

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE II.

## LUCIAN AND CHRISTIANITY.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CHURCH HISTORY OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

By Adolf Planck, Dean of Heidenheim in Württemberg. Translated by Rev. Alvah Hovey, M. A., Teacher of Hebrew in Newton Theological Seminary.  
[Concluded from page 305.]

2. *Peregrinus as a Christian. Lucian's opinion of the Christians.*

The section in Peregrinus on the Christians (chap. 11—13. 16), takes a place always deserving of notice among the testimonies of pagan writers respecting Christianity. It is about equal in extent to the well-known letter of Pliny, but its contents are not satisfactory in relation to the time, eighty years later perhaps, when so keen an observer of surrounding objects as Lucian might have perceived many things capable of casting light upon difficult questions of church history. We will give the passage in the original, and explain it, and compare the assertions of Lucian with those of contemporaneous church writers. After Peregrinus had strangled his father and been forced to flee, he came, according to Lucian's account, into contact with the Christians in Palestine. *Ὅσα περ*, it reads in the 11th chapter, *καὶ τὴν θαυμαστὴν σοφίαν τῶν χριστιανῶν ἐξέμαθε, περὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ γραμματεῦσιν αὐτῶν ξυγγενόμενος*. Thus Peregrinus had learned the wonderful wisdom of the Christians, and, indeed, if we are to regard the force of *ἐκ*, most thoroughly, although in Lucian's opinion there was not much to learn. Therefore an old scholiast breaks out in the words: "Wonderful, indeed, O man accursed, and raised above all wonders, although blind boaster (*ἀλαζόνι τυφλῷ*), thou wilt not perceive its beauty." But it is surprising that the Christians are said to have had *priests* and *scribes*, and it is a proof of the little certain knowledge which Lucian had of the constitution of Christian churches, of the titles and dignities of their servants and officers; or it may be explained on the supposition that he, as well as many earlier and later pagan writers, confounded Christianity with Judaism. Yet it must be observed that Lucian (a passage in the *Tragopodagra* excepted) never mentions the Jews. In Suetonius (*Vita Claudii*, 25) the intermingling in the passage: *Judeos impulsore Christo assiduis tumultuantibus Roma ex-*

*ῥηκίς*, is easy to be explained; but Dio Cassius himself, in the third century, still speaks (67. 14, certainly with reference to Christians under Domitian) of the *ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι εἰς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἤθη ἐξοκείλοντες* (declinantes) *πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν*. In that case "priests and scribes" would have to be explained as Jewish titles applied to Christians by one who confounded the two classes. For there is no passage to be given where Christian church officers are denominated *ἱερεῖς*. Clemens Romanus (*ad Cor.* 1, 40) often speaks of the Jewish *λειτουργίαι*, instead of which we have (chap. 42) the offices of *ἐπίσκοποι*, *διάκονοι* and *πρεσβύτεροι*. Reference cannot well be had to the designation of Christians as a priestly people (1 Pet. 2: 9 and Rev. 1: 6. 5: 10. 20: 6). On the other hand, according to the expression of Christ (Matt. 13: 52), his disciples might be called *γραμματεῖς*. Yet Lucian may have taken these titles from paganism, as he is generally fond of such transfers. He speaks on one occasion of Panathenae which were solemnized in Rome, and this kind of transference of Greek and Roman appellations to whatever is foreign in matters of religion, occurs in all writers. The word *γραμματεῖς* is used by Lucian of Egyptian priests in the *Philopseudes* 34, and *De Sacrific.* 14. That *σοφία* is used ironically by him of Christianity and is not chosen with reference to the names *φιλοσοφία*, *γνώσις*, etc., current with the church writers of his time, is shown by the addition *θαυμαστή*. The Christians of that time, we know, after the example of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 2: 6), name their doctrines a *θεισοεβὲς σύστημα* (*Martyr. Ignat.* 2), and the oration *ad Graecos*, to be found in Justin's works, chap. 5, speaks of the *σοφία ἀπαρμιλλήτος* of the Christians. The epistle to Diognetus, chap. 5, has also the designation of a *θαυμαστή καὶ παράδοξος κατέστασις τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν πολιτείας*, but in an earnest sense well and eloquently carried out. Lucian understands by the *σοφία θαυμαστή* nearly the same as Tacitus (*Annal.* 15, 44) by *exitiabilis superstitio*.

In the following, Lucian represents his Peregrinus as rising from one dignity to another among the Christians. He proceeds: *Καὶ εἰ γάρ, ἐν βραχέι παιδᾶς αὐτοῦς ἀπέφηνε, προφήτης καὶ θιασάρχης καὶ συναγωγῆς καὶ πάντα μόνος αὐτὸς ὢν*. Peregrinus is thus made presently to excel his teachers to such a degree that they were as scholars by his side. He was prophet, principal on sacrificial occasions and sacred processions, and leader of religious meetings, briefly, all in all. If this latter means that he united in himself all the church offices, it is certainly not historical; for at this time, as the

letters of Ignatius certainly prove, a separation of the different offices and a proper organization obtained already in the church. But the expression may also mean that Christians thought everything of him. The other three dignities are still less clear. *Συναγωγεός* may have remained in use among the Palestinian Jews, of whom Lucian primarily speaks, as well as the word *συναγωγή* itself. This also is found in James 2: 2, and *ἐπισυναγωγή* in Heb. 10: 25. But we cannot with Walch find a proof-text for *συναγωγεός* in the assertion of Ignatius (*ad Polyc.* 4), *συναγωγαὶ πνευτώτερον γενέσθωσαν*; which merely signifies, that they should oftener assemble for religious worship, but does not prove that the houses of prayer were called *συναγωγαί*. In like manner the word *προφήτης* appears to belong to the Old Testament dialect. To be sure, *προφητεύειν* occurs in Matt. 7: 22, and *προφήτης*, 10: 41, in the general sense of teacher; so also Acts 11: 27. 13: 1. 15: 82. In Rom. 12: 6, and yet more certainly in 1 Cor. 14: 3, 29, *προφητεία* is evidently a *χάρισμα*. Prophets are mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians, 3: 5. 4: 11, as teachers specially qualified. Yet Montanists were the first who attributed to prophecy, also among Christians, great significance. Hence it has been conjectured that Lucian had especially in his eye Montanistic and Chiliasm Christians of Asia Minor. But *προφήτης* occurs in Lucian — e. g. *Dial. Mort.* 13, 1 — of the priests of Ammon also. The expression *θιασάρχης*, which *Pauly* renders *elders of the church*, is certainly borrowed from the nature of heathen sacrifices. (The reading *θουσιάρχης* is an emendation unsupported by the manuscripts.) The word signifies merely the leader in the *θίασος*, by which may be meant religious processions on occasion of sacrifice, and also choruses and feasts. *Walch* thought of the *convivantium coetus*, of the sacred love-feasts of the Christians; but these are spoken of afterwards, and Lucian plainly wishes to designate merely the principal in the worship, the leader in the song, or temple music. The expression is therefore indefinite, and does not perhaps give us an account of an ecclesiastical office in the church, but is merely transferred by analogy from the pagan to the Christian worship of God.

In what follows, Lucian proceeds to a description of Peregrinus's doings in the Christian church. He says: *καὶ τῶν βιβλίων τὰς μὲν ἐξήγειρο καὶ διεσάφη, πολλὰς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ξυτέγραφε, καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐκείτοι ἠγοῦντο καὶ νομοθέτη ἔχρωντο καὶ προστάτην ἐπέγραφον*. While the sense, that the Christians regarded Peregrinus as a god and honored him as a law-giver, is too improbable, *Brucker* supposed that both expressions must refer to Christ, who is spoken of in the

following sentence. But the text is here much too plain, and on *Brucker's* assumption, the *προστάτην ἐπίγραφον*, they made him bishop, must also be referred to Christ. There is rather a certain carelessness in Lucian's words; it is rhetorical exaggeration, that Christians are said to have worshipped Peregrinus with divine honors. In this expression Lucian did not think of Christ. But it is clear that *προστάτης*, after so many dignities were already mentioned, can mark only that of bishop. *Clemens Romanus* (*ad Cor.* 1. 36) names Christ himself *προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν*. In 1 Tim. 5: 17, we find *οἱ καλῶς προσετιῶτες πρεσβύτεροι*, and perhaps, indeed, Rom. 12: 8, *ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ*, says something similar. Justin, in the well-known passage of the *Apology*, 1, 65 seq., has at all events used the expression *προσετιῶς* several times for bishop, e. g. *τὸ συλλεγόμενον* (after the *agape*) *παρὰ τῷ προσετιῶτι ἀποτίθεται*. If now we think of the epistles of Ignatius in connection with the bishop, then would the divine worship paid him at once acquire a definite sense. There the dignity of bishop is so highly exalted that it is said: the bishop *εἰς τόπον θεοῦ κάθηται* (*ad Magn.* 6, and often elsewhere); whoever honors him honors God himself and will be again honored by God (*ad Smyrn.* 9). Now, we may here add to the first part, it is inconceivable, that Peregrinus could have been actually a bishop. For the first letter of Clement to the Corinthians (44) was written probably in the first century, and at that time only those men who had been long since tried and proved faithful, were chosen bishops, and indeed, *συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, μεμαρτυρημένους πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων*. Already the Epistle to Titus, 1. 6, requires similar virtues of the *ἐπίσκοπος*. And Lucian himself testifies in his *Alexander* (chap. 25), that the Christian churches in Asia Minor were at that time very wide spread, so that one could easily acquire information respecting Peregrinus. As we find in this a further proof of the inaccuracy of Lucian's knowledge of Christians and their rules, so we cannot look upon all contained in the remaining account as sure historical narrative. Yet Lucian appears, at all events, to have heard of the holy books of the Christians, which were, sometimes, indeed, taken from them in the persecutions, and perhaps also of sermons or written commentaries on the same. In Justin's works are found not only beginnings of a careful exegesis and hermeneutical rules on the interpretation of the prophets (*Apol.* 1, 36 seq.), but he tells us expressly, that after the solemnity of the love-feast a discourse was delivered by the bishop upon the prophets and passages of the *ἀπομ-*

ημμενύματα of the apostles (1. 67). The *Martyrium* of Ignatius speaks of his exegesis (see above), and it is known of Tatian, as well as of Marcion, that they instituted exegetical and critical investigations. Yet it has been shown in the first section, that something quite different must be meant by the sacred writings composed by Peregrinus, and even by his explanations of the same.

