

The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1914

NOTES AND STUDIES

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

II

IN my previous article I discussed at some length the relation between the lost treatise of Porphyry *Katà Χριστιανῶν* and the attacks of a Neoplatonist philosopher preserved in the apology of Macarius Magnes. Dr Harnack was led to the conclusion that these attacks were the *ipsissima verba* of Porphyry, though he is compelled to suppose that Macarius only had them in the form of anonymous excerpts, of which he did not know the real author. If this be true, we have recovered enough of the treatise to form the basis of an edition. But my own investigation, the results of which I have already stated, has convinced me that these attacks are with much greater probability to be ascribed to Hierocles. The arguments, however, are borrowed so largely from Porphyry, that although we cannot claim to have recovered his actual words, we may be sure that we possess the substance of many of his attacks. This is in itself a valuable result, and though it is useless for the purposes of an edition, it forms a new and valuable aid towards a conjectural reconstruction of the lost work. Such a reconstruction of the argument is the object of the present article.

But before we proceed to try to fit in the *data* thus obtained, a collection must be made of the quotations from Porphyry's work and references to it which may be found in other writers. I have made a fresh investigation on my own account, although most of the references had already been brought together by others. I have then carefully compared their conclusions with my own, with the result that as many as forty-six fragments and references may be cited. I propose to give these *in extenso* as a further basis of the subsequent attempt to reconstruct the contents of the treatise. It is true that something of the kind has already been given by others, but it is nearly two centuries since it was done by Lardner in English, and the recent work of

Wagenmann, Kleffner, and Georgiades (who writes in Greek) is considerably less than my own. A word about each of them had best be inserted here, and reference to some of the suggestions they offered will be made in the course of my reconstruction.

Lardner, in *The Credibility of the Gospel Narrative* among his *Testimonies of Ancient Heathens*,¹ devoted much space to the consideration of Porphyry. He is the only author I have been able to find who has made an actual collection of the fragments of the *Katὰ Χριστιανῶν* and references to its contents. But there are several limitations to his work. The original citations are only given in foot-notes. Again, he has not placed the references either in the order they seem to have had in Porphyry or according to the authors from whom they are cited, but his list is founded on their Biblical sequence. This is natural in one whose object was evidential, but the interpolation of apologetics somewhat obscures the list. For instance, he devotes nearly a third of the whole to the consideration of the passages in Daniel which Porphyry had interpreted in his twelfth book. There are some references in his list where the name of Porphyry is not mentioned, and Lardner can only say that it is 'not unlikely' that Jerome meant Porphyry and Julian when he referred to *Gentiles canes* and *qui scripserunt contra Evangelia*.²

Of course he makes no reference to the fragments contained in Macarius, as he wrote long before the Athens MS was discovered.

Wagenmann, writing in 1878, in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*,³ comes to the conclusion that Macarius has preserved for us important fragments of Porphyry's book, but suggests that he may have only possessed them in the form of excerpts. He devotes a page or two to the reconstruction of Porphyry's book, and concludes with a translation into German of the words of Macarius's opponent. Dr Harnack praises this translation, although he makes another himself.

A. Georgiades, writing in 1891,⁴ follows the same line of argument, and discusses in fuller detail and with further references (pp. 20-30) the reconstruction of Porphyry's book, but is more brief in his treatment of Macarius.

A. I. Kleffner, writing in 1896, contributes a short essay,⁵ in which he expands and for the most part follows what had been said by Wagenmann. He differs somewhat in his reconstruction of the book, and thinks the references to it found in the *Quaestiones Paganorum* of Augustine belonged to some of the last of the fifteen books.

¹ Ed. Kippis, 1788, vol. viii pp. 176-251.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 209-210 on St Matt. xxi 21 and xxvii 45.

³ Vol. xxiii pp. 269-314 *Porphyrius und die Fragmente eines Ungenannten bei Makarius*.

⁴ περὶ τῶν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν Ἀποσπασμάτων τοῦ Πορφυρίου. Leipzig, Bär u. Hermann, 1891.

⁵ *Porphyrius der Neuplatoniker und Christenfeind*. Paderborn 1896.

I now proceed to give a collection of the quotations from Porphyry's book and references to it. The result of bringing together all such evidence as I can find is as follows:—

1. In his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, Jerome deals at length with the apparent discord of the Apostles in chapter ii, and refutes the theory that the Cephas there mentioned was not the same as the Apostle Peter. This theory seems to have been advanced in order to repel an attack by Porphyry, for he adds: 'Maxime cum Lucas scriptor historiae, nullam huius dissensionis faciat mentionem; nec dicat unquam Petrum Antiochiae fuisse cum Paulo et *locum dari Porphyrio blasphemanti*; si autem Petrus errasse, aut Paulus procaciter apostolorum principem confutasse creditur. Quibus primum respondendum, alterius nescio cuius Cephae nescire nos nomen etc. Ad extremum si propter Porphyrii blasphemiam, alius nobis fingendus est Cephas, ne Petrus putetur errasse, infinita de Scripturis eradenda divinis . . . Sed et adversum Porphyrium, in alio, si Christus iusserit, opere pugnabimus.'¹

2. The above reference is from the text of his commentary, but he considers the attack of Porphyry of sufficient importance to require separate treatment in the Preface to his book.² Here he adds three further details, namely that the passage was from Porphyry's first book, that he had accused St Paul of impudence, as well as St Peter of error; and he also gives to Porphyry the disputed epithet *Bataneotes*. 'Quod nequaquam intelligens *Bataneotes* et sceleratus ille Porphyrius, in primo operis sui adversum nos libro, Petrum a Paulo obiecit esse reprehensum, quod non recto pede incederet ad evangelizandum: volens et *illi maculum erroris inurere, et huic procacitatis* et in commune *ficti dogmatis accusare mendacium*, dum inter se Ecclesiarum principes discrepent.'

3. In his Commentary on Isaiah liii 12, Jerome suggests³ that Christ divided the spoil of the strong, when the Apostles of the circumcision and of the uncircumcision 'Sub uno Domino in diversa starent acie', and he goes on to speak of those 'qui dispensatorium *inter Petrum et Paulum contentionem vere dicunt iurgium fuisse atque certamen*, ut blasphemanti Porphyrio satisfaciant et veteris caeremonias in ecclesia Christi a stirpe credentis Israel esse credendas'.

4. Again, in his Epistles, in commenting on the fact that St Paul behaved as a Jew, and thus did himself that which he had reproved Peter for doing, he says that others have written to defend the Apostles, and 'blasphemantis Porphyrii impudentiam coercerent, qui Paulum et Petrum puerili dicit inter se pugnasse certamine: immo *exarsisse Paulum in invidiam virtutum Petri*, et ea scripsisse iactanter, quae vel

¹ Hier. *Comm. in Ep. ad Galat.* Migne t. xxvi p. 341.

² Ed. Migne vol. vii p. 310.

³ Jer. *Comm. in Isaiah liii 12.* Migne P. L. t. xxiv p. 513.

non fecerit, vel si fecerit procaciter fecerit *id in alio reprehendens quod ipse commiserit*'.¹

In the same Epistle he speaks of answering Porphyry 'qui Pauli arguit procacitatem, quod principem Apostolorum Petrum ausus est reprehendere, et arguere in faciem, ac ratione constringere, quod male fecit, id est, in errore fuerit: in quo fuit ipse, qui alium arguit delinquentem'. The reference is plainly to the incident at Antioch recorded in Gal. ii 11, and the allusions to what St Paul did himself suggest his own statement in 1 Cor. ix 20 'Unto the Jews I became as a Jew', and also such actions on his part as the circumcising of Timothy, the vow at Cenchreae, and his following of the advice of St James at Jerusalem.

5. A further reference to St Paul's treatment of St Peter is found in Jerome's words on Gal. i 16 ('I conferred not with flesh and blood'), 'Nam et Porphyrius obiicit, quod post revelationem Christi non fuerit dignatus ire ad homines et cum iis conferre sermonem: ne post doctrinam videlicet Dei a carne et sanguine instrueretur. Sed absit ut ego Petrum et Iacobum et Iohannem carnem et sanguinem putem.'²

Possibly this part of Galatians was commented on in detail by Porphyry, but the intention seems always the same, and it is to be noted that in the above fragment St John is introduced as well as St Peter as spoken of slightly by St Paul.

6. Jerome also refers to Porphyry's attacks on St Peter, whom he accused of bringing about the death of Ananias and Sapphira by his imprecation. His words, contained in the Epistle to Demetriades,³ are as follows:—

'Denique et Apostolus Petrus nequaquam imprecatur eis mortem, ut stultus Porphyrius calumniatur; sed Dei iudicium prophético spiritu annunciat, ut poena duorum hominum sit doctrina multorum.'

Concerning the above six references which we owe to Jerome, one or two points suggest themselves for comment. As they are all concerned with an attack on St Peter, and one of them is explicitly stated to come from Porphyry's first book, it is natural to conclude that all of them come from the beginning of his work. He seems therefore to have begun (unlike the philosopher of the *Apocriticus*)⁴ with an attack, not on Christ, but on His first followers, as being quite unworthy of credence.

And in the question of the relations of St Peter and St Paul at Antioch, it is not only the inconsistency of the former that is blamed (as in the *Apocriticus*), for St Paul receives an equal share of blame.

7. The largest and most important fragment is preserved in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius.⁵ The author is speaking of Origen,

¹ Jer. *Ep.* 112. 11. Migne *P. L.* t. xxii p. 923.

² Jer. *Comm. in Gal.* Migne t. xxvi p. 326.

³ P. 156 of Semler's edition of *Ep. Pelag. ad Demetr.*

⁴ See frag. of ch. vi bk. 1.

⁵ Euseb. *H. E.* vi 19.

and mentions the unconscious compliment paid to him by Porphyry, who, when unable to attack the doctrines, reviled and calumniated their interpreters, especially Origen, finding fault with his allegorical method of interpreting the Old Testament.

