

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01110929 5

(96)

7

T H E
A D D R E S S
O F
Q. SEPT. TERTULLIAN,
T O
SCAPULA TERTULLUS,
PROCONSUL OF AFRICA.

T R A N S L A T E D
B Y S I R D A V I D D A L R Y M P L E .

E D I N B U R G H :

P r i n t e d b y M U R R A Y & C O C H R A N E .

M D C C X C .

BR

65

T343

1790



T O

The RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN BUTLER, D. D.

BISHOP of HEREFORD,

THIS TREATISE

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

B Y

DAV. DALRYMPLE.

P R E F A C E.

I Offer to the Public a Version of the Address of TERTULLIAN to SCAPULA. The merit of the original is well known. It contains many circumstances respecting the state of the Church soon after the commencement of the third century, and therefore may be reckoned among the valuable Remains of Christian Antiquity.

The traces of a wild imagination are not so discernible in the Address to SCAPULA, as in the other works of TERTULLIAN. The topics which he uses, seem, in general, well chosen, and judiciously enforced.

As

As the original is printed along with the version, the learned reader will have an opportunity of comparing them, and of detecting the errors which may have been committed in the attempt to render Tertulian into English. The attempt, in itself, was difficult, and became more so by a fancy of mine, which, without pretending to justify it, I must communicate to my readers.

Whether William Duke of Normandy conquered England as a kingdom, or only acquired it as an inheritance, it is no part of my present business to inquire. This much, however, is certain, that the Norman conquest

conquest or acquisition had violent effects on the English language, for, at that æra, French words and phrases rushed in, and well nigh overwhelmed the Anglo-Saxon dialect.

It occurred to me that, between Anglo-Saxon and Latin, a few pages might be composed without the aid of French auxiliaries, and this produced the following version, a version which, perhaps, loses more by the singularity of its style, than it gains by the grave and solemn air produced from the blending of old English and Latin.

For the better understanding of the sense of Tertullian, many Notes and Illustrations became necessary. After

I had availed myself of the aid of former commentators, I found that much, especially as to the historical part, remained without explanation. The attempt made to supply this deficiency, is submitted to the candour of the reader.

While engaged in the drawing up of these Notes, I had occasion to remark some strange inaccuracies in the work of a celebrated Historian; and I have used the liberty of pointing them out. Even in the first volume of The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and independently of the two famous chapters, there is a wide field for literary and historical criticism.

Q. SEPT. TERTULLIAN,

T O

SCAPULA TERTULLUS,

PRESIDENT OF AFRICA,

And His COUNCIL.

OF a truth, we Christians do not mightily fear or dread aught which we undergo from those who know us not; forasmuch as when we became of *this sect*, we thereby

A

bound

bound ourselves to let out our very lives in the warfare belonging unto it. We look not only for the reward which God proffers, but we also fear his threatenings against those who live after another way. Furthermore, we strive against your utmost cruelty, crowding uncalled before you, and happier on being found guilty than when we are dismissed ; and, therefore, have we sent unto you this little book, not that we fear aught for ourselves or our well-wishers, but that we fear for you and for all our foes.

This is the rule of our faith, that we love those who hate us, and that we beseech God to bless those who afflict us ; and herein lieth that goodness which is *peculiar to us*. All men love those who love them, Christians alone those who hate them. We, who bewail your
want

want of knowledge, who mourn over the wanderings of mankind, who foresee what will befall, and see daily its tokens, we must needs break forth, and, after this way, put in writing the things of which ye will not give us leave to speak before you.

We worship the One God, whom, by nature, ye all know, at whose lightnings and thunders ye all quake, whose loving-kindnesses gladden you all. Others also there are whom ye believe to be gods, and whom we know to be demons. But it belongeth of right unto mankind, that every one may worship as he thinketh best; nor doth the religion of any man harm or help another. Neither indeed is it the business of religion to compel religion, which ought to be taken up willingly, and not against the

A 2

will :

will: a willing mind is looked for even from him who sacrificeth; and, therefore, should ye indeed compel us to sacrifice, *that* would do nought for your gods; of the unwilling they would not have sacrifice, unless they were wayward. God is not so; and He, who is true, dealeth all things rightly unto the profane and unto his own; and, therefore, hath he set a day of doom everlasting for those whom he loveth, and for those whom he loveth not.

Ye think us sacrilegious, and yet ye have never found us to be guilty of theft, much less of sacrilege; while those who plunder temples, do also swear by the gods and worship them. Such men are not Christians, nevertheless they are found to be sacrilegious. It would be too long for me to unfold
in

in how many other ways all your gods are scoffed at, and made light of by their worshippers themselves.

Again, we are branded with the name of men untrue to the State. No Christian, however, was at any time found in fellowship with Albinus, or Niger, or Cassius; while the men who, but yesterday, swore by the *genius* of the Cæsars, who, for *their* health, made and became bound to make sacrifices, and who had often doomed the Christians to die, even *they* were found untrue to the Cæsars. Christians have no hatred or ill-will at any man, and least of all at Cæsar; for knowing him to be set up by *their* God, they must needs love him, and shew him worship, and wish his welfare, and the welfare of the Roman state, while the times which now are shall last,
and

and so long shall *that* state last : Thus do we give worship unto Cæsar, so far and in such a way as is lawful for us and is fit for him, as a man next to God, and having from God whatever he hath, and as only less than the true God. This he himself ought to wish, for he is greater than all others, in that he is less than the one and the true God. So also is he greater than your gods, for he beareth sway over them. Furthermore, we indeed sacrifice for the health of Cæsar ; but we do this unto our God and his, and after that way which He hath willed, by the invoking of him in the way of supplication only. For He, the maker of the world, standeth in no need of any sweet smells, or of the blood of aught ; *these* are the food of dæmons. As for dæmons, we not only abhor them, but we overcome
and

and draw them forth daily, and we drive them out of men, as is known unto very many of yourselves. We, of all others, most fitly beseech God for the health of Cæsar, seeing that we ask of *Him* who can bestow it; and, in truth, it may be plain enough to you, that we behave ourselves after the rules of heaven-taught forbearance, since being so *many*, and reckoned nearly the *most* in every city, we, nevertheless, live in stillness and moderation, better known, perhaps, singly than as a body, and no otherwise known at all, than as men who have laid aside their former sins. But far be it from us, that we should repine at what we wish to bear, or that we should plot aught to seek *that* retaliation ourselves which we look for from God. Nevertheless, as we have said already, we must needs mourn
for

for this, that no city which hath shed our blood shall be held guiltless. Thus, while Hilarion was President, the multitude called out together, speaking of the threshing-floors where we bury our dead, "No threshing floors;" and there were none, for the harvest was never brought in! Moreover, in the rain of last year it was seen what ought to befall mankind, as in old times a flood came for the unbelief and evil deeds of men. And what those fires threatened, which, not long ago, hung over the walls of Carthage throughout the night, *they* know who saw them; and the former thunder, what tidings it brought, *they* know whose hearts were thereby hardened. All these are the tokens of the impending wrath of God, which it behoves us, in whatever way we can,

to

to set forth and foretel, and meanwhile to beseech Heaven that the evil may reach no farther ; but they who misunderstand such tokens shall feel, in fit time, that it will reach over all, and be *the great and the last evil*. Again, the sun, with his light almost put out, in the district of Utica, was indeed portentous. That could not have been owing to any eclipse, for he was then in his altitude and house. Ye have astrologers, ask of them !

We might also lay before you the end of some Presidents, who, at last, came to know, that, in their afflicting of the Christians, they had sinned. Vigilius Saturninus, foremost in this city amongst our persecutors, became blind ; and, in Cappadocia, Claudius Herminianus, being angry that his wife had gone over to our sect, wrought much ill to the Chri-

B

stians.

stians. But, wasted by the plague, forsaken of his friends in his own house, and, while yet alive, swarming with worms, he thus spake: “ Let no one know of this, lest the Christians be glad over me.” And then, having seen his transgression, in that by torture he had made some to fall off from the faith, he died almost a Christian; and Cœcilius Capella, at the overthrow of Byzantium, called out, “ Now, Christians, be glad.”

SCAPULA, thou mayest think, that there are men of this kind, whom no evil hath hitherto overtaken. Nevertheless we wish that thy sickness, which followed soon after Mavilus of Adrumetum was by thee doomed to fight with lions, may have been only a warning; yet now, when, in a like time, it hath come back, may not blood have put in its claim?

claim? Think, however, of what is to come.—We mean not to affright *thee*, whom we fear not. My single wish is, that we Christians could shield all men from evil, by admonishing them, “not to war against God.” Thou mayest do the duties of thy station, and yet remember humanity, were it but for this, that thou also art under the rule of another: and what else hath Cæsar prescribed unto thee, but that thou should’st doom to death those who acknowledge that, by the laws, they are worthy of death, and that thou should’st, through tortures, elicit a like acknowledgement from those who withhold it?

So, by urging men to say what, of themselves, they have already said, ye set at nought the mandates of Cæsar, and ye bear testimony that *we* are guilt-

less, *whom* ye will not find guilty on our *own* acknowledgement.—In striving to overwhelm us, ye invade innocence itself. But have not many Presidents, although more hard-hearted and bloody than you, connived at us? Such was Cincius Severus, who at Tifdra did himself shew a way whereby the Christians might make answer, and yet go free: such also was Vespronius Candidus, who dismissed a Christian, saying, “ Were I
 “ to yield to the call of the multitude,
 “ uproar might arise.” Thus, when a man having been slightly tortured, fell off from the faith, Asper did not require him to sacrifice; and he had said at first, “ Sorry am I that such business should
 “ have fallen to my share.” Pudens too dismissed a Christian who had been sent to him; and understanding the accusation

fation to be spiteful and vexatious, he tore it, and professed that, by the mandates of Cæsar, he could try no man without an accuser.

Thine advocates, SCAPULA, could, as is their bounden duty, suggest all this unto thee, those very advocates, who, however they may rail against us, are much beholden to the Christians; for the amanuensis of one, having been thrown headlong by a dæmon, was freed, and, in like wise, others had a kinsman and a young lad healed; and how many are there of good station, for I speak not now of the vulgar, who by us have been either relieved from dæmons, or healed of distempers?

Severus himself, the father of Antoninus, was mindful of us, for he sought out the Christian Proculus, (the steward
of

of Euhodus, and who by oil had formerly healed his master), and kept him while he lived in the Palace. Antoninus, himself fostered by a Christian, knew Proculus well. Besides, Severus was so far from harming the women and the men of high station whom he knew to be of our sect, that he spake in their praise, and he also staid the multitude when maddened against us.

Moreover, Marcus Aurelius, while warring with the Germans, impetrated plentiful rain, in the great drought, through the supplications which the Christians of his host made unto God; and indeed at what time have not great droughts given way to our fastings and supplications? Then the multitude shouted together, giving thanks unto "the God of gods, who alone is mighty." And

And thus, by the appellation of Jupiter, did they bear witness unto our God.

Furthermore, we keep not back that which hath been deposited in our hands, we violate no one's marriage-bed, we deal conscientiously with our wards, we help the needy, and we never retort evil for evil. Let those who untruly give out that they are of our sect, look to themselves; we know them not. In a word, *who* is there that hath aught to say against us, and *when* is a Christian called to answer at law, unless for his religion? A religion which, after so long time and inquiry, no man hath evinced to be incestuous, or defiled with blood. For behaviour thus harmless, and for such integrity, for righteousness, for modesty, for faithfulness, for truth, for the living God, are we burnt. The sacrilegious

legious are not so dealt with, neither are outlaws, nor those, how many soever, who have been found false to the state. Nay, at this very time, it is *with the sword alone* that the Presidents of Leon and of Mauritania persecute the Christians; and such, by the first mandates of Cæsar, was the doom for delinquents of this kind. But the more desperate the fight, the greater are the rewards “to him which overcometh;” and your bloody deeds work our glory.

Take heed, SCAPULA, lest we, who undergo such unutterable hardships, should all of us at once break forth and shew, that so far from dreading, we spontaneously call for ‘tortures. While Arrius Antoninus was zealously persecuting the Christians in Asia, they came uncalled, and in one body, before him.

Having

Having doomed some few of them to death, he said unto the rest, “ Wretches, “ if ye must needs die, have you not “ crags and halters!” Should the Christians *here* act like those of Asia, what wouldst thou do to so many thousands, men and women, young and old, and of every station, yielding themselves up uncalled at thy tribunal! How great fires and how many swords would then be needed, and what would Carthage herself, to be decimated by thee, then undergo, when each one might recognise, in the croud, his kinsmen and his bosom-friends; when, perhaps, thou mightest see senators like thyself, and matrons, and men of the first repute, and the kinsmen and friends of thine own friends! Wherefore, if thou wilt not spare us, spare thyself, and, if not

C

thyself,

thyself, spare Carthage, spare the whole Province, which, as soon as thy meaning towards us was understood, became obnoxious to the insults of the soldiery, and each man in it to the malevolence of his foes. We have no Lord but God alone; he is before thine eyes, neither can he be hid; but against him thou canst not do aught. Moreover, they whom thou thinkest to be thy lords are men, and, at some time, they shall die; but this sect shall remain, reared into a more stately and stronger building by what you think will overthrow it. For every one beholding such wonderful endurance, becomes perplexed in his mind, and then is led eagerly to inquire *what* Christianity is; and, on his finding out, he follows THE TRUTH.

Q.

Q. SEPT. FLOR. TERTULLIANI

A D

SCAPULAM TERTULLUM,

AFRICÆ PRÆSIDEM,

LIBELLUS.

