makes no use at all of the work of Eusebius against Hierocles. The testimony that it gives to the kind of objections brought by that opponent of the faith ought to be valuable when compared with the kind of objections brought by the adversary of Macarius.

(1) At the outset he speaks of Hierocles as the author of the *Φιλαλήθεις Λόγοι*, saying that his objections were not original, and had largely been already met by Origen's reply to Celsus.⁴ The indebtedness of Macarius's opponent to Celsus has already been mentioned, and his identity with Hierocles is thus suggested.

(2) Eusebius goes on to refer to Hierocles' assertion that St Peter and St Paul exaggerated Christ's doings, in such language as *τὰ μὲν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ τινες τούτων παραπλήσιοι, κεκόμπασι, ἀνθρωποὶ ψευσταὶ, καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι καὶ γόητες.*⁵ In the *Apocritica* more than a quarter of the extant questions refer to either St Peter or St Paul, and reveal the same inconsistent charges against them of both cunning and stupidity.

(3) The tone of Hierocles is shewn to have been of that same haughty and scornful description which we see in the *Apocritica*, as revealed in such superior claims of position and knowledge as *σκεψώμεθά γε μὴν ὅσω βέλτιον καὶ ξυνετώτερον ἡμεῖς ἐκδεχόμεθα τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ ἦν περὶ τῶν ἐναρέτων ἀνδρῶν ἔχομεν γνώμην.*⁶

¹ *Apocr.* i 6.

² *Ibid.* ii 7.

³ *Ibid.* iv 11, p. 170 l. 19.

⁴ Eusebius in *Hieroclem*, in Gottfriedus Alearius's edition of *Philostratus*, Lipsiae 1709, p. 428.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 430.

⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 445.

(4) Hierocles is shewn as belittling the life of Christ (after the manner of the Neoplatonists) by adducing that of Apollonius of Tyana, and the statement of Philostratus is introduced by Eusebius, ἀφανισθῆναι τοῦ δικαστηρίου φησὶν αὐτόν.¹ Book III of the *Apocritica* begins with a criticism of Christ in His Passion, asking why He did not disappear like Apollonius. τίνος ἔνεκεν . . . μὴ καθάπερ Ἀπολλώνιος μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ αὐτοκράτορι λαλήσας Δομετιανῷ τῆς βασιλικῆς αὐλῆς ἀφανῆς ἐγένετο ;²

Add such indications as these to the arguments of Duchesne, and there is only one thing which can prevent us from accepting Hierocles with certainty as the opponent of Macarius. Is it impossible from other considerations to allow the *Apocritica* such a date as will be compatible with this theory? Those who have rejected it have done so on the score of date; and therefore, to maintain my thesis, as well as to advance another step in the argument, I must endeavour to shew that it is to that period that we may and must assign the book.

The Date of the Apocritica.

1. I begin with a presumption in favour of the end of the third century; for if I have proved that there is a real dialogue underlying the book, and that the opponent in that dialogue was Hierocles, it follows that, unless there are grave reasons against it, we must assign the work to the time of Hierocles. I have already suggested that Macarius points his opponent to Antioch, Edessa, and Syria generally, in a fashion that indicates that he was still governor of Palmyra. This must be before 304 A. D. when he went to Bithynia. And it is noteworthy that although Macarius is afraid of him, and is tempted to cower before his commanding personality, he gives no hint that he can or will cause him bodily harm. The persecution has evidently not yet begun. Nor does Hierocles himself say a word that is threatening to the Christians, but so far there remained a *modus vivendi* of a kind; 'we have our temples, and you have your churches' is the attitude.

2. But in spite of the absence of actual persecution, Macarius, with all his readiness of defence and unflagging zeal, seems overawed with a strange and nameless terror. As soon as he is launched on an argument he forgets his fear, but directly his defence is over, however satisfactory it may be, there comes back to him a sense of the hopelessness of it all, and the impossibility of even standing on a level with his heathen adversary. This is not the tone of a Christian in the controversies of the fourth century, even when the Emperor Julian had

¹ Op. cit. p. 459.