He then makes two quotations from Porphyry, stating afterwards that they occur in the third book of his work against the Christians. The words are as follows:—

Τῆς δὴ μοχθηρίας τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν Γραφῶν οὐκ ἀπόστασιν, λύσιν δέ τινες εὐρεῖν προθυμηθέντες, ἐπ' ἐξηγήσεις ἐτράποντο ἀσυγκλώστους καὶ ἀναρμόστους τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, οὐκ ἀπολογίαν μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῶν θθνείων, παραδοχὴν δὲ καὶ ἔπαινον τοῖς οικείοις φερούσας. Αἰνίγματα γὰρ τὰ φανερώς παρὰ Μωϋσεὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι κομπάσαντες, καὶ ἐπιθειάσαντες ὡς θεοπείσματα πλήρη κρυφίων μυστηρίων, διὰ τε τοῦ τύφου τὸ κριτικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς καταγοητεύσαντες, ἐπάγουσιν ἐξηγήσεις.

He further quotes him as saying—

Ὁ δὲ τρόπος τῆς ἀτοπίας, ἐξ ἀνδρὸς ᾧ κἀγὼ κομιδῆ νέος ὢν ἔτι ἐντετύχηκα, σφόδρα εὐδοκίμησαντος, καὶ ἔτι δι' ὧν καταλέλοιπεν συγγραμμάτων εὐδοκίμουτος παρελήφθω, Ὁριγένους, οὐ κλέος παρὰ τοῖς διδασκάλοις τούτων τῶν λόγων μέγα διαδέδοται. Ἀκροατῆς γὰρ οὗτος Ἀμμωνίου τοῦ πλείστην ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις ἐπίδοσιν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐσχηκότος γεγονώς, εἰς μὲν τὴν τῶν λόγων ἐμπειρίαν, πολλὴν παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἐκτήσατο, εἰς δὲ τὴν ὀρθὴν τοῦ βίου προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐκείνῳ τοῦ βίου πορείαν ἐποίησατο. Ἀμμωνίος μὲν γὰρ Χριστιανὸς ἐν Χριστιανοῖς ἀνατραφεὶς τοῖς γονεῦσιν, ὅτε τοῦ φρονεῖν καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἤψατο, εὐθὺς πρὸς τὴν κατὰ νόμους πολιτείαν μετεβάλετο, Ὁριγένης δὲ Ἕλλησιν ἐν Ἕλλησι παιδευθεὶς λόγοις, πρὸς τὸ βάρβαρον ἐξώκειλε τόλμημα· ᾧ δὴ φέρων αὐτόν τε καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ἕξιν ἐκαπήλευσεν, κατὰ μὲν τὸν βίον, Χριστιανῶς ζῶν καὶ παρανόμως, κατὰ δὲ τὰς περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τοῦ θείου δόξας ἐλληγίζων τε καὶ τὰ Ἑλλήνων τοῖς θθνείοις ὑποβαλλόμενος μύθοις. συνῆν τε γὰρ αἰεὶ τῷ Πλάτῳ, τοῖς τε Νουμηνίου καὶ Κρονίου, Ἀπολλοφάνους τε καὶ Λογγίνου καὶ Μοδεράτου Νικομάχου τε καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς Πυθαγορείοις ἐλλογιμῶν ἀνδρῶν ὁμίλει συγγράμμασιν, ἐχρήτο δὲ καὶ Χαϊρήμονος τοῦ Στωϊκοῦ, Κουρνούτου τε ταῖς βίβλοις. παρ' ὧν τὸν μεταληπτικὸν τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησιν μυστηρίων γνῶνός τινος, ταῖς Ἰουδαϊκαῖς προσῆψε γραφαῖς.

Concerning this fragment it is to be noted that the condemnation of the allegorical method of Old Testament interpretation by Porphyry plainly shews that he was himself dealing in his third book with the contradictions and discrepancies of the Pentateuch. For he would naturally condemn a method of interpretation which took all the force out of his criticisms of the literal meaning, by contenting itself with allegorical explanations of difficult passages. His reference to Origen

is of considerable interest, but he is plainly mistaken in saying he was a convert from heathenism.

8. That Porphyry dealt thus with the Pentateuch is shewn by a reference contained in a homily of Severian of Gabala on the creation of the world, where the question is raised (suggested by Gen. iii 5) why God forbade the knowledge of good as well as evil.¹

Λέγουσι πολλοί, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ τῷ θεοστυγεῖ Πορφυρίῳ ἀκολουθήσαντες, τῷ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν συγγράψαντι, καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ δόγματος πολλοὺς ἀποστήσαντι· λέγουσι τοίνυν· Διὰ τί ὁ θεὸς ἀπηγόρευσε τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ; Ἔστω, τὸ πονηρὸν ἀπηγόρευσε· διὰ τί καὶ τὸ καλόν; εἰπὼν γάρ, Ἄπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ εἶδέναι καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν μὴ φάγητε, κωλύει, φησί, αὐτὸν τοῦ εἶδέναι τὸ κακόν· διὰ τί καὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν;

9. Of the fourth book a fragment is preserved to us by Eusebius, most of it being also quoted by Theodoret.

In the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, in order to maintain the antiquity of Moses, Eusebius twice refers to the words of Porphyry that the truest historian of the Jews was Sanchuniathon.

The words of Porphyry are as follows, quoted as ἐν τετάρτῳ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὑποθέσεως.

Ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀληθέστατα, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς τόποις καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν αὐτῶν τὰ συμφωνότατα, Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρυτίος, εἰληφὼς τὰ ὑπομνήματα παρὰ Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰενώ· ὃς Ἀβιβάλῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ Βηρυτίων τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀναθεῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἐξεταστῶν τῆς ἀληθείας παρεδέχθη. Οἱ δὲ τούτων χρόνοι καὶ πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν πίπτουσι χρόνων, καὶ σχεδὸν τοῖς Μωσέως πλησιάζουσιν, ὡς αἱ τῶν Φοινίκης βασιλέων μηνύουσι διαδοχαί. Σαγχουνιάθων δὲ ὁ κατὰ τὴν Φοινικὴν διάλεκτον φιλαλήθως πᾶσαν τὴν παλαιὰν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγραφῶν συναγαγὼν δὴ καὶ συγγράψας ἐπὶ Σεμιράμειος γέγονε τῶν Ἀσσυρίων βασιλίδος, ἣ πρὸ τῶν Ἰλιακῶν, ἣ κατ' αὐτοὺς γε τοὺς χρόνους γενέσθαι ἀναγράφεται. τὰ δὲ τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος εἰς Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἠρμήνευσε Φίλων ὁ Βύβλιος.²

The same quotation is made by Theodoret, as far as the reference to Semiramis, with only one or two verbal differences,³ while Eusebius himself, later in the same work, when dealing again with the antiquity of Moses, introduces these words of Porphyry a second time.⁴

This fragment is enough to prove that, if Porphyry dealt with detailed criticisms of the language of the Old Testament in Book III, he probably proceeded in Book IV to consider the history of the Jews as a whole.

¹ Sever. *De Mundi Cr. Hom.* 6 *ap Chrys.* Migne P. G. t. lvi p. 488.

² Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* p. 31 a and b.

³ Theod. *Graec. Affect. Curatio* p. 28, l. 10.

⁴ Euseb. *l. c.* p. 485 b.

In setting up Sanchuniathon as their true historian, he is probably denying the truth of their history as recorded in their own scriptures. Eusebius introduces the quotation with the remark that he reviled not only the Christians but also the Jews, and Moses, and the prophets after him, and all by the same kind of blasphemies.

10. A very similar reference is contained in the Chronicle of Eusebius (preserved in the Latin translation of Jerome), which deals with the date of Moses.

‘Ex ethnicis vere impius ille Porphyrius, in quarto operis sui libro, quod adversum nos casso labore contexit, post Moysem Semiramim fuisse affirmat.’¹

Evidently Porphyry had made an elaborate computation and comparison of dates, and had drawn conclusions with regard to the place of the Jews in the world’s history which had to be seriously considered. For this false version is given as the reason for setting forth the true in the sentences which follow. ‘Cum haec ita se habeant, necessarium duxi veritatem diligentius persequi. Et ob id in priore libro quasi quandam materiam futuro operi omnium mihi regum tempora praenotavi.’

Two more references are preserved in the same work of Theodoret, which may well have also come from Porphyry’s fourth book, as they evidently form part of an argument about the Hebrews and their scriptures.

11. In speaking of the great Greek philosophers, he says: *φασὶ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ οὐ μόνον παρ’ Αἰγυπτίων ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ’ Ἑβραίων τὰ περὶ τοῦ ὄντος διδαχθῆναι θεοῦ. Καὶ ταῦτα διδάσκει . . . Πορφύριος ὁ κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας λυττήσας.*²

12. Elsewhere, when speaking of the sacrifices enjoined in the Old Testament, he declares that Porphyry failed to grasp the real meaning of the Scriptures, but like an ape was only able to imitate up to a certain point. He introduces this statement by saying: *Τούτοις ἀκριβῶς ἐντυχῶν ὁ Πορφύριος (μᾶλα γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐνδιέτριψε, τὴν καθ’ ἡμῶν τυρεῶν γραφήν), καὶ ἀλλότριον εἰσεβείας καὶ αὐτὸς ἀποφαίνει τὸ θύειν, παραπλήσιόν τε τοῖς πιθήκοις καὶ δρῶν καὶ πάσχων.* He further describes him as *τὰ θεῖα λόγια κεκλοφῶς, καὶ ἐνίων τὴν διάνοιαν τοῖς ξυγγράμμασιν ἐνθετικῶς τοῖς οἰκειοῖς.*³

13. One more quotation is found in both Eusebius⁴ and Theodoret,⁵

¹ Euseb. in Lib. ii. *Chronicorum Prooemium. Hier. Interprete. Migne P. G. t. xix p. 317.*

² Theod. *op. cit.* p. 6. 7.