NOS quidem neque expavescimus,
neque pertimescimus ea quæ ab
ignorantibus patimur : cum ad hanc sec-
tam utique susceptâ conditione ejus pacti
venerimus, ut etiam animas nostras auc-

C 2

torati

torati in has pugnas accedamus, ea quæ Deus repromittit, consequi optantes, et ea quæ diversæ vitæ comminatur pati timentes. Denique cum omni sævitia vestra concertamus, etiam ultro erumpentes: magisque damnati quàm absoluti gaudemus. Itaque hunc libellum non nobis timentes misimus, sed vobis et omnibus inimicis nostris, nedum amicis. Ita enim disciplinâ jubemur diligere inimicos quoque, et orare pro eis qui nos persequuntur, ut hæc sit perfecta et propria bonitas nostra, non communis. Amicos enim diligere omnium est, inimicos autem, solorum Christianorum. Qui ergo dolemus de ignorantia vestra, et miseremur erroris humani, et futura prospicimus, signa eorum quotidie intentari videmus, necesse est vel hoc modo erumpere ad proponenda vobis ea, quæ palam

lãm non vultis audire. Nos unum Deum colimus, quem omnes naturaliter noſtis: ad cujus fulgura et tonitrua contremiſcitis, ad cujus beneficia gaudetis. Ceteros et ipſi putatis deos eſſe, quos nos dæmonas ſcimus. Tamen humani juris et naturalis poteſtatis eſt unicuique quod putaverit colere: nec alii obeſt aut prodeſt alterius religio. Sed nec religionis eſt, cogere religionem, quæ ſponte ſuſcipi debeat, non vi: cum et hoſtiæ ab animo libenti expoſtulentur. Ita et ſi nos compuleritis ad ſacrificandum, nihil præſtabitis diis veſtris: ab invitis enim ſacrificia non deſiderabunt, niſi contentioſi ſunt: contentioſus autem Deus non eſt. Denique qui eſt verus, omnia ſua ex æquo et prophanis et ſuis præſtat. Ideoque et iudicium conſtituit æternum de gratis et ingratis. Tamen nos, quos
 ſacrilegos

sacrilegos existimatis, nec in furto unquam deprehendistis, nedum in sacrilegio. Omnes autem, qui templa despoliant, et per deos jurant et eosdem colunt, et Christiani non sunt, et sacrilegi tamen deprehenduntur. Longum est, si retexamus quibus aliis modis et derideantur et contemnantur omnes dii ab ipsis cultoribus suis. Sic et circa majestatem imperatoris infamamur, tamen nunquam Albiniani, nec Nigriani, vel Cassiani inveniri potuerunt Christiani: sed iidem ipsi, qui per genios eorum in pridie usque juraverant, qui pro salute eorum hostias et fecerant et voverant, qui Christianos sæpe damnaverant, hostes eorum sunt reperti. Christianus nullius est hostis, nedum imperatoris: quem sciens à Deo suo constitui, necesse est ut et ipsum diligat, et revereatur, et honoret, et salvum velit,

velit, cum toto Romano imperio, quousque sæculum stabit : tamdiu enim stabit. Colimus ergo et imperatorem sic, quomodo et nobis licet, et ipsi expedit, ut hominem à Deo secundum ; et quicquid est, à Deo consecutum, et solo Deo minorem. Hoc et ipse volet. Sic enim omnibus major est, dum solo vero Deo minor est. Sic et ipsis diis major est, dum et ipsi in potestate sunt ejus. Itaque et sacrificamus pro salute imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius, sed quomodo præcepit Deus, purâ prece ; non enim eget Deus, conditor universitatis, odoris aut sanguinis alicujus ; hæc enim dæmoniorum pabula sunt : dæmones autem non tantùm respuimus, verùm et revincimus, et quotidie traducimus, et de hominibus expellimus, sicut plurimè notum est. Ita nos magis oramus pro salute

lute imperatoris, ab eo eam postulantes, qui præstare potest. Et utique ex disciplina patientiæ divinæ agere nos satis manifestum esse vobis potest, cùm tanta hominum multitudo, pars penè major civitatis cujusque, in silentio et modestia agimus, singuli fortè noti magis quàm omnes, nec aliunde noscibiles quàm de emendatione vitiorum pristinorum. Absit enim ut indignè feramus ea nos pati quæ optamus, aut ultionem à nobis aliquam machinemur, quam à Deo expectamus. Tamen (sicut supra diximus) doleamus necesse est, quod nulla civitas impune latura sit sanguinis nostri effusionem : sicut et sub Hilariano præside, cum de areis sepulturarum nostrarum adclamassent : AREÆ NON SINT : areæ ipsorum non fuerunt : messes enim suas non egerunt. Ceterùm et imbre anni præteriti,

præteriti, quid commeruerit genus humanum apparuit, cataclysmum scilicet et retrò fuisse, propter incredulitatem et iniquitates hominum: et ignes qui super mœnia Carthaginis proximè pependerunt per noctem quid minati sint, sciunt qui viderunt, et pristina tonitrua quid sonuerint, sciunt qui obduruerunt. Omnia hæc signa sunt imminentis iræ Dei, quam necesse est, quoquo modo possumus, ut et annuntiemus, et prædicemus, et deprecemur interim localem esse. Universalem enim et supremam suo tempore sentient, qui exempla ejus aliter interpretantur. Nam et sol ille in conventu Uticensi extincto penè lumine adeo portentum fuit, ut non potuerit ex ordinario deliquio hoc pati, positus in suo hypsomate et domicilio. Habetis Astrologos.

Possumus æquè et exitus quorundam

D

præsidum

præfidum tibi proponere, qui in fine vitæ suæ recordati sunt deliquisse quòd vexassent Christianos. Vigellius Saturninus, qui primus hìc gladium in nos egit, lumina amisit. Claudius Herminianus in Cappadocia, cùm, indignè ferens uxorem suam ad hanc sectam transisse, Christianos crudeliter tractasset, solusque in prætorio suo vastatus peste cùm vivus vermibus ebullisset, “ Nemo sciat, aiebat, ne spe
 “ [l. *super me*] gaudeant Christiani.” Postea cognito errore suo, quòd tormentis quosdam à proposito suo excidere fecisset, penè Christianus decessit. Cæcilius Capella in illo exitu Byzantino, “ Christiani
 “ gaudete,” exclamavit. Sed et qui videntur tibi impune tulisse, venient in diem divini judicii. Tibi quoque optamus admonitionem solam fuisse, quòd cùm Andrumeticum Mavilum ad bestias damnasses,

nasses, et statim hæc vexatio subsequuta est, et nunc ex eadem causa interpellatio sanguinis. Sed memento de cetero. Non te terremus, qui nec timemus : sed velim ut omnes salvos facere possimus, monendo *μὴ θεομαχεῖν*. Potes et officio jurisdictionis tuæ fungi, et humanitatis meminisse, vel quia et vos sub gladio estis. Quid enim amplius tibi mandatur, quàm nocentes confessos damnare, negantes autem ad tormenta revocare? Videtis ergo quomodo ipsi vos contra mandata faciatis, ut confessos negare cogatis. Adeo confitemini innocentes esse nos, quos damnare statim ex confessione non vultis. Si autem contenditis ad elidendos nos, jam ergo innocentiam expugnatis. Quanti autem præfides, et constantiores et crudeliores, dissimularunt ab hujusmodi causis? ut Cincius

Severus, qui Tifdræ ipse dedit remedium quomodo responderent Christiani, ut dimitti possent : ut Vespronius Candidus, qui Christianum, quasi tumultuosum civibus suis satisfacere, dimisit : ut Asper, qui modicè vexatum hominem, et statim dejectum, nec sacrificium compulit facere, ante professus inter advocatos et adfessores, dolere se incidisse in hanc causam. Pudens etiam missum ad se Christianum, in elogio concussione ejus intellecta, dimisit, scisso eodem elogio, sine accusatore negans se auditurum hominem, secundùm mandatum. Hæc omnia tibi et de officio suggeri possunt, et ab eisdem advocatis, qui et ipsi beneficia habent Christianorum, licet adclament quæ volunt. Nam et cujusdam notarius cùm à dæmone præcipitaretur, liberatus est : et quorundam propinquus
et

et puerulus. Et quanti honesti viri (de vulgaribus enim non dicimus) aut à dæmoniis, aut à valetudinibus remediati sunt. Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit. Nam et Proculum Christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodi procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit, et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem ejus: quem et Antoninus optimè noverat, lacte Christiano educatus. Sed et clarissimas feminas, et clarissimos viros Severus sciens hujus sectæ esse, non modò non læsit, verùm et testimonio exornavit, et populo furenti in nos palàm restitit. Marcus quoque Aurelius in Germanica expeditione, Christianorum militum orationibus ad Deum factis, imbres in siti illa impetravit. Quando non geniculationibus et
 jejunationibus

jejunationibus nostris etiam ficcitates sunt depulsæ? Tunc et populus adclamans, **DEO DEORUM QUI SOLUS POTENS EST**, in Jovis nomine Deo nostro testimonium reddidit. Præter hæc, depositum non abnegamus, matrimonium nullius adulteramus, pupillos piè tractamus, indigentibus refrigeramus, nulli malum pro malo reddimus. Viderint qui sectam mentiuntur, quos et ipsi recusamus. Quis denique de nobis alio nomine queritur? Quod aliud negotium patitur Christianus, nisi suæ sectæ? quam incestam, quam crudelem, tanto tempore nemo probavit. Pro tanta innocentia, pro tanta probitate, pro justitia, pro pudicitia, pro fide, pro veritate, pro Deo vivo cremamur; quòd nec sacrilegi, nec hostes publici, verùm nec tot majestatis rei pati solent. Nam et nunc à præside Legionis,

nis, et à præfide Mauritaniæ vexatur hoc nomen, sed gladio tenus, sicut et à primordio mandatum est animadverti in hujusmodi. Sed majora certamina majora sequuntur præmia. Crudelitas vestra gloria est nostra. Vide tantùm ne hoc ipso, quòd talia sustinemus, ad hoc solum videamur erumpere, ut hoc ipsum probemus, nos hæc non timere, sed ultro vocare. Arrius Antoninus in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis Christiani ante tribunalia ejus se manu factâ obtulerunt; cùm ille, paucis duci jussis, reliquis ait, ὦ δειλοί εἰ θέλετε ἀποθνήσκειν, κρημινὸς ἡβρόχως ἔχετε. Hoc si placuerit et hìc fieri, quid facies de tantis millibus hominum, tot viris ac feminis, omnis sexûs, omnis ætatis, omnis dignitatis, offerentibus se tibi? Quantis ignibus, quantis gladiis opus erit? Quid ipsa Carthago passura est decimanda à te,

te, cùm propinquos, cùm contubernales suos illic unusquisque cognoverit, cùm videris illic fortasse et tui ordinis viros et matronas, et principales quasque personas, et amicorum tuorum vel propinquos vel amicos? Parce ergo tibi, si non nobis, Parce Carthagini, si non tibi: parce provinciæ quæ visâ intentione tuâ obnoxia facta est concussionibus et militum et inimicorum suorum cujusque. Magistrum neminem habemus, nisi Deum solum. Hic ante te est, nec abscondi potest, sed cui nihil facere possis. Ceterùm quos putas tibi magistros, homines sunt, et ipsi morituri quandoque. Nec tamen deficient hæc secta; quam tunc magis ædificari scias, cum cædi videtur. Quisque enim tantam tolerantiam spectans, ut aliquo scrupulo percussus, et inquirere accenditur, quid sit in causa; et ubi cognoverit veritatem, et ipse statim sequitur.

NOTES and ILLUSTRATIONS.

P. 1. l. 3.

SCAPULA TERTULLUS. There is extant a rescript addressed by Marcus Antoninus, and his son Commodus, *Scapulae Tertyllo Præsidi*, l. 14. Dig. *de Officio Præsidis*. Every antiquary knows, that *Tertullus* and *Tertyllus* are different ways of spelling the same name.

Hence it appears, that *Scapula Tertullus* was high in office towards the latter end of the reign of Marcus Antoninus.

Prosper Aquinas [*Chronicon*] places *Tertullus* and *Clemens* as Consuls in the third or fourth year of the Emperor Severus, and so also the *Fasti Idatiani*. The *Fasti Consulares Anonymi*, published by

E . Cardinal

Cardinal Noris, bear A. U. C. 948. A. C. N. 195. “ *Tertullo et Clemente Coff.*” There is extant in Gruter, *Inscript.* p. 1027. N^o 4. the delineation of a stone dug up at Ostia, which bears the following words: “ P. Martio. Quir. Philippo, — *tribuno fabrum navalium Portens. Corpus fabrum navalium Ostiens. Quibus ex S. C. coire licet, Patrono optimo, P. P.*” On the right side of this stone, there is added, “ *Dedicata iii. Idus April.* Scapula *Tertullo et Tineio Clemente Coff.*” Pamelius *ad Tertul.* p. 68. (a) says, that this stone is preserved in the Farnese palace at Rome; and, to add one evidence more, mention is made of “ *Oratio Severi Augusti, in Senatu recitata, Tertullo et Clemente Consulibus,*” l. 1. § 1. Dig. *de Rebus eorum qui sub tutela, &c.* The discourse was read in the Senate, [*in senatu recitata*],” by reason of the absence of the Emperor

on his military expeditions. And this, by the way, shews the great trust which he reposed in Scapula Tertullus.

In the treatise of Tertullian, now under consideration, we find *Scapula Tertullus* President, or, to speak with more accuracy, Proconsul of Africa.

One is naturally led to inquire for some further particulars of the history of a man who bore a high office under Marcus Antoninus; who remained secure, if not distinguished, throughout the times of Commodus; who obtained the dignity of Consul from Severus in the early part of that reign; and who, even at its conclusion, held the government of Africa.

There is a passage in Julius Capitolinus, which appears applicable to Scapula Tertullus. The historian says, that Marcus Antoninus was blamed for having promoted the paramours of his wife Faustina to various eminent offices. *Ter-*

tullus stands first in the list of the persons so promoted. I subjoin the passage, which contains many remarkable circumstances :

“ Crimini ei datum est quòd adulteros ux-
 “ oris promoverit, *Tertullum*, et *Uti-*
 “ lium, et *Orphitum*, et *Moderatum*, ad
 “ varios honores : quum *Tertullum* etiam
 “ prandentem cum uxore deprehenderit.
 “ De quo mimus in scena, præsentè An-
 “ tonino, dixit, quum stupidus nomen a-
 “ dulteri uxoris à servo quæreret, et ille
 “ diceret ter *Tullus*, et adhuc stupidus
 “ quæreret, respondit, *jam dixi* ter *Tul-*
 “ *lus dicitur.*” *Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 34. It
 seems unnecessary to give a translation of
 this *chronique scandaleuse*.