Lucian continues: τὸν μέγαν γοῦν ἐκεῖνος ἐπι σέβουσιν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ ἀνασκολοπισθέντα, ὅτι καινῆς αὐτῆς τελευτῆς εὐήγαγεν εἰς τὸν βίον. The γοῦν here offers the first difficulty, since its usual meaning, at least, will give no correct sense. Hence Tanaquil Faber conjectured that in this place there is a lacuna in the text, through the fault of the transcribers — *multa hic a Luciano adversus Christum scripta fuisse, quae a majoribus nostris, hominibus nimium priis sublata fuere*. Yet with Solanus the γοῦν may be justified. That the Christians so highly exalted Peregrinus is not very surprising; at least they honor also a man, namely, the Crucified; or better thus: Lucian wished to leave the veneration of Peregrinus undefined; let that, however, be as it may, at all events it is certain of their Crucified one, that, etc. Yet we prefer to understand, that Lucian believed he had already, in the hastily written passage, said something more respecting the θαυμαστὴ σοφία τῶν χριστιανῶν, and he brings together the preceding by the γοῦν, referring back by this word to the σοφία θαυμαστή. This at least is certain and truly very strange, that the Christians worship a crucified man. The reading μάγον, which some expounders prefer, does not well suit ἄνθρωπον; moreover, it would agree nicely with the objections of Celsus (*Orig. com. Cels.* 1, 5. 6) and other adversaries of Christianity, who assert that Christ, as a γόης, wrought his miracles μαγικῇ τέχνῃ (*Just. ap.* 1, 30. μάγος = βιαίως σοφός in Philostratus, *Apoll.* 1, 2). The σέβουσιν is, to be sure, not exactly divine worship, and is not quite equivalent to the *Christo quasi Deo carmen dicere* of Pliny (*Epis.* 10, 97). Lucian uses it also elsewhere for veneration to men of high standing. His *Demonax* (61) says: σέβω τὸν Σωκράτη. Yet σέβασθαι is used also of divine worship by the Apologists (*Just. Apol.* 1. 6, 13. and elsewhere). No definite representation, then, would be contained in Lucian of the divinity of Christ. It may also surprise us that he hastens so rapidly over the death of the founder of this religion on the cross, a point generally seized by pagan mockers. How much this death was a μαφία for the Greeks, we may see from Celsus (in Origen, 7, 53): τὸν οὐκίστην θανάτῳ χρησάμενον θεὸν τίθεσθε (*Ibid.* 2. 31, and further, *Minuc. Felix* in the

*Octav.* 9, 29. *Arnob. adv. gentes*, 1, 36. *Lactant. instit.* 4, 16. and *Justin. Apol.* 1, 9, 13). Instead of ἀνασκοιοπιζειν (compare also *Luc. Charon.* 14. *Sup. confut.* 8.) which is used by Herodotus, we find in the other passages of Lucian the Biblical σταυρός and ἀνασταυροῦν (*Prometh.* 4. 10, 17. and *Judic. Vocalium* often). This is also remarkable in Lucian, compared with the heathen opponents, that he intimates only by a single word, καινήν, the strongly urged objection to Christianity, that it was a new religion. Suetonius already speaks (*Nero*, 16) of a *superstitio nova et malefica*. The pagan Caecilius (in *Octav.* 8) loudly complains that such uncultivated people as the Christians (*religionem tam vetustam, utilem, salubrem dissolvere aut infirmare nitantur*), wish to introduce a new religion, while a Justin, and especially Tatian, maintain with very great learning, that Christianity which is referred back by the prophets to Moses, is older than all heathen wisdom and worship of God, so that the objection of newness holds now only among ignorant people (*Tatian, adv. Graec.* 36 seq. *Theoph. ad Aut.* 3, 4). That Christianity is called a τελετή, a sort of mystery, agrees with the appellation, *mysterium*, often given to it by Tertullian, Clement, Origen and Lactantius. The *Martyrium Ignatii* has for this θεοσεβής σύστημα (2). The *Epist. ad Diognet.* speaks of a καινὸν γένος ἢ ἐπιτήδευμα (1). The εἶτι — “still,” exhibits Christianity as a kind of belief already pretty old; the ταύτην refers not to omissions in the text, but to the preceding θαυμαστή σοφία. Gesner makes the remark, certainly correct, that transcribers who had taken offence at the supposed admissions in the text, would certainly have erased that which remains to us, since it must still be repugnant to so tender feelings.

The sentence now following: τότε δὴ καὶ συλληφθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὁ Πρωτεύς ἐπέπεσον εἰς τὸ δεισματοῦριον, needs no further explanation. There were beyond question Christian persecutions under the Antonines, since the edict of toleration ascribed to them is not genuine. The canon of Trajan may have been the rule (*Plin.* 10, 98): *si deferantur puniendi sunt*. Thus Peregrinus may not have denied his Christianity; ἐπὶ τούτῳ says that no other crime was laid to his charge than his mere connection with the Christians. This imprisonment, proceeds Lucian (we do not here give the Greek text, for it has no importance for the matter in question), surrounded Peregrinus for the rest of his life with considerable authority and made him more eager after notoriety (*ταρατεία καὶ δοξοκοπία*). But the Christians looked upon his imprisonment as a great misfortune. Ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν εἰδίδετο, οἱ χριστιανοὶ συμφορὰν ποιούμενοι τὸ πρᾶγμα

πάντα ἐκίνουν, ἐξαρκάσαι πειρούμενοι αὐτόν. Εἰς ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἦν ἀδύνατον, ἢ γε ἄλλη θεραπεία πᾶσα οὐ παρέργως, ἀλλὰ ἐν σπουδῇ ἐγένετο καὶ ἔωθεν μὲν εὐθύς ἦν ὄραν παρὰ τῷ δασμοτηρίῳ περιμένοντα γραῖδια, χήρας τινὰς καὶ παῖδια ὀρφανὰ· οἱ δ' ἐν τέλει αὐτῶν καὶ συνεκάθευδον μετ' αὐτοῦ, διαφθεύροντες τοὺς δασμοφύλακας. Lucian is here an unintentional witness of the brotherly love and hearty sympathy which the Christians manifested to each other. Although it were not the imprisonment of Peregrinus in which such things took place, yet Lucian may have himself beheld scenes like those he has described, in his many journeys in Gaul, Greece and Asia Minor. We see in them a living fulfilment of the words of Christ: ἐν φυλακῇ ἤμην καὶ ἦλθετε πρὸς με (Matt. 25: 36, 40), and of the exhortation: μνησκόσθε τῶν δεσμίων (Heb. 13: 3). The χῆραι are the deaconesses, beginning with the break of day their labor of love, and remind us of 1 Tim. 5: 9, according to which the χῆραι should assist the θλιβομένους; that χῆραι has this meaning is shown by the passage of Ignatius *ad Smyrnaeos* 13. The ἔωθεν may not refer expressly to the *conventus antelucani* of Tertullian (this writer speaks of the visiting of martyrs in prison by women, *ad uxorem* 2, 4, 8), or to the *ante lucem convenire* of Pliny; for, not meetings on the Sabbath, but daily services of love, are described in our passage. Since the attempts to liberate and to bribe, on the part indeed of the most respectable and the officers, are opposed to Rom. 13: 1—8, and to the usual willingness of early Christians to suffer and die, they are perhaps not historical; yet Eusebius relates something similar of the Gallic churches (5, 1). The aged mothers, who must endure the mockery of Celsus, were already by Athenagoras (*Leg.* 11) defended as beloved and respected members of the churches. Lucian proceeds: εἶτα δεῖπνα ποικίλα σίσεκομίζετο καὶ λόγοι ἱεροὶ αὐτῶν ἐλέγοντο καὶ ὁ βέλτιστος Περεγρίνος (εἶτι γὰρ τοῦτο ἐκαλεῖτο) καινὸς Σωκράτης ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὠνομάζετο. That the Christians named their dear Peregrinus a second Socrates, is a scoff of Lucian unskillfully chosen. The uncultivated knew nothing of Socrates, the educated thought little of him as a pagan. To be sure, Justin (*Apol.* 1, 5) judges of him not unfavorably, traces his death to the hatred of the demons whom Socrates had opposed, and chap. 46. places him as one of the μετὰ λόγου βιωσάντων in a line with Abraham. Similarly in the second apology (4, 7). On the other hand, Socrates is blamed by Theophilus (*ad Autol.* 3, 2), and Octavius (in *Minuc. Felix*, 38) calls him the *scurra Atticus*. Still better known are the severe opinions of Tertullian respecting Socrates. The ὠνομάζετο which sounds his-