³ Theod. *op. cit.* p. 108. 9.

⁴ Euseb. *op. cit.* p. 179 *d.*

⁵ Theod. *op. cit.* p. 179. 41. He adds that this *ἠμολόγησεν ὡς πιστευόμενος Ἰησοῦ φροῦδους ἀπέφηνε τοὺς θεοὺς.*

evidently drawn from quite a different part of Porphyry's book, for it is a statement that the gods have given up helping men since the honouring of Jesus began. His actual words are given thus: *Νυνὶ δὲ θανμάζουσι, εἰ τοσοῦτων ἐτῶν κατέλιψεν ἡ νόσος τὴν πόλιν, Ἀσκληπίου μὲν ἐπιδημίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν μηκέτι οὔσης. Ἰησοῦ γὰρ τιμωμένου, οὐδεμιᾶς τις τῶν θεῶν δημοσίας ὠφελείας ἤσθετο.*

We know nothing that remains of Books V to XI, but they must have contained criticism of the New Testament. We may therefore place here the reference to this subject by Jerome.

14. In his *Dialogus Adv. Pelagianos*, bk. ii p. 761,¹ he speaks of the apparent contradiction involved in St John vii 8 and 10 with regard to the visit of our Lord to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles. 'Iturum se negavit, et fecit quod prius negaverat. Latrat *Porphyrius, inconstantiae ac mutationis accusat*, nesciens omnia scandala ad carnem esse referenda.'

15. The accusation that the Evangelists had falsified their records is referred to in *Epist. 57 ad Pammach.* c. 9.² 'Haec replico non ut *Evangelistas arguam falsitatis* (hoc quippe impiorum est, Celsi, Porphyrii, Iuliani) sed ut reprehensores meos arguam imperitiae.'

16. At the beginning of his commentary on Daniel, Jerome is speaking of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin, and says that in the genealogy given by St Matthew one generation seems to have been missed out where these names occur 'quia secunda *τεσσαρακαίδεκάς* in Ioacim desinit filio Iosiae, et tertia incipit a Ioachin filio Ioacim'. He goes on to say that Porphyry misunderstood the facts when he charged St Matthew with error. 'Quod ignorans Porphyrius, calumniam struit Ecclesiae, suam ostendens imperitiam, dum evangelistae Matthaei arguere nititur falsitatem.'³

Porphyry evidently attacked *seriatim* the difficulties to be found in the first Evangelist, and his criticisms were so well known as to be remembered by one who was engaged on Old Testament work, and was dealing with the two kings about whom the difficulty in the genealogy was raised.

17. Again Jerome, in commenting on Genesis i 10, refers to Porphyry's accusation against the Evangelists, that in order to manufacture a miracle on the lake of Gennesaret, they called it a 'sea'.

'Frustra igitur Porphyrius, *Evangelistas* ad faciendum ignorantibus miraculum, eo quod Dominus super mare ambulaverit, *pro lacu Genezareth, mare appellasse calumniatur*, cum omnis lacus et aquarum congregatio maria nuncupentur.'⁴

¹ Migne vol. ii p. 553.

² Migne vol. i p. 575.

³ Jer. *Comm. in Daniel* i 1. Migne t. xxv p. 495.

⁴ Jer. *Quaest. in Genes.* i 10. Migne t. xxiii p. 939.

This is an attack which is made by the opponent of Macarius.¹ The parallel is certainly close, even to the expression ἵν' ἐκ τούτου ὡς μέγα τι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνεργήσαντα σημείον εἰσαγάγη, which corresponds to 'ad faciendum ignorantibus miraculum'. But this is just the kind of attack which would be passed on from one writer to another.

18. In writing against Vigilantius on the credit to be given to miracles, Jerome refers to Porphyry as follows:—

'Nisi forte in morem gentilium, impiorumque Porphyrii et Eumomii, praestigias daemonum esse confingas, et non vere clamare daemones, sed sua simulare tormenta.'²

The reference is probably to the miracle of the demons and the swine, as that is the only place in the Gospels where the word 'torment' is used by the demons. The importance of this passage lies in the fact that, although the opponent of Macarius deals with this miracle at great length, he does not introduce this detail. This I have referred to elsewhere as an indication that he is an abridger of Porphyry and not a copyist.

19. Jerome makes mention of Porphyry's objection to the call and response of Matthew in St Matthew ix 9.³

He says: 'Arguit in hoc loco Porphyrius et Iulianus Augustus, vel imperitiam historici mentientis, vel stultitiam eorum qui statim secuti sint Salvatorem, quasi irrationabiliter quemlibet vocantem hominem sint secuti.'

20. Theophylact in commenting on the first words of St John's Gospel, has not only recorded the fact that that Gospel likewise was the subject of Porphyry's attack, but he has preserved a few of his actual words.

ὥστε διαπέπτωκε τοῦ Ἑλληνος Πορφυρίου τὸ σόφισμα. ἐκείνος γὰρ ἀνατρέπειν πειρώμενος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τοιαύταις ἐχρήτο διαιρέσεσιν. εἰ γὰρ λόγος, φησίν, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἦτοι προφορικός ἐστίν, ἢ ἐνδιάθετος· ἀλλὰ μὴν οὔτε τοῦτο, οὔτε ἐκείνο. οὐκ ἄρα οὐδὲ λόγος ἐστίν.⁴

We know from Jerome that the opening words of St Mark's Gospel were also attacked, but this was in a later part of Porphyry's book, and with a somewhat different purpose (see Fragment 38).

21. We may place here a reference to the way the Apostles tricked their hearers when they argued in favour of the faith.

Jerome is commenting on Joel ii 28-31 (the words quoted by St Peter on the day of Pentecost), and in speaking of the Apostle's way of arguing he says:—

¹ *Apocr.* iii 6.

² *Jer. Contra Vigil.* Migne t. xxiii p. 348.

³ *Jer. Comm. in Evangel. Matth.* Migne t. xxvi p. 56.

⁴ Theophylact *Enarr. in Ev. Joann.* Migne P. G. t. cxxiii p. 1141.

‘Non quod abuterentur audientium simplicitate et imperitia, ut impius calumniatur Porphyrius.’¹

Porphyry's words refer specially to Pentecost. It suggests that his attack on the Gospels was followed by a series of objections to the Acts of the Apostles. But it is to be noted that Jerome makes no reference to St Peter's speech at Pentecost, but completes his sentence with the words ‘sed iuxta apostolum Paulum, praedicarent opportune, importune’. Further, when he shortly does make reference to *Acts*, it is to the passage in Acts xix where the men are perfected who had only received John's baptism.

The references that follow seem also to belong to a part of Porphyry's work earlier than the twelfth book.

22. Jerome, in his Epistle to Ctesiphontes, in refuting Pelagius, refers to the objection of Porphyry to the fact that God allowed the heathen to be without a knowledge of His commands.²

‘Et ad externum (quod solet nobis obiicere contubernalis vester Porphyrius) qua ratione clemens et misericors Deus ab Adam usque ad Moysen, et a Moysen usque ad adventum Christi passus sit universas gentes perire ignorantia legis et mandatorum Dei.’ This objection of Porphyry is also mentioned by Augustine in his Epistle to Deogratias.³ The second of the six questions which he then faces is stated to be as follows:—

‘Si Christus se (inquiunt) salutis viam dicit, gratiam et veritatem, in seque solo ponit animis sibi credentibus reditum (Ioan. xiv 6); quid egerunt tot saeculorum homines ante Christum? Ut dimittam (inquit) tempora ante Latium regnatum, ab ipso Latio quasi principium humani nominis sumamus. In ipso Latio ante Albam dii culti sunt. In Alba aeque religiones ritusque valere templorum. Non paucioribus saeculis ipsa Roma, longo saeculorum tractu sine Christiana lege fuit? Quid (inquit) actum de tam innumeris animis, qui omnino in culpa nulla sunt; siquidem is cui credi posset, nondum adventum suum hominibus commodarat? Orbis quoque cum ipsa Roma in ritibus templorum caluit. Quare, (inquit) Salvator qui dictus est, sese tot saeculis subduxit? Sed ne (inquit) dicant lege Iudaica veteri hominum curatum genus, longo post tempore lex Iudaeorum apparuit ac viguit angusta Syriae regione, postea vero prorepsit etiam in fines Italos; sed post Caesarem Caium, aut certe ipso imperante. Quid igitur actum de Romanis animabus vel Latinis, quae gratia nondum advenientis Christi viduatae sunt, usque in Caesarum tempus?’⁴

¹ Jer. *Comm. in Joel*. Migne t. xxv p. 975.

² Jer. *Epist.* 133. 9. Migne t. xxii p. 1157.

³ Aug. *Ep. ad Deogratias* Ep. 102. Migne t. xxxiii p. 373.

⁴ L. c. *Sex Quaestiones contra Paganos expositae, Liber Unus, seu Epist.* 102.

The first thing to note about the above extract is the diffuseness with which the objection is stated, and the extreme brevity with which it is referred to by Jerome. This indicates that Porphyry filled his fifteen books by elaborating in many words the attacks of which we only know by means of brief references.

The elaborate reference to Rome is quite in accord with the fact that Porphyry had stayed there, and wrote his book in Sicily. But a further study of the Epistle to Deogratias suggests that it is not only the second of the six questions which has been extracted from Porphyry.

The first question is not referred to its author, but the second is introduced by 'Item *alia* proposuerunt, quae dicerent de Porphyrio contra Christianos tanquam validiora decerpta'. Before the fifth question we are told 'Post hanc quaestionem, qui eas ex Porphyrio proposuit, hoc adiunxit'. This suggests that the third and fourth objections are also derived from Porphyry.