If we suppose Scapula Tertullus to have been a man of sixty-three or sixty-four when Tertullian addressed him, there will be no anachronism in the ranking him among the favourites of Faustina ; and thus the passage in Julius Capitolinus, and l. 14. *D. de Officio*

cio Præsidis, already quoted, will serve to illustrate each other.

P. 1. l. 9. 10.

“ When we became *of this sect*,” [cùm ad hanc *sectam* venerimus]. The followers of different philosophers were called “ *philosophorum sectæ, familiæ, disciplinæ.*” In imitation of this, Tertullian applies the phrase, “ *hæc secta*,” to the disciples of Christ; and, presently after, he calls their institutions “ *disciplina.*”

P. 2. l. 1.

“ We thereby bound ourselves to *let*
 “ *out* our very lives in the warfare be-
 “ *longing to it*,” [ut etiam animas nostras *auctorati* in has pugnas accedamus]. This alludes to the practice of gladiators, who *contracted* to fight. The version does not express the energy of the original: “ To let out life,” is an awkward and an ambiguous phrase; “ we hire our
 “ *lives*,” might sound better; but, in
 modern

modern English at least, “to hire,” is “*conducere*,” and not “*locare*.”

P. 3. l. 17.

“Neither indeed is it the business of religion to compel religion,” [sed nec religionis est cogere religionem]. “Left,” Pamelius says, “any one should chance to pervert this passage, as if it meant to admit of *licence to sects*, it is proper to take notice of an opinion of the author, in the beginning of the treatise called *Scorpiace*, [or *the Antidote*], which is altogether contrary to such *liberty*.” [“Ne quis fortè locum hunc detorqueat ad *sectarum licentiam*, adnotata venit auctoris sententia earundem *libertati* prorsus contraria,” p. 69. edit. Rigalt.]

Licentia, in Latin, may signify the same thing as *libertas*; but, as it is generally used in a bad sense, it would have been expedient to repeat the word instead of varying it. The varying of terms commonly

ly happens, when an author unintentionally puts the change on himself, or intentionally on his readers.

The *Antidote* prescribed by Pamelius is in these words: “ It is fit that heretics be compelled to their duty, and not enticed; their obstinacy ought to be vanquished, not soothed;” [“ ad officium hæreticos compelli, non inlicitum dignum est; duritia vincenda est, non suadenda,” p. 488.]

This expression appears *harsh* in language and sentiment. But, granting it to imply all that Pamelius imagines, it proves, at most, that “ Tertullian contradicted himself.” Such a proposition cannot sound strange to any one who is so well acquainted with the works of that learned and capricious African, as to be able to write commentaries on them.

The words, taken in general, might also prove, that Tertullian, when heated

ed

ed in controversy, spake a language different from that which he used in an address for the Christians at large to a Roman governor.

One might easily retort the observation of Pamelius thus : “ Lest any one should
 “ chance to pervert this passage in *Scor-*
 “ *piace*, as if it meant to recommend
 “ *intolerance*, it is proper to take notice
 “ of an opinion of the author in the
 “ beginning of the treatise to *Scapula*,
 “ which is altogether contrary to such *in-*
 “ *tolerance*.”

The truth is, that, in the preface to *Scorpiace*, Tertullian speaks not of intolerance at all. At that time, as is well known, the Christians of Africa were miserably divided on an important point, not of metaphysics, but of practice. Some were of opinion, that persecution ought to be avoided ; and perhaps they went
 too

too far in the means which they used for the avoiding of it: Others again were of opinion, that it ought rather to be courted; and perhaps they too, in their honest zeal, went to the other extreme. The former were naturally led to depreciate martyrdom, or to employ expressions capable of being so interpreted. The latter, while extolling martyrdom, grew lavish in their commendations of every martyr.

Tertullian espoused the opinions of the severer party, and undertook to confute its adversaries. Full of confidence, probably brought by him from the bar into the church, he imagined that every cause which *he* patronized, would be won. Hence in the like triumphant style, he attacked the heresies of Marcion, and vindicated the extravagancies of Montanus and his followers.

Keeping this in view, we shall easily

F

perceive

perceive the meaning of the phrase, that “ Heretics must be *compelled* to their duty,” and of the other lofty expressions to which Pamelius alludes. Tertullian made no doubt, that he should, by dint of argument, if a colloquial term may be used, subdue his antagonists, and lead them captives to his system.

Indeed when the state of the Christian church in that age is considered, it seems unreasonable to suppose that Tertullian meant to speak of any thing else than the efficacy of his own arguments. The times had not yet arrived, when the Princes of the earth, by wholesome severities, “ compelled heretics to their duty,” and *the State* became an executioner for *the Church*.

P. 5. l. 7.

“ Albinus.” An account of him, ascribed to Julius Capitolinus, is to be found in *Hist. Aug. Script.* Salmasius peremptorily ascribes it to Spartian; and Mr Gibbon

bon implicitly follows Salmasius, v. 1. p. 134. *not.* 17. “ Spartianus, “ says he,” “ in his indigested collections, mixes up all the virtues and all the vices that enter into the human composition, and bestows them on the same object.”

This criticism seems much too severe. In the delineating of the manners of Albinus, the author, be he Julius Capitolinus, or be he Spartian, quotes the accounts given of him by Ælius Cordus, Marius Maximus, and by the Emperor Severus himself in his memoirs. Those accounts are, no doubt, inconsistent; but what could an author do, who, living at a later period, had no knowledge of Albinus, other than what he learned from more early historians? It is true, that he might have first formed an hypothesis, and then have selected whatever was favourable to the reputation of Albinus, or unfavourable, just as best suited his purpose.

pose. But *this* would have been to *make* history, not to *write* it. Unacquainted with such refinements, the historian has set down every thing that he found related, either in praise or dispraise, of the unsuccessful usurper.

We moderns have one art, among others, which the ancients knew not : what we are unwilling to place in the *text*, we huddle into *notes* ; and thus, without any disparagement to ourselves, we may either tell the same story in two different ways, or alternately assume a doubtful or a decisive *tone*.

Not meaning to be the historian of Albinus, I cannot stay to examine all the portraits which have been drawn of him. The latest, and not the most inconsiderable artist says : “ Virtue, or the *appearances of virtue*, recommended Albinus to the confidence and good opinion of Marcus.” [Aurelius Philosophus.] *Gibbon*,

i. 134. I judge the sense of the author to be, that “ the appearances of virtue were
 “ necessary to recommend a man to the
 “ good opinion of the Royal Philoso-
 “ pher.”

But, at p. 103. I read, that the same Emperor “ promoted several of the lo-
 “ vers of his wife to posts of honour and
 “ profit.” *What* those lovers were, we learn from p. 102. and from the note 2. Now it might be worth the inquiring, whether the paramours of Faustina were recommended to Marcus by the appearances of virtue? If they were, they agree not with the account given of them at p. 102. If they were not, then Marcus is unjustly praised at p. 134. and he proves to have been just such a one as many other Princes, who bestow places of honour and profit from their own caprice or conveniency, or from the caprice or conveniency of their ministers.

And

And here I must be permitted to observe, that the note in question, and another [59] at p. 179. might well have been spared. Mr Gibbon must have thought little of his own ability to instruct his readers, and of his readers ability to be instructed, when he judged that any *commentaries* were requisite to explain his *meaning*.

An historian should say to himself, with the Poet,

Virginibus puerisque canto.

The work of Mr Gibbon, being fashionable, may have found its way to the toilets of virgins; and it is certain enough that youths have read it. Surely he did not desire to have *such* readers of *such* notes.

P. 5. l. 8

“ In fellowship with Cassius,” [*Cassiani.*] Avidius Cassius rebelled against Marcus Antoninus, and assumed the imperial dignity; he was assassinated about three months after by some of his soldiers.

Dion

Dion Cassius, l. lxxi. c. ult. *Julius Capitolinus*, Hist. Aug. Script. p. 33. *Vulcatius Gallicanus*, ib. p. 42. There is no fact in ancient history better authenticated than the murder of Avidius Cassius; and, therefore, one cannot, without considerable surprize, read the following passage in Mr Gibbon, i. 95. “ Marcus regretted, that Avidius Cassius, who excited a rebellion in Syria, had disappointed him, *by a voluntary death*, of the pleasure of converting an enemy into a friend.”

What renders this error still more extraordinary, is, that Mr Gibbon himself quotes *Vulcatius Gallicanus*, who has preserved the letter written by Marcus Antoninus to his wife Faustina, on the death of Cassius. “ In a word,” says the Emperor, “ had the events of war corresponded with my wishes, not even Avidius himself should have been killed.”

“ led.” [Denique, si ex mea sententia de bello judicatum esset, nec Avidius esset occisus.]

I have looked into the abridgement of Mr Gibbon's work, and I see that the abridger has faithfully turned *assassination* into *suicide*.

P. 5. l. 8.

“ Cassius.” The like sentiment is expressed at greater length by Tertullian. *Apol. c. 35.* “ Unde Cassii, et Nigri, et
 “ Albini, unde qui inter *Duas Laurus* obfi-
 “ dent Cæsarem? unde qui faucibus exprimendis palæstriam exercent? unde qui ar-
 “ mati Palatium irrumpunt, omnibus Sige-
 “ riis atque Partheniis audaciores? De Romanis, nisi fallor, id est de non Christianis, atque adeo omnes illi sub ipsa
 “ usque impietatis eruptione et sacra faciebant pro salute Imperatoris, et genium ejus dejerabant, alii foris, alii intus, et utique *publicorum hostium* nomen
 “ Christianis dabant. Sed et qui nunc scelerum
 “ lestarum

“ lestarum partium focii aut plaufores
 “ quotidie revelantur, post vindemiam
 “ parricidarum racematio superstes, quàm
 “ recentissimis et ramosissimis laureis po-
 “ stes præstruebant, quàm elatissimis et
 “ clarissimis lucernis vestibula nebula-
 “ bant, quàm cultissimis et superbissimis
 “ toris Forum sibi dividebant? non ut
 “ gaudia publica celebrarent, sed ut vota
 “ propria jam edicerent in aliena solem-
 “ nitate, et exemplum atque imaginem
 “ spei suæ inaugurarent, nomen Principis
 “ in corde mutantés.”

This passage is paraphrased by Reeves
 in the following manner, *Christian Apolo-*
gies, vol. 1. p. 319. “ Whence come the
 “ Cassius’s, the Nigers, and Albinus’s?
 “ Whence those who set upon the Em-
 “ peror Commodus between the two Lau-
 “ rel groves at Lauretum? and those who
 “ got him strangled at his exercise with

G

“ his

“ his wrestling-master Narcissus ? Whence
 “ those who broke into the Palace, sword
 “ in hand, and murdered Pertinax in a
 “ more audacious manner, than Domi-
 “ tian was by the Sigerius’s and the Par-
 “ thenius’s ? Now these parricides, if I
 “ mistake not, were men of rank, and
 “ Romans, and not a Christian among
 “ them. And these traitors, just before
 “ the perpetration of this horrid impiety,
 “ offered sacrifices to Cæsar’s health, and
 “ swore by Cæsar’s genius, with religion
 “ in their faces, and murder in their
 “ hearts, and branded the Christians with
 “ the character of public enemies. But
 “ the principals and abettors of this
 “ wicked conspiracy, which are daily de-
 “ tected, and picked up as the gleanings
 “ after a vintage of rebellion ; Bless me !
 “ With what loads of laurel did they sig-
 “ nalize their gates on Cæsar’s birth-day ?
 “ With what extraordinary illuminations
 “ did

“ did their porches overcast the sun?
 “ With what exquisite and stately tables
 “ did they take up the forum? Not, in
 “ truth, to celebrate the public joy, but
 “ to take omens from hence of their own
 “ future empire, and to inaugurate this
 “ image of their hopes, even upon Cæ-
 “ far’s festival, by calling themselves in
 “ the hearts by the name of Cæsar.”

He who has ever made the experiment,
 must know how very difficult it is to ren-
 der the sentiments of Tertullian into Eng-
 lish; and this may serve as an apology
 both for Reeves and for myself.

I do not mean to censure Reeves’s pa-
 raphrase for the colloquial phrases with
 which it abounds; such as, “ *got Com-*
 “ *modus strangled—broke into the Pa-*
 “ *lace sword in hand—not a Christian*
 “ *among them—picked up—Bless me.*”
 Writers of the age in which Reeves lived,

and writers by far his superiors, were too apt to debase their serious works by the use of mean and vulgar language; so, what was the fault of his times, ought not to be particularly censured in him. The error of the present times is just the reverse of what formerly prevailed. For now, a marriage, or an elopement, a resignation of an office, or an appointment to it, an additional bow-window at a Nobleman's seat, or a new gravel-walk at a watering-place, are all announced to the public, and what is it that is not announced to the public, either in the grave style of History, or with every trope of Rhetoric.

The paraphrase of Reeves deviates so widely from the meaning of the original, that, for the sake of the unlearned reader, it cannot be passed over without some few criticisms.

He has interpolated the phrase, "men
" of

“ of rank,” forgetting that Narcissus, *the wrestler*, was the chief conspirator against Commodus.

Converting night into day, he speaks of “ *illuminations which overcast the sun;*” and I must add, that the conclusion of his paraphrase is unintelligible jargon.