tical, is a proof how easily Lucian ascribes his own thoughts to other persons. Since he also elsewhere, especially in chap. 87, compares the friends of Peregrinus with those of Socrates who is so wrongly treated by him, it may be possible, that the *διαφθείρειν τοὺς δεσμοφύλακας* was taken from the Crito, and perhaps also the *περιμένειν* in face of imprisonment from the Phaedo (*Phaed.* 3. *περιμένοντες ἐκείστοτε, ἕως ἀνοχθείη*). So much the weightier appear the *δείπνα ποιίλα*, and in connection with them the *λόγοι ἱεροί*. We must in these certainly find a reference to the Christian love-feasts. *Ποίλος* can undoubtedly mean, that the food was brought together, contributed by the individual members. Yet already Solanus found in them the reproach, that the meals were luxurious, because Lucian everywhere makes the Christians indulge in luxury with Peregrinus. Augusti (*Denkwürdigkeiten*, IV. 53) translates the word in like manner, rich repasts, and explains it of the many dishes or courses, referring to the complaints of the Apostle (1 Cor. 11: 20. 2 Peter 2: 13. Jude 12). To me the similarity to the *cibus innoxius et promiscuus* of Pliny appears much more obvious and close. But that their part of the gifts at the love-feast was brought to the imprisoned in their place of confinement, Justin Martyr says expressly in the well-known passage (*Apol.* 1, 67); Tertullian asserts the same (*Apol.* 3). From the principal passage in Justin respecting baptism and the Lord's Supper, we learn also what the *λόγοι ἱεροί* are designed to signify. They are neither the *ἕμνοι θεολογούντες* of Clemens Alexandrinus (paedagog. end of third book), nor the *carmen* of Pliny, but the usual exhortation and prayer of the bishop after supper: *κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιούμεθα, ὅπως δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοῦ πολυτενταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὐρεθῆναι καταξιωθῶμεν, καὶ ὁ προσετώσ δὲ ἰὰ λόγον τῆν νοουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μμησίσεως ποιείται*.

We have already above, in the comparison with Ignatius, adduced a part of what is related in the 13th chapter. Lucian says: *καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ πόλεων ἔστιν ὧν ἤκόν τινες τῶν χριστιανῶν στελλόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ, βοηθήσοιτες καὶ ξυναγορεύσοιτες καὶ παραμυθησόμενοι τὸν ἄνδρα*. Thus we find church chests, and, if *ξυναγορεύσοιτες* signifies legal advocates, lawyers also among the Christians already, though Lucian holds the majority to be common people. In what follows Lucian, though involuntarily, is a witness of the love, the self-sacrificing sympathy and the dying courage of the Christians. As this mutual assistance among Christians at a later period excited the wonder of Julian, so did it now of Lucian, yet

without exciting in him respect towards them. *Ἀμήχανον δέ, he proceeds, τὸ τάχος ἐπιδεικνύναι, ἐπειδὴν τι τοιοῦτον γένηται, δημόσιον ἐν βραχεῖ γὰρ, ἀφειδοῦσι πάντων.* In church matters they spare neither cost nor labor, and reckon all as nothing. *Καὶ δὴ καὶ τῶ Περεγρίῳ πολλὰ τότε ἦκε χρήματα παρ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ προφάσει τῶν δεσμῶν, καὶ πρόσδορον οὐ μικρὰν ταύτην ἐποίησατο. πεπείκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες, τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι δεσθῆαι καὶ βιώσεσθαι τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον.* The belief in immortality, at which Lucian as an Epicurean often railed, should here first explain, why the Christians were so ready to relinquish earthly possessions. But Lucian, in the following, connects with that a description of their joy in death. He says: *παρ' ὃ καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ἐκόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιδιδάσκειν οἱ πολλοί.* The delivering themselves to death is naturally only this, that Christians would not abjure their faith in persecutions and before courts of justice; a circumstance which appeared to another heathen as *μανιά*, as *inflexibilis obstinatio*. The *τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατοι* evidently means: wholly, body and soul, and therefore designates the so much ridiculed hope of a resurrection of the body, which Celsus (in *Origen*, 5, 14) names a hope of worms, at which Caecilius also cannot laugh enough (in *Minuc. Felix*, 8, 11; comp. also *Theoph. ad Autol.* 1, 13). In what follows there are again certain difficulties. Lucian says: *ἔπειτα δὲ ὁ νομοθέτης ὁ πρῶτος ἐπεισεν αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἀδελφοὶ πάντες εἰεν ἀλλήλων, ἐπειδὴν ἀπαξ παραβάντες θεοὺς μὲν τοὺς Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρτήσονται, τὸν δὲ ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκείνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνου νόμους βιώσι.* It appears that Lucian distinguished the first law-giver of the Christians from that crucified sophist. Hence Tanaquil Faber thought of the Apostle Paul (Rom. 12: 10), Fabricius (in the *Biblioth. ed Harles V.* 341) of John, who gives such prominence to the *ἀδελφότες* (1 John 2: 7. 8: 10). But the word of Christ (Matt. 23: 8), *πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε*, is much more striking; and, while Lucian also appears at the end of the sentence to refer by the *ἐκείνου* to laws of the sophist, we prefer to assume an inaccuracy in the structure of the sentence, rather than that Lucian committed so gross an error as to assert there was another law-giver of the Christians besides Christ. If the *ἐπειδὴν* began a new statement, for which to be sure the apodosis fails in what follows, that strange opinion would not have arisen. But the structure of the sentence is plainly loose and inaccurate. Yet Lucian has strange ideas of the *νομοθέτης*, since he also above brings forward Peregrinus as such. How much finer is the sense with our interpretation, namely, that the true Christian fraternity,

the full citizenship in the church, first begins, when the heathen gods are forsaken, Christ is honored, and a new walk is begun. The Christian's contempt of death is described very beautifully by Justin (*Dial. cum Tryphone*, cap. 110), and in Octavius, chap. 37. The malicious explanations of the word *ἀδελφοί*, which Lucian in like manner omits, appear in Octavius, chap. 9, and elsewhere, while this writing on the hearty love of the Christians contains the expression: *amant mutuo pacem ante, quam novum, occultis se notis et insignibus noscunt*. (On the beneficence of the earliest Christians, we may compare also Justin, *Apol.* 1, 6. Cyprian, *Epist.* 60. Euseb. 7, 22.) But that Lucian calls Jesus a crucified *sophist* appears to us certainly, at first sight, spoken contemptuously and injuriously, and the old scholiast breaks out in words of sorrowful imprecation: *οἴα ληραῖς, ὃ κατάρτε, κατὰ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν, who also will deliver thee to eternal condemnation for thy mockery and for thy inscrutable wantonness!* The learned *Solanus* finds here a *duplex crimen*; Christ is represented as a *sophist* and as a *maleficus crucifixus*. But that Christ was a criminal, Lucian does not say with a single word, any more than he reproaches the Christians for their apostasy from heathenism (*παρεβάντες ἀπαρνήσονται*), a point which the scholiast and D. Soul have in like manner introduced without reason. The word *σοφιστής*, in Lucian's use of it, and as it was generally employed by the age in which he flourished, has not that offensive and contemptuous sense which we connect with it from the Socratic-Platonic period. Lucian, however, gives this sense so usual with us in the *Fugitivi*, cap. 10, where he fully describes the sophists in a sketch of the history of philosophy. But elsewhere he, as well as Plutarch, Philostratus, and other writers of the second and third centuries, means by *σοφιστής* simply a teacher of wisdom, of rhetoric, or of the arts. Lucian has also connected with *σοφιστής* in the *Vitarum Auctio* 12, *Dial. Mort.* 30. 8, the associated idea of a crafty and quick intellect. The Egyptian theologians are called *σοφισταί*, *De Sacrif.* 14. On the other hand, Lucian names himself in the *Apologia pro Mercede Conductis*, 15. *σοφιστής τοῖς μεγαλομίθοις ἐναριθμοσύμενος*. In the writing, *De Gymnasiis*, 22, the *sophist* in Solon's mouth is a teacher of goodness and righteousness. In the *Rhetorum Præceptor* (1), we read: *τὸ σεμνότερον τοῦτο καὶ πάνδημον ὄνομα σοφιστής*. But certainly we expect a more discriminating term for the founder of a religion than this, which Justin (*Apol.* 1, 14) rejects with the words: *οὐ σοφιστής ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν*. It is further to be noticed, that Lucian in his *Philopseudes* also employs