Further, the sixth is said to be 'proposita de Iona, nec ipsa quasi ex Porphyrio, sed tanquam ex irrisione Paganorum'. This seems to indicate that the fifth was also derived from Porphyry. If this be the case, we may feel justified in adding at least three more items to our list of Porphyrian remains, as given in the third, fourth, and fifth questions.¹

Whether they are his actual words is uncertain, but their brevity suggests that this was not the case. In this respect they are in strong contrast with the second question, which has just been quoted at length. These further extracts are as follows:—

23. The third question is: 'Accusant (inquit) ritus sacrorum, hostias, thura, et caetera, quae templorum cultus exercuit; cum idem cultus ab ipsis (inquit) vel a Deo quem colunt exorsus est temporibus priscis, cum inducitur Deus primitiis eguisse.' This objection follows so naturally from the previous one that it may well have belonged to the same part of Porphyry's treatise.

24. The fourth question is in regard to the words of Christ in St Matthew vii 2.

'Minatur (inquit) *Christus sibi non credentibus, aeterna supplicia* (Ioan. iii 18); *et alibi ait: In qua mensura mensi fueritis, remetietur vobis.* Satis (inquit) ridicule atque contrarie: nam si ad mensuram redditurus est poenam, et omnis mensura circumscripta est fine temporis, quid sibi volunt minae infiniti supplicii?'

25. The fifth question seems to have little point except as giving

¹ Wagenmann only refers four of the *Quaestiones* to Porphyry, but Kleffner says the second, third, and fourth are certainly his, and perhaps the first and sixth. Georgiades (*op. cit.* 28) only accepts the second, third, and fourth.

Augustine opportunity to explain that Christ is the Wisdom spoken of by Solomon. It is as follows: 'Sane etiam de illo (inquit) me dignaberis instruere, *si vere dixit Salomon, Filium Deus non habet.*'

26. The first question, which is about the difference in the Resurrection of Christ and of Lazarus, may be with slightly less certainty referred to Porphyry.

'Si Christi, inquit, quomodo potest haec convenire resurrectioni natorum ex semine eius qui nulla seminis conditione natus est? Si autem Lazari resurrectio facta sit de corpore nondum tabescente, de eo corpore, quo Lazarus dicebatur; nostra autem multis saeculis post ex confuso eruetur. Deinde si post resurrectionem status beatus futurus est, nulla corporis iniuria, nulla necessitate famis, quid sibi vult cibatum Christum fuisse, et vulnera monstravisse? Sed si propter incredulum fecit, finxit: si autem verum ostendit, ergo in resurrectione accepta futura sunt vulnera.'

27. The sixth question probably comes from the same source, in spite of its being introduced by the statement that it is 'nec ipsa quasi ex Porphyrio, sed tanquam ex irrisione Paganorum'.

He proceeds to give it as follows:—

'Deinde quid sentire, *inquit*, debemus de Iona, qui dicitur in ventre ceti triduo fuisse; quod ἀπιθαρόν est et incredibile, transvoratum cum veste hominem, fuisse in corde piscis. Aut si figura est, hanc dignaberis pandere. Deinde quid sibi etiam illud vult supra evomitum Ionam cucurbitam natam; quid causae fuit ut haec nasceretur?'

The introduction of *inquit*, as before, and the occurrence of *deinde* at the beginning of the quotation, seem to suggest the probability that this question is also derived from Porphyry. Perhaps the statement that it is scarcely his, only means that it is part of the stock in trade of every heathen opponent, for Jerome proceeds to remark, 'Hoc enim genus quaestionis, multo cachinno a Paganis graviter irrisum animadverti', as though to explain what he meant by 'nec ipsa quasi de Porphyrio'.

The above six *Quaestiones Paganorum* cannot be said to form in any way a homogeneous whole. Not only are there varying degrees of certainty with which the various objections may be ascribed to Porphyry, but their subjects are so different that they can scarcely have been taken from the same part of his attack. If some have been culled from one book and some from another, we see exactly the same kind of treatment of his work as I imagine it to have received at the hands of Hierocles. And there may be a parallel in another respect also, if the language has been altered and the argument abbreviated in most cases, while in one of them (the second of the series) it seems likely that there has been little change in the original wording.

We pass on to some certain references to the twelfth book.

28. Jerome in his *Comment. in Daniel. Proph.*¹ begins his preface by facing the statement made by Porphyry in his twelfth book that the book of Daniel is not prophecy but history.

‘Contra prophetam Daniele[m] duodecimum librum scripsit Porphyrius, nolens eum, ab ipso, cuius inscriptus est nomine, esse compositum: *sed a quodam qui temporibus Antiochi qui appellatus est Epiphanes, fuerit in Iudaea, et non tam Daniele[m] ventura dixisse, quam illum narrasse praeterita.* Denique quidquid usque ad Antiochum dixerit, veram historiam continere: si quid autem ultra opinatus sit, quia futura nescierit, esse mentitum.’

He considers it sufficient that others have answered this attack, particularly Eusebius ‘tribus voluminibus, id est octavo decimo et nono decimo, et vicesimo’.

But he adds that Porphyry had brought arguments to prove that the original language of the Book of Daniel was Greek.

‘Sed et hoc nosse debemus inter caetera, Porphyrium de Danielis libro nobis obiicere, idcirco *illum apparere confictum, nec haberi apud Hebraeos, sed Graeci sermonis esse commentum,* quia in Susannae fabula contineatur, dicente Daniele ad presbyteros, ἀπὸ τοῦ σχίνου σχίσαι, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίνου πρίσαι, quam etymologiam magis Graeco sermoni convenire, quam Hebraeo.’²

This etymology dates back to Origen, but it is worth noting that Porphyry is thus shewn to have discussed etymologies in his work against the Christians. In his extant works this was a noteworthy characteristic,³ and thus the lost work is seen to be in line with them. But there is not a word about etymologies in the opponent of Macarius, to whom such points evidently did not appeal.

As Jerome proceeds with his commentary, he frequently mentions Porphyry’s interpretations. The passages are as follows:—

29. In Dan. ii 44, Jerome says of the stone which should break the kingdoms: ‘Quod Iudaei et impius Porphyrius male ad populum referunt Israel, quem in fine saeculorum volunt esse fortissimum, et omnia regna contere[n]s, et regnare in aeternum.’

30. Again on v 46, and the respect paid by Nebuchadnezzar to Daniel, he says: ‘Hunc locum calumniatur Porphyrius, quod nunquam superbissimus rex captivum adoraverit.’⁴

31. In ch. v 10, where the queen enters the banquet hall and praises Daniel, Jerome objects to his opponent’s theory that she was

¹ Migne vol. xxv p. 491.

² *Id.* p. 492.

³ See e.g. *De Antro Nympharum* ch. x ναῖδες, αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ναμάτων οὕτω κέκληνται. Ch. xv δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ τιθαυβόσσειν, τὸ τιθέναί τὴν βόσιν. Ch. xxiii, Januarius as the θυραῖος μὴν, ἰάνονα being equivalent to θύρα.

⁴ *L. c.* p. 504.

Belshazzar's wife, saying: 'Evigilet ergo Porphyrius, qui eam Bathasaris somniatur uxorem, et illudit plus scire quam maritum.'¹ One is reminded of the mockery which Porphyry has elsewhere for the high position of women in the Christian Church.

32. Porphyry seems to have been active in his speculation concerning the kingdoms and the beasts, for concerning Dan. vii 7-14 Jerome says² 'Porphyrius duas posteriores bestias, Macedonum et Romanorum in uno Macedonum regno ponit et dividit: Pardum volens intelligi ipsum Alexandrum: bestiam autem dissimilem caeteris bestiis, quatuor Alexandri successores, et deinde usque ad Antiochum cognomento Epiphanen decem reges enumerat; qui fuerunt saevissimi: ipsosque reges non unius ponit regni, verbi gratia, Macedoniae, Syriae, Asiae et Aegypti, sed de diversis regnis unum efficit regnum ordinem, ut videlicet ea quae scripta sunt: Os loquens ingentia, non de Antichristo, sed de Antiocho dicta credantur'. He adds 'Frustra Porphyrius cornu parvulum, quod post decem cornua ortum est, Epiphanen Antiochen suspicatur, et de decem cornibus tria evulsa cornua, sextum Ptolemaeum cognomento Philometorem septimum Ptolemaeum Evergetem, et Antaxiam regem Armeniae'.

In his comment on v 14 he asked Porphyry, if Antiochus were the small horn, who it was that broke him, and suggests his replying 'Antiochi principes a Iuda Machabaeo fuisse superatos'.³

From these extracts it is quite plain that Porphyry dealt in detail with the words of Daniel, in order that he might shew that they were fulfilled in other ways than by the coming of Christ, and of Anti-Christ. Several more references are contained in the rest of Jerome's commentary.

33. In ch. ix 1 Jerome declares that the Darius mentioned is not 'illum Darium, cuius anno secundo templum aedificatum est (quod Porphyrius suspicatur, ut annos Danielis extendat)'.⁴

Here again Porphyry is charged with bringing down the date of Daniel.

34. Likewise in Dan. xi 20 we are told of the one here referred to 'Porro Porphyrius non vult hunc esse Seleucum sed Ptolemaeum Epiphanen'.⁵ (Cf. also his words on v 36.)

In the verses which follow with regard to Antiochus, Jerome states that there is no contention 'inter Porphyrium et nostros', but he has occasion to answer him again in commenting on v 34, saying that Porphyry thinks the 'parvulum auxilium' to be Mattathias 'de vico Modin'.⁶ The smallness of the help being explained by the fall in battle of Mattathias, and of his son Judas Maccabaeus.

¹ *L. c.* p. 520.

² *L. c.* p. 530.

³ *L. c.* pp. 530 and 533.

⁴ *L. c.* p. 539.

⁵ *L. c.* p. 565.

⁶ *L. c.* p. 569.

A further reference to this expression is found in Jerome. In commenting on the word *fortitude* in Isaiah xxx 3 he discusses the Hebrew word for the 'strength' of Pharaoh. 'Pro fortitudine Pharaonis, quae in hoc loco bis ponitur, in Hebraico scriptum habet *Maoz* (מעוז). Hoc annotavimus, ut quod in Danielis scriptura legimus (Dan. xi) visione Deum *Maozim* (מעוזים) non, ut Porphyrius somniat, Deum *viculi Modim* (al. *Moden*) sed *robustum* Deum et *fortem* intelligamus.'¹

35. There is a special interest in the next two references, for they appear to be an actual citation of the words of Porphyry, who attributes the language of Dan. xi 44, 45 to Antiochus.