At first sight, I inclined to rank the expression, “ those who got Commodus “ strangled *at his exercise with his wrestling-master Narcissus,*” among the mistranslations of Reeves. Dion Cassius, b. lxxii. p. 828.; the author of the life of Commodus, in *Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 52.; and Herodian, p. 28. 29. [edit Steph.] all concur in relating, that Commodus was strangled, while incapable of making any resistance. Yet, if Aurelius Victor may be credited, Commodus died in that way which the paraphrase of Reeves describes. His words are: “ Et Commodum “ quidem primò occultatius veneno peti-
 “ vere,

“ vere, cujus vis frustrata per cibum quo
 “ se casu repleverat, cùm alvi dolorem
 “ causaretur, auctore medico principe fac-
 “ tionis, in palæstram perrexit, ibi per
 “ ministrum ungenti, nam fortè is quo-
 “ que e consilio erat, *faucibus quasi arte*
 “ *exercitii brachiorum nodo validius pressis,*
 “ exspiravit.” This is just what Tertullian
 may have meant by the words, “ qui
 “ faucibus exprimendis palæstricam ex-
 “ ercent.” Dion Cassius, indeed, omits
 this singular circumstance, and gives a dif-
 ferent turn to the story; and he professes,
 that he wrote by *a divine impulse*, and was
 perfectly master of the subject; but I ob-
 serve, that notwithstanding such profes-
 sions, Mr Gibbon does not follow him
 implicitly. Dion Cassius expressly says,
 that poison was administered to Commo-
 dus in a dish of beef, [*ἐν κρεάσι βοείοις,*]
 or, as Principal Blackwall would have ex-
 pressed

pressed it, “ of beef-steaks, on which his
“ Imperial Majesty supped heartily.”

Mr Gibbon, after Herodian, says, i.
118. “ Marcia seized the occasion of
“ presenting a draught of wine to her
“ lover, after he had fatigued himself
“ with hunting some wild beasts. Com-
“ modus retired to sleep; but whilst he
“ was labouring with the effects of *poison*
“ and drunkenness, [for it seems that
“ the wine was poisoned, though the hi-
“ storian forgets to mention it], a robust
“ youth, by profession a wrestler, entered
“ his chamber, and strangled him with-
“ out resistance.”

It is of little moment in what way Com-
modus, a brute and a madman, was put
to death; but it will be remembered, that
Tertullian wrote before any of the histo-
rians now extant, who have undertaken
to relate the circumstances of that event.

I think that the meaning of Tertullian,
in

in the passage quoted, may be thus expressed.

“ Whence were Cassius, and Niger, and Al-
 “ binus ? whence those, who between *the*
 “ *Laurel Groves* beset Cæsar, and those who,
 “ to shew their proficiency in the art of
 “ wrestling, strangled him ? Whence were
 “ the armed men, who forced their way
 “ into the Imperial Palace, and atchieved
 “ a deed more audacious than any of Si-
 “ gerius or Parthenius ? If I mistake not,
 “ they were Romans, that is, they were
 “ not, in any sort, Christians ; and ac-
 “ cordingly, until the very moment at
 “ which their impious conspiracy burst
 “ forth, all of them performed holy
 “ rites for the welfare of the Emperor,
 “ and solemnly swore by his tutelary ge-
 “ nius, loyal in the outside, but inward-
 “ ly traitors ; and yet such men never
 “ ceased to bestow the appellation of pu-
 “ blic enemies on the Christians ! And
 “ even now, those associates or abettors
 “ of

“ of flagitious factions, who are detected
 “ from day to day, those gleanings after
 “ a vintage of parricides, what fresh and
 “ bushy garlands of laurel did they pile
 “ up before their gates, with what lofty
 “ and refulgent lamps did they over-
 “ spread the entry to their houses, and
 “ with how many elegant and sumptuous
 “ tables did they share the *Forum* among
 “ themselves; not that they might partake
 “ in the celebration of the public joy,
 “ but that they might even then, on a
 “ festival appointed for a very different
 “ purpose, utter their private vows, and,
 “ substituting in their own thoughts the
 “ name of another Emperor, seize the
 “ occasion to figure to themselves an o-
 “ minous representation of their own
 “ hope.”

P. 5. l. 19.

“ The welfare of the Roman State,”
 [ut ipsum saluum velit cum toto Romano
 H imperio.]

imperio.] To the like purpose he elsewhere speaks. “ Est et alia major necessitas nobis orandi pro Imperatoribus, etiam pro omni statu imperii—qui vim maximam, universo orbi imminentem—Romani imperii comteatu *scimus* retardari,” *Apol.* c. 32. An excellent summary of both passages is to be found in the following words: “ Tertullian is at pains to vindicate the Christians from the charge of being ill-affected to the State; and gives it as one reason, among others, why in their public liturgies they constantly prayed for the safety of the Cæsaræan empire, from the persuasion then generally held, and professedly founded on the authority of this text, [2 Theff. c. 2. v. 5.—8.] that Antichrist could not be revealed, so long as that empire should continue, and that the greatest calamity which ever threatened the world, was only delayed

“ ed

“ ed by its preservation.” *Sermons* by Bp Halifax, v. i. p. 152.

On this occasion, I indulge myself in the melancholy pleasure of quoting the words of a lamented friend, and I add my testimony of approbation, such as it is, to *that* of all who knew his worth and accomplishments.

P. 6. l. 9.

“ So also is he greater than your gods,
 “ for he beareth sway over them ;” [et
 ipſis diis major eſt, dum et ipſi in pote-
 ſtate ſunt ejus.] He explains this at more
 length in *Apol.* c. 29. “ Multi denique dii
 “ habuerunt Cæſarem iratum. Facit ad
 “ cauſam ſi et propitium; cùm illis ali-
 “ quid liberalitatis aut privilegii confert.
 “ Ita qui ſunt in Cæſaris poteſtate, cujus
 “ et toti ſunt, quomodo habebunt ſalutem
 “ Cæſaris in poteſtate, ut eam præſtare
 “ poſſe videantur, quam facilius ipſi a Cæ-
 “ ſare conſequantur ?”

P. 8. l. 5.

“ Threshing-floors.” [Areæ.] *Area* is thus described by Varro, *de l. l. iv.* “ U-
 “ bi frumenta secta teruntur et arefcunt :
 “ propter harum fimilitudinem, loca in
 “ urbe pura *areæ* ;” and hence *Florenti-*
nus, l. 24. *D. de verborem fignificatione*,
 fays, “ locus fine ædificio in urbe, *area*.”
 In this laft fignification, the word has
 been received into the Englifh language.

Such places ufed for fepulture, how-
 ever inconsistent with modern notions,
 were known among the ancient Chriftians.
 Thus Pontius, fpeaking of Cyprian the
 martyr, fays, “ Sepultus eft in *areis* Ma-
 “ crobii Candidi Procuratoris,” *vita Cypr.*
 p. 14. edit. *Fell.* It is probable that the
 ancient Chriftians did not incline to lay
 their dead in places dedicated to Pagan
 divinities, nor the Pagans to admit them
 there.

There is an ambiguity in the phrafe of
 Tertullian,

Tertullian, which cannot be expressed by any translation. The cry of the multitude related to those *areas*, or *void spaces*, in which the Christians were wont to bury their dead. But Tertullian interprets it in another sense, as implying *the threshing or treading floors* then in use for the separation of grain from the husk. The manner of preparing and using such areas, may be seen in *Dickson's Husbandry of the Ancients*, ii. 175.—194.

In the heathen world, there were very many phrases of *ill omen*, which dastardly men applied to their own condition and circumstances, while men of more courage and presence of mind, although not free from superstition, turned them into omens of good. Here Tertullian, according to the genius of Paganism, perverts an unimportant expression into an ill omen, verified, as he says, by the event.

To the learned reader, this note must
appear

appear superfluous, but it may be of use to the unlearned.

P. 9 l. 7.

“ In the district of Utica,” [in conventu Uticensi.] One might suppose that the author spake of a phænomenon which was observed at the time of some public assembly held in the city of Utica; but his meaning is, that the phænomenon was observed in “ the district,” or, “ in the territory subject to the jurisdiction of “ Utica.”

P. 9. l. 12.

“ *That* could not have been owing to “ any eclipse, for he was then in his al- “ titude and house,” [ut non potuerit ex ordinario deliquio hoc pati, positus in suo hypsomate et domicilio.] For the following commentary on this obscure passage, I am beholden to an ingenious and learned friend.

For the better explaining of the pas-
sage

sage in Tertullian, it may be proper to premise a few observations on the science of Astrology, and the terms of art which its professors employed.

The two luminaries, and the five planets, were among the principal objects with which the science was concerned.—To each of them respectively, were attributed certain fundamental virtues derived from their own nature, but acting with more or less energy, according to the circumstances in which those bodies at any given time were placed.

The circumstances which thus modified their action, were in barbarous Latin called *dignitates* and *debilitates*, and were divided into essential and accidental.

The two first of the essential dignities were the *House*, (in Latin, *Domus* or *Domicilium*, and in Greek $\delta\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$), and the *exaltation*, which the Greeks called $\upsilon\psi\omega\mu\alpha$,
and

and the Latins *elevatio*, *exaltatio*, and sometimes *altitudo*.

The *house* of the planet or luminary, was a certain constellation of the Zodiac, supposed to suit best with its particular nature, and in which it was more vigorous than elsewhere. Each of the five planets had two houses, a day-house and a night-house, but one only was assigned to each of the luminaries.

The Sun's house was the constellation Leo, the reasons for which choice I need not speak of.

As to the ὕψωμα, it was an exaltation of strength arising from the planet or luminary being also in a particular constellation of the Zodiac, but which constellation, according to most of the ancient and all the modern astrologers, was different from its house. Thus the Sun's ὕψωμα was in *Aries*.

Julius Firmicus, however, a Latin astrologer,

loger, (supposed to have written in the fourth century), mentions (ii. 3.) that according to the Babylonians, the house and place of exaltation were the same.

Ἐψωμα, it may be observed, was also used to signify the place where the exaltation happened.

In regard to the meaning of the word ἔψωμα, as an astrological term, see Sextus Empiricus, p. 115. ed. Genev. 1621; and also Plutarch, *Sept. sap. conviv.* vi. 564. edit. Ruskii.

The reason for explaining the sun's ἔψωμα in *Aries* seems to have been, that he was there passing into the northern hemisphere, and his light and heat increasing. Hence Sextus Empiricus puts it in the nineteenth degree of the *constellation*, which I suppose he understood in his own days as the place of the equinox.

It is, however, to be remarked, that still the term ἔψωμα did not, in the sense

of astrologers, exprefs his growing altitude above the plane of the horizon, or any other plane, but merely the exaltation of his strength and vigour, or the place where fuch exaltation happened. This is exprefsly remarked by Origanus, a Profeffor of Mathematics, who is author of the Brandenburg Tables, to which he has prefixed a very complete fyftem of astrology. The paffage I allude to is in page 415. of his introduction to thofe Tables. It appears to me too, that the paffages above quoted indicate this to be the true fenfe of the word; nor have I been able to find any instance where it is ufed fynonymoufly with *ἑπαρσις*, *αἰώρημα*, or the like words. Befides, it is to be obferved, that the moon and the five planets had their *ὑψωμάλα* affigned to them, for reafons which do not feem to admit of this word's being underftood otherwife

therwife than in the fenfe above mentioned.

I muft now fpeak concerning the divifion of the heavens by astrologers into twelve portions, known more lately by the name of *domus cœleftes*, or *the celeftial houfes*. The divifion itfelf appears to have been very ancient, but the name has, I fufpect, more lately come into ufe. This fort of houfe is totally different from that of which I have already fpoken. It was by their own proper motions, that the planets and two luminaries entered into and left their *own houfes*; but it was by the revolution of the *primum mobile*, that they, as well as the fixed ftars, paffed fucceffively in the courfe of a fidereal day through all the twelve *celeftial houfes*.

The circles of the fphere by which this divifion of the heavens was made, were different in different fyftems of aftrology. But all the fyftems feem to have agreed in

this, that the semicircle forming the westmost boundary of the first house, was either the eastern semicircle of the horizon, or another semicircle cutting it, and that the houses were numbered from west to east, according to the order of the signs of the ecliptic.

I need not take notice of the names and properties of the different houses, it being sufficient to mention, that all questions concerning human affairs were solved by considering what stars, at a particular time, were in certain celestial houses, and in what arrangement they were disposed;—one house being more fit for resolving one set of questions, and another a different set.

It became, therefore, an important object, to have a method of determining with precision, what stars, at any given instant of time, and at a given place, were in the different houses. It could be but
 very

very rudely done by actual observation, and frequently not at all. But if the place of every star referred to some known circle of the celestial sphere, such as the ecliptic or equator, was known for every instant of time, the celestial house which at any time it occupied could be found by calculation, if the place of observation was given: And hence it was, that in the older ephemerides of Europe, tables were constructed to facilitate those calculations.

When I first read the passage in Tertulian, I imagined *suum domicilium* to mean the *celestial house* in which the sun was at the time, and *hypfoma* his altitude above the horizon, from which, the hour and place of observation being given, and as he is always in the ecliptic, his place in the heavens might be determined. And I considered the author as meaning to say,
that

that the sun was in a place, where he could not undergo so complete an eclipse.

I am now disposed to consider *domicilium* and *hypfoma* as employed by Tertullian, not in this sense, but in that which I first explained, namely, *domicilium*, as signifying his *own proper house*, and *hypfoma*, as signifying that exaltation of strength, or the place where it accrued to him, of which I have said so much. For, *first*, We seem to have no authority for considering the word *hypfoma*, when applied to him, as having any other meaning. And, in the *next* place, I am not satisfied, that the twelve portions of the heavens, called more lately celestial houses, had in Tertullian's days obtained that name. Likewise, although in the case of the sun, from the celestial house being given in which he was, and his altitude above the horizon, his place in the ecliptic might be found, yet it would be a
 very

very aukward way of proceeding. *Lastly*, as Tertullian says not a word about the moon's place, it appears to me obvious, that he cannot have had in view her interposition between the sun and earth, as the cause which the Pagans assigned for solar eclipses, and which cause, he intended to say, could not account for such a darkness, as in this particular instance had happened. It is impossible, that if this theory had been in his view, he would have mentioned only the *sun's* place in the heavens: For the possibility of an eclipse depends entirely on his distance from the moon's node at the time of change, and not at all on his own place.

It seems to me more likely therefore, that he had some other theory in contemplation, which he understood to be *that* by which the Pagans accounted for eclipses, and which he intended to shew

was

was insufficient to account for the particular phænomenon to which he refers.