² *Apocr.* iii 1.

galvanized into life the dying attacks of paganism. There is then a certainty of final victory which is lacking in Macarius. In fact we may say that any Christian after his faith was made a *religio licita* in 313 A. D. would hold his head higher than our author does. A study of fourth-century literature proves the truth of Kurtz's remark, 'The literary conflict between Christianity and paganism had almost completely altered its tone'.¹ The tone of the *Apocritica* will therefore fit in better with the years immediately preceding the persecution of Diocletian than with any later period. The reign of Aurelian had shewn the older Christians of that day that it was more from accident than from principle that the terrors of a Decius and a Valerian had not been renewed. And so, though naturally the *Apocritica* contains no actual hint of the coming storm of final persecution which burst so suddenly upon the Church, its tone of nameless dread accords exactly with what a Christian apologist would shew as he stood face to face with the very man who was in a few years to be described as 'auctor persecutionis faciendae'.

3. The limit of date in the other direction is given not only by the passage which says πολλοὶ ἄρχουσι τοῦ κόσμου,² but by the opponent's words which go back to Hadrian in order to give an instance of a μονάρχης. The fourfold division of the empire took place in 292 A. D., so this must be the upward limit, and we may add that mention was more likely to be made of such divided rule in the years immediately succeeding the change, while it was still unfamiliar, than at any later period.

Nor is the reference to Cyprian as a hero of former time³ compatible with an earlier date, and it is curious that these things were ignored by Turrianus, in spite of his full knowledge of our author, when he placed the book nearly 150 years earlier.

4. With regard to the downward limit of date, there is a reference which seems to have escaped notice. In iv 13 Macarius gives a list of some of the peoples of the earth who had not yet heard the preaching of the Gospel. The list is a short one, and only four regions are mentioned altogether, but one of them is *Ethiopia*,⁴ and another *Mauretania*. It is a well-known story how the shipwrecked Frumentius worked in the former country from the year 316, and was at length made bishop of the country in 338, and it proves that Macarius cannot possibly have written as late as 403 A. D., by which time the Ethiopian Church was fully established.

¹ Kurtz *Church History* Eng. tr. vol. i p. 236.

² *Apocr.* ii 15, p. 24.

³ *Id.* iii 24, p. 109, l. 30, where he is contrasted with τοὺς νῦν.

⁴ *Apocr.* p. 179 l. 6 . . . οὐδέπω τὸν λόγον ἀκήκοεν, ἀλλ' οὐδ' Αἰθίοπες . . . εὐαγγελίου λόγον οὕτω μεμαθήκασι. He adds that they are called Macrobian from their long life, and gives several strange details from *Herodotus* bk. iii.

It is true that the Macrobian Ethiopians are said by Herodotus to have lived in the far South, but modern researches suggest rather that their region was much further north, in fact nearer Egypt than Abyssinia, possibly the neighbourhood of Kordofan.¹

Again, he mentions τοὺς ἑσπερίους ἢ Μαυρουσίους. But surely Mauretania (re-divided as it was into two provinces by Diocletian) had heard the Gospel before the end of the fourth century. Into the Numidian part of it, at least, the faith spread with surprising rapidity from Ethiopia, and in connexion with τοὺς ἑσπερίους we may take the statement of Kurtz² that 'the real missionizing church of this period was the Western'. Reference may also be made to Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*. He quotes Origen in *Matth. Comment.* series 39 (Lommatzsch iv pp. 209 et seq.) on St Matth. xxiv 9 in a passage which it is interesting to compare with Macarius³: 'Non enim fertur praedicatum esse evangelium apud omnes Ethiopas, maxime apud eos qui sunt ultra flumen; sed nec apud Seras nec apud Ariacin' (which Harnack locates on the west coast of India), &c. But in the fourth century the country south of Philae and towards Abyssinia was Christianized.⁴ Tertullian is also quoted (*Adv. Iudaeos* vii) as already saying 'Maurorum multi fines (crediderunt)', and Eusebius *HE.* x 5 is referred to for martyrs in Mauretania.⁵

5. Nor is it possible to suppose that a writer of later date than about 330 A.D. could mention several examples of heretics without introducing the name of Arius or any of his followers. That such a book should be entirely free from the controversy which absorbed the attention of all Christians after the Council of Nicaea, is quite incredible.⁶

¹ Smith's *Dict. of Gk. and Roman Geog.* vol. ii p. 240.