'Et in hoc loco Porphyrius tale nescio quid de Antiocho somniat: Pugnans, *inquit*, contra Aegyptios, et Libyas Aethiopasque pertransiens, audiet sibi ab Aquilone et ab Oriente praelia concitari, unde et regrediens capiet Aradios resistentes, et omnem in littore Phoenicis vastabit provinciam. Confestimque perget ad Artaxiam regem Armeniae, qui de Orientis partibus movebitur, et interfectis plurimis de eius exercitu, ponet tabernaculum suum in loco Apedno, qui inter duo latissima situs est flumina, Tigrim, et Euphratem.' Jerome breaks off to express his indignation that 'inter duo maria' in Daniel should be interpreted as 'flumina'.²

36. In Dan. xii 1, Jerome declares that Porphyry passes all bounds by still seeing a reference to Antiochus when Michael the great prince is spoken of.

'Et hoc, *inquit*, de Antiocho scriptum est, qui vadens in Persidem, Lysiae qui Antiochiae, et Phoeniciae praeerat, reliquit exercitum, ut adversus Iudaeos pugnaret urbemque eorum Ierusalem subverteret; quae omnia narrat Iosephus historiae auctor Hebraeae, quod talis fuerit tribulatio, qualis nunquam, et tempus advenerit quale non fuit ex quo gentes esse coeperunt usque ad illum tempus. Reddita autem victoria, et caesis Antiochi ducibus, ipsoque Antiocho in Perside mortuo, salvatus est populus Israel: omnes qui scripti erant in libro Dei, hoc est, qui Legem fortissime defenderunt, et e contrario qui deleti sunt de libro, hoc est, qui praevaricatores exstiterunt Legis, et Antiochi fuerunt partium. Tunc, *ait*, hi qui quasi in terrae pulvere dormiebant, et operiti erant malorum pondere, et quasi in sepulcris miseriarum reconditi, ad insperatam Victoriam de terrae pulvere surrexerunt, et de humo elevaverunt caput, custodes Legis resurgentes in vitam aeternam, et praevaricatores in opprobrium sempiternum. Magistri autem et doctores, qui Legis notitiam habuerunt, fulgebunt quasi coelum, et qui inferiores populos exhortati sunt ad custodiendas caeremonias Dei, ad instar astrorum splendebunt in perpetuas aeternitates.'

Jerome then adds: 'Ponit quoque historiam de Machabaeis, in qua

¹ Jer. *Comm.* in *Isaiah* xxx 3. Migne t. xxiv p. 339.

² Migne t. xxv p. 573.

dicitur multos Iudaeorum sub Mattathia et Iuda Machabaeo ad eremum confugisse, et latuisse in speluncis, et in cavernis petrarum, ac post victoriam processisse (1 Mach. ii). Et haec μεταφορικῶς quasi de resurrectione mortuorum esse praedicta.’¹

The above extract is certainly one of the most interesting which Jerome has preserved, for it reveals the anxiety of a heathen opponent to find another explanation for Old Testament passages which the Christians used as prophecies of the resurrection from the dead.

37. The rest of Dan. xii was likewise interpreted literally by Porphyry. We may collect the references thus. The ‘time, times and half a time’ of v 7 ‘tres et semis annos interpretatur Porphyrius’.² The scattering of the people (in the same verse) refers to the persecution of Antiochus.³ The 1,290 days of v. 11, he says were fulfilled ‘in tempore Antiochi, et in desolatione templi’.⁴ The 1,335 days of v. 12 shews ‘victoriae contra duces Antiochi tempus’ (i. e. in the 45 days by which the earlier number is exceeded) when Judas succeeded in cleansing the temple. Finally v. 13 is again referred to the time of Antiochus.

38. We also find a reference to Porphyry’s next book, for it is stated by Jerome in his commentary on St Matt. xxiv 15 that in his thirteenth book Porphyry dealt fully with ‘the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet’, and that Eusebius answered him more fully still.

‘De hoc loco . . . multa Porphyrius tertio decimo operis sui volumine contra nos blasphemavit, cui Eusebius Caesariensis episcopus tribus respondit voluminibus, decimo octavo, decimo nono et vicesimo. Apollinaris quoque scripsit plenissime: superflueque conatus est uno capitulo velle disserere, de quo tantis versum millibus disputatum est.’⁵

39. In the fourteenth book, Porphyry seems to have seized upon some of the passages where Old Testament prophecy was quoted by the Evangelists, to shew how little they knew about what they were quoting. We may set down the next two references as belonging to this book.

Among the works once regarded as Chrysostom’s are contained fourteen homilies on St Mark’s Gospel. The first of these discusses the difficulty contained in its first verses, where the words of Malachi’s prophecy are ascribed to Isaiah. The author makes the following statement:—

‘Locum istum impius ille Porphyrius in quarto decimo volumine disputat, et dicit; Evangelistae tam imperiti fuerunt homines, non solum in secularibus sed etiam in scripturis divinis, ut testimonium, quod alibi scriptum est, de alio ponerent Propheta.’⁶

¹ L. c. p. 575, 576.

² L. c. p. 577.

³ L. c. p. 578.

⁴ L. c. pp. 579.

⁵ Jer. *Comm. in Matth.* xxiv 15. Migne t. xxvi p. 178.

⁶ Chrys. Paris ed. of 1614, t. ii p. 968.

We have also a plainer allusion to the same passage contained in Jerome, which may reckon as part of the same reference to Porphyry.

The former, in commenting on Matt. iii 3 (the prophecy of Isaiah 'The voice of one crying' &c.), says that Porphyry compared this with the statement in Mark i 2, that the previous words 'Behold, I send my messenger before thy face' were also from Isaiah.

'Porphyrius istum locum Marci Evangelistae principio comparat: in quo scriptum est: sicut scriptum est in Isaia propheta etc. . . . Quum enim testimonium de Malachia Isaiaque contextum sit, quaerit, quomodo velut ab uno Isaia exemplum putemus assumptum. Cui Ecclesiastici viri plenissime responderunt.'¹

This is perhaps the best instance of the care with which Porphyry studied the Gospels in order to find points of attack. He plainly here possessed the older reading. Can this very objection of his have had any influence on the text?

40. In the *Breviarium in Psalmos*, the writer² speaks of Ps. lxxviii 2, which was entitled 'A Psalm of Asaph', being ascribed to Isaiah in Matt. xiii 35 ('that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet [Isaiah] saying, I will open my mouth in parables &c.'). He adds:—

'Hoc Isaias non loquitur, sed Asaph. Denique, et impius Porphyrius proponit adversum nos hoc ipsum et dicit; Evangelista vester Matthaeus tam imperitus fuit, ut diceret, quod scriptum est per Isaiam prophetam.'

The form of the last sentence indicates that the actual words of Porphyry are quoted. This must therefore count as another fragment of his work. And here then is again the same kind of textual interest as in the previous reference. If one of them belonged to the fourteenth book, certainly the other is to be placed with it.

41. There is still one more source from which references may be obtained, for a few pages have been preserved of the lost work of Methodius in answer to Porphyry.³ By means of the references contained therein, and with the aid of the titles prefixed to each of the five fragments in the MSS in which they are found, we are able to add five more to the list of objections brought by him. Whether these titles depend on further information than the actual contents I do not know.

The first fragment is stated to be an answer to the question, τί ὠφέλησεν ἡμᾶς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ σαρκωθεὶς ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος; καὶ διὰ τί τῷ τοῦ σταυροῦ σχήματι ἠνέσχeto παθεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἄλλη τινὶ τιμωρίᾳ; καὶ τί τὸ χρῆσιμον τοῦ σταυροῦ;

The chief interest of the answer is that it deals with Christ's action

¹ Jer. *Comm. in Matth.* Migne t. xxvi p. 29.

² Ap. Jer. *Brev. in Psalt.* Migne t. xxvi pp. 1045-1046.

³ Bonwetsch *Methodius von Olympus* pp. 345-348 'Εκ τῶν κατὰ Πορφυρίου.

specially in relation to the world of demons, thus indicating that this was a point discussed by Porphyry in the *Adv. Christianos* as well as in the *Philosph. ab Orac. Haur.*, and the *Ep. ad Anebo.*

42. The second extract seems to be dealing with the same subject, but the earlier part is lost, and it begins in the middle of a sentence. The inscription of the MS gives the question as Πῶς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν βραχεῖ τε καὶ περιωρισμένῳ χρόνῳ διαστολαῖς σώματι ἐπεχώρητο; καὶ πῶς ἀπαθῆς ὢν ἐγένετο ὑπὸ πάθος;

43. The third fragment deals with a similar subject, the title of the MS being πρὸς τοὺς ἐπαισχυνομένους ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. It unites the contents of the two earlier fragments by giving the reason why ἔπαθε σαρκὶ τῷ σταυρῷ προσπαγεῖς ὁ λόγος, and explaining how ἦν ἐν τῷ παθητῷ μένων ἀπαθῆς. In none of the three, which evidently all come from the same source, is Porphyry referred to by name. But a sentence of the third is quoted in another MS as τοῦ ἁγίου Μεθοδίου, ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Πορφυρίου. This is sufficient to prove that the other two fragments are also from the work of Methodius against Porphyry.

The remaining two fragments are quite brief, but in each case they are specially quoted as from Methodius's book against Porphyry.

44. The fourth deals with the conditions of the forgiveness of sins, and the extent of the effects of repentance. The words of Methodius are as follows: Μετάνοια τότε ἁμαρτήματος παντὸς γίνεται ἀπαλειπτική, ὅταν ἐπὶ τῷ γενομένῳ ψυχῆς σφάλματι ἀναβολὴν μὴ δέξηται, μηδὲ παραπέμψῃ τὸ πάθος εἰς χρονικὸν διάστημα· οὕτω γὰρ οὐχ ἕξει καταλείψαι ἴχνος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ κακόν, ἀτε ἅμα τῷ ἐπιβῆναι ἀποσπασθὲν δίκην φυτοῦ ἀρτισυστατικοῦ.