Considering the period at which he wrote, I doubt not, that although a few philosophers might still retain the knowledge of the true cause, yet the *vulgar* theory of eclipses might be founded, (as it seems to have been in earlier days), on some strange notions of their being occasioned by a disease or enemy with which the luminary had to struggle. We may suppose Tertullian to have heard, that the Pagans imputed the sun's eclipse to an accident of this sort. We may suppose him also to have had a superficial knowledge of astrology, and to have understood in general, that there were certain constellations where the sun, moon, and planets, were more powerful than in any others, which may have given him a confused notion of their getting in such places an increase of strength and vigour,
like

like that which an animal or a plant gets in favourable circumstances.

Supposing this to have been the state of his ideas on the subject, if he was told, that at the time of the eclipse happening the sun was in his *own house*, or in his *sign of exaltation*, or (according to the Babylonian astrology) that he was in a constellation which was both his own house and place of exaltation, it may have appeared to him impossible, without supernatural means, and the special interposition of the Deity, that the luminary, when thus at his utmost strength, and most exalted in all his powers, (*in domicilio suo et hypsomete positus*), should be so much overpowered, as to have his light almost extinguished.

This interpretation appears to derive support from the sneering manner in which Tertullian brings in the *habetis astrologos*, and is on the whole (though I am by no

means confident of having rightly explained the passage) the most plausible account that at present occurs to me of the author's meaning.

Lampridius records a sudden darkness at Rome in the reign of Commodus, "Re-
 " *pentina caligo ac tenebra in circo Cal.*
 " *Januariis oborta,*" Hist. Aug. Script.
 p. 31. It is probable, that the darkness recorded by Tertullian was of a like kind, to be accounted for by natural philosophers, rather than by astrologers.

P. 10. l. 5.

" *Left the Christians be glad over me,*"
 [*Ne spe gaudeant Christiani.*] The word *spe* occurs in no manuscript of this treatise but one, and, therefore, Rigaltius looks upon it as an interpolation. Indeed the phrase, " *left the Christians rejoice in hope,*" is much too scriptural for a heathen to use; and we may reasonably presume, that Herminianus did not
 use

use it. But let us inquire, whether there may not have been some mistake here, and whether, while we set aside the word *spe*, we may not find some other expression more applicable to the circumstances of Herminianus.

In a MS. full of abbreviations, as ancient MSS. not written in capitals generally are, we may suppose, that *super me* was written thus, *spme*, or even *spē*; that one transcriber, not adverting to the contraction, and to the upper line expressive of *m*, wrote *spe* for *spē*; and that other transcribers observing the strange characters *spme*, omitted them as being unintelligible. From this conjecture, there will arise a new reading, “ ne *super me* gaudeant Christiani,” by which Herminianus is made to convert a general observation and inference into something more apposite and peculiar to his own condi-

tion. By the reading *spe*, the Christians are understood to *rejoice*; by the reading *super me*, which I propose, they are understood to *insult*.

P. 10. l. 10.

“ At the *overthrow* of Byzantium,” [in illo exitu Byzantino.] This seems the just translation; “ at the *end* of Byzantium,” would have been literal and absurd. Tertullian frequently uses the word *exitus*. Thus, not to mention other examples, he has “ *ſæculi exitus*,” opposed to *diſpoſitio*, as if one ſhould ſay, “ the *compoſing* and *decompoſing* of things,” *Apol. c. 18*. “ *Exitus hodiernus Judæorum*,” the preſent ruined ſtate of the Jews, *Apol. c. 21*. “ *Exitus furoris*,” the conſequences of fanaticiſm, *Apol. c. 21*. “ *Apoſtolorum exitus*,” the martyrdom of the Apoſtles, *Scorpiace, c. 15*. And “ *exitus Domini*,” the paſſion of our Lord, *de Fejun. c. 10*.

Byzantium,

Byzantium, having been occupied by the soldiers of Niger, long withstood Severus; and at last, as Mr Gibbon chuses to express it, i. 147. “ surrendered to fa-
 “ mine.” Were we to speak with precision, we should say, that “ Byzantium was attack-
 “ ed by sea, and blockaded on the land-
 “ side;” and that, “ for want of provisions,
 “ the garrison capitulated.” See *Herodian*, iii. 68. *edit. Steph.*

Mr Gibbon says, that, in Byzantium, “ the citizens and soldiers, *we know not*
 “ *from what cause*, were animated with
 “ equal fury.” The cause may be found in *Herodian*, iii. 64. They knew the implacable temper of Severus. “ Severus,” says *Herodian*, “ after having cut off Niger,
 “ indiscriminately and unsparingly pu-
 “ nished his associates, and all who,
 “ from choice, or *even from necessity*, had
 “ attached themselves to him.” [ὁ δὲ
 Σεβήρος, καθελὼν τὸν Νίγρον, τοὺς μὲν φίλους
 αὐτοῦ,

αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔτι τινες, ἔ μόνον ἐκ προαιρέσεως, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀνάγκης προσέθεντο αὐτῶν, πάντας ἀφειδῶς ἐκόλασε.]

That elegant Historian, whom I have so often occasion to quote, says, “ for the
 “ theory [of the siege of Byzantium], the
 “ fanciful Chevalier de Folard may be
 “ looked into. See *Polybe*, tom. 1. p. 76.”
 [p. 88. edit. Paris.] It is probable, that few of my readers are acquainted with Folard's work, and therefore I have transcribed the passage which contains the *theory* of the siege of Byzantium. “ Il
 “ n'y a guères de siège régulier et de vive
 “ force, qui soit plus mémorable dans
 “ l'Histoire, ni qui ait duré plus long tems.
 “ Dion dit, que la ville fut assiégée durant
 “ trois ans par les flots, s'il faut ainsi dire,
 “ de toute la terre, et qu' il y avoit un si
 “ grand nombre de machines, faites presque
 “ toutes par Prisque, bourgeois de Nicée,
 “ qui avoit un art tout particulier pour cela,
 “ qu'on

“ qu'on n'avoit jamais rien vû de sembla-
 “ ble.” On “ peut bien juger que parmi
 “ les machines des assiégés il y avoit des
 “ corbeaux (*harpagones*), à l'extrémité des-
 “ quels étoient des griffes ou des agraphes
 “ de fer, qu'on lançoit et qu'on jettoit sur
 “ les assiégés, qui s'accrochant à tout
 “ ce qui pouvoit donner prise, l'enlevoit d'
 “ une vitesse et d'une rapidité surprenante.”

Hence we learn, and we learn nothing more, that *harpago*, “ a large hook or a grappling-iron,” is in French *un corbeau*, and that such an instrument was no doubt employed by the besieged at Byzantium, although Dion Cassius says nothing of the matter. This is called “ the *theory* of the siege of Byzantium.”

It should seem, that Tertullian has preserved the name of the brave, although unfortunate governor of Byzantium, COECILIUS CAPELLA.

P. 11. l. 17.

Cyprian has expressed this argument at greater length, and, as I think, with more perspicuity. “ Quæ hæc est infatiabilis carnificinæ rabies ? quæ inexplebilis libido sævitix ? Quin potius elige tibi alterum de duobus : Christianum esse, aut est crimen, aut non est : si crimen est, quid non interficis confitentem ? si crimen non est, quid persequeris innocentem ? torqueri enim [s. equidem] si negarem, si pœnam tuam metuens, id quod prius fueram, et quòd deos tuos non colueram, mendacio fallentia celarem, tunc torquendus fuiffem, tunc ad confessionem criminis vi doloris adigendus ; sicut in ceteris quæstionibus torquentur rei qui se negant crimine quo accusantur teneri, ut facinoris veritas, quæ indice voce non promitur, dolore corporis exprimatur, nunc verò cùm sponte confitear et clamem, et cre-

bris

“ ac repetitis identidem vocibus, Christi-
 “ anum me esse confessor; quòd tormenta
 “ admoves confitenti, et deos tuos non
 “ in abditis et secretis locis, sed palàm, sed
 “ publicè, sed in foro ipso, Magistrati-
 “ bus et Præsìdibus audientibus destru-
 “ enti?” &c. *Ad Demetrianum*, p. 191.
 edit. *Fell.*

P. 12. l. 6.

“ Cincius Severus.” We must regret
 that Tertullian has omitted to record that
 expedient which this mild Governor de-
 vised for the relief of the Christians in their
 day of trial.

There is extant, in the Province of
Byzantium, an inscription, bearing these
 words: “ Pro salute M. Antonini Aug.
 “ Pii liberorumque ejus *Cintius*, C. F. R.
 “ N.” &c. *Shaw*, Travels, Part 1. c. 3.
 p. 101. A *Cincius Severus* was put to
 death in the early part of the reign of Se-
 verus, on a charge of having attempted

to poison the Emperor. “ Cincium Se-
 “ verum calumniatus est quòd se vene-
 “ no appetisset, atque ita interfecit,” *Æl. Spartian*, Hist. Aug. Script. p. 69.

If we hold him to be the person whom Tertullian applauds, it is probable, that the expedient, proposed at Tifdra, took place during the persecution under Marcus Antoninus, for Commodus, the successor of Antoninus, gave peace to the Christians.

P. 12. l. 7.

“ At Tifdra,” [Tifdra,] “ *Tifdra*, Tif-
 “ drus, Thyrsdrus, Thydrum, Tifdro,
 “ now called *Jemmè*, about six leagues to
 “ the S. S. W. of *Surseff*, (anciently *Sar-*
 “ *sura*), in the kingdom of Tunis,” *Shaw*,
 Travels, t. 1. part 2. c. 5. p. 117. 4to e-
 dit. Mr Gibbon, speaking of the insur-
 rection in Africa, while Maximin reign-
 ed, says, “ the conspirators seized on *the*
 “ *little town* of Thydrus,—and compel-
 “ led Gordianus their Proconsul to ac-
 “ cept

“ cept the imperial purple.” He adds in a note, “ *this city* was decorated, probably by the Gordians, with the title of Colony, and with a fine amphitheatre, still in a very perfect state,” i. 212. He refers to Dr Shaw, and seems to improve on his conjecture. The words of Dr Shaw are: “ As the elder Gordian was proclaimed Emperor at this city, it is not improbable, that, in gratitude to the place where he received the purple, he might have been the founder of it. Upon one of the medals of the younger Gordian, [meaning the *youngest*], we have an *amphitheatre*, not hitherto accounted for by the medalists: It may be too peremptory, perhaps, to fix it here at Tifdra,” Travels, p. 117.

Dr Shaw forgot, that the *first* Gordian reigned, if he may be said to have reigned at all, but a year and six months at most; in the opinion of some critics, six

months ; and of others, only *thirty-six days*. This last opinion is approved of, as being indubitable, by Mr Gibbon, i. 219. The *second* Gordian was slain in battle before the death of his father, *ib.* p. 218. Thus, whichever computation be followed, it is plain that neither the *first* nor the *second* Gordian had time or leisure to finish, or even to found such an amphitheatre as that at Tifdra. The *third* Gordian was murdered at a very early age, and the disturbed state of the empire during his short reign, must necessarily have prevented him or his guardian Misitheus from erecting such public buildings as amphitheatres. Indeed great and ornamental works of that nature are not erected, unless in times of wealth and tranquillity. And accordingly we learn, from Julius Capitolinus, *Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 164. that Gordian *intended* to have made a portico near the *Campus Martius*, with

with what, in modern language, would be called a shrubbery, and also public baths. But the only things which the historian mentions, of the nature of public works, as actually executed by Gordian, were certain fountains, or conduits, [*Nymphæa*]; a pretty plain proof, that he had never heard of a magnificent amphitheatre at Tifdra erected by Gordian.

Dr Shaw admits, that the amphitheatre in question “seems to have been built near the time of *the Antonines*, agreeing exactly in proportion and workmanship with the buildings of that age.” Why then should he, contrary to all likelihood, suppose it to have been erected at a later period?

He adds, it is true, that on the reverse of a medal of Gordian there is an amphitheatre. I can have no doubt that an author so worthy and respectable as Dr Shaw spake from information; but the
course

course of his studies did not lead him to any knowledge in medals; and it is remarkable, that Vaillant, who has described no fewer than 316 coins of the *third* Gordian, takes no notice of any one of them with an amphitheatre on the reverse; and this is the more remarkable, because an *amphitheatre* is an uncommon reverse, and therefore could hardly have escaped the observation of Vaillant, had he discovered it on a coin of that Emperor. See *Vaillant Numismata Imperatorum*, p. 148. —158. *edit.* Huguetan.

But although the fact, reported by Dr Shaw, were to be admitted, it would not follow of necessary consequence, that Gordian erected an amphitheatre, either at Tifdra, or any where else. In proof of this, I appeal to two indisputable facts; 1st, There is extant a medal of the *first* or of the *second* Gordian, with this inscription, *Victoria Augustorum*. It was struck
by

by authority of the Roman Senate, on account of the victory which the Gordians, father and son, *were* to obtain over Maximin; struck, to use the emphatical expression of Mr Gibbon, “ When the Gordians themselves were no more.” i. 218. A delineation of this medal may be seen in *Begeri Thesaurus*, iii. 144. *2dly*, Vaillant has described a medal of the *third* Gordian, which represents a chariot drawn by four horses, with all the circumstances of a solemn triumph. *Numismata Imperatorum*, p. 157. Yet, unfortunately, the *third* Gordian never triumphed. The truth is, that about the time of the Gordians, the zeal of various cities, and even of the Roman Senate, by a fond anticipation, celebrated the events which they wished and looked for. If then, a reverse of the third Gordian, having *an amphitheatre*, be produced, I make no doubt, that it will be found to imply

no

no more than this, that some future amphitheatre was looked for, to rise under the reign of Gordian, after he had conquered the Persians, and restored universal security to the Roman Empire; or, perhaps, that an order had been given under the reign of Gordian, for the reparation of the ancient amphitheatre of Vespasian and Titus at Rome.

This much was necessary to shew, that from the hypothesis of Mr Gibbon himself, the amphitheatre in question could not have been erected by the *first* or by the *second* Gordian, and that there is no evidence, or even probability, that it was erected by the *third*.