² *Ch. Hist.* vol. i p. 397 Eng. tr.

³ Harnack *Exp. of Christ.* transl. Moffatt, vol. ii p. 160.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 323 note.

⁵ *Op. cit.* pp. 157, 422.

⁶ It is true that the word *χριστομάχος* occurs in *Apoc.* iii 14, p. 91, and Möller claims that it must refer to Arians. But this is not borne out by the context. Macarius is refuting those who try to circumscribe the Person of Christ when granting Paradise to the thief on the cross. But what if it be not the Arians but the Monarchians, as represented by Paul of Samosata, that are being here condemned? These *χριστομάχοι* are further defined as *Ἰουδαϊκῆς μαρίας κωνωνοί*. Not only is there the kinship suggested between Monotheism and Monarchianism, but Paul's patroness Zenobia was herself a Jewess, and he seems to have shaped his doctrines in order to give royal satisfaction. But there is a further likeness between Monarchianism and that which Macarius here condemns. The Patripassians affirmed that, by the *κένωσις*, there was at the Incarnation *ὁὶαν οὐσίας περιγραφῆν* (Dorner *On the Person of Christ* p. 31). Is not this exactly what Macarius denies (as Hippolytus had done before him), speaking against *τολμῶντα περιγράφειν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ πάθει* (loc. cit. l. 16)? It is absurd to suppose that *χριστομάχοι* can only refer to Arians, because Athanasius applied the word to them

6. An indirect argument for the early date of the book is to be found in the likeness between the opponent's questions and the attacks of Porphyry.¹ Though the relics of Porphyry's writings are so meagre, they are sufficient to prove that his follower Hierocles borrowed his objections, as, for example, the behaviour of St Peter to Ananias.² And nothing could be more telling than for Macarius to face Hierocles with the words of his own master, on the subject of the heathen gods.³ Porphyry's expression of Neoplatonism did not remain stereotyped in the succeeding age. It was soon to be much altered by his pupil Iamblichus, in the very region with which the *Apocritica* is to be connected. It is not likely that Macarius should so humbly set about refuting the objections of Porphyry at so late a date as 403 A.D., by which time answers had come from Eusebius, Methodius, Apollinaris, and Philostorgius.⁴

But the close connexion of Porphyry with Hierocles, and the fact that the former did not die till 303 A.D., enable us to form a surmise which would go a long way to explain the form of Hierocles' argument. There is something strangely mechanical about the method of his assault. He delivers an attack of seven or more objections, and then, without caring to come to close quarters by replying to the answer, heedless of what result his assaults have had, he starts at once to send a different set of missiles into his enemy's lines, and in this way he goes on fighting through the course of the dialogue. But we must remember who he was. He might claim the title of philosopher, but he had only secondhand thoughts to offer. He was no ordinary man of thought, but an energetic man of affairs, who finally shewed that his keenest argument was the edge of the sword. What if Porphyry's writings supplied him with a stock of arguments to hurl at Macarius? This would explain his refusing to discuss the arguments of his

so frequently. Elsewhere in the *Apocritica* it is used in a loose and general way, and even concerning so early an opponent of the faith as Herod Agrippa I. For, in reference to Acts xii 1 and 2, Macarius says in Bk. iii 29, p. 122 l. 3, *χριστομάχῳ λύττη καθοπλίσας ταυτὸν τὸν μὲν Ἰάκωβον ἀνείλεν ἀνατίαις μαχαίρῃ κτλ.* Would he have been likely to use such a word here if he had known its later narrowed signification? With regard to the opposition of Macarius to Paul which has been thus suggested, Lumper (*Migne Patr. Lat.* v p. 343) actually conjectures that our author was the very man who was present at the Council of Antioch in 265. He is there referred to as *Ἱεροσολύμων Μάγνης τις ἱερεὺς.*

¹ See Mosheim *Comm.* vol. ii p. 151.

² *Apocr.* iii 21, cf. Porphyry ap. Jerome *Ep. ad Demetriadem* in Semler's edition of Pelagius's *Ep. ad Demetr.* p. 12.

³ *Apocr.* iii 42, p. 145 l. 25. The mention in this passage of Porphyry's *χρησμός τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος* receives valuable corroboration from Eusebius *Præp. Evang.* iv 6 et seq., where a collection of his oracles of Apollo &c. is given.