Evidently Porphyry had gone deeply into the ethics of repentance.

45. The fifth fragment seems likewise to be dealing with the relation of ethics and religion, for it lays down that κακόν consists in distance from God and ignorance of Him, and the things which come from ourselves, whereas ἀγαθόν consists in likeness to God and faith, and a movement towards that which is immortal.

These abstract questions plainly belonged to quite a different part of Porphyry's book from anything else that remains to us, and seem to form part of a section on the doctrines of Christianity. Possibly this was the climax which he reached in the last books of his great work, but it is quite as likely that this attack formed a section in the lost books in the middle of his work.

46. One more reference remains, which is made by Jerome in commenting on Isaiah iii 12.¹

‘Caveamus ergo nos ne exactores simus in populo, ne iuxta impium Porphyrium matronae et mulieres sint noster senatus, quae dominantur

¹ Jer. *Comm. in Isa.* Migne t. xxiv p. 66.

in ecclesiis et de sacerdotali gradu favor iudicat feminarum.' Here Porphyry's reference to the high position of women in the Church may form part of a scathing satire on the Christian society and organization, a theme which he may perhaps have reached near the close of his treatise.

The forty-six quotations or references given above are all that I can find, and they represent all that can be regained of the lost fifteen books unless use is made of the *Apocriticus*.¹ And this we are, I believe, justified in using as a second source for the arguments, though not for the language, of Porphyry himself.

I proceed to an attempt to reconstruct provisionally the whole work with the help of the above sources.² It must be understood that the *order* is often a matter of conjecture.

Book I. The *first book* was an attack on the credibility of the New Testament, the quarrels and inconsistencies of the Apostles being adduced to prove that they were unworthy of credit.

From the commentary of Jerome on Galatians we know of three points of attack :—

1. When at Antioch Paul withstood Peter to his face, it shewed both the impudence of the former and the inconsistency of the latter (also in *Apocr.* iii 22).

2. When Paul says he 'conferred not with flesh and blood', he means to degrade Peter, James, and John by calling them thus.

3. Peter brought death upon Ananias and Sapphira, by his imprecation on them (also in *Apocr.* iii 21).

From the *Apocriticus* we may add three more attacks upon Peter, and nine upon Paul :—

(a) Attacks upon Peter.

1. He cut off the ear of the high-priest's servant instead of forgiving until seventy times seven, as he had been bidden (iii 20).

2. He made his escape from prison when Herod had seized him (iii 22).

3. He claimed the right to have a wife, and so brought himself under the condemnation of Paul's words in Cor. i 9 'Such are false apostles' (iii 22).

(b) Attacks upon Paul.

These are chiefly in the form of inconsistencies.

¹ Lardner *op. cit.* p. 226 n., refers to Macknight *The Truth of the Gospel History*, p. 319, as having stated, without giving the reference, that Porphyry blamed Christ for encouraging fraud by the Parable of the Unjust Steward. He considers that Macknight was mistaken, and certainly the reference cannot be found.

² In each case the references which come from the *Apocriticus* will be placed last, as having a less degree of certainty.

1. He said he was 'free' and yet was 'the servant of all' (iii 30).
2. He abused circumcision as being merely *κατατομή*, and yet he himself circumcised Timothy (iii 30).
3. He said at one time that he was a Roman, and at another that he was a Jew of Tarsus (iii 31).
4. He shewed his greed by applying to himself and his own support what Moses said about the oxen in the law (iii 32).
5. He declared that the whole law must be kept, for it is spiritual, and the commandment holy (Rom. vii 14), and yet he said that those under the law are under a curse, in Gal. iii (iii 33).
6. Again, he quoted the law to help his argument, but called it the strength of sin, which entered that grace might abound (iii 34).
7. He said it was wrong to sacrifice to demons, and yet he declared that there is no idol in the world (iii 35).
8. He said 'meat will not present you to God', and yet he told them to eat whatever was sold, for 'the earth is the Lord's'.
9. He not only contradicts himself, but also the present teaching of Christianity, for instead of honouring virginity, he said that deceivers forbid to marry (1 Tim. iv 3), and that concerning virgins he had no command (iii 36).

To the first book there may perhaps be added the objection implied in the fragment of Book V of the *Apocriticus*, which is to be found in the writings of the Jesuit Turrianus.¹ It is concerned with the difficulties with regard to the relation of faith and works, and may possibly have formed part of an attack based on the discrepancies between Paul and James. This is the more likely, as in the second of the attacks quoted above from Jerome in *Galat.*, Paul's contempt for James as well as Peter seems to have been shewn.

Book II. The *second book* is entirely lost, and its contents can only be a matter of conjecture.² But a guess may be made with some probability in the light of the contents of the books which follow. For Book III contained detailed criticisms of the Old Testament, and Book IV went on to discuss generally the history of the Jews. As Book I began to deal similarly with the New Testament, it seems probable that Book II proceeded in the same way, and dealt with the unhistorical basis of Christianity on more general lines than Book I.

Book III, as already mentioned, consisted of an attack on the Old Testament, and gave examples of its inconsistencies and absurdities, largely drawn from the Pentateuch.

(a) The fragment preserved by Eusebius attacks Origen's allegorical

¹ See *J.T.S.* (July 1907).

² Neither Wagenmann nor Kleffner offers any suggestion.

method of interpretation, for Porphyry required the language of the Mosaic books to be taken literally, if he was to ridicule it effectively.

(b) The reference in Severian raises the question why in Gen. ii 17 God forbade the knowledge of good as well as evil.

(c) Two objections to later books of the Old Testament¹ (other than the prophecies of Daniel) are preserved by Augustine,² which may possibly have belonged to the third book.

1. The language of Solomon (presumably in Proverbs) contradicts the Christian idea that God has a son.

2. The story of Jonah is absurd and incredible.

Book IV. The *fourth book* discussed the history of the Jews, shewing that the story as possessed by the Christians was quite untrustworthy, and that the true history had been preserved by Sanchuniathon.

The reference to the Hebrews in another fragment, side by side with the Egyptians and other nations, suggests that Porphyry was proving them to be an ordinary nation, and not a chosen and peculiar people with a special revelation from heaven.

Nothing remains of the following books from the fifth to the eleventh. But, as we know that the later books contained both a detailed attack upon the prophecies of Daniel and a reference to the Christian hope as contained in the New Testament, the intervening books must have consisted of an attack on the Christian's God, their Saviour and His claims, the doctrines of the Church, and the language of the New Testament itself. The deadliness of Porphyry's polemic seems to have consisted largely in his merciless ridicule of the Gospels, and this fact makes it probable that in reverting to Christianity in Book V after his digression on Judaism in the two previous books, he began with this detailed form of attack.³ He would deal first with the life of Christ, His deeds and miracles, and then fasten on His sayings, and the inconsistent accounts of the Evangelists. This would lead to the Christian idea of God, and His relation to the heathen gods, which would itself suggest the relation of the Christian rites to those of paganism. From rites he would pass to doctrines, such as Baptism and the Resurrection, and would end this section of his work with objections to the whole theory of salvation through the Incarnate and Crucified Christ. The above seven topics correspond to the number of the lost books. It would of course be foolish to pretend that we

¹ Wagenmann speaks of the third book as concerned with scripture commentaries, and Georgiades gives it as *περὶ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν Γραφῶν*, but Kleffner appears to narrow it to the Pentateuch.

² In his *Quaestiones Paganorum*.

³ Kleffner says he seems to have criticized all the books of the New Testament almost verse by verse.

can reconstruct the order of the books accordingly. But besides the references contained in other works, some of the above topics are dealt with in various parts of the *Apocriticus* in such a way as to suggest that they are selected from the arguments in different books of Porphyry.

I therefore tentatively suggest a reconstruction something like the following one:—

Book V. The life of Christ, with objections to His deeds and miracles.

1. In John vii 6–10 Christ said He would not go up to the feast, and then stultified Himself by going (Jer. *Dial. adv. Pelag.*).

2. Objections are brought to the Miracles of healing. The single fragment that is preserved by Nicephorus of Book I of the *Apocriticus* is an answer to an attack upon the healing of the woman with an issue of blood.

3. Objections to Christ's behaviour found later in the *Apocriticus*.

(a) Why did He not appear to Pilate and Herod and other trustworthy witnesses after the Resurrection, and not merely to women and peasants? He had told the high-priest, &c., that they would see Him in His glory. Had He shewn Himself, it would have caused belief, and saved persecution (ii 14).

(b) Why did He allow Himself to be mocked and crucified not saying anything worthy for the benefit of His judge or His hearers, but tolerating insults like the meanest of men? (iii 1).

(The reference to Apollonius is omitted as introduced by Hierocles.)

(c) Why, after saying 'Fear not them that kill the body', did He pray in His agony that His suffering might pass from Him? (iii 2).

(d) Why did He not cast Himself down when the tempter told Him to? Did He fear the danger? (iii 18).

4. The miracle of the demons and the swine is discussed in detail. The length of this passage as given by Macarius is in such contrast with the usual brevity of the objections, that it seems likely that in this case the original words of Porphyry are preserved, but not all. For not a word is said of the saying repeated by Vigilantius, which is to the effect that when the demons cried out, they only made pretence of torments, so that miracles may be the result of their trickery.

The points contained in the *Apocriticus* are as follows. Not only are the Evangelists shewn to disagree, but Christ is blamed for letting the demons extend their dominion to the sea. He shewed His wickedness by doing much harm in order to cure one man, and His partiality in only driving the enemy from one place to another. Besides, other objections make the account impossible (iii 4).

Book VI. The sayings of Christ, and their many inconsistencies.

1. The words of Christ recorded in Matt. vii 2 (the fourth question

answered by Augustine in his *Ep. ad Demetr.*) He said 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again', and yet He threatened (in John iii 18) eternal punishment for those who did not believe on Him.

(2) In the opening words of St John's Gospel Christ is not the Word either in the outward or the inward sense. Therefore He is not the Word at all.

3. Five series of objections contained in Books II and III of the *Apocriticus*.¹

(a) A series of objections which are not extant, but only the answers are preserved.

Matt. x 34-38 'I came not to send peace on the earth but a sword', &c. (ii 1).

Matt. xii 48-49 'Behold My mother and My brethren' (ii 2).

Mark x 18 'Why callest thou me good? None is good', &c. And yet He says elsewhere 'A good man out of the good treasure', &c. (ii 3).

In Matt. xvii 15 how is it that the man asked Christ, 'Have pity on my son, for he is a lunatic', and yet 'it was not the doing of the moon but of a demon?' (iii 4). [N.B. This objection is not quite of the same kind as the rest.]

In John v 31 Christ said 'If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true'; and yet He did bear witness of Himself, as when He said 'I am the Light of the world' (ii 5).

(b) No sense can be found in such sayings as that in John xii 31 'Now is the judgement of this world; now the ruler of this world shall be cast outside' (ii 15).

In John viii 43-44 He said 'Ye are of your father the devil'. But it is quite obscure who this devil is, and what is the slander which gave him his name, and who were the parties in it (ii 16).

(c) In John v 44 He said 'If ye believed Moses, ye would believe Me, for he wrote concerning Me'. But the stupidity of the saying is shewn, firstly, in that no writings of Moses have been preserved; and secondly, in that, even if Moses did write them, they cannot be shewn to speak of Christ as God (iii 3).

In Matt. xix 24 He said 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom'. But if this is the case, all practical morality disappears, and salvation depends, not on virtue but on poverty. The words must really be those of some poor woman in distress (iii 5).

In Matt. xxvi 11 He said 'Me ye have not always', but elsewhere He said the exact opposite, 'Lo, I am with you always' (iii 7).

¹ Each series occurs in a different set of attacks in Macarius.

(d) The saying in John vi 54, about eating His flesh and drinking His blood, beats the savages in its savagery. No hidden meaning can excuse the outward significance. The first three Evangelists probably suppressed it because of its unseemliness (iii 15).

Note the saying in Mark xvi 18 about the signs following believers, the healing of the sick, and receiving no harm from deadly drugs. If it were true, it ought to be made the test of belief, and of appointing church officers (iii 16).

Similarly in Matt. xvii 19 He said 'Ye shall say to this mountain, Be thou lifted up', &c. Therefore those who cannot use their faith thus are not worthy of the name of Christian. But not even the clergy can do it (iii 17).

His words to Peter in Matt. xvi 18 are utterly inconsistent, for first He said 'Get thee behind me, Satan'; and then 'On this rock will I build my Church' (iii 19).

(e) In Matt. xiii 31 Christ compares the kingdom of heaven to mustard seed, to leaven, to a merchant seeking goodly pearls. Such comparisons are unintelligible, in spite of having been written for babes (iv 8).

In Matt. xi 25 He thanks the Father that these things were revealed unto babes. If so, they certainly ought to have been spoken more plainly. If His object was to hide them from the wise, and reveal them to fools, it must be better to seek after ignorance than knowledge (iv 9).

In Luke v 31 He says 'They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick'.

He refers to His own coming to save these sick with sin, but did not other ages of the world equally need healing? Besides, if (as St Paul says in 1 Tim. i 15), He 'came into the world to save sinners', the more a man turns away from the healing which a Christian needs, the more righteous he will be (iv 10).

This last objection is stated in much fuller form in the second of the six *Quaestiones Paganorum* in Augustine's *Ep. ad Demetr.* It is very possibly a translation of the original words of Porphyry.

Book VII. The untrustworthiness of the Evangelists. This must have formed a much larger subject than the few examples which remain to us would suggest. Jerome's statement (*Ep. ad Pam.*) that the Evangelists were accused of falsehood, and elsewhere that they were charged with making up miracles, indicates that this was an important item in Porphyry's attack.

1. Matthew is wrong in the genealogy which he gives in ch. i (*Jer. in Dan. init.*), for one generation seems to have been missed out at Jechonias at the end of the second fourteen.

2. In Matt. ix 9 the account of the call of Matthew is most improbable, and makes him follow the first man he casually meets. Either the Evangelist is untruthful or the Saviour's first followers had no sense (*Jer. in Matt.*).

3. The Evangelists, in their desire to make the miracle of Christ walking on the Sea, wilfully called Genezareth a 'sea' though it was a mere lake (*Jer. in Gen. i 10*).

The account in Mark vi 48 is attacked in detail in *Apocr. iii 6*. It was merely a small lake where the river widens by Tiberias, which a boat could cross in an hour or two. Mark exaggerated by making them sail all night and pictured storms and waves, to which the lake was not subject, in order to represent Christ as calming them (*iii 6*).

Also the miracle of the demons and the swine cannot be true, for so many swine could not have been drowned in so small a lake (*iii 4 fin.*).

4. There is a great discrepancy about the Crucifixion. Mark says some one offered Christ ὄξος, and He uttered the cry 'My God', &c. Matthew says it was οἶνος μετὰ χολῆς, which He tasted and refused. John says they gave Him ὄξος μεθ' ὑσσώπου, which He took and said 'It is finished', and died. Luke says the great cry was 'Father into Thy hands', &c. These discrepancies shew that it is not history, and that therefore all the narrative is untrustworthy (*ii 12*).

5. Another proof that the accounts are only guesswork lies in the statement of John alone (*xix 33 f*) that the soldier's spear brought forth 'blood and water', adding that this is the true statement of an eye-witness (*ii 13*).

Possibly in this part of the work, the attack on the Gospels was followed by a series of objections to the contents of the Acts of the Apostles. The reference to Peter's treatment of Ananias and Sapphira might be placed under this head. Also the charge that in their arguments the Apostles abused the simplicity of their hearers. It may be noted here that it is possible that these lost books were in part arranged as a consecutive commentary, in the same way as we find to be the case with the Book of Daniel in Book XII. Thus one book would contain attacks on the First Gospel, another on the Second, and so forth. But this seems a less likely reconstruction than the one I am attempting, especially in view of the sequences found occasionally in the *Apocriticus*, which would thus become meaningless.

Book VIII. The Christian idea of God, and His relation to the heathen gods.

A series of four objections on this subject follows in *Apocr. Book IV*, after the completion of the detailed attack upon the New Testament.

1. God is called a 'Monarch' in contrast with the other gods. But

this very title proves that He has other gods to rule over, as may be shewn from its use when applied to men (iv 20).

2. The difference between the gods and the angels is only in name. The words in Matthew about being 'as the angels' prove their divine nature. Images are only reminders of the gods, and are naturally in the form of man, God's fairest work. God Himself is said to have 'fingers' in Exodus xxxi 18. Heathen temples are imitated by the Christians (iv 21).

3. If the Greeks do think that the gods dwell in statues, at least it shews a purer mind than the belief that the deity went into the virgin's womb (iv 22).

4. God is not angry if the title 'god' is applied to others, for it is even used of men, as in Exodus xxii 28 'Thou shalt not revile the gods' (iv 23).

Book IX. The Christian rites, and their relation to those of heathenism.

It is natural that the author of the *Philosophia de Oraculis Haurienda* should speak at length on this subject, though scarcely any references to it remain.

The third of the *Quaestiones Paganorum* in Augustine (*Ep. ad Demetr.*) says that the Christians abuse the sacrifices and worship of the heathen temples, but they represent their own God as having needed them once. If God appointed them, why did Christ abrogate them?

In the latter part of *Apocr.* iv 21 (which has been already referred to), it is stated that the Christians imitate the heathen temples with their great houses of prayer, which are not needed, if the Lord is everywhere.

Book X. The Christian doctrines, and their unreasonableness.

1. Baptism. It is strange that in that Baptism of which Paul says 'But ye were washed, but ye were cleansed', a man should be made clean from the stains of a lifetime. Such teaching is subversive of all law and order, for it encourages a man to commit sins, if he knows he can be freed from them (*Apocr.* iv 19).

2. The Resurrection of the body. The first of the *Quaestiones Paganorum* in Augustine (*Ep. ad Demetr.*) asks how the resurrection of ordinary men can be like that of the Virgin's Son. Or will the resurrection be like that of Lazarus? Again, if there is no hunger or pain after it, how did Christ eat, and shew His wounds?

The same subject is continued in *Apocr.* iv 24 (where it has not been mentioned previously, but the attack begins *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν αὐθις ἀφηγγητέον*).

Why should God overthrow His own arrangement for the preservation of the nations? How absurd for men of all epochs to rise together! How can bodies rise which have been devoured by beasts, &c.? It

is no good saying 'All things are possible with God', for He cannot undo what is done, nor make Himself evil.

It is unreasonable to destroy the beautiful earth, and preserve men's corrupted bodies. And if all shall rise again, how is the world going to contain them?

As Book IV of the *Apocr.* breaks off abruptly in the middle of the answer to this attack, it is quite likely that other similar objections to Christian doctrines immediately followed. It is possible that the fragment of Book V preserved in Turrianus about 'faith and works' belongs to the same category.

The last two of the fragments which remain of Methodius's answer to Porphyry may also be added here, as follows:—

3. The effects of Repentance. How can it wash away all sin, and how far is it moral that it should do so? (Method. Κατὰ Πορφ. Frag. 4).

4. The ethics of the Christian religion. How can faith in God, and approach to Him, or the reverse, be said to have anything to do with the moral duties as regards what is 'good' and what is 'bad'? (*ibid.* Frag. 5).

Book XI. Special objections to the doctrine of the Incarnate Christ.

The following objections are preserved in the fragments of the work of Methodius:—

1. What was the use of the Son of God becoming man? (Frag. 1).

2. Why did He choose to suffer by means of the cross? And what is its use? (The question is discussed specially in relation to the world of demons.) (*Ibid.*)

3. How did Christ become subject to change and suffering, although He could not suffer? (Frag. 2).

4. What but disgrace was brought by the cross? (Frag. 3).

The arrangement of the foregoing books, beginning with Book V, has been purely a matter of conjecture. In the next two books we return to surer ground, and our knowledge of Book XII is far fuller than of any other.

Book XII. An investigation of Old Testament prophecy, and the Christian claim of its fulfilment. The Book of Daniel studied in detail, almost in the form of a commentary.¹ The general conclusion is (a) that Daniel wrote about what had already happened, and not about what was to come, (b) that the references are not to Christ and Anti-Christ, but to the Jews and Antiochus Epiphanes, (c) that the original language of the book was Greek.

Jerome refers to some ten or twelve passages where the text of Daniel has been interpreted accordingly.

¹ Kleffner suggests that this twelfth book must have been one of the most important in the treatise, since Daniel, being so full of Messianic prophecies, was specially valuable to the Christians.

Book XIII. The Christian hope. The prophecy of the Old Testament leads to that of the New.

Jerome, in commenting on Matt. xxiv 15, shews that the thirteenth book has dealt at great length with 'the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet'. Probably reference is made to the conclusions of Book XII about Daniel, and then Christ's apocalyptic discourse is attacked.

A sequence of seven attacks in Book IV of the *Apocriticus* deals with the same subject, and may with some certainty be also placed in the thirteenth book.

1. What does Paul mean by saying that 'the fashion of the world passeth away'? (1 Cor. vii 31). What passes away, and why? If the Creator does it, it shews that, even if the change is a good one, He made it imperfect to begin with.

Can Paul mean in the words that follow that 'He that hath' the world (viz. the Creator) 'must be as He that hath not', because of the coming change? (iv 1).

2. What can the passage mean in 1 Thess. iv 14-16 'We that are alive shall be caught up together with them in a cloud', &c.? Even the wonder-working Word of God would not so pervert nature as to make men fly like the birds. It says 'We that are alive', but no one has been caught up yet, though 300 years have passed (iv 2).

3. In Matt. xxiv 14 (the verse preceding that in which Porphyry is said by Jerome to have written at length about the abomination of desolation) it was said 'The Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world, and then shall come the end'. And yet, though the whole world has received the Gospel, there is no end, nor ever will be (iv 3).

4. Paul was promised 'No man shall harm thee' (Acts xviii 9) and was to judge angels, but he was soon afterwards beheaded at Rome. Peter was given authority to feed the lambs, but he was crucified. It is unworthy of God that these and many others of His servants should end thus (iv 4).

5. Christ said in Matt. xxiv 5 'Many shall come in my name', &c. But no one has come in 300 years, unless it be Apollonius (iv 5).

6. In the Apocalypse of Peter it is said that the earth is about to be judged 'together with the heaven that contains it'. But though earth suffers change, heaven does not. And will it be proved to have done wrong, or be slandered as such? (iv 6).

7. The same book also says that 'the heaven shall be rolled up as a scroll', &c. This is like Christ's boast in Matt. v, about which it is hard to see how His words could stand if heaven and earth had passed away.

As Christ called God 'Father of heaven and earth' it would be like a man destroying his own children. Elsewhere heaven is magnified, and called God's throne and dwelling-place. But where will He live, and what will be His seat and His foot-stool, when heaven and earth have passed away? (iv 7).

Book XIV. The subject of the two previous books (Prophecy in the Old Testament and in the New) leads to the proof that the Evangelists themselves did not know and understand the Prophets properly.

The first of the two following attacks is known to have been from Book XIV.

1. Mark, in his opening verses, confuses two quotations from Malachi and from Isaiah, and quotes them as if Isaiah wrote them both.

2. In Matt. xiii 35 Christ is said, in speaking by parables, to have fulfilled the words of the prophet Isaiah, 'I will open my mouth in parables', &c. But really the words are Asaph's, in the seventy-eighth Psalm.

Other passages were doubtless similarly discussed.

Book XV. No more references to the books remain, but two passages have not yet been inserted which may best be placed here.¹ For after speaking of the Church's future, it is natural to turn to its present state, and then to pass to the present state of the *world*, as the climax of the treatise, shewing how evil an effect Christianity had upon it.

Thus the suggested contents of the last book would be :—

1. The Christian Church : its present state. The high position of women in the Church is a matter of ridicule. They really are the assembly, they are paramount in the churches, and the honours of ministerial office depend upon their favour (*Jer. in Isa.* iii 12).

This was probably one of many such satires on the Christian society and organization.

2. The present state of the world, as the result of Christianity.

The gods have given up helping men since the honouring of Jesus began.

The few words of the fragment, preserved by Eusebius and Theodoret, state :—

(i) The plague raging so long in the city is the result of Asclepius and the other gods no longer having their abode within it.

(ii) Men wonder at this, but the reason is that, owing to the cult of Jesus, no public benefit has come from the gods.

The plague then troubling Rome is thus represented as one of the

¹ Kleffner (unlike Wagenmann and Georgiades, the former of whom he for the most part follows exactly) inserts in these later books (XII–XV) three, and possibly five, of the *Quaestiones Paganorum* found in St Augustine, and inserted already above under Books V–XI.

results of Christianity. Such practical changes would form a fitting finale to the *Katà Xριστιανῶν*.

It is now time to note any conclusions which may be drawn either with regard (1) to Porphyry's work itself, or (2) to its use by the opponent of Macarius Magnes, whom I venture to speak of now as Hierocles.

1. The *Katà Xριστιανῶν* was the work of a man who knew the language of the Bible from one end to the other, and annotated a great deal of it with the shrewd and biting criticisms of a sceptical common sense. It was here that his chief force lay, and he made no attempt to play the philosopher, or anything but the destructive critic, in dealing with the passages which he ridiculed.

He followed the same course in dealing with Christian doctrines, but when he spoke of God, he was led to discuss His relation with demons, and to express something of the polytheistic attitude.

In spite of his own ideas on the miraculous, he relentlessly attacked the Christian miracles as not resting on sufficient evidence. His objections anticipate much that modern criticism has repeated. It is worthy of note that nothing is said about any later miracles among Christians; the attack is confined to those recorded in Scripture. He seems to have regarded these as merely made up to glorify Jesus, whom he considered a good but weak enthusiast, who often said and did what was inconsistent and unwise.

He laid the chief blame for the propagation of a false religion upon the followers of Jesus, who were both fools and knaves at once, and gave themselves up to unworthy quarrels and jealousies. That he regarded this as the first essential of his attack is seen by the fact that he placed it in Book I in the forefront of his argument. And yet it is really one of its weakest parts, for he has to admit the extraordinary success of the Apostles in spite of their blighting animosities.

When he ventured to deal with earlier history his judgement was warped and untrustworthy. This is seen in what he says about Jewish history, and his preference for what purported to be the work of Sanchuniathon.

As a higher critic he forestalled many modern revolts against the traditional Christian standpoint. This is specially noteworthy with regard to the Book of Daniel, which he strips of its mystery, and regards as a *vaticinium post eventum*. His detailed treatment of prophecy was due to the insistence upon it always shewn by Christian apologists. The story of Jonah he cannot rationalize, so he sets it aside as legend. The Pentateuch cannot be the original work of Moses, which had certainly perished. The eschatology of the Gospels

was a weak basis for the Christian hope, the great difficulty being that it had not been fulfilled.

He shewed the evil effect of Christianity upon the world, not only by the change in society made through its exaltation of women, but also by its effect in the spirit world. Here his argument reaches a climax, when he explains away the fact that the ancient gods of heathenism were no longer shewing their work in the world, by saying that this was caused by the Christians' action, and that their active benevolence to the world had ceased ever since the honouring of Jesus had begun.

2. We pass finally to the consideration of the work answered in the *Apocriticus*. Its unlikeness to the structure of the *Katà Χριστιανῶν* has been already noted, but sundry conclusions may be drawn therefrom.

The author seems to have altered the whole plan of the work, so as to place the more direct attack upon the Founder of the faith in the earlier part, and the absurdities and inconsistencies of the accounts in which His words and deeds are preserved. He then made a division of his subject (at iii 19) in order to divide his work into two books, and in his second book he proceeded to attack the first Christian teachers and writers. This arrangement seems a very great improvement on Porphyry's work, for it is both a more logical order, and an avoidance of the objection to the first book of the *Katà Χριστιανῶν* mentioned above. He seems to have left the consideration of the Christians' God, and their chief doctrines and religious rites until the end, laying stress (as Porphyry had done in his thirteenth book) upon the futility of the Christian hope.

He decided to confine himself to an attack upon Christianity itself, and to omit Porphyry's elaborate consideration of the Old Testament and Jewish history generally, which had occupied at least a fifth of his work.

All through his treatise he merely made selections from the abundant attacks which he found in each section of Porphyry's work, and he greatly reduced the length of those he chose to incorporate, omitting some of the points, and putting most of the rest into his own language. It is absolutely necessary to draw these inferences, in order to explain the rarity of the coincidences in the extant parts of the two works, and the differences of style and language.

If Macarius is to be trusted in his grouping of the objections which he answers, they frequently shew a sequence of about half a dozen attacks, mostly on the same subject, but not always so. In some cases they have obviously been taken from the same part of Porphyry's book; in others the connexion is harder to trace; while in one at least the copyist has incorporated the second of two objections without giving the first.

If in the foregoing considerations I have rightly interpreted the problem of the relation of the *Katà Xριστιανῶν* and the objections quoted by Macarius, the latter assume a double importance. For they give us the contents of the lost *Philalethes* of Hierocles, and at the same time they have provided us with many of the arguments in the book which he copied, and have enabled us to reconstruct its contents far more fully than would be the case, if we only relied upon the quotations from the *Katà Xριστιανῶν* and the references to it, which I have collected from other sources.

T. W. CRAFER.