Mr Gibbon appears to doubt, whether Tifdra ought to be called *a little town*, or *a city*; for, in the very same page, he gives it both appellations. Without entering into criticisms as to *town* and *city*, I think that it must have been *a very considerable*

considerable place. Its spacious and elegant amphitheatre, although not *decorated*, from an imaginary sentiment of gratitude, *by any of the Gordians*, proves that it was opulent and populous. We learn from Tertullian, that Cincius Severus, the Roman Governor of the district called *Bizacium*, had, occasionally at least, his tribunal at Tifdra; and which deserves particularly to be remarked, when Gordian the Proconsul was obliged to assume the fatal purple, he resided *there*, not as in a retreat from business, but as in a place where, in quality of supreme magistrate, he sat for the daily administration of justice: We learn this from Herodian, vii. 150. who says, “ The young men [the
 “ insurgents, who had just before assassi-
 “ nated the Procurator of Africa] pro-
 “ ceeded in the afternoon to the house
 “ of Gordian the Proconsul. Gordian
 “ had chanced to bestow that very day

M

“ at

“ at home, in repose from his labours, and
 “ in cessation from public business,” &c.

[Οἱ νεανίσκοι — ἤδη μεσαζύσης ἡμέρας ἐπίασιν
 ἐπὶ τὴν τῆ Ἀνθυπατεύοντος οἰκίαν — Συνέβαινε
 δὲ ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἢς τᾶυτα ἐπράττετο, οἶκος
 τὸν Γορδιανὸν διαίριβειν ἠσυχάζοντα, δεδωκότα τοῖς
 καμάρτοις ἀνάπαυαν ἀεργίαν τε ταῖς πράξεσι.]

Here is an amiable picture of an aged magistrate enjoying an interval of rest amidst the duties of his office.

One more quotation from Herodian, p. 150. will convince Mr Gibbon, if he can believe his favourite historian, that Tifdra was not a *little town*. The leaders of that disastrous insurrection assembled a great multitude of their slaves from the country, [μέγα δέ τι πλῆθος ἠθροίσθη], having concealed weapons, bludgeons, and hatchets, [ξύλα τε καὶ πελέκεις], and ordered this multitude to follow them to the residence of the Procurator, but so as to appear *a part of the croud*, [κελεύουσιν
 αὐτοῖς

ἀνθρώποις ἐπισθαι, ὡς ὄντας μέρος τῷ λοιπῷ ὄχλῳ.] Unless upon the supposition that Tisdra was a very considerable place, the whole of this narrative must appear utterly absurd.

P. 12. l. 10.

“Vespronius Candidus.” This name occurs different times, both in history and in the *fasti consulares*, from the days of Trajan down to the accession of Severus. But the distance of time between the one æra and the other is so great, that every thing that is said of a *Vespronius Candidus* cannot relate to the same man.

It is certain that there was a *Julius Vespronius Candidus* consul in the reign of Trajan. Pliny the younger records a saying of his; “aliud eloquentia, aliud lo-
“quentia,” Epist. v. 20. For it seems that, in those days, the distinction was not generally understood. He was again Consul in the reign of Hadrian; and it is pos-

sible, though not very likely, that he is the *Vespronius Candidus* to whom the Emperor Marcus Antoninus Pius addressed a rescript, *l. 7. Dig. de Accusationibus*.

If the person, whom I have mentioned as repeatedly consul, be the magistrate to whose prudence Tertullian bears honourable testimony, then the circumstance which he mentions happened during the persecution under Trajan.

But there is another person, plainly of the same family, *Vespronius Candidus*, consul immediately after the decease of Marcus Antoninus the philosopher. See Norris, *Epistola Consularis, ap. Græv. Thes. Antiquit. Roman. xi. 460*. He was one of the ambassadors sent by the Senate to persuade the Pannonian, or, more properly, the Illyrian legions, to abandon their leader Severus. He is thus described by Spartian, or by some more ancient author, whom Spartian has copied: “ In-
“ ter

“ ter cæteros legatus est Vespronius Can-
 “ didus vetus consularis, olim militibus
 “ invifus ob durum et fordidum imperi-
 “ um,” *Hift. Aug. Script.* p. 62. Such
 a commander, at once rigid and penu-
 rious, muft have been hateful to the fol-
 diery; and hence he was the moft unfit
 perfon imaginable to be fent for the pur-
 pofe of corrupting the legions. This feems
 the fense of the hiftorian. One fhould na-
 turally have looked for Vespronius Can-
 didus, in the long lift of consular men,
 and other eminent Senators, whom Seve-
 rus put to death, but his name is not to
 be found *there*; hence it is no improbable
 conjecture, that he purchafed his fafety
 with that wealth which he had hoarded up-
 while in office.

Of this perfon, I fuppofe, Tertullian
 fpeaks: For it is not likely that any of
 the examples which he gives of the beha-
 viour of Roman governors towards the
 Christians,

Christians, refer to times so far remote as those of Trajan.

P. 12. l. 15.

Asper. Two persons bearing that name are mentioned as consuls in the first year of Caracalla, A. U. C. 465. A. C. N. 212. Whether either of them be the person here meant, it is impossible to determine. It is conjectured by *Noris*, *Epistola Consularis*, p. 469. *ut. sup.* that they were the sons of L. Julius Julianus.

P. 12. l. 18.

Pudens. Probably Septimius Pudens. He appears to have been a favourite of Marcus Antoninus; for, according to some of the *fasti*, he was consul for two successive years in the early part of that Emperor's reign. *Ælius Lampridius* mentions him as consul with Pollio in the year when Commodus received the title of Cæsar, *Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 50.

P. 12.

P. 12. l. 20.

“ Understanding the accusation to be
 “ spiteful and vexatious, he tore it,” [in
 elogio, concussione ejus intellectâ, scisso
 eodem elogio, &c.] *Le Clerc* magisterially
 says: “ *Elogium* est accusatio, quâ a quo-
 “ piam, *per libellum sine nomine*, [quis]
 “ Christianismi accusabatur; quod factum
 “ vocatur *concussio*, hoc est, injusta vexatio.
 “ sæpe, in hos sensus, utrâque voce utitur
 “ Tertullianus, cujus locos *glossæ Tertullia-*
 “ *næ* suppeditabunt,” *Hist. Eccles.* p. 580.
 p. 9. Thus, according to *Le Clerc*, *elogium*
 “ is an *anonymous* information; in which
 “ sense, (it is said), Tertullian frequently
 “ uses the word.” But, in truth, *elogium*
 means *any* information conveyed to a
 judge, whether with or without the name
 of the informer or accuser. I do not
 think that, unless in this single passage,
 Tertullian ever uses it in the sense of an
 anonymous information. So extensive is
 the

the meaning of the word, that a “state
 “ of the grounds of accusation,” trans-
 mitted by an inferior judge to a superior,
 was called *elogium*. To this it is that
 Festus alludes, *Act. Apost. c. 25. v. 26.*
 Περὶ ἧ ἀσφαλές τι γράψαι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἔκ ἔχω.
 διὸ προήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ’ ὑμῶν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ
 σὺ, Βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὅπως τῆς ἀνακρίσεως
 γενομένης σχῶ τι γράψαι. Le Clerc is e-
 qually mistaken, when he says, that the
 act of presenting an anonymous infor-
 mation is termed *concuſſio*. See *Dig. tit.*
de Concuſſione. In the second law of that
 title it is said, “ poenâ legis Cornelix te-
 “ neri jumentur, qui in accusationem in-
 “ nocentium coierint.” This, as I under-
 stand, is what the English law calls a *con-*
spiracy.

Were I at liberty to alter the text in
 Tertullian, I should read, “ Pudens etiam
 “ missum ad se Christianum *cum* elogio,
 “ concuſſione ejus intellectu, dimisit, scif-
 “ so

“ *fo eodem elogio, sine accusatore negans se auditurum hominem, secundum mandatum :*” that is, Pudens declined to admit, as equivalent to a criminal charge, the grounds of accusation transmitted to him by an inferior judge.

P. 13. l. 2.

“ The mandates,” [mandatum.] The instructions which the Emperor gave to governors of provinces, as rules for their conduct, were called “ *Mandata.*” They were divided into heads or articles; and hence any point of those instructions might be called *mandatum*.

It is not unlikely that Pudens had in view *the article of instructions*, which required an accuser in the trial of crimes. But the general opinion is, that he alluded to a letter written by the Emperor Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus, proconsul of Asia. Justin. M. subjoined that letter in Latin, to what is called his *First Apo-*

N

logy.

logy. Eusebius translated it into Greek, as he himself says, *Eccles. Hist.* iv. 8.; and it is *that* Greek translation, iv. 9. which now appears at the end of Justin's Apology. The unlearned reader will find a translation of it in Lardner, *Testimonies*, ii. 109. But the learned reader will peruse it as in Eusebius. Dr Jortin justly observes, that " it is obscure, and that it is " probable that Hadrian composed it so " on purpose," *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* ii. 89. I am apt to consider it as a private or familiar letter; the expression *meberclè*, [μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα], would have founded odd in a *mandatum*, a *rescriptum*, or even in an *Epistola Principis*.

P. 13. l. 3.

" He could try no man without an accuser," [sine accusatore negans se auditurum hominem.] " *Audire hominem*," is an uncommon phrase. The Emperors Severus and Antoninus say, " *lis tunc con-*
" *testata*

“ *testata videtur, cùm judex per narra-*
“ *tionem negotii causam audire cœpit,*”
l. un. Cod. de lit. contest. The mean-
ing here is “ enter upon the trial of a
“ man.”

A cause could not proceed without an
accuser. Thus, Marcus Antoninus says,
“ Non possumus reum facere quem nul-
“ lus accusat,” *Vulcat. Gallic. Hist. Aug.*
Script. p. 40.

P. 13. l. 5.

“ Thine *advocates.*” He means the *affef-*
fores, men conversant in the form of judi-
cial proceedings, whom the governors of
provinces were wont to consult.

P. 13. l. 18.

“ Severus himself,” [ipse Severus.] Of
this subject, I have treated at large, *In-*
quiry into the secondary causes, &c. p. 67—
79; and I see no reason to depart from
the opinion there delivered, unless in one
particular. It seems rather improbable,

that the words "Severus, the father of Antonin," are to be understood of Severus while yet alive. Sulpicius, no doubt, relates, in his ecclesiastical history, that the Christians enjoyed peace during the reign of Caracalla; and it may be objected, that if they were persecuted during the first year of that Emperor, they could not be said to have enjoyed peace during his reign. But, if we hold the words of Tertullian to be more applicable to the reign of Caracalla than to *that* of Severus, the evidence of a writer, who spake of what was passing before his eyes, must greatly overbalance that of one who wrote long after. Besides, it is very probable, that on the demise of Severus, the governors of provinces would enforce edicts still existing against the Christians, though dormant; and *that*, not only to procure popularity from the vulgar in the beginning of a new administration; but also

also in the view of gain from confiscations and compositions. This violence might naturally enough have continued, until it was stopped by the orders of Caracalla : so that, upon the whole, I incline to date the address to Scapula in the early part of the first year of Caracalla, and while he reigned with Geta ; and so far to assent to the opinion of Mosheim, which I formerly rejected. *This* makes no difference whatever in my general argument.

P. 14. l. 5.

“ Severus,” &c. Salmasius seems to consider this passage as inconsistent with what is said by Spartian : “ Judæos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit, idem etiam de Christianis sanxit,” *Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 70. p. 138.

But in truth, there is no discrepancy between the two authors. Tertullian says, that on certain occasions, Severus screened

ed many Christians from the fury of the populace; not surely, that he never persecuted the Christians at all.

I am apt to suppose, that the edict of Severus, mentioned by Spartian, was directed principally against those who became profelytes to the faith; and of course against those who were instrumental in the conversion of Pagans. By such means a politic Emperor might, naturally enough, endeavour to check the growth of a religion which he could not eradicate.

It was fit that Tertullian, addressing himself to Scapula, should place the moderation and benevolence of Severus in the fairest light. But we, who have learnt from the concurring voice of historians, that he was both cruel and covetous, may well conjecture, that, covetousness having prevailed over cruelty, he sold his moderation

ration and benevolence, for a price paid by Christians of eminent rank.

P. 14. l. 11.

“ Marcus Aurelius.” Tertullian elsewhere alludes to the same event, *Apol. c. 5.*
 “ Literæ Marci Aurelii, gravissimi Impera-
 “ toris, requirantur, quibus illam Ger-
 “ manicam fitim, Christianorum *fortè*
 “ militum precationibus impetrato imbre
 “ discussam contestatur;” which is thus translated by the laborious Dr Lardner, *Testimonies*, ii. 226. “ If the epistle of
 “ that worthy Emperor Marcus Aurelius
 “ be sought for, it will *perhaps* be seen,
 “ that he ascribes his deliverance from a
 “ great drought in the German war, to
 “ the prayers of Christian soldiers.” At p. 247 he changes the position of *perhaps*, and says, obtained *perhaps* by the
 “ prayers of the Christian soldiers ”

Dr Lardner observes, that Basnage, *Annal.* an. 174. took notice of the word *fortè*;
 . *tè*;

tè; and said, “*dixissetne Christianorum*
 “*fortè militum precationibus* si literas per-
 “legisset.” He then adds, “in the La-
 “tin original of Tertullian’s Apology, and
 “also as it is cited in the Latin edition of
 “Eusebe’s Chronicle, there is an un-
 “lucky *fortè* or *perhaps*; wherein he
 “seems to express a doubt, whether the
 “Emperor did, in his letter to the senate,
 “expressly acknowledge, that his delive-
 “rance, in a time of great drought, was
 “owing to the prayers of the Christians.
 “—It must be allowed, that if this *for-*
 “*tè* has no meaning, it comes in very un-
 “luckily.”