⁴ See Philostorgius ap. Phot., *Migne Patr. Gr.-Lat. saec. v* vol. i p. 566.

opponent, and it would explain, too, his decision to leave public argument with Christians alone, and to go home and work up his notes into two books of *φιλαληθείς λόγοι*, that men might tremble at a distance as they read in his name the thunderings of a Porphyry and a Celsus, and perhaps of other real masters of Neoplatonism besides. But all this absolutely demands an early date, and (especially if Hierocles wrote his book before the persecution began) we are pointed to the closing years of the third century.

7. The use of the New Testament Scriptures by Macarius is such as to suggest a date before the fourth century. The argument from silence is of course a precarious one, but it is remarkable that no definite quotations are made from books which only gained universal acceptance in the course of that century. The omission of the Apocalypse of St John has been noted by Zahn¹ as the more remarkable in view of the fact that the Apocalypse of Peter is twice quoted by the opponent, and, if not accepted, at least not disowned by Macarius in his reply. If, as he says, it be strange that a post-Constantinian writer should omit the one Apocalypse and quote the other, the fact suggests that the book should be dated earlier than Constantine. The quotation from the Apocalypse of Peter is so like a passage in 2 Peter² that we should have confidently expected that the latter would be used in order to support it. But Macarius falls back on similar words in Isaiah. If this be an indication that he did not accept 2 Peter as canonical, it gives an additional reason why he should be assigned a date before that epistle was universally recognized as part of the Canon of the New Testament. These questions will be discussed later, in considering the bearing of the *Apocritica* on the history of the Canon.

8. One more argument for a date before the fourth century must suffice. Difficulty has been found in the opponent's assertion that the Christians *μιμούμενοι τὰς κατασκευὰς τῶν ναῶν, μεγίστους οἴκους οἰκοδομοῦσιν*.³ But Eusebius describes the period just before the outbreak of the persecution of 303 A.D. as a time when the older churches were too small and new and larger churches were being built, which were soon to be razed to the ground.⁴ This exactly agrees with the date suggested for the *Apocritica*. And the context of this statement of Macarius's opponent is worth noting. He is arguing in favour of the use of images. If he had been able to tell the Christians that they put images in their churches like the pagans, the inducement thus to

¹ Zahn *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* II Band 1878, p. 450 et seq.

² 2 Pet. iii 12.

³ *Apocr.* iv 21, p. 201 l. 5.

⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* viii 1 and 2, where we are told *μηδαμῶς ἐτι τοῖς παλαιοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἀρκούμενοι, εὐρείας εἰς πλάτος ἀνὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἐκ θεμελίων ἀνίστων ἐκκλησίας*.

strengthen his argument would have been irresistible. But as he can only refer to the churches themselves, it is obvious that the dialogue took place before images began to be placed in Christian churches.

I omit sundry historical references which must remain unproved. It has already been suggested (p. 414) that Macarius possibly refers to the fall of Zenobia. And there are two passages in which he speaks of a βασιλεύς, although he has said that there are several rulers. In the first, he speaks of βασιλική φιλανθρωπία in the present, as being shewn in contrast to an ἀπάνθρωπος τύραννος in the past.¹ And in the second he says that only *yesterday* certain prisoners obtained a release βασιλικὴν πρόδον ὑποκύψαντες.² Is there any point of history with which these references accord better than the first few years of the fourth century, when Diocletian was living in regal magnificence and gracious tolerance as Emperor of the East?

The consideration of objections to the above views, which should naturally be faced next, must be left till another article, for they must be dealt with at considerable length. But in the meantime I may conclude the present article with a word about the full title of the work, its author, and his probable abode.

The Title of the work.

We may follow the leading of Neumann,³ who argues that the title is to be transposed as Μονογενὴς ἡ Ἀποκριτικὸς κτλ.⁴ The full title, gathered from the headings and indices of various parts of the work, was probably Μακαρίου Μάγνητος Μονογενὴς ἡ Ἀποκριτικὸς πρὸς Ἑλληνας. Περὶ τῶν ἀπορουμένων ἐν τῇ καινῇ Διαθήκῃ ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων λόγος α', β', γ', δ', ε'.

The further suggestion has been made (see Bardenhewer, loc. cit.) that the first part of the title, i. e. Μονογενὴς, was probably made more use of in the first part of the work, which is now lost. A careful investigation of the use of the word Μονογενὴς in what remains scarcely bears this out. It occurs seventeen times, and of these fourteen are in six chapters of Book III. The other three are in a single chapter of Book II.⁵ Another frequent title given to our Lord is ὁ Σωτήρ. This expression occurs twenty-three times, all of them in the course of thirteen chapters, four of which are the same as those containing the title

¹ *Apocr.* p. 178 l. 21.

² *Ibid.* p. 208 l. 3.

³ C. I. Neumann *Iul. Imp. Lib. contra Christ. quae supersunt* pp. 14-23. Lips. 1880.

⁴ This suggestion is tacitly accepted by Bardenhewer *Patrologie*, 1894, p. 550.

⁵ See ii 8, p. 9, p. 10, 14, p. 11, 5; iii 8, p. 66, 1; iii 9, p. 71, 19; iii 13, p. 87, 15; iii 14, p. 92 (5 times); iii 23, p. 105, 29; iii 27, p. 116, 18, p. 117, 20, 24; iii 40, p. 138, 5.

Μονογυής.¹ These are facts from which it is not easy to draw any conclusive inference.

The Author and his probable abode.

With regard to the person of the author, it is generally accepted that his real name was Macarius. Some have thought it was Magnes,² but the natural signification of the word suggests locality, and it simply denotes *man* of Magnesia. It is not proved that he was necessarily a bishop at all,³ but, even if he was, his name does not suggest that he must needs have been bishop of Magnesia. It is of course the meaning of the title in such names as Gregorius Nazianzenus, but quite as often, as in the case of Johannes Damascenus, it refers to the place where the man spent his life or did his chief work. And further, it frequently denotes simply the place of birth or education. This is especially the case where the name is a common one, and we may give Paul of Samosata as an instance in that period. A Macarius, particularly in the East where the name seems to have been commonest,⁴ might well need to be described as 'the Macarius who came from Magnesia'. This is the explanation which accords best with the evidence of the book itself. Others have already noted how he points his opponent to Antioch in Syria, and also to Edessa; how Hierocles was once connected with Palmyra; and how the use of the word 'parasang' suggests an Eastern locality. But there are further indications to be found in the book.

1. In his list of heresies he not only refers exclusively to those of the East, but he shews a knowledge of the Encratites of Asia Minor which suggests that those regions were familiar to him. And when he speaks of false Christs who have arisen, he instances Bardesanes of Edessa, Sositheus of Cilicia, Manes of Persia, and Montanus of Phrygia. The

¹ i. e. iii 9, p. 72 (twice); iii 13, p. 87, 88 (twice).

² Turrianus and those who followed him persistently call him *Magnetes*.

³ What internal evidence there is, certainly points the other way. In iii 16, p. 96, the opponent says that if to drink a deadly drug does not hurt a true believer, then this ought to be made a test in the choosing of bishops—*ἐχρήην γοῦν τοὺς ἐκκλήτους τῆς ἱερωσύνης καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἀντιπιοιούμενους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἤτοι προεδρίας τούτω χρήσασθαι τῷ τῆς κρίσεως τρόπῳ κτλ.* If this forms part of a dialogue, there would surely be a more personal reference if a bishop were being addressed. And in the answer in iii 24, p. 108 et seq., Macarius feels no need of personal defence. After giving Polycarp and others as examples of great bishops of olden time, he proceeds *παρεῖς δ' ἐκείνους, τοὺς νῦν ἀφηγήσομαι πόσοι . . . χεῖρας ἐκείνουτες εἰς εὐχὴν . . . ἰάσαντο*; And throughout the book there is no suggestion that Macarius bears so exalted a position in the Christian community. See also p. 414 supra, and p. 416 note 1.

⁴ There are twenty-four of the name in the *D. C. B.*, only three or four of whom are connected with the West.

only name connected with the west is that of Marcion, and even he came originally from Pontus.

2. He also knows details about other natives of the same regions, Aratus, the astronomer of Cilicia,¹ and Apollonius of Tyana, about whom he adds to the disappearance from the tribunal, to which his opponent had referred, that in a moment of time he was solemnly talking to the Emperor and then digging cabbages in the garden.²

3. Again, when he gives a list of the countries which had not yet heard the Gospel, he locates Ethiopia as south-west, which implies that he was as far eastward as Syria.

4. It is true that when he mentions some of the heroes of the Church it is to the West and to such names as Fabian and Cyprian that he turns,³ and this has led Duchesne to the surmise that he visited Rome. But the one other name—Polycarp of Smyrna—that occurs in the list is that of a native of Asia Minor,⁴ and Irenaeus also stands as a link between that region and the West. Also, when he refers to the Romans, it is as *Βάρβαρον ἔθνος* (p. 29 l. 12). We therefore arrive at the conclusion that Mesopotamia, Syria, and Asia Minor are the localities to be connected with the name of Macarius. Everything points to the dialogue itself having taken place in the neighbourhood of Edessa or Palmyra, and although the nearest parts of Asia Minor seem the most familiar, such as Cilicia, Tyana, and Lycaonia (which comes in his book, in place of Asia in Epiphanius, as an abode of the Encratites), yet knowledge and interest are shewn in connexion with the whole of it.

I would suggest that these facts might be explained if the author was then living at or near Edessa, but had come originally from Magnesia in Asia Minor.

And indeed this assumption extricates us from a difficulty which must be frankly admitted. It is almost impossible to believe that an Origenist like Macarius (who is far more Origenistic and allegorical than Origen himself in controversy with a pagan) can have been a product of the famous Antiochene school, which was flourishing at that date. His interpretation of Scripture would have been utterly different had he been brought up under the influence of such men as Lucian, who was born at Edessa and had recently founded the school at Antioch. Very different, too, was another native of Edessa a few years later, Eusebius, bishop of Emesa. The theology of

¹ *Apoer.* iv 17, p. 191 l. 17.

² *Ibid.* iii 8, p. 66 l. 19.

³ *Ibid.* iii 24, p. 109 fin.

⁴ It may be added that the Western fathers are merely referred to by name, whereas ten lines of detail are given about Polycarp, from the same source as the *Vita Polycarpi*.

Macarius by itself might certainly suggest Alexandria; but the rest of the book forbids, and in speaking of recluses he could not have failed to instance those of Egypt instead of the East, had he come from that part of the world. So we may infer that he had acquired a theology which was independent of locality. If he came from Magnesia, he may have brought some of it with him from there. One is inclined to wonder why nothing was heard afterwards of so devoted and successful a champion of the faith. But two final considerations suggest themselves. His handling of the Scriptures would have been distasteful to the theologians of the neighbourhood (and it must be remembered that, apart from Antioch, there had been a school at Edessa itself almost from the second century), and his efforts may therefore have been unappreciated by his fellow Christians, and allowed to pass into oblivion. Or may he not at once have fallen a victim to the persecution of 303 A.D.? Before it broke out, the governor Hierocles had to be content to face him in fair fight, and to grind his teeth in silence as he lost point after point in the argument. But this 'auctor faciendae persecutionis' had just time after the issue of the famous 'fourth edict' of the year 304 A.D. to begin the bloody work around Palmyra before he went that same year to Bithynia. And would not one of his first victims be the man who had dared to uphold Christianity in public argument with him? We can picture a second scene between them, another dispute, of a different kind, concerning the heathen gods and sacrificing, a scene which justified the fear which the author of the *Apocritica* had displayed before his opponent. And it is not doubtful whether such a stout defender of the faith against heathenism would choose death in preference to sacrificing to those gods which once he had so vigorously denounced. The person of Macarius Magnes and his very name must remain wrapped in doubt and mystery; could we know all, we might add to his names the further appellation 'Martyr'.

T. W. CRAFER.

(To be continued.)

MORE SPANISH SYMPTOMS.

THE DATE OF SOME PRAYERS IN THE MOZARABIC MISSAL—THE REVISION OF THE TOLEDAN MISSAL IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY—A SUPPOSED *Liber Officiorum* OF HILARY OF POITIERS.

MR EDMUND BISHOP, in his most valuable *Liturgical note in illustration of the Book of Cerne* (1902) p. 270, has called attention to the great importance of a prayer for the dead which is not found in the ordinary