σοφιστής of Jesus. Lucian finishes his account with these words: καταφρονούσιν ὄν ἀπάντων ἐξίσης καὶ κοινὰ ἡγοῦνται, ἄνευ τινὸς ἀκριβοῦς πίστεως τὰ τοιαῦτα παραδεξάμενοι· ἢν τοῖνυν παρὰ Ἰη. τις εἰς αὐτοὺς γόης καὶ τεχνίτης ἄνθρωπος καὶ πράγμασι χρῆσθαι δυνάμενος, αὐτίκα μάλ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐν βραχεὶ ἐγένετο, ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις ἰσχυροῖν. The ὄν appears to signify, that Christians, because they esteemed themselves to be brethren, despised all worldly possessions. But to fill out the thought, we can supply, from the νόμοι of the foregoing sentence, the idea, that they at once, according to the will of their law-giver, direct their attention more to the immortal, eternal life than to earthly things, and therefore think lightly of private property, and share all they have with each other. Community of goods is intimated by two short words; but κοινὰ is not, therefore, to be explained by *impruta* or *profana*, and the reading *κατὰ* proposed by Faber is not even good Greek. Rather does κοινὰ agree perfectly well with the passages of Acts 2: 44: ἅπαντα εἶχον κοινὰ, and 4: 32: οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν ἰδίον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτοῖς πάντα κοινά. Yet these passages are to be limited by 5: 4 and 12: 12, and we must already in the Acts understand there was a prevailing disposition to communicate to those in need rather than a strictly observed institution requiring community of goods. It were certainly worth knowing whether Lucian had found, in Syria, Societies of the Essenes, or whether at this time a strict community of goods anywhere prevailed. But his account is throughout somewhat superficial. We may compare what the *Epistola ad Diogn.* 1, says: αὐτὸν δὲ κόσμον ὑπερορῶσι πάντες καὶ θανάτου καταφρονούσι καὶ τὴν φιλοστοργίαν ἔχουσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους. The τὰ τοιαῦτα refers, not so much to their contempt of life and property, as, by way of conclusion, to all which had been said before of the Christians, and also in particular to their belief in immortality. Lucian reproaches them with having received all this on trust and faith without investigation. He demands the πίστις ἀκριβής, rational grounds, and, because he does not find these, Christians are in his opinion well-disposed, but simple, unreasoning fanatics. In this he agrees with almost all heathen opponents of Christianity. Thus Celsus berates the Christians as ἄσθροποι βλακικοί καὶ ἰδιῶται (*Orig.* 1, 3; compare the mocking passage, 3, 44); so does the physician Galen speak of the νόμοι ἀναπόδεικτοι of the Christians; and the heathen Caecilius (in *Oct.* 5, 8, 12) reviles them as *studiorum rudes, litterarum profani*, yes, *homines desperatae, illicitae deploratae factionis, de ultima faece collecti*; while Justin, in his second apology, 2, 10, can truly say, that not merely

*ιδιώται* and *χειροτέγναι*, but also *φιλόσοφοι* and *φιλόλογοι* have believed in Christ. Hierocles (*Euseb. in Hierocl. cap. 2*) looks down with pride upon *εἶν τῶν χριστιανῶν κουφότητα*, and names, not the Christians only, but the apostles themselves, *ἄνθρωποι ψεύσται καὶ ἀπαιδῶνται καὶ γόητες*. Theophilus also (*Ad Autol. 8, 4*) mentions the charge of heathen, that there is in Christianity no *ἀπόδειξις ἀληθείας*. The emperor Marcus Aurelius (in the well-known passage referring to Christians *πρὸς ἑαυτὸν 11, 8*) claims that joy in death ought to spring *ἀπὸ ἰδικῆς κρίσεως, μὴ κατὰ φιλήν παρὶ ταξίν, ὡς οἱ χριστιανοί, ἀλλὰ λελογισμένως καὶ σεμνῶς, καὶ ὡς τε καὶ ἄλλον πείσαι, ἀτραγῶδως*. In like manner Arrian, perhaps a friend of Lucian, hopes, if the interpreters of Lucian's Alexander (*cap. 36*) rightly explain the name Xenophon, to appropriate that fearlessness of death through reason, which the Galileans secure from mad fanaticism and custom; while a Justin was moved, by observing their unshaken courage in death, not only to disbelieve the reproaches made against Christians, but also to admire and embrace Christianity himself (*Apol. 1, 50*). Now it is certainly very surprising that Lucian, after having acknowledged their touching love and sympathy, and their belief in immortality, shared in common with Plato and other philosophers, yet derides them as simple, stupid people. The ground of his opinion surely lies deeper, in his Epicurean heartlessness, which could not see the truth in love. The spiritual should be judged spiritually. Yet we must at once add, that Lucian, in his account of Alexander, who was the most crafty of all *γόητες*, places the Christians with the sceptical Epicureans and intimates their disbelief in his lying arts. But of course it does not follow from this that Lucian at a later period became more favorable to Christianity, as *Kestner*, in his strange *Agape* (s. 504), has concluded. For the unbelief of Christians in Alexander's lying oracle had wholly other grounds, viz. their detestation of a heathen oracle in Alexander, while Lucian and his friends perceived the deception and philosophical impossibility of the existence of oracles. But the Christians in his Alexander are at all events not superstitious, stupid and easy to be deceived, as Lucian will represent them in the *Peregrinus*.

The remaining passages in the *Peregrinus* (16), so far as they were not noticed in the first section, may be abridged. Although by his legacy *Peregrinus* had gained the favor of the *Parians*, he turns himself anew to the Christians: *ἔξῃ το δέυτερον πλαησομενος, ἰκανὸ ἐφόδια τοὺς χριστιανούς ἔχων, ὑπ' ὧν δορυφορούμενος ἐν ἅπασιν ἀφ' ἑθνοῖς ἦν, καὶ χρόνον μὲν τινα οὕτως ἐβόσκατο· εἶτα παραινομήσας τε*

καὶ ἐς ἐκείνους — ὠφθη γὰρ τι, ὡς αἶμαι, ἐσθίαν τῶν ἀπορήτων αὐτοῖς — οὐκ ἔτι προσιεμένων αὐτῶν ἀπορούμενος — — — he attempted in vain to reclaim his legacy. Since we cannot well suppose *δορυφορούμενος* refers to an escort, we may find in it with *Walch* the so-named *epistolae communicatorias* or *commendaticias*. Peregrinus had thus at last offended the Christians, and was therefore excluded from the church. *Palmer* and *Tanaquil Faber* accuse *Lucian* of now and then confounding Christian with Jewish customs, and they are of the opinion that he was thinking of Jewish prohibitions of various articles of food. But *Lucian*, without doubt, has in view the use of the *εἰδωλόθυστα*. The heathen might easily learn that the use of these was an abomination to Christians, both from civil examinations and from their not joining in the sacrifices. The mild judgment of the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 10: 25, was somewhat restricted by 8: 10 and 10: 40. On the whole, the prohibition of Acts xv. remained valid; compare Rev. 2: 14, 20. The use of the *εἰδωλόθυστα* is, according to *Justin (Dial. c. Tryphone 34)*, precisely equivalent to idolatry itself, and Christians should rather suffer death than eat of such food. Only heretics and nominal Christians permitted this use. In like manner does *Irenaeus* express himself, *Adv. haeret.* 1, 1. 23. 27. 32. *Orig. contra Celsum* 8, 24. The belief of *Justin* and his contemporaries in demons induced this greater strictness in that later time (*Just. Apol.* 1, 58). The heathen, also, in the *Octavius* of *M. Minucius Felix*, says (12): *praecceptos cibos abhorretis*; but *Octavius* (38): *sacrificiorum reliquias contemnimus ne quis existimet aut demonis, quibus libatum est, nos cedere, aut nostrae religionis pudere*. In case the excommunication of *Peregrinus* had this ground, it would be a proof for the strictness of discipline in the church at that time.

It appears from all which has now been adduced, that *Lucian* had a pretty accurate knowledge of the Christians of his time. He knows of their Sacred Scriptures, and single points in their creed; he is acquainted with their brotherly love and their joy in death; he is informed of their common meals, and perhaps of their community of goods; he knows the intercourse of the churches with each other, and has also heard of their strict discipline. All this he relates without special interest, *sine ira et studio*, one might say. The narrative is evidently composed without any passion; their love and their contempt of death in persecutions excites neither respect nor sympathy; their apostasy from heathenism moves him as little. The only objection he makes to them, is, that they have received their faith without trial or proof, that is, a want of intelligence. To state the mat-

ter positively, Lucian sees in Christianity a blameworthy fanaticism; in the Christians, well-disposed, simple people. They are *ιδιώται* and *κακοδαίμονες*, to be pitied because they surrender themselves to false hopes, yet quite as much to be derided because through them another folly has come up in the world. Christianity is one of the temporary follies in that great fool-house, the world; this, if we take into consideration the other satirical works of Lucian, must we give as his real opinion. He laughs and mocks, but he does not complain and denounce. Nothing on earth is certain to him except the *χρύσι* *δόξα* of his own Epicurus, which he praises in the Alexander (47) as a universal remedy for superstition. He has learned in Epicurus freedom of soul from empty fancies, from the foolish belief in miracles, and from vain expectations; also independence of thought, enlightenment and true purification from all superstition, and specially from the two great tyrants which rule human life, fear and hope (cap. 8). Whoever has not advanced thus far, is to be pitied and derided. This is the peculiar point of view from which Lucian opposes Christianity as well as Paganism. By this he is distinguished from all the assailants of Christianity. Where these perceive criminal obstinacy, danger to the State, and want of reverence towards the emperor, he finds nothing but a new species of fanaticism. Apostasy from the gods could not appear a crime to him who was the most dangerous foe of the popular heathen faith; and hence his judgment respecting the Christians is at once milder and fairer, than that of Tacitus, Pliny and others. Tacitus, in the depths of his heart, was as far from the ancient gods as Lucian. The *ira deum in rem Romanam* (*Annal.* 4, 1. *Hist.* 2, 38. 3, 71), the *prodigia coelo terraque, fulminum monitus, futurorum præsagia* (*Hist.* 1, 3), which announced the wrath of the gods against Rome — all this is more than mere rhetoric for the decoration of history; these are earnest-sounding words taken from the popular belief; but they agree very poorly with the question: *fatone an forte res mortalium volvantur?* (*Annal.* 6, 22; comp. 3, 22.) But Tacitus wished, it seems, to uphold the State now verging to ruin, for whose ancient dignity he is enthusiastic, by the rotten support of the popular faith. Hence he is so full of bitter reproaches against Judaism (*Hist.* 5, 5 seq.): *fides obstinata, contemnere deos, exuere patriam, moriendi contemptus*, — all this is a *mos absurdus sordidusque* of the *gens teterrima*; but in Christianity he sees a *superstitio exitiabilis*, and its spread in Rome belongs to the *atrocitas pudendaque* which flow together into this sink of vices (*Annal.* 15, 44). He has no tone of sympathy for the persecuted; they are *con-*

*tas et novissima exempla meriti*, and deserve death for the *utilitas publica*. We never find in Lucian a sense for the national greatness or dignity, nor, to speak generally, any patriotism; for the rhetorical piece *encomium patrias*, provided it is genuine, contains only the praise of his native city without extending to the whole land. Therefore Lucian sees in Christianity no danger to the State, since he himself, as a cold egotistic thinker, knows of no higher good for mankind than the cultivation of taste, and what is called at the present day humanity.

Hence we must regard the opinion of Jacobi as unfounded, who thinks Lucian followed the view of the emperors in his bias against Christianity, and perceived that, for the great mass of that age, nothing could be less pious than scrutiny and reflection upon the existing religious institutions, because this would lead to indifference toward the State, and to an inactive life! If one does not choose to introduce all this into *καταφροσύνην πάσαν ἐξέστης*, he will be able to find elsewhere no proofs for the above opinion. Besides, the two writings from which Jacobi would make Lucian a moral and political reformer, are those in which Lucian's peculiar spirit least of all appears. Further, Lucian is milder in his judgment upon Christians than Pliny. In the latter, we perceive the dogmatic, imperious Roman spirit, which is vexed because the people adhere so firmly to their opinions. Although he does not find their life and morals criminal (*Ep.* 10, 97. *qualecunque esset, quod faterentur*), still their *pervicacia* and *inflexibilis obstinatio* must be punished. Yet Pliny also, as well as Lucian, sees in them *error* more than *culpa*, and bears witness with Lucian to their tendencies as morally pure, acknowledging that they *sacramente non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria, committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent*. But he still sees, as earlier Suetonius (*Nero*, 16), in a *genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae*, only a *superstitio prava et immodica*; *prava*, because sacrifices are not offered to the emperor, and the heathen offerings have diminished. But all honor to Lucian, that he does not allude by even a word to the wide-spread evil reports respecting the *epulae Thyestaeae* and *conviviis Oedipodei*, against which the Apologists cannot enough defend themselves (*Justin*, *ap.* 1, 26. 82. *Diad. cum Tryphone* 10. *Orot.* 8, 9. *Athenag. Leg.* 3. *Theoph.* 3, 4). While in other cases it is a small thing for him to assert every possible baseness of persons whom he hates (Apollonius, Alexander, etc.), we must here not only recognize his impartiality, but also, it may be, assume that the Chris-

tians, persecuted in his view so undeservedly, excited his sympathy, at least so far that he would not make or repeat in this work charges against them, the truth of which he had not ascertained. In this respect, Lucian stands far above Fronto, Crescens, Celsus and the later Neo-Platonists. The hatred of Crescens, a shameless cynic and the mortal enemy of Justin (*Apol.* 2, 8. *Tatian, adv. Gr.* 19), against Christians, may have sprung from a miserable longing for popularity, or from the piercing consciousness of his own moral worthlessness made evident to him by the Christians. Moreover, it was extravagant fawning on the part of Fronto, an orator well received at court, that he favored the rumor of the *epulas Thyestae*, and made use of his oratorical elegance to the injury of Christians (*Oscorian.* 81. *convivium ut erator adpersit*). Celsus, who was similar to Lucian in culture and penetration, appears to have known a certain philosophical interest, a certain preference for philosophical ideas of religion. Yet in his controversy he employs the common charges against Christians of the *καθήρησ ενομήκας*, and of customs dangerous to the State. Still, according to Origen, Celsus possessed many elements which were more clearly developed in Neo-Platonism. He holds the poets to be *θεοεσ*, is acquainted with an allegorical interpretation of their works, and appears still (as Plutarch) to have had some faith in oracles (8, 45); he also cites the flying Abaris, the Proconnesian Aristaeus who rose after seven years rest in the grave, and the bodiless Hermotimus of Clazomenae walking about in the air. Celsus is also a Monotheist, speaks of *θεοί ανεισπαροι*, is initiated into the mysteries, and demands thank-offerings for the good spirits. The soul he deems an emanation from the Deity, the body a fetter for it, the world an organism — clear statements and thoughts, which give to his polemic against Christianity a certain philosophical and religious basis, but, at the same time, thoughts which Lucian has through and through derided. Thus Celsus and Lucian are merely free thinkers in common; otherwise they are different. At the Neo-Platonists, finally, and their strange explanations of the old divinities, Lucian had sneered far more bitterly than at the Christians, because, in his opinion, their education should have kept the former from such fanaticism, while he thought the folly of Christians might be excused on the ground of their rudeness. Accordingly the judgment of Lucian respecting Christians is the mildest of all those we now possess from heathen writers of his age. He neither accuses, judges, nor condemns them; he merely laughs at, mocks, and pities them. They are not criminals nor apostates from an old and venerable faith;

they are simple fanatics and fools, neither better nor worse than the many thousand other fools in the world. If we remember this, the harsh judgment of Laetantius (*Inst. div.* 1, 9) and of Suidas (*Lex.* 4, 457), both of whom make him an arch-scoffer and denier of God, the heir of hell-fire, appears not to be well-grounded, at least so far as our passage in Peregrinus is concerned. It is not easy to understand why Peregrinus since 1664 through Pope Adrian VII. has come into the *index librorum prohibitorum*. Although Lucian remained in heart and spirit a stranger to Christianity, yet the spread of this faith is more indebted to his satirical dialogues of the gods than those zealots ever once imagined. Lucian, by his mockery, perfectly destroyed the authority of Olympus and its inhabitants, and the way in which he makes ridiculous the world of gods, even though in his contempt he also mistook the nature of Paganism itself, was more efficacious in destroying the old faith than a dry and subtle refutation, or the often unfortunate arguments of the apologists. Lucian exhibits the gods, as Wieland says, in *negligent*; and, while he brings out in ever new and ludicrous situations their weaknesses, perplexities, conflicts, in a word, the finite of this infinite, they put off their own divinity and Olympus falls. Yet we will not forget, that whoever by means of Lucian's mockery lost his faith in heathenism, was thereby unfitted for any religion and remained so, unless from other writings and by other teachers the positive blessings of faith were disclosed to him.

8. *Was Lucian acquainted with the sacred writings of the Christians?*

The first two sections of this Article afford us some materials for the answer of this question which has been so often proposed. We have seen that Lucian had obtained a pretty accurate knowledge of the Christians of his day, and in the *Peregrinus* he speaks explicitly of their books: *εὖν βιβλῶν τὰς μὲν ἐξήγειρο καὶ διασάφα, πολλὰς δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ξυγγράφη*. But, on the other hand, the statement that *Peregrinus* himself wrote such books, proves that Lucian had a false idea of their writings, that is, if he places those of *Peregrinus* on one and the same line with them. Yet he assumes, it is known, that Christians had their own books. It is, moreover, possible, that the *λόγοι ἱεροί* (12, see above) are discourses on portions of the Holy Scriptures; and if Lucian had in view the epistles of Ignatius, as we sought to show in section first, then we have proof that he drew his narratives not merely from tradition but also from the literature of Christians. We think it has been proved that Lucian could not have

wanted opportunities to become accurately acquainted with Christian writings. His journeys led him for the most part into cities where flourishing churches were located. Edessa, one of the earliest seats of Christianity, was hard by Samocata; besides, we find Lucian for a longer or shorter period in Antioch, Thessalonica (Philippi), Athens, Rome, Ephesus, Toulouse and Lyons, and in Alexandria.

We also assume as proved, that he made a special business of observing his contemporaries, and resorted to great assemblies for the purpose of watching the human heart and its follies. While all forms of religious faith had for him a satirical interest, while he informed himself so carefully respecting the Egyptian, Syrian, Greek and Roman worship of the gods, it certainly concerned him to learn something specific about the new Christian mysteries (*κρυπτή ελευση*). We may indeed assume, that the Christians kept secret their holy writings; but in times of persecution the *traditores*, or betrayers, would make this matter easy to such heathen as for any reason desired to become acquainted with them. It is also probable, that in times of rest the Christians were not displeased to see the unconverted present at their worship, their prayers, and their discourses. If this took place in the earliest times, as we may conclude from 1 Cor. 14: 23—25 and James 2: 2, why should we regard it improbable at a later period? It was, moreover, very easy for so shrewd a man as Lucian, under an appearance of sympathy and interest, to steal into such meetings or to sift good natured Christians by all sorts of questions. At least, several quotations found in his works, and supposed to be from Christians, make this impression. These cannot be explained from tradition in Lucian's time, any more than with Philostratus or Celsus. To be sure, Philostratus, as the tendency of his work implied, appears to have had a far more accurate knowledge of Christianity and of the accounts of miracles in the New Testament; and, if his citations do not verbally agree with the original, he had good reasons for this. Yet many quotations in Lucian remind one of similar quotations in Philostratus, and therefore we state beforehand our opinion respecting this question, that *Lucian's works certainly contain allusions to Christian accounts of miracles*. Yet it does not follow, that he had an exact knowledge of the Holy Scriptures themselves; he had heard from the Christians single points, and, like many of his heathen contemporaries, he thought the current narratives of demons and the healing of sick persons especially worthy of notice. Further, as he esteemed the Christian belief of immortality so pitiable a notion, he has communicated something def-

nite respecting their hopes in view of the other world, and it is possible that he was not ignorant of the Chiliastic expectations so wide spread at that time.

The series of quotations which we would now adduce, are, to be sure, of such a nature that one can always debate the point, whether they may not be explained without reference to the contents of the Holy Scriptures. A surprising vacillation in respect to this question appears in the many treatises of ancient and modern time. We will simply state the facts, and leave the reader to form his own judgment. And we begin with those passages where the reference to Christian accounts appears most manifest.

In the Philopseudes of Lucian, already characterized in our introduction, two friends, Philoctes and Tychiades, hold a conversation on the passion for the fabulous, invented and false, so prevalent among men. The conversation takes place at a sick-bed. Together with many evil things which are spoken of, their discourse in the 10th chapter turns upon the cures wrought by repeating sacred names. In chapter 10, the Platonist Ion speaks of a cure which he witnessed when a boy. Midas, the servant of his father, bitten by a viper, was freed from his sufferings by the magical words of a Babylonian. And *ὁ Μίδας αὐτὸς ἀράμενος τὸν σκίμποδα, ἐφ' οὗ ἐκεκόμιστο, φήγετο ἐς τὸν ἀγρὸν ἀπαιῶν.* This bite of a serpent has been compared with Acts 28: 4, where Paul in like manner is bitten by an *ἐχίδνα*. But the bed carried by Midas himself calls to mind far more clearly the narrative of the paralytic, Matt. ix. Mark ii. Lucian also represents Midas as carried before this cure by his fellow servants (*ἑσπρωμένω αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σκίμποδος ἰκὸ ἐῶν ὁμοδούλων προσκομιζόμενον*); in Mark the *ὑπὸ πτεσσάρων αἰρόμενος* is healed by the cry: *ἄρον τὸν κράββατόν σου* (comp. also John 5: 8). The Attic *σκίμποδος* is precisely the Hellenistic *κράββατος*; and, since this feature of the case does not look exactly like an invention of Lucian, we think an allusion to the Christian narrative is here possible. *Κλίβη* refers very pertinently to a similar miracle, which Livy relates, 2, 36. But the carrying of the bed is just what fails in Livy. Further, in the Philopseudes a hyperborean is mentioned, who walked upon water and passed through fire with entire comfort (*ἐφ' ὕδατος βαδίζοντα καὶ διὰ πυρὸς διεξιόντα*). Here the resemblance to Matt. 14: 30 (the *περιπατεῖν* of Peter, *ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα*) is very slight, and the attendant circumstances are entirely wanting. But what will the reader say to the following? In chap. 16, the Platonist Ion says: I might well ask you, what you say of those who heal demoniacs (*τοὺς δαιμονιασῆτας ἀπαλλάττοντας*

τῶν δαιμόνων) and continues: πάντες ἴσασι τὸν Σύρον, τὸν ἐκ τῆς Ἰκκαλιστίας, τὸν ἐπὶ τούτων σοφιστήν (see our second section on this word) ὅσους παραλαβὼν καταπίπτοντας πρὸς τὴν σελήνην καὶ τὰ ὀφθαλμῶ διασιρόφοντιαι καὶ ἀφροῦ συμπλημένους τὸ στόμα ὄμας ἀνίστησι καὶ ἀποπέμπει ἀρτίους, ἐπὶ μισθῷ μεγάλῳ ἀπαλλάξας τῶν δαιῶν· ἐπιδάειν γὰρ ἐπίσθη κειμένους καὶ ἔρηται, ὅθεν εἰσεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸ σῶμα, ὁ μὲν νοσῶν αὐτὸς σιωπᾷ, ὁ δαίμων δὲ ἀποκρίνεται ἑλληγεῶν ἢ βαρβαρίζου, ἢ ὅθεν ἂν αὐτὸς ἦ, ὅπως τε καὶ ὅθεν ἐπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον· ὁ δὲ ὄρκους ἐπάγων, εἰ δὲ μὴ πεσθεῖς, καὶ ἀπαλοῶν ἐξελάνθει τὸν δαίμονα. This passage treats of a well-known Palestinian, of lunatics, of those foaming at the mouth, of demoniacs from whom the demon speaks, and of conjurations. Yet Lucian, we freely concede, speaks of the Syrian as though he were still alive (ἀποπέμπει). Hence Palmer thought of a scholar of the apostles, and appeals to the miracles, which, as the Apologists with Origen and Eusebius testify, took place in the second century. And since Christ and his apostles performed their cures gratuitously (Matt. 10: 8, δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε), Gesner supposes we are to think of an exorcist not a Christian. Kühn refers to Matt. 12: 27. Luke 9: 49. Acts 19: 13. 8: 9. 18: 6, where also persons who are not Christians cast out demons. The Philopseudes is throughout aimed against the *magical superstitions*, mainly against the Babylonian and Chaldaean, whose diffusion and practices we learn from the writers of that age (e. g. *Tac. Annal.* 2, 82. 12, 59. I add *Journal*, 6, 610. 8, 77). Wieland asks (I. 169), why Lucian should not have freely mentioned Christ or Christian magic, if they were in his mind? But we are not authorized to urge such questions so long as we are unacquainted with the special circumstances or design of the author in composing his work. Perhaps Lucian was conscious in this, as in the *Peregrinus*, of being unable to verify properly his assertions; perhaps for other reasons he spared the Christians who were in his opinion wrongfully persecuted and oppressed. Altogether the name had nothing to do with the thing. Lucian wishes to give in his work a full collection of miraculous cures by magic and to ridicule them; and yet it is clear he speaks of a Palestinian known to all (though not specially named, πάντες ἴσασι). Now the particular traits are so strikingly similar to the miracles of Jesus, that there can be scarcely a doubt respecting the person of the Palestinian. The present ἀποπέμπει is entirely adapted to the form of discourse; we also thus narrate similar past events in animated conversation, and Lucian may also have desired to indicate by this tense the still existing faith of

Christians in these things. That he makes his Syrian ask a great sum in payment is plainly added according to the ordinary custom of such thourgists; this trait is besides of too little consequence to be urged when the principal facts agree. Lucian seems to me in the passage given above to have united several miraculous accounts of the New Testament. The conclusion reminds one of the Gergesenes, where the spirit from the demoniac actually *βαρβαρίζω*, says: *λεγειὸν δοσμά μοι*, Mark 5: 9. The lunatics are called *σαλγιαζόμενοι*, Matt. 4: 24 and 17: 15; the *μετ' ἀφροῦ, ἀφρίζεις*, occurs in Mark 9: 21 and Luke 9: 39. For the *ἀσπείων*, Matt. 17: 18 and Luke 9: 42 have *ἀπειθήματα*. As the discourse goes on in the Philopseudes, mention is made of healing rings, *σιδήρον ἐν ταῖς σταυρῶν πεποιημένον*, and of an *ἐπιθετὴν πολυαίνουμος*. Were these rings of iron taken from crosses, to be referred to Christians, here would be testimony of a very early use of such sacred charms. Nor could it be a matter of surprise, if the cross was thus employed by the lower classes of Christians. The *ἐπιθετὴν πολυαίνουμος* might be some Christian hymn or the Lord's Prayer. This at least is so called in the Philopatria, chap. 27.

Another writing of Lucian's, the *Veras Historias*, offers mere materials for the solution of our question than the Philopseudes. In two books of this work Lucian describes an adventurous journey in the tone of a trustworthy narrator, but in a style unsurpassed for its ease and humor. While the piece is intended to amuse, it is at the same time a parody on the many false descriptions of journeys current in his day, as those of Hegesias, Clitarch, Onesicritus, Megasthenes, Eudoxus, Antonius, Diogenes, and specially of Ctesias and Jambulus, who fabled so many things respecting Ethiopia, Thule, and the great ocean. Lucian states this himself in the introduction to the first book, chapter second, and adds, that he might have adduced the writers who were parodied, but the reader would be able to guess who were meant. He refers also to Homer, the greatest of all liars (fablers). Now a reference to Christians might seem to be excluded by these remarks; but the luxurious and ever active fancy of Lucian certainly did not disdain to include Christian representations in the images of his magic lantern. Let one examine for himself! The travellers come after many wanderings (2, 11) to the island of the blessed, which is ruled by Rhadamanthus of Crete. The capital of the island is described in such a way, that even the old scholiasts saw only mockery at the prophets and Apocalypse in the description. For the city was *πᾶσα χρυσοῦ, τὸ δὲ τεῖχος περικίταται σμαράγδινον· πόλιν δὲ αἰῶν ἐπὶ πᾶσαι μονόφυλοι κ. τ. λ., γαοὶ δὲ*

πάντων θεῶν βηρύλλον ἠχοδομημένοι καὶ βωμοὶ μέγιστοι, μονόλιθοι, ἀμειθύστινοι κ. τ. λ. In Rev. 21: 18, we read of the heavenly Jerusalem, καὶ ἡ πόλις χρυσίον καθαρὸν; and further οἱ θεμελιοὶ τοῦ τείχους παντὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ κεκοσμημένοι, . . . ὁ δὲ τέταρτος σμάραγδος. Instead of Lucian's seven gates from one tree, we find in Rev. 21: 21 twelve gates ἐξ ἑνὸς μαργαρίτου. The beryl and amethyst occur in the Apocalypse as well as in Lucian, namely, in the foundations of the wall ὁ ὄγδοος βήρυλλος, ὁ δωδέκατος ἀμέθυστος; along with many other precious stones, among which, it is true, these two familiar ones could hardly be omitted. The number twelve does not, indeed, appear in Lucian; and while it is said in the Apocalypse ναὸν οὐκ ἔδον ἐν αὐτῇ, Lucian asserts that many temples were met with on his island. Moreover, the four costly materials, gold, smaragdus, beryl and hyacinth, occur also elsewhere in a description of Lucian's (*Adv. Indoctum*, 9). But the similarity in the above description is nevertheless surprising; and there are still other passages where an allusion to the Christian Scriptures seems possible. In chapter 12 we read farther of the island: οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὸξ παρ' αὐτοῖς γίνεται, οὐδ' ἡμέρα πάνυ λαμπρά, but the light of dawn is spread over the land. This addition, it is plain, injures the resemblance to Rev. 21: 23: ἡ πόλις οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει τοῦ ἡλίου, and 22: 8: τὸξ οὐκ ἔστι. Further, as Rev. 22: 1 speaks of a ποταμὸς ὕδατος ζωῆς, so with Lucian a ποταμὸς μύρον τοῦ καλλίστου flows around the city; while his description of the fertility of that land αἱ μὲν ἄμπελοι δωδεκαφῆραι εἰσὶ, καὶ κατὰ μῆνα ἕκαστον καρποφοροῦσι, corresponds verbally in part to the ξύλον ζωῆς ποιοῦν καρπὸς δάδεναι, κατὰ μῆνα ἕκαστον ἀποδιδόν τὸν καρπὸν (Rev. 22: 2). Kühn remarks (p. 14) on this and the foregoing passage: *ex hoc rerum verborumque nonnullorum consensu efflci potuit, Lucianum voluisse exprimere et irridere scriptorem Christianum. For in eadem re describenda duos scriptores eisdem imaginibus et translationibus uti posse, without one's being necessarily dependent on the other. It is very natural to employ gold and precious stones in descriptions of this kind; and the principal characteristics in the Apocalypse — the Lamb, the throne of God, the number twelve, derived from the apostles not from the months — just these are wanting in Lucian. If one would assume a reference by way of parody to earlier descriptions, the Elysium of Homer (*Od.* 4, 568), or the account of the golden age in Hesiod (*Ἔργα*, 67 seq.), and in Pindar (*Olymp.* II. 75—91), may be sufficient. Yet, if we compare these passages, scarcely any resemblance to Lucian will be found. Homer has merely the clear breathing zephyr with Lucian*

(end of chap. 12, εἰς ἄμενος πνεῖ, ὁ ζέφυρος); in like manner Hesiod offers scarcely any points of comparison, and the famous passage of Pindar knows of an ἀδακρος αἰὼν and of the πῆσος μακάρων, of soft rustling wind and of golden blossoms; but neither of the three poets affords so strong points of comparison as the Apocalypse. Yet we accede with pleasure to the correctness of Kühn's remark.

The *Verae Historiae* also reminds one in many other passages of biblical representations. The men upon the island (chap. 12) have garments made of the spider's web, αὐτοὶ δὲ σώματα μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀναφρεῖς καὶ ἄσαρκοί εἰσι — καὶ ἀσώματοι ὄντες ὁμῶς οὐχ ἑστᾶσι καὶ κινεῦνται — — εἰ γοῦν μὴ ἄψαιτό τις, οὐκ ἂν ἐλέγξειε μὴ εἶναι σῶμα τὸ ὁρώμενον. One might be satisfied in this passage with the allusion to Homer's νεκυία. Kühn properly refers to Od. 11, 210—228, where Ulysses in vain attempts to grasp the shade of his mother, but receives an answer from her, though she has neither σάρκας nor ὄστέα. One might also find in it an ironical allusion to the Pythagorean-Platonic doctrine of immortality. But since the Christian doctrine of immortality is treated as so sad an error in the Peregrinus, perhaps the σῶμα πνευματικόν of 1 Cor. 15: 44 was in the writer's mind. The sentence εἰ γοῦν μὴ ἄψαιτο, as commonly translated, "if one should not touch them, he would not believe they possess bodies," might seem to contain a reference to the unbelieving Thomas, Luke 24: 39. John 20: 27. But it is rather to be rendered: "no one would be persuaded that they have not bodies," that is, they merely seem to have bodies, but are in truth incorporeal, and if one tries to lay hold of them, they vanish from his grasp. This passage, therefore, falls away.

In showing the fruitfulness of the island, Lucian employs these representations (2, 13): ἀντὶ δὲ πυροῦ οἱ στάχυες ἄρτους ἐτοιμῶς ἐπ' ἄκρον φύουσι; thus bread ready made grows instead of wheat. Some have sought in this an allusion to Ps. 104: 14, according to the LXX.: ἐξαγαγὼν ἄρτον ἐκ τῆς γῆς; Kühn more properly refers to Od. 9, 107 and Athenaeus 2, 95. On the other hand, the πηγαὶ ὕδατος and ποταμοὶ γάλακτος and πηγαὶ μέλιτος, in the same chapter, remind us of the "land flowing with milk and honey," Ex. 3: 8, ἡ ῥέουσα γάλα καὶ μέλι. Moreover, Lucian has similar representations in the Saturnalia, chap. 7, where he speaks of the golden age: Bread grows instead of corn, the wine flows in streams, and there are πηγαὶ μέλιτος καὶ γάλακτος — ἀγαθοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν καὶ χρυσοὶ ἅπαντες. Citations from the Old Testament have also been found in the same second book of the *Verae Historiae*. While passing over the sea, the wooden

goose attached to the ship suddenly claps its wings and cackles, the mast begins to throw out branches and leaves, and presently in the top of it are seen figs and clusters of grapes (ὁ ἰστός ἐξεβλάστησε καὶ κλάδους ἀνέφυσε καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρῳ ἑκαρποφόρησε). So also was it with Aaron's rod, Num. 17: 8 (ἰδοὺ, ἐβλάστησεν ἡ ράβδος Ἀαρὼν καὶ ἐξήνεγκε βλαστὸν καὶ ἐξήνθησεν ἄνθη). But Kühn has with much greater propriety referred to the Homeric hymn, *ad Dionysium*, v. 37; for there also it is the mast which is covered all over with clusters of grapes. Something similar occurs in Ovid's *Metamor.* 3, 664. 4, 393. A like report concerning the club of Hercules is also familiar. The passage, chap. 43, where a huge gulf suddenly opened on the voyage, the masses of water having separated and formed a chasm (ἐπέστημεν χάσματι μεγάλῳ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος διαστώτος γεγενημένῳ), resembles very slightly the history of the Israelites' passage through the Red Sea, Ex. 14: 21. 15: 8. ἐσχίσθη τὸ ὕδωρ, διέστη τὸ ὕδωρ, ἐπάγη αἰεὶ τείχος τὰ ὕδατα. Here also Kühn better refers to the *Il.* 24, 96, and *Virg. Georg.* 4, 359. Nor is an allusion to the N. T. any more justified in the last passage of this second book, where in chapter fourth the voyagers, on one occasion, meet men who walk on the sea, but whose feet are made of cork (ἐπὶ τοῦ πελάγους διαθείοντας, οὐ βαπτίζομένους, ἀλλ' ὑπερέχοντας τῶν κυμάτων καὶ ἀδευῆς ὁδοιποροῦντας). Krebs supposes the *maledicentissimus scurra* has here ridiculed the walking of Peter and Jesus on the sea, *Matt.* 14: 25 (περιπατεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν); but the cork feet mar the allusion. But quite as far-fetched is the reference, proposed by Fritzsche, to the water-walking horses of Erichthonius, *Il.* 20, 226. Augusti (*Denkwürd.* IV. 40) supposes, indeed, that Lucian perhaps wished to explain the walking of Jesus in a rationalistic way by means of the cork feet and at the same time by this means to make it ridiculous.

The first book of the *Veras Historiae* has single passages, into which some have introduced more than they contain. A conflict between Endymion and Phaethon is very fully described in chapters 12—21. Though all special analogy is wanting, yet Krebs, and after him Eichstädt, found here a reference to the conflict of Michael with the Dragon, *Rev.* 12: 7. ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. With penetration somewhat too subtle, Burmeister saw in it an invention *ad irridendam varias philosophorum de natura solis et lunae opiniones*. So also, according to Krebs, Eichstädt and Lehmann, were the cloud-centaurs, chap. 18 (θαύμα παραδοξότατον, ἐξ ἰππων πτερωτῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων ξυγκείμενοι) an ironical allusion to the form of the cheru-

bim in Ezek. 1: 10. 10: 8 and Rev. 4: 6. But these latter have always πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου καὶ πτέρυγας. Had Lucian known of these, he would have imitated them more closely. He thought rather of the centaurs only. With more reason have some insisted upon the narrative in chap. 30. The voyagers suddenly meet a great multitude of whales. One of the largest comes upon them with open jaws and swallows the whole ship. Within his belly are entire cities, forests, etc., and the voyagers remain there more than two years, 2, 4 (τὸ μέγιστον τῶν κητῶν ἐπήνυ κεχηγὸς ἀναβροφῆσαν ἡμᾶς αὐτῇ πρὶ κατέπιεν). Krebs recognizes in this the whale of Jonah (Jon. 1: 17): προσέειπε κύριος κῆτει μεγάλην καταπιῶν τὸν Ἰωνᾶν. And as the voyagers in this case also came forth uninjured from the monster, Lucian's reference to the O. T. account cannot be so easily rejected. Kühn directs attention to the later embellishments of the story of Hercules. According to Lycophron and Hellanicus, this hero delivered Hesione from the jaws of a whale and himself remained three days in his throat. Lucian has everywhere sneered at the lying stories of voyagers, which were current at his time, and which fabled so much respecting monsters in the ocean.

Manifold allusions to the Holy Scriptures have been found in the other writings of Lucian. In the *Peragrinus*, Theagenes, chap. 6, says respecting the fire-death of his friend: ἀλλὰ σὺν ἕξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαλμα τοῦτο οἰχθήσεται, ὀχοῦμετον ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ὄρφανούς ἡμᾶς καταλαπῶν. One might discover in this an allusion to the fiery chariot of Elijah, to the ascension of Jesus, and to the passage John 14: 18: οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὄρφανούς. But Lucian never speaks of a fiery chariot, always of a death by fire. Kühn remarks on the word ὄρφανός, that philosophers are frequently called fathers, and their pupils υἱοί; he may have simply referred to Plato's *Phaedo*, 116. A. chap. 65, where the friends of Socrates say: ἀτεχνῶς ἡγοῦμενοι, ὡς περ πατρὸς σεσηθέντες, διάξεν ὄρφανοὶ τὸν ἔπιτα βίον. The remaining passages are entirely doubtful. It was ridiculous to see an allusion to the history of Joseph in the passage, *Calumniatori non temere credendum*, 24, where one is spoken of who seeks to transfer his guilt to another. Yet the *Phaedra* of Euripides and the *Bellerophon* in the *Il.* 6. 164, offered examples, if such must be sought. The views of the philosophers are represented in the *Icono-Menippus*, and it is there said: "others again banish all other gods from the world in order to give the authority to one" (ἐνὶ μόνῳ τῆν τῶν ὄλων ἀρχὴν ἀπένεμον). But while the discourse is merely of philosophers, we must not think of the Jewish or Christian mono-

theism. It would be more correct to think of Pythagoras, Plato, and especially Orpheus, whose verses, probably forged, Justin and the other apologists so often quote: εἰς Θεὸς κ. τ. λ. In the Cataplus 10, Megapenthes wishes to leave the lower world and to give his loved friend as a pledge for his return. Lehmann found echoes of the N. T. in the words ἀνταδρον ὑμῖν ἀντ' ἑμαντοῦ παραδώσω τὸν ἀγαπητόν. Yet these words are of no importance. Telemachus, Od. 2. 365, is ἀγαπητός, and so also Astyanax, Il. 6. 401; ἀνταδρος may bring to mind Admetus, for whom Alceste died (*Apollod.* I. 9, 15). In the *Dial. Mort.* 8. 2, the ἥρωες is defined as ἐξ ἀνθρώπου καὶ θεοῦ σύνθετος; and in 16. 1, Lucian affirms derisively that Hercules, though son of a god, must die; τέθνηκε Λιδὸς υἱός; in this there lies, it has been thought, a reference to the two natures of Christ and to his death! But the passage is fully and only explained by the belief in heroes. The expressions ἐξυρημένοι τῆν καραλίην and τὰς καρδίας προσεξηρημένοι occur in the *Conviv.* 18 and *Alex.* 15. By wresting these words they have been made an imitation of Stephen's language, Acts 7: 51, ἀπειρίμητοι τῇ καρδίᾳ! It is said in the *Fugitivi* 17, of the philosophers who became so quickly famous, that this seemed to them like the golden age (ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος καὶ ἀτεχνοῦς τὸ μέλι αὐτὸ ἐς τὰ στόματα ἰσχυρῶν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). Hence Wieland (8, 129) found here an allusion to the manna. But the addition ἐπὶ Κρόνου requires us to think only of heathen descriptions of the golden age, in which honey never fails (*Virg. Eol.* 4, 80. *Tibull.* I. 8, 45. *Ovid. Metam.* I. 112). The passage also of the *Dea Syria* 12, where occur Deucalion's flood and chest (λάραξ) and the animals assembled by pairs (πάντα ἐς ζεύγασα) in the ark, need not be referred to Gen. 7: 9 (δύο, δύο). For the story of the deluge was very widespread (comp. *Tuch* on Gen.), and Lucian may perhaps have been acquainted with Berosus, who speaks of Noah's dove.

Besides the passages now adduced, still others may perhaps be found in Lucian. Kühn says that Burmeister has collected some which had been previously overlooked. But as I could not obtain his work, I will add a few which have met my notice. In the *Veræ Historias*, the voyagers see five islands of the godless (ἤησοι τῶν ἀσεβῶν, ἀφ' αἷν δὴ ὄραῖς τὸ πολὺν πῦρ καιόμενον), and from the place of torment (says Lucian, chap. 29), ὁδμὴ δεινὴ ἡμᾶς διεδέχτετο, οἷον ἀσφάλτου καὶ θείου καὶ πίστεως ἅμα καιομένων. This reminds one of the expression in Rev. 21: 8, λίμνη καιομένη πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ. Yet I am not acquainted with the particular views of the heathen respecting the fire in Hades. The water changed to blood by the stroke of a

sword, according to the 46th chapter of the same book, might be compared with the plague of Moses, Ex. 7: 17 seq. Yet the blood in Lucian could be explained from this, that he had before let a woman be changed into water. The description of the *Demonax* as an *ἀόργητος*, *ὀλίγα μὲν λαλῶν, πολλὰ δ' ἀκούων*, reminds us of the admonition of James, 1: 19, *ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκούσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν*. Moreover, the oft-discussed passage (*Pro Imagin.* 28) is probably to be traced back to a Biblical source. Lucian had ascribed to a female friend of the emperor, the beauty of all the goddesses. This was too much; and she found therein partly unmerited praise and partly neglect of the reverence due to the goddesses. Lucian, therefore, justifies his encomium, and first calls attention to Homer, who has transferred divine predicates to men, and then proceeds: *οἱ θεοὶ οὐδὲ τὸν ἀριστὸν τῶν φιλοσόφων ἠμύνατε, εἰκόνα θεοῦ τὸν ἀνθρώπον εἰκόνα εἶναι*. Wieland (3, 889) shows, in detail, that Epicurus—in Lucian's opinion the best of philosophers—has no such thought, and moreover, that Plato, in the *Timæus* (92), names the world only, and not man, *εἰκὼν θεοῦ*. Diogenes, the cynic, says, to be sure, that good men are the images of the Divinity. But the word of Lucian obviously looks like a quotation, and we must, therefore, think of Gen. 1: 27, unless we are willing to assume that the thoughts or writings of the Christian apologists were known to him. See Tatian, *Adv. Græcos.* 7: *ὁ λόγος εἰκόνα τῆς ἀθανασίας τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐποίησα*, or chap. 15: *μόνος ἀνθρώπος εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις θεοῦ*. In like manner Theophilus says (*Ad Autol.* 1, 14): *ἀνθρώπος πλάσμα καὶ εἰκὼν θεοῦ*. The passage in *Jupiter Trag.* 82, where Hercules wishes to shake the pillars of the hall in order to cast all the plunder on the head of Damis, the atheist (*τῆν στοὰν διασεισας ἐμβαλῶ τῷ Δάμυδι*), brings to mind the vengeance of Samson, Judges 16: 26 seq. A striking similarity of expression occurs in the *Fugit.* 5, where Zeus pities the human race sinking ever deeper in error, and sends to them philosophy, which alone can furnish aid (*μόνη ἰάσασθαι δύναται*). Finally, one is reminded of Christian doctrines in regard to the creation, and especially of *Lactant. instit. divin.* 7. 5, by a passage in the Prometheus (15), where it is given as the end of man's creation, that the beauty and glory of the universe might not be without a witness (*μη γιγνομέγον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀμάρτυρον συνέβαινε τὸ κάλλος εἶναι τῶν ὄλων*). The *Hermotimus* (24) speaks of a *πολις πανευδαίμων*, in which poor and rich, alien and native, small and great, have equal part; estimation depending not on property or external things, but wholly and

alone in judgment and striving after goodness. Lucian says, that an old man gave him, fifteen years before, an account of this city, but from the youthfulness of his understanding he was unable to follow him. Roth (im Schönthaler Program. 1844, *de satirae Romanae indole*, p. 14) believes this passage must refer to Christianity. But the whole connection points clearly to the philosophical schools; Lucian says, chap. 22: *ἔστω ἡ ἀρετὴ οἷον πόλις*; and in chap. 25 *Hermotimus* will seek such a city among his stoics. Wetzlar (*de vita, aetate et scriptis Luciani*, p. 36) rightly conjectures that the old man who spoke of this city was the Platonist Nigrinus. At least, *Nigrinus*, chap. 4, answers fully to the description in the *Hermotimus*, and the city as an emblem of organized moral life reminds one of Plato's Republic.

Finally, we remark, that Lucian, in his two principal writings against the superstition and fanatical credulity of his time, the *Alexander* and *Nigrinus*, quotes also the Sibylline oracles. While it is known, that these were composed in part by Christians, and were employed by their apologists in argument (comp. *Just. col. ad Græcos*, 16. 37. 38. *Apol.* 1, 20. 40. *Theoph. ad Autol.* 2, 3, 9. 36, and *Orig. contra Cels.* 7, 53), and while the composition of many Sibylline oracles, according to Thorlacius and Bleek, belongs to the period 100—170, it would not have been impossible for Lucian to make mention of them as a phenomenon of the time known to himself. He says, *Alex.* 11: *εὐρηγο χρησμὸς ὡς Σιβύλλης προμαντευσαμένης*, and *Peregr.* 29: *Σίβυλλαν ἔφη προειρηγέται*, and both times he proceeds to make the verses himself. He does not, indeed, think of any use of such Sibylline words by Christians; but they should not fail in his satirical picture of the times, which everywhere relates to superstition.