I think that *fortè*, however *unlucky* it
 may be esteemed, has a meaning, but that
 Basnage, and Lardner after him, have
 mistaken it. The passage in Tertullian
 ought to be pointed thus: “Christiano-
 “rum, *fortè* militum, [or militantium]
 “precationibus;” that is, “through the
 “prayers

“ prayers of Christians, who chanced to
 “ be soldiers in the Imperial army,” [qui
 tum fortè sub Marco Aurelio militabant ;]
 and not, “ *perhaps* he ascribes his delive-
 “ rance—to the prayers of Christian sol-
 “ diers.”

Dr Lardner observes, that no expres-
 sion corresponding to the word *fortè* ap-
 pears in the Greek translation of Tertul-
 lian, which Eusebius has inserted in his
 Ecclesiastical History, v. 5.

Here it may be fit to remark, that Eu-
 sebius *refers* to Tertullian, but does not
translate his words. If he understood *for-
 tè* as I do, he has expressed what I sup-
 pose to be the sense of Tertullian,—
ταῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐυχαῖς, must mean, “ by
 “ the prayers of Christian *soldiers*, who
 “ chanced to be in the Imperial army ;”
 for it could only be in the quality of
 soldiers, that any Christians encountered
 the *Quædi* and *Marcomanni* in Germany.

Not having the original Greek of the Chronicle of Eusebius, we know not whether it contained the word *fortè*; the presumption is, that it did, or something equivalent. The Latin version, as was most reasonable, transcribes the very words of Tertullian; so there is no evidence, that Eusebius, in his Chronicle, meant to suppress any thing which Tertullian had said.

Let me not be understood, as intending to assert, that Tertullian ever saw a letter to the Roman Senate, in which Marcus Antoninus ascribed the seasonable, if not wonderful, rain to the prayers of his Christian soldiers. On the contrary, I imagine that Tertullian, in his *Apology*, adopted a prevalent rumour, which he afterwards discovered to be of no authority. For it is plain, that the passage in the address to *Scapula*, which gave occasion to this note, says much less, and in
words

words more guarded, than had been formerly used in the *Apology*.

The supposed epistle of Marcus Antoninus to the Roman Senate, is generally subjoined to the works of Justin Martyr, as a translation into Greek from the original Latin; no sound critic in our days will assert its absolute authenticity: But the question remains, is it *false*, or is it only *interpolated*? The general narrative may be authentic, although what respects the Christians ought to be considered as the shameless forgery of a later age. This, however, is a matter of criticism foreign to the present subject of inquiry.

Towards the beginning of this note, I gave the epithet of *laborious* to Dr Lardner; and in other tracts published by me, I have, in speaking of that author, used the same epithet, or something equivalent.

While engaged in the support of the

proofs of Christianity, I little expected to meet with the following note by one whom we must suppose friendly to the common cause: “ *That spirit of the Warburtonians,* “ which induces one of them to call the “ author of *The Credibility of the Gospel History, the laborious Doctor Lardner.* “ —The disciples of this school generally “ dispense their praise with a discretion, “ which prevents its being exhausted by “ their occasional prodigality, to the pro- “ fane, σπείρσαι χειρὶ, but to the initiated, “ ὄλω τῷ θυλάκῳ.”

The friends of Christianity, and in particular the friends of the Church of England, ought to be cautious in giving currency to such a *nickname*, when they recollect *who* it was that added to the English language, already redundant in terms of sarcasm and invective, the phrase *Warburtonian school*. I received many civilities from Bishop Warburton, and I honour

nour

nour his memory: I have possessed the friendship of *his* friends, and I am proud of it; but neither they nor I ever considered the Bishop as infallible.

————— *Non isto vivitur illic*

“ *Quo tu vere modo.*”

And now as to the epithet bestowed on Dr Lardner, I should be glad to know *what* I ought to have called him? *Orthodox divine, able textuary, exact translator, or elegant writer?* I praised him for his labour and industry well employed; and *this* may be esteemed no mean praise, since every age produces persons superior to him in genius and literary accomplishments, who do not employ *their* time and talents so usefully as *he* did. I like to give things their true names; and, were a man to empty his common-place book of Greek and Latin upon the public, I might say that he had *read much*, but I should hardly
call

call him *judicious*; I might *scatter a few grains of praise*, but I should be unwilling to pour out *a sackful of encomiums* on his pamphlet.

After all, it is probable enough, that the author of this bitter sarcasm had in his eye a person much my superior. But as *he* cannot answer for himself, I desire, that what I have said may be considered as an apology for what my departed friend has said.

P. 15. l. 16.

“ Incestuous, or defiled with blood,” [quam incestam, quam crudelem nemo tanto tempore probavit.] This alludes to the charges brought against the Christians by the malice or credulity of the Heathens. See what I have collected on this subject, *Remains of Christian Antiquity*, vol. 1. p. 169.—183.; and *Notes on Minucius Felix*, p. 146.—156.

P. 15.

P. 15. l. 18.

“ For the living God are we burnt,” [pro Deo vivo cremamur], that is, for the avowal of our belief in the self-existent, the one God. He began his discourse with this assertion, “ *We worship the one God.*” The atheism of Christians was a constant topic of declamation among the heathens; and their *wise men* were the loudest in the cry, “ away with the atheists, [ἄιρετὸς ἀθέος.] Aristides the sophist, after having vehemently abused some of his brethren, adds, “ their manners nearly resemble those of the impious people “ in Palestine,” ii. 309. edit. *Jeb.* [Τοῖς ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ δυσσεβέσι παραπλήσιος τὰς τρόπους.] It is remarkable, that this rhetorician suppresses the name of *Christians*, although they had, too surely, acquired a name in law, by the sanguinary edicts issued against them, and the more sanguinary execution of those edicts.

P. 16.

P. 16. l. 18.

Arrius Antoninus. Three Proconsuls of Asia, bearing the name of *Arrius Antoninus*, are recorded in history, and all of them very eminent persons.

1. *Arrius Antoninus*, the father of *Arria Fadilla*, and maternal grandfather of the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*. He it was whose judicious address to *Nerva*, on his assuming the imperial dignity, is recorded in the epitome of *Victor*. “ When *Nerva*,
 “ on his entrance into the senate-house,
 “ was felicitated by the senators, *Arrius*
 “ *Antoninus* alone, a man of spirit and
 “ discernment, and one intimately con-
 “ nected in friendship with the Emperor,
 “ forbore to join in the general congra-
 “ tulations; but embracing him, thus
 “ spake: *I felicitate the senate, and the*
 “ *people, and the provinces, not you per-*
 “ *sonally; it would have been more eligible*
 “ *for you to have continued to elude the*
 “ *machinations*

“ machinations of wicked Princes, than,
 “ while labouring under the weight of sove-
 “ reignty, to be subjected to vexations and
 “ dangers ; and, at the same time, to have
 “ your reputation exposed to the malevo-
 “ lence, not only of your enemies, but also
 “ of your friends. For your friends, ima-
 “ gining that their deserts cannot be too
 “ amply recompensed, will, whenever they
 “ fail in extorting any favour from you,
 “ become more virulent than even your
 “ avowed enemies : thus did he judi-
 “ ciously describe the condition of Prin-
 “ ces :” [Nerva cùm in curiam a senatu
 gratanter exceptus esset, solus ex omnibus
 Arrius Antoninus, vir acer, eique amicissi-
 mus, conditionem imperantium prudenter
 exprimens, gratulari se ait senatui et po-
 pulo provinciisque : ipsi autem nequaquam
 cui satius fuerat malos principes eludere,
 quàm tanti oneris vim sustinentem, non
 molestiis modò et periculis subjici, sed famæ

etiam inimicorum pariter et amicorum, qui, cum se mereri omnia præsumunt, si quicquam non extorserint, atrociores sunt [l. fiunt] ipsis quoque hostibus.]

Of him also Pliny the younger thus speaks: “ That you have been twice consul, and acted with the dignity of the ancients in that office; that you have been Proconsul of Asia, and that scarce any of your predecessors or successors, your modesty prohibits me from saying none, have equalled you, and that in morality, authority, and even in age, you are the principal person in our city, is, I confess, a very venerable and beautiful part of your character, and yet I admire you still more in your retirement,” *Lord Orrery’s* translation. [Quòd semel atque iterum consul fuisti similis antiquis, quòd Proconsul Asiæ qualis ante te, qualis post te vix unus aut alter, non finit enim me verecundia tua dicere, qualis

lis

lis nemo, quòd sanctitate, quòd auctoritate, ætate quoque Princeps civitatis, est quidem venerabile ac pulchrum; ego tamen te vel magis in remissionibus miror, *Epist.* iv. 3.] Thus likewise Julius Capitolinus, when speaking of Antoninus Pius, says: "He was the only Proconsul of Asia, who, in the worthy discharge of that office, excelled his *grandfather*:" [Proconsulatum Asiæ sic egit, ut solus avum vinceret," *Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 18.]

It seems very improbable, that *he* was the *Arrius Antoninus* mentioned by Tertullian. He could not have been Proconsul of Asia at any time later than the reign of Domitian. Now, it is hardly supposable, that, in so early times, the Christians of Asia could have amounted to such numbers as the narrative in Tertullian implies. It is a true proposition, that "the growth of Christianity was rapid." But the maintainers of that proposition ought

to prove it by unambiguous testimonies: feeble arguments, in defence of truth, must be thrown aside, they suit not our warfare.

II. The Emperor *Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Antoninus Pius*, was Proconsul of Asia. He sometimes had the appellation of *Arrius* from his maternal grandfather, that venerable magistrate already mentioned, *Æl. Spartian. Hist. Aug. Script. p. 11. Jul. Capitol. ib. p. 18.* Mr Gibbon says: “ I am inclined to ascribe
 “ this story [in Tertullian] to Antoninus
 “ Pius, who was afterwards Emperor,
 “ and who *may* have governed Asia, un-
 “ der the reign of Trajan,” i. 662.

It may nevertheless be averred, with as much certainty as is generally looked for in historical facts, that Antoninus Pius, afterwards Emperor, did not govern Asia “ under the reign of Trajan.”

He was consul with L. Catilius Severus, A. U. C. 873. A. C. 120. in the 4th
 year

year of Hadrian, *Jul. Capit. Hist. Aug. Script.* p. 17.

It appears from *Jul. Capit. ib.* p. 18. that he never exercised the office of Proconsul of Asia but once; and that this was during the reign of Hadrian, no one can doubt who reads the story in Philostratus concerning Polemo, *vita Sophist.* c. 25. § 3.

Le Clerc, *Hist. Eccles.* p. 575 9. adopts an hypothesis different from that of Dodwell and Mr Gibbon. He observes, that Antoninus Pius, under the title of *T. Aurelius Fulvus*, was consul, A. U. C. 873. A. C. 120; and he supposes that in the following year, A. C. 121. he went Proconsul into Asia, and persecuted the Christians in the manner related by Tertullian. Le Clerc naturally enough fixes the commencement of the proconsulship of Antoninus Pius in the 120th year of the vulgar æra, or the *fifth* of Hadrian.

But

But he fails altogether in his application of the passage, quoted from Tertullian, to the conduct of Antoninus Pius.

What could have induced Tertullian, if he meant to speak of the Emperor Antoninus Pius, to give him the appellation of *Arrius Antoninus*, an appellation by which he was not known after he became Emperor, and by which, it is probable, he was little known even before his elevation?

To this let me add, that Hadrian himself was not disposed to do violence to the Christians. This tolerant system, whether founded on his natural dispositions, or on policy, must have been respected by his confident and son-in-law, while acting under his authority. From all which we may conclude, that the *Arrius Antoninus* mentioned by Tertullian, was a person different from the Emperor Antoninus Pius.

III. IF

III. If what has been already said should be considered as satisfactory, it follows, that Tertullian meant to speak of a third *Arrius Antoninus*, proconsul of Asia. While in the exercise of that office he gave some judgement, we know not of what nature, against one Attalus. Cleander, the worthless favourite of the worthless Commodus, was, it seems, the friend of Attalus, and therefore he resolved to revenge himself on Arrius Antoninus. This he at last accomplished by accusing him to Commodus of an intention to assume the Imperial purple. On such pretences Arrius Antoninus was put to death, and shared a like fate with many of the Senators, whom Marcus Antoninus had favoured. *Æl. Lamprid. Hist. Aug. Script, p. 48. and Jul. Capitol. ib. p. 54.*

The learned reader, when he recollects the manner in which Marcus Antoninus
spake

Spake of the Christians, will discern a striking similitude between it and the language in which Arrius Antoninus addressed them. He, like his master, the Imperial Stoic, saw nothing but *mere obstinacy* in their persisting to avow the tenets of their religion.

It has been supposed in this note, that Hadrian was no persecutor of the Christians; but here I meet with a very respectable contradictor in St Jerom, who thus speaks: “ Did not Quadratus, a disciple
 “ of the apostles, and Bishop of Athens,
 “ present a treatise in defence of our re-
 “ ligion to the Emperor Hadrian, while
 “ he was visiting Athens at the celebra-
 “ tion of the Eleusinian Mysteries; and
 “ did not his transcendent abilities, ad-
 “ mired by all men, calm a most grievous
 “ persecution?” [Quadratus, apostolorum
 discipulus, et Atheniensis Pontifex eccle-
 siæ,

fiæ nonne Adriano Principi Eleusinia sacra invisenti librum pro nostra religione tradidit, et tantæ admirationi omnibus fuit, ut *persecutionem gravissimam* illius excellens sedaret ingenium?] *Epist.* 83. *al.* 84.

Thus speaks St Jerom, and thus many others, on his authority, speak.

Were I purposing to defend an hypothesis, as the wont is, with every sort of argument, I might to the testimony of St Jerom oppose *that* of Tertullian, who expressly asserts, that Hadrian did not persecute the Christians, *Apol.* c. 5.; but there occurs a circumstance which makes me, in a great measure, disregard his assertion. He thought fit to aver, that none but flagitious Princes ever persecuted the professors of our faith; and, in support of this paradoxical fancy, he mitigated the rigour of Trajan, and threw a veil over the severities of Marcus Antoninus; and perhaps it might be said, that he spake of

Q

Hadrian

Hadrian also in a like strain of indulgence; neither will it be a sufficient apology for such want of precision, that he considered nothing as a *persecution authorised by the Emperors*, unless it took place at Rome, the seat of empire.

Setting aside then the evidence of Tertulian, let us hear Eusebius. He gives an account of the cause which induced Quadratus to present his apology very different from *that* given by St Jerom. “ It was,” says he, “ for this reason, that some wicked men were attempting to disturb those of our religion.” [ὅτι δὴ τινες πονηροὶ ἄνδρες τὰς ἡμετέρας ἐνοχλεῖν ἐπειρώντο,] *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 3.

That “ certain evil-minded persons attempted to molest the Christians,” is far short indeed of “ a most grievous persecution.”

At that time, the edicts against the professors of Christianity, however dormant, stood

stood unrepealed ; and it was natural, that men, enjoying the exercise of their religion under a precarious connivance, should seek to obtain some legal mitigation of penal laws ; and such appears to have been the purpose of that Apology which Quadratus addressed to the Emperor Hadrian.

If Eusebius be right in his statement of the fact, St Jerom is wrong.

The authority of “ a father of the “ Church” might have been preferred to that of “ the father of ecclesiastical history,” had both of them lived in the same age, and possessed equal means of information. But Eusebius lived much nearer the times of Quadratus than St Jerom did ; and that he had better opportunities of knowing the state of the Christian Church under the Emperor Hadrian may be collected from this, that he wrote with the Apology of Quadratus before him,

Q 2

which,

which, it should seem, St Jerom only knew, as we now do, from the testimony of Eusebius.

“ While Arrius Antoninus was zealously persecuting the Christians,” [cùm persequeretur instanter, &c.] No words can be plainer than those which Tertullian uses; and yet there are two writers of eminent learning, who have contrived to misunderstand them, and who have drawn inferences from them altogether inconsistent with their obvious meaning.

The first is Mr Dodwell, who says, “ It is not probable, that *many* Christians were put to death, since Arrius Antoninus, in so cold and careless a way, inflicted capital punishment on *a few* only.” I may have mistaken the import of Mr Dodwell’s words, and therefore I subjoin them: “ Ceterùm *multos* fuisse probabile non est, quos ita *paucos* tam frigidè censuit esse animadvertendos,” *Diss. Cypr.* xi. §. 27.

Overlooking,

Overlooking, as Dr Lardner well observes, the words “ *cùm persequeretur instanter,*” Mr Dodwell seems to suppose, that, at the first moment of persecution, *all* the Christians of Asia presented themselves before the tribunal of the Proconsul; yet it is plain, that they were the Christian inhabitants of *one* city, no matter whether Ephesus or Smyrna, who thus came in a body to offer themselves to death; and that their appearance in this humble, though affecting manner, ought to be ascribed to a persecution already begun, and even severely felt: “ Brethren, let us die together;” must have been their sentiment; but *that* is not the sentiment which arises in the human mind on the very first emergency of distress.

Arrius Antoninus dismissed the croud (*manus facta*) with expressions of contempt, and it would have been well had the story ended *there*.—But, just by way of example,

ple, he ordered *a few* of the Christians to instant execution. I can hardly imagine that a person entrusted with the government of Asia by Marcus Antoninus, was a believer in the rabble of Pagan divinities. He, probably, in his heart thought of Paganism as his Emperor did. Yet it was politically expedient, that men who disdained to conceal their belief in *one God*, should be punished for their obstinacy, and that some human sacrifices should be made in honour of that popular religion which the Emperor and his vicegerents knew to be false!

This apology, however, may be offered for Mr Dodwell, that he had an hypothesis to maintain, *that* of “the paucity
“ of martyrs.”

But what apology can be offered for the other learned man, Mosheim, who thus paraphrases the words of Tertullian: “Ta-
“ king it amiss that they had met with no
“ accuser,

“ accuser, and that the proconsul, in obedience to the Imperial edict, would not move in any inquiry for their prosecution, they became accusers of themselves.” [Molestè nimirum ferentes nullum sibi accusatorem obtigisse, et proconsulem inquirere nolle, quod Imperator vetuerat, ipsi accusatorum sibi partes sumebant.] *De Reb. Christian. ante Constantin. M. p. 235.* and all this is gravely related on the authority of Tertullian !

Tertullian said, rhetorically perhaps, that the Christians, standing before the Heathen tribunals, rejoiced more when found guilty, than when absolved: but, surely, he never said that the Christians, while permitted in peace to worship God according to their consciences, provoked their Heathen rulers, and, with one voice, called aloud for tortures and death ! On the contrary, he recollects in the language of exultation and thankfulness, *that*
 tranquillity

tranquillity which the church had, at intervals, enjoyed.

The conclusion of Mosheim's paraphrase runs thus: " So, that he might intimidate
 " the others, he condemned a few of the
 " Christians to death, and, with marks
 " of disdain and contempt, dismissed the
 " rest of the multitude." [Itaque paucis,
 ut terreret cæteros, condemnatis, reli-
 quam multitudinem cum *indignatiene* et
 contemptu dimittebat.]

The learned reader will observe that I have translated *indignatio* in Mosheim by *disdain*. Had I translated it *indignation*, I should have perverted the sense of that author; careless as his paraphrase is, it could never mean to convey an idea equivalent to that forcible English word, *indignation*.

Mosheim's paraphrase is again paraphrased by Mr Gibbon, i. 662. " Ar-
 " rius Antoninus," says he, " was ex-
 " tremely

“ tremely cautious, *as is observed by a*
 “ *learned and pious historian,* of punish-
 “ ing men who had found no accusers
 “ but themselves, *the Imperial laws not*
 “ *having made any provision for so unex-*
 “ *pected a case ;* condemning, therefore,
 “ a few, as a warning to their brethren,
 “ he dismissed the multitude with indig-
 “ nation and contempt.”

Thus, by the help of two paraphrasts,
 the “ *cùm persequeretur instanter*” of
 Tertullian, is fairly excluded from the
 narrative, and the case comes to this :
 “ The Christians of Asia, while enjoy-
 “ ing a profound peace, and having no
 “ one to disturb them, presented them-
 “ selves, at once, before the tribunal
 “ of the proconsul, and called for execu-
 “ tion of the Imperial edicts against them-
 “ selves.” The fanatics of Munster, du-
 ring a paroxysm of outrageous phrenzy,
 could not have done more !

Of this I read nothing in Tertullian; and it would have been just as well had Mr Gibbon looked a little at the original, instead of relying with implicit faith on the *learning* and *piety* of Mosheim. The *learning* of Mosheim is nothing to the purpose, when he paraphrases the plain words of a known author, and his *piety* cannot make a paraphrase *right*, however much it may serve as an apology for a paraphrase if *egregiously wrong*.

There is another thing which, on Mr Gibbon's hypothesis, requires some explanation: "*The Imperial laws had not made any provision for the unexpected case of persons accusing themselves.*" If so, by what authority did the proconsul put any of those *self-accusers* to death? *This* was beyond the *mandate*; and every one, acquainted with Roman jurisprudence, knows that he ought to have staid execution, have written to the Emperor, and have given judgement

judgement according to the instructions contained in the Imperial *rescript*, or, “ answer to the case put.” Thus, if Mr Gibbon be right, the proconsul, *so extremely cautious*, erred in a point of form familiar to the meanest practitioners in his court.

As to Mosheim, any one not acquainted with his principles might be led to suppose, that he meant to throw some blame on the Christians of Asia, and to insinuate that the proconsul, without any great severity, might have ordered for instant execution, some more of those men who were so ready to die.

The words uttered by the proconsul shew plainly that he dismissed the Christian multitude with contempt. Mr Gibbon appears uncertain whether this contempt was *real*, or only *affected*?

Supposing Arrius Antoninus to have been a bigotted heathen, who held that

there was an intercommunity of local gods, or an unprincipled politician, who held "that private opinions must yield to "state policy," I judge that his "contempt" was *real*. But supposing that he was himself a *Theist*, and that he had inquired into the opinions of those whom he was "zealously, or earnestly, persecuting," I judge his "contempt" to have been *affected*.

CORRECTIONS and ADDITIONS.

P. 4. l. 11. The original has "de gratis
" et ingratis," which is ambiguous.
We might render the passage thus, "for
" the thankful and the unthankful,"
or, "for those who are thankful for
his blessings, and those who are not."

P. 5. l. 6. "was at any time found"
rather, "has at any time been found,"
— l. 13. were found" perhaps, "have
" been found"

P. 8. l. 3. "Hilarion" r. "Hilarian"
or "Hilarianus"

— l. 15. "the former thunder." A
correspondent ingeniously observes, that
"Tertullian may allude to the thunder
" in the days of Pharoah, as, before,
" he had alluded to the deluge."

P. 10.

P. 10. l. 14. Some words are wanting in the translation ; add, “ Nevertheless “ they shall come to the day of doom,” [sed venient in diem divini iudicii], “ and we wish,” &c.

P. 15. l. 1. “ by the appellation” perhaps “ under” &c.

— l. 3. “ Furthermore,” perhaps “ Above all this,”

— l. 11. “ *who* is there that hath aught “ to say against us ?” r. “ *who* is there “ that, on any other ground, hath “ aught to say against us ?”

P. 17. l. 16. “ see senators” r. “ see, among us, senators,”

P. 18. l. 9. “ Moreover, they whom thou “ thinkest to be thy lords are men,” r. “ As for those, whom thou thinkest to “ be thy lords, they are men,”

— l. 11. “ they shall die ;” r. “ they “ themselves shall die ;”

P. 19. It has been suggested to me
that,

that, as the topics used by Tertullian are sufficiently distinct, they ought to be separated into paragraphs thus: P. 21. l. 1. "Nos unum" &c. P. 22. l. 9. "Sic et" &c. P. 24. l. 2. "Et utique" &c. P. 27. l. 6. "Potes et" &c. P. 28. l. 14. "Hæc omnia" &c. P. 30. l. 5. "Præter hæc" &c. P. 31. l. 6. "Vide tantùm," &c. I am sorry that this suggestion came too late for me to profit by it.

P. 19. l. 3. "patimur: cum" r. "patimur; cùm"

P. 20. l. 6. "erumpentes:" r. "erumpentes;"

— l. 9. The words "nedum amicus," should be placed in the preceding line after "misimus." This correction of the text seems necessary, and the translation is agreeable to it.

— l. 18. "figna" r. "et figna"

P. 21.

P. 21. l. 11. “ non vi: cùm” r. “ non
“ vi; cùm”

— l. 18. “ suis præstat. Ideoque” r.
“ suis præstat; ideoque”

“ P. 22. l. 18. “ imperatoris:” r. “ im-
“ peratoris;”

P. 25. l. 12. “ localem esse. Universa-
“ lem” r. “ localem esse; universalem”
&c.

— l. 16. “ *adeo* portentum fuit,” “*a*
“ *Deo*” has been proposed as a correction
of the text; and if the words which fol-
low, “ ut non potuerit ” &c. do not op-
pose this correction, it seems an eligible
one.

P. 26. l. 10. “ ebullisset,” r. “ ebullisset,”

P. 30. l. 8. “ indigentibus refrigeramus.”
An eminent philologist of my acquaint-
ance is surprised at this phrase.

A commentator is, in some sort, the *Pa-*
tron of the author on whom he com-
ments, and he has always some favour-
able

able gloss or conjectural emendation to produce in the cause of his *client*. Were we to read *refrigerium damus*, instead of *refrigeramus*, the emendation would not be very violent, and the credit of the Latinity of Tertullian would be saved; but unfortunately he himself has excluded this conjecture: for, in his treatise *de anima*. c. 51. he says, “*con-*
“*pus, mutatione fitûs, sibimet ipsi re-*
“*frigerasset.*” I quote this passage on account of its *construction*, without regard to its *sense*. Thus, some other apology must be thought of.—*Indigentibus opitulare*, or, more commonly, *opitulari*, is good Latin; because, as we are informed by the grammarians, the verb *opitulo* means *opem tollo*. Perhaps Tertullian, not adverting to the compound, which includes the noun governed, has formed *indigentibus refrigerare* from *indigentibus opitulari*.

- P. 31, l. 15. ἡβρόχης r. ἡ βρόχης
- P. 36. l. 14. “ *dicitur*” ought to be left out. Spartian, or his transcriber, has spoilt the jest, such as it is, by the inserting of the word *dicitur*.
- P. 48. l. 13. “ *palæstriam*” r. “ *palæstricam* ;” that is, as I understand it, “ *ar-tem palæstricam*.”
- P. 74. l. 4. After “ *meaning*” add].
- P. 81. l. 6. “ *audientibus*” r. “ *audientibus,*”
- l. 15. “ *Byzantium,*” r. “ *Byzaci-um,*”
- P. 108. l. 11. “ *prodigality,*” r. “ *prodigality;*”
- P. 109. l. 5. 6. r.
—— *Non isto viximus illic,
Quo tu rere, modo.*
- P. 110. l. 10. After “ *friend*” add “ *Bi-
shop Hallifax,*”
- P. 111. l. 10. ἀίρεσις r. ἀίρε τής
- P. 113. l. 12. *euemies* : r. *enemies* :
—— l. 19. *nequaquam* r. *nequaquam,*

Published by the same Author.

- I. *Remains of Christian Antiquity*, in three volumes:
- Vol. 1. *Containing, Account of the Martyrs at Smyrna and Lyons, in the second century.*
 - Vol. 2. *The Trial of Justin, surnam^d Martyr, and of his companions. — The Epistle of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, to Fabius Bishop of Antioch. — The Trial and execution of Cyprian Bishop of Carthage: — The Trial of Fructuosus, and his two deacons: — The Maiden of Antioch.*
 - Vol. 3. *History of the Martyrs in Palestine, from the original of Eusebius.*
- II. *Octavius, A Dialogue*, by M. Minucius Felix.
- III. *Of the manner in which the Persecutors died. A treatise* by L. C. F. Lactantius.
- IV. *Disquisitions concerning the Antiquities of the Christian Church.*





BR Tertullianus, Quintus
65 Septimius Florens
T343 The address
1790

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY





