

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON • NEW JERSEY




PRESENTED BY

HENRY VAN DYKE

A. 25





THE
W O R K S
OF
NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

WITH A LIFE BY DR. KIPPIS.


IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON :

WILLIAM BALL, 34, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

MDCCCXXXVIII.



JOHN CHILDS AND SON, BUNGAY.

CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

PART II.

CHAP.	A. D.	PAGE
	..	3
	..	6
I.	71	17
II.	96	29
III.	..	55
IV.	100	57
V.	107	73
VI.	108	94
VII.		
	...	110
VIII.	112	115
IX.	116	116
X.	140	125
XI.	...	140
XII.	170	144
XIII.	172	147
XIV.	173	152
XV.	177	157
XVI.	...	160
XVII.	178	165
XVIII.	...	193
XIX.	180	201
XX.	181	303
XXI.	192	215
XXII.	194	220
XXIII.	196	259
XXIV.		
	...	261
XXV.	200	263
XXVI.	...	264
XXVII.	...	267
XXVIII.		
	...	306
	123	307
	126	308
	132	309
	140	310

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE
	5 Soter - - - - -	164	311
	6 Pinytus - - - - -	170	312
	7 Philip - - - - -	...	ibid
	8 Palmas - - - - -	...	ibid
	9 Modestus - - - - -	...	313
	10 Musanus - - - - -	176	ibid
	11 Claudius Apollinaris - - - - -	...	ibid
	12 Bardesanes - - - - -	180	316
	13 Apollonius - - - - -	186	323
	14 Rhodon - - - - -	...	324
	15 Victor - - - - -	...	ibid
	16 Bacchylus - - - - -	...	325
	17 Theophilus and Nareissus - - - - -	...	ibid
	18 Symmachus - - - - -	200	326
XXIX.	Supposititious Writings of the Second Century	...	330
	1 The Acts of Paul and Thecla - - - - -	...	331
	2 The Sibylline Verses - - - - -	...	333
	3 The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	...	346
	4 The Recognitions - - - - -	...	364
	5 The Clementine Homilies - - - - -	...	376
	6 The Clementine Epitome - - - - -	...	381
	7 Remarks upon the three last Pieces - - - - -	...	382
	8 The Conclusion of the Second Century	...	386
XXX.	Minucius Felix - - - - -	210	ibid
XXXI.	Apollonius - - - - -	211	391
XXXII.	Caius and others - - - - -	...	394
	1 Caius - - - - -	212	ibid
	2 An Anonymous Author against Artemon	...	402
	3 A Treatise of the Universe - - - - -	...	409
XXXIII.	Asterius Urbanus - - - - -	232	410
XXXIV.	St. Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem - - - - -	212	414
XXXV.	St. Hippolytus - - - - -	220	421
XXXVI.	Ammonius - - - - -	...	438
XXXVII.	Julius Africanus - - - - -	...	457
XXXVIII.	Origen - - - - -	230	468
XXXIX.	St. Firmilian - - - - -	233	578
XL.	Divers Writers in the former part of the Third Century - - - - -	..	583
XLI.	Noetus, and others, called Heretics, in the former part of the Third Century, or soon after - - - - -	...	590
XLII.	Gregory, Bishop of Neocæsarea - - - - -	243	608
XLIII.	Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria - - - - -	247	643

THE
CREDIBILITY
OF THE
GOSPEL HISTORY,

OR,

THE PRINCIPAL FACTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
CONFIRMED BY PASSAGES OF ANCIENT AUTHORS,
WHO WERE CONTEMPORARY WITH OUR SA-
VIOUR, OR HIS APOSTLES, OR LIVED
NEAR THEIR TIME

PART II.

PREFACE.

THE design of this Work has been shown in the Preface and Introduction to the foregoing part. It is, in short, to enable persons of ordinary capacities, who have not an opportunity of reading ancient authors, to judge for themselves concerning the external evidence of the facts related in the New Testament. They who are pleased to attend to this will soon perceive the reason of the method observed in this work : why I not only transcribe passages at length, but likewise prefix a history of the authors themselves. This I have done very much in the words of other ancient writers, who were their contemporaries, or not very remote from them in time : mentioning also the sentiments of some learned moderns, eminent for their skill in antiquity, who have already written with great diligence and accuracy the history of my authors and their works. Somewhat of this kind was necessary for the information and satisfaction of those, for whom this work is chiefly intended. It might be well expected, that I should observe the age and character of the witnesses I produce : and distinguish their genuine writings from others, if any have been without ground ascribed to them. The testimonies themselves I have endeavoured likewise so to dispose, as that the value of them might be most readily perceived.

I am aware that some learned men, who have already formed their judgment upon a full knowledge of antiquity, may at first dislike the alleging in this volume so many passages, which contain at the most only allusions to the writings of the New Testament, some of which too may appear doubtful and uncertain. But if these had been wholly omitted, I do not see how the representation of this evidence could have been complete. And when it is considered, that I do not lay a stress upon all these passages, but after the producing them, sum up the testimony of each author, and often distinguish the importance of the passages alleged, and leave it to every one to judge as he sees best ; I hope, this conduct will be no longer disapproved.

The authors are produced in the order of time. By this means their authority and the value of their testimonies immediately appear: it being allowed by all, that the respect for a writer's testimony ought to be proportioned very much to his nearness to the time of which he writes.

Many of the passages are placed at the bottom of the page in their original languages, which will not be disagreeable to those who are acquainted with them. And beside these, there are a few notes, more particularly intended for the less learned reader.

The translations are my own, unless I give notice of my borrowing from others: for which, I suppose, there will be seldom occasion. But there is one person of great eminence on account of his station in the church, and the merit of his services for the christian religion, to whom I am obliged to make my acknowledgments in this place: I mean His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. There are few of the many passages of the Apostolical fathers here alleged, which I had not translated, as I collected them out of the originals: but I have since thought proper, to make my own more agreeable to his lordship's well known and apostolical English: and I have often taken his translation entire, without any alteration.

Though I have used my best care and diligence, it is nevertheless very natural to be apprehensive of some errors and omissions in a work of this compass and difficulty. I can rely upon the candour of the learned and judicious, who may observe them: and upon information I will readily own and correct the errors, and supply the omissions if they are material. For what is here aimed at is not glory, but truth and a fair representation of it.

The method is prolix: but the subject is of importance. And perhaps in this way some disputes may be shortened, and some questions decided, which could not be so well determined otherwise. And possibly the whole we have to offer may be brought within less room than could be at first imagined.

The work will not, I presume, be judged altogether useless, or unnecessary at this time. The fathers have not been hitherto considered in this method. Though many excellent and beautiful passages have been transcribed out of them by others in modern languages, none have yet, so far as I know, attempted the transcribing at length their testimony to the sacred scriptures. Nor has the canon of the New Testament been often considered and enquired into in this method, of placing together at once the testimony of

every age as it ariseth : but generally the evidence for particular books has been collected, and placed by itself. Which though it have some advantages, I believe it will be found, that the method here taken has also some peculiar advantages belonging to it.

It was the reading of the works of Eusebius of Cæsarea, and particularly his Ecclesiastical History, in which he has collected so many passages of ancient writers before him, that gave the first rise to this design. Though the execution of it should not be equal to the model upon which it was formed, it may be of benefit to some. A large part of the riches of that work will be transferred into this, and will be its greatest ornament.

The numerous passages here produced out of ancient authors, will not discourage any who have ability and opportunity from going to the originals : but rather, I hope, be a means of leading some into a further acquaintance with them. After all the Ecclesiastical Histories, Bibliothèques and Memoires, that have been published, there remain, if I mistake not, good gleanings in Ecclesiastical antiquity, for those who shall be pleased to be at the pains of gathering them in. The ancient writers of the church will ever afford somewhat curious and entertaining, to an attentive and judicious reader. The study of the fathers is indeed laborious, and not very profitable with regard to any secular advantages : but it is the fitter for men of generous minds, who prefer the pleasure of gaining and communicating useful knowledge to all the pomp of a vain world. Nor is every one who looks into these writings obliged to make the study of them his professed work and employment. A man of ingenuity and a good taste may gain a considerable knowledge of them (especially of the most ancient and most valuable) for his own satisfaction in the way of amusement.

As my aim in this work has been the promoting, according to my ability, the interest of true religion ; it is no small satisfaction to me, that the first part of it was so well received at home, and that it has been so far approved abroad, as to be translated by two learned foreigners ; by Mr. Cornelius Westerbaen of Utrecht into Low Dutch, and by Mr. J. Christopher Wolff of Hamburgh into Latin. I cannot but esteem it an uncommon happiness, that my thoughts have been so justly represented by persons well known in the republic of letters for compositions of their own.

London, March 1, 1733-4.

INTRODUCTION.

HAVING in a former treatise produced sufficient evidence of that part of the Gospel History, which concerns the facts occasionally mentioned in the New Testament: I now proceed to lay before the public, in a like manner, the evidences of the principal facts of the same history, which in the Introduction to the foregoing part were briefly said to be these: “The birth and preaching of John the Baptist; the miraculous conception and birth, the discourses, miracles, predictions, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ; the mission of the apostles, the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them, and the other attestations, which were given to the divine authority of Jesus Christ, and the truth of his doctrine.”

It may be now proper to represent these particulars somewhat more at large. The substance of the history of the New Testament then is this:

Jesus, called the Christ, having been conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of a virgin named Mary, espoused to a mean person whose name was Joseph, of the family of David, was born at Bethlehem in Judea, in the reign of Herod king of the Jews, at a time when there was a taxing, or enrolment, ordered in that country by a decree of Augustus, the Roman emperor. Matt. i. Luke i. ii.

The birth of Jesus was attended and followed with some events of an extraordinary nature, Matt. ii. After eight days he was circumcised, and then presented at the temple according to the custom of the law of Moses. And his birth, as king of the Jews, having been notified at Jerusalem, by the arrival of some wise men of the East, who had seen his star in their own country, and came to Jerusalem to worship him: Herod formed a design against the life of the young child. But he was preserved by flight into Egypt, whither he was carried by Joseph, together with his mother Mary, by divine order: and after a short space of time was brought back again by Joseph, who then went and settled at Nazareth. There is little more related of the early part

of his life, except that at the age of twelve years he went up to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover, where he gave some proofs of uncommon knowledge, and returned thence to Nazareth, and was subject to his parents, Luke ii. 41.

In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, then emperor of Rome, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod tetrarch of Galilee, John, called the Baptist, son of Zacharias, of the race of the Jewish priests, and of his wife Elisabeth, (who was born a few months before Jesus, in the reign of the forementioned Herod, king of the Jews,) appeared in the country beyond Jordan, preaching the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." And great numbers of men from all parts of Judea resorted to him, and were baptized, "confessing their sins." He taught that the kingdom of God was at hand, bid men bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and not to depend upon any national privileges, or external performances, for acceptance with God. "The people were then in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts, whether he were the Christ or not." And when the "Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, who he was, he confessed, he was not the Christ;" at the same time openly declaring, that there was then among them a great person, whom as yet, they knew not: and though he came after him, he was so far preferred before him, that he was not "worthy to unloose the latchet of his shoes: and whereas he baptized them with water unto repentance, this great person would baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Luke ii. iii. Matt. iii. Mark i. John i.

When a great part of the people had been baptized, Jesus also came to John, and was baptized of him in Jordan. Matt. iii. 13, "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. At which time Jesus was about thirty years of age," Luke iii. 23.

Having been thus baptized, he was led by the Spirit into a solitary and desert place, where he fasted forty days and forty nights, and had a great and remarkable temptation, Matt. iv. Luke iv. The temptation being ended, "he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee," and wrought miracles, and began to gather disciples, who "seeing his glory believed on him." At which time John still baptizing, bore testimony to him: that he was the person of whom he

had spoken, and that he must increase. But, says he, "I must decrease: he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him," John ii. 11. iii. 30, 34.

Soon after this, John was cast into prison for his free, but just reproofs of Herod the tetrarch of Galilee: by whose order he was also afterwards beheaded, Matt. xiv. 1--12. Mark vi. 16, 29. Luke iii. 19, 20. ix. 9.

When John had been cast into prison, Jesus began to preach more publicly: and having chosen out of the number of his disciples twelve, whom he named apostles, to be generally with him, that they might be afterwards the witnesses to the world of his life, his doctrine, miracles, and resurrection, he went about the several parts of the country of Judea, resorting likewise to Jerusalem at the time of the great feasts of the Jewish nation, Matt. iv. 12. Mark i. 14. iii. 13. Luke vi. 12, 13. Acts x. 39--41.

He taught that men should repent, and for their encouragement declared, that he "came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance," Matt. ix. 13. He moreover taught, that God is to be worshipped in spirit and truth, and that such worship is acceptable in all places, John iv. 21, 23, 24: That the things which defile a man are those which "proceed out of the heart; evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies; but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man." Matt. xv. 19, 20: That the great branches of men's duty, are the love of God and their neighbour: That men should do to others as they would that others should do to them, Matt. vii. 12: That they ought to imitate God in mercy, forgiveness, and all goodness, Matt. v. 44, 45: That they ought to be pure in heart, as well as unblamable in their outward actions: That they ought not to pray, fast, or give alms to be seen of men; but in all things to act with an eye to the approbation and acceptance of God, who seeth the most secret, as well as the most public actions. He recommended moderate affections for the things of this present world, and bid men seek in the first place the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and without solicitude and anxiety about the concerns of this life, to confide in the providence of God, which oversees and directs all things, Matt. vi. 1, 19, 20, 25. He assured them that they who believed in God, and in him whom God had sent, and obeyed the commandments delivered by him, should enjoy eternal life, "and he would raise" them "up at the last day," John vi. 39: That God had given all authority and judgment to him, and that he

would come again, and render to all according to their works. And of this doctrine taught by him, he required a sincere and open profession, declaring, Matt. x. 32, 33, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.

These, and the like excellent precepts, and powerful inducements to all virtue, he taught and inculcated every where; speaking sometimes plainly, sometimes in parables, as men were able to hear him: always with such a mixture of authority and familiarity for the manner, such weight and dignity for the matter of his discourses, that the multitude "wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth;" and enemies were obliged to acknowledge, that never man spake like him, Matt. v. vi. vii. Luke vi. Matt. xiii. Mark iv. 33. Luke iv. 22. John vii. 46.

As he went about teaching this doctrine, he wrought many miracles as evidences, that the Father had sent him, and of the truth of all his words. He turned water into wine; fed with a few loaves and fishes great multitudes in desert places; walked on the sea; calmed the winds and the waves; gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, soundness and strength to the lame, and those that were bowed down; healed diseases of all sorts; restored to their right mind lunatics and dæmoniacs, and raised the dead. These miracles were performed at his word, in an instant, and some were wrought on persons at a distance from him. They were done by him in the most public and open manner; at Jerusalem, and in every part of Judea and Galilee; in cities, in villages, in synagogues, in private houses, in the streets, and the highways, in the presence of enemies, before scribes and pharisees, and rulers of synagogues, when attended by multitudes: in a word, before men of all characters.

There were also in the course of his ministry divers other signal testimonies given to him. Beside the voice from heaven at his baptism, he was transfigured in the presence of three of his disciples, when "his face shone as the sun, and his raiment was white as light, and a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him," Matt. xvii. 1—8. See Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 28. At another time, being at Jerusalem, surrounded by a great multitude, and having prayed, "Father, glorify

thy name; there came a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again," John xii. 28.

To all these great things he appealed, as proofs of his divine authority: referring men to the witness of John, the miracles he had wrought, and these testimonies from heaven, John v. 19, 20, 32—38. x. 25, 37, 38.

Beside the wonderful works done by him, he also manifested a clear knowledge of the thoughts and designs of men, and foretold frequently, and expressly, and with many circumstances, his own death and resurrection; the descent of the Holy Ghost upon his apostles; their sufferings and success; the destruction of Jerusalem, (at the prospect of which he was so affected, as to lament over that city with tears, Luke xix. 41,) and many other events; that when they came to pass, his disciples and others might be confirmed in their faith in him and his doctrine. John xiii. 19.

He had likewise sent forth from him, for a time, his twelve disciples, and after that seventy other, "with power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases, to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick:" which they did, and "returned with great joy," Matt. x. 1. Mark. iii. 15. Luke ix. 1. x. 1.

While God thus glorified him, he lived in a mean condition, without external state and splendor, and was meek and condescending in his behaviour toward his disciples, and all who resorted to him for instruction, or relief: at the same time freely declaring to all their duty, and impartially correcting the faults and failings of his disciples: and with a true prophetic resolution and intrepidity reproving the hypocrisy, pride, ambition, covetousness, false maxims, and vain traditions of the scribes and pharisees, and the chief men of the Jewish nation.

When he had fully taught and confirmed his doctrine, knowing that the time of his departure out of this world was nigh, and that the Father had put all things into his hands; he took his leave of his disciples in the most affectionate and instructive manner, and appointed a memorial of himself and his death. And then retiring to a private place, where he sometimes resorted with his disciples; and having resigned himself to the will of the Father, with regard to the bitter sufferings, of which he had a near and affecting prospect; he was betrayed by one of his disciples to the chief priests and council of the Jewish nation, by whom he was examined, and condemned, after he had in their presence solemnly avowed his great character: and then was by

them accused and prosecuted before Pontius Pilate, who at their earnest and clamorous importunity was prevailed upon, against his own conscience, to condemn him to be crucified. And he was accordingly crucified near Jerusalem, at the great feast of the passover, in the common place of execution, between two malefactors. However, during this very extraordinary scene of sufferings, there were some extraordinary testimonies given to his innocence and dignity. There was a darkness of three hours continuance over the whole land; the "vail of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent," John xiii. xiv. xv. xvi. xvii. Matt. xxvi. xxvii. Mark xiv. xv. Luke xxii. xxiii. John xviii. xix. Matt. xxvii. 45, 51.

Jesus having expired on the cross, and Pilate having received particular information that he was dead: the body was with his leave taken down from the cross, and laid in a sepulchre, in which "never man before was laid." And the Jewish council took care to have the sepulchre secured by a guard of Roman soldiers, lest, as they said, his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and then say to the people, he is risen from the dead, Luke xxiii. 53. Matt. xxvii. 64.

But notwithstanding these precautions of his enemies, who had all power and authority in that country; on the third day after his crucifixion and burial, early in the morning Jesus arose, and showed himself to his apostles, and others who were well acquainted with him. He was seen of them several times for the space "of forty days." They viewed him, they handled him, he discoursed and ate with them, and said to his apostles: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore," says he, "and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you." And having renewed to them the promise of the Holy Ghost, and commanded them to "tarry at Jerusalem," till they were "endued with power from on high; he led them out to Bethany," where he "was parted from them, and while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight," Matt. xxviii. Mark xvi. Luke xxiv. John xx. Acts i. 3, 9.

After which, at the motion of Peter for supplying the vacancy made by the apostasy and death of Judas, Matthias was added to the eleven apostles by divine appointment, Acts i. 26.

At the pentecost next following the passover, at which Jesus had been crucified, the promised gift of the Holy Ghost was bestowed upon the apostles, and the men that were with them, and they began to speak with divers tongues, Acts ii. 1. At the same time there were at Jerusalem, beside the stated inhabitants, from all parts of the world Jews, and proselytes of the Jewish religion; men of the greatest zeal, understanding, and prudence; who when they heard him speak "the wonderful works of God" in the languages of the several countries in which they resided, were "amazed and marvelled." Whereupon "Peter standing up with the eleven," informed them, that Jesus, whom the rulers of the Jewish nation had taken, and "with wicked hands had crucified," after he had been "approved of God by miracles, signs, and wonders, done by him in the midst of them," had been raised up by God: of which they, his apostles, were witnesses: and that the same Jesus, being "by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, had shed forth that which they now saw and heard." And concluded his discourse with these words: Acts ii. 36—38, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." And when they were hereupon filled with much concern of mind, and said, "What shall we do?" Peter said unto them: "Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Such was the effect of this discourse, and these exhortations, consequent upon the wonderful effusion of the Holy Ghost, that many "gladly received the word, and were baptized, and the same day there were added unto the disciples about three thousand souls," Ver. 41. And by the hands of Peter, and the other apostles, "were many signs and wonders wrought among the people," which could not be disputed, Acts v. 12, 14. And "believers were added to the Lord, multitudes of men and women." All this multitude lived in the greatest harmony, "neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessed of houses or lands, sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man, according as he had need," Acts iv. 34, 35. But the care of making a proper distribution to so many persons being too great for the apostles, and some obstruction to them in their main work of preaching, and some complaints

likewise being made, there were chosen "seven men to attend the daily ministrations," ch. vi.

Beside the numerous church at Jerusalem, there were also in a short time several churches of the faithful gathered in other parts; in Judea, in Galilee, and Samaria, ch. ix. 31. And on those who believed were bestowed the gifts of the Holy Ghost, by prayer and the laying on of the hands of the apostles, ch. viii. 14—17.

This beginning and progress had the doctrine of the gospel, notwithstanding many hardships and sufferings endured by the apostles and the believers of every rank.

When this doctrine had been planted in the minds of great numbers of Jews and Samaritans, it was preached by Peter, ch. x. and then by others, to Gentiles, men uncircumcised, in the land of Judea, and in the neighbouring countries: and among them were converts made, upon whom also were bestowed gifts of the Holy Ghost.

In the mean time Saul, called also Paul, who had been of the sect of the pharisees, educated by Gamaliel, a celebrated doctor among the Jewish people, and who had been a warm and violent opposer and persecutor of the disciples of Jesus, was converted to the same faith by an extraordinary appearance, Acts xxii. 3—10. Who received the full knowledge of the doctrine of the gospel by special revelation, and was appointed an apostle by Jesus Christ himself, without the interposition of any of those who had been apostles before, Gal. i. 1, 12. Eph. iii. 3. As the other apostles had done, he also spoke with tongues, wrought miracles in great variety and abundance, and conferred gifts of the Holy Ghost upon his converts.

Paul together with Barnabas and his fellow-workers in the gospel, taught, as Peter had done before, that God had raised up Jesus from the dead, exhorted men to repent, and believe in him whom God had sent, Acts xiii. 16—41. To the Gentiles he declared, that they should turn from idols to the worship of God that made the heaven and the earth, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, or, live in the practice of virtue: "forasmuch as God had appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he has ordained, whereof he has given assurance unto all men, in that he has raised him from the dead," Acts xvii. He moreover strenuously asserted the acceptance of the Gentiles, and their right to all the privileges of the church and people of God, without the observation of the rites of the law of Moses.

In preaching this doctrine he also had great success, and formed churches of christians in many places, consisting of men converted from idolatry and vice to the worship of God, a faith in Jesus, and the practice of virtue.

The converts of each city, having been^a first baptized, were formed into religious societies and^b churches, which met together for the performance of religious worship: in which assemblies they worshipped God^c by prayers and praises, had^d discourses and exhortations, and readings^e of sacred writings, and^f celebrated the memory of the death of Jesus Christ, by eating together bread, and drinking wine in a solemn manner. And they were directed by the apostles to pray^g for ‘kings,’ and governors, and “all who are in authority.” These assemblies were ordinarily held at least every first day of the^h week, called theⁱ ‘Lord’s day,’ in memory of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead: on which^k day, they were directed also to “lay by in store, as God had prospered them,” for the relief of their necessitous brethren.

And that the worship of these assemblies might be performed in an orderly and decent manner, for general profit, and instruction in the principles and practice of piety; and that the necessities of each member might be duly provided for, and true religion preserved among them in a flourishing condition; there were at the very time of forming such societies, or soon^l after, appointed in them officers and ministers, called^m bishops, or elders, or pastors, or teachers; and deacons: men who had been before approved, as persons of integrity and capacity for the work to which they were appointed, 1 Tim. iii. 10. The peculiar workⁿ of the former of whom was to preach the word, and feed the flock, of which they were overseers, with wholesome and sound doctrine and instruction; “to reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.” Of the latter, the peculiar work, according to the primitive institution, was the “serv-

^a Acts ii. 41. viii. 12. Rom. vi. 3. 1 Cor. i. 13—16. ^b Gal. i. 2. “to the churches of Galatia.” 1 Cor. xiv. 33. “as in all the churches of the saints.” xvi. 19, the “churches of Asia salute you.” 2 Cor. viii. “the churches of Macedonia,” and many other places. ^c Acts i. 14, 24. ii. 42. vi. 4. 1 Cor. xiv. 14—17.

^d 1 Cor. xiv. throughout. Acts xviii. 11. xx. 7. Gal. vi. 6. Hebr. xiii. 7. ^e Coloss. iv. 16. 1 Thess. v. 27.

^f Acts ii. 42. xx. 7. 1 Cor. xi. 23. ^g 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. ^h Acts xx. 7. ⁱ Rev. i. 10. ^k 1 Cor. xvi. 2. ^l See Whitby’s

Annotations on 1 Cor. xiv. 32. Gal. vi. 3. and the Paraphrase on 1 Thess. after Mr. Locke’s manner; the note on chap. v. 12. ^m “To all the saints which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” Philip. i. 1.

ⁿ See Acts xx. 28. the epistles to Timothy and Titus. 1 Pet. v. 1.

ing tables," and making a prudent and faithful distribution of the stock of the ° society, Acts vi. 2.

And these several officers were to be examples of all virtue to the rest of the christian societies, in which they presided and ministered: as these societies themselves were to be examples to the world around them.

These apostles of Christ, (of whom we have particularly spoken,) together with their companions and fellow-labourers, evangelists, and others, had such success in the work of preaching the gospel, that before they left the world, they had erected societies, or churches of christians, in most parts of the Roman empire; in the countries of Judea, Cyprus, Crete, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Greece, and Italy, in the cities of Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Antioch, Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Rome, and in other cities and countries: consisting, it is likely, for the most part, of persons of mean condition. But there were likewise among them men of learning, wealth, and power.

By these means, and upon this foundation, was raised the church of Christ, which still subsists, and against which, according to his express assurance, no adverse power shall ever prevail, Matt. xvi. 16.

This is the substance of the history of the New Testament, which being well known, needs not, I presume, to be drawn out here into a greater length. Of these several things I propose to collect the evidence, which there may be in ancient writers; whether christians or others.

I begin with testimonies of christian writers, which will be placed in the following order.

I. Their testimonies concerning the antiquity, genuineness, and authority of the books of the New Testament, in which is contained this history.

II. Their testimonies concerning the facts, properly so called; the birth, miracles, death, resurrection of Jesus Christ; the mission of the apostles, their miracles, and success.

III. The doctrine and principles of belief and practice, delivered and taught by Christ and his apostles.

° Some however are of opinion, that the seven men of the church of Jerusalem, who were appointed by the apostles for 'serving tables,' were quite different from the deacons, concerning whom Paul speaks in his epistles to Timothy and the Philippians, and who were known by the name of deacons in the primitive christian churches. They think, that the seven in the Acts were extraordinary ministers or assistants, chosen for a particular occasion, the like to which were not continued in the church. This opinion has been learnedly asserted by Vitringa de Synagog. Vet. l. 3. p. 2. cap. v. p. 920—934.

IV. The worship appointed by Christ and his apostles.

Which two last are to be considered as facts; that is, that those principles were delivered, and that worship here spoken of was appointed by Christ, and his apostles.

All which testimonies to these several matters of fact may be confirmed, I believe, by some considerations, which will add weight to them, and very much increase their credibility.

And if it should be needful, some objections to the validity of this evidence may be stated and considered.

I now proceed to exhibit in the first place the testimonies of christian writers concerning the books of the New Testament.

The Reigns of the Roman Emperors during the first Two Centuries of the Christian Æra.

		A. D.
Augustus having reigned from the death of Julius Cæsar 57 years and some months, and from the defeat of Mark Antony at Actium, 44 years, died		August 19. 14.
Tiberias began his reign	- - - - -	August 19. 14.
Caius Caligula	- - - - -	March 16. 37.
Claudius	- - - - -	January 24. 41.
Nero	- - - - -	October 13. 54.
Nero died	- - - - -	June 9. 68.
Galba	} reigned from	{ June 9. 68. } to { Jan. 15. } { Jan. 17. 69. } { Apr. 16. } { Jan. 2. 69. } { Dec. 21. }
Otho		
Vitellius		
Vespasian began his reign	- - - - -	July 1. 69.
Titus	- - - - -	June 24. 79.
Domitian	- - - - -	September 13. 81.
Nerva	- - - - -	September 18. 96.
Trajan	- - - - -	January 27. 98.
Adrian	- - - - -	August 10. 117.
Antoninus Pius	- - - - -	July 10. 133.
M. Antoninus the Philosopher	- - - - -	March 7. 161.
Commodus	- - - - -	March 17. 180.
Helvius Pertinax	- - - - -	December 31. 192.
Didius Julianus	- - - - -	March 28. 193.
Septimius Severus	- - - - -	April 13. 193.
and reigned to	- - - - -	February 4. 211.

THE
PRINCIPAL FACTS
OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT
CONFIRMED, &c.

PART II. CHAP. I.

ST. BARNABAS. HIS HISTORY.

BARNABAS was a Levite, of the country of Cyprus, and one of those christians, who, soon after the resurrection of Jesus, sold their goods and lands, and brought the money, and “laid it at the apostles’ feet,” Acts iv. 36, 37. He afterwards preached the gospel in divers parts, together with the apostle Paul, Acts xv. 36. But upon a dissension about the person that should accompany them in a journey they were undertaking, they separated from each other: though, it is likely, in friendship: or at least they were afterwards reconciled, as may be concluded from the honourable and affectionate mention which St. Paul makes of Barnabas,^a and Mark,^b the person about whom the dispute was, in some of his epistles. And Barnabas has this testimony given him by^c St. Luke, that he “was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith.” There is little known of him, besides what is said in the New Testament; except that some of the ancients have supposed him to be one of Christ’s seventy disciples, whom he employed in preaching in the land of Judea, in his own lifetime on earth.

There is still extant an epistle, ascribed to St. Barnabas. It consists of two parts. The first is an exhortation and argument to constancy in the belief and profession of the christian doctrine; particularly, the simplicity of it without

^a 1 Cor. ix. 6.

^b Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24.

^c Acts xi. 24.

the rites of the Jewish law. The second part contains moral instructions.

In order to judge of the antiquity and authority of this piece, and the value of the testimonies to be taken from it; I shall give some account of it from the most ancient christian writers. The same method will be observed with regard to other writings, which I now take with this epistle, the first piece quoted by me.

St. Clement of Alexandria has often quoted him, and sometimes calls him apostle. ‘Rightly^d therefore says the ‘apostle Barnabas. I need^e only allege the apostolical ‘Barnabas, one of the seventy, and fellow-worker with ‘Paul.’ These quotations are from the first part of this epistle. He has also quoted a passage^f found in the last chapter of this epistle, which assures us, that the second part, containing the moral instructions, was supposed to be his, as well as the former.

Origen, in his answer to^g Celsus, quotes it with the title of ‘The Catholic Epistle of Barnabas.’ In another work^h he has quoted from him a passage now found in the second part of this epistle, as the former was from the first part of it.

Eusebiusⁱ says, ‘That Clement [of Alexandria] in his ‘Institutions [a book now lost] has written short commentaries upon the books of scripture, not omitting those that ‘are contradicted: I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other ‘Catholic epistles, and that of Barnabas, and the Revelation ‘of Peter.’ In another^k place Eusebius reckons this epistle among those books that are spurious, meaning, it is likely, contradicted.

St. Jerom, in his catalogue of illustrious^l men, says; ‘Barnabas of Cyprus, called Joseph, a Levite, ordained an ‘apostle of the Gentiles with Paul, wrote an epistle for the ‘edification of the church, which is read among the ‘apocryphal scriptures.’

These testimonies, without adding any more, let us see the opinions of the ancients concerning this epistle; the passages cited by them being still found in that epistle, which we now have under the name of Barnabas.

The judgments of the^m moderns are various. Pearson,

^d Strom. l. 2. p. 373. Paris, 1629.

^e Ibid. p. 410.

^f p. 396.

^g Lib. l. p. 49. Cantab. 1677.

^h De Princip. l. 3. c. 2.

ⁱ Hist. Ec. l. 6. c. 14. vid. et c. 13.

^k Ibid. l. 3. c. 25.

^l Cap. 6.

^m The sentiments of many moderns concerning this epistle are collected by Mr. J. Jones: *New and full method of settling the canonical authority of the New Testament*, vol. 2. c. 38.

Cave, Du Pin, Wake, and many other learned men, suppose it to be a genuine epistle of Barnabas, the companion of Paul. Some are more doubtful, as^a Cotelerius: who is rather inclined to think, it was not written by Barnabas. Others think, there are many things in it unworthy of him. The objections against the genuineness of it are strongly urged by^o Basnage. And the late Mr. Jeremiah Jones^p has offered in our own language many objections to the same purpose. But the real difficulties may be reduced to a small number.

The epistle has no inscription, not being directed to the christians of any particular place: for which reason it has been sometimes called a Catholic epistle. Many learned men have supposed, as^q Wake does, that it was addressed to the Jews, ‘to draw them off from the letter of the law to ‘a spiritual understanding of it.’

It appears to me most probable, that this epistle was written by Barnabas, and not to Jews, but to Gentiles: or perhaps rather to christians in general, of whatever nation or people they were. The design of the epistle I think likewise to be the same with that, which is the main design of St. Paul in the epistle to the Galatians, and in part in other epistles; to abate in christians the respect for the peculiar rites and institutions of the Jewish laws, and to show, that they were not binding upon christians: which design may be also observed in the first epistle of St. Peter.

It seems evident from a passage of the epistle itself, that the temple of Jerusalem was destroyed at the time of writing it. ‘For,’ says^r he, ‘through their waging war it has been ‘destroyed by their enemies.’ In another place the author writes: ‘Consider^s yet this also; that [or since] ye have ‘seen so great signs and prodigies in the people of the Jews, ‘and thus God forsakes them.’ From both which passages I conclude, that the temple was but just destroyed: and that the signs and prodigies preceding and attending the destruction of Jerusalem had happened in the time of the

^a Eo magis inclino, ut censeam non esse apostoli. Coteler. Judicium de Epist. S. Barnab. ^o Ann. Pol. Eccles. A. D. 50. n. 52. et seq.

^p As above, c. 39. ^q See his Discourse prefixed to the Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers. Chap. vii. sect. 14. and 35.

^r Δια γαρ το πολεμειν αυτες, καθηροθε υπο των εχθρων. c. 16.

^s Adhuc et illud intelligite, cum videritis tanta signa et monstra in populo Judæorum, et sic illos derelinquit Dominus, cap. iv. The late archbishop of Canterbury translates it thus: ‘Consider this also: although you have seen so ‘great signs and wonders done among the people of the Jews, yet this notwithstanding the Lord has forsaken them.’ But I humbly apprehend, that his lordship has misinterpreted this passage, the verb *derelinquit* being in the present tense.

persons to whom he writes: forasmuch as they had seen them. And since God was now only forsaking them, this epistle was written, whilst the Jewish people were under great afflictions; between the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the reduction of the remaining cities of Judea, of which^t Josephus has given an account, after the taking and burning of the temple. So that, whether this epistle be Barnabas's or not, it was written by some zealous christian of that^u time. And he thought fit, I suppose, to improve that opportunity for abating the extreme veneration for the Jewish law, which was so prejudicial to true christianity.

Any one who reads this epistle, with but a small degree of attention, will perceive in it many Pauline phrases and reasonings. To give the character of the author of it in one word: he resembles St. Paul, as his fellow-labourer, without copying him.

I shall quote it as being probably Barnabas's, and certainly ancient, written soon after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; most likely in the year of our Lord 71, or 72. And, as it is not a part of the canon of the New Testament, I have a right to make the best use of it I am able for supporting the authority of these books, and the credit of the doctrine and facts delivered in them. We may be obliged, before we have done, to consider, what pretensions this epistle has to be a part of the canon of the New Testament: but there is no necessity for us to enter into that inquiry at present; and it may be done to better advantage hereafter.

This epistle was written in Greek. But the four first chapters or sections, and a part of the fifth, are wanting in the Greek copies. It is however entire in an ancient Latin version.

In the epistle of Barnabas there is not any express mention of any book of the New Testament.

But there is in it a text or two of the New Testament, with a mark of quotation prefixed: and the words of several other texts are applied by him; and to some others he may be supposed to allude.

^t Vid. Jos. de B. J. l. vii. c. 6. et seq. ^u Dr. Mill, Prolegom. n. 144. says it was written about the year 70. and A. B. Wake, somewhat after the destruction of Jerusalem.

QUOTATIONS.

NEW TESTAMENT.

I. Matt. xvi. 24. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me."

This is plainly a quotation, though perhaps not designed for an exact quotation of the words of any text, but only of the sense. It is impossible to say, what particular text of the New Testament he refers to: but it is probable he refers to some such as that I have set over against this passage. This seems to me more likely than the words of Paul and Barnabas, Acts xiv. 22. "And that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." See below n. xxii.

N. T.

II. Matt. xx. 16. "So^y the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen."

Ch. xxii. 14. "For many are called, but few are chosen."

This is genera'ly allowed by learned men to be a reference to St. Matthew's Gospel. And it is a very remarkable one, being made in that form of quotation, which was used by the Jews, when they cited their sacred books: "It is written."

We meet with in this epistle the exact words of several texts, without any marks of quotation: and there may be thought to be allusions to some others.

Words of the New Testament, or allusions to them.

N. T.

III. Matt. v. 42. "Give^a to him that asketh thee."

Luke vi. 30. "Give to^b every man that asketh thee."

IV. Matt. ix. 13. "For^d

BARNABAS.

I. Ch. vii. 'So^x they, saith he, who will see me, and obtain my kingdom, must receive me with many afflictions and sufferings.'

BARNABAS.

II. Ch. iv. 'Let us^z therefore beware, lest it should happen to us, as it is written: "There are many called, few chosen."'

BARNABAS.

III. Ch. xix. 'Give^c to every one that asketh thee.'

IV. Ch. v. 'That^e he might

* Ουτω, φησιν, οι θελοντες με υειν, και αφαισαι με της βασιλειας, οφειδουσι θλιβεντες και παθοντες λαβειν με.

^y Πολλοι γαρ εισι κλητοι, ολιγοι δε εκλεκτοι. ^z Adtendamus ergo, ne forte, sicut scriptum est, multi vocati, pauci electi inveniamur.

^a Τω αιτηντι σε ιδε. ^b Παντι δε τω αιτηντι σε ιδε. ^c Παντι αιτηντι δε ιδε.

^d Ου γαρ ηλθου καλεσαι δικαιω, αλλ' αμαρτωλωσ εις μετανοιαν. ^e Οτι εκ ηλθε καλεσαι δικαιω, αλλ' αμαρτωλωσ εις μετανοιαν.

N. T.

I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."

In St. Matthew's gospel, these words are spoken by Christ in answer to the reflections made on his eating with publicans and sinners at Matthew's house after he had called him to follow him, as one of his apostles. And Barnabas says here, 'That Christ chose for his apostles, who were 'to preach his gospel, men who were great sinners, that he 'might show that he came not to call,' &c.

It ought to be observed however, that the same thing is said, Mark ii. 17, and Luke v. 32, and upon the same occasion. This therefore renders it doubtful, which gospel he refers to: and it may be questioned, whether he refers at all to any written gospel.

N. T.

V. Matt. xxii. 43, 44. "He saith unto them, how then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying: The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." See Psalm cx. 1.

VI. Matt. xxiv. 22. "And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened."

These two last^f passages I have put down, that it might not be thought I had overlooked them: but I do not think them very material. Barnabas, or whoever wrote this epistle, was able to make use of divers arguments from the Old Testament, found now in the gospels, without having his eye to any written gospel.

N. T.

VII. Matt. xxv. 5. "While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept, 6. And at midnight there was a cry made: The bridegroom

BARNABAS.

show, that "he came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance."'

BARNABAS.

V. Ch. xii. 'But because they would say, that Christ is the son of David, therefore fearing and knowing the error of sinful men, he says: "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool."—Behold how David calls him Lord.'

VI. Ch. iv. 'For this cause the Lord has shortened the times and days, that his beloved might hasten his coming to his inheritance.'

BARNABAS.

VII. Ch. iv. 'Take heed, lest at any time sitting still now that we are called, we fall asleep in our sins, and the wicked one getting power

^f See Jones's New and Full Method, &c. Part III. p. 21, 24. His arguments to prove, that in these two places Barnabas refers to St. Matthew's gospel.

N. T.

cometh—10. And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came, and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage, and the door was shut.”

It is not unlikely, that here is an allusion to the parable of the ten virgins. But we have here the only old Latin translation of this epistle: for which reason this passage appears with disadvantage.

N. T.

VIII. Matt. xxvi. 31. “For it is written [viz. Zech. xiii. 7.] I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.”

IX. Acts x. 42. “That it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead.”

2 Tim. iv. 1. “I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, whoⁱ shall judge the quick and the dead.”

1. Pet. iv. 5. “Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.”

It is not possible to say, what text he refers to, though that in Timothy has the same words. But perhaps there is no proof that he refers to any. This was an article well known to every common christian, whereas this writer (whoever he be) was able to teach the christian religion, and that without respect to any written gospels or epistles.

N. T.

X. Rom. ix. 10, 11, 12. “And not only this, but when Rebekah had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, (for the children not being yet born—) it was said unto

^g See Jones as before, p. 22, 23.
και νεκρους.

BARNABAS.

over us, stir us up, and shut us out of the kingdom of the Lord.’

BARNABAS.

VIII. Ch. v. ‘When I shall smite the shepherd, then the sheep of the flock shall be scattered^g abroad.’

IX. Ch. vii. ‘If therefore the Son of God, who is the Lord of all, and^h “shall judge the quick and the dead,” hath suffered, ——’

BARNABAS.

X. Ch. xiii. Barnabas argues, that the followers of Jesus are the people of God. ‘But let us inquire, says he, whether this people be the heir, or the former: and whe-

^h Και μελλοντος κρινειν ζωντας
ⁱ Τα μελλοντος κρινειν ζωντας και νεκρους.

N. T.

her, The elder shall serve the younger.”

Rom. iv. 3. “ For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness, v. 16. Therefore it is of faith—to the end, that the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) &c.

St. Paul’s argument, Gal. iv. 22—31, might be compared with these arguments of Barnabas, especially the former of them. But I do not suppose these passages contain a reference to any of St. Paul’s epistles, though they greatly illustrate them.

BARNABAS.

ther the covenant belong to us, or to them. Hear then concerning the people, what the scripture says: Isaac prayed for his wife Rebekah, because she was barren, and she conceived. Afterwards Rebekah went forth to inquire of the Lord. And the Lord said unto her: “ There are two nations in thy womb, and two people shall come from thy body. And the one people shall prevail above the other people; and the elder son shall serve the younger.” [Gen. xxv. 23.] You ought to consider, who is Isaac, and who Rebekah; and of whom it was declared, that this people should be greater than that.—You see of whom he appointed it, to be this first people, and heir of the covenant.’ Afterwards in the same chapter: ‘ What then saith he to Abraham, when upon believing he was placed in righteousness? Behold, “ I have made thee a father of many nations,” which without circumcision believe in the Lord.’ Gen. xvii. 4, 5.

N. T.

XI. Rom. xi. 36. "For of him, and^k through him, and to him, are all things."

But though here are words resembling those of St. Paul, Rom. xi. there is no reason to think Barnabas has any respect to them. They are used by him in a different sense, and on another account.

N. T.

XII. 1 Cor. iii. 16. "Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

XIII. 1 Cor. xi. 20. "When^m ye come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper."

XIV. 2 Cor. v. 17. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."

1 Pet. ii. 5. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house."

XV. Eph. v. 16, 17. "Redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding, what the mind of the Lord is." And Eph. ii. 2, "The prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."

BARNABAS.

XI. Ch. xii. Barnabas having spoken of the directions given by Moses to the Israelites in the wilderness, to look to the brazen serpent, says: 'You^l have in this also the glory of Jesus; forasmuch as in him are all things, and to him.'—

BARNABAS.

XII. Ch. vi. 'For, my brethren, the habitation of our heart is an holy temple to the Lord.'

XIII. Ch. iv. 'Butⁿ coming together into one place, inquire what is fitting and profitable for the beloved in common.'

XIV. Ch. xvi. 'Having received the remission of our sins, and trusting in the name of the Lord, we are made new, again created afresh: therefore God truly dwells in our house, that is, in us.— This is the spiritual temple built unto the Lord.'

XV. Ch. ii. 'Seeing then the days are exceeding evil, and the adversary has the power of this present world; we ought to give diligent heed, to inquire into the righteous judgments of the Lord.'

^k Οτι εξ αυτου, και δι' αυτου, και εις αυτον τα παντα.
τα παντα, και εις αυτον.

^l Οτι εν αυτω

^m Συνερχομενων εν ἑμῶν ἐπι το αυτο, κ. λ.

ⁿ Sed in unum convenientes, inquirete.

N. T.

XVI. Philip. iv. 5. "The Lord^o is at hand."

2 Pet. iii. 10. "The earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up.

Rev. xxii. 12. "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me."

Some may apprehend, that there is here a reference to some text, or texts, of the New Testament. But I think by no means. If he alludes to any text of scripture, it is to Isa. xl. 10. "His reward is with him, and his work before him:" or lxii. 11. "Behold, thy salvation cometh: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him:" as Menard has observed upon this place of Barnabas.

N. T.

XVII. 2 Tim. i. 10. "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

Rom. xv. 8. "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."

XVIII. Heb. iii. 5. "And^q Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant. —6. But Christ, as a son, over his own house, whose house are we."

BARNABAS.

XVI. Ch. xxi. 'The day is^p near, in which all things shall be destroyed, together with the wicked one. The Lord is near, and his reward.'

BARNABAS.

XVII. Ch. v. 'But he, that he might abolish death, and make manifest a resurrection from the dead, because it behoved him to appear in the flesh, suffered, that he might perform the promise made unto the fathers.'

XVIII. Ch. xiv. Barnabas having observed, that Moses received from God the two tables of the commandments, written by the finger of God, but the people being fallen to idolatry, he cast them to the ground, and the tables of the covenant were broken, goes on.—'Moses^r being a servant received them [or it, meaning the covenant, or

^o Ο Κυριος εγγυς.

^p Εγγυς γαρ ημερα, εν η συναπολειται παντα τω πονηρω. Εγγυς ο Κυριος, και ο μισθος αυτη.

^q Και Μωσης μεν πιστος—ως θεραπων.—Χριστος δε, ως υιος επι τον οικον αυτη, ου οικος εσμεν ημεις.

^r Μωσης θεραπων ον ελαβεν—αυτος δε ο Κυριος ημιν εδωκεν, εις λαον κληρονομιας, δια ημας υπομειναι.

N. T.

BARNABAS.

testament.] But the Lord himself has given them to us, the people of his inheritance, he having suffered for us.'

There does not appear to me any the least reason to suppose, that Barnabas has here any respect to the epistle to the Hebrews. He often argues like the author of that epistle, without borrowing from him.

N. T.

BARNABAS.

XIX. Heb. x. 25. "Not^s forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is."

XIX. Ch. iv. 'Do^t not withdraw yourselves from others, like justified men.'

XX. 1 Pet. i. 17. "And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons, judges according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear."

XX. Ch. iv. 'As much as in us lies, let us meditate on the fear of God, and strive to keep his commandments, that we may rejoice in his judgments. For the Lord judges the world without respect of persons, and every one shall receive according to what he does.'

Thus I have put down the most^u material passages of Barnabas, which may be supposed to contain allusions to the books of the New Testament, that every one may be able to judge for himself. But excepting some of the first numbers, I do not allege them as express quotations or allusions. In most of these places, Barnabas does not appear an imitator, or copier of others, but an original author, who had in his mind the same doctrine with Paul,

^s Μη εγκαταλειποντες την επισυναγωγην, καθως εθος τισιν.

^t Non

separatim debetis seducere vos, tanquam justificati.

^u Note: at ch. vii.

This writer says of the Jews, that they shall say; 'Is not this he whom we crucified, having despised him, pierced him, and mocked him?' Where he seems to apply the words of Zech. xii. 10, which are also applied John, ch. xix. 37. Mr. Jones, vol. III. p. 144, hence concludes, that he used St. John's gospel. But I am not convinced by his arguments, the force of which depends very much upon his supposition, that this writer was originally a Gentile, and not a Jew. For though the circumstance of our Saviour's being pierced at his crucifixion be related only by St. John, v. 34, it never was a secret, but was all along well known to the christians of that time, before John wrote this gospel. It is most manifest, (as will appear hereafter,) that this writer was a perfect master of our Lord's history, and I believe, learned men in general are satisfied, he was better acquainted with the Old Testament than Mr. Jones supposed. Besides that, 'whom they have pierced,' may have been at that time the reading of the Seventy, as well as the Hebrew. See R. Simon. Hist. Critique du text du N. T. ch. xx. p. 242, 243.

and the other apostles. This is the idea I have formed of this epistle, from a frequent perusal of it. And some learned men have been^x of much the same opinion.

It is probable, that at the writing of this epistle he had read St. Matthew; and that he refers to him in numbers I. II. III. IV. and perhaps at VI. and VII. But it cannot be thought strange, that a man who was contemporary with the apostles, and had the same spirit, and the like gifts with them, if he was not an apostle himself, should often speak and reason and argue like them, without quoting their writings, or referring to them.

XXI. Before we quite leave this epistle, we must take notice of a singular passage in it.

Ch. iv. ‘As^y the Son of God says: “Let us resist all iniquity, and hate it.”’

Menard upon the place says: This sentence we have in none of the gospels, but he had heard it from Christ, or some one of his disciples. It is like that passage of St. Paul, Acts xx. 35, “And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said; It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

XXII. And this passage may lead us to one observation more; that I do not in this epistle perceive any quotations or references to Apocryphal gospels. Nor do I at present recollect, that the learned men, who have so diligently collected the passages of those gospels, have suspected any quotations of them in this epistle, beside this last mentioned passage, and that at number I. And I think it without reason, that they have suspected these: it being no uncommon thing for writers to report the sense of a text or saying, without representing their very words. Or, as the same Menard upon that place says: ‘He^z there alleges not any ‘one particular text of the gospel, but expresses the sense ‘of many of Christ’s sayings, concerning the necessity of ‘enduring tribulations for the sake of eternal life: as “strait ‘is the gate: He that will come after me”——and the like, ‘which occur frequently in the gospels.’

^x —per omnia orthodoxus, et Apostolorum, præsertim Stⁱ. Pauli, vestigiis insistens; ut si non laborum et itinerum, saltem dogmatum, participem ubique agnoscamus. Ad calcem J. Armachani de Barnabæ epist. præmonitionis, ap. Cotel. p. 13. Ed. Amst. 1698. ^y C. 4. Sicut dicit filius Dei: resistamus omni iniquitati, et odio habeamus eam. ^z Sic inquit, nempe Jesus. Non profertur hic certus aliquis Evangelii locus, sed sensus multorum Christi dictorum, de tribulationibus perferendis ab eis qui sunt æternæ vitæ studiosi: ut, Arcta via est, quæ ducit ad vitam: Qui vult venire post me, &c. et similia, quæ passim in Evangelio reperire est. Menard. ad. cap. vii. See likewise Jones, as before, vol. i. p. 518, 519.

CHAP. II.

ST. CLEMENT. HIS HISTORY.

THE next piece, which I am to quote, is the epistle of Clement, bishop of Rome, to the church of Corinth: whom ancient writers, without any doubt or scruple, relate to have been the same Clement, whom St. Paul mentions among his “fellow labourers, whose names are in the book of life,” Philip. iv. 3. The epistle is written in the name of the whole church of Rome to the church of Corinth. And therefore it is called at one time the epistle of Clement, and at another the epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians. The main design of it is to compose some dissensions, which there were in the church of Corinth about their spiritual guides and governors. Which dissensions seem to have been raised by a few turbulent and selfish men among them. Upon this occasion Clement recommends not only concord and harmony, but love in general, humility, and all the virtues of a good life, and divers of the great articles and principles of religion. The^a style is clear and simple. It is called by the ancients an excellent, an useful, a great and admirable^b epistle. And the epistle still in our hands deserves all these commendations: though not entire, there being some pages wanting in the manuscript of it: and though we have but one ancient manuscript of it remaining. For which reason it cannot be altogether so correct, as if we had a number of copies to compare together.

It being of considerable importance in these most early writings, to settle their true age; somewhat must be observed concerning the time when this epistle was written.

The succession of the first bishops of Rome lies at present in some uncertainty and obscurity. Bishop^c Pearson sup-

^a Απλως δε κατα φρασιν και εγγως τη εκκλησιαστικη και απεριεργη χαρακτηρισ. Phot. Cod. 126.

^b Photius commends the epistle in the main. But still he says, ‘There are in it several things liable to censure. One is, that the ‘writer, though he calls our Lord our high-priest and patron, gives him none ‘of the higher and more divine titles. However he does not any where ‘openly blaspheme him.’ *Λιτιασαιτο δ’ αν τις εν ταυταις—οτι αρχιερεα και προσατην τον Κυριον ημων Ιησεν Χριστον εξονομαζων, εδε τας θεοπρεπεις και υψηλοτερας αφηκε περι αυτη φωνας. Ου μην εδ’ απαρακαλυπτως αυτον εδαμη εν τατοις βλασφημει.* Cod. 126. p. 306. That is, in modern language, it is a Socinian epistle. So upon many occasions, Photius is apt to censure ancient writers, who come not up to the orthodoxy of his time. ^c Opera. Post. p. 172.

poses, that Clement was bishop of Rome from the year of our Lord 69, or 70, to the year 83, the second of Domitian:^d Pagi, that Clement succeeded Linus in 61, and sat in the see of Rome till 77, when he abdicated, and died long after a martyr in the year 100. Those learned men, who place the bishoprick of Clement so early, or that suppose he might write this epistle before he was bishop, (as Dodwell,) usually place it before the destruction of Jerusalem. The archbishop of Canterbury^e concludes, that this epistle was written shortly after the end of the persecution under Nero, between the 64 and the 70 year of Christ. Le Clerc^f places it in the year 69, and Dodwell^g in 64. Du Pin, Tillemont, and others^h think, he was not bishop till the year 91, or 93. This is the more common opinion, and is agreeable to the sentiments of Irenæus, Eusebius, and others, the most ancient christian writers.

I shall observe some notes of time in the epistle itself, and then the testimonies of the ancients.

First, Of notes of time in the epistle itself. The Romans begin with saying, that ‘the calamities and afflictions, which had befallen them, had somewhat retarded their answering the Corinthians to those things they had required of them.’ This letter therefore was written soon after some persecution, or at the conclusion of it; either the persecution of Nero about 64, or that of Domitian in 94, or 95, the next persecutor of the church. But that it was written after the latter, and not so soon as that of Nero, may be argued from divers passages. In the 44th ch. Clement seems to intimate, that there had then been some successions in the church, since those appointed by the apostles: for he says, ‘Wherefore we cannot think, that those may be justly thrown out of their ministry, who were either appointed by them, [the apostles,] or afterwards chosen by other eminent men with the consent of the whole church,’—and ‘have beenⁱ for a long time commended by all.’ In the 47th chapter he bids the Corinthians take into their hands the epistle of Paul written to them ‘in the^k beginning of the ‘gospel:’ and in the same chapter he calls the church of Corinth an^l ‘ancient church.’ I know indeed, that learned

^d Crit. A. D. 100. N. 2.

^e See his discourse prefixed to the genuine epistles of the apostolical fathers, p. 12.

^f Hist. Ec. A. D. 69. N. vi.

^g Disserta. sing. de Rom. Pont. success. c. xi. p. 153.

^h Vid.

Cotelerii judicium de priore S. Clem. Ep. apud Patres, Ap. T. i. p. 141. Of this opinion was Dr. Cave, when he wrote his Apostolici, vid. Life of St. Clement, sect. iv. but altered it afterwards. Vid. Hist. Lit. Clemens.

ⁱ Μεμαρτυρημενους τε πολλοις χρονοις υπο παντων.

^k Εν αρχη

τη ευαγγελια εγραψεν.

^l Αρχαιαν Κορινθιων εκκλησιαν.

men, who are for the more early date of this epistle, endeavour to evade the force of the argument taken from these two last expressions: but I think, it cannot be done without some violence to them.

There is indeed a passage in the 41st chapter, from whence it is argued, that the temple at Jerusalem must have been standing, when Clement wrote; because he speaks in the present tense concerning the sacrifices of the Mosaic law: ‘That^m the sacrifices are not offered every where, but only ‘at Jerusalem.’ But I am surprised, so many learned men should have insisted on this argument. Josephus, in his Antiquities, not finished before the year 93, continually speaks in the present tense, when he gives an account of the several kinds of sacrifices appointed by the law. ‘A ‘privateⁿ person, says he, when he brings a whole burnt-offering, sacrificeth an ox, and a lamb, and a kid. When ‘these are slain, the priests pour out the blood round about ‘the altar. Then having washed them, they divide the ‘members, and having sprinkled them with salt, lay them ‘on the altar, &c.’ By which all men will understand no more, than that this was the appointment of the law: and that when sacrifices were brought this was the way of offering them. And, as Cotelerius^o observes, the same style may be used concerning the same matter to this very day.

In the next place, I shall put down some ancient testimonies concerning this epistle, not barely to ascertain the time of it, but also to represent the value of it, and its occasion, design, and argument.

Irenæus says, ‘When^p the blessed apostles [Peter and ‘Paul] had founded and established the church, [at Rome,] ‘they delivered the office of the bishoprick in it to Linus. ‘Of this Linus Paul makes mention in his epistles to Timothy, [2 Tim. iv. 21.] To him succeeded Anencletus. ‘After whom, in the third place after the apostles, Clement ‘obtained that bishoprick, who had seen the blessed apostles, and conversed with them: who had the preaching ‘of the apostles still sounding in his ears, and their traditions ‘before his eyes. Nor he alone, for there were then still

^m Ου πανταχθ προσφέρονται θυσιαί, κ. λ. ⁿ Ανηρ ιδιωτης ολοκαυτων θυει μεν βην, και αρνιον, και εριφον—σφαγεντων δε τετων, τον κυκλον τη αιματι λευσοι τε βωμω οι ιερεις, ειτα καθαροποιησαντες διαμελιζοσι, και πασαντες αλσιw επι τον βωμον αναθηασι, κ. λ. Antiq. l. iii. c. 9. sect. 1. vid. et sect. 2, 3. ^o Sed Clemens, inquit viri doctissimi, meminit, cap. 41, oblationem in templo. Quidni meminisset? cum nunc quoque, tot elapsis seculis, par mentio idemque sermo haberi queat; quemadmodum legenti patebit. Judicium de priore Ep. Clement. ubi supra. p. 141. ^p Con. Hær. l. iii. c. 3. et apud Euseb. H. E. l. v. c. 6.

‘ many alive, who had^a been taught by the apostles. In the
 ‘ time therefore of this Clement, when there was no small
 ‘ dissension among the brethren at Corinth, the church at
 ‘ Rome sent a most excellent letter to the Corinthians, per-
 ‘ suading them to peace among themselves,’ &c.

Thus Irenæus makes Clement the third in succession after the apostles. In like manner Eusebius. ‘ In^r the
 ‘ second of whose reign [that is, of Titus, and according to
 ‘ Eusebius’s account, A. D. 79.] Linus, bishop of the
 ‘ church of the Romans, when he had governed it twelve
 ‘ years, delivered it to Anencletus.—In^s the twelfth year
 ‘ of this reign, [Domitian’s, A. D. 92.] Anencletus having
 ‘ been bishop of the church of Rome twelve years, was suc-
 ‘ ceeded by Clement, whom the apostle mentions in his
 ‘ epistle to the Philippians, ch. iv. 3.’ Again, ‘ Of this^t
 ‘ Clement there is one epistle acknowledged by all a great
 ‘ and admirable epistle, which as from the church of Rome he
 ‘ wrote to the church of the Corinthians, on occasion of a dis-
 ‘ sension that there was then at Corinth. And we know that
 ‘ this epistle has been formerly, and is still publicly read in
 ‘ many churches. Furthermore, Hegesippus is a sufficient
 ‘ witness of the dissension which there was at Corinth in
 ‘ the time of Clement.’ In another place: ‘ At^u the same
 ‘ time [beginning of Trajan’s reign] Clement still governed
 ‘ the church of Rome, who was the third in that succession,
 ‘ after Paul and Peter. For Linus was the first, and after
 ‘ him Anencletus.’ And he^v afterwards says that Clement
 ‘ died in the third year of Trajan, [that is, A. D. 100.] having
 ‘ been bishop nine years. Farther: ^w — ‘ And the epistle
 ‘ of Clement acknowledged by all, which he wrote to the
 ‘ Corinthians, in the name of the church of Rome. In^x
 ‘ which inserting many sentiments of the epistle to the He-
 ‘ brews, and also using some of the very words of it, he
 ‘ plainly manifests that epistle [to the Hebrews] to be no
 ‘ modern piece. And hence it has been not without reason
 ‘ reckoned among the other writings of the apostle. For
 ‘ Paul having written to the Hebrews in their own tongue,

^a It is plain from these several observations of Irenæus, that he had not the least suspicion this epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem; but when all or most of the apostles had been for some time dead. Nor would it have been worth observing, that in the year 70, there were many living, beside Clement, who had been taught by the apostles; at which time it would be strange, not to suppose a great part of them still alive.

^r Eus. H. E. l. iii. c. 13. ^s Ibid. c. 15. ^t Ibid. c. 16. ^u Ibid. c. 21.

^v Ibid. c. 22.

^w Ibid. c. 34.

^x Εν η της προς

Εβραϊκας πολλα νοηματα παραθει, ηδη δε και απολιξει ρητοις τισιν εξ αυτης χρησαμενος, κ. λ.

‘ some think the evangelist Luke, others, that this very Clement translated it [into Greek]: which last is the most likely, since there is a great resemblance between the style of the epistle of Clement and the epistle to the Hebrews; as well as between the sentiments of those writings. It ought to be observed, that there is another epistle said to be Clement’s: but this is not so generally received as the former; nor do we know the ancients to have quoted it. There have been also published not long since other large and prolix writings in his name, containing dialogues of Peter and Apion: of which there is not the least mention made by the ancients. Nor have they the pure apostolical doctrine.’ To add but one place more; speaking of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, about 170. Eusebius observes from this epistle to the church of Rome addressed to Soter their bishop at that time: ‘ That^y in his epistle Dionysius makes mention also of the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, testifying, that it had been wont to be read there in the church from ancient time, saying, To-day we have kept the holy Lord’s-day in which we read your epistle: which we shall continually read for our instruction, as well as the former written to us by Clement.’

With Eusebius, St. Jerom (though a Latin) agrees, in his book^z of Illustrious Men: ‘ Clement, of whom the apostle Paul writes in his epistle to the Philippians [ch. iv. 3.] the^a fourth bishop of Rome after Peter, for as much as Linus was the second, Anacletus the third (though most of the Latins think Clement to have been the second after the apostle Peter,) wrote a very useful epistle in the name of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth, which in some places is read publiely.’ He goes on to observe, as Eusebius had done before, its agreement with the epistle to the Hebrews. And then adds: ‘ There is also a second epistle with his name, but it is rejected by the ancients, and a long dialogue of Peter and Apion, which Eusebius has censured in the third book of his Ecclesiastical History. He died in the third year of Trajan:’ that is, A. D. 100.

All these testimonies agree together, and they are the most valuable we can have. It was indeed the more common opinion of the Latins, as Jerom owns, that Clement was next after Peter, but he does not follow them. And we find^b Tertullian, the most ancient Latin father remaining, though not so ancient as Irenæus, saying that Clement was

^y Euseb. H. E. l. iv. c. 23. p. 145. B. C.

^z Cap. 15.

^a He

reckons St. Peter for the first.

^b Sicut Romanorum Clementem, a Petro ordinatum. De Præscr. c. 32.

ordained by Peter. To which, I think, it may be a sufficient answer to say, that Tertullian might be mistaken in this; and that the testimony of Irenæus, confirmed by Eusebius, is much more valuable than his. But if it be needful to reconcile Tertullian with others, this also may be done. For it may be said, that though Clement was ordained by Peter; it was not to the bishoprick of Rome or any other office in that church, but to some service of the gospel elsewhere. But I think, that is not agreeable to the words of Tertullian: which plainly intend an ordination in the church of Rome, either to the bishoprick of that church, or some other office in it. There is another way of reconciling this matter by saying, that Clement was ordained, or appointed by Peter, to be bishop in the church of Rome, but he declined it for some reason. Epiphanius^c has a conjecture, that though he was ordained bishop by Peter, he declined the exercise of that charge, till after the death of Linus and Cletus: and he builds that conjecture upon a passage of Clement, in this very epistle, chap. liv. ‘Who is there among you that has any charity? Let him say, if this sedition, if this contention, be upon my account; I am ready to depart, I go away—only let the flock of Christ be in peace.’ And thus he might have practised what he here recommends. And Epiphanius says likewise, that this is related in some writings he had seen. But though we cannot be certain of this, yet I think it best to follow those testimonies I have first produced: according to which his bishoprick of Rome must have commenced in the year 91 or 92, and the epistle was written at the latter end of the reign of Domitian, in 95, or rather 96.

As for the opinion, that this epistle was written by him, after he had resigned, and in a supposed banishment, it hardly deserves any consideration: it being plainly confuted by the epistle itself, which appears to be written from Rome in the name of the church there, after some troubles, or when they were abated. And they desire the speedy return of the three brethren, whom they sent with it to Corinth. ‘The messengers,’ say they at the end of the epistle, ‘whom we have sent unto you, Claudius Ephebus, and Valerius Bito, with Fortunatus, send back to us again with all speed—that they may the sooner acquaint us with your peace and concord.’

Upon the whole, I think this epistle was written by Clement, when bishop, at the end of Domitian’s persecution, in the year 96.

^c Har. 27. c. 6.

The passages I have quoted have sufficiently shown, not only the age of Clement, and of this epistle, but the character of it, and also that this is the only piece of Clement that can be relied on as^d genuine. I shall therefore be excused, if I do not quote the Constitutions, Recognitions, or any other piece, as his: no, not that which is called his second epistle: though I shall give some account of it, after I have put down my extracts out of this.

Indeed the second epistle might be shown by many arguments not to be genuine, though some learned men have been willing to own it as such. It is expressly rejected as spurious by^e Photius. Grabe^f has well observed, that the forementioned Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in the second century, makes mention of but one epistle of Clement: that Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who have quoted the first, never take any notice of the second: nor yet Irenæus, who has so particularly mentioned the first, and could not well have omitted to mention the other also, if he had known any thing of it. From all which Grabe concludes, with great probability, that this piece was not written before the middle of the third century.

I would only farther observe, that some have supposed our Clement to have been of the family of the Cæsars, and to have suffered martyrdom. But both these suppositions seem to be originally owing to a confounding him with Flavius Clemens, the consul: who was a near relation of Domitian, and was also put to death by him for christianity. That Clement was no martyr, is fairly concluded from the silence of Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, and others: who could not have omitted this, if there had been any ground for it.

*A Book of the New Testament expressly quoted by
St. Clement.*

In this epistle there is but one book of the New Testament expressly named, which is the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.

N. T.

CLEMENT.

I. 1 Cor. i. 12. " Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of	I. Ch. xlvii. ' Take ^g into your hands the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle.
--	--

^d Vid. Phot. Cod. 112, 113, et 126. p. i. p. 266—269.

^e Cod. 113.

^f Spicil.

^g Αναλαβετε την επιστολην τῶ μακαρισ Πανλῆ τῆ αποστολῆ. Τι πρωτον υμιν εν αρχη τῆ εναγγελιῆ εγραψεν; επ' αληθειῆς πνευματικῶς επεσειλεν ὑμιν, περι αυτῆ τε, και Κηφα τε, και Απολλω, κ. λ.

N. T.

Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ.”

CLEMENT.

What did he at the first write to you in the beginning of the gospel? Verily he did by the Spirit admonish you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then you did form parties.’

St. Clement here quotes this epistle to the Corinthians themselves: to whom, he says, it was written by the apostle Paul. I need not observe, how strong an argument this is for the genuineness of the first epistle to the Corinthians, which we now have. And he says, Paul wrote, and admonished them, by the Spirit: or, as in the original, spiritually.

Quotations and Allusions.

N. T.

II. Jer. ix. 23, 24. “Thus saith the Lord: Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom,” &c. Comp. I Cor. i. 31.

Luke vi. 36. “Be ye therefore^h merciful, as your Father also is merciful. V. 37, Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: 38, Give, and it shall be given unto you: good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal, it shall be measured to you again.”

CLEMENT.

II. Ch. xiii. ‘And let us do as it is written. For thus saith the Holy Spirit. “Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom”—ⁱ Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, which he spake, teaching gentleness and long suffering. For thus he said: “Be ye merciful, that ye may obtain mercy: forgive, that it may be forgiven unto you. As you do, so shall it be done unto you: as you give, so shall it be given unto you: as ye judge, so shall ye be judged: as ye show kindness, so shall kindness be shown unto you: with what measure ye mete, with the same shall it be

^h Γινεσθε εν οικτιρμονης, καθως και ο πατηρ υμων οικτιρμων εστι.—Διδοτε, και δοθησεται υμιν—τη γαρ αυτω μετρω φ μετρειτε, αντισμετρηθησεται υμιν.

ⁱ Μαλιστα μεμνημενοι των λογων τς Κυρια Ιησθ ος ελαλησε—Ουτως γαρ ειπεν’ Ελεειτε ινα ελεθητε, αφιετε ινα αφιθη υμιν’ ως ποιειτε, ουτω ποιηθησεται υμιν’ ως διδοτε, ουτω δοθησεται υμιν’ ως χρηρευεσθε, ουτως χρηρευθησεται υμιν’ φ μετρω μετρειτε, εν αυτω μετρηθησεται υμιν.

N. T.

Matt. vii. 1. "Judge not, that ye be not judged. 2. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. Ver. 12, Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them."

This passage shows the great respect, which was paid to the words of Christ, [as recorded by the evangelists,] since having quoted a text of the Old Testament, as dictated by the Holy Spirit; he yet demands a still more especial regard to the words of Christ, which there follow.

N. T.

III. Matt. xxvi. 24, "But woe to that man, by whom the Son of Man is betrayed: it had been good for that man, if he had not been born."

Matt. xviii. 6. "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me; it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were cast into the sea."

Mark ix. 42. "And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea."

Luke xvii. 2. "It were better for him, that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones."

Here is however one difficulty: and it is a difficulty which may frequently occur, whilst we are considering these very early writers, who were conversant with the

CLEMENT.

measured to you." By this command, and by these rules, let us establish ourselves, that we may always walk obediently to his holy words.'

CLEMENT.

III. Ch. xlvi. 'Remember the words of the Lord Jesus. For he said: "Woe to that man [by whom offences come]. It were better for him that he had not been born, than that he should offend one of my elect. It were better for him, that a millstone should be tied about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the sea, than that he should offend one of my little ones.'

I have put down on the other side the words of several evangelists, that every one may the better judge: but it is generally supposed, that the latter part of this passage refers to Luke xvii. 2.

apostles, and others, who had seen and heard our Lord, and were in a manner as well acquainted with our Saviour's doctrine and history as the evangelists themselves; unless their quotations or allusions are very express and clear. The question then here is, whether Clement in these places refers to words of Christ written and recorded; or whether he reminds the Corinthians of words of Christ, which he and they might have heard from the apostles, or other eye and ear witnesses of our Lord. Le Clerc^k in his Dissertation on the Four Gospels is of opinion, that Clement refers to written words of our Lord, which were in the hands of the Corinthians, and well known to them. On the other hand, I find, bishop Pearson^l thought, that Clement speaks of words which he had heard from the apostles themselves, or their disciples.

I certainly make no question but the first three gospels were written before this time. And I am well satisfied, that Clement might refer to our written gospels, though he does not exactly agree with them in expression. But whether he does refer to them, is not easy to determine, concerning a man, who very probably knew these things before they were committed to writing: and even after they were so, might continue to speak of them, in the same manner he had been wont to do, as things he was well informed of, without appealing to the scriptures themselves. However either way he by these passages greatly confirms the truth of our gospels. If he be supposed to refer to them, the case is clear. If the words are spoken of, as what he had received from the apostles or others, he confirms our gospels, forasmuch as these words are agreeable to those which are there recorded: and he speaks of them, as certain and well known; both to himself, and the Corinthians of that time. We are therefore assured by Clement, that

^k Clemens quidem non laudat nomine ullum evangelistam, sed bis *λογος* sermones Jesu Christi, quorum jubet memores esse Corinthios, cap. xiii. et cap. xlv. Quæ manifesto videntur respicere ad scriptos sermones, eosque manibus Corinthiorum vulgo tritos. Ac sane prior locus exstat, Luc. vi. 36, 37, et 38, quanvis non totidem prorsus verbis, sed eodem plane sensu. Posteriora vero verba leguntur, Matt. xxvi. 24. Marc. ix. 42. Luc. xvii. 2. Matt. xviii. 6. Fateor tamen hic etiam sensum potissimum respici. Sed sic solent quoque apostoli passim laudare Vetus Testamentum, et varia loca in unam orationem conjungere: nec tamen dubium est, quin respiciant ad libros sacros, quos etiamnum habemus, et quorum sacrosancta dudum erat auctoritas. Dissert. iii. p. 542. a.

^l Cum veritati magis mihi consonum videatur ab apostolis ipsis, aut eorum discipulis, hæc accepisse Clementem.

I have not room for his whole argument, which is in Vindic. Ignat. Part ii cap. ix.

our evangelists have truly and justly recorded the words of Christ, which he spake, teaching gentleness and long-suffering, and that they are worthy to be remembered with the highest respect.

But though here is a difficulty, yet I suppose, most learned men may be of that opinion, which I have spoken of as Le Clerc's. Indeed when St. Paul exhorts some in a like manner, Acts xx. 35, "To remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive:" I believe, it is generally reckoned, he refers them not to any writing, but only to some words of Christ, of which he and they were well informed. But nevertheless, it does not follow, that this form of reference ought always to be so understood. It may be as well used to refer to written, as to unwritten, words of the Lord. We shall find Polycarp using the same form, when he very probably, or rather certainly, refers to our written gospels. 'Remembering what the Lord said teaching.' See hereafter, in Polycarp, Numb. IV. and VIII.

Before we proceed any farther, we ought likewise to observe, that the learned Dr. Mill^m concludes from a passage of Irenæus, that Clement did in his manner obscurely quote Matt. xxv. 41. Irenæusⁿ is arguing with some heretics, and refers them to the epistle of Clement, 'who therein declares the doctrine received from the apostles, which declares, that there is one God Almighty, the maker of the heaven and the earth,—who brought in the flood, and called Abraham,—who spake to Moses,—and sent the prophets, who has prepared the fire for the devil and his angels. That He is declared by the churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, they who will may learn from the epistle itself.' And this is one of Mill's arguments, that the true reading of that text of Matthew is not, as in our copies, "everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels;" but 'everlasting fire, which my Father has prepared for the devil and his angels.'

I must leave it to the reader to consider, whether it can be hence determined, that Clement did here refer to Mat-

^m Citavit nimirum obscurius, suo more, locum illum. Matt. xxv. 41. Prolegom. n. 140. vid. et n. 141, 343, 369, et ad Matthæi locum.

ⁿ Adnuntians quam in recenti ab apostolis acceperat traditionem, annuntiantem unum Deum omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ,—qui induxerit cataclysmum, et advocaverit Abraham,—qui colloquutus sit Moysi,—et prophetas miserit, qui ignem præparaverit diabolo et angelis ejus. Hunc Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi ab ecclesiis annuntiari, ex ipsâ scripturâ, qui velint, discere possunt, apostolicam ecclesiæ traditionem intelligere. Iren. lib. iii. c. 3. sect. 3.

thew's gospel. I may however say, that this passage of Irenæus does deserve consideration, though there are not now any such words in Clement's epistle. For we have it not entire, as was before shown.

IV. I shall here put down a passage of St. Jerom in his commentary upon Is. lii. that every one may judge, whether it can be thence concluded, that St. Clement quoted St. John's gospel. 'Of which also,' says^o St. Jerom, 'Clement 'an apostolical man, who after Peter governed the church 'of Rome, writes to the Corinthians: The sceptre of God 'the Lord Jesus Christ came not with arrogance of pride, 'though he could do all things, but in humility: insomuch 'that when struck by the servant of the high-priest, he answered: "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: 'but if well, why smitest thou me?"' John xviii. 22, 23.

The former words, concerning Christ's being the sceptre of God, are in the 16th chap. of Clement's epistle, and will be quoted presently under the epistle of Paul to the Philippians: but the words following, of John xviii. are not there. I apprehend, they never were. Nor can it be concluded, that Jerom himself supposed they were there: he in that place heaping texts of scripture upon one another, without any nice order.

Mr. Jones says,^p 'That St. Clement appears to have cited 'St. John in sect. 49. and that he manifestly uses those 'words of that gospel, ch. x. 15.' The words in^q St. John are: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." In^r Clement: "He that has the love that is in Christ, let him keep the precepts of Christ." But I think this reference to be at best doubtful. Clement knew very well from the public instructions of the apostles, as well as from his conversation with them, that a profession of love for Christ obliged men to keep his precepts.

N. T.

V. Acts xiii. 22. "And when he had removed him, he raised up unto them David to be their king, to whom also he gave testimony, and said, I have found David the

CLEMENT.

V. Ch. xviii. 'And what shall we say of David, so highly testified of? To whom God said; "I have found a man after my own heart, David the son of Jesse, with

^o Scribit ad Corinthios: sceptrum Dei, Dominus Jesus Christus, non venit in jactantia superbiae, quum possit omnia, sed in humilitate: in tantum ut, verberatus a ministro sacerdotis, responderit: "Si male loquutus sum, argue de peccato: sin autem bene, quid me caedis?" ad Is. c. 52. Op. T. 3. p. 382.

^p Vol. 3. p. 144.

^q Εάν αγαπάτε με, τας εντολας τας εμας τηρησατε.

^r Ο εχων αγαπην εν Χριστω τηρησατω τα τε Χριτω παραγγελματα.

N. T.

son of Jesse, a man after my own heart, which shall fulfil all my will."

Comp. Ps. lxxxix. 20. "I have found David my servant: with my holy oil have I anointed him." And I Sam. xiii. 14. "The Lord has sought him a man after his own heart."

VI. Acts xx. 35. "How he said: ^s It is more blessed to give, than to receive."

VII. Rom. i. 29. "Being ^u filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity: whisperers, 30. backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters; 32. who knowing the judgment of God, (that they which do such things are worthy of death,) not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

Every one sees, we have here the conclusion of the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans: and, as Mill thinks, the true and original reading. In the former part of the sentence is also a plain allusion to what goes before in that chapter. And we have here, as it seems, a plain and un-

CLEMENT.

holy oil have I anointed him."

It is true, these words are also to be found in the O. T. But they are introduced by Clement with the same or like form of quotation, with that in the Acts, and the words agree very much; which may dispose one to think, he had an eye to that place.

VI. Ch. ii. 'Ye were all of you humble-minded——^t more willingly giving than receiving.'

VII. Ch. xxxv. Casting off^v from us all 'unrighteousness,' and iniquity, 'covetousness, debates, malignities, deceits, whisperings, backbitings, hatred of God, pride, boasting,' and vain glory, and ambition. 'For they that do these things are hateful to God: and not only they that do them, but they also who have pleasure in them.'

^s Μακαριον εστι διδοναι μαλλον η λαμβανειν. ^t Ηδιον διδοντες η λαμβανοντες. ^u Πεπληρωμενης παση αδικια, πορνεια, πονηρια, πλεονεξια, κακια, μεσες φθονος, φονος, εριδεις, δολος, κακοηθειας. Ψιθυριζας, καταλαλας, θεοστυγεις, υβρισις, υπερηφανεις, αλαζονας——οιτινες το δικαιωμα της Θεου επιγνωντες, (οτι οι τα τοιαυτα πρασσουντες αξιοι θανατου εισιν,) ο μόνον αυτα ποιουσιν, αλλα και συνευδοκωσι τοις πρασσοσσι. ^v Απορριψαντες αφ' ευτων πασαν αδικιαν και ανομιαν, πλεονεξιαν, ερις, κακοηθειας τε και δολος, ψιθυρισμους τε και καταλαλας, θεοστυγιαν, υπερηφαναριαν τε και αλαζονειαν, κενοδοξιαν τε και φιλονικιαν. Ταυτα γαρ οι πρασσουντες συνηγοι τω Θεω υπαρξουσιν ου μόνον δε οι πρασσουντες αυτα, αλλα και οι συνευδοκωντες αυτοις.

deniable instance of St. Clement's alluding to the New Testament: or giving his exhortations to the Corinthians, in imitation of the apostle Paul's writings, without confining himself exactly all along to his very words. And I hope, this will justify several other passages, which I shall allege, on account of a like allusion.

N. T.

VIII. Rom. ix. 4. "Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises. 5. Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came."

IX. Rom. xii. 5. "So we being many, are one body in Christ; and every^w one members one of another."

Mill^y thinks, that^z Clement refers to the 13th ver. of the same xiith chapter, and that he had a right reading in it.

N. T.

X. Rom. xiv. 1. "Him that is weak in the faith receive you, but not to doubtful disputations. v. 3. Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth. Ch. xv. 1. We then that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak."

CLEMENT.

VIII. Ch. xxxiii. 'If any one shall consider them singly and distinctly, he will acknowledge the greatness of the gifts given through him [Jacob]. For from him are the priests and the Levites, all who minister at the altar of God: from him the Lord Jesus according to the flesh.'

It is hard to think, he had not here a reference to the text set on the other side.

IX. Ch. xlvi. 'Why—do we raise seditions against our own body? and come to such madness as to forget,^x that "we are members one of another."'

CLEMENT.

X. Ch. xxxviii. 'Let not him that is strong despise the weak: and let the weak reverence the strong.'

^w Οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὃ δὲ καθ' εἰς, ἀλλήλων μέλη.

^x Καὶ ζῆσσιαζομεν πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἴδιον, καὶ εἰς τοσαύτην ἀπονοίαν ἐρχομεθα, ὥστε ἐπιλαθεσθαι ἡμᾶς, ὅτι μέλη ἔσμεν ἀλλήλων. ^y Vid.

Mill. ad Rom. xii. 13, et Proleg. n. 142. ^z Οὕτως γὰρ ἐστὶ ἀντοῖς ἐγκαρπὸς καὶ τελεία ἢ πρὸς θεοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀγίας, μετ' οἰκτιρῶν, μνηία. Clem. cap. 56.

We have already seen Clement's express testimony concerning the first epistle to the church of the Corinthians. Nevertheless I shall put down also some passages, containing allusions, or references. They will show us his manner, and be convincing examples of his way of alluding.

N. T.

XI. 1 Cor. x. 24. "Let no man seek his own; but every man another's wealth."

XII. 1 Cor. xii. 12. "For as the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of that body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.—v. 15, If the feet shall say, Because I am not the head, I am not of the body: is it therefore not of the body?—v. 22, Nay much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary.—v. 24, But God has tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked."

The allusion will appear yet more manifest, if Clement be compared with St. Paul's whole argument from v. 12 to 27.

N. T.

XIII. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. "Charity suffers long and is kind: Charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, v. 7, beareth all things."

Comp. ver. 1, 2, 3.

XIV. 1 Cor. xv. 20. "But now is Christ risen, and be-

CLEMENT.

XI. Ch. xlviii. 'And to seek what is profitable to all, and not his own things.'

XII. Ch. xxxvii. 'The great cannot be without the little: nor the little without the great. There is a temperament in all things, and herein is a benefit. Let us, for example, take our body. The head without the feet is nothing: so neither the feet without the head. Even the smallest members of our body are necessary, and useful to the whole body. And all conspire together, and are subject to one common use, the preservation of the whole.'

CLEMENT.

XIII. Chap. xlix. 'Charity^a endures all things, is long suffering in all things. There is nothing base in charity, nothing proud. Charity has no schism: charity is not seditious: charity does all things in concord:—without charity nothing is acceptable to God.'

XIV. Ch. xxiv. 'Let us consider, beloved, how the

^a Note. This passage is cited by Clemens A. Strom. l. 4. p. 518. c. where is wanting 'There is nothing base,' to 'seditious,' inclusive. But possibly he omitted these words, as not necessary to be alleged. And, without them, the reference to 1 Cor. xiii. is manifest.

N. T.

come the first-fruits of them that slept.”

In the same chapter of Clement follows also an argument from seeds, resembling St. Paul’s, 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37, 38.

N. T.

XV. 2 Cor. iii. 18. “ We all with open face, beholding as^b in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image.”

XVI. 2 Cor. viii. 5. “ But first gave their own selves to the Lord, and to us by the will of God.”

XVII. 2 Cor. x. 17. “ But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. 18, For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth.” Comp. Rom. ii. 29, “ Whose praise is not of men, but of God.”

XVIII. 2 Cor. xi. 24. “ Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. 25, Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned.”

I omit several passages of Clement, in which are words found in these two epistles; because those words are also in the O. T. which may therefore render it doubtful, whether he referred to the Old Testament, or to St. Paul.

N. T.

XIX. Gal. i. 4. Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this

^b Την δοξαν Κυριου κατοπτριζομενοι. την αμωμον—οψιν αυτες.

CLEMENT.

Lord does continually show us, that there shall be a resurrection: of which he has made the Lord Jesus Christ the first-fruits, having raised him from the dead.’

CLEMENT.

XV. Ch. xxxvi. ‘ By him we shall look up to the height of the heavens: by him we^c shall behold as in a glass his spotless and most excellent visage.’

XVI. Ch. lvi. ‘ Therefore let us also pray for such as are in any sin, that moderation and humility may be given to them; so as to yield themselves not to us, but to the will of God.’

XVII. Ch. xxx. ‘ Let our praise be in God, not of ourselves: for God hates those that commend themselves.’

XVIII. Ch. v. ‘ Seven times was he [Paul] in bonds: he was whipped, was stoned.’

CLEMENT.

XIX. Ch. xlix. ‘ For the love which he had for us, Christ our Lord gave his

^c Δια τρις ενοπτρισωμεθα

present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.”

XX. Eph. iv. 4. “There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called with one hope of your calling. 5, One Lord, one faith, one baptism. 6, One God, and Father of all.”

XXI. Philip. i. 10. “That ye may be sincere, and without offence unto the day of Christ.”

XXII. Philip. ii. 5. “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus. 6, Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. 7, But made himself of no reputation,” &c.

XXIII. Col. i. 10. “That ye^d might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work.”

XXIV. 1 Thess. v. 18. “In every thing give thanks.”

XXV. 1 Thess. v. 23. “And I pray God, your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless

blood for us by the will of God: his flesh for our flesh, his soul for our soul.”

XX. Ch. xlvi. ‘Have we not one God, and one Christ? and is there not one Spirit poured out upon us, and one calling in Christ?’

XXI. Ch. ii. ‘Ye were sincere, and harmless toward each other, not mindful of injuries.’

XXII. Ch. xvi. ‘For Christ is theirs who are humble.—The sceptre of the majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the show of pride and arrogance, though he could have done so; but in humility.—Ye see, beloved, what is the pattern, which has been given to us. If the Lord thus humbled himself, what should we do, who are brought by him under the yoke of his grace?’

XXIII. Ch. xxi. ‘Unless^e we ordering our conversation worthily of him do with one consent those things which are good and pleasing in his sight.’

XXIV. Ch. xxxviii. ‘Having therefore all these things from him, we ought “in all things to give thanks to him.”’

XXV. Ch. xxxviii. ‘Let therefore our whole body be saved in Jesus Christ.’

^d Περιπατησαι ἡμας ἀξίως του Κυριου εις πασαν ἀρεσκειαν, κ. λ.

^e Εάν μη ἀξίως αυτη πολιτευομενοι, τα καλα και ευαρετα ενωπιον αυτη ποιωμεν μεθ' ὁμοιοιας.

N. T.

unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

XXVI. 1 Tim. ii. 8. “I will therefore, that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting.”

XXVII. 1 Tim. iii. 13. “For they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ.”

XXVIII. 1 Tim. v. 4. “For that^f is good and acceptable before God.”

Beside the agreement of the words, the particular modesty, with which Clement here delivers his advice, induces me to think, he alludes to this place: St. Paul having in the first verses of that chapter directed: “Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father, and the young men as brethren.”

N. T.

XXIX. 2 Tim. i. 9. “Who has saved us, and called us with an holy calling.”

XXX. Titus iii. 1. “To^h be ready to every good work.”

XXXI. Heb. i. 3. “Who being the^k brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person—4, Being^l made so much better than

CLEMENT.

XXVI. Ch. xxix. ‘Let us therefore come to him in holiness of soul, lifting up to him chaste and undefiled hands.’

XXVII. Ch. liv. ‘Let him say—I am ready to depart—only let the flock of Christ be in peace, with the elders that are set over it. He that shall do this, will procure to himself great glory in the Lord, and every place will receive him.’

XXVIII. Chap. vii. ‘Let us consider what^g is good and what agreeable and acceptable in the sight of him that made us.’

CLEMENT.

XXIX. Ch. vii. ‘And let us come up to the glorious and venerable rule of our holy calling.’

XXX. Ch. ii. ‘Yeⁱ were “ready unto every good work.”’

XXXI. Ch. xxxvi. “Who being the^m brightness” of his majesty, “is by so much” greaterⁿ “than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtain-

^f Τωτο γαρ εστι καλον και αποδεκτον ενωπιον τω Θεω. και τι τερπνον, και προσδεκτον ενωπιον τω ποιησαντος ημας. παν εργον αγαθον ετοιμας.

^g Τι καλον,

^h Προς

ⁱ Ετοιμοι εις παν εργον αγαθον.

^k Ος ων απαυγασμα της δοξης.

^l Τωστω κρειττων χειρομενος των

αγγελων, οσω διαφορωτερον παρ αυτης κεκληρονομηκεν ονομα.

^m Ος

ων απαυγασμα της μεγαλωσυνης αυτα.

ⁿ Τωστω μειζων εστιν

αγγελων, οσω διαφορωτερον ονομα κεκληρονομηκεν.

the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. 5, For unto which of the angels said he at any time: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee? [Comp. Ps. ii. 7, 8,] v. 7, “And of the angels he saith: Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. [Ps. civ. 4.] v. 13, But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?” [Psal. cx. 1.]

XXXII. Heb. iii. 2. “As also Moses was faithful in all his house. v. 5, And verily Moses was faithful in all his house.”

Comp. Numb. xii. 7. “My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house.”

XXXIII. Heb. iv. 12. “And is ^o a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”

XXXIV. Heb. vi. 18. “That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie.”

XXXV. Heb. Ch. xi. 5. “By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see death, and was not found, because God had translated him, [Comp. Gen. v. 24.] v. 7, By faith Noah being warned of God of things not seen as yet moved with fear, prepared an ark.—

ed a more excellent name than they.” For so it is written: “Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.” But of his Son, thus said the Lord: “Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession.” And again he saith unto him: “Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.”’

XXXII. Ch. xliii. ‘When also Moses, that blessed and “faithful” servant in all his house.’ And ch. xviii. ‘Moses was called “faithful in all his house.”’

XXXIII. Ch. xxi. ‘For he is ^p a searcher of “the intents and thoughts.”’

XXXIV. Ch. xxvii. ‘For nothing is impossible with God, but to lie.’

XXXV. Ch. ix. ‘Let us take Enoch [for our example] who by obedience being found righteous, was translated, and his death was not found. Noah being found faithful, did by his ministry preach regeneration to the world: and the Lord by him saved the living creatures

^o Και κριτικός ενθυμησεων και εννοιων καρδιας.
εσιν εννοιων και ενθυμησεων.

^p Ερευνητης γαρ

N. T.

V. 8. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed, and he went out, not knowing whither he went." Comp. Gen. xii. 1.

V. 31. "By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace." Comp. Josh. ii. 1—6.

V. 32. "And what shall I more say? For the time would fail me to tell of—David also, and Samuel, and the prophets."

V. 33. "Who through faith—stopped the mouths of lions."

V. 34. "Quenched the violence of fire."

V. 35. "Others were tortured."

V. 36. "And others had trials of cruel mockings, yea moreover of bonds and imprisonment."

V. 37. "They were stoned—were slain with the sword, afflicted, tormented."

CLEMENT.

that went with one accord into the ark.'

Ch. x. 'This man [Abraham] by obedience went out of his own country, and from his kindred, and from his father's house, that so forsaking a small country, and a weak affinity, and a little house, he might inherit the promises of God.'

Ch. xii. 'By faith and hospitality was Rahab the harlot saved. For when the spies were sent by Joshua the son of Nun to Jericho—the hospitable Rahab having received them, hid them on the top of her house, under stalks of flax.'

Ch. xlv. 'The righteous were persecuted, but it was by the wicked. They were cast into prison, but it was by the unholy. They were stoned by transgressors. They were put to death by cursed men, and those who had conceived unjust envy. When they suffered these things, they endured them gloriously. For what shall we say, brethren? was Daniel cast into the den of lions by men fearing God? Were Ananias, Misael, and Azarias, thrust into the furnace of fire by men practising the excellent and glorious worship of the most High?—Men full of all wickedness proceeded to so great rage, as to bring into torment those that feared God. But they

N. T.

V. 39. "And these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises."

V. 37. "They wandered^q about in sheep-skins and goat-skins."

XXXVI. Heb. xii. 1. "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which does so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us; 2, Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."

V. 6. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. [See Prov. iii. 11.] v. 9. Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much more be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live? 10, For they verily for a few days

CLEMENT.

enduring with a full persuasion have obtained glory and honour, and have been exalted, and lifted up by God in their memorial throughout all ages.'

Ch. xvii. 'Let us be imitators of^r those who went about in goat-skins, and sheep-skins, preaching the coming of Christ.'

XXXVI. Ch. xix. 'The humility and submissive obedience of so many and so excellent men, thus testified of, have made not only us, but the generations before us, better. Having therefore many and great and glorious examples, let us return to the mark of peace, which from the beginning was set before us: and let us look up stedfastly to the Father and Creator of the whole world: and let us cleave to his glorious and exceeding excellent gifts and benefits of peace.' See also ch. xlvi. beginning.

Ch. lvi. 'Let us receive correction, at which no man ought to repine. The reproof and correction which we exercise toward one another is good and exceeding profitable; for it closely unites us to the will of God. For so says the sacred word— "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he re-

^q Περηλθον εν μηλωταις, εν αιγειοις δερμασιν. ^r Οιτινες εν δερμασιν αιγειοις, και μηλωταις περιπατησαν, κ. λ. Confer. Clem. Al. Strom. lib. iv. p. 516. B. C.

N. T.

chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. 11, Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

I have now represented the several supposed allusions of Clement to the epistle of the Hebrews. And, I think, we must assent to Eusebius, that Clement has inserted in his epistle, 'many of the sentiments of the epistle to the Hebrews, and made use of some of the very words of it.' But of these last there are not many instances. And some^s may be apt to think it not impossible for a man who had been conversant with the apostles, who was fully instructed in their doctrine, and manner of reasoning, and also well acquainted with the Old Testament; to write with this great resemblance of the epistle to the Hebrews, both in thought and expression, without borrowing from it, or imitating it.

Dodwell was not positive, that^t the parallel places in Clement were taken from the epistle to the Hebrews.

After all, it must be owned, that we lie here under some disadvantage. We have not the whole epistle of Clement before us, as Eusebius had. And therefore we are not so good judges of the agreement between the two epistles, as he was; who seems to have been fully satisfied, that Clement had an eye to the epistle to the Hebrews, and did 'plainly^u manifest that epistle to be no modern writing.'

N. T.

XXXVII. James i. 5. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. 6, But let him ask in faith, nothing waver-

CLEMENT.

ceiveth."—Yesee, beloved, there is a defence for those who are corrected by the Lord. For being a good instructor, he is willing we should be admonished by his holy discipline.'

CLEMENT.

XXXVII. Ch. xxiii. 'Our all-merciful and beneficent Father has bowels toward them that fear him: and in a most kind and tender manner bestows his favours upon them that come to him with

^s See Mr. J. Hallet's Introduction to his Paraphrase of the three last chapters of the Ep. to the Heb. p. 2, 3.

^t Nec tamen illam [ad. Hebr. epistolam] penitus fuisse etiam antiquioribus illis temporibus incognitam, ostendunt loca gemina, ut videtur, inde desumpta in Clementis epistolâ ad Corinthios. Diss. Iren. i. n. 41.

^u See before, p. 32.

N. T.

mg—7, For let not that man think, that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. 8, A double minded^v man is unstable in all his ways.”

2. Pet. iii. 4. “ And saying: Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”

There is no great agreement here in words: but the sense is so resembling in the former part of this paragraph, that either Clement had an eye to St. James, or they both alluded to some one third writer.

N. T.

XXXVIII. James ii. 21. “ Was not our father Abraham justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his only son upon the altar?”

V. 23. “ And was called the friend of God.”

Comp. 2 Chron. xx. 7.—“ And gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy friend.” Is. xli. 8. “ The seed of Abraham my friend.”

V. 24. “ Ye see then, how by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.”

XXXIX. James iii. 13. “ Who is a wise man, and

CLEMENT.

a simple mind. Wherefore let us not be double minded: neither let us doubt in our hearts about his excellent and glorious gifts. Let that be far from us which is written: “ Miserable^w are the double-minded, who are doubtful in their minds, and say: These things have we heard, even from our fathers; and behold, we are grown old, and none of these things have happened to us.”’ See Numb. XLIV.

CLEMENT.

XXXVIII. Ch. xxxi. ‘ For what was our father Abraham blessed? Was it not, because that through faith he wrought righteousness and truth? Isaac knowing with full assurance what was to come, willingly became a sacrifice.’

Ch. x. ‘ Abraham, who was called [God’s] friend, was found faithful, in that he was obedient to the words of God.’

Ch. xvii. ‘ Abraham has been greatly witnessed of, and was called the friend of God.’

Ch. xxx. ‘ Justified by works, not by words.’

XXXIX. Ch. xxxvii. ‘ Let the wise man show forth his

^v *Ανηρ διψυχος ακαταστατος εν πασαις ταις οδοις αυτου. πωροι εισιν οι διψυχοι οι ετισταζοντες την ψυχην, κ. λ.*

^w *Ταλαι-*

N. T.

endued with knowledge amongst you? Let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom."

XL. James iv. 3. "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. 4, Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not?—v. 6, But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he says: God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble." See Prov. iii. 34.

XLI. 1 Pet. iv. 8. "For^x charity shall cover a multitude of sins." Comp. James v. 20.

XLII. 1 Pet. v. 5. "Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble." See above, Numb. XL.

XLIII. 2 Pet. ii. 5. "And saved Noah a preacher of righteousness."

V. 6. "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow.—7, And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked.—9, The

CLEMENT

wisdom, not in words but in good works.'

XL. Ch. xxx. 'Fleeing evil speakings one against another, all filthy and impure embraces—abominable concupiscences, detestable adultery, and execrable pride. For God, says he, "resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."'

These last words are also in 1 Pet. v. 5. But the context of James and Clement agree, as well as Prov. iii. 34.

XLI. Ch. xlix. 'Charity^y covers the multitude of sins.'

XLII. Ch. xxxviii. 'And let every one be subject to his neighbour.'

Ch. ii. 'Ye were all of you humble-minded—rather subject than subjecting. The A. B. desiring rather to be subject than to govern.'

Ch. xxx. "For God," saith he, "resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."'

XLIII. Ch. vii. 'Noah preached repentance, and they who hearkened [to him] were saved.'

Ch. xi. 'By hospitality and godliness was Lot delivered out of Sodom, when all the country round about was destroyed by fire and brimstone; the Lord there-

^x Οτι ἡ ἀγάπη καλυπτει πληθος αμαρτιων.
πληθος αμαρτιων.

^y Η ἀγάπη καλυπτει

N. T.

Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.”

Jude, ver. 7, may be compared.

XLIV. 2 Pet. iii. 4. “ And saying: Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”

XLV. I have now put down from St. Clement what is proper for confirming the antiquity and genuineness of the books of the New Testament. I have omitted divers lesser matters, that might be taken notice of; but I have endeavoured to select the most remarkable. I have also omitted some passages, because they might be supposed equally, if not rather, to refer to some text in the Old, than the New Testament. And where I have alleged any passages that contain any words of the Old Testament, as well as the New, I have marked them, as I have gone along.

In the passages I have alleged, the references or allusions are not all equally clear. But I think the sum of the testimony of Clement to the scriptures of the New Testament, does amount to thus much.

The first epistle to the Corinthians is expressly ascribed to Paul. Words of our blessed Lord, found in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are recommended with a high degree of respect, but without the names of the evangelists. And though, as I have already owned, all these passages are not equally important or clear; yet I think they are such as deserve to be considered, whether they are not allusions (beside the evangelists) to the Acts of the Apostles; the epistle of Paul to the Romans; both the epistles to the Corinthians; the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians; the first to the Thessalonians; first and second to Timothy, to Titus, the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, and the first and second of Peter: but

CLEMENT.

by making it manifest, that he does not forsake those that trust in him; but those that turn aside [from his commandments] he appoints to punishment and torment.’

XLIV. Ch. xxiii. ‘ Let that be far from us which is written: “ Miserable are the double-minded, who are doubtful in their mind, which say: These things have we heard even from our fathers; and behold, we are grown old, and none of these things have happened to us.” ’ See Numb. XXXVII.

all without any name, or so much as a mark of citation. Among these books, the references and allusions to some are manifest, and I think undeniable: as those to the epistle to the Romans, and the first to the Corinthians. I should likewise willingly place here the epistle to the Hebrews, as certainly alluded to, were it not for those considerations above mentioned at Numb. XXXVI. and for one more, which I shall now mention. Eusebius² and St. Jerom^a inform us, that the church of Rome in their time did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews. This seems very much to weaken the supposition, that Clement had often alluded to that epistle. For if the church of Rome in his time owned it as an epistle of Paul, or otherwise canonical; it would be somewhat difficult to conceive how they should afterwards reject it.

Mill^b however allows, that it appears from this epistle, that Clement had in his hands, not only our first three gospels, but also the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistle to the Romans, both the epistles to the Corinthians, and the epistle to the Hebrews.

And the testimony hereby given to the antiquity, genuineness, or authority of the books of the New Testament, is to be esteemed not only the testimony of Clement, but likewise of the church of Rome in his time. Moreover, it ought to be allowed, that the Corinthians likewise, to whom this epistle was sent, were acquainted with, and highly respected, the books quoted or alluded to.

I would also observe concerning this epistle, as I did before of that ascribed to Barnabas, that I have not perceived in it any quotations, or references to any of the apocryphal gospels, as they are called. Nor do I remember, that any of the passages of the gospel according to the Hebrews, or that according to the Egyptians, which have been collected by learned men from the writings of the ancient christians, are taken out of this epistle.

The only exception to this must be, I think, the quotation at Numb. XXXVII. ‘Let that be far from us which is written, “Miserable are the double minded.”’ But if he does not intend the epistle of St. James, nor the second of St. Peter; still I apprehend it most likely, that he does not refer to any apocryphal book of the New Testament, but to some writing of the Old Testament, either canonical or apocryphal; the rather, because the same words are quoted in the fragment, called Clement’s second epistle, § xi.

² H. E. l. 3. c. 3.
Martian. T. 2. p. 608.

^a Ad Dardanum, ep. 129. ord. vulg. edit.
^b Proleg. n. 140.

in this manner: “For the prophetic word says: Miserable are the double-minded”——which^c was a common form of quotation among the ancient christians, when they intended the scriptures of the Old Testament.

CHAP. III.

A FRAGMENT CALLED ST. CLEMENT'S SECOND EPISTLE.

BESIDE the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, there is a fragment of a piece called his second epistle: which being doubtful, or rather plainly not Clement's, I do not quote as his. I shall however, as I promised, give an account of the method of quoting the scriptures of the New Testament in this piece, which by^a some is thought not to be an epistle, but a discourse or sermon.

I. § iv. ‘Let us then not only call him Lord, for that will not save us. For he saith: “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall be saved, but he that doth righteousness,”’ Matt. vii. 21. ‘Wherefore if we should do such wicked things, the Lord hath said: Though ye should be joined unto me, even in my very bosom, and not keep my commandments, “I would cast you off,” and say unto you: “I know ye not whence ye are, ye workers of iniquity,”’ Matt. vii. 23. Luke xiii. 27.

II. Ch. ii. ‘And another scripture saith: “I came not to call the righteous, but sinners,”’ Matt. ix. 13.

III. Ch. v. ‘For the Lord saith: “Ye shall be as sheep in the midst of wolves,” [Matt. x. 16.] Peter answered and said: What if the wolves shall tear in pieces the sheep? Jesus said unto Peter, Let not the sheep fear the wolves after death. “And ye also fear not those that kill you, and after that have no more that they can do unto you: but fear him, who, after you are dead, has power to east both soul

^c Προφητικος λογος. Euseb. Comm. in Ps. p. 83. C. Δεικνυσιν ὁ προφητικος λογος. Theodoret. in Ps. lxxvii. v. 24. T. I. p. 707. D. Διδασκει τοιωνν ὁ προφητικος λογος. Id. ad Ps. lxxiv. v. 16. p. 721. D. Εν τῷ ψαλμῳ ο προφητικος λογος. Ad. Ps. cv. p. 824. A. et. passim. Περὶ ἧς το προφητικον πνευμα φησι. Alex. Episcop. Alex. ap. Theod. H. E. l. 1. c. 4. p. 12. C. ο ευαγγελικος λογος. Theod. in Es. cap. x. T. 2. p. 50. D. ^a Sed nec epistolæ formam servat secunda hæc, quæ dicitur, epistola——Et vero recentiorem illam esse Clemente, et pro ejus *ἰδαχῆ* potius habendam, alibi ostendimus. Dodwell de Annis priorum Romæ Episcop. Diss. 2. c. vi. p. 202. Vid. et Diss. i. Iren. sect. 29, &c. Vid. et Grabe Spicil. P. i. p. 268.

and body into hell-fire.”’ See Luke xii. 4, 5, and also Matt. x. 28.

IV. Ch. iii. ‘For even he himself says: “Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father.”’ See Matt. x. 32.

V. Ch. viii. ‘For so the Lord hath said: “They are my brethren, who do the will of my Father.”’ See Matt. xii. 50.

VI. Ch. viii. ‘For the Lord saith in the gospel: “If ye have not kept that which was little, who will give you that which is great? For I say unto you: He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much.”’ See Luke xvi. 10, 12.

VII. Ch. vi. ‘For thus saith the Lord: “No servant can serve two masters.” If therefore we shall desire to “serve God and Mammon,” it will be no profit to us. [Luke xvi. 13, and Matt. vi. 24.] “For what shall it profit, if one gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?”’ See Matt. xvi. 26.

VIII. Ch. i. This fragment begins thus: ‘Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God; as of the “judge of the quick and the dead.”’ Where may be thought to be a reference to Acts x. 42. But as this character of Christ was a common article of every christian’s belief, and may be found in other texts of the New Testament, that cannot, I think, be depended upon.

IX. Ch. vii. ‘And yet all are not crowned, but they only that labour much, and strive gloriously,’ comp. 2 Tim. ii. 5. In the same chapter, or section, seem to be divers allusions to 1 Cor. ix. 24, 25.

X. Ch. iii.—‘but have by him been brought to the knowledge of the Father of truth. Whereby shall we show that we do know him [or what is the knowledge which is toward him,] but by not denying him, by whom we have come to the knowledge of him?’ Perhaps here is an allusion to 1 John iii. 19, or v. 20.

XI. Lastly, Ch. xii. near the conclusion of this fragment, are some words mentioned, as spoken by our Lord, which are not in our gospels, and are supposed to be taken out of an apocryphal writing, called the gospel according to the Egyptians: which are to this purpose: ‘The Lord himself ‘being asked by some body, when his kingdom should ‘come, said: ‘When two shall be one, and that which is ‘without as that which is within, and the male with the ‘female neither male nor female.’’

XII. What we have to observe here is, that we have the

gospels several times quoted in this fragment more expressly than in Clement's epistle to the Corinthians with such terms as these: 'He himself says:' 'The Lord saith:' 'Thus saith the Lord:' 'Another scripture says:' and, 'The Lord saith in the gospel:' and that in a fragment not one fifth part so large as the forementioned epistle to the Corinthians. This is an internal character, that may confirm the account given by Eusebius, and the judgment of those modern critics, who have supposed it not to have the same author with the Epistle to the Corinthians, and to be of a later date. For which reason I may be the shorter in my remarks upon it: though it is undoubtedly ancient, written before the time of Eusebius, in the third century at the latest.

And as this piece has not Clement for its author, we have the less reason to be concerned about the apoeryphal quotation just mentioned. For whenever that gospel was composed, this quotation can never prove it to be so ancient as our gospels, nor as Clement himself.

Mr. Jones^b has made divers just observations upon this fragment, and several of the passages here cited by me.

CHAP. IV.

HERMAS. HIS HISTORY.

THE antiquity of the book, called the Shepherd or Pastor of Hermas, is manifest and unquestionable from the quotations of it in Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and others.

I must be as brief as I can in the testimonies I allege. Therefore referring to^a Cotelerius for the rest, I shall only put down those of Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, and St. Jerom in his Catalogue of Illustrious Men; as representing very much the sense of the ancients before them, concerning the value of this book, as well as that of the christians of their own time.

Eusebius^b speaking of what are the genuine writings of Peter and Paul, adds: 'Forasmuch as the apostle, in the salutations at the end of his epistle to the Romans, makes

^b See New and Full Method, &c. Vol. i. in the Appendix, p. 522—531.

^a Patres Apost. vol. i. See also A. B. Wake's Preliminary Discourse, chap. viii. Cave Hist. Lit. Du Pin. Bibl. et Tillemont Mem. Eccles. T. ii. Part i. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 7, &c.

^b H. E. l. 3. c. 3. p. 72. C. D.

‘ mention among others of Hermas, who, it is said, wrote
 ‘ the book called the Shepherd ; it is to be observed, that
 ‘ it is doubted of by some. Wherefore it ought not to be
 ‘ placed among the books of unquestioned authority. By
 ‘ others it is judged to be a most necessary book, especially
 ‘ for those who are to be instructed in the first elements of
 ‘ religion. And we know, that it is publicly read in the
 ‘ churches, and that some very ancient writers make use of it.’

In another place of the same work, having spoken of the books of the New Testament, which ought to be received, he says : ‘ Among^c the spurious are to be placed the Acts of Paul, the book called the Shepherd, and the Revelation of Peter.’ By which we are not, I think, to understand, that the book of Hermas, or the Shepherd, is not genuine, but that it ought not to be reckoned canonical scripture.

St. Jerom in the book^d of Illustrious Men : ‘ Hermas, of whom the apostle makes mention in his epistle to the Romans, saying : “ Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them,” is affirmed to be the author of the book which is called Pastor. And it is publicly read in some churches of Greece. It is indeed a useful book, and many of the ancient writers have made use of testimonies out of it. But among the Latins it is almost unknown.’ So Jerom says. But it was well known to^e Tertullian, and to the christian churches in general of his time, as is evident from the manner in which he speaks of it.

It is then probable, that this book was written by Hermas, whom Paul salutes. And it ought not to be doubted, that it is an ancient christian ecclesiastical writing, though not properly canonical.

The exact time of writing it is uncertain. It appears from^f the book itself, that it was written at Rome, or near it, in the time of Clement, probably then bishop. For Hermas is directed, at the end of the second Vision, ‘ to write two books, and send one to Clement, and one to Grapte. For Clement shall send it to the foreign cities.’ As therefore I place the bishoprick of Clement, with most of the ancients, about the 91st year of our Lord and onwards ; I suppose this book to have been written toward the latter end of the first century of the christian æra. Tillemont^g supposes it was written about the year 92, a

^c *Εν τοις νοθοις κατατεταχθω*, κ. λ. Eus. H. E. l. 3. c. 25. p. 97. B.

^d Cap. x.

^e De Pudicitia, cap. 10.

^f See V. 1. begin. et

Vis. 2. sect. i. et sect. 4.

^g Mem. Ec. T. 2. Par. 1. in Hermas, p.

201. Bruxelles.

little before Domitian's persecution. Which leads me to observe, that it is more than once intimated in the book itself, that a time of trial was then near. 'But thou wilt say: Behold, there is a great trial coming.' Vis. ii. sect. 3. Again, 'Here you have the figure of the great tribulation, that is about to come.' Vis. iv. sect. 3. See also Vis. ii. sect. 2, quoted hereafter, Numb. III. This trial could not be the persecution under Nero, because that was the first great persecution; and before the writing of this book, christians had suffered 'wild beasts, scourgings, imprisonments, and crosses.' Vis. iii. sect. 2, which is a good description of the persecution under Nero. See also Simil. ix. sect. 28. This trial therefore must relate to the persecution under Domitian, about the year 94, or to some sufferings under Trajan. Moreover, it seems, that all the apostles were now dead. 'Because,' says he, 'these apostles and teachers, who preached the name of the Son of God, dying after they had received this power, preached to them who were dead before.' Sim. ix. sect. 16. However, as Clement was still living, who died, according to Eusebius, in the third of Trajan, A. D. 100, we cannot, I think, place this piece later than the conclusion of the first century, about which time it seems to have been written.

It is said, there was one Hermes, brother of Pius, bishop of Rome, about the year 141. But there is no^b good reason to suppose him the author of this book, which is constantly ascribed by the most ancient writers to Hermas, and that the book we have, is the same they had, is evident from the agreement of their quotations with the book itself.

The Shepherd of Hermas was written in Greek. But we have now only an ancient Latin version, beside some fragments of the Greek preserved in the ancient Greek authors who have quoted him. It consists of three books. In the first are four Visions, in the second twelve Commands, in the third ten Similitudes.

In Hermas are no express citations of any books of the New Testament. We must be content with only some words of scripture, or allusions to them. Nor was it suitable to the nature of his writing to quote books. There are no books of the Old Testament quoted here.

^b However some learned men have been of this opinion. Vid. Dallæum de Libris supp. Dionys. et Ignat. l. 2. c. 4. p. 250. et Basnage, Annal. Polit. Ec. A. D. 157. n. 2, &c. Blondel des Sibylles, l. 1. ch. v. p. 19. l. 2. ch. vi. p. 160. Beaus. Hist. des Manich. T. 2. p. 230. I do not particularly confute this opinion. I have said enough above, that it is contrary to the testimony of the most ancient writers. Du Pin, and others, may be consulted by those who are curious.

N. T.

I. Matt. v. 28. "But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her has committed adultery with her already in his heart."

II. Matt. v. 42. "Give to him that asketh thee."

Luke vi. 30. "Give to every one that asketh thee."

III. Matt. x. 32. "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. 33, But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

IV. Matt. xiii. 5. "Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth. 6, And

HERMAS.

I. Command iv. sect. 1. 'I command thee, that thou suffer not the thought of anotherⁱ man's wife, or of fornication, to enter into thy heart.' Comp. Vis. i. sect. 1.

II. Command ii. 'Give without distinction to all that are in want, not doubting to whom thou givest, &c.' There follows a fine argument upon this subject, which may serve as a comment upon this text of the gospel.

III. Vision ii. sect. 2. 'Happy are ye, whosoever shall endure the great trial that is at hand, and whosoever shall not deny his life. For the Lord has sworn by his Son, that whosoever shall deny his Son, and him, being afraid of his life, they will also deny him in the world that is to come. But those who shall never deny him, of his great mercy he will be favourable to them.'

Similitude ix. sect. 28. 'They who have deliberated in their heart, whether they should confess or deny him, and yet have suffered, their fruits are smaller. Wherefore I speak this unto you, who deliberate, whether ye should confess or deny him.'

IV. Similitude ix. sect. 21. 'Of the fourth mountain which had many herbs—some being touched by the heat of the sun withered, —their herbs having no^k

¹ Περὶ γυναῖκος ἀλλοστρίας. ^k Nullum fundamentum habentes herbæ eorum.

when the sun was up, they were scorched: and because they had not root, they withered away—20, But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it: 21, Yet has he not root in himself, but dureth for a while; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended. 22, He also that received seed among thorns is he that heareth the word: and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choak the word, and he becometh unfruitful.”

V. Matt. xiii. 7. “And some fell among thorns: and the thorns sprung up and choked them.”

Ch. xix. 23. “Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. 24,—It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”

VI. Matt. xiii. 31, 32. “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed—which—when it is grown, is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.”

See Mark. iv. 30—32. “So

¹ Cum ergo venerit tribulatio. intrabuunt.

foundation [that is, ‘deepness of earth’]. For as their herbs dry away at the sight of the sun, so likewise the doubtful, as soon as they hear of persecutions, fearing inconveniences, return to their idols, and again serve them, and are ashamed to bear the name of their Lord. Vision iii. sect. 6. These are they who have faith, but have also the riches of this world. When¹ therefore tribulation ariseth, because of their riches and traffick they deny the Lord.’

V. Similitude ix. sect. 20. ‘They who are of the third mountain, which had thorns and brambles, are such as believed, but were some of them rich, others taken up with many affairs. For the brambles are riches: the thorns are they who are entangled in much business, and a diversity of affairs. These^m therefore shall with difficulty [or ‘hardly’] enter into the kingdom of God.’

VI. Simil. viii. sect. 3. ‘This great tree, which covers the plains and the mountains, and all the earth, is the law of God, published throughout the whole world. This law is the Son of God, preached in all the ends of the earth. The people that stand under its shadow are

^m Hi ergo difficile in regnum Dei

N. T.

that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it." And Luke xiii. 19, 20.

VII. Matt. xviii. 3. "Verily I say unto you, except ye shall be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. 4, Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven."

That is an excellent paraphrase of our Lord's discourse, Matt. xviii. and I think it plain he has a reference to it.

N. T.

VIII. Matt. xxiii. 6. "And love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues." Compare Mark xii. 39. Luke. xx. 46.

IX. Matt. xxviii. 18. "All power is given to me in heaven, and in earth. 19, Go ye therefore, and teach all nations."

HERMAS.

those which have heard his preaching, and believed.'

VII. Simil. ix. sect. 29. 'Whosoever therefore, says he, shall continue asⁿ little children, free from malice, shall be more honourable, than all these, of whom I have yet spoken. For^o all little children are honourable with the Lord, and esteemed the first of all.' And sect. 31. 'For this present world must be cut away from them, and the vanities of their riches, and then they will be fit for the kingdom of God. For they must enter into the kingdom of God, because God has blessed this innocent kind. I the angel of repentance pronounce you happy, whosoever are innocent like little children, because your portion is good, and honourable with the Lord.'

HERMAS.

VIII. Vis. iii. sect. 9. 'I therefore now say unto you, who are^p set over the church, and love the highest seats.'

IX. Simil. v. sect. 6. 'You see, said he, that he is Lord of his people, having received all power from his Father.'

Simil. ix. sect. 25. 'They are such as believed the

ⁿ Quicumque ergo permanserint, inquit, sicut infantes. enim infantes honorati sunt apud Dominum, et primi habentur.

^p —qui præestis ecclesie, et amatis primos consessūs.

^o Omnes

N. T.

To all which might be added, Vis. iv. sect. 2. "It had been better for them they had not been born." See Matt. xxvi. 24.

N. T.

X. Luke xiii. 24. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in and shall not be able. 25, When once the master of the house is risen up, and has shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Open to us," &c.

XI. Luke xvi. 18. "Who-soever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and who-soever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery," Comp. Matt. v. 32.

This may be reckoned a probable, if not a manifest allusion to St. Luke.

XII. Our blessed Lord has several parables in the gospels of a vineyard, particularly Matt. xxi. 33—41. Mark xii. 1—9. Luke xx. 9—17. Hermas [Simil. v. sect. 2.] has a similitude of a husbandman and his vineyard, which bears a considerable resemblance with those parables.

N. T.

XIII. John xiv. 6. "I am the way and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." And our Lord compares himself to a 'door.' Ch. x. 7, 9.

Entering into the kingdom of God is a common expression in the gospels, and so likewise in Hermas. See particularly Simil. ix. sect. 12.

HERMAS.

apostles, which the Lord sent into all the world to preach.'

HERMAS.

X. Vis. iii. sect. 9. 'Ye that are more eminent, seek out the hungry, whilst the tower is yet unfinished. For when the tower shall be finished, ye shall be willing to do good, and shall have no place.'

XI. Command iv. sect. 1. 'If the woman continues on in her sin,—Let her husband put her away, and let him continue by himself. But if he shall put away his wife, and marry another, he also doth commit adultery.'

HERMAS.

XIII. Simil. ix. sect. 12. 'The gate is the only way of coming to God. For no man shall go to God, but by his Son.'

N. T.

XIV. Acts v. 41. "And they departed from the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name."

XV. Rom. ix. 4. "To whom pertaineth the adoption,—and the giving the law—and the promises. Ch. xi. 29. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

XVI. 1 Cor. iii. 16. "Know ye not, that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." And Rom. viii. 11, "shall quicken you by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." 2 Tim. i. 14, "by the Holy Ghost that dwelleth in us."

XVII. 1 Cor. iii. 17. "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy."

XVIII. 1 Cor. vii. 11. "But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife.—15, But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart," &c.

Perhaps Hermas refers here to the seventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians.

^q —quod dignos vos habet Dominus, ut nomen ejus feratis.

utrisque eis—sunt dona et promissiones.

ΚΑΤΟΙΚΕΥΝ ΕΝ ΣΟΙ.

HERMAS.

XIV. Simil. iv. sect. 28. 'But ye who suffer death for his name, ought to honour the Lord; that the Lord counts you^q worthy to bear his name.'

XV. Vis. iii. sect. 2. 'However to both of them belong^r gifts and promises.'

For a reference to this epistle see likewise below, Numb. XXV.

XVI. Comm. v. sect. 1. 'If thou shalt be patient, the Holy^s Spirit that dwelleth in thee shall be pure.'

XVII. Simil. v. sect. 7. 'For if thou defile thy body, thou shalt also at the same time defile the Holy spirit. And if thou defile thy body, thou shalt not live.'

XVIII. Comm. iv. sect. 1. 'If therefore a woman perseveres in any thing of this kind, and repents not; depart from her, and live not with her: otherwise thou also shalt be partaker of her sin. But it is therefore commanded, that both the man and the woman should remain unmarried, because such persons may repent.'

^r Sed

^s Το πνευμα το αγιον

N. T.

XIX. 2 Cor. vii. 10.—
“But the sorrow of the world
worketh death.”

XX. Gal. iii. 27. “For as
many of you as have been
baptized into Christ, have
put on Christ.”

XXI. Eph. iv. 4. “There
is one body, and one spirit,
even as ye are called with
one hope of your calling.”

XXII. Ephes. iv. 30. “And
grieve not the Holy Spirit of
God.”

31. “Let all bitterness,
and wrath, and anger,—be
put away from you, with all
malice.”

XXIII. Philip. iv. 18.
“But I have all, having re-
ceived the things which were
sent from you,—a^w sacrifice
acceptable, well-pleasing to
God.”

However there are several
texts resembling this, as Rom.
xii. 1. 1 Tim. ii. 3. 1 Peter
ii. 5.

XXIV. Col. i. 15. “Who
is—the first born of every

[†] Εκτριβει το πνευμα το ἅγιον· et sect. 2. Ακθε ουν πως ἡ λυπη εκτριβει το πνευμα. ^u Και λυπει το πνευμα το ἅγιον. ^v Και μη λυπει [al. ἄλιβε] το πνευμα το ἅγιον το εν σοι κατοικεν, μηποτε εντευξηται τῷ Θεῷ, και αποτη απο σε. Ibid. Vid. Wolf. Cur. ad Eph. iv. 30. ^w Θυσιαν δεκτην, ευαρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. ^x Εσαι ἡ θυσια σε δεκτη ενωπιον Κυριε.

^y Quoniam, inquit, omnium prima creata est, ideo anus: et propter illam mundus factus est.

HERMAS.

XIX. Vis. iii. sect. 2. ‘But
the remembrance of injuries
[or evils] worketh death:
but the forgetting them life
eternal.’

XX. Simil. ix. sect. 13.
‘So else they who have be-
lieved in God through his
Son, have put on this spirit.’

XXI. Simil. ix. sect. 13.
‘Behold there shall be one
spirit, and one body, and one
colour of their garments.’

XXII. Com. iii. ‘And
should not have grieved the
holy and true Spirit of God.’
And Comm. x. sect. 1, speak-
ing of anger, and doubting,
and sadness, he says of the
last: ‘It^t ‘torments the Holy
Spirit:’ and afterwards, ‘it^u
grieves the Holy Spirit.’

And farther he exhorts:
‘Grieve^v not the Holy Spi-
rit that dwelleth in thee, lest
he ask of God, and depart
from thee.’

XXIII. Simil. v. sect. 3.
‘Thy^x sacrifice shall be ac-
ceptable in the sight of the
Lord.’

XXIV. Vis. ii. sect. 4.
‘She^y [the church of God]

N. T.

creature. 16, For by him were all things created—all things were created by him, and for him.”

XXV. 1 Thess. v. 13. “And be at peace among yourselves.”

Mark ix. 50. “And have peace one with another.”

Rom. xv. 7. “Wherefore receive ye one another.”

XXVI. 2 Tim. iv. 18. “And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom.”

XXVII. Heb. xii. 17. “For he found no place of repentance.”

XXVIII. James i. 5. “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. 6, But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering.”——

XXIX. James ii. 7. “Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?”

HERMAS.

is therefore, said he, an old woman, because she was the first of all the creation, and the world was made for her.’ And Simil. ix. sect. 12. ‘The Son of God is more ancient than any creature.’

XXV. Vis. iii. sect. 9. ‘Now^z therefore hearken unto me, and have peace one with another, and receive one another.—Wherefore admonish one another, and be at peace among yourselves.’

XXVI. Vis. ii. sect. 3. ‘They who are such, shall prevail against all wickednesses, and continue unto eternal life.’

XXVII. Sim. viii. sect. 8. ‘For^a these there is no place of repentance.’

XXVIII. Sim. v. sect. 3. ‘Whosoever is the servant of God, and hath the Lord in his heart, he asketh of him understanding, and obtaineth.—But^b they that are indolent, and slow to pray, they doubt to ask of the Lord: although the Lord be of so inexhausted goodness, as to give all things without ceasing to them that ask him.’

XXIX. Simil. viii. sect. 6. ‘Who among their other crimes, blaspheming the Lord, have denied his name,

^z Nunc ergo audite me, et pacem habete alius cum alio; et visitate vos alterutrum, et suscipite invicem——Commonete ergo vos invicem, pacatique estote inter vos. ^a His igitur non est locus pœnitentiæ. ^b Quicumque vero inertes sunt, et pigri ad orandum, illi dubitant petere a Domino; cum sit Dominus tam profunda bonitatis, ut petentibus a se cuncta sine intermissione tribuat.

N. T.

XXX. James iii. 15. "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish—17, But the wisdom which is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits."

XXXI. James iv. 2. "Ye lust, and ye have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight, and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. 3, Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. 4,—know ye not, that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?"

XXXII. James iv. 7. "Submit yourselves therefore to God: resist the devil, and he will flee from you."

XXXIII. James iv. 12. "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save, and to destroy."

XXXIV. James v. 1. "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. 2, Your riches are corrupted, and your garments moth-eaten.—4, Behold, the hire of the labourers, which have reaped down your fields,

HERMAS.

which had been called upon them.'

XXX. Comm. xi. 'Believe not the earthly empty spirit, which is from the devil, in which there is not faith, nor virtue, xii. sect. 1. The Spirit which^c is from above is quiet, and humble, and departs from all wickedness, and vain desire of this world, and makes himself more humble than any man.'

XXXI. Simil. iv. 'For they who are involved in much business, sin much, because they are taken up with their affairs; and serve not God. And how can a man that does not serve God, ask any thing of God and receive it?'

XXXII. Comm. xii. sect. 5. 'For if^d ye resist him [the devil] he will flee from you with confusion.'

XXXIII. Comm. xii. sect. 6. 'Fear the Almighty Lord, who is able to save and to destroy you.'

XXXIV. Vis. iii. sect. 9. 'Wherefore this intemperance is hurtful to you who have, and do not communicate to them that want. Consider the judgment that is coming upon you.—Beware therefore, ye that glory in your riches, lest^e perhaps they

^c Spiritus qui desursum est, quietus est. [diabolo] fugiet à vobis confusus. et gemitus eorum ascendat ad Dominum—

^d Si enim resistitis illi

^e Ne forte ingemiscant ii qui egent,

N. T.

which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them that have reaped, have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth."

I suppose, all these passages are sufficient to prove the antiquity of the epistle of St. James, and that Hermas alluded to it, and had a high respect for it.

N. T.

XXXV. I Pet. i. 6. "Though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations. 7, That the trial of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Christ."

XXXVI. I Pet. iii. 15. "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be always ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear."

XXXVII. I Pet. v. 7. "Casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you."

XXXVIII. 2 Pet. ii. 15. "Which have forsaken the right way."

^f Inmittite sollicitudines vestras super Dominum, et ipse diriget eas.

HERMAS.

sigh who are in want, and their sighing ascend to the Lord, and ye be shut out with your goods without the gate of the tower.'

HERMAS.

XXXV. Vis. iv. sect. 3. 'The golden part are ye, who have escaped from this world. For as gold is tried by the fire, and made profitable, so are ye also tried who dwell among them [the men of this world]. They therefore who shall endure to the end, and be proved by them, shall be purged. And as gold is cleansed, and loses its dross; so shall ye also cast away all sorrow and trouble, and be made pure for the building of the tower.'

XXXVI. Comm. xii. sect. 4. 'Take care therefore, ye that are empty and light in the faith, to have the Lord your God in your heart: and ye shall perceive, that nothing is more easy, nor more pleasant, nor more gentle and holy than these commands.'

XXXVII. Vis. iv. sect. 2. 'Cast your cares^f upon the Lord, and he will direct them.' Again, Vis. iii. sect. 11.—'And did not cast your care from yourselves upon the Lord.'

XXXVIII. Vis. iii. sect. 7. 'They are such as have believed indeed, but through

N. T.

V. 20. "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world," &c.

XXXIX. 1 John ii. 27. "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you—and is truth, and is no lie."

XL. 1 John iv. 6. "Hereby know we the spirit of truth."

Ch. v. 6.—"Because the spirit is truth."

He is called "the spirit of truth," also John xiv. 17. xv. 26. xvi. 13.

XLI. 2 John ver. 4. "I rejoice, that I found of thy children walking in truth."

3 John ver. 3.—"as thou walkest in the truth." v. 4, "I have no greater joy than to hear, that my children walk in truth."

XLII. Jude ver. 21. "Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." 24, "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory. See also ver. 23.

XLIII. It is very probable, that Hermas had read the book of St. John's Revelation, and imitated it. He has many things resembling it.

I. St. John is directed, ch. i. 11, "What thou seest write in a book, and send it to the seven churches that are in Asia."

^g Quia Deus verax in omni verbo, et non est mendacium in ipso.

^h Ελαβον γαρ πνευμα αληθειας, και εγενοντο οικητηρια αληθινου πνευματος.

ⁱ Quoniam immaculati et puri erunt electi Dei in vitam æternam.

HERMAS.

their doubtings have forsaken the true way.'

Vis. iv. sect. 3. 'The golden parts are you who have escaped this world.'

XXXIX. Comm. iii. 'And the Lord may be glorified, who has given such a spirit to thee. Because^g God is true in all his word, and in him there is no lie.'

XL. Comm. iii. 'For^h they received the spirit of truth, and became habitations of the true spirit.'

XLI. Comm. iii. 'For thou oughtest, as the servant of God, to have walked in the truth.'

Indeed, the whole third command in Hermas, and the epistles of St. John, might be well compared together.

XLII. Vis. iv. sect. 3. 'Becauseⁱ the elect of God shall be pure and without spot unto life eternal. And see what follows.

—Ver. 19, “Write the things which thou hast seen.” Ch. ii. 1, “Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write.” And so of the rest. Hermas also in his visions receives orders to speak ‘to those^k who preside over the church to order their ways in righteousness.’ Again: ‘After this I saw a vision in my house, and the old woman whom I had seen before came unto me, and asked me,^l whether I had delivered the book [or her book] to the elders. And I answered, that I had not yet. She replied, thou hast well done. Thou shalt write two books, [that is, two copies,] and send one to Clement and one to Grapte.’

2. In the Revelation, ch. xii. the church is represented under the figure of a woman, as we have already seen the church to be in Hermas; who is expressly told, that^m old woman is the church, and he has the reasons of the figure given him. In the Revelation, that woman is persecuted by a dragon. Hermas also sees a great and terrible beast, which he is informed ‘isⁿ the figure of the trial which was coming.’ St. John saw the “holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.” Ch. xxi. 2, Hermas says, ‘Behold^o there met me a virgin well adorned, as if she were just come out of the bride-chamber, clothed in white.—And I knew by my former visions, that it was the church.’ St. John sees a city, the “foundations of the walls of which were garnished with all manner of precious stones,” Ch. xxi. 19. Hermas sees ‘a^p tower built with bright square stones.’ In the Revelation, v. 16, “the city lies four square.” The tower in Hermas likewise is ‘built upon^q a square.’

3. Farther, the writer of the Revelation says, xxi. 14, “And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.” The woman in Hermas says to him: ‘Hear now concerning the stones that are in the building. Those^r square and white stones, which agree exactly in their joints, are the apostles, and bishops, and teachers, and ministers——’

^k Dices ergo eis qui præsunt ecclesiæ, ut dirigant vias suas in justitiâ. Vis. ii. sect. 2.

^l Interrogavit me, si jam libellum dedissem senioribus—scribes ergo duos libellos, et mittes unum Clementi, et unum Graptæ. Ibid. sect. 4.

^m Annum illam——quam putas esse?——Est ecclesia Dei. Vis. ii. sect. iv.

ⁿ Bestia hæc figura est pressuræ supervenientis. V. iv. sect. 2.

^o Ecce occurrit mihi virgo quædam exornata, tanquam de thalamo prodiens, tota in albis. Ibid.

^p Nonne vides contra te turrim magnam, quæ ædificatur super aquas, lapidibus quadratis splendidis? V. iii. sect. 2.

^q In quadrato enim ædificabatur turris. Ibid.

^r Lapidem quidem illi quadrati et albi, convenientes in commissuris suis, si sunt apostoli, et episcopi, et doctores, et ministri. V.

iii. sect. 5.

4. St. John is bid to write, ch. xix. 9, "Blessed are they which are called to the marriage-supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God." Hermas is informed: 'When^s the structure of the tower is 'finished, they shall feast together near the tower, and shall 'glorify God, because the structure of the tower is finished.' And soon after: 'Say unto them, that all these things are 'true, and that there is nothing in them that is not true.'

5. In the Revelation is frequent mention of the "book of life." Ch. iii. 5, "I will not blot his name out of the book of life." xii. 8, "whose names are not written in the book of life." See also xvii. 8. xx. 15. Hermas is required to admonish his sons. 'For the^t Lord knows they will repent with all their heart, and he will write thee in the book of life.' Others read, 'they shall be written in the book of life.' Again: 'Keep^u the commandments of the Lord, and thou shalt be approved, and shalt be written in the number of those that keep his commandments.'

6. In Rev. vii. 9, "After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude—stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." Hermas says; 'Then^v the angel of the Lord commanded crowns to be brought, made as of palms. And the angel crowned those men,—and commanded them to go into the tower.' The writer of the Revelation is soon after informed, who these are. v. 14, He said to me; "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." In Hermas we have a like explication. 'But^w who then, Lord, said I, are they who enter into the tower crowned? He says to me: All who having striven with the devil, have overcome him, these are crowned. And these are they who have suffered hard things that they might keep the law.' Again; Rev. iii. 5, "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment." vi. 11, "And white robes were given unto every one of them." Hermas says of the persons before mentioned, and of some others; 'For^x they had the same garment, which was white as snow, with which he commanded them to go into the tower.' And presently

^s Cum ergo consummata fuerit structura turris, omnes simul epulabuntur juxta turrim, et honorificabunt Deum. Dic illis, quod hæc omnia sunt vera, et nihil extra veritatem est. V. iii. sect. 4. ^t Vis. i. sect. 3.

^u Sim. v. sect. 3. ^v Tunc nuntius Domini coronas jussit adferri. Allatæ sunt autem coronæ, velut ex palmis factæ; et coronavit eos viros nuntius—et jussit eos ire in turrim. Sim. viii. sect. 2. ^w Sim. viii. sect. 3. ^x Sim. viii. sect. 2.

after of some others: ‘He gave them a white garment, and so sent them away into the tower.’

7. In the book of the Revelation is mention made of a new name, and a new city. Ch. ii. 17, “To him that overcometh will I give a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth, saving he that receiveth it.” iii. 12, “Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, and I will write upon him my new name.” In *Hermas*: ‘The^y Son of God is indeed more ancient than any creature. But the gate is therefore new, because^z he appeared in the last days in the^a fulness of time, that they who shall attain to salvation may by it enter into the kingdom of God. No man shall enter into the kingdom of God, but he who shall receive the name of the Son of God. For if you would enter into any city, and that city should be encompassed with a wall, and had only one gate; could you enter into that city but by that one gate? So neither can any enter into the kingdom of God, but only by the name of his Son, who is most dear to him.’

8. I forbear to transcribe any more. But this book of *Hermas* may be of use to explain divers things in the first epistle of St. John, and the book of the Revelation. And one may be apt to conclude, they were all written about the same time.

XLIV. The allusions which I have here produced from *Hermas* relate to these several books of the New Testament: the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. And for Mark’s gospel Numb. XXV. may be observed; the Acts; the epistle to the Romans; first and second to the Corinthians; the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians; first to the Thessalonians; second to Timothy; to the Hebrews; the epistle of James; first and second of Peter; the epistles of John, Jude, and the book of the Revelation.

If the reader is desirous to distinguish these allusions into those which are more, and those which are less probable; I hope he will be willing to place in the former rank the allusions to the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, especially those to the two former. I would likewise will-

^y Simil. ix. sect. 12.

^z Quia in consummatione in novissimis diebus apparuit, ut qui assecuturi sunt salutem, per eam intrent in regnum Dei.

^a And here is a reference to Gal. iv. 4. or rather to Eph. i. 9, 10. At least, it is the doctrine of those texts.

ingly place here the allusions to the Acts, the epistle to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, the epistle to the Ephesians, and the epistle of James. And all the rest deserve consideration; except that I think those to the Galatians, Philippians, first to the Thessalonians, second to Timothy, and the epistle to the Hebrews, some of the least material!

Here are certainly many allusions to our genuine books of the New Testament, which show the great respect these writings were in, though they are not expressly cited. But the reason is, that it was not suitable to the nature of the work to quote books. The only quotation in Hermas is in this^b manner: ‘The Lord is nigh to them that turn to him, as it is written in Heldam and Modad, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness.’ Compare Numb. xii. 26, 27. But it is reasonable to suppose, this is not a christian, but a Jewish writing. Eldad and Modad are mentioned among the apocryphal books of the Old Testament in the Synopsis Scripturæ, ascribed to Athanasius, but not his. It was no unusual thing for the ancient christians to quote Jewish as well as heathen books, without intending to give them any authority. Finally, I do not perceive in this work of Hermas any allusions to any apocryphal gospels, or other apocryphal books of the New Testament. It is certain, no such books are here quoted.

CHAP. V.

ST. IGNATIUS. HIS HISTORY.

IGNATIUS was bishop of Antioch in Syria, the latter part of the first, and the beginning of the second century. He is said by some to have been the child whom our Lord took in his arms and set in the midst of his disciples, as an emblem of humility. But for this story there is no foundation in the earliest antiquity.

Eusebius^a in his Ecclesiastical History says, ‘That Euodius having been the first bishop of Antioch, Ignatius succeeded him.’ With whom St. Jerom^b agrees. In his Chronicle, Eusebius places the ordination of Ignatius in the year 69, after the death of Peter and Paul at Rome. Nevertheless some think, that Ignatius was ordained by Peter; and suppose, that Euodius and Ignatius were both bishops of Antioch at one and the same time; the one of the Jewish,

^b Vis. iii. sect. 3.

^a Lib. 3. cap. 22.

^b De Vir. Ill. n. 16.

and the other of the Gentile christians: but that after the death of Euodius they all came to be under Ignatius, as their bishop. If Ignatius only succeeded Euodius about the year of our Lord 70, it may be reasonably concluded, he was acquainted with several of the apostles. And St.^c Chrysostom says, ‘ he conversed familiarly with them, and ‘ was perfectly acquainted with their doctrine;’ and had the^d hands of apostles laid upon him.

Beside the bishoprick, the martyrdom of this good man is another of those few things concerning him which are not contradicted. But the time of it, as well as some other things, is disputed. Du Pin places it in the tenth of Trajan, A. D. 107, as do^e Tillemont and^f Cave. But^g Pearson, Loyd,^h Pagi,ⁱ Le Clerc,^k Fabricius, in 116.

Having given this general account of the age of Ignatius, I shall next transcribe the most ancient testimonies concerning him and his epistles. And then I shall make a few remarks.

We have this passage in^l Irenæus; ‘ As one of our people, ‘ for his testimony of God condemned to wild beasts, said: ‘ I am the wheat of God, and ground by the teeth of wild ‘ beasts, that I may be found to be pure bread.’ Which words are in sect. 4. of Ignatius’s epistle to the Romans. And this passage is also cited from Irenæus by^m Eusebius; who in anotherⁿ place likewise says: ‘ Irenæus mentions ‘ Justin Martyr, and Ignatius, making use of testimonies out ‘ of their writings.’

We meet with Ignatius twice mentioned by Origen. ‘ Finally,’ says^o he, ‘ I remember, that one of the saints, ‘ Ignatius by name, has said of Christ: My love is cruci- ‘ fied,’ which words are in the same epistle to the Romans, sect. vii. Again: ‘ I have^p observed it elegantly written ‘ in an epistle of a martyr, I mean Ignatius, second bishop ‘ of Antioch after Peter, that the virginity of Mary was un- ‘ known to the prince of this world.’ See the epistle to Ephesians, sect. xix.

Eusebius,^q beside what has been already taken from him, says in another place, after the mention of Polycarp and Papias, as contemporaries: ‘ At the same time also flourish-

^c T. i. Hom. 42. in Ignat. p. 562. c.

^d Ib. p. 563. B.

^e Mem. Eccl. Tom. 2. p. 2. Ignace, Art. ix.

^f Hist. Lit.

^g Dissertat. de Anno quo S. Ignatius condemnatus.

^h Critic. in

Baron, 107. n. 3, &c.

ⁱ Hist. E. 116. n. 7.

^k Bibl. Gr. T.

v. p. 39.

^l Advers. Hæc. l. v. cap. 28.

^m H. E. l. 3. c. 36.

ⁿ L. v. c. 8. p. 173.

^o Prolog. in Cant. Cantic. p. 496. T. i. Basil.

1571.

^p Hom. vi. in Luc. Tom. 2. p. 214.

^q H. E. l. 3

cap. 36.

‘ ed Ignatius, who is still highly honoured, being the second
 ‘ in the succession of the church of Antioch after Peter. It
 ‘ is said, that he was sent from Syria to Rome to be devoured
 ‘ by wild beasts, for the testimony of Christ. And making
 ‘ his journey through Asia under a strong guard, he con-
 ‘ firmed the churches in every city by his discourses, and
 ‘ especially cautioned them against the heresies then spring-
 ‘ ing up, and gaining ground; and exhorted them to adhere
 ‘ to the tradition of the apostles. And for the greater se-
 ‘ curity, he also put down his instructions in writing.
 ‘ Therefore when he came to Smyrna, where Polycarp was,
 ‘ he wrote an epistle to the church at Ephesus, another to
 ‘ the church in Magnesia upon the [river] Meander—and
 ‘ another to the church at Trallium—and beside these, he
 ‘ wrote also to the church at Rome; [from which Eusebius
 ‘ quotes a long passage.] These things he wrote from the
 ‘ forementioned city to those churches. Afterwards re-
 ‘ moving from Smyrna he wrote to the Philadelphians from
 ‘ Troas, and to the church of Smyrna, and in particular to
 ‘ their president Polycarp.’ Eusebius proceeds there not
 only to refer to a passage of this epistle to Polycarp, but
 quotes also distinctly a passage from the epistle to the
 church of Smyrna; and then puts down a passage of the
 epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, in the latter part of
 which he says to them: ‘ The epistles of Ignatius sent by
 ‘ him to us, together with what other have come to our
 ‘ hands, we have sent to you, which are subjoined to this
 ‘ epistle; by which you may be greatly profited. For they
 ‘ treat of faith and patience, and of all things pertaining to
 ‘ edification in our Lord.’ And thus we have seen also
 Polycarp’s testimony in general to these epistles, who
 collected them.

To the same purpose St. Jerom in his book of^r *Illustrious Men*: ‘ Ignatius, the third bishop of the church of Antioch
 ‘ after the apostle Peter, in the persecution under Trajan
 ‘ was condemned to wild beasts. And when he came to
 ‘ Smyrna, where Polycarp the disciple of John was bishop,
 ‘ he wrote an epistle to the Ephesians, another to the Mag-
 ‘ nesians, a third to the Trallians, a fourth to the Romans:
 ‘ and when he was gone thence he wrote to the Philadel-
 ‘ phians, the Smyrneans, and in particular to Polycarp.’

I shall transcribe no more testimonies of the ancients, but
 refer the reader for the rest to the *Patres Apostolici* of Le
 Clerc.

Beside those seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius and

^r Cap. 16.

Jerom, there are several other epistles which have been ascribed to Ignatius. But they are now almost universally supposed by learned men to be spurious, and I think are plainly so.

Of these seven, mentioned by Eusebius and Jerom, there are two editions; one called the larger, and oftentimes the interpolated; and another, called the smaller. And, except Mr. Whiston, and perhaps some few others, who may follow him, it is the general opinion of learned men, that the larger are interpolated, and that the smaller have by far the best title to the name of Ignatius.

I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the larger are an interpolation of the smaller, and not the smaller an epitome or abridgment of the larger. I desire no better evidence in a thing of this nature.

And the quotations of Ignatius in the most ancient christian writers do also better agree with the smaller than the larger epistles, as may be seen in archbishop Usher's^s *Dissertations*.

But whether the smaller themselves are the genuine writings of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics. And whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own, I have found it a very difficult question. I shall however deliver my opinion, formed upon the inquiry I have made into this controversy. And every one will be able to judge of it by the testimonies here alleged.

I make little doubt, but the smaller epistles, which we now have, are, for the main, the same epistles of Ignatius which were read by Eusebius, and which, it seems pretty plain from Origen, were extant in his time. As for the quotation from Irenæus, it is disputable, whether he there cites a passage of a writing, or only mentions some words or expressions of Ignatius, which might be spoken by him upon the near view of his martyrdom. But though that may bear some dispute, the testimony of Irenæus is not altogether without its weight in favour of the epistles.

Considering then these testimonies, which I have alleged from Irenæus, Origen, and Eusebius, and also the internal characters of great simplicity and piety, which are in these epistles, (I mean the smaller,) it appears to me probable, that they are for the main the genuine epistles of Ignatius.

If there be only^t some few sentiments and expressions

^s Cap. 3, 4.

^t Beausobre, though he favours the genuineness of

which seem inconsistent with the true age of Ignatius, it is more reasonable to suppose them to be additions, than to reject the epistles themselves entirely; especially in this scarcity of copies which we now labour under. As the interpolations of the larger epistles are plainly the work of some^u Arian, so even the smaller epistles may have been tampered with by the Arians, or the orthodox, or both: though I do not affirm there are in them any considerable corruptions or alterations.

The time of these epistles of Ignatius is determined by that of his martyrdom. For they were written after he was condemned to the wild beasts, and while he was going a prisoner from Antioch to Rome. Concerning this I have already mentioned two different opinions. Pearson, Loyd, and Pagi, are positive for the year 115 or 116. Basnage however^v puts the year of Ignatius's death among the obscurities of chronology. Indeed those learned men have for their opinion no other grounds but the testimony of Malala, an author of the sixth century, of no great account in other matters; and the Acts, or Martyrdom of Ignatius, which say, that he was condemned by Trajan in person at Antioch. But it being certain, as these learned men have shown, that Trajan was not at Antioch before the year 112; therefore they conclude, that Ignatius was not condemned, at the soonest, before that year. But the genuineness of those Acts may be well disputed for^w divers reasons. And these Acts themselves say, that Ignatius was martyred at Rome when Senecio and Sura were consuls, who were so in the year 107, the tenth of Trajan. Since therefore Eusebius says nothing of Ignatius being condemned by Trajan himself at Antioch, and his death is placed by him^x in the tenth of Trajan, I the rather incline to that opinion; which indeed appears to me much the more probable.

These epistles are now extant in Greek, and in an ancient Latin version. The latter was published by A. B. Usher in 1644. In 1646, Isaac Vossius published six of the seven epistles in Greek from a manuscript at Florence. The epistle to the Romans, which was wanting there, has been since published in Greek by Ruinart^y from a manuscript at Paris.

the smaller epistles, suspects that even they have been interpolated. See Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 378. Note (3) and p. 380. Note (2). ^u Vid. Usser. Dissert. cap. 12. 15. Grabe Spicileg. Patrum, sect. ii. p. 225, 226. et Clerici Dissertat. alteram, sect. xi. apud Patres Apost. edit. 1724.

^v Annal. 107. sect. vi.

^w Vid. Basnage Ann. Pol. E. 107. sect. viii.

^x See his Chronicle.

^y Ap. Acta Martyr. Sincera, p. 13. et seq.

Extat etiam apud Grabe Spicileg. Patr. T. ii. Patres Apost. Cleric. edit. 1724.

To conclude : As the epistles which we now have of Ignatius are allowed to be genuine by a great number of learned men, whose opinion I think to be founded upon probable arguments, (as I have also shown in the testimonies here alleged,) I now proceed to quote them as his.

His Testimony to the Books of the New Testament.

In all the epistles of Ignatius there is but one book of the N. T. expressly named by him, which is St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians. For writing to the Ephesians he says : sect. 12.

1. 'Ye^z are the companions [in the mysteries of the gospel] of Paul the sanctified, the martyr, [or highly commended,] deservedly most happy,—who throughout all his epistle makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.'

He means plainly the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, in which^a the apostle praises and commends those Christians, and never reproves them.

^z Παυλος συμμυσται τῶ μεμαρτυρημενῶ, ὅς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεὺει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

^a That is according to the sense of Valesius, whose note upon the place is to this effect: Frustra sunt—viri literati, non videntes ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ esse, in totâ epistolâ, ad Ephesios nimirum scriptâ, quâ illos laudat valde ac semper commendat, nunquam reprehendit apostolus, ut fuit ab Hieronomo observatum. Which interpretation, so far as I can see, Pearson has well defended, and more at large, Vindic. Ignat. P. 2. cap. x. init. Indeed μνημονεὺω is seldom used in the sense in which it is here understood by these learned men, for praising or commending. But that sense of the verb seems to be preserved in the noun μνημονεὺμα in a passage of Aristotle cited by Stephens in his Gr. Thesaurus V. Μνημονεὺω—In quem locum hæc scribit P. Victorius: Μνημονεὺματα, nisi fallor, appellat elogia, et quæ memoriâ alicujus ornant. And the verb is used for remembering with affectionate regard in Hebr. xi. 15. Καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκεῖνης, ἐμνημονεὺον, ἀφ' ἧς ἐξῆλθον.—However, the very learned writer of a letter concerning the persons to whom St. Paul wrote what is called the epistle to the Ephesians, at the end of Dr. Benson's History of the first planting the Christian Religion, thinks that instead of ὅς μνημονεὺει—we should read, ὅς μνημονεὺω ὑμῶν, meaning that Ignatius himself mentioned the Ephesians in every epistle. But that conjecture appears to be without ground; forasmuch as in all the editions of Ignatius's epistles the verb is in the third person; not only in the Greek of the smaller epistles, which I translate, but likewise in the old Latin version. Qui in omni epistolâ memoriâ facit vestri in Jesu Christo. And in the Greek interpolated epistles: Ὅς παντοτε ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν αὐτῶ μνημονεὺει ὑμῶν. In like manner in the Latin version of the same: Qui semper in suis orationibus memoriâ est vestri—referring, as may be supposed, to Eph. i. 16. and perhaps to some other parts of the same epistle. There is therefore no various reading. And a new one ought not to be admitted, unless the sense should require it; which it does not appear to do here. For Ignatius is extolling the Ephesians. And one part of their glory is, that the apostle throughout his epistle to them had treated them in an honourable manner. The same is observed by some other ancient writers, who supposed this epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, as may be seen in Pearson. Indeed Ignatius has mentioned the Ephesians in every

Quotations and Allusions.

N. T.

II. Matt. iii. 15. "For^b thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness."

III. Matt. x. 16. "Be^d ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."

IV. Matt. xii. 33. "For^f the tree is known by his fruit."

V. Matt. xv. 13. "Every^h plant, which my heavenly Father has not planted, shall be rooted up."

VI. Matt. xviii. 19. "If two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing

IGNATIUS.

II. Smyrn. sect. 1. 'Baptized of John, that all^c righteousness might be fulfilled by him.'

III. Polycarp. sect. 2. 'Be^e wise as a serpent, in all things, and harmless as a dove.'

IV. Ephes. sect. 14. 'The^s tree is manifest by its fruit.'

V. Trall. sect. 11. 'Theseⁱ are not a plant of the father.'

He has the same expression in^k another epistle.

VI. Ephes. sect. 5. 'For if the prayer of one or two be of such force; how much

one of his epistles, except to Polycarp. But so he has likewise the church of Antioch, in every letter, not excepting that to Polycarp. It is likely therefore, that if Ignatius intended to say, that he mentioned the Ephesians in all his epistles, he would have added: 'As I do also the church of Antioch in Syria, 'of which I am not worthy.'

And what seems to determine this passage to belong to Paul, and not to himself, together with the constant unvaried reading of the place, is the style of Ignatius in many other places, where he carries on his sentences with divers *ὅς*, and *ὄν*, and *ὄν*. I shall give an instance or two. Vid. ad Magnes. sect. viii.—Ad Philad. sect. i. *Ὁν ἐπισκοπον ἐγνων ἔκ ἀφ' εαυτῆς, — ἀλλὰ ἐν ἀγαπῇ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἔκ καταπεπληγμαι τὴν ἐπιεικείαν, ὅς σιγων πλειονα δύναται τῶν ματαία λαβερτων.* Et ib. sect. xi. *Περὶ δε Φιλωνοῦς τῆς διακοῦν ἀπο Κιλικίας, ἀνδρὸς μεμαρτυρημενῶν, ὅς καὶ νυν ἐν λογῶ Θεοῦ ὑπηρετεῖ μοι, ἅμα ῥέω — ἀνδρὶ ἐκλεκτῶ, ὅς ἀπο Συρίας μοι ἀκολαθεῖ, ἀποταξαμενὸς τῷ βίῳ. Οἱ καὶ μαρτυροῦσιν ἡμῖν. Καγὼ τῷ Θεῷ εὐχαριστῶ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὅτι ἐδέξασθε αὐτοῦ, ὡς καὶ ὑμᾶς ὁ Κύριος.* Which last passage shows also, that if, after having first spoken of Paul, Ignatius had said any thing of himself, particularly, that he mentioned them in all his epistles, he would have said, *καγὼ*. as indeed the nature of the thing requires he should.

All which therefore seems to render it probable, that Ignatius had a copy of this epistle with an inscription of it to the Ephesians. But that this will determine the controversy, concerning the persons to whom it was sent, I do not say.

^b Οὕτω γὰρ πρεπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρωσαι πασαν δικαιοσυνην. ^c Ἴνα πληρωθῇ πασα δικαιοσυνη ὑπ' αὐτῶν. ^d Γινεθε ἐν φρονιμοῖς ὡς οἱ οφεις, καὶ ἀκεραιοὶ ὡς αἱ περιτεραι. ^e Φρονιμοὺς γίνετῶ ὡς ο φεις, καὶ ἀκεραιοὺ ὡσει περιτερα. ^f Ἐκ γὰρ τῆ καρπῶ το δένδρον γινωσκεται.

^g Φανερὸν το δένδρον ἀπο τῆ καρπῶ αὐτῶ. ^h Πασα φυτεια — ἐκριζωθησεται. ⁱ Ουτοὶ γὰρ ἔκ εἰσιν φυτεια πατρὸς. ^k Ad Philadelph. sect. 3.

N. T.

that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. 20, For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

VII. Matt. xix. 12. "He¹ that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

VIII. To the Philadelphians, sect. 6, he speaks of some, 'who seem to him to be but as monuments and sepulchres of the dead, upon which are written only the names of men.' Which may be thought to refer to Matt. xxiii. 27, &c. but I do not think it material.

IX. To the Magnesians, sect. 9: 'And therefore he, whom they [the prophets] justly waited for, being come, raised them up from the dead.'

He is here supposed to refer to Matt. xxvii. 52. But I have taken several passages that plainly refer to Matthew's gospel, and therefore need not insist upon it. Moreover Ephes. sect. 19, he speaks of a bright star, by which our Lord was manifested to the world: where he is supposed to refer to Matt. ii. and undoubtedly confirms that history.

N. T.

X. Luke xiv. 27. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father and mother,—yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

XI. John iii. 8. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof: but" caust not tell whence

¹ Ο δυναμενος χωρειν χωρειτω.
εκ ουδας ποθεν ερχεται, και πη υπαγει.
και πη υπαγει, κ. λ.

IGNATIUS.

more that of the bishop, and the whole church?'

VII. Smyrn. sect. 6. 'He^m that receives it, let him receive it.'

Ignatius, however, is not speaking of the same thing with our Saviour, but of quite another matter.

VIII. To the Philadelphians, sect. 6, he speaks of some, 'who seem to him to be but as monuments and sepulchres of the dead, upon which are written only the names of men.' Which may be thought to refer to Matt. xxiii. 27, &c. but I do not think it material.

IX. To the Magnesians, sect. 9: 'And therefore he, whom they [the prophets] justly waited for, being come, raised them up from the dead.'

He is here supposed to refer to Matt. xxvii. 52. But I have taken several passages that plainly refer to Matthew's gospel, and therefore need not insist upon it. Moreover Ephes. sect. 19, he speaks of a bright star, by which our Lord was manifested to the world: where he is supposed to refer to Matt. ii. and undoubtedly confirms that history.

IGNATIUS.

X. Romans, sect. 5. 'Now I begin to be a disciple.'

It has been thought, that he refers to the opposite text in St. Luke. But I think, it can hardly be determined, what particular text he refers to.

XI. Philadelph. sect. 7. ——"Yet the Spirit is not deceived, being from God: for^o it knows whence it

^m Ο χωριων χωρειτω. " ΑΛΛ'
^o Ουδεν γαρ ποθεν ερχεται,

N. T.

it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the spirit."

XII. John viii. 29. "And he that hath sent me is with me: the Father has not left me alone: ^p for I do always those things that please him."

Note: The words I omit here^r are these: 'Who is his 'eternal word, not coming forth from silence.' Which last expression has afforded a strong objection to the genuineness of these epistles. If the whole be genuine, there is probably a reference to John i. I. in that character of 'eternal word.' For my own part, I have^s suspected the whole which I have omitted to be an interpolation. The connexion is best preserved without those words.

N. T.

XIII. John x. 9. "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved," &c.

XIV. John xii. 49. "For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." See ch. v. 19. x. 30. xiv. 11.

XV. John xvi. 28. "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father."

XVI. In John's Gospel, ch. xii. 31. xiv. 30. xvi. 11, Satan is called the^t "prince of this world."

IGNATIUS.

comes, and whither it goes, and reproves secret things.'

XII. Magnes. sect. 8. 'That there is one God, who has manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son:—who in^a all things pleased him that sent him.'

IGNATIUS.

XIII. Philad. sect. ix. 'He [Christ] is the door of the Father, by which enter in Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the apostles, and the church.'

XIV. Magnes. sect. 7. 'As therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to him; neither by himself, nor by his apostles,' &c.

XV. The same: 'As to one Jesus Christ who proceedeth from one Father, and exists in one, and is returned to him.'

XVI. Rom. sect. 7. 'The^u prince of this world would fain carry me away.' He has the same expression in another epistle.^v

^p Οτι εγω τα αριστα αυτω ποιω παντοτε. ευηρεσησε τω περιψαντι αυτον.

^s Vid. Voss, not. in loc.

^u Ο αρχων τω αιωνος τωτω διαρπασαι με βλεπεται.

^a Ος κατα παντα

^r Ος εστιν αυτω λογος αιδιος, εκαπο

^t Ο αρχων τω κοσμου τωτω.

^v Φευγετε ενεδρας

N. T.

XVII. Acts x. 41. — “Who^w did eat and drink with him after he arose from the dead.”

Comp. Luke xxiv. 42, 43.

XVIII. Rom. xv. 7. “Wherefore^y receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God.”

Though the original word for ‘receive’ is not the same with that in Paul, that alone ought not to render the reference doubtful. Ignatius used his memory. And these two words, *προσλαμβάνομαι* and *δέχομαι* are both used in this sense in the N. T.

XIX. In sect. v. of his epistle to the Romans is supposed to be an allusion to Rom. viii. 38, 39.

St. Paul, Rom. i. 3, 4, “Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who^a was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power.” Ignatius, Smyrn. sect. 1, says: ‘Our Lord was truly^b of the race of David, according to the flesh, the Son of God, according to the will and power of God.’ Again he says, Ephes. sect. 18, ‘He was^c of the seed of David.’ Once more, *ib.* sect. 20, That he was, ‘according to the flesh, of the race [or family] of David.’ Whether he takes this from the epistle to the Romans, or from the genealogies in the gospels, I cannot say.

N. T.

XX. 1 Cor. i. 10. “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that^d ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the

IGNATIUS.

XVII. Smyrn. sect. 3. But^x after his resurrection he did eat and drink with them.’

XVIII. Philad. sect. 11. ‘And I give thanks to God for you^z that ye have received them, as the Lord you.’

IGNATIUS.

XX. Ephes. sect. 2. ‘It is fitting therefore, that in all manner of ways ye should glorify Jesus Christ, who has glorified you, that^e in one obedience ye may be perfectly joined together, in the same mind, and in the

τῶ ἀρχόντῳ τῶ αἰῶνος τῶτῶ. Ad. Philad. sect. 6. Vid. et Ephes. sect. 17. 19.

^w Οἱτινες συνεφαγομεν καὶ συνεπισημεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

^x Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀναστασιν συνεφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνεπιεν.

^y Διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσέλαβετὸ ἡμᾶς εἰς ὄψαν Θεοῦ.

^z ——— ὅτι ἐδέξασθε αὐτῶς ὡς καὶ ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος.

^a Τῶ γενόμενῳ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα.

^b Ὀντα ἐκ γενεῆς

Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα.

^c Ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβὶδ.

^d ——— ἵνα

τὸ αὐτὸ λεγῆτε πάντες, καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ἡμῖν σχίσματα, ἥτε δὲ κατηρητισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοί, καὶ ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ.

^e Ἴνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποτάγῃ ἥτε κατηρητισμένοι

τῷ αὐτῷ νοί, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λεγῆτε πάντες περὶ τῶ αὐτῶ.

N. T.

same mind and in the same judgment.”

XXI. 1 Cor. i. 18. “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness: but unto us that are saved, it is the power of God. 19, For it is written,—I will bring to nothing the^t understanding of the prudent. 20, Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? But we preach Christ, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness. 24. But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.”

XXII. 1 Cor. iv. 4. “For I^h know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby justified.”

XXIII. 1 Cor. v. 7. “Purge out therefore^k the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.” 8, “Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness.”

XXIV. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.

IGNATIUS.

same judgment, and may all speak the same thing of the same thing.’

XXI. Ephes. sect. 18. ‘Let my life be sacrificed for the doctrine^s of the cross, which is a stumbling block unto unbelievers, but to us salvation, and life eternal. Where is the wise? Where is the disputer? Where is the boasting of them that are called prudent?’

XXII. Rom. sect. 5. ‘Butⁱ I am not therefore justified.’

XXIII. Magnes. sect. x. ‘Cast^l away therefore the evil leaven which is waxed old and sour, and be transformed into the new leaven, which is Jesus Christ.

XXIV. Ephes. sect. 16.

¹ Την συνεσιν των συνετων σθετησω—Πη σοφος; η γραμματευς; η συζητητης τω αιωνος τωτ—ημεις δε κηρυσσομεν Χριστον εσαυρωμενον, Ισδαιους σκανδαλον, κ. λ.

² —Τη σαυρα, ο εστιν σκανδαλον τοις απιστοις, ημιν δε σωτηρια, και ζωη αιωνιος. Πη σοφος; η συζητητης; που καυχησις των λεγομενων συνετων.

³ η παρα τωτο δεδικαιωμαι.

⁴ Αλλ’ ηκ εν τωτω δεδικαιωμαι.

⁵ Αλλ’

⁶ Εκκαθαρατε εν την παλαιαν ζυμην, ινα ητε νεον φυραμα—ωτε εορταζωμεν, μη εν ζυμη παλαια μηδε εν ζυμη κακιας και πονηριας, κ. λ.

⁷ Υπερθεσθε ονν την κακην ζυμην την παλαιωθεισαν, και ενοξισασαν, και μεταβαλεσθε εις νεαν ζυμην, ο εστιν Ιησους Χριστος.

N. T.

“Be not^m deceived: neither fornicators,—nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, shall inherit the kingdom of God.”

XXV. 1 Cor. xv. 8. “And last^o of all, he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.”

XXVI. 2 Cor. v. 14. “For the love of Christ constrains us—15, And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.”

XXVII. Gal. i. 1. “Paul an apostle, not^q of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.”

XXVIII. Gal. v. 4. “Christ is become of no effect unto you: whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace.”

XXIX. I think, that Ignatius in his salutation of the church of Ephesus alludes to Eph. i. 3, 4, and iii. 19. But as he has expressly owned the epistle of St. Paul to the

IGNATIUS.

‘Be notⁿ deceived, my brethren, corrupters of houses [or families] shall not inherit the kingdom of God.’ See also Philad. sect. 3. at the end.

XXV. Rom. sect. ix. ‘For^p I am not worthy, being the last of them, and one born out of due time. But I have obtained mercy to be some body, if I shall get to God.’

It is plain, he imitates Paul’s style.

XXVI. Rom. sect. vi. ‘Him I seek, who died for us: him I desire, who rose again for us.’

XXVII. Philadelph. sect. 1. ‘Which bishop [of the Philadelphians] I know obtained the ministry for the public, not of himself, nor^r by men, nor out of vain-glory, but by the love of God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.’

XXVIII. Magnes. sect. viii. ‘For if we still live according to Judaism, we confess we have not received grace.’

^m Μη πλανασθε—βασιλειαν Θεου η κληρονομησησιν. ^o Μη πλανασθε—οι οικοφθοροι βασιλειαν Θεου η κληρονομησησιν. ^p —ων εσχατος δε παντων, ωσπερι τω εκτρωματι ωφθε καρμοι. ^q —ων εσχατος αυτων, και εκτρωμα’ αλλ’ ηλεγμαι τις ειναι, εαν Θεου επιτυχω. Conf. 1 Cor. vii. 25. 1 Tim. i. 13, 16. et Ignat. Smyrn. sect. xi. εσχατος αυτων ων.

^r Ουκ απ’ ανθρωπων, ης ε’ ανθρωπων. ανθρωπων, κ. λ.

^r Ουκ αφ’ εαυτη, ης ε’ ε’ ανθρωπων.

Ephesians, [Numb. I.] and there are divers other allusions to that epistle to be taken notice of, I omit it.

N. T.

XXX. Eph. ii. 22. "In whom ye also are builded for an habitation of God through the Spirit." See ver. 20, 21.

IGNATIUS.

XXX. Ephes. sect. ix. 'As being stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for the building of God the Father: drawn up on high by the engine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, using for a rope the Holy Ghost.'

Smyrn. sect. 1. He may allude also to the foregoing verses of Ephes. ii. when he says, 'that Christ by his passion and resurrection had lifted up a sign for all ages, to his holy and faithful people, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, in one body of his church.'

N. T.

XXXI. Ephes. iv. 3. "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace." 4, There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. 5, One Lord, one faith."

IGNATIUS.

XXXI. Magnes. sect. vii. 'Coming together into one place, let there be one^s prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope in charity and joy undefiled. There is one Lord Jesus Christ.'

XXXII. Eph. v. 2. "And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us, and has^t given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour."

XXXII. Ephes. sect. 1. 'That I may become the disciple of him," who offered himself for us to God, an offering and a sacrifice.'

XXXIII. Eph. v. 25. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church."

XXXIII. Polyearp. sect. v. 'In like manner exhort my brethren, in the name of Jesus Christ, to love their wives, as^w the Lord the church.'

29. "For no man hateth his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, as^v the Lord the church."

^s Μια προσευχη, μια δεησις. The archbishop: 'Have one common prayer, 'one supplication.' Which is according to the larger, or interpolated epistles. But as his lordship professes to translate the smaller, I think, with submission, it had been better to follow them here also; though by putting the word *common* in Italic he has hinted that it is not in the original.

παρεδωκεν εαυτον υπερ ημων προσφοραν και θυσιαν τω θεω.

υπερ ημων εαυτον ανενεγκοντος θεω προσφοραν και θυσιαν.

και ο κυριος την εκκλησιαν.

^t και

^u τε

^v καθως

^w Ως ο κυριος την εκκλησιαν.

N. T.

30. "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."

XXXIV. Ephes. vi. 13. "Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God. 14, Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness. 16, Above all taking the shield of faith.—17, And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

XXXV. Philip. i. 21. "For me to live is Christ, and to die^x is gain."

And that he refers to this text of the Philippians is farther evident, in that he is here entreating the Romans not to desire his life, and prevent his suffering for Christ: and would have them consider the 'things^z that straiten' him, or how he was straitened, as Paul^a also says he was, ver. 23.

N. T.

XXXVI. Philip. ii. 3. "Let^b nothing be done through strife. 5, Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus."

XXXVII. Col. i. 7. "As ye also learned of Epaphras^d our dear fellow servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ." See iv. 7.

XXXVIII. 1 Thess. v. 17. "Pray without^f ceasing."

^x Και το αποθανειν, κερδος. lucrum mihi adjacet. Vers. Lat.

^a Συνεχομαι γαρ εκ των δυο.

φρονεισθω εν υμιν ο και εν Χριστω Ιησω.

κατα εριθειαν πρρασειν, αλλα κατα χριστομαθιαν.

συνδωλα ημων, ος επι πιστος υπερ υμων διακονος τη Χριστω.

τη συνδωλα μη Βερρη, τη κατα Θεον διακονη υμων εν πασι ενλογημενη.

^f Αδιαλειπτως προσευχεσθε.

IGNATIUS.

Ephes. sect. v. 'That he may acknowledge by the things ye do, that ye are members of his Son.'

XXXIV. Polycarp. sect. 6. 'Let none of you be found a deserter, but let your baptism remain as [your] arms, faith as a helmet, love as a spear, patience as whole armour.'

XXXV. Rom. sect. vi. 'He^y is the gain that is laid up for me.'

IGNATIUS.

XXXVI. Philadelph. sect. viii. 'I beseech you, that^c ye do nothing through strife, but according to the instruction of Christ.'

XXXVII. Eph. sect. ii. 'For what concerns Burrhus my^e fellow servant, and according to God your deacon, blessed in all things.'

XXXVIII. Polyc. sect. 1. 'Be at leisure^g to pray without ceasing.'

^y Ο δε τοκετος μοι επικειται. Ille

^z Ειδως τα συνεχοντα με.

^b Μηδεν κατα εριθειαν—τρωτο γαρ

^c Παρακαλω δε υμας, μηδεν

^d Τη αγαπητη

^e Ηερι δε

^g Προσευχαις σχολαζει αδιαλειπτοις.

And to the Ephes. sect. x. he writes: ‘Pray also for other men^h without ceasing.’ Which are the very words of St. Paul’s advice.

N. T.

XXXIX. 2 Tim. i. 16. “The Lord give mercy to the house of Onesiphorus, for heⁱ oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain.”

18. “The Lord grant unto him, that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day.”

XL. 2 Tim. ii. 4. “No man^m that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.”

XLI. Tit. ii. 3. “The^o aged women, that they be in behaviour as becometh godliness.”

The only reason of taking notice of this place is the word *καταστημα*, ‘behaviour,’ which is no where in the N. T. but this place to Titus.

N. T.

XLII. Philem. ver. 20. “Yea,^a brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord.”

This phrase of St. Paul to Philemon occurs in several^s of Ignatius’s epistles.

N. T.

XLIII. Heb. x. 28. “He that despised Moses’ law,

IGNATIUS.

XXXIX. Eph. sect. ii. ‘And Crocus—has in^k all things refreshed [or comforted] me, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ shall also refresh him.’

He has more to the same purpose, Smyrn. sect. 9, 10. and says: My soul be for yours, ‘and my bonds, which ye have not despised, nor been ashamed of.’^l

XL. Polycarp. sect. vi. ‘Pleaseⁿ him, under whom ye war, and from whom ye receive your wages.’

XLI. Trall. sect. iii. ‘Whose^p very behaviour is an excellent instruction [speaking of their bishop],’

IGNATIUS.

XLII. Ephes. sect. ii. ‘And^r may I always have joy of you.’

IGNATIUS.

XLIII. Ephes. sect. xvi. ‘If therefore they who do

^h Και ὑπερ τῶν ἀλλῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσευχεσθε.

ⁱ Ὅτι πολλακίς με ἀνεψύξε, καὶ τὴν ἀλυσὶν μὲ ἐκ ἐπισηχυνθε.

^k Κατὰ

πάντα μὲ ἀνεπαύσεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ὁ Πατὴρ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναψύξει.

^l Καὶ τὰ δεσμά μὲ, ἐχ ὑπερηφανήσατε, οὐδὲ ἐπισηχυνθητέ.

^m Οὐδεὶς

ἐρατευόμενος ἐμπλεκεταὶ ταῖς τῆς βίβης πραγματείαις, ἵνα τῷ ἐρατολογησάντι ἀρεσῇ.

ⁿ Ἀρεσκετε ὡς ἐρατευεσθε.

^o Πρεσβυτέρως, ὡσαντὼς

ἐν καταστημάτων ἱεροπρεπείας.

^p Οὐ αὐτὸ τὸ καταστημα μεγάλη μαθητεία.

^q Ἐγὼ σε οὐαμίην ἐν Κύριῳ.

^r Οὐαμίην ἡμῶν διὰ πάντος.

^s Magnes. sect. xii. Polycarp. sect. vi.

N. T.

died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. 29, Of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing?"

XLIV. Heb. xiii. 9. "Be^t not carried about with divers and strange doctrines: for it is a good thing, that the heart be established with grace, not with meats, which have not profited them which have been occupied therein."

The larger or interpolated epistles of Ignatius are in this place thus: 'Be not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies, [1 Tim. i. 4,] and to the Jewish pride. Old things are passed away: behold, all things are become new.' [2 Cor. v. 17.] Whence I think it must be owned, that by 'old fables which are unprofitable,' the author was led to think of 1 Tim. i. 4, and was therefore induced to put down that place distinctly. Nevertheless, I think the whole passage of the smaller epistles contains a probable allusion to Heb. xiii. 9.

XLV. Ignatius, Ephes. sect. v. 'For it is written: God resisteth the proud.' Which words are indeed in James iv. 6, and 1 Pet. v. 5. But it is most probable, that Ignatius refers to Prov. iii. 34.

N. T.

XLVI. 1 Pet. v. 5. "Yea,^v all of you, be subject one to another."

XLVII. 1 John i. 2. "And the life was manifested—and —we show unto you that

IGNATIUS.

these things according to the flesh have died, [or suffered death,] how much more shall he who by wicked doctrine corrupts the faith of God, for which Jesus Christ was crucified? Such a one being defiled, shall go into fire unquenchable, as shall he who hears him.'

XLIV. Magnes. sect. viii. 'Be^u not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor with old fables, which are unprofitable. For if we still continue to live according to the Jewish law, we confess we have not received grace.'

The larger or interpolated epistles of Ignatius are in this place thus: 'Be not deceived with heterodox opinions, nor give heed to fables and endless genealogies, [1 Tim. i. 4,] and to the Jewish pride. Old things are passed away: behold, all things are become new.' [2 Cor. v. 17.] Whence I think it must be owned, that by 'old fables which are unprofitable,' the author was led to think of 1 Tim. i. 4, and was therefore induced to put down that place distinctly. Nevertheless, I think the whole passage of the smaller epistles contains a probable allusion to Heb. xiii. 9.

XLV. Ignatius, Ephes. sect. v. 'For it is written: God resisteth the proud.' Which words are indeed in James iv. 6, and 1 Pet. v. 5. But it is most probable, that Ignatius refers to Prov. iii. 34.

IGNATIUS.

XLVI. Magnes. sect. xiii. 'Be^w subject to the bishop, and to one another.'

XLVII. Magnes. sect. vi. —'Jesus Christ,^x who was with the Father before the

^l Διδάχαις ποικίλαις και ξεναις μη περιφερεισθε· καλον γαρ χαριτι βιβαιοσθαι την καρδιαν, ε βρωμασιν, εν οισ εκ ωφεληθησαν οι περιπατησαντες.

^u Μη πλανασθε ταις ετεροδοξαις, μηδε μυθενμασιν τοις παλαιοις ανοφελεισιν ησιν, κ. λ. ^v Παντες δε αλληλοις υποτασσομενοι. ^w Υποταγητε

την επισκοπην και αλληλοις. ^x Ος προ αιωνων παρα Πατρι ην, και εν τελει εφανη.

N. T.

eternal life, which^y was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.”

IGNATIUS.

world was, and in the end appeared.’

This is the doctrine of the New Testament. But the same thing being said likewise in other texts, as Tit. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 20. one can hardly say positively, that Ignatius refers to the epistle of John.

N. T.

XLVIII. 3 John 2. “ Beloved, I wish above^z all things that thou mayest prosper, and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth.”

IGNATIUS.

XLVIII. Magnes. sect. xiii. ‘ That^a whatever ye do, ye may prosper in flesh and spirit,’ &c.

When Ignatius writes, Smyrn. sect. x. ‘ Ye have well done, that ye have received Philo, and Reus Agathopus, who followed me for the word of God, as the servants [or deacons] of Christ our God:’ there is a great resemblance with ver. 5, 6, 7, 8. of this third epistle of John.

XLIX. Beside these allusions and references to particular books, or texts, of the New Testament; it has been observed by^b some learned men, that this ancient writer has made mention of the scriptures of the N. T. under some general names and divisions.

L. Philadelph. sect. 5. ‘ Fleeing^c to the gospel, as the flesh of Jesus, and to the apostles, as the presbytery of the church. Let us also love the prophets, because that they also spoke of the gospel, and hoped in him, [or Christ,] and expected him.’

In this place Grabe and Mill understand by ‘ the gospel,’ the book or volume of the gospels; by ‘ the apostles,’ the book or volume of their epistles: as by ‘ the prophets,’ the volume, or whole canon of the Old Testament. And^d Le Clerc, who assents to the truth of the observation of these learned men, has farther commented upon this passage in this manner: ‘ Which words,’ says he, ‘ as it seems, are to be understood of the evangelic and apostolic writings. So that what Ignatius intends is this: that in order to understand the will of God, he fled to the gospels, which he believed no less than if Christ himself, in the flesh, that is,

^y Ἦτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν.

ἐνοῦσθαι καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, καθὼς καὶ ἐνοῦσται σε ἡ ψυχή.

σὰρκα καὶ πνεύματι.

^b Vid. Millii Prolegom. n. 198, 199.

^z Ευχομαι σε

^a Κατενοῶθητε

^c Προσφυγων τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῆς προφητείας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν, κ. λ.

^d Vid. Histor.

Ec. An. D. 116. sect. 25.

‘ in the condition he was in on earth, present and still living
 ‘ among men, delivered with his own mouth those discourses
 ‘ which are contained in the gospels. As, also, he fled to the
 ‘ writings of the apostles whom he esteemed as the presbytery
 ‘ of the whole christian church, under Christ the universal
 ‘ bishop, which [presbytery] taught all christian societies
 ‘ what they ought to believe. Whence it is sufficiently
 ‘ manifest, how much the sacred books of the N. T. were
 ‘ esteemed at that time. He adds: “ Let us also love the
 ‘ prophets.” Which words intend the Old Testament as
 ‘ written: for the prophets could not be otherwise known
 ‘ to Ignatius. Nor ought it to be passed by without ob-
 ‘ servation, that he in the first place mentions the writings
 ‘ of the N. T. by which we are christians, as his “ refuge:”
 ‘ and in the second place the books of the O. T. because
 ‘ the New may be confirmed out of them.’

LI. Again: Philadelph. sect. ix. ‘ But^e the gospel has
 somewhat in it more excellent, the appearance of our Lord
 Jesus Christ, his passion and resurrection. For the beloved
 prophets referred to him, but the gospel is the perfection of
 incorruption.’

Smyrn. sect. vii. ‘ Ye^f ought to hearken to the prophets,
 but especially to the gospel, in which the passion has been
 manifested to us, and the resurrection perfected.’

In these two places Mill supposes to be meant the book
 of the gospels. And in the following passage by ‘ gospel’
 he supposes to be meant the canon of the New Testament
 in general.

LIII. Smyrn. sect. v. ‘ Whom^g neither the prophecies,
 nor the law of Moses, have persuaded; nor yet the gospel
 even to this day, nor the sufferings of every one of us.’

LIV. Philadelph. sect. viii. ‘ Because^h I have heard of
 some who say, unless I find it in the ancients, [some are for
 archives], I do not believe in the gospel: and I said unto
 them, It is written: they answered me, It is not mentioned.
 But to me instead of all ancients is Jesus Christ. And the

^e Ἐξαιρετον δε τι χειρι το ευαγγελιον, την παρυσιαν τῶ Κυριου ἡμων Ιησῶ Χριστῆ, το παθος αυτου, και την αναστασιν· οι γαρ αγαπητοι προφηται καταγγειλαν εις αυτον· το δε ευαγγελιον απαρτισμα εστιν αφθαρσιας. ^f Προσεχειν δε τοις προφηταις, εξαιρετως δε τῶ ευαγγελιω εν τῶ παθος ἡμων δεδηλωται, και ἡ αναστασις τετελειωται. ^g Οὐς εκ επεισαν αι προφητειαι, εδ’ ὁ νομος Μωσῆως, ἀλλ’ ἔδε μεχρι νυν το ευαγγελιον, εδε τα ἡμετερα των κατ’ ανδρα παθηματα. ^h Ἐπει ηκασα τινων λεγοντων οτι εαν μη εν τοις αρχαιοις εδρω, εν τῶ ευαγγελιω ε πιτευω· και λεγοντος με αυταις, οτι γεγραπται, απικριθησαν μοι οτι προκειται. [al. ε προκειται. Vid. Voss. in loc.] εμοι δε αρχεια εστιν Ιησῶ Χριστος. τα αθικτα αρχεια ὁ ταυρος αυτου, και ὁ θανατος και ἡ αναστασις αυτου, και ἡ πισις ἡ εἰ’ αυτου.

uncorrupted ancient [doctrines] are his cross, and his death, and his resurrection, and the faith which is by him.’

This difficult text I have rendered as near as I could, according to the sense in which it is understood by Le Clerc,ⁱ which I think to be the most likely meaning. He supposes it to be an answer to the Jews, who refused to believe the gospel, for want of some clearer prophecies in the Old Testament. I have thought proper to take this notice of this passage, to prevent any wrong conclusions from it, as it stands in the Archbishop’s translation.

LV. We are to observe one place more. Smyrn. sect. iii. ‘And when he [Christ] came to those who were with Peter, he ^k said unto them: Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal dæmon:’ or, in other words, I am not a spirit.

Eusebius ^l has quoted this passage of Ignatius, and says, he did not know whence Ignatius took these words of our Saviour. But Jerom ^m says it was taken out of the gospel according to the Hebrews. If these ancient writers, and some learned moderns, had not suspected these words to be taken out of some particular writing, I think one might have supposed, that Ignatius only quoted Luke’s gospel in a loose manner, where is exactly the same sense. Chap. xxiv. 39, “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” And if it had not been a disputed point, I should have inserted this passage above, as a quotation of the gospel of St. Luke, or a reference to it. I find Mr. Le Clerc so much of the same mind, that I shall place his words ⁿ in the margin. And I would also add, that it was the opinion of ^o Isaac Casaubon, and bishop

ⁱ Vid. Hist. E. 116. 26. et ad loc. Ignat. ap. Patr. A. ed. 1724.

^k Εφη αυτοις, λαβετε, ψηλαφησετε με, και ιδετε, οτι εκ εμι δαιμονιον ασωματον.

^l H. E. l. 3. c. 36. p. 108. A.

^m De Vir. Ill.

n. 16. in Ignatio. Vid. et Grabe Spicil. T. i. p. 25.

ⁿ Quæ crediderim quidem Hieronymo fuisse in evangelio Hebræorum; sed videntur esse paraphrasis verborum, quæ sunt Lucæ, cap. xxiv. 39. quâ uti potuit Ignatius, pro more antiquissimorum patrum, qui persæpe scripturæ sensum potius quam verba laudant. Certe Ignatius ea verba Matthæo non tribuit: et Nazaræi etiam historiam, quæ apud Lucam exstabat, potuerunt suo exemplari Matthæi nonnihil immutatam inserere; ita ut utrique ex eodem fonte hauserint, non Ignatius ex Nazaræis Dissertat. iii. quæ est de iv. Evangeliiis: ad calcem Harmoniæ Evangelicæ.

^o Quin est fortasse verius, non ex evangelio Hebræico Ignatium illa verba descripsisse, verum traditionem allegasse, non scriptam quæ postea in literas fuerit relata, et Hebræorum evangelio, quod Matthæo tribuebant, inserta. Casaub. Exerc. ad Baron. xvi. Num. 126. Pearson having cited this passage approves it: Et hoc quidem multo mihi verisimilius videtur. Vindic. Ign. P. 2. Cap. 9.

Pearson, that Ignatius did not quote these words out of the gospel of the Hebrews, but that they were afterwards inserted in it.

Having shown the opinion of these learned men, I beg leave to detain the reader a little longer, while I set before him this passage with the context more at large. In opposition to some heretics, Ignatius says: ‘Christ truly suffered, as he also truly raised up himself: not as some unbelievers say, that he only seemed to suffer, they themselves only seeming to be. And ^p as they think, so shall it happen to them, to be incorporeal and phantastical [in the original, literally, “incorporeal and dæmoniac.”] But I know, that after the resurrection he was in the flesh, and I believe him to be so still. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said to them: Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal phantom.’ From whence I think it appears, Ignatius was wont to use the words dæmon and dæmoniac, as equivalent to phantom or spirit, and phantastical. This being his style, if he had not St. Luke before him, (as it is very likely, in his circumstances, he had not,) it was very natural for him to represent the sense of that text of St. Luke’s gospel just as we see in this passage.

I shall now make two observations :

1. That this is the first place of the apostolical fathers in which we have a passage, I do not say quoted from, but found in, an apocryphal book of the New Testament. And this is the first in Grabe’s collection of the fragments of the gospel according to the Hebrews. It will not be improper for me to confirm this observation by the judgment of Mr. Le Clerc, who has been so conversant with these writers. He says then^q expressly, ‘that he has not observed in any ‘of the apostolical fathers, (he means those already here ‘quoted, and St. Polycarp, who will next follow,) any ‘quotations of apocryphal books, concerning the doctrine or ‘history of Christ, except only this one passage of Ignatius; ‘in which he may seem to quote the gospel of the Naza-

And again afterwards: Quidni pariter et S. Ignatius, [inquit Pearsonus,] qui cum apo-tolis et eorum discipulis versatus est, præsertim eo tempore, quo scriptis evangelis uti forte ei non licebat, eandem historiam quam narrat S. Lucas aliis verbis explicaret? Ibid.

^p Καὶ καθὼς φηροῦσιν, καὶ συμβήσεται αὐτοῖς, οὕτω ἀσωματοῖς καὶ δαιμονικοῖς.

^q Non animadverti ulla usquam evangelia, aut scripta apocrypha ad historiam aut doctrinam Christi pertinentia, ab iis laudari; excepto uno illo Ignatii, in quo videri possit laudare evangelium Nazareorum; sed quem ex Lucâ expressum potius existimaverim, ut jam dixi. Le Clerc, Harmon. Evangel. p. 542. b.

‘renes: but I rather think, says he, the place taken from ‘St. Luke.’

2. I would observe concerning the gospel according to the Hebrews, that this passage of it affords an argument, that it was composed after our genuine gospels; because it appears to be taken out of St. Luke’s gospel, only with a little alteration; in conformity, perhaps, to this very place of Ignatius. I think I could argue the same thing from some other passages of that gospel of the Hebrews. But we may have a better opportunity of showing more at large that the ground-work of that gospel is St. Matthew’s gospel; to which have been made additions of things taken out of St. Luke’s, (and perhaps other gospels,) and other matters that had been delivered by oral tradition.

LVI. Thus I have given an account of the testimony which Ignatius affords to the books of the New Testament, without any respect to the larger epistles, except in Numb. XLIV. where I have particularly mentioned them. The larger epistles would have supplied me with many more, and express quotations of the gospels and epistles, if we could allow them to be genuine. But beside the many other arguments against their genuineness, this may be one, that there are more quotations out of the Old and New Testament than could be well expected. The larger epistles were plainly composed by a man at leisure. Ignatius at his writing was very much straitened for time, being at once a traveller, and a prisoner under a strong guard; and, at the places where he rested, much engaged by the kind and respectful visits of the Christians there, and from the neighbouring cities, and in giving them exhortations by word of mouth. I have endeavoured to take nothing but what is genuine. The Greek edition, even of the smaller epistle to the Romans, as now published by Ruinart, would have afforded me two references or quotations more than I have taken: one of Matthew xvi. 26, the other of 2 Cor. iv. 8, the words of which texts are there at length. But Grabe^r has honestly and ingenuously owned, he suspects them to be additions, they being wanted in the ancient Latin version of that epistle.

LVII. We may now sum up the testimony of Ignatius. And in the first place, he has expressly ascribed the epistle to the Ephesians to St. Paul. In the next place, here are plain allusions to the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John.

^r Neque tamen dissimulare possum, et istud non omnino sincerum, sed loca scripturæ, 2 Cor. iv. et Matth. xvi. aliaque, addita videri, quæ a vetere versione absunt. Grabe, Spicil. Patr. T. 2. p. 8.

Whether he has alluded to the gospel of St. Luke, is doubtful, unless we allow him to refer to it in the passage at Numb. LV. The other allusions here taken from Ignatius relate to the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Romans, first and second to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, first to the Thessalonians, second to Timothy, to Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, first epistle of Peter, first and third epistles of John. And most of these allusions, I apprehend, will be allowed manifest. The least considerable seem to be those to the Colossians, Titus, and the Hebrews. And if any think, likewise, the agreement between Ignatius and some of the other books not material, I shall not contend about it. Every one is now able to judge for himself. But I think, there are some references to the greatest part of these books, which will not be disputed.

And besides, here are terms used by him, importing a collection of the gospels, and of the epistles of the apostles, and of the books of the New Testament in general.

CHAP. VI.

ST. POLYCARP. HIS HISTORY.

THE character and age of Polycarp, and the genuineness of his remaining epistle to the Philippians, will appear from some passages of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul. These passages will also serve to show at the same time the age, and consequently the authority, of Irenæus himself, and the value of his testimony, when we shall come to make use of it.

Irenæus^a says in his excellent work against all heresies :
 ‘ And Polycarp teaches the same things, who was not only
 ‘ taught by the apostles, and had conversed with many who
 ‘ had seen Christ, but was also by the apostles appointed
 ‘ bishop of the church of Smyrna in Asia. Whom also I
 ‘ saw in my early age ; (for he lived long, and at a great age
 ‘ had a glorious and splendid martyrdom :) I say, Polycarp
 ‘ always taught these things, which he had learned from
 ‘ the apostles, which he delivered to the church, and which
 ‘ alone are true. To this bear witness all the churches in
 ‘ Asia, and they who to this time have succeeded Polycarp ;

^a L. 3. c. 3. sect. 4. Edit. Mass. et apud Euseb. H. E. l. iv. cap. 14.

‘ that he is a more credible and sure witness of the truth
 ‘ than Valentinus and Marcion, and other authors of cor-
 ‘ rupt opinions. Who also, when he came to Rome in ^b the
 ‘ time of Anicetus, converted many of the before-mentioned
 ‘ heretics to the church of God, declaring that to be the one
 ‘ and only truth which had been received from the apostles,
 ‘ and was delivered by the church. And there ^c are those
 ‘ who have heard him say, that John, the disciple of the
 ‘ Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus
 ‘ already in the bath, came out again in haste without
 ‘ bathing, saying to those who were with him : “ Let us flee
 ‘ hence, lest the bath should fall while Cerinthus the
 ‘ enemy of the truth is within.” And Polycarp himself,
 ‘ Marcion once coming in his way, and saying to him, “ Do
 ‘ you own me ?” he answered : “ I own you to be the first-
 ‘ born of Satan.” There is also a most excellent epistle
 ‘ of Polycarp, written to the Philippian ; from which they
 ‘ who are willing, and are concerned for their own salva-
 ‘ tion, may learn both the character of his faith, and the
 ‘ doctrine of the truth.’

This passage has been transcribed by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical^d History, who immediately adds : ‘ Poly-

^b The occasion of Polycarp’s journey to Rome is said to be some controversy about the time of keeping Easter. See Euseb. H. E. l. 4. c. 14. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. c. 17. But learned men are not agreed about the time of it. It must be determined by that of Anicetus being bishop of Rome. Bishop Pearson, as he places the bishopric of Anicetus in the beginning of the reign of Antoninus the pious, places this journey accordingly about the year 142. Oper. Post. Diss. ii. c. 14. Others in 153. Basnage, Ann. 153. sect. 64. Others in 158, or 160. See Pagi Crit. 165. n. v. Du Pin, Bibl. Polycarpe.

^c The same story is told with different circumstances by Epiphanius, H. 30. c. 24. But the truth of it has been sometimes called in question. It is observable, that Irenæus, though personally acquainted with Polycarp, does not say that he had it himself from him ; but that there were some who had heard him say as much : *και ειςιν οι ακηκοοτες αυτε*. It is not at all likely that the apostle John should go to a public bath. Epiphanius, or whoever formed the story, as related by him, saw this impropriety ; and therefore says, that ‘ John was moved by the Spirit to go ‘ thither.’ *Ηναγκασθη ὑπο τῶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματος προελθειν ἕως τῶ βαλανεῖο*. And Theodoret says, that ‘ John went thither because of an indisposition he hap-
 ‘ pened to labour under :’ *συνεβη γαρ και αυτον ἐν ἀρρώστιαν χρῆσθαι τῷ βαλανεῖῳ*. Theod. H. F. l. 2. c. 3. Irenæus and Theodoret say, it was Cerinthus : Epiphanius, that it was Ebion, who was in the bath. And there are other different circumstances in the relations of this matter, and also other objections against this whole story, which may be seen in Lampe, Prolegom. de Vit. Joann. Evang. lib. 1. cap. v. n. 1, 2. to whom I refer. And indeed some of the ancients who mention it speak of it only as an uncertain report, particularly Theodoret, before quoted. *Τῶτον, ὡς φασιν, ὁ θεσπεσιος Ἰωαννης ὁ ευαγγελιστης ληομενον θειασαμενος*. κ. λ. ubi supra.

^d L. iv. cap. 14.

‘ carp, in the forementioned epistle to the Philippians, which is still extant, has made use of some testimonies from the first epistle of Peter.’

Irenæus also, in a ^e letter to Florinus, who had embraced the errors of Valentinus, has these words: ‘ Those opinions the presbyters before us, who also conversed with the apostles, have not delivered to you. For I saw you, when I was very young, in the lower Asia with Polycarp— For I better remember the affairs of that time, than those which have lately happened; the things which we learn in our childhood growing up with the soul, and uniting themselves to it. Insomuch that I can tell the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and taught, and his going out and coming in, and the manner of his life, and the form of his person, and the discourses he made to the people; and how he related his conversation with John, and others who had seen the Lord; and how he related their sayings, and what he had heard from them concerning the Lord; both concerning his miracles and his doctrine, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the Word of Life: all which Polycarp related agreeable to the scriptures. These things I then, through the mercy of God toward me, diligently heard and attended to, recording them not on paper, but upon my heart. And through the grace of God I continually renew the remembrance of them. And I can affirm, in the presence of God, that if this blessed and apostolical presbyter had heard any such thing, he would have cried out, and stopped his ears, and, according to his custom, would have said: Good God, to what times hast thou reserved me, that I should hear such things! And he would have fled from the place in which he was sitting or standing, when he heard such words. And as much may be perceived from his epistles, which he sent to neighbouring churches, establishing them; or to some of the brethren, instructing and admonishing them.’

We have now seen in Irenæus Polycarp’s age and character, particular mention of his letters to the Philippians and other churches, and to some of the brethren or particular persons.

Eusebius, speaking of those who flourished in the time of Trajan, as Ignatius and Papias,^f says: ‘ At that time flourished in Asia Polycarp, disciple of the apostles, who re-

^e The letter itself is not extant. But Eusebius has preserved a fragment of it, L. v. c. 20.

^f H. E. l. 3. c. 36.

‘ceived the bishopric of the church in Smyrna from the
‘eye-witnesses and ministers of the Lord.’

St. Jerom in his book ^g of *Illustrious Men* says : ‘ Polycarp, the disciple of John the apostle, and by him ordained bishop of Smyrna, was the prince of all Asia. Forasmuch as he had seen and been taught by some of the apostles, and those who had seen the Lord.—Afterwards, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus and L. Aurelius Commodus, in the fourth persecution after Nero, he was condemned to the flames at Smyrna, the proconsul being present, and all the people in the amphitheatre demanding his death. He wrote to the Philippians a very useful epistle, which to this day is read in the assembly of Asia.’

His martyrdom happened, according to bishop^h Pearson, who supposes he suffered under Antoninus the pious, in the year 148 : according to Du Pin, Tillemont, and many other learned men, in the year 167, or thereabouts, in the seventh year of Marcus Antoninus the philosopher : according to Basnage,ⁱ in the year 169, which was also^k archbishop Usher’s opinion. These latter opinions seem to me much nearer the truth than bishop Pearson’s, because Eusebius and Jerom place it in the time of Marcus Antoninus : though to determine the exact year of this martyrdom is very difficult, as^l Pagi has observed.

So I said in the first edition. I must now add, that^m there is an ancient inscription, which very much favours Pearson’s argument for the early date of St. Polycarp’s martyrdom.

We have the relation of his martyrdom in a letter of the church of Smyrna, to the church of Philadelphia and other churches. In this relation Polycarp says to the proconsul : ‘ Eighty and six years have I now served Christ.’ Understand this of his life ; and, according to every calculation of the time of his death, he lived a good while in the first century. Understand it of his christianity, asⁿ Tillemont does, and being martyred, as he says, in the year 166, his conversion to christianity happened in the year 80. Understand it of his serving Christ in the ministry ; and he was bishop of Smyrna from the year 84, according^o to Basnage. He is thought by many to be the angel of the

^g Cap. 13.

^h Op. Post. Diss. ii. c. 15, 16, 17.

ⁱ Ann. 169. sect. vi. et seq.

^k Vid. Not. ad Cap. xi. Ep.

Polyc. ad Philip.

^l Critic. in Bar. 167. sect. 4, 5.

^m See Chishull’s Travels, p. 11.

ⁿ Mem. E. T. 2. Part 2.

Polycarp, Art. 1.

^o Annal. 84. sect. 3. 169 sect. 12.

church of Smyrna, to whom the epistle in the Revelation is sent.

But though we should not be able precisely to settle the time of Polycarp's birth, or death, it is evident from the testimonies here alleged, that he was a disciple of John; appointed bishop of Smyrna by him, if not also by some other apostles joining with him therein; and that he had conversed with several who had seen the Lord.

Irenæus assures us, Polycarp had written divers letters. The loss of the writings of such a person cannot but be lamented. And I think it somewhat likely, that Eusebius and Jerom had seen nothing of his, beside the epistle to the Philippians.

There is scarce any doubt or question among learned men about the genuineness of this epistle of Polycarp, though there have been exceptions taken to a passage or two of it, as if they were additions and interpolations. Indeed, the epistle we still have well answers to the apostolical character of Polycarp himself, and agrees with the character given of his epistle by Irenæus, and the observation of Eusebius, that he had therein quoted the first epistle of Peter, and not the second. It has also the passages expressly quoted from it^p by Eusebius. It ought therefore to be received and respected as his, without hesitation.

It is certain this epistle was written after the death of Ignatius, and, as is generally supposed, soon after it. Basnage^q indeed denies that there is any proof of this. However I shall place it here in the year next after the death of Ignatius, A. D. 108.

The former and larger part of this epistle we have in its original Greek. The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth sections (of which there are thirteen in the whole) are now extant only in an ancient Latin version, which is entire, and contains the whole epistle.

The Relation of the Martyrdom of Polycarp, written by the church of Smyrna, of which he was bishop, is an excellent piece; which may be read with pleasure by the English reader in the archbishop of Canterbury's Collection of the apostolical Fathers. As there are in it some quotations of the books of the New Testament, or references to them, I shall give an account of it when I have made my collections out of Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians. The greatest part of that relation is inserted by

^p H. E. l. 3. c. 36. p. 108.

^q Annal. 110. sect. 4, 6.

Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical^r History; and it^s is preserved elsewhere entire.

There are some fragments called Responsiones, ascribed to St. Polycarp; in which the four evangelists, and the characters of their gospels, are distinctly mentioned. These fragments were first published by Feuarentius in his Irenæus, from Victor of Capua, a writer of the sixth century, and have been since several times republished by^t others. But we have already observed it to be somewhat likely, that there was nothing remaining of Polycarp in the time of Eusebius and Jerom, beside his epistle to the Philippians. Du Pin^u says plainly, there is a good deal of reason to think these fragments are supposititious. And our most reverend Metropolitan,^v having observed that, beside the great distance of Victor Capuanus, the first collector of them from the time of Polycarp, he has given, upon some other occasions, manifest proofs of his little care and judgment in distinguishing the works of the ancient fathers who lived any long time before him; and that the passages themselves ascribed to St Polycarp, are little agreeable to the apostolical age, concludes: ‘All these considerations have justly restrained learned men from giving any credit to those fragments, or from receiving them as belonging in any wise to so ancient an author.’ They will therefore be no farther taken notice of here. I proceed to consider the testimonies of the only remaining piece of this father.

In St. Polycarp’s short epistle to the Philippians are many texts of the New Testament, though but few books cited, or expressly named. However, of these in the first place.

Books of the New Testament quoted by Polycarp.

N. T.

I. 1 Cor. vi. 2. “Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?”

POLYCARP.

I. Ch. xi. ‘Do^w we not know that the saints shall judge the world? as Paul teaches.’

^r L. iv. c. 15.
Martyr. et alibi.
T. 2. p. 203.

^s Apud Patr. Apost. Cotel. v. ii. Ruinart, Act.

^t Ap. Grabe, Irenæ. p. 205. et Patres Apost.

^u Il y a bien de l'apparence, que ce sont des choses supposées. Bibl. Eccl. en Polycarpe.

^v Discourse con-

cerning the treatises of his collection. Ch. 3. sect. 14.

^w An nescimus, quia sancti mundum judicabunt? sicut Paulus docet.

N. T.

II. Eph. iv. 26. "Be ye^x angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath."

POLYCARP.

II. Ch. xii. 'For I trust that ye are well exercised in the holy scriptures. — As in these scriptures it is^y said: Be ye angry, and sin not. And, Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.'

It is true, the first of these directions is the same with that, Ps. iv. 4, "Stand in awe, and sin not;" which in the Septuagint version is, *Οργιζεσθε, και μη αμαρτανετε*, 'Be 'angry, and sin not.' But as the latter advice is no where in the Old Testament, and both these precepts are together in the epistle to the Ephesians, it seems to me, that Polycarp does expressly refer the Philippian to St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, and calls it scripture. If this be so, then we see, that the writings of the New Testament had now the name of 'sacred writings,' or 'holy scriptures,' and that they were much read by christians in general.

III. Chap. iii. 'For neither I, nor any one like me, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul, who, when absent,^z wrote to you letters, [an epistle, A. B. Wake,] into which if you look, you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith which has been delivered to you.'

Ch. xi. 'But I have neither perceived nor heard any such thing to be in you, among^a whom the blessed Paul laboured, who are in the beginning of his epistle: for he glories in you in all the churches, which then alone knew God.'

In the former of these two passages the original Greek word, which I have rendered 'letters,' is in the plural number. But thereby some understand only an epistle, and so it is rendered by the archbishop in his excellent translation. And it is^b certain that the original word is sometimes used in the plural number for only one epistle. Understand it so here, and we have at least an express testimony for the epistle of Paul to the Philippian. But comparing these two passages together, I am^c apt to think, that by 'epistles' Polycarp intends the epistle to the

^x *Οργιζεσθε, και μη αμαρτανετε: ο ηλιος μη επιδυντω επι τη παροργισμω υμων.*

^y Ut his scripturis dictum est: Irascimini, et nolite peccare. Et, Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram.

^z *Ὁς και απων υμιν εγραψεν επιτολας, εις ας εαν εγκυπτητε, κ. λ.*

^a In quibus laboravit beatus Paulus; qui estis in principio epistolæ ejus. De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis, quæ Deum tunc solæ cognoverunt.

^b Vid. Coteler. in loc.

^c This was the

opinion of Salmeron. Vid. Usser. Notas ad h. l.

Philippians, and also both the epistles to the Thessalonians. For in this last passage he seems to quote these words, 2 Thess. i. 4, "So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God." Nor is it at all unlikely that Polycarp might consider the epistles directly sent to the Thessalonians, as written likewise to the Philippians; they being also in the same province of Macedonia, of which Thessalonica was the capital city.

And though the word in the first passage should be limited to one epistle, that directly to the Philippians, yet this latter passage is so clear for the second to the Thessalonians, that we are in a manner obliged to understand Polycarp to suppose the Philippians concerned in those epistles.

Words of the New Testament, and allusions, without the name of the book or writer.

N. T.

IV. Matth. v. 3. "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. v. 7. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. 10. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

Matth. vii. 1. "Judge not, that ye be not judged. 2. And with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

Luke vi. 20. "Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God. 36. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful. 37. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged. Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. 38. For with the same measure that ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

POLYCARP.

IV. Ch. ii. 'But^d remembering what the Lord said teaching: Judge not, that ye be not judged: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: be ye merciful, that ye may obtain mercy: with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And, Blessed are the poor, and they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of God.'

^d Μνημονευοντες δε ὡν ειπεν ὁ Κυριος διδασκων. κ. λ.

N. T.

V. Matth. v. 44. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."

VI. Matth. vi. 12. "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. 14. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. 15. But if ye forgive not," &c.

VII. Matth. vi. 13. "And lead us not into temptation."^e

VIII. Matth. xxvi. 41. "The^s spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." See also Mark xiv. 38.

I have put down in the margin the original words of these two last passages, and of the corresponding texts in Matthew, to be compared as a specimen of the agreement between the originals. It would be too tedious to do so all along, without some special reason. But in the other places there is also a like agreement in the originals with what appears in the translations.

We have in divers of these passages words of our Lord, with a mark of reference, 'The Lord hath said,' though no historian or evangelist is expressly named.

N. T.

IX. Acts ii. 24. "Whomⁱ God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death."

X. Rom. xiii. 9. "And if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, name-

POLYCARP.

V. Ch. xii. 'And pray for those that persecute you, and hate you, and for the enemies of the cross.'

VI. Ch. vi. 'Not severe in judgment, knowing that we are all debtors in point of sin: if therefore we pray the Lord, that he will forgive us, we ought also to forgive.'

VII. Ch. vii. 'With supplication beseeching the all-seeing God,^f not to lead us into temptation.'

VIII. Ch. vii. 'As the Lord^h hath said: The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.'

I have put down in the margin the original words of these two last passages, and of the corresponding texts in Polycarp, to be compared as a specimen of the agreement between the originals. It would be too tedious to do so all along, without some special reason. But in the other places there is also a like agreement in the originals with what appears in the translations.

We have in divers of these passages words of our Lord, with a mark of reference, 'The Lord hath said,' though no historian or evangelist is expressly named.

POLYCARP.

IX. Ch. i. 'Whom^k God hath raised, having loosed the pains of hell.'

X. Ch. iii. 'Led on by love toward God, and Christ, and toward our neighbour: for if any man has these

^e Καὶ μὴ εἰσενεγκῆς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν. ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμὸν.

^f Μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν

^g Το μὲν πνεῦμα προθυμὸν, ἢ δὲ σαρξ ἀσθενής.

^h Καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα προθυμὸν, ἢ δὲ σαρξ ἀσθενής.

ⁱ Ὁν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησε, λύσας τὰς ὠδύνας τῆ θανάτου.

^k Ὁν ἐγείρειν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς ὠδύνας τῆ ἀδῆ.

N. T.

ly, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 10. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.”

XI. Rom. xiv. 10. “We¹ shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. 12. So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.”

In 2 Cor. v. 10, is much the same sense, and some of the same words. But he who compares the places together will perceive this is the place which Polycarp had an eye to particularly.

N. T.

XII. 1 Cor. v. xi. “But now I have written unto you, not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, with such a one, no not to eat.”

XIII. 1 Cor. vi. 9. “Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, 10. Shall inherit the kingdom of God.”

XIV. 2 Cor. iv. 14. “Knowingⁿ that he which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus.”

XV. 2 Cor. vi. 7. —“by the armour of righteousness.”

XVI. 2 Cor. viii. 21.

POLYCARP.

things, he has fulfilled the law of righteousness: for he that has love is far from all sin.’

XI. Ch. vi. ‘And^m must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and every one give an account for himself.’

POLYCARP.

XII. Ch. xi. ‘If any one does not keep himself from covetousness, he shall be polluted with idolatry, and shall be judged as if he were a Gentile.’

XIII. Ch. v. ‘And neither fornicators, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, shall inherit the kingdom of God.’

XIV. Ch. ii. ‘But^o he who raised up him from the dead, will raise us up also, if we do his will.’

XV. Ch. iv. ‘Let us arm ourselves with the armour of righteousness.’

XVI. Chap. vi. ‘Always^p

¹ Παντες γαρ παρασησομεθα τω βηματι τω Χριστω· Αρα εν εκατος ημων περι εαυτε λογον δωσει Θεω.

^m Και παντας δε παρασηναι τω βηματι τω Χριστω, και εκατον υπερ εαυτε λογον δειναι.

ⁿ Ειδοτες οτι ο εγειρας τον Κυριον Ιησεν, και ημας δια Ιησε εγειρει.

^o Ο δε εγειρας αυτον εκ νεκρων, και ημας εγειρει.

^p Προνοωντες αι τω καλω ενωπιον Θεω και ανθρωπων.

N. T.

“Providing^a for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but in the sight of men.”

Part of this advice is given also, Rom. xii. 17, “Provide things honest in the sight of all men.” But any one may see he rather refers to the text in the Corinthians.

This also, with many other places, may afford proof of the first christian writers citing, or referring to, texts of scripture by memory, without looking upon them. For which reason Polycarp says, ‘what is honest,’ in the singular number, instead of ‘honest things.’

N. T.

XVII. Gal. i. 1. “But by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.”

XVIII. Gal. iv. 26. “For Jerusalem, which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all.”

XIX. Gal. vi. 7. “Be^r not deceived, God is not mocked.”

XX. Ephes. ii. 8, 9. “For^t by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God, not of works.”

XXI. Philip. ii. 10. “That at the name of Jesus every knee^v should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. 11. And that every tongue should confess.”

^a Προνοημενοι καλα, η μονον ενωπιον Κυριω, αλλα και ενωπιον ανθρωπων.

^r Μη πλανασθε, Θεωσ η μυκτηριζεται.

η μυκτηριζεται.
—εκ εξ εργαων.

εργων.

^v Παν γωνυ καμψη επερανων και επιγειων—και πασα γλωσσα εξομολογησεται.

επιγεια' ω πασα πνοη λατρνευι.

POLYCARP.

providing what is honest in the sight of God and men.’

POLYCARP.

XVII. Ch. xii. ‘Who shall believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his Father, who raised him from the dead.’

XVIII. Ch. iii. —‘edified in the faith delivered to you, which is the mother of you all.’

Perhaps, says Dr. Young, it should be ‘us all.’

XIX. Ch. v. ‘Knowing^s therefore that God is not mocked.’

XX. Ch. i. ‘Knowing,^u that by grace ye are saved, not of works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ.’

XXI. Ch. ii. ‘To whom all things are made subject, that are in^w heaven, and that are in earth, whom every living creature serves.’

^s Ειδότες εν οτι Θεωσ

^u Τη γαρ χαριτι εσε σεσωσμενοι δια της πιτεωσ

^w Ειδότες οτι χαριτι εσε σεσωσμενοι, εκ εξ

N. T.

Ver. 16. "That I may rejoice in the day of Christ, that I have not run in vain."

XXII. Col. i. 28. "That we may present every man perfect in Christ."

XXIII. 1 Thess. v. 17. "Pray^x without ceasing."

Ver. 22. "Abstain^z from all appearance of evil."

XXIV. 2 Thess. iii. 15. "Yet^b count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother."

XXV. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. "I exhort therefore that supplications, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and all that are in authority."

XXVI. 1 Tim. vi. 7. "For^d we brought nothing with us into this world, and it is certain, that we can carry nothing out.—10. For the love of money is the root of all evil."

Here Polycarp transposeth the order of the words. He used his memory.

XXVII. In the fifth chapter of this epistle Polycarp adviseth that deacons should not be 'double tongued,' as St.

POLYCARP.

Ch. ix. 'Being persuaded that all these have not run in vain.' Speaking of Paul, and the other apostles, and some others.

XXII. Ch. xii. 'That your fruit may be manifest in all, and ye may be perfect in him.'

XXIII. Ch. iv. 'Praying^y without ceasing for all.'

Ch. ii. 'Abstain^a from all evil.'

XXIV. Ch. xi. Giving advice about one who had offended, he says: 'Be ye also moderate in this, and do not^c count such as enemies, but call them back as suffering and erring members.'

XXV. Ch. xii. 'Pray for all the saints: pray also for kings, and powers, and princes.'

XXVI. Ch. iv. 'But^e the love of money is the beginning of all troubles. Knowing therefore, that as we brought nothing into the world, so neither can we carry any thing out.'

^x Αἰαλειπτως προσευχεσθε. περι παντων.

^a Abstinetes vos ab omni malo. αλλα νεθετετε ως αδελφον.

^d Ουδεν γαρ εισηνεκαμεν εις τον κοσμον, οηλον οτι εδε εξενεγκειν τι δυναμεθα. 10. Ριζα γαρ παντων των κακων εστιν η φιλαργυρια.

^e Αρχη δε παντων χαλεπων φιλαργυρια. Ειδοτες εν οτι εδεν εισηνεκαμεν εις τον κοσμον, αλλ' εδε εξενεγκειν τι εχομεν.

^y Εντυχανεσας αιαλειπτως

^z Απο παντος ειδος πονηρης απεχεσθε.

^b Και μη ως εχθρον ηγεισθε,

^c Et non sicut inimicos tales ex-

istimetis, sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos revocate.

Paul does, 1 Tim. iii. 8. And in that and the following chapter Polycarp gives divers other directions to presbyters and deacons, resembling those in the third chapter of the first epistle to Timothy: but they need not, I apprehend, be transcribed in this place.

N. T.

XXVIII. 2 Tim. ii. 11. “It is^f a faithful saying, 12. If we suffer, we shall also reign with him.”

XXIX. 2 Tim. iv. 10. “For^h Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world.”

XXX. Heb. iv. 12. “And is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. 13. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.”

The author of the epistle to the Hebrews useth in this place metaphorical expressions, borrowed from sacrifices, which were flayed, divided, and laid open from the neck to the rump, downwards. Polycarp here says, that ‘widdows are to be free^k from all faults, knowing that they are the altars of God, and that he sees——’ This, together with the resemblance of expression, renders it probable, that Polycarp alludes to this text in the epistle to the Hebrews.

Again: Polycarp, Ch. xii. ‘Now^l the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he himself our everlasting high priest, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, build you up in faith and truth.’ Compare Heb. iv. 14; vi. 20; vii. 3.

^f *Εἰ υπομενομεν, και συμβασιλευσομεν.*
λευσομεν αυτω.

^h *Αγαπησας τον νυν αιωνα.*

^l *Ου γαρ τον νυν ηγαπησαν αιωνα.*

^k *Και παντος κακῃ, γνωσκῃσας οτι εἰσι θυσιαστηρια Θεῷ, και οτι παντα ἡμων σκοπεῖται [A. B. Wake reads πάντα μορμωσκοπεῖται, and translates it, ‘sees all blemishes.’ Vid. Usser. Not. in h. l.] και λεληθεν αυτον εδεν, ετε λογισμων, ετε εννοιων, ετε τι των κρυπτων της καρδιας.*

^l *Deus autem et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et ipse sempiternus pontifex, Dei Filius, Christus Jesus, ædificet vos in fide et caritate.*

POLYCARP.

XXVIII. Ch. v. ‘According as he has promised us, that he will raise us up from the dead, and that if we walk worthy of him, we shall also reign^g with him.’

XXIX. Ch. ix. ‘Forⁱ they loved not this present world.’

XXX. Ch. iv. ‘Knowing that he sees all things, and that nothing is hid from him, not the reasonings, nor the intents, nor any secrets of the heart.’

N. T.

XXXI. 1 Pet. i. 8.
“Whom^m having not seen ye love: in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory.”

Ver. 13. “Wherefore, gird up the loins of your mind, be sober.”

Ver. 21. “Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory.”

XXXII. 1 Pet. ii. 11.
“I beseech you,^o abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.”

Ver. 12. “Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles, that whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.”

Ver. 17. “Love^q the brotherhood.”

Ver. 22. “Who^s did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. 24. Who his ownself bare our sins in his own body on the tree.”

POLYCARP.

XXXI. Ch. i. ‘Inⁿ whom, though you see him not, ye believe, and believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory.’

Ch. ii. ‘Wherefore, girding up the loins, serve the Lord in fear and truth—having believed in him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave him glory, and a seat at his right hand.’

XXXII. Ch. v. Polycarp says, ‘young men ought to restrain themselves from all evil,^p because every lust wars against the spirit.’

Ch. x. ‘Having your conversation unreprouvable among the Gentiles, that by your good works both ye yourselves may receive praise, and the Lord may not be blasphemed through you.’

Ch. x. ‘Lovers^r of the brotherhood.’

Ch. viii. ‘Let us, therefore, without ceasing, steadfastly adhere to our hope,^t which is Jesus Christ: who bare our sins in his own bo-

^m ‘Ὁν ἔκ εἰδοτες αγαπατε, εἰς ὃν ἀρτι μὴ ὄρωντες, πιστευοντες δε, αγαλλιασθε χαρὰ ἀνεκκλαητῶ καὶ δεδοξασμενῆ. ⁿ Εἰς ὃν ἔκ ἰδοντες πιστευετε, πιστευοντες δε αγαλλιασθε χαρὰ ἀνεκκλαητῶ καὶ δεδοξασμενῆ.

^o Παρακαλῶ—ἀπεχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἰτινες σρατευονται κατα της ψυχης.

^p ‘Ὅτι πασα ἐπιθυμία κατα τῶ πνευματος σρατενεταί.

^q Τὴν ἀδελφοτητα αγαπατε.

^r Fraternitatis amatores. ^s ‘Ὅς ἄμαρτιαν ἔκ ἐποιησεν, εἰς εὔρεθῆ δολος ἐν τῷ σωματι αὐτῶ. 24. ‘Ὅς τας ἄμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτος ἀνηγεκεν ἐν τῷ σωματι αὐτῶ ἐπὶ τὸ ξυλον.

^t ‘Ὅς ἀνηγεκεν ἡμῶν τας ἄμαρτίας τῶ ἰδίῳ σωματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξυλον ὅς ἄμαρτιαν ἔκ ἐποιησεν, εἰς εὔρεθῆ δολος ἐν τῷ σωματι αὐτῶ.

N. T.

XXXIII. 1 Pet. iii. 9. “Not^u rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing.”

Ver. 14. “And if ye suffer for righteousness’ sake, happy are ye.”

XXXIV. 1 Pet. iv. 5. “Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.”

Ver. 7. “Be ye therefore sober, and^w watch unto prayer.”

XXXV. 1 Pet. v. 5. “Yea, all of you be subject one to another.”

XXXVI. 1 John ii. 7. “The old commandment is the word, which ye have heard from the beginning.”

XXXVII. 1 John iv. 3. “And^y every spirit, that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof you have heard,” &c.

XXXVIII. Jude, ver. 3. “——^a earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints.”

^u Μη αποδίδοντες κακον αντι κακου, η λαιδωριαν αντι λαιδωριας.

^v Μη αποδίδοντες κακον αντι κακου, η λαιδωριαν αντι λαιδωριας.

^w Και νηψατε εις τας προσευχας.

^x Νηφοντες εις προσευχας.

^y Και παν πνευμα ο μη ομολογει τον Ιησυν Χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα, εκ τω Θεω ηκ εστι, και τωτο εστι το τω αντιχριστω. κ. λ.

^z Ηαυ γαρ ος αν μη ομολογη Ιησυν Χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθηναι αντιχριστος εστι.

^a Επαγωνξισθαι τη απαξ παραδοθειση τοις αγιοις πιστει.

^b Οικοδομεισθαι εις την δοθεισαν ημιν πιστιν.

POLYCARP.

dy on the tree: who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.’

XXXIII. Ch. ii. ‘Not^v rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing.’

Ch. viii. ‘But suffered all for us, that we might live through [in] him. Let us therefore imitate his patience: and if we suffer for him, we shall glorify him.’

XXXIV. Ch. ii. ‘Who comes [as] the judge of the quick and the dead.’

Ch. vii. ‘Watching^x unto prayer.’

XXXV. Ch. x. ‘Be all of you subject one to another.’

XXXVI. Ch. vii. ‘Let us return to the word that was delivered to us from the beginning.’

XXXVII. Ch. vii. ‘For^z whoever confesseth not, that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is Antichrist.’

XXXVIII. Ch. iii. ‘To edify^b yourselves in the faith delivered [given] to you.’

XXXIX. He has this declaration, which seems to respect the writings of the N. T. in general, ‘And^c whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says there is neither resurrection nor judgment, he is the first-born of Satan.’ And we before saw the epistle to the Ephesians referred to under the term of ‘holy scriptures.’ Numb. II.

XL. Thus I have given (omitting however some lesser things) a large and distinct account of Polycarp’s testimony to the writings of the N. T. So many exhortations in the words of Christ and his apostles, in so short a letter, are a lively evidence of the respect which christians had for these books, and that these things were deeply engraved on their memories. For it is from thence chiefly, as I apprehend, Polycarp borrowed these expressions, without looking into the books themselves.

XLI. We have then in St. Polycarp quotations of the first epistle to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Ephesians and Philippians, and both the epistles to the Thessalonians. Words of our Lord, found in St. Matthew’s and St. Luke’s gospels, are quoted as spoken by him. And beside these, we have references, which may be reckoned undoubted, to the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles to the Romans, first and second to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, first and second to the Thessalonians, first and second to Timothy, first of St. Peter, and first of St. John, and a probable reference to the epistle to the Hebrews. Those to the epistle to the Colossians, and the epistle of St. Jude, are only doubtful.

The respect for the books of the New Testament appears in the great number of allusions to them, and in some particular expressions, in which they are called ‘sacred scriptures,’ and ‘oracles of the Lord.’

^c Και ὅς αν μεθοδενη τα λογια τα Κυρια προς τας ιδίας επιθυμιας, και λεγη αιητε ανατασιν μητε κρισιν ειναι, οὔτος πρωτοτοκος επι τα Σατανα. c. vii

CHAP. VII.

The relation of St. Polycarp's martyrdom; and general observations on the testimony of the Apostolical Fathers.

I NOW proceed to give a brief account of the notice taken of the books of the N. T. by the church of Smyrna, in their epistle concerning Polycarp's martyrdom. Though it was not written until a considerable time after the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, (as we have before shown,) yet it will very properly stand here. For the testimony of Polycarp is also the testimony of his church: and their testimony is likewise to be considered as his, the epistle having been written presently after his death.

I. sect. 1. They say at the beginning: 'All things that went before were done, that^a the Lord might show us from above [or from the very first] a martyrdom according to the gospel. For he expected to be delivered up, as the Lord also did, that we likewise might be imitators of him.'

Undoubtedly here is a reference to the history of our Lord's sufferings, and to his being betrayed and apprehended, as shown at the latter end of the several gospels. But as Polycarp had retired from Smyrna for a while, and was taken in the place of his retreat; I think it likely, that there is also a reference to Matt. x. 23, "But when they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another." And sect. 4, speaking of a christian who had offered himself to the proconsul, and afterwards was affrighted at the sight of the wild beasts, they say: 'We do not commend^b those who offer themselves: forasmuch as the gospel teaches us no such thing.' Referring perhaps to the same text, as well as to other things: however, in both these places calling the history of Jesus Christ and his doctrine 'the gospel.'

II. sect. 7. They say: 'The serjeants and other officers who went to look for Polycarp, went^c with their usual arms, as against a thief.' Referring perhaps to Matt. xxvi. 55.

III. sect. 2. They make use of the words of I Cor. ii. 9. 'And with the eyes of the soul looked to those good things

^a ἵνα ἡμῖν ὁ Κύριος ἀνωθεν ἐπιδείξῃ το κατὰ το εὐαγγελίων μαρτυρίον.

^b Ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οὕτως ἕτασκει το εὐαγγελίον.

^c Μετὰ των συνηθων ὅσλων, ὡς ἐπὶ λητῆν τρεχόντες.

‘ which are reserved for those that endure, which neither ear has heard, nor eye seen, nor have entered into the heart of man.’ And though the like sense is also in Isa. lxiv. 4, yet I think it plain they refer to the epistle to the Corinthians.

IV. sect. 10. There seems to be a reference to Rom. xiii. 1, and Tit. iii. 1.

V. sect. 14. Polycarp, in a prayer of his there inserted, says : ‘ I praise and glorify thee^d through the eternal high priest, Jesus Christ, thy well-beloved Son.’ This character may be thought to be borrowed from the epistle to the Hebrews, where Christ is said to be “ made an high priest for ever,” ch. vi. 20, and to have an “ unchangeable priesthood,” ch. vii. 24. Indeed, in the Greek copy of this epistle in Cotelerius, this place stands thus : ‘ I^e glorify thee with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ.’ But in Eusebius it is as I have given the place at first. And with him the old Latin version, published by Usher, agrees in the main, saying : ‘ By^f the eternal high priest, the all-powerful Jesus Christ.’

VI. sect. 17. When they say, ‘ Christ^g suffered, who was without spot, for sinners,’ they may be thought to refer to 1 Pet. iii. 19. But I think the place not very material. Nor are those words in Eusebius, or his translator Rufinus, or the ancient Latin version, as Usher observes.

VII. In the salutation at the beginning of this epistle are these words : ‘ Mercy^h and peace, and love from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied.’ This is very agreeable to Jude, ver. 2, “ Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplied.” However, compare 1 Pet. i. 2, “ Grace unto you and peace be multiplied.” 2 Pet. i. 2, “ Grace and peace be multiplied unto you.”

VIII. Any one is able to add this testimony to that of Polycarp in his epistle, of which we there gave a summary view. The principal thing to be observed here is, that the church of Smyrna has more plainly given the title of ‘ gospel’ to the history of our Lord by the evangelists :ⁱ and perhaps in the^k second place, where that word was used by them, they intend the New Testament in general. They

^d Δια τε αιωνια αρχιερωσ Ιησθ Χρισθ. Apud Euseb. H. E. p. 133. D.

^e Συν τω αιωνιω και επερανω Ιησθ Χριστω. ^f Per æternum pontificem omnipotentem Jesum Christum. Vid. Notas Usser in loc. apud Coteler. Patr. Apost.

^g Αρωμον υπερ αμαρτωλων.

^h Ελεος, ειρηνη, και αγαπη απο Θεσ Πατροσ και τε Κυρισ ημων Ιησθ Χρισθ πληθυνθειη.

ⁱ Numb. I.

^k In sect. 4. in

the remark on Numb. I.

may be reckoned likewise to give some confirmation to the supposition that St. Polycarp was acquainted¹ with the epistle to the Hebrews.

IX. Having now gone through all the apostolical fathers, it will not be disagreeable to conclude our extracts out of them with some general observations. Le Clerc's Dissertation on the Four Gospels, already mentioned, will afford us several. He speaks of these fathers in this order: Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp. I shall however put down his observations in the order I have quoted these writers, which is not very different from his. I shall take no particular notice here of the fragment called St. Clement's Second Epistle; because we have shown it does not belong to this time.

1. 'Barnabas,' says^m Le Clerc, 'has many more passages out of the Old Testament than the New: but then almost throughout that epistle he argues against the Jews, against whom it was in vain to allege the New.'

I think there is another very obvious reason of this, arising from the time and character of the writer, as I have shown in my remarks upon him.

2. 'Clementⁿ has more passages out of the Old Testament, and oftener alludes to it than the New. But yet he quotes this more than once, and often refers to it.—Indeed, he does not mention the names of the writers of the New Testament. Nor is it his custom to mention the names of the books or writers of the Old Testament.'

3. 'Hermas^o quotes neither the Old nor the New Testament. The reason is, because he only relates his visions, and delivers precepts as received from angels.'

4. 'Ignatius^p does not quote the Old Testament oftener than the New. Nay, he seems to refer or allude to this oftener than to the other.'

¹ See here Numb. V. and compare it with Polycarp in the foregoing ch. Numb. XXX.

^m Barnabas multo plura habet ex Vetere Testamento quam ex Novo; sed per totam ferme epistolam contra Judæos ratiocinatur; contra quos Novum proferre non potuit, nisi illis ludibrium debere vellet. Dissertat. iii. de Quatuor Evang. p. 543. b.

ⁿ Ex hisce autem [scriptoribus] Clemens sæpius quidem attulit loca deprompta e Vetere Testamento, atque ad id alludit, quam ad libros Novi, ex quo etiam pauciora profert. Sed tamen non semel posterius hoc laudat, nec raro ad id respicit.—Non profert quidem nomina scriptorum Novi Testamenti; sed nec Veteris Librorum aut scriptorum nomina solet proferre. Ibid.

^o Hermas nec Vetis nec Novum Testamentum laudat, quia visiones suas narrat, et præcepta, veluti ab angelis accepta, exponit. Ibid.

^p Ignatius non frequentius laudat Vetis Testamentum quam Novum, atque ad hoc crebrius respicere videtur. Ibid.

Le Clerc speaks of the smaller epistles, the same we have made use of, without any regard to the larger or interpolated, which he utterly rejects. But he speaks modestly. For I think that Ignatius has alluded much oftener to the New Testament than to the Old.

5. ‘ Polycarp¹ has alluded above twenty times to texts of the New Testament, or recited the very words of them, and scarce once refers to any passage of the Old Testament.’

These are Le Clerc’s observations, which appear to me very much to our purpose.

X. I would observe farther, first, that all these are but short pieces. The largest is the Shepherd of Hermas, which is as large as several of the other, and almost as large as all the rest put together. But it was inconsistent with the nature of that work for the writer to quote books.

2. All these pieces, except the Shepherd of Hermas, are epistles written to christians; who, it is likely, needed not at that time to be particularly informed what books they ought to receive; but only to be admonished to attend to the things contained in them, and to maintain their respect for them, as is here often done.

3. Considering the shortness and the nature of these pieces, it is reasonable to suppose that most, or all of these writers, and those they write to, received more books or writings of the New Testament as sacred or canonical, than those expressly named, or clearly alluded to by them. For as these several pieces are short, so they never design to give a list or catalogue of the books, either of the Old or the New Testament, received by christians. All the mention made of either is only occasional. Beside that, we have lost divers letters written by St. Polycarp, both to churches and particular persons. It cannot therefore by any means be concluded that his one remaining epistle to the Philippians gives us full information of all the books received by him. It is most reasonable to suppose, it contains quotations or allusions to a part only of those books which he received and owned, as the rule of christian belief and practice.

4. In the writings of these apostolical fathers, there is all the notice taken of the books of the New Testament that could be expected. Barnabas, though so early a writer, appears to have been acquainted with the gospel of St. Matthew. Clement, writing in the name of the church of

¹ Polycarpus pluries quam vigesies alludit ad loca Novi Testamenti, aut ea verbo tenus laudat: vix semel respicit ad locum Veteris. Ibid.

Rome to the church of Corinth, on occasion of some disension there, desires them to 'take into their hands the 'epistle of the blessed apostle Paul,' written to them; and refers them particularly to a part of that epistle, in which he admonished them against strife and contention. He has likewise in his epistle divers clear and undeniable allusions to St. Paul's epistle written to the church over which he presided, and in whose name he wrote. Not to mention at present other things.

5. Quotations there could not be, as we have often observed, in the book of *Hermas*. But allusions there are to the books of the New Testament, such as were suitable to his design.

6. *Ignatius*, writing to the church of *Ephesus*, takes notice of the epistle of Paul written to them, in which he 'makes mention of them in Christ Jesus.'

7. Lastly, *Polyearp*, writing to the *Philippians*, refers them to the epistle of the 'blessed and renowned Paul,' written to them: if not also, as I imagine, to the epistles sent to the *Thessalonians*, christians of the same province. Not to mention now his express quotations of other books of the New Testament, or his numerous and manifest allusions to them.

8. From these particulars here mentioned, it is apparent that they have not omitted to take notice of any book of the New Testament which, as far as we are able to judge, their design led them to mention. Their silence therefore about any other books can be no prejudice to their genuineness, if we shall hereafter meet with credible testimonies to them. And we may have good reason to believe that these apostolical fathers were some of those persons from whom succeeding writers received that full and satisfactory evidence which they appear to have had concerning the several books of the New Testament.

9. And though I do not here design to sum up the whole evidence given by these writers, from their allusions, and other particulars, but only to mention some general observations; yet it ought to be here remembered that *Ignatius* has made use of terms denoting a code or collection of 'gospels' and 'epistles.'

CHAP. VIII.

EVANGELISTS IN THE REIGN OF TRAJAN.

EUSEBIUS^a in the history of things in the reign of Trajan has this remarkable passage :

‘ Among those who were illustrious at that time was
 ‘ Quadratus, who, together with the daughters of Philip, is
 ‘ said to have enjoyed the gift of prophecy. And beside
 ‘ these there were at that time many other eminent persons,
 ‘ who^b had the first rank in the succession of the apostles :
 ‘ who, being the worthy disciples of such men, every where
 ‘ built up the churches, the foundations of which had been
 ‘ laid by the apostles ; extending likewise their preaching
 ‘ yet farther, and scattering abroad the salutary seeds of
 ‘ the kingdom of heaven all over the world. For many of
 ‘ the disciples of that time, whose souls the Divine Word
 ‘ had inspired with an ardent love of philosophy, first ful-
 ‘ filled our Saviour’s precept, distributing their substance
 ‘ to the necessitous. Then travelling abroad, they per-
 ‘ formed the work of evangelists, being ambitious to preach
 ‘ Christ,^c and deliver the scripture of the divine gospels.’

I presume I have not improperly placed this passage here. Eusebius, as I just said, is writing the history of things under Trajan. In the foregoing chapter he had given an account of Ignatius and his writings, who died in the tenth of Trajan. And in the two following chapters he speaks of Clement of Rome, and Papias. Though therefore Eusebius does not always place things in his Ecclesiastical History in the exact order of time ; yet I think it must be allowed, that he was fully persuaded, that before the end of the reign of Trajan, who died in 117, the gospels were well known, and collected together : and they who preached the doctrine of Christ to those who had not heard it, carried the gospels with them, and delivered them to their converts. They must therefore have been before this for some time in use, and in the highest esteem in the churches planted by the apostles. It must have been no difficult thing at that time to know the genuineness of writings which were of so great authority with them. And

^a H. E. l. 3. c. 37.
 επεχοντες διαδοχης.
 γραφην.

^b Την πρωτην ταξιν της των αποστολων
^c Και την των χειρων εναγγελιων παραδιδουαι

certainly they were well assured of it, or they had not so highly esteemed them. The persons of whom Eusebius here speaks were the immediate successors of the apostles, and had the first rank among them : and they lived a good part of their time in the very first century, as well as St. Ignatius and St. Clement.

There can be, I think, but one exception to my placing this passage here, in the reign of Trajan, at the year 112, which is, that this is not a passage of any ancient writer of this time, but of Eusebius, an author of the fourth century. To which I would answer, that it is reasonable to suppose, Eusebius had good ground, from ancient authors, for what he here says. And that the gospels were before now well known, and in great esteem, and collected together, appears probable from what we ourselves have seen in the apostolical fathers still remaining, particularly in Ignatius. If this does not satisfy, I would add, that I do not intend to bring forward many more passages of Eusebius, or any other writer, in this manner.

CHAP. IX.

PAPIAS.

PAPIAS is placed by Cave^a at the year 110. According to others, he flourished about the year^b 115, or^c 116. How long he lived is uncertain. He is said by some^d to have been a martyr. But as this is not mentioned by Eusebius or Jerom, I think it need not be much regarded. Irenæus^e speaks of him as a hearer of John, and companion of Polycarp; and by John seems to intend the apostle and evangelist.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, has a whole chapter concerning him, beside what he says of him in other places. There is no part of that chapter which we shall not have occasion for at one time or other. I think therefore, though it be long, it will be the shortest course to take it all here at once.

^a Hist. Lit. Papias.

^o Basnage, Ann. P. E. 115. n. 8.

^c Pagi, Crit. in Bar. A. D. 116. Cleric. H. E.

^d Vid. Cave, *ibid.*

^e L. v. c. 33.

‘ There are,’ says^f Eusebius, ‘ five books of Papias, entitled, An Explication of the Oracles of the Lord. These
 ‘ Irenæus makes mention of as the only books written by
 ‘ him, after this manner : “ These things Papias, who was a
 ‘ hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp, an^g ancient
 ‘ man, attests in his fourth book : for there are five books
 ‘ composed by him.” Thus speaks Irenæus. But Papias
 ‘ in the preface of his books does by no means say, that^h
 ‘ he heard or saw any of the holy apostles : but only, that
 ‘ he had received the things concerning the faith from those
 ‘ who were well acquainted with them, which he shows in
 ‘ these words : “ I shall not think much to set down toge-
 ‘ ther with my interpretations, what I have learnedⁱ from
 ‘ the elders, [or presbyters,] and do well remember, con-
 ‘ firming the truth by them. For I took no delight, as most
 ‘ men do, in those that talk a great deal, but in those that
 ‘ teach the truth, nor in those that relate strange precepts,
 ‘ but in them that relate the precepts which the Lord has
 ‘ entrusted us with, and which proceed from the truth it-
 ‘ self. And if at any time I met with one who had con-
 ‘ versed with the elders, I enquired after the sayings of the
 ‘ elders : what Andrew or what Peter said ; or what Phi-
 ‘ lip, what Thomas, or James had said : what John or
 ‘ Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord
 ‘ were wont to say : and what Aristion, or John the pres-
 ‘ byter, disciples of the Lord say : for I was of opinion,
 ‘ that I could not profit so much by books^k as by the
 ‘ living.” Where it is proper to observe, that he twice
 ‘ mentions the name of John ; the former of whom he
 ‘ reckons with Peter, James, Matthew, and the rest of the
 ‘ apostles, manifestly intending the evangelist. Then mak-
 ‘ ing a distinction in his discourse, he places the other John
 ‘ with the others who are not of the number of apostles,
 ‘ putting Aristion before him ; and he expressly calls him
 ‘ presbyter. By which too is shown the truth of their ac-
 ‘ count, who have said, that there were two in Asia of that
 ‘ name ; and that there were two sepulchres at Ephesus,
 ‘ and that each of them are still said to be the sepulchre of

^f H. E. l. 3. c. 39.

^g Ἀρχαίος ἀνηρ.

^h It is therefore still a question, whether Papias was a hearer of John the apostle, as Irenæus seems to intimate, or only of John the elder. See this question considered by Grabe, Spic. T. 2. p. 26, &c. Tillem. Mem. Ec. T. 2. p. 2. St. Papias, Note i. Pagi, Crit. in Baron. 116. n. 5. Basnage, Ann. 115. n. ix. Beausobre, Hist. des Manich. liv. 2. ch. 2. p. 352. Note (2.)

ⁱ Παρα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.
καὶ μνήσης.

^k Ὅσον τα παρα ζωσης φωνης

‘ John. This is worthy of our remark. For it is likely
 ‘ that the Revelation, which goes under the name of John,
 ‘ was seen by the second, if not by the first. This Papias
 ‘ then, of whom we have been speaking, confesseth, that he
 ‘ received the apostles’ sayings from those who conversed
 ‘ with them; and says, that he was a hearer of Aristion, and
 ‘ John the presbyter. And indeed he often mentions them
 ‘ by name, and puts down in his writings the traditions he
 ‘ had received from them. Nor will our mention of these
 ‘ things, I suppose, be judged unprofitable. It will be
 ‘ worth while to add here to the fore-cited words of Papias
 ‘ some other of his passages, in which he mentions some
 ‘ miracles, and other things which had come to him by tra-
 ‘ dition. That Philip the apostle resided with his daugh-
 ‘ ters at Hierapolis, has been shown in some things we have¹
 ‘ already produced. Now we are to observe how Papias,
 ‘ who lived at the same time, mentions a wonderful relation
 ‘ he had received from Philip’s daughters. For he relates,
 ‘ that in his time a dead man was raised to life. He also
 ‘ relates another miracle of Justus surnamed Barsabas :
 ‘ that he drank deadly poison, and by the grace of the
 ‘ Lord suffered no harm. Now that this Justus, after the
 ‘ ascension of our Saviour, was sent forth by the holy apos-
 ‘ tles together with Matthias, and that they prayed, that one
 ‘ of them might be allotted to fill up their number in the
 ‘ room of Judas the traitor, the scripture of the Acts re-
 ‘ lates in this manner, ch. i. 23, 24, “ And they appointed
 ‘ two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus,
 ‘ and Matthias. And they prayed, and said.” And other
 ‘ things the same writer has related, which he received by
 ‘ unwritten tradition, and some strange parables of our Sa-
 ‘ viour, and sermons of his, and several other things of a
 ‘ fabulous kind. Among which he says likewise, that
 ‘ there shall be a thousand years after the resurrection of
 ‘ the dead, wherein the kingdom of Christ shall corporally
 ‘ subsist upon this earth. Which opinion, I suppose, he
 ‘ was led into by misunderstanding the apostolical narra-
 ‘ tions; and for want of seeing into those things which
 ‘ they spoke mystically, and in figures. For he^m was a
 ‘ man of no great capacity, as may be conjectured from his
 ‘ writings. Yet he gave occasion to a great many ecclesias-
 ‘ tical writers after him to be of the same opinion, who re-
 ‘ spected the antiquity of the man; as Irenæus, and the
 ‘ rest who have maintained that opinion. In the same

¹ L. 3. c. 31.

^m Σφοδρα γαρ τοι σμικρος ων τον νεν, ως αν εκ των αυτη λογων, τεκμηραμενον ειπων, φαινεται.

‘ writing; he delivers many other narrations of the fore-
 ‘ mentioned Aristion, of the words of the Lord, and tradi-
 ‘ tions of John the presbyter; to which we refer the curi-
 ‘ ous reader. But it is requisite we should subjoin to his
 ‘ fore-cited passages a tradition which he has concerning
 ‘ Mark, who wrote the gospel, in these words: “ And this
 ‘ the presbyter [or elder] said: Mark being the interpreter
 ‘ of Peter wrote exactly whatever he remembered: but not
 ‘ in the order in which things were spoken or done by
 ‘ Christ. For he was neither a hearer, nor a follower of
 ‘ the Lord; but, as I said, afterwards followed Peter, who
 ‘ made his discourses for the profit of those that heard him,
 ‘ but not in the way of a regular history of our Lord’s
 ‘ words. Mark however committed no mistake in writing
 ‘ some things, as they occurred to his memory. For this
 ‘ one thing heⁿ made his care, to omit nothing which he
 ‘ had heard, and to say nothing false in what he related.”
 ‘ Thus Papias writes of Mark. Concerning Matthew he
 ‘ says: “ Matthew wrote the [divine] oracles in the He-
 ‘ brew tongue, and every one interpreted them as he was
 ‘ able.” He also brings testimonies out of the first epistle
 ‘ of John, and of Peter in like manner. He relates also
 ‘ another story, of a woman accused of many crimes before
 ‘ the Lord, which is^o contained in the gospel according to
 ‘ the Hebrews.’

It should be just observed, that in another place^p Euse-
 bius, speaking of Ignatius and Polycarp, says: ‘ At the
 ‘ same time flourished Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, an
 ‘ eloquent man, and skilful in the scriptures.’ But Vale-
 sius in his notes offers divers reasons for believing this last
 character to be an interpolation: it being wanting in several
 manuscripts, and also in the translation of Rufinus, and
 contrary to what Eusebius says in the above-cited chapter.

I need not put down distinctly what Jerom in his Cata-
 logue says of Papias, it being little more than a transcript
 of Eusebius. Only we may observe, that he assures us he
 was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia, and that he wrote five
 books, called An Explication of the Words of the Lord.

Omitting now the confirmation which Papias affords to
 the facts of the evangelical history, in what he says of our
 blessed Lord and his apostles, there are divers things in
 the foregoing chapter of Eusebius to be taken notice of,

ⁿ Ὡς τε εἶδεν ἡμᾶρτε Μάρκος, ἅπως εἶνα γραφᾶς ὡς ἀπεμνημονεύσεν ἕνος
 γὰρ ἐποησατο προνοίαν, τὴ μὴδεν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψευσασθαι τι ἐν
 αὐτοῖς.

^o Ἦν το καθ' Ἑβραϊσ εὐαγγελίων περιεχει.

^p H. E. l. 3. c. 36. in.

very much to our present purpose. We must by all means observe what is here said or hinted concerning St. Matthew's and St. Mark's gospels, the Acts of the apostles, some other books of the N. T. and the story contained in the gospel according to the Hebrews.

1. *Of St. Matthew's Gospel.*

1. Here is an authentic testimony to the genuineness of the gospel of St. Matthew. It was well known in the time of Papias. No one doubted but it was written by him.

2. Papias says, this gospel was written in Hebrew. The same thing we shall hereafter find often affirmed by ancient christian writers. Nevertheless, some very learned men have disputed this. They think succeeding writers have taken this account upon trust from Papias, without duly considering the matter. I think it must be allowed there are not in our Greek gospel of St. Matthew any marks of a translation: but of this I shall say no more here.

3. The particular observation concerning St. Matthew's gospel, that it was written in Hebrew, seems to imply, that it is the only gospel that was originally written in that language.

4. He says, 'every one interpreted it as he was able.' Which some have thought to be one specimen of this man's weak capacity: for it requires some knowledge in the Hebrew tongue, to interpret a book written in that language.

5. Allowing St. Matthew's gospel to have been written in Hebrew, it does not follow from what Papias says, that there was then no Greek gospel of St. Matthew, or that Papias knew of no such. Papias collected accounts of former things from any persons whom he thought credible. What he says, therefore, of every one interpreting it as he was able, may relate only to some short time after it was written. All that can be concluded from what Papias says, is, that he thought the gospel of Matthew was written originally in Hebrew; and that for some time, till a Greek translation was published, every one interpreted it as he could.

That at the time of Papias, and before, there was extant a Greek gospel of St. Matthew, is apparent from the quotations or allusions of the apostolical fathers, particularly those of Ignatius and Polycarp; there being a great agreement between them and our Greek gospel, not only in sense, but also in the very words.

2. *Of St. Mark's Gospel.*

1. Here is an authentic testimony to the gospel of St. Mark. What Papias writes concerning it he had received from the presbyter, meaning undoubtedly the presbyter John. The presbyter said, Mark was the interpreter and follower of Peter, and the gospel written by him was composed out of Peter's sermons. And better materials no man could have. Nor could any man, not an apostle himself, have better advantages for writing a gospel, than frequent hearing the apostle, and intimate conversation with him.

2. But we need not be determined absolutely by the judgment of the elder, that Mark did not write in the order in which things were spoken or done by Christ. For though Peter in his sermons might not always deliver things in the order of time in which they happened, nor in each sermon every particular here related; yet there was usually in his sermons some regard to the order of time. And Mark, who long attended on him, and often heard him preach, would certainly be able to put the whole together, when he came to write, very much in the order of time in which things were spoken or done. And if Peter's public instructions had not fully qualified him for writing a regular history, he had in his conversation with Peter frequent opportunities of making farther inquiries about any matters he doubted of.

3. The presbyter, according to this account, put the credit and authority of Mark's gospel upon its being a true and faithful relation of the preaching, or sermons, of the apostle Peter. This is manifest from every particular there mentioned.

4. However, it ought by no means to be overlooked, that in another place Eusebius, after he had put down what Clement of Alexandria says of Mark's gospel, adds: 'And^a Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, agrees with him.'

What St. Clement says there is to this purpose: that St. Peter's hearers at Rome were desirous of having his sermons written down for their use: that they made their request to Mark, to leave them a written memorial of the doctrine they had received by word of mouth: that they did not desist from their entreaties till they had prevailed upon him: that when the apostle Peter knew what had been done, he was pleased with the zeal of the men,

^a Hist. Ec. l. 2. c. 15.

and^r confirmed that writing by his authority, that it might be read in the churches. ‘This is related,’ says Eusebius, ‘by Clement in the sixth book of his Institutions; and ‘Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, agrees with him.’

From this passage of Eusebius it has been concluded by learned men, that Papias had related not only what we have before seen in the foregoing chapter from the elder, but likewise that Peter had confirmed Mark’s gospel. So thought Mr.^s Richardson, who has written with so much judgment on the canon of the New Testament. ‘And we ‘learn,’ says he, ‘from Eusebius, that both Papias and ‘Clement of Alexandria attested, that the Romans having ‘prevailed with St. Mark to write his gospel, what he had ‘done was revealed to St. Peter by the Holy Ghost, who, ‘thereupon, authorized the work, and appointed it to be ‘read publicly in the church.’

But to this I crave leave to say two things :

First, That this same passage from Clement of Alexandria is related by Eusebius in another^t place differently, and I think in some respects more accurately than here. There Eusebius informs us, that Clement says, when Mark had ‘composed his gospel, he delivered it to them that ‘had asked it of him. Which when^u Peter knew, he neither ‘forbid it nor encouraged it.’ But of this I say no more here. When we come to Clement himself, we shall farther consider these two accounts of Eusebius : how they may be reconciled, and which is the most accurate.

Secondly, Whichsoever of these two accounts is the more accurate; supposing that Clement did write, that when Peter ‘knew what was done, he confirmed the writing by his authority, that it might be read in the churches;’ yet it cannot be inferred from Eusebius, that Papias had said all this. Eusebius says : ‘And Papias, bishop of ‘Hierapolis, agrees with Clement.’ Such observations as these are, in my opinion, to be interpreted cautiously. These words of Eusebius do not imply, that Papias had expressly related every thing there said by Clement; but only in general, that the two accounts of St. Mark’s gospel given by Clement and Papias are agreeable to each other. They agree in the author of that gospel, that he was a disciple and companion of St. Peter, and that it was composed

^r —κυρωσαι τε την γραφην εις εντευξιν ταις εκκλησιαις—συνεπιμαρτυρει δ’ αυτω και ο Ιεραπολιτης επισκοπος, ονοματι Παπιας.

^s The Canon of the N. T. vindicated, p. 34. ed. third, 1619.

^t H. Ec. l. vi. c. 14.

^u Ὅπερ επιγοντα τον Πετρον, προτρεπτικως μητε κωλυσαι, μητε προτρεψασθαι. p. 216. B.

out of that apostle's sermons. But because Papias is said to agree with Clement, it is by no means necessary to suppose he had delivered every particular contained in that passage of Clement.

3. *Of the Acts of the Apostles.*

Papias does undoubtedly give some confirmation to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, in what he says of Philip; and especially in what he says of Justus, called Barsabas. But I think it cannot be affirmed, that he did particularly mention, or refer to, the book of the Acts. For I reckon, it is Eusebius himself who adds that quotation out of the Acts, upon occasion of what Papias had written of the before-mentioned Barsabas.

4. *Of the Epistles of Peter and John.*

1. Papias evidently confirms the genuineness and authority of the first epistle of Peter, and the first of John.

2. Papias had written nothing of the second epistle of Peter, or of the other epistles of John. If he had, Eusebius would certainly have taken notice of it. These epistles were doubted of and contradicted by some in his time. He therefore diligently observed whatever he met with concerning them in ancient writers, and fails not of informing his readers of it.

3. Nevertheless, nothing can be inferred from the silence of Papias to the prejudice of the genuineness of these epistles. He no where designed to give a catalogue of the writings of these apostles. All Eusebius says is, 'Papias brought testimonies out of the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter likewise.' That he has alleged no passages out of the other is not at all strange. Papias dealt chiefly in unwritten traditions, and had no particular occasion to quote any other epistles of those apostles. He confirms these, therefore, without prejudicing the rest.

5. *Of the Revelation.*

I think it also highly probable, that Papias had read the book of the Revelation. And this may be confirmed from the passage of Irenæus, where he mentions him. But I apprehend too that it may be fairly concluded from what Eusebius says of the two Johns, that Papias had no where in these five books expressly said, that the Revelation was written by John the apostle. However, I do not take the

silence of Papias in this matter to be any objection to that supposition. Who was the author of that book was well known in his time: but he might have no particular occasion to mention him.

And it is observable that Andrew, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadoeia, who is^v supposed to have flourished about the year 500, in the preface to his Commentary upon the Revelation, mentions Papias, together with others who had borne testimony to this book, in this manner: ‘But^w we judge it needless,’ says Andrew, ‘to enlarge on the divine inspiration of this book, to which so many blessed men bear a credible testimony: as Gregory the divine, and Cyril, and others more ancient than they; I mean Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus.’

6. *Of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.*

Papias gives no confirmation to this gospel. Eusebius says, he had a history, ‘which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.’ The words of Eusebius are remarkable. He does not say, that this story was taken out of that gospel, or that Papias had quoted, or brought testimonies out of it. This gospel seems to have contained several stories and relations, or circumstances of things, added to the gospel of St. Matthew. It is not at all wonderful that Papias, who collected unwritten traditions, should have one story found or ‘contained’ in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. When these additions were inserted in that gospel is uncertain: possibly about the time of Papias, possibly after it; and if they were a little before it is not very material. I conclude however that Papias had no where quoted that gospel. And I infer therefore likewise, that when Papias spoke of St. Matthew’s gospel, he spoke of his Greek gospel, which he was well acquainted with. He had received some tradition by word of mouth, that it was written originally in Hebrew. But as for any Hebrew gospel of Matthew in his time, he knew nothing of it, being a perfect stranger to that language.

It may be thought that I have been too particular in my remarks upon Papias, a man of small capacity. But I esteem the testimony very valuable, which he has given to

^v Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. ^w Περὶ μὲντοι τῆς θεοπνευστῆς τῆς βιβλῆς περιττον μὴ κυνῆν τον λογον ἡγγεμεθα, των μακαριων, Γρηγοριε τῆς θεολογῆς, — προσετι δε και αρχαιοτερων, Παπιας, Ειρηνηαις, Μεθοδιω, και Ἰππολυτῆς, ταυτη προσμαρτυρησαντων το αξιοπιστον. Andr. Ptoleg. ad Apoc. p. 3. B. C. ad calcem. T. 8. Opp. S. Chrys. Ed. Morell.

the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and to the first epistle of St. Peter, and St. John. If Papias had been a wiser man, he had left us a confirmation of many more books of the New Testament.

CHAP. X.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

- I. *His history.* II. *His works, with extracts out of the Questiones et Responsiones ascribed to him.* III. *His testimony to the Scriptures of the New Testament, particularly the Gospels.* IV. *The Acts of the Apostles.* V. *St. Paul's Epistles.* VI. *The second Epistle of St. Peter.* VII. *The Revelation.* VIII. *Of Apocryphal Scriptures supposed to be quoted by him.* IX. *The sum of his testimony to the Scriptures of the New Testament.*

THE history of Justin may be collected partly from his own writings, partly from other ancient authors.

He was born^a in Flavia Neapolis, anciently called Sichem, a city of Samaria in Palestine. His father's name was Priscus, his grandfather's Bacchius.

He was early a lover of truth, and studied philosophy under several masters: first, under a Stoic, next a Peripatetic, then a Pythagorean, and lastly, a Platonic: whose principles and sentiments he preferred above all other, until he became acquainted with the christian religion, which he then embraced, as the 'only^b certain and useful philosophy.' Of his conversion to christianity he gives an account in his Dialogue with Trypho. All these particulars we have from himself.

The exact time of his conversion is uncertain. Cave conjectures^c it happened about the year 132 or 133. Tillemont^d is of much the same opinion, who supposes he was born in 103, and was about thirty years of age when he embraced christianity, in the reign of Adrian, A. D. 133.

^a Apol. i. init. Paris. p. 55.

^b Ταυτην μονην ειρισκον φιλοσοφιαν ασφαλη τε και συμφορον. p. 225. C. in Dial.

^c See Justin's Life, sect. v. in Lives of the Primitive Fathers, and Historia Liter. p. 36.

^d Mem. Ecc. T. 2. Part ii. Vie de Justin M. Art. ii. Not. 1. et Art. v. Not. 4.

The course of his life after his conversion is thus briefly digested by Cave.^e In the beginning of the reign of Antoninus the pious he came to Rome, and in the year 140 presented his first Apology to that emperor. Afterwards he went into Asia, where he had the celebrated conference with Trypho the Jew; and then returned again to Rome, where he wrote his second Apology, inscribed to Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, and suffered martyrdom about the year 164. Tillemont^f is rather inclined to place his death in the year 167 or 168. Fabricius^g supposes he was born in 89, and suffered martyrdom in the 74th year of his age, A. D. 163. Grabe^h is also of the same opinion about the time of his birth, and that his martyrdom happened in the year 163 or 165, the 74th or 76th year of his age.

Justin is mentioned by many ancient christian writers; by his disciple Tatian, by Irenæus,ⁱ Tertullian,^k Methodius, Eusebius, Jerom, Epiphanius, Photius, and others. I shall put down some of their testimonies.

Tatian^l calls him an ‘admirable man.’ Methodius^m says, he was a man not far removed from the apostles in time or virtue. Eusebiusⁿ says, he flourished not long after the times of the apostles. Photius^o says, ‘he was well acquainted with the christian philosophy, and especially with the heathen; rich in the knowledge of history, and other parts of learning. But he took little care to set off the native beauty of philosophy with the ornaments of rhetoric. For which reason his discourses, though weighty and learned, want those allurements which are apt to attract the vulgar.’ He adds: ‘He^p showed himself a philosopher not only in words, but in his actions, and his habits.’

II. Eusebius, beside the accounts he had before given^q of Justin’s books against Marcion, and all heresies, and his Apologies, gives also^r this distinct enumeration of his works. He says, that ‘Justin left behind him a great number of very useful works, as his Apology to Antoninus the pious, and his sons, and the Roman senate, and another to his successor: a book against the Greeks [or Gentiles]: another book against the Gentiles, called Elenchus [or a

^e Histor. Lit. Gr. T. v. p. 51, 52.

^f Ubi supra, Art. 22.

^g Biblioth.

^h Spicileg. Patrum, T. ii. p. 146, 147

ⁱ Adver. Hær. l. iv. cap. 6. et lib. v. cap. 26.

^k Adv. Valent.

cap. v. Justinus Philosophus et Martyr.

^l Ὁ θανατωτατος

ἱερωτος. Cont. Gr. p. 157. c.

^m Apud Phot. cod. 234. p. 921.

ⁿ H. Ec. l. 2. c. 13.

^o Cod. 125.

^p φιλοσοφων

και τοις λογοις, και τη βιω, και τη σχηματι, ibid.

^q H. E. l. 4.

cap. 11, 12, 16.

^r Cap. 18.

‘ Confutation]: another of the Monarchy of God : another ‘ entitled Psaltes : of the Soul : a Dialogue against the ‘ Jews, which he had at Ephesus with Trypho. There are ‘ also,’ says Eusebius, ‘ many other books of his, which ‘ are in the hands of the brethren.’ Jerom’s^s account of Justin’s works agrees with this of Eusebius.

The principal works of Justin are his two Apologies, and his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, in two parts.

The first and larger Apology was addressed, as has been already hinted, to Titus Antoninus the pious, Marcus Antoninus, and Lucius Verus, the senate and people of Rome.^t Tillemont and Grabe^u think it was not presented to the emperor before the year 150. Cave says, in 140: Pagi^v and Basnage,^w in the year 139: Massuet,^x about 145. The Benedictine editors of Justin’s works, in their preface, support Tillemont’s opinion in a very plausible manner.

The Dialogue with Trypho was written not long after, and according to Pagi and Basnage, in 140; according to^y Massuet and the fore-mentioned Benedictines, about the year 155.

The second Apology seems to have been presented to Marcus Antoninus in the beginning of his reign, in the year 162.

The larger Apology is still extant entire. The beginning of the second Apology is wanting: as is the conclusion of the first, and beginning of the second part of the Dialogue with Trypho.

Beside these there are two discourses to the Gentiles, which are generally allowed to be Justin’s: one called, An Oration to the Gentiles; the other, *Παρασκευασις*, or, An Exhortation to the Gentiles, which is supposed^z to be the Elenchus mentioned by Eusebius.

The piece we now have of the Monarchy of God seems to be a fragment of the genuine work of Justin with that title.

The epistle to Zena and Serenus is at best doubtful, and I think not Justin’s.

The epistle to Diognetus is generally supposed to be Justin’s, though it is doubted of by some because the style is more elegant than that of his other pieces. For my own part, I cannot persuade myself to quote it as Justin’s;

^s De Vir. Ill. cap. 23. and note 3.

^t Væ de Justin, as above, art. 13.

^u Spicileg. sect. ii. p. 150.

^v Crit. in Bar. A. D. 148. n. 5.

^w Ann. P. E. 139. sect. 5.

^x Vid. Diss. i. in Irenæ. num. ii. p. xv.

^y Ibid.

^z Vid. Grabe, Spic. Patr. T. 2. p. 149.

since the style is allowed to be superior to his, and there is no mention made of it by Eusebius or Jerom. It would indeed be to my purpose to suppose it genuine, because it has more references to St. Paul's epistles than all the other works of Justin. But this is another exception, it not being very usual for Justin to express himself in the style of the New Testament, as this writer does. Nor can there be any particular reason for it in this epistle, written to a Gentile, and not to a christian. And how can one pretend to ascribe to any author a small piece, not mentioned among his works by the ancients, different from the ordinary style of all his other allowed pieces, when there is no character in the title or conclusion to determine whose it is? Tillemont,^a who is sensible the style is abundantly superior to Justin's, endeavours to prove it more ancient, and written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Those arguments are fully confuted by^b Basnage, who is willing to think the epistle genuine. The christians, before the writing of this epistle, had suffered several persecutions; which could not be said of them before Jerusalem was destroyed. It is an excellent epistle. And as, at the time of writing it, the christians were in^c a suffering condition, it must have been written before the reign of Constantine. I think, therefore, that the author of it is some anonymous ancient christian writer, whose age cannot be exactly settled. I shall quote him as such; and, after I have made my extracts out of Justin, show what testimony this writer bears to the books of the New Testament.

The *Quæstiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos*, and some other pieces usually joined with Justin's works, are allowed to have the marks of a later time.

It may not be improper however, for me to take notice of those *Quæstiones et Responsiones*, the work of a learned and laborious author.

Cave^d thinks him a writer of the fifth century. Du Pin^e observes, that some ascribe it to Theodoret; and he argues that the writer lived in the fifth or sixth century. Beausobre thought this work^f to be rightly ascribed to Diodorus of Tarsus. The Benedictine editors of Justin Martyr have examined this point with so much care, that their observa-

^a Le stile si magnifique et si eloquent de cette lettre s' élève beaucoup au dessus de celui de St. Justin. Vie de Justin, Art. 12. p. 371.

^b A. D. 165. sect. ix.

^c See Du Pin, Bibl. Basnage, as

above. ^d Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. in Justin M. et Irenæ. et Conf. Dodwell. Diss. Iren. iii. n. 22.

^e Bib. Ecc. T. i. p. 58.

^f Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 288. n. (1.)

tions deserve to be briefly inserted here. They say, it^g is needless to prove it not to be a work of Justin, the thing is so evident. They think it probable that the author was a Syrian; which might lead us to Theodoret; nevertheless, there are strong reasons against that supposition. In the end, they conclude the author to have been a Pelagian of that country in the fifth century.

In this work most of the writers of the New Testament are quoted, and particularly the four evangelists by name. In like manner the author quotes the^h epistle to the Hebrews, andⁱ the second epistle of Peter. He reckoned^k both the genealogies to be Joseph's, one of his natural, the other of his legal father. And he says, that^l both the writers of the genealogies, meaning Matthew and Luke, were Hebrews, and took their accounts from the public registers. As he supposed Luke to have been a Jew, it is likely that he did not think him to be the physician mentioned by the apostle Paul, Col. iv. 14.

It is beside my design to give any farther account of those works of Justin which are not extant: though every one must lament the loss of them; as his book against all heresies, which he particularly refers to in his first Apology; and his book against Marcion; and likewise that part of his book of the Monarchy of God, which is not extant; especially if he therein argued from the scriptures of the New, as well as of the Old Testament. The words^m of Eusebius are, 'Of the Monarchy of God, which he proved, 'not only out of our scriptures, but also the books of the 'Gentiles.'

III. We are now to take a different method from what we have used with the apostolical fathers. For it is impossible to transcribe all the places of Justin, in which he has quoted the gospels in his Apologies and Dialogue, though always without expressly mentioning the names of the evangelists. I shall endeavour to take passages enough to show his manner of quoting.

^g Admonit. in Q. et R. p. 434—437.

^h Qu. 99. p. 480. D

E. et passim, Ed. Bened.

ⁱ Καθ' ἃ φησιν ὁ ἀποστολος Πιτρος εν τη δευτερα αυτη καθολικη επιτολη. Qu. 94. p. 478. C.

^k Vid. Qu. 131, 132, 133. Et Conf. Qu. 66. Vid. et Beaus. Hist. de Manich. T. 1. p. 354, 355.

^l Ἑβραιοι γαρ ησαν εξ Ἑβραιων, οἱ τας γενεαλογιας συγγραψαμενοι ευαγγελισται. Qu. 133. p. 491. E.

^m Ην κ̄ μονον εκ των παρ' ἡμιν γραφων, αλλα και εκ των Ἑλληνικων συνιτησι βιβλιων. H. E. p. 140. Δ.

Quotations and Allusions.

1. ‘Atⁿ the same time an angel was sent to the same virgin, saying: “Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Ghost, and thou shalt bring forth a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins:” as they have taught who have written the history of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ. And we believe them.’ Matt. i. 20, 21. Comp. Luke i. 31. Thus he writes in his first Apology.

2. Again, in the same Apology. ‘But lest^o we should seem to deceive you, it may be fit to lay before you some of the doctrines of Christ. His words were short and concise. For he was no sophist, but his word was the power of God. Of chastity he spoke in this manner: “Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, has committed adultery with her already in his heart, in the sight of God. And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out. For it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of heaven with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into eternal fire. And he who marries her who is divorced from another man committeth adultery,”’ Matt. v. 28, 29, 32.

3. In his Dialogue. ‘And it is^p written in the gospel, that he said: “All things are delivered to me of the Father. And no man knoweth the Father, but the Son: neither the Son, save the Father, and they to whom the Son will reveal him,”’ Matt. xi. 27.

4. ‘And^q the virgin Mary having been filled with faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel brought her good tidings, that the ‘Spirit of the Lord should come upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadow her, and therefore that holy thing born of her should be the Son of God,’ answered, “Be it unto me according to thy word,”’ Luke i. 35, 38.

5. It is undoubted that the gospels of Matthew and Luke are chiefly quoted by him, and Mark’s but seldom. However, I shall take a part of a passage, in which within the compass of half a page these three gospels are quoted.

‘And in^r other words he says, “Depart from me into outer darkness, which the Father has prepared for Satan

ⁿ Apol. i. p. 75. B. Paris. 1636.

^o P. 61. E.

^p Καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γεγραπται, ἐπιφων. 326. D.

^q Dial. Par. ii. p. 327. C.

^r P. 301. D.

and his angels," Matt. xxv. 41. And again he said in other words: "I give unto you power to tread upon serpents, and scorpions, and venomous^s beasts, and upon all the power of the enemy," Luke x. 19. "—And before he was crucified, he said: "The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the scribes and pharisees, and be^t crucified, and rise again the third day," Mark viii. 31.

These last words are exactly quoted by Justin again^u in another place. In St. Luke ix. 22, is a text very resembling; but in this place Justin appears to have used St. Mark. In St. Luke it is, "and^v be slain, and raised the third day."

6. That Justin had read St. John's gospel, might be concluded from his calling Christ the 'Word,' and the word and reason of God. However, it will not be amiss to observe a quotation, or a reference or two.

7. 'But^w he is the first power next after God the Father and Lord of all, and Son, and the Word. And in what manner being made flesh he became man, I shall show hereafter.' John i. 14.

8. Speaking of John the Baptist: 'They^x suspected him to be the Christ: to whom he said: "I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying, There will come one mightier than me, whose shoes' latchet I am not worthy to bear,"' John i. 20, 23, 27. Compare Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16.

9. 'For^y Christ himself has said: "Unless ye are born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," John iii. 3, 4, 5. But it is manifest to all, that it is impossible for those who have been once born, to enter into the wombs of them that bare them.'

10. 'For thus he^z said: "He that hears me and does the things I say, he hears him that sent me,"' John xiv. 24.

11. Justin often speaks of the gospels under the title of Memoirs, or^a Commentaries; Commentaries^b of the apostles; His,^c or Christ's Memoirs; Memoirs of the apostles and their companions: and we have before seen him use the word gospel, as he does also gospels.

^s Και σκολοπενῶρων. ανασηναι.

και τη τριτη ἡμερα εγερωθηναι.

^x Dial. p. 316. C.

^z P. 64. A.

p. 332. C.

αυτε γεγραπται. 332. B. et alibi.

αυτε. p. 333. D.

^t Και τανρωθηναι, και τη τριτη ἡμερα

^u P. 327. A.

^v Και αποκτανθηναι,

^w Apol. i. p. 74. B.

^y Apol. p. 94. A.

^a Ὡς απο των απομνημονευματων εμαθομεν.

^b Ὅπερ εν τοις απομνημονευμασι των αποστολων

^c Εν τοις απομνημονευμασι

12. Speaking of the eucharist: ‘For the^d apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called gospels, have thus delivered it, that Jesus commanded them to take bread, and give thanks.’ Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19, 20.

13. ‘For^e in the Commentaries, which, as I have said, were composed by the apostles, and their followers, [or companions,] it is written, that his sweat fell like drops of blood, as he prayed, saying: “If it be possible, let this cup pass from me.”’

There can be no doubt but he here intends particularly Luke xxii. 42, and Matt. xxvi. 39.

14. And upon the whole, it must be plain to all, that he owned, and had the highest respect for, the four gospels; written two of them by apostles, and the other two by companions and followers of the apostles of Jesus Christ; that is, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

15. Farther, these gospels were publicly read in the assemblies of the christians every Lord’s day, by a person appointed for that purpose, whom he calls ‘reader.’ For, giving an account of the christian worship to the emperor, in the first Apology, he says: ‘The^f memoirs of the apostles, or the writing of the prophets, are read according as the time allows; and when the reader has ended, the president makes a discourse, exhorting to the imitation of so excellent things.’

16. Trypho the Jew, in the Dialogue, says^g to Justin: ‘I am sensible that the precepts in your gospel, as it is called, are so great and wonderful, that I think it impossible for any man to keep them. For I have been at the pains to read them.’

Whether the Dialogue be real, or only a fictitious discourse, this is a proof the gospels were open to all, and were well known in the world. For it is reasonable to suppose that Justin chose to write in character.

IV. Let us in the next place observe some references to the Acts of the Apostles.

^d Apol. i. p. 98. B. Ἄ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. ^e Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονευμασιν, ἃ φημι ὑπο τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτὰ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολυθησαντῶν συντεταχθαι, ὅτι ἰδρῶς. κ. λ. p. 331. C. D.

^f Καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονευματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγραμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινωσκειται μέχρις ἐγχώρει εἰτα πανσημεῖα τὰ ἀναγινωσκοντος. κ. λ. p. 98. D.

^g Ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγέλιῳ—ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐμελέησιν ἐντρυχεῖν αὐτοῖς. p. 227. C.

N. T.

1. Acts vii. 22. "And^h Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians."

2. Acts xiii. 27. "But they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew^k him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him."

I think it plain, there is here a reference to the history in the Acts. See Ch. xiii. from ver. 44, to the end.

N. T.

3. Acts xxvi. 22, 23. "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that^m Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead," &c.

V. We will now proceed to St. Paul's epistles.

N. T.

1. Rom. i. 4. "Or despisest thou^o the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long suffering, not knowing that the goodness

JUSTIN.

1. 'Moses wasⁱ thought worthy to partake of all the learning of the Egyptians,' &c.

2. 'For the Jews who had the prophecies, and always expected the coming of Christ, knew him not,^l and not only so, but killed him. But the Gentiles, who had never heard of Christ, until the apostles' setting out from Jerusalem taught them the things concerning him, —being filled with joy and faith—gave themselves up to the unbegotten God through Jesus Christ.'

3. 'For though it had been obscurely declared by the prophets, thatⁿ Christ should suffer, and after that be Lord of all,' &c.

JUSTIN.

JUSTIN.

1. 'For^p the goodness and kindness of God, and the immensity of his riches, esteem, as Ezekiel declares, him that repents of his sins,

^h Και επαιδευθη παση σοφια Αιγυπτιων. Αιγυπτιων παιδευσεως μετασχειν ηξιωθη.

^k Τετον αγροησαντες, κ. λ.

^m Ει παθητος ο Χριστος, κ. λ. Χριστος. Dial. p. 302. A.

—καταφρονεις—;

^p Ἡ γὰρ χρηστοτης, και ἡ φιλανθρωπια τῶ Θεῷ, και το αμετρον τῶ πλετῶ αυτῶ. Dial. p. 266. D.

ⁱ Αλλα και πασης της Ad Græc. Cohort. p. 11. B.

^l Ηγροησαν. Ap. i. p. 85. A.

ⁿ Παθητος μενησομενος ο ο Η τῶ πλετῶ της χρηστοτητος αυτῶ

N. T.

of God leadeth thee to repentance?"

JUSTIN.

as one who is righteous, and has not sinned.' See Ezek. xxxiii. 15, 16.

The first words have a great resemblance with Paul's, Rom. ii. 4. Dr. Thirlby in his Notes refers also to Rom. xi. 33; Eph. ii. 7; iii. 8.

2. 'Nor was Abraham declared righteous by God because of circumcision, but because of faith. For before that he was circumcised, it was said of him: "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." [Gen. xv. 6.] Wherefore we also in the circumcision of our flesh believing in God through Christ, and having the circumcision which is useful to them that have it, that is, of the heart, hope to appear righteous, and acceptable to God.' In these last words is a great resemblance with Rom. ii. 28, 29. as in the first with Paul's argument, Rom. iv; Gal. iii.

For Rom. xi. 2, 3, 4, may be seen Dialog. p. 257. D. But I do not think it worth while to insert the passage here.

N. T.

3. 1 Cor. v. 7. "For^a even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us."

4. 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.— "I^s hear that there are divisions among you, and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you."

5. 1 Cor. xii. 8, 9, 10. "For to one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit; to another faith by the same spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits."

JUSTIN.

3. 'For Christ^r was the passover, who was afterwards sacrificed for us.'

4. For he said——^t 'And there shall be schisms and heresies.'

5. 'One^u receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of power, [or miracles,] another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of doctrine, another of the fear of God.'

^a Καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη, Χριστός.

^r Ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τυθείς ὑπέρων. Dial. p. 338. C.

^s Ἀκούω, σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπαρχειν—Δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἵρεσις ἐν ἡμῖν εἶναι.

^t Καὶ εἰσὶν αἱ σχίσματα καὶ αἵρεσις, p. 253. B.

^u Dial. p. 258. A.

N. T.

6. 1 Cor. xv. 12. "How say^v some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

7. "Gal. iv. 12. "Brethren, I beseech^x you, be as I am: for I am as ye are."

8. The Jew in the Dialogue allows, that the Messiah might suffer; but it seems incredible to him that he should be so ignominiously^z crucified: 'For,' says he, 'we read 'in the law, that he who is crucified is accursed:' referring to Deut. xxi. 23; which is also observed, Gal. iii. 13. Justin afterwards^a answers this; but his respect to the epistle to the Galatians is not very manifest.

N. T.

9. Eph. ii. 20. "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus^b Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

He^d argues from the words of Ps. lxxviii. 18, which are quoted, Eph. iv. 8, but his reference to that epistle is not very clear.

N. T.

10. Philip. iv. 8. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest,—just,—pure,—lovely,—think of these things."

11. Col. i. 15. "Who^f is the first-born of every creature."

JUSTIN.

6. 'Who also say^w that there is no resurrection of the dead.'

7. 'In his oration to the Greeks: Be you^y as I am, for I also was as you are.'

8. The Jew in the Dialogue allows, that the Messiah might suffer; but it seems incredible to him that he should be so ignominiously^z crucified: 'For,' says he, 'we read 'in the law, that he who is crucified is accursed:' referring to Deut. xxi. 23; which is also observed, Gal. iii. 13. Justin afterwards^a answers this; but his respect to the epistle to the Galatians is not very manifest.

JUSTIN.

9. 'But our circumcision manifested next after yours has been^c made by sharp stones, that is, by the words of the apostles of the chief corner stone.'

He^d argues from the words of Ps. lxxviii. 18, which are quoted, Eph. iv. 8, but his reference to that epistle is not very clear.

JUSTIN.

10. Justin says,^e 'That in the law of Moses are enacted those things that are by nature good, pious, and just.'

11. Justin says, 'Christ is^g the first-born of all things made.' Again, 'The^h first-born of every creature.' Once more, 'Theⁱ first-born

^v Πως λεγσαι τινες εν υμιν, οτι αναστασις νεκρων ηκ εστιν;

^w Οι και λεγσαι μη ειναι νεκρων αναστασις. Dial. p. 307. A.

^x Γινεσθε ως εγω, οτι καγω ως υμεις.

^y Γινεσθε ως εγω· οτι

καγω ημην ως υμεις. p. 40. D.

^z P. 317. A.

^a P. 322, 323.

^b Ουτος ακρογωνιας αυτη Ιησος Χριστος.

^c Δια λιθων ακροτομων, τριτεσι, δια των λογων των δια των αποστολων τη ακρογωνιας λιθου. p. 342. A.

^d P. 258. B.

^e Dial. p. 263. D.

^f Πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως.

^g Πρωτοτοκον των παντων ποιηματων. p. 310. B.

^h Πρωτοτοκος

πασης κτισεως. p. 311. B.

ⁱ Πρωτοτοκεν τη Θεου, και προ

παντων των κτισματων. p. 326. D.

N. T.

12. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. "For that day shall not come, except there be^k a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth, and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped."

13. Heb. v. 9, 10. "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec." Ch. vi. 20. "Made an high priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec." See Ch. vii. 11; Ps. ex. 4.

14. In another place Justin says of Christ, the Word, and Son of God: 'That^o he is also called both angel and apostle.' As Christ is no where in the scriptures of the Old and New Testament called 'apostle,' except in Heb. iii. 1, Grabe thinks, it^p may be hence not unfairly collected, that Justin knew and approved of that epistle.

N. T.

VI. 2 Pet. iii. 8. "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." See Ps. xc. 4.

VII. 'And^r a man from among us, by name John, one

JUSTIN.

of God, and before all the creatures.'

12. Justin, speaking of Christ's second coming, says, 'He shall appear from heaven in glory, when also¹ the man of apostasy, who, speaking great things against the Most High, shall vex us christians.'

13. 'This is he^m who after the order of Melchisedec is king of Salem, and eternal priest of the Most High.' He calls Christⁿ elsewhere also, God's eternal priest and king. See hereafter, Numb. VII.

JUSTIN.

VI. 'We have also^q understood, that the saying, that 'a day of the Lord is as a thousand years,' belongs to this matter.'

^k Ὅτι εἰαν μὴ ἐλθῆ ἀποστασία πρῶτον, καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῆ ὁ ἀνθρώπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, κ. λ.

¹ Ὅταν καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἀνθρώπος, κ. λ. p. 336. D.

^m P. 341. in.

ⁿ Καὶ αἰώνιον τῶ Θεοῦ

ἰερέα, καὶ βασιλεῖα, καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γενέσθαι, p. 323. C.

^o Καὶ ἀγγελὸς ἔε καλεῖται, καὶ ἀποστόλος. Ap. i. p. 95. D.

^p Vid. ejusd. Annot. ad Justin. loc. ed. Oxon. 8vo. cap. 82. p. 121.

^q Συνήκαμεν καὶ τὸ ἐρημικόν, ὅτι ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη, εἰς τριπλὸν συναγει, p. 308. A.

^r Καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀνὴρ τις φέρομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τῶ Χριστῶ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῶ, κ. λ. p. 308. A.

of the^s apostles of Christ, in the revelation made to him, has prophesied, that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and after that shall be the general, and in a word the eternal resurrection and judgment of all men together. [See Revel. ch. xx.] The same thing, which also our Lord has said: "That they shall neither marry, nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal to the angels, and shall be the children of God, being [the children] of the resurrection," Luke xx. 35, 36.

It deserves to be considered likewise, whether the expression of 'eternal resurrection and judgment' do not allude to Heb. vi. 2, "And of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

St. Jerom^t seems to say, that Justin and Irenæus explained, or wrote commentaries upon, the Revelation. But perhaps we misunderstand him. He may only mean, that they had quoted it, and made some remarks upon it, in their works. If he intends any commentary of theirs, he must have been mistaken. Divers learned men have shown there is no ground to think, that either of those fathers wrote any commentary upon that book. I shall place in the margin a note of^u Fabricius. Huet^v also writes to the same purpose.

VIII. Thus far of quotations, or allusions of Justin Martyr, to our books of the New Testament commonly received. There is likewise a passage or two, in which some have supposed him to refer to apocryphal writings.

1. In his Dialogue with Trypho he says: 'Wherefore^w also our Lord Jesus Christ has said: "In whatsoever [things, or actions, or ways] I shall find you, in the same I will also judge you."'

^s Eusebius may be supposed to refer to this very passage, when, in his account of Justin's works, he observes: *Μεμνηται δε και της Ιωαννης αποκαλυψεως, σαφως τε αποσολε αυτην ειναι λεγων.* Hist. Ec. l. 4. c. 18. p. 140. D.

^t Scripsit [Joannes] Apocalypsim, quam interpretantur Justinus Martyr et Irenæus. De Vir. Ill. Joannes, c. ix.

^u Hieronymus in chronico: 'Sub eo [Domitiano] apostolus Joannes in 'Patmum insulam relegatus Apocalypsim vidit, quam Irenæus interpretatur.' In Græco Eusebii est, *ως δηλοι Ειρηναιος.* Itaque nec de Justini nec Irenæi commentario in Apocalypsin cogitandum, quem nec Hieronymus infra, ubi horum scripta persequitur, neque alius quisquam veterum, memorat. Saltem illud interpretatur, sive ut Græcus interpres, *μετεφρασεν*, non potest nisi de illis locis scriptorum Justini M. et Irenæi intelligi, in quibus Apocalypscos Joannis mentionem faciunt, vel verba quædam illius explicant. Vide Tillemontium, Tom. I. Mem. Ec. p. 637. [St. Jean l'Evangeliste, Note x.] et Spicilegium Patrum, J. E. Grabe, T. II. p. 170. Fabric. ad. loc. Hieron. de Vir. Ill.

^v Demonst. E. Propos. i. sect. 9.

^w *Διο και ο ήμετερος Κυριος Ιησους Χριστος ειπεν· Εν οίς αν ήμας καταλαβω, εν τωτοις και κρινω.* Apol. p. 267. A.

I think I need not stay long upon this passage. Possibly Justin designed not to quote any text, but to represent the sense of many of our Lord's sayings. Fabricius^x has observed, that this saying has been quoted by many writers, and that Justin is the only one who ascribes it to our Lord; and that there are words resembling these in Ezekiel: "I will judge them according to their ways," Ezek. vii. 3, 8; and xviii. 30; xxiv. 14; xxiii. 20. Moreover Justin had but just before expressly quoted Ezekiel. Mr. Jones^y conjectures, that Justin wrote only the 'Lord hath said;' and that some scribe, ignorantly imagining these to be the words of Christ, inserted in his copy the words 'our,' and 'Jesus Christ.'

2. In another place, in the same Dialogue, Justin^z says: 'And then when Jesus came to the river Jordan, where John was baptizing, as Jesus descended into the water, a fire also was kindled in Jordan: and when he came up out of the water, the apostles of this our Christ have written, that the Holy Ghost lighted upon him as a dove.'

Somewhat like this there was in the gospel made use of by the Nazarenes, or Ebionites. Epiphanius,^a in his account of the Ebionites, says, that in their gospel it is written, 'that when Jesus came up out of the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the shape of a dove descending and entering into himself. And there was a voice out of heaven, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." And again, "I have this day begotten thee." And^b immediately a great light shone round about the place.'

Ittigius^c observes, that the accounts given of our Lord's baptism by Justin and the Nazarene gospel are different; and concludes therefore, that Justin did not take his account from thence. It is plain I think they differ, in that

^x Cæterum non putem apocryphum Ezechielis librum ab autore vitæ Antonii, vel Joh. Climacho inspectum esse; sed potius ex prophetiâ Ezechielis, qualis hodie extat, ab aliquo exculptam, et deinde pluribus repentibus invaluisse, licet non eadem plane verba apud Ezechielem leguntur. Deinde, nisi Justinum M. memoriâ lapsum dicere velimus, qui solus verba illa Christo tribuit, et plus simplici vice in allegandis scriptoribus hallucinatus est, probabile sane fuerit ab eo lecta esse in apocrypho aliquo evangelio. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 333.

^y New and Full Method, V. i. p. 539.

^z Καὶ τότε ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν, εἶθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβαπτίζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πῦρ ἀνήθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ· καὶ ἀναδύτης αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὡς περιεραν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιτηναί ἐπ' αὐτὸν, ἐγράψαν οἱ ἀποστολοὶ αὐτῶν τὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν. Dialog. Part. 2 p. 315. D.

^a Har. 30. sect. 13.

^b Καὶ ἐνθὺς περιελαμψε τὸν τοπὸν φῶς μέγα.

^c Appendix ad Diss. de Hæres. p. 24.

Justin says, ‘as Jesus descended into the water,’ there was a great light kindled in Jordan: whereas, according to that gospel, the light appeared after Jesus was come up out of the water, and after the ‘voice from heaven.’ Mr. Jones^d has observed another disagreement. The one speaks of a ‘fire kindled in the river:’ the other of ‘a great light encircling, or shining round all the place.’

Grabe^e has an observation, which, I think, is not contemptible: that Justin does not say, the apostles have related any thing of this fire, but only, that when he came up out of the water, the Holy Ghost lighted upon him as a dove. This account therefore of the fire in the river Jordan, seems to be only a story which Justin had received by tradition. And perhaps it is only a conclusion from those words in our gospels, that the ‘heavens were opened to him,’ or a particular explication of them.

But I think we need not any farther concern ourselves with these passages. It is plain from his numerous quotations, that our gospels are the books Justin made use of, as authentic histories of Jesus Christ.

IX. It is time we sum up the evidence of this writer. He has numerous quotations of our gospels, except that of St. Mark, which he has seldom quoted. He quotes them, as containing authentic accounts of Jesus Christ and his doctrine. He speaks of ‘memoirs,’ or records, written by ‘apostles’ and ‘their companions;’ plainly meaning the apostles and evangelists, Matthew and John; and by companions, or disciples of apostles, Mark and Luke. These gospels were read and expounded in the solemn assemblies of the christians, as the books of the Old Testament were; and as they had been before in the Jewish synagogues. Whether any other books of the New Testament were so read, he does not inform us. This reading of the gospels he mentions in his first Apology to Antoninus the pious. He must have been well assured of the truth of what he says: and, it is likely, knew it to be the ordinary custom of the christian churches he had visited in his travels. If it had not been a general practice, or had obtained in some few places only, he must have spoken more cautiously, and

^d As before, V. i. p. 542.

^e Verum Justinus ipsâ verborum constructione, quasi studio, indicâsse videtur, verba, ‘scripserunt apostoli,’ posteriorem propositionem de columbæ descensu, quem Mattheus et Johannes apostoli memoriæ prodiderunt, non item priorem de igne splendescente, spectare, siquidem illa solum in modo infinitivo expressa ad τὸ ‘scripserunt,’ relationem habet, non prior, quæ modo indicativo posita est, ideoque merito in impressis exemplaribus per colon distincta. Spic. T. I. p. 19, 20.

made use of some limitations and exceptions. For if there were christian churches in which the 'memoirs' he speaks of were not read; upon enquiry made by the emperor, or his order, he had run the hazard of being convicted of a design to impose upon all the majesty of the Roman empire; and that, not in an affair incidentally mentioned, but in the conduct and worship of his own people, concerning whom he professeth to give the justest information. The general reading of the gospels, as a part of divine worship, at that time, about the year 140, or not very long after, is not only a proof that they were well known and allowed to be genuine, but also that they were in the highest esteem. These gospels were not concealed. Justin appeals to them in the most public manner, and they were open to all the world: read by Jews and others.

The other passages of Justin here alleged relate to the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, the second to the Thessalonians, the epistle to the Hebrews, the second of Peter, and the book of the Revelation; which last he expressly ascribes to John the apostle of Christ. I shall leave it to the reader to consider how many of the references to any of the other books are full and clear. I think it was not the method of Justin to use allusions in his style so often as some other writers do.

CHAP. XI.

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

I SHALL now show, as I promised, how the words of the New Testament are adapted and applied by the author of the epistle to Diognetus. It is plain he was acquainted with the gospels of Matthew and John. I have observed no references to the Acts of the Apostles. But whereas in all Justin's works hitherto quoted, several of which are of considerable length, there are very few expressions borrowed from the epistles of the New Testament, and those generally obscure, here we shall find many in an epistle of about nine folio pages. I shall put them down, and leave every one to judge how different this is from Justin's man-

ner in those works we have hitherto made use of. But though this epistle be not Justin's, the testimonies it affords to the books of the New Testament are very valuable.

I. 'Christ has taught us,' he^a says, 'not to be solicitous [or take any thought] about raiment or food.' See Matt. vi. 25—31.

II. The author says, 'God^b has sent from heaven the truth, and the holy word : ' and he^c says, ' he was from the beginning : ' and calls Christ the ' Word ' several^d times ; which character he may be well supposed to have learned from the beginning of John's gospel. He says^e likewise, that ' christians live in the world, but they are not of the world.' See John xvii. 14, 15, 16.

III. ' For^f what could cover our sins but his righteousness ? By whom could we, who were wicked and ungodly, be justified, but by the only Son of God ? O delightful exchange, O unsearchable contrivance, O unexpected benefit ! that the iniquity of many should be hid by one righteous person, and the righteousness of one justify many wicked.'

Herein is an allusion to the whole fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. See also ch. xi. 33.

N. T.

IV. 1 Cor. iv. 12. " — being^g reviled we bless."

V. 1 Cor. viii. 1. " — knowledgeⁱ puffeth up, but charity edifieth."

VI. 1 Cor. ix. 10. " — That he that ploweth, should plow in hope : and that he that thresheth in hope, should be partaker of his hope. Comp. ver. 7. Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof ? "

VII. 2 Cor. x. 3. " For though we walk in the flesh,

The Epistle to DIOGNETUS.

IV. ' They^h are reviled and bless.'

V. ' The apostle^k says : Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.'

VI. ' But he who^l with fear knows, and seeks life, planteth in hope, expecting fruit.'

VII. ' They are in the flesh, but they live not after

^a Περὶ ἐνδύσεως καὶ τροφῆς μὴ μεριμνᾶν. p. 500. D.

^b Αὐτὸς ἀπ' ἑρανῶν τὴν ἀληθεῖαν καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ἀπειροήτῳ ἀνθρώποις ἐκδηρῶται. P. 498. B.

^c Οὗτος ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. P. 501. D.

^d P. 501. C. D.

^e Καὶ χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οὐκ εἰσι ἐξ

ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. P. 497. D.

^f P. 500. B. C.

^g Λαίδορμενοι, εὐλογεμενοι.

^h Λαίδορμενται καὶ εὐλογεσιν.

P. 497. C.

ⁱ Ἢ γνῶσις φῦσις, ἢ δὲ ἀγαπῆ οὐκοδομεῖ.

^k Ἀποστολὸς—λεγει ἢ γνῶσις φῦσις, ἢ δὲ ἀγαπῆ οὐκοδομεῖ. p. 502. C.

^l P. 502. C.

N. T.

we do not war after the flesh.”

2 Cor. vi. 8. “By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report. 9. As unknown, and yet well known: as dying, and behold we live: as chastened, and not killed. 10. As sorrowful, and yet always rejoicing: as poor, yet making many rich: as having nothing, yet possessing all things.”

The whole passage (of which I have transcribed here but a part) is a most beautiful representation of the suffering circumstances and virtues of the christians of the author's own time, in allusion to these and other words of the New Testament. Therefore a part of it has been already transcribed, and more of it will appear in some following numbers.

N. T.

VIII. Philip. iii. 20. “For ourⁿ conversation is in heaven.”

IX. 1 Tim. iii. 16. “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”

X. 2 Tim. i. 11. “Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle,

The Epistle to **DIOGNETUS**.
the flesh. They^m are unknown, [he speaks of christians in his own time all along,] and yet are condemned. They are put to death, and yet are revived. They are poor, and make many rich. They want all things, and abound in all things. They are in dishonour, and in dishonour are glorified. They are evil-spoken of, and are justified. Being put to death, they are made alive.’

The Epistle to **DIOGNETUS**.

VIII. ‘They dwell^o on earth, but they converse in heaven.’

IX. ‘Who [the disciples] being esteemed^p by him, were acquainted with the mysteries of the Father. For which cause he sent the Word, that he might appear to the world: who having been rejected of the people, preached by the apostles, was believed on by the Gentiles.’

X. ‘And being^q a disciple of the apostles, I become a teacher of the Gentiles.’

ⁿ P. 497. B. C.
υπαρχει.
P. 497. B.

^o Ἦμων γὰρ τὸ πολιτεῦμα ἐν ἕρανσις
ἐπὶ γῆς διατριβῶσιν, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἕρανῳ πολιτεῦνται.
^p P. 501. D.

^q Ἀλλ’ ἀποστόλων γενομένος μαθητῆς, γίνομαι διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν. P. 501. C.

N. T.

and^r a teacher of the Gentiles.”

XI. 1 Pet. ii. 20. “ — but if^s when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.”

XII. 1 Pet. ii. 24. “ Who^u his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.”

XIII. 1 Pet. iii. 18. “ For Christ also has once suffered for our sins, the^w just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.”

XIV. 1 John iv. 9. “ In this was manifested the love of God to us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world.”

10. “ Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us.”

16. “ And we have known and believed the love that God has to us.”

17. “ Herein is our love made perfect.”

19. “ We love him because he first loved us.”

XV. Speaking of the state of things after the coming of

The Epistle to DIOGNETUS. [So the author speaks of himself.]

XI. ‘ When they^t do well they are punished as evil.’

XII. ‘ Saying himself : He^v took our sins.’ This is evidently a quotation, and only by a different pointing may be read thus: saying, He himself took our sins. But perhaps it may be doubtful, whether he refers to this text of Peter, or to Isa. ch. liii.

XIII. ‘ He delivered up^x his own Son a ransom for us, the holy for the transgressors, the innocent for the guilty, the just for the unjust.’

XIV. ‘ For God loved mankind — to whom he sent his only-begotten Son, to whom he has promised a kingdom in heaven, and will give it to them that love him. And^y when you know him, with how great joy will you be filled? And how will you love him who so loved you before? And having loved him, you will be an imitator of his goodness.’

^r Και διδάσκαλος εθνων.

^s Αλλ' ει αγαθοποιουντες, κ. λ.

^t Αγαθοποιουντες, ως κακοι κολαζονται. 497. C. ^u Ὅς τας ἀμαρτίας ἡμων αὐτος ἀνηνεγκεν.

^v Λεγων αὐτος, τας ἡμετερας ἀμαρτίας ἀνεδέξατο.

500. B. ^w Δικαιος ὑπερ ἀδικων.

^x Αὐτος τον ἰδιον υἱον ἀπέδοτο

λυτρον ὑπερ ἡμων, τον αγιον ὑπερ ανομων, τον ακακων ὑπερ των κακων, τον εἰκαιον ὑπερ των ἀδικων. 500. B.

^y P. 501. A.

Christ, he has this passage, in which he seems to speak of the volume of the gospels, and of the epistles of the apostles.

‘The^z fear of the law is sung, and the grace of the prophets is known, and the faith of the gospels is established, and the tradition of the apostles is kept, and the grace of the church rejoiceth exceedingly.’

XVI. The passages alleged from this epistle relate to the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, the epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, the epistle to the Philippians, the first and second to Timothy, and the first epistle of St. Peter, and first of St. John. And in most of them the allusion is plain. Words of the first epistle to the Corinthians are expressly cited as the apostle’s, meaning Paul. The author seems likewise to speak of a code or collection of gospels and apostolical epistles, which he joins together with the law and the prophets.

CHAP. XII.

DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH.

DIONYSIUS, bishop of Corinth, flourished, according to Cave,^a about the year 170. Eusebius in his Chronicle,^b at the eleventh year of Marcus Antoninus, (which is the year 171 of our Lord,) says, ‘Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, a ‘sacred man, was then in reputation.’ He wrote seven letters, called by Eusebius^c Catholic, or general, they being sent to divers churches, and another to a christian woman. These epistles are mentioned^d by Eusebius in the following order: one to the Lacedemonians: another to the Athenians: the third to the faithful of Nicomedia, which was the capital city of Bithynia: the fourth to the church at Gortyna, and the rest of the churches of Crete: the fifth to the church in Amastris, together with the churches throughout Pontus: the sixth to the Gnossians, likewise in Crete: the seventh to the Romans, inscribed to Soter then bishop. ‘And

^z *Εἶτα φόβος νομῆ ἀδεῖται, καὶ προφητῶν χάρις γινώσκειται, καὶ ἐναγγελίων πίστες ἔρυνται, καὶ ἀποστολῶν παραδόσεις φυλάσσειται, καὶ ἐκκλησίας χάρις σκιρτά.* p. 502. A.

^a Hist. Lit.

^b Διονύσιος ἐπίσκοπος

Κορινθῶν ἱερός ἀνὴρ ἐγνωρίζετο.

^c Καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας

ἐπιτολαῖς. H. E. l. 4. c. 23. p. 143. C.

^d Eod. cap.

‘beside these,’ says Eusebius, ‘there is extant another ‘sent to Chrysophora, a most faithful sister.’ Of these epistles nothing remains, except some fragments in^e Eusebius.

St. Jerom’s^f account of Dionysius contains an enumeration of these letters. And he says, ‘he was a man of great ‘eloquence and industry : and that he flourished under M. ‘Antoninus and Commodus.’ He has been called a martyr by some, but without^g any foundation in antiquity.

I shall now put down a few particulars, suitable to our present design, out of the fragments of these epistles preserved by Eusebius.

‘The letter to the Athenians,’ says Eusebius, ‘is^h exhortatory to the faith, and a conversation according to the ‘gospel:’ meaning by gospel the doctrine and precepts of the christian religion, or the books of the New Testament, in whole or in part. However, it must be owned these are properly the words of Eusebius.

In this epistle ‘he relatesⁱ moreover,’ says Eusebius, ‘that Dionysius the Areopagite, who was converted to the ‘faith by the apostle Paul, according to the account given ‘in the Acts of the Apostles, was appointed the first bishop ‘of the church of the Athenians.’

How far Dionysius had referred for this to the book of the Acts of the Apostles is doubtful, and cannot be determined from Eusebius. But every one will upon this occasion regret the loss of these epistles.

In the epistle to the Nicomedians, ‘he^k opposeth the ‘heresy of Marcion, and strenuously asserts and^l defends ‘the rule of truth.’

It is highly probable, he here maintained the genuineness and authority of divers books of the New Testament against Marcion, who^m rejected some, and mutilated and curtailed others.

In the epistle to the church of Amastris, Eusebiusⁿ says, ‘he has inserted expositions of the divine scriptures.’

We cannot be positive indeed: but there is no reason to forbid our supposing, here were expositions of the scriptures of the New, as well as of the Old Testament.

^e Ibid. et l. 2. cap. 25. p. 68. A.

^f De Vir. Ill. cap. 27.

^g Vid. Tillemont, Mem. E. T. ii. Denys de Corinthe, ad fin.

^h Διεγερτική πίστεως και της κατα το ευαγγελιον πολιτειας. l. iv. c. 23. p. 143. D.

ⁱ P. 144. A.

^k Εν η̄ Μαρκιωνος

αίρεσιν πολεμων, τω της αληθειας παρισταται κανονι. p. 144. A.

^l Vid. Vales. in loc.

^m Vid. Irenæ. l. 1. cap. 27. [al. 28.] et

Tertullian, adv. Marcion.

ⁿ Γραφων τε Σειων εξηγησεις

παρατεθειται. ib. B.

‘Farther,’ says Eusebius, ‘the same person, speaking of his own epistles, as having been corrupted, expresseth himself^o in this manner: “I have written epistles,” says he, “at the desire of the brethren. But the apostles of the devil have filled them with darnel, taking out some things, and adding others: for whom there is a woe reserved. It is not to be wondered, therefore, if some have attempted to corrupt the scriptures of the Lord, [or the Dominic scriptures,] since they have attempted the same thing in writings not comparable to them.”’

When he says, ‘there is a woe reserved’ for those persons, Le Clerc^p says, he seems to allude to Isa. v. 20, or to Rev. xxii. 18, 19; but of this we cannot be certain.

By ‘scriptures of the Lord’ he seems to mean the scriptures of the New Testament in general, as containing the doctrine and precepts of the Lord Jesus. There were some who endeavoured to corrupt them. He intends, it is likely, in particular, the followers of Marcion. However, the Catholic christians were upon their guard. These heretics, therefore, only attempted this; and it was a vain attempt, without any considerable success. The alterations they made were detected by the vigilance of the sounder part of christians; who, by the numerous copies of most of the books of the New Testament, in the apostolic churches, in almost every part of the world, could without much difficulty discover the frauds attempted to be practised on their sacred writings.

There is another remarkable fragment of this writer in Eusebius, which may deserve to be placed here. Eusebius is speaking of Nero’s persecution, and the martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul: ‘And,’ says^q he, ‘that they both suffered martyrdom about the same time, Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, assures us in his epistle to the Romans, writing in this manner: “So also you, by this your so suitable admonition, have joined together the plantation of the Romans and the Corinthians, which was made by Peter and Paul. For they both coming to our city of Corinth planted and taught us. And in like manner going together to Italy, they taught there, and suffered martyrdom about the same time.”’

^o Ἐπι δε ὁ αὐτος και περι των ιδιων επιστολων ὡς ῥαδιουργηθειςων, ταυτα φησιν· επιστολας γαρ αδελφων αξιωσαντων με γραψαι, εγραψα και ταυτας οι τι διαβολη αποστολοι ζιζανιων γεγεμικαν· ἃ μιν εξαυραντες, ἃ δε προσιθεντες· οἱς το και κειται ἢ θανρασον αρα, ει και των κυριακων ῥαδιουργησαι τινες επεβληνται γραφων, ὅποτε και ταις ἢ τοιανταις επιβεβληκασι. p. 145. C.

^p Vid. Hist. E. p. 735. Note 3.

^q Eus. H. E. l. 2. c. 25. p. 68. A.

This is all I have to offer at present^r from this writer. But from the little that remains of him it may be justly concluded, that his epistles would be of great use to us, if they were now extant; especially considering the traces of eminent virtue that appear in almost every part of his short fragments. He shows a peaceable disposition, in recommending peace and unity to the Lacedemonians. He shows his goodness and candour, in his precept to the Amastrians, ‘that all who recover from any fall, whether of vice or heretical opinion, should be kindly received:’ and his judgment and good sense, as well as true virtue, in his admonition to Pinytus, bishop of the Gnosians: ‘not to impose on the brethren the heavy yoke of continence as necessary, but to consider the infirmity of the most.’ In a word, it is the character which Eusebius gives him, ‘that he was useful to all by his divine labours, and not only to the church particularly under his care.’ Dionysius was an excellent man.

CHAP. XIII.

TATIAN.

TATIAN flourished, according to^a Cave, about the year 172. In his Oration against the Gentiles, generally reckoned his only remaining work, he has informed us of several things concerning himself. That^b he was born in Assyria, was originally a heathen, and^c was converted to christianity by reading the books of the Old Testament, and by reflecting on the corruptions and absurdities of Gentilism; and that^d he had been a considerable traveller, and seen the world; and afterwards came to Rome, where he farther improved himself in arts and sciences. The Oration itself shows him to be a man of reading, and well acquainted with the Greek learning; which character is also universally allowed him by ancient writers. He mentions Justin Martyr with^e great respect: and by many

^r See hereafter, Ch. XXVIII. Numb. V. VI. See likewise Ch. II. p. 33.

^a Hist. Lit. Vid. et Tillemont, Mem. Ec. T. 2. Part 3. Les Encratites. Basnage, Ann. 172. sect. 3, 4, &c. Du Pin, Bibl. Fabrie. Bibl. Gr. T. vi. p. 81, &c.

^b P. 174. B. C.

^c P. 165. B.

^d P. 170. B. C.

^e P. 157. D. 158. A.

ancient christian writers we are well assured that he was his follower; but some while after his death, which happened about the year 165, he went into a great variety of absurd opinions. He is said to be the author of the sect of the Encratites, or Continents; condemned the use of wine; denied the lawfulness of marriage, the reality of Christ's sufferings, the salvation of Adam; embraced the Æons of Valentinus; asserted, with Marcion, that there are two gods. But whatever were his principles in the latter part of his life, he will afford a good proof of the antiquity, and high esteem of the gospels in his time, and be otherwise of considerable use to us.

I shall farther observe briefly the notice that has been taken of him by the ancients. Irenæus^f says, he was a follower of Justin, and mentions the heresies he taught after Justin's martyrdom. Clement^g of Alexandria makes frequent mention of him, and confutes him. Origen^h speaks of his Oration to the Greeks as a learned work. Eusebius,ⁱ in his Chronicle, dates his heresy at the 12th of the emperor Marcus Antoninus, or the year 172. What Eusebius says farther of Tatian will be placed below distinctly. Epiphanius^k has given a particular account of his heresy.

St. Jerom's account of Tatian, in his book^l of Illustrious Men, is this: 'Tatian, who first taught rhetoric, and gained a great deal of honour thereby, was a follower of Justin Martyr, and flourished in the church as long as he adhered to him. But afterwards puffed up with the pride of eloquence, he founded a new heresy, called that of the Encratites, which was afterwards improved by Severus. Tatian wrote an infinite number of books; of which there is one written against the Gentiles, which is reckoned the most considerable of all his works. He flourished under the emperor M. Antoninus Verus, and L. Aurelius Commodus.'

I shall take no more passages concerning the history of this writer. I proceed to those which will set before us his testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament.

I. Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, having given an account of Tatian, and his opinions, from Irenæus, and then of Severus, and his followers, who had made additions

^f Adv. Hær. l. i. cap. 28. [al. 30, 31.] l. iii. cap. 23. [al. 36, &c.]

^g Strom. lib. i. p. 320. B. lib. iii. p. 466. A. B. D. 465. C. ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου Ἐπιτ. 806. C.

^h Cont. Cels. l. i. p. 14.

ⁱ Tatianus hæreticus agnoscitur: a quo Encratitæ. Chr. p. 170.

^k Hær. 26. al. 46.

^l Cap. 29.

to some of Tatian's opinions, adds : ' But^m their first leader, ' Tatian, composed I know not what harmony and collection ' of the gospels, which he called [Dia Tessaron] Of the ' Four, which is still in the hands of some. And it is said, ' that he had the assurance to alter [or explain] some words ' of the apostle, as pretending to correct the composition ' and order of his style. He left a great number of books : ' of which, his celebrated discourse against the Gentiles has ' been quoted by many ; which seems to be the most ele- ' gant, and most useful, of all his writings.'

This is a strong proof that there were four, and but four gospels, which were in esteem with christians. It seems that Eusebius had not seen this harmony or collection of Tatian.

Theodoret,ⁿ who flourished in the fifth century, about 423, speaks of this book in the following manner : ' He ' [Tatian] composed a gospel which is called Dia Tessaron, ' [Of the Four,] leaving out the genealogies, and every ' thing that shows the Lord to have been born of the seed ' of David according to the flesh : which has been used ' not only by those of his sect, but also by them who fol- ' low the apostolical doctrine ; they not perceiving the ' fraud of the composition, but simply using it as a com- ' pendious book. I have also met with above two hundred ' of these books, which were in esteem in our churches : all ' which I took away, and laid aside in a parcel, and placed ' in their room the gospels of the four evangelists.'

Victor Capuanus, a writer of the sixth century, says, that Tatian called his harmony *Δια Πεντε*, Of the Five. Whence some learned moderns have inferred, that Tatian used also the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Ittigius^o has shown it, I think, to be very probable, that this *Δια Πεντε*, Of the Five, in Victor, is only an error of the transcribers for *Δια Παντων*, Of All. Eusebius calls it ' Of the ' Four,' as does Theodoret. All the fault that Theodoret, who had seen so many copies, finds with this performance is, that Tatian had left out the genealogies.

It is said that^p Ephraim the Syrian, of the fourth cen-

^m 'Ο μერთο γε προτερος αυτων αρχηγος ο Τατιανος, συναφειαν τινα και συναγωγην εκ οιδ' οπως των ευαγγελιων συνθεις, το δια τεσσαων τριστο προσωνομασεν' ο και παρα τισιν εισετι νυν φερεται' τα δε αποτολα φασι τολμησαι τινας αυτων μεταφρασαι φωνας ως επιδιορθωμενον αυτων την της φρασεως συνταξιν. H. E. l. iv. c. 28. Vid. et cap. 16. de Tatiano.

ⁿ Heret. Fab. l. i. cap. 20.

^o Tho. Ittigi de Hæresiarchis,

sect. 2. cap. 12. p. 182.

^p Syriacum Tatiani Diatessarôn commentariis illustravit Sanctus Ephræmus, testibus Barsabæo et Barhebræo, quorum verba retuli. T. i. p. 57, 58. Asseman. Bib. Orient. T. 3. P. i. p. 13.

tury, wrote commentaries upon Tatian's harmony, or Diatessaron.

Whether this harmony be now extant, is disputed by^q learned men: I think I need not concern myself with that question.

The apostle, whose words Tatian had the assurance to alter, or explain, undoubtedly is Paul. But it cannot be determined from this passage of Eusebius, what epistles of Paul Tatian owned, or how many of them he had explained, or corrected. Nay, it seems, that Eusebius had never seen the work itself. What he writes of it is only from the report of others. Mill^r thinks there was no ill design in this work of Tatian: that his altering the words of Paul amounted to no more than some interlineary or marginal explications: putting here and there over against the apostle's other synonymous words, which were somewhat clearer. Tatian's 'correcting of the composition of 'the apostle's style,' likewise, according to him, was only disposing in the margin some of the words of St. Paul in a more natural order, without intending, or in the event doing, any prejudice to the apostle's original text.

The Oration against the Gentiles being commended by so many, affords an argument, that it was written before the year 172, about which time Tatian left the Catholic opinions; and as it seems to have been written after Justin's death, therefore some time between 165 and 172. In this Oration are a few references or allusions to the gospels, which I shall take notice of.

N. T.

II. Luke vi. 25. "Woe^s unto you that laugh now: for ye shall mourn and weep."

III. John i. 3. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made."

TATIAN.

II. 'You may^t laugh, but you will weep.'

III. 'Forsaking dæmons, give up yourselves to the one God. For^v all things are by him, and without him was not any thing made.'

^q Vid. Vales. Not. ad Euseb. H. E. l. iv. cap. 29. Tillemont, Mem. T. ii. Part 3. Les Encratites, Not. 2. Basnage, Ann. 172. u. vi. Fabr. Bibl. Gr. T. vi. p. 83.

^r Proleg. n. 361, 362.

^s Ουαι ὑμιν οἱ γελωντες νυν' ὅτι πειθησεται και κλαυσετε.

^t Γελατε δε ὑμεις, ὡς και κλαουσονται. p. 167. C.

^v Παντα εἰ' αὐτε εγενετο' και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ηδε εν, ο γεγονεν.

^w Παντα ὑπ' αυτου, και χωρις αυτου γεγονεν ηδε εν. p. 158. D.

IV. John i. 5. “And the light shineth in darkness, and^w the darkness comprehendeth it not.”

IV. ‘This is^x what is said: The darkness comprehendeth not the light.—And the word [or reason] is the light of God: the ignorant soul is darkness.’

V. He seems to refer to the beginning of St. John’s gospel in another place.^y He likewise says,^z ‘God is a spirit,’ in the very words of John iv. 24.

VI. ‘He^a that wants nothing is not to be traduced by us as if he wanted.’ This is much the same thought, and applied to the same purpose with Paul’s, Acts xvii. 25, “as though he needeth any thing.” But it is a character of the Deity so obvious, that I think it cannot determine us to suppose he had an eye to those words of the apostle.

VII. St.^b Clement has informed us, that Tatian, in a book called Perfection according to the Saviour, argued against marriage from the words of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 5; and from St. Jerom^c it appears, that Tatian had abused to the same purpose the words of Paul, Gal. vi. 8: but I do not think it needful to translate either of these passages.

And from^d Irenæus we learn, ‘that Tatian had endeavoured to support his opinion concerning Adam, that he was not saved, from these words, 1 Cor. xv. 22, that “in Adam all die:” and from some other expressions of the apostle.’

VIII. Lastly, St. Jerom, in his preface to his Commentary upon the Epistle to Titus, says: ‘But Tatian,^e the patriarch of the Encratites, though he rejected some of Paul’s epistles, was of opinion, that this to Titus ought to be owned as the apostle’s without any hesitation.’

^w Καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτοῦ καὶ καταλαμβάνει. ^x Καὶ τὸτο ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰρημερον’ ἡ σκοτία τοῦ φῶς καὶ καταλαμβάνει. p. 152. C.

^y P. 245. A. B. C.

^z Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός. p. 144. C.

^a P. 144. D.

^b Γράφει γὰρ κατὰ λέξιν ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν Σωτῆρα καταρτισμῶν· Συμφωνοῦν μὲν οὖν ἰσχυρῶς προσευχῆ κοινῶν ἐκ φθορᾶς λυεὶ τὴν ἐντέξιν. κ. λ. Strom. l. iii. p. 460. A.

^c Tatianus, qui putativam Christi carnem introducens, omnem conjunctionem masculi ad feminam immundam arbitratur, Encratarum vel acerrimus hæresiarches, tali adversum nos sub occasione præsentis testimonii usus est argumento: ‘Si qui seminat in earne, de carne metet corruptionem:’ in carne autem seminat, qui mulieri jungitur. Ergo et is qui uxore utitur, et seminat in carne ejus, de carne metet corruptionem. Comm. in Gal. cap. 6.

^d Tentans et subinde uti hujusmodi a Paulo assidue dietis: quoniam in ‘Adam omnes morimur.’ l. iii. cap. 23. sect. 8. al. cap. 39.

^e Sed Tatianus Encratarum patriarches, qui et ipse nonnullas Pauli epistolas repudiavit, hanc vel maxime, hoc est, ad Titum, apostoli pronuntiandam credidit; parvi pendens Marcionis et aliorum, qui cum eo in hac parte consentiant, assertionem.

IX. We see then plainly, that the gospels, and many of Paul's epistles, were received by Tatian, and owned by him to the last: and his rejecting any of the rest is of no weight, when a man gave way to such manifest absurdities as he did in the latter part of his life.

CHAP. XIV.

HEGESIPPUS.

HEGESIPPUS, as we are informed by Eusebius,^a was originally a Jew, converted to the christian faith. He is supposed to have been born in the beginning of the second century; and died, according to the Alexandrine Chronicle, in the reign of Commodus. 'He wrote,' says^b Eusebius, 'a faithful relation of the apostolic preaching in a 'very plain style.' And in these books, Eusebius says, he mentions his journey to Rome: that in his way he conversed with many bishops: that in all of them he perceived one and the same doctrine. 'When^c I came to Rome,' says he, 'I took^d up^e my abode with Anicetus, whose deacon Eleutherus [then] was. After Anicetus succeeded 'Soter, and after him Eleutherus.' And in another place^f Eusebius says, that Hegesippus writes, he came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, and staid there until the bishopric of Eleutherus. Though therefore learned men are not exactly agreed about the time of these bishops of Rome, we must suppose the five books of Hegesippus not finished till after 170, very^g few placing the beginning of Eleutherus's bishopric before that year.

Eusebius^h however assures us, he was in the 'first succession of the apostles:' and Stephenⁱ Gobar, in Photius,

^a H. E. l. iv. c. 22. p. 143. B. ^b *Ἐν πέντε δὲ οὖν συγγραμμασιν οὗτος τὴν ἀπλάνην παραδοσὶν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρυγματός ἀπλασάτη συντάξει γραφῆς ὑπομνηματίζαμενος.* l. iv. c. 8. init. ^c *Γενομένος δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδόχην [ἢ. ἐπιστρίβην] ἐποίησαμην μεχρὸς Ἀνικητῆς, οὗ διάκονος ἦν Ἐλευθέρος· καὶ παρὰ Ἀνικητῆς διαδέχεται Σωτήρ, μεθ' ὃν Ἐλευθέρος.* *ibid.* c. 22.

^d *Vid. Vales. Not. in loc. Eus.* ^e Or, as others: 'I composed a succession (of the bishops of Rome) to Anicetus.' *Vid. Pearson. Op. Post. p. 24. Grabe, Spicil. T. 2. p. 212, et 256.*

^f *Ibid. cap. xi. p. 125. B.*

^g *Vid. Grabe, Spic. T. 2. p. 204.*

^h *Ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένου διαδόχης.* l. 2. c. 23. p. 63. C.

ⁱ *Ἀρχαίος τε ἀνήρ καὶ ἀποστολικός.* Phot. Cod. 232.

calls him an ‘ancient and apostolical man.’ St. Jerom, in his Catalogue,^k writes of him to this purpose: ‘Hegesippus, who was near the times of the apostles, composed a history of the affairs of the church from the passion of our Lord to his own time. And collecting together a great variety of matters for the benefit of his readers, he wrote five books in a plain and simple manner, imitating^l therein the style of those whose life he followed [or, as perhaps some may choose to have it rendered, “whose life he wrote”]. He says, he came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, the tenth bishop after Peter, and continued there to the time of Elentherus, bishop of the same city, who formerly had been deacon of Anicetus.’

These five books are all lost, except some fragments preserved by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, and one more in Photius from Stephen Gobar; of which I shall presently give an account, so far as they relate to our present subject: and in the margin I shall put the character^m of this writer, as given by some moderns, though it be not very much to his advantage.

I. The first fragmentⁿ is his relation of the death of James the Just at Jerusalem. In this narration, the style of the scriptures of the New Testament often appears. When the Jews (scribes and pharisees) and others came to James to desire him to tell the people his opinion of Jesus, they say to him: ‘For^o we and all the people bear witness to you, that you are just, and accept no man’s person,’ Matt. xxii. 16; Luke xx. 21. Afterwards, James says to them: “Why^p do you ask me concerning Jesus the Son of man? He sits in heaven, on the right hand of the Great Power, and will come in the clouds of heaven,” Matt. xxvi. 64. ‘Whereby many were fully persuaded, and glorified God for that testimony of James, saying, “Hosanna to the Son

^k Cap. 22.

^l Ut quorum vitam sectabatur, dicendi quoque exprimeret characterem.

^m Suspectum tamen merito Hegesippi est testimonium, quia ex reliquis ejus apud Eusebium fragmentis abunde constat, eum non accuratum, sed credulum ac fabulosum fuisse scriptorem. Ingenuum hic est judicium Dupinii, qui recensitis fragmentis Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Hegesippi addit: ‘Autant que nous pouvons juger par ce qui nous reste, il étoit peu exact, et plus rempli d’histoires feintes et fabuleuses, que ‘narrations solides et véritables.’ Idem judicium est Basnagii, et aliorum. Lampe, Prolegom. in Joann. l. i. c. 4. n. x.

ⁿ Eus. H. E. l. 2. c. 23.

^o ‘Ἡμεῖς γὰρ μαρτυροῦμεν σοὶ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός, ὅτι δίκαιός εἶ, καὶ ὅτι προσώπων οὐ λαμβάνεις. p. 64. C.

^p Τι με ἐπερωτατε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; Καὶ αὐτός καθήται ἐν τῷ θρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης ἐδναμείως, καὶ μέλλει ἐρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ πολλῶν πληροφορηθέντων καὶ ἐδοξάζοντων ἐπὶ τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τοῦ Ἰακώβου, καὶ λεγοντων, Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ. p. 64. D

of David," Matt. xxi. 9, 15. When they had thrown him down from the battlement of the temple, he not being quite dead, they began to cast stones at him. 'But^a he kneeling down said: "I beseech thee, O Lord God the Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do,"' Acts vii. 60; Luke xxiii. 34.—'This man was a^r faithful witness both to the Jews and Greeks, that Jesus was the Christ,' Acts xx. 21.

II. The next^s fragment of this writer contains an account of Domitian's inquiry after the posterity of David. 'At that time,' says he, 'there were yet remaining of the kindred of Christ the grandsons of Jude, who was called his brother according to the flesh. These some accused, as being of the race of David; and Evocatus brought them before Domitianus Cæsar. For^t he too was afraid of the coming of Christ, as well as Herod,' Matt. ii.

This passage deserves to be remarked. It contains a reference to the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew; and shows plainly, that this part of St. Matthew's gospel was owned by this Hebrew christian. But Epiphanius^u informs us, that the gospel of the Ebionites begins thus: 'It came to pass in the days of Herod the king of Judea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan;' which is the beginning of the third chapter of St. Matthew, a little altered. And he there^v says expressly, that their gospel called according to St. Matthew, is 'defective and corrupted.' It is plain however from this passage, that Hegesippus received the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew: so that he used our Greek gospel. Or, if he used only the Hebrew edition of St. Matthew's gospel, this history must have been in it in his time.

These grandsons of Jude were interrogated by Domitian concerning their own substance; which they informed him of, and gave him proofs they were poor labouring men. 'Being asked,' says^w Hegesippus, 'of Christ and his king-

^a Ἄλλα τραπεῖς ἐθηκε τὰ γόνατα, λεγὼν παρακαλῶ, Κύριε Θεε Πατερ, ἀφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τι ποιοῦσιν. p. 65. B.

^r Μαρτυρὸς οὗτος ἀληθοῦς Ἰεδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήσι γεγεννηταί, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστίν. p. 65. C. ^s Eus. H. E. l. 3. c. 19, 20.

^t Εφοβείτο γὰρ τὴν παρεσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης. p. 89. C.

^u Hær 30. sect. 13. p. 138. A. T. i. ed. Petav. ^v Ibid. init. sect. 13.

^w Ἐρωτηθέντας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, ὅποια τις εἴη, καὶ ποσὲ καὶ ποὶ φαινέσμενῃ; λογονθέναι, ὡς ἢ κοσμικῆ μὲν εἰδ' ἐπιγίως, ἐπικρατοῦς δὲ καὶ ἀγγελικῆ τυγχάνει, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος γενέσμενῃ, ὀπῆρκα ἐλθὼν ἐν δοξῇ κρίνει ζώντας, καὶ νεκροῦς, καὶ ἀποδώσει ἕκαστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδύμματα αὐτοῦ. p. 90. A. B.

dom, of what kind it was, and when and where it should appear? Luke xix. 11; they answered that it was not worldly nor terrene, but heavenly and angelical, and would be in the end of the world; when he coming in glory should judge the quick and the dead, and render to every man according to his works,' 2 Tim. iv. 1.

I do not pretend absolutely to determine a reference to any particular texts in these last words: but I have thought it very proper to place them here, together with what precedes, as representing the doctrine of the New Testament very much in the style of it.

I omit the next fragment of this author in^x Eusebius, giving the history of the martyrdom of Simeon bishop of Jerusalem, it containing nothing suitable to our present design.

III. But afterwards, in another chapter,^y Eusebius observes several things which were in the five books of this writer: 'That in his journey to Rome he visited many bishops, in particular Primus bishop of Corinth, where he staid many days: and where,' says he, 'we received mutual refreshment from the true faith. From thence he went to Rome, and staid there to the time of Eleutherus.' He^z adds: 'And in every succession, and in every city, the same doctrine is taught, which the law, and the prophets, and the Lord preacheth.' Here it seems, that by 'the Lord' he must mean the scriptures of the New Testament; which he looks upon as containing the very doctrine taught and preached by Jesus Christ. However, he afterwards speaks of heresies; but the true church was free from these.

IV. 'He also takes some things,' says^a Eusebius, 'out of the gospel according to the Hebrews, and out of the Syriac, and in particular out of the Hebrew tongue; manifesting hereby, that he is one of the faithful from among the Hebrews.'

The former part of this sentence is rendered agreeably to the translation of Valesius, which I suppose is generally taken very contentedly; though, on the other hand, some have been mightily puzzled about the true meaning. I think Valesius's version is agreeable enough to the Greek

^x L. iii. cap. 32.

^y L. iv. cap. 22.

^z *Ἐν ἑκάστη δὲ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἑκάστη πόλει οὕτως ἐχει, ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύττει, καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ, καὶ ὁ Κύριος.* p. 142. C.

^a *Ἐκ τῆς καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγελίας, καὶ τῆς Συριακῆς, καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς διαλεκτῆς τινὰ τιθήσιν, ἐμφανῶν ἐξ Ἑβραίων αὐτῶν πεπιστευκεῖναι.* p. 143. B.

in Eusebius. But one would be apt to suspect our present copies are here hardly right. I cannot pretend to correct them: but I imagine that St. Jerom has given us, though undesignedly, the true sense of what Eusebius wrote, when he says: ‘in the^b gospel according to the Hebrews, which is written indeed in the Syriac and Chaldaic tongue, [or Syro-Chaldaic tongue,] but in Hebrew characters is this history;’ which he there relates.

Let this passage of Eusebius be allowed to be ever so obscure, I think it affords proof, that there was an Hebrew gospel in the time of Hegesippus, and that he made use of it; but how far, we cannot say. Here is nothing to help us to determine the question, whether this gospel according to the Hebrews, written in the Syriac language, but in Hebrew letters, was a translation, or an original.

V. The last passage concerning our author to be taken from Eusebius is this: ‘And discoursing^c of the books called apocryphal, he relates, that some of them were forged by some heretics in his time.’

Whether he speaks of apocryphal books of the Old Testament, or the New, may be doubtful; because the last preceding observation of Eusebius is, that this writer, as well as Irenæus, and some other ancients, call the Proverbs of Solomon by the name of Wisdom. But the connection in Eusebius does not, I think, afford any certain proof that he means the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. However this we may learn hence, that the first christians were not only upon their guard against heretics, but also against their forgeries.

VI. Beside these, there is a remarkable fragment of Hegesippus preserved by Photius^d in his extracts out of Stephen Gobar, a tritheistical writer of the sixth century.

Gobar there says: ‘The eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for the righteous: though^e Hegesippus, an ancient and apostolical man, in

^b In evangelio juxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaïco quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebræicis literis scriptum est;—adv. Pelagian. lib. iii. int. Op. T. iv. Part 2. p. 533. ed. Bened.

^c Καὶ περὶ τῶν λεγομένων δὲ ἀποκρυφῶν διαλαμβανῶν, ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων πρὸς τινῶν αἱρετικῶν ἀναπεπλάσθαι τινὰ τῶν ἰσορῶν. p. 143. B.

^d Cod. 232. p. 893.

^e Ἠγῆσιππος μὲν τοι, ἀρχαῖος τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός, ἐν τῷ πεμπτῷ τῶν ἀπομνηματίων, ἐκ οὐδ’ ὅ, τι καὶ παθῶν, ματὴν μὲν εἰρησθαι τὰντα λέγει, καὶ καταψευδέσθαι τῶς τὰντα φαιμένους τῶν τε θείων γραφῶν, καὶ τῶ Κῆρις λεγοῦτος, Μακαριοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν οἱ βλέποντες, καὶ τὰ ὠτα ἡμῶν τὰ ἀκροῦντα, καὶ ἐξῆς. Apud Matth. Ὑμῶν δὲ μακαριοὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ, ὅτι βλέψουσὶ καὶ τὰ ὠτα ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἀκροῦντα.

‘ the fifth book of his Commentaries, [or Memoirs,] I know
 ‘ not for what reason, says, this is said without ground, and
 ‘ that they who say so contradict the divine scriptures, and
 ‘ the Lord, who says : “ Blessed are your eyes which see,
 ‘ and your ears which hear :” and what follows.’

Here is a good quotation of St. Matthew’s gospel, ch. xiii. 16. The other words are in 1 Cor. ii. 9 ; Isa. lxiv. 4. It is likely Hegesippus did not blame^f these words themselves, but only some interpretation of them by persons who pretended that Jesus Christ was a mere phantom, and that the senses were not good judges of his actions.

VII. We have then seen in Hegesippus divers things expressed in the style of the gospels, and Acts, and some other parts of the New Testament. He refers to the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew, and recites another text of that gospel, as spoken by the Lord. He speaks of the doctrine taught by the law, the prophets, and the Lord ; by which last expression he must mean some writing or writings containing the doctrine of Christ. Moreover, he used the gospel according to the Hebrews, and says, there had been books forged by heretics ; but they were such only as were called apocryphal, and were not received by the Catholics as of authority.

CHAP. XV.

MELITO.

THIS writer will afford little relating to our present design. However, for the sake of that little, and his otherwise great merit, and many labours, it is very fit we should here settle his time, and give some account of him.

Melito is placed by^a Cave at the year 170. He was bishop of Sardis in Lydia. Some moderns have supposed him to be the angel of the church of Sardis, to whom the epistle is directed, Rev. iii. 1—6 ; but this is without ground from antiquity : and, as Tillemont^b observes, it would oblige us to suppose he was bishop above seventy years ; which is not easy to believe, none of the ancients

^f Vid. Grabe, Spic. T. 2. p. 256.

^a Hist. Lit.

^b Mem. Ec. T. ii. Meliton, Note 1

calling him a disciple of the apostles, or making any mention of his great age; and Eusebius placeth him after several others who flourished about the middle of the second century.

Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, calls him an eunuch, on account, as is generally supposed, of his living a chaste and self-denying life in celibacy, for the sake of the gospel. ‘What need I,’ says^c he, ‘mention Melito the eunuch, who conducted himself in all things by the Holy Spirit, who lies buried in Sardis?’

St. Jerom^d informs us, ‘that Tertullian, in one of his books, praises Melito’s elegant and oratorical genius, and says, that he was esteemed a prophet by many of our people.’

He travelled into Palestine on purpose to learn the number of the books of the Old Testament. His catalogue^e is preserved by Eusebius, who took it out of Melito’s preface to his book of Extracts out of the Law and the Prophets. ‘It is a catalogue,’ says Eusebius, ‘of the scriptures of the Old Testament universally acknowledged.’ It contains the books received by the Jews into their canon; but he does not mention the book of Esther. It is the first catalogue of the books of the Old Testament recorded by any christian writer.

Melito^f presented, or addressed at least, an Apology to Marcus Antoninus in behalf of the christians then under sufferings. It is placed by Eusebius in his Chronicle at the year 170, the tenth of that emperor, after the death of Lucius Verus, adopted brother and colleague of Marcus Antoninus, which happened in the year 169. With Eusebius agrees the Alexandrian Chronicle. It is evident, it could not be written sooner than the year 170, or the latter part of 169. Pagi^g herein follows the Chronicle of Eusebius. Tillemont,^h from the manner in which Melito speaks of the emperor’s son in a passage of his Apology, (recorded byⁱ Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History,) concludes, that Commodus had then the tribunitian power, if he was not colleague with his father in the empire. The former, Commodus received in the year 175, and equal power with his father Marcus Antoninus in 176 or 177. Tillemont

^c Τι δε δε λεγειν—Μελιτωνα τον ευνηχον, τον εν αγιω πνευματι παντα πολιτευσαμενον. ap. Eus. H. E. l. v. c. 24. p. 191. D.

^d Hujus elegans et declamatorium ingenium laudans Tertullianus in septem libris quos scripsit adversus ecclesiam pro Montano dicit eum a plerisque nostrorum prophetam putari. De Script. Ill. n. 24.

^e Eus. H. E. l. iv. cap. 26. p. 148, 149.

^f Ibid.

^g Critic. in B. 170. sect. 3.

^h Melton, as above, Note 2.

ⁱ L. iv. c. 26. p. 148. A.

therefore is inclined to place this Apology in the year 175, and Basnage^k is rather for 177. This argument for the latter date of this Apology is so cogent, that I likewise choose to place it in 177.

Eusebius^l has given us this catalogue of Melito's works :
 ' Two books concerning Easter : Rules of Life, and of the
 ' Prophets : Of the Church : A Discourse of the Lord's
 ' Day : Another of the Nature of Man, and of his Forma-
 ' tion : Of the Obedience of the Senses to Faith : Of the
 ' Soul and Body, or of the Mind : Concerning Baptism :
 ' Of Truth, and of Faith, and the Generation of Jesus
 ' Christ : His Book of Prophecy, and of Hospitality : and
 ' the Key, and of the Devil, and^m the Revelation of John.'
 Another book, the titleⁿ of which I do not translate, be-
 cause^o the meaning of it is doubtful. ' And lastly, his
 ' little book to Antoninus : ' by which Eusebius means his
 forementioned Apology.

St. Jerom^p gives also a catalogue of Melito's works, in the main agreeable to Eusebius. We need not here concern ourselves about some little differences between them. These books are all lost, except a few fragments.

It was not amiss to put down here at length the titles of all this good man's works, to show the diligence of our christian ancestors. But the only piece belonging to our present design is that concerning the Revelation of John. What it contained, we are not informed. Mill^q says, it was a commentary upon that book. It is plain he ascribed that book to John, and very likely to John the apostle. I think it very probable he esteemed it a book of canonical authority.

There is nothing in the fragment of his Apology preserved by Eusebius to be inserted here. But in his preface to his Extracts out of the Law and the Prophets is a short passage, which I shall put down in this place, having only first observed, that^r Eusebius professes there to give us the passage he alleges, word for word. It is a letter to one Onesimus, to whom Melito says : ' When^s therefore I went

^k Ann. Polit. Ec. 177. sect. 3.

^l H. E. l. iv. c. 26. p. 146, 147.

^m Και τα περι της διαβολης, και της αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννης.

ⁿ Και ο περι ενσωματου Θεου.

^o See Tillemont, as before, in

Meliton, Note 3. et Fabric. Gr. V. v. and the references there.

^p De Vir. Ill. cap. 24.

^q Melito vero Sardensis ecclesiae (ad

quem quintam Johannis, cap. 3. Apoc. epistolam datam aiunt) episcopus integro eam commentario illustravit. Prolegom. n. 227.

^r Εχοντα επι λεξεως ουτως. p. 148. D.

^s Ανελθων εν εις την ανατολην,

και εως της τοπης γενομενος ενθα εκηρυχθη και επραχθη, και ακριβως μαθων τα της παλαιας διαθηκης βιβλια, υποταξας επεμψα σοι. Ibid. p. 149. A.

into the east, and was come to the place where those things were preached and done; I procured an accurate account of the books of the Old Testament, the catalogue of which I have here subjoined, and sent to you. Their names are these.'

From this passage I would conclude that there was then also a volume or collection of books, called the New Testament, containing the writings of apostles and apostolical men: but we cannot from hence infer the names, or the exact number of those books.

Melito then received the book of the Revelation, written by John; and, it is probable, many other books, collected together in a volume, called the New Testament; just as the books received by the Jews, as of divine authority, were called the Old Testament.

CHAP. XVI.

THE EPISTLE OF THE CHURCHES OF VIENNE AND LYONS.

IN the time of Marcus Antoninus the christians suffered extremely. 'In the seventeenth year of the reign of this 'prince,' says Eusebius,^a in his Ecclesiastical History, 'the persecution against us raged with great violence in 'several parts of the world, through the enmity of the 'people in the cities. What vast multitudes of martyrs 'there were throughout the whole empire, may be well 'concluded from what happened in one nation.' He means that of Gaul. The persecution was particularly violent at Lyons, and the country thereabout. At this time many of the christians of Lyons and Vienné suffered exquisite torments with the greatest patience. Pothinus bishop of Lyons, then above ninety years of age, was apprehended and carried before the governor, by whom he was examined, and before whom he made a generous confession of the christian religion; and having suffered many indignities, he was sent to prison, where he soon expired.

The time of the persecution in Gaul has been disputed. Some have argued for the year 167, thinking that Eusebius himself places it there in his Chronicle. Dodwell^b has de-

^a L. v. Proëm.

^b Diss. Cypr. xi. sect. 36.

fended this opinion with his usual diligence ; but the general opinion is with Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, who, as we have just shown, there places it in the seventeenth year of Marcus Antoninus, the 177th of our Lord. Supposing that Eusebius had in his Chronicle placed it in the seventh of that emperor, it would nevertheless be more reasonable for us to adhere to the account in the Ecclesiastical History, written after his Chronicle, where he gives the most particular account of the sufferings of these christians. But indeed Eusebius does not disagree with himself. The christians suffered, in one part or other of the world, from almost the beginning of Marcus's reign to the end of it. In his Chronicle, Eusebius assigns the fourth persecution to the seventh year of that emperor, because some suffered then ; and upon that occasion he makes a general mention of the martyrs of Lyons. But the persecution of the churches in Gaul did not happen until the seventeenth year of Marcus, as Eusebius particularly relates in his History. But I need not farther insist upon this point. The probability of the latter date of the persecution in Gaul has been so well argued, the invalidity of Dodwell's arguments so fully shown, and every difficulty so fairly considered and removed by Pagi^c and^d Tillemont, that, I think, every unprejudiced person must acquiesce. Nor do I expect that any learned man, who has a concern for his reputation as a critic, should attempt a direct confutation of this opinion.

The churches of Lyons and Vienne sent a relation of the sufferings of their martyrs to the churches of Asia and Phrygia. Eusebius^e placed this epistle entire in his collection of the acts of the martyrs ; and he has likewise inserted a large part of it into his Ecclesiastical History, which we still have. It is the finest thing of the kind in all antiquity. Some think it was composed by Irenæus.

There were at the same time some other letters despatched from these churches, concerning the affair of Montanism ; which having had its rise about the year 171, began now to make a noise in the world. One of these letters likewise was sent to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, another to Eleutherus bishop of Rome. These letters concerning the pretended prophecies of Montanus were written by the martyrs^f themselves, when in prison, before they were brought forth to be put to death. Of these letters

^c Critic. in Baron. 177. sect. 3—7.

^d Memoires Eccles.

Tom. 3. St. Pothin, et les Martyrs de Lion. Art. ii. et Note i.

^e Vid. H. E. l. v. Procem.

^f Eus. H. E. l. v. c. iv. fin. v. in.

there is little remaining. But the former, containing the relation of the sufferings of the martyrs at Lyons, being for the main part of it preserved in Eusebius, will afford a considerable testimony to the books of the New Testament. And how valuable their testimony is, must be manifest from what has been said of them; and that they had for their bishop Pothinus, who died aged above 90, in the year 177, and was born therefore about the year 87 of our Lord. We shall make frequent mention, in the course of this work, of this epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons. I am now to exhibit only the testimony it affords to the books of the New Testament.

N. T.

I. Luke i. 6. "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless."

II. John xvi. 2. "Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doth God service."

III. Acts vii. 60. "And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."

I may be allowed to observe here, that the words of these Greek quotations, or references, are exactly conformable to the Greek original in our copies.

N. T.

IV. Rom. viii. 18. "For I reckon, that^k the sufferings

The EPISTLE, &c.

I. Of one of their brethren they say, 'That^ε though young, he equalled the character of old Zacharias: for he walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless.'

II. 'Then was^h fulfilled that which was spoken by the Lord, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth God service.'

III. 'They prayedⁱ for those from whom they suffered hard things, as did the perfect martyr Stephen: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." And if he prayed for those that stoned him, how much more ought we to pray for the brethren?'

The EPISTLE, &c.

IV. 'Showing indeed, that^l the sufferings of this

^ε Eus. H. E. l. v. cap. i. p. 155. D. Vid. et p. 156. A. B.

^h Ibid. p. 157. A.

ⁱ P. 167. A.

^k 'Οτι εκ αξια τα παθηματα τε νυν καιρα, προς την μελλουσαν δοξαν αποκαλυφθηναι εις ημας. ^l 'Οτι εκ αξια τα παθηματα τε νυν καιρα, προς την μελλουσαν δοξαν αποκαλυφθηναι εις ημας. P. 155. B.

N. T.

of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us.”

Here is also an exact agreement in the very words, and it is remarkable.

V. ‘Then they^m came to Blandina; by whom Christ showed, that those things, which to men appear mean, obscure, and contemptible, are greatly honoured by God, for the love toward him shown in power, not boasted of in appearance.’ Here may be an allusion to 1 Cor. i. 25—31, and 2 Cor. v. 12.

N. T.

VI. Eph. vi. 5. “Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh.”

VII. Philip. ii. 6. “Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.”

One would be almost apt to think that these churches understood this text thus: ‘did not think it a thing to be ‘caught at, to be equal, or like to God.’ They seem at least to use the last words in that sense. They are not to their purpose in any other; unless we should suppose, that by reciting these they intend to refer to what there follows. But I think, that if they had not understood these words to be expressive of our Lord’s humility, they would have proceeded somewhat farther in that portion of scripture; at least so far as to mention one branch of the humility of our blessed Lord.

N. T.

VIII. 1 Tim. iii. 15. “Which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.” See Rev. iii. 12.

IX. 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4. “—commanding to abstain from

^m P. 157. B.

^o Οἱ και ἐπι τοσωντων ζηλωται και μιμηται Χριστου εγενοντο, ος εν μορφη Θεου υπαρχων εν ἀπαγαμον ἠγησατο το ειναι ισα Θεου. p. 166. B.

^p P. 157. B.

The EPISTLE, &c.

present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us.’

The EPISTLE, &c.

VI. ‘For whenⁿ we were all afraid on her account, and [especially] her fleshly mistress.’

VII. ‘Who^o also were so far followers and imitators of Christ: who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal to God.’

The EPISTLE, &c.

VIII. ‘Attalus—who^p was always the pillar and ground of the christians there.’

IX. ‘Alcibiades lived upon bread and water, in pri-

ⁿ Ibid.

N. T.

meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving." See also Rom. xiv. 2.

X. 1 Pet. v. 6. "Humble^r yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time."

XI. There is likewise, I think, [p. 160. B. C.] an allusion to 1 Pet. iv. 14, 15, 16. But the passage being somewhat long, and this being a plain allusion to that epistle, I forbear putting it down.

N. T.

XII. 1 John iii. 16. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us. And^t we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."

XIII. Rev. xiv. 4. "These are they^v which follow the lamb whithersoever he goes."

XIV. The passages alleged out of this epistle have a reference to the gospels of St. Luke and St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, the epistles to the Ephesians and the Philippians, the first to Timothy, the first of St. Peter, the first of St. John, and the book of the Revelation; most of which will be readily allowed to be good references. But there is not any book of the New Testament expressly quoted in this epistle. However, a text of John is referred to as containing words of 'the Lord.'

^a P. 167. D. τα θεα, ινα υμας υψωση εν καιρω.

κραταιαν χειρα, υφ' ης ικανως εν εισιν υψωμενοι. P. 166. D.

^t Και ημεις οφειλομεν υπερ των αδελφων τας ψυχας τιθειναι.

^u Ευδοκησας υπερ της των αδελφων απολογιας και την εαυτη θειναι ψυχην. P. 156. A. B.

^v Ουτοι εισιν οι ακολαθουντες τω αρνω οπε αν υπαγη.

^w Ακολαθων τω αρνω οπε αν υπαγη. P. 156. B.

The EPISTLE, &c.

son. Attalus declared, 'It^a was revealed to him, that Alcibiades did not do well 'in not using the creatures 'of God:'—and Alcibiades was persuaded, and partook of all things promiscuously, and gave God thanks.'

X. 'They^s humbled themselves under the mighty hand, by which they are now proportionably exalted.'

The EPISTLE, &c.

XII. 'Which he manifested by the abundance of his love, for^u he was willing in defence of the brethren to lay down even his own life.'

XIII. 'For he was indeed a genuine disciple of Christ,^w following the lamb whithersoever he goes.'

Ruinart,^x in his edition of this Epistle, has put down in the margin, Rev. xxii. 11, against these words: ‘That the scripture might be fulfilled,’ “Let the wicked be wicked still, and the righteous be righteous still.” But I rather think they refer to Dan. xii. 11, which is set by Valesius in the margin^y of Eusebius over against those words.

CHAP. XVII.

ST. IRENÆUS.

I. *His history, time, works, and character.* II. *His testimony to the Scriptures of the New Testament, particularly to the Gospels.* III. *The Acts of the Apostles.* IV. *St. Paul's Epistles.* V. *The Catholic Epistles.* VI. *The Revelation.* VII. *An observation.* VIII. *A summary account of the books of the New Testament received by him.* IX. *Titles and divisions of the books of Scripture.* X. *Respect for the Scriptures.* XI. *Of reading the Scriptures.* XII. *Whether he received any other writings, as of authority.* XIII. *Upon what grounds he received the Gospels of St. Mark, and St. Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles.*

I. THE age and authority of Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, have been already shown in part in the history of St. Polycarp. His country is not certainly known; but it is probable, from his name, that he was a Greek; and, from his early acquaintance with St. Polycarp, that he was of Asia. It is likewise probable, that he was from the beginning educated in the christian religion. When he came into Gaul is unknown. Some have supposed that he came to Rome with St. Polycarp, in the time of Anicetus, about the year 157, and from thence passed into Gaul. But concerning this we have no information in antiquity; and it is in vain to form conjectures.

Learned men are not entirely agreed about the time of Irenæus himself, or of his principal work against heresies. Dodwell^a supposes he was born in the reign of Nerva, in

^x Act. Martyr. p. 69.

^y P. 165.

^a Diss. Irenæi. 3. sect. 4.

the year 97; wrote^b his books against heresies in 176 or 177; and did not^c outlive the year 190. Grabe^d is unwilling to differ from Dodwell, but thinks Irenæus was not born till about the year 108, and speaks dubiously about the time of writing the work against heresies. Du Pin^e says, Irenæus was born in the latter part of the reign of Adrian, or the beginning of that of Antoninus, a little before the year 140, and died a martyr in 202. Massuet^f differs little from him, supposing that Irenæus was born in the year 140, and died in 202: and that he wrote^g the fore-mentioned work about the year 192. Tillemont^h thinks that Irenæus was born about the year 120, and died in 202; and that theⁱ work against heresies might be written partly in the latter end of the time of Eleutherus, who died, according to him, in 192, and the remaining part in the time of his successor Victor.

I shall now put down some few of the testimonies of the ancients concerning this father, and then make some remarks.

The^k martyrs of Lyons, in their letter to Eleutherus, make a very honourable mention of him, and give him the title of presbyter.

Tertullian mentions him as one of the most considerable writers of the christian church, and says,^l he was a ‘diligent enquirer of all sorts of opinions.’ He means, it is likely, that Irenæus had well studied the sentiments of the heathen philosophers, and of heretics, as well as the principles of the christian religion.

Eusebius says: ‘When^m Pothinus had been put to death with the martyrs in Gaul, Irenæus succeeded him in the bishopric of the church of Lyons; who, in his youth, had been a disciple of Polycarp.’ He there observes likewise, that his book against heresies was written when Eleutherus was bishop of Rome.

Of the works of Irenæus, Eusebius has made this mention in several places: ‘Irenæusⁿ wrote,’ says he, ‘several letters against those which at Rome corrupted the true doctrine of the church: one to Blastus concerning schism; another to Florinus, concerning the monarchy; or, that

^b Diss. 4. sect. 41.

^c Diss. 3. sect. 29.

^d Prolegomena de Vit. et Script. Irenæi, sect. 1, 2.

^e Nouv. Bibl. Irenée.

^f Dissertat. ii. sect. 2.

^g Ibid. sect. 47.

^h Mem. Ecc. Irenée, article ii.

ⁱ Ibid. artic. vii.

^k Apud Eus. H. E. l. v. c. 4.

^l ——— ut Irenæus omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator. Contra Valentin. c. 5.

^m H. E. l. v. p. 170.

ⁿ Cap. 20.

‘ God is not the author of evil ; and concerning the number eight.’ Again : ‘ Beside^o the treatises and epistles of Irenæus already mentioned, there is extant a short, but very necessary, discourse of his against the Gentiles, entitled, Concerning Knowledge ; another inscribed to a brother named Marcianus, being a Demonstration of the apostolical preaching ; and a little book of divers disputations, [or discourses,] in which he makes mention of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book called the Wisdom of Solomon, alleging some passages out of them.’ Eusebius^p also gives an account of a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, concerning the controversy about the time of celebrating Easter ; which, he says, was written in the name of the brethren in Gaul, over whom he presided. And beside all these, he has moreover quoted divers^q large passages out of the work, Against Heresies.

It is proper to show here what Eusebius had observed in his works concerning the scriptures of the New Testament, beside what has been already said relating to the epistle to the Hebrews.

He^r first takes a passage from the third book of Irenæus concerning the four evangelists, which will be found at length below. Eusebius then proceeds : ‘ In his fifth book he thus discourses of the Revelation of John, and the computation of the name of Antichrist : “ These things being thus, and this number being in all the exact and ancient copies, and they who saw John attesting the same things, and reason teaching us, that the number of the name of the beast, according to the computation of the Greeks, is expressed by the letters contained in it.” And a little after, of the same matter he says : “ We therefore will not run the hazard of affirming any thing too positively of the name of Antichrist. For if his name were to have been openly declared at this time, it would have been mentioned by him who saw the Revelation. For it was not seen long ago, but almost in our age, near the end of the reign of Domitian.” He also mentions the first epistle of John, alleging many testimonies out of it. He also in like manner mentions the former [epistle] of Peter.’

It is perhaps needless to put down after these St. Jerom’s testimony : I shall, however, take a part of his account of this excellent person, which we have in his book of^s Illustrious Men.

^o Cap. 26.

^p Cap. 24. p. 192. C. D.

^q L. v. c. 6, 7, 8.

^r H. E. l. v. c. 8.

^s Cap. 35.

‘ Irenæus, presbyter of Pothinus, who was bishop of the church of Lyons in Gaul, carried a letter from the martyrs of that city concerning some disputes of the church to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, in which letter he is honourably mentioned. Afterwards, Pothinus having obtained the crown of martyrdom, when he was almost ninety years of age, he was substituted in his room. It is certain, he was a disciple of Polycarp, bishop and martyr. He wrote five books against heresies;’ and divers others, which Jerom there mentions agreeable to Eusebius. He concludes: ‘ He flourished chiefly under the emperor Commodus, who succeeded M. Antoninus Verus.’

Though then it is not in our power at present to determine exactly the time, either of the birth or death of Irenæus; we have good reason to believe he was a disciple of St. Polycarp, presbyter in the church of Lyons under Pothinus, whose martyrdom happened in the year 177, and that he succeeded Pothinus in the bishopric of that church. His antiquity is farther confirmed, from the^t frequent mention he makes of a presbyter who had conversed with the immediate successors of the apostles. But who this was, cannot be determined; whether Papias, whom he has quoted by name, or Pothinus, or some other. Eusebius, who also has particularly taken notice of this, says: ‘ Irenæus^u has mentioned the sayings of a certain apostolical presbyter, without telling us his name, and puts down his expositions of the divine scriptures.’

As for the time of writing his five books against heresies, it is the opinion of divers learned men, that they were not written and published all together, but rather at some distance of time. In his very^v first book he gives an account of the heresies of Tatian, who is not supposed to have left the Catholic church before the year 172. In his third^w book he expressly mentions Eleutherus, as being then the twelfth bishop of Rome. He also speaks^x of the translation of Theodotion, which is generally allowed to have been published in the reign of Commodus. These are some notes of time that are commonly insisted on: but I shall not attempt to settle exactly the year in which this work was completed. It seems to me however most probable, that it was not written till some time after he was bishop.

^t Quemadmodum audiavi a quodam presbytero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant, et ab his qui didicerant. Adv. H. l. iv. c. 27. sect. 1. Massuet, [al. c. 45. in.] et alibi.

^u Eus. H. E. l. v. c. 8.

p. 173. C.

^v L. i. cap. 31. al. 28.

^w L. 3. cap. 3.

^x L. 3. cap. 24. al. 21.

That he may stand near those christians to whom he was particularly related, I shall place him in the year 178; though I am rather inclined to think his five books, Against Heresies, were not published quite so soon.

It is commonly said, that Irenæus died a martyr: but from the silence of Tertullian, and Eusebius, and others, concerning this matter, it is justly argued by^y Cave, and^z Basnage, and^a Dodwell, that there is no good ground for that supposition.

There is nothing now remaining of Irenæus, beside his five books Against Heresies, and fragments of some other pieces; and those five books, which were written by him in Greek, are extant only in an ancient Latin version, excepting some fragments preserved by Eusebius, and other Greek writers who have quoted them.

Irenæus has shown himself, in this large work, Against Heresies, well acquainted with the heathen authors, and the absurd and intricate notions of heretics, as well as with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. He was at the same time a very humble, modest man, and, agreeable to his name, a lover of peace; as appears from his letter^b to Victor, on occasion of the controversy about the time of keeping Easter.

Photius^c indeed says of him, that in some of his writings he weakens the certain truth of the doctrines of the church by false reasonings. However, he at the same time calls him the divine^d Irenæus: but I shall not now offer a particular apology for any of those reasonings to which Photius may be supposed to refer. Irenæus, though his writings may not be free from imperfections, has given such proofs of learning, integrity, and good sense in the main, that all good judges must esteem him, (as doubtless Photius did,) an ornament to the sect he was of.

II. I shall now show particularly how the books of the New Testament are quoted by him.

I. The first will be a long passage concerning the four gospels, the writers of them, their ability and fitness for the work: having been first filled with the knowledge of the doctrine of the gospel by the Spirit; and, having first preached that doctrine, then set it down in writing.

‘For^e we have not received,’ says he, ‘the knowledge of

^y Hist. Lit. in Irenæ.

^z Annal. 194 sect. 4.

^a Vid. Diss. iii. in Iren. cap. 21.

^b Eus. H. E. l. v. c. 24.

^c *Ει και εν τισιν αυτων η της κατα τα εκκλησιαστικα δογματα αληθειας ακριβεια νοθοις λογισμοις κιβδηλευεται.* Cod. 120.

^d *Τη θεσπεσιω Επιρηναιω.*

^e Adv. Hær. lib. iii. cap. 1.

the way of our salvation by any others than those by whom the gospel has been brought to us ; which gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will of God committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of our faith.—For after that our Lord rose from the dead, and they [the apostles] were endued from above with the power of the Holy Ghost coming down upon them, they received a perfect knowledge of all things. They then went forth to all the ends of the earth, declaring to men the blessing of heavenly peace, having all of them, and every one alike, the gospel of God. Matthew then, among the Jews, wrote a gospel in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome, and founding a church there. And^f after their exit, [death,] or departure, Mark also, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter : and Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel preached by him [Paul]. Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, he likewise published a gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia. And all these have delivered to us, that there is one God, the Maker of the heaven and the earth, declared by the law and the prophets, and one Christ, the Son of God. And he who does not assent to them, despiseth^g indeed those who knew the mind of the Lord : but he despiseth also Christ himself the Lord, and he despiseth likewise the Father, and is self-condemned, resisting and opposing his own salvation, as all heretics do.

That part of this passage, which particularly concerns the four evangelists severally, is cited by^h Eusebius : the rest is only in the old Latin version.

2. Norⁱ can there be more or fewer gospels than these. For ‘ as there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four catholic spirits, and the church is spread all over the earth, and the gospel is the pillar and foundation of the church, and the spirit of life ; in like manner was it fit it should have four pillars, breathing on all sides incorruption, and refreshing mankind. Whence it is manifest, that the Word, the former of all things, who sits upon the

^f Μετα δε την τετων εξοδον, Μαρκος ο μαθητης και ερμηνευτης Πετρος, και αυτος τα υπο Πετρος κηρυσσομενα εγγραφως ημιν παραδεδωκε και Λυκας δε ο ακολευθος Παυλος, το υπ' εκεινης κηρυσσομενον ευαγγελιον εν βιβλῳ καταθετο.

^g Spernit quidem participes Domino.

^h H. E. l. v. c. 8.

ⁱ Neque autem plura numero quam hæc sunt, neque pauciora, capit esse evangelia, &c. Lib. 3. cap. xi. sect. 8. [Apud Gualde, p. 221.]

cherubim, and upholds all things, having appeared to men, has given us a gospel of a fourfold character, but joined in one spirit.—The gospel according to John declares his primary and glorious generation from the Father: “In the beginning was the Word.”—But the gospel according to Luke, being of a priestly character, begins^k with Zacharias the priest offering incense to God.—Matthew relates his generation, which is according to man: “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.”—Mark begins from the prophetic Spirit, which came down from above to men, saying: “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written in Esaias the prophet.”’

In these passages we see the number of gospels owned by Irenæus, and the names of the writers of them, and sufficient particulars concerning them, to satisfy us, he means the very same books of the gospels which we now have. Nevertheless, I shall take a passage or two more concerning each of these gospels.

3. The first passage will relate to Matthew’s gospel from a fragment^l of Irenæus.

‘The gospel according to Matthew was written to the Jews; for they earnestly desired a Messiah of the seed of David: and Matthew having also the same desire to a yet greater degree, strove by all means to give them full satisfaction, that Christ was of the seed of David; wherefore he began with his genealogy.’

4. ‘Wherefore^m also Mark, the interpreter and follower of Peter, makes this the beginning of his evangelic writing: “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God.”—And in the end of the [his] gospel Mark says: “So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.”’

5. ‘But if anyⁿ one rejects Luke, as if he did not know the truth, he will be convicted of throwing away the gospel, of which he professeth^o to be a disciple. For there are many, and those very necessary parts of the gospel,

^k Though Irenæus does not in this account of St. Luke’s gospel mention his genealogy of our Lord, which is in ch. iii. 23, to the end; he owned it, and has particularly observed, that St. Luke carried up our Saviour’s genealogy to Adam. L. 3. cap. 22. sect. 3. [al. cap. 33.]

^l E. Possini *Catena Patrum in Matthæum*; apud Massuet, p. 347. Grabe, p. 471.

^m L. 3. c. x. sect. 6. [ed. Grabe, p. 217.]

ⁿ L. 3. c. 14. sect. 3. [Grabe, p. 235.]

^o Because the heretics, with whom Irenæus there disputes, owned the whole, or part at least, of that gospel.

which we know by his means : as, Luke i. ii. iii; the birth of John, the history of Zacharias, and the visit of the angel to Mary, and the descent of the angels to the shepherds, and the things said by them, and the testimony of Anna and Simeon to Christ, and that at the age of twelve years he was left behind at Jerusalem, and the baptism of John, and the age of our Lord when he was baptized, and that this was done in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, and what he said in his sermon to the rich : “ Woe unto you that are rich, for ye receive your consolation,” Luke vi. 24, 25, 26. — All these things we know from Luke only. And we have learned from him many actions of our Lord, which^p all receive : as the great multitude of fishes which they who were with Peter inclosed, when at the command of the Lord they cast their nets ; and the woman with the infirmity of eighteen years, who was cured on the sabbath-day, ch. xiii. 11 ; and the man with the dropsy, whom the Lord healed on the sabbath-day, xiv. 2, 3 ; and how he defended his healing on that day ; and how he taught his disciples not to covet the chief seats ; and that we ought to invite the poor and infirm, who cannot recompense us again, 7—13 ; and of him who knocked at the door in the night time for bread, and obtained it, because of his importunity, xi. 8 ; and that, sitting at table at the house of a pharisee, a woman that was a sinner kissed his feet, and anointed him with ointment, vii. 36 ; and all that, for her sake, the Lord said concerning two debtors ; and the parable of the rich man that hoarded up his increase, xii. 16 ; to whom also it was said, “ This night shall thy soul be required of thee : then whose shall these things be, which thou hast provided ? ” As also the parable of the rich man, that was clothed in purple, and fared sumptuously, and the beggar Lazarus, xvi. 19 ; and the answer which he made his disciples, when they said to him, “ Increase our faith,” xvii. 5 ; and the conversation with Zaccheus the publican, xix. 1 ; and concerning the pharisee and the publican who worshipped together at the temple, xviii. 10 ; and the ten lepers whom he healed at the same time in the way, xvii. 12 ; and that he commanded the lame and the blind to be brought to the wedding from the streets and the lanes, xiv. 21 ; and the parable of the judge who feared not God, whom the widow’s importunity compelled to avenge her, xviii. 1 ; and of the fig-tree in the vineyard, which bore no fruit, xiii. 6. And many other things there are to

^p That is, parts of his gospel received by all, heretics as well as catholics
 ‘ Et plurimos actus Domini per hunc didicimus, quibus omnes utuntur.’

be found in Luke alone, which [things] Marcion and Valentinus made use of: and beside all these things, after his resurrection, what he said to the disciples in the way, and how he was made known to them in breaking of bread,' xxiv. 35.

6. There is likewise a passage relating to John's gospel, representing the design of it, which may deserve to be transcribed.

' John,^a the disciple of the Lord, being desirous by declaring the gospel to root out the error that had been sown in the minds of men by Cerinthus, and a good while before by those who are called Nicolaitans,—that he might confute them, and satisfy all, that there is one God who made all things by his word; and not, as they say, one who made the world, and another the Father of the Lord; and one the Son of the Creator, and another from the super-celestial places, even Christ, who they say also continued ever impassible, who descended upon Jesus the Son of the Creator, and fled away again into his 'pleroma' [or fulness]:—the disciple therefore of the Lord, willing at once to cut off these errors, and leave a rule of truth in the church; that there is one God Almighty, who by his word made all things visible and invisible; declaring likewise, that by the Word, by which God finished the creation, by the same also he bestowed salvation upon those men who are in the creation; he thus begins in his doctrine, which is according to the gospel: "In the beginning was the Word,"' John i. 1—5.

So far of the gospels.

III. The Acts of the Apostles is a book much quoted by Irenæus, as written by Luke,^r the disciple and companion of the apostles. There are few things recorded in that book, which have not been mentioned by Irenæus. I shall put down one passage, giving a general account of all the latter part of it.

I. ' And that^s Luke was inseparable from Paul, and his fellow-worker in the gospel, he himself shows, not boasting of it indeed, but obliged to it for the sake of truth. "When Barnabas, and John, who was called Mark, separated from Paul, and they sailed to Cyprus, Acts xv. 39, we came to Troas: and when Paul had seen in a dream a man of Macedonia, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help

^a L. 3. cap. xi. sect. 3. Massuet, al. cap. xi. et apud Grabe, p. 218.

^r Simon—de quo discipulus et sectator apostolorum Lucas ait: 'Vir quidam autem nomine Simon.' Acts viii. 9. et seq. Lib. i. cap. 23. sect. 1. [al. cap. 20.]

^s L. 3. cap. 14. init.

us, Paul; immediately," says he, "we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us for to preach the gospel unto them: therefore, loosing from Troas, we came in a straight course to Samothracia," ch. xvi. 8, 9, 10, 11. And then he carefully relates the rest of their course to Philippi, and how they began their preaching there. "And we sat down," says he, "and spake to the women that resorted thither," [the place of prayer,] ver. 13; relating also who believed, and how many. And again he says: "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came to Troas, where we abode seven days," ch. xx. 6. And the other things he relates, while he was with Paul, xxi. xxvii. xxviii; mentioning exactly the places, and cities, and number of days, until they went up to Jerusalem; and what things happened there to Paul; how he was sent bound to Rome, and the name of the centurion that took charge of him, and the signs of the ship, and how they were shipwrecked, and in what island they were saved, and how courteously they were received, Paul healing the chief man of the island; and how they sailed from thence to Puteoli, and from thence arrived at Rome, and how long they staid at Rome: at all which things he was present, and relates them with fidelity, and without ostentation.—And that he was not only a companion, but also a fellow-labourer of the apostles, and especially of Paul, Paul himself has declared in his epistles.' For this he quotes the words of 2 Tim. iv. 9, 10, 11, and Colos. iv. 14; and presently after he quotes also Acts xx. 17.

2. Beside these, and many other things in behalf of Luke, he argues with those who disowned the authority of Paul, and yet owned Luke's gospel, that they must of necessity own the Acts, and consequently Paul's authority.

'Nor can^t they,' says he, 'pretend that Paul is not an apostle, when he was chosen to this end: nor can they show that Luke is not to be credited, who has related to us the truth with the greatest exactness. [He refers to Acts ix. 5, 15, 16; containing an account of Paul's conversion and vocation, which he had just before quoted expressly.] And possibly God has for this reason so ordered it, that many parts of the gospel should be declared to us^u by Luke, which all are under a necessity of receiving; that so all might receive likewise his subsequent testimony, which he has given concerning the acts and doctrine of the

^t L. 3. cap. 15. in.

^u See the passage, p. 171—173.

apostles, and might have a sincere and uncorrupt rule of truth, and be saved. Therefore his testimony is true; and the doctrine of the apostles is manifest and uniform, without any deceit, hiding nothing from men, nor teaching one thing in private, and another in public.'

IV. Thirteen epistles of Paul are expressly quoted as his by Irenæus, and most of them frequently, except the epistle to Philemon, which is not quoted at all. The quotations of Paul's epistles are so numerous, that they must be acknowledged by all who but cast an eye upon this father's writings. Nevertheless, perhaps it might be thought a defect, if, amidst this plenty of passages concerning the other books of the New Testament, none should appear in behalf of Paul's epistles. I shall therefore put down one quotation at least of each of his epistles.

1. 'This same thing Paul^v has explained, writing to the Romans: "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, separated to the gospel of God," Rom. i. 1—4.—And again, writing to the Romans of Israel, he says: ix. 5, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever."'

2. 'This also Paul^w manifestly shows in his epistle to the Corinthians, saying: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud,"' 1 Cor. x. 1—12.

3. 'Paul^x in the second to the Corinthians: iv. 4, "In whom the god of this world has blinded the eyes of them that believe not."'

4. 'The apostle^y Paul says: where he quotes the words of Gal. iv. 8, 9, and presently after, the apostle^z in the epistle to the Galatians: "Wherefore then serveth the law of works? It was added, until the seed should come, to whom the promise was made." Gal. iii. 19.

5. 'As the blessed^a Paul says in the epistle to the Ephesians: ver. 30, "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." This epistle is often quoted by him, as written to the Ephesians.

6. 'As also Paul^b says to the Philippians: iv. 18, "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God."'

^v L. iii. cap. 16. sect. 3. al. cap. 18. sect. 3. al. cap. 45.

^y L. iii. cap. 6. sect. 5.

^a L. v. cap. 2. sect. 3. al. cap. 24

^w L. iv. cap. 27.

^x L. iii. cap. 7. sect. 1.

^z L. iii. cap. 7. sect. 2.

^b L. iv. cap. 18. sect. 4.

7. ‘ Again he [Paul] says in the^e epistle to the Colossians : iv. 14, “ Luke the beloved physician greets you.” ’

8. ‘ The^d apostle, in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, v. 23, says : “ And the God of peace sanctify you wholly.” ’

9. ‘ And^e again, in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, ii. 8, speaking of Antichrist, he says : “ And then shall that wicked one be revealed.” ’

10. Irenæus thus begins his preface to his work, *Against Heresies* : ‘ Whereas some, having rejected the truth, bring in lying words, and “ vain genealogies, which minister questions,” as the apostle says, “ rather than godly edifying, which is in faith,” ’ 1 Tim. i. 4. This epistle is quoted several times.

11. ‘ Of this^f Linus [who he there says was bishop of Rome] Paul makes mention in his epistle to Timothy.’ See 2 Tim. iv. 21, “ Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus.”

12. ‘ As^g Paul says : “ A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject,” ’ Tit. iii. 10.

13. The epistle to Philemon is not quoted in any of the works of Irenæus now extant. But this may be very well owing to its brevity, and that he had not any particular occasion to make use of it.

14. We being now near to the conclusion of our collections relating to St. Paul’s epistles, I shall here put down a critical observation of Irenæus upon his style : ‘ That^h the apostle frequently uses ‘ hyperbata,’ [or transpositions of words from their natural order,] because of the rapidity of his words, and because of the mighty force of the Spirit in him.’

15. As for the epistle to the Hebrews, Eusebiusⁱ has expressly assured us, that in a work now lost, Irenæus had alleged some passages out of that epistle and the Wisdom of Solomon : but he does not say that he had quoted it as Paul’s. And perhaps this observation of Eusebius may amount to an intimation, that he had not observed that epistle cited in any works of Irenæus, except that which he there mentions. We will however consider what notice may appear to be taken of it in his remaining works.

^e L. iii. cap. 14. sect. 1.

^f L. iii. cap. 7. sect. 2.

^g L. iii. cap. 3. sect. 4.

^d L. v. cap. 6. sect. 1.

^f L. iii. cap. 3. sect. 3.

^h Quoniam autem hyperbatis frequenter utitur apostolus propter velocitatem sermonum suorum, et propter impetum qui in ipso est Spiritus, ex multis quidem aliis est invenire. L. iii. cap. 7.

ⁱ See before, p. 167.

He says in one place, ‘that^k God made all things by the word of his power.’ And in Heb. i. 3, we have these words: “Upholding^l all things by the word of his power.” In another place, ‘That Moses^m is said by the Spirit to be a faithful steward and servant of God:’ which character is given Moses, Heb. iii. 2, 5; but it is also in the Old Testament, Numb. xii. 7; and from thence Irenæus might as well take it, and, from what there precedes, seems rather so to do.

Again: speaking of the external purifications appointed before the coming of Christ: ‘Which,’ⁿ says he, ‘were ordained as a figure of things to come, the law making a draught of a certain shadow, and by temporal things delineating eternal, by earthly heavenly things.’ Paul says, Colos. ii. 17, “Which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.” It is said, Heb. x. 1, “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices make the comers thereunto perfect.” It may be proper to compare likewise Heb. viii. 5, “Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things;” and ix. 23, “It was therefore necessary, that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.”

Once more, he says, ‘Enoch^o was translated:’ and in another place, ‘That^p Enoch having pleased God was translated in the body, foreshowing the translation of the just.’ Heb. xi. 5, “By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see death: and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation, he had this testimony, that he pleased God;” wherein is a reference to Gen. v. 24; and to the same text Irenæus likewise might refer.

I have thus carefully exhibited every thing which may be supposed in the works of Irenæus to have any allusion to this epistle.

^k Condens et faciens omnia verbo virtutis suæ. L. ii. cap. 30. sect. 9. [apud Grabe, p. 184. B.]

^l Φερων τε τα παντα τω ρηµατι της δυναµεως αυτου.

^m Non autem vere Dominus appellatur, nec Deus vocatur a prophetis sed fidelis Möyses famulus et servus Dei dicitur a spiritu, quod et erat. L. iii. cap. 6. sect. 4. [Grabe, p. 210. b.]

ⁿ Quæ [munditiæ exteriores] in figuram futurorum traditæ erant, velut umbræ cujusdam descriptionem faciente lege, atque delineante de temporalibus æterna, de terrenis cœlestia. L. iv. cap. xi. sect. 4. [ap. Grabe, p. 311. b.]

^o Et translatus est. L. iv. cap. 16. sect. 2. [Grabe, p. 319. b.]

^p Ὁπνεγε Ενωχ εναρεσησας τω θεω, εν σωματι μετετεθη, την μεταθησιν των δικαιων προμηνυων. l. v. c. 5. sect. 1. [Grabe, p. 404.]

Moreover by^a Photius we are informed, that Stephen Gobar writes thus: ‘ Hippolytus and Irenæus say, the ‘ epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is not his:’ by which perhaps we need not understand, that Irenæus had expressly said so any where. If we are so to understand him, the question is decided about the opinion of this father in this matter.

However, I think it may be fairly concluded with much probability from Eusebius, that, so far as he knew, Irenæus had never expressly ascribed it to Paul; and from these very few, and some of them but obscure, references to this epistle in the remaining works of Irenæus, it may be argued, he did not esteem it to be written by Paul. Considering the length of this epistle, I think that, if Irenæus had esteemed it a part of sacred scripture, (as he certainly would, if he had supposed it to be Paul’s,) we should have had many large quotations out of it.

St. Jerom^r says, ‘ That all the Greeks receive the epistle ‘ to the Hebrews:’ and in^s another place, ‘ That it is received as the apostle Paul’s, not only by all the churches ‘ of the east, but also by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers of former times.’ But there are few general observations without exceptions. We are able to judge for ourselves concerning the opinion of Irenæus in this matter. What we have seen in his remaining works, and in the testimony of Eusebius, and Stephen Gobar, concerning this writer in particular, is of more importance a great deal than the general observation of St. Jerom concerning the Greek writers: and Irenæus, on account of his residing chiefly in the western part of the Roman empire, may be reckoned among the Latin writers of the church. Mill^t seems to allow that Irenæus did not own this epistle for Paul’s.

Upon the whole then, Irenæus affords proof, that the epistle to the Hebrews was in being in his time, and that he was acquainted with it; but he was not fully satisfied it was Paul’s: and having some doubts about that matter, he was cautious of making much use of it as a book of scripture.

^a Ὅτι Ἰππολυτος καὶ Εἰρηναῖος τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραῖος ἐπιτολὴν Παύλου, ἐκ ἐκείνων εἶναι φασί. Phot. Cod. 232. p. 904.

^r Præterea plenius esse tractatum in epistolâ ad Hebræos, quam omnes Græci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum. Epistol. ad Evangelium Presbyter. inter Epist. Crit. Hieron. Tom. 2. p. 571. Paris. 1699.

^s Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi apostoli Pauli, suscipi. Epist. ad Dardanum, ibid. p. 608. al. ep. 129.

^t Prolegom. ad N. T. sect. 117.

V. About the Catholic epistles we must be particular, taking almost every thing that has an appearance of a relation to them.

1. James i. 18. "Of his own will begat he us, by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." 22. "But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only." Irenæus says: 'That^u we are taught by Christ to be imitators of his works, and are made doers of his words:' and presently after, 'That^v we are made the beginning of the creation.' But I confess, these can hardly be called allusions to this epistle.

2. James ii. 23. "And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith: Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God." Irenæus says, 'And^w that not by these [the Mosaical rites] a man is justified, but that they were given to the people for signs, is shown, in that Abraham himself, without circumcision, and without observation of sabbaths, believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God.' Irenæus in^x another place also observes, 'that Abraham was the friend of God.' The words of this passage do doubtless very much resemble those of St. James: but the same thing in a manner is said, Gen. xv. 6, Rom. iii. at the end, and iv. beginning, and Gal. iii. 6.

There is nothing more to be alleged relating to this epistle, beside a passage, which will be produced presently, after the particular account of the rest of these epistles.

3. The first epistle of Peter is quoted as his more than once. 'And^y Peter says in his epistle: "Whom not seeing ye love."' See 1 Pet. i. 8. Again, 'Peter^z says: "Not using our liberty for a cloak of maliciousness."' See ch. ii. 16.

4. Relating to the second epistle there is nothing in all the works of Irenæus, but this sentence, twice^a mentioned,

^u Uti imitatores quidem operum, factores autem sermonum ejus facti. L. v. cap. i. init. [Grabe, p. 393.] ^v Facti autem initium facturæ. Ibid.

^w Et quia non per hæc justificabatur homo, sed in signo data sunt populo, ostendit, quod ipse Abraham sine circumcissione, et sine observatione sabbatorum, credit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est. L. iv. cap. 16. sect. 2. [Grabe, p. 319. a.]

^x Amicus factus est Deo. p. 243. Massuet. [p. 315. Grabe.]

^y Et Petrus ait in epistolâ suâ: Quem non videntes diligitis, l. iv. cap. 9. sect. 2. [Grabe, p. 307.] ^z L. iv. c. 16. fin. [Grabe, p. 320.]

^a Quoniam enim dies Domini sicut mille anni. L. v. cap. 23. sect. 2. [Grabe, p. 435.] ἼΙ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς ἄ ετη. cap. 28. sect. 3. [Grabe, p. 445.]

‘That the day of the Lord is as a thousand years.’ See 2 Pet. iii. 8, “But beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.” But, beside the words, there is nothing to determine us to think he had an eye to this epistle; nor are the words exactly the same.

5. The first and second epistles of John are expressly cited as John’s, the disciple of the Lord. Having quoted this gospel, he adds: ‘Wherefore^b also in his epistle he says thus to us: “Little children, it is the last time,”’ 1 John ii. 18. He quotes afterwards in the^c same chapter 1 John iv. 1, 2, 3, and v. 1.

Here also he says: ‘And^d in the forementioned epistle, John the disciple of the Lord commands us to shun these persons, saying: “Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. Look to yourselves, that ye lose not those things which ye have wrought.”’ These are plainly the words of the second epistle. He seems to quote them as in the first, the same epistle he had before quoted. This is supposed owing to a slip of memory.

‘And John^e the disciple of the Lord does not so much as allow us to bid them God speed: “For,” says he, “he that biddeth them God speed, is partaker of their evil deeds,”’ 2 John 10, 11.

The third epistle is no where quoted by him: but this omission can be of no moment, considering the shortness of the epistle.

6. Concerning the epistle of Jude, there is nothing material, or that so much as deserves our notice: he says indeed, ‘that in the time of Lot, there rained from heaven upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and sulphur, as a token of the just judgment of God:’ which possibly some may think a reference to Jude, ver. 7. But certainly the destruction of those cities might be as well learned from the book of Genesis; and the words, ‘token of the just judgment of God,’ are taken from 2 Thess. i. 5.

The omission of this epistle affords, I think, an argument, that either Irenæus knew nothing of it, or else, that he did

^b L. iii. cap. 16. sect. 5. [Grabe, p. 241.]

^c Sect. 8.

^d Et discipulus ejus Joannes in prædictâ epistolâ fugere eos præcepit, dicens: Multi seductores. Ibid. sect. 8.

^e Ἰωαννης δὲ ὁ τῆς Κυριας μαθητῆς—ὁ γὰρ λεγων αυτοις, φησι, χαιρετε, κοιωνει τεις εργασις αυτων τοις πονηροισ. 1. i. cap. 16. sect. 3. [Grabe, p. 79.]

^f Exemplum justii judicii Dei. 1. iv. cap. 36. sect. 4. [Grabe, p. 371.]

not own it as a book of authority. Though the epistle is short, yet it seems to be so much to his purpose, who was writing against heretics, that he could not well avoid quoting it, if he knew it to be a book of canonical scripture, or universally received as of authority.

7. However, there is a passage of a general nature [which I promised above] which may dispose some to think, he knew of these epistles, which are not expressly quoted by him, particularly the epistles of James and Jude.

Speaking of the apostles who had written, as well as preached: ‘For Peter, and ^s John, and Matthew, and Paul, and the rest of them, and their companions, have quoted the words of the prophets, according to the translation of the [seventy] elders.’ Here it seems, that he supposed there were other apostles who had written, beside those he nameth. For he plainly distinguishes between apostles and their companions, by these last meaning Mark and Luke. By the rest therefore, or others of them, he may be thought to mean James and Jude. Nevertheless,^h Grabe thinks it may be conjectured from this passage, and the silence about James, while he mentions the other apostles who had written, that Irenæus had not seen the epistle of James, or that he did not own it. However, I think few learned men are of his opinion; and I should be rather apt to suppose, it might afford an argument in favour of the epistles of James and Jude. But whether it be alone sufficient to outweigh the argument for the other side, taken from the total omission, or very obscure citations of these epistles, in so large a work as this, against heresies, may be questioned. Every one is able to judge of this point, from the particular account I have given of the testimonies of this father.

VI. The Apocalypse, or Revelation, is often quoted by him as the Revelation of ⁱ John, the disciple of the Lord. And in one place he says: ‘It was ^k seen no long time ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian.’

^s Etenim Petrus, et Joannes, et Matthæus, et Paulus, et reliqui deinceps, et horum sectatores, prophetica omnia ita annuntiaverunt, quemadmodum seniorum interpretatio continet. L. iii. cap. 21. sect. 3.

^h Dum Irenæus apostolos, quorum scripturas habemus, justo ordine recensens, Jacobum principem eorum omisit, ejus epistolam non vidisse aut agnovisse haud vane conjicitur, præsertim cum nusquam eam diserte allegârit. Grabe, in loc. p. 256.

ⁱ Sed et Joannes Domini discipulus in Apocalypsi. l. iv. cap. 20. sect. 11. l. v. cap. 26. in.

^k Δι’ ἐκεῖνος ἀν ἐρρήθη τῆ και τὴν ἀποκαλυψὶν ἑωρακοτος· ἔδε γὰρ προ πολλῆ χρονῆ ἑωραθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεας, προς τῆ τελει τῆς Δομετιανῆ ἀρχῆς. l. v. cap. 30. sect. 3. [Grabe, p. 449.]

And in the place before cited¹ from Eusebius, he speaks of the exact and ancient copies of this book, confirmed likewise by the agreeing testimony of those who had seen John himself. The testimony of Irenæus in behalf of this book is certainly very considerable. However, he wrote no commentary upon the Revelation, as was before shown.^m

VII. I have now shown at large, what books of the New Testament are cited by Irenæus. I had much rather represent the truth (as I have often endeavoured to do) without a particular confutation of any mistakes which some learned men have made through inadvertence. By this method one may save them the uneasiness which the detection of a mistake is apt to occasion, especially if they are named. Nevertheless, I think it not improper, in this place, to take notice of an observation in Le Clerc'sⁿ *Ecclesiastical History*: that Irenæus has cited all the books of the New Testament, except the third epistle of John; whereas it is manifest, from what has been said, that beside the omission of the just mentioned epistle, Irenæus has not quoted at all, nor referred to, the epistle of Paul to Philemon. And there are likewise several other books, concerning which it is doubtful, whether he has so much as referred to them. I have mentioned this, as some justification of the strictness of our present inquiry into the evidence given by the primitive christian writers to the books of the New Testament, if indeed it needs any. But no reasonable person, from this particular inaccuracy, will draw any general conclusion to the disadvantage of so learned and useful a writer as Le Clerc.

VIII. We have then in Irenæus, full, and express, and abundant testimony to the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, twelve of Paul's epistles. The omission of the epistle to Philemon may be well ascribed to its brevity. He knew the epistle to the Hebrews, but was not satisfied that it was Paul's. As for the Catholic epistles, we have express quotations of the first of Peter, and the first and second of John; and the reason of not quoting the third may be well allowed to be its brevity. But to the epistle of James, the second of Peter, and the epistle of Jude,

¹ See before, p. 167.

^m P. 137.

ⁿ Recte Eusebius II. E. l. v. c. 8. pro more suo animadvertit, Irenæum discrete meminisse quatuor evangeliorum, quæ habemus, Apocalypscos, et I Joannis—Verum et e citationibus ejus cæteros omnes N. T. libros, quos habemus, exceptâ unâ brevissimâ Joannis epistolâ, quæ tertia numeratur, admissos, et pro apostolicis habitos, ex indicibus locorum scripturæ, qui nuperis editionibus subjecti sunt, patet. II. E. A. D. 180. sect. 3.

there are none, or very obscure references, hardly any that can be reckoned material. Nevertheless, on account of a general passage concerning the writings of the apostles, it may be questioned, whether he did not also know the epistles of James and Jude. The book of the Revelation is expressly ascribed to John the disciple of the Lord. His testimony for this book is so strong and full, that, considering the age of Irenæus, he seems to put it beyond all question, that it is the work of John the apostle and evangelist.

IX. Having shown what books of the New Testament are cited and owned by Irenæus, I shall observe some general titles and divisions made use of by him in his quotations.

‘Concerning^o which,’ says he, ‘the scriptures affirm, “that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God,”’ Gal. v. 21. He calls them also^p divine scriptures,^q divine oracles,^r scriptures of the Lord.

Sometimes, It is said,^s in the gospel: at other times,^t in the gospels. The books of the New Testament are comprehended under these two divisions, of evangelic and apostolic writings. ‘The Valentinians,’ he^u says, ‘endeavour to fetch arguments for their opinions, not only from the evangelic and apostolic writings, but also from the law and the prophets:’ manifestly intending hereby a code or collection of gospels and apostolical epistles; though such general titles do not show exactly what books are contained in each collection.

He speaks of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament in this manner: ‘Since^v all the scriptures, both prophecies and gospels, are open and clear, and may be heard of all.’ — In another place: ‘In^w the law and the gospel, the first and greatest commandment is, to love the Lord with all the heart.’ He has these several expressions together:

^o Περὶ ὧν καὶ γραφαὶ διαβεβαιῶνται. κ. λ. L. i. cap. 6. sect. 3.

^p Ἐν ταῖς θεῖαις γραφαῖς λελεκται. L. ii. cap. 27. in.

^q Τα λογια τῆ θεῶ. L. i. cap. 8. sect. 1. fin.

^r Et Dominicis scripturis enutriti. L. v. cap. 20. sect. 2. Vid. et. L. ii. c. ult. ad fin.

^s Ab hoc quod dictum est in evangelio. L. ii. cap. 26. Non legunt in evangelio. L. iv. cap. 29. in.

^t Non scrutati sunt in evangeliiis. L. ii. cap. 22. sect. 3.

^u Καὶ ἄ μόνον ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν καὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πειρῶνται τὰς ἀποδείξεις ποιῆσθαι—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ νόμων καὶ προφητῶν. L. i. cap. 3. sect. 6. Grabe, p. 19.

^v Cum itaque universæ scripturæ, et prophetiæ, et evangelia, in aperto sint, et sine ambiguitate, et similiter ab omnibus audiri possint, etsi non omnes credunt. L. ii. cap. 27. sect. ii. al. cap. 46.

^w In lege igitur et in evangelio, cum sit primum et maximum præceptum, &c. L. iv. cap. 12. sect. 3.

‘With^x our assertions agree the preaching of the apostles, the doctrine of the Lord, the declaration of the prophets, the word of the apostles, the ministration of the law.’

X. His respect for the books of the New Testament has appeared in many passages here produced, particularly Numb. II. where he affirms the complete knowledge the apostles had of the doctrine of Christ; and that they did not preach, much less write, till after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them: and that the gospel was ‘committed to writing by the will of God, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of our faith.’

Arguing from some texts of Paul to the Romans, he^y says: ‘For he foreseeing by the Spirit, that there would be divisions caused by evil teachers, and being desirous to prevent all occasion of difference in these things, spake after this manner.’ And a^z little before: ‘But the Holy Spirit, foreseeing there would be deceivers, and guarding beforehand against their deceit, says by Matthew: “Now the birth of Christ was in this wise.”’ See Matth. i. 18, where we read Jesus Christ. But it is likely, the copies of Irenæus had Christ only. Again: ‘Well^a knowing that the scriptures are perfect, as being dictated [or spoken] by the Word of God and his Spirit.’ And he says, ‘That a heavy^b punishment awaits those who add to, or take from the scriptures.’ Lastly: ‘But we,’ says^c he, ‘following the one and only true God as our teacher, and having his words as a rule of truth, do all always speak the same concerning the same things.’

Irenæus however does not slight reason. ‘A sound mind,’ says^d he, ‘that is sober, discreet, and a lover of truth, what-

^x Quoniam autem dictis nostris consonat prædicatio apostolorum, et Domini magisterium, et prophetarum annuntiatio, et apostolorum dictatio, et legislationis ministratio. L. ii. cap. ult. ad fin.

^y Prævidens enim et ipse per Spiritum subdivisiones malorum magistrorum — ait quæ prædicta sunt. L. iii. cap. 16. sect. 9.

^z Sed prævidens Spiritus Sanctus depravatores, et præmuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthæum ait: Christi autem generatio sic erat. L. iii. cap. 16. sect. 2. al. cap. 17.

^a Rectissime scientes, quia scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ. L. ii. cap. 28. sect. 2. al. cap. 47.

^b Ἐπειτα δὲ τῆ προσθεντος, ἡ ἀφελοντος τι τῆς γραφῆς, ἐπιτιμῶν ἔ τῆν τυχῶσαν ἐχοντος. κ. λ. L. v. cap. 30. sect. 1. [ap. Grabe, p. 448.]

^c Nos autem unum et solum verum Deum doctorem sequentes, et regulam veritatis habentes ejus sermones, de iisdem semper eadem dicimus omnes. L. iv. cap. 35. sect. 4. al. cap. 69.

^d Ὁ ὕγιης νῆς, καὶ ἀκινδύνος, καὶ ἐνλαβῆς, καὶ φιλαληθῆς, ὅσα ἐν τῆ των ἀνθρώπων ἐξῆσαι δέδωκεν ὁ Θεός, καὶ ὑποτεταχῆ τῆ ἡμετέρῃ γνώσει, ταῦτα προθυμῶς ἐκμελετήσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς προκοψῃ, διὰ τῆς καθημερινῆς ἀσκησιῶς ῥάδιαν τῆν

ever things God has put in the power of men, and made knowable by us, these such a mind will study, and improve in them, rendering the knowledge of them easy by daily exercise. And the things knowable by us are those which fall under our sight, and whatsoever things are plainly, and clearly, and expressly said in the divine scriptures.'

XI. We just now saw, that Irenæus declares, that the scriptures 'are open and clear, and may be read by all.' Nevertheless, in another place he expresses himself to this purpose: 'Such^e an one will be well satisfied about these things, if he also diligently read the scriptures with those who are presbyters in the church, with whom is the apostolical doctrine, as we have shown.' By which, however, I think Irenæus does not intend to say, that christian people should not read the scriptures without the leave of their presbyters; but that they ought to take care, that they use those copies of the scriptures that are uncorrupted, such as are in the hands of the presbyters of the catholic church. Or, perhaps he rather means, that they should not only read the scriptures privately themselves, but that, in case any difficulties appear, they should likewise consult the presbyters in the church. Therefore he says: 'Such an one will be well satisfied of these things, if he *also* diligently read these scriptures with those who are presbyters in the church.'

XII. It may be worth while to consider whether Irenæus quotes any other christian writings in the same manner, and with the same respect which he shows to these books of the New Testament, commonly received as canonical. Beside the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, and Josephus, and some heathen authors, and perhaps some heretical writers, the only authors quoted in Irenæus by name are these following: Clement of Rome, Hermas, Polycarp, Papias, and Justin Martyr. For Ignatius is not so quoted by him.

I. We shall begin our considerations with Hermas, because it is thought there is somewhat^f singular in the quotation of his book. The passage is taken notice of by Eusebius.

μαθησιν ἑαυτῶ ποιῶμενος. Ἐπι δὲ ταῦτα, τατὲ ὑπ' οὐδὲν πιπτοῦντα τὴν ὑμετέραν καὶ ὅσα φανερώς καὶ ἀναμφιβόλως ἀποδέξει ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς λέλεκται. L. ii. cap. 27. in. al. cap. 46.

^e Post deinde et omnis sermo ei constabit, si et scripturas diligenter legit apud eos qui in ecclesiâ sunt presbyteri, apud quos est apostolica doctrinâ, quemadmodum demonstravimus. L. iv. cap. 32. al. cap. 52.

^f Illud etiam non omittendum, quod Hermæ Pastorem, velut canonicam scripturam, laudet Irenæus. L. iv. cap. 20. n. 2. Massuet, Dissert. Præv. in Irenæi. iii. sect. 7.

Having observed what Irenæus said of the Apocalypse of John, and that he had often cited the first epistle of John, and the first of Peter, he immediately adds: ‘Nor did^g he only know, but he also receives [or approves] the scripture of the Shepherd, saying: ‘Well therefore spake the scripture, which says: “First of all believe that there is one God, who created and formed all things,”’ and what follows.’

Upon this passage I would briefly make these several remarks.

(1.) This is the only christian writing quoted by Irenæus with an appearance of a like respect to what he has for the writings of the apostles, and their two disciples and followers, Mark and Luke.

(2.) By scripture we need not understand sacred and inspired scripture, but only writing. So the word is frequently used by the ancients. Mr. Richardson^h gives instances of it from Origen, Tertullian, Rufinus, and Augustine. Eusebiusⁱ useth it of the gospel of Peter, which he absolutely rejects. Epiphanius^k likewise speaks of the apocryphal scriptures or writings, which were used by the Encratites. Nor do the words of Eusebius imply, as I conceive, that he thought Irenæus reckoned that book a part of the sacred scripture. Eusebius says, ‘Irenæus receives,’ that is, approves, or commends, ‘the writing called ‘the Shepherd.’ He seems to take notice of this, because^l that book was much despised by some. Nor is Eusebius speaking there only of the books of the New Testament cited by Irenæus: but he proceeds next to observe, that he had several times mentioned the sayings of a certain apostolical presbyter; and adds, that he had also cited Ignatius, and Justin Martyr, whose works certainly were never reckoned a part of sacred scripture.

When therefore Irenæus says here, ‘Well spake the scripture,’ his meaning is exactly this: ‘Well spake that writing, work, or book, which says.’—It is certain, that Irenæus himself has so used this word *γραφη*, or scripture. Giving an account of the epistle of Clement, written to the Corinthians in the name of the church of Rome, he^m says:

^g Ου μόνον δε οὐδεν' ἀλλὰ και ἀποδέχεται την τε Προφητιαν γραφην, λεγων καλωσ εν απεν η γραφη η λεγουσα, κ. λ. Eus. H. E. p. 173. B.

^h Canon of the New Testament vindicated, p. 26, 27.

ⁱ H. E. l. vi. c. 12. p. 213. C.

^k Har. 47. sect. 1. p. 400. A.

^l H. E. p. 72. C. D. See before, ch. iv. The history of Hermas, at the beginning. Vid. et Orig. de Princ. l. iv. in Philoc. c. 1. p. 9.

^m Επεσειδεν η εν Ρωμη εκκλησια ικανωτατην γραφην τοις Κορινθιοις. l. iii. c. 3. Scripsit quæ est Romæ ecclesia potentissimas literas Corinthiis. Interp. l.

‘The church of Rome sent a most excellent scripture,’ that is, epistle, ‘to the Corinthians.’ Andⁿ afterwards: ‘From that scripture,’ or epistle, ‘any one may learn the apostolical tradition of the church.’ Massuet has^o a good note to this purpose upon the place.

(3.) There are numerous and long quotations of most of the books of the New Testament, received by Irenæus as sacred and divine scripture; and but one short single citation of this book of the Shepherd, though it is much larger than any book of the New Testament. Considering the largeness of this work of Hermas, it is probable it would have been often quoted by Irenæus if he had esteemed it a part of sacred scripture.

2. The epistle of Clement, though so great a man, and a companion of the apostles, is but once quoted by Irenæus; and it is rather quoted as an epistle of the church of Rome than of Clement. The design of quoting it too, is only to show what was the tradition or belief of the christian churches. The heretics, with whom he argues, sometimes^p cavilled against *scripture*, and pretended that oral tradition was a more certain and complete rule of truth. Irenæus descends into this kind of argument likewise, and says, the belief and testimony of the apostolical churches were on his side, as well as the *scriptures* of the apostles. ‘And because,’ as he^q says, ‘it was impossible to show this at large of all the apostolical churches, he should therefore instance in the greatest, most ancient, and well known church of Rome, glorious on account of its being founded by two apostles, Peter and Paul. These blessed apostles,’ he says, ‘having founded the church, gave the office of the bishopric to Linus, who was succeeded by Anencletus, and he by Clement. In the time of this Clement there being no small dissension among the brethren at Corinth, the church

ⁿ Ex ipsâ scripturâ, qui velint, discere possunt. Ibid.

^o Scriptura.] Vocem γραφή, quâ paulo ante usus est Irenæus, quamque recte vertit interpres, literas, et hic reddere debuisset, literæ seu epistola: nam de Clementis epistolâ sermo est. Massuet.

^p Cum enim ex *scripturis* arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum *scripturarum*, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia varie sint dictæ, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui nesciant traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per *vivam vocem*. L. iii. c. 2. in.

^q Traditionem itaque apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni ecclesiâ adest respicere omnibus qui vera velint videre; et habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur.—Sed quoniam valde longum est omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximæ, et antiquissimæ—ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, &c. Ibid. c. 3.

of Rome sent a most excellent epistle to the Corinthians, containing the doctrine lately received from the apostles, which declares, that there is one God Almighty.—And that^r He is declared by the churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, they who will may learn from the epistle itself, and understand the apostolical tradition of the church, since that epistle is more ancient than the false teachers of the present time.’ And he goes on to enumerate the several successors of Clement to Eleutherus, the twelfth bishop of Rome. ‘In this very order and succession,’ says he, ‘has the tradition which is in the church, and the preaching [or doctrine] of the truth, come to us from the apostles.’

It is plain, then, that he quotes this epistle of Clement, or the church of Rome, only as representing the tradition of the church agreeable to the doctrine of the apostles.

3. The next writer we are to consider is Polycarp; and it is of him that Irenæus likewise speaks next, immediately after he had shown the tradition of the true doctrine from the apostles in the church of Rome. It is the passage which we before transcribed from Irenæus at the beginning of the history of St. Polycarp: which passage concludes thus: ‘There is also a most excellent epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians; from which they who are willing, and are concerned for their own salvation, may learn both the character of his faith, and the doctrine of the truth. Moreover the church in Ephesus also, founded by Paul, and in which John resided until the time of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the apostles.’

It is plain, then, that he alleges these epistles of the church of Rome, and Polycarp, and also the testimony of the church of Ephesus, as declaring the doctrine of the apostles agreeable to the sacred scriptures. But these epistles are manifestly distinguished from the gospels, and other books of the New Testament, which he had just before called scripture in the strictest and highest sense of the word.

Let me add here likewise, that though he has taken so many long passages from the gospels, and most of the other books of the New Testament, he recites none distinctly from the epistles of Clement, or Polycarp: but only gives a general description of those writings, and refers men to the reading of them.

4. Papias likewise is but^s once mentioned in the works

^r Hunc Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi ab ecclesiis annunciari, ex ipsâ scripturâ qui velint discere possunt, et apostolicam ecclesiæ traditionem intelligere. Ibid.

^s L. v. c. 33. sect. 4. Grabe, p. 455.

of Irenæus by name. The passage is already transcribed at the beginning of the ninth chapter of this book.

5. Justin is quoted twice: 'Well^t says Justin, in his treatise against Marcion;' and again, 'Well^u said Justin:' in both which places he puts down a short saying, or sentence, of his.

I do not perceive, then, that there is the least ground for supposing that Irenæus had the like respect for any other christian writings, which he had for those books of the New Testament commonly received by us, which are quoted by him.

6. There is likewise a passage or two^v in Irenæus, in which some words are ascribed to our Lord, which are a small matter different from those recorded in our gospels: from whence some have been disposed to think, they might possibly be taken out of apocryphal gospels. But certainly nothing more needs to be added to show that Irenæus received but four gospels, and that they are the same with ours; nor shall I stay to inquire particularly, whether his small variation from our gospels in those places be owing to his using his memory in those quotations, or to a difference of reading in the copies used by Irenæus. Moreover, as to one of those passages, it may be^w questioned, whether Irenæus does not designedly put it down, as it was expressed in some apocryphal writings of the heretics, against which he is there arguing; and not as found in any writing supposed by him to contain a true account of our Lord's words.

7. There is a passage among the Fragments of St. Irenæus, published by the learned Dr. Pfaff, Professor of Divinity, and Chancellor of the University of Tubingen, from some manuscripts in the king of Sardinia's library at Turin, which may be supposed by some people to men-

^t Καὶ καλῶς Ἰεζηνός ἐν τῷ πρὸς Μαρκίωνα συντάγματι φησιν. L. iv. c. 6. sect. 2. al. e. 14. [Grabe, p. 300.]

^u L. v. c. 26. sect. 2.

^v Et ideo Dominus dicebat ingratis existentibus in eum: si in modico fideles non fuistis, quod magnum est quis dabit vobis? Vid. Luc. xvi. 11. L. ii. c. 34. sect. 3. al. cap. 64. Hæc [inquit Massuetus in 1.] ex memoriâ citavit Irenæus. Nam paulo aliter habet evangelii textus, Luc. xvi. 11.—Unde ad sensum magis quam ad verba attendisse videtur auctor noster. Vid. et Irenæ. L. i. cap. 20. sect. 2. al. cap. 17. Ἄλλα καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰρηκεναί, πολλακις ἐπεθυμήσα ἀκεῖσαι ἓνα τῶν λόγων τῆτων, καὶ ἐκ ἐσχον τοῦ εἰρηκεναί. Ad quem locum ait Massuetus: Hæc verba frustra quæsieris in scripturis sacris; nullibi exstant. Ab hæreticis istis, vel male feriatis quodam, conficta sunt. Vid. et Grabe, in loc. And Mr. Jones likewise may be consulted upon both these passages. New and Full Method, &c. Vol. i. p. 526, 547.

^w See, beside the learned men already referred to, Mill, Proleg. n. 331.

tion, and give some authority to, the Apostolical Constitutions.

The second of those Fragments begins thus: ‘They^x who are acquainted with [or have understood] the latter constitutions of the apostles, know that the Lord in the New Testament has appointed a new offering, according to what is said in the prophet Malachi, i. 11, “For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering.” As also John in the Revelation, v. 8, says: “The incense is the prayers of the saints.” And Paul exhorts us, Rom. xii. 1, to “present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service.” And again, Heb. xiii. 15, “Let us offer the sacrifice of praise, that is, the fruit of the lips.” These offerings indeed are not according to the law, the hand-writing of which the Lord having blotted out, has taken it out of the way, but according to the spirit,’ Col. ii. 14. “For God ought to be worshipped in spirit and truth,” John iv. 24.

Upon this passage I make only two remarks.

1. There is no good and sufficient evidence, that this is a passage of Irenæus bishop of Lyons. I learn from Dr. Pfaff’s preface to his edition of the Fragments of St. Irenæus, that the learned marquis Scipio Maffei had proposed in the Italian Literary Journal several objections against their genuineness. I have not seen that Journal. However, there can be no question but Dr. Pfaff has fairly represented those objections in his preface. But so far as I am able to judge, he has not fully answered them, especially those against this second Fragment, which is attended with some difficulties peculiar to itself. I perceive likewise by a note of the marquis Maffei upon^y the Complexions of Cassiodorus, or Cassiodorius, (as that learned man thinks his name should be written,) that he is not convinced by what Dr. Pfaff has said. I add one objection against this second Fragment, which I do not see urged by the marquis Maffei: that the writer, whoever he is, seems to own the epistle to the Hebrews for St. Paul’s; whereas, I suppose it

^x Οἱ τὰς δευτέρας τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεις παρηκολοθηκοτές ἴσασι, τὸν Κύριον νεὰν προσφορὰν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ καθέστηκεν ἀκατὰ τὸ Μαλαχίᾳ τῆς προφητείας—ὡσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλύψει λέγει· τὰ θυμιάματα εἰσὶν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων· καὶ ὁ Παῦλος παρακαλεῖ ἡμᾶς παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν θυσιαν ζωσταν, ἄγιαν, εὐαρεστον τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ἡμῶν, καὶ παλιν· Ἀναφερόμεν θυσιαν αἰρέσεως, τῷ τῆς καρποῦ χεῖλει. κ. λ. Irenæi Fragmenta Anecdota, p. 25. Hagæ comitum. 1715.

^y Annot. ad Complexion. Cassiodor. in 1 Ep. ad Corinthi. sect. xx.

has been ^z before shown to be probable, that St. Irenæus, though he was acquainted with that epistle, did not know it to be St. Paul's, or own it as such. It appears to me indiscreet to admit the genuineness of a passage taken out of one of the Greek chains, as they are called, which is liable to several considerable difficulties.

2. The former part of this passage is obscure. Nor is it any wonder that there should be some obscurity, when we know not what preceded in the place of the author whence it was originally taken. It is not easy to say, what is meant by the latter, or second constitutions of the apostles. It is by no means plain, that the author intends any book with that title. He rather seems to mean only the constitutions, ordinances, or appointments of the apostles in the books of the New Testament, commonly received; and these he calls the later, in opposition to the more ancient ordinances of the law. This is the sense which first offers itself to my mind, and appears to be the most natural and likely meaning of the words. I have transcribed the more of this passage, that those of my readers who have not an opportunity of consulting the original may the better form some judgment of it. I shall only add, that in the third passage, published by Dr. Pfaff as a Fragment of St. Irenæus, the word 'constitute, appoint, or ordain,' is used concerning the directions and precepts of the apostles in their epistles: 'The^a apostles have ordained, that we "should not judge any man in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days."'

Perhaps he intends particularly the precepts of the apostles in their epistles: and these he calls the latter, or second, with regard to the preceding doctrine and precepts of Christ himself in the gospels. But we need not be much concerned about the meaning of a passage, of which we know neither the time nor the author.

XII. The last thing which we are to consider, is upon what account Irenæus receives the gospels of Mark and Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles, written likewise by St. Luke; since these were not apostles, and he does not appear to have received any books as part of the sacred scriptures of the New Testament, but such as were written by apostles, excepting the writings of these two persons: and, if I mistake not, the ground upon which he receives the writings of these two evangelists is, that they were well

^z See p. 176, 177.

^a Ἐτάξαν οἱ ἀποστολοὶ, μὴ δεῖναι ἡμᾶς κρίνειν τίνα ἐν βρωσῆι, καὶ ἐν ποσῆι, καὶ ἐν μερεὶ ἑορτῆς, κ. λ. Irenæi Fragmenta Anecd. p. 147.

informed of the doctrine of the apostles, and have faithfully recorded it.

This seems evident from the passage above^b cited, where he says: ‘Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things which had been preached by Peter; and Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel preached by him.’

For this reason it is, that he calls all the gospels, the gospels of the apostles. The Valentinians seem to have written a new gospel, of which Irenæus speaks in this manner: ‘They^c have become so audacious,’ says he, ‘as to call that which has not been long since written by them, the gospel of truth, though it agree in nothing with the gospels of the apostles.’ And he there speaks several times of the things contained in the gospels being delivered by the apostles, in a passage somewhat obscure; for which reason I place the rest of it only in the margin, as we have it in the Latin version. But there were two only of the gospels written by apostles: the other two can be no otherwise the apostles’, but as they contain the preaching or doctrine of the apostles; just as all the scriptures of the New Testament are the scriptures of the Lord, as containing his doctrine, whilst he himself wrote nothing. I say, they can be no otherwise the gospels of the apostles, but in the sense before mentioned: unless it should be supposed that, after they were written by those evangelists, they were expressly approved and authorized by the apostles. But this is not the ground Irenæus goes upon; (which is what we are now enquiring into;) but the veracity of these evangelists, and their intimacy with the apostles, whose disciples and inseparable companions they were, and whose doctrine they have faithfully delivered in writing.

And that Irenæus could not proceed upon the ground of an express approbation of the apostles, is evident, at least as to Mark’s gospel: in that he says, it was ‘after their exit,’ that is, either death or departure of the apostles Peter and Paul, that Mark delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter.

These two gospels, then, and the Acts, were received by

^b P. 170.

^c Si quidem in tantum processerunt audacie, uti quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, veritatis evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens apostolorum evangelis, ut neque evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemâ. Si enim quod ab eis profertur, veritatis est evangelium, dissimile est autem hoc illis, quæ ab apostolis nobis tradita sunt, qui volunt, possunt discere, quemadmodum ex scripturis ostenditur; jam non esse id quod ab apostolis traditum est, veritatis evangelium, &c. L. iii. cap. xi. sect. 9.

him as faithful narratives of the apostles' doctrine, composed by persons fully acquainted with it; with the guidance and assistance, undoubtedly, of the Holy Spirit.

This observation, if just, may be of use to us hereafter.

CHAP. XVIII.

ATHENAGORAS. HIS HISTORY.

WE have two pieces of Athenagoras, an Apology for the Christians, and a Treatise of the Resurrection. The Apology has the title of an embassy: from whence some have concluded, that Athenagoras was deputed by the christians of the country in which he lived, and waited upon the Roman emperor with this Apology. Others^a rather think, there is no reason to suppose it was ever presented; and the Greek word translated^b embassy may as well signify a petition.

There is no mention of Athenagoras in Eusebius or Jerom; but he is quoted by Methodius in a passage of his preserved in^c Epiphanius and^d Photius: and there is a particular account given by Philip Sidetes, (who flourished in the beginning of the fifth century,) in a Fragment of his Christian History published by^e Dodwell. Philip says, Athenagoras was at first a heathen, and that he intended to write against the christians: but when he was reading the scriptures, with a view of making his work the more complete, he was converted. He says that Athenagoras flourished under Adrian and Antoninus the pious, to whom his Apology was presented; and that he was the first president of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and master of Clement, who wrote the Stromata. I think it not easy to rely upon this account of Philip. Basnage^f has made divers exceptions to it. It is certain the History of Philip has no great character given it by^g Socrates, or^h Photius, who had read it. As there is little said of Athenagoras by the ancients that can be relied on, we can know little certain of him, but

^a See Bayle, Dict. H. et Critic. Athenagoras, Note B.

^b Πρεσβυτια.

^c H. er. 64. sect. 21. Vid. et Petav. not. p. 261.

^d Cod. 234. p. 908.

^e Append. ad Diss. Iren. p. 488.

^f Ann. P. E. 176. sect. 6.

^g L. vii. cap. 27.

^h Cod. 35. p. 21.

what may be collected from his works themselves: nor will they afford much light into his history. In the title, however, of both these pieces he is styled an Athenian, and a philosopher.

The Apology is inscribed to Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, and Lucius Aurelius Commodus: but learned men differ about the time of it. Pagiⁱ is of opinion the Apology was written in 166: Dodwell, in^k 168: Cave,^l about 177: Du Pin,^m in 178: Basnage,ⁿ in 176: Tillemont,^o not before 177, which is also the opinion of^p Mr. Mosheim.

The chief ground of this difference is a doubt about one of the persons to whom the Apology is addressed. Pagi and Dodwell suppose it was addressed to Marcus Antoninus, and his adopted brother and colleague in the empire, Lucius Verus, who died in 169. The learned men of the other opinion think it was inscribed to Marcus Antoninus, and his son Commodus: and if to them, then after Commodus had the proconsular power: which is the opinion of Basnage: who therefore places the Apology in 176, or else when Commodus had equal power with his father, which he did not receive till the year 177. This is the opinion of Tillemont and others, who place it in 177, or a little later. In behalf of this later date Tillemont^q has a learned argument: to whom I refer the reader, and to Bayle's account of the controversy in his Dictionary, in the article of Athenagoras. I shall only observe farther, that^r Fabricius, who doubtless had seen and weighed the arguments on both sides, says: 'Athenagoras seems to have written his Apology between the year of Christ 177 and 180, and to have presented it (so he thinks) to M. Antoninus and Commodus, whose names are prefixed to it in all the manuscripts:' and Mr. Mosheim has supported his opinion with divers arguments and considerations, omitted by others.

As this opinion appears to me much the more probable of the two, I therefore place Athenagoras at the year 177 or 178.

It is likely the discourse 'Of the Resurrection of the

ⁱ Critic. in Baron. A. D. 165. sect. vi. 177. sect. viii, &c.

^k Dissert. Cypr. xi. sect. 37, 38.

^l Hist. Lit.

^m Bibl. des Auteurs Ecc.

ⁿ Annal. Polit. E. An. 176. sect. 6, &c

^o Mem. Ec. Tom. ii. Persecution de Marc Aurèle, Art. 8, and Note x.

^p Vid. ejusd. Diss. de verâ ætat. Apol. Athenag.

^q In the place before referred to.

^r Apologiam videtur

scripsisse Athenagoras intra annum Christi 177 et 180, obtulisseque M. Aurelio Antonino et L. Commodo, quorum nomen in MSS. codicibus constanter præfixum legitur. Bibl. Gr. vol. vi. p. 86.

‘Dead’ was written after the Apology; because, as Tillemont observes, he seems to promise such a thing at the end of the Apology; where having fallen upon the subject of the resurrection, he^s defers a fuller discourse upon it to another time.

In this discourse he rather argues from reason than scripture. His two points are, the possibility and the fitness of a resurrection.

Though this author has been seldom mentioned in antiquity, there is no one doubts the genuineness of either of these pieces.

Athenagoras is a polite writer, and his Greek Attic. He has only rendered his style less agreeable by frequent parentheses.

His testimony to the books of the New Testament.

I. ‘For^t he that looks,’ says he, ‘on a woman, to lust after her, hath committed adultery in his heart.’ See Matt. v. 28.

II. ‘We can convince you,’ says he to the emperors, ‘that we are not atheists, by the principles we hold, which are not of human invention, but delivered and taught by God. What^u then are our maxims, in which we are instructed? “I say unto you: Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven, who maketh his sun to rise on the evil, and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust.”’ See Matt. v. 44, 45.

These are so plain quotations of the words in St. Matthew’s gospel, that I need not put down in the margin the Greek at length. I may however observe, that the originals of St. Matthew and Athenagoras agree, as they are represented to do by this translation.

There are likewise in the Apology some other passages^v taken from St. Matthew’s gospel, especially from our Saviour’s sermon on the mount; and having recited some of those precepts of our Lord, he adds; that^w he alleges but ‘a few out of many.’

^s Δλλ’ ανακεισθω μεν ο περι της ανατασεως λογος.

^t ‘Ο γαρ βλεπων, φησι, γυναικα προς το επιθυμησαι αυτης, ηδη μεμοιχευσεν εν τη καρδια αυτη. P. 36. B. Paris. 1663.

^u Τινες ουν ημων οι λογοι, ος εντρεφομεθα; λεγω υμιν’ κ. λ. p. 11. B. C.

^v Vid. p. 2. D. 12. A. D. et 38. A.

^w Ταυτα μεν ουν, μικρα απο μεγαλων, και ολιγα απο πολλων, ινα μη επι πλειον υμιν ενοχλοημεν, p. 13. A.

N. T.

III. Mark x. 6. "But^x from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female."

He mentions this observation with the same view with that of our Lord in St. Mark, as an argument against divorces; though, it must be owned, there are much the same words in Matt. xix. 4.

N. T.

IV. Luke xvi. 18. "Who-soever^z putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery."

It may be questioned, whether he refers to St. Luke, or to St. Matt. v. 32, or rather xix. 9. It is however a quotation.

N. T.

V. John x. 30. "I^b and my Father are one."

Ver. 38.—"That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him."

It is undoubted, that he acknowledged the gospel of St. John, from his^d so often calling the Son the 'Word' or Reason of God.

N. T.

VI. John xvii. 3. "And^e this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

ATHENAGORAS.

III. 'Because^y in the beginning God formed one man and one woman.'

ATHENAGORAS.

IV. 'For^a whosoever, says he, shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.'

ATHENAGORAS.

V. 'The^c Father and the Son being one; and the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son.'

ATHENAGORAS.

VI. 'For this alone^f concerned, to know the one God, and the Word [proceeding] from him——knowing, that the life we shall obtain hereafter is better than can be expressed in words, if we

^x Απο δε αρχης κτισεως, αρσεν και θηλυ εποηισεν αυτες ο Θεος.

^y Παραβαιωνων μεν την χειρα τω Θεω, οτι εν αρχη ο Θεος ενα ανδρα επλασε και μιαν γυναικα. p. 37. B.

και γαμων ετεραν, μοιχευει.

την γυναικα αυτη, και γαμιση αλλην, μοιχαται. Legat. p. 37. B.

^b Εγω και ο Πατηρ εν εσμεν—ινα γνωτε, και πιστευσητε, οτι εν εμοι ο Πατηρ, κειγω εν αυτω.

^c Ένος οντος τω Πατρω και του

'Υιου' οντος δε του 'Υιου εν Πατρι, και Πατρω εν 'Υιω. p. 10. C.

^d P. 10. B. C. 12. C. D. 17. D. 27. A. 34. D.

^e Αυτη δε εστιν η αιωνιος ζωη, ινα γνωσκωσι σε τον μονον αληθινον Θεον,

και ον απειταλας Ιησων Χριστον.

^f 'Υπο μονω δε παραπεμπομενοι

τωτω τον ισωθ Θεον και τον παρ' αυτου λογον ειδεναι—πολυ δε και κρειττονα η ειπειν λογω, τον εκδεχομενον βιον ειδοτες. p. 12. C. D.

N. T.

VII. Acts xvii. 25. “Neither^g is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed any thing.”

VIII. Rom. i. 24. “Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness—^k to dishonour their own bodies between themselves.”

27. “Men with men working that which is unseemly.”

IX. Rom. xi. 36. “For^m of him, and through him, and to him are all things.”

X. Rom. xii. 1. “I beseech you therefore, brethren,—that ye^o present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service.”

XI. I Cor. xv. 30. “And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? 31. I protest by your rejoicing, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily. 32. If after the manner of men, I

ATHENAGORAS.

shall but go hence pure from all unrighteousness.’

VII. ‘Since he^h wanteth not, nor needeth any thing.’ He there gives this character of the Deity upon the same account that St. Paul does: and much to the same purpose again: ⁱ ‘Not as if God needed.’

VIII. ‘Men with^l men working those things which are abominable, many ways abusing their comely and beautiful bodies, and dishonouring the excellent workmanship of God.’

IX. ‘For ofⁿ him, and through him were all things made.’ Though perhaps he refers to John i. 3.

X. ‘But why should I be concerned about whole-burnt-offerings, which God does not need? It is much^p better therefore to offer an unbloody sacrifice, and bring a reasonable service.’

XI. He had argued at length the disadvantages of virtue; that many of the best men endure in this life vexation and sorrow, reproaches and calumnies: ‘that if there be no retribu-

^g Ουδέ ὑπο χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεραπεύεται, προσδεόμενος τινος.

^h Ἀνευδέης καὶ ἀπροσδέης. p. 13. B.

ⁱ Οὐχ ὡς ἔορμεν

τοῦ Θεοῦ. p. 15. C.

^k —Τὰ αἰμαζέσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν

ἐαυτοῖς—ἀρσενες ἐν ἀρσέσι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι.

^l Ἀρσενές ἐν ἀρσέσι τὰ δεινά κατεργαζόμενοι, ὄσων σεμνοτέρα καὶ εὐειδέτερα σώματα, παντοίως αὐτὰ ὑβρίζοντες, αἰτιμούντες καὶ τὸ ποιῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ καλόν. p. 37. C.

^m Ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς

αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα.

ⁿ Πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῦ πάντα

^o Παρατηρεῖται τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν θύσιαν

ζῶσαν—τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ἡμῶν.

^p Καίτοι προσφέρειν

θεῶν ἀναίμακτον θύσιαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν. p. 13. D.

N. T.

have fought with beasts at Ephesus; what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Though these last words are also in Isa. xxii. 13; it seems from the conformity of his argument, that he refers to St. Paul.

N. T.

XII. 1 Cor. xv. 54. "So^r when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption."

2 Cor. v. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that^s every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad."

XIII. Gal. iv. 9. "How thus^v turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements?"

These are the very words of Paul, which Athenagoras borrows, though he useth them upon a different account.

N. T.

XIV. 1 Tim. v. 1, 2. "Rebuke not an elder, but intreat him as a father, and the younger men as bre-

ATHENAGORAS.

tion,^q—virtue is a senseless thing: to follow pleasure is the greatest good: and that ought to be the common maxim and law of all, which is admired by the voluptuous and wicked: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

ATHENAGORAS.

XII. 'It is manifest therefore, that, according to the apostle, this^t corruptible and dissipated must put on incorruption; that the dead being raised up to life, and the separated, and even consumed parts being again united, every^u one may receive justly the things he has done in his body, whether they be good or bad.'

XIII. 'And fall down to the beggarly and^w weak elements.'

ATHENAGORAS.

XIV. 'Wherefore,^x according to the difference of age, some we count as sons and daughters, others we

^q De Resurr. p. 62. A. B.

^r Όταν δε το φθαρτον τῆτο ἐνδύσῃται ἀφθαρσιαν. κ. λ.

^s Ἴνα κομισῆται ἕκασος τα δια του σωματος, προς ἃ ἐπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθον, εἴτε κακον.

^t Ἐνδύλον παντι το λιπομενον, ὅτι δι, κατα τον αποτολον, το φθαρτον τουτο και διασκεδατον ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσιαν. De Resurr. p. 61. C.

^u Ἐκασος κομισῆται δικαιως ἃ δια του σωματος ἐπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθα, εἴτε κακα. *ibid.*

^v Πως ἐπιτρεφετε παλιν ἐπι τα ἀσθενη και πτωχα ποιχεια.

^w Ἐπι τα πτωχα και ἀσθενη ποιχεια καταπιπτομεν. Legat. p. 15. D.

^x P. 36. C.

N. T.

thren: the elder women as mothers, the younger as sisters, with all purity.”

XV. 1 Tim. vi. 16. “Who only has immortality, dwelling in^y the light which no man can approach unto.”

XVI. James iii. 13. “Who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge amongst you? Let him shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom.”

XVII. James v. 7. “Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain.”

XVIII. 2 Pet. i. 21. “For^c the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

XIX. Rev. xx. 13. “And the^e sea gave up the dead which were in it: and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them.”

XX. There is a particular passage in Athenagoras, which we may not omit. It follows what we have transcribed at Numb. XIV. ‘The aged we reverence as fathers and

ATHENAGORAS.

consider as brethren and sisters, and the aged we reverence as fathers and mothers.’

XV. ‘For God is^z to himself all things, light inaccessible,—or, according to our translation, light which no man can approach unto.’

XVI. ‘For our^a excellence lies not in the structure of words, but in the demonstration and doctrine of works.’

XVII. ‘For as the^b husbandman, when he has cast the seeds into the earth, expecteth the time of the harvest,’ &c.

XVIII. Of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other prophets, he says: ‘Who^d according to the ecstacy of the thoughts in them, the Divine Spirit moving them, spoke out those things which were operated in them.’

XIX. He speaks of it as the general opinion of christians, that^f at the time of the resurrection, ‘the earth shall deliver up her dead.’

^y Φως οικων απροσιτον. αυτω, φως απροσιτον. p. 15. C. αλλ’ επιδειξει και διδασκαλια εργα τα ημετερα. p. 37. B.

^b P. 37. A.

^c Ου γαρ θεληματι ανθρωπων ηνεχθη ποτε προφητεια, αλλ’ υπο πνευματος αγιου φερομενοι ελαλησαν οι αγιοι θεοι ανθρωποι.

^d Και των λοιπων προφητων, οι κατ’ εκτασιν των εν αυτοις λογισμων, κωησαντος αυτους του θεου πνευματος, α ενηργουντο εξεφωνησαν. p. 9. D.

^e Και εδωκεν η θαλασσα τες εν αυτη νεκρες, και ο θανατος και ο ριθης εδωκεν τες εν αυτοις νεκρες.

^f Και αποδωσειν μεν νομιζειν την γην τες υιους νεκρες. p. 39. A.

^z Παντα γαρ ο θεος εστιν αυτος

^a Ου γαρ μελετη λογων,

mothers. It is therefore our great concern, that the bodies of those whom we call sisters, or by any other name of kindred, should be preserved chaste and unpolluted, the ^s Word again saying to us [or our doctrine teaching us]: “If any one shall kiss a second time, because it pleaseth him:” And afterwards: “A kiss is to be given so slightly, that it may be rather only a salutation: for if the mind be in the least polluted, it endangers our enjoyment of eternal life.”’

I think we need not solicitously inquire, whence Athenagoras had these observations. There is no necessity of supposing he ascribes them to Christ, or that he took them out of any copies of our gospels, or from any apocryphal gospel. They may be as well cited from some christian writer, whom Athenagoras thought to have expressed himself upon this subject agreeably to the strict doctrine of Christ delivered in the gospels. Mr. Jones^h has some remarks upon this passage.

XXI. I have now represented very particularly the testimony which Athenagoras gives to the books of the New Testament; but all these passages are not equally material. It is plain, he owned the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John: there do not appear so clear references to those of St. Mark and St. Luke. Here are also plain references or allusions to the epistle to the Romans, and the first to the Corinthians: words of which last are expressly cited by him as the apostle’s, meaning Paul: and there is a probable allusion to the second epistle to the Corinthians, and the epistle to the Galatians. The passages here alleged by me concerning the Acts of the Apostles, the first to Timothy, the epistle of St. James, the second of St. Peter, and the book of the Revelation, are doubtful, and are only proposed to the reader’s consideration. And beside these, he has a passage, not found in any book of the New Testament, which might at first sight seem to be taken out of some book of authority with him; but notwithstanding, it may be as well supposed the passage of some christian writing, esteemed by him only as an orthodox pious work.

Though we meet with no references in Athenagoras to the other books of the New Testament, they may have

^s Παλιν ἡμιν λεγοντος τα λογα· Εάν τις δια τουτο εκ δευτερον καταφιληση, οτι ηρησεν αυτω· και επιφεροντος· πτωσ ουν ακριβωσασθαι το φιλημα μαλλον δε προσκυνημα δει, ως, επε μικρον τη διανοι παραθωλωθει, εξω ἡμας της αιωνιας τιθεντος ζωης. p. 36. C. D.

^h New and Full Method of settling the canonical Authority of the New Testament, Vol. I. p. 551.

been all, or most of them, received by him as books of authority. It is not to be expected, that, in two such pieces as these, we should find references to all the books esteemed sacred by the author.

CHAP. XIX.

MILTIADES.

MILTIADES flourished, according to Cave,^a in the beginning of the reign of Commodus about the year 180: from whom Du Pin^b does not much differ, who says he flourished under the emperor Commodus. We have no certain marks of his age. It is very probable, his Apology (of which we shall speak presently) was written in the latter part of the reign of M. Antoninus, or the beginning of that of Commodus. I proceed to the testimonies of the ancients.

Miltiades is called by Tertullian^c the sophist of the churches: by which I see no reason to understand him to say, that Miltiades was a rhetorician, and taught that science, but only that he was a learned and elegant christian writer. Tertullian places Miltiades between Justin Martyr and Irenæus; which affords a very good hint for settling his time in general, though not exactly. And it is upon the ground of this passage chiefly, that Tillemont^d concludes, Miltiades had appeared in the world before the middle of the second century, and died in the time of Commodus.

Eusebius^e having mentioned a treatise of Miltiades, written against the Montanists, with this title, ‘That it does not become prophets to speak in ecstasy,’ adds; ‘And^f beside that work, Miltiades has left us other monuments of his zeal for the divine oracles, as well in his writings against the Gentiles as against the Jews: for he wrote against both distinctly in two treatises. Moreover^g he made an

^a Hist. Lit.

^b Bibl. Miltiades.

^c Ut Justinus Philosophus et Martyr, ut Miltiades Ecclesiarum Sophista, ut Irenæus, &c. Advers. Valent. cap. v.

^d Mem. E. T. 3. P. 1. Miltiade.

^e H. E. l. v. c. 17.

^f Και αλλας ημιν της υμιας περι τα θεια λογια σπυδης μνημας καταλειπειν. Ibid.

^g Επι δε και προς της κοσμικης αρχοντας, υπερ ης μετηι φιλοσοφιας, πεποιηκεναι απολογιαν. Ibid.

‘ Apology to the princes of this world for the philosophy which he followed :’ that is, for the christian religion.

Learned men are not agreed about the meaning of the words ‘ princes of this world.’ Valesius,^h who supposes the Apology was written in the time of Commodus, when there was but one emperor, understands them of the governors of provinces ; which meaning the words will well bear. Othersⁱ understand thereby the Roman emperors, which they suppose to have been either M. Antoninus and Lucius, or M. Antoninus and his son Commodus.

St. Jerom, in his book of^k *Illustrious Men*, having recited the titles of this writer’s works, says, he flourished in the time of M. Antoninus Commodus.

We have nothing to observe at present upon these works, except what Eusebius says of the ‘ monuments of his zeal for the divine oracles’ in his book against both Jews and Gentiles. It is very likely here were many valuable testimonies concerning the books of the New as well as the Old Testament ; but we can only lament our loss of them.

However, it may not be improper to add another passage of St. Jerom : where having observed, that Miltiades^l wrote an ‘ excellent book against the Gentiles ;’ he proceeds to mention Hippolytus, Africanus, and divers other christian writers, and then concludes : ‘ The writings of all these ‘ persons are so full of passages of the philosophers and ‘ their sentiments, that it is not easy to say, which ought to ‘ be most admired in them ; whether their polite literature, ‘ or their knowledge of the scriptures.’

^h Vid. Annot. ad Eus. loc. Iren. iv. sect. 38.

ⁱ Vid. Dodwell, Diss. ^k Cap. 39.

^l Scripsit et Miltiades contra Gentes volumen egregium—Qui omnes in tantum philosophorum doctrinis atque sententiis suos referunt libros, ut nescias, quid in illis primum admirari debeas, eruditionem seculi, an scientiam scripturarum. Ad magnum Orat. Ep. 83. al. 84.

CHAP. XX.

THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH.

THEOPHILUS, bishop of Antioch, was originally a heathen, as he^a has informed us himself. His works show him to have been well acquainted with the Greek learning. He succeeded Eros in^b the eighth year of Marcus Antoninus, of our Lord 168.

There is nothing remaining that can be depended on as his, beside three books to Autolyceus, a learned^c and studious heathen, who had provoked Theophilus by frequent discourses, if not also by writing, to make a defence of the christian religion. These books were not finished, as is evident from^d divers passages of them, until after the death of the fore-mentioned emperor. It is the^e general opinion, that they were written by Theophilus a little before his own death, in the beginning of the reign of Commodus, A. D. 181.

Dodwell^f indeed was willing to suppose that Theophilus, author of these books to Autolyceus, was another Theophilus, different from the sixth bishop of Antioch, and that he wrote these books in the reign of Severus about the year 203. But this supposition has been well confuted by several^g learned men: and every one may perceive, how contrary it is to the ancient testimonies concerning this bishop of Antioch; which I shall now put down, because they will not only determine his age, but also give us an account of his works, and his respect for the writings of the New Testament.

Eusebius^h says, ‘Theophilus was the sixth bishop of Antioch after the apostles.’ His order is this: Euodius, Ignatius, Heros, Cornelius, Eros, Theophilus.

In anotherⁱ place, ‘There are,’ says Eusebius, ‘three books of Theophilus bishop of Antioch to Autolyceus, containing the elements of religion. There is another book of

^a Ad Autol. L. i. p. 78. C. D. Paris.

^b Vid. Euseb. Chron.

^c Ad Autol. L. i. p. 69. A. B. L. ii. p. 116. C. D. L. iii. p. 119. A. B. 138. D.

^d P. 137, 138.

^e Vid. Fabr. Bib.

Gr. T. v. p. 91, 92.

^f Vid. Pearson, Op. Post. p. 11, 12.

^g Tillemont, Memoires, T. 3. P. 1. Theophile. Not. 2. Basnage, Ann. 188. sect. 5, 6. Cave, Hist. Lit. P. 2. p. 31.

^h H. E. l. iv. c. 20.

ⁱ Ibid. cap. 24.

‘ his against the heresy of Hermogenes, in^k which he has
 ‘ made use of testimonies from John’s Apocalypse. There
 ‘ are also other books of his concerning the rudiments of
 ‘ our religion.’ He likewise mentions another book of his
 against Marcion, which he says is well written, and was
 then extant, as well as the other before mentioned.

St. Jerom in his^l book of *Illustrious Men*, agreeably
 to Eusebius, says: ‘ Theophilus, the sixth bishop of the
 ‘ church of Antioch, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, com-
 ‘ posed a book against Marcion, which is still extant. His
 ‘ three volumes to Autolytus are also in being, and one
 ‘ book against the heresy of Hermogenes, and other short
 ‘ and elegant treatises conducive to the edification of the
 ‘ church. I have^m read some commentaries upon the
 ‘ gospel, and the Proverbs of Solomon, which go under his
 ‘ name; but they do not appear to me to answer the style
 ‘ and elegance of the fore-mentioned writings.’

In his prefaceⁿ to St. Matthew, Jerom says again: ‘ I
 ‘ have also read the commentaries of Theophilus bishop of
 ‘ Antioch.’

In another place: ‘ Theophilus^o the seventh bishop of the
 ‘ church of Antioch after Peter, who^p collecting into one
 ‘ work the words of the four evangelists, speaks thus in his
 ‘ Commentaries upon this parable: [Luke xvi. 1—14:]
 “ The rich man who had a steward is God Almighty, than
 ‘ whom no one is richer. His steward is Paul, who learned
 ‘ the holy scriptures at the feet of Gamaliel, and had
 ‘ received the law of God to manage; who, when he had
 ‘ began to persecute, bind, kill those that believed in
 ‘ Christ, and to waste all his Lord’s substance, was called to
 ‘ an account by the Lord: “ Saul, Saul, why persecutest
 ‘ thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,”’
 Acts xxii. 3. ix. 4. I shall not transcribe any more of this

^k *Ἐν ᾧ ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαλυψῆως Ἰωάννης κεχρηται μαρτυριας.*

^l Cap. 25. ^m Legi sub nomine ejus in evangelium, et in
 proverbialia Salomonis commentarios; qui mihi cum superiorum voluminum
 elegantia et phrasi non videntur congruere. ⁿ Et Theophili
 Antiochenæ urbis episcopi commentarios. Prol. in Comm. sup. Matth.

^o Here he counts Peter for the first bishop.

^p —Qui quatuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens ingenii
 sui nobis monumenta dimisit, hæc super hæc parabolâ in suis commentariis
 est locutus: Dives, qui habebat villicum, sive dispensatorem, Deus omni-
 potens est, quo nihil ditius. Hujus dispensator est Paulus, qui ad pedes Ga-
 malielis sacras literas didicit, et legem Dei suscepit dispensandam. Qui
 quum cœpisset credentes in Christo persequi, ligare, occidere, et omnem
 domini sui dissipare substantiam, correptus a Domino est: Saül, Saül, quid
 me persequeris? Durum est tibi contra stimulum caleitrare. Hieron. Ep.
 151. Algasie. Qu. vi.

passage: only it ought to be observed, that afterwards some words of Philip. iii. 8, are there adapted, and put into the mouth of Paul.

There are still remaining short^a ‘commentaries,’ or ‘allegories, upon the four holy gospels,’ in four books, which go under the name of our Theophilus; but they are now allowed to^r be the work of a much later writer. And whether those commentaries, which St. Jerom quotes, were really composed by Theophilus may be doubted; since they were unknown to Eusebius, and were observed by Jerom to differ in style and expression from his other works. However, if they are not his, they were the work of some anonymous ancient.

I now proceed to represent the quotations and allusions to the books of the New Testament, which are in his remaining, and undoubtedly genuine, books to Autolyceus.

I. Having recited many precepts of piety and virtue from the Old Testament, he says: ‘But^s the evangelic voice teaches chastity in yet greater perfection: “Whosoever looks on another man’s wife, to lust after her, has committed adultery with her already in his heart. And whosoever putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery.”——But the gospel^t says: “Love your enemies, and pray for them that despitefully use you. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? Even robbers and publicans do the same.” And it teaches those that do good not to boast: For, says he, “Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth,”” Matt. v. 28, 32, 44, 46; vi. 3.

N. T.

THEOPHILUS.

II. Luke xviii. 27. “And he said: The^u things which are impossible with men, are possible with God.”

II. ‘For the things^v which with men are impossible, are possible with God.’

The same sense is in Matt. xix. 26, Mark x. 27. But the words of Theophilus agree best with St. Luke.

N. T.

THEOPHILUS.

III. Luke xx. 35, 36. “But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain

III. ‘For God has given us a law and holy precepts: which he that does may be

^a Apud Biblioth. Maxim. Patr. Lugd. T. ii. p. 166, &c.

^r Vid. Tillem. ubi supr. Not. 1. Fabr. Bib. Gr. Vol. v. p. 93, 94.

^s Ἡ δὲ εὐαγγελίος φωνὴ επιτακτικώτερον διδάσκει περὶ ἀγνείας, λέγουσα—— Lib. iii. p. 126. A.

^t τὰς ἐχθρὰς. Ibid. B. C.

^v τὰ δὲ εὐαγγελίον, ἀγαπάτε, φησι,

^u τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις,

^v δύνατα ἐστὶ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

^v τὰ γὰρ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις

ἀδύνατα, δύνατα ἐστὶ παρὰ Θεῷ. L. ii. p. 92. B.

N. T.

that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more: for they are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.”

IV. Luke xxiv. 47. “And^x that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name.”

V. ‘These things^z the holy scriptures teach us, and all who were moved by the Holy Spirit, among whom John says: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God:” showing, that at the first, God was alone, and in him was the Word. Then he says: “And the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made,”’ John i. 1, 3.

VI. Theophilus says: ‘The^a prophets have taught us to abstain from abominable idolatry and adultery, and murder, fornication, theft, covetousness, swearing, lying, anger, and all lasciviousness and impurity: and that whatever things a man would not have done to himself, those neither should he do to another.’

I should not have put down this passage here, if Mill^b had not supposed, that in this place Theophilus refers to Acts xv. 20, which, it seems, in some manuscripts and some ancient fathers, is read with an additional clause to this purpose: ‘But that we write to them to abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things

^w Και της ανατασεως τυχων κληρονομησαι την αφθαρσιαν. P. 104. A. L. ii.

^x —Και κηρυχθηναι—μετανοιαν και αφεσιν αμαρτιων.

^y ‘Οπως η και τωτο εις δειγμα τω μελλειν λαμβανειν τωσ ανθρωπωσ μετανοιαν και αφεσιν αμαρτιων δια υδατοσ. κ. λ. L. ii. p. 95. B.

^z ‘Οθεν διδασκασιν ημασ αι αγια γραφαι, και παντεσ οι πνευματοφοροι, εξ ων Ιωαννης λεγει εν αρχη ην ο λογος’ και ο λογος ην προς τον Θεον’ δεικνυσ οτι εν πρωτοισ μονοσ ην ο Θεοσ, και εν αυτω ο λογος’ επιτα λεγει κ. λ. P. 100. C.

^a Οι και ειδαζαν απεχεσθαι απο τωσ αθεμιτωσ ειδωλολατρευασ, και μοιχειασ, και φονωσ, πορνειασ, κλοπησ, φιλαργυρειασ, ορκωσ, ψευδωσ, οργησ, και πασησ υσελγειασ, και ακαθαρσιασ’ και παντα οσα αν μη βελεται ανθρωποσ ιαντω γενεσθαι, ινα μηδε αλλω ποιη. L. ii. p. 110. C.

^b Fallor an huc respexerit Theophilus Antiochenus, Προφηται, inquit, ειδαζαν απεχεσθαι, κ. λ. Mill. N. T. ad Acts xv. 20.

THEOPHILUS.

saved, and^w obtaining a resurrection may inherit incorruption.’

It seems to me somewhat likely, that he alludes to the words of St. Luke in the opposite column.

IV. ‘That this might be a sign, that^y men should receive repentance and remission of sins through water.’

—See hereafter Numb. XXIV.

strangled, and from blood; and that^c whatever things they would not have done to themselves, they do not do to others.' Mill allows, (and in my opinion justly,) that this last clause is an interpolation. But admitting it to be genuine, there could be, I think, but slender ground for supposing, that Theophilus referred to this text; the like precept being recorded in some other texts of the New Testament, and represented there as the doctrine, or substance of the law and the prophets, (agreeably to what Theophilus here writes,) much more distinctly than in this place of the Acts: as Matt. vii. 12. See likewise xxii. 40, and Luke vi. 31. And the foregoing part of the passage of Theophilus has but little agreement with the 20th verse of the xvth chapter of the Acts, as in our copies. But all this is submitted to the consideration of others.

I would only add, that two of the most remarkable expressions of this passage of Theophilus are found in 1 Pet. iv. 3, "For the time past of our life may suffice us, to have wrought the will of the Gentiles: when we walked in^d lasciviousness, lusts—and abominable idolatries."

VII. He says likewise: 'For^e God, the father and former of all things, has not forsaken the human nature, but gave the law and sent the holy prophets for to declare and show the human kind, that every one of us might awake and acknowledge, that there is one God.'

These words immediately precede the passage last transcribed; and they are likewise preceded by the words which will be found at Numb. XXVIII. They are here put down, that it may be considered, whether there be in them any reference to Acts xiv. 15, 16, 17, "—and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein. Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons"—or to Acts xvii. 27, "That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."

^c Και ὅσα ἀν μὴ ἐβλώσωιν ἑαυτοῖς γινεσθαι, ἑτέροις μὴ ποιεν. Vid. Mill, *ibid.*

^d Ἐν ἀσελγείαις, —καὶ ἀθεμιταῖς εἰδωλολατρείαις.

^e Ὁ μὲν τοι γὰρ Θεὸς, καὶ πατὴρ καὶ κτίστης τῶν ὅλων, οὐκ ἐγκατέλιπε τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκεν νόμον, καὶ ἐπέμψεν προφήτας ἁγίους, πρὸς τὸ καταγγεῖλαι καὶ δεῖξαι τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰς τὸ ἕνα ἕκαστον ἡμῶν ἀναγγεῖλαι, καὶ ἐπιγινώσκειν, ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶ Θεός. p. 110. C

N. T.

VIII. Acts xvii. 25. "Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though^f he needed any thing."

28. "For in him we live, and move, and have our being."

IX. Rom. ii. 6, 7, 8, 9. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life: But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doth evil."

X. Rom. xiii. 7, 8. "Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another."

These, with many other passages, afford full proof, that the ancient christian writers often quoted, or alluded to, texts of the N. T. by memory, without looking into the books themselves.

THEOPHILUS.

VIII. He says of God, that he needeth^g nothing. But this is so obvious a character of the Creator, that I think it cannot be hence concluded that he referred to Paul's discourse at Athens. He likewise says of God, that 'he is his own place.'

IX. 'He will^h search out all things, and judge justly, rendering to all according to the desert of their actions. To them that by patient continuance in well doing seek for immortality he will give eternal life, joy, peace, rest, and many good things which neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man. But to the unbelieving, and the despisers, and them that obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness,—shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation, and anguish. And in a word, eternal fire shall be the portion of such.'

X. 'And it [the divine word] teachethⁱ us to render to all all things: honour to whom honour, fear to whom fear, tribute to whom tribute; to owe no man any thing, but only to love all men.'

^f Προσδεόμενος τινος.

^g Αλλ' αυτος εαυτη τοπος ων και ανενδεης ων, και υπερεχων προ των αιωνων, ηβελησεν ανθρωπον ποιησαι ψηφωσθη—ο γαρ γενητος και προσδεης εσιν' ω δε αγενητος κλεινος προσδεεται.

L. ii. p. 88. B.

^h L. ii. p. 79. B. C.

ⁱ L. iii. p. 126. C.

There are, beside these, some other allusions^k to words of the epistle to the Romans; but here is enough to show that epistle was well known to Theophilus.

N. T.

XI. 1 Cor. ii. 7. “For we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world to our glory. 8. Which none of the princes of this world knew. 10. But God has revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for^l the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. 11. —even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.”

XII. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, 11. “Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind. Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye are washed,” &c.

XIII. 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37. “—That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but^o bare

THEOPHILUS.

XI. ‘Whence it is manifest, that all others are in error, and that christians only have attained to the truth. For we are taught of the Holy Spirit who spoke in the holy prophets, and foretold all things. It^m remains therefore for you with a good disposition to search the things of God, I mean the things spoken by the prophets, that comparing the things said by you, [perhaps it should be us,] and by others, you may find the truth.’

XII. ‘Let meⁿ see therefore, whether you are not an adulterer, or a fornicator, or a thief, or an extortioner,—or one that abuseth himself with mankind, or a reviler. —For to those who do such things God manifests not himself, unless they first purify themselves from every defilement.’

XIII. ‘Is there not a resurrection of seeds and fruits, and that for the use of men? For^p instance, a grain of wheat, or of other seeds, when it is cast into the earth,

^k Thus, when Theophilus tells Autolytus, that if he does not believe there will be a resurrection, till he sees it, ‘his faith will be counted for unbelief;’ και η πιστις σε εις απιστιαν λογισθησεται, p. 74. C; it cannot be doubted, but he alludes to St. Paul’s argument and words, Rom. iv. 3, 5.

^l Το γαρ πνευμα παντα ερευνα, και τα βαθη τα θεα—οὕτω και τα τα θεα εδειξαι οιδεν. κ λ. ^m Και το λοιπον ερω σοι φιλοφρονων ⁿ I. i. p. 70. C. D.

^o Αλλα γημιον κοκκον, ει τυχοι, σιτη, η τινοσ των λοιπων.

^p Ει γαρ τυχοι ειπειν κοκκοσ σιτη, η των λοιπων σπερματων, επαν βληθη εις

N. T.

grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain."

XIV. 2 Cor. v. 4. "Not^q that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

XV. 2 Cor. xi. 19. "For^s ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise."

XVI. Ephes. ii. 2. "According to the prince of the power of the air, theⁿ spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."

XVII. Ephes. iii. 10. "Might^w be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God."

XVIII. Philip. iii. 20. "Whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who^y mind earthly things."

By 'repenting not,' he seems to mean the same thing as 'glorying in their shame.'

N. T.

XIX. Philip. i. 10. "That

την γην, πρωτον αποθνησκει και λυεται, ειτα εγειρεται, και γινεται σαχνης. L. i. p. 77. D.

^q Εφ' ὃ ἢ θελομεν εκδυσασθαι, αλλ' επενδυσασθαι, ινα καταποθη το θνητον υπο της ζωης.

^r Όταν αποθη το θνητον, και ενδυση την αφαρσιαν. L. i. p. 74. B.

^s Ηδεις γαρ ανεχεσθε των αφρονων, φρονιμοι οντες.

^t ανεχη. L. iii. p. 119. A.

^u εν τοις υιοις της απειθειας.

^v Έως γαρ τα δευρο ενεργων εν τοις ενθουσιαζομενοις ὑπ' αυτη ανθρωποις. L. ii. p. 104. D.

^w 'Ινα γνωρισθη—ἡ πολυποικιλος σοφια Θεου.

^x Δε' ὁ και εν τατοις δεικνυται ἡ πολυποικιλος σοφια τῃ Θεῳ. L. ii. p. 95. B.

^y Οἱ τα επιγεια φρονοντες.

και μη μετανοητων. L. ii. p. 95. D.

THEOPHILUS.

first dies and is dissolved, then it rises, and becomes a stalk.'

XIV. 'Then will you understand these things, when^r you shall have laid aside this mortal, [or this mortality,] and put on incorruption.'

XV. 'For seeing you^t yourself are wise, you may suffer simple people gladly.'

XVI. Speaking of Satan, who deceived Eve, he says: 'For to this day^v he worketh in them that are acted by him.'

XVII. 'On the fifth day were made living creatures out of the water. Wherefore^x also in these is shown the manifold wisdom of God.'

XVIII. 'But the four-footed creatures, and wild beasts, are a lively image of some men, who know not God, and are wicked, who^z mind earthly things, and repent not.'

THEOPHILUS.

XIX. Persuading Auto-

^z Και τα επιγεια φρονοντων,

N. T.

ye^a may approve things that are excellent," or try things that differ.

But though these are the very words of the apostle, the agreement being in a very obvious thing, it may not be material.

N. T.

XX. Philip. iv. 8. "Whatsoever things^c are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think of these things."

XXI. Col. i. 15. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the^e first-born of every creature. 16. For by him were created all things that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible. —17. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

XXII. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. "I exhort therefore, that supplications, prayers, — be made for all men: for kings, and all that are in authority, that^g we may

THEOPHILUS.

lycus to employ the eyes of his mind in inquiring^b after truth, he says, 'By the eyes of the body men try things that differ.'

THEOPHILUS.

XX. 'And that^d these things are true, and profitable, and just, and lovely in the sight of all men, is manifest.'

XXI. 'For before that any thing was made, he had him for his counsellor, being his understanding and wisdom. But when he determined to make those things about which he had taken counsel, he^f brought forth from himself this Word, the first-born of every creature.'

XXII. 'The divine word^h moreover commands us to be subject to principalities and powers, and to pray for them, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life.'

^a Εἰς τὸ δοκιμαζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα. τὰ διαφέροντα. L. i. p. 70. A.

^b Ἄμα δοκιμαζόντες ὅσα εἰπὼν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνὰ, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἀγαθὰ, ὅσα προσφιλῆ — ταῦτα λογιζέσθε.

^c Ὅτι μὲν ἐν ταῦτα ἀληθῆ, καὶ ὠφέλιμα, καὶ δίκαια, καὶ προσφιλῆ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις τυγχάνει, ἐῆλον ἐστίν. L. ii. p. 114. D.

^d —πρωτοτοκος πάσης κτίσεως.

^e Τῶτον τὸν λόγον ἐγένησε προφορικῶν, πρωτοτοκῶν πάσης κτίσεως. L. ii. p. 100. B.

^f Ἴνα ἡρεμῶν καὶ ἡσυχῶν βίῳν διαγωνίην ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνοτητί.

^g Ἐπι μὴν καὶ περὶ τῆς ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὐχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, κέλνει ἡμῖν θεῖος λόγος, ὅπως ἡρεμῶν καὶ ἡσυχῶν βίῳν διαγωνίην. L. iii. p. 126. C.

N. T.

lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.”

Tit. iii. 1. “Putⁱ them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers.”

XXIII. Tit. ii. 11, 12. “For the grace of God—has appeared to all men,^k teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this world.”

XXIV. Tit. iii. 5, 6. “But according to his mercy he saved us, by^m the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.”

XXV. There is a short passage, said to beⁿ a fragment of the Commentary of Theophilus upon Solomon’s Song, to this purpose.

‘Our^p Lord is of the Gentiles according to the flesh, saying too the truth of what is said, “that he is of Judah:” which is supposed to be a reference to Heb. vii. 14. “For it is evident, that our Lord sprang out of Judah.”’

In this fragment there is also a plain quotation of these words: “But the greatest of these is charity,” 1 Cor. xiii. 13.

ⁱ Ὑπομνησκει αὐτοῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι.

^k Παιδεύσασα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα—σωφρονῶς, καὶ δικαίως, καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι.

^l Ὅς διδάσκει ἡμᾶς δικαιοπραγεῖν, καὶ εὐσεβεῖν, καὶ καλοποιεῖν. I. iii. p. 123. A.

^m Διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λῆτρῃς παλιγγενεσίας, καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου· οὐ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς πλῆσσιως.

ⁿ Διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λῆτρῃς παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τῶς προσωντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. I. ii. p. 95. B.

^o Fragmentum Commentarii Theophili in Cant. Canticorum. Ex Eusebii Expositione Cantici, &c. Apud Grabe, Spic. T. 2. p. 224.

^p Ἐξ ἐθνῶν το κατὰ σάρκα ὁ Κυριος, σωζομενθ καὶ τῆ ἐξ Ἰσδα. Ibid.

THEOPHILUS.

XXIII. He says, ‘Christians have for their law-giver the true God: who^l teaches us to act righteously, godly, and honestly.’

XXIV. That this might be a sign, that men should receive repentance and remission of sins, throughⁿ water, and the washing of regeneration, even all that come to the truth, and are regenerated, and receive blessing from God. This blessing from God may also intend the renewing of the Holy Ghost, &c. See also 1 Tim. ii. 4.

XXVI. He says: 'At^q that time there was a righteous king, named Melchisedec, in the city of Salem, now called Hierosolyma. He was the first priest of the most high God. From him the city was called Jerusalem, which before was called Hierosolyma. From him there have been priests spread over all the earth.' This passage may be compared with Heb. vii. 1, 2, 3. See likewise Gen. xiv. 18. and Joseph. Antiq. L. 1. cap. x.

N. T.

XXVII. Heb. xii. 9. "Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh, who corrected us, and we gave them reverence. Shall^r we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live?"

This appears a more likely reference to the epistle to the Hebrews than the foregoing.

N. T.

XXVIII. 1 Pet. i. 18. ——"redeemed^t from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers."

XXIX. 1 Pet. ii. 13. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme.—15. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. 17. Honour all men: love the brotherhood: fear God: honour the king."

XXX. 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

^q L. ii. p. 108. C.

τη πατρι των πνευματων, και ζησομεν;

τοις γονευσιν υποτασσεσθαι, ποσῳ μαλλον τη Θεῳ και Πατρι των ὄλων;

L. ii. p. 102. C.

πατροπαραδοσῃ.

πατροπαραδοσῃ γνωμης ασυνετῃ. L. ii. p. 110. B.

^v L. i. p. 77. A.

THEOPHILUS.

XXVII. 'But if children ought to be in subjection to their parents, how^s much rather should we be in subjection to the God and Father of all?'

THEOPHILUS.

XXVIII. 'These idols the multitude of vain men worships;—^u adhering to vain maxims, through the error of a foolish opinion received by tradition from their fathers.'

XXIX. 'But do^v you honour the king, bearing him good will, being in subjection to him, praying for him. For so doing you do the will of God. For the law says: "My son, honour God and the king, &c." See Prov. xxiv. 21.

XXX. 'But^w men of God,

^r Ου πολλῳ μαλλον υποταγησομεθα

^s Ει δε χρῆ τα τεκνα

^t Ελυτρωθητε εκ της ματαιας ὑμων ανατροφης

^u Πειθομενοι δογμασι ματαιοις, δια πλανης

^w L. ii. p. 87. D.

N. T.

“Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

I cannot tell, whether this will be allowed to be a paraphrase of the text in the second of Peter.

N. T.

XXXI. Rev. xii. 9. “And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world.”

And Eusebius has assured us, that Theophilus, in his book against Hermogenes, brought testimonies, from the Apocalypse of John: it cannot therefore be doubted, but he owned that writing.

XXXII. If we now take a review of these passages, we shall find the amount to be this: Theophilus has quoted words of St. Matthew’s gospel, as plainly as if he had named him. It is probable, he had read St. Luke’s also; and St. John is quoted by name. If the Commentaries upon the gospels, mentioned by St. Jerom, are allowed to be written by Theophilus, it is evident he had the four gospels before him.

In these books to Autolyeus are no plain references to the book of the Acts; but in those Commentaries we saw plain references to it.

In these books to Autolyeus there are sufficiently plain allusions to the epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, first and second to the Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, first to Timothy, and to Titus. The references to the epistle to the Hebrews are doubtful, except that in the fragment. The passages that seem to bear a respect to the first and second of Peter are of some moment, and may deserve consideration. That the book of the Revelation

THEOPHILUS.

filled with the Holy Ghost, and becoming prophets, inspired by God himself, and being enlightened, were taught of God, and were holy and righteous. Wherefore they obtained the honour to become the organs of God.’

THEOPHILUS.

XXXI. ‘This Eve,^x because she was deceived by the serpent,—the evil dæmon, who is also called Satan, who then spoke to her by the serpent—does not cease to accuse: this dæmon is also called the dragon.’

^x L. ii. p. 104. D.

was owned by him, is undoubted from Eusebius; and our extracts afford a passage which seems to contain an allusion to it.

XXXIII. Nothing more remains, but that we observe some general titles and forms of quotation used by Theophilus, and the respect he has expressed for the scriptures of the New Testament.

In the passage at Numb. I. after he had recited many precepts of virtue and piety out of the books of the Old Testament, he says: 'But the evangelic voice teaches chastity in yet greater perfection.' And afterwards, 'But the gospel says: "Love your enemies."'—At Numb. V. he reckons the gospel of John among the holy scriptures, and John with those who were 'moved by the Holy Spirit.' At Numb. XXII. quoting a precept out of the epistles of Paul, he says: 'The Divine Word commands.' And in another passage, not yet taken notice of, he says: 'Moreover,^y concerning the righteousness which the law teaches, the like things are to be found also in the prophets, and the gospels, because that all being inspired spoke by one and the same Spirit of God.' And this passage may very much dispose us to think, he had before him the four gospels. Nor will any one imagine it likely, that in these books to Autolycus a heathen, we should have express references to all the writings which were esteemed sacred, and of authority, by Theophilus.

CHAP. XXI.

PANTÆNUS.

PANTÆNUS flourished, according^a to Cave, about the year 181; which is not said altogether without reason, though St. Jerom^b says, he lived to the time of Caracalla, who did not begin his reign after his father's death till 211. His native country is uncertain. Some have supposed him a Jew, others a Sicilian. Fabricius^c says, he was an

^y *Ἐτι μὴν καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἧς ὁ νόμος εἰρηκεν, ἀκολουθεῖ εὕρισκεται καὶ τὰ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν εὐαγγελίων, διὰ τοῦ τῶν παντῶν πνευματοφόρου ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ λελαθηκεναι.* L. iii. p. 124, 125.

^a Hist. Lit.

^b De Vir. Ill. cap. 36.

^c Bibl. Gr. Tom. v. p. 193.

Athenian : relying, I suppose, upon the authority of Philip Sidetes. He is generally thought to be one of the masters of Clement^d of Alexandria, of whom he speaks with great respect in his *Stromata* : and, as^e Eusebius assures us, he expressly called Pantæus his master in his *Institutions*. He is also mentioned with great respect by Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, in a fragment of a letter to Origen, preserved by^f Eusebius : in which he particularly says, Pantæus was the person who brought him into acquaintance with Origen : which also is another proof, that Pantæus did not die before the beginning of the third century. Origen^g justifieth himself in the study of heathen learning by the example of Pantæus, who, he says, was a very useful person, and well furnished with that part of knowledge. Photius^h speaks of him, as a hearer of some of those who had seen the apostles, and even of some of the apostles themselves ; which last is admitted by very few moderns : nor does Photius speak positively in this matter.

The time, character, and employments of this great man will appear farther in the testimonies of Eusebius and Jerom.

Eusebiusⁱ having observed, that Julian received the bishopric of the church of Alexandria in the first year of Commodus, proceeds : ‘ At that time there presided in the
 ‘ school of the faithful at that place a man highly celebrated
 ‘ on account of his learning, by name Pantæus. For
 ‘ there had been from ancient time erected among them a
 ‘ school of sacred learning, which remains to this day : and
 ‘ we have understood, that it has been wont to be furnished
 ‘ with men eminent for their eloquence and the study of
 ‘ divine things. And,^k it is said, the forementioned person
 ‘ excelled others of that time, having been brought up in
 ‘ the principles of the Stoic philosophy. It is^l said, that he
 ‘ showed such ardour of affection for the divine word, as to
 ‘ be nominated also a preacher of the gospel of Christ to
 ‘ the nations of the East, and to have gone as far as India
 ‘ [or Ethiopia]. For there were yet at that time many
 ‘ evangelists of the word animated with a divine zeal of
 ‘ imitating the apostles, by contributing to the enlargement
 ‘ of the gospel, and building up of the church ; of whom
 ‘ Pantæus also was one, who is^m said to have gone to the

^d *Strom.* l. 1. p. 274. *D. Conf. Eus. H. E.* l. v. cap. xi. in.

^e *Eus. ibid.*

^f *L. vi. cap. 14. p. 216. C.*

^g *Ap. Eus. H. E.* l. vi. cap. 19. p. 221. B.

^h *Cod. 118. p. 297. ver. 30.*

ⁱ *H. E.* l. v. cap. 9, 10.

^k *Λογος εχεται.*

^l *Φασιν.*

^m *Λιγεται.*

‘ Indians ; where ⁿ it is commonly said he found the gospel
 ‘ of Matthew, which before his arrival had been delivered
 ‘ to some in that country, who had the knowledge of
 ‘ Christ: to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, is
 ‘ said to have preached, and to have left with them that
 ‘ writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters, and that it was
 ‘ preserved among them to that time. This Pantænus
 ‘ therefore, for his many excellent performances, was at last ^o
 ‘ made president of the school of Alexandria, where he set
 ‘ forth the treasures of the divine principles both by word
 ‘ of mouth and by his writings.’

Certainly Eusebius is here inaccurate in saying, that Pantænus was at last made president of that school, when he had before expressly said, he presided in it in the beginning of the reign of Commodus: not to insist farther, that St. Clement of Alexandria ^p succeeded Pantænus in that school about the year 190, and was succeeded by ^q Origen. It will be no vindication of Eusebius to say, there might be two schools at Alexandria, and that Pantænus was master of one of them. If Eusebius thought so, he should have said it. But let there be but one, or ever so many, it is improper to say, he was at last made president or master of the school, when he had been so, according to his own account, long before. However, Eusebius seems to have thought, he was for some time after his return from Ethiopia employed in the same office he had before he went thither.

What Jerom says of this ancient christian is to this purpose: ^r ‘ Pantænus, a philosopher of the Stoic sect, according to an ancient custom of the city of Alexandria, where from the time of the evangelist Mark there had been always ecclesiastical masters, was a man of so great prudence and learning, both in the divine scripture and secular literature, that, at the request of ambassadors from India, he was sent into that country by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, where he found that Bartholomew, ^s

ⁿ *Ενθα λογος εὔρειν αυτον, προφθασαν την αυτη παρρησιαν, το κατα Ματθαιον ευαγγελιον παρα τισιν αυτοθι τον Χριστον επεγνωκοσιν, ος Βαρθολομαιος των αποσολων ἐνι κηρυξαι αυτοις τε Ἑβραϊων γραμμασι την τε Ματθαισ καταλειψαι γραφην’ ἦν και σωζεσθαι εις τον ἐλημενον χρονον.*

^o *Τε κατ’ Αλεξανδρειαν τελευτων ἡγειται διδασκαλις.*

^p *Eus. Hist. l. vi. cap. 6.*

^q *Eus. ibid. cap. 3.*

^r *De Vir. Ill. cap. 36.*

^s *Ubi reperit, Bartholomæum de*

duodecim apostolis, adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi juxta Matthæi evangelium prædicasse, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum, revertens Alexandriam secum detulit. Hujus multi quidem in sanctam scripturam extant commentarii, sed magis vivâ voce ecclesiis profuit. De Vir. Ill. cap. 36.

‘ one of the twelve apostles, had preached the coming of
 ‘ our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the gospel of Mat-
 ‘ thew, which he brought back with him to Alexandria,
 ‘ written in Hebrew letters. There are also extant many
 ‘ commentaries of this person upon the holy scripture; but
 ‘ he was more profitable to the churches by his discourses.
 ‘ He taught under the reign of Severus, and Antoninus
 ‘ called Caracalla.’

I have placed Pantænus at the year 192, because it is the soonest that we can suppose him returned from Ethiopia.

St. Jerom says, the school at Alexandria had been in being from the time of St. Mark: and Eusebius, from ancient time. Pantænus, however, is the first master of it of which there is any mention made in antiquity, unless we admit the account given by Philip Sidetes, of which we have^t spoken before; who says, Athenagoras had this office. But it is somewhat strange, that no notice should be taken of this by Clement, nor Origen, nor Eusebius.

Jerom says, ‘ there were extant commentaries of Pantæ-
 ‘ nus upon the scripture:’ but he gives no particular account of them, and says, he was more profitable by his discourses than his writings. Nor has Eusebius mentioned the title of any work of Pantænus. There is nothing now remaining of him, except a short passage in the *Eclogæ*, ascribed to^u Clement of Alexandria, containing a rule for the better understanding the style of the prophets. It might be taken out of a commentary upon the nineteenth psalm.

Eusebius mentions no authority for what he relates of Pantænus, and throughout his account mixes such phrases as these, ‘ it is said,’ or ‘ reported,’ and the like. It is said, Bartholomew had preached the gospel before in India, and that he found the gospel of Matthew there in Hebrew. St. Jerom adds, that he brought it home with him to Alexandria, without any ground for it, so far as appears: and, as Richard Simon^v thinks, mistaking the words of Eusebius, who only says, that the christians of Ethiopia had preserved that Hebrew gospel till the arrival of Pantænus. And farther the same critic^w says, that if this story of Eusebius be true, these first christians of Ethiopia were

^t Ch. xviii. p. 193.

^u P. 808.

^v *Histoire Crit. du Texte du N. T.* ch. iv. p. 41.

^w *Ibid.* See likewise Du Pin, who doubts of the truth of this relation, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecc.* Tom. i. Pantænus, et *Response aux Remarques sur la Bibliothéque*, &c. ch. vii. at the end of the sixth century.

descended from the Jews, and spake the same language with them that lived in Judea.

I think indeed, this story is of no great importance, it not being supported by the authority of any ancient writer of that time; though it could not be quite omitted here.

And if any should be therefore of opinion, that I have been too long in my account of Pantænus, I would observe, that, as I was obliged to mention him, it could not be amiss to relate his history here at length. It is true, it affords not much concerning this part of our design; but it is very suitable to the general design of this work, the 'Credibility of the Gospel History,' to show the merit of the professors of christianity on account of learning, diligence, zeal, remarkable integrity, or any other laudable qualifications. And though we need some particular information concerning the journey into Ethiopia, and the gospel which Pantænus is said to have found there, it cannot be doubted but he was president of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and a man of eminent learning. This is evident from the testimonies here alleged, several of which have no dependence at all upon this story about the Hebrew gospel.

CHAP. XXII.

ST. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

1. *His history, time, works, and character.* II. *Three passages of Clement from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, concerning the four Gospels, particularly St. Mark's Gospel.* III. *Difficulties in these passages considered.* IV. *Remarks upon the same passages.* V. *More passages concerning the four Gospels, from the remaining works of Clement.* VI. *Of the Acts of the Apostles.* VII. *St. Paul's Epistles.* VIII. *The Catholic Epistles.* IX. *The Revelation.* X. *A summary account of the books of the N. T. received by him.* XI. *General titles and divisions of the Scriptures, and respect for them.* XII. *Whether he quotes other writings, as of authority. And first of ecclesiastical writings.* 1. *St. Barnabas.* 2. *Clement of Rome.* 3. *Hermus.* 4. *A general remark.* XIII. *Apocryphal writings quoted by him.* 1. *The Gospels according to the Hebrews, and the Egyptians.* 2. *The preaching of Peter.* 3. *The Revelation of Peter.* 4. *Acts of Peter.* 5. *Traditions of Matthias.* 6. *Sayings of Christ.* XIV. *Of the Sibylline poems.*

I. TITUS^a FLAVIUS CLEMENS, usually called St. Clement of Alexandria, flourished, according to^b Cave, from the year 192 and onwards. He is said by some^c to be a native of Athens: by others, of Alexandria, where he certainly resided a good while. Eusebius^d intimates, that he was originally a heathen. We do not certainly know the time of his birth, or death. He flourished plainly in the latter part of the second, and beginning of the third century, in the reigns of Severus, and his son Antoninus Caracalla; that is, between 192 and 217. Du Pin^e supposes he lived to the time of Heliogabalus, and that he did not die before the year 220; but most are of opinion his death happened sooner.

^a For a more particular account of this author than I have room to give, may be seen Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. v. p. 102, &c. Du Pin, Bibl. des Aut. Ecc. et Tillemont, Memoires Eccl. Tom. iii. Le Clerc, Bibl. Univ. Tom. x. p. 175.

^b Hist. Lit.

^c Epiphani. Hær. 32. c. 6. p. 213. B.

^d Præp. Ev. l. ii. c. 2. p. 61.

^e Biblioth. in Clement d' Alex. at the beginning.

He has the title of presbyter given him by several of the ancients: he was likewise president of the catechetical school of Alexandria. He seems to have succeeded Pantænus, in that office, upon his going into Ethiopia, about the year 190: and it is very ^f probable that, upon the publication of the edicts of Severus against the christians, in the tenth year of his reign, A. D. 202, Clement was obliged to lay down that office, and likewise to retire from Alexandria. We do not certainly know what eminent men proceeded from Clement's school: but ^g Eusebius has expressly assured us, that Origen, when young, was his hearer; and it is probable that Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, had been taught by him.

Clement wrote a great number of books: there are catalogues of his works in ^h Eusebius and ⁱ Jerom, which yet seem not to contain a complete enumeration of them.

The works of Clement now remaining are, an Exhortation to the Gentiles; The Pædagogus, or Instructor, in three books; and the Stromata, or Various Discourses, in eight books: and a small treatise entitled, Who is the Rich Man that may be saved. The Stromata were written after the death of Commodus, in the reign of Severus, as Eusebius ^k has observed from a passage of the work itself. Dodwell ^l was of opinion, that all the works of Clement which are remaining, were written between the beginning of the year 193 and the end of the year 195.

Beside these there is frequent mention in ^m Eusebius of another book of Clement, called Hypotuposes, or Institutions, which is lost. But we have in Greek two small pieces, one called an Epitome of the Writings of Theodotus, and the Oriental doctrine; the other, Extracts from the Prophets; both which are generally supposed to be collected out of the lost book of Institutions, or to be fragments of it. There is likewise in Latin a small treatise or fragment, called Adumbrations on some of the Catholic Epistles: which also, if it be Clement's, was probably translated from the same work called Institutions; which, as we know from ⁿ Eusebius and others, contained short explications of many books both of the Old and New Testament.

^f See Tillemont, Mem. E. St. Clement d' A. Art. ii. and Euseb. H. E. l. vi. p. 201, 208.

^g H. E. l. vi. cap. 6.

^h H. E. l. vi. cap. 13.

ⁱ De Vir. Ill. cap. 38.

^k H. E. l. vi. cap. 6.

^l Dissert. Iren. iii. sect. 27.

^m H. E. l. i. cap. 12. l. ii. cap. i. p. 38. c. 9, et c. 15. l. vi. cap. 13, 14.

ⁿ H. E. l. vi. cap. 14.

There are great commendations of Clement in many of the ancients. I shall put down some of them. But first of all I would take a passage from himself, in part also cited by^o Eusebius: because it will be of use to inform us of his character, and his authority in the things we shall allege from him.

He^p says, in the first book of his *Stromata*: ‘ This work I have composed not for ostentation, but as an artless image and picture of the powerful and lively discourses of those blessed and truly worthy men, which I have had the happiness to hear.’ The following part of the passage is somewhat obscure. But he speaks of one, by whom he had been taught in Greece: another in Italy: and two more, as it seems, in the East: and another in Egypt, supposed by Eusebius to be Pantænus, of whom he speaks in this manner: ‘ But the last whom I met with was the first in merit. After a long search I found him lying hid in Egypt, and in him I acquiesced. He was indeed a Sicilian bee, who gathered the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadow, and filled the minds of his hearers with sincere knowledge. These^q men [he intends his masters, of whom he had before spoken] having preserved the true tradition of the blessed doctrine in a direct succession from the holy apostles, Peter, James, John, and Paul, as from father to son, (though few are like their fathers,) have lived by the blessing of God to our time, to lodge in our minds the seeds of the ancient and apostolical doctrine.’

It appears from this passage, that our Clement had travelled, and was inquisitive; and that what he valued above all things was the pure, ancient, and apostolical doctrine.

I shall next put down some testimonies of the ancient writers concerning this father; and the first must be that of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, contemporary with Clement, and perhaps one of his scholars. Alexander, in a letter to the Antiochians, written before he was bishop of Jerusalem, in the heat of the persecution under Severus, speaks to them of Clement in this manner: ‘ This letter I have^r sent you by Clement, a blessed presbyter, a virtuous and approved man, whom also ye know, and will

^o H. E. l. v. cap. 11.

^p P. 274. B. C.

^q Οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀληθὴ τῆς μακαρίας σωζόντες διδασκαλίας παραδοσιν, ἐνθὺς ἀπο Πέτρου τε καὶ Ἰακώβου, Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Παύλου, τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, πατρὸς πατρὸς ἐκδεχομένους· ὀλίγοι δὲ οἱ πατράσιν ὅμοιοι ἦκον διὰ συνθεῖν καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ προγονικά ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀποστολικά καταθησομένοι σπέρματα. Ibid. p. 274. D. 275. A.

^r H. E. l. vi. cap. xi.

‘ know better : who having been brought hither by the
 ‘ divine disposal and providence, established and increased
 ‘ the church of the Lord.’

The same Alexander, in a letter to Origen, written after the death of Clement, speaks thus : ‘ For we^s know those
 ‘ blessed fathers, who have gone before us, and with whom
 ‘ we shall shortly be ; I mean Pantænus, truly blessed, and
 ‘ my master ; and the sacred Clement, who was my master,
 ‘ and profitable to me.’ These two fragments are preserved in Eusebius.

Eusebius in his^t Chronicle, at the year 194, says : ‘ Cle-
 ‘ ment, the author of the Stromata, presbyter of Alexandria,
 ‘ an excellent master of the christian philosophy, was emi-
 ‘ nent^u for his writings.’ At this year therefore I place him.

In another work Eusebius calls him more than once the admirable^v Clement.

St. Jerom in his^w book of Illustrious Men, assures us, he was presbyter of the church of Alexandria, a hearer of Pantænus, and his successor in the school of Alexandria ; and says of his works, of which he there gives a catalogue, that they^x are full of erudition and eloquence, ‘ borrowed
 ‘ from the treasures of the divine scripture and secular
 ‘ literature.’ He concludes his account of him, that he
 ‘ flourished in the times of Severus, and his son An-
 ‘ toninus.’

And in another place : ‘ Clement,^y presbyter of the
 ‘ church of Alexandria, in my opinion the most learned of
 ‘ all men, [or perhaps, of all the christian writers whom he
 ‘ there names,] wrote eight books of Stromata, as many of
 ‘ Institations, and another against the Gentiles : the Pæda-
 ‘ gogue also in three books. What is there in them un-
 ‘ learned ? what not taken out of the very depths of
 ‘ philosophy ?’ This short passage shows what were Cle-
 ment’s chief works.

I omit many other testimonies, that may be seen prefixed to the Oxford edition of St. Clement’s work’s : and shall content myself with adding, that there are divers passages

^s Eus. l. vi. cap. 14. p. 216. C.

^t P. 216.

^u *Συντακτων διελαιμπεν.*

^v *Κλημης ο θαυμασιος.* Præp. Ev. l. ii. p. 61. B. & l. iv. cap. 16. p. 157. A.

^w Cap. 38.

^x Feruntur ejus insignia volumina, plenaque eruditionis & eloquentiæ, tam de scripturis divinis quam de sæcularis literaturæ instrumento. Ibid.

^y Clemens, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ presbyter, meo judicio omnium eruditissimus.—Quid in illis indoctum, imo quid non de mediâ philosophiâ est ? Ad Magnum Orat. Ep. 83. al. 84.

of St. Cyril^z of Alexandria, and another of Socrates^a in his *Ecclesiastical History*, very much to his advantage.

Photius^b indeed has severely censured Clement's *Hypotuses*, or *Institutions*. We have not that work, to enable us to judge of the justness of his censure: but it seems, that in that work Clement collected and delivered a variety of opinions of the ancients before him, of hereties as well as the catholics. This is probably the reason of the blasphemies and fables, which Photius says there were in that book. This is an observation^c of R. Simon. The more ancient writers, however, seem not to have taken any offence at it, who knew this work very well, and yet have bestowed their praises on the author without hesitation.

There are some moderns likewise, who^d have thought St. Clement's judgment not equal to his reading, which was certainly prodigious. I shall not make a particular apology for him; nor do I assert the infallibility of the fathers. I have said enough to show the age, and authority of St. Clement in those things we shall allege from him.

II. I now proceed to observe what there is to our present purpose in his remaining works, or in the quotations made out of them, or others, by ancient writers.

Eusebius has several passages of St. Clement relating to his quotations of the books of scripture, or his history of them.

I. The first passage of Eusebius is in the fourteenth chapter of the second book of his *Ecclesiastical History*; where, having in the foregoing chapters given the history of the success of St. Peter's preaching the gospel at Rome, and his defeat of Simon Magus in that city, he proceeds: 'But^e the lustre of religion had so enlightened the minds of Peter's hearers, [at Rome,] that, not content with a single hearing, nor with an unwritten instruction in the divine doctrine, they with many prayers entreated Mark, the follower of Peter, whose gospel we have, that he would leave them in writing a memorial of the doctrine which had been delivered to them by word of mouth; nor did they desist, till they had prevailed with him. And thus they were the means of writing the gospel,

^z *Contra Jul.* l. 3. p. 87. *E.* l. 6. p. 205. *B.* l. 7. p. 231. *E.* l. 10. p. 342. *D.* ed. Lips. 1696.

^a *L.* 2. cap. 35. p. 130.

^b *Cod.* cix.

^c En effet, il y a de l'apparence que cet ouvrage n'étoit autre chose, qu'un recueil des auteurs ecclésiastiques qui l'avoient précédé, & dont une partie étoient hérétiques. *Hist. Crit. des Commentat. du N. T.* ch. 2. p. 18.

^d Le Clerc, *Bibl. Univ.*

T. x. p. 231.

^e *Euseb. H. E.* l. ii. cap. 14.

‘ which is called according to Mark.—It is said, that^f
 ‘ when the apostle knew what had been done, the Spirit
 ‘ having revealed it to him, he was pleased with the zeal
 ‘ of the men, and authorized that writing [or scripture] to
 ‘ be read in the churches. Clement gives this account in
 ‘ the sixth book of his Institutions; and herein agrees with
 ‘ him^g Papias, bishop of Hierapolis.’

2. The next passage of Eusebius to be here taken notice of, is in the 13th chapter of the sixth book of his Ecclesiastical History: where, mentioning divers of St. Clement’s works, and particularly his Stromata, he says: ‘ Moreover^h
 ‘ in these works, he makes use of testimonies out of those
 ‘ scriptures which are contradicted; as out of that which is
 ‘ called the Wisdom of Solomon, and the book of Jesus the
 ‘ son of Sirach; and the epistle to the Hebrews, and the
 ‘ epistle of Barnabas, and Clement, and Jude.’

3. The third passage of Eusebius is in the next chapter, the title of which is: What Scriptures are mentioned by Clement. It begins thus: ‘ Butⁱ in his Institutions, to
 ‘ speak briefly, he gives short explications of all the ca-
 ‘ nonical scripture, [or, as Valesius renders it, of the
 ‘ scriptures of each Testament,] not omitting those that are
 ‘ contradicted: I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other
 ‘ catholic epistles, and the epistle of Barnabas, and the
 ‘ book called the Revelation of Peter. And he says, that
 ‘ the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul’s, and that it was
 ‘ written to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language; and
 ‘ that Luke, having carefully translated it, published it
 ‘ for the use of the Greeks; which is the reason of that
 ‘ conformity of style which is found in this epistle and
 ‘ the Acts of the Apostles: but that he did not make use
 ‘ of that inscription, Paul the apostle, of which he assigns
 ‘ this reason: For, says he, writing to the Hebrews, who
 ‘ had conceived a prejudice against him, and were sus-
 ‘ picious of him, he wisely declined setting his name at the
 ‘ beginning, lest he should offend them. And afterwards
 ‘ he says: Now as the blessed presbyter said: Forasmuch
 ‘ as the Lord was sent as the apostle of Almighty God to
 ‘ the Hebrews, Paul, out of modesty, as being sent to the
 ‘ Gentiles, does not style himself the apostle of the He-

^f Γνοντα δε το πραχθεν φασι τον αποστολον, αποκαλυψαντος αυτω τε πνευ-
 ματος, ησθησαι τη των ανδρων προθυμια, κυρωσαι τε την γραφην εις εντευξιν
 ταις εκκλησιας.

^g See before, p. 121—123.

^h Κεχρηται δ’ εν αυτοις και ταις απο των αντιλεγομενων γραφων μαρτυρσαι:
 —και της προς Εβραιωσ επιτολης της τε Βαρναβα και Κλημεντος και Ιωδα.
 I. vi. cap. 13.

ⁱ Eus. H. E. l. vi. cap. 14.

‘ brews : both out of respect to the Lord, and that, being
 ‘ the preacher and apostle of the Gentiles, he over and
 ‘ above wrote to the Hebrews. Moreover, in the same
 ‘ books Clement has a tradition concerning the order of the
 ‘ gospels, which he had received from presbyters of more
 ‘ ancient times, and which is to this purpose : He says,^k
 ‘ that the gospels containing the genealogies were first
 ‘ written : that the occasion of writing the gospel according
 ‘ to Mark was this : Peter having publicly preached the
 ‘ word at Rome, and having spoken the gospel by the
 ‘ Spirit, many who were there, entreated Mark to write the
 ‘ things that had been spoken, he having long accompanied
 ‘ him, [Peter,] and retaining what he had said ; and that
 ‘ when he had composed the gospel, he delivered it to
 ‘ them who had asked it of him : which when Peter knew,
 ‘ he neither forbade it nor encouraged it : and that last of
 ‘ all John, observing that in the other gospels those things
 ‘ were related that concerned^l the body, [of Christ,] and
 ‘ being persuaded by his friends, and also moved by the
 ‘ Spirit of God, wrote a spiritual gospel. So far Clement.’

III. These are the three passages of Eusebius. We must begin our remarks on them, with considering the difficulties in the two accounts which Eusebius has given concerning St. Mark’s gospel in the first and last of these passages. One difficulty concerns the interpretation of some words in the former of them : the other is the disagreement which there seems to be between these two accounts.

1. The first difficulty relates to the interpretation of some expressions in the first of these passages, where, after the account of Mark’s writing his gospel at the desire of the Romans, it is added : ‘ It is said, that when the apostle
 ‘ knew what had been done, the Spirit having revealed it
 ‘ to him, he was pleased with the zeal of the men ;’ which is also the sense of Valesius’s translation. And yet one may

^k Προγεγραφθαι ελεγεν των ευαγγελιων τα περιεχοντα τας γενεαλογιας· το δε κατα Μαρκον ταυτην εσχρηκεναι οικονομιαν· τω Πετροω δημοσια εν ‘Ρωμη κηρυξαντος τον λογον, και πνευματι το ευαγγελιον εξιποντος, τωσ παροντας πολλωσ οντας παρακαλεσαι τον Μαρκον, ωσ ακολουθησαντα αυτω πορρωθεν, και μεμνημενον των λεχθεντων, αναγραφαι τα ειρημενα ποιησαντα δε το ευαγγελιον, μεταδδναι τοις δεσμενοισ αυτω· οπερ επιγοντα τον Πετρον, προτρεπτικωσ μητε κωλυσαι μητε προτρεψασθαι τον μεντοι Ιωαννην εσχατον συνιδοντα οτι τα σωματικα εν τοις ευαγγελιοις δεδηλωται· προτραπεντα υπο των γνωριμων, πνευματι ξεοφορηθεντα, πνευματικον ποιησαι ευαγγελιον· τωσαντα ο Κλημησ. Eus. ib. p. 216. B.

^l So the original words are rendered by Valesius: quæ ad corpus Christi pertinent. Others may choose they should be rendered, ‘ which appertained
 ‘ to Christ’s humanity.’

be apt to suspect this interpretation, though perfectly agreeable to the present text of Eusebius; because the thing itself is unlikely, that Peter should have a revelation of such a thing made to him. I have sometimes thought, that the meaning or design of these words might be taken without inconvenience from the latter account; wherein it is said, that ‘Peter had publicly preached the word, and ‘spoken it by the Spirit.’ The revelation of the Spirit to Peter, then, is not to be understood of the fact of Mark’s having written a gospel, or of his having been desired by the Romans to do so, but only of the gospel which had been preached by Peter.

But yet it must be owned, that these words in Eusebius seem to have been formerly understood of the fact, that Mark had written a gospel; this passage having been translated in that sense^m by Rufinus, as well as by learnedⁿ modern interpreters. And Theophylact, of the eleventh century, in his preface to St. Mark’s gospel, writes to this purpose: ‘That Mark usually accompanied Peter, and ‘particularly was with him at Rome. The faithful^o therefore at Rome, entreated him, not only to preach by word ‘of mouth, but also to write out for them the history of the ‘life of Christ. After much persuasion he wrote: and it ‘was revealed to Peter from God, that Mark had written a ‘gospel. Having seen it, and confirmed the truth of it, he ‘sent him away to be bishop in Egypt.’ This must weaken our supposition that this sentence may be interpreted by the latter account, and understood of the gospel preached by Peter. But if we should not quite remove this diffi-

^m Petrus vero, ut per Spiritum Sanctum religioso se spoliatum comperit furto, delectatus est, fidem eorum per hæc devotionemque considerans: factumque confirmavit, et in perpetuum legendam scripturam ecclesiis tradidit. Rufinus.

ⁿ Modern Interpreters. I choose to put down here some of their translations. Aiunt autem apostolum, cum ex instinctu Spiritûs Sancti factum hoc cognovisset, delectatum esse virorum istorum voluntate, et scriptum hoc evangelium ecclesiis ad legendum autoritate suâ confirmâsse. Wolf. Muscul. Basil. 1611. Cum ergo Petrus apostolus, divinâ Spiritûs Sancti revelatione suggerente, intelligerit, illud opus editum esse: ferunt eum propenso et acri hominum studio magnopere fuisse delectatum, hancque scripturam autoritate suâ ratam fecisse, quo in ecclesiis passim perlegeretur. (Ex interpretatione Christophorsoni, et recognitione Suffridi Petri.) Quod cum Petrus per revelationem Sancti Spiritûs cognovisset, delectatus ardentis hominum studio, librum illum auctoritate suâ comprobâsse dicitur, ut deinceps in ecclesiis legeretur. Henr. Vales.

^o Ἦτησαντο ἐν αὐτῷ οἱ ἐν Ῥώμῃ πειτοὶ, μὴ μόνον ἀγραφῶς κηρυσσεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγγραφῶς αὐτοῖς ἐκθεσθαι τὴν κατὰ Χριστὸν πολιτείαν· μόλις οὖν πεισθεὶς συνεγράψατο· τῷ δὲ Πέτρῳ ἀπεκαλυφθῆ παρα Θεοῦ, ὅτι Μάρκος συνεγράψεν ἐναγγέλιον· ἰδὼν οὖν, καὶ ἐπιβεβαιώσας ὡς ἀληθές, εἶτα ἐπισκοποῦν αὐτὸν ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον. Theophyl. præfat. ad Marc.

culty, we may be the less uneasy, because this part of the relation is introduced in Eusebius, with an ‘it is said:’ of which more hereafter, when I hope we may likewise farther clear up this passage.

2. The other difficulty is the disagreement between these accounts, one saying, that ‘Peter authorized Mark’s ‘gospel:’ the other, that he ‘neither forbade it nor encouraged it.’

The method which Valesius takes to reconcile these accounts is this: ‘The difficulty,’ says he, ‘is, that^p in the ‘latter passage Eusebius seems to make Clement speak ‘differently from what he had done in the former. But,’ says he, ‘if we consider these things carefully, there is no ‘contradiction between them. For Clement says, that when ‘Peter knew that Mark’s gospel was written and published, ‘he did not openly forbid it, or commend it; therefore he ‘approved it by a tacit consent. Thus are these two places ‘to be reconciled. Moreover Rufinus took them in this ‘sense, translating thus: “When Peter afterwards knew ‘what was done, although he had not ordered it, yet when ‘it was done, he did not forbid it.” But perhaps,’ says Valesius, ‘Papias had spoken more plainly than Clement, ‘and said, that Mark’s gospel was confirmed by Peter.’

So then Valesius abides by this last passage, as containing the justest account of what Clement had written; in which I take him to be in the right. But neither had Papias said expressly, that Mark’s gospel was confirmed by Peter, as I have^q shown formerly; in that these words of Eusebius concerning Papias do not necessarily imply any such thing; and in that there is nothing like it in the very particular account which Eusebius has given us of the testimony of Papias to Mark’s gospel: to which I now add, that there is nothing like it in the account given of Mark’s gospel by Irenæus, who was so well acquainted with the books of Papias. As to Papias, therefore, the case appears to me very clear, that he had said no such thing.

^p Illic vero Clementis verba ex eodem libro referens Eusebius aliter eum loquentem inducit. Verum si rem attentius consideremus, hæc inter se non pugnant. Ait enim Clemens, Petrum eum evangelium a Marco scriptum editumque esse cognovisset, palam nec vetuisse nec laudasse. Rem igitur tacito consensu approbavit. Atque ita concilianda sunt hæc duo loca, quæ Christophorus inter se pugnare existimavit. Sed et Rufinus eundem sensum secutus est, cum ita vertit: ‘Cumque factum Petrus postmodum cognovisset, ‘licet fieri ipsum non jusserit, tamen factum non prohibuit.’—Fortasse autem Papias apertius locutus fuerat quam Clemens, et Marci evangelium a Petro confirmatum fuisse dixerat. Vales. ad L. vi. cap. 14.

^q Ch. ix. p. 121, 122.

I shall now endeavour to remove this difficulty in these several propositions.

1.) The last passage of Eusebius does probably contain the most exact and distinct account of what Clement had written concerning St. Mark's gospel. In the first passage Eusebius writes in the quality of an historian, as from his memory, in a continued narration of the affairs of St. Peter; and mentions an opinion, which he introduces with a proper distinction: 'it is said,' and then adds: 'Clement gives this account in the sixth book of his Institutions, and Papias agrees with him:' which words are plainly to be understood in a general way, that Clement writes 'to this purpose.' At the writing of the last passage, Eusebius has Clement before him, and he quotes and transcribes him word for word.

2.) It is Eusebius whom we are to reconcile, and not Clement, if there is any disagreement between these two accounts.

3.) These two accounts of Eusebius may be well reconciled in this manner.

(1.) Eusebius needs not be supposed to affirm in the first passage, that Clement, or Papias, had said that Peter did expressly authorize Mark's gospel: all that Eusebius intends to ascribe to them may be supposed to be in the former part of that passage. Then he adds: 'It is said'—by which he may be reckoned to hint, that he there inserts the opinion of some of his own time, or perhaps of some anonymous writers before him. And those words, 'it is said,' and what follows in that sentence, might be very well read in a parenthesis. This supposition is confirmed by the exact agreement of the full and particular accounts of the two testimonies of Clement and Papias with the former part of this passage of Eusebius.

(2.) And it may be said, that this very account is in the main agreeable to that in the third and last passage, containing only some improvement of it. In this last passage it is said, 'that Peter's hearers at Rome entreated Mark to write the things that had been spoken—and that when he had composed the gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked it of him: which when Peter knew, he neither forbade it nor encouraged it:' that is, as Valesius well expresses it, he 'approved by a tacit consent.' For though Peter did not expressly authorize it, yet by permitting it to be delivered to his hearers, or published, as a history of his preaching, he allowed it to be a faithful and true narrative of what he had taught by word of mouth. This

may have been understood and represented by some, as amounting to an authorizing of that gospel, according to what Eusebius observes in the first passage: ‘It is said, ‘that when the apostle knew what had been done, he was ‘pleased with the zeal of the men, and authorized that ‘writing to be read in the churches.’

I think these two accounts are thus well reconciled.

Nevertheless, I entreat the reader’s patience whilst I examine afresh a part of this last passage, which appears somewhat obscure, and which I have already thus translated. Clement says: that ‘many of Peter’s hearers entreated Mark to write the things which had been spoken’—and^r ‘that when he had composed the gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked it of him: which when Peter knew, he neither forbade it nor encouraged it.’ I now propose another translation to be considered. ‘The occasion ‘of the writing the gospel according to Mark was this: ‘Peter^s having publicly preached the word at Rome, and ‘having spoken the gospel by the Spirit; many who were ‘there entreated Mark to write the things that had been ‘spoken, he having long accompanied him, [Peter,] and ‘retaining what he had said; and when he had composed ‘it, to deliver it to them that had asked it of him: which ‘when Peter knew, he neither forbade it nor advised it.’

According to the sense of the first translation, it seems that Peter knew nothing of this request of his hearers, or the work of Mark, till that gospel was both composed and delivered: and when he knew what had been done, he permitted the whole to pass without any express approbation or dislike. According to the sense of the second translation, St. Peter, by revelation of the Spirit, or some other information, knew of the request of his hearers, to have a gospel written and delivered to them, before they had actually received it from St. Mark. He might therefore have seen and read the gospel before it was delivered and published; and his ‘not forbidding or advising’ will relate chiefly to the publication of it. He therefore permit-

^r The learned reader, if he thinks fit, is referred to the Greek before transcribed, p. 225. The version of Valesius is thus: Marcus igitur evangelium composuit, iisque qui illud ab ipso rogabant impertit. Quod cum Petrus comperisset, nec prohibuit omnino rem fieri, nec ut fieret incitavit.

^s The translation of Wolfgangus Musculus is thus: Cum Petrus Romæ publice prædicaret verbum, et evangelium Spiritu promulgaret, multos præsentium Marcum, tanquam eum qui apostolo jam diu fuisset assecutor, dictorumque illius adhuc recordaretur, rogasse, ut quæ dicta ab illo essent, conscriberet, conscriptumque evangelium illis daret, qui hoc ab ipso peterent. Hoc ubi Petro innotuisset, illum nec prohibuisse, nec jussisse.

ted it to be delivered : which amounts to a tacit approbation of that gospel, as a faithful history of what he had said. So Theophylact seems to have understood it, if he refers to this place. For he says : ‘ It was revealed to Peter ‘ by God, that Mark had written a gospel. Having seen it, ‘ and confirmed it as true, he sent him away to be bishop in ‘ Egypt.’ So the opinion, mentioned by Eusebius in his first passage, was, that ‘ when Peter knew what had been ‘ done, [that the gospel had been written,] the Spirit revealing it to him, he authorized that writing to be read in ‘ the churches :’ or, approved it by a tacit consent.

In a word, according to each of these interpretations, this gospel is represented to have a tacit or implicit approbation of Peter. If he did not know of it till after it was delivered by Mark ; yet he owns it to be a faithful history, by not discountenancing or disallowing it. If he saw it, and read it, before it was published, he also approves it, though he did not command or advise the publication, since he did not forbid it.

Perhaps it will be here observed by some, that this account does not agree with that given^t by Irenæus, who says, that Mark wrote his gospel after the ‘ exit of Peter ‘ and Paul.’ But my present concern is to represent, as I am able, the testimony of Clement. If there are any differences between the testimonies of several writers, they may be better considered at some other time.

It may be likewise objected, that there are several things very strange and unlikely in this account. The christians at Rome, hearers of St. Peter, are represented as applying in a clandestine manner to St. Mark, to afford them a written gospel. St. Mark too is hardly persuaded to undertake this work, and consents not without much entreaty. And at last, when it is composed, the apostle Peter does not advise or command the publication.

To which I answer, that there is nothing improbable in this whole relation, excepting only the revelation given to Peter of the fact, that Mark had written a gospel ; which Eusebius has not delivered to us as a relation of Clement, but as a common report or doubtful opinion of some of his own time, or perhaps also of some before him. Every other part of this history may be accounted for from the great humility and modesty of the apostle Peter. The christians then at Rome were desirous of a written relation of the things they had heard, which might be a perpetual help to their memory, and of constant use among them.

^t See p. 170.

But considering the before-mentioned virtues of that apostle, which they were well acquainted with, they were afraid to petition him directly for such a thing; and were even apprehensive that, if they did, he might prohibit it. They therefore, in the most private manner, apply themselves to St. Mark. And he, knowing the uncommon humility of St. Peter as well, or better than any man, is afraid to comply with the request made to him, lest he should offend the person for whom he had the highest respect. At length he yields to perform what was desired; but still conceals his undertaking from St. Peter as much as possible. However, by some unforeseen method, which scarce any man could account for, the thing was discovered to Peter; who, when he knew the writing had been composed, did not expressly direct the publication, nor yet forbid it.

This is the sum of this relation; and these seem to be the grounds and reasons of the conduct of the several persons here mentioned. And the gospel called, according to St. Mark, which in this account is represented as the substance of St. Peter's preaching, is a monument of the humility and modesty here ascribed to that apostle; 'there being in the Gospel History several very remarkable circumstances in favour of St. Peter, which are related by the other evangelists, and not so much as mentioned or hinted at by St. Mark.' This is an observation of Mr.^u Jones, who has given a catalogue of the several places in the other gospels, which relate things tending to the honour of St. Peter, which are not mentioned by St. Mark in his gospel: nor has he forgot to mention an observation of Estius to the like purpose, concerning the apostle Peter's modesty.

IV. Having considered these difficulties, and removed them so far as I am able, we are now to make some remarks of another kind.

1. Here is a very valuable testimony to the four gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, all which were owned and received by Clement. Moreover, here is a tradition concerning the order in which these four gospels were written, which he had received from presbyters of more ancient times. It affords a proof of the curiosity and inquisitiveness of the ancient christians concerning the sacred books of the New Testament, which they had received.

2. We have here an assurance of the genuineness of the

^u New and Full Method of settling the canonical Authority of the N. T. V. 3. p. 78—81.

genealogies in the first chapter of St. Matthew, and the third chapter of St. Luke. This likewise Clement had received from more ancient presbyters. This testimony to the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel is so strong, that it seems to put the antiquity and genuineness of it out of question.

3. Here is a particular account of the occasion of writing St. Mark's gospel; and it agrees with those of Papias and Irenæus, in that this gospel is said to contain the substance of St. Peter's preaching, and to have been composed by one who had been long a companion or follower of Peter, and who retained in his memory the things that had been spoken by that apostle.

This then is^v the third ancient father, who puts the authority of St. Mark's gospel upon the foundation of its being a faithful and true narrative of the apostle Peter's public discourses to his hearers. Nor let any therefore be in pain for the credit and authority of this gospel, though not written nor expressly authorized by an apostle. The authority of it seems to be very well maintained by these writers, especially by Clement in this account. Peter spoke the gospel by the Spirit. Mark had long and often heard him at Rome, and at other places, and remembered the things he had spoken. He wrote his gospel at the request of many hearers of Peter at Rome, and then delivered it to them who asked it of him. These persons, who set so great a value on Peter's discourses, and were not contented with a single hearing, and unwritten instruction, could not but know, whether the written gospel, which they received from Mark, was agreeable to the words they had lately heard from Peter. It is by no means reasonable to suppose, that Mark could form a design of deceiving or imposing upon any. Here is, however, an additional argument for the truth and exactness of his narration, that it was delivered, when composed, to those who had heard Peter preach, of which there was a considerable number. Lastly, it is here intimated, that the apostle Peter himself knew of this gospel, either before it was published, or soon after. And though he did not advise the publication, nor recommend the gospel when published, yet he did not forbid the publication, nor disallow of it afterwards: which amounts to a tacit or implicit approbation of it, and a confirmation of the truth of it, as containing a just relation of his preaching. There is, according to this account, the fullest security given, that Mark's written gospel contains

^v Papias, ch. ix. p. 121, 122. Irenæus, ch. xvii. p. 170, 189.

the very gospel which the apostle Peter had spoken by the Spirit.

It will be very proper to put down here a passage, or note, of the Adumbrations before mentioned, which we have in a Latin translation made by Cassiodorius, or his order. “There^w saluteth you Mark my son.” [1 Pet. v. 14.] ‘Mark, the follower of Peter, (Peter preaching the gospel at Rome before some of the emperor’s knights, and giving many testimonies to Christ, that the things which had been spoken might be well fixed in their memory,) composed out of the things spoken by Peter the gospel which is called, according to Mark: as Luke also wrote the Acts of the Apostles, and translated the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews.’ Or, possibly, these last words should be thus understood: As Luke also ‘wrote a gospel,’ and likewise the Acts of the Apostles, and translated the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews.

This likewise confirms the account, that St. Mark’s gospel is the substance of St. Peter’s sermons. And he says nothing of its having been afterwards authorized by Peter, nor so much as its having been ever seen by him. It is true, Cassiodorius left out^x some things of St. Clement, that might give offence. But certainly these things would not have offended, or hurt any man.

It is not very improbable, that Cassiodorius had here before him that very history in Clement, which Eusebius has preserved; wherein it is said, that ‘Peter neither forbid nor encouraged,’ or recommended, what Mark had done in this affair: or some other account to the like purpose. But that did not thoroughly please Cassiodorius, and therefore he left it out. But whether we guess right here, or not, I cannot help wishing that we had entire the Institutions of Clement, a writer^y near in time^z to the immediate successors of the apostles. I do not believe that work would do us any harm.

^w ‘Salutat vos Marcus filius meus.’ [ver. 14.] Marcus Petri sectator, palam prædicante Petro evangelium Romæ coram quibusdam Cæsareanis equitibus, et multa Christi testimonia proferente, penitus ab eis ut possent quæ dicebantur memoriæ commendare, scripsit ex his quæ Petro dicta sunt, evangelium quod secundum Marcum vocitatur. Sicut Lucas quoque et Actus Apostolorum stylo executus agnosceret, et Pauli ad Hebræos interpretatus epistolam. Clement, Adumbr. in 1 Petr. Epist. Oxon. p. 1007.

^x Ubi multa quidem subtiliter, sed aliqua incaute locutus est: quæ nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam offendentibus purificata doctrina ejus securior posset hauriri. Cassiod. Divin. Lect. cap. viii.

^y See before, p. 221.

^z ‘Ὁν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ ἑαυτῶν δηλοῖ, ὡς ἐγγίσα τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένη διαδόχης. Eus. b. II. E. l. vi. cap. 13. p. 215. A.

4. Of St. John he says, that he wrote last. He likewise supposes him to have seen and approved the other three gospels. St. John having observed what the other evangelists had written, added in his gospel some things omitted by the others. The occasion of his writing was the persuasion of his friends, and moreover he was moved by the Spirit.

5. The Acts of the Apostles also is owned by him, and ascribed to Luke as the author, who likewise translated the epistle to the Hebrews.

6. The epistle to the Hebrews is owned for Paul's; and Clement had been informed, that it was written in Hebrew. He had received likewise a tradition, giving an account of the reason why that apostle did not set his name to this, as he did to his other epistles.

7. Clement was a commentator of the scriptures. Eusebius says, that in his Institutions he had given short explanations of all the canonical scripture. Photius however seems to render this doubtful in the account he gives of the same work. He says, 'the^a Institutions of Clement contain discourses on some passages of the Old and New Testament, which he also explains and interprets in a brief and summary manner.' This indeed does not restrain Clement's commentaries to any particular books of scripture; for he might explain some passages in every book, without explaining the whole of any one. But Photius says afterwards: 'The whole^b scope of the work seems to be an interpretation of Genesis, Exodus, the Psalms, the epistles of the divine Paul, and the catholic epistles, and Ecclesiasticus.' Which may well render it doubtful, whether Clement had commented upon all the books of scripture: or rather, it affords good ground to conclude, that Clement had explained only some books of the Old and of the New Testament. And so it is likely, Eusebius ought to be understood: for Photius seems to have had before him entire the Hypotyposes of Clement, in which these expositions were.

8. Lastly, Eusebius says, Clement had 'given in that work short explanations of the scriptures, not omitting those that are contradicted; as the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles, and the epistle of Barnabas,

^a Αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν ὑποτυπώσεις διαλαμβάνει περὶ ῥητῶν τινῶν τῆς τε παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας γραφῆς ὧν καὶ κεφαλαιώδως, ὡς ἐγένον, ἐξηγήσιν τε καὶ ἐρμηνείαν ποιεῖται. Cod. cix.

^b Ὁ δὲ ὅλος σκοπὸς, ὡς αὐτὸ ἐρμηνεύει τυγχάνει τῆς Γενέσεως, τῆς Ἐξοδῆς, τῶν Ψαλμῶν, τῆς θείας Παντῶν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ τῶν καθολικῶν, καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς. Ibid.

‘and the book called the Revelation of Peter.’ But I think it does not hence follow, that Clement paid a like or equal respect to all these books. Le Clerc in our time has written notes upon the writings of the apostolical fathers, as well as upon the books of scripture commonly received as canonical, without having the same regard for the former as for these latter. But of this we shall see more hereafter: for having thus shown what Eusebius, and some other ancients, have observed of St. Clement’s method of quoting scripture, I shall briefly observe upon his remaining works.

V. In his *Stromata*, or *Various Discourses*, he says in answer to an objection: ‘We^c have not this passage in the four gospels delivered to us, but in that according to Egyptians.’

The four gospels are often quoted: I shall put down a particular or two of each.

1. ‘In^d the gospel according to Matthew, the genealogy from Abraham is brought down to Mary, the mother of the Lord.’

2. In the three larger works of Clement, the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, the *Pedagogue*, and the *Stromata*, the gospel of St. Mark is not quoted by name, though there are divers passages taken from it. But in the short treatise, ‘Who is the Rich Man that may be saved?’ having quoted the words of Mark x. 17—31, he adds: ‘These^e things are written in the gospel according to Mark.’

3. ‘The^f truth of this is evident. For thus it is written in the gospel according to Luke: “Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar the word of the Lord came unto John the son of Zacharias,”’ Ch. iii. 1, 2.

4. ‘The^g Lord, in the gospel according to John, speaks figuratively: “Eat my flesh,” saith he, “and drink my blood.”’ Referring to ch. vi. 53, 54.

5. We should here just take notice of an observation of Clement, That there were some who had written short marginal notes or interlineary explications of texts of the New Testament, or at least of the gospels. This seems to

^c Πρωτον μιν ουν, εν τοις παραδεδομενοις ἡμιν τετταρσιν εναγγελιοις εκ εχομεν το ρητον, αλλ’ εν τω κατ’ Αιγυπτιας. Str. l. iii. p. 465. D.

^d Εν δε τω κατα Ματθαιον εναγγελιω ἡ απο Αβρααμ γενεαλογια, μεχρι Μαριας της μητρος τῆ Κυριας, περαιεσται. Str. l. i. p. 341. B.

^e Ταυτα μιν εν τω κατα Μαρκον εναγγελιω γεγραπται’ Quis Div. &c. sect. 5. p. 938. Οξον.

^f ‘Οτι δε τῶτ’ αληθες εσιν, εν τω εναγγελιω τω κατα Λεβαν γεγραπται οὕτως’ κ. λ. p. 340. A. Str. l. i.

^g Αλλαχοθι δε και Κυριος εν τω κατα Ιωαννην εναγγελιω. κ. λ. Pæd. l. i. p. 100. A.

be what he means, when he says: ‘Blessed^h are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, because they shall be called the sons of God: [see Matt. v. 9, 10:] or, as some of those who explain [or paraphrase] the gospels,’ “Blessed,” says he, “are they which are persecuted by righteousness, *because they shall be perfect.*” And, “Blessed are they which are persecuted for my sake, *because they shall have a place where no persecution reaches.*” I only put down this passage. Mill, who is in every body’s hands, mayⁱ be consulted upon it.

VI. The book of the Acts of the Apostles is often quoted in these works. It is ascribed to St. Luke thus: ‘As^k Luke in the Acts of the Apostles records Paul to have said: “Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious.”’ Quoting ch. xvii. 22, 23.

VII. I shall give the following account of his quoting St. Paul’s epistles.

1. ‘The^l apostle in the epistle to the Romans, ch. xvi. 16. “Behold”^m therefore, saith Paul, “the goodness and severity of God,” &c. ch. xi. 22. Inⁿ like manner writes Paul in the epistle to the Romans,’ ch. vi. 2, 6—13.

2. ‘The^o blessed Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians: “Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit, in malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men,”’ ch. xiv. 20. And in like manner frequently.

3. He has also many passages out of the second epistle to the Corinthians. ‘The apostle calls^p the common doctrine of the faith a “savour of knowledge,” in the second to the Corinthians,’ [See ch. ii. 14,] where he proceeds to quote 2 Cor. iii. 14. Again: ‘Hence also^q Paul: “Ye have these promises,” says he, “dearly beloved: let us cleanse our hearts from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God,”’ 2 Cor. vii. 1.

^h Η ὡς τινες των μετατιθεντων τα ευαγγελια. κ. λ. Str. l. iv. p. 490. C.

ⁱ Prolegom. ad N. T. n. 287, 640.

^k Καθο και ὁ Λυκας εν ταις Πραξιται των Αποστολων απομνημονευει τον Παυλον λεγοντα· Ανδρες Αθηναιοι. κ. λ. Str. l. v. p. 588. B.

^l Εν τη προς Ῥωμαιωσ επιτολη χαιρειν ὁ αποστολος ὁμολογει. κ. λ. Pæd. l. i. p. 89. B.

^m Ἰδε ουν, φησιν ὁ Παυλος. κ. λ. p. 117. C.

ⁿ Ὁμοιωσ, δε και ὁ Παυλος εν τη προς Ῥωμαιωσ επιτολη γραφει. Str. l. iii. p. 457. B. ^o Σαφεστατα γιν ὁ μακαριος Παυλος εν τη προτερα προς Κορινθιωσ επιτολη. Pæd l. i. p. 96. D.

^p Την δε κοινην διδασκαλιαν της πιστεωσ οσηνη γνωσεωσ ερηκειν, εν τη δευτερα προς Κορινθιωσ. Str. l. iv. p. 514. A.

^q Ὅθεν και ὁ Παυλος·—Ταντασ ουν εχετε τασ επαγγελιασ, φησιν, αγαπητοι· καθαρισωμεν εαντων τασ καρδιασ. κ. λ. Str. l. iii. p. 456. D.

4. 'Wherefore also^r Paul writing to the Galatians says: "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you." This epistle is also frequently cited as the apostle's, as Paul's.

5. 'Wherefore^s the blessed apostle: "I testify in the Lord," says he, "that ye walk not as other Gentiles walk," Eph. iv. 17, 18, 19, in another place: 'Wherefore^t in the epistle to the Ephesians he writes: "Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God," &c. Eph. v. 21, 22.

6. 'When Paul^u confesseth of himself: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect," &c. Philip. iii. 12—14. He quotes^v part of the first and second chapters of this epistle, as expressly concerning the Philippians. He quotes it again in this manner: 'The^w apostle also of the Lord, exhorting the Macedonians, says: "The Lord is at hand," take heed that we be not found empty,' Philip. iv. 5.

7. The epistle^x to the Colossians is often quoted by Clement, expressly with that title, as the apostle's, or as Paul's.

8. 'This the^y blessed Paul plainly signified, saying: "When we might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ, we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children," I Thess. ii. 6, 7. Words of this epistle are quoted by him several times as the apostle's.

9. 'And the^z apostle says: "There is not in every man that knowledge." [I Cor. viii. 7.] "But pray ye, that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not faith," 2 Thess. iii. 2. I think this is the only place in which this epistle is quoted by Clement.

10. 'Of which^a the apostle writing, says: "O Timothy,

^r Διο και Παυλος Γαλαταις επιτελλον, φησι Τεκνια μω. κ. λ. Str. l. iv. p. 468. B.

^s Δια τωτο ο μακαριος αποτολος, Μαρτυρομαι εν Κυριω, φησιν, κ. λ. Adm. ad G. p. 54. A. B.

^t Διο και εν τη προς Εφεσιωσ γραφει. κ. λ. Str. l. iv. p. 499. C.

^u Αυτε ομολογηντος τω Παυλω περι εαυτω. Ουχ οτι ηδη ελαβον. κ. λ. Pæd. l. i. p. 107. D.

^v Τωσ Φιλιππησιωσ συμμετοχωσ της χαριτωσ καλωσ. Str. l. iv. p. 511. A.

^w Ταυτη και ο αποτολος τω Κυριω, παρακαλων τωσ Μακεδονασ.—Ο Κυριωσ ηγγικει, λεγων. Ενλαβεισθε μη καταληφθομεν κενωι. Adm. ad Gent. p. 56. B.

^x Καν τη προς Κολοσσαιωσ επιτολω. Str. l. i. p. 277. B. Vid. l. iv. p. 499. D. l. v. p. 576. C. l. vi. p. 645. D.

^y Τωτο τοι σαφιστατα ο μακαριωσ Παυλωσ υπεσημηνατο, ειπων. Δυναμενοι εν βαρει ειναι, ωσ Χριτωσ αποτολοι, κ. λ. Pæd. l. i. p. 89. A.

^z Και ουκ εν πασι, φησιν ο αποτολος, η γνωσιωσ προσενχεσθε τε, κ. λ. Str. l. v. p. 544. A.

^a Περι ησ αποτολος γραφωσ, Ω Τιμοθεε, φησιν,——ηπο ταυτης ελεγχομενοι της φωνησ οι απο των αιρεσιων, τασ προς Τιμοθεον αθετσωσ επιτολασ. Str. l. ii. p. 383. C.

keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called; which some professing, have erred concerning the faith." [1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.] The heretics confuted by this saying, reject the epistles to Timothy.' This alone amounts to a strong assertion of the genuineness of two epistles of the apostle to Timothy. Moreover, he has frequently quoted words of the second epistle, and mentions it^b expressly as Paul's.

11. The epistle to Titus is also quoted several times. And he observes, 'that Paul^c had cited Epimenides the Cretan in his epistle to Titus, after this manner: "One of themselves, a poet of their own, said: "The Cretans are always liars,"' &c. Tit. i. 12, 13.

12. The epistle to Philemon is no where quoted in the remaining works of Clement. This may be ascribed to its brevity.

13. We have already seen enough in a passage of Eusebius, taken chiefly from the Institutions of Clement, to satisfy us that Clement received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's. Nevertheless it will not be improper to observe a passage or two in his remaining works, in confirmation of what has been said by Eusebius. 'Nor does^d Paul (says Clement in his Stromata) appear to have blamed philosophy in his epistles, though he would not have the more perfect return to it.—Wherefore writing to the Hebrews, who were declining from the faith to the law: "Have ye need," says he, "that one teach you again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat?" [Heb. v. 12.] In like manner to the Colossians, converted from Gentilism: "Beware, lest any spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." [Col. ii. 8.] Thus he expressly ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to Paul, and to the same person who wrote that to the Colossians. And in many other places of these works he quotes^e the epistle to the Hebrews as the apostle's, the divine apostle's, and Paul's.

^b Εν τη έτερω προς Τιμοθεον επισολη ο γεννηαιος διατασσειται Παυλος. Str. l. iii. p. 448. C.

^c Οί δε Επιδενιδην τον Κρητα—ού μεμνηται ο αποστολος Παυλος εν τη προς Τιτον επισολη. κ. λ. Str. l. i. p. 299. B. C.

^d Επει και Παυλος εν ταις επισολαις η φιλοσοφιαν διαβαλλων φαινεται—διο και τοις Έβραιοις γραφων, τοις επανακαμπτεισιν εις νομον εκ πιτειως, η παλιν, φησι, χρειαν εχετε της διδασκειν υμας—; αρα και τοις εξ Έλληνων επιστρεφουσι Κολοσσαενσι. κ. λ. Str. l. vi. p. 645. C. D.

^e Str. l. ii. p. 362. B. p. 364. A. p. 420. B. C. l. iv. p. 514. C. D. p. 515. A. et alibi.

VIII. Thus we have gone over the epistles of Paul. We proceed next to the seven epistles called Catholic. And I think it best to be very particular here, to see how far the remaining works of Clement confirm, or disagree with, the account given by Eusebius.

1. Having quoted Isa. xl. 6, 7, 8, "All flesh is as grass, the flower fadeth,"—and Jer. xiii. 24, Clement proceeds: 'This^f is the flower of the grass, and to walk according to the flesh, and to be carnal, according to the apostle, as they are who are in their sins.' Compare James i. 10, "But the rich, in that he is made low; because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away." But I perceive here no reference to St. James. It is an obvious comparison enough. Besides, it is also in Isaiah, whom Clement had quoted; and also in I Pet. i. 24. 'To be carnal, according to the apostle,' is a reference to St. Paul.

James ii. 8, "If ye fulfil the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well." Clement having quoted Matt. v. 20, adds: 'That it is not sufficient to abstain from evil: for unless^g ye become more perfect, so as to love your neighbour, and be able to do good, ye will not be royal.' This may be thought by some a reference to the above-mentioned text of St. James. But 'to love our neighbour' is a frequent precept of the New Testament: and in the phrase, being 'royal,' I rather think he refers to the Stoic maxim, that a wise man only is a king. The title of the sixth chapter of the third book of Clement's Pedagogue is, that a 'christian only is a rich man.'

James, ii. 23, says: 'Abraham was called the friend of God.' Clement has the same observation^h several times; but there is no evidence that he took it from St. James: it is more likely that he borrowed it from the Old Testament. See before in St. Clement of Rome, ch. ii. n. 38.

Clement has twiceⁱ observed, 'that the scripture says: "God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble:"' which words are likewise in James iv. 6. But they are also in I Pet. v. 5, and Prov. iii. 34.

James v. 12, "But above all things, my brethren, swear not: but^k let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay."

^f Τῆτο γὰρ τὸ ἀνθος τῆ χορτῆς, κ. λ. Str. l. iv. p. 540. B. [Oxon. p. 639.]

^g Συν τῷ μετὰ τῆς ἐν τῆτοις τελειώσεως, καὶ τὰ τὸν πλησίον ἀγαπᾶν, καὶ ἐνεργεῖν ὀνιάσαι, ἢ ἐσεσθε βασιλικοὶ. Str. l. vi. p. 696. B. [Oxon. p. 825.]

^h Pæd. l. iii. p. 221. A. [Ox. p. 259.] ib. p. 238. C. [Ox. p. 279.] Str. l. ii. p. 367. C. [Ox. p. 439.]

ⁱ Str. l. iii. p. 466. C. [Ox. p. 533.] l. iv. p. 516. D. [Ox. p. 611.]

^k Ἦτω δὲ ἡμῶν τὸ ναὶ, ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ, οὐ.

‘Again,’ says¹ Clement, ‘that is to be compared with the Lord’s saying: “Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay.”’ Which words are indeed extremely agreeable to those in James. But he quotes them not as his, but Christ’s, and must therefore be supposed to refer to^m Matt. v. 37. In another place he says: ‘It is theⁿ epitome of justice to say: “Your yea shall be yea, and your nay, nay.”’ He refers likewise^o once more to the same precept; but without any particular intimation whence he takes it.

Clement has also this expression, that ‘charity^p covers a multitude of sins.’ But there is no reason to suppose he refers to James v. 20. He takes it as from Clement of Rome’s description of charity, the main part of which we before transcribed, ch. ii. numb. 13. and 41. And these words are also in 1 Pet. iv. 8.

Upon the whole, I perceive not in St. Clement any quotation of the epistle of St. James, or any allusion or reference to it, that can be depended upon.

Since the writing of this, I have observed, that Clement of Alexandria is not mentioned by Mr.^q Richardson among those fathers who have quoted the epistle of St. James; nor by Huet^r nor by Tillemont.^s The same thing may be said, it is likely, of the other learned moderns, if consulted.

2. The first epistle of Peter is often quoted by Clement: ‘But^t and if we suffer for righteousness’ sake, says Peter, we are happy: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled:’ 1 Pet. iii. 14, 15, 16, 17. Again: ‘And^u Peter says the like things in his epistle.’ I put down in the margin^v a few more places, where this epistle is expressly quoted as Peter’s.

3. 2 Pet. ii. 2. “And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.” Clement says: ‘Cease^w to obstruct the way of truth.’ But this is also an Old Testament phrase. Ps. cxix. 30. Here is no sign of a reference to Peter. This is

¹ Πάλιν αυ τω τε Κυριε ρητη, Εσω υμων το ναι, ναι, και το ου, ου, εκεινω απεικασεον. Str. l. v. p. 596. C. [Oxon. p. 707.]

^m Εσω δε ο λογος υμων, Ναι ναι, Ου ου.

ⁿ Δικαιοσυνης γαρ ην επιτομη φαναι. Εσαι υμων το ναι ναι, και ου ου. Str. l. vii. p. 739. A. [Oxon. p. 872.]

^o Ibid. p. 729. A. [Oxon. p. 861.]

^p Str. l. iv. p. 518. [Oxon. p. 613.]

^q See the Canon of

the N. T. vindicated, p. 42. the third edit.

^r Demonstr. Ev.

Prop. i. sect. 12. p. 25. Paris. 1690.

^s Mem. Ec. T. i. S. Jaque

le Mineur, not. xv.

^t Str. l. iv. p. 493. A.

^u Και ο Πετρος εν τη επισολη τα ομοια λεγει. Ibid. l. iii. p. 473. B.

^v Pæd. l. i. p. 103. A. l. ii. p. 258. D. Διο και ο Ξαυμασιος Πετρος φησιν. Str. l. iii. p. 457. A. l. iv. p. 493. B. ‘Ο Πετρος εν τη επισολη φησι p. 525. C.

^w Και την οδον της αληθειας εμποδιζοντες. Adm. ad Gent. p. 66. C.

the only place in the remaining works of Clement, which I have observed to have any relation to the second epistle of Peter. In the Oxford edition of this father, by mistake, is put 2 Pet. iv. 8, for 1 Pet. iv. 8, both in the Index at the end, and in the work itself at p. 306.

4. The first epistle of John is often quoted. ‘This^x is the love of God, says John, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous,’ 1 John v. 3. It is quoted as John’s^y several times; and once in this manner: ‘John^z also, in his larger epistle, seems to show the difference of sins: “If any man see his brother sin a sin, which is not unto death,”’ 1 John v. 16. It is plain therefore he knew and owned one more epistle of St. John, and possibly two more: which he ascribed not to John the elder, but to John the apostle: the same who is the author of the first, or larger epistle. But I do not perceive any reference to either of these two epistles in his works. It is without ground, as I apprehend, that in the Oxford edition there is^a marked a reference to 3 John, ver. 15; or, as in our English Bibles, ver. 14, ‘Peace be to thee.’

5. The epistle of St. Jude is several times quoted as his: ‘I will that ye^b should know,’ says Jude, ‘that God having once saved the people out of the land of Egypt,’ Jude, ver. 5, 6, and 11. But Clement quotes from his memory. Again: ‘Of these^c and the like heretics, I think, Jude spoke prophetically in his epistle: “Likewise also these dreamers.”’ ver. 8—16.

In the Adumbrations upon the Epistle of St. Jude, as we now have them in Latin, is an observation concerning the modesty of the writer: ‘That^d Jude did not style himself, at the beginning of his epistle, brother of the Lord, though he was related to him, but “Jude the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.”’ Which observation may serve to show whom Clement took to be the writer of this epistle. See Matt. xiii. 55; Mark xv. 40.

^x Pæd. l. iii. p. 257. B.

^y P. 264. D. 444. D. 445. A. 514. B.

^z Φανερται δε και Ιωαννης εν τη μειζονι επιστολη, τας διαφορας των αμαρτιων διδασκων εν τριτοις. κ. λ. Str. l. ii. p. 389. B.

^a Pæd. l. ii. p. 203. [Paris. p. 173. C.]

^b Ειδεναι γαρ ημας, φησιν ο Ιουδας, βελομαι, κ. λ. Pæd. l. iii. p. 239. C.

^c Επι τριτων ομιμα—προφητικως Ιεδαν εν τη επιστολη ερηκεναι. Str. l. iii. p. 431. A. B.

^d Judas, qui catholicam scripsit epistolam, frater filiorum Josephi, extans valde religiosus, quum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, se ipsum fratrem ejus esse. Sed quid dixit? ‘Jacobus servus Jesu Christi,’ utpote Domini, ‘frater autem Jacobi.’ Vid Adumbr. in Ep. Judæ ep. Clem. A. p. 1007. Ed. Oxon.

6. We have seen then, in St. Clement's remaining works, quotations of the first epistle of Peter; the first epistle of John, with an intimation that he had written another, if not also a third epistle; and of the epistle of Jude.

Suppose now we should compare this with the account which Eusebius has given of the books cited by St. Clement. Eusebius said, in the second passage quoted from him, that Clement had, in his *Stromata*, and other books he there speaks of, 'taken testimonies out of those scriptures that are contradicted; as the epistle to the Hebrews, and the epistle of Barnabas, and Clement, and Jude.' And what we find in those works is agreeable to what Eusebius says: these scriptures are there quoted, as we have particularly seen concerning the epistle to the Hebrews, and the epistle of Jude. But in the third passage, Eusebius says, that Clement had in his *Institutions* given 'short explications of all the canonical scriptures, not omitting those that are contradicted: I mean the epistle of Jude, and the other catholic epistles, and the epistle of Barnabas, and the book called the Revelation of Peter.' Photius likewise mentions Clement's explications of the catholic epistles. But yet in the remaining works of Clement we find no notice taken of the epistle of James, or the second of Peter. This seems to me somewhat strange: for if he had written short explications on them in his *Institutions*, one might reasonably expect to see them quoted in these remaining works. It is certain all the other books there mentioned by Eusebius are quoted in these works, which we still have; as the epistle of Jude, and Barnabas; excepting only the Revelation of Peter. Methinks this may justly create a suspicion, whether Clement had commented upon all the seven catholic epistles; particularly that of James, and the second of Peter. Besides, it is very observable, that Cassiodorus says: 'Clement,^e presbyter of Alexandria, author of the *Stromata*, explained the canonical epistles: that is, the first epistle of St. Peter, the first and second of St. John, and the epistle of James;' it is probable it^f should be Jude: and mentions no other. These likewise, Cassiodorus says, he ordered to be translated into Latin. And that he had no comment of Clement upon the other catholic epistles, is evident from what he there

^e In epistolis autem canonicis Clemens Alexandrinus presbyter, qui et Stromateus vocatur, id est in epistolâ Sancti Petri primâ, Sancti Joannis primâ et secundâ, et Jacobi, Attico sermone declaravit. *Divin. Lect.* c. 8.

^f Vid. Fell. not. edit. *Op. Clem.* Ox. p. 1006.

proceeds to say : ‘ That St. Augustine^g had explained the epistle of James ; but that he was still solicitous for a comment upon the rest of the canonical epistles : and to his great satisfaction he met with a book of Didymus, containing an exposition of the seven canonical epistles.’ And accordingly the Latin Adumbrations of Clement, supposed to be those translated by Cassiodorius, or by his procurement, are upon the first epistle of Peter, first and second of John, and the epistle of Jude. Nor is there any reason, that I know of, to question, whether Cassiodorius had the Hypotuposes, or Institutions, of Clement entire : which seem to have been in being long after, in the time of Photius. In another place Cassiodorius says : ‘ It is^h reported that Clement of Alexandria explained in the Greek tongue all the divine scriptures of the Old and New Testament, from the beginning to the end.’ Which manner of speaking seems to show, that this was more than he had certain proof of. It is likely, this common report he speaks of was founded on the general expressions of Eusebius, which either are inaccurate, or ought to be interpreted in a general way, with an allowance for some exceptions.

Upon the whole, it appears to me probable, that St. Clement had not, even in his Institutions, any comment, or short exposition, of the epistle of James, or the second of Peter, or the third of John, notwithstanding what Eusebius and Photius have said of his short explications of the catholic epistles : for they may be understood to speak in a loose and general manner only : just as Cassiodorius says, that Clement had written of the canonical epistles : though at the same time he means only some, and not all of them. Nor can I see why Eusebius should not have mentioned the epistle of James, and the second of Peter, as well as that of Jude, when they were all, in the time of Eusebius, among the scriptures that were contradicted : but only that Jude was expounded by Clement, and the rest not.

We have not then at present any ground to think, that the epistle of James, the second of Peter, or the third of John, were received by Clement, or so much as known to him. However, as to the third epistle of John, considering

^g Sanctus quoque Augustinus epistolam Jacobi apostoli solitâ diligentia suæ curiositate tractavit.—Sed cum de reliquis canonicis epistolis magna nos cogitatio fatigaret, subito nobis codex Didymi Græco stylo conscriptus expositionem septem canonicarum epistolarum, Domino largiente, concessus est. Ibid.

^h Ferunt itaque scripturas divinas Veteris Novique Testamenti, ab ipso principio usque ad finem, Græco sermone declarasse Clementem A. cognomento Stromateum. Præfat. ad libr. de Institutione Divin. Lectionum.

the shortness of it, we have no good argument to conclude he was unacquainted with it.

IX. The book of the Revelation is several times quoted by Clement, and once in this manner: ‘Suchⁱ an one, though here on earth he be not honoured with the first seat, shall sit upon the four-and-twenty thrones, judging the people, as John says in the Revelation.’ See Rev. iv. 4; xi. 16. But Clement joins together the words of several^k texts, and quotes by memory. See Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30. And that he supposed this writer to be John the apostle, appears^l from another place, where he refers to Rev. xxi. 21, as the words of an^m apostle.

X. I shall now immediately sum up the testimony given by Clement to the books of the New Testament. He has expressly owned the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the Apostles, which he also ascribes to Luke. He owns likewise all the fourteen epistles of Paul, except the epistle to Philemon, which he has no where mentioned, that we know of: but this omission may be very well supposed owing to no other reason but the brevity of that epistle. He has also quoted the first epistle of Peter, the first and second epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude, and the book of the Revelation: but we have not found any quotations of the epistle of James, the second of Peter, or the third of John, nor any evidences that these were owned by him.

XI. I shall in the next place observe some general names, titles, and divisions of the books of the New Testament, and some expressions of high respect for them.

Quoting some of our gospels: ‘For proof of this,’ saysⁿ Clement, ‘I need not use many words, but only to allege the evangelic voice of the Lord.’ Again: ‘The^o Lord will confirm this by what he says in the gospel.’ And: ‘The^p Lord expressly in the gospel.’ Again: ‘It is said^q in the gospels.’

He quotes the epistles of Paul and the other apostles in this manner: ‘Wherefore^r the blessed apostle: Admi-

ⁱ *Ἐν τοῖς εἰκοσι καὶ τεσσαραὶ καθέδρευται θρόνοις, τὸν λαὸν κρινῶν, ὡς φησὶν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωαννῆς.* Str. l. vi. p. 667. B.

^k Vid. notas in h. l. edit. Oxon.

^l *Καὶ τὰς δώδεκα τῆς*

βρανοπολεως πυλας, τιμοῖς ἀπεικασμενας λιθοῖς, τὸ περιόπτρον τῆς ἀποστολικῆς φωνῆς αἰνιττεσθαι χαριτος ἐκδέχομεθα. Pæd. l. ii. cap. 12. p. 207. A.

^m However, see Lampe in Johan. Evang. T. i. p. 117. not. (d.)

ⁿ *Τὴν εὐαγγέλιον τῶ Κυρίου παραθεμενω φωνῆν.* Pæd. l. i. p. 117. D.

^o *Ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μαρτυρησεί Κυριος εὐαγγέλιον, λεγων.* p. 118. B.

^p *Σαφῶς δὲ ὁ Κυριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγέλιον.* Pæd. l. ii. p. 210. B.

^q *Ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις λεγεται.* Str. l. i. p. 325. C.

^r *Δια τῆτο ὁ μακαριος ἀποστολος.* Adm. ad Gent. p. 54. A. B.

rably^s the blessed Peter.’ It should be Paul. He refers to words in 1 Tim. ii. ‘Excellent^t well the divine apostle directs us to put on Christ: The excellent^u apostle: The^v admirable Paul admonishes: The^w Holy Spirit in the apostle says.’

‘If there is one master in heaven, as^x the scripture says: Therefore^y also the scripture says.’ He calls them, ‘Divine^z scriptures, divinely inspired^a scriptures.’ Again: ‘Which^b are written in the holy books.’

Clement observes, that there is a consent and harmony between^c the ‘law and the prophets, the apostles and the gospel.’ This and other passages show the sacred christian scriptures were divided into two parts, under the titles of apostolical epistles, and gospels. Again: ‘There is^d one God, who is preached by the law, the prophets, and the gospel.’ Here, and in other places, the gospel is the whole New Testament. ‘That we should do these things, both^e the gospel and the apostle command.’ Having cited the words of Tit. iii. 3, he adds: ‘As the^f apostolical scripture says.’ Here the apostle, and the apostolical scripture, mean the collection of epistles, and the gospel is the collection of the gospels. He says again: ‘The law^g and prophets, together with the gospel, conduct to one and the same knowledge in the name of Christ.’ And: ‘There^h are two ways spoken of by the gospel, and the apostles, and by all the prophets.’ In the treatise, ‘Who is the Rich Man that may be saved,’ he uses these terms:ⁱ ‘Prophesies, gospels, and apostolical words.’

^s Πανν εν Θανασιως ο Πετρος ο μακαριος. Pæd. l. ii. p. 211. B.

^t Παγκαλως ημιν Θειος αποσολος συμβελενει, κ. λ. Pæd. l. iii. p. 245. B.

^u Κατα τον γενναιον αποσολον. Str. l. ii. p. 420.

^v Ο Θεοπεισιος παρηγεσε Παυλος. Str. l. v. p. 546. D.

^w Το εν τω αποσολω αγιον πνευμα λεγει. Pæd. l. i. p. 106. A.

^x Ως φησιν η γραφη. Pæd. l. i. p. 88. A.

^y Διο και φησιν η γραφη. p. 112. A.

^z Μετα μικρον δε και Θειας επισηφω γραφαις. Pæd. l. iii. p. 219. A.

^a Κατα τας Θεοπνευτες γραφας. Str. l. vii. p. 761. B.

^b Εγγεγραφεται ταις βιβλοις ταις αγιας. Str. l. i. p. 264. C.

^c Νομος και προφητων ομω, και αποσολων, συν και τω εναγγελιω. Str. l. vi. p. 659. C. ^d Τον δια νομω, και προφητων, και εναγγελιω κηρυσσομενον. Str. l. iv. p. 510. A.

^e Το τε εναγγελιον, ο τε αποσολος, κελευσει.

^f η φησιν η αποσολικη γραφη. p. 4. A.

^g Νομος τε ομω και προφηται, συν και τω εναγγελιω, εν ονοματι Χριτω εις μιαν συναγονται γνωσιν. Str. l. iii. p. 455. C.

^h Παλιν αυ δυο οδωσ υποτιθεμενη τω εναγγελιω και των αποσολων, ομωιωσ τοις προφηταις απασιν. Str. l. v. p. 561. A.

ⁱ Ητενετω προφηταις, εναγγελιωις, λογωις αποσολικοις. Quis. Div. S. prope fin.

He says: ‘The^k scriptures, which we believe, have been confirmed by almighty authority;’ and that ‘one God, and Almighty Lord, is taught by the law, and the prophets, and the blessed gospel.’ He calls the books of the New Testament,^l ‘the true evangelical canon.’ Finally, he^m calls them ‘the scriptures of the Lord,’ and recommends the reading them, as useful and necessary for proving what we assert.

XII. It remains only, that we now inquire whether Clement quotes any other writings as sacred, or of authority, and with the same respect which he expresses for those now commonly received as canonical, of which we have hitherto spoken. And it has already been observed, upon the third passage of Eusebius concerning this father, that his writing notes upon any book is no certain proof that he owned it for sacred, or of authority.

But that we may the better judge of this question, we shall consider particularly Clement’s quotations of two sorts of writings: those which we call christian and ecclesiastical writings, and some others which we generally call apocryphal.

Of the former sort there are several: the epistle of Barnabas, the epistle of Clement of Rome, and the Shepherd of Hermas. These are the books, of this sort, which seem to be quoted by Clement with higher marks of respect than others, as they are deserving of it on account of their early age, and their authors’ acquaintance with the apostles, or apostolical men. We have no occasion to take notice here of Tatian, or any other writers beside these.

I. St. Barnabas is cited by Clement five or six times at least. I shall observe the manner of these quotations. ‘Rightlyⁿ therefore said the apostle Barnabas.’ And soon after: ‘And^o the apostle Barnabas: Thus^p says Barnabas: Truly^q Barnabas says mystically: For this I need not^r use many words, but only to allege the testimony of the apos-

^k Ὡς και τας γραφας, αἰς πεπιτευκαμεν, κυριας ἡσας εκ αυθεντιας παντοκρατορικης επιδειξαντας,—ἵνα δεικνυται Θεον, και Κυριον παντοκρατορα, τον δια νομου, και προφητων, προς δε και τς μακαρις ευαγγελις. Str. l. iv. p. 475. A.

^l Τη κατα την αληθειαν ευαγγελικη ποιησαντες κανον. Str. l. iii. p. 453. D. ^m Ἦτε των γραφων των κυριακων αναγνωσις εις αποδειξιν των λεγομενων αναγκαια. Str. l. vi. p. 660. C.

ⁿ Εικοτως εν ὁ αποστολος Βαρναβας. Str. l. ii. p. 373. B.

^o Και Βαρναβας ὁ αποστολος. p. 375. B. ^p Ταυτα μεν ὁ Βαρναβας. p. 389. D. Φησιν ὁ Βαρναβας. Str. l. v. p. 571. D.

^q Αμελει μυστικως ὁ Βαρναβας. Str. l. ii. p. 396. D.

^r Ου μοι δει πλειονων λογων, παραθεμενω μαρτυν τον αποστολικον Βαρναβαν ὁ εἰ των ἐβδομηκοντα ην, και συνεργος τς Παυλας. p. 410. D.

tolie Barnabas, who was one of the seventy, and fellow-labourer of Paul.' In another^s place Barnabas is mentioned, where his name seems to have been put by mistake for Clement.

Upon these citations I shall make but two remarks. First, that Clement, though he sometimes calls Barnabas apostle, does not hereby mean, that he was an apostle in the highest sense of the word: so as the twelve, and Paul, were apostles. The word is sometimes used in an inferior sense by the ancient christians. I need not refer to particular places. However I will just observe, that^t Tertullian calls all the seventy disciples apostles: and it is plain that Clement so uses the word; for at another time he calls Barnabas apostolical only, and says, he 'was one of the seventy, and fellow-labourer of Paul.' These are the highest characters which he really intends to give to Barnabas, and what he means when he styles him apostle: therefore he need not be supposed to ascribe to Barnabas that large measure of inspiration and high authority, which was peculiar to the apostles, strictly and properly so called.

Secondly, it has been observed by^u Cotelerius, and by Mr.^v Jones after him, that Clement contradicts an assertion of Barnabas in a place where he cites some of his expressions, without naming him; 'which,' says Cotelerius, 'he 'would not have done, if he had thought his epistle belonged to the canon.'

2. St. Clement of Rome is also several times quoted by our Clement. As, 'Clement,^w in the epistle to the Corinthians:' and, 'the^x apostle Clement, in the epistle to the Corinthians.' In another place: 'It is^y written in the epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians.' And in some other^z places this epistle is quoted as Clement's.

Upon these citations we may observe, that when our author calls Clement apostle, he gives him that title in the inferior sense of the word, as equivalent to apostolical, in the like manner that he had given it before to Barnabas: it

^s Str. l. vi. p. 646. C.

^t Adlegit et alios septuaginta apostolos super duodecim. Adv. Marcion, l. iv. c. 24. p. 540. D.

^u Quippe qui opus, quod credidit esse Barnabæ, impugnat, licet suppresso honoris causâ nomine. Pædagogi l. ii. c. 10. Id porro nequaquam commisit, si ad canonem pertinere fuisset arbitratus. Coteler. Judicium de Ep. S. Barnabæ.

^v The New and Full Method, &c. vol. ii. p. 537.

^w Αυτικα Κλημης εν τη προς Κορινθιος επιστολη. Str. l. i. p. 289. A.

^x Να μη εν τη προς Κορινθιος επιστολη ο αποστολος Κλημης. Str. l. iv. p. 516. A.

^y Αλλα καν τη προς Κορινθιος Ρωμαιων επιστολη— γεγραπται. Str. l. v. p. 586. B.

^z Str. l. iv. p. 518. C. l. v. p. 586. B.

cannot be here used by him otherwise. Clement was not an apostle in the strictest and highest sense of the word. And farther it is to be observed, that he considers this epistle as the epistle also of the church of Rome.

3. Hermas too is frequently quoted by Clement. I shall take those places which contain the strongest expressions of respect, and refer the reader for the rest to the testimonies in Le Clerc's *Patres Apostolici*. 'Divinely^a therefore the power which speaks to Hermas by revelation. For^b the power that appeared in vision to Hermas says.' And, 'The^c shepherd, the angel of repentance, says to Hermas, concerning the false prophet.' And in some other places: 'The^d shepherd says: as the shepherd says.'

Concerning these citations of Hermas, I think we may say, it is reasonable to suppose that Clement could not ascribe to Hermas a higher character than that given to Barnabas and Clement: which is that of apostolical, or apostle in the lower sense of the word.

4. And with regard to the citations of these three writers, I would observe in general, that it seems not very easy to determine the exact measure or degree of respect which Clement had for them; but I do not perceive any plain evidence of his having the same respect for them which he had for the gospels, and the epistles of the apostles. He might well esteem them worthy of the highest respect, next to that given to apostles: and, in citing books of the next order to those of the apostles, the forms of citation may possibly bear a resemblance with those used when their writings are cited. But still there may be a superior regard had to the writings of the apostles above all other; as I think there was by our Clement, and all catholic christians in general.

Mark and Luke, apostolical men, may write histories of our Lord's and his apostles' preaching, and doctrine, and miracles, which shall be received as sacred, and of authority; but no epistles or other writings, delivering doctrines and precepts, (except only in the way of historical narration,) can be of authority, but those written by apostles. Many of the ancient christian writers seem to have gone upon this supposition. Some instances of it must have been observed

^a Θεως τοιωνν ή δυναμις, ή τω 'Ερμα κατα αποκαλυψιν λαλεσα. Str. l. i. p. 356. B.

^b Φησι γαρ εν τω οραματι τω 'Ερμα ή δυναμις ή φανεισα. Str. l. ii. p. 360. A.

^c Λεγει δε και ο ποιμην ο αγγελος της μετανοιας τω 'Ερμα, κ. λ. Str. l. i. p. 311. D.

^d Str. l. ii. p. 384. D. l. iv. p. 503. C.

in the passages we have^e already produced. But the more particular consideration of this point is deferred till hereafter.

XIII. Beside these, there are other books, called apocryphal, cited by Clement: and it has been thought that some of them are quoted by him as authentic scripture. Le Clerc,^f and some others, are of this opinion. On the contrary, Mill^g says, ‘That though Clement quotes apocryphal gospels, he carefully distinguishes them from ours, ‘where there is occasion.’ The nature of our design will not allow us to omit an inquiry into this matter; but I hope that, after all that has been already said, it may be despatched in a few words.

The books of this sort quoted by Clement are these following: The gospels according to the Hebrews, and according to the Egyptians; the Preaching of Peter, the Revelation of Peter, the Acts of Peter: Traditions of Matthias: to which we may add some words of Christ, not in our gospels.

1. We shall begin the two before-mentioned gospels. The gospel according to the Hebrews is but once expressly quoted by him. Having just before quoted the traditions of Matthias, he adds: ‘And^h to the same purpose it is written in the gospel according to the Hebrews: “He who admires shall reign, and he who has reigned shall be at rest.”’

The gospel according to the Egyptians is quoted several times. The fragments of it preserved in Clement may be seen in Grabeⁱ and^k Jones, and others. With regard to these gospels we need only to observe these two things.

1.) That Clement owned our four gospels, and those

^e I suppose particularly, that Papias, Irenæus, and our Clement himself, go upon this ground in receiving St. Mark’s gospel as a faithful narrative of St. Peter’s preaching; though written after that apostle’s death, or not expressly approved by him. For Papias, see p. 121, 122; for Irenæus, p. 170, 192; and for Clement, in this chapter, numb. iii. p. 226, 227, &c. But yet they do not receive the Shepherd of Hermas, the epistles of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, no, nor Barnabas, as sacred scripture, and of authority. This I think has appeared plainly with regard to St. Irenæus, ch. xvii. numb. xii. And I suppose that it has been now shown of our Clement, that there is no proof he was of a contrary opinion.

^f See Bibliothecæ Univ. Tome x. p. 195, and 230, &c.

^g Cum enim in omnigenis veterum monumentis spatiaretur [Clemens A.] ac ne quidem apocrypha evangelia præteriret intacta (quæ tamen, ubi opus est, caute distingunt a παραδεδομένοις ἡμῶν, sive quatuor nostris canonicis) et quæ seq. Prol. n. 627. edit. Kust. ^h ἡ κἀν τῷ καθ’ Ἑβραίων εὐαγγελίῳ—γεγραπται. Str. l. ii. p. 380. A.

ⁱ Spicileg. T. i. p. 35, 36.

^k New and Full Method, Vol. i. p. 244—247.

only. This is evident from the passages before cited from Clement, and from the numerous quotations of these gospels in all his works.

2.) In several of the places where the gospel according to the Egyptians is quoted, there are expressions used by Clement, which show that he did not own it as a genuine, authentic history of Christ and his doctrine. ‘But,’ says he,¹ in one place, ‘they who oppose the creation of God by their specious continence, urge also the things spoken to Salome, which I mentioned before: they are, I think, in the gospel according to the Egyptians: for they say, that our Saviour himself said:’ which sufficiently shows, that Clement was little acquainted with this gospel, and had no regard to it, but when he was obliged to confute the false opinions which others endeavoured to support by it. And it seems somewhat probable that he had never read the gospel itself, but only the quotations of it which he had met with in heretical writers.

A little after: ‘Well,^m but do not they who choose to follow any thing, rather than the true evangelical canon, quote what follows there, as said to Salome?’ Again: ‘Therefore’ Cassianus [an heretical writer of Clement’s own time] says, that when Salome asked, “When the things should be known concerning which she enquired,” the Lord answered——’ To which Clement immediately replies: ‘First of all, we have not this passage in the four gospels delivered to us, but in that according to the Egyptians.’ See before, Numb. V. p. 236.

Mr.^o Jones has made several good remarks upon the passages of this gospel in Clement. He asserts, that ‘Clement Alexandrinus never saw the gospel of the Egyptians, nor made any citations out of it; but on the contrary rejected it, as an impious, heretical, and apocryphal book.’

I need say nothing more particularly about the gospel according to the Hebrews, which is but once cited by Clement, and was probably unknown to him; for it being written in Hebrew, he could not read it in a language he was unacquainted with. It is likely, the single passage

¹ Οἱ δὲ ἀντιτασσομένοι τῇ κτίσει τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς εὐφημίας ἐγκρατείας, κακείνα λέγουσι τὰ πρὸς Σαλωμὴν εἰρημένα, ὧν προτερον ἐμνησθημεν· φέρεται δὲ οἶμαι ἐν τῷ κατ’ Αἰγυπτίως εὐαγγελίῳ, φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε Σωτῆρ, κ. λ. Str. l. iii. p. 452. C.

^m Τι δὲ; ἔχει καὶ τὰ ἔξω τῶν πρὸς Σαλωμὴν εἰρημενῶν ἐπιφερῶσιν οἱ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀληθειαν εὐαγγελικῷ σοιχησαντες κανόνι. Ibid. p. 453. D.

ⁿ Str. l. iii. p. 465. C. D.

^o New and Full Method, &c. vol. i. p. 253—257.

cited out of it was taken at second hand from some author who had made use of it.

I have but one thing to add : that what we have just seen in Clement seems to afford a convincing argument of the obscurity of these gospels at this time, and particularly of that according to the Egyptians. For if Clement, who lived at Alexandria, and was so well acquainted with almost all sorts of books, had but a slight, or no knowledge at all of this gospel, how obscure must it have been at this time ? how little regarded by catholic christians ?

2. The next book of this sort is, *The Preaching of Peter*, which is often quoted by this father. It is of this in particular that Le Clerc speaks, when he says, Clement used apocryphal books. ‘He^p often cites,’ says Le Clerc, ‘supposititious books, as if they were owned by every body ; as may be observed in the passage of the *Preaching of St. Peter*, which we before quoted ; and in another of *St. Paul*, which seems to be taken out of the book of his *Travels.*’ As to this passage of *St. Paul*, I think Le Clerc mistaken about the book from whence Clement took it. It appears to be taken out of the same book, *The Preaching of Peter*.

In the place before referred to,^q Le Clerc expresses himself thus : ‘He cites also a book ascribed to *St. Peter*, which was entitled, *The Preaching of Peter*. It is apparent that Clement had no doubt but the book was *Peter’s.*’ If this be so, it must be supposed Clement owned this as a book of scripture in the highest sense : a writing of the apostle Peter would certainly be esteemed by him of canonical authority. But herein I differ from Le Clerc.

1.) The first observation, therefore, upon Clement’s citations of the book we are now examining, must be this : That I see no reason to think that this book was supposed by Clement, or any one else, to be *Peter’s.* The title of it imports no such thing ; nor do the forms of quotation used by Clement oblige us so to understand him. A book containing an account of Peter’s discourses, may be called *Peter’s Preaching*, whether written and composed by Peter, or another. If written by a disciple of Peter, it is fitly

^p Il cite souvent des écrits supposez, de même que s’ils avoient été reconnus de tout le monde, comme on le peut remarquer par le passage de la Prédication de St. Pierre que l’on a rapporté, et par un autre de St. Paul, qui semble être tiré du livre de ses Voïages. *Bibl. Univ.* as above, p. 231.

^q Il cite ailleurs [*Str.* l. vi. p. 635.] un livre qu’on attribuoit à St. Pierre, et qui étoit intitulé *Κηρυγμα Πιερου*, La Prédication de St. Pierre. Il paroît que Clément ne doutoit point que ce livre ne fût de St. Pierre. *Ibid.* p. 195.

called, *The Preaching of Peter*: it is the substance of the book that gives it a right to that title. When Clement says: ‘In the *Preaching of Peter* you may find the Lord called the Law and the Word:’ or, ‘Peter says in the *Preaching*,’ or his *Preaching*; the plain meaning of these words is: Peter says this in the book entitled, *The Preaching of Peter*; without determining, or so much as implying in the least, that it was written and composed by that apostle. So Clement says: ‘And^r Peter says in the Acts: “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons,”’ ch. x. 34, 35. And it is common to say, that Peter, or Paul, says such a thing in the Acts, without intending that the book of the Acts was written by either of those apostles. There is a great uniformity in Clement’s quotations of this book, the *Preaching of Peter*; and they none of them seem to imply any thing more than what I have said. I have collected them for my own satisfaction, and shall put them in the^s margin, because they may be of use to others. Sometimes it is, ‘Peter says in the *Preaching*:’ sometimes only, ‘Peter says,’ if he had but a little before expressly named the book: just as it is usual to quote what Paul or Peter says in the Acts.

And that Clement did not suppose this book to be St. Peter’s, may be argued from his quotation of a passage of St. Paul out of the same book, in this manner: ‘This^t the apostle Paul will manifest, saying in the *Preaching of Peter*.’ This seems to show, that Clement thought this book was composed by some person who wrote the history of Peter’s preaching, inserting also some discourses of the apostle Paul, and perhaps of others likewise; but calling the whole from the principal subject of it, *The Preaching of Peter*.

2.) I observe then farther, that Clement has no where mentioned the name of the author of this book, as he has done of the book of the Acts, containing the history of the

^r Καὶ μὴν καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσιν. Str. l. vi. p. 646. B.

^s Ἐν δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ κηρυγματι εἴροισ ἀν, κ. λ. Str. l. i. p. 357. A. ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρυγματι. Str. l. ii. p. 390. A. Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρυγματι λέγει. l. vi. p. 635. A. αὐτος διασαφήσει Πέτρος ἐπιφερωῶν. *ibid.* C. Δηλώσει πρὸς τῷ Πέτρῳ κηρυγματι ὁ ἀποστολὸς λέγων Παῦλος. p. 636. C. Δια τῆτο φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκεναὶ τὸν Κυρίον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, κ. λ. *ibid.* D. Αὐτικά ἐν τῷ Πέτρῳ κηρυγματι ὁ Κυρίος φησὶ πρὸς τῆς μαθητῶν μετὰ τὴν ἀναστασίν. p. 639. B. ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῷ κηρυγματι περὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων λέγων, φησὶν. p. 678. A.

^t The Greek words are among the citations, and are thus justly rendered by Grabe: Declarabit in Petri Prædicatione apostolus Paulus, dicens. Spic. T. i. p. 65. Whereas in the Latin version in St. Clement’s works it is, præter Petri Prædicationem declarabit Paulus.

preaching of Peter, and some others, though chiefly of Paul, which he has ascribed to St. Luke. Nor does it appear that he knew who was the author of the Preaching of Peter: if he had, it is likely he would have mentioned him. Of any book, to be received as of authority, one would be glad to know the name and character of the author; whether he was an apostle, or at least an apostolical man; a follower or disciple of apostles, and intimately acquainted with them.

3.) Clement has no where called this book ‘scripture,’ or used any particular expression of high respect and veneration in his quotations of it.

4.) The testimony of Eusebius ought to be of considerable weight in this point. Having, in his Ecclesiastical History, spoken of the first and second epistle of Peter, he says: ‘But^u the book entitled his Acts, and the gospel named according to him, and that which is termed his Preaching, and that called his Revelation, we know that they have not been delivered (to us) as catholic writings; forasmuch as no ecclesiastical writer of the ancients, or of our time, has made use of testimonies out of them.’ It is very strange that Eusebius should so forget himself as to say this, if so great a man as Clement of Alexandria had quoted the Preaching of Peter, as a book of that apostle, or of an apostolical man. Or, if he had quoted it as a book of authority, we must suppose the stream of antiquity to have been strong against him; otherwise Eusebius could hardly have expressed himself in this manner.

5.) Nevertheless it seems that Clement, when he quotes any words of Peter, or Paul, out of this book, quotes them as if he thought them to be really theirs, and that they were there recorded in a credible manner. This seems to appear in these expressions: ‘Peter says in the Preaching: This Peter himself will manifest, when he subjoins: Wherefore also Peter, in the Preaching, speaking of the apostles, says.’ And yet perhaps it may be questioned, whether Clement has not so distinctly named this book, whenever he takes any thing out of it, with a design that every one may the better judge of the authority of what he produces from it: as much as to say, I take this out of the book entitled, The Preaching of Peter, and let it avail as

^u Το τε μην των επικεκλημενων αυτη πραξεων, και το κατ’ αυτον ωνομασμενον ευαγγελιον, το, τε λεγομενον αυτη κηρυγμα, και την καλεμενην αποκαλυψιν, καθ’ ολως εν καθολικοις ισμεν παραδεδομενα οτι μη τε αρχαιων μη τε των καθ’ ημας τις εκκλησιαστικος συγγραφευς ταις εξ αυτων συνεχρησατο μαρτυριας. H. E. l. iii. sect. 3. p. 72. A.

much as it can. There may be some foundation for this conjecture, since Clement has never called this book scripture, nor mentioned the name of the author or composer of it.

Upon the whole, it must be allowed to be difficult to decide, what authority Clement assigned to this book; but, at the same time, I see no proofs of his esteeming it a book of sacred scripture, in the highest meaning of these terms.

I would observe in general, concerning the *Preaching of Peter*, which contained, as it seems, a history of the preaching of Peter chiefly, but also of the preaching of Paul, and perhaps of some others: that if it had been composed by an apostolical man, a disciple of apostles, intimately acquainted with them, and there had been a credible tradition concerning the book, and the author of it; it might be a book of sacred authority, like the *Acts of the apostles*, written by Luke, an apostolical man: provided also, that it had in it nothing manifestly false and absurd; as I suppose it would not, if it had been written by such a person, and credibly witnessed to as such. But hitherto we have not met with, as I apprehend, any testimony to this book, the *Preaching of Peter*, that it was written by an apostle, or an apostolical man.

No one, I hope, will be offended at the prolixity of the argument upon this question, who considers the importance of it.^v

^v I have discoursed largely of St. Clement's opinion of the authority of this book: I add a conjecture concerning the age of it. It was written before the end of the second century, as appears from Clement's quotations of it; it was written after the *Sibylline Verses*, because it refers to them. If therefore they were composed about the middle of the second century, this book was written somewhat later. That the *Sibylline Verses* are referred to in this book, the *Preaching of Peter*, appears to me probable from two quotations of it in St. Clement, which I here put down. 'That, as God desired the salvation of the Jews, giving them prophets; so, likewise, raising up the most approved of the Greeks to be prophets to them in their own language, as they were able to receive the divine beneficence, he distinguished them from the bulk of mankind, the apostle Paul will manifest in the *Preaching of Peter*, saying: "Take likewise the Greek books. Consider the Sybil, how she declares the one God, and things future. Take also and read *Hystaspes*, and you will there find the Son of God most clearly and evidently described.'" Str. l. vi. p. 636. C. D. See Blondel *Des Sibylles*, l. i. cap. 5. This suits our *Sibylline Verses*; beside that it also shows, that the *Preaching of Peter* was written after *Hystaspes*, another forgery. In the other passage the *Sibylline Verses* are plainly described: 'Whence also Peter in *The Preaching*, speaking of the apostles, says: "But when we had perused the books which we had of the prophets, mentioning Jesus Christ sometimes in parables, sometimes enigmatically, sometimes clearly and expressly; we found his coming, and death, and cross, and all the other sufferings which the Jews inflicted on him, and his resurrection and assump-

3. The Revelation of Peter is to be next considered. Of this Eusebius has informed us, that Clement in his Institutions, where he had written notes upon divers books of scripture that were contradicted, had written notes also upon this. And it still appears quoted twice or thrice in the Extracts^w of The Scriptures of the Prophets, supposed to be a fragment of Clement's Institutions, or collected out of them. But that this was not esteemed by Clement a book of authority, may be concluded from what Eusebius says in the passage lately cited from him, that it had not been delivered as a 'catholic writing' or scripture: and secondly, in that it is not quoted in any of the remaining works of Clement. If it had been reckoned by him a book of that character, it is very probable it would have been there quoted.

4. Clement has a passage too, which Grabe^x supposes to have been in a book called the Acts of Peter: but if it was, it is plain this book was not owned by Clement, as a book of scripture; since he has never quoted it, and this passage is introduced by Clement as an uncertain report. 'They say^y therefore of Peter,' and what follows: which shows, it is a matter of which he was not well assured.

5. Clement has likewise^z cited a book called Traditions

tion to heaven, before the building of Jerusalem, as all these things had been written, which he was to suffer, and which should be after him."'. Str. l. vi. p. 678. A. B. [*καθως εγγραπτο ταυτα παντα, α εδει αυτον παθειν, και μετ' αυτον α εσαι.* So I propose these words should be pointed, and I have translated them accordingly.] For the original words I must refer the more learned and inquisitive to St. Clement himself: but every one may judge of the probability of this argument from what we shall hereafter produce out of the Sibylline books. I would only observe farther at present, that whereas Peter in this second passage speaks of the 'books of the prophets,' in the style of the christian writers about this time, the Sibyl is often called a prophet or prophethess, particularly by St. Clement himself. Adm. ad Gent. p. 17. B. 32. D. 33. A. In the first of these quotations likewise he calls the Sibyls, prophets. So also Theoph. ad Aut. l. ii. p. 112. A. B. Nor ought it to be reckoned any objection against this opinion, that this book was cited by Heracleon, a follower of Valentinus, as we learn from Origen. Comm. in Johan. T. xiv. p. 211. E. Indeed, Heracleon is placed by Grabe at the year 123. Spic. T. i. p. 62. But his age is not certain. Vid. Massuet, Dissert. præv. in Irenæ. p. 52. sect. 93. He might live much longer. His master Valentinus continued to the time of Anicetus, as we are assured by so good authority as that of St. Irenæus, l. iii. cap. 4. sect. 3. It is needless to guess at the writer of the Preaching of Peter; but possibly he is the author of the Sibylline Verses. He might well be fond of so curious a work, and recommend it in his following performances: it is very likely they were not his only forgery. See Jones, New and Full Method, vol. i. p. 453—456.

^w Sect. 41, 48, 49.

^x Vid. Spic. Patr. T. i. p. 79.

^y Φασι γωνν τον μακαριον Πετρον, κ. λ. Str. l. vii. p. 736. B.

^z Μαθηας εν ταις παραδοσει παρανων. Str. l. ii. p. 380. A.

of Matthias, or Traditions in general, in which are some words ascribed to Matthias. But, from the places in which he mentions these Traditions, it is evident^a he did not rely upon them, if he did not think them forged by some heretics. The passages of Clement, in which he mentions or refers to these Traditions, are collected by Grabe^b and^c Jones, to whom the reader is referred. There is no need we should insist any longer upon them here.

But, beside the passages collected by those learned men from Clement's remaining Greek works, there^d is another passage in the Latin Adumbrations upon the first epistle of St. John, taken from some traditions: which passage supposeth the genuineness of that epistle of St. John. Beausobre is of opinion, that^e this passage was in a work of Leucius, called Travels of the Apostles.^f

6. Clement has also a saying, which he is supposed to ascribe to our Lord: 'Ask,'^g says he, 'great things, and the small shall be added to you.' These words are not exactly in any of our gospels, and it has been suspected that he took them out of some other gospel; but it has been sufficiently shown, that Clement owned only our four gospels. This passage may be allowed then to be a loose quotation of the sense of Matt. vi. 33, without confining himself exactly to the words of the text. Mr. Jones^h was much of this opinion, when he says: 'Clement rather chose to expound the words, [of Matt. vi. 33.] than literally to cite them. And this is most undeniably proved by another place, which I find in the same Clement, where he both produces the text, and these words

^a Λεγασι γαρ [Carpocratiani] και τον Μαθθιαν οὕτως διδάξει. Str. l. iii. p. 436. D. Vid. et Str. l. vii. p. 765. B. ^b Spic. Patr. T. ii. p. 117, 118. ^c New and Full Method of settling the canonical Authority of the N. T. vol. i. p. 316. et seq.

^d Fertur ergo in traditionibus, quoniam Joannes ipsum corpus quod erat extrinsecus tangens manum suam in profunda misisse, et ei duritiam carnis nullo modo reluctatam esse, sed locum manui præbuisse discipuli. Propter quod et infert: Et manus nostræ contrectaverunt de verbo vitæ, &c. Adumbr. in 1 Joh. i. 1. p. 1009.

^e Comme on opposoit aux Docetes la prédication et les écrits des apôtres, il y en eut d'assez hardis pour composer de faux Actes de ces saints hommes, où ils les faisoient parler conformément à leurs erreurs. C'est ce que fit en particulier Leuce Carin, dans un livre, qu'il intitula Les Voyages des Apôtres. Clement d'Alexandrie l'a cité sous le nom de Traditions, dans un petit Commentaire sur la 1 Ep. de S. Jean.—Nous verrons tout à l'heure, que cette fable se trouvoit dans Les Voyages de S. Jean par Leuce. Beaus. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 383. ^f See ch. lxiii. sect. vi. numb. ix.

^g Αιτεισθε γαρ, φησι, τα μεγαλα, και τα μικρα υμων προζησηται. Str. l. i. p. 346. B. ^h As before, p. 553.

‘ as an exposition. Seek ye first theⁱ kingdom of heaven ‘ and its righteousness, “ for these are the great things ; ‘ but the small things,” and things relating to this life, ‘ these shall be added to you.’ Perhaps this exposition was added to the 33d verse of the sixth chapter of Matthew, in some copies of that gospel. The curious may do well to consult Mill upon the place.

This is the only ‘ saying of Christ,’ not in our gospels, taken out of Clement, in Grabe’s collection^k of these things. As for any quotations of words of Christ from the gospel according to the Hebrews, or the gospel according to the Egyptians, we have sufficiently considered them already, in what has been said of those gospels.

I think, upon the whole, it appears that there is no good reason to suppose that St. Clement received as ‘ scripture,’ in the highest sense of the word, any christian writings beside the books of the New Testament, now commonly received by us.

XIV. I have as yet taken no particular notice of St. Clement’s opinion of the Sibylline books: for, if they are genuine, they are not a christian, but a Jewish or a heathen writing, published long before the nativity of our Saviour. However, I think myself obliged to acknowledge, before I conclude this chapter, that St. Clement, St. Theophilus, and some other Greek fathers of the second century, had a much greater respect for the Sibyls than they deserved: for I am well satisfied that the Sibylline Verses quoted by them are the forgery of some christian. The ancient Sibylline Verses did not recommend the worship of the one God alone, condemning all manner of idolatry, as these do which are cited by ^l Justin, ^m Theophilus, and ⁿ Clement: not to mention at present any other things. Nevertheless it must be owned, that Clement calls the Sibyl a prophetess, and seems to quote her verses as scripture,^o in the strictest sense of the word,^p together with the scriptures of

ⁱ Ζητετε δε πρωτον την βασιλειαν των ουρανων, και την δικαιοσυνην ταυτα γαρ μεγαλα τα δε μικρα, και περι τον βιον, ταυτα προστιθησεται υμιν. Str. l. iv. p. 488. A.

^l Cohort. ad Gr. p. 16, 17.

^m Ad Autol. l. ii. p. 112, 113.

ⁿ Admon. ad Gent. p. 32. D. 41. β. et alibi.

^o Ὅρα τουνυ, — επι τας προφητικας ειναι γραφας — γραφαι δε αι θειαι, και πολιτεια σωφρονες, συντομοι σωτηριας οδοι. — αυτικα γυν η προφητις ημιν απατω πρωτη Σιβυλλα το ασμα το σωτηριον. — ενθεις σφοδρα την μεν απατην απικαζουσα τω σκοτει. — Ιερεμιας δε ο προφητης, ο πανσοφος, μαλλον δε εν Ιερεμια το αγιον πνευμα. κ. λ. Adm. ad G. p. 50. C. D. 51. A.

^p If the Sibylline Verses are the prophetic books recommended in the Preaching of Peter, as appears probable from what has been said at note ^v, p. 255, 256, they seem to be represented also as ancient and divine scripture by the author

the Old Testament: so that if there be any books improperly advanced by him into the rank of sacred scripture, we may say that the Sibylline are the books. But yet, after all, I think it not likely that he did esteem them of equal authority with the books of the Jewish canon.

I shall observe but one thing more: That Clement himself affords us evidence, that those verses, which he quotes to the Greeks, were rejected by them in his time. For having proposed to them the ‘Sibyl^a’ prophetess, as a mistress’ to teach them, and quoted some verses from her, he adds: ‘But^r if you do not choose to hearken to a prophetess, hear your philosopher, the Ephesian Heraclitus.’ Why should they not hearken to a prophetess as readily as to a philosopher? Clement gives us the reason: the philosopher was theirs, the prophetess not. The heathen people therefore knew nothing of these verses till they were found out, or rather forged, by some christian, and then incautiously and imprudently recommended by others.

CHAP. XXIII.

POLYCRATES. HIS HISTORY.

POLYCRATES^a was bishop of the church of Ephesus, the latter part of the second century. He was the eighth christian bishop of his family. About the year 196, he called a numerous synod of the bishops of Asia, upon occasion of the controversy about the time of celebrating Easter, which was then kept by the churches of Asia Minor on the fourteenth day of the moon, on whatever day of the week it happened; but by the Romans, and most other churches, on the Lord’s day following. Victor, bishop of

of that work. I shall transcribe his words, to be considered by those who are so disposed. So Peter goes on in the place there cited: *Καθως εγγραπτο ταυτα παντα, α εδει αυτον παθειν, και μετ’ αυτον α εσαι. Ταυτα εν επιγροντες, επιτευσαμεν τω Θεω δια των γεγραμμενων εις αυτον. Και μετ’ ολιγα επιφerei παλιν, θεια προνοια τας προφητειας γεγενησθαι παριτας ωδε. Εγνωμεν γαρ οτι ο Θεος αυτα προσεταξεν οντως, και κθεν ατερ γραφης λεγομεν.* Str. l. vi. p. 678. B. ^q Διδασκαλον δε ημιν παραθησομαι την προφητιν Συβυλλαν. Adm. ad G. p. 32. D.

^r Συ δε, αλλ’ ει μη προφητεος επακκεις, τα γε σε ακασον φιλοσοφα τα Εφεσια Ηρακλειτη. Ibid. p. 33. B.

^a V.d. Eus. H. E. l. iii. cap. 31. l. v. cap. 24.

Rome, required the bishops of Asia to follow the custom of other churches. Polycrates, having consulted the bishops of Asia, wrote a letter with their approbation to Victor and the church of Rome, declaring their resolution to keep Easter at the time they had hitherto observed it: whereupon Victor excommunicated^b all the churches of Asia, and those in their neighbourhood. Of this epistle there are two fragments in Eusebius. This is in short the history of Polycrates. It will be confirmed by that part of his letter which I am now about to transcribe, so far as is suitable to our purpose.

Only I would first of all observe, that^c confirms the account given by Eusebius: and farther speaks of Polycrates as a person of considerable capacity and authority; and says, he flourished in the time of the emperor Severus, who began his reign in 193.

‘We therefore,’ says^d Polycrates, ‘observe the true and genuine day, neither adding nor detracting any thing. For in Asia there are great lights buried, which shall be raised up in the day of the Lord’s advent, in which he shall come with glory from heaven, and shall raise up all his saints; as Philip, one of the twelve apostles; and moreover John,^e who leaned upon the Lord’s breast. And what need I mention Melito, the eunuch, who conducted himself in all things by the Spirit; who rests in Sardis, expecting the visitation from heaven, at which he shall rise from the dead? All^f these have kept the day of Easter on the fourteenth day according to the gospel; not transgressing in the least, but following the rule [or canon] of faith. And so have I Polycrates, who am the least of all, according to the tradition of my relations, some of whom also I have followed; for seven of my relations have been bishops, and I am the eighth; and my relations always kept the day, when the people [of the Jews] cast away their leaven. I therefore, brethren, who^g am sixty-five years of age in the Lord, and who have conversed with the brethren in many

^o Eus. l. v. c. 24. p. 192. B. C. et Socrat. H. E. l. v. c. 22. p. 284. B.

^c Hæc propterea posui, ut ingenium et auctoritatem viri ex parvo opusculo demonstrarem. Floruit temporibus Severi principis. De Vir. Ill. cap. 45.

^d Ap. Eus. p. 191.

^e Ἐπι δε και Ιωαννης ο επι το σηθος

Κυριου αναπεσων.

^f Ουτοι παντες ετηρησαν την ημεραν της τεσσαρεσκαιεκατης τσ πασχα κατα το ευαγγελιον, μηδεν παρεκβαινοντες, αλλα κατα τον κανονα της πιτewς ακολοθωντες. p. 191. D.

^g Εγω ουν, αδελφοι, εξηκοντα πεντε ετη εχων εν Κυριω, και συμβεβληκως τοις απο της οικουμενης αδελφοις, και πασαν αγιαν γραφην διεληλυθως, ε πυρρομαι επι τοις καταπλησσομενοις. Οι γαρ εμς μειζονες ειρηκασι, πειθαρχειν δε Θεω μαλλον η ανθρωποις. p. 192. A.

parts of the world, and have read over all the holy scripture, am not moved at what I am threatened with. For they who are greater than me have said: "We ought to obey God rather than men," Acts v. 29.

We are at present to observe only what has a relation to any particular books of the New Testament, or to the collection of them in general.

When Polycrates calls Melito an eunuch, possibly he refers to Matt. xix. 12, where our Lord says: "There be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."

When he observes of John, that he 'leaned on the Lord's breast:' he very probably refers to those places of St. John's gospel where this particular is mentioned: as ch. xiii. 25; xxi. 20.

Where he says, that greater than he had said: "We ought to obey God rather than men," there is an undoubted reference to Acts v. 29.

He moreover speaks of many who had observed this feast on the fourteenth day 'according to the gospel;' probably meaning thereby the collection of gospels, which he likewise calls the rule of faith.

Lastly, he says, he had 'read over all the holy scripture;' meaning, it is likely, the scripture of the Old and the New Testament, and perhaps those of the New in particular.

This testimony needs not be summed up: it lies in a short compass.

CHAP. XXIV.

HERACLITUS,

And several other writers near the end of the second century.

HERACLITUS, says^a Cave, flourished about the year 196. He is mentioned by Eusebius in his^b Ecclesiastical History, together with several other writers of the church, who lived in the reign of Commodus and Severus, or about that time.

^a Hist. Lit. p. 60.

^b L. v. cap. 27.

‘ Moreover,’ says he, ‘ there still remain, in the hands of many, divers monuments of the laudable industry of those ancient and ecclesiastical men. Of such of them as have come to our knowledge^c are the writings [or commentaries] of Heraclitus upon the apostle: and of Maximus, concerning the question so much discoursed of among the heretics, Whence proceeds evil? and concerning the creation of matter: and of Candidus upon the six days’ work, and of Appion upon the same argument. Likewise the treatise of Sextus on the resurrection, and a book of Arabianus, and innumerable other:’ whose time, Eusebius says, he did not know. He goes on: ‘ There are besides treatises of many others, whose names we have not been able to learn;’^d orthodox and ecclesiastical men, as the interpretations of the divine scripture given by each one of them manifest.’

St. Jerom has inserted a short account, in his Book of Illustrious Men, of all these writers, whom Eusebius has mentioned by name; of ^e Heraclitus, ^f Maximus, ^g Candidus, ^h Appion, ⁱ Sextus, and ^k Arabianus. And Eusebius in another work^l has preserved a large fragment of Maximus, of whom he there gives a great encomium.

Of Heraclitus St. Jerom^m says, agreeably to Eusebius, ‘ In the time of Commodus and Severus he wrote commentaries upon the apostle:’ by which is generally understood, that Heraclitus wrote commentaries upon the epistles of St. Paul. It is pity Eusebius, or Jerom, if they had read Heraclitus, did not give us a more particular account of his performance, and how many of the apostle’s epistles he had explained.

I have nothing farther to add here, but that it may be probably concluded that all, or most, of those writers, who, as Eusebius says, had manifested their orthodoxy by their ‘ interpretations of the divine scriptures,’ had taken some notice of the books of the New, as well as of the Old Testament.

^c Ὡν γε μὴν αὐτοὶ διεγνώμεν, εἴη τὰ Ἡρακλεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἀποστόλον. Ibid.

^d Ὀρθοδόξων μὲν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, ὡς γε δὴ ἡ ἕκαστα παραδεικνύσι τῆς θείας γραφῆς ἑρμηνεία. Ibid. ^e Cap. 46. ^f Cap. 47.

^g Cap. 48.

^h Cap. 49.

ⁱ Cap. 50.

^k Cap. 51.

^l Præp. Evan. l. vii. p. 337. A. &c.

^m Heraclitus sub Commodi Severique imperio in apostolorum commentarios composuit. De Vir. Ill. cap. 46.

CHAP. XXV.

HERMIAS.

HERMIAS has left us a short, but elegant discourse, called,^a A Derision, or Banter, of the Gentile Philosophers. In the inscription of this work he has the title of Philosopher; but who he was, and when he lived, is unknown. Some have thought him to be a writer^b of the fourth or fifth century: Cave supposes that he wrote in the second century; whose arguments appear to me sufficient to render his opinion probable. The work itself seems to show, as that learned author^c observes, that Gentilism still prevailed: and Du Pin^d agrees with him, that it was written before the fall of paganism. Tillemont^e likewise thinks the argument of his book gives ground to suppose, it was written in the first ages of the church. I have therefore placed him here in the last year of the second century.

I have not observed, in this discourse, any reference to the books of the New Testament, except a quotation at the very beginning of it, to this purpose: ‘The^f blessed apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians in Laconic Greece, did not speak beside the purpose, when he said: “The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God,”’ I Cor. iii. 19.

^a Ἑρμίας φιλοσοφῆ διασυρμος τῶν ἐξω φιλοσοφῶν.

^b Vid. Cave, Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 50. P. ii. p. 35, 36. Fabric. Bib. Gr. Tom. v. p. 96.

^c Ex toto opusculi contextu constare videtur, vigente adhuc gentilismo scriptum fuisse. Hist. Lit. P. ii. p. 36.

^d Il n’y a pas de doute, qu’il est ancien, et qu’il vivoit avant que la religion payenne fût détruite. Bibl. Eccl. Tom. i.

^e Tout ce que nous en pouvons dire, c’est que son sujet donne lieu de croire, qu’il écrivoit dans les premiers siècles de l’Eglise, où l’on s’occupoit à détruire le paganisme. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. p. i. en Hermogene.

^f Παῦλος ὁ μακάριος ἀποστολος, τοῖς τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὴν Λακωνικὴν παροικεῖσι Κορινθίοις γραφῶν, ὡ ἀγαπητοί, ἀπέφηνατο λεγῶν· Ἡ σοφία τῆς κοσμοῦ τὰς μωρία παρα τῆς Θεοῦ, κα ἀσκοπῶς ἐπιπῶν. p. 175. B. Paris.

CHAP. XXVI.

SERAPION.

WE have already seen the testimony of two bishops of the church of Antioch, Ignatius and Theophilus; under which last we observed the succession of the bishops of that church from the time of the apostles. Theophilus was succeeded^a by Maximin, about the year 181; and he by Serapion, the eighth in that succession, who was bishop from about^b the year 190 to 211, or somewhat later. I may therefore well place him here, at the year 200.

Eusebius^c says, Serapion wrote many pieces: but he had not seen any of them, beside a letter to Caracus and Ponticus, concerning the Montanists; another to Dominus, who in the time of the persecution [probably that of Severus] forsook the faith of Christ, and turned Jew; and some other epistles. ‘There is also,’ says Eusebius, ‘another book of his concerning the gospel, entitled, according to Peter, wherein he confutes the falsities of that Gospel; which book he composed for the sake of some in the parish of Rhossus, [in Cilicia,] who by means of that writing were led into heterodox opinions. It cannot be improper to transcribe some short passages, in which he declares his sentiment of that book. “We,^d brethren, receive Peter, and the other apostles, as Christ: but, as skilful men, we reject those writings which are falsely ascribed to them; well knowing, that we have received no such. When I was with you, I supposed you had all held the right faith: and, not having read the Gospel offered to me under the name of Peter, I said, if that be the only thing that causeth a difference among you, let it be read. But now having understood, by what has been told me, that their minds are secretly filled with some heresy, I will do

^a Vid. Eus. H. E. l. iv. cap. 24. l. v. cap. 19.

^b Vid. Cave, Hist. Lat. p. 52. Du Pin, Bibl. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. ii. Les Montanistes, Art. iv. et T. iii. Serapion. ^c H. E. l. vi. c. 12.

^d Ἡμεῖς γὰρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς ἀποστολῆς ἀποδεχομεθα, ὡς Χριστὸν τὰ ἐκ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδέπιγραφα, ὡς ἐμπειροὶ παραιτημέθα γινώσκοντες, ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελαβόμεν. Ἐγὼ γὰρ, γενομένος παρ’ ἡμῶν, ἔπενονεν τῆς παντὰς ὀρθῆ πίτι προσφέρεισθαι. Καὶ μὴ διελθὼν τὸ ἐπ’ αὐτῶν προφερομένην ὀνοματι Πέτρῳ εὐαγγελίον, εἶπον· Ὅτι εἰ τῆτο ἐτι μορον τὸ ἔοκαν παρεχίν μικροψυχῶν, ἀναγινοσκεισθω. κ. λ. Ibid.

‘ my endeavour to come to you again : therefore, brethren,
 ‘ you may expect me shortly. And we, brethren, have
 ‘ found what was the heresy of Marcianus, and that he
 ‘ contradicted himself, not understanding what he said : as
 ‘ you may perceive from what is here written to you. For
 ‘ we have obtained the sight of that Gospel from others that
 ‘ make use of it ; that is, from the successors of those who
 ‘ were the authors of that opinion, whom we call^e Docetæ
 ‘ (for the chief sentiments of it belong to that sect). Hav-
 ‘ ing^f therefore obtained it of them to read it over, we have
 ‘ found that the main part of the book is agreeable to the
 ‘ right doctrine of our Saviour. Nevertheless there are
 ‘ some other things added, which we have noted down, and
 ‘ sent to you.”’

Jerom, in his book of *Illustrious Men*,^g says : ‘ Serapion
 ‘ was ordained bishop of Antioch in the eleventh year of
 ‘ Commodus,’ or the year of our Lord 191. His catalogue
 of Serapion’s works is agreeable to that in Eusebius. He
 says, particularly, ‘ That^h he wrote a book concerning the
 ‘ Gospel, that goes under the name of Peter, which he sent
 ‘ to the church of Rhossus in Cilicia, which had been led
 ‘ into heresy by reading of it.’

The fragment of this book deserves some remarks.

1. We see the great respect paid by christians to the writings of the apostles. Serapion assures us, the church received the apostles as Christ; that is, their writings, as the very words and doctrine spoken and preached by Christ himself.

2. We see his method of judging of the genuineness and authority of any books of scripture : those which had been delivered with an authentic tradition, as the apostles, he received : others he rejected.

3. The book called the Gospel of Peter was no part of canonical scripture, nor any writing of Peter : it had not been delivered as such.

4. We learn the obscurity of this book, called the Gospel of Peter. Here is a bishop of the large and celebrated church of Antioch, about the end of the second century, who had never read it, or seen it : and who, as far as we are able to judge, was not unworthy of his high office. He

^e They denied that Jesus Christ had a true human body.

^f Χρησαμενοι παρ’ αυτων διελθειν’ και εδρειν μεν τα πλειονα τς ορθς λογς τς Σωτηρος’ τινα δε προσδυσαλμενα, α και υπεταξαμεν υμιν. Ibid.

^g Cap. 41.

^h Et alium de evangelio, quod sub nomine Petri fertur, librum ad Rhossensem Ciliciæ ecclesiam, quæ in hæresim ejus lectione diverterat. Ibid.

seems to have been a learned man, and a vigilant pastor. He wrote divers treatises and epistles. This book concerning the Gospel of Peter, which he composed for the benefit of the christians at Rhossus, is a good proof of his ability and diligence. Nothing could be more to the purpose, to demonstrate the obscurity and insignificance of the book called, the Gospel of Peter, than this letter or treatise of Serapion. It is plain, it was in no repute with the catholic christians: nor could Serapion find a copy of it among them. In order to procure a sight of it, he was obliged to send to some of those called Docetæ, and borrow it of them.

5. It may at first appear somewhat strange, that he should consent to the use of this writing: but really there is nothing at all strange or improper in it. Serapion supposed the people of Rhossus had all held the right faith: and not having read the book complained of by some, he took it for granted, it was a pious orthodox book, which christians might read with edification. Being also a lover of peace, and unwilling to deliver unnecessary precepts, he consented to their use of it. However, he prudently took an opportunity to procure and examine this writing: and having perceived there were in it some false and absurd notions, mixed with those which are true and right, he was at the pains of collecting the several errors of it in a distinct treatise, which he immediately sent away to Rhossus: and promises them a second visit upon this occasion, if needful. Thus acted this christian bishop of Antioch.

Grabe,ⁱ and Beausobre,^k suppose this Gospel of Peter to have been a composition of Leucius, the famous forger of apocryphal pieces.

ⁱ Evangelium Petri fuisse reor figmentum Leucii hæretici, seculo ii. plura ejusmodi eudentis, eaque nominibus apostolorum supponentis. Grabe, Spic. T. i. p. 58.

^k Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 349, 350, 358, 375, et 458.

CHAP. XXVII.

TERTULLIAN.

- I. *His history, works, time, and character.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures of the N. T. particularly the four gospels.* III. *The integrity of St. Luke's gospel.* IV. *Upon what grounds he receives the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke.* V. *More passages concerning the four gospels.* VI. *Of the Acts of the Apostles.* VII. *St. Paul's epistles.* VIII. *The meaning of authentic letters.* IX. *Of the epistle to the Hebrews.* X. *He received thirteen epistles of St. Paul.* XI. *Of the Catholic epistles.* XII. *The Revelation.* XIII. *A summary of the books received by him.* XIV. *The integrity of the Scriptures.* XV. *Their authority.* XVI. *General titles and divisions.* XVII. *The order of the books of the N. T.* XVIII. *Of chapters.* XIX. *A Latin translation in his time.* XX. *The Scriptures of the N. T. open to all men.* XXI. *Whether he cites apocryphal books.* XXII. *A book forged in the name of St. Paul.* XXIII. *The conclusion.*

I. 'QUINTUS SEPTIMIUS FLORENS TERTULLIANUS,' or Tertullian, generally reckoned the most ancient Latin father now remaining, was born at Carthage, the capital city of Africa, not long after the middle of the second century. His father^a was a proconsular centurion, that is, a military officer under the proconsul of Africa, which is not reckoned to have been a post of any great consideration. Tertullian was well acquainted with the Roman laws; but it does not appear that he went to the bar, or any other way practised the law as a profession. He had besides read the Greek and Roman poets, historians, orators, philosophers, and other heathen writers of all sorts, as his works show abundantly. His skill in Greek was so considerable, that he^b wrote several books in that language.

^a Vid. Tertull. Apol. cap. 9. p. 10. A. et Hieron. in Chron. et De Vir. Ill. cap. 53.

^b Sed et huic materix propter suaviludios nostros Græco quoque stilo satisfecimus. De Coronâ, c. 6. ad fin. p. 123. D. Sed de isto plenius jam nobis, in Græco digestum est. De Baptismo, cap. 15. p. 262. D. At ego, si quid utriusque linguæ præscripsi. Adv. Praxeam, cap. 3. p. 636. A Paris. 1634.

From divers^c expressions of Tertullian in his works, it is concluded by learned men that he was once a heathen: whether they afford full proof of this, may be disputed. They may be however allowed, together with his father's profession of a soldier, to be sufficient to render it probable. We have no particular account of the time, or circumstances, of his conversion. He was a man of a lively fancy, as well as extensive knowledge, but of a severe temper. The character of his style given by^d Lactantius may be allowed by all: that it is 'rugged and unpolished, and 'very obscure:' and yet, as^e Cave observes, 'it is lofty 'and masculine, and carries a kind of majestic eloquence 'along with it, that gives a pleasant relish to the judicious 'and inquisitive reader.' He wrote a multitude of books, some of which are lost: but there still remains a good number, some composed before, others after he embraced the errors of Montanism. His apology is a master-piece; and his other performances are written with wit and force, and are edifying and instructive. Though he had a great deal of vehemence and positiveness in his constitution, there appear^f in his writings frequent tokens of true unaffected humility and modesty; virtues in which the primitive christians were generally so very eminent.

The ecclesiastical writers mentioned by him (not to insist on any reputed heretical authors) are ^g Hermas, ^h Justin

^c Hæc et nos risimus aliquando; de vestris fuimus. Apol. cap. 18. Pœnitentiam, hoc genus hominum, quod et ipsi retro fuimus, cæci sine Domini luce, naturâ tenus nôrunt, &c. De Pœnit. c. i. Vid. et De Spectaculis, c. xix. p. 99. A. De Resurrectione, c. xlix. p. 427. A.

^d Septimius quoque Tertullianus fuit omni genere literarum peritus, sed in eloquendo parum facilis, et minus comptus, et multum obscurus fuit. Divin. Inst. l. v. c. 1.

^e Lives of the Primitive Fathers, p. 211.

^f Literæ ad hoc seculares necessariæ: de suis enim instrumentis secularia probari necesse est. *Quantulas attigi*, credo sufficient. De Coronâ, cap. vii. Nec tantus ego sum, ut vos alloquar; et quæ sequuntur. Ad Martyres, cap. i. Confiteor ad Dominum Deum, satis temere me, si non etiam impudenter de patientiâ componere ausum, cui præstandæ idoneus non sim, ut homo nullius boni. De Patientiâ, cap. i. It seems that Tertullian had convinced Praxeas that he had been in an error, and brought him to a recantation; yet he expresseth himself in this modest manner: Fruticaverant avenæ Praxeanae, hic [Carthagine] quoque superseminatæ, — — — trductæ dehinc *per quam Deus voluit*, etiam avulsæ videbantur. Contr. Prax. cap. i. p. 634. D. Vid. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. Tertullien, artic. iii. Pagi, Crit. in Baron. 171. sect. 3. Tho. Ittig, de Hæresiarchis, sect. ii. cap. 16. p. 237.

^g De Oratione, cap. 12. p. 154. A. De Pudicitia, cap. 10. p. 727. A. B. et cap. 20. p. 741. C.

^h Ut Justinus philosophus et martyr, ut Miltiades ecclesiarum sophista, ut Irenæus omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator, ut Proculus noster, virginis senectæ, et christianæ eloquentiæ dignitas: quos in omni opere fidei, quemadmodum in isto, optaverim assequi. Adv. Valent. cap. v. p. 291. B.

Martyr, Miltiades, Proculus, once a catholic, afterwards a Montanist: of all whom (excepting Hermas) he speaks together, with great respect. And inⁱ another place he makes a general mention of divers christian authors who had written learned defences of their religion against the Gentiles.

Having given this general account of Tertullian, I shall next put down some of the testimonies of the ancients, and then proceed to the observations of the moderns.

Lactantius, in the place just cited, where he censures Tertullian's style, says, he was 'well skilled in all parts of learning;' and, in another place, that^k 'he had fully defended the christian cause in his Apology.' Eusebius says, in his Ecclesiastical History, where he several times quotes Tertullian's Apology, that^l 'he was extremely well acquainted with the Roman laws: eminent likewise on other accounts, and especially celebrated at Rome;' or, as Valesius renders it, 'and most renowned among the Latin writers.'

I believe we may do well to take here entire St. Jerom's history of this father, in his book of Illustrious Men. 'Tertullian, a^m presbyter, is now reckoned, after Victor and Apollonius, the first of the Latins. He was born in the province of Africa, in the city of Carthage. His father was a proconsular centurion. He was a man of anⁿ eager and vehement temper: flourished chiefly in the time of the emperors Severus and Antoninus Caracalla: and wrote a great number of books, which, because they are generally known, I omit. I have seen one Paul of Concordia, which is a small town in Italy, then an old man, who said, that when he was very young, he had seen the secretary of the blessed Cyprian, then of a great age: and^o that he was wont to tell him, that not a day passed but Cyprian read something in Tertullian: and that he would often say to him, "Bring me my master," intend-

ⁱ Nonnulli quidem, quibus de pristina literaturâ et curiositatis labor et memoriæ tenor perseveravit, ad gentes opuscula penes nos condiderunt. De Testimon. Animæ, cap. i. p. 80. B.

^k Quamquam Tertullianus eandem causam plene peroraverit in eo libro, cui Apologetico nomen est. Divin. Instit. lib. v. cap. 4.

^l Ταῦτα Τερτουλλιανος τῆς Ῥωμαίων νομῆς ἠκριβωκώς ἀνηρ τα τε ἀλλὰ ἐνδοξος, καὶ τῶν μαλιστα ἐπι Ῥωμῆς λαμπρῶν. H. E. l. ii. cap. 2. p. 41. B.

^m Tertullianus presbyter nunc demum primus post Victorem et Apollonium Latinorum ponitur.

ⁿ Hic acris et vehementis ingenii.

^o Referreque sibi solitum, nunquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diem præterisse, ac sibi crebro dicere, 'Da magistrum;' Tertullianum videlicet significans.

‘ing:^p Tertullian. When he had continued a presbyter of the church till about the middle part of his age, on account of the envy and reproaches of the clergy of the Roman church, he went over to the sect of Montanus: and in many of his books makes mention of that new prophecy. Several books especially were composed by him against the church, as these: Of Chastity, Of Persecution, Of Fasts, Of Monogamy, [or, against second marriages,] Of Ecstasy, in six books: to which he added a seventh, written against Apollonius. He is said to have lived to an extreme [or decrepit] old age: and to have written many books beside those which are now extant.’

In his Chronicle, at the 15th of Severus, and 208th year of our Lord, Jerom says: ‘Tertullian,^q an African, son of a proconsular centurion, is famous in all the churches.’

Jerom has in other places extolled Tertullian’s wit and learning, and says: ‘His Apology,^r and his other books against the Gentiles, take in all the treasures of human learning.’

The encomium of Tertullian, given by Vincentius Lirinensis, a writer of the fifth century, is beautiful, but too long to be transcribed, and had better be read in himself. The sum of it is in the very beginning: That, ‘as^s Origen had the first place among the Greeks, so Tertullian ought to be esteemed without dispute the prince of the Latin writers of the church.’

So far of testimonies from the ancients. I shall now represent the sentiments of some learned moderns.

Cave^t places Tertullian at the year 192. He supposes he might be born a little before the middle of the second century, and that he embraced christianity about the year 185, and was made a presbyter of the church of Carthage about 192. What Jerom says of Tertullian’s leaving the catholic church about the middle of his age, is understood by that learned writer not of his natural, but christian life:

^p It is observed by learned men, that Tertullian is not once quoted by Cyprian, in his works now extant. Nevertheless, in another place Jerom says positively, that Cyprian’s works show he esteemed Tertullian his master. Et beatus Cyprianus Tertulliano magistro utitur, ut ejus scripta probant. Hieron. ep. 69. And it is allowed that he imitates Tertullian in some of his remaining works.

^q Tertullianus, Afer, centurionis proconsularis filius, omnium ecclesiarum sermone celebratur. p. 172. Amsterd. 1658.

^r Quid Tertulliano eruditius? quid acutius? Apologeticus ejus et Contra Gentes libri cunctam sæculi obtinent disciplinam. Ad Magnum Oratorem, ep. 84.

^s Sed et Tertulliani quoque eadem ratio est; nam sicut ille apud Græcos, ita et hic apud Latinos, nostrorum omnium facile princeps judicandus est. Commonitorium adv. Heres. cap. 24. init.

^t Hist. Lit.

he therefore concludes, he became a Montanist about the year 199, and died, as may be conjectured, about 220.

Du Pin^u says, Tertullian flourished chiefly in the time of Severus and Antoninus Caracalla: that is, from about the year 194 to 216.

Tillemont^v computes him to have been born in 160, under Antoninus Pius, or his successor; to have left the church, and become an open Montanist, about 205; and to have died under Philip, about the year 245, when he was between 80 and 90 years of age.

Many learned^w men have employed their labour in settling the time of the several works of this author. They generally divide them into two periods, those written before, and those after his fall into Montanism. I shall only observe some of their opinions concerning the date of the Apology, the most celebrated of all his pieces. Cave reckons but three of his books, written whilst he was a catholic; Of Baptism, Of Penitence, and Of Prayer; and thinks the Apology to have been written about the year 202. Du Pin places his Apology in 200, before he became Montanist, which, according to him, happened in 202 or 203. Tillemont likewise places it at the year 200; Basnage^x in 203; Pagi^y in 205, but I think his arguments not sufficient to prove it so late; and Mr. Mosheim, after a very laborious examination of this point, concludes that^z it was composed in the year 198. The Apology, as is now generally allowed by learned men, was not addressed to the senate of Rome, but to^a the governors of provinces, or perhaps to the proconsul of Africa, and the chief magistrates residing at Carthage, where it was written.

I am desirous to speak of Tertullian about the time of his writing his Apology. He is often reckoned a writer of the second century; but a large part of his remaining works were written in the third century. I place him therefore at the year 200, which I take to be soon enough.

^u Nouv. Bib. des Aut. Ecc. Tertullien. iii. Tertullien, art. 13.

^v Mem. Ecc. Tom.

^w Joseph. Scal. Animadv. ad Euseb. Chron. p. 229. Cave, Hist. Lit. Allix, Disserta. de Vit. et Scriptis Tertulliani. Du Pin, Bibl. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. Basnage, Annal. P. E. 200. sect. 4, 5, 6, et seq. Pagi, Vid. indicem Crit. in Baron. V. Tertullianus.

^x Ibid. A. D. 200. sect. 8.

^y Crit. in Baron. A. D. 199. sect. 6.

^z Vid. ejusd. Diss. de Ætate Apol. Tertull. n. xxix, xxx.

^a The Apology begins: Si non licet vobis, Romani imperii antistites, in aperto et edito, in ipso fere vertice civitatis præsidentibus ad judicandum, palam dispicere, &c. Apol. cap. 1. Hoc imperium, cujus ministri estis, civilis, non tyrannica dominatio est. Cap. 2. p. 3. D. Hoc agite, boni præsides. Cap. 30. p. 30. C. Vid. et cap. ult. p. 45. B.

Tertullian's conversion to Montanism is a remarkable event in his life; but we know little of the causes of that change in him, beside what Jerom says, who ascribes it to the envy and reproaches of the Roman clergy. Divers other particular reasons have been assigned by some moderns; as, a disappointment of the bishopric of Rome, or Carthage: but Tertullian is now generally acquitted by learned men of that charge. Some indeed do still conjecture, that the specious pretences of the Montanists to greater mortification in fasts and continence had an effect upon Tertullian, who was of a severe temper; which is not improbable.

However, the principles of Montanism made so little alteration in this author, that there are several of his pieces, concerning which it is not easy to determine, whether they were written by Tertullian a Montanist, or Tertullian still a catholic. To use the words of^b Daille: ‘As for Tertullian, I must confess his very turning Montanist has taken off indeed very much of the repute which he before had in the church, both for the fervency of his piety, and also for his incomparable learning. But yet, beside that a great part of his works were written while he was yet a catholic, we are also to take notice, that this his Montanism put no separation at all betwixt him and other christians, save only in point of discipline; which he, according to the severity of his nature, would have to be most harsh and rigorous. For as for his doctrine, it^c is very evident that he constantly kept to the very same rule, and the same faith, that the catholics did: whence proceeded that tart speech of his: That^d “people rejected Montanus, Maximilla, and Priscilla, not because they had any whit departed from the rule of faith, but rather because they would have us fast oftener than to marry.”’

Tertullian nevertheless, from this time forward, believed^e

^b Right Use of the Fathers, b. ii. ch. 4. p. 69. London, 1675.

^c Vid. lib. De Monogam. cap. 2. &c. et De Jejuniiis, cap. 1.

^d Hi Paraceto controversiam faciunt; propter hoc novæ prophetiæ recusantur; non quod alium Deum prædicent Montanus, et Priscilla, et Maximilla; nec quod Jesum Christum solvant; nec quod aliquam fidei aut spei regulam evertant; sed quod plane doceant sæpius jejunare quam nubere. De Jejuniiis, cap. 1. p. 701. C.

^e Sed et si nubendi jam modus ponitur, quem quidem apud nos spiritalis ratio, Paraceto auctore, defendit, unum in fide matrimonium præscribens. Adv. Marcion, l. i. p. 452. B. Hanc et Ezechiel novit, et apostolus Joannes vidit, et qui apud fidem nostram est, novæ prophetiæ sermo testatur, ut etiam effigiem civitatis ante representationem ejus conspectui futuram in signum prædicarit. Adv. Marcion. l. iii. p. 499. B

the Spirit of God to have spoken in Montanus, and his two prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla; and to have made by them some farther discoveries, for the greater perfection of christians, than had been made before. He approved of the longer, more strict, and more frequent fasts of the Montanists; condemned second marriages,^f as unlawful in all; and denied the power of the church to pardon any great sins committed after baptism; that is, to receive again to communion any^g who had fallen into fornication, adultery, or any such like offences after their baptism. He also often arrogantly calls his own people spiritual, and the catholics, as^h contemptuously, animal or carnal.

II. We proceed to consider his testimony to the books of the New Testament.

I begin with a passage of Tertullian concerning the four gospels, and their authors, taken out of his books against Marcion, writtenⁱ in the year of Christ 207 or 208.

‘ In the first^k place we lay this down for a certain truth, that the evangelic^l scriptures [literally, evangelic instrument] have for their authors the apostles, to whom the work of publishing the gospel was committed by the Lord himself. And if also [it have for authors] apostolical men, not them alone, but with the apostles, and after the apostles. [Which was very fit.] Forasmuch as the preaching of the disciples might have been suspected as liable to the charge of a desire of glory, if not supported by the authority of the masters, yea, of Christ, who made the apostles masters. To conclude, among the apostles John

^f Vid. De Monogam. cap. 12. et alibi.

^g Vid. De Pudicitia, cap. 19. p. 740. D. 741.

^h Mirarer Psychicos, si solâ luxuriâ tenderentur, quâ sæpius nubunt; et non etiam ingluvie lacerarentur, quâ jejunia oderunt.—Agnosco igitur animalem fidem studio carnis, quâ tota constat, tam multivorantiæ quam multinubentia pronam; ut merito spiritalem disciplinam pro substantia æmulam, in hac quoque specie continentia accuset. De Jeuniis, cap. 1. p. 701. A. B. Licet nec hoc Psychici curent. De Monog. c. 11. p. 684. A. Evasisti, Psychice, si velis, vincula disciplina totius. Ib. c. 12. p. 685. B.

ⁱ Adv. Marcion, l. i. c. 15. p. 440. B.

^k Constituimus in primis, evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum. Si et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis, et post apostolos. Quoniam prædicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloria studio, si non adsistat illi auctoritas magistrorum, immo Christi, qui magistros apostolos fecit. Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant; ex apostolicis, Lucas et Marcus instaurant, iisdem regulis exorsi, quantum ad unicum Deum attinet creatorem, et Christum ejus, natum ex virgine, supplementum legis et prophetarum. Adv. Marc. l. iv. c. 2. p. 502. D. 503. A.

^l By the evangelical scriptures, in this place, Tertullian means the collection of the gospels.

and Matthew [first] teach us the faith : among apostolical men, Luke and Mark refresh it, going upon the same principles, as concerning the one God the creator, and his Christ born of the virgin, the accomplishment of the law and the prophets.' And soon after : ' But^m Marcion having got the epistle of Paul to the Galatians, who blames the apostles themselves, as not walking uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, [ch. ii. 14,] and also charges some false apostles with perverting the gospel of Christ, sets himself to weaken the credit of those gospelsⁿ which are theirs, and are published under the name of apostles, or likewise of apostolical men.' [That is, are published under the name of apostles, or however of apostles and apostolical men.]

These passages show at once the number of the gospels universally received, the names of the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and their proper characters ; two of which were apostles, and companions of Christ himself ; and the other two apostolical men, or companions of Christ's apostles.

III. In the next passage to be here taken, Tertullian asserts against Marcion the genuineness and integrity of the copies of St. Luke's gospel, owned by himself and christians in general. For this he appeals to divers apostolical churches. He asserts at the same time the truth of the other three gospels ; and that christians had the fullest persuasion of the genuineness and authority of the gospels

^m Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos suggilantis, ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantis pseudapostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum, quæ propria, et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam apostolicorum. Ibid. c. 3. p. 503. C.

ⁿ ' Which are theirs,' or, ' their own,' ' quæ propria,' I have translated literally ; but Tertullian hereby intends likewise ' of the highest authority.' And because all the four gospels are not written by apostles, and therefore, strictly speaking, are not all theirs ; nor, according to Tertullian, in themselves of the first and highest authority ; after saying, they were ' theirs, and published under the name of apostles,' he corrects himself, or represents the case more distinctly ; adding, ' or likewise of apostolical men ;' that is, of apostles, or, however, of apostles and apostolical men. That this is what Tertullian means, is evident from a passage where he joins together the words ' properly' and ' principally,' and ascribes the highest and primary authority to apostles only : *Disciplina igitur apostolorum proprie quidem instruit ac determinat principaliter sanctitatis omnis erga templum Dei antistitem, et ubique de ecclesiâ eradicantem omne sacrilegium pudicitiam, sine ullâ restitutionis mentione. Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos. De Pudicitia, c. 20. p. 741. B. C.*

which they had received, upon the ground of a very sure and credible testimony of the churches, from the time of writing them to his own age.

‘In^o a word,’ says he, ‘if it be certain, that is most genuine which is most ancient, that most ancient which is from the beginning, and that from the beginning which is from the apostles; in like manner it will be also certain, that has been delivered from the apostles which is held sacred in the churches of the apostles. Let us then see, what milk the Corinthians received from Paul; to what the Galatians were reduced; what the Philippians read; what the Thessalonians, the Ephesians, and likewise what the Romans recite, who are near to us, with whom both Peter and Paul left the gospel sealed with their blood. We have also churches which are the disciples of John: for though Marcion rejects his Revelation, the succession of bishops traced up to the beginning will show it to have John for its author. We know also the original of other churches [that is, that they are apostolical]. I say then, that with them, but not with them only which are apostolical, but with all who have fellowship with them in the same faith, is that gospel of Luke received from its first publication, which we so zealously maintain: that is, the genuine entire gospel of Luke, not that which had been curtailed and altered by Marcion. He adds presently afterwards: ‘The same^p authority of the apostolical churches will support the other gospels, which we have from them, and according to them [that is, according to their copies]: I mean John’s and Matthew’s; although that likewise which Mark published may be said to be Peter’s, whose interpreter Mark

^o In summâ, si constat id verius quod prius, id prius quod et ab initio, id ab initio quod ab apostolis; pariter utique constabit, id esse ab apostolis traditum, quod apud ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum. Videamus, quod lac a Paulo Corinthii hauseriat; ad quam regulam Galatæ sint recorrecti; quid legant Philippenses, Thessalonicenses, Ephesii; quid etiam Romani de proximo sonent; quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt. Habemus et Joannis alumnas ecclesias. Nam, etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recens in Joannem stabit auctorem. Sic et cæterarum generositas recognoscitur. Dico itaque apud illas, nec solas jam apostolicas, sed apud universas, quæ illis de societate sacramenti confœderantur, id evangelium Lucæ ab initio editionis suæ stare, quod cum maxime tuemur. Adv. Marcion, l. iv. cap. 5. p. 505. B.

^p Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum cæteris quoque patrocina-bitur evangeliiis, quæ proinde per illas, et secundum illas habemus; Joannis dico et Matthæi; licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri adfirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus: nam et Lucæ Digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Capit magistorum videri, quæ discipuli promulgârint. Ibid. c. 5. p. 505. C. D.

was. For Luke's Digest also is often ascribed to Paul. And indeed it is easy to take that for the master's, which the disciples have published.'

IV. It has been sometimes said, that Tertullian here supposes the gospels of Mark and Luke to have been reviewed, and then approved and confirmed, by the apostles Peter and Paul; since he is willing to allow them to be the gospels of those apostles, though written by apostolical men. But I think that Tertullian means no more, than that they were the gospels of these apostles for the matter or substance of them. He had just before mentioned particularly the authority of the gospels written by Matthew and John, who were apostles: he adds, that the other two, though written by apostolical men, were of the like authority; because it is reasonable to suppose that what the disciples published is the same that was taught by their masters, or perfectly agreeable to their doctrine: and therefore what they have published has in it the very authority of those apostles.

He supposes, likewise, that the gospels of Mark and Luke are confirmed and authorized by the gospels of Matthew and John, without intimating in the least that they were reviewed, and expressly approved, by either of these apostles. This is apparent from what he says at the beginning of the first passage here cited: 'If also apostolical men, not them alone, but with apostles, and after apostles. Forasmuch as the preaching [or work] of the disciples might have been suspected as liable to the charge of a desire of glory, if not supported by the authority of the masters, yea of Christ, who made the apostles masters.'

This is still more apparent from what follows in the same book against Marcion, when he says, that if^a 'Marcion had introduced a gospel under the name of Paul himself, that work alone would not be of sufficient credit, if unsupported by his predecessors. For it would be reasonable to

^a Ut et si sub ipsius Pauli nomine evangelium Marcion intulisset, non sufficeret ad fidem singularitas instrumenti, destituto patrocinio antecessorum. Exigeretur enim id quoque evangelium quod Paulus invenit, cui fidem dedit, cui mox suum congruere gestiit. Siquidem propterea Hierosolymam ascendit ad cognoscendos apostolos et consultandos.----Igitur si ipse illuminator Lucæ auctoritatem antecessorum et fidei et prædicationi suæ optavit, quanto magis cam evangelio Lucæ expostulem, quæ evangelio magistri ejus fuit necessaria? Aliud est, si penes Marcionem a discipulatu Lucæ cœpit religionis christianæ sacramentum. Cæterum, si et retro decucurrit, habuit utique authenticam paraturam, per quam ad Lucam usque pervenit, cujus testimonio adsistente, Lucas quoque possit admitti. Adv. Marcion, l. iv. c. 2. p. 503. C.

consider what was that gospel which was in being before Paul. He then insists on Paul's journey to Jerusalem, to confer with those who were apostles before him, and says: 'If even Luke's instructor wished to have the authority of his predecessors for his faith and preaching, how much more may I desire it [their authority, the authority of the former apostles] for Luke's gospel, which was necessary for the gospel of his master?' And more follows there to the like purpose. That is, I may justly expect that Luke's gospel be found agreeable to the gospels written by apostles, or I cannot receive it as of authority.

And he supposes that the preaching and gospels of apostles derive their authority from Christ himself, who made them masters: not that their gospels were reviewed and approved by Christ, but because it is reasonable to conclude, that what they have written is no other than the doctrine which they received from him, and which he commanded them to publish to the world. So in another place^r he calls the whole collection of the gospels, 'the gospel of the Lord.' They are his gospel for the matter and substance, not as written, or expressly approved by him after they were written.

Exactly in this manner had Justin Martyr spoke before, calling the gospels^s the 'Commentaries,' or histories, 'of the apostles of Christ:' not that they were all written^t by apostles, but because they contain the doctrines and sense of the apostles, as^u Dodwell justly explains him. Justin also calls them 'His,'^v that is, Christ's commentaries, [not Peter's commentaries, meaning St. Mark's gospel, as Mr. Jones^w supposed,] as containing the doctrine preached by Christ during his ministry here upon earth.

Tertullian's opinion then was this: That the gospels of Mark and Luke are supported by the authority of the

^r Unus omnino baptismus est nobis, tam ex Domini evangelio, quam ex apostoli literis. De Baptismo, c. 15. p. 262. C. And see before, n. ii. p. 273.

^s Ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονευμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτῆ δεικνύεται. Justin. p. 559. C.

^t See before, ch. x. n. iii. p. 132.

^u Sic autem illa tribuit [Justinus] apostolis, quod apostolorum dogmata mentemque complecterentur, ut una tamen aliorum agnoscat in scriptione operam qui fuerint apostolos sectati. Dissert. Iren. i. sect. 40. p. 70.

^v Καὶ τὸ εἶπεν μετωνομακεῖν αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγραφθῆαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονευμασιν αὐτῆ γεγονημένον καὶ τῆτο. Dial. p. 333. D.

^w New and Full Method, &c. vol. iii. p. 92. If there be any difficulty in understanding this of Christ, it might be conjectured, that, instead of αὐτῆ, Justin wrote αὐτῶν, meaning the apostles: but I see no difficulty herein, as we find the scriptures of the New Testament in general sometimes called the scriptures of the Lord, [See ch. xii. p. 146,] and the collection of gospels, 'the gospel of the Lord.'

apostles ; forasmuch as it is reasonable to think that they contain the very doctrine of the apostles Peter and Paul, whom they particularly attended ; and are also agreeable to the gospels written by the apostles Matthew and John ; and have the testimony of the churches that they are genuine : and all the gospels are authorized by Christ, as truly representing his doctrine. Or : It may be depended upon that the gospels were written by the persons whose names they bear. The apostles have truly preached and written the doctrine they received from Christ. The apostolical men have also faithfully published in writing what they received from apostles. All the gospels are therefore supported by the authority of apostles, yea, of Jesus Christ.

It is likewise plain why this high authority is ascribed to the apostles above all others : they were immediately appointed by Christ to publish the gospel to the world ; and ^x had the largest measure of the gifts of the Spirit, a measure peculiar to themselves.

V. In these passages we have seen the authority, genuineness, and sincerity of all the four gospels asserted with the fullest assurance, and upon the best ground. I shall nevertheless add a few more concerning the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John.

1. ‘ And ^y especially Matthew, the most faithful historian of the gospel, as being a companion of the Lord, for no other reason than that we might be informed of the origin of Christ according to the flesh, began in this manner : “ The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.” ’ He quotes likewise some of the last words of this gospel : ‘ Baptism ^z is appointed, and the form prescribed : “ Go ye,” says he, “ teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” ’

2. ‘ Moreover, Luke ^a was not an apostle, but apostolical ;

^x Sequere admonitionem cui divinitas patrocinator. Spiritum quidem Dei etiam fideles habent, sed non omnes fideles apostoli. Cum ergo qui se fidelem dixerat, adjecit postea, Spiritum Dei se habere, quod nemo dubitaret etiam de fidei ; ideo id dixit, ut sibi apostoli fastigium redderet. Proprie enim apostoli Spiritum Sanctum habent in operibus prophetiæ et efficaciâ virtutum, documentisque linguarum, non ex parte, quod cæteri. De Exhort. Cast. c. 4. p. 667. B.

^y Ipse in primis Matthæus, fidelissimus evangelii commentator, ut comes Domini, non aliam ob causam quam ut nos originis Christi carnalis compotes faceret, ita exorsus est : Liber genituræ Jesu Christi, filii David, filii Abraham. De Carne Christi, c. 22. p. 376. C.

^z Lex enim tinguendi imposita est, et forma præscripta. Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tinguentes eas in nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. De Baptismo, cap. 13. p. 262. B.

^a Porro Lucas non apostolus, sed apostolicus ; non magister sed discipulus ;

not a master, but a disciple; certainly less than his master; certainly so much later, as he is a follower of Paul, the last of the apostles.' I have put down this passage, as expressing again the true character of Luke: but Tertullian does not say this with a design to diminish St. Luke's testimony, whose gospel he just now said he and all christians in general 'zealously maintained;' but because Marcion, with whom he is here arguing, received Luke's gospel only, and^b curtailed even that.

3. Having quoted many passages out of St. John's gospel, he adds: 'How^c these things were spoken, certainly so famous an evangelist and disciple as John knew better than Praxeas.'

VI. The Acts of the Apostles are often quoted by Tertullian under that title.

1. 'So that^d afterwards,' says he, 'we find, in the Acts of the Apostles, that they who had John's baptism had not received the Holy Ghost, nor so much as heard whether there was any,' Acts xix. 1, 2, 3. Once, and I think but once, he has expressly ascribed this book to St. Luke; calling it^e 'Luke's commentary,' or history.

2. He had a great respect for this book. 'And truly^f he [Christ] fulfilled the promise he had made; [of sending the Spirit, who should lead the disciples into all truth;] the Acts of the Apostles attesting the descent of the Holy Spirit. Which scripture they who do not receive, cannot be of the Holy Spirit; nor can they prove the Holy Spirit to have been sent to the disciples, nor can they defend the church: forasmuch as they have nothing to show, when, and with what beginnings, this body was formed.'

This passage shows the great authority and usefulness of utique magistro minor; certe tanto posterior, quanto posterioris apostoli sec-tator Pauli sine dubio. Adv. Marc. l. iv. c. 2. p. 503. B.

^b Nam ex iis commentatoribus quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse, quem cæderet. Ibid.

^c Hæc quomodo dicta sint, evangelizator, et utique tam clarus discipulus Joannes, magis quam Praxeas novit. Adv. Praxeam. cap. 23. p. 655. D.

^d Adeo postea in Actis apostolorum invenimus, quoniam qui Joannis baptismum habebant, non acceperant Spiritum Sanctum, quem ne auditu quidem noverant. De Baptismo, cap. 10. p. 260. B.

^e Porro, cum in eodem commentario Lucæ, et tertia hora orationis demonstratur, sub quâ Spiritu Sancto initiati, pro ebriis habebantur; et sexta, quâ Petrus ascendit in superiora, &c. De Jejuniis, c. 10. p. 708. B.

^f Et utique implevit repromissum, probantibus Actis apostolorum descensum Spiritûs Sancti. Quam Scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritûs Sancti esse possunt, qui necdum Spiritum possint agnoscere discentibus missum, sed nec ecclesiam defendere, qui quando, et quibus incunabulis institutum est hoc corpus, probare non habent. De Præscript. Hæret. cap. 22. p. 239. A. Possumus et hic Acta apostolorum repudiantibus dicere. Ibid. B.

this book; and that christians had then no authentic account of the first preaching and progress of the gospel, after our Saviour's resurrection, beside this one book of the Acts of the Apostles; out of which Tertullian has quoted so many passages, and which we still have.

3. Moreover in another place, in a long argument from the epistle to the Galatians, speaking of Paul, he says: 'Then^s relating his own conversion, how of a persecutor he became an apostle, he confirms the scripture of the Apostolical Acts; in which likewise the substance of that epistle is confirmed, that there were some who interposed, and said, that men ought to be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses.' See Gal. i. 13, to the end; ch. ii. 1—5; Acts xv. Tertullian proceeds in the history of that dispute, and the decision of it, as recorded in the Acts; and calls it again the Acts of the Apostles: and says likewise once more, 'that^h the performance of the promise of the Holy Ghost cannot be otherwise proved, but from the instrument of the Acts,' as he there calls it.

VII. Most of St. Paul's epistles are expressly and frequently quoted by Tertullian.

1. 'I will therefore by no meansⁱ say Gods, nor Lords; but I will follow the apostle, so that if the Father and the Son are to be mentioned together, I will say God the Father, and Jesus Christ the Lord. But when I mentioned Christ only, I can call him God, as the apostle does: "Of whom Christ came, who is," says he, "over all, God blessed for ever,"' Rom. ix. 15. This epistle is often quoted expressly, among other epistles of St. Paul,^k as written 'to the Romans.'

2. 'Paul, in^l the first epistle to the Corinthians, speaks

^s Exinde, decurrens ordinem conversionis suæ de persecutore in apostolum, scripturam Actorum apostolorum confirmat apud quam ipsa etiam epistolæ istius materia recognoscitur, intereessisse quosdam, qui dicerent circumcidi oportere, et observandam esse Mōysi legem. Adv. Marcion. l. v. e. 2. p. 578. B.

^h Quod si et ex hoc congruunt Paulo apostolorum Acta, eorum ea respuatis jam apparet, ut Deum scilicet non alium prædicantia quam Creatorem, — quando nec promissio Spiritûs Sancti aliunde probetur exhibita, quam de instrumento Actorum. Ibid. C.

ⁱ Itaque Deos omnino non dicam, nec Dominos; sed apostolum sequar; ut si pariter nominandi fuerint pater et filius, Deum patrem appellem, et Jesum Christum Dominum nominem. Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere, sicut idem apostolus: Ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus, super omnia benedictus in ævum omne. Adv. Praxeam, cap. 13. p. 645. D.

^k Ut cum ad Romanos, naturâ facere dicens nationes ea quæ sunt legis. De Coronâ, e. 6. p. 123. C. Vid. et Scorpiac. e. 13. p. 631. C. D. et alibi.

^l Paulus in primâ ad Corinthios notat negatores et dubitatores resurrectionis. De Præscript. c. 33. p. 243. D.

of them who denied or doubted of a resurrection.' See 1 Cor. ch. xv.

Tertullian, in his book of Monogamy, computes^m it to be about 160 years from St. Paul's writing this epistle to the time when he wrote that book.

3. 'For indeedⁿ they suppose the apostle Paul, in the second to the Corinthians, to have forgiven the same fornicator whom in the first he had declared ought to be "delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh."' Compare 2 Cor. ii. 6—10, with 1 Cor. v. 5.

4. 'But^o of this no more needs to be said, if it be the same Paul, who, writing to the Galatians, reckons "heresies" among "the works of the flesh;" and who directs Titus to "reject a man that is an heretic, after the first admonition; knowing that he that is such an one is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."'

5. 'I pass,' says^p he, 'to another epistle, which we have inscribed to the Ephesians, but the heretics to the Laodiceans.' Afterwards: 'According to^q the true testimony of the church, we suppose that epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans: but Marcion has endeavoured to alter the inscription, upon a pretence of his having made a more diligent inquiry into that matter. But the inscriptions are of no importance, since the apostle wrote to all, when he wrote to some.' There are some learned remarks upon the title of this epistle inserted in^r Mr. La Roche's Literary Journal, beside what has been said by^s Mill and others.

6. 'Of which hope^t and expectation Paul to the Gala-

^m Quum magis nunc tempus in collecto factum sit [vid. 1 Cor. vii. 39.] annis circiter clx. exinde productis. De Monog. cap. 3. p. 675. B.

ⁿ Revera enim suspicantur Paulum in secundâ ad Corinthios eidem fornicatori veniam dedisse, quem in primâ dedendum Satanae in interitum carnis pronuntiârît. De Pudicitia, cap. 13. p. 728. D.

^o Nec diutius de isto, si idem est Paulus, qui et alibi hæses inter carnalia crimina numerat, scribens ad Galatas; et qui Tito suggerit, hominem hæreticum post primam corruptionem recusandum, quod perversus sit ejusmodi, et delinquat, ut a semetipso damnatus. De Præscript. cap. 6. p. 232. B.

^p Prætereo hic, et de aliâ epistolâ, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad Laodiceos. Adv. Marcion, l. v. c. 11. p. 598. C.

^q Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad eunus apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam. Adv. Marcion, l. v. c. 17. p. 607. B.

^r Vol. iii. p. 165.

^s Prolegom. N. 71--79. ^t De quâ spe et expectatione Paulus ad Galatas; Nos enim spiritu ex fide spem justitiæ expectamus; non ait, tenemus. Justitiæ autem Dei dicit ex judicio, quo judicabimur de mercede. Ad quam pendens et ipse, quum Philippensibus scribit, si quâ, inquit,

tians: "For we, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith," Gal. v. 5. He does not say we have obtained it; but he speaks of "the hope of the righteousness" of God, in the day of judgment, when our reward shall be decided. Of which being himself in suspense, when he writes to the Philippians, "If by any means," says he, "I might attain to the resurrection of the dead; not as though I had already attained or were perfect," Philip. iii. 11, 12.

7. 'From^u which things [endless genealogies and unprofitable questions] the apostle restraining us, expressly cautions us against philosophy, writing to the Colossians: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, not after the instruction of the Holy Spirit,"' Coloss. ii. 8.

8. 'And in^v the same epistle to the Thessalonians, he [the apostle] adds: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, there is no need that I write to you. For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night."—[1 Thess. v. 1, 2, 3.] And in the second [epistle] to the same persons he writes with greater solicitude: "But I beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, nor be troubled."—2 Thess. ii. 1—7.

9. 'And this^w word Paul has used, writing to Timothy: "O Timothy, keep [the depositum; or, according to our translation] that which is committed to thy trust," 1 Tim. vi. 20. And again: "That good thing which was committed to thee, keep," 2 Tim. i. 14. He quotes there several other passages of both these epistles.

10. I need not put down here any passage concerning the epistle to Titus, it being quoted already as^x Paul's, and will be mentioned again in the following passage.

11. Tertullian has no where, in his remaining works, quoted any thing from the epistle to Philemon, nor ex-

concurram in resurrectionem quæ est a mortuis; non, quia jam accepi, aut consummatus sum. De Resurrectione Carnis, c. 23. p. 395. C. D.

^u A quibus nos apostolus refrenans, nominatim philosophiam contestatur caveri oportere, scribens ad Colossenses: Videte ne quis vos circumveniat per philosophiam et inanem seductionem, secundum traditionem hominum, præter providentiam Spiritus Sancti. De Præscript. c. 7. p. 233. A.

^v Et in ipsâ ad Thessalonicenses epistolâ suggerit: De temporibus autem et temporum spatiis, fratres, non est necessitas scribendi vobis.—Et in secundâ, pleniore sollicitudine, ad eosdem: Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per adventum Domini. De Resurrectione Carnis, cap. 24. p. 396. C. D.

^w Et hoc verbo usus est Paulus ad Timotheum: O Timothee, depositum custodi. Et rursus: Bonum depositum serva. De Præscript. II. cap. 25. p. 240. A.

^x See p. 281.

pressly named it. We may well ascribe this to its brevity. But yet there is a passage which must relate to this epistle, and where one may be apt to think it had been named by Tertullian, though it does not stand there in our present copies. He had quoted and argued from some texts out of the epistle to the Philippians, and then the words of I Thess. iv. 17, after this manner: "But we,"^y says he, "shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord." "If taken up with them, then also changed with them. This epistle alone has had an advantage from its brevity, for hereby it has escaped the falsifying hands of Marcion. Nevertheless I wonder, that when he receives an epistle to one man, he should reject two to Timothy, and one to Titus, which treat of the government of the church. He had a mind, I suppose, to alter also the number of the epistles: that is, as he had done of the gospels.

Here is a character of the epistle to Philemon: it is written to 'one person,' and it does not concern ecclesiastical matters, or relate to the 'government of the church,' as those to Timothy and Titus. And if the words, 'brevity of this epistle,' relate to the epistle afterwards spoken of, as written to 'one person,' here is another thing very suitable to it. Nor can those words relate to the first to the Thessalonians, just quoted before, which is longer than the second to the Thessalonians, and that to Titus: not to mention the second to Timothy, though it is also longer than that. Nor is there any reason to suspect a reference to the second or third of St. John, because here is no mention of any but St. Paul's epistles; beside that, as Mr. Richardson^z observes, 'Marcion rejected all the canonical epistles, and consequently the second and third of St. John, which also were not at that time generally embraced by the catholics.' And indeed it seems to me, as I have already hinted, that the epistle to Philemon was originally mentioned here by Tertullian, but has been dropped out of our copies. However here is still enough to satisfy us the discourse is about that epistle, and that it was received by Tertullian, and the catholic church, as a part of scripture.

^y Atqui nos, cum illis, dicit, simul rapiemur in nubibus obviam Domino. Si cum illis sublatis, utique cum illis et transfigurati. Soli huic epistolæ brevitatis sua profuit, ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit. Affectavit, opinor, etiam numerum epistolarum interpolare. Adv. Marcion, l. v. cap. ult. p. 615. D.

^z The Canon of the New Testament vindicated, sect. 4. p. 2. in the notes.

If it were needful to say any thing more, to confirm this argument, I might add, that we are expressly assured by^a Epiphanius, that the epistle to Philemon was one of the ten epistles of St. Paul, which Marcion received. Moreover there is a passage in^b Jerom's works, which seems to show that he also understood Tertullian's words as I have explained them.

VIII. There is a remarkable and well-known passage of Tertullian, which may be not improperly put down here. 'Well, if you^c be willing to exercise your curiosity profitably in the business of your salvation, visit the apostolical churches, in which the very chairs of the apostles still preside; in which their very authentic letters are recited, sounding forth the voice, and representing the countenance, of each one of them. Is Achaia near you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you can go to Asia, you have Ephesus. But if you are near to Italy, you have Rome, from whence we also may be easily satisfied.'

By 'authentic letters' some^d understand the originals themselves, sent in the apostle's hand-writing, or that of the person who wrote for him, and signed at the conclusion by himself. Rigaltius,^e in his note upon this place, explains the word 'authentic' in the sense of the original Greek language in which the epistles were written: and supports his interpretation^f by another place of Tertullian, where he

^a Epiph. H. 42. n. ix. p. 310. A.

^b Et quoniam Marcionis fecimus mentionem, Pauli esse epistolam ad Philemonem, saltem Marcione auctore doceantur. Qui cum cæteras epistolas ejusdem vel non susceperit, vel quædam in his mutaverit atque corroserit, in hanc solam manus non est ausus committere, quia sua illam brevis defendebat. Hieron. Procem. in Ep. ad Philem.

^c Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurrere ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsentantur; apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, et representantes faciem, uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedoniâ, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. De Præscript. cap. 36. p. 245. B.

^d Sequuntur epistolæ Paulinæ, quas a primâ usque scriptione celeberrimas fecere ipsius apostoli tam crebræ peregrinationes, et nota ejus in omni epistolâ manus, et autographa earum in illis quibus datæ essent ecclesiis diutissime ad Tertulliani usque tempora conservata. Dodwell, Dis. Iren. i. sect. 41. See Richardson's Canon of the New Testament vindicated, p. 118. And to the like purpose others.

^e 'Ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum.' Linguâ scilicet eâdem quâ fuerunt ab apostolis conscriptæ, sonantes vocem eujusque. Sic ipse de Monogamiâ ad Græcum authenticum pauli provocat. Rigalt.

^f Sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico. De Monog. cap. 11. p. 684. A.

uses the phrase, ‘authentic Greek;’ appealing to that for the true meaning of St. Paul in one of his epistles. Richard^s Simon, who embraces the same interpretation, has referred to a passage of St. Jerom, where he uses the phrase, ‘authentic books,’ for the scriptures of the Old Testament in the original Hebrew language in opposition to Greek or other versions; not for the books in the original hand-writing of the prophets. So Tertullian, the churches of Africa using only a Latin version of the New Testament, calls the Greek text ‘authentic.’

I think this must be allowed to be a difficult passage; and I question whether either of these interpretations represents to us the true meaning of it. Though Tertullian is an obscure writer, I hope it will not be thought trifling to propose a few remarks, to determine, if possible, his precise meaning.

1. Tertullian, by ‘authentic letters,’ does not mean the original epistles. If that be his meaning, the persons, whom he sends to some one of these places, could have received satisfaction only concerning one or two, at the most, of St. Paul’s epistles sent thither. If they had gone to all these churches, they could have seen no more than the originals of several of St. Paul’s epistles: whereas he supposes, that by visiting these apostolical churches, they might hear the authentic letters recited, ‘sounding forth the voice, and representing the countenance, of each one’ of the apostles; that is, of those of them who had written. It is very improbable that Tertullian meant no more than that they [of Africa] might be satisfied of the genuineness of St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans, by sending or going to Rome: ‘unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est.’

2. Nor does he mean letters in their original language. He speaks of the language in which they were ‘recited,’ or read, ‘sounding forth the voice’ of the apostles: and he sends some to Rome: but it is probable that in that church the scriptures were read in the Latin tongue. Besides, he proposes a visit to Corinth, or Philippi, or Ephesus, to be

^s Comme on ne lisoit dans les Eglises d’Afrique que la Version Latine du Nouveau Testament, il donne le nom d’authentique au texte Grec. St. Jérôme se sert aussi d’une semblable expression au regard de l’Ancien Testament, quand il oppose le texte Ebreu aux versions Grecque et Latine: car il appelle le premier, ‘veritatem Hebraicam,’ ‘la vérité Ebraïque;’ voulant marquer par là les Originaux de l’Ecriture, qu’il nomme même, comme Tertullien, ‘Authenticos Libros,’ dans son commentarie sur le chap. 64. du prophete Isaie. Il ne croyoit pour cela que ce fussent les premiers originaux écrits de la main des prophètes. Histoire Crit. du Texte du N. T. ch. 4. p. 40.

made by those who were near Achaia, or Macedonia, or Asia: whereas it is probable that they who were near these countries had the scriptures read to them in their own churches in the original Greek language; and had no occasion to go from home to see or hear a Greek epistle of St. Paul.

3. By 'authentic letters' Tertullian seems to mean certain, well attested; the Greek word is so used by^h Cicero: and by 'authenticæ literæ' we are not to understand 'authentic letters,' or epistles, but 'scriptures:': so the word ought in my opinion toⁱ be rendered. This passage may be well reckoned parallel with another before transcribed, where he appeals to the apostolical churches for the genuineness and sincerity of the gospel of St. Luke, used by all christians in general; and afterwards for the genuineness likewise of the other three gospels. He appeals there to almost the same churches that he does here; the Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Ephesians, and Romans. Of the last he speaks to this purpose: 'Let us see likewise,' says he, 'what the Romans recite,' or sound forth, 'who are near to us, with whom both Peter and Paul left the gospel sealed with their blood. We have also churches, which are disciples of John.—With all these is that gospel of Luke received, which we so zealously maintain.' Just so here, after the mention of divers others: 'But if you are near to Italy, you have Rome, whence we also may be easily satisfied. How^k happy is that church, to which the apostles delivered the whole evangelical doctrine together with their blood: where Peter suffered the same death which the Lord did; where Paul was crowned with the death of John; where^l

^h Quid quæris? etiam illud erat persuasum, Pompeium cum magnis copiis iter in Germaniam per Illyricum fecisse; id enim *αυθεντικος* nuntiabatur. Ad Att. l. x. ep. 9. ad quem locum Ursinus. Videtur scribendum in Galliam, ex loco simili in ep. 6. 'Pompeium *pro certo* habemus per Illyricum proficisci in Galliam.'

ⁱ Apud literas sanctas ordine cognoscitur. Ap. c. 22. p. 23. C. Ipsi literarum nostrarum fidem accendunt. C. 23. p. 26. A. Inspice Dei voces, literas nostras. C. 30. p. 30. D. Coimus ad literarum divinarum commemorationem. C. 31. p. 34. D.

^k *Ista quam felix ecclesia! cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine profuderunt: ubi Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquatur; ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur; ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur.* De Præscript. Hær. cap. 36. p. 245. B.

^l That story is received by some, by others it is reckoned to be doubtful, and by others rejected as a fiction. Authors, with references to them, may be seen in Lampe, Prolegom. de Vit. Joan. Ev. l. i. c. 4. n. iii. iv. v. who himself rejects it, and argues in this manner: First, it relies almost entirely upon the sole credit of Tertullian. Secondly, it is omitted by several ancient writers, who would have mentioned it if there had been any good ground for it, as Irenæus, Origen, and some others, who

the apostle John, after he had been cast into a cauldron of boiling oil, without suffering any harm, was banished into an island!

As Tertullian before appealed to the apostolical churches for the integrity of St. Luke's gospel, so here he proposes, to such persons as were curious, a visit to some apostolical church which was nearest to them; where the 'very authentic,' well attested, genuine, and uncorrupted 'scriptures' of the apostles 'are recited.' It is not then an appeal to these churches for the genuineness of one or more epistles of Paul, written to them in particular; but it is an appeal to each one of these churches for the certainty, genuineness, and integrity of all the scriptures of the New Testament, which they held sacred, and constantly read in their assemblies; whether gospels or epistles, written by Paul or other apostles, or by apostolical men. Though every church, which had communion with apostolical churches, had copies of the several books of the New Testament that might be relied on as genuine and sincere; yet he supposes it to be a satisfaction to know, at the first hand, what was read in the churches planted by apostles: and that the labour of a visit to some of them was not unbecoming men of curiosity. Here lies the stress of the argument: the scripture received by apostolical churches are 'authentic;' the testimony^m given by those churches, according to Tertullian, is an authentic, original, certain testimony.

I am not positive in this interpretation, though it appears to me probable. If I understand this passage right, it would be more properly placed lower, after we have considered this author's particular testimonies to the rest of the books of the New Testament. But I thought it might be too presuming to defer a passage any longer, which has

speak of the sufferings of the apostles, and John's banishment into Patmos, and yet say nothing of this extraordinary miracle. And though Jerom has occasionally mentioned it once or twice, he takes no notice of it in the history of this apostle, inserted in his book of Illustrious Men. Thirdly, nor does this story in its circumstances suit the time in which it is placed; for it is not known that casting into oil was a punishment then in use. That learned author thinks this story might be invented, or at least more readily received, as an accomplishment of Christ's prophecy concerning the two sons of Zebedee. *Ego fabulam illam eo avidius acceptam esse censeo, ut ita eo clarior redderetur sensus prædictionis Christi de poculo passionum filiis Zebedæi propinando.*

^m Cæterum si et retro decucurrerit [evangelium] habuit utique authenticam paraturam, per quam ad Lucam usque pervenit, cujus testimonio adistente, Lucas quoque possit admitti. Adv. Marcion, l. iv. cap. 2. p. 503. C. Thus the testimony of apostolical churches is authentic, and prior to that of others.

been so generally supposed to relate particularly to some epistles only of St. Paul.

IX. We are in the next place to observe, how the epistle to the Hebrews is quoted from him, when he was plainly a Montanist. Having argued by the epistles of Paul, and the first of St. John, and proved his point sufficiently from apostles, as he supposeth, he proceeds: ‘Nevertheless” I am willing, over and above, to allege the testimony of a companion of the apostles; a fit person to show, at the next remove, what was the sentiment of the masters. For there is an epistle of Barnabas, inscribed “to the Hebrews,” written by a man of such authority, that Paul has placed him with himself in the same course of abstinence: “Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working?” [or, of doing^o this, that is, to carry about a sister.] 1 Cor. ix. 6. And certainly the epistle of Barnabas [he means the epistle to the Hebrews] is more generally received by the churches than the apocryphal pastor of adulterers [that is, Hermas]. Admonishing then his disciples, “Leaving all first principles, rather to go on to perfection, and not to lay again the foundation of repentance from the works of the dead: for it is impossible, says he, for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the sweet word of God, if they fall away now at the end of the world, to recall them again to repentance, since they crucify again the Son of God to themselves, and put him to an open shame.”—[Heb. vi. 1, 4—8.] He who learned this from the apostles, and taught with the apostles, never knew that a second

ⁿ *Disciplina igitur apostolorum proprie quidem instruit ac determinat. —Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superinducere idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, adeo satis auctoritatis viro, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiæ tenore: ‘Aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem?’ Et utique receptor apud ecclesias epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho pastore mœchorum. Monens itaque discipulos, omissis omnibus initiis, ad perfectionem magis tendere, nec rursus fundamenta pœnitentiæ jacere operibus mortuorum; impossibile est enim, inquit, eos qui semel inluminati sunt, et donum cœlestis gustaverunt, et participaverunt spiritum sanctum, et verbum Dei dulce gustaverunt, occidente jam ævo cum exciderint, rursus revocari in pœnitentiam, refigentes cruci in semetipsos filium Dei et dedecorantes.—Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit, et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam mœcho et fornicatori secundam pœnitentiam promissam ab apostolis nôrat. Optime enim legem interpretabatur, et figuras ejus jam in ipsâ veritate servabat. De Pudicitia, cap. 20. p. 741. C. D.*

^o So it is at present in Tertullian. Mill supposes this to be a corrupt reading of that text, 1 Cor. ix. 6. Prolegom. n. 552.

repentance had been promised by the apostles to an adulterer and a fornicator. For he excellently interprets the law, and shows its figures in the truth.'

Here is enough to satisfy us, that he means the same epistle to the Hebrews which we have under that title; and that he supposed it to be written by Barnabas, an apostolical man, who had been taught by apostles, and taught with them, but especially with Paul.

This is the only passage of Tertullian, in which this epistle is expressly quoted: but I am willing to observe also the other places in which it may seem to be referred to, that we may the better judge of the respect he had for it, or what authority it was of with him.

We find then in him these following expressions: 'That^p Word called his Son, seen of the patriarchs in divers manners, in the name of God, always heard in the prophets, at last brought down by the Spirit and power of God the Father into the Virgin Mary,' &c. See Heb. i. 1, 2. And presently after he says: 'Being taken^q up into heaven, he sat "down on the right hand of the Father."' See ver. 3. The expressions in another book, that have been thought to allude to the words of ver. 4, have a small resemblance with them. But in the same^r place he observes: 'Who makes, saith he, "his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire."' Ver. 7. See Ps. civ. 4. And likewise: 'That he had not put in subjection the world to man incapable of governing, and not higher than the angels, to whom he has not put in subjection any such thing;' where may be thought an allusion to ch. ii. 5—7. He calls Melchisedec^s 'Priest of the most High God' more than once. See Heb. vii. 1. Gen. xiv. 18. He speaks of^t Christ's being 'God's High Priest, a priest for ever,' and, 'after the order of Melchisedec:' which things are treated

^p Id Verbum Filium ejus appellatum, in nomine Dei varie visum a patriarchis, in prophetis semper auditum, postremo delatum, &c. De Præscript. cap. 13. p. 235. C.

^q In cœlos ereptum sedisse ad dexteram

Patris. Ibid.

^r Sed et imago et similitudo Dei, fortior angelo; sed adflatus Dei generosior spiritu materiali, quo angeli constiterunt. Qui facit, inquit, spiritus angelos, et apparitores flammam ignis. Quia nec universitatem homini subjecisset infirmo dominandi, et non potiori angelis, quibus nihil tale subjecit. Adv. Marc. lib. ii. p. 459. D.

^s Unde Melchisedek sacerdos Dei Summi nuncupatus? Adv. Judæos, c. 2. p. 206. D. Quid Ezechias ad Melchisedek Altissimi sacerdotem? Adv. Marc. lib. v. p. 593. B.

^t Sed Jesus iste Christus Dei patris summus sacerdos. Adv. Jud. c. 14. p. 229. A. Tu es sacerdos in ævum. Adv. Marc. lib. v. p. 593. B. At in Christum conveniet ordo Melchisedek. Ibid.

of in the epistle to the Hebrews; but Tertullian^u seems to deduce them from Psalm cx. 4. In another place he observes the enmity which there had been against virtue in this world, from the very beginning: ‘That Abel^v was murdered by his brother; and that not only righteous men, but prophets also, had been ill treated; that David was harassed, Elias banished, Jeremy stoned, and Esaias sawn asunder:’ where may be thought a reference to Heb. xi. 4. 32, 37. In another place he says: ‘If we^w think some evils are laid upon us by the Lord, toward whom should we behave ourselves patiently, if not to him? Yea rather we are taught to rejoice and be glad of the favour of divine chastisement: “I, says he, chastise whom I love.”’ See Heb. xii. 5, 6. Prov. iii. 11, 12. Once more, he observes, that^x ‘Christ suffered without the city.’ See Heb. xiii. 11, 12.

Whether in these passages there is an allusion to this epistle to the Hebrews, is not easy to determine. But supposing that Tertullian borrowed these thoughts from it, or was led to them by reading it; we are however obliged, I think, to judge of his respect for it by the first passage, in which he has expressly quoted it. And upon that passage we may now make the following remarks.

1. That at that time it was received by a good number of christian churches; and those, as we may reasonably suppose, of the Latin communion, which had their place in those parts of the Roman empire where the Latin tongue was used, with which churches Tertullian was most particularly acquainted. By many of these churches it was received, by more than the Shepherd of Hermas, but not by all.

2. Tertullian ascribes this epistle to Barnabas: this must have been therefore a common opinion, at that time, in the churches with which he was acquainted. If he had had any good ground to ascribe it to Paul, he would have done it here, where he esteemed the sentiments of that epistle

^u Sed et hic psalmus Salomoni canere dicitur. Ibid. C.

^v Statim ut coli Deus cœpit, invidiam religio sortita est. Qui Deo placuerat, occiditur, et quidem a fratre.—Denique non modo justorum, verum etiam et prophetarum: David exagitur, Helias fugatur, Hieremias lapidatur, Esaias secatur. Scorpiac. cap. 8. p. 624. B. C.

^w Quod si a Domino nonnulla credimus incuti, cui magis patientiam quam Domino præbeamus? Quin insuper gratulari et gaudere nos docet, dignatione divinæ castigationis. Ego, inquit, quos diligo, castigo. De Patientiâ, cap. 11. p. 166. B.

^x Extra civitatem crucifixus est. Adv. Judæos, cap. 14. p. 229. B.

favourable to him, and was willing to make the best advantage of it.

3. It does not appear that he gave the highest degree of respect to this epistle. He considers it only as written by an apostolical man, and of authority next to the apostles.

4. Nor does it plainly and certainly appear, from any thing which Tertullian has said, what respect was paid to this epistle by those churches which received it; or, whether they received it as of the highest authority or not.

X. I think it is now evident, that Tertullian received thirteen epistles of St. Paul, and that they were received universally, or generally, by the christians of his time. The epistle to the Hebrews he supposed to have been written by Barnabas.

XI. We proceed to the catholic epistles.

I. And here we are first to inquire, whether Tertullian received the epistle of St. James. In his exposition of that petition of the Lord's prayer, 'Lead us not into temptation,' he says: 'But^y far be it from us to suppose, that the Lord should seem to tempt, as if he was ignorant of any man's faith, or had a desire to overthrow it.' Which somewhat resembles James i. 13, "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." But I believe few can be influenced by this to conclude he owned this epistle.

In another place he says: 'Whence^z was Abraham accounted the friend of God, but for the practice of the equity and justice of the law of nature?' St. James says, ii. 23, "And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God." Abraham has this title, 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isa. xli. 8. I think neither of these places sufficient to prove, that Tertullian was acquainted with this epistle.

Once more: 'Who^a now should better know the marrow of the scriptures than the school of Christ itself?—To whom should he rather reveal his mind than to whom he showed his glory, Peter, James, John, and afterwards

^y Cæterum absit ut Dominus tentare videatur, quasi ignoret fidem cujusque, aut dejicere gestiens. De Oratione, cap. 8. p. 152. B.

^z Unde Abraham amicus De deputatus, si non de æquitate et justitiâ legis naturalis? Adv. Judæos, cap. 2. p. 206. D.

^a Quis nunc medullas scripturarum magis nosset, quam ipsa schola Christi? —Cui potius figuram vocis suæ declarasset, quam cui effigiem gloriæ suæ revelavit, Petro, Jacobo, Joanni, et postea Paulo? Scorpiac. cap. 12. p. 630. B.

Paul?' And then he immediately quotes the first epistle of Peter, and first of John, and his Revelation, and several epistles of Paul; but nothing from the epistle of James, though it might have been so much to his purpose. The quotation from Peter is 1 Ep. ii. 20, 21: "For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently?"—And again, iv. 12, 13, 15: "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial, which is to try you."—It would have been as much to his purpose to have cited also James i. 2: "My brethren, count it all joy, when ye fall into divers temptations;" and ver. 3, and 12.—Moreover, after the quotations from Peter, John, and Paul, he comes to the Acts; where, as he observes, are recorded the afflictions and sufferings of Peter, Stephen, James, Paul, and others. Considering all these things, and that James, the author of the epistle which we have, could not be James who saw Christ's glory, but James the Just, or some other of that name; it seems to me very probable, that Tertullian knew nothing of any epistle of James.

Nor was he in the least obliged to omit our epistle of James, because it was not written by James who saw Christ's glory: forasmuch as, after the quotations from Peter, John, and Paul, whom he at first expressly mentioned, he quotes also the Acts, and the gospels.

And if we consider that he knew, and has referred to, the short epistles of Titus and Philemon, as has been shown; his not citing the epistle of James in this remarkable place, nor in any other part of his remaining works, must amount to a kind of proof, that he knew nothing at all of this epistle: or, that he did not esteem it a book of authority, if he did know it. But the former appears to me the more probable supposition of the two.

Mill^b thinks it likely that Tertullian refers to St. James, when he observes, in the place before quoted, that 'Abraham was accounted the friend of God:' but that nevertheless he did not esteem this epistle a book of authority, or a part of the canon.

2. The first epistle of Peter is expressly quoted as his. In the place just cited, having mentioned those who saw Christ's glory, he adds: 'Peter^c says to the people of

^b In eâ [ecclesiâ Africanâ] enim licet jam seculo tertio Tertullianus ad versum 23. cap. ii. hujus epistolæ digitum intendisse videatur, dum libr. contra Judæos, cap. 2. scribit Abrahamum 'amicum Dei deputatum esse;' non tamen auctoritate ejus ad probandum aliquod fidei dogma usus est, aut diserte ipsam canonicis scripturis accensuit. Prolegom. n. 207.

^c Petrus quidem ad Ponticos: Quanta enim, inquit, gloria, si non ut

Pontus: "How great glory is it, if, when ye are punished not for your faults, ye take it patiently! For this is acceptable, and even hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that ye should follow his steps,"' 1 Pet. ii. 20, 21: to which he adds the words of ch. iv. ver. 12—16. The words themselves and the title assure us, he refers to our first epistle of St. Peter, which is inscribed to the "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia," and other countries thereabout. Again, soon after: 'Peter^d appointed that the king should be honoured.' Referring to 1 Ep. ch. ii. 13. These are the only places, I think, where this epistle is expressly quoted by him as Peter's.

3. There are in Tertullian no express quotations of the second epistle of Peter, or references to it.

Tertullian in his Apology asserts, that all the 'power of dæmons and such like spirits is subject to christians:' but yet he owns that they molest them, and excite persecutions. He accounts for this several ways. One of his solutions is this: 'Besides, being^e already condemned, it is a consolation to them, in their desperate condition, to do mischief, during the delay of punishment.' Possibly some may think that here is an allusion to 2 Pet. ii. 4: but there is a text to the same purpose in Jude, ver. 6; which epistle was owned by Tertullian, as we shall see presently. But there is no good reason to suppose here an allusion to either of those texts. This was a common notion among the Jews, as may be concluded from what some dæmoniacs said to Christ. Matt. viii. 29. See also Mark v. 27; Luke viii. 28. And it might be common likewise among the christians, who by this time had learned several things from the Jews. Lactantius has a^f like thought.

4. The first epistle of John is often quoted. In the place just cited for the first of Peter, where he had mentioned the four apostles who saw Christ's glory, he says: 'John^g exhorts us to lay "down our lives for the brethren, denying there is any fear in love:" for "perfect love casteth out

delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis! Hæc enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis, &c. Scorpiac. cap. 12. p. 630. C.

^d Condixerat, scilicet Petrus, regem quidem honorandum. Ibid. cap. 14. p. 633. A.

^e Præterque et desperata conditio eorum ex prædamnatione solatium reputat fruentæ interim malignitatis de pœnæ morâ. Apol. c. 27. p. 29. A.

^f Ita diaboli satellites facti, ut haberent solatium perditionis suæ, ad perdendos homines se converterunt, quos ut tuerentur advenerunt. Lactant. Epit. cap. 17. p. 42. edit. Pfaff. Conf. Orig. in Num. Hom. xiii. n. 7.

^g Joannes vero, ut etiam pro fratribus nostris animas ponamus, hortatur, negans timorem esse in dilectione, &c. Scorpiac. c. 12. p. 630. D

fear," and what follows.' 1 John iii. 16, and iv. 18. In another place: 'Lastly,^h let us consider whom the apostles saw: "That which we have seen," says John, "which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the Word of life: for the Word of life was made flesh."——And we saw his glory, as of the only-begotten of the Father.' 1 John i. 1 John i. 14. Here is full proof that he ascribed this first epistle to John the apostle and evangelist.

In another place: 'Whomⁱ the apostle John calls anti-christs, as denying Christ is come in the flesh:' which is thought to be a reference to 2 John 7; but is not decisive, because he writes to the same purpose in the first epistle, ch. ii. 18, 22, but especially iv. 3. Tertullian has more than once referred to these words,^k as in an epistle of John. And farther, speaking of heretics, he says, 'we^l are forbid to converse with them:' in which he has been supposed to refer to 2 John 10: "Receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." But he may as well refer to Paul's advice, Tit. iii. 10: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject:" and probably does so.

There^m is an expression in Tertullian, which at first sight may be understood as if he spoke of a 'former epistle of John:' but it means only 'the former part of the' same 'epistle.' Tertullian is showing that something said by St. John, in that first epistle, is not inconsistent with what he had said in the former part of it: as may appear to any one that consults the place, and reads that whole chapter of our author. There is therefore no proof of Tertullian's

^h Denique, inspicimus quem apostoli viderint. Quod vidimus, inquit, Joannes, quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostræ contrectaverunt de sermone vitæ. Sermo enim vitæ caro factus est——et vidimus gloriam ejus tanquam unigeniti a patre, &c. Adv. Praxeam, cap. 15. p. 647. A. B.

ⁱ ——quos apostolus Joannes antichristos pronuntiavit, negantes Christum in carne venisse. Adv. Mare. lib. iii. cap. 8. p. 483. B.

^k At in epistolâ eos maxime antichristos vocat [Joannes] qui Christum negarent in carne venisse, et qui non putarent Jesum esse filium Dei. De Præscript. c. 33. p. 244. B. Certe, qui negat Christum in carne venisse, hic antichristus est. De Carne Christi, cap. 24. p. 378. A.

^l Apud hæreticos? ubi omnia extranea et adversaria nostræ veritati; ad quos vetamur accedere. De Præscript. cap. 12. p. 235. B.

^m Juxta est igitur ut exeidisse sibi dicamus Joannem, in primore quidem epistolâ negantem nos sine delicto esse; nunc vero præscribentem non delinquere omnino. De Pudic. c. 19. p. 740. D. Ita Joanni ratio constabit diversitatis, distinctionem delictorum disponenti, cum delinquere filios Dei nunc adnuit, nunc abnuit. Prospiciebat enim clausulam literarum suarum, et illi præstruebat hos sensus, dicturus in fine manifestius: Si quis seit fratrem suum delinquere delictum non ad mortem, postulabit, &c. Ibid. p. 741. A.

owning, or knowing, the second epistle of John. As for the third, there does not appear any the least notice of it in Tertullian's remaining works.

It is supposed by some learned men, that ⁿ Tertullian has alluded to the disputed text which we have in 1 John v. 7, 8. I have put his words in the margin.

5. There is one plain quotation of the epistle of St. Jude, the only place in which it is mentioned: 'Hence^o it is,' says he, 'that Enoch is quoted by the apostle Jude;' referring to Jude, ver. 14.

XII. The Revelation of John is often quoted. I put together two or three passages, which show his full persuasion it was written by the apostle and evangelist of that name. 'John^p in his Apocalypse is commanded to correct those who "eat things sacrificed to idols, and commit fornication." [Rev. ii. 20.] But in his epistle he especially calls them "antichrists, who deny that Christ is come in the flesh, and who did not think that Jesus is the Son of God,"' 1 John ii. 18, 22; iv. 2, 3; v. 5. In the place already referred to more than once, after the mention of the four who had seen Christ's glory, he takes a large quotation out of John's Revelation. 'Again: The^q apostle John in the Apocalypse describes a "sharp two-edged sword coming out of the mouth of God." Lastly, we^r have churches, disciples of John: for though Marcion rejects his Revelation, the succession of bishops traced to the original will assure us that John is the author.'

XIII. There are then in Tertullian plain testimonies to all the books of the New Testament commonly received by christians at this time, except the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second or third of John. The epistle to the Hebrews he supposed to have been written by Barnabas.

XIV. We have seen in the passages already transcribed

ⁿ Cæterum, de meo sumet, inquit, sicut ipse de Patris. Ita connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero; qui tres unum sunt, non unus. Quomodo dictum est, Ego et Pater unum sumus: ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem. Adv. Prax. c. 25. p. 657. C.

^o Eo accedit quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet. De Cultu Fem. l. i. c. 3. p. 172. A.

^p Joannes vero in Apocalypsi idolothyta edentes et supra committentes jubetur castigare. At in epistolâ eos maxime antichristos vocat, &c. De Præscript. cap. 33. p. 244. A. B.

^q Nam et apostolus Joannes in Apocalypsi ensem describit ex ore Dei prodeuntem, bis acutum, præacutum. Adv. Marc. lib. iii. cap. 14. p. 489. A.

^r Habemus et Joannis alumnas ecclesias. Nam etsi Apocalypsim ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recens in Joannem stabit auctorem. Adv. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 5. p. 505. B.

several testimonies to the integrity and sincerity of the gospels, and other books of the New Testament in his time, as well as to their genuineness. We will nevertheless take a few more to the like purpose. He affirms, that^s the three other gospels were in the hands of the churches from the beginning, as well as Luke's: that^t Luke's gospel, as well as the rest, had been 'preserved entire,' till Marcion pretended to correct it. He says, he may^u justly say (in the name of the christian church) to all heretics: 'Who are you? when and whence came you hither? what do you do in my ground since you belong not to me? by what right, O Marcion, do you cut down my woods? what authority have you, Valentinus, to turn the course of my fountains? who gave you power, Apelles, to overthrow my fences? what do you sowing and feeding here at your pleasures? The possession is mine. I have enjoyed it a long time. I first enjoyed it. I derive a certain original from the authors themselves, whose it was. I am the heir of the apostles. As they ordained in their testament, as they committed to my trust, as they adjured, so I still hold it.' A large part of this passage is translated by^v Mr. Richardson: I have taken his translation, as far as it goes. Tertullian soon after calls heretics 'foreigners, and enemies of the apostles.' 'They^w who were resolved to teach otherwise, were under a necessity of new modelling the records of the doctrine, that they might have some ground to go upon. As they could not succeed in corrupting the doctrine without corrupting the records of it, so the true doctrine [of the apostles] could not have been with us, nor could it have been delivered by us to others, if we had not the records entire wherein it was taught. For what do we maintain contrary to them? what have we added of our own heads to the doctrine, that we should be obliged to alter any thing in the scriptures, by adding to them, or taking from them, or transposing any parts of them? What^x we are, that the scriptures were from the

^s Itaque et de his Marcion flagitandus, quid, omissis eis, Lucæ potius institerit; quasi non et hæc apud ecclesias a primordio fuerint, quemadmodum et Lucæ. Adv. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 5. p. 505. D.

^t Denique emendavit, quod corruptum existimavit. Sed nec hoc merito, quia non fuit corruptum. Si enim apostolica integra decucurrerunt; Lucæ autem quod est secundum nos, adeo congruit regulæ eorum, ut cum illis apud ecclesias maneat; jam et Lucæ constat integrum decucurrisse usque ad sacrilegium Marcionis. p. 506. A. ^u De Præscript. c. 37.

^v The Canon of the N. T. vindicated, p. 119.

^w Ibid. c. 38.

^x Quod sumus, hoc sunt scripturæ ab initio suo: ex illis sumus, antequam aliter fuit; antequam a vobis interpolarentur. Ibid. p. 246. B.

‘beginning: we agree with them, as they were before they were altered, before they were interpolated, by you.’ Then he severely censures Marcion for altering the text of the scriptures, ‘openly employing a knife,’ as^y he says, ‘not a style;’ the better to render them agreeable to his erroneous opinions.

XV. In many of the passages already transcribed we have seen the great authority of the books of the New Testament, and the respect which was showed to them: but it may be proper to observe a few more to this purpose.

In his disputes^z with Praxeas, and others, he plainly supposes the scriptures to be the rule of the christian faith. He greatly commends the church of Rome, that ‘she^a joins the law and the prophets with the evangelical and apostolic scriptures, and thence takes her faith.’ He plainly supposeth them written by divine inspiration, and calls them the words of God, in a passage to be transcribed presently at length.

‘The Spirit of the Lord,’ says^b he, ‘has declared by the apostle, that covetousness is the root of all evil.’ I Tim. vi. 10. This is an observation which might be made by the human understanding; nevertheless he says, ‘The Spirit of the Lord has declared it by the apostle:’ which seems to imply, that the apostles, in their epistles written for the direction and edification of the churches, were under a special direction of the Holy Spirit. Afterwards he says, in the same book: ‘The apostle^c recommends charity with all the force of the Holy Spirit:’ referring to I Cor. xiii. which chapter he there quotes largely. Having mentioned Matthew under the character of the companion of the Lord, and the most faithful historian of the gospel, and referred particularly to his genealogy, he adds: ‘And Paul^d likewise, as being both a disciple and a master, and

^y Marcion enim exerte et palam machærâ non stylo, usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam eadem scripturarum confecit. Ibid. p. 246. C.

^z Probare autem tam aperte debebis ex scripturis, quam nos probamus illum sibi Filium fecisse sermonem suum.—Aut exhibe probationem quam exoptulo meæ similem; id est, sic scripturas eundem Filium et Patrem ostendere, quemadmodum apud nos distincte Pater et Filius demonstrantur. Adv. Prax. c. 11. p. 641. D.

^a Legem et prophetas cum evangelicis et apostolicis literis miscet, et inde potat fidem. De Præscript. c. 36. p. 245. C.

^b Cupiditatem omnium malorum radicem Spiritus Domini per apostolum pronuntiavit. De Patientiâ, c. 7. p. 163. D.

^c Quam [dilectionem] apostolus totis viribus Sancti Spiritus commendat. De Patientiâ, c. 12. p. 167. B.

^d Sed et Paulus, utpote ejusdem evangelii et discipulus, et magister, et testis, quâ ejusdem ipsius Christi apostolus, confirmat Christum ex semine David secundum carnem, utique ipsius. De Carne Christi, cap. 22. p. 376. C.

also a witness of the same gospel, inasmuch as he was an apostle of the same Christ, confirms the account that Christ was of the seed of David, according to the flesh.' And we may here recollect the passage before quoted, where he had equalled the apostle Paul with the chief of the apostles, those three who saw Christ's glory on the mount. Another proof of the high respect which these writings were in with christians, is the reading them in their religious assemblies. In his description of the christian worship, in his Apology, he says, among other things, 'We^e come together to recollect the divine scriptures. We nourish our faith, improve our hope, confirm our trust, by the sacred words.'

XVI. We should next observe some forms of quotation, and general titles and divisions of the books of the New Testament.

Justin Martyr often calls the gospels commentaries, or short histories of Christ. In like manner, and possibly in imitation of him, Tertullian calls the evangelists^f commentators, or historians of the gospel; and their^g writings commentaries, or short histories.

'For the^h Lord in the gospel admonishes Peter: "Behold," says he, "Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat," Luke xxii. 31. And inⁱ the gospel the wedding garment may signify the holiness of the flesh. He^k remembered the evangelical maxim: "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake." But^l enough has been alleged from the prophets: I now appeal to the gospels.' He presently after speaks of them by the name of scripture: 'But^m observe how the scripture relates this: "He spake also a parable unto them,"' Luke v. 36.

^e Coimus ad literarum divinarum commemorationem; si quid præsentium temporum qualitas aut præmonere cogit, aut recognoscere, certe fidem sanctis vocibus pascimus, spem erigimus, fiduciam figimus. Apol. c. 39. p. 34. D.

^f Ipse in primis Matthæus, fidelissimus evangelii commentator. De Carne Christi, c. 22. p. 376. C. Aut a commentatore evangelii illuminatam. De Resurrect. Carn. p. 403. A. Nam ex iis commentatoribus quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse, quem cæderet. Adv. Marcion, l. iv. c. 2. p. 503. B. ^g Porro, cum in eodem commentario Lucæ [libro nempe Actuum apostolorum]. De Jejun. c. x. p. 703. B.

^h Siquidem Dominus in evangelio ad Petrum: Ecce, inquit, postulavit vos Satanas, uti cerneret vos sicut frumentum. De Fuga in Persecu. c. 2. p. 690. C.

ⁱ Et in evangelio indumentum nuptiale sanctitas carnis agnoscitur potest. De Resurrect. Carnis, cap. 27. p. 398. D.

^k Meminerat evangelicæ definitionis: Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam. De Resurrect. cap. 41. p. 409. C.

^l Satis hæc de prophetico instrumento: ad evangelia nunc provoco. De Resurr. c. 33. p. 402. C.

^m Sed quomodo referat scriptura, considera: Dicebat autem et parabolam ad eos. Ibid. p. 402. D.

The gospels are distinguished by the names of the writers, as we have already seen. One instance may not be amiss here. ‘Weⁿ have considered John’s gospel;—and I shall not now,’ says he, ‘insist on the other gospels.’

He calls the gospels^o ‘our Digesta,’ in allusion, as it seems, to some collection of the Roman laws digested into order; as in a passage before cited he called Luke’s gospel ‘his Digest.’ Again: ‘Justly^p the evangelist: “The law and the prophets were until John.”’ He speaks^q at once of the ‘sayings of the prophets, gospels, and apostles.’ Here ‘apostles’ seems to stand for the collection of the epistles of the apostles. In another book: ‘What^r patriarch, what prophet,—what priest, or in later times what apostle, or evangelist, or bishop, is found crowned?’

‘Let^s us be mindful of the predictions of the Lord, and the epistles of the apostles.’ He says: ‘We^t have one baptism according to the gospel of the Lord, and the epistles of the apostle. Marcion,’ he says, ‘had two different Gods, one^u of each Instrument, or (which is more commonly said) Testament.’ In another place: ‘If^v I do not clear this point from all the difficulties of the ancient scripture, I will take the proof of our interpretation from the New Testament.—For behold, I perceive, both in the gospels and the apostles, God to be visible and invisible.’ This plainly shows, that the collection of the sacred christian books was called the New Testament; and that it was divided into two parts, one of which was called the ‘gospels,’ the other the ‘apostles.’

XVII. It is very likely that the Revelation was included in this latter part, and was joined with the epistles of the

ⁿ Videmus Joannis evangelium decurrere.—Cæterum ut alia evangelia non interponam. Adv. Prax. c. 26. p. 657. D. 658. A.

^o —et inde sunt nostra digesta. Adv. Marc. l. iv. c. 3. p. 504. A.

^p Et merito evangelista: Lex et prophetæ usque ad Joannem. Adv. Jud. c. 8. p. 215. B.

^q Compendiis paucorum verborum, quot attinguntur edicta prophetarum, evangeliorum, apostolorum? De Oratione, c. 9. p. 152. C.

^r Quis denique patriarches, quis prophetes,—aut sacerdos,—quis vel postea apostolus, aut evangelizator, aut episcopus, invenitur coronatus? De Coronâ, c. 9. p. 125. D.

^s Quin potius memores simus tam dominicarum prænuntiationum, quam apostolicarum literarum. De Præscr. c. 4. p. 231. C.

^t Unus omnino baptismus est nobis, tam ex Domini evangelio, quam ex literis apostoli. De Baptismo, c. 15. p. 262. C.

^u Alterum alterius Instrumenti, vel (quod magis usui est dicere) Testamenti. Adv. Marcion, l. iv. cap. 1. p. 501. B.

^v Si hunc articulum questionibus veteris scripturæ non expediam, de Novo Testamento sanam confirmationem nostræ interpretationis.—Ecce enim et in evangelii et in apostolis v. sibilem et invisibilem Deum deprehendo. Adv. Praxeam, c. 10. p. 646. D.

apostles. But it does not yet appear in which part the book of the Acts of the Apostles was now placed. We will therefore see whether we can find any light into that question. In his treatise ‘Of the Resurrection of the Flesh,’ having brought arguments for a resurrection out of the gospels, he adds: ‘The^w apostolical instruments [or records] do also teach a resurrection:’ and showing how the apostles preached a resurrection, the first text in which he instances is out of the Acts: ‘You find Paul, brought before the high priests by the chief captain, professing his faith among sadducees and pharisees: “Men and brethren,” says he, “of the hope and resurrection am I called in question before you.”’ He proceeds to observe Paul’s discourse to king Agrippa and the Athenians, recorded in the Acts. This seems at once to show that the Acts were then placed in the Apostolicon, and the reason of it. The gospels contained the history of Christ, and his preaching and ministry; all the other books contain the doctrine taught by the apostles, whether it be delivered in their own epistles, or recorded in the Acts by an historian.

There is another place in Tertullian, which very much confirms the supposition that this book was placed in the latter division of the scriptures of the New Testament. He expresses himself thus: ‘As^x to the gospel, the question about the parables has been discussed.’ And then afterwards: ‘Let^y them now show, at least out of the apostolical Instrument, [or Testament,] that sins of the flesh, committed after baptism, may be washed away by repentance.’ And what he thereupon immediately considers, is the decree of the council at Jerusalem in Acts xv; and then proceeds to the epistles.

Dodwell^z supposes, that the Acts were originally the second part or discourse of one and the same work, of which St. Luke’s gospel was the first discourse. This he infers from Acts i. 1. If they were ever joined together as one book, it is plain they were now separated; St. Luke’s gospel being placed undoubtedly in the Evange-

^w Resurrectionem apostolica quoque instrumenta testantur. Habes Paulum apud summos sacerdotes sub tribuno inter Sadducæos et Phariseos fidei suæ professorem. Viri, inquit, patres,—De spe nunc et de resurrectione judicor apud vos.—De Resurr. Carn. c. 39. p. 407. C. D.

^x Exinde quod ad evangelium pertinet, parabolarum quidem discussa quæstio est. De Pudicitia, cap. 11, p. 727. C.

^y Age nunc vel de Apostolico Instrumento doceant maculas carnis post baptisma resperere pœnitentiâ dilui posse. Ibid. c. 12. p. 727. D.

^z Sunt enim Acta δευτερος ejusdem operis λογος, cujus πρωτον λογον ipse [Lucas] suum agnoscit evangelium. Acts i. 1. Diss. in Irenæ. i. sect. 39.

licon, or with the other gospels; and the Acts probably in the Apostolicon, or with the epistles.

Which leads us likewise to observe the order of the several gospels. It seems that, in Tertullian's time, in the African churches at least, they were disposed according to the quality of the writers: in the first place those two which were written by apostles; then the other two, written by apostolical men. This I am willing to infer from the passage at Numb. II. where Tertullian says: 'Among the apostles, John and Matthew teach us the faith,' or instil the faith into our minds: 'among apostolical men, Luke and Mark refresh' or revive 'it.' It is observable, that Tertullian here places John before Matthew; so likewise in the passage at the end of Numb. III. Possibly therefore we here see the exact order in which each gospel was placed in some churches of that time. Indeed, in the passage near the end of Numb. III. Mark is put before Luke; but the occasion of mentioning him there, next after John and Matthew, seems to be, that Luke's gospel had been largely discoursed of before in that place. The curious may consider of this, and consult Tertullian himself; for I do not affirm that in these passages we have plain proof of the order of each gospel: but it appears probable that the two gospels written by apostles were put before the two written by apostolical men. I shall only add, that, in some of^a the most ancient manuscripts which we have, the order of the several evangelists is thus: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark.

XVIII. That the several books of the New Testament were now divided into any certain number of sections, or chapters, is not easily proved. However, I will observe a passage or two which may seem to afford some ground to think they were so divided. 'Do^b they flatter themselves,' says he, 'with that paragraph [literally 'short chapter'] of the first to the Corinthians, where it is written, If any brother hath a wife that believeth not——?' Where he cites 1 Cor. vii. 12—14; from those words here transcribed to 'else were your children unclean.' Again, in another work: 'But^c this the common way of perverse, and igno-

^a In N. T. evangelia hunc ordinem, Matt. Joan. Luc. Marc. in aliquibus Codd. Gr. obtinent; ut in Bezae Cantabrigiensi, in Benedictinorum S. Germani Paris. et in alio, quem testatur Druthmarus se vidisse, qui S. Hilarii dicebatur. Hodius de Bibl. Textib. Orig. p. 664.

^b Numquid inquam, de illo capitulo sibi blandiuntur, primæ ad Corinthios, ubi scriptum est: 'Si quis fratrum infidelem habet uxorem.' Ad. Uxor. l. ii. c. 2. p. 187. D.

^c Sed est hoc solenne perversis et idiotis et hæreticis, jam et Psychicis universis, alicujus capituli ancipitis occasione

rant, and heretical men, and of all the Psychici [or, ‘carnal people:’ so he calls the catholics who reject Montanism,] to fortify themselves with some one ambiguous paragraph [or ‘short chapter’] against an army of sentences of the whole instrument;’ that is, of the whole New Testament, both gospels and apostles.

But I think that these, and other^d the like passages of Tertullian, will scarce amount to a full proof, that there were then marked in the copies of the New Testament any sections or chapters, either greater or smaller; for by ‘paragraph,’ or ‘short chapter,’ he may mean no more than a text or passage in these books.

XIX. Tertullian affords proof, that there was in his time a Latin version of some or all the books of the New Testament. It might be inferred from his quotations. In one place, arguing against the lawfulness of second marriages, and explaining in his way I Cor. vii. 36, he says: ‘But^e it is not so in the authentic Greek as we have it in the copies vulgarly used.’

XX. The scriptures of the New Testament were open to all, and well known in the world, in the time of Tertullian. In his Apology addressed to the Roman presidents, or to the magistrates at Carthage, as was before observed, he says: ‘Whoever^f of you therefore think that we have no concern for the safety of the emperors, look into the words of God, our scriptures, which we ourselves do not conceal, and many accidents bring into the way of those who are not of our religion. Know then that by these we are commanded, in abundance of goodness, to pray to God even for enemies, and to wish well to our persecutors. [Matth. v. 44.] And who are more enemies and persecutors of

adversus exercitum sententiarum instrumenti totius armari. De Pudicitia, c. 16. sub. fin. p. 735. D.

^d Sic ergo in eodem ipso capitulo, quo definit, Unumquemque, in qua vocatione vocabitur, in ea permanere debere. De Monogam. c. 11. p. 683. D.

^e Sciamus plane non sic esse in Græco authentico, quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem. Si dormierit vir ejus, quasi de futuro sonet; ac per hoc videatur ad eam pertinere, quæ jam in fide virum amiserit. De Monogam. cap. 11. p. 684. A. Vid. Rigalt. in loc.

^f Qui ergo putaveris nihil nos de salute Cæsarum curare, inspicite Dei voces, literas nostras, quas neque ipsi supprimimus, et plerique casus ad extraneos transferunt. Scitote ex illis præceptum esse nobis, ad redundantiam benignitatis, etiam pro inimicis Deum orare, et persecutoribus nostris bona precari. Qui magis inimici et persecutores christianorum, quam de quorum majestate convenimur in crimen? Sed etiam nominatim atque manifeste, Orate, inquit, pro regibus, et pro principibus, et potestatibus, ut omnia tranquilla sint vobis. Apol. c. 31. p. 30. D.

christians, than they against whom we are accused of treasonable practices? But, beside this, it is expressly and plainly said: "Pray for kings, and for princes, and powers, that ye may live a quiet life," 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. Here are in a short compass references to gospels and epistles. He lays them all before the Roman magistrates, and speaks of both parts of the New Testament with equal respect, as the 'words of God, their scriptures,' by which they were obliged to regulate their behaviour.

XXI. There is little or no suspicion of Tertullian's quoting any christian apocryphal book with the same respect as he has quoted those now commonly received as canonical, unless it be that of Hermas. That he rejected when a montanist, as is evident from a passage already quoted out of a treatise written by him, after he had been for some time in those notions, where he speaks of this book with the utmost contempt, and even abhorrence; as he does likewise in another place of the same treatise: 'But I^g would yield the point to you,' says he, 'if the scripture [or book] of the Shepherd, which alone is favourable to adulterers, deserved to be placed in the divine testament; if it were not reckoned apocryphal and spurious by every assembly^h even of your own churches.'

We must however observe how he quoted it when a catholic. It is in this manner: 'That itⁱ is a custom with some to sit down when prayer is over, I do not perceive the reason: unless, if that Hermas, whose scripture is usually called the Shepherd, had not sat down upon a bed after he had prayed, but had done somewhat else, we should have made a precedent of that too: certainly not. And now it is but just mentioned, "when I had prayed and sat down," in the course of the narration, not deli-

^g Sed cederem tibi, si scriptura Pastoris, quæ sola mœchos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi, si non ob omni concilio ecclesiarum vestrarum inter apocrypha et falsa judicaretur. De Pudicitia, c. 10. p. 727. A.

^h Some have understood the word 'concilium' here in our ordinary sense of 'council' or 'synod.' But any church-assembly for divine worship was sometimes called a 'council' or synod by ancient writers, as has been shown by Mr. Joseph Bingham. Antiquities of the Christian Church, book viii. chap. 1. sect. 7.

ⁱ Item quod adsignatâ oratione assidendi mos est quibusdam, non perspicio rationem, nisi si Hermas ille, cujus scriptura fere Pastor inscribitur, transactâ oratione non super lectum assedisset, verum aliud quid fecisset, id quoque ad observationem vindicemus. Utique non. Simpliciter enim et nunc positum est, 'Cum adorâsem et assedissem super lectum,' ad ordinem narrationis, non ad instar disciplinæ. Alioquin nusquam erit adorandum, nisi ubi fuerit lectus. Immo contra scripturam fecerit, si quis in cathedrâ aut subsellio sederit. De Oratione, cap. 12. p. 154. A.

vered as a rule; otherwise we may never worship but where there is a bed. Nay, he would act contrary to the scripture [or 'this scripture'] who would sit upon a chair or a form.⁷

If there is any thing in this passage of a doubtful meaning, it must be interpreted by the foregoing. It cannot be supposed, that Tertullian ever esteemed any book a part of sacred scripture, which was reckoned apocryphal by all the catholic churches he was acquainted with. But I see nothing in the passage itself to incline us to think that he now esteemed this a sacred book, and of authority. It is true, there is in it^k what he refers to, of sitting upon a bed after prayer: but if Tertullian had been well acquainted with the book, or had thought it worth the while, he might have argued^l from divers places, where Hermas speaks of his prayers, and makes no mention of sitting after them, that he gave no authority to that custom. He speaks likewise contemptuously of the author, as an obscure person: 'That Hermas.' Then he hardly knows the title of the book, or ridicules it: 'fere Pastor inscribitur.' As for his calling it 'scripture,' it is of no moment: the word is continually used by ecclesiastical writers, as equivalent to writing, book, epistle, or treatise; by Tertullian particularly, who uses the same word of this book, when he plainly and openly shows his contempt of it. He uses likewise the same term speaking of^m heathen authors.

XXII. The only thing that remains to be taken notice of in this writer, is an early forgery of a book in the name of St. Paul. Tertullian is arguing against some who permitted women to baptize, and gives the history of this book, as what he was well informed of. 'Butⁿ if they think fit to make use of writings falsely ascribed to Paul, to support the right of women to teach and baptize; let them know that the presbyter who composed that writing, as if he had been able to increase Paul's fame, being convicted of it, and having confessed that he did it out of love to Paul, was deposed.'⁷

I shall immediately put down what Jerom says of this affair, in his chapter concerning St. Luke, in the book of *Illustrious Men*: where, having spoken of St. Luke's gospel

^k Lib. ii. in Procem. sect. 1. et alibi.

^l Vid. l. i. Vis. i. sect. 1. Vis. ii.

^m Cum de secularibus quoque scripturis exemplum præsto sit. De Præscr. cap. 39. p. 246. D.

ⁿ Quod si quæ Paulo perperam adscripta sunt, ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique defendunt, sciant in Asiâ presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum, atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse. De Baptismo, cap. 17. p. 263. C.

and the Acts, he says: ‘Therefore^o the Travels of Paul and Thecla, and the whole fable of the baptized lion, we reckon among the apocryphal scriptures. For how should the constant companion of the apostle, who knew his other affairs so well, be ignorant of this alone? Moreover Tertullian, who lived near those times, relates that a certain presbyter in Asia, an admirer of the apostle Paul, was convicted before John to be the author of it; and that he confessed he had done it out of love to Paul, and that for that reason he was deposed.’

Jerom here ascribes to Tertullian more than we have in his treatise of Baptism, where this relation is; for Tertullian there makes no mention of the person before whom this presbyter was convicted. Ernestus Soloman Cyprianus, in his notes^p upon the fore-cited place of Jerom has an ingenious conjecture, that Jerom took his account of this matter from the Greek edition of Tertullian’s treatise of Baptism. He thinks this supposition the more probable, because Jerom gives us a Greek title of that book forged by the presbyter, and uses a Greek word likewise when he calls him an admirer of Paul; neither of which Greek words is in our Latin text. And we know from^q Tertullian himself, that before he wrote the Latin treatise of Baptism which we have, he had treated the same argument in the Greek tongue.

However this be, it is plain the forgery was detected, and the author degraded; and the whole affair was notified to the churches, that they might be upon their guard: Tertullian, in Africa, was not ignorant of it. It is an argument of the vigilance and scrupulosity of the christians about the writings which they received in the name of apostles.

XXIII. We have now seen a very valuable testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament in the remaining works of Tertullian, written in the latter part of the second, and the beginning of the third century. It is considerable for the number of the books cited by him, almost all those which are now received by christians as canonical, without so much as a suspicion of placing any other in the same

^o Igitur Περιόδου Pauli et Theclæ, et totam baptizati leonis fabulam, inter apocryphas scripturas computamus. Quale enim est, ut individuus comes apostoli, inter cæteras ejus res, hoc solum ignoraverit? Sed et Tertullianus, vicinus eorum temporum, refert presbyterum quendam in Asiâ, *σπαδασην* apostoli Pauli, convictum apud Joannem, quod auctor esset libri, et confessum se hoc Pauli amore fecisse, et ob id de loco excidisse. De Vir. i. c. 7.

^p Apud Fabricii Bibliothecam Ecclesiasticam, p. 50.

^q De Baptismo, cap. 13.

rank with them, and for the large and numerous quotations of them. There are perhaps more and larger quotations of the small volume of the New Testament in this one christian author, than of all the works of Cicero, though of so uncommon excellence for thought and style, in the writers of all characters for several ages. And there is a like number of quotations of the New Testament in St. Irenæus, and St. Clement of Alexandria, both writers of the second century. Tertullian's testimony is considerable too for the evident tokens of that high respect which was paid to these scriptures. Indeed they would not have been so much quoted, if they had not been greatly esteemed. Nor have the differing sentiments of those called heretics done us any lasting prejudice. The contest which they occasioned has increased our proofs of the genuineness, authority, and integrity of the evangelical and apostolical scriptures. It is easy for every one to observe the value of this testimony upon some other accounts, which I therefore need not mention. The whole which we have transcribed from Tertullian may afford satisfaction to a serious christian, as confirming his faith in the holy scriptures; and enabling him, if there be occasion, to convince, or at least to confute and silence, adversaries with abundance of evidence.

CHAP. XXVIII.

SEVERAL WRITERS OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

I. *Quadratus*. II. *Aristides*. III. *Agrippa Castor*. IV. *Aristo of Pella*. V. *Soter*. VI. *Pinytus*. VII. *Philip*. VIII. *Palmas*. IX. *Modestus*. X. *Musanus*. XI. *Claudius Apollinuris*. XII. *Bardesaues*. XIII. *Apoltonius*. XIV. *Rhodon*. XV. *Victor*. XVI. *Bacchylus*. XVII. *Theophilus and Narcissus*. XVIII. *Symmachus*.

BESIDE those writers which I have quoted, there were many others in the second century, whose works are now lost. I choose to give here a short history of the chief of them, that my readers may have the clearer idea of the learning and labours of the christians of that time; and may the better judge what disadvantage we lie under for

want of their writings. It is a necessary part of our design, and will not take up a great deal of room.

I. *Quadratus* is first mentioned by Eusebius,^a in his Ecclesiastical History, in the reign of Trajan. He ascribes to him the gift of prophecy, and reckons him among the evangelists of that time, in a passage^b which we have already transcribed. In his Chronicle^c he gives Quadratus the title of a ‘disciple of apostles.’ Quadratus is also reckoned among the prophets of the New Testament, in a fragment of an anonymous author preserved^d in Eusebius. We are farther informed, by the same^e ecclesiastical historian, that Quadratus presented an Apology for the christian religion to the emperor Adrian, which was then extant, ‘containing evident marks of his ability, and of the true apostolical doctrine.’ There is nothing now remaining of Quadratus, beside a short but very valuable fragment of his Apology, concerning the miracles of our Saviour; which we shall not fail to produce upon a proper occasion.

This writer is placed by^f Cave at the year 123, about which time undoubtedly he flourished. We here choose to follow the Chronicle of Eusebius, according to which his Apology was presented^g in the year 126. He seems to be the first christian who presented a written Apology to any of the Roman emperors; in whose dominions the christian religion had its rise, and in which it long struggled under difficulties, but continually prevailed, till it became the religion of the empire. According to^h Jerom, this Apology had a good effect upon the emperor; which is also intimated by Eusebius in his Chronicle.

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, who flourished about the year 170, in his letter to the Athenians, makesⁱ mention of one Quadratus, who was bishop of that church after the martyrdom of Publius; and informs us, that ‘by his care ‘the christians’ of that city, ‘which had been scattered by

^a H. E. l. iii. c. 37. in.

^b Ch. viii. p. 115.

^c Κουδρατος ὁ ἱερος των αποστολων ακρωτης. p. 81. Vid. et p. 211.

^d H. E. l. v. cap. 17. p. 183. C. D.

^e Τουτῳ [Αδριανῳ] Κουδρατος λογον προσφωνησας αναδιδωσιν, απολογιαν συνταξας ὑπερ της καθ’ ἡμας Θεοσεβειας—εξ οὗ [συγγραμματος] κατιδειν εστι λαμπρα τεκμηρια, της τε τῶ ἀνδρος διανοιας, και της αποστολικης ορθοτομιας. L. iv. cap. 3.

^f Hist. Lit.

^g Tillemont, Mem. Ec. T. ii. La Persecution d’Adrien, note 6. Basnage, Ann. P. E. 126. sect. 3.

^h Quadratus apostolorum discipulus, et Atheniensis pontifex ecclesie, nonne Adriano principi, Eleusinæ sacra invisenti, librum pro nostrâ religione tradidit? et tantæ admirationi omnibus fuit, ut persecutionem gravissimam illius sedaret ingenium. Ad Magnum, ep. 83. al. 84.

ⁱ Eus. H. E. l. iv. c. 23. p. 143. D.

‘the persecution, were brought together again, and the ‘ardour of their faith was revived.’ But it is disputed whether this be the same person with Quadratus the apologist. It is plain that^k Jerom supposed the apologist to have been bishop of Athens. But Valesius^l supposing that the words of Dionysius imply, that Quadratus, bishop of Athens, was his contemporary; and observing that Eusebius has never called Quadratus, author of the Apology, ‘bishop;’ nor Quadratus, bishop of Athens, ‘disciple ‘of the apostles,’ concludes that they are different persons: in which he is followed by divers learned men, as ^m Du Pin, ⁿ Tillemont, ^o Basnage. Nevertheless Cave^p is of opinion that Quadratus, bishop of Athens after Publius, is the same with the apologist. Grabe^q approves of his arguments for that opinion, and has supported it with some additional considerations.

It may be best not to be positive on either side. If the words of Dionysius imply that Quadratus was then living, and lately made bishop of Athens, we must needs suppose them two different persons. But if he can be supposed to mean no more than that Quadratus had been some time bishop of Athens; and it could be allowed that Publius suffered martyrdom so early as the time of Trajan or Adrian (which is not improbable); Quadratus the apologist might then be his successor, but not otherwise; for the age of Quadratus the apologist is sufficiently settled by Eusebius. He was an eminent man in the time of Trajan, and probably did not outlive the reign of Adrian, or however not long.

II. *Aristides* is more than once mentioned, together with Quadratus, by Eusebius and Jerom. In his Ecclesiastical History Eusebius adds to his account of the forementioned apologist: ‘And^r Aristides, a faithful man of our religion, ‘left an Apology for our faith, as Quadratus did, addressed ‘to Adrian:’ which he says too was then extant. In his Chronicle he places this Apology in the same year with

^k Quadratus, apostolorum discipulus, Publico Athenarum episcopo ob Christi fidem martyrio coronato, in locum ejus substituitur.—Cumque Hadrianus Athenis exegisset hyemen—porrexit ei librum pro religione nostrâ compositum, valde utilem, plenumque rationis et fidei, et apostolicâ doctrinâ dignum. De V. I. cap. 19. Vid. supra ^b.

^l Annot. in Euseb. p. 81.

ⁿ As before, note vii.

^p Hist. Lit. P. I. p. 32.

^m Bibliotheque, Quadratus.

^o Annal. 126. sect. 3.

^q Spic. T. ii. p. 120, 121.

^r Καὶ Ἀριστείδης δὲ, πιστὸς ἀνὴρ, τῆς καθ’ ἡμᾶς ὁρμωμένος εὐσεβείας, τῷ Κοδρατῷ παραπλήσιως ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ἀπολογίαν ἐπιφώνησας Ἀδριανῷ, καταλείλοιπε. H. E. l. iv. cap. 3. fin.

that of Quadratus; and informs^s us of one particular more concerning Aristides, that he was an Athenian philosopher. Jerom,^t in his book of Illustrious Men, confirms this account; with the addition of another circumstance; that after his conversion he continued to wear his former habit of a philosopher: ‘Aristides,’ says he, ‘a most eloquent Athenian philosopher, and in his former habit a disciple of Christ, presented to the emperor Adrian, at the same time with Quadratus, a book containing an account of our sect, that is, an Apology for the christians, which is still extant, a monument with the learned of his ingenuity.’ In another place, after he had spoken of Quadratus, he commends the learning of this Apology; and says, that afterwards, ‘Justin^u imitated Aristides in the book which he presented to Antoninus Pius, and his sons, and the Roman senate.’ This is all we have to say of Aristides; for, to our great regret, there is nothing of him remaining.

III. *Agrippa Castor* flourished, according to Cave, about the year 132. Eusebius speaks of him in his account of things near the end of the reign of Adrian. He wrote against Basilides, who, as^v Eusebius informs us, was an ‘Alexandrian, and erected schools of his impious doctrines in Egypt.’ That ecclesiastical historian says, there were at that time a great many ecclesiastical men, defenders of the apostolical doctrine against the heresies of Saturninus, and Basilides, and others. He adds: ‘Of these there^w is come down to us an ample confutation of Basilides by Agrippa Castor, a most eminent writer of that time, where he discovers the subtilty of his imposture. Laying open his secret mysteries, he says that he composed four and twenty books upon the gospel; and that he taught it to be an indifferent thing to eat meat offered to idols: and that, in time of persecution, men might without scruple abjure the faith.’

^s Τῶν καὶ Ἀριστείδης Ἀθηναῖος φιλοσοφὸς ὑπὲρ χριστιανῶν ἀκολουθεῖ τῆς αυτοκράτορι προσεφώνησεν Ἀδριανῶ. Chr. p. 81.

^t Aristides, Athemiensis philosophus eloquentissimus, et sub pristino habitu discipulus Christi, volumen nostri dogmatis rationem continens, eodem tempore quo et Quadratus, Hadriano principi dedit, id est, Apologeticum pro christianis, &c. De V. I. c. 20.

^u Aristides philosophus, vir eloquentissimus, eidem principi apologeticum pro christianis obtulit, contextum philosophorum sententiis; quem imitatus postea Justinus, et ipse philosophus, Antonino Pio, et filiis ejus senatuique, librum contra gentiles tradidit. Ad Magnum Or. ep. 84.

^v H. E. l. iv. c. 7. p. 119. C. D.

^w Ὅν εἰς ἡμᾶς κατήλθεν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ τε γνωριμωτάτου συγγραφέως Ἀγρίππα Καστοροῦ ἰκανωτάτος κατὰ Βασιλεῖδα ἐλεγχοῦ, τὴν εὐνοίαν τῆς τ' ἀνδρὸς ἀποκαλυπτῶν γοητείας. Ἐκφανῶν δ' ἐν αὐτῇ τα ἀπορήρητα, φησὶν αὐτὸν εἰς μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τεσσαρὰ πρὸς τοὺς εἰκοσι συντάξαι Βιβλία. Ib. p. 120. A. B.

I need not transcribe at length Jerom's^x account of Agrippa. He calls him a 'very learned man;' and places the rise of the heresy of Basilides at Alexandria in the time of Adrian; which is agreeable to what Eusebius writes in his Chronicle at the seventeenth year of Adrian, and 133d of our Lord, that^y Basilides then dwelt at Alexandria. Agrippa must have written whilst Basilides was living. Theodoret^z says that Agrippa wrote likewise against Isidorus, son of Basilides: whether he means the fore-mentioned work, is uncertain. When Agrippa says that 'Basilides composed four and twenty books upon the gospel;' it is doubtful whether he intends any of our gospels, or a gospel written by Basilides himself. We may have another opportunity to examine that point more particularly. There is nothing remaining of this learned man, except what was in the account given by Eusebius in the above-cited passage, of which I have transcribed a part.

IV. *Aristo*, of Pella in Palestine, is cited by^a Eusebius, as saying, that, after the conquest of 'Judea by Adrian, 'the Jews were prohibited by the edicts of that emperor to 'behold so much as afar off their native soil.' Aristo is generally supposed^b to be the author of a dialogue, entitled, 'A Dispute of Papiscus and Jason,' expressly mentioned by^c Celsus the Epicurean, in his books against the christian religion, written about the middle of the second century, or some time after. Celsus says it was a book 'not so much worthy of laughter, as of pity and aversion.' Origen says, in answer to this, that 'whoever will 'read that little book, without prejudice, will find it not 'worthy of either hatred or laughter; in which a christian is introduced arguing with a Jew from the Jewish 'scriptures; and showing that the prophecies concerning 'the Messiah agree to Jesus, although the adversary strenuously maintained his point against him.'

This dialogue is twice quoted by^d Jerom, but without mentioning the name of the author. It was translated by one Celsus into Latin; but his translation, as well as the original, is lost. The Latin preface only of Celsus to his

^x Agrippa, cognomento Castor, vir valde doctus, &c. De V. I. c. 21.

^y Basilides hæresiarches in Alexandria commoratur, a quo Gnostici.

^z Hæret. Fab. l. i. c. 4. sub fin.

^a Αριστων ὁ Ἑλληναὸς ἰσορει. κ. λ. l. iv. c. 6. p. 118. D.

^b This is taken chiefly upon the credit of Maximus, a writer of the seventh century. Vid. Cave, Hist. Lit. P. I. p. 34.

^c Οἶαν δὲ καὶ Παπισκου τινος καὶ Ιασονος ἀντιλογίαν ἐγγων, κ. λ. Ap. Orig. c. Cels. l. iv. p. 199.

^d Quæstion. Hebr. in Genesim. pr. et Comm. in Gal. iii. 13.

translation is remaining, and is published at the end of St. Cyprian's works. There was a Celsus, bishop of Iconium, in the third century, who is mentioned in^e Eusebius; but there is no proof that he is the author of this translation. All that we can be certain of, says^f Cave, concerning him is, that he wrote in times of persecution, and before the Roman emperors embraced the christian religion; as appears from several passages of the preface. Tillemont too thinks it very probable that he lived while the church was under persecution, at least before the council of Nice. Some place it about the time of St. Cyprian. But whenever the translator lived, we have sufficient assurance, from Celsus the Epicurean, that the dialogue itself was written before, or about, the year 140; or, as Cave says, 136. I shall only add, that the translator informs us, in his preface, that^g Jason was a Hebrew christian, Papiscus a Jew of Alexandria; that Papiscus was convinced by the arguments set before him, and desired of Jason to be baptized. They who desire to know more of this dispute may consult, beside, ^h Cave, ⁱ Tillemont, ^k Grabe, ^l Fabricius, and the authors referred to by him.

V. *Soter*, successor of^m Anicetus in the see of Rome, flourished, according to Cave, about the year 164. Eusebiusⁿ has taken no notice of any writing of his, beside a letter to the Corinthians; written by him, as it seems, in the name of the church of Rome, as St. Clement's had been long before. He speaks of it in his account of the several letters of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth; one of which was to the church of Rome, addressed to Soter, their bishop at that time: in which he informs them, that their late epistle had been read in the public assembly of the church of Corinth on the Lord's day, and that it should be so read often. The passage has been transcribed^o already. Dionysius not only commends the letter of the church of Rome, but the church itself, and Soter their bishop, for an excellent custom, which had long since obtained among them, of sending relief to foreign churches in necessity, and to their brethren in the mines. This passage too we shall have occasion to produce hereafter.

^e H. E. l. vi. c. 19. p. 222. B.

^f Ubi supra.

^g Illud præclarum atque memorabile gloriosumque Iasonis Hebræi christiani, et Papisei Alexandri Judæi disputationis occurrit,—p. 31. B.

^h Hist. Lit.

ⁱ Mem. Ecc. T. ii. P. 1. Saint Luc. Evangeliste, p. 248—251.

^j Bibl. Gr. T. v. p. 187.

^k Spicil. Patr. T. ii. p. 127.

^l Bibl. Gr. T. v. p. 187.

^m Eus. H. E. l. iv. c. 22. p. 142. C.

ⁿ Ibid. c. 23. p. 145. B.

^o Ch. ii. p. 33.

VI. I have already^p mentioned the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the church of Gnosus in Crete, and his admonition to *Pinytus* their bishop. Eusebius^q likewise informs us, that ‘Pinytus wrote an answer to that letter, wherein he greatly commends Dionysius: but at the same time desires him to impart to them more solid food, and in some future letter to write more perfect instruction for the nourishment of the people under his care; lest, being ever accustomed to milky discourses, they grow old in a childish discipline.’

Jerom has likewise an article for Pinytus in his catalogue of Illustrious Men; and gives much the same account of this answer to Dionysius, calling^r it ‘an elegant epistle.’ He says, Pinytus flourished in the time of M. Antoninus and Commodus. As we have no account of any writing of his, beside this epistle, I make no scruple of placing him at the same year with Dionysius, his contemporary. It may be considered whether here be any allusion to I Cor. iii. 2. or to Heb. v. 12, 13. Pinytus is mentioned by Eusebius, in another place,^s with Dionysius of Corinth, Philip, Apollinaris, Melito, Musanus, Modestus, and other eminent persons of that time.

VII. We formerly^t mentioned also a letter of the same Dionysius to the church of Gortyna in Crete, of which *Philip* was bishop. Of him Eusebius^u soon after says, that ‘he composed a most elaborate work against Marcion.’ St. Jerom has an article for^v this writer, and commends his piece; and says he flourished in the times of Marcus Antoninus and Commodus.

VIII. One of the letters of Dionysius of Corinth was written to the church of Amastris, together with the other churches in Pontus. Eusebius^w informs us, that in that letter Dionysius mentions by name *Palmas*, their bishop. In another place, writing of the controversy about the time of keeping Easter, at the year 196, he says: ‘There^x

^p Ch. xii. p. 144—147.

^q Προς ἡν ὁ Πινυτος αντιγραφῶν, θαυμάζει μὲν καὶ ἀποδέχεται τὸν Διονυσίου· ἀντιπαρακαλεῖ δὲ σφόδρως ἤδη ποτε μεταδιδόναι τροφῆς, τελειωτέροις γραμμασίῳν εἰσαυθίς τὸν παρ’ αὐτῶν λαὸν ὑποθρεψάντα, ὡς μὴ διὰ τέλος τοῖς γαλακτιώδεσιν ἐνδιατριβόντες λόγοις τῆ νηπιῶδει ἀγωγῇ λαθοῖεν καταγρησάντες. H. E. l. iv. c. 23. p. 144. D.

^r Valde elegantem epistolam.

De V. I. c. 28.

^s L. iv. c. 21.

^t Ch. xii. p. 144.

^u Φιλίππος γέ μιν, ὃν ἐκ τῶν

Διονυσίῳ φωνῶν τῆς ἐν Γορτυνῇ παροικίας ἐπισκοποῦν ἐγνώμεν, πανν γέ σπερδαιοτάτου πεποιθῆται καὶ αὐτός κατὰ Μαρκίωνος λόγον. L. iv. c. 25.

^v De Vir. Ill. c. 30.

^w H. E. l. iv. c. 23. p. 144. B.

^x Τῶντε κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκοπῶν, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιοτάτος προὔτετακτο. L. v. c. 23. p. 191. A.

‘ is also a letter of the bishops in Pontus, over whom Palmas presided, as being the most ancient.’ It may be supposed that this letter was composed by him.

IX. Eusebius having, in the forecited passage concerning Philip, said that ‘ he composed a most elaborate work against Marcion,’ adds: ‘ As^y did also Irenæus and *Modestus*; which last did most excellently, and beyond the others, detect his frauds, setting them in the fullest light before all the world.’ St. Jerom^z says, ‘ Modestus, who lived in the time of M. Antoninus and Commodus, wrote a book against Marcion, which is still extant. There are likewise other works under his name, but they are rejected by the learned as supposititious.’ We know nothing more of them: there are no such now.

X. Soon after,^a Eusebius says, that there was extant in his time a ‘ very eloquent piece of *Musanus*, written to some brethren who were gone over to the heresy of the ‘ Eucratites.’ Jerom^b speaks to the same purpose of this work, and says it was written in the time of M. Antoninus. Theodoret^c calls *Musanus* a ‘ defender of the truth,’ and says he wrote against the Severeans, which were a branch of the Eucratites. Both these writers are placed by Cave at the year 176.

XI. *Claudius Apollinaris* was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, of whom Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History writes to this purpose: ‘ At^d the same time flourished also ‘ Melito bishop of Sardis, and Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis, men of great reputation: each of which severally ‘ presented apologetical discourses for the christian religion ‘ to the fore-mentioned emperor, [M. Antoninus,] who ‘ reigned at that time.’ In the next chapter Eusebius speaks thus of his works: ‘ Although there are many ‘ books of Apollinaris still extant, and in the hands of ‘ many, I am acquainted with these following only: An ‘ Oration to the fore-mentioned emperor [this is his Apology]; Five books against the Gentiles; Two books of ‘ Truth; Two against the Jews; and the books which he ‘ afterwards wrote against the Phrygian heresy, which not ‘ long after gave great disturbance, but was then making ‘ as it were its first appearance, Montanus being as yet ‘ employed in laying the foundation of that error with his ‘ false prophetesses.’ Serapion, not long after bishop of

^y L. iv. c. 25.

^a Ibid. c. 28.

^c Hær. Fab. l. i. c. 21.

^z De V. l. c. 32.

^b Ibid. c. 31.

^d L. iv. c. 26. in.

‘Antioch,^e styles him the ‘blessed Claudius Apollinaris, ‘who was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia.’ And it may be argued, from his expressions, that what Apollinaris had written against the Montanists was in the epistolary way. Eusebius^f informs us, that Apollinaris had mentioned the extraordinary deliverance and victory which M. Antoninus obtained in the year 174. He does not say in which of his books this affair was mentioned, though his Apology may be reckoned as likely a place for it as any.

Jerom in his^g Catalogue says, Apollinaris flourished in the time of M. Antoninus, ‘to whom^h he presented an excellent book for the christian faith.’ He reckons his works as Eusebius does, except that he omits the two works ‘against the Jews,’ which are wanting likewise in some manuscriptsⁱ of Eusebius. Apollinaris is mentioned again by Jerom, in another^k place, together with Irenæus, and other the most eminent christian writers: ‘who,’ he says, ‘had shown in their works the origin of the several ‘heresies, and from what sects of the philosophers they ‘had sprung.’

Theodoret has mentioned the writings of Apollinaris against the Montanists, and says, ‘he^l was a man worthy of ‘praise, and that he had added to the knowledge of religion the study of polite literature.’ In another place^m he speaks of Apollinaris having written against those Encratites which were called Severians, from Severus, who, after Tatian, made some additions to the peculiar notions of that sect.

Photius speaks of threeⁿ books of Apollinaris, which he had read; Against the Gentiles, Of Piety, and Of Truth; and commends his style. The second, Of Piety, is mentioned no where else that I know of. Photius says, likewise, that there were other writings of his which deserved to be taken notice of, but he had not seen them.

We have seen enough to satisfy us, that this author flourished in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, about the same time with Melito. And Eusebius in his Chronicle, at the

^e Πεπομφα ἕμιν και Κλαυδιε Απολλιναριε τε μακαριωτατε γενομενε εν Ἱεραπολει της Ασιας επισκοπε γραμματα. Ap. Eus. H. E. l. v. c. 19. p. 187. A.

^f L. v. c. 5. p. 169. C. D.

^g De V. I. c. 26.

^h Cui et insigne volumen pro fide

christianorum dedit.

ⁱ Vid. Vales. Annot. in loc Euseb.

^k Ad Magnum, ep. 83. al. 84.

^l Αληθ αξιειπαινος,

και προς τη γνωσει των θειων και την εξωθεν παιδειαν προσειληφως. Hær. Fab. l. iiii. cap. 2.

^m Ibid. l. i. cap. 2.

ⁿ Προς Ἑλληνας, και περι Ευσεβειας, και περι Αληθειας. Phot. C. 14.

eleventh year of Marcus, of Christ 171, says: ‘Then flourished Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis:’ which is the year next after that in which he had placed the flourishing of Melito. Cave places him at the year 170. As Apollinaris has spoken of the victory of Marcus, which happened in the year 174, and of the legion which he says was from thence called the Thundering Legion, and written against the Montanists, and, according to Theodoret, against those Eneerates which were called Severians; I choose to place him with Melito at the year 176 or 177, though possibly he was then in the decline of life.

Nothing remains of these writings of Apollinaris. It is easy to guess we suffer a great deal in the loss of the numerous works of so eminent a person.

There are however two fragments ascribed to Apollinaris in the preface to the Paschal, or, as it is often called, The Alexandrian Chronicle: which the author alleges to show, ‘that^o at the time when our Lord suffered, he did not eat ‘the typical passover.’

‘And Apollinaris,’ says he, ‘the most holy bishop of ‘Hierapolis in Asia, who was near the times of the apostles, in^p his discourse Of Easter, teaches the same things, ‘saying: “There are some, who through ignorance raise ‘contentions about these things, which is a pardonable ‘thing; for ignorance is not to be blamed, but rather needs ‘instruction: they say, that upon the fourteenth day the ‘Lord eat the lamb with the disciples; and that on the ‘great day of the feast of unleavened bread he himself ‘suffered; and that Matthew says as much, as they understand him. Whence it is evident, that their interpretation ‘is contrary to the law: and, according to them, the ‘gospels disagree.’

‘Again^q the same person writes in the same book: “The ‘fourteenth is the day of the true passover, the Lord, [who ‘is] the great sacrifice, instead of the Lamb the Son of ‘God, who was bound, who^r bound the strong man, who, ‘though judged, is^s judge of the quick and the dead; and ‘who was^t delivered into the hands of sinners, that he ‘might be crucified: who was exalted upon the horns of ‘the unicorn, and whose sacred^u side was pierced; who

^o P. 6, 7. Paris. 1668.

^p Εν τω περι τῆ Πασχα λογω. κ. λ. Ib.

^q Καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ λογῷ γεγραφεὶν οὕτως· Ἡ ἡ^ω τῆ ἀληθινῆς τῆς Κρούς πασχα, ἡ εὐστία ἡ μεγάλη, κ. λ. Ib.

^r See Matt. xii. 29. Mark iii. 27. Luke xi. 21, 22.

^s Acts x. 42, and other places.
Mark xiv. 41, and other places.

^t Matt. xxvi. 45.

^u John xix. 34.

‘ also poured out of his side two cleansers, water and blood, the word and the Spirit; and who was buried on the day of the passover, a stone^v being laid upon the sepulchre.’

I think it may be questioned, whether these passages be taken out of a book of Apollinaris, or of some other person.

It is indeed possible that he might write a book about Easter, though it is not expressly mentioned by Eusebius: for he says, there were extant many writings of Apollinaris, beside those he was acquainted with. But the single testimony of a writer of the seventh century can hardly afford full satisfaction in this point. Tillemont^w dares not rely upon their being taken out of any work of this father; he rather thinks they belong to Pierius, presbyter of Alexandria in the^x third century: which may be reckoned a probable conjecture, since Photius has mentioned a book of Pierius entitled, A^y Discourse on Easter.

Whoever is the author of this book, it appears, from these short passages, that he owned and respected St. Matthew’s and the other gospels.

XII. I insist here chiefly on catholic authors. Nevertheless I am unwilling to omit *Bardesanes the Syrian*, who flourished, according^z to Cave, about the year of Christ 172, the twelfth of Marcus Antoninus. There can be no inconvenience in placing him a little lower, about 180, in which year Marcus died. I suppose we may hereafter see reason for so doing.

Eusebius speaks favourably of Bardesanes, though most later writers call him an heresiarch. ‘ Moreover,’ says^a that historian, ‘ in the reign of the same emperor, [Marcus Antoninus,] when there were many heresies in Mesopotamia, Bardesanes, a most eloquent writer in the Syriac language, and an excellent disputant, wrote several dialogues in his own language against Marcion, and other authors of different opinions; beside a great number of other pieces, which his disciples (for^b he had many followers, because^c he strenuously defended the faith)

^v Matt. xxvii. 66, and all the other gospels.

^w Un auteur inconnu et assez nouveau cite deux passages tirés, dit il, d’un discours qu’il avoit fait sur la Paque. Mem. E. T. ii. P. 3. p. 91. ed Bruxelles. St. Apollinaire.

283. II. L. P. i. p. 101.

^x He is placed by Cave at the year

^y Εχει δε και εν τω εις το πασχα και τον Ωσηε λογω, κ. λ. Cod. cxix. p. 299.

^z Hist. Lat. P. i. p. 47.

^a H. E. l. iv. c. 30.

^b Πλειστοι δε ησαν αυτω δυνατως τω λογω παρασημενω. Ibid.

^c Some may choose to understand the original words, as expressive of the eloquence of Bardesanes.

‘ translated out of Syriac into Greek ; among which is his
 ‘ excellent dialogue Of Fate, inscribed to Antoninus. It is
 ‘ said that he wrote several other books upon occasion of
 ‘ the persecution of that time. He was at first a follower
 ‘ of Valentinus ; but afterwards disliking his doctrine, and
 ‘ having discovered several parts of it to be fabulous and
 ‘ without foundation, he seemed to himself to have attained
 ‘ to the right faith : but he did not get entirely clear of
 ‘ his former errors.’ In another work Eusebius says, that^d
 Bardesanes was a Syrian, but a complete master of the
 Chaldaic learning.

Jerom in his^e Catalogue says : ‘ Bardesanes was famous
 ‘ in Mesopotamia, who, being first a follower of Valentinus,
 ‘ then a confuter of him, founded a new heresy.—He
 ‘ wrote a vast number of volumes against almost all the
 ‘ heresies that sprung up in his time ; among all which his
 ‘ book about Fate, which he inscribed to Marcus Antoninus,
 ‘ is the most celebrated, and most excellent. He wrote
 ‘ many other books upon occasion of the persecution ;
 ‘ which his disciples translated out of Syriac into Greek.
 ‘ But if there be such force and beauty in a translation,
 ‘ how much may we suppose there must be in the ori-
 ginal ?’

Jerom says, the dialogue about Fate was inscribed to
 Marcus Antoninus, meaning the emperor, in which he is
 followed by many learned moderns. But^f Valesius, and^g
 divers others, think this to be said without good ground :
 because Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, does not
 call Antoninus, to whom the book of Fate was inscribed,
 ‘ emperor.’ And when he quotes that book, in another
 place, he calls it^h ‘ a Dialogue with his friends ;’ or, as
 Valesius understands it, inscribed to his friends. Nor is it
 very likely, they say, that this book, written in the Syriac
 language, should be dedicated to the Roman emperor. But
 these arguments are not conclusive.

The abilities of Bardesanes, and his writings against
 heretics, are commended by Jerom in someⁱ of his other

^d Εξ ἀνδρός Συρια μὲν τὸ γένος, ἐπ’ ἀκρον δὲ τῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς ἐπισημῆς
 ἐλληλακοτος. Præp. Evang. l. vi. p. 273. B. ^e Cap. 33.

^f Annot. in Euseb. H. E. l. iv. c. 30. ^g Tillemont, Mem.
 Ec. T. ii. Bardesane. Ernest. Sal. Cyprian. ad Hieron. De V. l. c. 33.

^h Ὅς ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἐταίρους διαλογοῖς. Præp. Evan. l. vi. cap. 9. p.
 273. A. ⁱ Quid de Apollinario Hierapolitanæ ecclesiæ
 sacerdote, Dionysioque Corinthiorum episcopo, et Tatiano, et Bardesane, et
 Irenæo Photini martyris successore : qui origines hæreseon singularum, et ex
 quibus philosophorum fontibus emanarint, multis voluminibus explicarunt.
 Ad Magnum, ep. 83.

works: and he says^k that he was admired by heathen philosophers.

Epiphanius^l says, that Bardesanes was a native of Edessa in Mesopotamia; and that he was very intimate with Abgarus, prince of Edessa, whom he commends as a zealous christian. Bardesanes is supposed to have been the adviser of a law published by that prince, and mentioned by himself in the fragment of the book *Of Fate* in^m Eusebius.

Epiphanius, as well as Jerom, counts him the author of a new heresy, which he calls that of the Bardesianists. As Epiphanius cannot be relied on, I shall not take all he says of this writer. It may be justly argued that he is mistaken, when he affirms that Bardesanes was skilful in Greek, as well as Syriac; this not having been mentioned by Eusebius, or any other authors; and they having considered his works in the Greek language as translations. He says too, that Bardesanes wasⁿ originally a catholic; whereas Eusebius and Jerom suppose him to have been first a Valentinian. He mentions his book *Of Fate*; and allows that there are other^o works of his agreeable to the right faith. He tells likewise a story very honourable to Bardesanes: ‘When^p Apollonius, a friend of the emperor Antoninus, persuaded him to deny that he was a christian, he almost deserved to be reckoned a confessor for the pious and resolute answer which he made, saying: That he was not afraid of death, which he could not escape, though he should not disobey the emperor.’ But yet, he says, this great genius afterwards went into several great errors. However, ‘he^q continued to use the Law and the Prophets, both the Old and the New Testament, joining with them likewise some apocryphal books.’ For this last Bardesanes is not to be commended: But I wish that Epiphanius had informed us what were these apocryphal books; whether ancient or modern, Jewish or christian.

Theodoret says, that Bardesanes was a Syrian, born at Edessa, and that he ‘flourished under Marcus Verus;’ that is, ‘Marcus Antoninus the philosopher.’ He adds,

^k Talis Bardesanes, cujus etiam philosophi admirantur ingenium. Comment. in Osee, cap. 10. ^l Hær. 56.

^m Præp. Evan. l. vi. cap. 10. p. 279. D. ⁿ Εκ γαρ της άγιας του Θεου εκκλησιας ώρματο. Hær. 56. p. 476. D.

^o Και αλλα δε κατα την ευσεβη πιζιν εμφερεται αυτου συγγραμματα. Epiph. ibid. p. 477. A.

^p Of this Apollonius, see Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. as above; and Basnage, Annal. P. E. 173. sect. 8; and Is. Casaub. ad Jul. Capitolin. Antoninum Pium, cap. 10.

^q Χρηται δε νομω και προφηταις, παλαια τε και καινη διαθηκη, και αποκρυφους τισιν ωσαντως. Ibid. sect. 2. p. 477. C.

‘ Bardesanes ^r wrote many books in the Syriac language, which were translated into Greek.’ He says likewise, that ‘ he himself had seen his book Of Fate, against the heresy of Marcion and not a few other.’

According to the anonymous author of the Edessen Chronicle, who is supposed ^s to have written about the middle of the sixth century, Bardesanes ^t was born in the year of Christ 154.

There is extant a noble fragment of the Dialogue about Fate in ^u the Evangelical Preparation of Eusebius; in which is a passage, which may be of good use to us upon another occasion where he expressly calls himself a christian.

Ephrem the Syrian made ^v good use of that Dialogue of Bardesanes. The same Ephrem assures us, that ^w our author composed a hundred and fifty psalms in elegant verse, in imitation of David’s Psalter.

Bardesanes ^x had a son named Harmonius, who was an ingenious and learned man: but differed little from his father, according to Sozomen, as to his peculiar sentiments.

There is a Bardesanes twice mentioned in the remaining works of Porphyry. It has been generally ^y thought that there were two of this name; Bardesanes the Syrian, of whom we have spoken, who lived in the second century; and Bardesanes the Babylonian, author of a book concerning the Indian philosophers, called by the Greeks Gymnosophists, who lived at the beginning of the third century, and is cited by Porphyry. But Tillemont ^z makes no scruple of allowing Bardesanes the Babylonian to be the same with him who is usually called the Syrian. Upon this supposition Dodwell ^a has formed an argument against

^r Πολλά δε και τη Συρων συνεγραψε γλωττη, και ταυτα τινες μετεφρασαν εις την Έλλαδα φωνην. Εντετυχηκα κγω λογοις αυτα, και κατα εμαρμενης γραφεισι, και προς την Μαρκιωνος αιρεσιν, και αλλοις εκ ολιγοις. Hæret. Fab. l. i. cap. 22.

^s Vid. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. T. i. p. 387.

^t Apud Asseman. ibid. p. 389.

^u P. 279. D.

^v Vid. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 124, 125.

^w Varia Bardesanis scripta hoc loco commemorat S. Doctor, quæ ex Sozomeno et Theodoreto supra indicavimus: et addit, ab eodem centum et quinquaginta psalmos eleganti carmine fuisse elaboratos, ad imitationem Psalterii Davidici. Assem. ibid. p. 132. n. 53.

^x Vid. Sozomen,

H. E. l. iii. e. 16. p. 526. Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. l. i. cap. 22. et H. E. l. iv. cap. 29.

^y Vid. Voss. de Historicis Græcis; Morery’s

Dictionary, and the Supplement.

^z Bardesane étoit Syrien

d’extraction, originaire d’Edesse en la Mésopotamie. Et comme ce pays n’ étoit pas loin de celui de Babylone, c’est lui sans doute, que l’on appelle quelque fois Bardesane le Babylonien. Mem. Ec. Bardesane, T. ii. P. iii. p. 93.

^a D. ssert. Iren. iv. cap. 35.

the common opinion of the age of Bardesanes, which is, that he flourished in the time of M. Antoninus the philosopher. Perhaps that learned man would not have insisted on this argument if he had seen the Edessen Chronicle, since published by Dr. Asseman. However we will consider the difficulty, without pretending to set it aside upon the Chronicle alone, though its authority may be justly reckoned to be of weight in this question.

In one place Porphyry quotes ‘Bardesanes the Babylonian, who,’ says he,^b ‘lived in the time of our fathers.’ In the other^c he speaks of some, ‘who waited on Bardesanes of Mesopotamia, at the time that the emperor Antoninus, who was of Emesa, came into Syria.’ He means the emperor Antoninus Heliogabalus, whose^d reign is computed from the year 218 to 222.

Dodwell^e therefore suspects that Eusebius has mistaken the emperor under whom Bardesanes flourished. Finding the book Of Fate inscribed to Antoninus, he concluded Marcus Antoninus the philosopher to be thereby intended; whereas it was probably the emperor Heliogabalus, who was of Emesa, and had also the name of Antoninus. And Eusebius, being himself deceived, has deceived and misled all following historians: so that learned man Grabe^f too was of opinion, that Bardesanes flourished in the time of Heliogabalus.

And it is obvious, that Porphyry’s Bardesanes is of the same country with him mentioned by christian writers; that is, of Mesopotamia: and as Porphyry calls him a Babylonian, so does^g Jerom likewise, in a place not yet referred to, cite ‘Bardesanes the Babylonian:’ the quotation too is a part of one of the passages alleged by^h Por-

^b Ὡς Βαρδῆσανης, ἀπὸ Βαβυλωνίου, ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν γεγονώς· καὶ ἐντυχῶν τοῖς περὶ Δαμασκόμην [αἰ. Δανδάρμην] πεπεμμένους Ἰνδοῖς πρὸς τὸν Καίσαρα, ἀνεγράψεν. Porphyr. de Abstin. l. iv. sect. 17. p. 167. Cantabrigiæ, 1655.

^c Ἴδου οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ ἐξ Ἐμισῶν εἰς τὴν Συρίαν ἀφικόμενου Βαρδῆσανη τῷ ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας εἰς λόγῳ ἀφικόμενοι ἐξηγήσαντο, ὡς ὁ Βαρδῆσανης ἀνεγράψεν, κ. λ. De Styge, p. 282. περὶ οὗ ὁ Βαρδῆσανης ταδε γράφει. Ibid. p. 283.

^d Vid. Pagi, Critic. in Baron. 222. sect. 2.

^e Sed vereor ne recentioribus Eusebio historicis omnibus imposuerit Eusebium, qui Marco librum illum ‘de Fato’ putat a Bardesane dicatum. Eusebium autem ipsum, ni fallor, fecellit homonymia in voce Antonini. Sub Antonino enim, non Marco, sed Emesâ oriundo, Elagabalo, floruit Bardesanes, scriptor celeberrimus, e Syriâ, etiam eadem quâ et hæreticus, Mesopotamiâ, teste certissimo Porphyrio de Styge.—Diss. Iren. iv. sect. 35.

^f Spicil. T. i. p. 317.

^g Bardesanes, vir Babylonius, in duo dogmata apud Indos Gymnosophistas dividit, &c. Adv. Jovin. l. ii. T. iv. col. 206. Ed. Marrian.

^h Vid. Porphyr. de Abstin. p. 169.

phyry. We before observed, that Jerom assures us, Bardesanes was admired by philosophers: accordingly we find one of that name cited by Porphyry with respect. These particulars seem to render it probable, that one and the same person is every where intended. And, if so, Porphyry has determined his age, about which all our authors are mistaken.

Let us however consider their testimony, and whether it is likely that they should be in the wrong. Dodwell allows, that Eusebius, both in his *History* and *Chronicle*, places Bardesanes near Tatian. This uniformity of computation seems to show, that Eusebius had no doubt of the truth of it. All our christian writers agree together about the age of Bardesanes, and they had every one of them some knowledge of his writings. Eusebius knew very well the book *Of Fate*. He was not wholly unacquainted with his other performances, as appears from his observation, that Bardesanes did not get entirely clear of his former errors. Jerom too commends his style and learning. Epiphanius passes his judgment upon the writings of this author, approving some and condemning others. And Theodoret says expressly, that he had seen a great many of them: which acquaintance with his works may be reasonably supposed to have enabled them to judge of his age, without depending upon the authority of Eusebius. Then Epiphanius relates some conversation between Bardesanes and Apollonius, a friend of the emperor Antoninus. And there was, beside others, a Stoic philosopher of that name, of Chaleis too, a city in Syria, who wasⁱ first a master, and afterwards an intimate friend, of Marcus Antoninus. Finally, Eusebius informs us, that it was generally said, (he was not certain of this,) that Bardesanes wrote some books concerning the persecution of that time, meaning the reign of Marcus. And Epiphanius informs us of the persuasions or threatenings of Apollonius, to induce Bardesanes to renounce the christian religion. These particulars concur in describing the reign of Marcus, not that of Heliogabalus, or his immediate predecessors, which Dodwell allows not to have been times of remarkable rigour against the christians.

I think then that we may allow, that Porphyry, and the christian writers, speak of one and the same person: and that we need not dispute either his or their authority, concerning the age of Bardesanes, but may reconcile them

ⁱ Vid. Jul. Capitolin. in Antonino Pio. cap. 10. et M. Antonino Philos. cap. 2, 3.

together. The visit to Bardesanes of which Porphyry makes mention, when Antoninus Heliogabalus came into Syria, was made, we may suppose, in the year 218, before Heliogabalus set out from Antioch to go to Rome. And it is likely that Bardesanes did not live long after this, he having died before the time of Porphyry, who was born about the year 232. For so Porphyry says: ‘He lived in ‘the time of our fathers.’

Probably at the year 218 Bardesanes was of a great age. His extensive knowledge, vast reputation, the great number of his books, and of his followers, and his change of sentiments, are indications of no short, but rather of a long life. Possibly too he was an author in the early part of his life. Great men are usually, first of all, illustrious youths. There are many men who have flourished, as authors, thirty or forty years, and more. Tertullian, about the same time, flourished as long; Libanius, of the same country, longer. I perceive not any absurdity in supposing Bardesanes to have been a writer of repute in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, and his being alive, and greatly respected, in the year 218 or 220.

If, according to the Edessen Chronicle, Bardesanes was born in 154, he was not yet seventy years of age in 220; and he would be twenty-six years of age complete in 180, the year in which Marcus died, before which time he might have written several books.

Thus Porphyry and our christian writers are reconciled, even allowing them all to speak of one and the same person. It happens, that Porphyry has spoken of some things near the conclusion of Bardesanes’ life; whilst our authors have chiefly mentioned him about the time when he began to be famous in the world, without^k denying him to have continued much longer.

^k ‘Without denying him to have continued much longer.’ We must however except Epiphanius, according to the common reading and interpretation of his words, Hær. 56, sect. 1. *Διηκεσε μεν μετα την εκεινη τελευτην αχρι των χρονων Αντωνινου Καισαρος, ου του Ευσεβουε καλεμενου, αλλα του Ουρηου.* ‘That he continued after the death of Agbarus until the times of the ‘emperor Antoninus, not him who is called Pius, but Verus;’ that is, Marcus Antoninus the philosopher: which words must be allowed to imply, that Bardesanes did not outlive the reign of Marcus. But on the other hand, if we could suppose Epiphanius to mean Heliogabalus, who was often called Varius, [vid. Lampridi Antonin. Heliogab. cap. i.] he would afford an argument, not that Bardesanes flourished in the time of Heliogabalus, as Grabe says, [Spicil. T. i. p. 317.] but that he continued till the reign of that emperor, after having been eminent for a considerable time before, which may be the truth. But I think it in vain to criticise upon the words of Epiphanius, whose chronology is not always exact.

All this is proposed to be considered, upon the supposition that Porphyry and the christian writers speak of one and the same Bardesanes. But I do not allow that to be certain, and out of doubt: for methinks it may be very well questioned, whether Jerom, when he quotes Bardesanes the Babylonian, means the same whom he has several times mentioned as a christian, or a heretic. However I maintain that our christian writers are not mistaken about the time of Bardesanes, whom they speak of as living, and being an author, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus. And I take it for granted that I have said enough to clear them from all suspicion of mistake in this matter.

XIII. Eusebius has given a short account of *Apollonius*, who suffered martyrdom at Rome in the time of Commodus; probably in the year 186 or 187. He says, that¹ ‘Apollonius was celebrated for learning and philosophy.’ Being accused before Perennis, [præfect of the Prætorium,] ‘Perennis desired him to give an account of himself before the senate, which he did, in a most eloquent apology for the faith pronounced in that assembly: and was then sentenced to lose his head, as by a decree of the senate.’ Eusebius adds: ‘They who are desirous to read what Apollonius said before the judge, his answers to the interrogatories of Perennis, and^m his whole Apology in the senate, may find them in the collection which I have made of the ancient martyrdoms.’ Which collection is lost.

Jerom has given Apollonius a place in his Catalogueⁿ of Ecclesiastical Writers. He calls him a ‘senator of Rome.’ ‘Being commanded to give an account of his faith, he composed an excellent piece, which he read in the senate. But nevertheless he was beheaded for Christ, by order of the senate.’

There are difficulties attending some parts of the history of Apollonius, which I pass over, considering him at present chiefly as an author. Jerom says, he read his Apology in the senate, which is not said by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History. However he deserves to be reckoned an author. If he only pronounced the apology, it might be taken down from him in writing. Eusebius is express, that this ‘whole apology’ might be read in his collection of the Acts of Martyrs.

¹ Απολλωνιον ανδρα των τοτε πιτων επι παιδεια και φιλοσοφια βεβοημενον. H. E. l. v. c. 21. p. 189. C.

^m Πασαν τε την προς την συγκλητον απολογιαν. Ibid. D.

ⁿ De V. l. c. 42.

Jerom,^o in another work, mentions Apollonius among some of the most eminent christian writers. He is there placed with Greek authors: but in his Catalogue, in the article of Tertullian, he says, that father was then reckoned the ‘first of the Latin writers, after Victor and Apollonius;’ where he seems to mean the same person. Possibly the reason of this different way of reckoning may be, that Apollonius delivered his apology to the senate in Latin; but in Jerom’s time it was extant only in Greek, in the Acts of the ancient Martyrs, collected by Eusebius.

XIV. *Rhodon* is spoken of by Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, under the reign of Commodus. Jerom^p says, he flourished in the times of Commodus and Severus: they both say, he was a native of Asia. I shall confine myself to the account which Eusebius gives of his works. He says, that Rhodon wrote several books; among others one against the heresy of Marcion, which he assures us was then divided into several parties. He relates a conference which he had with Apelles, one of them, then an old man, whom he confuted and exposed. ‘In the same book,’ says^q Eusebius, ‘which he inscribes to Callistion, he informs us, that he had been instructed by Tatian at Rome, and says that Tatian had composed a book of difficult questions, for the explication of several obscure places of scripture: Rhodon at the same time promises to put out a distinct work, containing a solution of those questions. There is extant a commentary of his upon the ‘six days’ work of the creation.’

XV. *Victor*, as we are informed by^r Eusebius, succeeded Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, in the reign of the emperor Commodus. He says, that upon occasion of a difference about keeping the time of Easter, ‘Victor endeavoured to cut off from the common unity all the churches of Asia, together with the churches in their neighbourhood, as holding things contrary to the right faith: and^s by letters proscribed, and declared excommunicated, all the brethren in those parts:’ for which he was reproved^t by Irenæus, and other bishops, as acting contrary to the laws of peace and charity.

There was before this a synodical letter, upon the same

^o Scripsit et Miltiades contra gentes volumen egregium. Hippolytus quoque et Apollonius, Romanæ urbis senator, propria opuscula considerunt. Ad. Magnum, ep. 83. al. 84. ^p De V. I. c. 37.

^q L. v. c. 13.

^r H. E. l. v. c. 22. init.

^s Καὶ σηλιτενεὶ γὰρ διὰ γραμμάτων, ἀκοινωνησὶς ἀρδὴν παντὸς τοῦ ἐκείσε ἀνακηρυττων ἀδελφῶς. L. v. c. 24. p. 192. B. C. ^t Ib. p. 192, 193.

question, written^u by the bishops assembled at Rome, which had Victor's name prefixed.

Jerom in his^v Catalogue says: 'Victor, the thirteenth bishop of the city of Rome, wrote about the question of Easter, and other small pieces. He governed the church ten years under the emperor Severus.' In his Chronicle Jerom says, that in his time there were extant^w some books of 'Victor concerning religion, which were tolerably well written:' though perhaps he speaks rather of the bulk than of the merit of his books: they are not in being now. There are extant, however, some letters ascribed to him, but^x without ground, as is generally allowed.

XVI. *Bacchylus*, bishop of Corinth, successor of the fore-mentioned Dionysius, is mentioned by Eusebius, with Polyerates bishop of Ephesus, Serapion bishop of Antioch, and others, 'who^y had left testimonies of the orthodoxy of their faith in writing.' He afterwards speaks of a letter written^z by Bacchylus, about the time of celebrating Easter. Jerom in his Catalogue says: 'Bacchylus, bishop of Corinth, who flourished in the time of the emperor Severus, wrote^a an elegant book about Easter in the name of all the bishops in Achaia.' I suppose he means the epistle mentioned by Eusebius.

XVII. *Theophilus*, bishop of Cæsarea, and *Narcissus*, bishop of Jerusalem, are likewise mentioned by^b Eusebius in the fore-cited place, together with those who had testified the orthodoxy of their faith by their writings. Afterwards^c he says, 'that there is extant an epistle [about the question of Easter] in the name of the bishops of Palestine assembled in council, over whom presided Theophilus, bishop of Cæsarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem.' Eusebius^d has mentioned some particulars of this letter, and transcribed a passage out of it.

Jerom^e says, 'that Theophilus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, in the time of Severus, composed, together with the other bishops of that country, a very useful synodical epistle against those who kept Easter, with the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the moon.'

^u Καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης δὲ ὁμοίως ἀλλή περὶ τῆ αὐτοῦ ζήτηματος, ἐπισκοποῦν Βικτοῦρα ἐηλοῦσα. L. v. c. 23. p. 190. D. ^v Cap. 34.

^w Cujus mediocria de religione extant volumina. p. 171.

^x Vid. Basnage, Annal. 192. sect. 8. Pagi, Critic. in Baron. 196. sect. 3. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. St. Victor, Article viii.

^y H. E. l. v. c. 22. p. 190. A. B.

^z Ib. c. 23. p. 291. A.

^a Elegantem librum scripsit. De V. I. c. 44.

^b H. E. l. v. c. 22.

^c Ibid. c. 23.

^d Ibid. c. 25.

^e De V. I. c. 43.

Jerom has no particular article in his Catalogue for Narcissus. He speaks of him, however, in the chapter of Alexander, who was afterwards colleague or coadjutor of Narcissus in the church of Jerusalem. Narcissus lived to ^s a great age. There are several remarkable stories concerning him in ^h Eusebius, which we may have occasion to take notice of some other time.

There have been published 'Acts of the council of Cæsarea, concerning the Question of keeping Easter.' But they are with good reason suspected, and rejected, by ⁱ several learned men, as not genuine.

XVIII. Having given, beside catholic writers, a short history of Bardesanes, whom Eusebius does not allow to have been completely orthodox, and others called an heresiarch, I shall conclude this chapter with *Symmachus*.

Before the nativity of our Saviour there was no other Greek version of the books of the Old Testament, but that called the Version of the Seventy. In the time of Origen there were, beside that, the versions of Aquila, (who lived in the reign of Adrian,) Theodotion, Symmachus, and two or three others which are anonymous: though these last seem not to have contained a translation of all the Old Testament, but of some particular books only.

The exact age of Symmachus is not certain, some reckoning him a writer of the second, others of the third century. It is likewise disputed, which version of the Old Testament was first made; that of Theodotion, or Symmachus. Petavius thinks ^k Theodotion's was first in the order of time: Hody, ^l and ^m most other learned men, are of a different opinion. I shall put down here only an observation of ⁿ Hody: It is not easy to determine the year, or the reign, in which either Theodotion or Symmachus made their versions; but it is certain that Theodotion's was published before Irenæus wrote his work 'Against Heresies,' because he is there cited. And it is probable that Symmachus had not then published his version; because,

^f De V. I. c. 62.

^g Vid. Hieron. *ibid.* et Eus. H. E. l. vi. c. 11.

^h *Ibid.* c. 9, 11.

ⁱ Vid. Fabric. *Bibl. Gr. T. V.* p. 194.

Tillemont, *Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. 1.* p. 177 et 479. Bruxelles.

^k *Annot. ad Epiph. de Mensuris et Ponderibus*, cap. 16.

^l *De Biblior. Text. Orig. l. iv.* p. 579.

^m This point may be seen argued in Du Pin, *Dissertation Prelim. l. i. c. vi. sect. 5.* Huet, *Origeniana*, p. 256. Montfauçon, *Preliminaria in Hexapla Origenis.* Fabric. *Bibl. Gr. T. ii.* p. 336, &c. Tillemont, *Mem. Ecc. T. iii.* Origene, *Art. viii.* et note x. beside Hody, as above, l. iv. See likewise Dodwell, *Diss. Iren. iv. c. 40.*

ⁿ *Ibid.* p. 580. m.

when^o Irenæus quotes Aquila and Theodotion, he makes no mention of Symmachus, though there was the same reason for mentioning him as the other too. This argument seems to me sufficient to show, at least, that Irenæus was not acquainted with the version of Symmachus, if it was then published.

I speak of Symmachus at the end of the second century, which is very little different from^p Cave's computation, who has fixed the time of his flourishing at the first year of the third century.

Epiphanius^q says, that Symmachus was a Samaritan, and one of those whom they call 'wise men:' but meeting with some disappointment in his ambitious views among his own people, he turned Jew. He must have been converted afterwards to christianity, for Eusebius^r and others^s call him an Ebionite: and it is not improbable, that this is what Epiphanius^t means, when he says Symmachus turned Jew; he considering Ebionitism as a sort of Judaism. According to some^u ancient authors, the Ebionites, or some branch of them, were called Symmachians from him.

I enlarge no farther on the history of Symmachus, which may be seen in^v Hody, who has likewise collected a great number of ancient testimonies relating to him. Our chief concern at present is with a passage of Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.

Having given an account of Origen's labours in the Old Testament, and particularly of the editions of his Tetrapla and Hexapla; in the former of which were the versions only of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, together with that of the Seventy; Eusebius proceeds in the following chapter: 'Moreover it ought to be observed, that Symmachus, 'one of those interpreters, was an Ebionite. These Ebionites are such as say, Christ was born of Joseph and 'Mary, and suppose him to have been a mere man: and 'contend that the law ought to be kept after the manner of 'the Jews, as we have before shown. And^w to this day

^o L. iii. c. 21. al. 24.

^p Hist. Lit. p. 64.

^q Συμμαχος τις Σαμαρειτης των παρ' αυτοις σοφων. κ. λ. De Mens. et Pond. c. 16. p. 172. B. Vid. et Synopsis Scriptur. apud Athanas. T. ii. p. 203.

^r Euseb. H. E. l. vi. c. 17. Dem. Ev. l. vii.

cap. 1. p. 316. C.

^s Hieronym. De Vir. Ill. cap. 54.

Suidas, V. Ωριγενης. Theodoret. Hær. Fab. l. ii. cap. i.

^t Vid. Montfaucon, Præliminaria in Origenis Hexapla, p. 51.

^u Ambrosius seu quis alius in prologo commentariorum in epistolam ad Galatas: et Augustinus in lib. i. contra Crescen. cap. 31. Vid. Vales. ad Euseb. vi. 17.

^v Ubi supra, l. iv. c. 1. sect. 7.

^w Και ὑπομνηματα δε τῶν Συμμαχῶν εἰσὶ τῶν φέρεται ἐν οἷς ἔκει πρὸς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἀποτεινομενὸς εὐαγγελίῳ, τὴν δεδηλομένην αἴρεσιν κρατυειν.

‘ there are extant commentaries of Symmachus in which ^x
 ‘ he endeavours to support the fore-mentioned heresy, from
 ‘ the gospel according to Matthew. These, together with
 ‘ Symmachus’s other translations of the scripture, Origen
 ‘ had, as he informs us, from one Juliana: who, he says
 ‘ likewise, received those books from Symmachus himself.’

Valesius ^y contends, that the words above cited ought to be thus translated: ‘ There are still extant commentaries of ‘ Symmachus, in which, disputing strongly against Mat- ‘ thew’s gospel, he seems to confirm the foresaid heresy.’ He does not deny that the Ebionites received St. Matthew’s gospel: but he says, their gospel of Matthew was corrupted and mutilated; and he supposes, therefore, that in this work Symmachus disputed against our authentic genuine gospel of St. Matthew.

But Valesius has made few converts to this opinion; most other learned men understanding this passage agreeably to the version which I have given of it. And in favour of this sense ^z it has been alleged, that this passage was so translated by ^a Rufinus, and was so understood in the same manner ^b by Jerom: not to insist here on Nicephorus Callisti, Suidas, or others, who have taken it in this sense. It is possible, indeed, that the gospel according to Matthew, used by Symmachus, varied in some things from our gospel; but how far, or in what particulars, we cannot so much as pretend to make a conjecture: though if Symmachus was of that branch of the Ebionites, which said that

Ταυτα δε ο Ωριγενης μετα και αλλων εις τας γραφας ερμηνειων του Συμμαχου, σημαινει παρα Ιεβλιανης τινος ειληφεναι ην και φησι παρ’ αυτου Συμμαχου τας βιβλους διαδεξασθαι. Eus. H. E. l. vi. cap. 17.

^x The original words are *εν οίς δοκει—κρατυνει*: which have been generally understood by modern interpreters, as if Eusebius only said, that Symmachus ‘seems to confirm the foresaid heresy,’ ‘supradictam hæresin ‘adstruere videtur.’ Montfauçon has a learned observation upon the force of the Greek word; and corrects this interpretation: Cum sexcentis exemplis probetur *το δοκει*, maxime apud scriptores ecclesiasticos, non minuere affirmationem; quâ de re vide onomasticum nostrum ad Athanasii opera, in voce *δοκει*. Prælimin. in Origenis Hexapla, p. 83.

^y Ad locum Eusebii.

^z Vid. Hody, *ibid.* 585, 586.

Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* T. ii. p. 338, 339. Ittigius in *Dissertat. de Hæresiarchis*, p. 72. Tillemont, *Mem. Ecc. T. ii. P. i.* Les Ebionites, p. 198; and note 2. Montfauçon, *Præliminaria in Origenis Hexapla*, p. 13.

^a Eusebii verba sic vertit Rufinus: Sed et commentarios quosdam Symmachus conscripsit, in quibus conatur de evangelio secundum Matthæum auctoritatem suæ hæreseos confirmare. Apud Hodium, *ibid.*

^b Aquilæ scilicet Pontici Proselyti, et Theodotionis Ebionæi, et Symmachi ejusdem dogmatis, qui in evangelium quoque *κατα Ματθαιον* scripsit commentarios, de quo et suum dogma confirmare conatur. De V. I. Origen. cap. 54.

Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, (as Eusebius seems to hint, and Theodoret^c expressly says,) it might be suspected that he did not receive the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel. If this work of Symmachus were now extant, it would be a curiosity. It would, in all probability, give us a great deal of light into the notions of the Ebionites, and satisfy us how far the gospel of Matthew, which they used, was genuine or corrupted; and what respect they had for the other gospels; and how far they owned the authority of Paul, or the other twelve apostles of Christ.

Eusebius adds: 'These, [commentaries,] together with 'Symmachus's other translations [or interpretations] of the 'scriptures, Origen had, as he informs us, from Juliana.' By these 'other translations' Hody^d understands some comments, or expositions of the scripture, different from the Greek version of the Old Testament made by Symmachus: but he owns, at the same time, that Rufinus understood these words of the version. They are so understood likewise by^e Cave, and^f Dodwell, and others. I think this sense cannot be well disputed: especially, if we consider that there were two^g editions of the version of Symmachus: though if there were but one edition of that version, the words of Eusebius, taken in connection with what precedes, could not be understood, in my opinion, of any thing but the version which Symmachus had made of the Old Testament.

Hody thinks that Symmachus was not only an interpreter of the Old Testament, but likewise an expositor of the New: and that not barely on account of his commentaries upon the gospel of St. Matthew, mentioned by Eusebius, but for some exposition of St. Paul's epistles. This supposition is founded upon a passage of Agobardus, bishop of Lyons in the beginning of the ninth century. I shall put the passage in^h the margin; but I apprehend no certain

^c De Hæc. Fab. l. ii. cap. 1.

^d Cum dicit *μετα των αλλων ερμηνειων*, 'cum aliis interpretationibus,' perspicuum est intelligi non 'translationem;' quod putavit Rufinus, sed expositiones quasdam scripturarum. Rufinus postrema ea sic vertit: 'Hæc 'ipse Origenes cum interpretatione ipsius Symmachii scribit se apud Julianam 'quamdam reperisse.' Hod. *ibid.* p. 587.

^e Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 64.
et Fabric. Bibl. Gr. T. ii. p. 339.

^f Dissert. Iren. iv. c. 40. Vid.

^g Sic Hieronymus in Jer. 32. et in Nahum, c. 3. ab Hodio laudatus, *ibid.* p. 586.

^h Symmachum non modo ut interpretem V. Testamenti, verum etiam ut expositorem Novi, commemorare videtur Agobardus. Epist. ad Fredegisum, cap. xi. [conferatur cap. ix.] 'Hæc omnia idcirco dicimus, ut appareat, 'quia quam injuste a vobis criminamur, cum dicitis nos reprehensores apostolorum et divinarum scripturarum esse tam injuste; vel potius, multo injus-

conclusion can be founded upon it. Fabricius^l thinks that Agobardus refers to nothing else but the version of the Old Testament.

Hody^k supposes likewise, that^l Jerom speaks of some work of Symmachus written in the Latin tongue. Fabricius^m apprehends, that Jerom's words are not to be understood of Symmachus. This is a matter of no great consequence; but Hody's seems to be the most natural interpretation of Jerom. If this were a clear point, it would be an additional argument of the abilities and diligence of this Ebiomite; who then would be reckoned a master of more languages, than the most learned generally were at that time.

CHAP. XXIX.

SUPPOSITIOUS WRITINGS OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

I. *The Acts of Paul and Thecla.* II. *The Sibylline Oracles.* III. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* IV. *The Recognitions.* V. *The Clementine Homilies.* VI. *The Clementine Epitome.* VII. *Remarks upon the three last pieces.* VIII. *The Conclusion of the second Century.*

THERE were, before the end of the second century, several writings composed and published under the names of eminent persons, to whom they do not really belong; as

‘tius, quoscunque interpretes atque expositores cœquatis apostolis et evangelistis; cum Symmachum, et Paulum, et Didymum, et Joannem unâ ‘defensione indifferentique laude dignos ducitis.’ Respicere videtur ad expositionem epistolarum Paulinarum ab eo conscriptam. Hodus, *ibid.* p. 587.

^l Neque Agobardum vel catenarum compositores aliud opus Symmachi quam Versionem Bibliorum respicere existimo, quemadmodum Hodus ipse probe animadvertit Symmachum inter Latinos patres quandoque referri, quod Latini ecclesiæ doctores ejus translatione usi fuerunt. Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* l. iii. cap. 12. T. ii. p. 349.

^k *Ibid.* p. 587.

^l Symmachus igitur pro eo quod [Ps. cxxxv.] est in Græco περισσιον, in Hebræo ‘Segula,’ expressit εξαριτον, id est; ‘egregium’ vel ‘præcipuum:’ pro quo verbo, in alio volumine, Latino sermone utcas, ‘peculiarem’ interpretatus est. Hieron. *Comm.* in Ep. ad Tit. c. 2.

^m Sed videtur Hieronymus loqui de Latino veteri interprete, qui ‘in alio volumine,’ h. e. non in Psalmis, sed in alio libro Biblico περισσιον reddiderit ‘peculiarem.’ Fabric. *ibid.* p. 339.

is generally allowed. I need not inquire what were the views of the authors of these works. Some might design thereby the advancement of the christian religion in general; others might intend to recommend, together with that, some particular notions and sentiments which they had entertained. Whatever were the views of the authors, I have thought the writings themselves might be of some use to us at this time. If in these pieces, published under borrowed names, the main facts and principles of the New Testament are asserted; this may be esteemed an additional confirmation of the truth of the christian doctrine, beside what is afforded in the genuine writings of this early age. For this reason I have made some extracts out of divers supposititious pieces, and here propose them to the reader's consideration.

I. The Acts, or Travels, of Paul and Thecla have been^a already shown not to be a work of the apostle Paul, but of some weak presbyter of Asia, and never to have had any authority in the church of Christ. It is not certainly known when they were composed: it may be however reckoned probable, that they were written in the latter part of the first, or the beginning of the second century.

There is still extant a book with that title, both in Greek and Latin, published by the late Doctor Grabe from manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. That learned man supposes it to be the work itself of the fore-mentioned presbyter, with only some^b few interpolations. That there are interpolations, cannot be well disputed; even allowing it to be, for the main part, the ancient piece published under this title. The Old Latin version appears to me more sincere and uncorrupt than the Greek copy; but I think them both to have been oftener interpolated than Grabe supposed, and in things of great consequence.

I shall take a few passages of this book, containing, as I suppose, allusions, or imitations of some parts of the New Testament.

I. And in the first place I observe, that in this book Onesiphorus and Titus are introduced, as admirers and friends of the apostle Paul; and Demas, Hermogenes, Alexander the coppersmith,^c are represented as his pre-

^a Chap. 27. num. xxii.

^b Tandem etiamsi concedatur antiqua Acta Theclæ quibusdam in locis interpolata esse, nihilominus ipsa in lucem edere operæ pretium existimavi, quia paucissima sunt quæ in suspicionem corruptionis trahi queant, eaque haud magni momenti. Grabe, Spicil. T. i. p. 94.

^c At the beginning of these Acts, in the Greek copy, Demas and Hermogenes only are mentioned, which last is called a 'coppersmith.' *Αναβαλλοντος τῆ Πανλῆ εἰς Ἰκομιον*—*εργενηθησαν*

tended friends, but real enemies: and, whereas St. Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 17, speaks of some, particularly Hymeneus and Philetus, “who concerning the truth have erred, saying, That the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some;” so here these enemies of the apostle, Demas and Hermogenes, are brought in saying, ‘That^d they will show that the resurrection, which Paul says is to be, is already past [‘made’] in the children which they have, and that they have risen by knowing the truth.’ I put down now two or three other passages.

2. Paul is said to have preached at Iconium, in the house of Onesiphorus, in this manner: “Blessed^e are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,” Matth. v. 8. “Blessed are they who shall keep the flesh undefiled, for they shall be the temples of God.—Blessed are they who have wives, as though they had none, for they shall become angels of God,” 1 Cor. vii. 29.—“Blessed are they that receive the wisdom of Jesus Christ, for they shall be called the sons of the Highest,” Luke vi. 35.—“Blessed are they who for the love of Christ forsake the fashion of this world, for they shall judge angels, and shall be placed at the right hand of Christ, and shall not see a severe day of judgment,” 1 Cor. vii. 31; vi. 3.

In the old Latin version this last sentence is divided, as it were, into two; for after the ‘sitting at the right hand of Christ,’ or God, it is added, ‘Blessed^f are the merciful, for they shall not see a severe day of judgment:’ which is equivalent to those words, Matth. v. 7, “they shall obtain mercy.” And divers other expressions are here put into the mouth of Paul, which, though different from our Lord’s Beatitudes in St. Matthew and St. Luke, are a plain imitation of them; as some of these, which I have here put down, are exactly the same.

3. Paul is brought before the Roman governor at Ico-

αυτη συνοδοιποροι Δημας και Ερμογενης ο χαλκευς, υποκρισεως γειμοντες. Spiel. p. 93. In the Latin version ‘Alexander the coppersmith’ is joined with the other two: ‘Facti sunt ei comites Demas, Ermogenes, Alexander ærarius, repleti simulatione. Ibid. p. 120.

^d Και ημεις διδαξομεν, οτι ην λεγει ουτος ανασασιν γενεσθαι, ηδη γεγονεν εφ’ ος εχομεν τεκνοις, και ανεσημειν, Θεον επιγνωτες. p. 101. iul. Confer Ver. Lat. p. 122.

^e Μακαριοι οι καθαροι τη καρδια, οτι αυτοι τον Θεον οφονται. Μακαριοι οι αγνην την σαρκα τηρησαντες, οτι αυτοι ναοι Θεο γεννησονται.—Μακαριοι οι εχοντες γυναικας ως μη εχοντες, οτι αυτοι αγγελιο Θεου γενησονται.—Μακαριοι οι σοφιαν λαβοντες Ιησουν Χριστου, οτι αυτοι υιοι υψιστη κληθησονται.—Μακαριοι οι δι’ αγαπην Χριστου εξελθοντες τω σχηματος του κοσμου, οτι αυτοι αγγελως κρινουσιν, και εν δεξια του Χριστου ταθησονται, και εκ οφονται ημεραν κρισεως πικραν. Ibid. p. 97.

^f Beati misericordes, quoniam ipsi non videbunt diem iudicii amarum. p. 121.

nium, who asks him: ‘Who are^s you? what do you teach? for they grievously accuse you. And Paul lift up his voice, saying: If I this day be called in question what I teach, hear, proconsul: God is jealous, a God of vengeance: God, that needeth nothing but the salvation of men, has sent me to deliver men from vice and impurity, —that they may not sin. Therefore God has sent his son Jesus Christ, whom I preach, and teach men to have their hope in him, who alone has had compassion on an ignorant erring world, that they may be no longer exposed to condemnation, O proconsul, but might have faith, and the fear of God, and a knowledge of virtue, and a love of truth. If therefore I speak those things which have been revealed to me by God, proconsul, what crime am I guilty of? But the proconsul, having heard these things, commanded Paul to be bound, and to be cast into prison, till he should be at leisure to hear him more carefully.’

I suppose that here are references, or allusions, to several things in the Acts of the Apostles, [Acts xxiv. 21; xxiii. 6; xvii. 3, 25, 30, 31;] and that in some other places of this work the author refers to other things in the New Testament. But I shall not detain the reader any longer in this book, which really is of no great importance; though Dr. Grabe does undoubtedly deserve commendation, for publishing it in the greatest perfection he was able.

II. That the Sibylline Verses, or Oracles, which we now have in eight books, are not the same which were kept at Rome with so much care and veneration, nor any other heathen collection of Sibylline Oracles, but a christian forgery; has been so often and so clearly shown, and is so generally allowed by learned men, that I shall here take it for granted. However, I may have another opportunity, in the course of this work, of showing this particularly, if it should be needful.

We may take a general account of this collection of pretended Oracles in the words of Mr. Turner. ‘We there ‘find,’ says^h he, ‘an account of the creation of the world, ‘the fall of our first parents, the ark of Noah, the deluge ‘of waters, the tower of Babel and other matters, all un- ‘doubtedly taken from the book of Genesis. The histori- ‘cal books of the New Testament have also furnished the ‘forger of these Oracles with several pretended prophecies ‘concerning our Saviour. The manner of our Lord’s nati- ‘vity, his life and actions, his trial and sufferings, his resur-

^s Ibid. p. 101, 102.

^h ‘The Calumnies upon the Primitive Christians accounted for.’ Chap. II. p. 201. London, 1727.

‘ rection and ascension, are described with much plainness
 ‘ and particularity: which makes it more than probable,
 ‘ that several of those Oracles, relating to our blessed
 ‘ Saviour, are not predictions of future events, but historical
 ‘ narrations of facts that were already past and gone. The
 ‘ author, in order to disguise the imposture, is somewhat
 ‘ enigmatical in his account of the Roman emperors. He
 ‘ describes them all, from Julius to Adrian, chiefly by the
 ‘ initial letters of their names.’ So far Mr. Turner. But
 the author has made use of more than one artifice to dis-
 guise the imposture. It may be justly supposed, that with
 this view he inserted in his work several things takenⁱ from
 the ancient heathen oracles, and from Orpheus, Homer, and
 other poets.

I shall add little more preliminary to my extracts, but to
 show when these Oracles were composed.

Cave, who is well satisfied^k of their being a forgery,
 supposes that a large part of them were composed in the
 time of Adrian, about the year 130, they being quoted by
 Justin Martyr; that others were added in the time of the
 Antonines; and the whole work completed in the reign of
 Commodus.

Prideaux^l says, ‘ This collection must have been made
 ‘ between the year of our Lord 138 and the year 167. It
 ‘ could not be earlier, for therein is mention made of the
 ‘ next successor of Adrian, that is, Antoninus Pius, who
 ‘ did not succeed him till the year 138: and it could not be
 ‘ later, because Justin Martyr in his writings several times
 ‘ quotes it, and appeals to it, who did not outlive the year
 ‘ 167.’

Fabricius^m is of opinion, that this collection does not
 contain all the Sibylline Oracles which were used by the
 ancient fathers; but that, nevertheless, it contains a great
 part of them. He supposes, likewise, that several parts of
 the collection have been transposed, and placed in a wrong
 order by transcribers. He farther thinks, that the most
 ancient christian writers, who have quoted the Sibylline
 Oracles, had not the whole collection which we have, but
 only a part; which, together with additions made after-
 wards, compose the collection which we have.

ⁱ Sunt nonnulla in hac collectione, quæ auctor de industriâ inspexit ex antiquis oraculis Ethnicis, ex Orphæo, Homero, et aliis poëtis. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. i. l. i. c. 33. p. 217. Vid. et quæ sequuntur.

^k Conficta esse, idque in gratiam christianæ fidei, nemo non videt. Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 34.

^l Connection, &c. Part ii. book ix. p. 626. first ed.

^m Bibl. Gr. ut supra, p. 219—221.

These, and other observations of Fabricius, in his judgment upon this collection, have a great appearance of probability. We have good reason, I think, to conclude, that our collection contains a great part of the Sibylline books used by the fathers; because it has in it almost all the verses particularly quoted by them, and answers the character which they give of theirs. Justin Martyr, toward the end of his 'Exhortation to the Greeks,' (if that piece be his,) says: 'Theⁿ Sibyl expressly and clearly foretells the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ.' And again, a little after: 'That she^o not only expressly and clearly foretells the future coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ, but also all things that should be done by him.' So do ours, as will appear presently. Whether that work be Justin's, as is generally supposed, or not, is not very material in this case: it appearing from what he says in his^p first Apology, an undisputed work, that he had in his hands some Sibylline books, which were very favourable to the christian cause. St. Augustine^q too says, 'that the Sibyl has nothing in her whole poem favourable to the worship of false gods; but on the contrary she so speaks against them, and their worshippers, that she may be reckoned to belong to the city of God.'

However, some things contained in our present collection may have been added to those Sibylline writings which were in the hands of the first fathers. There may be some reason to suspect that the Acrostic, in particular, has been since added; it being first quoted^r by Constantine, and nowhere clearly referred to by Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, or Theophilus; whereas, had they known of it, it is likely we should have found in them some hint of it. Nor is there^s any good ground to think that Tertullian has alluded to it, as some have supposed.

I shall make no use therefore of that Acrostic in my extracts here, which ought to be confined to writings of the second century: and that the main part of this collec-

ⁿ Την του Σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου αφιξιν σαφως και φανερωσ προ-
αγορευουσα. Ad. Cohort. p. 36.

^o Περὶ δὲ τῆς του Σωτηρος
ημων Ιησου Χριστου μελλουσης εσεσθαι παρεσιας, και περι παντων των υπ'
αυτου γενεσθαι μελλοντων, σαφως και φανερωσ προαναφωνουση. Ib. p. 37. A.

^p P. 82. ^q Hæc autem Sibylla, sive Erythrea, sive, ut
quidam magis credunt, Cumana, ita nihil habet in toto carmine suo, cujus
exigua ista particula est, quod ad deorum falsorum sive fictorum cultum per-
tineat, quinimo ita etiam contra eos et contra cultores eorum loquitur, ut in
eorum numero deputanda videatur, qui pertinent ad civitatem Dei. De Civ.
Dei, l. xviii. cap. 23.

^r Ora. ad Sanctor. Cœt. cap. 18. ap.
Eus. H. E. p. 592.

^s See Mr. Rob. Turner, as before,
p. 207, 208; and Fabricius, p. 214.

tion was made within that time, I shall show briefly in two or three observations.

1. Justin Martyr is the first^t christian writer who appears to have quoted this collection of Sibylline Oracles, or any Sibylline Verses whatever, containing the peculiar doctrines of christianity. The more ancient writers preceding him, who have mentioned the Sibyls, have quoted nothing but what might be found in Sibylline writings among the heathen. This is an observation of^u Fabricius, to whom I refer for the particular proof of it.

2. Celsus, who wrote before the end of the second century, gives the christians the name^v of Sibyllists; and says, ‘that^w some of them had a great value for the Sibyl, ‘and had interpolated her writings with many blasphemous ‘things.’ I shall not need to put down here Origen’s answer to this charge, his answer being allowed by^x many learned men not to be sufficient. Celsus then may be reckoned to be a good evidence, that there were in his time Sibylline verses, which were more christian than heathen.

3. The author betrays his age by several things in this collection. He says, at the conclusion of the eighth book, that he^y is a christian. In the fifth book he says, he had^z ‘seen the second ruin of the desired house;’ most^a probably meaning the destruction of Jerusalem in the time of Vespasian. In the beginning of the fifth book he describes the Roman emperors to Adrian, and says, that ‘after^b him three shall reign,’ [that is, Antoninus, Marcus, and Lucius:] and that the ‘third of these shall obtain the power of all

^t They are quoted likewise, or referred to, by the anonymous author of the Preaching of Peter, who probably lived about the same time with Justin Martyr. See before, p. 255. note ^v.

^u Fab. Bib. Gr. l. i. cap. 33. sect. xi.

^v Εἶπε δὲ τινὰς εἶναι καὶ Σιβυλλιστὰς. Orig. c. Cels. l. v. p. 272.

^w Ὑμεῖς δὲ καὶ τὸν Σιβυλλαν, ἣ χροῦνται τινὲς ὑμῶν, εἰκοτῶς ἀν μάλλον προεσησασθε ὡς τὸ θεοῦ παιδᾶ ἔνν δὲ παρεγγραφεῖν μὲν εἰς τὰ ἐκείνης πολλὰ καὶ βλασφημία ἐκὴ δυνασθε. Ibid. l. vii. p. 368.

^x Fab. Bib. Gr. l. i. c. 31. sect. 13. Blondel, des Sibylles, l. i. ch. 20. p. 86—88. See also Du Pin, Dissert. Prælim. l. ii. c. 7. p. 115, 116. Amst. 1701. Johan. Richardsoni Prælectiones Ecclesiasticæ, vol. i. p. 161, 162. Jer. Jones, New and Full Method, &c. vol. i. p. 457.

^y Τ᾽ οὐνεκ᾽ ἀρ᾽ ἡμεῖς καὶ ὁσίης Χριστοῦ γενεθλῆς
Οὐρανής πεφύωτες, ἐπικλεομεσθα συναίμοι
Μνηστῆν εὐφροσύνης ἐπὶ Ξρησκείην κατεχόντες.

^z Ἐσβέσται παρὰ σείω παλαί πεποθημένοι οἶκος.
Ἦνκα δευτέρου εἶδον ἐγὼ ῥιπτουμένον οἶκον.

L. v. p. 332. Paris.

^a Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. i. c. 32. sect. 7. et Blondel, des Sibylles, l. i. c. 4. p. 12.

^b Τρεῖς ἀρξέσθω, ὁ δὲ τρίτος οὐφε κρατήσῃ πάντων.
L. v. p. 304. Paris.

things,' and in his time shall come the end of the world. This must have been written before 169, in which year Lucius died. He being the youngest, the author guessed he would have the longest reign. But Marcus survived him, and obtained 'the power of all,' or became sole emperor.

So this is generally understood: but possibly by the 'third' the author means Marcus. Lucius indeed, while he lived, was the third and last, in point of rank and dignity, as well as age; but, after his death, Marcus might be spoken of as the third and last. I suspect that he is the person here intended: and the author prophesies of his sole empire, after it obtained. If Marcus is the person whom the author calls 'the third,' then the passages, in which the 'universal power' of one of the three is mentioned, were written after the death of Lucius in 169.

He speaks to the like purpose again in the eighth book: That after him who shall take his name from the Adriatic Sea, that is, Adrian, 'three^c shall reign in the last day,' and then comes the end of the world. But first of all Rome shall^d be destroyed 'in the 948th year from her foundation,' which is the year of Christ 195. The event not answering this prediction, it is reasonable to conclude, that this is only a vain conjecture, delivered before the time here mentioned. It is not easy to suppose that any one should publish such a false prediction after the time fixed for its accomplishment.

I forbear to insist now on the sentiments of the author concerning the Millennium, and other matters, which might show the collection to be ancient, but do not prove it to be written in the second century.

4. These are things which have been already often urged by learned men in the dispute about the Sibyls. I shall add one observation more, though perhaps not very material. The first christians lay under the calumny of practising promiscuous lewdness, and other crimes, in their assemblies. It has been often supposed, that these calumnies arose from the licentious manners of those called heretics. Eusebins^c expressly says, that the impurities practised by the Valentinians, and other heretics, gave

^c Τον μετα τρεις αρξσαι παντατον ημας εχοντες.
L. viii. p. 367. Paris.

^d Τρεις δε τριακοσις και τεσσαρακοντα και οκτω
Ηληρωσις λικαβαντας, όταν σοι ενσματος ήξη
Μοιρα, βιαζομενη των ουνομα πληρωσασα.
L. viii. p. 375. Paris.

^e H. E. l. iv. c. 7. p. 120. D

occasion to the infidel Gentiles to reproach the christian religion, and all christians in general. But this was not so commonly said, by the most early christian writers, to be the ground of these calumnies. Justin Martyr^f freely owns in his first Apology, that he ‘did not know whether ‘those scandalous things, which the true christians were so ‘commonly charged with, were done by the heretics or ‘not:’ and says it^g was the wickedness of the heathen which disposed them to believe such things of other people which they practised themselves. Tatian^h and Theophilusⁱ speak of those calumnies, without making the heretics the occasion of them. Athenagoras,^k as well as Justin, says, the general wickedness of the heathen was the reason of their charging the christians as they did, though they were exemplarily virtuous. Just so the pretended Sibyl. The author describing, as I apprehend, the sect of the christians, writes to this purpose: Happy^l are those men, who praise ‘the great God before they eat or drink, who shun temples and altars defiled with the blood of four-footed beasts and other animals, and worship the one God; who commit no murder, nor theft, nor adultery, nor unnatural uncleanness: but the rest of the world will not imitate their virtuous behaviour, but will scorn and jeer them, and falsely impute to them the crimes which they commit themselves.’ This is all he says of that matter, in perfect agreement with the fore-mentioned early ecclesiastical writers.

Having shown this collection to be, for the main part, a work of the second century, we are now to observe what use the author appears to have made of the books of the New Testament.

I.) In the first book, the Sibyl, or the author under her name, foretells the coming of Christ in this manner: ‘Then^m

^f Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ δυσφῆμα ἐκεῖνα μυθολογούμενα ἐργα πράττουσι—οὐ γινώσκωμεν. p. 70. B. C.

^g Καὶ τὰ φανερώς ἡμῖν πραττόμενα, — ἡμῖν προσγραφέτε. p. 71. A.

^h P. 162. D.

ⁱ Ad Autol. lib. iii. p. 119. B. C. 126. D. 127. A.

^k Ἀλλ’ οἱ τοιοῦτοι (ὦ τι ἀν εἶποιμι τὰ ἀπορήτητα;) ἀκοῦμεν τὰ τῆς παροιμίας, ἢ πορνῆ τὴν σωφρονα. κ. λ. Legat. p. 37. C. D.

^l — Καὶ ἠθεα ἀνέρες ἄλλοι

οὐ ποτε μνησονται, ἀναίδειν ποθειντες.

Ἄλλ’ αὐτοὺς χλευῆ τε γελῶσι τε μυχθίζοντες,

Νηπιῶ ἀφροσυνῆσιν ἐπιψεύσονται ἐκείνοις,

‘Ὅσσ’ αὐτοὶ ῥέξουσιν ἀτασθαλα καὶ κακα ἐργα.

L. iv. p. 287. Paris. 1599. p. 1494. Orthodoxogr. Basil. 555.

^m Δὴ τότε καὶ μεγαλοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς ἀνθρωποῖσιν

Ἦξει σαρκοφόρος, θνητοῖς ὁμοιοῦμενος ἐν γῆ.

Τεσσαρα φωνηέντα φέρει τὰ δὲ ἀφῶνα ἐν’ αὐτῷ.

L. i. p. 184. Paris. p. 1473

shall come the son of the great God, clothed in flesh, made like to men on earth. He hath in his name four vowels and two consonants; that is, he shall be called *Iesous*, according to the Greek writing of that name. Here is a reference to Matt. i. 21. The author says, Christ shall be ‘clothed in flesh, and made like to men on earth.’ There are so many texts of the New Testament to this purpose, that it is not easy to determine a particular reference to any of them; as John i. 14; Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4; Heb. ii. 17; and many others.

2.) Afterwards: ‘Butⁿ do you remember [that this is] Christ, the Son of the most high eternal God. He will fulfil the law of God, and not destroy it, bearing a complete resemblance, and will teach all things. To him shall come priests offering gold, and myrrh, and frankincense; for he will perform all these things. But when a certain voice shall come in the desert, teaching men, and shall call to all to make straight paths, and to cleanse their hearts from all wickedness, and to be baptized in water, that, being born again, they may no more practise unrighteousness; a man of a barbarous disposition shall cut it off, for the reward of a dance by which he has been ensnared. Then shall suddenly appear to men a great sign, when a fair stone shall come safely preserved from the land of Egypt. The Hebrew people shall stumble at him; but the Gentiles shall come to his doctrine, and through him know the most high God.’

Here is a reference to Matt. v. 17, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil:” and to Matt. ii. 11, in what is said of the offering which should be brought to Christ. It is plain the author was acquainted with the first two chapters of St. Matthew. He afterwards seems to refer to our Saviour’s flight into Egypt, and his preservation there from the designs of Herod, recorded likewise in the second chapter of the same gospel. He also confirms the history of John the Baptist’s preaching and death which we have in our gospels.

3.) He presently proceeds to foretell or relate many of our Saviour’s miracles in this manner:

‘And^o then he will heal the diseased and iufirm, all whosoever believe in him: then the blind shall see, and the lame walk, and the deaf hear, and the dumb speak. He will expel dæmons, and raise the dead; he will walk upon

ⁿ L. i. Paris. p. 187. Orthod. p. 1474

^o L. i. p. 187, 188, 191. Paris.

the waves ; and in a desert place, with five loaves and sea-fish, abundantly satisfy five thousand, and the fragments will fill five baskets for the chaste virgin.' But the people of Israel, he says, will not understand ; ' but will strike him with the hand, and spit upon him most offensively, and give him impiously gall for his meat, and vinegar to drink.—But when he shall have stretched out his hands, and bore a crown of thorns, and his side has been pierced with a spear, for his sake there will be the dismal darkness of the night for three hours in the middle of the day. And then the temple of Solomon shall give to men a great sign, when he shall go down to the grave, declaring a resurrection for the dead. Then shall he, in three days, return to the light, and show to men that death is but a sleep : and, having taught all things, he will ascend to heaven upon the clouds.'

We ought to observe here, that where we read, in our collection, ' sea-fish,' Lactantius seems^p to have had in his copy, ' two fish ;' for so it is in his quotation from the Sibyl. And whereas afterwards, in our copies, we have ' for the chaste virgin ;' in Lactantius^q it is ' for the hope' or encouragement ' of many.' And much to the same purpose, in the eighth book of our collection, where the same miracle is spoken of, it is ' for the hope of the people.' I do not stay to enquire the distinct meaning of this writer's obscure expressions ; but possibly in those words ' for the hope of the people,' or ' of many,' he refers to the great satisfaction the people had in this miracle, which suited their desire and expectation of a temporal kingdom : which is more particularly related by St. John than any other of the evangelists ; insomuch that they were coming to " take him by force, to make him a king," John vi. 14, 15.

It is not necessary for me to refer here particularly to the several places of the gospels, in which all these matters are related. Certainly what I have transcribed is sufficient to satisfy every one, that it is from our gospels these pretended prophecies are taken. Beside the many miracles of our Saviour, here is an attestation of the wonders and signs attending our Saviour's crucifixion, recorded in our gospels ; as the rending of the vail of the temple, and the three hours' darkness. The account of our Saviour's ascension he could not take from St. Matthew or St. John, because it is not mentioned by them ; but probably from

^p Καὶ ἰχθυεσσὶ δοιοισιν. Lact. Div. Inst. l. iv. c. 15. p. 398.

^q Δωδεκα πληρωσσι κοφινῶς εἰς ἐλπίδα πολλῶν. Lact. Ibid.

Mark xvi. 19; or Luke xxiv. 51; and likewise from Acts i. 9; where alone is mentioned the ‘cloud, which received ‘him out of their sight.’

4.) This author has divers other expressions plainly taken from our gospels. ‘O blessed^r servants,’ says he, ‘whom the Lord, when he comes, shall find watching; who always watch, expecting him with waking eyes; for he will come in the morning, or in the evening, or at noon.’ He has here joined the texts of two evangelists, but it was not necessary for him to take the words exactly: “Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find watching,” Luke xii. 37. “Watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh; at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning,” Mark xiii. 35.

5.) And soon after: ‘Woe^s to them who are with child in that day, and who give suck to infants, and that dwell near the sea.’ The two former of these expressions are in Matt. xxiv. 19; Mark xiii. 17; Luke xxi. 23. The last woe may be taken from Rev. xii. 12, “Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea.”

I shall put down an abstract of some other passages, where he writes of our Saviour, as he has already done, with some additional particulars.

6.) In the sixth book, which is very short, he says: ‘I sing the great Son of the Eternal, washed in the river Jordan, on whom the gentle Spirit descended with the wings of a white dove.—He will teach men righteousness; he will walk on the waves, deliver men from their diseases, and raise the dead.’ The writer then denounces ruin to the Jews, for having put on him a ‘crown of thorns,’ and ‘giving him gall to drink,’ and crucifying him.

Fabricius^t ought to be consulted upon the beginning of

^r Ω μακαρες θεραποντες, οσως ελθων αγρυπνεντας
Ευροι ο δεσποζων τοι δ' αγραγορθεν απαντες
Παντοτε προσδοκαοντες ακοιμητοις βλεφαροιςιν.
‘Ηξει γαρ τ' ηωος, η δειλης, η μεσον ημαρ.

L. ii. Paris. p. 199, 200. Orth. p. 1476.

^s Λι οποσαι κεινω ενι ηματι φορτοφορρσαι
Γατερι φωραθωσιν, οσαι δε τε νηπια τεκνα
Γαλαδοτουσιν, οσοι δ' επι ρυμασι ναιεταουσιν.

L. ii. Paris. p. 200. Orth. p. 1476.

^t Liber sextus perbrevis, sed in quo clarissime agitur de Filii Dei baptismo ad Jordanem, et Spiritu ei superveniente. Locus corruptus forte ita restituendus:

Εκ πατρος εκ πρωτη πρωτος Θεος. ᾧ τε και ἡδεν
Πνευμ' επιγινομενον λευκης πτερυγεσσι πελευης.

Ex hoc Sibyllæ loco Lactantius, l. iv. cap. 15. ‘Spiritus Dei descendit ‘super eum, formatus in speciem columbæ candidæ.’ Fabr. *ibid.* p. 209.

this book, who has offered an emendation of the ordinary copies of our collection; and supposeth that to this place of the Sibyl Lactantius had an eye, when he says, ‘The Spirit of God descended upon him, in the shape of a white dove:’ which ought, I think, to be reckoned an argument of the genuineness or antiquity of this part of our collection, and that it is, in the main, the same which was used by the fathers. The author took the baptism of our Saviour in Jordan, and the descent of the Spirit, from our gospels; but the colour of the dove is an invention of his own. A man of his fancy could easily add a circumstance for which there was no foundation, and he would make no scruple of so doing. It makes his work a little more poetical.

7.) In the eighth book, near the end, the author expressly names Mary the mother of our Lord, and the angel Gabriel; relates or foretells his visit to her, her surprise and joy, and the nativity of our Lord at Bethlehem of a virgin mother: all manifestly taken from the first and second chapters of St. Matthew, and the first of St. Luke.

8.) He goes on: ‘When^u this child was born, heaven, and earth, and the whole world rejoiced. The wondrous new star that appeared was revered by the wise men; and the child wrapped in swaddling clothes, was shown to them in a manger, for their obedience to God. Bethlehem, the place of the nativity of the Word, is told to neatherds, goatherds, and shepherds.’ See Matth. ii; Luke i. ii. St. Luke speaks only of ‘shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night.’ It was easy to add to them the keepers of other sorts of cattle.

9.) In the same eighth book is the largest and most particular account of our Saviour’s miracles, and the extraordinary signs at his death, of which I shall also give some account.

‘He^v will do all things by his word, and heal every disease. He will calm the winds by a word, and compose the tempestuous sea, and by faith walk upon it. He will give his cheek to envenomed spittle, and his sacred back to stripes.—He will be silent, when smitten on the cheek —and will bear a crown of thorns.—He will feed,

^u Καιροφανης δε μαγοισι σεβασθη δεσφατος ατηρ.
 Σπαργανοθεις δε βρεφος δειχθε θεοπειθεσι φατην.
 Και λογη η Βηθλεεμ πατρις θεοκλητος ελεχθη
 Βητελαταις τε και αιγορομοις και ποιμεσιν αρων.

L. viii, p. 400. Paris.

^v L. viii. p. 384, 387, 388.

with five loaves and two fishes, five thousand in a desert place; and the fragments taken up will fill twelve baskets, for the hope of the people. And he will pronounce the souls blessed, that, when derided, return good for evil, who are beaten, whipped, and endure poverty. Knowing all things, seeing and hearing all things, he will lay open the breasts of men.—He who raised the dead, and healed all manner of diseases, will at last come into the hands of wicked and infidel men: and with impure hands they will strike God, and give him gall for his meat, and vinegar to drink. The vail of the temple will be rent, and at mid-day be the horrid darkness of the night for three hours.' He then says, he will be three days in the grave, and return to the light: 'and will be the first who shall show to the called the beginning of the resurrection.—Then the Lord will first of all appear to his own in the body, as he was before, and show the four marks imprinted in his hands and his feet.'

10.) These things must be reckoned a confirmation of our gospels, and satisfy us that they were books used by christian people, as containing our authentic history of Jesus Christ, his birth, preaching, miracles, and sufferings, and resurrection.

The author has borrowed very little from the epistles; but he may be supposed indebted to the book of the Revelation for several things. However I shall not transcribe any thing of that kind: I content myself with having shown a constant respect to our gospels, in these pretended predictions concerning Christ.

11.) But many of these things being so plainly taken from the books of the New Testament, perhaps some may suspect our present collection of Sibylline Oracles not to be genuine; that is, the same which was used by the ancient fathers: for how could any men take these for ancient predictions of the Sibyl, written before our Saviour's coming?

To which I answer, that the general character of the Sibylline Oracles, before taken from the fathers, gave us ground to expect as much. And a good part of these oracles, some of the plainest and most particular, those taken above from the eighth book of our collection, are still extant in ^w Lactantius, who flourished at the end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth century, quoted by him from the Sibyl in the original Greek. As it may be a satisfaction to some, I shall place in the margin a valuable

^w Vid. in primis, l. iv. c. 15. p. 397—399. et c. 18. p. 417, 419.

passage of^x St. Augustine, in which he gives at once a summary account (though it is not complete) of the testimonies alleged by Lactantius from the Sibyl. And that the Sibylline books, quoted by the ancient christian writers, contained plain and full testimonies to the christian sentiments, may be concluded from the exceptions made to them all along by the heathen, as not being a genuine production of the ancient Sibyl. We have already taken notice of the passages of Celsus preserved in Origen. We have likewise observed in^y another place, from St. Clement of Alexandria, that these oracles were not then received by the heathen people.

Lactantius also, Constantine,^z St.^a Augustine, and others, are witnesses of this exception being made by the heathens of their times. I shall translate only a short passage of Lactantius. Having quoted the same oracles, before translated by me from the eighth book of our collection, representing Christ doing all things by his word, healing diseases, calming the winds, and the seas, feeding five thousand in the desert, and other miracles, he presently adds :

* Inserit etiam Lactantius operi suo quædam de Christo vaticinia Sibyllæ, quamvis non exprimat cujus. Sed quæ singillatim ipse posuit, ego arbitratus sum conjunctim esse ponenda, tanquam unum sit prolixum, [carmen,] quæ illæ plura commemoravit et brevia.

‘ In manus iniquas,’ inquit, ‘ infidelium postea veniet, et dabunt Deo alapas ‘ manibus incestis, et impurato ore expuent venenatos sputus. Dabit vero ‘ ad verbera simpliciter sanctum dorsum.’

‘ Et colaphos accipiens tacebit, ne quis agnoscat quod verbum, vel unde ‘ venit ut inferis loquatur ; et coronâ spineâ coronabitur.’

‘ Ad cibum autem fel, et ad sitim acetum dederunt ; inhospitalitatis hanc ‘ monstrabunt mensam.’

‘ Ipsa enim insipiens gens tuum Deum non intellexisti ludentem mortalium ‘ mentibus, sed et spinis coronâsti, et horridum fel miscuisti.’

‘ Templi vero velum scindetur, et medio die nox erit tenebrosa nimis in ‘ tribus horis.

‘ Et morte morietur tribus diebus somno suscepto, et tunc ab inferis regressus ‘ ad lucem lætam veniet primus, resurrectionis principio vocatis ostenso.’— Ita Lactantius carptim per intervalla disputationis suæ, sicut ea poscere videbantur quæ probare intenderat, adhibuit testimonia Sibyllina ; quæ nos, nihil interponentes, sed in unam seriem connexa ponentes, solis capitibus distinguenda curavimus. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. xviii. c. 23. Vid. Fabricius, ubi supra, p. 227.

^y P. 259.

^z Ad Sanctorum Cœtum, cap. 19.

^a Nisi forte quis dixerit illas prophetias christianos finxisse de Christo, quæ Sibyllæ nomine, vel aliorum, proferuntur. Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. xviii. c. 46. Sed quæcumque aliorum prophetiæ de Dei per Christum Jesum gratiâ proferuntur, possunt putari a christianis esse confictæ. Ideo nihil est firmitus ad convincendos quoslibet alienos, si de hac re contenderint, nostrosque fulciendos, si recte sapuerint, quam ut divina prædicta ea proferantur, quæ in Judæorum scripta sunt codicibus. Ibid. c. 47.

‘ Confuted^b by these testimonies, some are wont to take ‘ refuge by saying, that those are not Sibylline Oracles, but ‘ forged and composed by our people.’ He expected that this objection would be made to his quotations; and he knew it to have been before. ‘ They are wont,’ he says, ‘ to ‘ betake themselves to this refuge.’

These things are well known to the learned: I mention them only for the sake of those of my readers who need information, and may be glad of it.

Mr. Whiston, who^c asserts that ‘ the present copy of the ‘ Sibylline Oracles, as they are now extant, in eight entire ‘ books, is not, in general, the same with that which was ‘ extant before, and at the first times of christianity, but ‘ very different from it,’ says^d likewise: ‘ The present spu- ‘ rious additions to the genuine Sibylline Oracles may be in ‘ some measure traced up to the middle of the second ‘ century itself.’ This is granting all we want at present.

We have then probable evidence that the whole, or a large part, of our present collection was in being in the second century: and certain evidence from Lactantius of its being composed before the end of the third century.

12.) Whatever was the particular view of the author in composing this work, and however improperly some ancient writers have produced testimonies from it in their defences of the christian religion, it is now of use to us, as it affords an argument that our gospels were extant, and in much repute, in the author’s time. He is to be blamed for assuming the character of a Sibyl. However, intending to compose a work in a prophetic style, and therein to represent, among other things, many particulars relating to our Saviour and his doctrine; he takes for his guides the historical books of the New Testament, and follows them throughout, with very little variation; excepting only what was needful, or agreeable, when they were to be turned into verse. And if he had been pleased to write a pretended prophecy, describing enigmatically the several books of the New Testament received in his time, as he has described the Roman emperors from Julius Cæsar to Adrian, it might be very acceptable.

III. There is also a book called, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, ‘ the sons of Jacob, delivered to their ‘ sons;’ in which those patriarchs are introduced speaking:

^b His testimoniis quidam revicti, solent eo confugere, ut aiant, non esse illa carmina Sibyllina, sed a nostris conficta atque composita. Lact. l. iv. cap. 15.

^c A Vindication of the Sibylline Oracles, p. 36.

^d Ibid. p. 49.

their last dying words, containing predictions of things future, and rules of virtue and piety; which they deliver to their sons as a choice treasure, to be carefully preserved, and to be delivered by them to their children.

There have been long since several editions of these Testaments in Latin: but Grabe^e first published them in Greek from^f some manuscripts in our Universities; and from his edition they have been re-published by^g Fabricius. Since which^h Mr. Whiston has given the publicⁱ an English translation of them.

Cave, in the first part^k of his *Historia Literaria*, places the anonymous author of this book at the year 192; but in the second part of^l that work he appears inclined to think, he wrote nearer the beginning of the second century. It is generally concluded, that these Testaments were composed before the time of Origen; because he quotes a book with that title in one of his Homilies upon the book of Joshua, which we now have only in a Latin version. ‘We^m find also,’ says he, ‘the like sentiment in a little book called, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, though it is not in the canon.’ It has been thought that this book was cited by Origen more than once: but Grabeⁿ has shown this to be the only quotation of it in that father. And there are scarce two or three^o other quotations of this work, in all the christian writers, for the space of seven or eight hundred years. Jerom seems to intend it among others, when he says, ‘there^p had been forged revelations of all the patriarchs and prophets.’

Cave^q thinks it not unlikely that the author was a judaizing christian. Dodwell was of the same opinion, as

^e Spicil. Patr. T. i. p. 129.

^f Vid. *ibid.* p. 144, 336.

^g Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T. 1713. p. 496.

^h Authentic Records, P. i. p. 294, &c.

ⁱ I have made considerable use of that translation in my extracts, though I do not always follow it exactly.

^k P. 52.

^l P. 29.

^m Sed et in alio quodam libello, qui appellatur Testamentum Duodecim Patriarcharum, quamvis non habeatur in canone, talem tamen quendam sensum invenimus, quod per singulos peccantes singuli Satanæ intelligi debeant. Homil. xv. in Josuam, sub fin. Confer Testamentum Ruben. sect. 3.

ⁿ Spicil. *ibid.* P. 131, 132.

^o Vid. Grabe, *ibid.* p. 134, &c. 335, 336. Mr. Whiston's Authentic Records, vol. i. p. 439—441.

^p Et si tibi placuerit, legito fictas revelationes omnium patriarcharum et prophetarum. Adv. Vigilantium, Hieron. Op. T. iv. P. 2. p. 284.

^q Judæus an christianus fuerit auctor, haud liquido constat; judaizans forte christianus, quales isto ævo non pauci extiterunt. Hist. Lit. P. 1. p. 52. Quin opus sit ejusdam judaizantis christiani dubitari nequit, cum omni fere paginâ inepte satis aliquid de Christo ingerit. Hist. Lit. P. 2. p. 29.

we are assured by^r Grabe; but he supposed them composed before the end of the first century. Grabe thinks^s rather, that they were written by some Jew before our Saviour's coming, and were afterwards interpolated in some places by a christian. But Mr.^t Whiston asserts, that 'the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are really genuine, and one of the sacred apocryphal or concealed books of the Old Testament.'

Grabe supposes that this book was written in Hebrew. But of this there is no credible testimony: for that learned man does not^u rely upon the story, that it was translated into Greek by St. Chrysostom. I think it might be written in Greek, though the author was a Jew.

I do not very well know what Cave means, when he says this book was written by a judaizing christian. If thereby he means only a Jew converted to christianity, I am not unwilling to assent to him, though I do not look upon that as a clear point. But if he means an imperfect christian, or one who joins the law with the gospel, as necessary to man's acceptance with God, I see no signs of it in this work. For here is very frequent mention of the share which the Gentiles should have in the salvation by the Messiah, without any hints of their complying with the law of Moses. The dispersion and captivity of the Jews, as punishments of their unrighteous treatment of Christ, are much insisted upon. And St. Paul's is a favourite character in this book, who is supposed to have been quite rejected by those christians that judaized. I shall have occasion to take passages enough to set this matter in a full light.

Henry Wharton, who thought^v this work an imposture, and that the author was a christian, is not positive that he was a Jew.

Beausobre, in his late learned^w work, 'The Critical History of Mani and Manichæism,' delivers his judgment on this book, and the author, after this manner: That it was forged at the end of the first, or the beginning of the second century, by some christian converted from judaism: and he suspects that the author of the Twelve Testaments

^r Spicileg. *ibid.* p. 132, 133.

^s Atque hæc fere sunt, quæ cuipiam persuadere possent, Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum a Judæo ante Christum natum literis consignata, posthæc autem a christiano hinc inde interpolata esse. *Ibid.* p. 140.

^u Vid. Spicileg. p. 143.

^t Authentic Records, p. 410.

^v Christianum fuisse compertum est.—Sectam quidem judaicam præ se fert impostor, ut exinde Judæis fucum piâ fraude faciat.—Auctarium Usseri de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis, cap. ii. p. 321, 322.

^w l. ii. c. 2. sect. 5. T. i. p. 354, 355.

was an Ebionite, and that he believed Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary—one of the tribe of Judah, and the other of the tribe of Levi; which he thought necessary to entitle him to the priesthood and the kingdom. It is true, says he, that the titles of ‘God’ and the ‘Great God,’ which are given to Christ in this book, are not agreeable to the style nor the faith of the Ebionites. But it can hardly be doubted, that they have been added by the Greek translator; for there is good reason to believe that the original was Hebrew.

I have spoken already to several of these points. But I do not see how it is consistent with Ebionitism to speak of St. Paul as this writer does, not to mention other things. Whether the author thought Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary, may be questioned. The following extracts may be of use to clear up this difficulty. I see no good reason to think that the titles of ‘God’ and ‘Great God,’ given to Christ, have been interpolated. The work is all of a piece, and the same style runs through the several Testaments. But yet it may be questioned, whether the author did not so far agree with the Ebionites, as to be an Unitarian. I shall put down likewise passages enough of this book concerning our Lord’s deity and humanity, or the presence of the Divine Being with the Messiah, to enable every one to judge of this matter. And if in these places the author appears an Unitarian, there will be the less reason to suppose them interpolations.

It appears to me very evident, that these Testaments are not the real last words of the Twelve Patriarchs. The clear knowledge of christian affairs and principles, shows this book to have been written, or else very much interpolated, after the publication of the christian religion. But, setting aside for the present the consideration of that matter, if these Testaments are not really genuine, they are an imposture. Some apocryphal books of the Jews might be written after those in their canon, without being liable to such a charge. But these are genuine, or they are forged with a view of imposing on mankind: for the author frequently alludes to the books of the Jewish canon, or takes thence expressions and passages without ever acknowledging it. And the better to support the character of that early age, the time of these patriarchs, though he knows every thing in the Old Testament as well as they who have that whole volume before them, he quotes only ‘the Scripture of Enoch, the Tables of Heaven,’ [if^x thereby he

* Vid. Grabe, Spicileg. T. i. p. 338, &c. Fabric. Cod. Pseudepigr.

‘ means any book at all,] and the^y Scripture of our Fathers;’ intending probably the fore-mentioned scripture or prophecy of Enoch.

I shall give some instances of this proceeding. Testament of Zabulon, sect. 3. ‘ For which cause it was written in the scripture of the law of Enoch, that he who will not raise up seed to his brother, his shoe shall be loosed, and they shall spit in his face.’ Which expressions seem to be taken from Deut. xxv. 7, 8, 9. Levi, sect. 18. ‘ The Lord will raise up a new priest, to whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed, and he shall make the judgment of truth in the fulness of days—and the earth shall be glad, and the clouds shall rejoice, and the knowledge of the Lord shall be poured out upon the earth, as the water of the seas.’ These things appear to me plainly borrowed from Isa. xi. 2—9. See also Habak. ii. 14. Reuben says, sect. 1. ‘ I drink no wine, nor strong drink, and no flesh came within my mouth. I tasted not any pleasant bread, but mourned for my sin.’ Which are the words of Daniel, a little transposed, according to the custom of allusions or loose quotations. See Daniel, ch. x. 2, 3. Judah, sect. 24. ‘ And a man shall be raised up of thy seed, as a son of righteousness.’ Zabulon, sect. 9. ‘ And after these things, the Lord himself, the light of righteousness, will arise to you, and there will be healing and commiseration under his wings.’ Which expressions, and characters of the Messiah, are plainly taken from Malachi, iv. 2. In the Testament of Judah, sect. 24, the Messiah is spoken of as the ‘ Branch of the Most High God;’ as in Zacharias, iii. 8, vi. 12.

And when the author delivers somewhat very unlikely to be known but from the books of the Old Testament; that he may the better prevent the suspicion of his borrowing from them, he usually takes care to mention particularly the prophecy of Enoch, or some such writing. Thus Test. Naphtali, sect. 4. ‘ I say this, my sons, because I know, by the holy scripture of Enoch, that you will yourselves also depart from the Lord.’ And Levi, sect. 10. ‘ For the house which the Lord will choose shall be called Jerusalem, as is contained in the book of Enoch the righteous.’ This is more than Moses appears to have known: and it is very unlikely that Levi should be acquainted so long beforehand, with the name of the place which God would choose. The author undoubtedly knew this the same way that we

V. T. p. 559, and Mr. Whiston’s Collection of Authentic Records, vol. i. p. 293.

^y Ἐγγρων ἐν γραφῇ πατέρων μ. Zabulon, Test. sect. 9.

do: but, the better to blind the eyes of men, Levi is made to say, that this is ‘contained in the book of Enoch.’

Indeed Mr. Whiston² says: ‘Though it be usually taken ‘for granted, that the author of these Testaments wrote ‘after the known books of the Old and New Testament, ‘and so took these notions and language thence; yet, since ‘all the real evidence is on the other side, that these Testaments are the eldest, it is most reasonable to suppose that ‘the writers of the Old and New Testament did, vice versâ, ‘allude to these Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.’ How can any man say this, that ‘all the real evidence is ‘on the other side?’ Not to insist now on the New Testament, how can any man say this with regard to the Old? Are there as many ancient testimonies to these Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, that they were written before the coming of Christ, as there are to the books of the Jewish canon? There is no evidence of that early age, worth considering, beside the pretensions of the book itself; which are of little moment, unless they were better supported by external evidence than they are.

Again, Mr. Whiston^a says: ‘Nor are the particulars thus ‘declared, especially those in the Testament of Levi, at all ‘unworthy either of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob; nor indeed ‘at all inferior, in their importance, to any parallel parts of ‘the canonical scriptures of the Old Testament.’ I perceive nothing of importance in this observation. All this is very likely, upon the common supposition of learned men, that this book was composed after the coming of Christ. A man acquainted with all the revelations of God in the Old Testament, may well write some things not unworthy of those three ancient patriarchs; and may rehearse, if he thinks fit, in a prophetic style, every thing contained in the canonical scriptures of the Old Testament, and put it in the mouth of whom he pleases. A man instructed in the gospel revelation may easily write in the like manner: and if he should take advantage from later events and discoveries, and should clothe all his knowledge of facts and principles in prophetic language, he may declare things which those holy men never knew; such things as many prophets and righteous men desired indeed to see, but did not see them; and to hear, but did not hear them.

But though here are many things not unworthy of those patriarchs, and a knowledge of future events vastly

² Authentic Records, P. i. p. 432.

^a Ibid. p. 412.

beyond what they really had, and several^b fine passages which it would be a pleasure to me to transcribe, if I had room; yet here are also some things^c unsuitable to the solemnity of a dying hour, and dying admonitions; particularly, in the Testament of Joseph, whom we know to have been a wise and excellent man, there are some things not^d altogether becoming the gravity of that patriarch. However, this is not mentioned as a matter of any great consequence: for I do not suppose that the virtue of any of those ancient Hebrews was complete according to the christian rule.

Upon the whole, I see nothing in this work but what might be written by a learned Jew of the second century, or later; though whether the author was a Jew, or a Gentile, I cannot say: I think he was a christian, and well versed in the Jewish learning. Nor do I pretend to determine the age of the anonymous author of the Twelve Testaments. I am of opinion, however, that he is placed early enough by Cave, in the first part of his *Historia Literaria*, at the year 192.

As I do not intend to take any further notice of this book in any other part of this work, if I can avoid it, I shall now transcribe, beside allusions to the books of the New Testament, several passages relating to some material facts of the gospel history; and likewise concerning our blessed Lord, the promised Messiah; containing this author's character of his person, and description of his circumstances in this world. If any are pleased to consider them as real prophecies of the Messiah, delivered before his coming, they will be a confirmation of the christian religion, so far as our Lord answered those prophetic characters. Take them to be representations of things already done, composed afterwards in a prophetic style, and they show the belief and sentiments of christians, of some at least.

1. The Testament of Simeon, sect. 7. 'For^e the Lord shall raise up out of Levi an high priest, and out of Judah a king, God and man. So he will save all the Gentiles, and the stock of Israel.'

By the 'high priest' may be intended John the baptist, who was of the tribe of Levi, and of the race of the Jewish priests. Luke i. The 'king out of Judah' is plainly our blessed Saviour. So this place is understood by Mr.

^b See the Testament of Gad, sect. 4. A-er, sect. 2.

^c Reuben, sect. 3. Judah, sect. 12. ^d Joseph, sect. 9.

^e Αναζησει γαρ Κυριος εκ τῆς Λευι αρχιερα, και εκ τῆς Ιουδα βασιλεα, Θεον και ανθρωπον.

Whiston. Some^f other learned men think, the ‘high priest out of Levi,’ and the ‘king out of Judah,’ to be one and the same person, Jesus the Messiah, in whom the priesthood and the kingdom were united: and that it was this author’s opinion, that Jesus was of the tribe of Levi by Mary, and of the tribe of Judah by Joseph. I cannot determine what is the intention of this passage; though I rather incline to the sense last mentioned, so far as to think one person only is spoken of. And there are several other passages, that may induce us to suppose the author reckoned the Messiah to be of both these tribes. But yet I think it does not follow, that he believed Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary: for he might suppose him to be of the tribe of Levi by his mother Mary, and of the tribe of Judah by his legal and reputed father Joseph.

2. Gad, sect. 8. ‘But do you yourselves tell this to your sons, that they are to honour Judah and Levi: for out of them the Lord will arise to you a Saviour to Israel.’ See, to the like purpose, Test. of Dan, sect. 5.

3. Joseph, sect. 19. ‘Do you therefore, my sons, keep the commandments of the Lord, and honour Judah and Levi: for out of them shall arise to you the Lamb of God, by grace saving all the Gentiles and Israel.’

I shall put in the margin^g a passage, supposed to be Origen’s. The learned reader will be pleased to consider whether it serves to give light to these, or any other passages of our Testaments.

4. Levi, sect. 2. Levi says, he had been told by an angel: ‘For thou shalt stand near to the Lord, and shalt be his minister, and thou shalt declare his mysteries to men, and shalt preach concerning the future redemption of Israel; [this may be John the Baptist;] and by thee and Judah the Lord shall be seen among men, saving by them [that is, by John the Baptist and Christ] all mankind.’

If here is no reference to John the Baptist, but only to our Saviour, the author may be supposed to say, that God would save mankind by those two tribes, inasmuch as the Messiah would be of both of them, or some way in a more especial manner allied to them. However, it does by no means appear plain to me, that the writer believed Jesus

^f Vid. Henric. Wharton, Auctar. Usserii. p. 322. Beausobre, Historie de Manichée, l. ii. ch. 2. sect. 5.

^g Πλην εκ τῶν δῆμων πατρος αυτων εσονται γυναικες.] Προσαρτε εν ὁ θεος, πλην της Ιαδα και της Λευι, μη εξιναι απο φυλης εις φυλην συναπτεσθαι, ινα μη ξενον τῶν Σωτηρος δειχθη ανωθεν ερχομενον, το, βασιλευς και ιερευς κατα την ταξιν Μελχισηδεκ. Orig. Select. in Num. xxxvi. G. T. ii. p. 274. F. Ed. Bened.

Christ to be born of Joseph and Mary. The expressions are ambiguous, and capable of other senses, and therefore the meaning of them must be doubtful. Perhaps one reason of insisting so much on these two tribes was, because, at the time of the coming of the Messiah, the land of Judea was chiefly inhabited by them, together with the tribe of Benjamin. It is observable, that in the Old Testament the interests of the family of David, (out of which the Messiah was to arise,) and the tribe of Levi, are closely connected. Jer. xxxiii. 20—22. Nay, it may be questioned whether this author does not mean Mary by the^h ‘Virgin born of Judah,’ in a place to be produced hereafter. In the mean time I put down in the margin someⁱ other passages which may be of use in this enquiry.

5. Levi, sect. 4. the angel proceeds in his discoveries to Levi: ‘Know ye, therefore, that the Lord will execute judgment upon the sons of men, when the rocks shall be rent, and the sun be extinguished, and the waters be dried up, and the fire shall make a trembling, and the invisible spirits shall melt away, and Hades^k be despoiled at the passion of the Most High; and men shall still be unbelieving, and continuing in their unrighteousness. For this reason shall they be adjudged to punishment.’

^h See numb. 38.

ⁱ Testament of Reuben, sect. 6. ‘For the Lord has given the principality to Levi and to Judah.’ Levi is preferred to Judah, Test. Issachar, sect. 5. Dan, sect. 5. And in Judah, sect. 21, are these words: ‘And now, my sons, love Levi——for the Lord has given the kingdom to me, and to him the priesthood, and has subjected the kingdom to the priesthood. To me he has given the things on the earth, to him the things in heaven. As heaven is superior to the earth, so is the priesthood of God superior to the earthly kingdom [or kingdom upon earth].’ In Judah, sect. 25, Levi is preferred to Judah. Once more, Naphtali, sect. 5. ‘For in the fortieth year of my life I saw in a dream, in the Mountain of Olives, on the east of Jerusalem, [by the way, this is not likely to have been spoken by Naphtali,] that the sun and the moon stood still. And behold, Isaac my father’s father said to us, Run, every one of you, and catch them according to your abilities, and the sun and the moon shall be to him that catcheth them. And we all ran together; and Levi caught the sun, and Judah made haste and caught the moon. And Levi appeared as the sun,——Judah was splendid as the moon.’ If this preference be given by the writer to the tribe of Levi above that of Judah, upon account of Christ’s birth of Mary, whom he supposed to be of the tribe of Levi, to which tribe therefore heavenly things appertained; it is an argument that he did not suppose Joseph, who was certainly of the tribe of Judah, to be the real father of Christ: for, if so, Judah would have been at least equal to Levi. I would just observe, that whatever is the design of this preference of Levi, the author supposes the eternal kingdom to belong to Judah. Testament of Judah, sect. 22, and in Levi, sect. 8, it is said: ‘A king shall be raised out of Judah, and shall ordain a new priesthood.’

^k Και του ἀδης σκυλευομενη επι τη παθει της Ὑψιστης.

Surely here is a reference to Matt. xxvii. 51—53, and to the following conduct of the unbelieving Jews, as described in the New Testament. The author mentions some things not particularly related in the gospels, ‘the drying up of waters,’ and ‘trembling of the fire:’ but such things may be well supposed concomitants of an earthquake, and an extinction, or extraordinary eclipse, of the sun.

6. Levi, sect. 4. The angel presently adds: ‘Thou shalt be a luminary to illuminate the posterity of Jacob,—until the Lord visit all the Gentiles in the bowels of his Son for ever. However, thy sons¹ will lay hands upon him to crucify him.’

This is not a real prophecy, that the Jewish priests would be the chief instruments of the crucifixion of the Messiah, before the manifestation of God’s gracious purposes to the Gentile world; but it is a just and true representation of matters of fact.

7. Levi, sect. 10. Beside other things relating to the gospel dispensation, Levi says to his sons: ‘I am innocent of all your impiety and transgression, which you will be guilty of in the consummation of the ages, in dealing impiously with the Saviour of the world.—And you will transgress together with Israel, insomuch that Jerusalem will not be able to support itself before the face of your wickedness. Nay, the veil of the temple will be rent, and will not cover your shame. And you shall be scattered among the Gentiles, and you shall be for a reproach, and a curse, and a conculcation.’

This is no real prophecy, at least not delivered before the building of Jerusalem, as is pretended, but probably written after the destruction of it by Titus. Nor is the composer of this book, whenever he lived, a judaizer.

8. Levi, sect. 14. Still Levi says: ‘And now, my sons, I know, from the scripture of Enoch, that in the end you will act impiously, laying hands upon the Lord in all wickedness. And your brethren will be ashamed of you, and you will be a derision to all the Gentiles. But our father Israel^m is pure from the impiety of the high priests, who will lay their hands upon the Saviour of the world.’ At sect. 15, he declares, ‘For these causes that very temple which the Lord shall choose shall become desolate.’

9. I shall take one passage more, representing strongly the state of the Jews and the Gentiles under the Messiah.

¹ Πλην οί υίοι σε επιβαλουσι χειρας επ’ αυτον του αποσκολοπισαι αυτον.

^m Καθαρος εστιν απο της ασεβειας των αρχιερων, οιτινες επιβαλισι τας χειρας αυτων επι τον Σωτηρα τη κοσμου.

Levi, sect. 18. 'And under his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth, and shall be illuminated by the grace of the Lord. But Israel shall be made little by their ignorance, and shall be darkened by their sorrow.'

The character of the Messiah, together with some other matters, is represented in the following passages.

10. Levi, sect. 18. 'And then will the Lord raise up a new priest, to whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed. And he shall make the judgment of truth upon the earth in the fulness of days. And his star shall arise in heaven as a king, affording light, the light of knowledge, above the sun in the day time: and he shall be magnified in the whole world, until his assumption.'

Here seems to be a reference to Matt. ii. 2, as well as a general description of our Lord's ministry.

11. Levi, sect. 18. 'The heavens shall be opened, and out of the temple of glory shall the sanctification come upon him, with the voice of the Father, as [it came] unto Abraham the father of Isaac.' See Matt. iii. 16, 17.

12. Judah, sect. 24. 'And after this,' says Judah to his sons, 'a star shall arise to you out of Jacob, in peace: and a man shall be raised up out of thy seed, as a sun of righteousness, conversing with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin shall be found in him. And the heaven shall be opened upon him, to pour out the Spirit, the blessing of his Holy Father. And he himself shall pour the spirit upon you, and ye shall be to him sons in truth,' Numb. xxiv. 17. See again, Matt. iii. 16, 17, and Acts ii.

13. Zabulon, sect. 9. 'Andⁿ after these things^o the Lord himself, the light of righteousness, will arise to you, and there will be healing and commiseration under his wings. He himself will redeem all the captivity of the sons of men from Belial. And every spirit of error shall be trodden down. And he shall convert all the Gentiles to have a zeal for him, and ye^p shall see God in the form of man, in Jerusalem, which the Lord will so name. And again you will provoke him to anger with the wickedness of your words, and ye shall be cast away till the time of the consummation.' Mal. iv. 2.

14. Naphtali, sect. 8. 'Do you therefore also charge your sons that they be united to Levi, and to Judah; for through

ⁿ Και μετα ταυτα ανατελει υμιν αυτος Κυριος φως δικαιοσυνης.

^o Or, 'The Lord himself will raise up the light of righteousness.' So Mr. Whiston.

^p Και οψεσθε Θεον εν σχηματι ανθρωπου.

Judah shall salvation arise to Israel, and in him shall Jacob be blessed. For by his^a tribe [or ‘sceptre’] shall God appear inhabiting among men upon the earth, to save the stock of Israel. And he will gather together the righteous of the Gentiles.’

15. Benjamin, sect. 10. ‘Then shall we also rise again, every one upon our sceptre, adoring^r the King of the heavens, who appeared upon earth in the form of man’s humiliation [or, ‘in the form of a man of humiliation’]. And as many as have believed on him upon earth, shall rejoice together with him. At which time all men shall rise again, some to glory, and others to disgrace. And the Lord will judge Israel in the first place, on^s account of their injustice to him; because they did not believe in God, when he came as their deliverer in the flesh.’

16. Simeon, sect. 6. ‘Then shall Sem be glorified, when^t the Lord, the great God of Israel, shall appear upon earth as a man, and shall save Adam by himself.—Then shall I rise again with gladness, and shall bless the Most High for his wonderful works, because^u God, taking a body, and eating with them, hath saved them.’

17. Aser, sect. 7. ‘—until^v the Most High shall visit the earth, and he himself shall come as a man, eating and drinking with men, and in silence bruising the head of the dragon with water. He shall save Israel and all the Gentiles.’

18. Levi, sect. 16. ‘And now I know, by the book of Enoch,—that you will despise the words of the prophets, and in your perverseness you will persecute righteous men, and hate the holy: you will abominate the words of those that speak truth; and^w you will declare that man, who renews the law in the power of the Most High, a deceiver: and in the end, as you suppose, you will kill him, not knowing his resurrection, and by malice will bring innocent blood upon your heads. And for his sake your holy places will become desolate, being profaned to the foundation.’ And more to the same purpose. One can hardly help

^a Δια γὰρ τῆ σκηπτρῶ αὐτῆ ὀφθῆσεται Θεός, κατοικῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

^r Προσκυνῶντες τὸν βασιλεῖα τῶν οὐρανῶν, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανεῖν ἐν μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου ταπεινωσῶς.

^s Περὶ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν ἀδικίας, ὅτι παραγενόμενον Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλευθέρωτην οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν.

^t Ὅτε Κύριος, ὁ Θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, φαινομένος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἀνθρώπος, κ. λ.

^u Ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς σῶμα λαβὼν, καὶ συνεισθίων ἀνθρώποις, ἐσῶσεν αὐτοὺς.

^v Ἔως οὐ ὁ ὑψίστος ἐπισκεψῆται τὴν γῆν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλθὼν ὡς ἀνθρώπος, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

^w Καὶ ἀνδρὰ ἀνακαινοποιῶντα τὸν νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου, πλανῶν προσαγορευσέτε.

thinking, that this pretended ancient prophecy is founded upon the event, and Matt. xxiii. 34, to the end.

The following passages I put down, as containing allusions or references to the books of the New Testament.

19. Dan, sect. 6. ‘His name in every place of Israel, and among the Gentiles, shall be the Saviour.’ See Matt. i. 21.

20. Joseph, sect. 3. ‘I therefore called to mind the words of the fathers of my father Jacob: and^x entering into my closet, I prayed to the Lord,’ Matt. vi. 6.

One would think that the author, when he wrote this, was afraid he should be suspected of borrowing from St. Matthew’s gospel, or some late direction conformable to it. Joseph therefore is made to say, he recollected ‘the words of his fathers.’

21. Joseph, sect. 1, says to his sons: ‘I was sold for a servant, and God made me free; I was taken as a captive, and his strong hand helped me.—I was in weakness, and the Most High visited me: I was in prison, and my Saviour dealt graciously with me; under false accusations, and he pleaded for me.’ See Matt. xxv. 35, 36.

In several of the passages before alleged are references to some parts of this gospel. See Numb. v. 11, 12, 18.

22. Judah, sect. 25, prophesying of Christ, says: ‘And they that died in sorrow shall rise again in joy; and they that were in poverty for the Lord’s sake shall be made rich; and they that were in want shall be filled; and they that were in weakness shall be made strong; and they that have died for the Lord shall be wakened in life.—But the impious shall mourn, and the sinner shall weep.’

I suppose that these things are borrowed chiefly from Matt. v. at the beginning; and Luke vi. 20—25.

23. Levi, sect. 18, prophesying of Christ, says: ‘And Beliar shall be bound by him, and he^y shall give power to his children to tread upon the wicked spirits.’ See Luke x. 18, 19.

24. Gad, sect. 6. ‘And if any one sin against thee, speak to him peaceably;—and^z if he confess his fault, forgive him.’ See Luke xvii. 3, 4.

25. Joseph, sect. 17, says to his sons: ‘Nor did I arrogantly exalt myself among them [my brethren] on account of my worldly glory, but I was among them as one of the least of them.’ See Luke xxii. 27.

^x Και εισερχομενος εις το ταμιειον, προσερχομεν Κυριω.

^y Και δωσει εξουσιαν τοις τεκνοις αυτου πατειν επι τα ποιηρα πνευματα.

^z Και εαν ομολογησας μετανοησῃ, αφες αυτην.

26. Levi, sect. 5. ‘And the angel opened to me the gates of heaven, and I saw the holy temple, and the Most High upon the throne of glory. And he said unto me, Levi, to thee have I given the blessings of priesthood, until I come and inhabit in the midst of Israel.’ See John i. 11, 14.

27. Benjamin, sect. 3, says that Joseph entreated Jacob to pray for his brethren, that the Lord would not impute to them what they had wickedly contrived against him. ‘Whereupon Jacob cried out, O my good son Joseph,—the prophecy of heaven, concerning the Lamb of God and Saviour of the world, shall be fulfilled in thee: for the spotless one shall be delivered up for transgressors, and the sinless one shall die for the impious, in the blood of the covenant, for the salvation of Israel and of all the Gentiles. And he shall destroy Beliar, and those that minister unto him.’ See John i. 29, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” See likewise Rom. v. 6, 8; Heb. ix. 14; 1 Pet. i. 19.

28. Benjamin, sect. 9. ‘And the twelve tribes shall be gathered there, [at Jerusalem,] and all nations, until the Most High send his salvation, in the visitation of the only-begotten. And he shall come to the first temple, and there the Lord shall be ill treated, and shall be lifted up upon a tree, and the veil of the temple shall be rent: and^a the Spirit of God shall descend upon [or ‘remove to’] the Gentiles, as fire poured out upon them. And, coming up out of hell, he shall ascend from earth to heaven. Now I know how low he shall be upon earth, and how glorious in heaven.’

This passage confirms, beside other things, the history of the book of the Acts, and of the epistles. See particularly Acts i. 1—11; ii. 30—33; x. 44. It likewise affords good evidence, that the author is not a judaizer. See hereafter, Numb. 35.

29. Naphtali, sect. 4. ‘Until the compassion of the Lord come, a man doing righteousness, and^b exercising mercy to all that are afar of, and that are nigh.’ See Eph. ii. 17.

30. Dan, sect. 5. ‘But^c depart from anger, and hate lying, that the Lord may dwell in you. Speak every one truth to his neighbour.’ See Eph. iv. 25, 26. There is a like exhortation in the Testament of Reuben, sect. 6.

^a Καταβησεται [α]. μεταβησεται] το πνευμα του Θεου επι τα εθνη, ως πυρ εκχυρομενον.

^b Και ποιων ελεος εις παντας τους μακραν, και τους εγγυς.

^c Αποστητε απο θυμου, και μισησετε το ψευδος, ινα Κυριος κατοικηση εν υμιν. Αληθειαν λαλειτε εκασος προς τον πλησιον αυτου.

31. Levi, sect. 6. ‘And^d the wrath of the Lord came upon them to the uttermost.’ See 1 Thess. ii. 16.

Mr. Whiston^e thinks that St. Paul alludes to this place of our Twelve Testaments; and Grabe^f is of much the same opinion. I do not affirm that this expression of the apostle was never used by any one before him; for that is more than we can be sure of. On the other hand, I know of no proof that St. Paul was acquainted with this book: whereas, I think it will appear plain to every one presently, that this author was acquainted with St. Paul’s epistles, and therefore might borrow this expression, as well as other things, from them.

32. Dan, sect. 6. ‘But draw near to God, and the angel that pleads for you, for^g he is the mediator between God and men for the peace of Israel.’ See 1 Tim. ii. v. Here also God is styled the^h ‘Father of the Gentiles;’ as he is called their God by Paul, Rom. iii. 29.

33. Reuben, sect. 6. ‘I charge you to hearken to Levi, for he shall know the law of the Lord,—tillⁱ the completion of the times of the high priest Christ, of whom the Lord has spoken.’

This is a character of the Messiah much insisted on in these Testaments, as well as in the epistle to the Hebrews: whether this author learned it thence, I cannot say. In the Testament of Naphtali, sect. 2, is somewhat resembling Heb. iv. 12, 13.

34. Levi, sect. 18. ‘And after vengeance shall be taken of these by the Lord, and the priesthood shall fail, the Lord will raise up a new priest,—and there^k shall be none to succeed him, from one generation to another, for ever.’ This passage should be compared with Heb. vii. 22—24.

35. Benjamin, sect. 11. ‘Moreover,’ says Benjamin, ‘I shall be no longer called a ravaging wolf, on account of your ravages; but the Lord’s labourer, distributing food to those who work that which is good. And in the last days shall be raised up out of my seed one beloved of the Lord, who shall hear his voice and enlighten all the Gentiles with new knowledge, affording [them] the light of knowledge in the salvation of Israel: snatching it like a wolf from them, and giving it to the congregation of the Gentiles: and until

^d Εφθασε δε ἡ ὀργὴ Κυρίου ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς εἰς τέλος.

^e Authentic Records, p. 313.

^f Spicileg. T. i. p. 138.

^g Ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐπιμεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων.

^h Ἵνα δέξηται ὑμᾶς ὁ Πατήρ τῶν ἐθνῶν.

ⁱ Μέχρι τελειώσεως χρόνων ἀρχιερεὺς Χριστοῦ, ὃν ἐπέε Κυριος.

^k Καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ διαδοχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς, ἕως αἰῶνος.

the consummation of the world he shall be in the congregation of the Gentiles, and among their princes, as a musical song in the mouth of all. And¹ in the holy books he shall be written, both his work and his word; and he shall be the elect of God for ever. And on his account it was that Jacob, my father, instructed me, saying, he shall fill up the defects of thy tribe.'

Every one perceives that the person here spoken of is the apostle Paul: and I should think that every one might perceive also, that this is not a real genuine prophecy, but an allusion, or representation of matters of fact already done, artfully put into the form of a prediction; with a design, probably, to gain some people, whom the author had in his eye, to acknowledge the christian religion, and the authority of Paul in particular. But a few remarks may be of use.

1.) The writer alludes to Gen. xlix. 27. which, according to the Septuagint Version, is thus: 'Benjamin^m is a ravening wolf, which devours in the morning still, and till the evening he gives food.' This prophecy is applied to St. Paulⁿ by Tertullian, in two places of his remaining works, as has been observed by Grabe. I do not mention this as an argument that the book we are considering, 'the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,' was not written till after the time of Tertullian; but only as a proof that this was a christian interpretation of the prophecy in Genesis. It may have been thought of by many before Tertullian. It was natural enough for christians to understand this text of Paul, who was of the tribe of Benjamin; who in the former part of his life, and in the early days of christianity, while it yet began to dawn upon mankind, fiercely persecuted the church of God, and afterwards became a diligent and successful labourer in confirming and increasing it.

It will not be disagreeable to the reader to see, with-

¹ Και εν βιβλοις ταις ἁγίαις εσαι αναγραφομενος, και το εργον, και ὁ λογος αυτου. Και εσαι εκλεκτος Θεοῦ ἕως του αιωνοῦ.

^m Βενιαμιν λυκος αρπαξ το πρωϊνον εδεται ετι, και εις το ἔσπερας δίδωσι τροφην.

ⁿ Inter illas figuras, et propheticas super filios suos benedictiones, Jacob cum ad Benjamin direxisset: Benjamin, inquit, lupus rapax ad matutinum comedet adhuc, et ad vesperam dabit escam. Ex tribu enim Benjamin oriturum Paulum providebat, lupum rapacem ad matutinum comedentem, id est, primâ ætate vastaturum pecora Domini, ut persecutorem ecclesiarum; dehinc ad vesperam escam daturum, id est, divergente jam ætate oves Christi educaturum, ut doctorem nationum. Adv. Marcion. l. v. c. 1. Vid. et Scorpiace, c. 13. initio.

out the trouble of looking for them, a few passages of ancient christian writers, who apply that text of Genesis to St Paul. I therefore put in the margin one passage of^o Origen, and another of^p Theodoret, and refer to a third in^q Augustine; all which are very much to our purpose.

2.) It is somewhat doubtful, what the author means by those expressions: ‘He shall be in the congregation of the Gentiles, and among their princes, as a musical song in the mouth of all.’ If hereby he intends Gentile princes that were become christian, it would afford a strong argument that this book was not composed before the third or fourth century. But herein may be only a reference to St. Paul’s appearance before Felix and Festus, and other Gentile rulers, and his discourses in their presence; which are not only recorded in the Acts, as matters of fact, but were also foretold by the Lord to Ananias, in this manner: “For he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel,” Acts ix. 15.

3.) When it is said, ‘And in the holy books he shall be written, both his work, and his word;’ there^r is a plain reference to the Acts of the Apostles, in which are recorded Paul’s actions for and against the christian religion, and his discourses and preaching in several places; as also to his epistles, all which are parts of the holy scriptures. But the author has not given sufficient hints to satisfy us, how many epistles of this apostle he received.

36. Issachar, sect. 7. ‘I am a hundred and twenty-two years of age, and I never was conscious of any sin unto death in me.’ See I John v. 16, 17.

I shall transcribe here part of a fine passage in the Testament of Gad, sect. 4, which bears a reference like-

^o Benjamin ille nunquam fuit lupus rapax. Benjamin ille nunquam ad vesperam dedit escam. Hebræus ex Hebræis, juxta legem pharisæus, circumciscus octavo die, Benjamin prædicabatur, lupus rapax ad matutinum comedens, quando juvenis fuit: et in vesperam dans escam, quando credens spiritalem præbuit cibum a se ecclesiis institutis. Orig. in Ezech. Hom. iv. T. iii. p. 731. A. B.

^p Εἶδεναι δὲ χρῆ, ὡς τινες εἰς τὸν θεσπεσιον Παυλον τὴνδε τὴν προρῶησιν εἰλκυσαν· λυκος γὰρ ἕκην ἐλυμῖναιετο τὴν ἐκκλησιαν κατὰ τῆς οἰκῆς εἰσπορευομενος· ὑπερονδέ τὴν πνευματικὴν τροφὴν τῆ οἰκουμένη διεδώκε. Theod. in Gen. Qu. ex. opp. T. i. p. 77. B.

^q Vid. Aug. Serm. 279. Tom. v. ed. Bened. et passim.

^r Pauli epistolæ vero et Lucæ Acta Apostolorum a Benjamin hisce indignantur verbis: Et in libris sacris erit inscriptus, et opus et sermo ejus: opus quidem in Actis Apostolorum, sermo autem et in his, et in ipsius Pauli epistolis. Grabe, Spic. T. i. p. 140.

wise to some things in the first epistle of St. John. 'For hatred co-operates to murder: and when any do well, and are in prosperity, and he either hears it or sees it, he is grieved. For, as love would revive those that are dead, and recall them back that are under the sentence of death; so would hatred slay those that are alive, and would not have them that have committed a small offence to live any longer.—But the spirit of love, by long suffering, co-operates with the law of God to the salvation of men.'

37. Levi, sect. 18. 'For he shall open the gates of paradise, and shall stop the threatening sword that was placed against Adam: and^s shall give to his holy ones to eat of the tree of life, and the Spirit of holiness shall be upon them.' See Rev. ii. 7.

38. Joseph, sect. 19, acquaints his sons with a dream which he had: 'And^t I saw, says he, that a virgin^u was born of Judah, that had on a fine linen garment, and from her proceeded a spotless Lamb. And on its left hand there was a lion, and all the wild beasts ran against him, and the Lamb overcame them and destroyed them, till they were utterly trodden down. And in him did angels, and men, and all the earth rejoice. These things shall be fulfilled in their season, in the last days.' Rev. xvii. 14.

39. Dan, sect. 5. 'And to them that call upon him shall he give eternal peace. And the righteous shall rejoice in the New Jerusalem, which shall be for the glory of God for ever. And Jerusalem shall no more undergo desolation, nor shall Israel be carried away captive; for the Lord shall be in the midst of her, conversing with men; and the holy one of Israel shall reign over them in humility and poverty. And he that believeth in him shall reign in truth, in the heavens.' It is probable that here is a reference to Rev. xxi. 2—4, and other parts of that book.

40. This writer is justly alleged by^v Henry Wharton, as delivering his opinion, and the sentiment of christians in his time, that the holy scriptures should be read by all sorts of men. 'And now, my sons,' says Levi, sect. 13, 'I charge you to fear the Lord your God out of your whole heart, and walk in simplicity of heart, according to all his law. Do^w you also teach your children learn-

^s Και ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς.

^t Και εἶδον, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Ἰουδα ἐγενήθη παρθένος, — και ἐξ αὐτῆς προήλθεν ἀμνος ἀμωμος, κ. λ.

^u Grabe has no doubt, but that hereby is intended the nativity of the Messiah of a virgin mother. Hæc nativitatem Messiae ex virgine spectare quilibet videt, Spicileg. T. i. p. 361.

^v Ubi supra, p. 347.

^w Διδάξατε δε και ὑμεῖς τα τεκνα

ing, that they may have understanding in all their life, reading continually the law of God.’

41. Thus this author, in an indirect manner, and a pretended prophetic style, bears a large testimony to the christian religion; to the facts, principles, and books of the New Testament. He speaks of the nativity of Christ, the meekness and unblamableness of his life, his crucifixion at the instigation of the Jewish priests, the wonderful concomitants of his death, his resurrection, and ascension. He represents the character of the Messiah as God and man, the Most High God with men, eating and drinking with them, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, of the Gentiles and Israel, as eternal high priest and king. He likewise speaks of the effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the Messiah, attended with a voice from heaven; his unrighteous treatment by the Jews; and their desolations, and the destruction of the temple, upon that account; the call of the Gentiles; the illuminating them generally with new light; the effusion of the Spirit upon believers, but especially, and in a more abundant measure, upon the Gentiles. Here is little notice taken of our Lord’s miracles: however he speaks of the Messiah as^x a ‘man who renews the law ‘in the power of the Most High;’ in which expressions the working of miracles seems to be implied. Here are also passages which seem to contain allusions to the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Ephesians, first to the Thessalonians, first to Timothy, the epistle to the Hebrews, the first epistle of St. John, and the book of the Revelation. And, as far as was consistent with his assumed character, the author declares the canonical authority of the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistles of St. Paul. Lastly, he recommends the reading of the holy scriptures.

42. I fear that some will think I have insisted too long upon this book: but it could by no means be quite omitted, as every one must be convinced by the contents of it, and the age in which it was written, according to the general opinion of learned men; either at the end of the first, or, at the utmost, some time in the second century: and I was willing to make an end with it at once. I think it cannot be disagreeable to see the testimonies of a variety of authors. And since some have been pleased to disguise themselves, and appeared under borrowed names and characters; it may be not only an entertainment, but a confirmation of our

ἡμῶν γραμματα, ἵνα εἴησιν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ζωῇ αὐτῶν, ἀναγιγνωσκόντες ἀδιαλείπτως τὸν νόμον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

^x See numb. 18.

faith, to find them also asserting in their way the chief things concerning the christian religion.

IV. They who are desirous to inform themselves concerning *The Recognitions of Clement*, may find satisfaction in the judgment of Cotelierius upon them, and in the testimonies prefixed to his edition of this work; and Grabe's learned and judicious Preface to the writings of St. Clement, in his Spicilegium.

The first ecclesiastical writer, who has mentioned this work, is Origen, by whom it is twice cited; once in the third Tome of his Commentaries upon Genesis, which passage is preserved in his^y Philocalia, where he calls it by the title of 'The Travels;' and again in his Tracts upon^z St. Matthew. He seems to quote it as Clement's, or at least as a book ascribed to him. It may be argued, from these few quotations of this book in all the remaining works of Origen, whether Greek or Latin, that it was in no great esteem with him, and of no authority.

The next author, whose testimony we are to consider, is Eusebius. Having spoken, in the third book of his Ecclesiastical History, of the first epistle of St. Clement of Rome, and then of the second ascribed to him, he adds: 'More-over,^a some men have, not long since, produced large and voluminous writings as his, containing Disputations of Peter and Appion, of which there is no mention made by the ancients; nor have they the pure apostolical doctrine. What therefore is the genuine and acknowledged writing of Clement, is manifest.'

Upon this passage we are to observe, in the first place, that^b Valesius and^c Cotelierius, and some others, reckon that hereby Eusebius intends the Recognitions; of which they suppose the Disputations, or Dialogues, of Peter and Appion to be a part. But I think that^d Grabe has proved these Disputations to be a different work. He observes that Photius mentions the Recognitions, and the Disputations of Peter and Appion, distinctly, as two different

^y Και Κλημης δε ο 'Ρωμαιος, Πετρος αποστολε μαθητης, συνψιδει τετοις εν τη παροντι προβληματι προς τον πατερα εν Λαοδικεια ειπων εν ταις Περιοδοις. Philoc. cap. 23. p. 18. Cantabr.

^z Tale aliquid dicit et Petrus apud Clementem, ad Matthæi cap. xxvi. 6. Op. Lat. p. 172. Paris. 1571.

^a Ηδη δε και ιτερα πολυεπη και μακρα συγγραμματα, ως τε αυτε, χθες και πρωην τινες προηγαγον, Πετρος δε και Απιωνος διαλογος περιεχοντα, ων εδ' ολωσ μνημη τις παρα τοις παλαιοις φερεται. Ουδε γαρ καθαρον της αποστολικης ορθοδοξιας αποσωζει τον χαρακτηρα. 'Η μιν ουν τε Κλημεντος ομολογεμενη γραφη, προδηλος εστιν. L. iii. c. 38.

^b In loc. Euseb.

^c Judic. de Libris Recognitionum: apud Patres Apostol.

^d Spicileg. T. i. p. 271. et seq.

works : and though in the tenth book of the Recognitions Appion is named several times, yet there is no mention of any dispute of Peter with him. Secondly, whether Eusebius here intends the Recognitions or not, he has condemned them. He owns nothing for St. Clement's but his epistle to the Corinthians, and rejects every thing else ascribed to him ; this book, in particular, if it was then extant.

In another place^e Eusebius rejects a book entitled ' The Acts of Peter,' together with several others, ' as not having been delivered to them for catholic writings.' If by these Acts of Peter he intends the Recognitions, they are here expressly rejected by him. It is plain, from^f Photius, that a part of this work was called ' The Acts of Peter.' Photius himself speaks^g of the whole work by that title, and commends the style of it, as much superior to the Constitutions. Grabe^h mentions a manuscript, in which it has this title : ' The Itinerary of St. Clement, concerning the Acts and Words of the blessed Apostle Peter.' And it is obvious to every one, from the contents, that the Recognitions may be very properly called ' Peter's Acts.' If by the Acts of Peter, rejected here in the beginning of the third book of his history, Eusebius means the Recognitions ; we have a good reason of his not mentioning them particularly afterwards, in the 38th chapter of the same book, where he speaks of the genuine and supposititious works of St. Clement.

Epiphanius says : ' Theⁱ Ebionites use likewise several other books, as the Travels of Peter written by Clement ; which too they have corrupted, leaving little that is genuine :' as appears, he says, from the epistles of Clement, which contain a different doctrine. Forasmuch as Epiphanius does not say that these Travels were forged, but only that they were ' corrupted,' he is supposed to allow that they were originally written by Clement.

Jerom's opinion of the works of Clement may be reckoned to be the same with that of Eusebius ; since in his article

^e Το γε μὴν τῶν επικεκλημένων αὐτοῦ Πραξέων—οὐδ' ὄλως ἐν καθολικοῖς ἴσμεν παραδεδομένα. L. iii. cap. 3. p. 72. A.

^f Ἐν ᾧ αἱ τε λεγόμεναι τῆ ἀποστολῆ Πέτρου Πραξίς, καὶ αἱ πρὸς Σίμωνά τον μαγόν Διαλέξεις, καὶ ἐπὶ ὁ Ἀναγνωρισμὸς Κλημεντος καὶ πατρὸς, καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀδελφῶν. Phot. Cod. 112, 113.

^g Ἡ μὲντοι γὰρ τῶν τῆ Πέτρου Πραξέων βιβλὸς τῷ τε λαμπρῷ καὶ τῷ σεμνοτητι.—καὶ τῷ ἀλλῇ ἀρετῇ λόγῳ τοσούτου ἔχει πρὸς τὰς διατάγας το παραλλάττον, κ. λ. Ibid. p. 289. ver. 45.

^h Itinerarium S. Clementis de Factis et Dictis B. Petri Apostoli. Spic. T. i. p. 276.

ⁱ Χρῶνται δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰς τισὶ βιβλοῖς, ἔηθεν ταῖς Περιόδοις καλεσμέναις Πέτρου, ταῖς διὰ Κλημεντος γραφείσαις, νοθεύσαντες τὰ μὲν ἐν αὐταῖς, ὀλίγα δὲ ἀληθινὰ εἰσαντες. Hær. 30. sect. 15.

of St. Clement, in his Catalogue, he does little more than transcribe the passage of Eusebius, in which he censures the Dialogues of Peter and Appion. And if the Recognitions are not the same with those Dialogues, yet he may be supposed to reject them by consequence, in as much as he insists upon no other piece of Clement, as genuine, beside the epistle to the Corinthians. In another work he refers to a book under the name of^k ‘The Travels,’ or ‘The Travels of Peter,’ which appears to have been of no authority. Once^l more he quotes Clement ‘in his Travels,’ or ‘in Peter’s Travels,’ for something not found expressly in this work at present.

Rufinus, who translated the ten books of Recognitions out of Greek into Latin, in whose translation only we now have them, plainly supposes them to have been written by^m Clement of Rome; but that the copies, in his time, had been corrupted in some places.

This book is, for a large part of it at least, a fiction, or romance, in which divers things concerning the christian religion are represented in a philosophical manner, in order to render them more agreeable to the Greeks. It is called ‘The Circuits,’ or ‘Travels and Acts of Peter,’ from the subject matter of it; as it contains an account of the apostle Peter’s disputes with Simon Magus, and his discourses to other people, and many miracles wrought by him in several places; at Cæsarea, Dora, Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon, Tripoli, Laodicea, Antioch, and his journeys from one city to another. It is called ‘The Recognitions’ from Clement’sⁿ recognizing his father, and mother, and brethren, who had been long separated from each other.

Mr. Whiston has a singular opinion concerning the author

^k Possumus autem de Petro dicere, quod habuerit socrum eo tempore quo crediderit, et uxorem jam non habuerit: quanquam legatur in *Περιοδοις* et uxor ejus et filia. Sed nunc nobis de canone omne certamen est. Adv. Jovinian. l. i. c. 14. p. 186. T. iv. p. 2. ed. Bened.

^l ‘Deinde post annos tres veni Hierosolyman videre Petrum.’ Non ut oculos, genas, vultumque ejus aspiceret; utrum macilentus an pinguis, adunco naso esset an recto; et utrum frontem vestiret coma; an (ut Clemens in *Periodis* ejus refert) calvitiam haberet in capite. Comment. in Ep. ad Galat. cap. i. ver. 18.

^m Clemens, apostolorum discipulus, qui Romanæ ecclesiæ, post apostolos, et apostolus et martyr præfuit, libros edidit, qui Græce appellantur *Αναγνωρισμος*, id est, Recognitio.—Sunt etiam alia nonnulla libris ejus inserta, quæ ecclesiastica regula non recipit. Rufin. de Adulteratione Librorum Origenis. Suscipe igitur, anime mi, redeuntem ad te Clementem nostrum; suscipe jam Romanum. Idem, in S. Clement. Recognitionum Libros Præfat. ad Caudentium.

ⁿ L. ix. sect. 38. et seq.

of this work. He allows, ‘that it^o was not written by Clement himself. This,’ he says, ‘is evident by the entire style and genius of the whole, as compared with the vastly different style and genius of Clement’s genuine epistles and Constitutions:’ but it was written ‘by^p some of the hearers of Clement, and other companions of the apostles.’ According to this account, it is the work of some anonymous person, who was a hearer or disciple of apostolical men: but I think that it must be reckoned to be Clement’s, or to be supposititious. This is evident from the testimonies of the ancients all along, who speak of this work as written by Clement, or at least ascribed to him. And that the author intended it should be esteemed the writing or composition of Clement, appears from the whole of the work, though from some passages more especially. It begins: ‘I, Clement, who was born in the city of Rome,’ and what follows. I shall transcribe a passage or two, taking Mr. Whiston’s translation of them. In the 25th section of the first book, Peter says: ‘Enough, O Clement; for thou hast repeated this discourse more clearly than I delivered it. Then I replied, A liberal education has enabled us to observe an agreeable method in discourse, to set proper truths in a clear light. Now if we use this talent in support of ancient errors,—we lose the design of the decency and sweetness of language; but if we make use of this art and beauty of language for the confirmation of the truth, I suppose there may great benefit accrue from it.’ This is the design of the work, and it is Clement to whom this talent is ascribed here, and in other places. But more expressly still, near the conclusion of the third book, after the account of Peter’s disputes with Simon Magus, and his discourses to other people, at Cæsarea; when they were almost ready to go from thence to Dora, it is said: ‘He also, [that is, Peter,] when he perceived that I [Clement] fixed what I heard deep in my memory, gave it me in charge to put together all the most memorable passages, and to write them in books, and to send them to you, my Lord James, as I have accordingly done in obedience to his orders. The first book, then, of those which I formerly sent to you, treats of the true prophet.’ Where follow short contents of the ten books ‘written and sent formerly:’ so that the same Clement, who wrote those former books, writes these also. This work therefore, as it is ascribed to Clement, but is not his,

^o Preface to Mr. Whiston’s translation of the *Recognitions of Clement*, p. 18. London, 1712.

^p *Ibid.* p. 17, et alibi.

is supposititious, and the author can hardly escape the character of an impostor.

The judgment of Cotelerius upon these books of Recognitions, which he so well understood, is in short this, that ‘they^q are supposititious and apocryphal, composed by ‘some learned and eloquent man in the second century.’

Which leads me to observe the time of these books. That they were in being in the latter part of the second, or the beginning of the third century, may be inferred from the citations of Origen; and that they were not extant much sooner, may be inferred from the silence of Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria about them. Moreover in the ninth book^r of the Recognitions is a long passage, which appears to be taken out of the book *Of Fate*, written by Bardesanes; though the author does not give any hint that he takes it from another. As Bardesanes flourished about the year 180, and his books were written originally in Syriac, it cannot be supposed that the Recognitions were published till near the end of the second century.

It happens that this passage, together with somewhat more, is quoted by Eusebius from Bardesanes himself. That Bardesanes did not take that passage from the Recognitions, but the author of the Recognitions from him, has been clearly shown by^s Grabe, upon as good evidence as can be desired in a thing of this nature: though, in my opinion, it needs no proof. I shall only just add, therefore, that, as Eusebius has ascribed that passage to Bardesanes, we ought to rely upon him for the author of it. It is a point that cannot be reasonably contested or disputed. Eusebius, when he introduces the quotation, says, he takes it^t out of a ‘*Dialogue of Bardesanes the Syrian*’; and at the end^u he says again, ‘Thus far the Syrian.’

Nevertheless Mr. Whiston disputes this point; but his objections do not appear to be material: nor do I suppose that any man, who looks into Grabe himself, can be much moved by them. But whereas^v Mr. Whiston observes, that ‘Epiphanius tells us the book *Of Fate*,’ written by Bardesanes, ‘was made up of collections taken out of other

^q Quantum ex re ipsâ, veterum testimoniis, ac recentiorum judiciis colligere licet, libri isti pseudepigraphi sunt et apocryphi, secundo sæculo compositi a viro docto quidem juxta ac diserto, sed philosopho magis et philologo quam theologo.—ap Patr. Ap. T. i. p. 484.

^r From sect. 19. to sect. 29.

^s Spicil. Patr. T. i. p. 278.

^t Præp. Evang. l. vi. cap. 9, 10. p. 275 A.

^u Τοσαυτα και ὁ Συρος. Ibid. p. 280. C.

^v Preface, as before, p. 12.

‘ authors,’ Hær. 56. sect. 2, I must take the ^w liberty to say, that I do not perceive Epiphanius to tell us any such thing.

With regard to the age of this work, I would add farther, that the arguments here used against heathenism seem to imply, that the christian was not yet the prevailing established religion. And the author often ^x speaks of the power of christians to heal diseases, and expel dæmons, as if it was common in his time. And that such gifts were enjoyed by many christians in the second, and the beginning of the third century, we are assured by Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and others: after which time, or however after the end of the third century, they were not so common, if they did not quite cease.

Mr. Whiston’s ^y opinion of this book is, ‘ That if it be ‘ not in some sense or other itself a sacred book, yet ought ‘ it certainly to be esteemed in the next degree to that of the ‘ really sacred books of the New Testament.’ In the opinion of ^z many other learned men, it is a worthless piece, of little or no use. We will endeavour however to make some good use of a work, which cost the author a great deal of labour, and in which are some excellent sentiments, and fine passages; though at the same time there are several very great faults,^a for which no good excuse can be made;

^w It is likely that Mr. Whiston’s mistake is owing to his misinterpretation of Epiphanius, Hær. 56. sect. 1. ‘Ὅς πολλα [προς] Αβειδαν τον αστρονομον κατα ειμαρμενης λεγων συνελογησατο’ which are thus rightly rendered by Petavius: Idem adversus Abidam astrologum contra fatum pluribus disputavit. But supposing Mr. Whiston to have understood the Greek word in the sense of ‘ collecting,’ he had no right to say, that ‘ Epiphanius tells us, the book ‘ Of Fate was made up of collections taken out of other authors.’ For those collections might be the fruit of Bardesanes’ own observations, as they plainly were, according to his own account. See Grabe, Spicil. p. 78.

^x L. iv. sect. 14, 20, 32, 33.

^y As before, p. 38.

^z Enfin cet ouvrage n’est d’aucune utilité, soit pour la manière dont il est écrit, soit pour les choses qu’il contient. Du Pin, Bibliothèque. St. Clement Romain. En un mot, on le regarde comme un ouvrage qui n’est d’ aucune prix, ni d’ aucune utilité. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. ii. P. i. St. Clement, Art. 6. p. 295.

^a He says, in the first book, that, whilst Jesus Christ was teaching in Judea, in the reign of Tiberius, ‘ A certain man [Barnabas] stood in one of the most public places of the city, [of Rome,] and proclaimed to the people, and said, “ O ye citizens of Rome, hearken to me. The Son of God is now present in the region of Judea, and promises, to all that are willing to hear him, eternal life.”’ B. i. sect. 7. This is said, I suppose, as more agreeable to Greeks and Romans, at the time of the author’s writing, than the real truth. For this is contrary to the gospels and the Acts, according to which Christ was not preached to the Gentiles till some time after his resurrection. And the author, as if he were himself sensible of the impropriety of this part of his fiction, makes Barnabas soon leave Rome upon a little ill treatment. He introduces Peter relating a silly miracle in Judea.—‘ Whilst,’ says he,

so that one cannot well help wishing, upon the whole, that this author, who was a man of great abilities, had employed his time better.

1. We are not to expect here any express citations of the scriptures of the New Testament, unless the author should forget himself; the discourses and conferences here related, being supposed to be made at a time when few or none of the books of the New Testament were written. He will therefore recite the words of our Lord recorded in the gospels, as heard by those persons who mention them, or learned from apostles, or others our Lord's hearers. I shall put down one passage, as an example of his indirect way of quoting, in compliance with the decorum of the circumstances his persons are supposed to be in. Peter speaks: 'Whence^b it was well said by a certain person to the preachers of truth, "Ye are the light of the world." And, "A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid: neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that it may give light to all that are in the house." Then said 'the old man, [Clement's father, yet a stranger, and not converted,]' "Whosoever that person was, he spake plain truth,"' Matt. v. 14, 15.

2. Thus we have given a good quotation of St. Matthew's gospel; but we will observe a particular or two more. Simon Magus says to Peter, 'If^c you do with reason require peace from your auditors, your master did without reason say, "I am not come to send peace on earth, but a sword,"' Matt. x. 34.—To this Peter answered, 'You^d remember that our master came not to send peace; but you do not remember that he said, "Blessed are the peaceable, for they shall be called the children of God,"' Matt. v. 9.

3. In these books are many passages out of this gospel. One may be apt to suspect, that in this author's copy the reading of Matt. v. 3, was, 'Blessed are the poor,' he having twice mentioned this beatitude in that form. However, he gives a good interpretation of it. 'In the beginning^e of his preaching, as he was desirous to invite and

'we were gone to the sepulchres of two of our brethren, which were every year new whited of their own accord. By which miracles the fury of many against us was repressed, when they thereby perceived that our brethren were had in remembrance with God.' B. i. sect. 71. Peter too says here, that Gamaliel 'was secretly their brother in the faith,' but, 'by their advice, [that is, the apostles,] continued still' among the Jewish priests and rulers, sect. 65. Which passage is censured by Cotelerius as it deserves: 'Vulpinum hoc consilium apostolis indignum est.' I omit other things.

^b L. viii. sect. 4.

^c L. ii. sect. 26.

^d Sect. 27.

^e Sect. 28.

draw men to salvation, and to persuade men to patience under their labours and temptations, he declared the poor blessed; and promised, as a reward of their patient, enduring poverty, that they should obtain the kingdom of heaven.' In a like manner^f in another place.

4. He gives the true sense of Matt. v. 6, understanding it of bodily 'hunger and thirst,' agreeably to St. Luke vi. 21. 'He^g did also promise,' says he, 'that they who hunger and thirst should be filled with the eternal blessings of righteousness; that, bearing want without discontent, they might not on that account do any unjust action.' He refers, not to St. Luke's but to St. Matthew's gospel, in which more especially this is placed near the beginning of our Lord's preaching.

5. He has likewise a good observation upon the parable of the sower, in Matt. xiii. and Luke viii. 'But^h because it cannot be, but that a husbandman, who would sow good ground, must lose some seeds which fall in stony places, or in places trodden by men, or such as are full of brambles and thorns, as our Master has taught us, showing hereby the different disposition of every one's soul in particular, I will proceed.'

6. 'Toⁱ those therefore, who believe and obey, he gives this command, that they should have peace one with another.' See Mark ix. 50.

He seems to refer to Mark xiii. 32, when Peter says, 'For^k if our Master confessed he did "not know that day and hour" whose signs yet he foretold, that he might refer all to the Father; how can we think it beneath us to own that we are ignorant of some things?' However, see Matthew xxiv. 36.

7. 'Then^l said Simon, [Magus,] I mightily wonder at your folly. You propose your Master's words to us, just as if it were certainly known that he was a prophet; whereas I can easily demonstrate that he has often contradicted himself.—For you own that he said, "Every kingdom, and every city, divided against itself, cannot stand" [Matt. xii. 25]. And you own^m that in another place he said, that he "sent a sword to set those at variance that were in the same house; so that the son would be divided from the

^f L. i. sect. 61.

^g L. ii. sect. 28. conf. l. i. sect. 61.

^h L. iii. sect. 14.

ⁱ Credentibus, ergo obedientibus,

pacem habere inter se invicem jubet. L. ii. sect. 29.

^k Si enim Magister noster diem et horam, cujus etiam signa prædixit, nescire se professus est, ut totum revocaret ad Patrem; quomodo nos—
L. x. sect. 14.

^l L. ii. sect. 32.

^m Et alibi iterum ais eum dixisse. Ibid.

father, and the daughter from the mother, and the brother from the brother: insomuch that if there were five in one house, three would be divided against two, and two against three," Luke xii. 52, 53. In these books are several passages taken out of St. Luke's gospel.

8. 'Forⁿ so did the true prophet testify to us with an oath, when he said, "Verily I say unto you, unless a man be born again of water, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,"' John iii. 5. Which the author understands of baptism.

9. In another place: 'Now^o the Son reveals the Father to those who do so honour the Son as they honour the Father.' John v. 23.

10. That this writer was acquainted with the book of the Acts of the Apostles, will appear from the following things. He mentions^p the choice of Matthias to the apostleship, in the place of Judas, which is recorded, Acts i. He relates a speech made by Gamaliel in favour of the apostles, though here he misrepresents some things: 'Be^q quiet for a while, O ye men of Israel; for you do not apprehend the trial which hangs over you: wherefore let these men alone. And if indeed what they do is a work of human counsel, it will soon come to an end: but, if it be of God, why do ye offend without cause, and yet advance nothing? For who can overcome the will of God?' See Acts v. 38, 39.

The author introduces Peter giving Clement, that is, himself, an^r account of a dispute which James and the other apostles had with the Jews at the temple: And when the high priest, and a great multitude, were almost prepared for the receiving of baptism, 'a certain enemy did just then come into the temple, with a few that followed him.' He made a warm speech, exclaiming against the folly of those Jews who were almost converted by the apostles, and put all things into confusion; and made such a disturbance, that several were killed, and James was very much hurt. 'After^s three days,' as Peter adds, 'one of the brethren came to us from Gamaliel,—giving us private information,^t that this enemy had received a commission from Caiaphas to persecute all who believed in Jesus, and was going to Damascus with his letters.' See Acts ix. 1, 2; xxii. 4, 5.

ⁿ L. vi. sect. 9.

^o L. ii. sect. 48.

^p L. i. sect. 60.

^q L. i. sect. 65.

^r Ibid. sect. 68, 69. &c.

^s Ibid. 71.

^t Quod inimicus ille homo legationem suscepisset a Caiaphâ pontifice, ut omnes qui crederent in Jesum persequeretur, et Damascus pergeret cum epistolis ejus.—Ibid.

Our author undoubtedly means Paul; I do not know why he does not name him: but here seem to be marks of ill-will towards St. Paul. Gamaliel is complimented with the ^u character of a brother, whilst his disciple is a furious enemy. Then the main reason why this enemy designed for Damascus, is said to be, that ^v ‘he thought Peter had fled thither,’ after the disturbance at the temple: which is an invidious charge. And he says nothing of the conversion of this enemy, though according to our accounts, and those undoubted, it happened soon after some things here related, in the way to Damascus; and was in all respects very extraordinary, and the greatest triumph of truth in any age.

Farther, the author has a relation of Simon of Samaria, that he affirmed himself to be ^w ‘the supreme power of the High God,’ (See Acts viii. 10.) and ^x that ‘he once believed in our Jesus.’ See ver. 13. He says too, that Christ’s ‘disciples, in ^y imitation of their master, when they suffered, did in like manner pray for their murderers;’ where he seems to refer to Stephen’s prayer, Acts vii. 60; and perhaps to other instances of the like eminent virtue in the followers of Jesus.

I think here is a good proof, that the author of this work was acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles.

11. ‘For ^z with God “he is not a Jew, who is called a Jew among men; nor is he a Gentile, who is called a Gentile,”’ Rom. ii. 28. There is another ^a place which contains a reference to Matt. vi. 24, or Rom. vi. 16.

12. It is here said that the Israelites had ^b ‘a cup afforded them from the rock which followed.’ I Cor. x. 4. It is ordered among the greatest of crimes, ^c ‘to partake of the table of dæmons; that is, to taste of what has been offered to them.’ See I Cor. x. 20, 21.

13. ‘So has your soul, by long negligence, produced

^u See note ^a, p. 369, 370.

^v Idcirco autem præcipue Damascum festinârat, quod et illuc crederet confugisse Petrum. Ubi supra. ^w Adserentem se esse quandam stantem,—et virtutem summam excelsi Dei. L. i. sect. 72.

^x Nam inde quid dicam, quod et Jesu nostro crediderat. L. iii. sect. 49.

^y Imitantes quoque discipuli magistrum, etiam ipsi, cum paterentur, similiter pro interfectorebus suis orabant. L. vi. sect. 5.

^z L. v. sect. 34.

^a L. v. sect. 12.

^b Et ex sequenti petrâ poculum ministratum. L. i. sect. 35.

^c Quæ autem animam simul et corpus polluunt, ista sunt, participare dæmonum mensæ: hoc est, immolata degustare.—et si quid aliud est quod dæmonibus oblatum est. L. iv. sect. 36.

many and pernicious notions of things, and^d opinions of “science, falsely so called.” 1 Tim. vi. 20.

14. In Hebr. vii. 2, Melchisedec, who was ‘made like unto the Son of God,’ is called ‘King of Peace.’ This author^e says twice, that Christ ‘was ordained of God to be the King of Peace.’ But one cannot be positive that herein is any reference to the epistle to the Hebrews.

15. ‘There is therefore an evident sign that such things are not spoken from the true God, when sometimes a lie is mixed with them; for^f “there is never any lie in the truth.”’ 1 John ii. 21.

He says, the ‘wedding garment’ is the grace of baptism. ‘The things whereby that garment may be defiled, are these: If any one departs from God the Father,—and receives any other teacher than Christ.—These^g are things which pollute the garment of baptism even unto death.’ Here seems to be an allusion to 1 John v. 16, 17.

16. Clement himself says, ‘God ordered that the whole multitude of mankind should be born into this visible world, that from^h among them he might choose friends for his Son, with whom he might rejoice; and who might be “made ready” for him, as a beloved “bride for her husband.” But till the time of “the marriage is come,” which is when the future world appears,—and what follows. See Rev. xix. 7—9; xxi. 2.

17. Beside these, there are some general things which seem to relate to the scriptures of the New Testament.

Among the ten books, which Clement, at the end of the third book of these Recognitions, says he had already sent to James, the contents of one of them are thus described: ‘Theⁱ eighth is concerning those words of our Lord which seem to contradict one another, but do not, and in what manner they are to be cleared.’ And somewhat of this kind is performed in the preceding part of this very work, as appears from our quotations.

In another place Peter is supposed to tell Clement, ‘How

^d Et intelligentias falsæ scientiæ. L. vi. sect. 2.

^e Et agatis gratias largitori oranium, Patri, per eum quem posuit Regem Pacis. L. iv. sect. 32.—ad hunc quem diximus a Deo destinatum Regem Pacis accessit. Ibid. sect. 34.

^f In veritate enim nunquam mendacium est. L. iv. sect. 36.

^g Hæc sunt quæ usque ad mortem baptismi polluunt indumentum. L. iv. sect. 36.

^h Ex quibus eligeret amicos Filio suo, cum quibus lætaretur, et qui eo, tanquam sponso, ut dilecta sponsa, pararentur. Verum usque ad nuptiarum tempus, quod est præsentia sæculi venturi statuit. L. ix. sect. 3.

ⁱ Octavus de verbis Domini quæ sibi videntur esse contraria, sed non sunt; et quæ sit horum solutio. L. iii. sect. 75.

the apostles were invited by the priests, and by the high priest Caiaphas, to the temple; and how James the archbishop stood upon the top of the stairs, and^k for seven days, one after another, proved out of the Lord's scriptures, to the whole body of the people, that Jesus was the Christ.'

The title of archbishop may be allowed to be added by Rufinus, or some other interpolater: but Dominic Scriptures, or the Lord's Scriptures, is a term often used by the christian writers of the second century. It must be owned to be out of character to speak of the scriptures of the New Testament in a dispute with Caiaphas, at which time none of them were written. But the author here forgot himself. And indeed it is next to impossible for a writer not to say some things improperly in a work of this kind, and of this length.

However, after all, perhaps hereby are meant only the scriptures of the Old Testament, and this phrase may be judged equivalent to 'the written word of God.'

18. It may be now proper to distinguish the passages alleged out of these books of Recognitions, and observe the value of them. Here are passages of our four gospels: and one might conclude that the author owned them all, were it not for a^l difficulty which I shall mention by and by; which may render it doubtful whether he used the four gospels, or some one gospel containing in it all these things. The reader will consider whether this difficulty be of any moment. He seems to own the first epistle of St. John, and the book of the Revelation. He was well acquainted too with the book of the Acts of the Apostles; but how far he owned it, I cannot say. As for the passages relating to St. Paul's epistles, they may be reckoned not very^m material; or however not sufficient to prove, that they were esteemed by this writer to be of authority. It may be suspected that the author had no great kindness for the apostle Paul; and for that reason made as little use of his epistles, and of the Acts of the Apostles, as might be, though he was well enough acquainted with them.

This author, whoever he be, bears testimony likewise to many principal facts of the New Testament. He givesⁿ

^k Et Jacobus archiepiscopus stans in summis gradibus, per septem continuos dies, universo populo de Scripturis Dominicis adsignaverit, quod Jesus esset Christus. L. i. sect. 73.

^l See below, num. v. 3. of this chapter.

^m Equidem observavi, nec in Clementinis, nec in *Recognitionibus*, quæ apocrypha sæpe diximus ab Ebionæis fuisse depravata, Paulum apostolum citatum inveniri. Coteler. Annot. ad Clementin. Homil. xix. sect. 2.

ⁿ L. iv. sect. 34.

an account of our Lord's temptation. He mentions^o the choice of the twelve apostles, and afterwards of other seventy-two disciples. In one place^p he speaks of the twelve apostles in such a manner, as if he intended to exclude Paul from the honour of the apostleship, and even to deny him the character of a 'sufficient and faithful preacher of Christ's word.' Here are also relations^q of the miracles of our blessed Lord's ministry, and of^r his death and resurrection, and the extraordinary signs attending those events.

20. To all these things does this writer bear witness. And yet, from his sly insinuations, and injurious reflections upon St. Paul, it may be suspected that he was a mere Ebionite; the ancients^s assuring us that this sect of christians rejected the authority of that apostle and his epistles. If this be our author's real character, what has been here alleged from this work ought to be considered as one instance of the advantage which may be made of the sentiments of those called heretics, for confirming the evangelical scriptures and history; which I hope will appear more fully hereafter.

V. Hitherto I have taken no notice of the *Clementine Homilies*; nor do I intend a large account of them; but it may be thought improper to omit them entirely. They are nineteen Homilies in Greek, published by Cotelerius, with two letters prefixed; one of them written in the name of Peter, the other in the name of Clement, to James, bishop of Jerusalem: in which last letter they are intitled 'Clement's Epitome of the Preaching and Travels of Peter.' But it may be questioned whether one or both these letters do not belong to the Recognitions. Photius^t seems to

^o L. i. sect. 40.

^p Propter quod observate cautius, ut nulli doctorum credatis, nisi qui Jacobi fratris Domini ex Hierusalem detulerit testimonium, vel ejus quicunque post ipsum fuerit. Nisi enim quis illuc ascenderit, et ibi fuerit probatus quod sit doctor idoneus, et fidelis, ad prædicandum Christi verbum; nisi inquam, inde detulerit testimonium, recipiendus omnino non est. Sed neque propheta, neque apostolus, in hoc tempore, speretur a vobis aliquis alius præter nos. Unus enim est verus propheta cujus nos duodecim apostoli verba prædicamus. Ipse enim est annus Dei acceptus, nos apostolos habens duodecim menses. L. iv. sect. 35. This is absolutely to exclude St. Paul, who was an apostle 'neither of men, nor by man,' as he openly professes, Gal. i. 1. See also ver. 11, 12, 17; ch. ii. 6. Against which claims of St. Paul this discourse of our author seems to be designedly levelled; as also possibly against 2 Cor. ii. 16, where St. Paul says, "And who is sufficient for these things?" or, as some read, "Who is so sufficient for these things?" Vid. Mill. in loc.

^q L. i. sect. 6, 7. l. v. sect. 10, 11.

^r L. i. sect. 41—43.

^s Irenæ. l. i. c. 26. al. 25. Orig. cont. Cels. l. v. p. 274. Euseb. H. E. l. iii. cap. 27.

^t Cod. 112, 113.

favour this supposition: at least, in his time, they were both prefixed to some editions of the Recognitions. The nineteenth Homily is imperfect at the end: and there is wanting another whole Homily to complete the number of twenty.

Le Clerc^u thinks that these Clementine Homilies were composed by an Ebionite in the second century. The learned Benedictine, Bernard Montfauçon, is^v of a quite different opinion, supposing them to have been forged much later; and not to have been mentioned by any author, till long after the age of St. Athanasius. This is one of his arguments, that the Synopsis, in which the Clementines are mentioned, was not composed by that father. Grabe^w says, the Clementines spoken of in that Synopsis, are not the same with our Clementine Homilies; which is very probable: those Clementines, mentioned in the Synopsis, are not the Clementine Homilies, but the Clementine Epitome, published by Cotelerius at the end of the Homilies. Montfauçon's argument, therefore, for the late age of the Synopsis may be very good, as I think it is; and Le Clerc too may judge very rightly about the time of writing the Homilies. For though these Clementine Homilies are ancient, they were not cited by the name of Clementines; but were either reckoned another edition of the Recognitions, or called the 'Travels of Peter,' or the 'Disputation of Peter and Appion.' That they were sometimes mentioned by this last title, is probable, as will be shown presently.

In these Homilies is the same fictitious history^x of the separation of Clement, and his father, and mother, and brethren, and their recognizing each other, with that in the Recognitions: and there is a great agreement between these two works in several other things, though each has some other matters wanting in the other. Rufinus^y says that there were two editions of the Recognitions: it is likely that by the other, which he left untranslated, he^z means

^u Sequuntur ipsa Clementina,——opus hominis Ebionitæ, qui vixit seculo secundo. Præf. ad Patres Apost. sect. 6.

^v Ad hæc in apocryphis Novi Testamenti numerantur in Synopsi Κλημεντια, seu Homiliæ Clementinæ, quarum mentionem primo reperimus, diu post Athanasii ævum, apud Nicephorum Patriarcham. Sunt enim illæ opus diversum a Recognitionibus, quarum Origenes, Rufinus, et alii meminere, licet ejusdem sint argumenti, et, ut videtur, postea confictæ. In Synops. Scripturæ Admonit. apud Athanasii Op. T. ii. p. 125.

^w Spicil. T. i. p. 287.

^x Vid. Homil. xii. xiii. xiv.

^y Puto quod non te lateat, Clementis hujus in Græco ejusdem operis Αναγνωσεων, hoc est, Recognitionum, duas editiones haberi; et duo corpora esse librorum, in aliquantis quidem diversa, in multis tamen ejusdem narrationis. Rufin. Præf. ad Gaudentium.

^z Vid. Cave, H. L. P. i. p. 19. in Clement. Rom.

these Homilies. He does not say which is the first edition, though that may be reckoned a point of some moment, if we could determine it. I am apt to think the Clementine Homilies may be the original, or the first edition, and the Recognitions an improvement of them, because they appear more finished and artificial.

This work bids fair for being the same with that censured by Eusebius, under the title of ‘Dialogues of Peter and Appion.’ The whole work is prolix; and in the fourth, fifth, and sixth Homilies, is a history of Appion, and of a dispute with him. It is true, as Grabe^a well observes, this dispute with Appion is not managed by Peter himself, but by Clement in his absence. But I do not know whether that be sufficient to overthrow this supposition; since Clement is reckoned the disciple of Peter, and his most intimate friend. And afterwards, in the seventh Homily, Appion is joined with Simon of Samaria, and others, who publicly declaim against Peter to the multitude. Not to add, that Clement relates that whole disputation to Peter, and receives his applauses for it.

Nor do I perceive that Photius says any thing to the prejudice of this opinion; he rather confirms it. In his article of the genuine and supposititious writings of Clement of Rome, the books mentioned by him are these five: the Constitutions; the Recognitions, under several titles, which he says are full of blasphemies against the Son, according to the Arian doctrine; the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians; the second epistle, which he says is rejected as spurious; and the ‘long disputation,’ as it is entitled, ‘of Peter and Appion,’ which he likewise calls spurious. If hereby he does not mean the Clementine Homilies, they are quite omitted, which is not likely.

Nicephorus Callisti, in the fourteenth century, suspected the Clementines then in use in the church, to be the Dialogue of Peter and Appion. He had only one difficulty: that^b Dialogue was censured by Eusebius, as not agreeable to the right faith; whereas the book called the Clementines, in the time of Nicephorus, was highly approved in the church. But the reason of this I take to be very evident: his Clementines are the Clementine Epitome, as it is called, in which the Clementine Homilies are reformed and new

^a Spic. T. i. p. 273.

^b Εγω δε ει μεν τα νυν παρ’ ημιν Κλημεντια ονομαζομενα λεγει, ου πειθομαι ταυτα γαρ τη εκκλησιαι και ευπαραδεκτα’ ει δε ετερα εισι παρα ταυτα, λεγειν εκ εχω. Nic. Call. Hist. E. l. iii. c. 18. Vid. Testimonia de Clementinis, apud Patres Apost.

modelled. The most obnoxious or offensive things, as not orthodox, had been left out, and other sentiments were inserted, agreeable to the age of him who reformed them. But still Nicephorus suspected those Clementines might be the Dialogue of Peter and Appion. We have much more reason to think the Clementine Homilies are the work which was sometimes spoken of under that title.

If our conjecture is not approved of, we must suppose that Dialogue to be lost; which is the opinion of^c Fabricius.

1. In these Homilies are many passages of the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and divers of them are different from those of the same gospels in the Recognitions. There is very little which can be certainly said to be taken from St. Mark's gospel, though Cotelerius has sometimes put it in the margin. We have these words mentioned as Christ's, after several other which are in Matthew and Luke: 'Hear,^d Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord;' which seems to be a reference to Mark xii. 29. He is supposed to refer,^e in several places, to Mark xii. 24; but I do not see why he may not as well intend Matt. xxii. 29. It is thought likewise that^f he refers to Mark i. 13, in what he says of our Lord's temptation in the wilderness. The small number of plain references to this gospel may be accounted for from its great agreement with the other two gospels just mentioned. There are several passages out of St. John's gospel: I shall mention some of them presently. But there is scarce any one passage which can be affirmed to be taken^g out of St. Paul's epistles, or any other book of the New Testament. However, in the before-mentioned letter of Clement^h to James, Peter is introduced speaking of his approaching death, 'which he had been taught by his Lord and Master, Jesus Christ,' much in the same manner as it is mentioned, 2 Pet. i. 14.

2. The words of Christ are mentioned and appealed to

^c Disputatio uberior Petri et Appionis Eusebio memorata et Hieronymo intercidit; falliturque Oudinus [de Script. Ex. Eccl. T. i. cap. 22.] qui eam a Cotelerio, sub nomine Clementinorum, editam esse sibi persuasit. J. A. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. Part iii. p. 603. Hamb. 8vo. 1719.

^d Εφη, Ακσε, Ισραηλ, Κυριος ο Θεος υμων Κυριος εις εστιν. Hom. iii. sect. 57.

^e Hom. ii. sect. 51. iii. sect. 50. xix. sect. 20.

^f Qui misit nos, Dominus noster et propheta, narravit nobis, quemadmodum diabolus quadraginta diebus cum eo collocutus, nihilque contra valens, promiserit se ex suis sectatoribus apostolos ad fraudem faciendam missurum. Hom. xii. sect. 35. Jam ergo confitetur, per quadraginta dies collocutum tentavisse se. Hom. ix. sect. 2.

^g Vid. Coteler. Not. in Hom. xix. sect. 2. in part cited above, page 375.

^h Sect. 2.

here, as in the Recognitions; not as written but heard by Peter, or learned by others from apostles, or others who had heard our Lord. Thus, Peterⁱ says, ‘Our Master declared the faithful poor blessed.’ ‘Wherefore^k he himself, being a true prophet, said, “I am the gate of life; he that enters in by me, enters into life,” John x. 9.—And again: “My sheep hear my voice,” ch. x. 27.—He^l said, moreover, “I am he of whom Moses prophesied,” ch. v. 46. In another place: For^m so the prophet swore to us, saying, “Verily I say unto you, except ye be born again of living water in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.”’ This is supposed to be a reference to John iii. 3, 5. But he seems to have joined together several texts.

3. If this be the work of an Ebionite, as is generallyⁿ supposed, and seems not improbable,^o it may be argued, that, when the author wrote, the^p four gospels were owned by that sect, or at least by some branch of it. For though there may be some interpolations in these Homilies, there is no reason to think that any texts have been added. If such a thing had been attempted, we should have had here some passages out of other books of the New Testament, and possibly out of St. Paul’s epistles. It is very probable also that we should have met with some forms of quotation, different from those now used in these Homilies.

I see no way of evading this conclusion, but by supposing that all^q these texts of our several gospels were in

ⁱ Πλην ὁ διδασκαλος ἡμῶν πεισθεσ πενητας εμακαρισεν. Hom. xv. sect. 10.

^k Δια τουτο αυτος αληθης ὡν προφητης ελεγεν, Εγω εμι ἡ ποθη της ζωης ὁ δι’ εμου εισερχομενος, εισερχεται εις την ζωνην.—και παλιν, Τα εμα προβατα ακουει της εμης φωνης. Hom. xiii. sect. 52.

^l Ετι μην ελεγεν, Εγω εμι περι οὐ Μωϋσης προεφητευσεν. Ibid.

^m Οὕτως γαρ ἡμιν ὠμοσεν ὁ προφητης, ειπων Ἀμην ἡμιν λεγω, εαν μη αναγεννηθητε ὑδατι ζωντι, εις ονομα Πατρος, Ἰου, Ἀγιε Πνευματος, ου μη εσελθητε εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων. Hom. xi. sect. 26.

ⁿ Vid. Præfat. Clerici, et iudicium Cotelerii de Clementinis, apud Patres Apost. Mill. Proleg. 670.

^o Vid. Hom. iii. sect. 12. vii. sect. 8. xvi. sect. 15. et alibi.

^p It is generally said, that the Ebionites ‘received the gospel according to St. Matthew only.’ So Irenæus: Solo autem eo quod est secundum Matthæum evangelio utuntur, et apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentes. Iren. l. i. cap. 26. al. 25. or, ‘the gospel according to the Hebrews, making little account of the rest.’ So Eusebius: *Εναγγελιω δε μονη τω καθ’ Ἑβραϊκως λεγομενω χωμενοι, των λοιπων σμικρον εποικεντο λογον.* H. E. l. iii. cap. 27. ‘The gospel according to Matthew alone, which they call according to the Hebrews; and that not entire, but corrupted and mutilated.’ So Epiphanius, Hæc. xxx. sect. 3. p. 127. C. sect. 13. p. 137. C. This account of their opinion may suffice for the present.

^q In this work are several things peculiar to St. Luke, which are not in any

some one gospel used by the Ebionites, called the gospel of Matthew, or according to the Hebrews, or by whatever other name it was distinguished. However, either way our evangelical history is confirmed.

This observation upon these Homilies may be reckoned applicable likewise to the Recognitions.

4. Though neither of these books be of any sacred authority, they may be both of some use; and may deserve a more particular examination than has been yet given them. I have said as much of them as is consistent with the nature of the present work, which does not allow me to stay too long upon any one piece. And yet I suppose enough has been said to render it probable, not only that the Clementine Homilies, but also that the book of Recognitions, which Mr. Whiston, in our time, has recommended to us, 'as certainly to be esteemed in the next degree to that of the really sacred books of the New Testament,' is the work of an Ebionite; and therefore, if there is in it any Arianism, it has been interpolated.

VI. After the Recognitions, and the Clementine Homilies, there follows, in the *Patres Apostolici*, a book entitled *The Clementine Epitome*; which had already been mentioned, and needs not to be now enlarged upon; it having plain marks of a later age than that we are concerned with at present. It seems to have been composed out of the Recognitions and Homilies, and perhaps some other works, leaving out some things, and adding others. Cotelierius,^r who published it, is much of this opinion. To this Clementine Epitome, or some such like piece, the author of the Synopsis, ascribed to St. Athanasius, refers, when,

of our three other gospels. I shall put down references to them; not proposing this, however, as a complete collection of texts taken from the gospel of that evangelist. Words of Luke x. 7, are found in Homily iii. sect. 71. chap. x. 18. Hom. xix. sect. 2. ch. x. 20. Hom. ix. sect. 22. ch. xi. 52. Hom. iii. sect. 18. and Hom. xviii. sect. 16. The parable of the unjust judge, Luke xviii. 1—17. in Hom. xvii. sect. 5. Our Lord's visit to Zaccheus recorded, ch. xix. 1—10. Hom. iii. sect. 63. ch. xix. 43. Hom. iii. sect. 15. ch. xxiii. 34. Hom. xi. sect. 20. And it is reasonable to suppose, that the author used many more things of St. Luke's and St. John's gospel, as well as of St. Matthew's, than those which we find recited or referred to in this work. But we shall have another opportunity of speaking more distinctly and at large of these things; I mean, when we come to consider the testimony of those called heretics. For if this be indeed the work of an Ebionite, we shall be obliged to take some notice of it once more.

^r Ex Homiliis Clementinis, et Recognitionum libris, tum ex epistolâ Clementis ad Jacobum, Clementis martyrio, atque narratione Eplhaimi, composita fuit ista Epitome, per eos homines, qui doctrinæ et pietatis suæ esse duxerunt, quicquid superfluum, falsum, et periculosum videbatur, id omne aut tollere, aut mutare et corrigere. Not. i. ad Epitom. Clement.

among the contradicted or apocryphal books of the New Testament, such as the Travels of Peter, the gospel according to Thomas, and some others, he mentions the Clementines, ‘out of which,’ he says,^s ‘those things have been selected which are true and divinely inspired.’ This is probably the book which Nicephorus likewise speaks of, as being in his time approved by the church.

But, in composing of it, not only those things were selected which are true and right in the ancient Clementines, but divers other things were added. Thus, in the Clementine Homilies,^t Clement says, ‘I give thanks to God;’ in the^u Recognitions, ‘I give thanks to Almighty God.’ But in the parallel place of this Clementine Epitome,^v Clement says, ‘I give thanks to God, even the Father, and to his only-begotten Son, and to his Holy Spirit.’ The preaching of Barnabas at Rome, which^w we before observed as it stands in the Recognitions, in this Epitome is thus represented: ‘O Romans, hear! the Son of God is in Judea, promising eternal life to all that are willing;—be converted, therefore, and^x acknowledge one God in three persons.’ In the Clementine Homilies Peter says to Clement, ‘If you would know the things of God, you can learn them from him only’ [that is, from Christ, the true prophet]. ‘And his doctrine^y and true preaching is, that there is one God, who made the world.’ In the parallel place of the Clementine Epitome, Peter says to Clement: ‘If you would know the things concerning God, you^z can learn them only from our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.—And it is his doctrine, that there is one God in three persons, who made the whole world.’ But we have no occasion to insist any longer on this book.

VII. I have spoken of these three pieces in the order in which they are placed by Cotelerius and Le Clerc, in their editions of them. But, as I before observed, I take the Clementine Homilies to be the original work upon which

^s Εξ ὧν μετεφρασθησαν εκλεγεντα τα αληθετερα και θεοπνευστα. Apud Athanas. Op. T. ii. p. 202.

^t Ἡδη ευχαριστω τῷ Θεῷ. Hom. i. sect. 21.

^u Omnipotentī, inquam, Deo gratias ago. L. i. sect. 18.

^v Εγω μεν, εφη, ηδη ευχαριστω τῷ Θεῷ και Πατρὶ, και τῷ μονογενει αυτου Ὑιω, και τῷ Πνευματι αυτου τῷ Ἁγίῳ. sect. 19.

^w See num. iv. note^a, p. 369, 370.

^x Και γνωστε τον εν τρισιν ὑποστασειν ενα Θεον. Clementin. Ep. sect. 7.

^y Ετιν τε αυτου το τε βιβλημα και το αληθες κηρυγμα, οτι εις Θεος, ου κοσμος εργον. Hom. ii. sect. 12.

^z Παρα τῶ Κυριῳ και Θεου και Σωτηρος ἡμων Ιησῳ Χριστῳ, ——— Ετι τε αυτου το βουβλημα, οτι εις Θεος εν τρισιν ὑποστασειν, ου ο κοσμος εργον ο πας. Cl. Ep. sect. 22, 23.

the Recognitions were formed; as the author of the Clementine Epitome has borrowed from both.

Thus has the name of Clement, the companion and fellow labourer of the apostle Paul, been abused by men of three several denominations and characters; an Ebionite, an Arian, and a Catholic. The hand of an Ebionite, in the Clementine Homilies, is, I think, generally acknowledged by learned moderns: and Epiphanius, speaking of the Travels of Peter, says, they had been altered and corrupted by the Ebionites. It was very natural for him, who supposed those travels were written by Clement, to say that they were corrupted by the Ebionites; for certainly the peculiar principles of that sect could not proceed from a fellow-labourer of the apostle Paul. But that there was no good foundation, in the most early antiquity, for supposing Clement to be the author of any of these pieces, may be concluded from Eusebius. I apprehend it must appear probable, from our extracts and observations, that the Clementine Homilies were composed by an Ebionite; and that the main ground and foundation at least of the Recognitions, also is the work of a man of the same sect.

Some Arian must have interpolated the Recognitions, as is evident from the character of them in Photius before mentioned; and from Rufinus, who^a says, ‘that in some places (in his Greek copies of the Recognitions) the doctrine of Eunomius is so plainly put down, that one would believe Eunomius himself was the speaker, teaching, that the Son of God was created out of nothing.’ These things, I suppose, could not be written before the fourth century.

That the Clementine Epitome was composed by an orthodox christian, is notorious. However, it may be said in favour of the catholics, that none of them appear to have had any hand in any of these Clementines during the first three centuries. It may be added likewise, that it was known that the Clementine Epitome was not an original piece; and that it was not pretended to be really written by Clement, but was allowed to consist of things selected out of some other work or works. This may be concluded from the author of the Synopsis: but yet this does not amount to a full vindication of this book, and the title given

^a In quibus [Recognitionis libris] cum ex personâ Petri apostoli doctrina quasi vere apostolica in quamplurimis exponatur; in aliquibus ita Eunomii dogma scribitur, [al. inseritur,] ut nihil aliud quam ipse Eunomius disputare credatur, filium Dei creatum ex nullis extantibus asseverans. De Adulteratione Libr. Originis.

to it. For though the learned author of the *Synopsis* knew very well, as it seems, that the book of *Clementines*, in use in the church, was not really written by *Clement*, but was an orthodox modern book, composed out of some other more ancient writings, which were not completely catholic; yet the generality of people would be induced, from the title, to take it for the work of *Clement* himself. Nor is the account of this book in the *Synopsis* just and fair: since, as has been shown, it is not a mere epitome of the ancient *Clementines*, but has many additions.

I am far from taking pleasure in mentioning these things but there is a necessity of distinguishing genuine and supposititious works. And I hope I may rely upon what is said by that great^b author, *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, speaking of the various readings of the several copies of the *New Testament*: ‘Depend on it, no truth, no matter of fact fairly laid open, can ever subvert true religion.’ It is possible that some weak and inconsiderate men may be offended at the detection of forged and supposititious writings; but I think that truth would suffer much more in the end by letting them pass without censure.

It cannot be, I think, beside the purpose, to put down in this place a passage of a letter of *Salvian*, presbyter of *Marseilles* in the fifth century, to *Salonius*, bishop^c of some place in *Gaul*, or near it. *Salvian* wrote a treatise, in four books, against covetousness, without putting his name to it. It begins with an epistolary address in this manner: ‘*Timothy*, the least of the servants of *God*, to the catholic church spread over the whole world, grace be to thee, and peace, from *God* our Father, and from *Jesus Christ* our Lord, with the *Holy Spirit*.’ *Salonius*, dissatisfied about this, sent his scruples in a letter to *Salvian*, as appears from what *Salvian* writes by way of answer, which is to this purpose: ‘You^d ask me, my dear *Salonius*, why the name of *Timothy* has been put to some books lately composed and inscribed to the church by some man of our time. You add likewise, that unless I clearly show the reason of this title, since they are called *Timothy’s*, perhaps they ought to be reckoned apocryphal.’ *Salvian*

^b Remarks upon a Discourse of Free-Thinking, sect. 32.

^c It is not certain what place he was bishop of. Vid. Cave, Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 457. Stephan. Baluz. Not. ad *Salvian*. p. 374. Paris. 1669. Du Pin, Bibliothèque.

^d Quæris a me, O mi *Saloni*, caritas mea, cur libellis nuper a quodam hujus temporis homine ad ecclesiam factis, *Timothei* nomen inscriptum sit. Addis præterea, quod nisi rationem vocabuli evidentè expressere, dum nominantur *Timothei*, inter apocrypha sint fortasse reputandi. *Salvian*. ep. ix.

then proposes the reasons of this title, still speaking of the author in the third person, without owning himself to have had any hand in those books. I need not now mention particularly those reasons; but I would make a few remarks upon this passage.

1. We see here the meaning of the word ‘apocryphal;’ it is much the same as spurious, or supposititious; at least the word was so used sometimes. A book with the name of Timothy, which was not his, Salonius thought should be placed in the number of apocryphal books.

2. Here is an instance of the vigilance and caution of christians about the books which they received as written by apostles, or apostolical men. The books against covetousness, named Timothy’s, are good books; nevertheless, since they were not his, Salonius was for having them called by the disadvantageous title of apocryphal, or spurious. So far from receiving them as canonical, he would not admit them into the rank of ecclesiastical writings. Indeed here is inserted a modest ‘perhaps,’ which, it is likely, he thought necessary in writing to his master Salvian, whose opinion upon the point he did not yet know. Otherwise he seems to have expressed himself positively enough, and desires a good reason to be given him of the name put to these books.

3. It is a dangerous thing to assume the names of great men; the consequence may be worse than we imagine. Salvian did not intend that these books should be thought to be really written by Timothy; he was a man of more virtue, and particularly of more modesty, than to incur the suspicion of such a design. Nevertheless, he acted indiscreetly, and Salonius justly demanded a clear reason of this title; otherwise these books were to be branded as apocryphal, lest they should be supposed, by some people, to be really Timothy’s. We are certainly indebted to the circumspection and care of Salonius, and perhaps of others likewise, in this affair. If no notice had been taken at that time of this ambiguous title, these books might have been reputed, by many, a genuine work of Timothy, the disciple and fellow-labourer of the apostle Paul; and notwithstanding this notice, they^e seem to have been published as his, in the first printed edition of them.

VIII. I now conclude my extracts out of christian writers of the second century. If any miss some authors,

^e Vid. Steph. Baluz. not. ad Salvian. p. 416. et Centuriatores Magdeburg. cent. v. c. 10. p. 1325.

which they expected to have seen mentioned here, it is likely they will find them in the following century.

I do not sum up the several testimonies which have been already taken: we are as yet collecting evidence, and expect more. As a general review of the whole will be made at the end, that may be sufficient.

It ought to be observed, that we have not here the whole remaining evidence of the first two centuries, because I have hitherto insisted chiefly on catholic authors. I suppose that the sentiments of those called Heretics, will give some confirmation to the testimonies of catholic christians. Possibly some heathen authors may afford us some evidence. Celsus the Epicurean, who within this period wrote professedly against the christian religion, will be a considerable witness in behalf of the books, as well as facts, of the New Testament. But these are to be considered hereafter in distinct articles.

CHAP. XXX.

MINUCIUS FELIX.

MARCUS MINUCIUS FELIX has left us an excellent defence of the christian religion written in the form of a dialogue or conference between Cæcilius Natalis, a heathen, and Octavius Januarius, a christian, in which Minucius sits as judge. Cæcilius first objects, and then Octavius answers. When he has finished, after a short interval of silence, Cæcilius owns himself convinced and overcome, and declares his readiness to become a christian.

This piece had been long reckoned an eighth book of ‘Arnobius against the Gentiles;’ but for some while has^a been restored by the critics to Minucius, to whom it is ascribed by ancient christian authors who have quoted it: not to mention any other reasons, why it ought not to be esteemed a part of Arnobius’s work.

It is difficult to determine with exactness the age of Minucius. The generality of learned men have placed him between Tertullian and St. Cyprian. Cave,^b in par-

^a Vid. imprimis Dissert. Fr. Balduini in M. Minucii Felicis Octavium.

^b De ætate ejus quâ vixit, nil habeo quod pro certo affirmare auserim: si

ticular, thinks he flourished about the year 220; but without being positive that he has hit his exact age. David Blondell^c thought Minucius wrote under Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, about the year 170. The late most ingenious^d and critical Mr. Moyle too thought, ‘that the age of Minucius, though not certain, had been fixed, with great probability, to the latter end of the reign of the same emperor, by Mr. Dodwell.’ And it is true, Mr.^e Dodwell declared that to be his opinion, in his *Dissertationes Cyprianicæ*, published in 1684. But in a book entitled, ‘A Discourse concerning the use of Incense in Divine Offices,’ published in 1711, he brings Minucius down a good deal later. ‘But,’ says he,^f ‘what then shall we think of the aræ nullæ in Minucius Felix? He wrote a little after Tertullian, as mentioning^g the representation of the God of the christians with an ass’s head, which was a calumny newly invented^h when Tertullian wrote his Apology; yet before St. Cyprian, who transcribes some passages out of him verbatim in his book *De Vanitate Idolorum*.’

It may be farther observed, that the internal characters of time in this work are not unsuitable to the latter part of the second, or the beginning of the third century. The christians are in afflictive circumstances, without altars and temples; and are loaded by Cæcilius, in his part of the dispute, with all manner of reproaches. Lastly, St. Jerom, in his book of *Illustrious Men*, where he has some regard to the order of time, has placed Minucius between Tertullian and St. Cyprian; and in the chapter of Tertullian says, that Tertullian was then generally reckoned the first of the Latin writers of the church, after Victor and Apollonius.

I think, upon the whole, that if this Dialogue was written after Tertullian’s Apology, yet it may be allowed to have soon followed it; and these two christian apologists may be reckoned contemporaries. I therefore place Minucius

tamen in re obscurâ dubiâque hariolari licet, conjiciam illum, utpote Tertulliano supparem, Cypriano antiquiorem, circa an. 220, claruisse. Cave, *Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 66.*

^c David Blondellus in *Apologiâ de Episcop. et Presbyt. Vid. Testimonia præfixa Minuc. Felic. ex editione Jacob. Gronov. Ludg. Bat. 1709.*

^d Works of Walter Moyle, Esq. vol. ii. p. 84. See also vol. i. p. 389.

^e Diss. iii. sect. 16. p. 35.

^f See Discourse, &c. sect. 20. p. 56.

^g Audio eos turpissimæ pecudis caput asini consecratum, nescio quâ persuasione, venerari. *Minuc. Fel. cap. 9. p. 55. et cap. 28. p. 143. ed. Davis. Cantabr. 1712.*

^h Vid. Tertullian, *Apolog. cap. 16. p. 17. D.*

at the year 210, near the end of the reign of Septimius Severus; which is agreeable to the opinion ofⁱ Baronius and others.

It is thought probable, by many learned^k men, that Minucius was an African. However, Trithemius, in the fifteenth century, calls^l Minucius a Roman. To which we may add, likewise, that he says, Minucius flourished in the reign of the emperor Alexander, at the year 230.

Lactantius has twice mentioned this writer. In the^m first place he quotes a passage from him, and gives his book the title of Octavius. In the other he says, ‘that Minuciusⁿ was an eminent pleader, and that his book, entitled Octavius, shows how able a defender of the truth he might have been, if he had given up himself entirely to that work.’ Lactantius here speaking of several christian apologists, first mentions Minucius, then Tertullian, and last of all St. Cyprian.

‘Minucius Felix,’ says St. Jerom in his^o book of *Illustrious Men*, ‘an eminent pleader of Rome, wrote a dialogue between a christian and a heathen, which is entitled Octavius. There is another book, which goes under his name, *Of Fate, or against astrologers*: which though it be likewise the work of an eloquent man, does not appear to me agreeable to the style of the fore-mentioned book. Lactantius, in his writings, makes mention of this Minucius.’

The book *Of Fate*, which is not now extant, is mentioned much after the same manner, in another work, by^p St.

ⁱ Baron. Ann. 211. sect. 2, 3. Vid. et Tillemont, Note sur Minuce Felix. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. i. p. 513. ed. de Bruxelles.

^k Cave, Hist. Lit. Tillemont, Minuce Fel. Basnage, Annal. Pol. Ec. 210. n. iii. Fr. Balduin. Diss. in Min. Fel. Oct. Rigaltius in notis.

^l Minucius Felix, causidicus, patriâ Romanus, vir in secularibus literis eruditissimus, et in divinis lectionibus studiosus,—claruit Romæ sub Alexandro imperatore, anno Domini ccxxx. Trithem. de Script. Eccl. cap. 34.

^m Minucius Felix, in eo libro qui Octavius inscribitur, sic argumentatus est.—Lactant. de Divin. Inst. l. i. c. 11. p. 67. Lugd. Bat. 1660.

ⁿ Minucius Felix non ignobilis inter causidicos loci fuit. Hujus liber, cui Octavio titulus est, declarat, quam idoneus veritatis assertor esse potuisset, si se totum ad id studii contulisset. Id. l. v. cap. i. p. 459.

^o Minucius Felix, Romæ insignis causidicus, scripsit dialogum christiani et ethnici disputantium, qui Octavius inscribitur. Sed et alius sub nomine ejus fertur, *De Fato, vel contra mathematicos*: qui, cum sit et ipse deserti hominis, non mihi videtur cum superioris libri stilo convenire. Meminit hujus Minucii et Lactantius in libris suis. De Vir. Ill. cap. 58.

^p Minucius Felix, causidicus Romani fori, in libro cui titulus Octavius est, et in altero contra mathematicos, (si tamen inscriptio non mentitur auctorem,) quid Gentilium scripturarum dimisit intactum? Id. ad Magnum, ep. 83. al. 84.

Jerom, who, upon several^a occasions, has commended the learning of this author. Minucius is also reckoned with the most eloquent christian writers, by^f Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the fifth century. I forbear to allege any more testimonies.

That Minucius pleaded at Rome, appears from the Dialogue itself; in which the author mentions^s the vintage season, when there was vacation at the courts of justice. We know likewise, from the book itself, that both Minucius and his friend Octavius were originally heathens; it is also intimated, that Minucius did not embrace christianity before^t he was of mature age, and able to judge for himself. As^u for Octavius, he seems to have pleaded against the christians, or to have sat in judgment upon them, in the former part of his life; when he treated them with the severity and injustice common with other heathen judges at that time.

This work is a monument of the author's ingenuity, learning, and eloquence. And the conversion of a man, of his great natural and acquired abilities, to the christian religion, and his public and courageous defence of it, notwithstanding the many worldly temptations to the contrary which he must have met with at that time, especially in his station; as they give an advantageous idea of his virtue, so they likewise afford a very agreeable argument in favour of the truth of our religion.

Here are no express quotations of the books of scripture. But as it may be expected I should not entirely omit the hints or allusions to them, found in so polite and elegant a

^a Taceo de Latinis scriptoribus, Tertulliano, Cypriano, Minucio, Victorino, Lactantio, Hilario. Hieron. Apologeticus ad Pammachium, ep. 30. al. 50. Atque in hunc modum eruditionis famam declinando eruditissimus habebatur; istud Cypriani, hoc Lactantii, illud Hilarii est: sic Minucius Felix, ita Victorinus, in hunc modum locutus est Arnobius. Ad Heliodorum, Epitaph. Nepotianii, ep. 35. al. 3.

^f Et quando clarissimos facundiâ Firmianum, Minucium, Cyprianum, Hilarium, Joannem, Ambrosium, ex illo volumine numerositatis evolvam. Eucher. in Ep. ad Valerianum.

^s Sane et ad vindemiam feriæ judiciarum curam relaxaverant. M. Minucii Octav. cap. 2. p. 24.

^t Utpote, cum diligentur in utroque vivendi genere versatus, repudiâris alterum, alterum comprobâris. Cap. 5. p. 31.

^u Et nos idem fuimus, et eadem vobiscum quondam adhuc cæci et hebetes sentiebamus. — Nos tamen cum sacrilegos aliquos et incestos, paricidas etiam defendendos et tuendos suscipiebamus, hos nec audiendos in totum putabamus: nonnunquam etiam miscerentes eorum crudelius sæviebamus, ut torqueremus confitentes ad negandum, videlicet ne perirent; excrcentes in his perversam quæstionem, non quæ verum crueret, sed quæ mendacium cogeret. Vid. et quæ sequuntur, cap. 28. p. 141.

performance, I shall take the following notice of such as have appeared to me in reading it.

I. ‘The^v birds subsist without any estate; and the beasts are fed by the day.’ Perhaps here is a reference to Matt. vi. 26, and Luke xii. 24, if not also to the petition in the Lord’s prayer for ‘daily bread.’

II. ‘How^w can he be thought poor, who is rich toward God.’ Compare Luke xii. 21.

III. Cæcilius says, ‘The^x Romans erect altars to unknown Gods.’ Though these are the words of the heathen disputant, it may be thought probable that Minucius, the composer of the Dialogue, refers to Acts xvii. 23; “I found an altar with this inscription, To the unknown God.”

IV. Octavius^y speaks of the intimate presence of God with us, or of our ‘living as it were with him,’ in terms so resembling those of Acts xvii. 27, 28, that some may think he refers to them.

V. ‘Seeds^z do not spring till after they have putrified.’ This resembles I Cor. xv. 36, “That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.”

VI. ‘Therefore,’ says^a Octavius, ‘as gold is tried by the fire, so are we [christians] by afflictions.’ See I Cor. iii. 13, and I Pet. i. 7. But this is too common a comparison to prove a reference to any particular writing.

VII. ‘Fortitude^b is improved by misfortunes;’ or, literally, ‘is strengthened by infirmities.’ See 2 Cor. xii. 10.

VIII. ‘Shall^c I bring offerings and sacrifices to God, of things which he has set forth for my use, and so fling him back again his gift? This will be ungrateful.’ Which has a resemblance with what is said, I Tim. iv. 3, 4; “——to abstain from meats, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving;——for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving.”

IX. ‘No^d man can be so poor as he was born.’ See I

^v Aves sine patrimonio vivunt, et in diem pecua pascuntur. Cap. 36. p. 176.

^w Et tamen quis potest pauper esse——qui Deo dives est? Ibid.

^x Dum aras exstruunt etiam ignotis numinibus, et manibus. Cap. 6. p. 41.

^y Unde enim Deus longe est, cum omnia cœlestia, terrenaque, et quæ extra istam orbis provinciam sunt, Deo cognita, plena sint? Ubique non tantum nobis proximus, sed infusus est.——Non tantum sub illo agimus, sed cum illo, ut prope dixerim, vivimus. Cap. 32. p. 162, 163.

^z Semina non nisi corrupta revirescunt. Cap. 34. p. 171.

^a Itaque ut aurum ignibus, sic nos discriminibus arguimur. Cap. 36. p. 177.

^b Fortitudo enim infirmitatibus roboratur. Ibid.

^c Hostias et victimas Domino offeram, quas in usum mei protulit, ut rejiciam ei suum munus? Ingratum est. Cap. 32. p. 160.

^d Nemo tam pauper esse potest, quam natus est. Cap. 36. p. 176.

Tim. vi. 7. But the same thing has been said by heathen authors.

X. 'What soldier^e is not more bold and courageous in the eye of his general? Nor is any man rewarded till he has been tried.—The soldier of God is not deserted in pain, nor does he perish when he dies.' The reader, if he thinks fit, may consider whether here is an allusion to St. Paul's comparisons, 2 Tim. ii. 3—6, 8.

I do not judge it worth the while to allege any more passages of this sort from Minucius.

CHAP. XXXI.

APOLLONIUS.

APOLLONIUS flourished, according to Cave,^a about the year of our Lord 192. But Eusebius^b informs us, that Apollonius himself says, that, when he wrote, it was forty years since Montanus had begun to recommend his false prophecy: and St. Jerom^c has observed the same thing. Whence Tillemont^d concludes, that Apollonius wrote about the year 211, at the conclusion of the reign of Severus, or in the first year of Caracalla. Valesius^e likewise is of much the same opinion.

Eusebius, who has preserved several fragments of the fore-mentioned treatise, calls Apollonius an ecclesiastical writer, beginning his account of it in this manner. 'Apollonius^f likewise, an ecclesiastical writer, composed a confutation of the Cataphrygian heresy, as it is called, which

^e Quis non miles sub imperatoris oculis audacius periculum provocet? Nemo enim præmium percipit ante experimentum: et imperator tamen quod non habet, non dat; non potest propagare vitam, potest honestare militiam. At enim Dei miles nec in dolore deseritur, nec morte finitur. Cap. 37. p. 178.

^a Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 53. in Apollonio.

^b Eus. II. E. I. v. cap. 18. p. 186. B.

^c Dicit in eodem libro quadragesimum esse annum usque ad tempus quo ipse scribebat librum, ex quo hæresis Cataphrygarum habuerit exordium. De Vir. Ill. cap. 40.

^d Mem. Ecc. T. ii. P. iii. Les Montanistes, art. v. p. 44. et art. xi. p. 68.

^e Vid. Not. ad Eus. L. v. c. 18. p. 100.

^f Της δε κατα Φρυγας καθεμενης αιρεσεως και Απολλωνιος εκκλησιαστικος συγγραφευς, ακμαζεσης εισετι τοτε κατα την Φρυγαν ιλεγχον ενσησαμενος, ιδιον κατ' αυτων πεποιηται συγγραμμα. L. v. c. 18. p. 884. B.

‘ at that time prevailed in Phrygia, writing a book on ‘ purpose upon that occasion.’

St. Jerom calls Apollonius a^s ‘ most eloquent man;’ and says, ‘ he wrote a long and excellent work against ‘ Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla; and that^h the seventh ‘ book of Tertullian’s treatise of Ecstasy was particularly ‘ designed as a confutation of this piece of Apollonius:’ which observation St. Jeromⁱ has mentioned more than once. He says, likewise, that Apollonius flourished in the reigns of the emperors Commodus and Severus.

Eusebius speaks of Apollonius under no other character than that of an ecclesiastical writer; nor has St. Jerom mentioned any office he had in the church: for which reason, as^k Tillemont says, it is not easy to rely upon Predestinatus, a later writer, and otherwise full of mistakes, who calls him bishop of Ephesus. He is plainly different from Apollonius of whom^l we spoke formerly, whom St. Jerom^m calls a Roman senator, who also suffered under Commodus; whereas this person flourished partly in the reign of Severus, and probably reached to that of Caracalla.

I proceed, without making any more observations, to transcribe what relates to our purpose in the fragments of this work of Apollonius, written against the Montanists, which are preserved in Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History.

I. After some other passages of this author, Eusebius adds: ‘ Thenⁿ he goes on saying, Is it not apparent, that ‘ all the scripture forbids a prophet to take gifts and ‘ money?’ By scripture, meaning undoubtedly the books of the Old and the New Testament; in which last, as well as in the former, are divers things to which he may be supposed to refer, particularly to Acts viii. 18—20. However, we shall presently see a text or two of the New Testament to this purpose.

II. Afterwards, speaking of Themison, a noted Montanist, he says: ‘ When^o he ought to have been humbled,

^s Apollonius, vir disertissimus, scripsit adversus Montanum, Priscam, et Maximillam insigne et longum volumen. De Vir. Ill. cap. 40.

^h Tertullianus sex voluminibus adversus ecclesiam editis, quæ scripsit περι Εκτασεως, septimum proprie adversus Apollonium elaboravit, in quo omnia quæ arguit conatur defendere. Floruit autem sub Commodo Severoque principibus. Ibid.

ⁱ De Vir. Ill. cap. 24. Melito; et cap. 30. Tertullianus.

^k Tillemont, as before, p. 68.

^l P. 323, 324.

^m De Vir. Ill. cap. 42.

ⁿ Ειτ’ επιφερει λεγων’ Δοκει σοι πασα γραφη κωλυειν προφητην λαμβανειν δωρα και χρηματα; Ap Eus. ib. p. 184. D.

^o Δειν επι τωτω ταπεινοφρονειν, ως μαρτυς καυχωμενος, ετολμησε μιμνρμενος

‘ [for the bad conduct which Apollonius there charges him
 ‘ with in time of persecution,] he exalted himself as if he
 ‘ had been a martyr; and had the assurance, as if he had
 ‘ been an apostle, to write a catholic epistle for the instruc-
 ‘ tion of men more faithful than himself. Yea, and in the
 ‘ abundance of his zeal for his vain sentiments, he proceeds
 ‘ so far as to speak disrespectfully of Christ, and the
 ‘ apostles, and the holy church.’

III. Again, reproving these men: ‘ When^p the Lord
 ‘ hath said, “Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor two
 ‘ coats,” [Matt. x. 9, 10.] these, on the contrary, have hei-
 ‘ nously offended in the possession of things forbidden.’
 And, soon after: ‘ For we^q ought to examine the fruits of
 ‘ a prophet; “for a tree is known by its fruit.”’ See Matt.
 vii. 15—20, and ch. xii. 33.

IV. ‘ Moreover, says^r Eusebius, he relates, as from tra-
 ‘ dition, that our Saviour commanded his apostles not to
 ‘ depart from Jerusalem for the space of twelve years. He
 ‘ also makes use of testimonies out of the Revelation of John;
 ‘ and he relates, that by the divine power, the same John
 ‘ raised up to life a dead man at Ephesus.’

V. Here is then a reference or two to the gospel of St.
 Matthew. We are assured by Eusebius, that Apollonius
 quoted the book of the Revelation. It is very probable,
 from the connection of things in this account, and from
 Eusebius’s saying nothing to the contrary, that Apollonius
 ascribed the Revelation to John the apostle. It appears
 farther, that the apostles of Christ, and their writings, were
 in the highest esteem; and that the books called scripture,
 in a strict and peculiar sense, by christians, were well
 known among them, and were considered as the rule of
 their faith and practice.

τον αποστολον, καθολικην τινα συνταξαμενος επιτολην^p κατηχειν μεν τες
 αμεινον αυτη πεπιτευκοτας^r συναγωνιζεσθαι δε τοις της κενοφωνιας λογιοις^q
 βλασφημησαι δε εις τον Κυριον, και τες αποστολεις, και την αγιαν εκκλησιαν.
 Ibid. p. 185. A.

^p Ειρηκοτος γαρ τς Κυρις, μη κτησησθε χρυσον μητε αργυρον μητε ενδο
 χιτωνας, ουτοι παν τουναντιον πεπλημμεληκασι περι τας τειτων των απηγο-
 ρευμενων κτησεις. p. 185. B.

^q Δει γαρ τες καρπες δοκιμαζεσθαι τς προφητες^r απο γαρ τς καρπς το
 δενδρον γινωσκεται. Ibid. C.

^r Ετι δε ως εκ παραδοσεως τον Σωτηρα φησι προσηταχεναι τοις αυτη αποσ-
 τολοις, επι δωδεκα ετεσι μη χωρισθηναι της Ιερουσαλημ. Κεχρηται δε και
 μαρτυριας απο Ιωαννης Αποκαλυψεως^q και νεκρον δε δυναμει θεια προς αυτη
 Ιωαννης εν τη Εφεσω εγγερωθαι ισορει. p. 186. C.

CHAP. XXXII.

CAIUS, AND OTHERS.

I. *Caius*. II. *An Anonymous Author against the Heresy of Artemon*. III. *A Treatise of the Nature of the Universe*.

I. CAIUS flourished, according to^a Cave, about the year 210. We are informed by Photius, ‘That it was commonly said, that Caius was a presbyter of the church of Rome in the time of Victor and Zephyrine, and that he was ordained bishop of the nations;’^b by which some learned^c men understand, that he was ordained to preach the gospel in infidel countries, without having any particular people or diocese assigned him. Fabricius, by a small alteration of the word in Photius, would read ‘Athens,’ instead^d of ‘nations;’ and supposes, that having been first a presbyter in the church of Rome, he was afterwards made bishop of Athens.

Photius says, likewise, that he had seen a note of some person, whom he does not name, in a book Of the Nature of the Universe, ascribed by some to Josephus: ‘That^e it was written by Caius, a presbyter, who dwelt at Rome, who is also said to be the author of the Labyrinth.’

We are well assured from Eusebius^f and^g St. Jerom, that Caius lived in the time of Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, about whose time^h learned men are not entirely agreed; and of Antoninus Caracalla, who reigned from 211 to 217.

^a Hist. Lit. in Caio.

^b Τετον τον Γαϊον πρεσβυτερον φασι γεγενησθαι της κατα Ῥωμην εκκλησιας επι Ουϊκτορος και Ζεφυρινη των αρχιερων. χειροτονοθηναι δε αυτον και εθνων επισκοπον. Phot. Cod. 48. col. 36, 37. Rhotom. 1653.

^c Cave, ut supra. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. i. p. 295. Caius.

^d Presbyter Romanus, atque inde episcopus Atheniensis; nam apud Photium pro εθνων επισκοπον legendum videtur Αθηνων. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. l. v. cap. i. T. v. p. 267.

^e Εύρον δε εν παραγραφαις ότι οικ επιν ο λογος Ιωσηπε, αλλα Γαιω, τινος πρεσβυτερος εν Ῥωμη διατριβοντος, εν φασι συνταξαι και τον Λαβυρινθον. Phot. ibid.

^f Eus. H. E. l. ii. cap. 25. p. 67. D. et l. vi. cap. 20.

^g De Vir. Ill. cap. 59.

^h Mr. Dodwell thought that Zephyrinus, successor of Victor, sat in the see of Rome from the year 195 to 214. Vid. Diss. singular. de Rom. Pontiff. Prim. Successione, c. xv. sect. 2. 7. &c. Tillemont says, Zephyrinus governed the church of Rome

It is thought, by many, that Caius was a disciple of Irenæus. This has been concluded from some words at the end of a manuscript copy of the epistle of the church of Smyrna, concerning the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, where it is said: ‘Thisⁱ was transcribed from the copy of Irenæus, disciple of Polycarp, by Caius, who also was acquainted with Irenæus. I Socrates, living in Corinth, transcribed from the copy of Caius.’ But it may be questioned whether this note may be relied upon: if it may, here is no certain proof that this is our Caius. As this was a common name, all that can be hence concluded is, that the transcriber of that epistle lived about the same time with our author. Indeed Caius, as we shall see by and by, does not reckon the epistle to the Hebrews among St. Paul’s epistles; which agrees well enough to a disciple of Irenæus, as Tillemont has observed. But this might be common, at that time, to many in several parts of the world.

It is also generally allowed, that Caius was a presbyter of the church of Rome; and bishop^k Pearson says directly, that Eusebius, as well as Photius, gives him that title. Du^l Pin too says, that Eusebius and St. Jerom call Caius presbyter, but without saying of Rome; these learned men do not refer to any particular place, where this is said: and I am not aware that Eusebius or Jerom say any thing more, than that Caius was an ecclesiastical man, and had a dispute with Proculus, at Rome, in the time of Zephyrinus. Though therefore it may be allowed to have some probability, from Photius, that Caius was a presbyter of Rome, it can by no means be reckoned a certain thing.

There are three or four books ascribed to Caius; A Dialogue, or Disputation, with Proculus or Proelus, a follower of Montanus; another, Of the Universe; a third, called the Labyrinth, and the Little Labyrinth; a fourth, written against the Heresy of Artemon. These are all mentioned together by^m Photius, as distinct works; but the two last are generally thought to be only different titles of one and from 201, or 202, to 219. See St. Zephyrine. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 1. and note, p. 336; as also Caius, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. i. p. 294. But Pagi says, from 197 to 217. Vid. Crit. in Baron. 197. n. v. 219. n. ii.

ⁱ Ταῦτα μετεγραψατο μεν Γαῖος ἐκ τῶν Εἰρηναίω, μαθητῆς τῆ Πολυκαρπῆ, ὅς καὶ συνεπολεμισατο τῷ Εἰρηναίῳ. Ἐγὼ δὲ Σωκράτης ἐν Κορινθῶν ἐκ τῆ Γαῖω ἀντιγραφῶν ἐγραψα. κ. λ. Ἐρ. Eccles. Smyrn. sect. 23. apud Patr. Apost. et Vales. Annot. in Euseb. H. E. p. 73. D.

^k Hunc Caium tum Eusebius tum Photius Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyterum fuisse asserunt. Pearson, Op. Post. Diss. ii. sect. 3. p. 148.

^l Eusébe et Saint Jérôme disent bien, qu’il étoit prêtre, et qu’il a vécu du tems du Zéphirin; mais ils ne disent pas, qu’il fut Romain. Du Pin, Bibl. Caius.

^m Cod. 48.

the same work. Theodoretⁿ says, that Caius wrote against Cerinthus; but I apprehend he means the book against the Montanists, in which Caius also opposed Cerinthus, as we shall soon see, from a passage to be transcribed from Eusebius. If Caius had composed a distinct work against that heretic, it is likely it would have been mentioned by Eusebius and Jerom.

There are therefore three books said to be written by Caius, of which we have some fragments remaining. I shall speak of each distinctly: and, first of all, of the Dialogue with Proculus, by which work Caius is best known; which is undoubtedly his, and which I take to be the only piece rightly ascribed to him. And since St. Jerom says that the dispute with the Montanists was held at Rome in the time of Caracalla, we cannot well place it before the year 212. It is probable, from the considerations mentioned by^o Tillemont, that this Dialogue was written in Greek; which was also the opinion of^p Valesius.

1. Eusebius having spoken of the martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, and the inscriptions on their tombs, says: ‘And^q Caius, an ecclesiastical man, who lived in the time of Zephyrinus, bishop of the Romans, in his book written against Proculus, a leader of the Cataphrygian sect, confirms this, speaking after this manner of the places where the sacred tabernacles of the fore-mentioned apostles are deposited: “I am able to show the trophies of the apostles: for whether you go to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Way, you will find the trophies of those who founded this church.”’

This passage is now produced chiefly as the testimony of Eusebius to our author’s character and time, and the book against the Montanists; which was particularly written against Proculus, who is supposed to be the same Proculus whom Tertullian^r has commended.

2. In another place, Eusebius, speaking of the writings of ancient ecclesiastical men, who flourished about the times of Severus and Antoninus Caracalla, says: ‘There^s

ⁿ Κατα τῆς δε οὐ μόνον οἱ προῤῥήθεντες συνεγράψαν, ἀλλὰ σὺν ἐκείνοις καὶ Γαῖος. Theodoret, Hær. Fab. l. ii. cap. 3. De Cerintho.

^o As before.

^p Annot. in Eus. l. vi. cap. 20. p. 123.

^q Οὐδὲν δ’ ἦττον καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ Γαῖος ὀνομα, κατὰ Ζεφυρίνου Ῥωμαίων γεγωνὸς ἐπίσκοπον. ὅς δὴ Προκλῶ τῆς κατὰ Φρυγίας προΐσταμενῆ γνώμης ἐγγράφως διαλεχθεὶς, κ. λ. Euseb. H. E. l. ii. c. 25. p. 67. D.

^r Tertullian adv. Valent. cap. v. p. 291. B. See also before in this volume, p. 269.

^s Ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γαῖος λογιώτατος ἀνδρὸς διαλογος, ἐπι—εν ᾧ τῶν δι’ ἐναντίας τὴν περὶ το συνταττεῖν καινας γραφας προπετειαντε καὶ τολμαν ἐπισομιζῶνι, τῶν τῆς ἱερῆς ἀποστολῆς δεκατριῶν

‘ is also come to our hands a dialogue [or disputation] of
 ‘ Caius, a most eloquent man, held at Rome in the time of
 ‘ Zephyrinus, with Proculus, a patron of the Cataphrygian
 ‘ heresy; in which also, reproving the rashness and auda-
 ‘ ciousness of the adversaries, in composing new writings,
 ‘ [or scriptures,] he makes mention of but thirteen epistles
 ‘ of the holy apostle, not reckoning that to the Hebrews,
 ‘ with the rest. And indeed to this very time, by some of
 ‘ the Romans this epistle is not thought to be the apostle’s.’

By the ‘ new writings,’ or scriptures composed by the Montanists, it is reasonable to suppose, are intended some of their prophecies, which they had not only spoken, but written and published, with a design, as it seems, to have them received with the same or like respect with that paid to the scriptures received and owned by christians as sacred. Upon this occasion Caius gave a list or catalogue of the apostle Paul’s epistles received by himself and the church in general. One may be apt to think, that Caius reckoned up all the scriptures in general received by christians from ancient time, in opposition to these ‘ new scriptures’ of the Montanists. But supposing that he put down only the epistles of St. Paul, we should have been glad to have had this passage at length. It would have been a great pleasure to see thirteen of St. Paul’s epistles expressly named, with the churches, or particular persons, to whom they were sent; or however described, at least, by their several characters, in the order then used, all together in one catalogue, composed by this ingenious writer, at the beginning of the third century. And I cannot but think that Eusebius deserves to be censured for this omission.

The observation which Eusebius makes, at the conclusion of this passage, concerning some of the Romans, in his own time, not receiving the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul’s, is somewhat remarkable. It may be considered, whether the occasion of it be, that Caius had some particular relation to the church of Rome; or whether it be only owing to this dispute having been held in that city, which was expressly mentioned before. If the former, this would afford some ground of suspicion that Caius was a presbyter of the church of Rome; which, we are informed by Photius, was a common opinion in his time.

As this testimony to St. Paul’s epistles is very consider-

μονων επιτολων μνημονευει, την προς 'Εβραιως μη συναριθμησας ταις λοιπαις. επει και εις δενρο, παρα 'Ρωμαιων τισιν, ε νομιζεται τα αποτολα τυγχανειν.
 H. E. l. vi. c. 20.

able, I shall transcribe also the passages of St. Jerom and Photius relating to the same matter; though they add little or nothing to the account given by Eusebius.

‘Caius,’ says St.^t Jerom, ‘in the time of Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, that is, in the time of Antoninus, son of Severus, had a very notable dispute with Proculus, a follower of Montanus, charging him with rashness in defending the new prophecy. And in the same book reckoning up only thirteen epistles of Paul, he says the fourteenth, which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is not his: and with the Romans, to this day, it is not looked upon as Paul’s.’ This is St. Jerom’s whole chapter concerning Caius, in his book of Illustrious Men.

St. Jerom, in this last sentence, says more than Eusebius, whose account is only, that ‘by some of the Romans, that epistle was not thought to be Paul’s.’ And when St. Jerom writes, that Caius says, ‘the fourteenth epistle, which is inscribed to the Hebrews, is not Paul’s,’ it is likely he ought to be explained by Eusebius, that when Caius mentioned thirteen epistles of Paul, he did not reckon that to the Hebrews with them, saying nothing about it.

Photius, at the conclusion of what he says of this writer, having mentioned the other books ascribed to him, adds: ‘That heⁿ is also said to have composed an elaborate disputation against Proculus, a follower of Montanus, in which he enumerates only thirteen epistles of Paul, not reckoning that to the Hebrews.’ So Photius. And I think he has better represented Eusebius’s sense than St. Jerom.

It has been supposed by^v some, that Caius rejected the epistle to the Hebrews, because the Montanists, with whom he was disputing, made use of it in support of their peculiar sentiments. So Mr. Twells; whose words I shall transcribe, that the reader may see the force of this argument. ‘Besides,^w Caius’s adversary in that dispute was a

^t Caius sub Zephyrino, Romanæ urbis episcopo, id est, sub Antonino Severi filio, disputationem adversus Proculum, Montani sectatorem, valde insignem habuit; arguens eum temeritatis, super novâ prophetiâ defendendâ: et in eodem volumine epistolas quoque Pauli tredecim tantum enumerans, decimam quartam, quæ fertur ad Hebræos, dicit ejus non esse. Sed et apud Romanos, usque hodie, quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur. De V. I. cap. 59.

^u ——— *Ἐν ἧ τρις καὶ δέκα μονὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἀριθμεῖται Παυλὺς, ἢ ἐγκρινῶν τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίων.* Phot. Cod. 48. col. 37.

^v Vid. Grot. in Ep. ad Hebr. cap. vi. ver. 4—6.

^w A Critical Examination of the late New Text and Version of the N. T. in Greek and English, Part ii. p. 50. London, 1731.

‘ Montanist, as Eusebius tells us. Now there is a passage
 ‘ in this epistle, ch. vi. 4—6, which at first sight favours
 ‘ Montanus’s opinion, against restoring ‘ lapsers ’ after
 ‘ ‘ baptism.’ This place was appealed to by these heretics,
 ‘ in defence of that singularity; (thus Tertullian, in his
 ‘ book *De Pudicitia*, c. 20; cites this very passage, to prove
 ‘ that there is no room for a second repentance;) as it was
 ‘ afterwards by the Novatians, who maintained the same
 ‘ error. It is not therefore to be doubted but Proculus
 ‘ made his advantage of that same passage; which easily
 ‘ accounts for the others leaving the epistle to the Hebrews
 ‘ out of the number of those written by St. Paul.’

But I am of opinion that this was not the reason of Caius’s omitting this epistle: or, that this does not ‘ account for ‘ leaving it out of the number of those written by St. Paul.’ For, I. If this epistle had been till then universally received by christians, Caius could not have omitted it here. If a heretic’s appealing to a book of scripture, in defence of any singular opinion maintained by him, had been a reason for rejecting such book, the catholics would have been obliged to reject most, if not all the books of the New Testament. But this could not be done, with regard to any book universally received. Therefore Caius’s omission of this epistle affords an argument, that it was not then universally received as an epistle of the apostle Paul. 2. We know that at that time, or thereabout, this epistle was not universally received by catholic christians, from the express testimony and^x acknowledgment of Tertullian himself, a Montanist. 3. This way of arguing makes Caius a mean and contemptible writer, which is not his character in antiquity. Mr. Twells is sensible of this consequence. Therefore he adds, in the words immediately following those already transcribed: ‘ It was perhaps easier to the ‘ eloquent Caius to cut this difficulty by rejecting the ‘ entire work, than to dissolve it by a critical discussion of ‘ the passage. We have such controvertists in our own ‘ times, men who judge of ancient writings according to ‘ modern prejudices; allowing no book or passage to be ‘ genuine, but what favours their own singularities; and ‘ condemning nothing for spurious that tends to support ‘ them.’

I suppose, then, that Caius here gave a candid and unprejudiced enumeration of the epistles of St. Paul; and that he did not think the epistle to the Hebrews to have been written by that apostle. Whether he ascribed it to

^x See before, chap. xxvii. p. 288—291.

Barnabas, as Tertullian did, and possibly divers others, at that time, or to some other person, we cannot be positive. It may be reckoned very probable, that this epistle was not unknown to Caius. But it appears to me not unlikely, that, in all his reading and conversation, he had never met with any who ascribed this epistle to Paul: and that, when he had enumerated his thirteen epistles, he supposed he had mentioned all the writings of that apostle.

3. In another place, Eusebius having cited part of a letter of Polycrates bishop of Ephesus to Victor bishop of Rome, concerning the death of John and Philip, also one of the twelve apostles, adds: ‘And in the Dialogue^y of Caius, which we mentioned just now, Proculus, with whom that disputation was held, agreeing with what we have here put down concerning the death of Philip and his daughters, says: “After this the four prophetesses, daughters of Philip, lived in Hierapolis in Asia, where is both their and their father’s sepulchre.”’ Thus he. ‘And,’ adds Eusebius, ‘Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, makes mention of the daughters of Philip, which had the gift of prophecy, who then lived with their father in Cæsarea of Judea, saying these words: “And we came unto Cæsarea, and entered into the house of Philip the evangelist,”’ Acts xxi. 8, 9. Whether Proculus referred to the book of the Acts we cannot say.

4. Once more, Eusebius, speaking of Cerinthus, says: ‘And^z Caius, whom we quoted before, in his Disputation, writes thus of him. And Cerinthus also, who by his relations, as if written by some great apostle, imposes upon us monstrous relations of things of his own invention, as shown him by an angel, says, that after the resurrection there shall be a terrestrial kingdom of Christ; and that men shall live again in Jerusalem, subject to sensual desires and pleasures. And being an enemy to the divine scriptures, [literally, ‘scriptures of God,'] and

^y Και εν τῷ Γαῖος δε 8 μικρῷ προσθεν εμνησθημεν διαλογῷ, Προκλος, προς ὄν εποειτο την ζητησιν, περι της Φιλιππε και των θυγατερων αυτε τελευτης συναδων τοις εκτεθεισιν οὕτω φησιν. Μετα τουτο δε προφητιδες τεσσαρες αι Φιλιππε γεγενηται εν Ἱεραπολει τη κατα την Ασιαν ὁ ταφος αυτων εστιν εκει, και ὁ τε πατρος αυτων ταυτα μεν οὕτος. H. E. l. iii. c. 31. p. 103. A. B.

^z Γαῖος, οὐ φωνας ἤδη προτερον παρατεθειμαι, εν τη φερομενη αυτε ζητησει ταυτα περι αυτε γραφει. Αλλα και Κηρινθος ὡ δὲ ἀποκαλυψειων ὡς απο μεγαλε αποσολε γεγραμμενων, τερατολογιας ἡμιν ὡς δὲ ἀγγελε αυτω δεδειγμενας ψευδομενος επεισαγει λεγων, μετα την αναστασιν επιγειον ειναι το βασιλειον τε Χριτε, και παλιν επιθυμιας και ἡδοναις εν Ἱερουσαλημ την σαρκα πολιτευομενην δελεειν. Και εχθροσ ὑπαρχων ταις γραφαις τε θεε αριθμον χιλιωνταετας εν γαμῷ ἑορτης θελων πλιναν λεγει γινεσθαι. H. E. l. iii. c. 28. p. 100. A.

‘ desirous to seduce mankind, he says, there will be a term of a thousand years spent in nuptial entertainments.’

This passage, together perhaps with other things in this dispute, said against Cerinthus, and not any particular and distinct book, I suppose to be what Theodoret refers to, when he says that Caius wrote against Cerinthus.

Whether Caius here intends our book of the Revelation, or some other piece, is a disputed point. Mr. Twells^a thinks it ‘ probable, that Caius’s testimony relates to some ‘ forgery of Cerinthus, under the name of St. John, and ‘ not to the present book of Revelation.’ And Mr. Jones^b thought this a clear case. But Dr. Grabe says, ‘ that ‘ though^c some learned men have concluded, from this ‘ passage of Caius, that the heresiarch Cerinthus published ‘ an Apocalypse ; yet it appears to him plain and manifest, ‘ from the words of this passage, that Caius ascribed the ‘ very Apocalypse of St. John to Cerinthus.’ And Dr. Mill is of the same opinion,^d that there were at that time some catholic christians, who ascribed the Revelation, which from the beginning had been owned for St. John’s, to Cerinthus, or some other impostor. This they did out of an abhorrence of those bad consequences which some drew from this book, not rightly understood.

And it must be owned that Dionysius of Alexandria^e affirms, that some before him had ascribed the Revelation, called St. John’s, to Cerinthus. And he may be thought to refer to our Caius : nevertheless it does not appear to me very plain, that Caius speaks of our book of the Revelation. His description does not suit it : unless he is to be supposed to ascribe to that book itself the false and sensual notions which some had of the expected Millennium. Nor does

^a See a Critical Examination of the late New Text and Version of the N. T. Part iii. p. 99, &c.

^b New and Full Method, &c. vol. i. p. 224, &c.

^c Cæterum Cerinthus hæresiarcham apocalypsin quandam edidisse, docti aliqui viri collegerunt ex verbis Caii, presbyteri Romani in dissertatione adversus Proculum, apud Eus. H. E. l. iii. cap. 28.—Verum ex ipsis hisce verbis planum atque apertum mihi videtur, Caium ipsam S. Joannis Apocalypsin Cerintho adscripsisse, non vero aliam ab illâ distinctam, a Cerintho sub Johannis nomine editam, adstruxisse, &c. Grabe, Spicil. T. i. p. 312.

^d Fuère jam in ecclesiâ Romanâ, aliisque, qui Apocalypseos dicta de millenario in Christi regno, ejusque gaudiis, paulo crassius interpretati, missâ ferme spe cœlestium, in terrestrium horum, ceu propediem venturorum, expectationem toto animo ferebantur. Hoc cum lugerent nonnulli sanctitatis christianæ studiosi, et vero dogma, unde, ex pravâ interpretatione, orta esset hæc impietas, in Apocalypsi traditum viderent, eo demum lapsi sunt, ut librum istum, qui sub nomine Johannis jam ab initio ferebatur, Cerinthi, aut alicujus alterius impostoris, esse crederent. Mill. Prol. n. 654.

^e Eus. H. E. l. iii. cap. 28. p. 100. B. C.

St. John, or whoever is the author of this book, here give himself expressly the title and character of apostle. However it must be allowed to be very probable, that Caius said nothing in favour of the book we now have with the title of the Revelation; if he had, Eusebius would not have failed to give us at least a hint of it. A bare silence about St. John's Revelation, even supposing Caius to have said nothing particularly against it, does not suit a disciple of Irenæus.

5. We have now observed four passages of the Dialogue written by Caius, and we have seen in them marks of a high respect for the ancient scriptures generally received by christians, which he also calls divine scriptures, or 'scriptures of God;' and his detestation of all attempts to bring any other into a like esteem with them, or to mislead men from the true sense and meaning of them. Thirteen epistles of Paul he reckoned up in his dispute, but did not name that to the Hebrews. It is highly probable that in the same place he mentioned other books of the New Testament, and possibly of the Old likewise: but it is very likely that he did not receive the book of the Revelation, if he did not think it an imposture of Cerinthus.

II. Eusebius has^f three passages taken out of a book written against the heresy of Artemon. It is evidently the same with that which is called by^g Theodoret the Little Labyrinth; what he takes thence being for substance the same with what Eusebius quotes out of the book against Artemon. This opinion is also confirmed by Nicephorus, as has been observed by^h bishop Pearson, and Cave. Photius indeed, in his article of Caius, mentions distinctly 'the Labyrinth,' as he calls it, and the book against the heresy of Artemon. But what he says can be of little weight against so much good evidence, that one and the same book is to be understood by these several titles.

This book is by some reckoned the work of an unknown writer; others think it to have been written by Caius. Among these last isⁱ Pearson, who is even offended at Blondel for calling the author anonymous. But Pearson is a great deal too positive in this matter. Eusebius's quota-

^f H. E. l. v. cap. 28.

^g Hær. Fab. l. ii. cap. 5.

^h Non tantum Nicephorus, lib. iv. cap. 20, affirmat τον Μικρον εισημενον Λαβυρινθον redarguisse absurditatem Artemonis et Theodoti, quem beatus victor depugnavit; sed et Theodoretus Hæreticarum Fabularum, lib. ii. cap. 5, trium pericoparum apud Eusebium summam ex Parvo Labyrintho deducit de Theodoto agens. Pearson, Op. Post. p. 148.

ⁱ Hunc anonyum vocat Blondellus, cum constet eum Caium fuisse. Pearson, ibid. p. 147.

tions of this book are introduced in this manner: ‘ There are,’ says ^k he, ‘ beside these, treatises of many others, whose names we have not been able to learn; orthodox and ecclesiastical men, as the interpretations of the divine scriptures given by each of them manifest: at ^l the same time they are unknown to us, because the treatises have not affixed to them the names of the authors.’ He goes on: ‘ In ^m a work of one of these persons, composed against the heresy of Artemon, which Paul of Samosata has endeavoured to revive in our time, is a relation very much to our purpose.’ St. Jerom, in his chapter of Caius, in his book of Illustrious Men, or Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, as it is also often called, takes no notice of any other work of his, but the dispute with Proculus. Theodoret ⁿ quotes this book thus: ‘ Against their heresy [that is, the heresy of Artemon and his followers] was written the Little Labyrinth, which some think to be a work of Origen, but the style is sufficient to show their mistake. But whether it was written by him, or some other, there is in it the following relation:’ without so much as making a conjecture at the author. As for Photius, on whom Pearson chiefly relies, he had seen the note upon the book Of the Universe, in which it was observed, ‘ That it was ^o ascribed to several, as also the Labyrinth was to Origen; whereas really it was by Caius, the same who composed the Labyrinth.’ And Photius may have been of the same opinion with the writer of this note, though I think he does not expressly say so. But since the more early writers, Eusebius, Jerom, Theodoret, appear not to have known the author of this work, it is best to consider him as anonymous, as I find some other learned ^p moderns beside Blondel have done.

^k Ὦν ἔδε τὰς προσηγορίας καταλεγειν ἡμῖν δυνατόν. Eus. l. v. cap. 27. p. 195. B.

^l Ἀδελῶν δ’ ὁμῶς ἡμῖν, ὅτι μὴ τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐπαγεται τῶν συγγραψαμένων. Ibid.

^m Τῶτων ἐν τίνος σπουδασματι κατὰ τῆς Ἀρτεμωνος αἵρεσεως πεπονημένῳ. κ. λ. Ibid. c. 28. in.

ⁿ Κατὰ τῆς τῶτων αἵρεσεως ὁ Σμικρὸς συννεγραφή Λαβυρινθός, ὃν τινεὶ Ὁριγενεὶς ὑπολαμβάνουσι ποιῆμα· ἀλλ’ ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐλεγχεῖ τὰς λεγούσας. Ἐἴτε δὲ ἐκεῖνος, εἴτε ἄλλος, συννεγράψῃ, τοιοῦνδε ἐν αὐτῷ διηγεῖται διήγημα. Fab. l. ii. cap. 35. De Theodoto.

^o Ὡσπερ καὶ τὸν Λαβυρινθὸν τινεὶ ὑπεγράψαν Ὁριγενεὶς· ἐπεὶ Γαῖος ἐπὶ ποιῆμα τῆ ἀληθείας, αὐτὸς συντεταχότος τὸν Λαβυρινθόν. Ap. Phot. Cod. 48.

^p Eruditissimus vero ille anonymus, &c. Dallæus, de Scriptis Dionys. Areop. &c. l. i. c. 2. p. 10. Genève, 1666. Vetus auctor apud Eusebium, libro v. Hist. Ecc. cap. 28. Jacob Sirmond. not. ad Facundum, lib. iii. cap. 2. Nec aliter scriptor antiquus contra Artemonis hæresin, ap. Euseb. Hist. Ecc. Cave, Dissertat. de Libris et Officiis ecclesiasticis Græcorum, p. 42. V. Εἰωθίνος. ad calcem. part. ii. Hist. Lit.

Though I do not reckon Caius the author of this work, it is fitly enough considered here, being mentioned by Eusebins in his account of matters about the time of the emperors Commodus and Severus. Indeed, as he did not know the name of the author of this work, so he might not exactly perceive the time of it. However, from the things and persons mentioned in the passages quoted by Eusebius, it is very probable that it was not composed under Victor, but under Zephyrinus, or his successor, as has been well shown by⁹ Pearson. I may therefore well enough place him in the same year with Caius.

1. The design of the first passage of this work is to show the novelty of that heresy, that our Saviour was a mere man; whereas the persons against whom the author writes, asserted its antiquity. 'For^r they say, that all the ancients, and even the apostles themselves, received and taught the same things which they now hold; and that the truth of the gospel was preserved, till the time of Victor, the thirteenth bishop of Rome from Peter; but by his successor [or, 'from the time of his successor'] Zephyrinus, the truth has been corrupted. And possibly what they say might have been credited, if, first of all, the divine scriptures did not contradict them; and then also, secondly, the writings of the brethren more ancient than Victor, which they published in defence of the truth against the Gentiles, and against the heresies of their times.' The brethren mentioned by name are Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clement, Irenæus, Melito, with a general appeal to many more not named, and to ancient hymns composed by the faithful in honour of Christ.

This shows plainly that there were scriptures called divine, which were esteemed to be of higher authority than the writings of the most early christian writers, who lived so near the time of the apostles. It likewise assures us, that the persons against whom this author argues, did also appeal to the apostles for the truth of their opinions, and did not pretend to assert any thing contrary to the doctrine of the apostles.

⁹ Pears. *ibid.* p. 148.

^r Φασι γαρ τες μεν προτερης απαντας, και αυτες αποσολως παρειληφεναι τε και διδασχεναι ταυτα, α νυν ουτοι λεγσαι και τετηρησθαι την αληθειαν τε κηρυγματος μεχοι των Βικτορος χρονων ος ην τρισκαιδεκατος απο Πητρος εν Ρωμη επισκοπος' απο δε τε διαδοχς αυτη Ζεφυρινη παρακεχαραχθαι την αληθειαν' ην δ' αν τυχον πιθανον το λεγομενον, ει μη πρωτον μεν αντιπιπτον αυτοις αι θειαι γραφαι. Και αδελφων δε τινων εσι γραμματα πρεσβυτερα των Βικτορος χρονων, α εκεινοι προς τα εθνη υπερ της αληθειας, και προς τοτε αιρεσεις εγραψαν. Eus. II. E. l. v. c. 28. p. 195. D.

2. ‘Moreover,’ adds Eusebius, ‘the author of the fore-mentioned book relates another thing which happened in the time of Zephyrinus, writing thus in these very words: ‘I will therefore^s remind many of the brethren of a thing which happened in our time, which if it had been done in Sodom, I think it might have reformed even them.’ Perhaps here is a reference to Matt. xi. 23. Well, what is this sad thing? The author proceeds: ‘There^t was one Natalis a confessor, [that is, who had suffered from the heathen for the sake of christianity,] not long ago, but in our times. This person was deceived by Asclepiodotus, and another Theodotus, a banker, both disciples of the first Theodotus the tanner, who had been excommunicated by Victor for this opinion, or rather madness. This Natalis was persuaded by them to accept of the office of a bishop of this heresy, upon the consideration of receiving from them a salary of one hundred and fifty denarii (about five pounds) by the month. Having associated himself with them, he was often admonished by the Lord in visions; for^u the merciful God,^v and our Lord Jesus Christ, would not that he should perish out of the church, who had been a witness of his own sufferings.’ 1 Pet. v. 1. The author proceeds to relate, that ‘Natalis for a^w while neglecting these visions, out of fondness for the honour enjoyed, and the love of filthy lucre, was at length scourged and sorely beaten by holy angels for a whole night. Whereupon in the morning, being convinced of his fault, he put on sackcloth, and humbled himself before Zephyrinus, and all the clergy and laity, and after many tears and entreaties was with difficulty re-admitted to the communion of the church.’

In what is here said of Natalis having been a ‘witness of Christ’s sufferings,’ it may be thought there is a reference to 1 Pet. v. 1, and in what is said of his ‘love of filthy lucre,’ to 1 Tim. iii. 3; or some other place where St. Paul condemns that fault.

3. ‘To these we shall add,’ says Eusebius, ‘some other words of the same writer concerning the same men, which

^s Ὑπομνησω γεν πολλας των αδελφων πραγμα εφ’ ημων γενομενον ο νομιζω οτι ει εν Σοδομοις εγεγονει, τυχον αν κακεινους ενθετησει. Ibid. p. 196. C.

^t Ναταλιος ην τις ομολογητης.

^u Ὁ γαρ ευσπλαγχνος θεος και Κυριος ημων Ιησους Χριστος ουκ εβλετο εξω εκκλησιας γενομενον απολεσθαι μαρτυρα των ιδιων παθων. Ibid. p. 197. A.

^v Or, as some may choose it should be translated, ‘our most merciful God and Lord Jesus Christ.’

^w Δελεαζομενος τη τε παρ’ αυτοις πρωτοκαθεδρια, και τη πλειστες απολυση αισχροκερδεια τελουταιον υπο αγιων αγγελων εμασιγηθη, δι’ ολης της νυκτος ο μικρωσ ακισθη. Ibid.

‘are to this purpose: Moreover, they^x have without fear corrupted the divine scriptures, and have rejected the rule [canon] of the ancient faith, and have been ignorant of Christ; not enquiring what the divine scriptures say, but carefully studying what figure of syllogism may be found out to support their impious system: and if any one object to them a text of divine scripture, they consider whether a conjunctive or disjunctive form of syllogism can be made of it. And, leaving the holy scriptures of God, they study geometry, as being of the earth, and speaking of the earth, and ignorant of him that cometh from above.’ Here is a manifest reference to John iii. 31. This writer proceeds to say, ‘that by some of these persons Euclid’s geometry is laboriously studied; and they admire Aristotle and Theophrastus; and by^y some of them Galen is even adored. They who abuse the sciences of the infidels for the support of their heretical sentiment, and with an impious subtilty adulterate the simple faith of the divine scriptures, of such men what need I say that they are far from the faith? For which reason they have without fear laid their hands upon the divine scriptures, saying that they have amended them. And that I do not charge them falsely, any one may know that pleaseth: for if any one will be at the pains to procure a number of their copies, and compare them together, he will find that they disagree very much; for the copies of Asclepiades [or Asclepiodotus] differ from those of Theodotus. And many of them may be met with, because their disciples have diligently transcribed their several emendations, as they call them, but indeed corruptions. Again, the copies of Hermophilus agree not with these already mentioned: and those of Apollonides [or Apollonius] differ one from another; for any one, by comparing those first put out with these which were afterwards again perverted by him, may perceive a difference. How daring^z a crime this is, pos-

^x Γραφας μεν θειας αφοβως ερραδιωρηκασιν· πιτωως δε αρχαιας κανονα ηθετηκασιν· Χριστον δε ηγνοηκασιν· ε τι αι θειαι λεγασιν, γραφαι ζητηντες, κ. λ. —καν αυτοις προτεινη τις ρητον γραφης θεικης, εξεταζουσι, —καταλιποντες δε τας αγιας τω θεω γραφας, γεωμετριαν επιτηδευουσιν· ως αν εκ της γης οντες, και εκ της γης λαλουντες, και τον ανωθεν ερχομενον αγνοουντες. κ. λ. p. 197. B. C.

^y Γαληνος γαρ ισως υπο τινων και προσκυνειται. Οι δε ταις των απιστων τεχναις εις την της αιρεσεως αυτων γνωμην αποχρωμενοι, και τη των αθεων πανουργια την απλην των θειων γραφων πιτωω καπηλευοντες· οτι μηδε εγγυς πιτωωσ υπαρχουσι, τι δει και λεγειν; Δια τωτο ταις θειαις γραφαις αφοβως επεβαλον τας χειρας, λεγοντες αυτας διορθωκεναι. Ibid. p. 197. D. 198. A.

^z Όσης δε τολμης εστι τωτο το άμαρτημα, εικος μη δε εκεινος αγνοειν. Ibid. A.

sibly they themselves are not ignorant: for either they do not believe the divine scriptures to have been dictated by the Holy Spirit, and then they are infidels; or else they think themselves wiser than the Holy Spirit, and what are^a they then but madmen? For they cannot deny this their daring crime, since the copies have been written out with their own hands; and they did not receive such^b books from those by whom they were first taught the christian doctrine: nor are they able to produce the copies from whence they transcribed these things. Nay, some of them have not thought it worth the while to corrupt the scriptures, but plainly^c rejecting the law and the prophets, by means of a lawless and impious doctrine, [taken up] under pretence of grace, they have fallen into the lowest pit of destruction.'

This may be thought a most terrible passage, weakening the credit of the sincerity or integrity of our present scriptures; since even in those early times there were men who had the assurance to correct and alter their copies according to their own fancy, in order to render them agreeable to their particular sentiments. But the concern may be abated by a few remarks.

1.) Whatever alterations were made, or attempted to be made, by some few, there were others who greatly disliked their conduct, and strictly guarded against alterations and pretended emendations of their copies. They loudly exclaimed against them, severely censured the authors of them, and warned all men against them.

2.) It is probable that all the alterations or corruptions here complained of, concerned only the copies of the Old Testament; and, if they relate to them, then to the copies only of some Greek version of the Old Testament, probably that of the Seventy. For this is what our author says: 'That some of these men did not think it worth the while to alter the scriptures, but they plainly rejected the law and the prophets.' They are therefore the scriptures of the Old Testament that he had been speaking of all along, when he complained of the alterations of the divine scriptures: and since these alterations were made, or attempted to be made, in a version only, the damage is the less. This indeed does not excuse these men, nor quite remove their crime, but it lessens the mischief of it.

3.) It seems reasonable to make some abatements in the

^a Και τι ἕτερον ἢ δαίμονωσιν; Ibid. B.

^b Και παρ' ὧν κατηχηθησαν μὴ τοιαύτας παρελάβον τὰς γραφὰς. Ibid.

^c Ἄλλ' ἀπλῶς ἀρνησαμένοι τον τε νομον και τας προφητας. Ibid.

charges of this writer. It is plain he is credulous, and indulges his passion, and declaims. I have no occasion to add a comment, by way of proof of these particulars; they are apparent from the passages here produced; so that every one may perceive as much by reflecting upon what we have transcribed. Besides, he blames these persons against whom he writes for things in which there is no fault. He censures them for 'studying geometry,' and for 'admiring Aristotle and Theophrastus.' Then it is likely he aggravates some things, as when he says, 'they left the scriptures to study Euclid's geometry.' Possibly they only joined together these two studies. He insinuates too, that some of them 'adored Galen,' which is very improbable. Considering all these things, it is reasonable to suppose that he has magnified the fault of these men; that is, in some measure misrepresented what they performed upon the scriptures. A writer of this character might censure a truly critical performance, as such things since have been often suspected and condemned by others.

4.) Upon the whole, then, we have seen in this writer a reference or two to the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, and St. Peter's first epistle. There were scriptures in the hands of christians which they respected as sacred and divine, dictated by the Holy Spirit, and the rule of their faith, and particularly of superior authority to the writings of the christian brethren next in succession after the apostles; and they esteemed it a daring crime, of a high nature, to make any alterations in them. This writer also bears witness to the followers of Artemon, that they made appeals to the writings of the apostles and the brethren for the truth and antiquity of their sentiments. He adds, and loudly complains of it, that they had attempted to correct and alter (that is, corrupt) the copies of the divine scriptures; but he has not particularly informed us, what copies: it appears to be most probable, that he means only the copies of a Greek version of the Old Testament. And there is reason to think, likewise, that in what he has said relating to this matter, he has been guilty of some mistake or misrepresentation, and has aggravated things beyond the truth.

5.) I do not despise any work or fragment of this early antiquity, tending to illustrate the scriptures, or any practices of the christian church. These passages are useful in several respects; but I could have spared a part of them for the sake of the passage or passages of Caius, concerning St. Paul's epistles, and the other ancient scriptures.

And I heartily wish that Eusebius had made room in his Ecclesiastical History for more of that eloquent man.

III. The third piece, which by some has been reckoned the work of Caius, is entitled, ‘Of the Universe,’ as likewise ‘Of the Cause of the Universe,’ and ‘Of the Nature of ‘the Universe;’ as we are informed by^d Photius, in whose time it had inscribed, in some copies, the name of Josephus. But he had seen a note in it, wherein it was said to be written by Caius, a presbyter who dwelt at Rome. By some, he says, it was ascribed to Justin Martyr, and by others to Irenæus. As for himself, Photius argues that it can hardly be esteemed a work of Josephus, because the author gives our Saviour the title of, ‘the Christ,’ and speaks rightly enough of his divinity: and also expresses himself unexceptionably of our Lord’s ineffable generation by the Father.

As this work has been ascribed to so many, and neither Eusebius nor Jerom have taken any notice of it in their accounts of Caius, I think there is no sufficient reason to reckon it his. Consequently bishop Bull has been too hasty in^e placing Caius among the Antenicene fathers who held the Nicene faith upon the sole foundation of what is said in this book. And it is^f now the general opinion of learned men, that it is Hippolytus who has the best title to this treatise.

It is not now extant entire: but we have a large fragment, which has been published by several learned men, and in particular not long since by Fabricius, in his edition of Hippolytus.

I shall give a short account of the references which there are in this Fragment to the books of the New Testament, which is all that can be expected in this place. I must take some farther notice of it in the chapter of Hippolytus.

Here are then made use of, in explaining the christian doctrines, several scripture phrases, as^g ‘fire unquenchable,’^h ‘Abraham’s bosom,’ Luke xvi. 22, 26. And it is said that between the good and bad ‘thereⁱ is a great and

^d Cod. 48.

^e Vid. Geo. Bull. Defens. Fid. Nic. cap. viii. sect. ii.

^f Uteunque autem de vero hujus operis auctore inter antiquos non convenit, neoterici Indiculi hujusce auctoritate, stylo et argumentationis genere, aliisque adhuc argumentis freti, Hippolyto id adjudicant; et in his novissimus Steph. Le Moynes, qui Latinâ versione instructum fragmentum ejus ab Hæschelio olim editum recudi fecit inter Varia Saera. Cave, Hist. Lit. P. i. in Hippolyto.

^g Διμνη πυρος ασβεστη. Apud Hippolytum, ex editione Fabricii, p. 220.

^h Τετηρ δε ονοματι κυκλησκομεν κολπον Αβρααμ. Ibid. p. 221.

ⁱ Χaos γαρ Βαθν και μεγα ανα μεσον εσηρικται, ωτε μη δικαιον συμπαθη-

deep gulph [or chaos] fixed, so that no righteous man, if he were in compassion desirous so to do, could get thither; nor is there any unrighteous man that can pass, though he should attempt it.' The author says, 'that all men, just^k and unjust, shall be brought before God the Word: for to him has the Father given all judgment.' Here is at least a reference to John v. 22. He has also the words^l of I Cor. ii. 6, and probably takes them thence, though they are also in Isa. lxiv. 4. He seems to allude to several things in the Revelation, in a passage too long to be inserted here; where he says,^m 'That in the kingdom of heaven, to which the righteous shall be brought, there is no night nor day measured by time,—nor sun,—nor moon,'—and what follows: Compare Rev. xxi. 23; xxii. 5. This does not suit Caius, who is supposed to have rejected the Revelation.

CHAP. XXXIII.

ASTERIUS URBANUS.

EUSEBIUS has made large extracts out of a treatise in three books against the Montanists, composed^a by one of those many eminent persons whom Divine Providence raised up at that time to defend the truth. But our historian has here expressed himself so obscurely, that it has been much^b doubted who is the author of this work; whether Asterius Urbanus, or Apollinaris of Hierapolis, or Apollonius, or Rhodon, or some other person whose name is unknown. However, Cave thinks it probable, from some words of^c Eusebius, among the citations of this work, that the author is Asterius Urbanus. Valesius^d too is of this

σαντα προσδιξεσθαι, μητε αδικον τολμησαντα διελθειν. Ibid. ^k Παντες γαρ, δικαιοι και αδικοι, ενωπιον τω Θεω λογησονται. Τωτω γαρ ο Πατηρ την κρισιν πασαν δεδωκε. p. 222. ^l Ibid.

^m Ουδε νυξ ουδ ημερα χρονω μετρομενη, ουχ ηλιος—ου σεληνη.—Ibid.

^a Αλλως τε συν αυτω [Απολλιναριω] πλειους των τηρικαδε λογιων ανδρων, η της αληθειας υπερωμαχος ανιση δυναμις. H. E. l. v. cap. 16. in.

^b Vid. Cav. H. L. in Asterio Urbano, p. 51. Vales. ad Eus. l. v. cap. 16. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. ii. P. iii. Les Montanistes, not. 7.

^c Και μη λεγεται εν τω αυτω λογω τω κατα Αστεριου Ουρβανου το δια Μαξιμουλλης πνευμα, κ. λ. Eus. ib. p. 182. A.

^d Εν τω αυτω λογω κατα Αστεριου Ουρβανου.] Hæc verba scholion esse mihi videntur, quod vetus quidam scholiastes, seu Eusebius ipse, ad marginem

opinion; though it seems to be somewhat doubtful whether those words are not interpolated.

Asterius Urbanus is placed by Cave at the year 188. Tillemont, who agrees with him as to the author of the treatise, concludes^e that it was written about the year of Christ 232, the eleventh of the emperor Alexander; because Maximilla is here said to have been dead^f between thirteen and fourteen years, whom the same learned man computes^g to have died in 218 or 219. It is doubtful whether this author was a bishop or a presbyter; and absolutely unknown of what place. I ought to observe, that^h Dodwell, who once took this writer to be Asterius Urbanus, afterwards altered his mind, not thinking the argument of Cave before mentioned sufficient to determine the point; and supposing that Eusebius's words are capable of another sense. Fabriciusⁱ agrees with Dodwell, and thinks this treatise was written some time after 212.

Nevertheless I am not unwilling to agree with those who suppose Asterius Urbanus to be the author of this treatise; and Tillemont's argument for the time of it appears to me probable. According to that computation, our extracts out of this work should be deferred somewhat longer. But because the subject matter of it has an affinity with that of some foregoing chapters, as concerning the Montanists; and because we would not be too confident in our opinion about the author or time of this performance, we choose to speak of it in this place.

It appears from the preface^k to this work, preserved in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, that the author upon some occasion was at Ancyrae in Galatia: and finding the church there disturbed with the new prophecy, as it was called, of Montanus, he disputed publicly upon that subject for several days; so as to comfort and establish the church, and confute the enemies of the truth. The presbyters of that place entreated him to draw up in writing the substance of what he had said upon that occasion; which he declined to do for some time, but at length com-

libri sui annotaverat ad ea verba quæ paulo ante præcesserunt, *αυθις δε εν τω αυτω φησι λογω.* Porro ex his verbis elicitur, Asterium Urbanum auctorem esse horum trium librorum adversus Cataphrygas, non autem Apollinarem, ut credidit Rufinus et Christophorus. Vales. in notis, p. 98.

^e See Tillemont, as before, Montanistes, art. 12. p. 70.

^f Πλειω γαρ η τρισκαιδεκα ετη εις παντην την ημεραν, εξ ου τετελευτηκεν η γυνη. Ap. Euseb. ib. c. 16. p. 182. C. Vir. et cap. 17. p. 184. A.

^g Tillemont, Les Montanistes, art. v. p. 45.

^h Dodw. Diss. Iren. iv. sect. 38.

ⁱ Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 190.

^k Ap. Eus. ibid. cap. 16. p. 179. C. D.

plied, at the request of Abercius Marcellus, to whom the work is inscribed.

I. The author then, in his preface, says to Abercius Marcellus: ‘I have hitherto deferred to perform your request, fearing¹ lest I should seem to some to add to the doctrine of the new covenant of the gospel, or to give new ordinances beside those there prescribed. To which it is as impossible that any thing should be added, as it is that any thing should be taken away from it, by one who has determined to govern himself according to the same gospel.’

Possibly it may be questioned by some, whether the author here expressly speaks of the writings of the New Testament, or only of the christian doctrine; for which reason I have aimed at a literal translation of this passage: though I am of opinion, that he intends the scriptures of the New Testament; the rather, because he was afraid of seeming, ‘by writing,’ to add any thing to the doctrine of the gospel. If the author be understood to speak of the scriptures of the New Testament, which appears most probable, this passage affords evidence of the high respect which this catholic christian had for them.

For the farther satisfaction of some of my readers, I shall put down a part of this passage, as it has been translated by^m Tillemont in his Ecclesiastical Memoirs. I have hitherto deferred to comply with your request,——‘because ‘I was apprehensive that some might accuse me of a design to add something to the divine scriptures, and to the rules which are prescribed to us by the word of the New Testament and of the gospel.’ Valesius translates thus: ‘Lest I should seem to some, by writing, to add any thing to the evangelical doctrine of the New Testament, and to make farther determinations of my own.’

II. Afterwards, in his accounts of the rise of the pretended prophecies of Montanus, he says, that at Ardaba, a village in Mysia near Phrygia, when Montanus uttered his prophecies, some discouraged him, ‘being mindfulⁿ of the premonition and caution of the Lord to beware of false prophets when they appeared. But others,’ he says, ‘forgetting the premonition given by the Lord, encouraged that

¹ Δεδιως δε και εξευλαβημενος, μη πη δοξω τισιν επισυγγραφειν η επιδιασσεισθαι τω της τε ευαγγελια καινης διαθηκης λογω· η μητε προσθηναι μητ’ αφελειν δυνατον, τω κατα το ευαγγελιον αυτο πολιτευεσθαι προρημενω. Eus. *ibid.* p. 179. C.

^m As before, art. xii. p. 70.

ⁿ Επετιμων, και λαλειν εκωλων· μεμνημενοι της τε Κυρις διασολης τε και απειλης, προς το φυλαττεσθαι την των ψευδοπροφητων εγρηγορωτως παρρησιαν, κ. λ. Eus. *cap.* 16. p. 180. B. C.

infatuating, deceitful, and seducing spirit.' It is likely the author refers to Matt. xxiv. 11, "And many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many." See also chap. vii. 15.

III. Eusebius informs us, that in the second^o book of his treatise the author writes to this purpose: 'Whereas then they call us also murderers of the prophets, because we did not receive their prating prophets, (for these, they say, are those which the Lord promised to send to the people,) let them tell us, in the name of God, who of their people, since the time that Montanus and his women began to prate, have been persecuted by the Jews, or put to death by the wicked Gentiles? Not one: nor have any of them been apprehended and crucified for the name of Jesus; nor have any of their women been whipped in the Jewish synagogues, nor stoned; no, no where, not one.' Here is a plain reference to Matt. xxiii. 34.

IV. He goes on: 'But^p it is said that Montanus and Maximilla had quite another kind of death. For it is reported that, at the same instigation of that mad spirit, they hanged themselves; though not both together, or at the same time.—And so they ended their days in the same manner that the traitor Judas did.' Here is undoubtedly a confirmation of the fact of Judas's making away with himself: and probably a reference to the history of it in Matt. xxvii. 5, Acts i. 18. However, afterwards this good man says modestly and charitably, that though this is reported of 'Montanus and the fore-mentioned woman,' yet it is not certain, nor does he know it to be true. 'Perhaps they died in that manner, perhaps in some other.' Nevertheless this shows, that even in those days there were some orthodox christians who gave out stories without ground against such as were reputed heretics. The author likewise mentions one Theodotus, another zealous Montanist, as he says, of whom there was a report, that giving himself up entirely to that spirit of error, he was by it taken up into the air, and perished miserably. But this writer does not own the truth of this, any more than of the other stories.

V. Afterwards Eusebius says, that this author reckons up all the prophets of the New covenant or Testament, showing that they did not prophecy in ecstacy: 'They^q

^o Ibid. p. 181. B. C.

^p Ἄλλω δὲ θανάτῳ τελευτῆσαι λέγονται Μοντανὸς τε καὶ Μαξιμίλλα. Τέτρες γὰρ ὑπὸ πνεύματος βλαψιφρονος ἑκατέρως ὑποκινήσαντος λόγος ἀναρτησάσαι ἑαυτὰς.—καὶ οὕτω τελευτῆσαι καὶ τὸν βίον κατατρεῖψαι Ἰεῶα προδοσὲ δικῆν. p. 181. C.

^q Τέτον δὲ τὸν τροπον, ὅτι τινὰ τῶν κατὰ τὴν παλαιάν, ὅτε τῶν κατὰ τὴν

will not be able to show,' says he, 'neither under the old nor the new covenant, [or dispensation,] any inspired prophet speaking after this manner; neither Agabus, nor Judas, nor Silas, nor the daughters of Philip.' Here are references to Acts xi. 27, 28, and xxi. 11, where Agabus is called a prophet, and his prophecies are related; and to ch. xv. 32, where Judas and Silas are called prophets; and to ch. xxi. 9, 10, where Philip is said to have 'four daughters which did prophecy.' The author does not confine himself here to prophets mentioned in the scriptures of the New Testament; he instances likewise in Quadratus, and Ammias of Philadelphia: and says he could mention others, whose example gave no encouragement to the way of prophesying used by the Montanists.

VI. Once more he argues against Montanists, that they had no succession of prophets among them; and that, though Maximilla had been dead above thirteen years, no other had appeared: 'But yet,' says he,^r 'the apostle expected [or, gives us ground to expect] that the gift of prophecy should continue in every church till the last advent 'of the Lord.' I cannot say what particular text he here refers to: by the apostle I suppose him to mean Paul; and possibly he refers to I Cor. xii. 8, "Charity never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail." Perhaps some concluded hence, that though prophecies should fail in the end, yet they were to continue in the church so long as the world lasts.

So far of this treatise against the Montanists, whether written by Asterius Urbanus, or by some other.

CHAP. XXXIV.

ST. ALEXANDER, BISHOP OF JERUSALEM.

ALEXANDER, whom^a we have already mentioned more than once, at first bishop of some place in Cappadocia, afterwards of Jerusalem, is placed by Cave as flourishing in

καινην [διαθηκην] πνευματοφορηθεντα προφητην δειζει δυνησονται' ουτε Αγαβου, ουτε Ισδαν, ουτε Σιλαν, ουτε τας Φιλιππης θυγατερας. Ib. c. 17. p. 183. C.

^r Δειν γαρ ειναι το προφητικον χαρισμα εν παση τη εκκλησια μεχρι της τελειας παρβασις ο αποσολος αξιοι. p. 183. D. ^a P. 223, 326.

the year of Christ 212, because he was then chosen bishop of Jerusalem, as^b we learn from Eusebius's Chronicle.

I choose to give, as often as may be done conveniently, the history of my authors in the very words of other ancient writers, who were their contemporaries, or lived near their time. Eusebius's account of Alexander lying scattered in several chapters of his Ecclesiastical History, it might be tedious to put down at length all his passages relating to this person. I shall therefore begin with transcribing St. Jerom's account in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers; which when I have done, I shall add some things out of Eusebius and others, confirming what St. Jerom says, or supplying his defects.

'Alexander,' says^c Jerom, 'bishop of Cappadocia, going to Jerusalem to visit the sacred places, when Narcissus, then of a great age, governed the church of that city, it was revealed both to Narcissus, and to many of his clergy, that the next day in the morning would come into that church a bishop, who should be a helper of the sacerdotal chair. This coming to pass as it had been foretold, in an assembly of all the bishops of Palestine, Narcissus himself consenting, and even promoting it above any one else, Alexander took upon him the government of the church of Jerusalem. This person, at the conclusion of a letter to the Antinoites, [the people of Antinopolis in Egypt,ⁿ] speaks of the peace of the church in this manner: "Narcissus salutes you, who before me filled the episcopal seat of this place, and now governs it together with me by his prayers, being an hundred and sixteen years old, and with me earnestly exhorts you to think the same things." He wrote another letter to the Antiochians, by Clement, presbyter of Alexandria, of whom we spoke before. He also wrote to Origen and for Origen against Demetrius, pleading that, in respect to the testimony given him by Demetrius himself, he had ordained him presbyter. There are likewise extant others of his to divers persons. In the seventh persecution, under Decius, at which time Babylas suffered at Antioch, he was apprehended and carried to Cæsarea, and being put in prison was crowned with martyrdom for his confession of the name of Christ.'

Eusebius, in^d his Ecclesiastical History, confirms what

^b Alexander, tricesimus quintus Ierosolymarum episcopus, ordinatur adhuc vivente Narcisso, et cum eo pariter ecclesiam regit. Eus. Chr. p. 172.

^c De Vir. Ill. cap. 62.

^d Εκ της των Καππαδοκων γης, ενθα το πρωτον της επισκοπης ηξιωτο, την πορειαν επι τα Ιεροσολυμα ευχης και των τοπων ιστοριας ενεκεν πεποιημενον. Eus. H. E. l. vi. cap. 11. p. 222. A.

Jerom says of Alexander's having been first bishop in Cappadocia, and his coming to Jerusalem 'for the sake of prayer, and to visit the [sacred] places,' or out of devotion: and that there were several revelations from God to encourage the choosing him bishop in that city, and, as it seems, one to Alexander himself; and^e likewise 'a voice heard distinctly by some eminent for piety [or 'understanding']. The brethren therefore of that church, 'would by no means consent to his return home, but detained him with them.' Beside these revelations and visions, Eusebius mentions another reason of this choice; which was, the fortitude with which Alexander had suffered in the late persecution under Severus. For in Jerom's Latin version of Eusebius's Chronicle, at the twelfth year of that emperor, of our Lord 204, it is said: 'Alexander is^f in esteem for the confession of the name of the 'Lord.' And in his Ecclesiastical History, having mentioned the death of Severus, and the accession of his son Antoninus, called Caracalla, in the year of Christ 211, he adds: 'At^g that time Alexander, one of those who had 'signalized themselves by their fortitude in the persecution, and by the favour of Divine Providence survived 'the combats they had sustained in their confessions,— 'being famous for his confessions of the christian faith in 'the time of the persecution, was promoted to the fore- 'mentioned bishopric of Jerusalem; Narcissus, his predecessor, being yet alive.'

Alexander was a great admirer of Origen. There was, as Eusebius says in his^h Ecclesiastical History, 'a great 'disturbance at Alexandria: so that Origen, not thinking it 'safe to stay there, nor yet in any other part of Egypt, went 'into Palestine, and took up his residence at Cæsarea, [about 'the year of our Lord 216,] where he was desired by the 'bishops of that country to discourse and expound the 'scriptures publicly in the church, though he was not yet 'ordained presbyter. This may be made evident from 'what Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus 'bishop of Cæsarea, write by way of apology in their letter 'to Demetrius.' Afterwards, about the year 228, as Eusebius expresses it, 'theⁱ two most approved and eminent

^e Φιλοφρονεσαστα οί τμηδε υπολαβοντες αδελφοι εκετ' οικαδε αυτω παλινοσειν επιτρεπασι, καθ' ετεραν αποκαληψιν και αυτοις νεκτωρ οφθειςαν, μιαν τε φωνην σαφιστατην τοις μαρισα αυτων σπεδαιοις χρησασαν. Ibid.

^f Alexander ob confessionem dominici nominis insignis habetur. Euseb. Chr. p. 172.

^g H. E. l. vi. c. 8. p. 210. A.

^h Ibid. c. 19. p. 222. A.

ⁱ Ibid. c. 8. p. 209. C.

‘ bishops of Palestine, I mean those of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, judging Origen worthy of the highest dignity and office, ordained him presbyter by imposition of their hands.’ And so writes^k Jerom after Eusebius. Photius^l says, ‘ Origen was ordained by Theoctetus [or Theoctistus] bishop of Cæsarea, with the approbation of Alexander bishop of Jerusalem.’

Eusebius, having given an account of Alexander’s promotion to the bishopric of Jerusalem, and of the letter to the Antinotes, as before in Jerom, proceeds: ‘ Serapion^m being dead at Antioch, [in the year 211,] Aselepiades succeeded him in the bishopric of that place, who also was famous for his confessions in the late persecution. Of this ordination Alexander makes mention, in a letter to the Antiochians, in this manner: “ Alexander,ⁿ the servant and prisoner of Jesus Christ, sendeth greeting in the Lord to the blessed church of the Antiochians. The Lord made my bonds light and easy in my imprisonment, when I heard that Aselepiades, so fit and worthy on account of the eminence of his faith, was by Divine Providence intrusted with the care of your holy church of the Antiochians.” This letter he sent by Clement, as appears from the conclusion of it, which is thus: “ This epistle, my lords and brethren, I have sent you by Clement, a blessed presbyter, a virtuous and approved man, whom you know already, and will know better: who, whilst he was here, confirmed and increased the church of the Lord.”’ The conclusion of this letter St. Jerom likewise has inserted in his book of *Illustrious Men*, in the chapter of Clement of Alexandria.

Aselepiades was ordained bishop of Antioch in the year 211, in the beginning of the reign of Caracalla: at which time, as appears by this letter, Alexander was in prison. If therefore he was put in prison so soon as the 12th of Severus, of our Lord 204, as is intimated in Eusebius’s *Chronicle*, he must have continued there seven or eight years, or else have been imprisoned more than once in the reign of Severus. This is an observation^o of Tillemont. The ‘ church of the Lord, which Clement had confirmed and increased,’ is the church in Cappadocia, of which Alexander was then bishop.

Eusebius has left us a fragment of Alexander’s letter to

^k De Vir. Ill. cap. 54.

^l Ἐχων συνενδοκαστα και τον

^m *Ἱεροσολυμων Αλεξανδρον*. Cod. 118. col. 297. ver. 38, &c.

ⁿ Euseb. *ibid.* p. 212. D. 213. A.

^o *Ibid.*

^o Tillem. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 314. St. Alexandre.

Origen. ‘Moreover,’ says^p he, ‘Alexander, in a letter to Origen, makes mention both of Clement and Pantæus as his friends, in this manner: “For this, as you know, was the will of God, that the friendship which was begun between us, from our ancestors, should not only remain inviolable, but also become more firm and fervent: for we know those blessed fathers, which have gone before us, with whom we shall shortly be; I mean the truly blessed Pantæus my lord, and the holy Clement, who was my lord, [or master,] and profitable to me: and if there be any others like them, by whom I came to the knowledge of you, my most excellent lord and brother.”’

St. Jerom says, ‘there were extant other letters of Alexander written to divers persons.’ But Eusebius has taken no particular notice of any, beside those which I have now given an account of.

In another place of his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius, speaking of the persecution under Decius, and the martyrdom of Fabian, bishop of Rome, and of others at that time, says: ‘And^q in Palestine Alexander, bishop of the church at Jerusalem, is again brought before the governor’s tribunal at Cæsarea for Christ’s sake; and having made a second glorious confession, is put into prison, being now venerable for his old age and grey hairs. Having died in prison, after a noble and illustrious confession before the governor’s tribunal, he was succeeded in the bishopric of Jerusalem by Mazabenes.’

Epiphanius likewise^r says, that Alexander suffered martyrdom at Cæsarea.

Dionysius of Alexandria, in a letter to Cornelius bishop of Rome, as we are informed by Eusebius, writes^s thus of the bishop of Jerusalem: ‘As for blessed Alexander, he was cast into prison, and there made a blessed end.’

Thus we are fully assured of Alexander’s martyrdom, and the manner of it: that he did not die by torments, or by the hand of the executioner; but that he expired in prison, where he had been confined for the name of Christ. The letter of Dionysius affords help likewise for settling the time of his death. That letter was written, as Tillemont^t says, in the reign of Gallus, in the year 252. It is reasonable therefore, as he farther argues, to place the death of Alexander in the year 251, at the end of the reign

^p Eus. *ibid.* l. vi. cap. 14. p. 216. C.
p. 234. B. C.

^q *Ibid.* l. vi. cap. 39.

^r De Mens. et Pond. num. 18.

^s ‘Ὁ μὲν γὰρ μακάριος Ἀλεξάνδρος ἐν φρεσὶ γενόμενος μακαρίως ἀνεπαύσατο.’
Eus. *ibid.* cap. 46. p. 248. A.

^t Tillemont, as before, p. 321.

of Decius, and not at the beginning of it, in 249 or 250; for it is not likely that Dionysius should send Cornelius a piece of news that was two or three years old. Basnage^u likewise, and^v Ruinart, think that Alexander died in 251, and at the latter end of that year: so that this bishop governed the church of Jerusalem for the space of 39 years.

We are farther informed, both by^w Eusebius and^x St. Jerom, that Clement of Alexandria dedicated to this Alexander a book entitled ‘The Ecclesiastical Canon,’ or, ‘Against those that judaized.’

There is yet one thing more to be taken notice of, which is omitted by Jerom: that Alexander erected a library at Jerusalem. Eusebius^y speaks of it in this manner in his *Ecclesiastical History*: ‘At that time flourished many learned and ecclesiastical men, whose epistles, which they wrote to each other, are easy to be found; for they are preserved to our time in the library at Ælia, [Jerusalem,] erected by Alexander bishop of the church in that city, from which also we have collected materials for our present work:’ which shows also, that this library had not been destroyed in any of the persecutions between Alexander’s and Eusebius’s time.

The meek and gentle spirit of Alexander is commended by Origen, at the beginning of a homily delivered at Jerusalem. ‘You^z are not, therefore, to expect in us,’ says he, ‘what you have in your bishop Alexander: for we acknowledge that he excels us all in the gift of gentleness. Nor do I only commend him for this quality; you have all full experience of it, and admire him on that account. —I have mentioned these things at the beginning, because I know you are ever wont to hear the mild discourses of your most gentle father; whereas the fruit of our plantation has somewhat of roughness in its taste. Nevertheless, by the help of your prayers, it may become medicinal and salutary.’

^u Basn. 251. n. xiii.
sect. 12. Apud Acta Mart. Sincera et Selecta, p. 137.

^w Eus. *ibid.* cap. 13. p. 214. C.

^y *Ibid.* cap. 20.

^v De Sancto Alexandro,

^x De Vir. Ill. cap. 38.

^z Nolite ergo in nobis illud requirere, quod in papâ Alexandro habetis; fatemur enim quod omnes nos superat in gratiâ lenitatis. Cujus gratiæ non solus ego predicator existo, sed vos omnes experti cognoscitis et probatis—Hæc ideo diximus in prefatione, quia scio vos consuevisse lenissimi patris dulces semper audire sermones. Nostræ vero plantationis arbuscula habet aliquid austeritatis in gustu; quod tamen, orantibus vobis, fiet medicamentum salutare, &c. In libr. Reg. Hom. i. in. T. ii. 482. A. Bened.

From this passage we may conclude, that Alexander was a frequent and an agreeable preacher; though, as Eusebius says^a in another place, he and Theoctistus attended on Origen as their master. The ‘mild discourses’ which his people were ‘always wont to hear,’ cannot be understood of private admonitions, but must mean public discourses or homilies, such as that which Origen was now engaged in.

Origen commends Alexander for the mildness of his temper. He himself possessed the same excellent property to a great degree. It is very conspicuous in his homilies, and other works, though he seems not to have known it.

We cannot but now reflect with pleasure and satisfaction upon the merit of this bishop of Jerusalem. His piety, particularly that amiable virtue of humility, is conspicuous in the fragments I have transcribed; and his meekness is celebrated by Origen. If he was not learned, he was however a patron of learning. Nor have we any reason to think him destitute of a competent measure of useful knowledge: he seems to have been a disciple of Pantaenus and Clement, under whose instructions he could not fail of making some considerable improvements. He had an intimate friendship with Clement and Origen, two of the most learned men that ever lived: and we cannot but reckon ourselves still indebted to him for his generous protection of Origen, and for his library, and the materials thereby afforded to Eusebius, and in all likelihood to others also. Above all are we obliged to him for his glorious testimony to the truth of the christian religion, and his remarkable example of steadiness in the faith of Christ, of which he made two confessions before heathen magistrates, at above forty years’ distance from each other; for the last of which he suffered an imprisonment, where he made a happy end. And certainly the succession of bishops and churches in the land of Judea, where the preaching, miracles, and sufferings of Christ and his first apostles are placed by the evangelists, under so many difficulties and troubles, affords a strong argument for the truth of those great and extraordinary facts, upon which the christian religion is founded.

^a H. E. l. vi. cap. 27

CHAP. XXXV.

ST. HIPPOLYTUS.

HIPPOLYTUS flourished, as Cave computes, about the year 220. He is generally called Hippolytus Portuensis, it being now a common opinion that he was a bishop of Portus in Italy, or else of Portus Romanus, otherwise called Adan, or Aden, in Arabia. As I am far from having room for all that might be said upon this article, I shall only produce some authentic testimonies to Hippolytus in ancient authors, and the judgments of some learned moderns; referring such as are desirous of farther information to those^a who have treated largely of this writer and his works.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, in his account of writers who lived not far from the beginning of the third century, says: ‘At that time flourished many eminent ecclesiastical men, whose epistles, which they wrote to each other, are still easy to be found. Among these were Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia;—and^b Hippolytus, also bishop of some other church.’ Soon after, in another chapter of the same work: ‘At^c that time Hippolytus, beside many other pieces, composed his book about Easter, containing a chronological history of affairs to the first year of Alexander, [year of Christ 222,] to which he added a canon of sixteen years for regulating the feast of Easter. The rest of his works which have come to our knowledge, are such as these: Upon the Six Days Work: Upon those Things which followed the Six Days Work: Against Marcion: Upon the Canticles: Upon some Parts of Ezekiel: Concerning Easter: Against all Heresies: and many other, which are still extant and in the hands of many people.’ So far Eusebius.

St. Jerom, in^d his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers:

^a Steph. Ie Moyne, *Varia Sacra*. Cave, *Hist. Lit.* P. i. et ii. Du Pin, *Bibl. Tillemont*, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. Fabric. *Bibl. Gr. T. v.* p. 203, &c. et Hippolyt. *Opp.* Hamburg. 1716. Oudin, *De Script. Ec. T. i.* Basnage, *Ann. Polit. Ecc.* 222. n. vii.—x.

^b Ὁσαυτως δὲ καὶ Ἱππολύτος ἑτέρας πῶς καὶ αὐτὸς προεζῶς ἐκκλησίας, H. E. l. vi. cap. 20. p. 222. D. ^c *Ibid.* cap. 22.

^d Hippolytus, cujusdam ecclesiæ episcopus, (nomen quippe urbis scire non potui,) temporumque canones scripsit, usque ad primum annum Alexandri

‘ Hippolytus, bishop of some church, (for I have not been
 ‘ able to learn the name of the city,) wrote a computation
 ‘ of Easter, and Chronicle of the Times, to the first year of
 ‘ the emperor Alexander: and invented a cycle of 16 years,
 ‘ which the Greeks call *εκαίδεκαετηρις*, and gave occasion to^e
 ‘ Eusebius’s canon of 19 years of the same kind. He wrote
 ‘ some commentaries upon the scriptures, of which I have
 ‘ seen these: Upon the Six Days Work, and upon Exodus,
 ‘ upon the Canticles, upon Genesis, and upon Zechariah; of
 ‘ the Psalms, and upon Isaiah; Of Daniel; Of the Revela-
 ‘ tion; Of the Proverbs; Of Ecclesiastes; Of Saul and the
 ‘ Pythoness; Of Antichrist; Of the Resurrection; Of Easter;
 ‘ Against all Heresies; and^f a Discourse [or Conference]
 ‘ in the praise of our Lord and Saviour, in which he inti-
 ‘ mates his delivering it in the church, when Origen was
 ‘ present. In imitation of him, Ambrose, who, as we before
 ‘ said, was converted from the heresy of Marcion to the
 ‘ true faith, persuaded Origen to write commentaries upon
 ‘ the scriptures.’

Fabricius in his notes upon this chapter observes, that St. Jerom is the only person who says that Ambrose was moved by the example of Hippolytus to excite Origen to write so many commentaries upon the scriptures; and thinks that^g Eusebius’s words, from whom St. Jerom seems to have taken this, ought to be understood of the time, rather than the example of Hippolytus. I would not be positive, because Eusebius’s expression is ambiguous; but I think that St. Jerom’s is one good sense, and not an improbable meaning: ‘ That from him’ (not from that time) ‘ was the rise of Origen’s commentaries upon the divine ‘ scriptures.’ And from divers places of Origen’s works it appears, that some had written commentaries upon the scriptures before himself. But suppose we translate Eusebius’s expression, *εξ εκεινυς*, ‘ from that time;’ yet the connection seems to afford ground to conclude, that the writings of Hippolytus (of which he had spoken just before) were partly an occasion of Origen’s commentaries upon the scriptures.

imperatoris; et sedecim annorum circulum, quem Græci *εκαίδεκαετηριδα* vocant, reperit. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 61.

^e Vid. Euseb. de Vit. Const. l. iv. cap. 34, 35.

^f Et *προσομιλιαν* de laude Domini Salvatoris: in quâ, presente Origene, se loqui in ecclesiâ significat. In hujus æmulationem Ambrosius, quem de Marcionis hæresi ad veram fidem correctum diximus, cohortatus est Origenem in scripturas commentarios scribere. Hieron. *ibid.*

^g *Εξ εκεινυς δε και Ωριγενει των εις τας θειας γραφας υπομνηματων εγινετο αρχη, Αμβροσιω εις τα μαριζα παρορμωντος αυτου, κ. λ.* Eus. H. E. l. vi. c. 22.

St. Jerom has mentioned this writer in divers other of his works. In his commentaries upon Daniel he takes notice of an opinion of^h Hippolytus concerning the Seventy Weeks. In his preface to his commentary upon Zechariah, he intimates, thatⁱ Hippolytus had written commentaries upon that prophet. In the preface to his commentaries upon St. Matthew, he says, that^k he had read the commentaries of the martyr Hippolytus. In one of his epistles he^l again calls Hippolytus martyr. In other places^m he mentions Hippolytus, together with Clement and Origen, and other ecclesiastical writers of note; he says likewise that he had ‘ⁿ written upon the Sabbath, whether we ought to fast on that day; and upon the question, whether the eucharist ought to be received daily, as they are said to do in the churches of Rome and Spain;’ and gives Hippolytus the character of an eloquent man. Nor has he failed to mention him in his letter^o to Magnus, among other learned christian authors; where he is placed with the Greek writers of the church, as he is also^p elsewhere. In the account of Dionysius of Alexandria, St. Jerom mentions a letter of his^q sent to Rome by Hippolytus, as does^r Eusebius also. If Dionysius was then bishop, and this be our Hippolytus, he could not die before 247 or 248, when Dionysius was made bishop of Alexandria.

I shall observe here, that Epiphanius^s mentions Hippolytus among other eminent ecclesiastical writers, ‘who had admirably confuted the Valentinians.’ Epiphanius is sup-

^h Hæc Eusebius. Hippolytus autem de eisdem hebdomadibus opinatus est ita. Hieron. in Dan. cap. ix. col. 1114. ed. Bened.

ⁱ Scripsit in hunc prophetam Origenes duo volumina.—Hippolytus quoque edidit commentarios. Hier. Pr. in Zachar.

^k Legisse me fateor.—Theophili, Antiochenæ urbis episcopi, commentarios; Hippolyti quoque martyris. Prolog. in Comm. super Matth.

^l Hippolyti martyris verba ponamus. Ad Damasum, ep. 125. qu. 3.

^m Scilicet nunc enumerandum mihi est, qui ecclesiasticorum de impari numero disputarunt, Clemens, Hippolytus, Origenes;—nostrorumque Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Lactantius. Ep. 30. al. 50. Nuper Sanctus Ambrosius sic Hexæmeron illius compilavit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basilique sequeretur. Ep. 41. al. 65.

ⁿ De sabbato quod queris, utrum jejunandum sit; et de eucharistiâ, an accipienda quotidie, quod Romana ecclesia et Hispaniæ observare perhibentur, scripsit quidem et Hippolytus, vir disertissimus. Ep. 52. al. 28.

^o Ep. 83. al. 84.

^p See before, note ^m.

^q Et ad Romanos per Hippolytum alteram. De Vir. Ill. cap. 69.

^r Καὶ ἔτερα τις ἐπιτολὴ τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ τοῖς Διονυσίῳ φέρεται διακονικῇ, εἰς Ἴππολυτῶν. Eus. l. vi. cap. 46. p. 248. A.

^s Φημι δὲ Κλήμητος, καὶ Εἰρηναίου, καὶ Ἴππολυτος, καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους, οἱ καὶ Σαυρατώως τὴν κατ’ αὐτῶν πεποινητὰ ἀνατροπῆν. Epiph. Hæc. 30. c. 33. p. 205. B.

posed by some ^t to have often borrowed from Hippolytus, without naming him.

Theodoret has quoted Hippolytus several times: he continually ^u calls him ‘bishop and martyr.’ It is worth the while to observe the works of Hippolytus which Theodoret has quoted, for the sake of the valuable fragments preserved by him. They are such as these: A Discourse or Homily upon those words, ‘The Lord is my Shepherd;’ Ps. xxiii. 1; A Discourse on Elkanah and Hannah; Another Discourse upon the beginning of Isaiah; all three quoted together by ^v Theodoret, in one of his Dialogues: and though they are cited as discourses, yet perhaps these are only some parts of the commentaries of Hippolytus. In another place are ^w fragments out of commentaries upon the second and upon the twenty-fourth psalm, and out of a homily ^x concerning the distribution of the talents; where also is quoted again the Discourse upon Elkanah and Hannah; A Discourse upon the Canticles, or ‘the great Hymn,’ as it is there called; An Epistle to a certain Queen, which is quoted ^y again in another place; where is the title of another work, called a Discourse upon ^z the Two Thieves. [See Matt. xxvii. 38; Luke xxiii. 39—43.] Who that queen was, whether some Arabian princess, or one of the Roman empresses, is not certain. Hippolytus is mentioned again by Theodoret,^a among many other authors who had written against Marcion and his followers; and in another place ^b among those who had written against the Nicolaitans.

Photius has two articles relating to Hippolytus. In the first he speaks of his book Against Heresies, which he calls a ‘little book.’ He says expressly that Hippolytus was a disciple of Irenæus, and seems to have learnt this from Hippolytus himself. ‘In this book was ^c a confutation of

^t Vid. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 17. St. Hippolyte.

^u Του ἁγίου Ἰππολυτου, επισκοπου και μαρτυρος. Dial. i. T. iv. p. 36. B. Vid. et Dial. ii. p. 88. A. Dial. iii. p. 155. Hæret. Fab. l. iii. c. 1 p. 227. A.

^v Dial. i. p. 36.

^w Dial. ii. p. 88, 89.

^x Εκ τῆς λογῆς, τῆς εἰς τὴν τῶν ταλαντῶν διανομῆν. Ibid. p. 88. A.

^y Dial. iii. p. 155. D.

^z Εκ τῆς λογῆς εἰς τῆς δύο ληπτας. Ib. 156. A.

^a Hæret. Fab. l. i. cap. 25.

^b Ibid. l. iii. cap. 1.

^c Ανεγνωσθη βιβλιῶδιον Ἰππολυτε. Μαθητης δὲ Εἰρηναῖο ὁ Ἰππολυτος. Ἦν δὲ το συνταγμα κατα ἀίρεσεων λβ. Ἀρχὴν ποιούμενος Δοσιθεανους, και μεχρι Νοητε και Νοητιανων ἐιαλαμβανομενον. Ταυτας δὲ φησιν ελεγχους ὑποβληθηται ὀμιλουντος Εἰρηναῖο ὡν και συνοψων ὁ Ἰππολυτος ποιούμενος τοδε το βιβλιον φησι συντεταχεναι. Τὴν δὲ φρασιν σαφης εστι και ὑποσημνος και απεριττος, εἰ και προς τον Αττικον εκ επισηφεται τον λογον. Λεγει δὲ αλλα τε τινα τῆς ακριβειας λειπομενα, και ὅτι ἡ προς Ἑβραιους επιτολη ουκ εστι τῆ αποστολῆς Ηανλῆ. Phot. Bibl. Cod. 121. p. 301.

‘ thirty-two heresies, from Dositheus to Noetus and the
 ‘ Noetians. Hippolytus says, that the same heresies had
 ‘ been confuted by Irenæus, and that he intended his small
 ‘ tract as an abridgment of what Irenæus had said. His
 ‘ style,’ says Photius, ‘ is clear, grave, and concise, without
 ‘ aiming however at the Attic purity and elegance. Never-
 ‘ theless he advances some things which are not right;
 ‘ particularly he says, that the epistle to the Hebrews is not
 ‘ the apostle Paul’s.’ Photius adds, that Hippolytus is
 said to have written many other pieces. This very much con-
 firms the supposition, that Irenæus did not receive the epistle
 to the Hebrews as St. Paul’s.^d

In the other place, Photius gives an account of his
 Commentary upon Daniel, and the Discourse of Christ and
 Antichrist; and calls Hippolytus^e bishop and martyr.
 With regard to the style of the former of these, Photius
 says ‘ it is clear, and such as is suitable to a commentary,
 ‘ though it is far from the Attic purity.’ The character
 which this great critic gives of our author, though he dis-
 likes and censures some things in him, is enough to make
 us regret the loss of so many, indeed almost all his works.

The whole of what Photius says of this commentary
 upon Daniel is so masterly, and so fine a model of criticism,
 that I cannot forbear inserting it here; though for the main
 it has been transcribed already by Du Pin and Mr. Tille-
 mont. ‘ It is not,’ Photius says, ‘ a continued explication
 ‘ of the prophet; nevertheless he omits nothing material.
 ‘ Many things are here expressed after the manner of the
 ‘ ancients, not with the exactness of later ages. But there
 ‘ is no reason to blame him on that account: for it would
 ‘ be unjust to find fault with those who have laid the foun-
 ‘ dations of any science, that they have not brought it to
 ‘ perfection; we ought rather to think ourselves obliged to
 ‘ them for their good endeavours, and leaving us such helps
 ‘ for farther improvement. But that he determines the
 ‘ appearance of Antichrist (at which time he also fixes the
 ‘ end of this visible world) to the year 500 from Christ,
 ‘ and the completion of 6000 years from the creation of the
 ‘ world; this is rather a mark of a warm fancy than of
 ‘ discretion, since Christ himself would not satisfy the
 ‘ disciples about such matters, though they desired him.
 ‘ This determination^f therefore is to be imputed to human
 ‘ ignorance, not to illumination from above.’

^d See before, ch. xvii. p. 177, 178

^e Διεγνώσθη Ἱππολύτης ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μαρτυρὸς ἐρμηνεῖα εἰς τὸν Δανιηλ,
 κ. λ. Cod. 102. p. 525.

^f Καὶ ἡ ἀποφασίς

It may not be improper to take some notice in this place of the extracts which Photius made out of Stephen Gobar's work, in which Hippolytus is mentioned several times. 'Stephen then,' as Photius assures^g us, 'observes what opinion Hippolytus and Epiphanius had of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons, and that they strongly condemned him; whilst Ignatius, Clement, Eusebius, and Theodoret, though they condemned the heresy of the Nicolaitans, say that Nicolas was not such an one.' Stephen informs us farther,^h 'that Hippolytus and Irenæus say, the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is not his.' Finally, 'heⁱ observes what opinion the blessed Hippolytus had of the heresy of the Montanists.'

We have now had a large testimony to the works of Hippolytus, and have seen him styled more than once bishop and martyr: but hitherto no discovery is made of the place either of his bishopric or martyrdom. However, there are writers of the fifth and following centuries, who mention the place of his bishopric; whether upon good ground or not, is not altogether certain. Gelasius, bishop of Rome in the latter end of the fifth century, calls Hippolytus^k metropolitan of the Arabians, if^l that passage be his, and not interpolated. Anastasius, presbyter of Rome in the seventh century, calls him^m bishop of Portus Romanus. Inⁿ the Paschal Chronicle, composed about the same time, Hippolytus is styled martyr, and bishop of Portus near Rome; by others he is called bishop^o of Rome, and^p a Roman writer, and the like; whose passages may be seen

ανθρωπινης αγνοιας, αλλ' ουκ επιπνοιας της ανωθεν διελεγχει. Phot. Cod. 202. col. 525.

^g Ετι δε ποιας υποληψεις εσχεν Ἰππολυτος και Επιφανιος περι Νικολαου, τε ενος των ζ διακονων, και οτι ισχυρωσ αυτον καταγιωσκουσιν. κ. λ. Phot. Bibl. Cod. 232. col. 901. n. 7, 8.

^h Οτι Ἰππολυτος και Ειρηναιος την προς Ἐβραιους επιστολην Παυλου, εκ εκεινου ειναι φασιν. Ibid. col. 904. n. 10.

ⁱ Τινας υποληψεις ειχεν ο αγιωτατος Ἰππολυτος περι της των Μοντανιστων αιρεσεως. Ibid. col. 904. n. 13.

^k Hippolyti, episcopi et martyris Arabum metropolis, in memoriâ hæresium. Gelas. in Testimon. de duabus naturis in Christo. Bib. Patr. T. viii. p. 704. Lugd.

^l See Tillemont's remarks upon this testimony, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 339. Bruxelles. Note ii. sur S. Hippolyte.

^m ——— testimonia ex dictis sancti Hippolyti, episcopi Portus Romani, ac martyris Christi Dei nostri. Anastasius, presbyter, et apocrisiarius Romæ, in epistolâ ad Theodos. presbyterum Gangrensem, laudat. a Fabric Op. S. Hippolyti, p. 225.

ⁿ Ἰππολυτος τοιονον ο της ευσεβειας μαρτυρ, επισκοπος τε καλουμενησ Πορτου πλησιον της Ῥωμης. Chr. Pasch. p. 6.

^o Κλημης και Ἰππολυτος επισκοπος Ῥωμης. Leont. Byz.

^p Και Ἰππολυτος ο Ῥωμαιος συγγραφευς. Niceph. C. Pol.

in the testimonies collected by Fabricius, in his edition of ^a Hippolytus.

Modern authors are divided in their opinions. Some have thought that he was bishop of Porto, near the mouth of the Tiber. Le Moyne ^r thinks he was bishop of Portus Romanus, otherwise called Adan, or Aden, in Arabia Felix. Cave ^s and ^t Basnage, and many others, go readily into this sentiment. According to these learned men, Hippolytus was an Arabian, and bishop of Portus Romanus in that country; but afterwards (at what time, and upon what occasion, is unknown) he came to Rome, and resided there some time; where he became famous for his zeal and labours in preaching the gospel, and defending the christian religion; where likewise, or near it, he might have the honour of suffering martyrdom.

Tillemont is more cautious in this respect: and thinks that since Eusebius, Jerom, and Theodoret were either plainly ignorant of the place where Hippolytus was bishop, or make no mention of it, it is not likely that later authors should teach us any thing certain, and that can be relied upon, in this matter. Tillemont discourses largely upon this question, in his second note upon Hippolytus. His own conjecture is, that Hippolytus might be bishop of some small city, the name of which was little known in the world; and that he has been supposed to have been bishop of Porto in Italy for no other reason, but that some person of the same name was martyred there, who perhaps came from the east, and in a long course of time was confounded with the great Hippolytus, bishop and martyr.

Prudentius has celebrated a martyr of this name, who suffered either at Portus or Ostia, near the mouth of the Tiber, whom Theodoric Ruinart ^u thinks to be our Hippolytus. But there are ^v arguments against that opinion, which to me appear unanswerable.

Dr. Heumann published some time ago a ^w curious

^a S. Hippolyti Op. p. 7—11. Hamb. 1716. ^r Vid. Steph. Le Moyne in Prolegomenis ad Varia Sacra; et Hippolyt. Fabric. p. 12.

^s Verum inter omnes hac de re sententias verisimillima videtur nupera Cl. Le Moyne conjectura, Hippolytum fuisse episcopum Portûs Romani in Arabiâ, *εμπορις της Αραβιας* a Ptolomæo vocati, ac postea Adanæ sive Adenæ nomen, quod et hodie retinet, adepti; Romanis mercatoribus perquam noti, et ab iis tunc temporis admodum frequentati. Cave, H. L. P. i. p. 66. Vid. et. P. ii. p. 42, 43. ^t Basn. Ann. Pol. Ec. 222. n. vii.

^u Vid. Acta Martyrum Sincera, p. 168.

^v Vid. Basn. Ann. 222. n. viii.

^w Dissertatio, in quâ docetur, ubi, et qualis episcopus fuerit Hippolytus Vid. Primitiæ Gottingenses, p. 239—253. Hanover. 1738. 4to.

dissertation, wherein he argues, that Hippolytus was not an ecclesiastical, but a civil bishop; probably warden or inspector of *Portus Romanus* or *Ostia*, an office of no small trust and honour. And he thinks that Hippolytus, though not a senator, was a Roman of quality, and an illustrious convert to the christian religion. He allows him to have written most of the works generally ascribed to him; but he does not think that Hippolytus died a martyr.

How long Hippolytus lived, is unknown. As he is said to have been a martyr, some are disposed^x to place his death in the persecution under Maximin, about the year 235; or else in the Decian persecution, about the year 250.

Though we are not able to determine with certainty the place of his bishopric, nor the place or time of his supposed martyrdom, and have scarce any history of his life, we have seen sufficient proof of his fame and great eminence for learning, and for the number of his works upon a variety of subjects. His having Origen for his hearer, is reckoned an argument that he was of the eastern part of the world: his being a disciple of Irenæus, might make us suspect that he was rather born and educated in the west. He certainly wrote in Greek. His works must have been well known in the east: this is evident from Eusebius's being acquainted with so many of them. He seems likewise to say that^y they were lodged in the library at Jerusalem, erected by Alexander, bishop of that city. But I do not perceive that this will enable us to determine the age of Hippolytus. If indeed his works were placed there by Alexander himself, who died in the year 251, it might be argued by some that Hippolytus had died some time before: but their being there in Eusebius's time, is no proof that they were placed there by Alexander; for some might be so generous as to make additions to the library begun by that good bishop of Jerusalem. Nor is it impossible that some of these works might be lodged there by Alexander, in the life-time of Hippolytus.

As this writer's works were evidently well known in the east, so a noble monument erected to his honour near Rome, seems to be a proof of his fame in Europe. Of this I must now give a short account. In the year 1551 was dug up in the neighbourhood of that city, a marble monument, with the image of a venerable person sitting in a chair: here likewise are engraved in Greek letters cycles of 16 years. Though there is no name remaining upon this monument, it

^x See Tillemont, *Mem. Ec.* T. iii. P. ii. p. 12.

^y *H. E.* l. vi. cap. 20.

is generally allowed to belong to our Hippolytus. Tillemont^z says, nobody doubts but this canon is his.

Upon this monument there is likewise a table of titles of divers works. Some of them are the same with those mentioned by Eusebius and Jerom; others are titles of works which they have taken no notice of. Beside others, all which are not equally legible, here are these: ‘Of the ‘Pythoiness; Of the Gospel of John, and the^a Revelation; ‘Against^b the Greeks, and against Plato, and also Of the ‘Universe; An Exhortation to Severina,’ which may be the epistle to a certain queen, mentioned by Theodoret; ‘Hymns ‘upon all the Scriptures.’

The late learned John Albert Fabricius has given us a very valuable edition of the remaining works and fragments of Hippolytus. But as there are several things ascribed to him without ground, and the pieces which are thought by some to be his are supposed to have been strangely interpolated, I shall now observe, as I promised at the beginning of this chapter, the judgments of divers learned men upon them.

Dodwell says: ‘The^c name of that blessed martyr has ‘been so abused by impostors, that it is not easy to distinguish what is his: nor can I see how that monument, where- ‘in so many of his matters are recounted, could be erected in ‘the age wherein he suffered.’ That is very right; it could not be erected immediately after his sufferings: but I suppose it cannot be questioned that this monument is of great antiquity. However, if there were any reason to think that this monument was not erected till some centuries (though a few only) after the death of Hippolytus, this would much weaken the authority of the catalogue of his works engraved upon it; and it might also help us to account for the differences between that catalogue and those in Eusebius and Jerom. Possibly the composer of the catalogue upon the monument confounded two persons of the same name, and ascribed several of the works of both to one.

Mill, who must be allowed a good judge in this matter, having^d designed to publish this author’s work, and^e hav-

^z As before, p. 10.

^a Ὑπερ τῆς κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως.

^b Πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα, καὶ περὶ τῆς Παντοῦ.

^c See Mr. Dodwell, in his Discourse concerning the Use of Incense in Divine Offices, p. 107.

^d Hanc [Διδασκαλίαν Ἰππολυτοῦ] ex codice MSS. eruit, et cum reliquis Hippolyti operibus propediem editurus est Joannes Mill,—a quo certiora de Hippolyto ejusque scriptis expectamus. Cav. Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 69.

^e Vid. Fabric. Hippolyt. in Præf. init.

ing made large preparations for it, expresses himself to this purpose in his Prolegomena to the New Testament: ‘ That ‘ Hippolytus left behind him many works. But the pieces ‘ extant under his name are in a manner all spurious, ex- ‘ cept perhaps the treatise of Antichrist, which Combefis ‘ will have to be genuine.’

Grabe, in his notes upon bishop Bull’s ‘ Defensio Fidei ‘ Nicenæ,’ scruples to insist upon any passages in the treatise ‘ Of the End of the World, and Antichrist, and the Second ‘ Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ;’ or in the other treatise, entitled, ‘ A Demonstration concerning Christ and ‘ Antichrist;’ affirming that^g both these are interpolated, especially the former: and that he has good reasons for this assertion, which he promises to show more fully in another place.

The Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose’s works, express themselves as if they^h thought all the works of Hippolytus entirely lost.

Du Pinⁱ says, the treatise of Christ and Antichrist is more ancient than the other, Of the End of the World, &c.: but he thinks that even that is not worthy of Hippolytus. Of the book against Noetus, Du Pin says, that though it is not really the work of Hippolytus, it contains the principles of the ancients concerning the doctrine of the Trinity. Tillemont^k thinks it probable, that the fore-mentioned book against Noetus, which we now have, is a fragment of Hippolytus’s work against Heresies, and the conclusion of it. And it appears to him undoubted, that it was written by some author of the third century, the sentiments concerning the Trinity being so agreeable to those times.

Casimire^l Oudin thinks the fragment of the work concerning the Universe, with the fragments in Theodoret’s Dialogues, all we have remaining of this martyr’s works.

^f Scripsit alia haud pauca Hippolytus. Quæ autem sub nomine ejus feruntur, spuria fere sunt, excepto forsan tractatu de Antichristo, quem pro genuino venditat Combefisius. Mill. Proleg. n. 655.

^g Reliqua certiora quidem sunt, attamen non omni prorsus dubio carent; quod utrumque Hippolyti scriptum, maxime prius, interpolatum esse videatur, ut in dicto Spicilegio pluribus demonstrabo. Grabe, ap. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. cap. 8. p. 95.

^h Duobus memoratis patribus insuper alios duos addit Hieronymus, Didymum ———, et Hippolytum martyrem. Sed cum hujus opera temporum iniquitate perierint, quod Hieronymi adjiciamus testimonio, nihil habemus. Præfat. ad S. Ambros. Op. p. penult.

ⁱ Du Pin, Bibl. Hippolite.

^k Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 16, 17.

^l Opinatus, hoc ferme unicum ex omnibus hujus martyris operibus superesse, cum fragmentis aliis, quæ Theodoretus in Dialogis refert. Oudin, de Scriptor. Ecc. T. i. col. 228.

Mr. Whiston, speaking of Hippolytus, says, ‘ We^m have, ‘ I believe, one small genuine treatise of his still extant, *De Antichristo*, published by the very learned Combefis; to ‘ which is added a very small piece, *De Susannâ*, which, ‘ with his Paschal Cycle, seems to be all that is really his.’

The treatise of Christ and Antichrist was first published by Gudius in Greek, and afterwards by Combefis, with a Latin translation.

Basnage is not unwilling to allow this last-mentionedⁿ piece to be the real and genuine work of Hippolytus, mentioned by Photius.

For a more particular critique upon the several works of Hippolytus, I would willingly refer my readers to Du Pin and Tillemont.

And if I may at last deliver my own opinion, I would say, though scarce any of them are altogether sincere and uncorrupted, there are few of which some good use may not be made by a man of candour and judgment.

Pearson^o being of opinion, that the Apostolical Constitutions were composed in the fourth or fifth century, out of divers small pieces, called Doctrines, or Institutions, said to be written by Clement, Ignatius, Hippolytus, and others, supposes that a large part of the eighth book of the Constitutions consists of a like piece, ascribed to Hippolytus. What ground there is for that sentiment, may be seen in Pearson himself, and others^p who espouse it, or have examined it. I apprehend that if the composer of the Constitutions did borrow from Hippolytus, it is nevertheless impossible for us now to determine with certainty what is his; and therefore I think I may defer the farther consideration of this opinion till I come to speak distinctly of the Constitutions, which I see no reason to do as yet. If my memory does not fail me, there is no notice taken of this matter by Du Pin, or Tillemont, or Oudin, in their history of Hippolytus and his works: either therefore they were

^m See Essay on the Apostolical Const. ch. iv. or, Primitive Christianity Revived, vol. iii. p. 402.

ⁿ Extant hodie duæ de Antichristo homiliæ sub nomine Hippolyti. Prior titulum habet, *De Consummatione Mundi, et Antichristo*; posterior, *De Antichristo*.——Ac posterior quidem est Hippolyto longe dignior: nobisque ea insidet sententia, quod illa ipsa est de quâ mentionem movit Photius. Basnage, Ann. 222. n. x.

^o Vid. Pearson, Vind. Ignat. Part i. cap. 4.

^p Vid. Grabe, Spicil. Patr. T. i. p. 43. et p. 284, 285. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 208. Hippolyt. ex ed. Fabric. p. 248, &c. Cav. Hist. Lit. in Hippolyto. Mr. Robert Turner's Discourse of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, ch. 24. p. 287, &c.

entirely ignorant of it, or they did not think it worthy of their regard. One of the titles upon the fore-mentioned monument, is^a ‘The Apostolical Tradition concerning ‘Gifts’ of the Spirit; and it has been argued that this means Hippolytus’s Didascalia, or Institution, supposed to be now inserted in the eighth book of the Constitutions. But all that Mr. Tillemont says of that title is, that probably^r it is some book written against the Montanists.

Mill, in his edition of the New Testament, a work of prodigious labour and extensive use, and above all my commendations, prefixes to each book of that sacred volume testimonies of ancient christian writers: and before the four gospels are so many testimonies, under the name of Hippolytus. Two of those testimonies or passages, those prefixed to St. Matthew’s and St. John’s gospels, are taken out of a little book, entitled, ‘Of the Twelve Apostles;’ the other two, prefixed to St. Mark’s and St. Luke’s gospels, are taken out of another little piece (though undoubtedly somewhat longer than the former) entitled, ‘Of the Seventy or Seventy-two Disciples.’ And among the testimonies prefixed to St. John’s gospel, that called Hippolytus’s is placed between Clement of Alexandria and Origen; which might well dispose some persons to think, that the Hippolytus hereby intended is our Hippolytus of the third century; though it is now well known to the learned, and universally agreed, that our Hippolytus is not the author of those two pieces, but that they were composed by Hippolytus Thebanus, in the tenth or eleventh century, or by some other later writer: so that I thought I had no reason to take any notice of either of these pieces in my account of Hippolytus’s works. Nor should I have done it now, if I had not accidentally cast my eye upon one of those testimonies in Mill’s New Testament, which I think are very improperly placed, and might mislead some persons. They are indeed of little or no value. In the book or catalogue of the seventy disciples, it is said of the evangelists Mark and Luke, ‘That they two were of Christ’s seventy disciples, ‘and that they were dispersed by the word which Christ ‘spoke: “Unless a man eat my flesh and drink my blood, ‘he is not worthy of me.” But the one being brought back

^a Περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποτολικῆ παραδόσις.

^r Outre ces ouvrages, cette table marque encore un écrit Des dons [du Saint Esprit]; De la Tradition Apostolique; ou de la Tradition Apostolique sur les dons; apparemment pour réfuter les Montanistes. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 15. Saint Hippolyte.

^s See John vi. 53, and 66.

‘ again to Christ by Peter, and the other by Paul, they both
 ‘ had the honour to write a gospel [or, to preach the gos-
 ‘ pel,] for which they suffered martyrdom; one being burnt
 ‘ to death, the other crucified upon an olive-tree.’ But
 such stories as these deserve no regard, unless they were
 to be found in some writings unquestionably ancient.

That every one who needs it may have full satisfaction
 concerning these pieces, I shall place in the margin the
 judgments of two or three learned men upon them, parti-
 cularly ^t Cave and ^u Du Pin; which last learned writer
 says, these pieces contain divers fictions of the modern
 Greeks. Fabricius, in his account of our Hippolytus,
 called Portuensis, gives ^v a large catalogue of his works,
 without mentioning either of these; and afterwards, in his
 article of the latter Hippolytus, called Thebanus, he says
 that ^w both these books are to be accounted his.

In what is here said, it is not intended to cast any reflec-
 tion upon Mill, for whom I have a profound respect. The
 greatest men upon earth are liable to some oversights amidst
 the labours of such a work as his New Testament.

I. Having now at length, I hope, cleared the way, I pro-
 ceed to represent this author’s testimony to the books of
 the New Testament: and I shall make my extracts chiefly
 out of the fragments of Hippolytus, preserved in Theodo-
 ret, which are unquestionably genuine. These alone bear
 testimony to the gospels, and to many particular and prin-
 cipal facts recorded in them, and to divers other books of
 scripture. Beside those fragments, I may also make some
 use of ‘ the Demonstration concerning Christ and Anti-
 ‘ christ,’ the fragment of the treatise ‘ Of the Universe,’
 and the book against Noetus.

^t De xii. apostolis, ubinam quisque prædicarit, et consummatus sit, Indi-
 culus. Hippolyto juniori potius tribuendus. Cave, de Hippolyto Portuensi.
 Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 70. Hippolytus, patriâ Thebanus, quem cum Hippolyto
 Portuensi male confundunt nonnulli, claruit circa ann. 933.—Hunc
 etiam, ut videtur, auctorem habet Indiculus de xii. apostolis, sub Hippolyti
 senioris nomine Gr. L. a Combefisio editus. Id. ibid. p. 580.

^u Le petit opuscule de la vie de Douze Apôtres, et de leurs actions, que
 le pere Combefis a fait imprimer——n’ est point d’ Hippolite, et contient
 plusieurs fictions des nouveaux Grecs, touchant la mort des Apôtres. On doit
 porter le même jugement d’un livre écrit à peu près sur un même sujet,
 attribué au même auteur, touchant les Soixante et Douze Disciples de Jesus
 Christ. Du Pin, Bib. Hippolite.

^v Vid. Fab. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. i. sect. 25. T. v. p. 203—211.

^w Sed et opusculum, quod de xii. apostolis, sub Hippolyti nomine,
 laudat Cotelerius.—atque integrum vulgavit cum versione suâ Combefisius—
 et quæ de lxxii. discipulis habet Baronius,—ex Hippolyti Thebani
 Chronico petita videntur. Fabr. ib. p. 212.

II. Theodoret, then, expressly quotes Hippolytus, bishop and martyr, as saying in his epistle to a certain queen: ‘Therefore he^x calls him the “first-fruits of them that slept,” and “the first-born from the dead;” who being risen, and willing to show that what had risen was the same that had died, his disciples doubting, he called Thomas to him, and said, “Handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have.”’ Hippolytus here cites the gospels inaccurately, and, as is probable, by memory only. But that we here have his words right, we are farther assured by another place of Theodoret; where he has quoted again^y this same passage, just as it is here. I Cor. xv. 10; Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5; John xx. 22; Luke xxiv. 39.

III. Presently after the forecited passages, Theodoret quotes another from the Discourse of Hippolytus upon Elkanah and Hannah, where the first epistle to the Corinthians is quoted again in this manner: ‘As^z the apostle says, I Cor. v. 7, “For Christ, God, our passover is sacrificed for us.”’

IV. It is worth the while to take some more passages of Hippolytus, cited presently after by Theodoret, out of the Discourse upon the ‘great Hymn,’ as he calls it, and other pieces. ‘They^a who do not acknowledge the Son of God incarnate, shall acknowledge him when he comes as judge in glory, even him who now is abused in an inglorious body.’ The same author, in the same Discourse: ‘For the apostles coming to the sepulchre on the third day, “found not the body of Jesus,” Luke xxiv. 3, as the children of Israel, when they went up to the mountain to seek the grave of Moses, found it not.’ The same author, in his commentary upon the second Psalm: ‘He, coming into the world, appeared to be God and man. His humanity is easily perceived, when^b he hungers, and^c is weary, and^d being weary thirsts, and^e fearing flees, and^f

^x Τὸ αὐτὸ, ἐκ τῆς πρὸς βασιλίδά τινα ἐπιστολῆς. Ἀπαρχὴν ἐν τέττον λέγει τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ἅτε πρωτοτοκῶν τῶν νεκρῶν, ὃς ἀνάσας, καὶ βεβλομένος ἐπιδείκνυται, ὅτι τέτο ἦν τὸ ἐγηγερμένον, ὅπερ ἦν καὶ ἀποθνήσκον, διτταζόντων τῶν μαθητῶν, προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν Θωμᾶν, εἶπεν· Δευρὸ ψηλαφήσον καὶ ἴδε, ὅτι πνεῦμα ὄσων καὶ σὰρκα οὐκ ἐχει, καθὼς ἐμε θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. Ap. Theodoret. Dial. ii. p. 88. B. T. iv. ^y Dial. iii. p. 155. D.

^z Ὡς ὁ ἀποστόλος λέγει· τὸ δε πασχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστὸς ὁ Θεός. Ibid. Dial. ii. p. 88. C.

^a Οἱ γὰρ τοῦ Ἰου τῶ Θεοῦ ἐνσάρκον μὴ ἐπιγινώσκοντες, ἐπιγινώσκονται αὐτὸν κριτὴν ἐν ὄξῃ παραγινόμενον, τὸν νῦν ἐν ἀδόξῃ σωματὶ ὑβρίζομενον. Ibid. p. 89. A. B. ^b Matt. iv. 2. ^c John iv. 6.

^d John iv. 7, or ch. xix. 28.

^e Matt. ii. 13, 14;

xii. 14, 15; John iv. 3, and other places.

^f Matt. xxvi. 37

praying is sorrowful, and^g sleeps upon a pillow, and^h deprecates the cup of his passion, andⁱ “being in agony sweats, and is strengthened by an angel,” and^k is betrayed by Judas, and^l insulted by Caiaphas, and set at nought^m by Herod, andⁿ scourged by Pilate, and^o derided by the soldiers, and^p is fastened to the cross by the Jews, and “crying with a loud voice,^q commends his spirit to the Father;” and^r “bowing his head, giveth up the ghost;” and^s his “side is pierced with a spear,” and^t “being wrapped in fine linen,” he is laid in a sepulchre; and^u on the third day is raised by the Father. His divinity also is clearly perceived, when^v he is worshipped by angels, and^w visited by the shepherds, and^x expected by Simeon, and^y receives testimony from Anna, and^z is inquired for by the wise men, and^a is shown by a star, and^b when he turns water into wine at a wedding, and^c rebukes the sea, violently agitated by the winds, and^d walks upon the sea, and^e gives sight to a man blind from his birth, and^f raises Lazarus who had been dead four days, and performs various works of power, and forgives^{gg} sins, and^{hh} gives power to his disciples.’

Much the same things are found again in the last chapter of the book against Noetus: and, if I mistake not, this passage mightily answers the character which Photius gave of this writer’s style, thatⁱⁱ it is concise, or free from superfluities. Here are references to all the four gospels; and many things are mentioned which are recorded in each of them.

V. In other passages of Hippolytus, cited by Theodoret, is notice taken of the birth of Jesus, at^{kk} Bethlehem, ‘of a

^g Mark iv. 38.

ⁱ Luke xxii. 43, 44.

^l Matt. xxvi. 65.

ⁿ Matt. xxvii. 26. John xix. 1.

Mark xv. 16. Luke xxiii. 36. John xix. 2.

^p Matt. xxvii. 35.

^r John xix. 30.

^t Matth. xxvii. 59, 60. Mark xv. 46. Luke xxiii. 53. John xix. 40.

^u Acts x. 40.

^w Ver. 15, 16, 17.

^y Ver. 36, 37, 38.

^a ——— ver. 2, 9.

^c Matt. viii. 26. Mark iv. Luke viii.

^d Matt. xiv. 25, 26. Mark vi. 48, 49. John vi. 19.

^e John ix. 1—7.

^{gg} Matt. ix. 2, 6. Mark ii. 10. Luke vii. 48, 49.

^{hh} Matt. x. 1. Mark iii. 15; vi. 7. Luke ix. 1; x. 19; xxiv. 49. John xx. 22, 23.

^{kk} ‘Ο δε Κυριος αναμαρτητος ην, εκ των ασηπτων ζυλων το κατα ανθρωπον,

virgin and the Holy Spirit;’ where he must refer to the first chapter of St. Matthew’s or St. Luke’s gospel.

VI. He may be supposed to refer to Acts x. 40, in those words before cited: ‘On the third day is raised by the Father.’ He may be reckoned likewise to have an eye to the first chapter of the Acts, and to chapter xxvi. 23, when in a passage preserved in Theodoret^l he speaks of Christ’s ascending at Pentecost, and of his being the first that ascended into the heavens. I suppose it cannot be doubted but Hippolytus received the Acts of the Apostles. Beside what is alleged here, this may be also argued from what was before cited from Photius: That Stephen^m Gobar observes, what opinion Hippolytus had of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons.

VII. It may be also reckoned undoubted, that he received thirteen epistles of St. Paul, and most other books of the New Testament; but the epistle to the Hebrews he did not allow to be St. Paul’s, as ⁿ was observed formerly. But we should have been glad to have seen his arguments and reasonings upon that matter, if he made use of any.

VIII. His opinion of the disputed catholic epistles, that of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the epistle of Jude, does not appear very manifest from his remaining works or fragments; where scarce any of these are quoted, except that there is ^o a reference to 2 Pet. i. 21, in the book Of Christ and Antichrist.

IX. The book of the Revelation was received by Hippolytus as the apostle John’s. About this there can be no question made. Jerom, in the catalogue of his works, mentions one entitled, ‘Of the Revelation.’ One of the titles upon the monument before mentioned is, ‘Of the Gospel according to John, and the Revelation.’ Mill thinks^p that this was a defence of both these books of scripture; which is perfectly agreeable to the description which ^q Ebedjesu gives of one of the works of Hippolytus,

τῆς ἑστίν ἐκ τῆς παρθενῆς καὶ τῆς Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.—Ἀγε δὴ μοι, ὦ Σαμουηλ, εἰς Βηθλεὲμ ἔλκομένην τὴν δαμαλὴν ἵνα ἐπιδείξῃς τὸν ἐκ Δαβὶδ βασιλεῖα τικτομένον.—Εἶπε μοι, ὦ μακαρία Μαρία, τί ἦν τὸ ὑπο σε ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ συνειλημμένον, καὶ τί ἦν τὸ ὑπο σε ἐν παρθενικῇ μητρᾷ βασιζόμενον; Ap. Theodoret. Dial. i. p. 36. B. C. D.

^l Ἐν δὲ τῇ πεντηκότηῃ ἵνα προσημνητῇ τὴν τῶν ἑρανῶν βασιλείαν, αὐτὸς πρῶτος εἰς ἑρανῶς ἀναβὰς, καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπον δῶρον τῷ Θεῷ προσενεγκας. Ap. Theodoret. Dial. ii. p. 88. C.

^m See before, p. 426.

ⁿ See before, p. 425.

^o Hippolyt. Op. p. 5.

^p Cum hoc, inquam, vidisset martyr, necessarium duxerit, S. Joannis operum vindicias agere. Mill, Proleg. n. 654.

^q Sanctus Hippolytus, martyr et epi-copus, composuit librum de dispensatione:—et apologiam pro Apocalypsi et evangelio Joannis apostoli et evan-

and undoubtedly meaning this. We saw formerly^r a reference to the Revelation in the fragment of the treatise ‘Of the Universe;’ it is largely quoted in the ‘Demonstration concerning Christ and Antichrist.’ Here it is said, ‘That^s John saw the revelation of tremendous mysteries in the Isle of Patmos, which he also made known to others.’ He is here called ‘blessed John, apostle and disciple of the Lord;’ and again, ‘prophet^t and apostle;’ prophet, no doubt, with regard to this book. Andrew of Caesarea, about the year 500, in his Commentary upon the Revelation, several times mentions our author’s interpretations of things recorded in that book. Andrew’s passages are collected by^u Fabricius, and may be seen in his edition of Hippolytus.

X. The respect for the sacred scriptures appears in the ‘Demonstration concerning Christ and Antichrist.’ At the beginning of that work the author tells Theophilus, to whom he writes, ‘That^v in order to give him instruction in the things about which he enquires, he will draw out of the sacred fountain, and set before him, from the sacred scriptures themselves, what may afford him satisfaction.’ He then quotes immediately both Paul’s epistles to Timothy, and afterwards many books of the New Testament. And near the conclusion of the same work, he says, ‘Two different^w advents of our Lord and Saviour have been shown out of the scriptures; the first inglorious in the flesh, the other glorious.’ He mentions this division of all the books of sacred scripture,^x ‘the law, prophets, gospels, and apostles.’

XI. Dr. Mill has observed^y some readings in this book different from our present copies. I shall take notice of but one, 2 Tim. ii. 2, ‘The^z things which thou hast heard

gelistæ. Ebedjes. Catalog. Lib. Syr. cap. 7. ap. Assem. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 15.

^r Chap. xxxii. at the end.

^s Οὗτος γὰρ ἐν Πατμῶν τῆ νήσῳ ὡν, ὄρα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι μυστηρίων φρικτῶν, αὐτὰ ἐξηγησάμενος ἀφθονῶς καὶ ἐτέρως διδάσκει. Λεγε μοι, μακαριε Ἰωαννῆ, ἀποστολε καὶ μαθητα τῶ Κυρίου, τί εἶδες καὶ ἠκουσας περὶ Βαβυλῶνος. De Chr. et Ant. sect. 36. p. 18.

^t Λεγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης καὶ ἀποστολος.

Ibid. sect. 50. p. 25.

^u P. 34, 35.

^v Βαλθηθεντος σε κατ’ ἀκριβειαν ἐμαθεν τα προτειθεντα σοι ὑπ’ ἐμῶ κεφαλαία, ἀγαπήτη με ἀδελφε Θεοφιλε, εὐλογον ἡγήσασμην ἀφθονῶς ἀρυσάμενος ὡς ἐξ ἀγίας πηγῆς, ἐξ ἀγιῶν γραφῶν παρασησαι σοι κατ’ ὄφθαλμον τα ζητούμενα. De Chr. et Ant. sect. 1.

^w Ὡσπερ γὰρ δύο παροῦσαι τῶ

Κυρίου καὶ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν δια γραφῶν εἰδεχθησαν. Ibid. sect. 44.

^x Ἐσφαλησαν οὐν κατὰ πάντα, ἐν μηδενὶ συμφῶνοι τῆ ἀληθείᾳ εὐρισκομενοι, μητε κατὰ τὸν νομὸν—μητε κατὰ τοὺς ἀποφῆτας—μητε κατὰ τὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων φωνὴν—μητε τοῖς ἀποστολοῖς πειθομενοι. Ibid. sect. 58.

^y Prol. n. 655, 656.

^z Καὶ ἠκουσας παρ’ ἐμῶ δια πολλῶν παρακλησιῶν. Ibid. sect. 1.

of me in many discourses,' instead of, 'among many witnesses.' Mill thinks this to be an explication only, and not a true reading.

I have no occasion to sum up this testimony; it is easy to see in these numbers what it is.

CHAP. XXXVI.

AMMONIUS.

I. *Ammonius; his History, and Testimony to the Books of the New Testament.* II. Qu. *Whether Tatian's and Ammonius's Harmonies are now extant?* III. *Extracts out of a Latin Harmony ascribed to Tatian.* IV. *Extracts out of a Latin Harmony ascribed to Ammonius.*

PORPHYRY, in his work which he wrote against the christians, as cited by Eusebius, says of Ammonius, the celebrated philosopher of Alexandria, master of Plotinus and other eminent men, 'That^a having been educated a christian by christian parents, as soon as he came to years of understanding, and had a taste of philosophy, he presently betook himself to a life agreeable to the laws.' To which Eusebius says, 'That^b it is a notorious falsehood, to say he exchanged christianity for Gentilism; for Ammonius maintained sincere and uncorrupted the doctrine of the divine philosophy to the end of his life, as his works which he left behind him still testify, and for which he is in great repute; as the treatise entitled, Of the Consent of Moses and Jesus, and divers others, which may be found with the curious.'

After Eusebius, St. Jerom, in his book of *Illustrious Men*,

^a Ἀμμωνίος μὲν γὰρ χριστιανὸς ἐν χριστιανοῖς ἀνατράφει τοῖς γονευσίν, ὅτε τοῦ φρονεῖν καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἤψατο, εὐθὺς πρὸς τὴν κατὰ νόμον πολιτείαν μετεβάλετο. Apud Eus. H. E. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 220. B.

^b Ψευδαμεινῶν δὲ σαφῶς—τὸν δ' Ἀμμωνίον ἐκ βίου τοῦ κατὰ τὴν θεοσεβείαν, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐθνικοῦ τρόπου ἐκπέσειν—τῶν τε Ἀμμωνίων τὰ τῆς ἐνθεῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀκεραία καὶ ἀδιαπτῶτα, καὶ μέχρις ἐσχάτης τῆς βίης διεμένε τελευτῆς· ὡς περὶ καὶ οἱ τ' ἀνδρὸς εἰσετι γινῶν μαρτυροῦσι πονοί, δι' ὧν κατέλιπε συγγραμμάτων παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις εὐδοκίμωντος· ὡσπερ ἐν καὶ ὁ ἐπιγεγραμμένος περὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ συμφωνίας, καὶ ὅσοι ἄλλοι παρὰ τοῖς φιλοκαλοῖς εἰρήνται. Ibid. p. 220. D. 221. A.

writes to this purpose: ‘ At that time [the person last
 ‘ spoken of is Origen] Ammonius, an eloquent and very
 ‘ learned man, was famous at Alexandria; who, among
 ‘ many excellent monuments of his wit, composed also an
 ‘ elegant work of the Consent of Moses and Jesus, and^c
 ‘ invented the Evangelical Canons, which Eusebius of
 ‘ Cæsarea afterwards followed. This person is falsely re-
 ‘ proached by Porphyry, that of a christian he became a
 ‘ heathen; when it is certain, he continued a christian to the
 ‘ end of his life.’

And to this day it has been the general opinion of learned men, that Ammonius Saccas, the celebrated Alexandrian philosopher, and the author of these two christian works, as well as of other pieces upon the same principles, are one and the same person. Tillemont^d says, he does not see that any one doubts of it: but that manner of expression seems to show, that he himself had some suspicion to the contrary. And^e Fabricius has openly called into question this supposition, and I think demonstrated, beyond dispute, that they are two different persons. I shall only observe, that Porphyry was nearer Ammonius Saccas than Eusebius; that he could not but be well informed by his master Plotinus, who spent^f eleven years with Ammonius: and besides, we are assured by Longinus, another disciple of Ammonius Saccas, that he never wrote any thing. This may be sufficient to satisfy us that the writings, of which Eusebius and St. Jerom speak, are not to be ascribed to Ammonius Saccas. I have no occasion, therefore, to add any thing farther relating to the history of that heathen philosopher, as one would think every one must allow him to be, who reads Porphyry’s life of Plotinus.

Who Ammonius was who composed these christian books, and continued a christian all his days, cannot be now certainly known. Eusebius has mentioned one of the same name, a presbyter^g of Alexandria, who suffered martyrdom in the Dioclesian persecution: and one might be apt to

^c ——— et Evangelicos Canones excogitavit, quos postea secutus est Eusebius Cæsariensis. Hunc falso accusat Porphyrius, quod ex christianis Ethnicus fuerit, cum constet eum usque ad extremam vitam christianum perseverasse. De Vir. Ill. cap. 55.

^d Nous ne voyons point que personne doute qu’ Ammone, auteur de la Concorde, ne soit le même que le philosophe. Mem. T. iii. P. ii. Ammone. note 2. p. 390.

^e Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. iv. p. 160, 161, 172. et seq.

^f Porphyr. de Vit. Plotin. cap. 3. Conferatur Conspectus Chronologicus Vitæ Plotini, apud Fabric. Bib. Gr. lib. iv. cap. 26. init.

^g Eus. l. viii. cap. 13. p. 308. C.

think that this was the man, if Eusebius had not been of a different mind. However, it may be argued that St. Jerom had some reason to think his Ammonius younger than Origen, since in the Catalogue he is placed after him; which would be improperly done, if he was satisfied that he was the same Ammonius^h who was Origen's master in philosophy; and who was plainly somewhat, though not a great deal, older than his scholar. Accordingly Origen is placed by Cave at the year 230, and Ammonius at 220. It might be added, for supporting this conjecture, that in the titles of the chapters of St. Jerom's Catalogue, Ammonius is called presbyter; and by Eusebius and Jerom, and every body, the author of this Harmony is called an Alexandrian: all which considerations might lead us to the Alexandrian presbyter and martyr of this name, if Eusebius's opinion upon the point did not lie as a bar in our way; for it may be reckoned somewhat probable, that if the author of the Harmony had been his contemporary, or had lived very near his own time, he must have known it. I therefore speak of Ammonius, the author of the Harmony, at the year 220, where he is placed by Cave, without presuming to determine his time; though I differ from him, and most other learned men, in thinking that he is not the same with Ammonius Saccas.

We have seen two writings ascribed to Ammonius, the Consent of Moses and Jesus, and Evangelical Canons, as St. Jerom calls them. The former is quite lost; of the latter we have this farther account in antiquity. Eusebius himself, in his letter to Carpian, says, 'That Ammoniusⁱ of Alexandria had left us a gospel composed out of the four with great pains and labour, subjoining^k to Matthew's

^h Vid. Euseb. ib. l. vi. c. 19. p. 220. B. 221. B. C.

ⁱ Αμμωνιος μεν ο Αλεξανδρευσ, πολλην, ως εικος, φιλοποιαν και σπεδην εισαγηοχως, το δια τεσσαρων ημιν καταλειοιπεν εναγγελιον, τω κατα Ματθαιου τας ομοφωνας των λοιπων εναγγελιστων περικοπας παραθεις—εκ τε πονηματος τε προειρημενε ανδρος ειληφως αφορμας, καθ' ετεραν μεθοδον κανονας δεκα τον αριθμον διεχαραξα σοι τας υποτεταγμενους. Euseb. Ep. ad Carp.

^k Subjoining, &c.] According to Mr. Wetstein's interpretation of the original words, I should have translated after this manner: 'Setting over against Matthew's gospel the parallel sections,' &c. For he says, Codex Latinus exhibet quatuor evangelistas in unum conflatos: Ammonius autem quaternis columnis quatuor evangelistas distincte descriperat; hæc enim est vis verbi παραθεις, i. e. juxta Matthæum reliquos apposuit. Prolegom. cap. vi. p. 67. But Eusebius uses that verb barely for 'alleging, subjoining, putting down,' and the like. Thus: Γαϊος, οὐ φωνας ηδη προτερον παραθειμαι, κ. λ. H. E. l. iii. cap. 28. init. So likewise Origen: Πολυ δε εστι νυν παρατιθεσθαι τε Ηρακλειωνος τα ρητα, κ. λ. Com. in Joh. Tom. xiv. p. 211. D. Huet.

‘gospel the consonant passages [or sections] of the other evangelists—and that, taking occasion from the work of the fore-mentioned writer, he had composed, in another method, ten canons in number, which are there sub-joined.’

St. Jerom, in his preface to the four gospels, expresseth himself thus of this author: ‘I have also put^l down the Canons which Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, disposed into ten numbers, following Ammonius of Alexandria.’

Cassiodorius^m ascribes the Canons to Eusebius, without mentioning Ammonius.

Victor of Capua says, ‘I haveⁿ understood that Ammonius of Alexandria, who is also said to be the inventor of the Evangelic Canons, joined the passages of the three [other] evangelists with Matthew, and composed a gospel in a continued series of narration. Eusebius, in his epistle to one Carpian, in the preface to his edition of the fore-mentioned Canons, professes to have imitated the design of that person.’

Zachary of Chrysopolis, in the 12th century, who wrote a commentary upon the Gospel of the Four, supposed to have been composed by Ammonius, expresses^o himself much after the same manner: but I do not think it needful to translate his words.

Upon the whole, though St. Jerom says that Eusebius followed Ammonius, and even reckons the Evangelic Canons among the works of Ammonius, they may have been properly Eusebius’s invention, whilst yet the Harmony of Ammonius had been the occasion of that thought; which I think is all that Eusebius’s words import: and his account of his own work may be justly reckoned the most authentic and exact.

All that I have said of Ammonius, is only to show that there was such a work, called a Gospel of the Four, or a Harmony of the Four Gospels, composed before Eusebius’s

^l Canones quoque, quos Eusebius Cæsariensis episcopus, Alexandrinum sequutus Ammonium, in decem numeros ordinavit, sicut in Græco habentur, expressimus. Hieronym. Præf. in Quatuor Evangelia.

^m Eusebius quoque Cæsariensis Canones Evangelicos compendiosâ brevitate collegit. Cassiodor. de Instit. Divin. Lit. cap. 7.

ⁿ Reperi Ammonium quendam Alexandrinum, qui Canonum quoque Evangelii fertur inventor, Matthæi evangelio reliquorum trium excerpta junxisse, ac in unam seriem evangelium nexuisse. Sicut Eusebius episcopus Carpiano cuidam scribens.—supradicti viri imitatus studium, refert in hunc modum. Vict. Cap. Præf. &c. apud Biblioth. Max. Lugdun. Tom. iii. p. 265.

^o Unum ex quatuor evangelistarum dictis evangelium claro studio composuit Ammonius Alexandrinus, qui Canonum quoque Evangelii fertur inventor—Zachar. Chrysop. Præf. ap. Bibl. Patr. Max. Tom. xix. p. 741. H

time by some learned Alexandrian, named Ammonius. The testimonies here alleged afford full proof of this matter, and leave no room to doubt of it: though we do not know exactly who this Ammonius was. This is satisfactory evidence that there were four authentic gospels, and no more, in use in the church; and this work is likewise a proof of the zeal of the christians for those writings, and of their care about them.

II. But before I conclude this chapter, I shall proceed a little farther; for this may be reckoned a fit opportunity for examining two Harmonies of the Gospels, which we now have in Latin; the one ascribed to Tatian in the second, the other to Ammonius in the third, century. What the most ancient writers have said of Tatian's Harmony, has been observed^p formerly; as now, what they have said of that composed by Ammonius. Whether either of these is now extant, is not absolutely certain. However, I shall take notice of the judgments of several learned moderns upon those we have, and then make some remarks upon each of them.

Cave is not unwilling^q to allow both the Harmonies of these two learned ancients to be still extant: only he thinks that, sometimes called Ammonius's, ought to be reckoned Tatian's; as on the contrary that the other, sometimes called Tatian's, ought to be given to Ammonius.

Mill^r thinks the short one, which is the same Cave supposes to be Tatian's, cannot be really his; but is rather an epitome of the gospels composed by some learned catholic writer long after Tatian, in the fifth century: but the Harmony of Ammonius he^s supposes to be still extant, which is the larger of these two we now have in Latin. And here he and Cave agree.

Mr. Jo. James Wetstein^t thinks, there is now no where one copy extant of Tatian's Harmony, of which Theodoret saw so many; nor will he^u allow the other to have been composed by Ammonius, but thinks it the work of some writer since Eusebius, for which he offers divers reasons. Valesius^v is of opinion, that the shorter Harmony, called Tatian's, is the work of some catholic christian, and therefore not his. I shall consider his arguments presently. These are the judgments of moderns.

^p Chap. xiii. p. 149.

^q Cav. Hist. Lit. P. ii. in Ammonio.

^r Prolegom. in N. T. num. 353. Vid. et num. 351, 352.

^s Id. ibid. num. 660—666.

^t Prolegom. ad Nov. Test. Græci edit. accuratissimam, p. 65.

^u Ibid. p. 66, 67.

^v Vales. Not. ad Euseb. l. iv. cap. 29

Victor of Capua, when he had found that which is the same with our larger Harmony, took it for ^w Tatian's, though indeed ^x he was not positive: however it was very probable he was mistaken, since it has the genealogies. Zachary before mentioned commented upon the same Harmony as Ammonius's, and took it for granted that Tatian's ^y was quite lost. But herein he might be mistaken; it might be extant, though he did not know it: and we have been lately assured by Dr. Asseman, that ^z Tatian's Diatessarôn, or Gospel of the Four, is now in the Vatican Library, in the Arabic language: it is one of the books which he brought out of the east. I wish we had a more particular account of that Arabic Diatessarôn; though the Greek, if it could be found, would be a much greater curiosity.

Valesius ^a has three arguments to prove, that the shorter of our two Harmonies is not Tatian's: that Tatian's Harmony was composed in the very words of the evangelists, leaving out only our Lord's genealogy from David; which plainly is not the method of our Harmony: that in the work we have, Christ is more than once called 'the son of David,' which Tatian had nothing of in his Diatessarôn: lastly, that here our Saviour's ministry consists of three years, whereas the ancients allowed it no more than the space of one year.

As for the first difficulty, I know of no good authority we have for thinking that Tatian's Harmony was composed in the very words of the evangelists. The third objection I hope to answer in my remarks upon this work, and extracts out of it, by and by. But the second argument insisted on by Valesius is of considerable weight; for Theodoret's words are, that ^b 'Tatian, in his Diatessarôn, left out the

^w Tatianus quoque—hoc evangelium (ut mihi videtur) solerti compaginatione disposuit.—Arbitror enim propterea non Ammonii, sed hujus [Tatiani] esse editionem memorati voluminis.—Victor. Præfat. ap. Bib. Patr. T. iii. p. 266. A.

^x Ut jure ambigi possit, utrum Ammonii an Tatiani inventio ejusdem operis debeat æstimari. Ibid. B.

^y Sane hujus hæresiarchæ [Tatiani] si superesset opus evangelicum, quod sancti Justini lateri adhærens fortassis expheuit, in eo Domini Jesu verba diligenter amplecti, secure legere ovis vocem cognoscentibus, nil prohiberet. Zachar. ap. Bib. Patr. T. xix. p. 742. A.

^z Tatiani Diatessarôn, seu, Quatuor Evangelia in unum redacta: in fol. Bembyc. 123. Asseman, Bib. Or. T. i. p. 619.

^a At evangelium Tatiani ipsismet evangelistarum verbis contextum fuit, resectis dumtaxat iis quæ ad Davidicam Christi genealogiam spectant. Præterea in opere illo quod editum est, Christus filius David dicitur non semel. Denique tres anni prædicationis Christi in illo opere distinguuntur; cum veteres annum dumtaxat unum prædicationi Christi tribuerint. Valesius, in notis ad Eus. H. E. l. iv. cap. 29.

^b Οὗτος και δια τεσσαρων καλεμενον συντεθεικεν ευαγγελιον, τας γενηλο-

‘genealogies, and every thing else that shows our Lord to have been born of the seed of David, according to the flesh.’ And if Theodoret’s words are to be understood strictly, that Tatian not only omitted the genealogies which showed our Lord’s descent from David, but also all those places of the gospels where Jesus is spoken of occasionally as ‘the son of David,’ I see no way of answering this difficulty.

Otherwise, there are several things very favourable to the supposition, that this is Tatian’s Harmony. It has an air of politeness in the style and method of it, even in the Latin translation, which suits Tatian well enough; who, as Eusebius says, ‘had^c the assurance to alter some words of the apostle Paul, and correct the composition and order of his style.’ It answers the description which Theodoret gives of Tatian’s performance, in two respects; it wants the genealogies and is very compendious. There are here also some marks of antiquity, as may appear hereafter: and from Dr. Asseman I learn, that Dionysius Bar-Salibi, bishop of Amida in Mesopotamia, in^d the twelfth century, who was well acquainted with^e Ephrem’s writings upon the gospels, writes^f in his preface to St. Mark’s gospel, speaking of Tatian’s Diatessarôn, ‘that St. Ephrem wrote commentaries upon that work, the beginning of which is “In the beginning was the word;”’ which are the first words of our shorter Latin Harmony.

This must be of considerable importance to Tatian, if it may be relied upon: I say, if it may be relied upon; for, as we in this part of the world have been puzzled about these two Harmonies, and each by turns has been ascribed to Tatian and Ammonius, so it is very possible that eastern writers likewise, of late times, may have made mistakes in this

γιας περικοψας, και τα αλλα οσα εκ σπερματος Δαβιδ κατα σαρκα γεγεννημενον τον Κυριον δεικνυσιν. Theodoret. Hær. Fab. l. i. cap. 20.

^c See before, p. 149.

^d Vid. Asseman. Bibl. Or. T. ii. p. 210.

^e Dionysius Barsalibæus, e Jacobitarum sectâ, Amidæ in Mesopotamiâ episcopus, in suis commentariis in evangelia sæpe laudat Ephræmi commentaria in textum evangeliorum; de quibus, in Præfatione in Marcum, sic loquitur. Assem. T. i. cap. vi. p. 57.

^f Aliud ab Ammonii et Tatiani Diatessarôn agnoscit, [Bar-Salibæus,] fol. 150. Eliæ nimirum Salamensis Syri, de quo in præfatione in Marcum, cap. 9. ‘Tatianus, Justini Martyris ac philosophi discipulus, ex quatuor evangeliiis unum digessit. Hunc librum S. Ephræm commentariis illustravit, cujus initium, “In principio erat Verbum.” Elias Salamensis, qui et Aphthonius, evangelium confecit instar τβ Diatessarôn Ammonii, cujus meminit Eusebius in Prologo ad Canones Evangelii. Nam quum Elias illud Diatessarôn quæsisset, nec invenisset, aliud ipsi simile elaboravit.’ Assem. T. ii. p. 159, 160.

matter. Ebedjesu, bishop of Soba, who flourished^g at the latter end of the thirteenth century, in^h his Catalogue, confounds Tatian and Ammonius, making both one. However, this testimony of Bar-Salibi is of the more weight, in that he appears to have known both these authors and their works: for Dr. Asseman has observed, thatⁱ Bar-Salibi, in his commentaries upon the gospels, quotes the Harmonies of Tatian and Ammonius. This then may be reckoned very honourable to Tatian's Harmony; for if Ephrem wrote commentaries upon it, it may be argued that it was not so contemptible, or so heretical, as some have thought.

This will be of some use to lessen the force of an objection of Dr. Mill, who says that^k Tatian was a Valentinian, and therefore supposed our Lord's ministry to have been but of one year's duration; whereas this Harmony has three years. So different are men's ways of arguing! It seems it was a heresy in the Valentinians to allow but one year to Christ's ministry; and yet Valesius says, all the ancients computed no more. But to answer Mill only at present. First, it is not certain that Tatian was a Valentinian, when he composed his Diatessarôn. Secondly, supposing him to have been then a Valentinian, he might not have embraced every notion of theirs, or they may not have been all of the same opinion. It is now thought by many that the ancient catholics allowed but one year to Christ's ministry; but yet some plainly computed three passovers in it, and reckoned it an error or a heresy in the Valentinians, to say it lasted only one year: at least this was Irenæus's opinion. Thirdly, Ephrem's Commentaries afford a considerable argument, that Tatian's Harmony was not composed upon the Valentinian scheme. So far in answer to Mill.

And I do not know whether these Commentaries may not also afford us some help with regard to the difficulty which I have before acknowledged to be so considerable. If it were true, in the strictest sense, of Theodoret's words, that Tatian had left out every thing that showed Jesus to be the son of David, it is hard to conceive that Ephrem should

^g Vid. Assem. Bibl. T. i. p. 538, 539. et T. iii. p. 3.

^h Evangelium, quod compilavit vir Alexandrinus Ammonius, qui et Tatianus, illudque Diatessarôn appellavit. Ebedjesu, in Catalog. Libr. Eccl. cap. iii. apud Assem. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 12.

ⁱ Præter Ephræmum vero——auctores hi ab ipso citantur; videlicet, ——Ammonii et Tatiani Diatessarôn, fol. 30. Asseman. ib. Tom. ii. cap. xxxii. p. 518. Vid. quæ supra, not. ^f.

^k Accedit, quod tres annos prædicationis Christi distinguat; cum Valentiniani, e quorum numero fuit Tatianus, annum unum duntaxat Christi prædicationi tribuerint. Mill, Prol. n. 352. Conf. Basnag. A. 29. n. 26.

have taken so much notice of him. Moreover, Theodoret owns that this book was made use of by a large number of catholic christians, as a compendious work. As for his laying aside the copies he met with, and putting the four gospels in their room, let Tatian's Harmony be ever so good, he was in the right to take care that he did not supply the place of the four gospels.

There may be then some room to suppose, that Tatian's Harmony was not so defective or fraudulent as some have thought. If it had been composed throughout upon the Valentinian, or any other heretical scheme, one would think that Bar-Salibi should not have said that Ephrem wrote commentaries upon it, but rather that he had written a confutation of it: and possibly the bare name of the author made some people think worse of the work than it deserved. But Ephrem, as it seems, was not entirely governed by prejudice.

However, it ought to be owned that Gregory Bar-Hebræus, otherwise called Abulpharagius, who flourished in the thirteenth century, speaking of the Harmony used by Ephrem, calls it¹ Ammonius's of Alexandria: but then he plainly means the same Harmony that Bar-Salibi does, for he says it began with those words, 'In the beginning was the Word;' which agrees with our lesser Harmony. And I think it may be said that Bar-Salibi's testimony is the more valuable of the two; because he appears to have been acquainted with both these Harmonies, and speaks more like a man of understanding in this matter than Bar-Hebræus. And if we are not enabled hereby to determine whose Harmony this is, whether Tatian's or Ammonius's, yet we gain a material point, the antiquity of our lesser Harmony; which seems now to be rendered unquestionable, from these testimonies to Ephrem's commentaries upon it in the fourth century. Thus Mill's opinion, that it was not composed before the fifth century, is quite overthrown.

With regard to Ammonius's Harmony, I would observe two things: First, that I question whether we fully understand Eusebius's description of that work. We read

¹ Idem testatur Gregorius Bar-Hebræus, vulgo Abulpharagius, episcopus Tagritensis, in libro quem 'Horreum Mysteriorum' inscripsit, quo totam sacram scripturam brevissimis notis dilucidat; ubi præfatione in Matthæum sic de Ephræmo scribit: 'Eusebius autem Cæsariensis, videns corruptelas quas Ammonius Alexandrinus in evangelium Diatessarôn nuncupatum induxerat, ejus initium, "In principio erat Verbum," quod Sanctus Ephræm dilucidavit, quatuor quidem evangelia, ut in textu, perfecta integre reliquit; verba vero, quæ in ipsis consentiunt, communi canone notavit.' Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. cap. vi. p. 57, 58.

him with preconceived notions, taken from Harmonies and Evangelical Canons since composed, with which we are best acquainted; which may cause some to mistake Eusebius's meaning, whose words I do not well understand, at least I am not fully satisfied about his meaning: and I had rather suspend my judgment than determine positively in a doubtful point. Secondly, It is very probable that this work has been interpolated since it was first composed; nay, the very form of it may have been in some measure altered. If I mistake not, these two observations may weaken some of the arguments made use of by Mr. Wetstein, and other learned men, to prove that our larger Harmony is not the work of Ammonius.

After all, I am not positive of the genuineness of either of these Harmonies. I am nevertheless somewhat inclined to think that the lesser may be Tatian's for the main part; and the larger, in like manner, Ammonius's; but I do not think that either of them is sincere and uncorrupt. And considering that we have no certain account of any other ancient Harmonies beside those two of Tatian and Ammonius; and that both these appear to have been famous in every part of the world, in the east and west, and made use of in many languages; I apprehend, that every slight objection ought not to be regarded: and that they had need to be very good reasons indeed, which shall induce us to conclude that the two Harmonies we now have, which are plainly of great antiquity, are not the Harmonies of Tatian and Ammonius, or at least remains of them.

III. I shall now make some remarks upon both these Harmonies; and, in the first place, upon the shorter of the two, which at present is more generally called Tatian's than the other: and I may likewise call it so sometimes, for avoiding circumlocutions, still leaving every one to judge as he sees fit of the real author.

1. Tatian's Harmony then is a compendious history of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, taken out of the four gospels. It consists of four parts. The first is a kind of introduction, containing the history of our Lord's nativity, and the former part of his life: the three other parts are the three years of our Lord's ministry.

2. The introduction is formed out of the beginning of St. John's gospel, and the first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and the beginning of St. Mark's gospel. The genealogies do not appear here; but he plainly has the history in the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel, from ver. 21 to the end, as well as that in Luke, chap. i. Our

Lord is conceived in the womb of a^m virgin; Joseph is admonished of it; is brought to Bethlehem by means of the assessment ordered by an edict of Augustus, Joseph being of the family of David. Here Jesus is born. Then follows the history of the shepherds, the wise men, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the infants, and other things about that time recorded in the evangelists.

3. The author says, thatⁿ ‘the child Jesus abode seven years in Egypt.’ This is a singularity.

4. In the same introduction the author mentions our Lord’s journey to Jerusalem at the age of twelve years, his baptism, fast and temptation in the wilderness, and other things, which need not be insisted upon.

5. The remaining parts of this work consist of the three years of our Lord’s ministry. But though his ministry is here divided into three years, I apprehend that, according to this Harmony, it consists only of two years and a part; for the third^o year, in which our Lord dies, is not complete. The author therefore computed three passovers in the gospels, at the last of which Jesus suffered. And that he reckoned no more, is farther evident hence, that he does not suppose the ‘feast of the Jews,’ mentioned John v. 1, to have been passover, but pentecost, as he^p also plainly calls it. This is a mark of antiquity; modern harmonizers, who prolong our Lord’s ministry beyond the space of three years, generally reckoning this feast, though without any good reason, a passover. So Irenæus^q likewise computed ‘three passovers’ in our Saviour’s ministry. Origen too^r says, ‘That Judas was not three years with Jesus.’ It is true, he speaks in another place of our Lord’s having^s

^m Censi capite sunt tum forte, Octavii Augusti edicto, omnes qui Romano parebant imperio; quum Joseph Bethleem, quæ civitas erat David, ad quem genus referebat, simul cum virgine proficiscitur; ubi illa partu soluta, enixa est Jesum. Evangeliorum Quatuor Harmonia, Tatiano Syro auctore. Ap. Bib. Pat. T. ii. P. ii. p. 204. B.

ⁿ Crescebat interea puer, et confortabatur spiritu, continuum septennium agens in Ægypto, usque post Herodis interitum. Ibid. C.

^o Et hæc quidem res gestæ finem secundo Dominicæ prædicationis anno imposuere. Extremus annus Dominicæ prædicationis idem illi plane qui et vitæ finis fuit. Ibid. p. 207. H. 208. A.

^p Contulit autem se eo itinere Hierosolymam, ad solennia Pentecostes, ubi ad Probatricam piscinam expositum duodequadraginta annorum languidum, sabbato (mirum in modum sævientibus Phariseis) sanum fecit. p. 206. D.

^q Quoniam autem tria hæc paschæ tempora non sunt unus annus, quilibet confitebitur. Iren. l. ii. cap. xxii. p. 147. ed. Massuet.

^r Ὁ δὲ Ἰούδας παρα τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶδε τρία διετρυφεν ἐτη. Contr. Cels. l. ii. p. 67. Cant. T. i. p. 397. F. Bened.

^s Ἐπιαντον γὰρ πρὸς καὶ μηνῶς ὀλιγὰς εἰδαξέ. De Princip. l. iv. p. 160. Bened. p. 4. Philoc. Cant.

‘preached only a year and some months:’ but he may be reconciled by supposing only that he thought our Saviour’s whole ministry was above two, but not quite three years, whilst the most public part of it did not consist of more than a year and some months; which indeed I have long taken to be the truth, so far as I am able to learn it from a careful reading the gospels. In St. John’s gospel are three passovers, and our Saviour’s ministry has two years and a part; but the former part of his ministry there related, was not so public as that after John’s imprisonment. In the other three evangelists, who relate chiefly our Lord’s most public preaching^t after John the Baptist’s imprisonment, is the history of only somewhat more than the space of one year; how much more, is not very easy to say. All which is much confirmed by comparing them with St. John.

Since therefore the author of this Harmony does not compute three years complete, or more, in our Lord’s ministry, the objection of Valesius, before mentioned, is invalidated. And here is one mark of the antiquity of this Harmony: it having been in the fourth century, and afterwards, a common opinion, that our Lord’s ministry consisted of three years and a half; though indeed even then that opinion did not obtain universally.

6. But notwithstanding this author’s just notion of the duration of our Lord’s ministry, it must be owned he makes many mistakes, and places divers actions and discourses of our Lord at a wrong time. However, it becomes us not to be too severe in our censures of this kind: there is a respect due to the first attempts in any part of knowledge. Nor are modern harmonists free from prejudged opinions: and I am apprehensive that most of their Harmonies likewise had need to be read with indulgence and caution, as well as those of the ancients.

7. Possibly some may be so curious as to inquire, At what time of the year did this author begin our Lord’s ministry? and how much longer than two years did he suppose it to last? In answer to such inquiries I would observe, that^u the first thing mentioned by him, in his account of the third year of Christ’s ministry, is his presence at Jerusalem at the feast of the dedication; (John x. 22. 23;—) which feast was kept in the Jewish month

^t See Matt. iv. 12, 13; Mark i. 14; Luke iii. 19, 20.

^u Extremus annus Dominicæ prædicationis, idem illi plane qui et vitæ finis fuit. Deambulabat tum forte Jesus in porticu templi Salomonis, in Judæorum encæniis; et cingebant illum Judæi, improbis conatibus ferme urgentes ut palam Christum se esse fateretur. p. 208. A.

Cisleu, or Casleu, and usually happens some time in our month of December, and may fall out in November. Which affords some ground for thinking that this author reckoned our Lord's ministry commenced about that time of the year, and lasted therefore about two years and a half; he having been crucified at the feast of the passover.

And according to this notion of things, we may digest the history of John the Baptist's and our Lord's ministry in this manner. Near the end of the summer season, harvest and vintage being over, or near over, which was a time of general leisure, John began to preach and baptize. There was soon a great resort to him, and multitudes of people were baptized by him in Jordan. And, as St. Luke says, iii. 21, 22, "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him:" That is, at the conclusion of that season of baptizing, in November, or some time in the month of December, or perhaps in the beginning of January, Jesus came and was baptized of John in Jordan: after which he was led of the Spirit into the wilderness, where he fasted forty days and forty nights, and was tempted of the devil; enduring at the same time, beside other inconveniences, all that extremity of cold which is usual in that season of the year. The temptation being ended, Luke iv. 14; John i. 35—51, "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee:" where he soon found Andrew and his brother Simon, and Philip and Nathanael, who all, upon the testimony of John the Baptist, and some conversation with Jesus, believed in him as the Christ; and were the disciples who had the honour of the most early personal acquaintance with Jesus, after the descent of the Spirit upon him. A few days after was a marriage feast at Cana in Galilee, where Jesus made the water wine. This was the 'beginning of his miracles, and he thereby manifested forth his glory.' It follows: "And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem," John ii. 1—13. This is the first passover in our Lord's ministry. John the Baptist still continued preaching and baptizing. [See John iii. 23—36.] Before the end of this year John was imprisoned, and Jesus had chosen the twelve apostles out of the number of his disciples^v that believed

^v "And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples; and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles." Luke vi. 12, 13.

on him, and his most public ministry was commenced. The second passover of our Lord's ministry is that mentioned, John vi. 4. And at the third passover, mentioned by all the evangelists, he was crucified.

Thus had I been wont to digest the history of the public life of John the Baptist and our Saviour, as I collected it out of the gospels, (agreeably, as I apprehend, to the sentiments of the most ancient christian writers,) a good while before I had particularly observed the method of this Harmony, called Tatian's.

8. I would now observe some disputed passages of our gospels. The author appears to have had in ^w his copies the latter part of the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark's gospel.

9. He has likewise the history ^x of our Lord's agony, as we now have it in Luke xxii. 43, 44, which was wanting in some ancient copies, as we learn from ^y Hilary, and ^z Jerom, and ^a Photius; which last intimates that the omission of this text was owing to some Syrians. Mill ^b thinks they must have been of the sect of the Jacobites. And Dr. Asseman ^c has particularly observed, that this text is quoted by Ephrem the Syrian. Epiphanius ^d likewise says, that these two verses were in the ancient copies, before they were collected and altered by some over-nice catholics, who did not well understand them.

10. John v. 4, where is mention made of the descent of the angel who 'troubled the water' at the pool of Bethesda, is another disputed text, wanting in some copies. The angel is not mentioned ^e in this Harmony; but considering the compendious method of it, I suppose it cannot be hence

^w P. 212. A. B.

^x P. 210. D.

^y Nec sane ignorandum a nobis est, et in Græcis et Latinis codicibus computurimis, vel de adveniente angelo, vel de sudore sanguinis, nihil scriptum reperiri. Hilar. De Trin. lib. x. cap. 41.

^z In quibusdam exemplaribus tam Græcis quam Latinis invenitur, scribente Lucâ: 'Apparuit illi angelus de cælo, confortans eum,' &c. Hieron. adv. Pelag. l. ii. col. 521. m. Bened.

^a Και προσενζατο, και ηγωνιασε, και της παχεις εκεινης και παραπλησιες αιματος θρομβους ιδρωτας εξιδρωσεν. Μηκειτι εν σοι τα ευαγγελια τοδε το χωριον περικεκοφθαι, καν τισι των Συρων, ως εφης, δοκει ευπρεπες, νομιζε. Phot. ep. 138. ed. Montacut. p. 194. Lond. 1651.

^b Mill, Proleg. n. 1036.

^c In hoc hymno meminit sanctus doctor sanguinei sudoris Christi in horto: 'Locus in quo sudavit, coronam ipsi nectat.' Ex quo planum fit, versiculum illum Lucæ, cap. xxii. 44, tanquam genuinam evangelici textûs partem a S. Ephræm agnitum, et in Syriacâ versione olim expressum fuisse. Asseman. Bibl. Orient. T. i. p. 97. A. M. Vid. et ib. B. infr. M.

^d Epiphanius in Ancoratu, sect. 31. Confer Mill, Prol. n. 797, 798.

^e P. 206. D. See the words before, p. 448. note ^p.

concluded that it was wanting in the author's copy. Kuster's observations relating to the genuineness of this text, in his preface to his edition of Mill's New Testament, deserve to be considered.

11. Here^f also is the history of the woman taken in adultery, John viii. 1—11. The author does not take any notice of our Lord's 'stooping down, and writing with his finger on the ground,' ver. 6, 8. But it cannot be hence concluded that this was wanting in his copies, for the reason just mentioned.

12. This author often paraphrases and explains. It is worth the while to observe some examples.

Our Lord says, Matt. xvi. 28, "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. Compare Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27. Our author understands this of Christ's^g appearing in glory on the mount, soon after, in the presence of three of his disciples. And that appearance may be considered as an emblem of our Lord's future glory, when he shall 'come with the angels to reward every one according to his works:' which is spoken of in the preceding verse, and is not omitted in^h this Harmony. But Grotius understands those words of Christ's resurrection, ascension to heaven, the mission of the Holy Spirit, and the propagation of the gospel by mighty signs and wonders; by which, as by most certain and undoubted evidences, Christ's advancement to his kingdom was made known. However, this writer is countenanced in his method of interpretation by the speedy fulfilment of some things spoken of by our Lord in the gospels. For example: our Saviour having said to his disciples, in the two last verses of the ninth chapter of Matthew, "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest;" it follows immediately, at the beginning of the next chapter, x. 1, "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness,

^f P. 208. H.

^g Sed quid ego, inquit, vos moror, quando ex hoc præsentî cœtu quidam sunt, quibus majestas mea etiãnum vivis palam reddetur conspicua? Et interjectis sex ferme diebus, plane contigit hæc promissio, præsentibus in monte quodam excelso Petro, Joanne, Jacobo, discipulis. p. 206. F.

^h Contemptum autem se in humanâ specie, aliquando in gloriâ Patris inter angelorum agmina visendum ait, quando jus sit redditurus, et præmia cuique pro meritis. Sed quid ego, inquit, vos longius moror? &c. p. 206. F.

and all manner of disease." And after the names of the twelve apostles it is said, ver. 5, 6, "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

13. In Luke xix. 3, Zacchæus is said to have been 'little of stature.' This author callsⁱ him a 'dwarf.'

14. I said just now, that in this Harmony appears the history of our Lord's agony in the garden, as related in Luke xxii. 43, 44. The author calls it^k a 'bloody sweat;' and explains the 'angel's comforting him,' saying, it was 'an angelic voice from heaven, which gave him strength and courage.' This is an honest christian, whoever he be; he is not ashamed of what he thinks to be the truth.

15. He represents the substance of our Lord's discourse in John vi.; and then says: 'discoursing^l of the word of eternal life, and sometimes mentioning bread, and sometimes flesh and blood, many, out of the horror of the thing not rightly understood, forsook Christ. But Peter, on the other hand, exhorted them [or, 'the disciples'] to persevere, forasmuch as these were words of eternal life.' It does not appear, therefore, that he understood those words of Christ in the sense of transubstantiation, nor yet as relating to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper.

16. He represents the institution of the Lord's Supper, and the design of it, as a memorial, in this manner: 'And^m having taken bread, [or, 'a loaf'], and then a cup of wine, and having said that they were his body and blood, he commanded them to eat and drink: for it was [or, they were] a memorial of his future suffering and death.'

17. He places our Lord's discourses, as also his prayer for the disciples, which are in John xiii. xiv. xv. xvi. xvii; after the just-mentioned institution, andⁿ immediately

ⁱ Recta autem Hierosolymam petens, delatus Hiericho, inter eundem natio illo Zacchæo, ut se hospitio reciperet, accersito. Cap. 12. p. 208. D.

^k Laborabat autem angore tanto Dominus, ut sudore ejus sanguinolento tellus etiam maderet; quum protinus e cælo vox angelica auditur, quæ animum ac robur addidit. p. 210. B.

^l Proinde quum de verbo vitæ æternæ loquens, jam panem nominaret, modo carnem et sanguinem, multi, horrore rei perperam intellectæ concepto, a Christo descivère. At Petrus contra, quod verba hæc sint vitæ æternæ, perdurandum suadebat. p. 206. B.

^m Et mox accepto pane, deinde vini calice, corpus esse suum ac sanguinem testatus, manducare illos et bibere jussit, quod ea sit futuræ calamitatis suæ mortisque memoria. p. 210. A.

ⁿ Fixis deinde in cælum oculis, Patrem orat, ut se clarum mundo reddat; discipulos, et eos quoque qui illorum verbo credituri sint, a malo servet—

before the 'hymn' mentioned, Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26.

18. Simon the Cyrenian's 'bearing the cross,' or 'bearing the cross after Christ,' mentioned, Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26; he understands not of taking off the cross from Jesus, and laying it upon Simon to carry it after him; ° but of his 'helping to bear it,' as he expresses it; that is, I suppose, bearing the hinder part of the cross after Jesus. And this too is to be understood as being done, after that our Lord had bore it all himself some way. Compare John xix. 17, which is plainly also our author's meaning. So that in a few words he has finely harmonized all the four evangelists.

19. He thus represents the penitent thief's petition, and our Lord's gracious answer: 'And afterwards, when the^P thief prayed that he would not disdain, at least, to remember him in his heavenly kingdom; he promised, what he was not asked, that he would take care he should be that day in paradise.'

So far of Tatian's Diatessarôn, or Gospel of the Four.

IV. Ammonius's Harmony is very different; it is composed out of the four gospels, in the very words of the evangelist.

I. Here^a are both the genealogies; that is, after St. Matthew's genealogy from Abraham, the author adds that part of St. Luke's genealogy which ascends from Abraham to Adam and God. This Harmony^r takes in the latter part of Mark xvi. Here appears^s our Lord's agony as described in Luke xxii. 43, 44; and the disputed^t text of John v. 4, concerning the angel's 'coming down into' the pool of Bethesda, or Bethsaida, as it is here called, and 'troubling the water;' as also the history^u of 'the woman taken in adultery,' related, John viii. 1—11; with our Lord's 'stooping down, and writing with his finger on the ground.' This is one of Mill's arguments for^v the genuineness of this paragraph; that it is found in Ammonius's Harmony, who, he

Et e vestigio quum hymnum absolvisset cum discipulis Jesus, urbem egressus, &c. p. 210. C.

° Itaque latâ hac sententiâ, eductus inter duos latrones, crucem ipse sibi gestare cogitur. Sed et Simonem quendam Cyrenensem adigunt ad opem in eâ re ferendum. p. 211. B.

^P Latroni mox oranti, ut in regno cœlesti non gravaretur sui vel meminisse, paradysum eo die se præstiturum, quem non fuerat rogatus, pollicetur. p. 211. B.

^a Bibl. Patr. Tom. iii. p. 267. G. H. p. 268. A.

^r P. 299. B. C.

^s P. 299. A.

^t P. 297. E.

^u P. 285. E. F.

^v Vid. Mill. ad Joh. cap. vii. v. 53.

says, lived so early as the year 220, and therefore within a hundred and twenty years after St. John's death. On the other hand, this is one reason why^w Mr. Wetstein thinks this Harmony spurious; for he says this story was not in the copies used by Ammonius or Eusebius. For my own part, I am unwilling to argue hence, that this Harmony is not genuine in the main; because it may have been interpolated, and very probably has been so, in many places: and for the same reason I should not choose to argue from this Latin Harmony, that the paragraph of the 'woman taken in adultery' was originally in St. John's gospel. They who are desirous to see more of the dispute concerning this paragraph, may do well to consult^x Mill and others.

2. In this Harmony many of our Lord's discourses and actions are much out of place; as, the history of the miracle of turning water into wine at Cana in Galilee, our Lord's^z conversation with the woman of Samaria, Nicodemus^a coming to Jesus by night; and many other things, which may be easily perceived to be so by any man of judgment.

3. The author seems to have supposed that the Lord's prayer was delivered but once. I infer this, because he inserts the occasion of the prayer mentioned Luke xi. 1, into Matt. vi.; and joins with our Lord's directions concerning almsgiving, fasting, and prayer, recorded in the last-mentioned place, after this manner: "But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do; for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be^b not ye therefore like unto them; for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. Then one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father,——."

Herein I take him to have been partly in the right: the prayer which Christ taught his disciples, was not delivered more than once. For I do not suppose that our Lord ever spoke at one time all those discourses, the substance of

^w Prolegomena ad N. T. ed. accurat. cap. 6. p. 66, 67.

^x Mill, ad Johan. cap. vii. 53. et Proleg. n. 251. sq. 892. Vid. et Bez. et Hammond. et Cleric. ad Joh. cap. vii. 53. Grot. ad cap. viii. i. Basnag. Ann. 32. num. 1.

^y P. 273. C.

^z P. 279. A. B.

^a P. 285. C. D.

^b Nolite ergo assimilari eis: scit enim Pater vester quid opus sit vobis, antequam petatis eum. Tunc dixit unus ex discipulis ejus ad eum: Domine, doce nos orare, sicut et Joannes docuit discipulos suos. Et ait illis, Cum oratis, dicite: Pater noster, qui es in cœlis, &c. p. 271. G.

which is recorded, Matt. v. vi. vii. But St. Matthew thought fit to place near the beginning of his gospel a summary of our Lord's doctrine delivered by him at divers times, and in divers places. The particular occasions, times, and places of many things recorded in those three chapters of St. Matthew, may be found in St. Luke's gospel. A large part of our Lord's sermon on the mount, as it is called, recorded by St. Matthew, is the same with that in Luke vi. ver. 20—49. The occasion of the Lord's Prayer is given in Luke xi. 1.—The time and occasion of our Lord's delivering those arguments against the love of riches, and against solicitude, which are recorded in Matt. vi. 19—34, are to be sought in Luke xii. 13—34, where are the same precepts and arguments, and the occasion of them. The like may be said of some other matters in those three chapters of Matthew. And the finding so many parts of the discourse which we have in that evangelist recorded again in St. Luke's gospel, at several places, greatly confirms the supposition, that all that long discourse, called our Saviour's sermon on the mount, was not delivered at one and the same time. I may not stay to consider every little objection and difficulty attending this observation; it is sufficient for the present to have proposed it to the consideration of the judicious.

4. In this Harmony is no doxology; it is likely it was wanting in the author's copies both of St. Matthew and St. Luke. The prayer concludes here with that petition: 'And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.'

5. The words of John xi. 7, 8, are thus put^c in this Harmony: 'Then after that, saith he to his disciples, Let us go into Judea again. His disciples say unto him, Rabbi, [or master,] into Judea! The Jews of late sought to stone thee, and goest thou thither again?'

^c Deinde, post hæc, dicit discipulis suis, Eamus in Judæam iterum. Dicunt ei discipuli, Rabbi, in Judæam! nunc quærebant te lapidare Judæi: et iterum vadis illuc? p. 188. G.

CHAP. XXXVII.

JULIUS AFRICANUS.

JULIUS AFRICANUS is placed by Cave at the year 220, who likewise supposes that^a he died in an advanced age, about the year 232. But I know of no very good reason for thinking that Africanus was then in an advanced age, or that he died so soon. Tillemont, however,^b thinks it undoubted, that he was older than Origen; (who was born, as he says, in 185; since in a letter to him he calls him^c ‘his son.’ Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, (having in the preceding chapter spoken of Origen, particularly of his preaching at Cæsarea, and some of his most celebrated scholars, who had come from distant parts to be instructed by him,) writes of Africanus to this purpose: ‘At^d that time flourished Africanus, author of the work ‘entitled Cesti. There is extant a letter of his to Origen, ‘in which he suspects the history of Susanna, in the book ‘of Daniel, to be spurious and a forgery, whom Origen ‘answers at large. There^e are come down to us also these ‘other pieces of the same Africanus: A chronological work, ‘in five books, accurately written, in which he speaks of ‘his having taken a journey to Alexandria, excited by the ‘fame of Heraclas; whom we have before related to have ‘excelled in the knowledge of philosophy, and other parts ‘of Greek learning, and to have been appointed bishop of ‘that church. There is also another epistle of Africanus ‘to Aristides, concerning the supposed differences in the ‘genealogies of Christ, which are in Matthew and Luke, ‘where he evidently demonstrates the harmony of the ‘evangelists out of a history he had received.’ When Africanus took this journey to Alexandria, Heraclas was only presbyter and catechist: he was not bishop of that city before the year 231.

There is another short account of this great man in St. Jerom’s Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers. ‘Julius^f

^a Profectâ jam ætate mortuus est, circa 232. Cav. H. Lit. P. i. p. 72.

^b Tillem. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 32.

^c Χαίρει, κυριε με και υίε. African. Ep. ad Orig. in.

^d Eus. l. vi. cap. 31.

^e Τε δ’ αὐτε Ἀφρικανὸν καὶ ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν πέντε χρονολογιῶν ἤλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπ’ ἀκριβεῶς πεπονημένα σπυδασμάτα. Ibid.

^f De Vir. Ill. cap. 63.

‘ Africanus, whose five books of Chronology are extant, in
 ‘ the time of the emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus, successor
 ‘ of Macrinus, undertook ^s an embassy for the restoration
 ‘ of the city of Emmaus, which was afterwards called Ni-
 ‘ copolis. There ^h is an epistle of his to Origen concerning
 ‘ the history of Susanna, wherein he says, that history is
 ‘ not to be found in Hebrew, nor is it agreeable to the
 ‘ Hebrew etymology, which is there written *απο τῆς σχινης*
 ‘ *σχισαι, και απο τῆς πρινης πρισαι*; in answer to whom Origen
 ‘ wrote a learned epistle. There is another letter of his to
 ‘ Aristides, in which he copiously treats of the difference
 ‘ which there seems to be in the genealogy of our Saviour in
 ‘ Matthew and Luke.’

This settles the time of Africanus; the emperor whom St. Jerom means being Heliogabalus, whose reign began in 218, and ended at 222. The embassy for that city shows the country where he chiefly resided, and affords an argument that he was a man of repute in the world; but whether he was a native of Palestine, or of Africa, is not certain. Suidas says, ‘ Africanus,ⁱ called Sextus, a philosopher of Libya, [or Africa,] wrote the Cesti, in 24 books.’ He also gives an account of the design of that work: and says that Origen answered the same author’s objections against the history of Susanna. But it may be questioned whether the author of the Cesti was not a different person from our Julius Africanus. However, since the more ancient writers have not particularly informed us that he was of Africa, I think it best not to rely too much on Suidas.

In Eusebius’s Chronicle, (I mean Jerom’s Latin version of that work,) at the fourth year of the fore-mentioned emperor, of Christ 221, the same matter is thus expressed: ‘ In ^k Palestine the city Nicopolis, which before was called
 ‘ Emmaus, was founded; Julius Africanus, author of the
 ‘ Chronology, undertaking an embassy for that purpose.’ This Emmaus has been generally supposed by learned men to be the same with that mentioned by St. Luke, ch. xxiv. 13. But Reland^l argues, that Emmaus, afterwards called

^s Legationem pro instauratione urbis Emmaüs suscepit quæ postea Nicopolis appellata est. Ibid. ^h Hujus est epistola ad Origenem super quæstione Susannæ; eo quod dicat in Hebræo hanc fabulam non haberi, nec convenire cum Hebræicâ etymologiâ, *απο, &c.* Ibid.

ⁱ Suid. in V. *Αφρικανος.* ^k In Palestinâ Nicopolis, quæ prius Emmaüs vocabatur, urbs condita est, legationis industriam pro cæ suscipiente Africano, scriptore Temporum. Eus. Chr. p. 173.

^l Vid. Adr. Reland. *Palæstin. Illustrat.* lib. ii. cap. 26. p. 426, 427.

Nicopolis, was another place, situated at a greater distance from Jerusalem.

Eusebius mentions four pieces of Africanus; the Cesti, the Chronology, and two letters, one to Origen, the other to Aristides. St. Jerom has omitted the first of these: Photius mentions them all four; he calls the chronological work a history, and gives a great commendation of it, when he says, ‘That^m though Africanus is concise, he omits ‘nothing that is necessary to be related.’ Photius adds, ‘That he begins at the Mosaic creation, and from thence ‘reaches down to the nativity of Christ. He likewise ‘succinctly relates things from Christ to the Roman emperor Macrinus.’ So Photius. Nevertheless it has been observed by severalⁿ learned men, from a fragment of Africanus himself, that this work was brought down by him to the year of Christ 221, the third or fourth year of Heliogabalus, successor of Macrinus.

From the passages already transcribed, we are in a good measure able to form a judgment concerning the genuineness of any other books which may be ascribed to Africanus. And whether the Cesti were written by him, is disputed. Valesius,^o Joseph^p Scaliger, and^q Du Pin think the author of that work to have been a different person. They suppose there were two of this name; our Julius of Palestine, author of the Chronology and a christian; the other an African, called Sextus, author of the Cesti, and a gentile philosopher. Tillemont says,^r that if this work was composed by Africanus, and the accounts left us of it be right, it was written by him whilst he was a heathen, and before his conversion to christianity. Cave speaks in the same manner, in the first part of his *Historia Literaria*; but he mentions it only as a conjecture; and I think it is mere conjecture. Africanus was a christian; this we know; but we have no ground to say he was originally a heathen, no ancient author having said any such thing; and Cave, in the second part of that work,^s delivers it as his judgment, that this piece was not written by Africanus. From the same learned writer I learn that the Cesti were published, though not very correctly, at Paris, in 1693; but I have not been so happy as to see them. I think it observable,

^m Cod. 34.

ⁿ Vid. Scaligeri Animadv. in Eus. Chron.

p. 232. Pagi, Crit. in Bar. 220. sect. 2. Tillemont, Jule Africain, note 2.

^o Vales. Annot. in Eus. l. vi. cap. 31.

^p Scal. Animadv.

in Eus. Chr. p. 232.

^q Pin, Nouv. Bib. Julius Africanus.

^r Till. Mem. Ecc. Jule Africain, init.

^s Interim Africani

nostri opus esse non videtur; etsi aliter visum veteribus, et recentiorum plurimis. Cav. Hist. Lit. P. ii. p. 50.

that Jerom does not mention this among the other works of Africanus; and for that reason, and because the fore-cited words of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, mentioning the Cesti among the works of Africanus, are wanting in Rufinus's version, Valesius^t thinks they are an interpolation, and that they ought to be blotted out. However^u Joh. Ger. Vossius, and J. Rodolph^v Wetstein, are of opinion, that this piece is rightly ascribed to Africanus; to whom I would refer those who are desirous to know more of this matter: for I do not think fit to swell this article with a particular account of their arguments upon a point which is of no great importance.

There is plainly no regard due to Trithemius, who^w reckons among the works of Africanus such as these: Of the Trinity, Of Circumcision, and others, which are books ascribed by^x Jerom, and by^y Trithemius himself, in another place, to Novatus. It may deserve a little more consideration, whether he wrote any commentaries upon the New Testament. It has been observed by^z Cave, and^a Fabricius, that Ebedjesu, who flourished^b at the end of the thirteenth, and died in the beginning of the following century, in the year 1318, affirms there were then extant^c Commentaries of Africanus, bishop of Emmaus, upon the New Testament, and his Chronicle. One Julius likewise is alleged^d in the Greek Chains, and sometimes called bishop. Dr. Asseman says, that Moses Bar-Cepha, who flourished in the latter end of the ninth century, quotes the Commentary of one^e Julius upon St. John's gospel, which has been observed likewise by^f Fabricius. And Dionysius Bar-Salibi, bishop of Amida in Mesopotamia, at the end of the twelfth century, in his Commentaries upon the gospels, quotes Africanus bishop^g of Emmaus. But, after all, I apprehend here is no sufficient ground to believe that our Julius Africanus wrote upon the New Testament. It is much better to rest satisfied with the accounts left us by

^t Vales. *ibid.* p. 127.

^u De Hist. Gr. l. ii. cap. 2.

^v Wetst. not. in Ep. Afr. ad Orig. Col. 151—154. Basil. 1674.

^w Trithem. de Script. Ecc. cap. 38.

^x De Vir. Ill. cap. 70.

^y Trith. *ibid.* cap. 44.

^z Vid. Cav. H. L. P. i. p. 74.

^a Fab. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 270.

^b Vid. Asseman, Bibl.

Orient. T. i. p. 539.

^c Beatus Africanus, episcopus Emmaüs,

habet Commentaria in Novum Testamentum, et Chronicon. Ebedjesu, Catalog. Libr. Syror. ap. Assem. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 14.

^d Et Julius quidam subinde in Catenis allegatur, et in Catenâ Corderiani in Johannem vocatur Julius episcopus. Fabr. *ibid.*

^e Assem. *ibid.* T. ii. p. 129.

^f Fabric. *ibid.*

^g Auctores hi ab ipso citantur.—Africanus, episcopus Emmaüs, Comment. in Evangel. fol. 33, 37. Asseman, *ibid.* T. ii. cap. 32. p. 158. A.

Eusebius, and Jerom, and Photius, who take no notice of such a work.

Africanus is reckoned by Jerom, in his letter to Magnus, among other eminent ancient^h christian writers. His Chronology is the work which Jerom particularly mentions; which is an argument that this was our author's principal performance; and Socrates has joined him with Clement and Origen, calling them 'i men skilful in every part of ' knowledge.' Tillemont^k says, it appears that Africanus understood Hebrew. He concludes this from an observation^l in Africanus's letter concerning the history of Susanna. Possibly this would be more apparent, if his Chronology were still extant.

That work is all lost, except some fragments. But it is supposed that Eusebius inserted a large part of it into his own Chronicle; though it is not easy to say what belongs to Africanus. And other historians have made good use of it. There is a large fragment of his letter to Aristides in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, and his letter to Origen is still extant entire.

I shall now put down what I have observed to our purpose in the remains of this great man.

I. Eusebius, in his Evangelical Preparation,^m has a long passage out of the third book of the Chronology of Africanus; but I have no occasion to transcribe any thing out of it at present.

II. In Eusebius's Evangelical Demonstrationⁿ is another passage taken out of the fifth book of the same work. This passage is quoted likewise by St. Jerom, in his Commentaries upon the book of Daniel; where Africanus, speaking of the 70 weeks, after which Christ was to appear, uses this expression: That 'visions^o and prophecies were until John,' as the words are in Eusebius's Greek: 'the law^p and the prophets were until John,' is in Jerom's Latin; which are our Lord's words, Luke xvi. 16. Compare Matt. xi. 13. Here it appears that Africanus placed

^h Extant et Julii Africani libri, qui temporum scripsit historias. Hier. ep. 83.

ⁱ Κλημεντα, και Αφρικανον, και Ωριγενην, ανδρας πασης σοφιας επισημονας. Socrat. Hist. l. ii. cap. 35. p. 130. B.

^k Till. Jule African, p. 31.

^l Εν μεν εν Έλληρικαις φωναϊς τα τοιαυτα ομοφωνειν συμβανει.—εν δε τη Έβραϊδι τω παντι διετηκεν. Afric. Ep. ad Orig. sect. 1.

^m Pr. Ev. lib. x. p. 487—493.

ⁿ D. Ev. l. viii. p. 389—391.

^o Όρασεις τε και προφητειαι μεχρις Ιωαννα. Ap. Eus. Dem. Ev. ib. p. 389. C.

^p Et impleta est visio, et prophetia, quia lex et prophetæ usque ad baptistam Joannem. Hieron. Com. in Dan. cap. ix. Col. 1110. Benedict.

the death of Christ in the^a 16th year of the reign of Tiberius, as the passage is in Eusebius; in the^r 15th year of the same reign, as it is in Jerom.

III. In George Syncellus is a fragment of Africanus, said to be taken out of the fifth book of his Chronology; where, speaking of our Lord's^s passion and resurrection, he says, 'That all his works of healing, both of the bodies and souls of men, and the mysteries of his birth and resurrection from the dead, were sufficiently made known to his apostles and disciples before us. There was a dreadful darkness over the whole world; and the rocks were rent by an earthquake; and many buildings were overturned in Judea, and other parts of the earth.' Then he makes remarks upon what Thallus had written concerning an eclipse or darkness about the same time. There can be no question but Africanus here refers to our gospels, particularly to Matt. xxvii. 51, 52; Luke xxiii. 44, 45. I wish we had what preceded these words; and that we had what follows them more exactly than we seem to have at present.

IV. I proceed to the letter to Aristides, 'concerning the disagreement supposed to be between the gospels in the genealogy of Christ.' It is thus introduced by Eusebius: 'But^t forasmuch as Matthew and Luke have differently delivered to us, in their gospels, the genealogy of Christ, so that great numbers of the faithful, through ignorance of the truth, have been mightily concerned to contrive solutions of that difficulty, let us take the account which Africanus gives in his epistle to Aristides, concerning the harmony of the genealogies in the gospel, where^u rejecting the opinions of others, as forced, and even false, he delivers the account he had received in these words: "For whereas the descents of families in Israel are reckoned either according to nature, or according to law; according

^a Κακειθεν επι το Τιβεριω Καισαρος εκκαιδεκατον ετος, εις ετη εξηκοντα. Ap. Eus. ibid. p. 390. B. ^r Atque exinde usque ad annum quintum decimum [εκκαιδεκατον] Tiberii Cæsaris, quando passus est Christus, numerantur anni sexaginta. Ap. Hieron. ib.

^s Αφρικανω περι των κατα το σωτηριον παθος και την ζωοποιον αναστασιν, εκ τε περιπτω λογω. Το δε καθ' εκατον των πραξεων αυτω και θεραπειων σωματος και ψυχων, και των της γενεσεωσ αποκρυφων, αναστασεωσ τε της εκ των νεκρων, ανταρκεστωσ προ ημων μαθηταισ τε και αποστολοισ αυτω δεδηλωται. Καθ' ολω τε κοσμω σκοτωσ επεγενετο φοβερωτατων' σεισμων δε αι πετραι διερρηγγυντο, και τα πολλα Ιουδαιασ και της λοιπωσ γησ κατερριφη. Ap. Geo. Syncell. Chronog. p. 322. Paris. 1652. et Euseb. Chronologos πρωτοσ, p. 77. ed. Scalig. Amst. 1658. ^t Eus. H. E. l. i. cap. 7. in.

^u Τασ μεν δη των λοιπων δοξασ ωσ αν βιωωσ και διεψευσμενωσ αποδειξασ' ην δ' αυτωσ παρεληφεν ισοριαν, ττωτοισ αυτωισ εκτιθεμενωσ τοισ ρημασι. Ibid. p. 20. D.

‘ to the order of nature, when it is by the succession of a
 ‘ natural seed; according to law, when another begetteth a
 ‘ son to succeed in the name of a brother deceased without
 ‘ issue:—And whereas, accordingly, of them who are reckon-
 ‘ ed in this genealogy [of Christ] some succeeded in a proper
 ‘ and natural order, as sons to their fathers; but some, be-
 ‘ gotten by one, received the name of another; therefore
 ‘ mention is made of both: of those who were truly fathers,
 ‘ and of those that were legal only, and as fathers. Thus
 ‘ neither of the gospels is false: one containing the line of
 ‘ nature, the other of law. For the families both of Solomon
 ‘ and Nathan were mixed together, partly by second mar-
 ‘ riages, partly by raising up seed to those who died with-
 ‘ out issue: so that the same persons had divers fathers,
 ‘ whereof some were reputed fathers, others really so. Thus
 ‘ both the accounts are true, and exactly meet and agree in
 ‘ Joseph. That what had been said may be made plain, I
 ‘ will observe the order of the descents. Reckoning the
 ‘ descent from David by Solomon, [according to Matthew,]
 ‘ Matthan is found to be the third from the end, who begat
 ‘ Jacob, the father of Joseph. Reckoning from Nathan, the
 ‘ son of David, according to Luke, in like manner the third
 ‘ from the end is Melchi, whose son was Eli, the father of
 ‘ Joseph. Joseph therefore being the person we are con-
 ‘ cerned about, it must be shown how each of these can be
 ‘ called his father; both Jacob, who descended from Solo-
 ‘ mon, and Eli, who comes from Nathan. And in the first
 ‘ place it must be shown, how these two, Jacob and Eli,
 ‘ were brothers; and then how their fathers, Matthan and
 ‘ Melchi, can be grandfathers of Joseph. This will be
 ‘ cleared up thus: Matthan and Melchi, having married suc-
 ‘ cessively one and the same woman, begat children, which
 ‘ were brothers by the same mother.—The first therefore,
 ‘ Matthan, descended from Solomon, begat Jacob of Estha;
 ‘ for that was the woman’s name. After the death of Mat-
 ‘ than, Melchi, who descended from Nathan, taking the
 ‘ widow to be his wife, had by her Eli. Thus we have found
 ‘ Jacob and Eli, though of different families, brothers by
 ‘ the same mother; one of whom, Jacob, his brother Eli
 ‘ having died without issue, took his wife, and begat of her
 ‘ the third Joseph, according to nature and reason his own
 ‘ son: wherefore also it is written, “And Jacob begat
 ‘ Joseph:” but according to law he was the son of Eli; for
 ‘ Jacob being his brother, raised up seed unto him. For
 ‘ which reason^v neither is that genealogy destitute of

^v Διοπερ εκ ακυροθησεται και η κατ’ αυτον γενεαλογια, ην Ματθαιος μεν ο

‘ authority, which the evangelist Matthew rehearses thus :
 ‘ “ And Jacob begat Joseph.” On the other hand Luke :
 ‘ being, as was supposed, (for he adds this withal,) the son
 ‘ of Joseph, “ which was the son of Eli, which was the son
 ‘ of Melchi.” He could not more^v plainly and properly
 ‘ express that kind of descent which is according to law.
 ‘ And so exact is he, that reciting the genealogy of this
 ‘ sort, he entirely omits the word ‘ begetting,’ to the very
 ‘ last, though he carries up the line step by step to Adam,
 ‘ “ who was the Son of God.”’

We are farther assured by Africanus, that this^x account was given by some who were kinsmen of our Lord according to the flesh. However, he says, ‘^y though it were unsupported by any such testimony, yet this account of the matter ought to be reckoned the best and the truest. But, be it so or not, the gospel is certainly true.’

Once more^z Eusebius says, ‘ And at the end of the same epistle he [Africanus] adds: “ Matthan, who descended from Solomon, begat Jacob. Matthan being dead, Melchi, who descended from Nathan, begat of the same woman Eli; Eli therefore, and Jacob, were brothers by the same mother. Eli died without issue, Jacob raised up seed to him, having begotten Joseph, according to nature indeed to himself, but according to law to Eli. So Joseph was ‘ the son of both.” Thus far Africanus.’

It ought to be observed, that whereas we read in our copies of St. Luke, iii. ver. 24, “ Which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, which was the son of Melchi:” Africanus omits the two former descents, and reads only the last. I hope this whole passage is now intelligible.

And that we have here the true reading of Africanus, is confirmed by a passage of Bar-Salibi, transcribed^a by Dr. Asseman.

εὐαγγελιστῆς ἐξαριθμημένος, Ἰακωβ δε φησιν ἐγεννησε τον Ἰωσηφ. Ibid. p. 22. B.

^v Την γὰρ κατὰ νομον γενεσιν ἐπισημοτερον ἐκ ἧν ἀναφορὰν ποιησαμενος ἕως τῆς Ἀδαμ καὶ τῆς Θεᾶς κατ’ ἀναλυσιν. Ibid. p. 22. B.

^x Τῶ γένει Σωτῆρος οἱ κατὰ σάρκα συγγενεῖς, εἴτ’ ἐν φανητιῶντες, εἰθ’ ὁπλῶς ἐκδιδασκοντες, παντῶς ἀληθευοντες, παρεδσαν καὶ ταυτα. p. 22. C. ‘Ὁν ἐτυγχανον οἱ προειρημενοι δεσποσῦνοι καλεμενοι. p. 23. B.

^y Καὶ ἡμῖν αὕτη μελετω, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐμμάρτυρος ἐστὶ, τῷ μὴ κρείττονα ἢ ἀληθεσιαν εἶναι εἰπείν. Το μῦτοι εὐαγγελιον παντῶς ἀληθευει. p. 23. C.

^z P. 23. D.

^a Quos Lucas refert Christi progenitores, eos ex Africano, Eusebio, Nazianzeno, Sarugensi, Græcisque et Syriacis codicibus, sic enumerat, [Dionys. Bar-Salibi,] fol. 37. ‘ Africanus et Eusebius ‘ tertium numerant Melchi, sicut etiam Mathan tertio loco collocat ante ‘ Joseph, hoc modo: “ Joseph filius Heli, filii Melchi.” In codicibus vero

St. Augustine, in his ^b *Retractations*, entirely approves of this method of reconciling the genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke; and Dr. Wall ^c says, ‘The best hypothesis that has been given for reconciling the two catalogues, is the old one of Africanus.’ I persuade myself therefore, that it will not be disapproved by any, that I have set it so much at large before my readers. I would add, that Mr. Richardson ^d has a dissertation upon this subject, which well deserves to be read by the curious.

But, whatever becomes of this method of reconciling the two evangelists, here is a very valuable testimony to their gospels, and in particular a cogent argument for the genuineness of the beginning of St. Matthew’s. It does not plainly appear that any whom Africanus disputed with, rejected it; though some may be ready to suspect this from those words: ‘For which reason neither is that genealogy destitute of authority, which the evangelist Matthew rehearses;’ which words possibly may be thought to imply, that St. Matthew’s genealogy was not altogether unquestioned, or reputed of equal authority with St. Luke’s. But I do not take that to be the design of those words, Africanus afterwards expressing himself in a like manner ^e also of St. Luke’s genealogy; his intention therefore is only to assert the truth and propriety of both. But if there were any whom Africanus argued against, who took this method of solving or evading the difficulty, it must be one of those opinions which, as Eusebius says, ‘Africanus rejected as false;’ since it is evident that he maintains the truth, authority, and usefulness of both the genealogies.

Considering then the learning and the age of Africanus, and the country in which he resided, and the history he had received from some of the kinsmen of Jesus according to the flesh; and that he made a particular inquiry into this matter, and appears to have been fully satisfied about it; it must be reckoned that we have here all the evidence for the genuineness of this part of St. Matthew’s gospel that can be well desired.

V. The letter to Origen concerning the history of Susanna, is generally supposed to have been written about the ^f year 228, though there are some learned men who are

‘Syriacis, qui apud nos extant, saneti Lucæ, quinto loco numeratur: “Joseph filius Heli, filii Matath, filii Levi, filii Melchi.”’ Asseman, *Bib. Or.* Tom. ii. cap. 32. p. 161, 162.

^b *Retract.* I. ii. cap. 7.

^c *Brief Critical Notes upon the N. T.* p. 65.

^d Joan. Richardson. *Prælect. Ecclesiast.* I. de Christi Genealogiâ.

^e *Ουδέ μὴν ἀναποδείκτον ἢ ἐσχεδιασμένον ἐστὶ τὰτο*, p. 22. C.

^f *Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 236. Tillemont, Mem. Ec. T. iii. P. ii. p.*

rather inclined to^g the year 240, twelve years after. The occasion of it was this: Origen, in a conference with one Bassus, where Africanus was present, made use of that history. Africanus, thinking it spurious and forged, took an opportunity some while after to write to Origen upon that point. It is a fine letter, learned and critical; and though short, does a great deal of honour to its author.

As the question in dispute relates only to a part of a book of the Old Testament, and the letter is very short, here are no quotations of the New Testament. However, Africanus here observes, ‘that^h all the books of the Old Testament were written in Hebrew, and from thence were translated into Greek;’ which shows that there was a collection of books, called the New Testament, for which he had the like respect with that paid to the books of the Old Testament, written in Hebrew.

VI. But it will be worth the while to observe what books Origen quotes to Africanus in his answer, which is long. Here then are several quotations of the gospels ofⁱ St. Matthew and St. Luke. The Acts of the Apostles^k are expressly quoted. Here are words of the epistle to^l the Romans, and first to the Corinthians; and^m St. Paul’s first epistle to the Thessalonians is expressly quoted at length. The epistle to the Hebrews is cited in this manner: Origen says, ‘That the story of Susanna being dishonourable to ‘the Jewish elders, it was suppressed by their great men; ‘and that there were many things kept as much as might ‘be from the knowledge of the people, some of which ‘nevertheless were preserved in some apocryphal books. ‘Of this,’ says he, ‘I shall give an instance in some things ‘related of Isaiah, and mentioned in the epistle to the He- ‘brews, though not written in any of their open books. ‘For the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, discoursing ‘of the prophets and their sufferings, says, “they were ‘sawn asunder, they were slain by the sword.” To what ‘person, I pray, does that relate, “they were sawn asun- ‘der?” according to an ancient custom, not only of the

38. Jule African; et T. iii. P. iii. p. 263.

^g Vid. Huet.

Origenian. l. iii. cap. 4. sect. 1. et Admon. in African. Ep. ed. Bened. T. i. p. 8.

^h Εξ Ἑβραίων δε τοὺς Ἕλλησι μετεβλήθη πανθ’ ὅσα τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης φερεται. African. Ep. ad Orig. sect. 1.

ⁱ Vid. Orig. Ep. ad Af. sect. 7. p. 18. D. E. Tom. i. Bened. sect. 9. p. 20. B. C. D.

^k Καὶ ἐν Ἰσραῆσι δε τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὁ Στεφανὸς μαρτύρων ἐπὶ πολλοὺς καὶ ταῦτα λέγει. κ. λ. Ibid. sect. 9. p. 22. A.

^l Ibid. sect. 4. p. 16. C.

^m Καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ τῆς πρὸς Θεσσαλονικεὺς ἐπιτολῆς ταῦτα περὶ Ἰσραίων μαρτύρων φησιν. Ibid. sect. 9. p. 22. B. C.

‘ Jews but also of the Greeks, expressed indeed in the
 ‘ plural number, but meant of one. It is certain that tra-
 ‘ ditions say, Isaiah the prophet was sawn asunder; and it
 ‘ is mentioned in an apocryphal [or ‘ secret ’] book, which
 ‘ perhaps some of the Jews have designedly corrupted;
 ‘ inserting in that piece some unbecoming things, that the
 ‘ whole might be discredited. But possibly someⁿ one,
 ‘ pressed with this argument, will take refuge in the opinion
 ‘ of those who reject this epistle as not written by Paul.
 ‘ In answer to such a one we design [or, ‘ had need ’] to
 ‘ write a distinct discourse, to show that epistle to be
 ‘ Paul’s.’

Hence it appears, that there were some in the eastern part of the world, as well as in the west, who rejected the epistle to the Hebrews: and it may be suspected, at least, that Origen did not know that Africanus received it as the apostle Paul’s.

VII. However, we have seen in Africanus an uncommon attestation to the two gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and especially to their genealogies. Several books of the New Testament are alleged and quoted to him by Origen, as of authority. He plainly had a volume, or collection of books, with the title and denomination of the New Testament, of equal authority with the Jewish sacred and canonical scriptures, written originally in Hebrew. There is therefore no ground to doubt, but sufficient reason to believe, that this great and learned man received as scripture the books generally received by christians in his time, and particularly by Origen, with whom he was well acquainted. Whether he received the epistle to the Hebrews as the apostle Paul’s, we cannot certainly say; nor have we any good ground to suppose he rejected it. The same may be said with regard to the other books of the New Testament, which were doubted of by some at that time. We do not know his opinion concerning them. In these, and some other matters, we should have had fuller satisfaction, if more of his learned and elaborate performances had come down to us.

As it is, we may glory in Africanus as a christian. For it cannot but be a pleasure to observe, that in those early days there were some within the inclosure of the church of Christ, whose shining abilities rendered them the ornament

ⁿ Ἀλλ’ εἰκος τινα ἐλιβόμενον ἀπο τῆς εἰς ταῦτα ἀποδείξεως, συγχρησασθαι τῆ βιβλίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὡς ἔ Παυλῶ γεγραμμένην. Πρὸς ὄν ἄλλων λόγων κατ’ ἰδίαν χρῆζομεν εἰς ἀποδείξιν εἶναι Παυλὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν. Ibid. sect. 9. p. 19, 20.

of the age in which they lived ; when they appear also to have been men of unspotted characters, and give evident proofs of honesty and integrity.

CHAP. XXXVIII.

ORIGEN.

- I. *His history and character.* II. III. *Select passages of Origen.* IV. V. VI. *Three catalogues of the books of the N. T.* VII. *Of the four gospels.* VIII. *Acts of the Apostles.* IX. *St. Paul's epistles.* X. *The epistle to the Hebrews.* XI. *The epistle of St. James.* XII. *First and second of St. Peter.* XIII. *St. John's three epistles.* XIV. *St. Jude's epistle.* XV. *The Revelation.* XVI. *Whether Origen says, that from the beginning christians were divided about the books of scripture.* XVII. *A passage containing a general enumeration of the books of the New Testament.* XVIII. *General titles and divisions of the books of scripture.* XIX. *Respect for them.* XX. *Reading them recommended.* XXI. *Publicly read.* XXII. *The inquiry, whether Origen received as scripture any books not in the present canon, proposed.* XXIII. *Of ecclesiastical writings cited by Origen, St. Barnabas's epistle ; St. Clement's ; The Recognitions ; the Shepherd of Hermas ; St. Ignatius.* XXIV. *Spurious and apocryphal writings ; apocryphal gospels in general ; the gospel according to the Hebrews ; the gospel according to Peter ; the doctrine and preaching of Peter ; Acts of Paul ; an anonymous book.* XXV. *Jewish apocryphal books ; Tobit, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Susanna, Maccabees ; the books of Enoch ; the Twelve Patriarchs ; the Ascension of Moses ; anonymous pieces ; apocryphal writings said to be referred to in the N. T.* XXVI. *Remarks upon the foregoing citations.* XXVII. *Select various readings.* XXVIII. *Explications of texts.* XXIX. *General observations*

upon the scriptures of the New Testament. XXX. Whether Origen thought that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew. XXXI. Sum of his testimony.

I. ORIGEN was born in Egypt, in the year of our Lord^a 184, or^b 185, that is, the fifth, or the sixth of the emperor Commodus, and died in the sixty-ninth^c or seventieth^d year of his age, in the year of Christ^e 253. Porphyry^f affirms, that Origen was born of Gentile parents, and educated in the Gentile religion; but that afterwards, when he was grown up, he embraced the christian religion. This is flatly contradicted by^g Eusebius, who was a great admirer of Origen, and wrote his history at large, which^h he collected partly from Origen's own epistles, and partly from the relations of his scholars, who lived to his time. And I suppose that none have observed in Origen's remaining works any evidences of his having been a heathen; which certainly would have appeared, if Porphyry had spoken truth in this matter.

Eusebius informs us, that Leonides, Origen's father, took great care of his education; and that in his childhood he raised the greatest expectations from his quick improvement in several parts of knowledge, especially of the holy scriptures; so thatⁱ he often gave his father some trouble by his inquiries into the profounder meaning of them. His father seemingly reprov'd him before his face, bidding him to content himself with the plain obvious sense of the words, and not to aspire to things above his age; but at the same time he was exceedingly pleased: and it is reported that Leonides has stood by his son as he slept, and uncovering his breast kissed it with reverence, as honoured with the indwelling of the divine spirit, accounting himself extremely happy in a child of such attainments.

We have no very particular information who were

^a Pagi, Crit. in Baron. 202. n. vi.

^b Basnag. Ann. 203. n. xii. Tillemont, Origene, art. ii.

^c Vixit usque ad Gallum et Volusianum, id est, usque ad lxxix. ætatis suæ annum, et mortuus est Tyri, in quâ urbe et sepultus est. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 54. Vid. et Phot. Cod. 118. col. 297.

^d Ωριγενης εν τριτω [Γαλλω] ενος δεοντα της ζωης εβδομηκοντα αποπλησας ετη τελευτα. Eus. H. E. l. vii. cap. 1.

^e Pagi, 253. n. 23. Basn. 203. n. xii. Tillem. Mem. Origene, art. 25.

^f Ωριγενης δε Έλληνη εν έλλησι παιδευθεις λογοις, προς το βαρβαρον εξωκελε πολμημα. Ap. Eus. vi. cap. 19. p. 220. B.

^g Ψευσαμενω δε σαφως. Eus. ibid. p. 220. D.

^h L. vi. c. 2. p. 201. C.
p. 202. C. D. 293. A.

ⁱ Vid. Eus. ibid. c. 2.

Origen's masters. It is undoubted, however, that Clement,^k then catechist at Alexandria, was one. He likewise heard for some time, occasionally at least, the celebrated philosopher Ammonius Saccas, as Porphyry^l relates expressly, and owns that Origen made good proficiency in the knowledge of philosophy under that master. Theodoret mentions^m the same thing as a common report. But it must have been long after this time, when Origen himself had been catechist some while, as may be concluded from what he says in a fragment of a letter preservedⁿ in Eusebius, where he defends himself against those who accused him of too great affection for secular literature. Basnage^o thinks, Origen might be then about 30 years of age.

There was another of this name among the disciples of Ammonius, and one of the most eminent of them. It is certain that^p he ought to be distinguished from our Origen: he published but two^q pieces, and the latter of them in the reign of Gallienus, after the death of him whose history we are now writing.

Leonides suffered martyrdom^r in the year 202, the tenth of Severus, leaving behind him a wife and seven children, of which Origen was the oldest, but not quite seventeen years of age. In the very beginning of this persecution, Origen showed great zeal for christianity, and was ready to offer himself to martyrdom. Being detained at home by the prudent care of his mother, he sent^s a letter to his father in prison, earnestly entreating him to be constant.

^k Ὡς και τον Ωριγενην των φοιτητων αυτη παιδα οντα γενεσθαι. Eus. l. vi. cap. 6.

^l Ακροατης γαρ ουτος Αμμωνιου τε πλειστην εν τοις καθ' ημας χρονοις επιδοσιν εν φιλοσοφια εσχηκοτος γεγονωσ' εις μεν την των λογων εμπειριαν, πολλην παρα τε διδασκαλις την ωφελειαν εκτησατο. Porphyr. ap. Eus. l. vi. cap. 19. p. 220. A.

^m Theodoret. Gr. Aff. l. vi. p. 573. D. ⁿ Eus. l. vi. c. 19. p. 221. B. Conf. cap. 18. fin.

^o Ann. 203. n. 15. ^p Vid. Vales. Annot. p. 120. in Eus. l. vi. c. 19. Huet. Origenian. l. i. cap. 1. num. vii. et Fabric. Bibl. Gr. T. v. p. 213. et T. iv. p. 97. in not. ad Porphyr. cap. 3. de Vit. Plotini; et Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 86. Ammonio Saccas. Vid. et Pagi, Crit. Ann. 246. n. ii.

^q Vid. Porphyr. de Vit. Plotin. cap. 3, et 20.

^r Ὡς δε ηδη αυτω ο πατηρ μαρτυριω τετελειωτο, και βραχυτεροις αδελφοις τον αριθμον εξ, επτακαιδεκατον 8 πληρες αγων ετος καταλειπεται. Eus. l. vi. cap. 3. p. 203. B. Vid. et cap. 1. Origenes, qui et Adamantius, decimo Severi Pertinacis anno adversum christianos persecutione commotâ, a Leonide patre, Christi martyrio coronato, cum sex fratribus, et matre viduâ, pauper relinquitur, annos natus circiter decem et septem: rem enim familiarem, ob confessionem Christi, fiscus occupaverat. Hieron. De V. l. cap. 54. in.

^s Διαπεμπεται τω πατρι προτρεπτικωτατην περι μαρτυρις συνταξας επισολην, εν η κατα λεξιν αυτω παραινει, λεγων' Επεχε, μη δε' ημας αλλο τι φρονησης. Eus. ibid. c. 2. p. 102. B. C.

Eusebius has preserved but one line of it; but, as Tillemont justly observes, it is worth many volumes: ‘Take heed, father, that you do not change your mind for our sake.’

Upon the death of Leonides, the family was reduced to great straits, the estate being confiscated. Origen however was^t taken care of by a rich and honourable lady of Alexandria: but in a short time he was able to provide for himself by teaching grammar.

At this time^u the chair of the catechetical school was empty. Nor was there any one at Alexandria to teach the principles of the christian religion; the terror of the persecution had caused so many to abscond, or flee out of the city. There came^v then some heathens to Origen, desiring to be taught by him the christian doctrine. The first of these, as he writes himself, was Plutarch, who, after having lived well, obtained the honour of martyrdom. The second was Heraclas, Plutarch’s brother, who was bishop of Alexandria after the death of Demetrius. Origen was^w not above eighteen years of age when he was set over the catechetical school by appointment of Demetrius; in which office he was eminently useful, and besides gained the universal esteem of the faithful, by his frequent visits, and other kind offices, to the confessors in prison, whether strangers or of his particular acquaintance.

Having^x alone the whole care of the school, and the number of his disciples increasing, he left off teaching grammar, and confined himself entirely to religious instructions; in which he continued to be so successful, that there were no less than^y seven of his scholars who suffered martyrdom, one of which was a woman.

There must have been at that time no stated salary for the president of that school at Alexandria; and Origen was unwilling to receive a gratuity from those whom he instructed in the rudiments of the christian religion. ‘For,’ as Eusebius^z says, ‘prudently considering with himself ‘how he might be able to stand in no need of assistance

^t Eus. ib. p. 203. B. C.

^u Eus. ibid. c. 3. p. 204. A.

^v Ibid. A. B.

^w Έτος δ’ ηγεν οκτωκαιδεκατον, καθ’ ο τω της κατηχησεως προεση διδασκαλις, κ. λ. Eus. ibid. p. 204. B. D. Hic, Alexandriae dispersa ecclesia, decimo octavo ætatis suæ anno κατηχησεων opus aggressus, postea a Demetrio, ejus urbis episcopo, in locum Clementis presbyteri confirmatus, per multos annos floruit. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. ibid.

^x Επειδη δε έωρα φοιτητας ηδη πλειως προσιοντας αυτω μονη της τω κατηχησεν διατριβης ύπο Δημητριω τω της εκκλησιας προεσωτος επιτετραμμενης, κ. λ. Id. cap. 3. p. 205. B.

^y Ibid. cap. 4, 5.

^z Cap. 3. p. 205. C.

‘ from others, he sold all his volumes of ancient authors, which he had collected with great care, and contented himself with four *oboli* [or five-pence] to be paid him daily by the purchaser.’

Not long after this, or however whilst he was but young, in the 21st year of his age, as is supposed,^a of Christ 205 or 206, he was guilty of that^b rash and indiscreet action so well known. For being in his early youth obliged to teach women as well as men, and being desirous to put himself out of the reach of scandal, and to deliver himself from temptations, he was induced to fulfil upon himself, in a literal sense, the saying of our Saviour, Matt. xix. 12, where he speaks of those who “make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven.” It might be said, by way of apology for him, that those words have been so understood also by others: but, as the action is in itself unjustifiable, so Origen was afterwards convinced of his error, and publicly confuted in his writings the literal interpretation of that text, in such a manner as to show that he condemned himself; saying, beside other things, ‘But^c we, who once understood Christ according to the flesh, and according to the letter, but now knowing him no more in that manner, approve not of that interpretation,’ which he there mentions.

Notwithstanding his important employment in the school, Origen went^d to Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, bishop of that city, ‘having^e a desire, as he somewhere writes, to see the most ancient church of the Romans.’ Having made there a short stay, he returned to Alexandria, and applied himself again with the greatest diligence to his ordinary work of teaching the principles of religion; Demetrius still favouring his endeavours, and even quickening his zeal by earnest exhortations to promote the edification of the church. The exact time of this^f journey cannot be determined, only it must have been performed before 217; some think^g about the year 213.

Origen finding that he was not able to apply himself to the study of the scriptures, and the interpretation of them, as he desired, and to satisfy all those who from morning till evening came flocking to the school, took in Heraclas

^a Vid. Basnag. 203. n. xiii. Pagi, 206. n. ii.

^b Vid. Eus. l. vi. c. 8.

^c In Matt. Tom. xv. p. 368,

369. Huet.

^d Eus. l. vi. cap. 14. p. 216. D.

^e *Ευχαριμενος την αρχαιοτατην Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν ἰδεῖν.* Ibid.

^f Vid. Pagi, Crit. 215. n. iii. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. Origene, art. 8.

^g Vid. Basnag. 203. sect. 14.

before mentioned to be his partner in that work; committing to him the instruction of the younger scholars, and reserving to his own care those who had made some proficiency.

The next thing mentioned by^h Eusebius is Origen's learning the Hebrew tongue: upon which occasion he also speaks of his editions of the Old Testament, in one of which he placed in several columns the original Hebrew text, and the Greek versions of the Seventy, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and some others, the names of which are not known. St. Jeromⁱ likewise says, that such was Origen's desire to understand and promote the knowledge of the scriptures, that, contrary to the custom of his time and country, he learned the Hebrew language; nay, he says he was^k admired by all Greece upon that account. However, divers^l learned moderns have observed, that Origen's skill in Hebrew was not exact.

Eusebius^m adds, 'About this time Ambrose, who followed the Valentinian heresy, was brought over to the orthodox doctrine of the church by the preaching of Origen.' St. Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, givesⁿ this account of Ambrose: 'That he was at first a Marcionite; afterwards, having been convinced of his error by Origen, he became a deacon of the church, and had the honour of suffering for Christ, as a confessor: to whom, and to Proctetus, Origen inscribed his book, Of Martyrdom: and that Origen dedicated to Ambrose many of his volumes, which were published at his desire, care, and charge. Ambrose was a man of a good family, and of no small wit, as his letters to Origen show. He died before Origen, and is blamed by many, that, though he was rich, he did not at his death remember his friend; who was not only poor, but likewise in his old age.'

So writes Jerom. Epiphanius informs us, that^o in his

^h L. vi. cap. 16.

ⁱ Quis ignorat et quod tantum in scripturis divinis habuerit studij, ut etiam Hebræam linguam, contra ætatis gentisque suæ naturam, edisceret? De Vir. Ill. cap. 54.

^k Vid. Hieron. 3. ep. 22. al. 25. init.

^l Huet. Origenian.

l. ii. c. i. sect. ii. p. 26. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. in Origen, art. ii. et note 3.

Vid. et Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 224.

^m Ibid. c. 18. in.

ⁿ Ambrosius, primum Marcionites, deinde, ab Origene correctus, ecclesiæ diaconus, et confessionis Dominicæ gloriâ insignis fuit; cui, et Procteto presbytero, liber Origenis de Martyrio scribitur. Hujus industriâ, et sumptu, et instantiâ, ad hunc infinita Origenes dietavit volumina. Sed et ipse, quippe ut vir nobilis, non inelegantis ingenij fuit; sicut ejus ad Originem epistolæ indicio sunt. Obiit ante mortem Origenis; et in hoc a plerisque reprehendatur, quod, vir locuples, amici sui senis et pauperis moriens non recordatus sit. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 56.

^o Τις δὲ τριτον

time it was said by some that Ambrose was at first a Marcionite, by others that he was a Sabellian; but I suppose Eusebius's account is the most credible, who calls him a Valentinian: his conversion might be made^p about the year 212. Protocetus was a presbyter of the church of Cæsarea in Palestine: his and Ambrose's confession for Christ was in the persecution under Maximin, about the year 236. Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History,^q speaks of their sufferings, as does likewise Origen in several places of his Exhortation to Martyrdom, inscribed to both of them, which is still extant. And there are besides remaining several other works of Origen dedicated to Ambrose: as his Commentaries upon St. John's gospel, the Treatise of Prayer, and the eight books against Celsus: which last shows, though Ambrose died before Origen, yet he lived to the year 250, or near it. St. Jerom says that Ambrose was a deacon of the church; at Alexandria, as is generally supposed. But Eusebius says nothing of this: and some^r are rather inclined to think he was a deacon of the church of Cæsarea, where Protocetus was presbyter. Origen, in a letter of which we have now only a fragment, calls Ambrose^s 'a man indeed devoted to God;' and speaks of his earnest desire to understand the scriptures, and his great application in the study of them. Ambrose had a wife named Marcella, by whom he had several children; she is commended by Origen,^t as a true christian, and faithful wife.

Eusebius^u informs us, that Ambrose was the person who excited Origen to write commentaries upon the scriptures, and that not only by words and entreaties, but by supplies of all things necessary: for there were seven notaries or more procured by him to attend Origen when he dictated, who relieved each other by turns: and besides there was a like number of young women, or others, skilful in the art of fair writing, all which were handsomely maintained by^v Ambrose.

των Αμβροσιον εφασαν οι μιν Μαρκιωνιτην, οι δε Σαβελλιανον. Epiph. Hær. 64. p. 526. 4.

^p See Tillemont, T. iii. P. ii. p. 59.

^q Ibid. cap. 28.

^r Ambrosium, ecclesiæ diaconum fuisse scimus ex Hieronymo; cujus vero ignoramus; eo tamen inclinatur conjectura, ut in Cæsariensi diaconum egerit. Origeni comes erat, qui plurimum Cæsareæ versatus est. Protoceto quoque Cæsariensi conjungit Ambrosium, dum ambobus librum de martyrio suum nuncupat. Basnag. Ann. 203. n. 22.

^s Vid. Orig. Op. T. i. p. 3. edit. Bened.

^t Ασπαζεται δε σε και η πισοτατη συμβιος αυτη Μαρκελλα άμα τοις τεκνοις. Orig. Ep. ad African. sub fin.

^u L. vi. cap. 23.

^v Ambrosius, quo chartas, sumtus, notarios ministrante, tam innumerabiles

Jerom said just now that Ambrose was blamed by many for leaving nothing at his death to Origen. But Tillemont thinks that Ambrose knew his friend's mind, and that Origen chose to be poor, and to live in a dependence on Providence.

Finally, St. Jerom speaks of Ambrose's epistles: but there is nothing of them remaining. It was fit, however, that we should give the account we have here done of this intimate friend and great admirer of Origen.

In the year of Christ 228, Origen was sent upon some affair of the church by Demetrius into Achaia. When he came to Cæsarea in Palestine, he^w was ordained presbyter by Theoctistus and Alexander, bishops in that country, being then about forty-three or forty-four years of age. Demetrius, who had before envied Origen's reputation, was now greatly^x offended at him: so that Origen, after his return from Athens, being very uneasy at Alexandria, left that city, and went to reside at Cæsarea, resigning the chair of the catechetical school to Heraclas,^y who had been already his partner for near twenty years. This happened in the year^z 231.

Upon this occasion Demetrius held two councils at Alexandria: in the first of which Origen was expelled that city, and forbid to teach in it; or, if he was retired before, the decree of the council must be understood to deprive him of the office he had enjoyed, and to forbid his return to Alexandria. This was all which that council would consent to, as Photius^a relates from Pamphilus. In the second he was deposed from being presbyter; and Jerom seems to say that he^b was excommunicated. Demetrius likewise sent letters to the bishops of the several parts of the world against Origen, who, as Jerom says, was thereupon condemned by the^c bishop of Rome, and generally

libros vere Adamantius et Chalcenterus noster explicavit. Hieron. ad Marcel. ep. 45. [al. 18.] p. 552. Conf. eund. de Vir. Ill. cap. 56, et 61.

^w Et cum jam mediæ esset ætatis, et propter ecclesias Achaiæ, quæ pluribus hæresibus vexabantur, sub testimonio ecclesiasticæ epistolæ Athenas per Palæstinam pergeret, a Theoctisto et Alexandro, Cæsareæ et Hierosolymorum episcopis, presbyter ordinatus, Demetrii offendit animum, qui tantâ in eum debacchatus est insaniâ, ut per totum mundum super nomen ejus scriberet. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. cap. 54.

p. 209. C. D. et cap. 23. p. 224. C. D.

^x Vid. Eus. ibid. cap. 8.

^y Eus. ibid. cap. 26.

^z See Tillemont, Mem. Origene, art. 19. and note 21.

^a Phot. Cod. 118. n. 297.

^b Contra sacerdotes ergo ecclesiæ generaliter disputans, a quibus indignus communione ejus fuerat judicatus. Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruf. l. ii. col. 411. T. iv. P. ii. Bened.

^c Porro hoc sudore quid accepit pretii? Damnatus a Demetrio episcopo, exceptis Palæstinæ, et Arabiæ, et Phœnicis, atque Achaiæ sacerdotibus. In

by all others, except the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Phœnicia, and Achaia, by whom he was still honoured.

Soon after this, in the^d very same year, as is supposed, Demetrius died, who was succeeded by Heraclas, and he by Dionysius, in the catechetical school; who^e was also one of Origen's scholars, and succeeded Heraclas in the bishopric of Alexandria: which, as Tillemont^f argues, may afford reason to conclude, that the animosity against Origen abated after the death of Demetrius.

Origen was well received at Cæsarea, where Theoctistus the bishop of that city, and Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, heard him as if he had been their master, and^g committed to him alone the interpretation of the scriptures, and other ecclesiastical instructions. Here there was a great resort to Origen, not only of the people of that country, but also of distant parts; the most noted of which were Gregory, afterwards called Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neocæsarea in Pontus, and his brother Athenodorus, afterwards also bishop in Pontus: these^h resided with Origen under his tuition for the space of five years. Firmilianus, at this time bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, invited Origen into his own country; andⁱ likewise made him several visits at Cæsarea in Palestine, and made a stay with him for the sake of farther improvement in divine knowledge. St. Jerom says,^k moreover, that Firmilianus, and all Cappadocia, pressed Origen to come to them; and that he actually accepted the invitation, and resided with them a good while. Tillemont^l thinks it probable that he lived there privately during the time of the persecution under Maximin; where also, as he supposes, he wrote his Exhortation to Martyrdom. Africanus was another of Origen's friends, with whom he had at least an epistolary correspondence. He wrote letters likewise to Fabian, bishop of Rome, and to divers other eminent bishops of the christian church; as

damnationem ejus consentit urbs Romana: ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum, non propter dogmatum novitatem, non propter hæresim,——sed quia gloriam eloquentiæ ejus et scientiæ ferre non poterant; et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur. Hieron. ep. 29.

και Δημητριος τελευτα. Eus. ibid. cap. 26.

p. 229. D.

^d Ουκ εις μακρον δε
^e Ibid. cap. 29.
^f Mem. Ec. Origene, art. 20. near the end.

^g Μοιρω τα της των θειων γραφων ερμηνειας και τα λοιπα τα εκκλησιαστικα λογη πραττειν συνεχωρων. Eus. ib. c. 27.

^h Ib. c. 30.

ⁱ Ib. c. 26, 27. ^k Quantæ autem gloriæ fuerit, hinc apparet, quod Firmilianus Cæsareæ episcopus, cum omni Cappadociâ, eum invitavit, et diu tenuit; et postea sub occasione sanctorum locorum Palæstinam veniens, diu Cæsareæ in sanctis scripturis ab eo eruditus est. De Vir. Ill. c. 54.

^l Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. Origene, art. 22. et note 24.

Eusebius assures us, who^m made a collection of Origen's epistles, to the number of a hundred and more.

We may observe here, as proofs of the uncommon abilities and suitable reputation of Origen, without concerning ourselves about the exact time of those events, which cannot be easily settled, if at all; thatⁿ Mamæa, mother of the emperor Alexander, sent for Origen to come to her at Antioch, that she might have discourse with him upon things of religion; at the same time, for his greater safety, appointing him a military guard to attend him in his journey: and^o that he had the honour to write a letter to the emperor Philip, and another to his wife Severa. These things are mentioned to the advantage of Origen by^p Jerom and others, as well as by Eusebius. But Jerom, instead of Philip's wife, says his mother.

And whilst Origen yet dwelt at Alexandria, as Eusebius^q says, there came a soldier who delivered letters to Demetrius bishop of that city, and to the præfect of Egypt, from the governor of Arabia, desiring them to send Origen to him with all speed, that he might have some discourse with him. Being therefore sent by them, he went into Arabia; and having in a short time finished the affair for which he was sent, he returned to Alexandria. Tillemont^r thinks this must have been before the year 217, when Origen was not more than thirty-one or thirty-two years of age.

Origen made another journey to Athens, beside that before mentioned by order of Demetrius. Eusebius, though he mentions this journey, does not inform us of the time of it; it is supposed, however, to have been about the year 240. Origen must have made some stay at Athens at this time; for he there^s finished his Commentaries upon Ezekiel, and began his Exposition of the Canticles.

At this time lived Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia. He was accused of saying,^t 'that our Lord and Saviour, before his coming to dwell among men, had no proper distinct subsistence; and that he had no godhead of his

^m H. E. l. vi. cap. 36.

ⁿ Ibid. cap. 21.

^o Ibid. cap. 36.

^p Sed et illud, quod ad Mammæam, matrem Alexandri imperatoris, religiosam feminam, rogatus venit Antiochiam, et summo honore habitus est: quodque ad Philippum imperatorem, ——— et ad matrem ejus literas fecit. De Vir. Ill. cap. 54.

^q L. vi. cap. 19. p. 221. D.
at the beginning.

^r Till. Origene, art. 13,

^s Eus. cap. 32. p. 231. A.

^t Τον Σωτήρα και Κυριον ήμων λεγειν τολμων μη προϋφεταναι κατ' ιδίαν κσιας περιγραφην, προ της εις ανθρωπος επιδημιας· μη δε μην θεοτητα ιδιαν εχειν, αλλ' εμπολιτενομενην αυτη μονην την πατριεην. Ib. c. 33. p. 231. C.

‘ own, but only that of the Father residing in him.’ There was a synod of bishops convened upon this occasion, at which Origen was present; and it is to his arguments chiefly that Eusebius ascribes the conviction of Beryllus. In another place our ecclesiastical historian says, that^u Beryllus left behind him divers epistles, and other writings, of an elegant composition. Beryllus is supposed by Cave to have flourished about the year 230.

Jerom’s account of this bishop is, ‘ That^v after he had ‘ for a considerable time presided in the church with great ‘ reputation, at length falling into that heresy which denies ‘ Christ to have subsisted before his incarnation, he was ‘ convinced by Origen. He wrote several pieces, particu- ‘ larly epistles, in which he thanks Origen: there are also ‘ letters of Origen to him. There is, besides, a conference ‘ of Origen and Beryllus, in which his heresy is confuted. ‘ He flourished in the time of Alexander, son of Mamæa, ‘ and Maximin, and Gordian, who succeeded him.’ Of these writings there is now nothing extant: they must have been very curious.

Eusebius^w informs us, that after this another dispute arose in Arabia; some there asserting, ‘ that the human ‘ soul died with the body, and turned to corruption, but at ‘ the time of the resurrection it should be revived together ‘ with it.’ For this reason a numerous synod was called, and Origen was desired to be present; where he discoursed publicly upon this question with such strength of reason, that they who had asserted the fore-mentioned doctrine were convinced, and altered their minds.

Eusebius adds,^x that at this time a new error arose, called the heresy of the Helcesaites, which was soon extinct. He transcribes there a passage of Origen concerning them, which we have no reason to insist upon at present.

When Origen was sixty years of age, and not before, as Eusebius^y informs us, about the year 244, he permitted his discourses which he made to the people to be taken down by short-hand writers; having by long use and exercise

^u ——— τῶν Βηρυλλος συν επιστολας και συγγραμματα διαφορες φιλοκαλιας καταλειπειν. Ibid. c. 20.

^v Beryllus, Arabiae Bostrorum episcopus, cum aliquanto tempore gloriose rexisset ecclesiam, ad extremum lapsus in hæresim, quæ Christum ante incarnationem negat; ab Origene correctus, scripsit varia opuscula; et maxime epistolas, in quibus Origeni gratias agit. Sed et Origenis ad eum litteræ sunt. Exstat dialogus Origenis et Berylli, in quo hæreseos coarguitur, &c. De Vir. Ill. cap. 60. ^w L. vi. c. 37. ^x Cap. 38.

^y Τας επι τη κοινῃ λεγομενας αυτη διυλεξεις, ταχυγραφους μεταλαβειν επιτρεψαι· ο προτιρον ποτε τῶτο γενεσθαι συγκεχωρηκοτα. Cap. 36.

gained a perfect habit of speaking. Of these homilies there were^z above a thousand, for he preached then almost every^a day. And about this time, as Eusebius proceeds to observe, Origen wrote his eight books against Celsus, and five-and-twenty tomes upon St. Matthew, and expositions of the twelve prophets.

In the Decian persecution, in 250, Origen^b was a great sufferer. He was imprisoned, and chained with an iron chain. He was put in the stocks, and for several days had his feet stretched to the distance of four holes; and suffered the threatenings of fire, and many other torments; the judge at the same time taking a great deal of care not to kill him outright. ‘Of all these things,’ as Eusebius says, ‘Origen had written in his own epistles, full of piety, and thoughts proper to comfort the afflicted.’ It is a great pity these epistles are all lost. They would have been very edifying, as all may perceive from the short passage already mentioned in Origen’s letter to his father, and from some other things we shall take notice of by and by.

Eusebius has nothing more of Origen after this, except that^c he says he died in the time of Gallus in the 70th year of his age. And we know from Jerom and Photius that he died and was buried at Tyre as was before mentioned.

Origen’s works were extremely voluminous: but, though some catalogues of them were composed, none of them are remaining. Eusebius says he had inserted^d an exact catalogue of them in his life of Pamphilus; but that life is not come down to us. St. Jerom says, in his book of Illustrious Men, that he forebore to give there a^e particular account of Origen’s works because he had already done it in one of his letters to Paula; but of that letter we have only a small fragment remaining.

It was long ago said of Origen, that^f he had written six thousand volumes. Jerom^g however is pleased to say,

^z Mille et eo amplius tractatus, quos in ecclesiâ loquutus est, edidit. Hieron. ep. 41. al. 65.

^a Præcipue vero per eos tractatus, quos pene quotidie in ecclesiâ habebat ex tempore; quos et describentes notarii, ad monumentum posteritatis tradebant. Apologia Pamph. pro Orig. col. 221. ap. Hieron. T. v. Benedict.

^b Cap. 39.

^c L. vii. cap. 1.

^d L. vi. cap. 32.

^e Et quia indicem operum ejus in voluminibus epistolarum, quas ad Paulam scripsimus, in quâdam epistolâ contra Varronis opera conferens posui, nunc omitto. De V. I. cap. 54.

^f *Εὐ γὰρ εἶναι ἀληθὲς ὃ περὶ σὲ ἀδεῖται, ὅτι ἑξακισχιλίας βιβλίας συνεγραψω,* κ. λ. Eriph. Hær. 64. sect. 63. p. 591. D.

^g Numera indices librorum ejus, qui in tertio volumine Eusebii, in quo scripsit vitam Pamphili, continentur: et non dico sex millia, sed tertiam partem non reperies. Hieron. Apol. adv. Ruf. l. i. T. iv. col. 419. Bened.

that, from the catalogue composed by Eusebius, it appears they did not amount to one third part of that number; but Eusebius's catalogue might not be complete; and, according to different ways of computing books or volumes, the number may be very different. Pliny^h calls the several books of his Natural History volumes. St. Jerom says, Origenⁱ wrote three volumes upon the epistle to the Ephesians, and five volumes^k upon the epistle to the Galatians. According to that way of reckoning, what a vast number of volumes must Origen have written upon the scriptures! especially if he wrote, as^l Epiphanius says, upon all the books of scripture: and, as^m Jerom informs us, three sorts of works; Scholia, or brief notes; Tomes, or commentaries; and Tracts, or homilies to the people. Origen wrote, as Jerom says, thirtyⁿ volumes upon only a part of Isaiah; and upon^o St. Matthew's gospel five-and-twenty volumes, beside as many homilies, and notes or scholia. His epistles^p made several books or volumes. St. Jerom speaks^q of the volumes of his own letters to Paula only, and^r calls the several books of Eusebius's life of Pamphilus so many volumes. Origen's homilies, all composed and published after he was sixty years of age, amounted to above a thousand. Accounting each one of these, and each book, or tome, or division of his other works, for a volume, and there might be six thousand volumes, some larger, some smaller;

^h Viginta millia rerum dignarum curâ——includimus triginta sex voluminibus. Plin. Præf.

ⁱ In epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios tria Origenes scripsit volumina. Hieron. ad. Ruf. ibid. col. 373. in. Vid. et ejusdem Prol. in Ep. ad Ephes.

^k —— Origenis commentarios sum sequutus. Scripsit enim ille vir in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas quinque propria volumina. Id. in Prol. in Comm. in Ep. ad Galat.

^l Vid. Epiph. Hær. 64. n. iii. p. 526. D. et n. v. p. 529. A.

^m Et illud breviter admonens, ut scias Origenis opuscula in omnem scripturam esse triplicia. Primum ejus opus excerpta, quæ Græcè *σχολια* nuncupantur, in quibus ea quæ sibi videbantur obscura, atque habere aliquid difficultatis, summam breviterque perstrinxit. Secundum *ὀμιλιτικόν* genus, de quo et præsens ejus interpretatio est. Tertium, quod ipse inscripsit *τομῆς*, nec volumina possumus nuncupare, in quo opere tota ingenii sui vela spirantibus ventis dedit, et recedens a terrâ in medium pelagus aufugit. Hieron. in Proleg. in Interpret. Ezech.

ⁿ Scripsit enim in hunc prophetam, juxta editiones quatuor ad visionem quadrupedum in deserto Origenes triginta volumina, &c. Prol. in Is. T. iii.

^o Legisse me fateor ante annos plurimos in Matthæum Origenis viginti quinque volumina, et totidem ejus homilias, commaticumque interpretationis genus. Prol. in Matt. T. iv.

^p Ne quis vero censeat sex illa librorum volumina, si modo totidem ab Origene scripti sunt, ingentia quædam volumina fuisse.——Epistolæ singulæ, singuli tomi, singulæ homiliæ, suo quæque titulo et nomine in hunc censum venerunt. Huet. Originian. l. iii. cap. I. n. v. p. 235.

^q See before, note ^e.

^r See before, note ^g.

which perhaps was the method by which some computed. Montfaucon^s thinks that Origen's Hexapla alone made at least fifty volumes of a very large size. Jerom himself owns, in another place, that^t Origen had written more than any other man could read: and in the fragment of the letter to Paula, where he gave a catalogue of Origen's works, he^u sets him against Varro, and all the Greek and Latin authors that ever were, as having exceeded the most laborious of them all. And it is from his unwearied pains in reading and writing that some think^v he had the name Adamantius; though others say it was given him^w because of the strength of his reasons, and the firm connection of his arguments. Eusebius, who^x says this was a common name of Origen, assigns no reason for it.

But though those two large and particular catalogues above mentioned are not now extant, there are accounts to be found of a good number of Origen's works in ancient writers, particularly in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, who has^y several chapters concerning them; and observes of divers of them, that they were written before Origen left Alexandria.

I have no occasion to give here a distinct account of Origen's works now extant: this has been already done so fully^z by divers learned men, that it is altogether superfluous in this place. It will be sufficient for the readers of this work, after the general history just given of this great man, to observe, that a large part of his works are entirely lost; and that of those which remain the greatest part consist only of Latin translations, made by Jerom or Rufinus, chiefly by the latter: but that nevertheless we still have, in the original Greek, Origen's Treatise of Prayer: his Exhortation to Martyrdom, addressed to Ambrose and Protoctetus, written in the persecution under Maximin, in

^s Vid. Præliminaria in Hexapla Origenis, cap. xi. sect. 1.

^t Quis nostrum tanta potest legere, quanta ille conscripsit? Ep. 41. al. 65.

^u Videtisne et Græcos pariter et Latinos unius labore superatos? Quis enim unquam tanta legere potuit, quanta ipse conscripsit? Ep. 29. col. 68. ed. Bened.

^v Quorsum Varronis et Chalcenterii mentio facta sit, queritis? Videlicet, ut ad Adamantium nostrumque Chalcenterum veniamus; qui tanto studio in sanctarum scripturarum labore sudavit, ut juste Adamantii nomen acceperit, &c. Id. ibid.

^w Τετον τοιων τον Ωριγενην, ον και Αδαμαντιον επονομαζεσθαι φασιν, οτι αδαμαντινους δεσμοις εφκεισαν ος αν δησειε λογης. Phot. Cod. 118. c. 297. M.

^x Ο γε τοι Αδαμαντιος, και τετο γαρ ην τω Ωριγενει ονομα. Eus. l. vi. cap. 14. p. 216. D.

^y Vid. l. vi. cap. 16, 24, 25, 31, 32, 33, 36.

^z Vid. Huet. Origenian. l. iii. cap. 3, 4. Cav. Hist. Lit. I. A. Fabric. Bibl. Gr. l. v. cap. i. sect. 26. Basnag. Ann. 203. n. xxii. xxiii. Du Pin, Bibl. Tillem. Mem. Ecc. Origene, art. 27. et seqq. et notes 29—41.

the year 235 or 236: his *Apology for the Christian Religion*, in eight books, against Celsus the Epicurean, composed, as some think, in the year 246, or, as others, not before 249; an excellent performance, greatly esteemed and celebrated, not only by ^a Eusebius and ^b Jerom, but likewise by many judicious men of late times, particularly by Du Pin; who says, ‘^c that it is polite, just, and methodical: not only the best work of Origen, but the completest and best written apology for the christian religion which the ancients have left us.’ Beside this, we still have in Greek an *Epistle of Origen to Africanus*, by some supposed to have been written in 228, by others in 240: another to Gregory Thaumaturgus: and fragments of a few other epistles: a part of his *Commentaries upon divers books of the Old and New Testament*, published by Huet: and we have reason to hope that the Benedictine editors of Origen’s works will make some new additions from manuscripts of commentaries which have not yet seen the light, especially upon the New Testament: *Philocalia*, containing extracts out of Origen’s works, made by Gregory Nazianzen and Basil the Great. These extracts are taken out of Origen’s tomes and homilies upon divers books of the Old and New Testament, and out of his books of Principles, and those against Celsus: and here is entire the *Epistle to Gregory Thaumaturgus* before mentioned. There are likewise in the collections out of the Fathers upon books of scripture, called *Chains*, many notes or scholia, supposed to be Origen’s; some of which are undoubtedly his, others ^d are admitted by learned men not without hesitation.

The Latin translations of Origen’s works, especially those made by Rufinus, have been often complained of as not faithful: and some learned ^e men suspect that the pieces still extant in Greek have been interpolated, or otherwise altered, to make this great man speak more agreeably to

^a Eus. contr. Hierocl. p. 511.

^b Scripserunt contra nos Celsus atque Porphyrius: priori Origenes, alteri Methodius, Eusebius, et Apollinaris, fortissime responderunt. Hieron. ep. 83. al. 84.

^c Du Pin, *Bibl. Origenes*, p. 142. Amst.

^d Vid. *Monitum in Psamos*, ed. Benedict. T. ii. p. 512.

^e Verum in hodiernis Origenis scriptis nihil non sanum et orthodoxum de peccato originali traditur—unde forte dicatur quæ in hodiernis ejus scriptis pro peccato originali comparent, aliena manu invecta fuisse. Nam opera Origenis in scripturam variis in locis interpolata, aut vitiata, vel truncata fuere: neque in promptu est dicere, quænam in scriptis ejus corrupta, quænam germana, et Græculorum ausibus intacta sunt. Rufini quoque versio vulgo suspecta habetur. Bern. Montfauçon, *Prelim. in Euseb. Comm. in Psalmos*, cap. vii. sect. 2. Vid. et Huet. *Origen. l. ii. cap. 1. sect. 3.*

the modern orthodoxy upon original sin, and some other controverted points, than he really thought or wrote.

There are some writings which have been ascribed to Origen without ground: as, two different works upon the book of Job, a Dialogue against the Marcionites, Philosophumena, and some other pieces, which I shall not cite as Origen's: but, if I make use of them at all, I shall speak of them distinctly about the time when they are supposed by the best critics to have been written.

It would be too tedious for me to enter into the particular consideration of Origen's sentiments about which the world sometimes has been divided: and this argument has been treated at large by Huet and others, to whom the curious may have recourse when they think fit.

On account of the different opinions of men concerning him, it has been often said, that he is a remarkable example of one who has passed through good and through ill report. It is probable that some of his sentiments were disliked by some in his lifetime: since Eusebius, speaking of his letters written to Fabian and other bishops, says, that therein^f he wrote of his own orthodoxy. The apology written for him jointly by Pamphilus and Eusebius, at the beginning of the fourth century, is a proof of the charges brought against him and his writings before that time; and indeed it must be owned that Origen, in his books of Principles, and some other works, gives a vast scope to his fancy. It is however observable, that the treatise of the Resurrection, the books of Principles, and the Stromata, the works which afterwards gave the most offence, were written before Origen left Alexandria, as Eusebius^g particularly observes: which seems to show that there was nothing in them that was reputed heretical at that time. They gave no offence till afterwards: for Origen was not expelled Alexandria for heresy, but for envy. It is probable, therefore, that he began to be censured as heterodox soon after his removal from Alexandria; for he mentions this in his^h letter to his friends in that city: but he treats it as a malicious calumny.

But though I forbear enlarging upon that matter, it is fit I should take notice of some of the testimonies of the

^f Γραφει δε και Φαβιανω τω κατα' Ρωμην επισκοπω, έτεροις τε πλεισις αρχεσιν εκκλησιων, περι της κατ' αυτον ορθοδοξιας. Eus. l. vi. cap. 36. p. 233. B.

^g Ib. cap. 24.

^h Quidam eorum qui libenter contentiones reperiunt, adscribunt nobis et nostræ doctrinæ blasphemiam, super quâ ipsi viderint quomodo illud audiant: 'Neque ebriosi neque maledici regnum Dei possidebunt.' Orig. T. i. p. 5. B. ed. Bened.

ancient writers to his great merit and uncommon fame. Eusebiusⁱ assures us, that there was honourable mention made of Origen in the works of divers Gentile philosophers of that time, some of which dedicated books to him; others sent their books to be revised and examined by him. Eusebius also transcribes a^k passage of Porphyry, in his books against the christian religion, where he certainly bears witness to his learning, how much soever he may affect to depreciate his judgment; for he says that Origen not only read Plato, but likewise divers Stoic and Pythagorean philosophers, whom he mentions by name.

St. Jerom's characters of Origen deserve some especial notice. 'In^l his book of *Illustrious Men* he calls him a 'man of immortal wit, and ascribes to him the knowledge 'of logic, geometry, arithmetic, music, grammar, and 'rhetoric, and of the opinions of all sects of philosophers; 'so that there was a great resort of persons to him for 'the sake of instruction in these parts of polite literature; 'whom likewise Origen received chiefly with this view, 'that he might thereby the better lead them to the christian 'faith.' The account which Jerom^m gives of the *Stromata*, is another proof of Origen's acquaintance with the Greek philosophers and their writings, and confirms what Porphyry says of the same matter.

St. Jerom sometimesⁿ styles Origen the greatest doctor of the churches since the apostles: the same thing had been said before by^o Didymus, Jerom's master, who was a favourer of our Origen. In another place Jerom^p says he

^l Euseb. l. vi. cap. 19. in.

^k Euseb. ib. p. 220.

ⁱ Illud de immortalitate ejus ingenio non tacens, quod dialecticam quoque, et geometriam, arithmetica, musicam, grammaticam, et rhetoricam, omniumque philosophorum sectas, ita didicit, ut studiosos quoque sæcularium literarum sectatores haberet, et interpretaretur quotidie; concursusque ad eum mirifici fierent, quos ille propterea recipiebat, ut sub occasione sæcularis literaturæ in fide Christi eos institueret. De V. l. cap. 54. Vid. et Euseb. H. E. l. vi. cap. 18.

^m Hunc [Clement. Alex.] imitatus Origenes, decem scripsit *Stromateas*, christianorum et philosophorum inter se sententias comparans; et omnia nostræ religionis dogmata de Platone, et Aristotele, Numenio, Cornutoque confirmans. Hier. ep. 83. al. 84.

ⁿ Imitari volens Origenem, quem post apostolos ecclesiarum magistrum nemo nisi imperitus negabit. Hieron. Præf. in libr. de Nom. Hebr. Non mihi nocbit, si dixerò; Origenes, quum in cæteris libris omnes vicerit, in Cantico Canticorum ipse se vicit. Nec formidabo sententiam, quâ illum doctorem ecclesiarum quondam adolescentulus nominavi. Id. in ep. 41. al. 65.

^o Magnum est quidem, amice, quod postulas, ut Origenem faciam Latinum, et hominem, juxta Didymi videntis sententiam, alterum post apostolum ecclesiarum magistrum, etiam Romanis auribus donem. Hier. Præf. in Translationem Homiliarum Orig. in Jerem. et Ezek.

^p Hoc unum dico,

would willingly undergo all the hatred Origen had met with, if he had but also his knowledge of the scriptures. In a letter written when he was not in the humour to bestow excessive commendations upon Origen, he says: ‘That^q he was a great man from his childhood, and the true son of a martyr; that he trampled the world under foot, vanquishing both the love of pleasure and of riches; and that he had the scriptures by heart, and laboured day and night in studying and explaining them.’ To conclude, in another place he says, ‘He thinks^r Origen ought to be read sometimes, because of his learning; just as we read Tertullian, Novatus, Arnobius, Apollinarius, and some other ecclesiastical writers both Greek and Latin, taking what is good in them, and leaving what is otherwise; according to the rule of the apostle, who says, “Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.”’ This may be reckoned a good rule to be observed, not only in reading these writers here mentioned, but all the rest of the fathers; and all books in general, except the holy scriptures.

Sulpicius Severus, beside other things concerning Origen, says, ‘He^s wonders how one and the same man could be so different from himself: that where he is in the right, he had not an equal since the apostles; and where he is in the wrong, no man ever erred more shamefully.’ Vincentius Lirinensis, who was far from being favourable to Origen’s sentiments, celebrates his virtue, fine^t genius, vast learning, eloquence, fame, and many other advantages, in a character so long, that I can only refer to it.

To sum up Origen’s character:—He had a capacious mind, and a large compass of knowledge; and throughout

quod vellem cum invidiâ nominis ejus habere etiam scientiam scripturarum, flocci pendens imagines umbrasque larvarum, &c. Præf. in libr. Heb. Quæst. in Genesim.

^q Vult aliquis laudare Origenem? Laudet ut laudo. Magnus vir ab infantiâ et vere martyris filius—voluptates in tantum fugit, ut zelo Dei, sed tamen non secundum scientiam, ferro truncaret genitalia: calcavit avaritiam; scripturas memoriter tenuit; et in studio explanationis earum diebus desudavit et noctibus. Ep. 41. al. 65.

^r Et quia meæ parvitatibus quæris sententiam, utrum secundum fratrem Faustinum penitus respiciendus sit, an secundum quosdam legendus ex parte? ego Origenem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertullianum, Novatum, Arnobium, Apollinarium, et nonnullos ecclesiasticos scriptores Græcos pariter et Latinos; ut bona eorum eligamus, vitemusque contraria, &c. Ep. 56. al. 76.

^s Ego miror unum eundemque hominem tam diversum a se esse potuisse, ut in eâ parte, quâ probatur, neminem post apostolos habeat æqualem; in eâ vero, quæ jure reprehenditur, nemo deformius doceatur errasse. Sulp. Sev. Dial. i. cap. 6.

^t ——— sed tanta etiam vis ingenii, tam profundi, tam aeris, tam elegantis, ut omnes pene multum longeque superaret. Vincent. Lir. Commonit.

his whole life was a man of unwearied application in studying and composing works of various sorts, some of them extremely tedious and laborious; and in teaching by word of mouth, in the way of catechetical instruction, public discourse to the people, and conference. He had the happiness of uniting different accomplishments, being at once the greatest preacher, and the most learned and voluminous writer of the age; nor is it easy to say which is most admirable, his learning or his virtue. In a word, it must be owned that Origen, though not perfect nor infallible, was a bright light in the church of Christ, and one of those rare personages that have done honour to the human nature.

II. As Origen's virtue is one of those things by which he is most distinguished; and one design of this work is, to promote true piety by giving my readers some idea of the spirit of the christians of the first ages; I hope it will be allowed me to transcribe some passages conducive to that end from a writer whose works were so numerous, before I proceed to his testimony to the scriptures.

1. There are in Origen many marks of unaffected modesty and true humility. In a homily, which we now have only in Latin, he has a thought, that angels may offer first-fruits to God, which they collect out of the fields of this world: 'The^u fields of the angels,' says he, 'are our hearts; each one of them, therefore, out of the field which he cultivates, offers first-fruits to God. If I should be able to produce to-day some choice interpretation, worthy to be presented to the supreme High Priest; so that out of all those things which we speak and teach, there should be somewhat considerable, which may please the great High Priest; it might possibly happen that the angel who presides over the church, out of all our words, might choose something, and offer it as a kind of first-fruits to the Lord, out of the small field of my heart. But I know I do not deserve it; nor am I conscious to myself that any interpretation is discovered by me, which the angel who cultivates us should judge worthy to offer to the Lord, as first-fruits, or first-born. And I^v wish that what we speak and teach may be such, that we may not deserve to be condemned for our words: that will be favour enough for us.'

2. In a homily upon Ezekiel he says, 'The^w devil has

^u In Num. Hom. xi. T. ii. p. 308. B. C. Benedict.

^v Atque utinam tale sit quod loquimur et docemus, ut non pro verbis nostris condemnari mereamur: sufficeret nobis hæc gratia. Ibid.

^w Mihi ipsi, qui in ecclesiâ prædico, laqueos sæpe tendit, ut totam eccle-

many snares. He often lays snares for me, who preach in the church, that he may shake the whole church by my conversation. And therefore they who are in public stations are attacked by the enemy, that by the fall of one man which cannot be hid, all may be offended, and the faith be obstructed by the wicked life of a few clergymen.' How modest, says a commentator upon this place, is Origen! of whom nevertheless Eusebius^x says, that he was such in his conversation as he was in his doctrine; and that he did not so much recommend the faith by his preaching, as by his life.

3. In another^y Homily, recommending the hearing of the word of God with an honest heart and good disposition of the mind, and censuring some faults of hearers, which he fears are in some of the catechumens, and perhaps also in some that have received baptism, he says, 'For all are not Israel, who are of Israel.' Rom. ix. 6. 'Nor^z are all who have been baptized with water, baptized also with the Holy Spirit; as, on the contrary, not all who are catechumens are strangers, or destitute of the Holy Spirit. For I find in the divine scriptures some catechumens accounted worthy of the Holy Spirit, and others after baptism unworthy of the gifts of the Spirit. Cornelius was a catechumen, and before he came to the water deserved to receive the Holy Spirit. Simon had been baptized, but because he asked hypocritically, he was refused the gift of the Holy Spirit. And I would not that you should doubt that there are now some Corneliuses among the catechumens, to whom it may be said, "Thy alms and thy prayers are come up to heaven," Acts x. 4. And again, among the people of the faithful, there are some Simons, to whom it may be said, "O full of all subtilty, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness," Acts xiii. 10. These things I speak by way of reproof of myself, and not of the hearers only; for I also am one of them that hear the word of God.'

4. Origen, in his books of Principles, where he gives himself a liberty to discourse of abstruse and difficult

siam ex meâ conversatione confundat. Et ideo plus hi, qui sunt in medio, oppugnantur ab inimico, ut per ruinam unius hominis, quæ celari non potest, omnibus scandalum fiat, et impediatur fides per pessimam conversationem clericorum. In Ezech. Hom. vii. T. ii. p. 642. Basil. 1571.

^x Οἶον γὰρ τον λογον, τοιονδε φασι τον τροπον' και οἶον τον τροπον, τοιονδε και τον λογον επεδεικνυτο. Διο δη μαλιστα, συναιρομενης αυτω δυναμεως θειας, μυριως ενηγεν επι τον αυτη ζηλον. Eus. l. vi. cap. 3. p. 205. A.

^y In Num Hom. iii. T. ii. p. 280. A. B. C. Bened.

^z Neque omnes qui loti sunt aquâ, continuo etiam Sancto Spiritu loti sunt Ibid. A.

points, and advances propositions justly disputable, often uses expressions^a of caution and diffidence. And in his Homilies likewise to the people it is very common with him to desire his hearers^b to judge and examine what he says, whether it be just or not, and not to take things upon trust. This is polite, as well as modest.

5. He tells Ambrose^c in one of his prefaces, that to write commentaries upon the scriptures, and publish them to the world, was a thing above his strength; but out of his goodness he was pleased to think him fit for such a work. Since he had been one great means of his writing so much, he tells him that he must bear witness to God for him, when he shall be called to account for his life and writings, with what purpose and disposition of mind he had acted. And earnestly entreats him to pray to God for him, that he may seek the truth in a right manner, and may be able to discover it.

6. Pamphilus, in his apology for Origen, mentioning several of his virtues, says, that his^d humility was the most amiable of them all. Indeed I do not remember to have observed one proud or conceited thought or expression in all his writings. It should be owned, however, that after his removal from Alexandria, he wrote a letter to his friends in that city, in which he complains of injustice done him on several accounts. But as we have not that letter in Greek, nor entire in Latin, it is not very easy to form a judgment upon it: and even here he leaves his enemies to the mercy of God, and^e professes his obligation rather to pity than hate them; and to pray for them, rather than wish them ill. Moreover, in his Commentaries upon St. John's

^a Quæ quidem a nobis etiam cum magno metu et cautelâ dicuntur, discutientibus magis et pertractantibus quam pro certo ac definito statuentibus. — Nunc autem disputandi specie magis quam definiendi, prout possumus, exercemur. De Princip. l. i. c. 6. T. i. p. 69. B. C. Bened.

^b Et vos facite quod scriptum est, ut uno dicente omnes examinent [1 Cor. xiv. 29]. Me ergo dicente quod sentio, vos discernite et examine, si quid rectum est, aut minus rectum. In libr. Jesu. Hom. xxi. T. ii. p. 448. ed. Benedict.

^c Ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῶν ἐν προοίμιῳ λελεχται, εἰς μεγίστον ἀγῶνα, καὶ ὁμολογῆ-
μενως ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, — ἀναγκαζόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς πολλῆς σε φιλομαθίας, καὶ
δυσωπῆμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χρηστοτητος, καὶ τῆς μετριοτητος σε, ἱερε Ἀμβροσιε,
κατελθεῖν. — Μαρτυρῶ σοι μοι πρὸς Θεον, μεθ' ὅλα τε βίαι, καὶ περὶ τῶν
ὑπηγορευμένων ἐξεταζόμενον, ποία τε προθεσεῖ τῆτο γεγενήται. — ἀξιῶμεν
τοῖννυν. — ὅπως. — αἰτησεις εἶσθηναι ἡμῶν πρῶτον καλῶς ζητεῖν, κ. λ.
Orig. in Ps. i. T. ii. p. 526. C. D. E.

^d — non humilitatis, quæ supra cæteras omnes virtutes ejus maximam gratiam continet. Pamph. pro Or. Apol. p. 757. Basil.

^e Quorum magis misereri quam eos odisse debemus; et orare pro illis, quam eis maledicere. Ep. ad Amicos Alex. T. i. p. 5. A. Bened.

gospel,^f he speaks of the Alexandrian storm, and compares his escape to God's deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt. But I do not know that these things cast any reflection upon Origen's good temper, which is conspicuous in so many places. There is a remarkable passage taken notice ^s of by Tillemont, where Origen speaks of the excesses and dangers of love, as well as hatred; which may serve to show, that he knew how to defend himself without pride or passion. Origen speaks of the different sentiments which men form of others, as^h a common case, relating to those who have any eminent station in the church: but it is likely there is a particular reference to his own case; though out of his prevailing modesty he brings in others to share with him, and speaks in the plural number. 'Some there are,' says he, 'who love us more than we deserve, and speak more advantageously of us and our performances than we approve of. On the other hand, some defame our discourses, by accusing us of sentiments we never held. Neither the one nor the other of these keep to the rule of justice; but they both deviate from the truth, one through hatred, the other through excessive love.' I suppose Tillemont's remarks upon this passage will be allowed to be well founded, that these complaints are made with as much humility as justice.

7. In the next place I would take a few passages out of Origen's Exhortation to Martyrdom. Having quoted Matt. xix. 27—29, he says to Ambrose, 'Forⁱ the sake of these sayings I could wish to be rich as you, or richer, and then to be a martyr of Christ; that I may receive " manifold," or, as in Mark x. 30, " an hundred fold." ' Afterwards, having quoted Luke xiv. 26,—' But^k do you so hate your life, as that by hating it you may keep it " to life eternal;" being persuaded that it is a good and profitable hatred which Jesus teaches. John xii. 25. And a life must be

^f *Εἰ καὶ ὁ κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρείαν χειμῶν ἀντιπράττειν εἶδεκε. κ. λ. Comm. in Joh. Huet. T. ii. p. 94. A. B. C.*

^s Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. p. 266. Origene, art. 37.

^h Quod quidem in ecclesiâ patimur: plerique enim, dum plus diligunt quam meremur, hæc jactant et loquuntur, sermones nostros doctrinamque laudantes, quæ conscientia nostra non recipit. Alii vero tractatus nostros calumniantes, ea sentire nos criminantur, quæ nunquam sensisse nos novimus. Sed neque hi qui plus diligunt, neque illi qui oderunt, veritatis regulam tenent; et alii per dilectionem, alii per odium, mentiuntur. Unde oportet caritati frena imponere, &c. In Lucam Hom. xxv. p. 236. Basil.

ⁱ *Τῶτων δὲ ἐνεκεν τῶν ῥητῶν, ἠνζαμην ἀν τοσαυτὰ κτησαμενος ἐπὶ γῆς, ὅποσα εἶχες, ἢ καὶ τῶτων πλεονα, γενεῖσθαι μαρτυρὸς ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Θεῷ, ἵνα πολλαπλασιασθῶ λαβῶ, ἢ, ὡς ὁ Μαρκοῦς φησιν, ἑκατονταπλασιασθῶ. Exh. ad Mart. sect. 14. T. i. p. 283. D. Bened.*

^k Ibid. sect. 37. p. 299. C.

hated, that it may be kept to eternal life; so do you, who have them, hate also wife and children, and brethren and sisters, that you may be profitable to those you hate.—And¹ as it was said to those who were of the seed of Abraham, John viii. 37, 39, “I know that ye are Abraham’s seed;” again, “If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do his works;” so it will be said to your children, I know that ye are the children of Ambrose; and, if ye were the seed of Ambrose, ye would do his works. And perhaps they will do so, you helping them more after your departure than if you had continued with them.’

8. Still, in the same work: ‘Christ^m has laid down his life for us. Let us therefore also lay down our life, I will not say for him, but for ourselves, and for those who may be edified by our martyrdom.’ Once more: ‘Andⁿ perhaps, as we are redeemed by the blood of Christ, Jesus having received a name above every name; so some will be redeemed by the blood of martyrs.’

9. It is glorious to write in this manner to a beloved and excellent friend, upon whom too a man has his chief dependence, as Origen had upon Ambrose. This is true friendship; this is to esteem heaven above the world, and to prefer religion to our own private interest. Such exhortations as these may be reckoned, next to suffering for Christ ourselves, some of the best proofs of our integrity, and of our true love both of Christ and our friends.

10. The conclusion of that work is admirable. Says Origen, ‘These^o things I have written unto you according to my ability, praying likewise that they may be of some use to you in the present combat. But if the abundant knowledge of the mysteries of religion, with which you are favoured, especially in your present honourable condition, affords you better counsel, and more effectual to the purpose, insomuch that you cannot but look upon what I have offered as childish and contemptible, it is no more than I could wish. My aim is not that you should obtain the crown by my assistance, but by any means whatever. And may it be obtained by what is most divine and excellent, and surpassing all human capacity, the words and wisdom of God.’

¹ Ibid. sect. 38. p. 299. E.

^m Ὑπερ ἡμῶν ἐθηκεν Ἰησοῦς τὴν ψυχὴν· καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν θῶμεν αὐτὴν, ἐκ ἐρω ὑπερ αὐτῆ, ἀλλ’ ὑπερ ἑαυτῶν· οἶμαι δ’ ὅτι καὶ ὑπερ τῶν ἐν τῷ μαρτυροῦ ἡμῶν οἰκοδομηθησομένων. sect. 41. p. 301. D.

ⁿ Ταχὰ δὲ καὶ ὡσπερ τιμῷ αἱματι τῆ Ἰησοῦ ἠγορασθημεν, Ἰησοῦ λαβόντος τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπερ παν ὄνομα· οὕτως τῷ τιμῷ αἱματι τῶν μαρτύρων ἀγορασθησονται τινές. sect. 50. p. 309. C.

^o Exh. ad Martyr. p. 310.

II. Origen impartially teaches the duties of the pastors, as well as of the people, of Christ's church. He^p mightily recommends humility and condescension to bishops and presbyters. He complains^q of the pride and haughtiness of some bishops in his time, especially in great cities. He says it is not to be thought that^r the clergy will be universally saved; for many presbyters will perish, and many of the laity will be found among the blessed. He^s earnestly dissuades from committing the care of churches to covetous, tyrannical, ignorant, and irreligious bishops, or presbyters, or deacons, which he compares to selling doves in the temple: and elsewhere^t declares, that for the most part the government of the churches was bestowed upon men qualified to teach, and of a good life; not upon such as were ambitious of authority, but upon those who out of modesty were unwilling to accept so great a charge. And he says, more^u will be expected of him, as a presbyter, than of a deacon; more of a deacon than of a layman; but from a bishop most of all. Whence it appears that Origen preached to himself, as well as to others.

III. To these passages, showing the pious disposition of Origen's mind, and, as I apprehend, strongly recommending

^p Qui vocatur ergo ad episcopatum, non ad principatum vocatur, sed ad servitutum totius ecclesiæ. In Esaiam, Hom. vi. p. 563. init. Tom. i. Basil. Quanti presbyteri constituti obliti sunt humilitatis! quasi idcirco fuerint ordinati, ut humiles esse desisterent. Quin potius humilitatem sequi debuerant, quia dignitatem fuerant consecuti. In Ezech. Hom. ix. p. 647. fin. Hæc autem diximus, volentes ostendere, quod ecclesiarum principes principum mundialium imitatores esse non debent, sed imitari debent Christum, accessibilem, et mulieribus loquentem, et pueris manus imponentem, &c. In Matth. Tr. xi. p. 87. Tom. ii. Basil.

^q Nos autem tales sumus, ut etiam malorum principum mundi excedere superbiam videamur: et non solum quærimus sicut reges acies præcedentes, et terribiles nos et accessu difficiles maxime pauperibus exhibemus.— Et est videre in quibusdam ecclesiis, præcipue civitatum maximarum, principes populi christiani nullam affabilitatem habentes, vel adire ad se permittentes. In Matth. Tr. xi. p. 86. fin.

^r *Ἰτε δε ὅτι 8 παντως ὁ κληρος σωζει· πολλοι γαρ και πρεσβυτεροι απολωνται· πολλοι και λαϊκοι μακαριοι αποδειχθησονται.* In Jerem. Hom. xi. p. 113. E. Tom. i. Huet. ^s *Και νομιζω ἀρμοζειν τον περι των πωλωντων τας περιπερας λογον τοις παραιδουσι τας εκκλησιας αισχροκερδεις, και τυραννικοις, και ανεπιστημοσι, και ανευλαβεσιν επισκοποις, η πρεσβυτεροις, η διακονοις.* Comm. in Matth. p. 442. B. Huet.

^t *Τως δυνατες λογω και βιω ὑγει χρωμενες επι το αρχην εκκλησιων παρακαλεμεν.* κ. λ. Contr. Cels. l. viii. p. 798. C. Tom. i. Bened.

^u *Πλειον εγω απαιτημαι παρα τον διακονον, πλειον ὁ διακονος παρα τον λαϊκον· ὁ δε την παντων ἡμων εγκεχειρισμενος αρχην αυτην την εκκλησιαστικην επι πλειον απαιτειται.* In Jerem. et Hom. xi. p. 114. A. Huet.

the like to others, I would add a few miscellaneous observations worthy of our notice.

1. Origen was of opinion that the light of nature, duly cultivated, is of use to bring men to embrace the christian religion. For having quoted Rom. ii. 15, he^v says, ‘that God gave the law of nature to mankind, and wrote it in the minds of all. This affords seeds and principles of truth: and if we rightly cultivate those seeds, they will bring forth the fruit of life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.’

2. Origen affirms, ‘That^w they are the wisest christians, who have most carefully examined the several sects of judaism and christianity.’

3. Origen was a man of generous sentiments, and he represents the moderation of christians toward men of different opinions as very remarkable. Celsus had said that the several sects of christians were very rigid, and full of enmity toward each other. Origen answers: ‘Such^x of us as follow the doctrine of Jesus, and endeavour to be conformed to his precepts, in our thoughts, words, and actions, “being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it; being defamed, we entreat.” Nor do^y we say injurious things of those who think differently from us. We labour indeed all that is in our power to convert men to the service of the only true God, the creator of the world, and to engage them to act in all respects as they that shall be judged.—But they who consider the words of our Lord, “Blessed are the peaceable,” and “Blessed are the meek,” will not hate those^z who corrupt the christian religion, nor give opprobrious names to those who are in error.’

4. Origen believes there will be different degrees of glory and happiness in the future state, according to men’s works in the present world. Having quoted I Thess. iv. 15, 16, 17, he says, ‘A^a diversity of translation, and a

^v Quis autem scripsit in cordibus eorum, nisi Deus digito suo? Legem utique naturalem, quam dedit Deus humano generi, et in cunctorum mentibus scripsit: unde et initia sumimus, ac semina quædam ad perscrutandam capimus veritatem: quæ semina, si bene excolamus, fructum vitæ afferent in nobis in Christo Jesu Domino nostro. In Numeros Hom. x. T. ii p. 303. C. Bened.

^w Οὕτως εἶποιμ’ ἂν καὶ τὸν ἐπιμελῶς ἐπιδόντα τὰς ἰσθμῶν καὶ χριστιανισμῶν αἵρεσιν, σοφωτάτον χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι. Contr. Cels. l. iii. p. 119. Cant. p. 455. C. Bened.

^x Contr. Cels. l. v. p. 273. Cant. p. 627. B. C. D. Bened.

^y Καὶ ἐκ ἂν ῥήματα καὶ ἀρήματα λεγομένων τῶν ἀλλὰ δοξαζόντων. Ibid.

^z Οὐκ ἂν ἀποσυγῆσαιεν τῶν παραχαραττόντων τὰ χριστιανισμῶν, εἰδὲ Κίρκας καὶ κωκηθρα αἰμύλα λεγομένων τῶν πεπλανημένων. Ibid.

^a Diversitas autem translationis et gloriæ ex meritis sine dubio et actibus uniuscujusque præstabitur, et erit unusquisque in eo ordine quem sibi gestorum

different glory undoubtedly will be given to every one, according to the merits of his actions; and every one will be in that order which the merits of his works have procured for him.'

5. He has a fine observation in his books against Celsus: 'That when God designed true religion should obtain among the Gentiles, he had so ordered things by his providence, that they should be under the one empire of the Romans; lest, if there had been many kingdoms and nations, the apostles of Jesus should have been obstructed in fulfilling the command he gave them, saying, Go and teach all nations.—It would,' says^b he, 'have been a great impediment to the spreading of the doctrine of Christ all over the world, if there had been many kingdoms. For, not to mention other things, these might have been at war with each other; and then men would have been obliged to be every where in arms, and fight for the defence of their country.'

6. I shall add here but one passage more, concerning the success of the christian doctrine; which, considering the age of our author, is very valuable. When Origen wrote his books against Celsus, the church had peace. 'By the good providence of God,' says he, 'the christian religion has so flourished, and continually increased, that it is now preached freely, without molestation, although there were a thousand obstacles to the spreading the doctrine of Jesus in the world. But as it was the will of God that the Gentiles should have the benefit of it, all the counsels of men against the christians were defeated. And by how^c much the more emperors, and governors of provinces, and the people, every where strove to depress them; so much the more have they increased, and prevailed exceedingly.'

IV. I now proceed to Origen's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

In Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History is a chapter with this title: 'How^d Origen mentions the scriptures of both Testaments.' The former part of that chapter contains a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, in a passage

merita contulerint. In Num. Hom. i. T. ii. p. 277. Bened.

^b Ην δε αν εμποδιον τε νεμηθηται την Ιησω διδασκαλιαν εις πασαν την οικουμενην το, πολλας ειναι βασιλειας· η μονον δια τα προειρημενα, αλλα και δια το αναγκαζεσθαι στρατευεσθαι και υπερ των πατριδων πολεμειν τωσ πανταχθ. Contr. Cels. l. ii. T. i. p. 412. D. E. Bened.

^c 'Οσω γαρ αυτωσ εταπεινεν βασιλεισ, και εθνων ηγουμενοι, και δημοι παιταχθ, τοσθτω πλεισ εγινοντο, και κατισχυον σφοδρα.—Contr. Cels. l. vii. p. 349. Caut. p. 713. A. Bened.

^d 'Οπωσ των ενδιαθηκων γραφων εμνημονευσεν. H. E. lib. vi. cap. 25

of Origen taken from his exposition of the first Psalm; the latter part of the chapter concerns the books of the New Testament. I shall transcribe this part now at length, though it relates to several parts of the New Testament, and is taken from several pieces of Origen; that so we may have the benefit of Eusebius's connection, if indeed there is any benefit in it.

Having then recited Origen's catalogue of the scriptures of the Old Testament, Eusebius proceeds: 'But in the^e first book of his Commentaries upon the gospel of Matthew, [Origen,] observing the ecclesiastical canon, declares that he knew only four gospels, expressing himself thus: "As I have learned by tradition concerning the four gospels, which alone are received without dispute by the whole church of God under heaven. The first was written by Matthew, once a publican, afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ; who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language. The second is that according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter dictated it to him; who therefore also calls him his son in his catholic epistle, 1 Pet. v. 13, saying, "The church which is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Mark my son." The third is that according to Luke, the gospel commended by Paul, published for the sake of the Gentile converts. Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8. Lastly, that according to John." And in the first book of his expositions upon the gospel according to John, the same author speaks thus of the epistles of the apostles: "Paul,^f who was made" an able minister of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit; who fully preached the gospel from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum, "did not write to all the churches he had taught; and to those, to which he did write, he sent only a few lines, 2 Cor. iii. 6; Rom. xv. 19. Peter, on whom the church of Christ is built," against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, "has left one epistle [universally]

^e Εν δε τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαίον εὐαγγέλιον, τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλακτικὸν κανόνα, μόνῃ τεσσάρῃ εἰδέναι εὐαγγέλια μαρτυρεῖται, ὡς πῶς γραφῶν ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθῶν περὶ τῶν τεσσαρῶν εὐαγγελίων, ἃ καὶ μόνῃ ἀναντιρρήτῃ ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Θεοῦ ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γεγραπταὶ τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτε τελωνίην, ὑπερον δὲ ἀποστολὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ματθαίου, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστευσασί, γραμμασί· Ἐβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον· δευτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγησατο αὐτῷ ποιησαντα ὄν καὶ υἱὸν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τῶν ὁμολογήσει φασκῶν—καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λῦκαν, τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινεμένον εὐαγγέλιον, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν πεποιηκότα ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην. Ibid. p. 226. B. C.

^f Ibid. p. 226. D. 227.

‘ acknowledged, Matt. xvi. 18. But let it be granted like-
 ‘ wise that he wrote a second; for it is doubted of. But
 ‘ what need I speak of John, who leaned upon the breast
 ‘ of Jesus, who has left us one gospel; professing, at the
 ‘ same time, that he was able to write more than even the
 ‘ world itself could contain? John xxi. 20. 5. He wrote
 ‘ also the Revelation, in which he is commanded to be silent,
 ‘ and not to write the voices of the seven thunders, Rev. x.
 ‘ 4. He has also left an epistle of a very few lines. Grant
 ‘ also a second, and a third; for all do not allow these to
 ‘ be genuine: however, they do not both together make a
 ‘ hundred lines.” Finally, of the epistle to the Hebrews.
 ‘ in his Homilies upon it, he gives his opinion in this man-
 ‘ ner: “ That the style of the epistle to the Hebrews has
 ‘ not the apostle’s rudeness of speech, who has confessed
 ‘ himself rude in speech, that is, in language, 2 Cor. xi. 6.
 ‘ But this epistle, as to the texture of the style, is elegant
 ‘ Greek; as every one will allow, who is able to judge of
 ‘ the differences of styles.” Again, he says, “ The senti-
 ‘ ments of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the
 ‘ acknowledged writings of the apostle. This will be
 ‘ assented to by every one who reads the writings of the
 ‘ apostle with attention.” Afterwards he adds: “ If I
 ‘ was to speak my opinion, I should say that the sentiments
 ‘ are the apostle’s, but the language and composition of
 ‘ some one who committed to writing the apostle’s sense,
 ‘ and as it were reduced into commentaries the things spoken
 ‘ by his master. If therefore any church receives this
 ‘ epistle as Paul’s, it is to be commended even upon that
 ‘ account; for it is not without reason that the ancients have
 ‘ handed it down as Paul’s: but who wrote this epistle,
 ‘ God only knows certainly. But the account come down
 ‘ to us is various; some saying that Clement, who was
 ‘ bishop of Rome, wrote this epistle; others, that it was
 ‘ Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.”’

Thus writes Eusebius. Upon this chapter of his we
 may make two remarks: First, that it is defective. Euse-
 bius has taken here no notice at all of Origen’s opinion
 about the epistles of James and Jude. But perhaps he
 supposed his readers would understand this omission as an
 intimation that these epistles were not received by this
 writer. However, I wish he had been more express, that
 we might have been in no suspense about his meaning.
 Secondly, it seems that Eusebius is to be blamed for cur-
 tailing the last passage of Origen, taken out of his Homilies
 upon the epistle to the Hebrews. We should have been

pleased to see Origen's whole argument relating to that epistle, and the author of it; whereas Eusebius makes a break, and when he had transcribed a part, he says, 'And afterwards Origen adds;' or, 'after some other intervening words, he adds.'

These two general remarks upon this long passage from Eusebius may suffice for the present. We shall have occasion hereafter to add divers other particular observations upon some parts of it, concerning several books of the New Testament.

V. In the next place I shall take some other passages of Origen, which seem to contain complete catalogues of the books of the New Testament.

One of them is in the thirteenth Homily upon Genesis, where Origen, descanting particularly upon Gen. xxvi. 18—22, says: 'Thus^e Isaac digged again the wells of water which the servants of his father had digged. One servant of his father was Moses, who dug the well of the law; other servants of his father were David and Solomon, and the prophets, and all they who wrote the books of the Old Testament.—Isaac therefore again digged new wells; yea, the servants of Isaac digged. The servants of Isaac are Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John: his servants also are Peter, James, and Jude, as likewise the apostle Paul; who all dig the wells of the New Testament.'

VI. In his seventh Homily upon the book of Joshua, Origen speaks to this purpose: 'But^h when our Lord Jesus Christ came, of whom Joshua the son of Nun was but a type, he sent forth the priests, his apostles,ⁱ bearing

^e Hoc ergo modo fodit puteos Isaac, quos foderant pueri patris sui. Puer patris sui erat Möyses, qui foderat puteum legis. Pueri patris sui erant David et Salomon, et prophetæ, et si qui alii sunt, qui libros scripserunt Veteris Testamenti.—Fodit ergo Isaac et novos puteos, imo pueri Isaac fodiunt. Pueri sunt Isaac, Matthæus, Marcus, Lucas, et Joannes; pueri ejus sunt Petrus, Jacobus, et Judas; puer ejus est et apostolus Paulus; qui omnes Novi Testamenti puteos fodiunt. Orig. Hom. in Gen. xiii. p. 95. A. Tom. ii. ed. Bened.

^h Veniens ergo Dominus noster Jesus Christus, ejus ille prior filius Nave designabat adventum, mittit sacerdotes apostolos suos portantes tubas ductiles, prædicationis magnificam cœlestemque doctrinam. Sacerdotali tubâ primâ in evangelio suo Matthæus increpuit. Marcus quoque, Lucas, et Joannes, suis singulis tubis sacerdotalibus cecinerunt. Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis; Jacobus quoque et Judas. Addit nihilominus adhuc et Joannes tubâ eanere per epistolas suas, et Apocalypsim; et Lucas, apostolorum gesta describens. Novissime autem ille veniens, qui dixit, 'Puto autem nos Deus novissimos apostolos ostendit;' et in quatuordecim epistolarum suarum fulminans tubis, muros Jericho, et omnes idololatriæ machinas, et philosophorum dogmata, usque ad fundamenta dejecit. Orig. Hom. in libr. Jes. vii. ib. p. 412. A. B.

ⁱ Bearing well-beaten trumpets.] 'Portantes tubas ductiles.' I suppose

well-beaten trumpets, sounding the glorious heavenly doctrine. Matthew sounds first with his priestly trumpet in his gospel; Mark also, and Luke, and John, sounded with their priestly trumpets. Peter likewise sounds aloud with the two trumpets of his epistles; James also and Jude. And John sounds again with his trumpet in his epistles and the Revelation; and Luke also once more, relating the actions of the apostles. Last of all comes he who said, 1 Cor. iv. 9, "For I think that God has set forth us the apostles last:" and sounding with the trumpets of his fourteen epistles, he threw down to the foundations the walls of Jericho, and all the engines of idolatry, and the schemes of the philosophers.'

These two passages are taken out of the remaining Latin versions of those works of Origen, made by^k Rufinus; I am of opinion therefore that these catalogues are not to be relied upon. These passages run well enough in the style of Origen: but it was very easy for a translator to thrust in a name or two, or alter a few words, and thereby render the whole agreeable to the sentiments of the times in which he wrote, without making any very remarkable alteration in the style of his author. This last is one of the catalogues given by^l Hody. And indeed Rufinus professes to have made an exact translation of Origen's Homilies upon the book of Joshua; but his word is hardly to be taken in that matter: nor is it impossible that some alterations may have been made in the copies of Rufinus's version since his time. It is somewhat remarkable, that in the fore-cited passage there is a various reading, where^m Peter's two epistles are mentioned. And soon after, in the same Homily, when Origen quotes St. John's first epistle, it is in this manner: 'Thisⁿ is what John sounds in the trumpet of his

Origen may allude to Numb. x. 2, 3. And, as some argument of this, I shall transcribe a part of another passage of Origen, to which the learned reader is referred. Ne forte ergo argentæ tubæ, quoniam argentum in multis locis pro verbo suscipitur, magna vox verbi intelligitur tuba argentea congregans unumquemque in ordine.—Voces autem argentearum et produc-torium tubarum in diebus lætitiæ Israël, quæ assumuntur in neomeniis ipsorum, erant umbræ futurarum neomeniarum, de quibus dicit apostolus, &c. In Matth. Tract xxx. p. 151. Tom. ii. Basil.

I may also add a passage of Jerom, confirming this interpretation. De hac tubâ et apostolus loquitur [1 Cor. xv. 1 Thess. iv.]; et in Apocalypsi Joannis legimus [viii.]; et in Veteri Testamento tubæ ductiles ex auro, et ære, argentoque, fieri præcipiuntur.—In Matth. xxiv. 31. T. iv. p. 117.

^k Vid. Huet. Origenian. l. iii. cap. 2. sect. 3. n. i. et v. Tillem. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. Origene, art. 29, 30.

^l Hody, de Biblior. Text. Origen. p. 646. col. 29.

^m Duabus.] Gemeticensis:

'ex tribus.' Vid. T. ii. p. 412. Bened.

ⁿ Hoc est, quod et

epistle, saying, “ Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world,” I John ii. 15.

It is very fit we should be at the pains of examining things more particularly. I shall endeavour therefore to set Origen’s opinion of the several books of the New Testament in a full light. Some prolixity, in considering the works of so great a man in the third century, will not be disagreeable.

VII. We transcribed^o just now a passage from Eusebius concerning the four gospels, taken out of the first book or tome of Origen’s Commentaries upon St. Matthew’s gospel.

1. Again, in the sixteenth tome of his Commentaries upon the same gospel, he expressly mentions^p ‘ four evangelists.’

2. In his Commentaries upon St. John he says, ‘ That^q as he is one whom many preach, so it is one gospel in virtue which is written by several; for indeed what is written by four is one gospel.’ I put down in the margin a few more^r passages where Origen expressly mentions ‘ four evangelists’ or ‘ gospels.’ Perhaps this may be of use to us hereafter.

3. In his Commentaries upon some of the four gospels he often compares the several accounts of the other evangelists. Thus, speaking of John the Baptist’s imprisonment and death, he says, ‘ Therefore^s Matthew now gave this account, and Mark much after the same manner with him; but Luke has omitted a good part of the history which is in them.’ A little after: ‘ It is^t observable,’ says he, ‘ that

Joannes epistolæ suæ personat tubâ, dicens: ‘ Nolite diligere mundum, neque ea quæ in mundo sunt.’ Ibid. p. 413. D. ^o See num. iv.

^p Τα δε κατα τον τοπον και οι λοιποι τρεις ευαγγελισται εξιθεντο, ων την προς αλληλης διαφοραν τε προκειμενε καιρη εσι διηγησασθαι, — των τεσσαρων ευαγγελιστων αναγραφαντων τα κατα τον τοπον. κ. λ. Comm. in Matth. T. i. p. 439. D. E. Huet. ed.

^q Ου συνιεντες, οτι ως εις εσιν ον ευαγγελιζονται πλειονες, ούτως εν εσι τη δυναμει το υπο των πολλων ευαγγελιων αναγεγραμμενον, και το αληθως δια τεσσαρων εν εσιν ευαγγελιον. Comm. in Joh. p. 91. C. D. Huet. Tom. ii.

^r Παρατηρητεον δε οτι των τεσσαρων ειρηκοτων το, εν υδατι ομολογειν Ιωαννην εληλυθειναι βαπτιζειν, μονος Ματθαιος τστω προσεθηκε το, εις μετανοιαν. Comm. in Joh. p. 124. C. D. Huet. Vid. et p. 127. E. Λεγετωσαν γαρ ημιν οι παραδεχομενοι τα τεσσαρα ευαγγελια. Ib. p. 150. E. Vid. et p. 151. E. ως παντα τον Ιησεν απο των τεσσαρων ευαγγελιστων μαθειν. Ib. p. 156. A. ούτω νοητεον και επι των τεσσαρων εχειν ευαγγελιστων, p. 153. A. ηγημα δε ειναι φιλοτιμον, και πρεπον τω εν Χριστω φιλομαθει συναγειν απο των τεσσαρων ευαγγελιων παντα τα περι της Καθαρισμα αναγεγραμμενα. p. 159. D.

^s Δια τστω ινν και τστω ανεγραψεν ο Ματθαιος, και ο Μαρκος δε αυτω παραπλησως ο δε Λukas τα πολλα της παρι τστοις παρεσιωπησεν ιστοριας. Comm. in Matth. T. i. p. 439. D. E.

^t Παρατηρητεον μεντοι οτι τες πεντε αρτες και τες δυο ιχθυας οι μαθηται

in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the disciples say, they have five loaves and two fishes, without signifying whether they were wheaten or barley loaves: John only has said they were barley loaves.' Matt. xiv. 17; Mark vi. 38; Luke ix. 13; John vi. 9. So with relation to the history of Christ's bearing his cross, and its being borne also by Simon the Cyrenian, he compares^u our four evangelists by name.

4. In another place says he, 'There^v being then these like expressions in all four, let us, as we are able, explain the meaning, and observe the lesser differences between them; beginning with Matthew, who likewise, as tradition says, wrote first, and delivered his gospel to the Hebrews, that is, the believers who were of the circumcision.'

VIII. The Acts of the Apostles are often expressly quoted by Origen, and ascribed to Luke, as^w we have seen already. However, I put down in the margin^x a passage or two more. Origen wrote Commentaries upon this book, or at least published Homilies upon it. A^y fragment of his fourth Homily upon the Acts is still extant in Greek. Origen speaks of the Acts of the Apostles as an uncontested book: 'But,' says^z he, 'suppose some one would reject the epistle to the Hebrews, as not being Paul's; what will he say to Stephen's discourses concerning the prophets slain by the Jewish people? or to what Paul writes to the Thessalonians? or to words of our Lord himself to the like purpose?' I have transcribed this from a piece in Latin; but there is exactly the same argument in Origen's^a Greek epistle to Africanus; where having quoted the epistle to

λεγων εχειν παρα τη Ματθαιω, και τη Μαρκω, και τη Λεκα, εθ' οτι πυρινοι, εθ' οτι κριθινοι ησαν υποσημειωσαιμενοι· ο δε Ιωαννης μονος κριθινωσ ειπεν ειναι τες αρτες. Ibid. p. 235. C. D.

^u Αλλ' ο μιν, ιν' ουτως ονομασω, κατα τον Ιωαννην Ιησους, εαυτω βαταζει τον πανρον, και βαταζων αυτον εξηλθεν, ο δε κατα τον Ματθαιον, και Μαρκον, και Λεκαν, εχ εαυτω αυτον αρει, Σμων γαρ ο Κυρηναιος αυτον βαταζει. [Conf. Joh. xix. 17. Matt. xxvii. 32. Marc. xv. 21. Luc. xxiii. 26.] Comm. in Matth. T. i. p. 287. E. 288. A.

^v Εχοντες τοιωνν τας ομοιας λεξεις των τεσσαρων φερε κατα το δυνατον ιδωμεν ιδια τον νυν εκατης και τας διαφορας, αρζαμενοι απο τσ Ματθαισ, ος και παραδειδονται πρωτος λοιπων τοις Εβραιωσ εκδεδωκεναι το εναγγελιον, τοις εκ περιτομης πισευουσιν. In Joh. p. 123. C. ^w See num. iv.

^x Και εν ταισ Πραξεισιν ο Λεκασ. Comm. in Joh. T. ii. p. 23. D. ως ο Λεκασ εν ταισ Πραξεισιν των Αποστολων εγραψεν. Contr. Cels. l. vi. p. 282. Cant. p. 638. C. Benedict.

^y Και παλιν εκ της εις τας Πραξεις ομλιας δ. Philoca. cap. 7. p. 32. Cant. et apud Huet. T. ii. p. 422.

^z Sed pone aliquem abdicare epistolam ad Hebræos, quasi non Pauli, nec non et secretum abjicere Esaiæ; sed quid faciat in sermones Stephani, vel Pauli ad Thessalonicenses de prophetis interfectis prolatos, vel ipsius Domini nostri? In Matth. Tract. xxvi. Tom. ii. p. 128. fin. Basil. 1571.

^a Ad Afric. sect. 9.

the Hebrews, and observed that some might dispute the authority of that epistle, he proceeds to quote, as undoubted books of scripture, the gospel of St. Matthew, the Acts, and Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians.

IX. It is needless to refer to particular places of Origen's works for St. Paul's epistles, they having been most of them so often quoted by him. Besides, it is well known that St. Paul's epistles were all along generally received in the church, except that to the Hebrews. However, I shall observe a few things relating to some of them.

1. In his books against Celsus, in answer to some things objected by that Epicurean, Origen says; 'Do^b you first of all explain the epistles of him who says these things: and having diligently read and attended to the sense of the words there used, particularly in those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, the Philippians, the Romans; demonstrate these two things—both that you have understood the words of Paul, and that you have observed some of them to be absurd and silly. For if any man reads him with attention, I am positive that he will admire his ability in expressing great things in vulgar words: or, if he does not admire him, he himself will appear ridiculous.'

2. The epistle to the Ephesians is quoted elsewhere^c by Origen with that title.

3. In his books against Celsus, having quoted I Thess. iv. 13, he says 'he^d had explained that passage in his Commentaries upon the first epistle to the Thessalonians.'

4. The epistle to Philemon is but once quoted in Origen's Greek works published by Huet; but it is very expressly, in this manner: 'Which^e Paul knowing, in his epistle to Philemon, he says to Philemon, ver. 14, concerning Onesi-

^b Πρωτον σαφηνησον τε ταυτα λεγοντος τας επισολας και ενατενισας τη βιβληματι εκαστης εν αυταις λεξεως (φερ' ειπεν τη προς Εφεισις, και προς Κολοσσαεις, και τη προς Θεσσαλονικεις, και Φιλιππησις, και προς Ρωμαις) αμφοτερα δειξον, και οτι νενοηκας τες Παυλε λογες, και παρατησαι ευηθεις τινας η ηλιθις. Εαν γαρ επιδω εαυτον τη μετα τε προσεχειν αναγνωσει, εν οιδ' οτι η θανασιεται τον νεν τε ανδρος, εν ιδιωτικη λεξει μεγαλα περιουσιος, η, μη θανασιεται, αυτος καταγελασος φανειται. Contr. Cels. l. iii. p. 122. Cant. p. 458. T. i. Bened. ^c Εν τη προς Εφεισις αναγεγραπται. De Orat. p. 205. C. T. i. Bened. Vid. ibid. p. 250. E.

^d Την δε φανεισαν ημιν εις τες τοπες διγησιον εξεθεμεθα εν ος υπηγορευσαμεν εξηγητικους της προς Θεσσαλονικεις προτερας επισολης. Contr. Cels. l. ii. p. 437. A. B. Bened. ^e 'Οπερ και ο Παυλος επιταμενος, ελεγεν εν τη προς Φιλημονα επισολη τη Φιλημονι περι Ονησιμου' ινα μη κατ' αναγκην το αγαθον σε η, αλλα καθ' εκβσιον. In Jerem. Hom. xix. p. 185. C. T. i. Huet.

mus, 'That thy benefit should not be of necessity, but willingly.'

X. I have already transcribed a long passage from Origen's letter to Africanus;^f where having quoted the epistle to the Hebrews, and argued from it, he says: 'But possibly some one, pressed with this argument, will take refuge in the opinion of those who reject this epistle as not written by Paul. In answer to such an one, we intend to write a distinct discourse, to show that epistle to be Paul's.' Which passage, as we observed, shows that Origen knew very well that there were some who did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's. It may be suspected, likewise, that he had some doubts whether it was received by Africanus as of authority. He elsewhere also makes a supposal of this epistle's being rejected of some: we cited the passage just now, speaking of the Acts of the Apostles. Origen himself however shows his good will to it, and expresses his readiness to write a distinct discourse, to prove it to be an epistle of the apostle Paul.

1. Accordingly we find frequent quotations of this epistle in Origen's works, beside those already referred to. 'To the^g same purpose says the apostle, "When for the time ye ought to be teachers of others." In the^h epistle to the Hebrews, the same Paul says.' Again, 'Paul,ⁱ in the epistle to the Hebrews.' These citations are taken out of Origen's remaining Greek Commentaries upon St. John's gospel. In his books against Celsus he quotes it expressly as^k Paul's, the same who wrote to the Corinthians. In his treatise^l of Prayer he quotes it as the apostle's, the same who wrote the epistle to the Ephesians. In a Latin Homily, 'Paul^m himself, the greatest of the apostles, writing to the Hebrews, says: "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched," and what follows.' Heb. xii. 18, 22, 23. Heⁿ also proves things from this epistle, as a writing of authority.

^f See chap. xxxvii. num. vi.

^g Κατα τὸ αὐτὸ φησὶν ὁ ἀποστόλος ὅτι οφείλοντες εἶναι διδασκαλοὶ. κ. λ. Comm. in Joh. T. ii. p. 18. B. Huet.

^h Καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίων, ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος φησὶν. Ibid. p. 56. A.

ⁱ Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίων. Ibid. p. 162. D.

^k Γεγραπται γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ, ἡμῶν Κορινθίους ἐπιτελλόντι—ὁ δ' αὐτὸς—φησὶ. Καὶ γεγωνατε χρεῖων ἔχοντες γαλακτος. [Hebr. v. 12.] Contr. Cels. l. iii. p. 143. Cant. p. 482. D. Bened.

^l De Oratione, p. 250. E. T. i. Bened.

^m Ipse ergo apostolorum maximus—Paulus—dicit, ad Hebræos scribens. In Num. Hom. iii. p. 231. C. D. T. ii. Bened.

ⁿ Εἰ δὲ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίων προσκοπτεῖ το λέγειν ἠλαττωσθαι παρὰ το Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τὸν Σωτήρα ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, προακτεῖον αὐτὸν ἀπο τῶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίων λεγομένων ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ ἀγγέλων ἐλαττονα ἕια το παθῆμα τῆ θανάτου ἀποφῆναι.

2. But the most considerable passage of Origen relating to this epistle, is that preserved ° by Eusebius, upon which we may make several observations.

1.) This passage is taken out of Homilies upon the epistle to the Hebrews; which is an argument of the authority of this epistle in the place where Origen then resided. It was publicly read in the assemblies of the church, and then expounded and preached upon.

2.) As Origen's Homilies that were published were preached in the latter part of his life, after he was sixty years of age, this passage must be reckoned to contain his last judgment concerning this epistle.

3.) What Origen says here was delivered in a Homily to the people. It may be hence inferred, that what he says in this place, though with great freedom, as it may seem to us, could be said at that time without danger of offence.

4.) There were different opinions concerning the writer, and probably also concerning the authority, of this epistle. This difference of sentiment was well known: 'If any church,' he says, [or whatever church,] 'receives it as Paul's, it is to be commended even upon that account.' Origen would not have expressed himself after this manner in a Homily, if it had not been generally known that there were doubts about the author of this epistle. However, it may be argued from these expressions, that it was more popular in Origen's audience to call it Paul's, than to deny it. And it is very probable it was received as the apostle's in the place where Origen then resided.

5.) Origen assures us that there were ancient writers before him who had spoken of this epistle as Paul's. His words, which follow those just transcribed, are these: 'For it is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as Paul's.' This argument for the genuineness of this epistle, is represented to great advantage by Mr. Hallet; for which reason I here put down his words: 'The^p traditions which Origen mentions are more to be regarded than his own private opinion and reasonings: and as he positively says, the "ancients did" in fact "hand it down as Paul's epistle;" so it is plain he laid vast stress upon this tradition, since he would not give it up, though he had strong temptations so to do. For he was very hard put to it, to reconcile this tradition with the style

μὲν τῆ Παύλῃ γεγονέναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν φησι γὰρ. [Hebr. ii. 9.] Comm. in Joh. P. ii. p. 57. E. 58. A. Huet.

° See before, num. iv.

^p See Mr. Hallett's Introduction to his Paraphrase and Notes on the three last chapters of the Ep. to the Hebrews, p. 8.

‘ of the epistle, and with other traditions, which named
 ‘ Clement or Luke as the writers of it; but, rather than
 ‘ give up the former tradition, “ that it was Paul’s epistle,”
 ‘ he would form such an odd hypothesis as that just now
 ‘ mentioned (that the thoughts only are Paul’s, while some
 ‘ other person by memory committed them to writing). It
 ‘ is very certain, then, that the churches and writers, who
 ‘ were ancient with respect to Origen, had one common
 ‘ tradition, that St. Paul was the author of the epistle to the
 ‘ Hebrews. And their testimony cannot but be of great
 ‘ weight; since those christians, who were ancients with
 ‘ respect to Origen, must have conversed with the apostles,
 ‘ or at least with their immediate successors.’

Thus far Mr. Hallett. But my good friend cannot suppose the tradition, that this was one of Paul’s epistles, to have been constant and universal till Origen’s⁹ time; or that he was the first person in the christian world who made a question whether this epistle was written by Paul. This Homily gives ground to think, that doubts about the author of this epistle were very common even in the east. It may be suspected from what Origen says here, that not only particular persons, but some whole churches, rejected this epistle; that is, did not receive it as Paul’s. When Origen wrote his letter to Africanus, he argued from the epistle to the Hebrews; but then he starts an objection, that some would say it was not Paul’s. It is not reasonable to think that Origen would weaken his own argument by a supposition of his own invention, and entirely without foundation. There were, therefore, a good while before Origen delivered this Homily upon the epistle to the Hebrews, christians who did not allow it to be Paul’s.

⁹ After the first edition of this volume, I received a letter from Mr. Hallett, in which he assures me that I have mistaken his meaning. He does not intend by ‘ ancients’ such as were before Origen; but he spoke of such as were ‘ ancients with respect to Origen,’ that is, at least such as were dead before the year 184, in which he was born; who therefore must have conversed with the apostles, or at least with their immediate successors. What Origen says, seems to him to be this: ‘ There are traditions that ascribe the epistle to the Hebrews to Clement or Luke; but the ancients, who lived before the said traditions, speak of the epistle as Paul’s. Those ancients, as Mr. Hallett argues, should be believed before modern traditions. As Origen speaks in general of “ the ancients,” he seems to mean, that they had one common universal tradition, that it was Paul’s epistle. The other traditions began among those that were modern with respect to Origen; and then the ancient tradition ceased to be universal.’ So Mr. Hallett; and certainly he has a right to explain his own terms. For my own part, I am still of opinion, that by ‘ ancients’ Origen means some only, or many, of the ancients, not all: and I rely upon what I have said already, without adding more.

Though Origen says that the ancients had handed it down as one of Paul's epistles, he cannot be understood to mean all ancient christians before his time, but only some. Undoubtedly Origen speaks truth, according to his knowledge; there were ancients who had spoken of this epistle as Paul's: in particular, Clement of Alexandria, Origen's master, and predecessor in the catechetical school of that place, received this epistle as Paul's, and was acquainted^r with a presbyter who gave him a reason why the apostle did not put his name to that epistle. But to suppose Origen to mean all ancients in general, is to charge him with great ignorance. We know very well that there were christians before Origen, as well as others about his time, who did not consider this as one of Paul's epistles. It is not easy to prove that any christians of the first two centuries, or somewhat lower, who lived in that part of the Roman empire where the Latin tongue was chiefly used, received this as an epistle of Paul. Mr. Hallett^s is one of those who did not think it a clear point, that Clement of Rome alluded to the epistle to the Hebrews, or borrowed any thing from it. I apprehend it to be very probable that Irenæus^t did not receive this epistle as Paul's; and his opinion is very considerable in this case. Though he lived in Gaul, he wrote in Greek, and came from Asia. Caius also wrote in Greek; and yet when he enumerated thirteen epistles of Paul, he omitted that to the Hebrews, saying nothing about it. It appears to me probable, that Caius had never heard that epistle called Paul's; which I am apt to think was Irenæus's case, as well as his. And, to add nothing more at present, Tertullian, though an African, was a man of extensive knowledge, a great master of Greek as well as Latin, and had no prejudices against this epistle; but with all his heart would have quoted it as Paul's, if he had had any ground for so doing. Nevertheless, with a great deal of formality, he quotes it as written by^u Barnabas, a 'companion of apostles; a fit person,' as he says, 'to show, at the next remove, what was the sentiment of the masters.' It is therefore highly probable, that in all the information which Tertullian had received concerning this epistle, he had never once heard it ascribed to the apostle Paul. These things, if I mistake not, are sufficient to make us think that the tradition, that the epistle to the Hebrews is Paul's, is not of the utmost antiquity; or that,

^r See before, ch. xxii. p. 225, 239.
 as before, p. 2, 3.

^s See his Intro-

^t See before, ch. xvii. p.

176—178.

^u See ch. xxvii. p. 288.

if it is, it must have lain for some time in a very few hands. Dr. Mill,^v remarking upon this passage of Origen, says, among all the fathers of the first and second centuries whose writings are come down to us, he hardly knows any one who has expressly cited this epistle, except Clement of Alexandria, who certainly has done so in a very ample manner. But to proceed in our observations.

6. There is an ambiguity in some of Origen's expressions in this passage. His words are: 'If therefore any church receives this epistle as Paul's, it is to be commended even upon that account. For it is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as Paul's: but who wrote this epistle God only knows. The account come down to us is various; some saying that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote this epistle; others, that it was Luke, who wrote the gospel and the Acts.' It is difficult to say what is meant by the word 'write,' when used of this epistle; whether Origen intends writing as an author, or only penning or writing down the sense of another. When Origen says, 'But who wrote this epistle God only knows,' one is supposed to understand him of writing as an author, for the sake of the opposition to what precedes. Moreover, he plainly uses the word in that sense, when he says, 'Luke wrote the gospel and the Acts.' On the other hand it is argued, that when Origen says, 'God only knows who wrote this epistle,' he means only, 'who penned it,' or 'to whom the language and composition are owing;' otherwise Origen is inconsistent with himself. For to say, first, that 'the ancients have handed it down as Paul's;' and presently after, that 'the account come down to us is various,' some ascribing the epistle to Clement, others to Luke, 'as authors,' would be a contradiction. Therefore, when he says that, 'God only knows who wrote' the epistle; and that some say, 'Clement wrote it, others Luke;' he must be supposed to speak only of 'penning' what had been heard from Paul: and in this latter sense the words are understood by two learned writers in our own language,^w Mr.

^v Quanquam autem ex dictis constet, plurimis in ecclesiis, et quidem a viris magni nominis, epistolam hanc Paulo haud fuisse adscriptam; certum tamen esse, quod ipsi *αρχαιοι*, seu primi apostolorum successores, eam tanquam Pauli receperint, teste ipso Origene, Hom. in Ep. ad Hebræos apud Eusebium. Utinam vero *αρχαιως* istos nominasset; si quidem ex patribus primi et secundi seculi, quorum scripta ad nos pervenere, haud quempiam nôrim qui hanc epistolam expresse citaverit, præter Clementem Alexandrinum. Mill, Prol. n. 218.

^w See Mr. Hallett, as before, p. 7.

Hallett and * Mr. Twells, who have both lately examined this matter with care and exactness.

7. Origen did not suppose this epistle to have been written originally in Hebrew or Syriac, but in Greek: for he says it has not the ‘apostle’s rudeness of speech,’ or homely style; but, as to the texture of the words, has a good deal of the elegance of the Greek language. This, he says, is very plain, and will be owned by every one who is able to judge of styles; whence he concludes that the sense being admirable, and worthy of the apostle, but the style very different from that of all his other writings, the sentiments are and must be Paul’s, but the composition is that of some other person, whose he cannot say: God only knows: but some say it was written by Clement, others by Luke.—Here is not one word of a translation, nor any thing founded upon that supposition: on the contrary, the whole, or a main part of the argument at least, is founded upon a supposition that the epistle was written in Greek. It is true, Eusebius has omitted a part of Origen’s argument relating to this epistle, which I heartily wish he had rather inserted at length; but I think we may be well satisfied there could be nothing here said of this epistle having been written in Hebrew, at least in Origen’s opinion.

Indeed Eusebius does say, in a passage^y which we formerly cited, ‘that whereas Paul wrote to the Hebrews ‘in their own tongue, some think the evangelist Luke, ‘others that Clement, translated it into Greek; which last,’ Eusebius says, ‘is the most likely, since there is a great ‘resemblance between the style of Clement’s epistle and that ‘to the Hebrews, as well as between the sentiments of these ‘writings.’ But it seems that Origen was not able to form any notion of this epistle having been written in Hebrew; therefore he does not say that some thought it was translated by Clement, others by Luke; but some said that Clement, others that Luke wrote it: and, to speak freely, all present appearances are in favour of its having been written in Greek, the language in which we now have it, and in which it was read by the most ancient christians, so far as we know. As for Eusebius’s opinion, that Clement translated it out of Hebrew, certainly it must be without all good ground; there being no reason to suppose that Clement understood Hebrew or Syriac, though perhaps Luke might.

8. We ought to consider on what account, or in what respect, Origen quotes this epistle so often in his works as

* Mr. Twell’s Critical Examination, &c. P. ii. p. 58—61.

^y See before, chap. ii. p. 33.

Paul's. It must be, I think, either out of deference to the commonly received, and more generally prevailing, opinion of the christians with whom he lived; or perhaps rather, on account of what he says in his Homilies upon this epistle, he quotes it as delivering and containing the real sentiments of the apostle Paul; which he supposed to be here truly represented, though the phrase and composition were not Paul's, but of some one else; probably one of his most intimate friends and constant companions, but which of them he did not certainly know. However, as there was a tradition in the church that the epistle was Paul's, so likewise there were accounts handed down to his time concerning the writer of it; some saying that it was written by Clement, others by Luke. This then was Origen's opinion of this epistle, in which^z Dr. Mill supposes him to have been singular. And thus we may reckon Origen to have performed at least, in this Homily, which he had intimated in his letter to Africanus he intended to do, and there was occasion for, considering the different sentiments about this epistle.

XI. The epistle to James we find thus cited by Origen in one of his tomes, upon St. John's gospel: 'For^a though it be called faith, "if it be without works, it is dead," as we read in the epistle ascribed to James.' This seems to show that there were doubts about this epistle; if there is not likewise an intimation of some doubt about it in his own mind. Nor do I know of any other place where this epistle is quoted in Origen's Greek works, published by Huet: excepting only one more, in another tome of his Commentaries upon John, where the^b same words are mentioned again—'faith without works is dead,'—without saying whence they are taken; intimating, however, that the sentiment itself, or the writing where it is found, was not admitted by all as of authority. Mill^c therefore says, that

^z Denique Origenis sententia hæc in re peculiaris fuisse videtur. Adjudicat epistolam hanc Paulo quoad ipsa νοηματα ex quibus constat; adjudicat autem ei, quoad stylum ac verborum compositionem, eo quod majorem Græci sermonis elegantiam præferre ipsi videntur hæc quam reliquæ Paulinæ. Mill, Prol. n. 217.

^a Εαν δε λεγεται μεν πιστις, χωρις δε εργων τυγχανη, νεκρα εστιν η τοιαυτη, ως εν τη φερομενη Ιακωβου ανεγνωμεν. Com in Johan. Tom. xix. T. ii. p. 284. D.

^b ——— ε συγχωρηθεν αν υπο των παραδεχομενων το Πιστις χωρις εργων νεκρα εστιν. In Joh. T. xxi. p. 294. E.

^c Imo vero ut in ipsius Origenis operibus, a Rufino Latinis factis, allegetur hæc epistola tanquam 'Jacobi apostoli fratris Domini,' et 'scriptura divina;' [Hom. xiii. in Gen. iii. et viii. in Exod. et Hom. ii. in Levit. et Comm. in cap. v. ep. ad Rom.] in Commentariis tamen in Joannem Græcis, ab omni interpolatione liberis, ceu dubiæ apud quosdam auctoritatis citatur. [P. 284

Origen cites this epistle as of doubtful authority with some: though in the works translated into Latin by Rufinus, it is alleged as the ‘epistle of James, apostle and brother of the Lord,’ and ‘divine scripture.’

In the books against Celsus Origen says, ‘It is^d very usual for the divine scriptures to call the evils that befall men in this life, temptations, by which, as gold in the fire, the soul of man is tried:’ and, in the Benedictine edition, over against these words are placed ‘James i. 2; 1 Pet. i. 7.’ And to the text in Peter there does appear to be a reference; but I perceive no sign of a reference to James, since afflictions are very often spoken of in scripture as temptations.

XII. In Origen’s passages before cited from Eusebius, we saw a sufficient attestation to St. Peter’s two epistles; that one is without all question genuine, and the other doubted of. However, I shall here observe farther, that the first epistle of this apostle is often quoted by Origen expressly. Thus in his well known books against Celsus: ‘As^e it is said by Peter, “Ye, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house,”’ 1 Pet. ii. 5. And in his Greek Commentaries upon St. John’s gospel: ‘Peter,^f in his catholic epistle, “Being put to death,” says he, “in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit,”’ 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20.

I do not remember any quotation of the second epistle of Peter in the books against Celsus, nor in any of Origen’s Greek works published by Huet; nor has Huet any reference to this epistle in his Index of scriptures. There is, however, a passage in Origen’s Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew, that may not be overlooked. ‘But,’ says^g Origen, ‘when I have alleged words to this purpose out of the first epistle of Peter, and the former of Paul to the Corinthians, you will assent to what has been said. For Peter says, “In whom, though now ye see him not,” namely,

et 294. Edit. Huetianæ.] Mill. Prol. 203.

^d ——— ὡς

πειρασμων της ψυχης· οὕτως γὰρ εἶθος τοῖς θεοῖς ὀνομαζεῖν λόγοις τὰ συμβαινόντα ἐν ἀνθρώποις· ἐν οἷς, ὡς χρυσοσ ἐν πυρὶ, ἢ τὰ ἀνθρώπων βασανιζομένη ψυχή ητοὶ ἐλεγχεται, ἢ θάυμασθῆ εἶναι ἀναφαίνεται. Contr. Cels. l. viii. p. 415. Cant. p. 783. F. Tom. i. Bened.

^e Καθὸ ὑπο μὲν τῆς Πέτρῳ λεγεται· Ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεισθε λίθοι ζῶντες. κ. λ. Contr. Cels. l. viii. p. 393. Cant. T. i. p. 757. Ben.

^f Καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορείας μετὰ πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιτολῇ· θανάτωθεις γὰρ, φησι, σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεις δὲ πνεύματι. κ. λ. In Johan. p. 126. A. B. T. ii. Huet.

^g Παραλαβὼν δὲ εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ἀπο τε τῆς πρώτης ἐπιτολῆς, καὶ ἀπο τῆς Παύλου πρὸς Κορινθίους προτερὰς ῥήματα, πρᾶχθησθ ὡς ὑγιῶς εἰρημενῶ τῷ λόγῳ· λέγει γὰρ ὁ μὲν Πέτρος. Εἰς ὃν ἀρτί μὴ ὀριωντες, δηλονοτι Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἔξης, ἕως τῆς. Εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμῶσιν ἀγγελιο παρακνῆσαι. Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος. κ. λ. Comm. in Matth. p. 396. D.

Jesus Christ, “yet believing ye rejoice;” and what follows to those words, “which things the angels desire to look into,” 1 Pet. i. 8—12. And Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 3, “Know ye not that we shall judge angels; how much more things that pertain to this life?” So Huet would give us this passage. But from his notes upon this place, if I understand them, it appears that he had not in his manuscript copy the word ‘first;’ but^h only four letters, which I think we may be positive mean Peter, written in an abbreviated manner: and then this passage will stand thus; ‘When I have ‘alleged some words to this purpose out of the epistle of ‘Peter, and out of the former of Paul to the Corinthians, ‘you will assent to what has been said.’ So then here is no mention made of two epistles of Peter, or of a first epistle of Peter; but only Peter’s epistle is expressly quoted by name, for what Origen there takes out of it. I suppose this may be reckoned a clear and certain emendation; I wonder Huet did not perceive the right reading. This observation is so easy, that there is no merit in it.

Nor have I observed the first epistle of Peter any where quoted in Origen’s Greek works in that manner. But the usual forms of quotation are such as those already mentioned,ⁱ ‘Peter says,’ ‘Peter teaches,’^k ‘Peter in his catholic epistle;’ which forms^l appear also in the Latin translations, though indeed we do find also in them expressly, ‘in^m the first epistle of Peter;’ but in the original it may have been only, ‘and Peter in his epistle.’

The second epistle is not often quoted in Origen’s Latin works. In a Homily upon the book of Numbers, speaking of Balaam: ‘Andⁿ as the scripture says in a certain place, “The dumb ass speaking with human voice, forbad the madness of the prophet,”’ 2 Pet. ii. 16. And in another

^h Παραλαβων δε εις τετο απο τε της πρωτης επισολης.] Legendum videtur, της Πιτρος πρωτης επισολης. Scripserat librarius ΠρϷ, quod cum syllabâ priore sequentis vocabuli propter soni similitudinem facile coaluit. Huet. notis, p. 70. ‘Sed meo iudicio legendum ΠρϷ, ut scripserat librarius, id est, ‘Πιτρος; sic, απο τε της Πιτρος επισολης.’

ⁱ Πιτρος ημας διδασκει, λεγων. In Jerem. Hom. v. p. 87. D. T. i. Huet. ως ο Πιτρος ονομασε. Comm. in Matth. p. 292. A. παρα δε τω Πιτροω ειρηται. Ibid. p. 422. C. ισε οτι, κατα τον Ιφετρον. Exh. ad Martyr. p. 300. B. T. i. Bened.

^k Κατα λεγομενα εν τη καθολικη επισολη παρα τω Πιτροω. In Psalm iii. p. 553. D. Bened.

^l Quomodo dicit Petrus. De Prin. l. ii. p. 95. A. T. i. Bened. Sicut ait Petrus apostolus. Ibid. l. iii. p. 145. F.

^m De quâ spe Petrus ipse in primâ epistolâ suâ ita ait. De Princip. l. ii. cap. 5. p. 88. D. T. i. Bened.

ⁿ Et ut ait quodam in loco scriptura: Mutum animal, humanâ voce respondens, arguit prophetâ dementiam. In Num. Hom. xiii. T. i. p. 321. C. Bened.

Latin Homily: ‘For^o I know it is written, that of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage,’ Ver. 19. Thus this epistle is quoted in a general way, without giving it any authority, so far as appears. In a Latin translation of a Homily: ‘And^p again Peter says, 2 Pet. i. 4, “Ye are made partakers,” says he, “of the divine nature.”’ In that place are several texts to the like purpose quoted from St. Paul and St. John. Perhaps the translator thought fit to add this also from St. Peter’s second epistle; and I think it looks somewhat suspicious, as if it were an addition. It is certain that Rufinus took a great liberty^q of adding, in his translations of some of Origen’s Homilies, particularly those upon Leviticus, (whence this quotation is taken,) according to his acknowledgment.

XIII. In Origen’s passages cited from Eusebius, when we first entered upon the consideration of this writer’s testimony to the books of the New Testament, St. John’s first epistle is expressly owned to be his; and it is frequently cited elsewhere. In his Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew: ‘As^r in the epistle of John, 1 John ii. 18, It is the last time.’ He quotes it often by the title of ‘John’s catholic epistle,’ in his^s Greek Commentaries still extant, and^t in the treatise of Prayer; he quotes it likewise^u as the epistle of the same John who wrote the gospel. A like form of quotation, such as^v ‘John the apostle, in his epis-

^o Scio enim scriptum esse. Quia unusquisque, a quo vincitur, huic et servus addicitur. In Exod. Hom. xii. p. 174. D.

^p Et iterum Petrus dicit, ‘Consortes,’ inquit, ‘facti estis divinæ naturæ.’ In Lev. Hom. iv. p. 200. B. Bened.

^q ——— dum supplere cupimus ea quæ ab Origene in auditorio ecclesiæ ex tempore, non tam explicationis quam ædificationis intentione, perorata sunt: sicut in Homiliis, sive in orationibus, in Genesim et in Exodum fecimus, et præcipue in his quæ in librum Levitici, ab illo quidem perorandi stylo dictata, a nobis vero explanandi specie translata sunt, &c. Rufin. laudat. Huet. Origenian. l. iii. sect. 3. p. 245. C.

^r Καθ’ ὃν ἐστὶν εὐκαίρως εἶπεν τὸ ἐσχατὴν ὥρα ἐστίν, ἐν τῇ Ἰωάννης ἐπιστολῇ κειμένου. Comm. in Matth. p. 234. B. Huet.

^s Ὅπερ παρασησομεν καὶ ἀπο τῆς Ἰωάννης καθολικῆς. In Jerem. Hom. ix. T. i. p. 106. B. Huet. Ἀπο τῆς Ἰωάννης καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς. Comm. in Matth. p. 476. E. ib. Ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ Ἰωάννης. κ. λ. Comm. in Joan. p. 22. C. Ὅμως κατανοητέον καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ ὑπο Ἰωάννης εἰρημένον περὶ νύων Θεοῦ. κ. λ. Comm. in Joan. p. 299. E.

^t Δηλὸν ὅτι ὁ ποιῶν ἁμαρτιαν, ὡς φησὶν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ὁ Ἰωάννης, ἐκ τῆς διαβολῆς ἐστίν. De Orat. p. 233. B. Bened. Ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ τῇ Ἰωάννης ἐπιστολῇ. Ibid. p. 232. A.

^u Ἐν δὲ τῇ καθολικῇ τῇ αὐτῆς Ἰωάννης ἐπιστολῇ λεγεται. Comm. in Joan. p. 70. A. Vid. et p. 261. C. ibid.

^v Unde credo et Joannes apostolus in epistolâ suâ dicit, quædam esse peccata ad mortem, quædam non esse ad mortem. In Exod. Hom. x. p. 176. B. Tom. ii. Bened. Annon et apostolus Joannes in epistolâ suâ eadem sentit? In Num. Hom. ix. p. 297. E. Quas apostolus Joannes in epistolâ suâ dis-

tle,' appears not seldom in the Homilies which we now have in Latin only.

In the passage cited from Eusebius, Origen informed us, there were doubts about the second and third epistles of John, for 'all did not allow' them to be genuine: 'but,' says he, 'let them also be granted to be his.' However, I do not know of any one quotation of either of these in Origen's remaining works.

XIV. We must be somewhat particular in our observations upon St. Jude's epistle. In the Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew, immediately after what was cited just now, relating to St. Peter's second epistle, Origen goes on: 'Consider,^w therefore, whether they were not more excellent, and superior to men, [or perhaps rather, governors or lords of men,] so long as they "kept their first estate, and left not their own habitation;"' which are words of Jude, ver. 6. And presently after he has likewise the following words of the same verse: "Reserved^x in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."

In the same Commentaries, having taken notice of these words, Matt. xiii. 55, 56: "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?" beside other remarks, he says that James is the same whom Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, speaks of, as having been seen by him. Gal. i. 19. He also observes a passage in the Antiquities of Josephus, relating to the same James; and then adds: 'And^y Jude wrote an epistle, of a few lines indeed, but full of powerful words of the heavenly grace; who at the beginning says, "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James."' This passage is of use to show us whom Origen took to be the author of this epistle; and I would farther observe, that it is somewhat strange that in this place nothing should be said by Origen concerning the epistle of James, if he supposed it to be written by the James before mentioned.

Again, in the same Commentaries: 'And^z in the epistle

tinctione comprehendit: ait enim, 'Scribo vobis, pueri; et scribo vobis, adolescentes; et scribo vobis, patres.' Ibid. p. 300. F.

^w 'Ορα εν, ει μη ουτοι μεν οσον ετηρουν την εαυτων αρχην, και εκ απελιπον το ιδιον οικητηριον, πολλη ανθρωπων εφερον, και ησαν αυτων πρωτοι. Com. in Matth. p. 396. E. Vid. et p. 397. A.

^x Εις κρισιν μεγαλης ημερας δεσμοις αιδειοις εν ζοφω τηρημενοι. p. 397. B.

^y Και Ιωδας εγραψεν επιτολην, ολιγοστιχον μεν, πεπληρωμενην δε των της υρανης χαριτος ερωμενων λογων, οστις εν τη προομιμω ειρηκεν' Ιωδας, Ιησους Χριστος δεσλος, αδελφος δε Ιακωβου. Ibid. p. 223. D. E.

^z Και εν τυ

of Jude, To “them that are beloved in God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.” Hence it appears that instead of ‘sanctified,’ in our present copies, Origen read ‘beloved.’

Once more, in the same Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew’s gospel, having cited 1 Pet. i. 12, he says: ‘But^a if any one receives also the epistle of Jude, let him consider what will follow from what is there said, ver. 6, “And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.”’ This shows that there were some at that time who doubted of, or denied, the authority of this epistle.

There are quotations of this epistle in Origen’s remaining Greek works. We find it also quoted in his Latin works, particularly in his books of Principles, in Rufinus’s translation: ‘Of which, in the^b Ascension of Moses, which book the apostle Jude quotes in his epistle, Michael the archangel, disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, says, the serpent, moved by the devil, was the cause of the sin of Adam and Eve.’ This epistle is^c quoted several times in a Latin epistle of Origen. We likewise saw Jude mentioned in the Latin catalogues^d transcribed above.

XV. The Revelation is mentioned, as we saw before, in Origen’s Greek passages transcribed from Eusebius, among the other writings of St. John, the apostle of Christ, and allowed to be his. Origen seems to have had no doubt about it; and it is often cited by him. He speaks of it in this manner, in his Commentaries upon St. John’s gospel: ‘Therefore^e John, the son of Zebedee, says in the Revelation, “I saw an angel fly in the midst of heaven,”’ Rev. xiv. 6.

In another^f place he says, ‘The sons of Zebedee drank of that cup, and were baptized with that baptism; forasmuch as “Herod killed James, the brother of John, with the sword,” Acts xii. 2; and^g a Roman emperor, as tra-

Ἰδὲ ἐπιστολῆς τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις καὶ κλητοῖς. Ibid. p. 332. A.

^a Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰδὲ προσδεχόμενος τις ἐπιστολὴν, ὁρᾷ τι ἔπεται τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῶν Ἀγγέλων τε μὴ τηρησάντας τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, κ. τ. λ. Ibid. p. 488. E.

^b De quo in Ascensione Mōysi, cujus libelli meminit in epistolâ suâ apostolus Judas, Michaël archangelus cum Diabolo disputans de corpore Mōysi, ait, a Diabolo inspiratum serpentem, causam exitisse prævaricationis Adæ et Evæ. De Prin. lib. iii. cap. 2. in T. i. p. 138. A.

^c Vid. Orig. p. 5. T. i. Bened.

^d See num. v. vi.

^e Φησὶν ἐν ἐν τῇ Ἀποκαλυψῇ ὁ τῶν Ζεβεδαίων Ἰωάννης. Com. in Joh. p. 14. E.

^f Com. in Matth. p. 417. B. C.

^g Ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς. Ib. B

dition informs us, banished John to the island of Patmos, for the testimony of the word of truth. Of his testimony John himself speaks, though he does not inform us by whom that sentence was passed upon him, saying thus in the Revelation, i. 9: "I John, your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle which is called Patmos, for the word of God:" and what follows: and^h it seems that he saw the Revelation in that island.' Perhaps it will be thought remarkable by some, that Origen does not name the emperor who pronounced this sentence against St. John.

Again, he calls the writer of theⁱ Revelation 'apostle and evangelist; and, on account of the Revelation, prophet.'

In his books against Celsus he mentions John's^k Revelation, and divers other books of scripture, particularly of the Old Testament; and soon after adds: 'But^l let Celsus and they that read his book know, that no where, in any of the scriptures that are genuine, and believed to be divine, is there any mention of seven heavens. Nor have any of our prophets, or the apostles of Jesus, or he himself the Son of God, borrowed any thing from the Persians or the Cabirians.' The Revelation therefore was among those books which were reputed genuine and divine scriptures.

And finally,^m Origen intended to write a commentary upon the Revelation, though we do not certainly know that he did so.

XVI. There is a place in Origen where he has been supposed to say, that from the beginning christians had been divided about the books that ought to be received as scripture. It is in his books against Celsus, who had said of the christians, that at first, and so long as they were few, they were all of one mind; but afterwards, when they were increased into a great number, they were miserably divided. In answer to what is said in the first part of this objection, Origen observes, 'That Celsusⁿ was so ignorant as not to

^h Και εοικε την Αποκαλυψιν εν τη νησω θεωρηκεναι. Ibid. C.

ⁱ Καλως μεντοιγε διαγραφων τα περι τω λογω τω Θεω εν τη Αποκαλυψει ο αποστολος και ευαγγελιτης, ηδη δε και εια της Αποκαλυψεως και προφητης, φησι, κ. λ. Com. in Joh. p. 51. D.

^k Αναγνωτω δε και εκ της Ιωαννης Αποκαλυψεως τα περι της πολεως. κ. λ. Contr. Cels. l. vi. T. i. p. 647. E. Bened.

^l Ιτω δε Κελσος, και οι εντυχανοντες αυτα τω βιβλιω, οτι εδαμα των γνησιων και θειων πεπιτευμενων γραφων επτα ειρηνται βρανοι. Ουτ' απο Περσων η Καβειρων λαβοντες ημων οι προφηται λεγωσι τινα, εδ' οι τω Ιησω αποστολοι, εδ' αυτος ο υιος τω Θεω. Ibid. p. 648. B.

^m Omnia hæc exponere singillatim, de capitibus septem draconis, [Rev. xii. 3.] non est temporis hujus; exponentur autem tempore suo in Revelatione Joannis. In Matth. Tr. 30. p. 147. in Tom. ii. Basil.

ⁿ Φησι δε και οτι εν εφρονην παντες εδ' εν τατω ορων, οτι αρχηθεν περι

know, that from the very beginning there were differences among the believers about the books that should be received as divine scripture.' So Origen has been understood to say; and so Spencer^o had translated this passage. But the Benedictine editor of Origen has translated it thus: 'That Celsus^p was so ignorant as not to know, that from the beginning there were differences among the believers about the sense [interpretation, or meaning] of the books believed to be divine.' And that this is what Origen means appears very evident from what he says presently afterwards in support of his assertion: 'That^q there were in the times of the apostle disputes among the Jewish believers, whether the converts from among the Gentiles should observe the rites of the Mosaic law, or not.' He insists also upon the question about the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 12, and some other matters mentioned in the New Testament. And, as he proceeds, he several times speaks of 'misunderstanding of doctrines,' and of the^s writings and words of Moses and the prophets: and says that^t 'from different interpretations of words believed by all to be divine, arose various sects:' using all along phrases that confirm De la Rue's version of the foregoing passage.

XVII. Origen has a long argument concerning the books of the New Testament, in the first tome of his commentaries upon St. John's gospel. It may be of use to us to take a large part of it. 'We^u may then be bold to say, the gospel is the first-fruit of all the scriptures.—It may be therefore not unfitly said, that^v of all the scriptures commonly received, and believed to be divine, in all the

την εν τοις πεπεισμενοις θειοις ειναι βιβλιοις εκδοχην γενοασι διαφωνια των πισευοντων. Com. Cels. l. iii. p. 117. Cant. p. 453. F. Tom. i. Bened.

^o Ne hic quidem videns, quod mox ab initio non conveniebat inter credentes de delectu divinatorum sacræ scripturæ voluminum. Vers. Spencer.

^p Neque hic novit, jam tum ab initio fuisse de sensu librorum, qui divini esse credebantur, inter fideles dissidia. Vers. Bened.

^q *Ετι γην των αποστολων κηρυσσοντων, — ζητησις εκ ολιγη προς αλληλεις γεγενηται παρα τοις απο Ισδαιων πισευσι περι των εξ εθνων επερχομενων τη λογη, ποτερον δε τα ισδαϊκα τηρειν εθη.* κ. λ. p. 454. A.

^r *'Οτι απ' αρχης γενοασι τινες παρεκδοχαι, εδεπω (ως οιεται Κελσος) πολλων των πισευοντων γεγενημενων.* p. 454. B.

^s *Αλλα και ισδαϊσμος προφασιν εσχε γενεσεως αιρεσεων, την διαφορον εκδοχην των Μωυσεως γραμματων και των προφητικων λογων.* Ibid. E.

^t *Τετω δ' ηκολυθησε, διαφορω εκδεξαμενων τωσ αμα πασι πισευθεντας ειναι θειωσ λογωσ, το, γενεσθαι αιρεσις, κ. λ.* p. 455. A.

^u *Και γαρ τολμητεον ειπειν, πασων των γραφων ειναι απαρχην το ευαγγελιον.* Com. in Johan. p. 3. E.

^v *Των τουτων φερομενων γραφων και εν πασαισ εκκλησαισ Θεω πεπεισμενων ειναι θειων, εκ αν αμαρτοι τισ λεγων πρωτογεννημα μεν τον Μωυσεωσ νομον, απαρχην δε το ευαγγελιον.* Ibid. p. 4. A.

churches of God the law of Moses is the first-begotten, the gospel the first-fruit.—If^w any object to this, that beside the gospels there are the Acts and the epistles of the apostles,—we need^x not scruple to say that the writings also of the apostles are in some sense gospel; forasmuch as it belongs to the office of an evangelist by exhortations to recommend a belief of the things concerning Jesus. And whereas it may be still objected, that we do not rightly call the whole New Testament gospel, because the epistles do not bear the inscription of gospel; it may be allowed that, since it is not uncommon for several scriptures to have two or more names, one may be, strictly speaking, more proper than the other. So the scripture called by the name of epistles, is not gospel, when compared with the history of the actions, and sufferings, and words of Jesus: nevertheless the gospel is the first-fruit of the whole scripture.—And^y I think that, there being four gospels, which are as it were the elements of the faith of the church, of which elements the whole world reconciled to God by Christ consists,—the gospel of John, which you have desired me to explain, is the first-fruit of the gospels. This I say with regard to him who writes the genealogy, and him who begins with him who had no genealogy. For Matthew, writing for the Hebrews, who expected him who was to descend from Abraham and David, says, “The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.” Mark writes, [Here some things are wanting, and it seems very plain that Luke also was mentioned in this place,]—But he reserves the greater and more perfect discourses concerning Jesus for him who lay in the bosom

^w Εαν δε τις ανθυποφερη για την εννοιαν της αναπτυξεως των απαρχων φασκων μετα τα ευαγγελια τας πραξεις και τας επισολας φερεσθαι των αποστολων, και κατα τωτο μη αν επι σωζεσθαι το προαποδεδομενον περι απαρχης, το απαρχην πασης γραφης ειναι το ευαγγελιον. Ibid. B.

^x Ουκ οκνησομεν, χαρακτηριζομενε τα ευαγγελισα, και εν προτρεπτικω λογω τω εις πιστοποιησιν των περι Ιησυ ευαγγελιον πως ειπειν τα υπο των αποστολων γεγραμμενα. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 4. E. 5. A.

^y Εγω δ' ομαι οτι και δ' οντων των ευαγγελιων οιονει σοιχειων της πιεως της εκκλησιας, εξ ων σοιχειων ο πας συνεστηκε κοσμος, εν Χριστω καταλλαγεις τω Θεω,—απαρχην των ευαγγελιων ειναι το προτεταγμενον ημιν υπο σε κατα δυναμιν ερευνησαι το κατα Ιωαννην τον γενεαλογημενον ειπων, και απο αγενεαλογητε αρχομενον· Ματθαιος μεν γαρ τοις προσδοκωσι τον εξ Αβρααμ και Δαβιδ Εβραιοις γραφον, Βιβλος, φησι, γενεσεως Ιησυ Χριστω, υιου Δαβιδ, υιου Αβρααμ και Μαρκος—αλλα γε τηρει τω επι το σθηθος αναπεσοντι τε Ιησυ τες μειζονας και τελειοτερας περι Ιησυ λογους εδεις γαρ εκεινων ακρατως εφανερωσεν αυτη την θεοτητα, ως Ιωαννης, παρασησας αυτον λεγοντα· Εγω εμι—τολμητεον τοιωνν ειπειν απαρχην μεν πασων γραφων ειναι τα ευαγγελια, των δε ευαγγελιων απαρχην το κατα Ιωαννην. Ibid. p. 5. C. D. E. p. 6. A.

of Jesus. For none of them have so distinctly declared his deity as John, who introduces him saying, "I am the light of the world; I am the way, and the truth, and the life; I am the resurrection; I am the door; I am the good shepherd;" and in the Revelation, "I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." We may be bold to say, then, that the angels are the first-fruits of all the scriptures, and the gospel according to John the first-fruit of the gospels.'

This passage is observable upon divers accounts; particularly, we see that Origen received four gospels, and no more. He owns without scruple the genealogy in St. Matthew: and we perceive what were the several scriptures of the New Testament generally received by christians—the gospels, Acts, epistles of apostles, and St. John's Revelation.

XVIII. This leads us to what comes next in order to be considered, the several titles and divisions of the books of sacred scripture.

1. The most general division is that of^z the Old and the New Testament, between both which Origen says there is a perfect harmony. There are other places where Origen speaks^a of the 'ancient' and the 'new' scriptures: in the former part he reckons the law and the prophets; in the latter the gospels and apostles, and asserts their complete harmony throughout.

2. Accordingly such titles and divisions as these are very frequent: 'The law^b and the prophets, the gospels and apostles; prophets,^c gospels, and apostles; The^a scriptures of the prophets of God and of the apostles of Jesus.'

3. 'They^e who mind earthly things—suffer a famine of

^z Πεπληρωμενη συμφωνιας δογματων κοινων τη καθεμηνη παλαια προς την ονομαζομενην καινην διαθηκην. Com. in Joh. p. 92. A. Huet.

^a Γινεται δε και τριτος ειρηνοποιος, ο παριτας την συμφωνιαν και την ειρηνην τειτων, ητοι παλαιων προς καινας, η νομικων προς προφητικας, η ευαγγελικων προς αποστολικας. κ. λ. E secundo tomo in Matth. Philoc. cap. vi. p. 30, 31. Cant. p. 204. Huet.

^b Quæ recitata sunt nobis, puteus est, et omnis simul scriptura Legis et Prophetarum: Evangelica quoque et Apostolica, scripta simul omnia, unus est puteus, &c. In Num. Hom. xii. T. ii. p. 314. C. Bened.

^c Εστι δε και παρα τοις ευαγγελιοις, και παρα τοις αποστολοις, και δια των προφητων μυριας οσας προσηγοριας συναγαγειν. κ. λ. In Joh. p. 22. A.

^d Και οσα αλλα λεγασι περι αυτη αι των προφητων τε Θεα και των αποστολων τε Ιησθ γραφαι. Contr. Cels. l. v. T. i. p. 580. C. Bened.

^e Qui enim de terrâ sunt, et terrena sapiunt——famem verbi Dei patiuntur, legis mandata non audiunt, correptiones prophetarum nesciunt, apostolicas consolationes ignorant, non sentiunt evangelii medicinam. In Gen. Hom. xvi. T. ii. p. 104. D.

the word of God. They hear not the commands of the law, they know not the reproofs of the prophets, they are ignorant of the consolations of the apostles, they receive not the medicine of the Gospel.'

4. 'That we may be able to bring forth out of our treasure things new and old, and may be scribes instructed unto the kingdom of heaven,' he says, 'we^f must give diligent attendance to reading,—and meditate in the law of the Lord day and night; not only the new oracles of the gospels and the apostles, and their revelation, but likewise the ancient oracles of the law and the prophets.'

5. Origen professes his own resolution^g to improve the talent he had received, 'whether of the gospel, or the apostle, or the prophet, or the law.'

6. These several titles and divisions of scripture, I think, must be of use to satisfy us that Origen received no books as sacred scripture, and of authority, beside those which we so receive at this time. More instances of these, or the like divisions, will appear in the article of the respect showed to the scriptures, to which we now proceed.

XIX. There are in Origen many evidences, not only of his own great respect for the scriptures, but also of the high esteem they were in with christians in general.

1. Discoursing of a seeming difference between the evangelists, he speaks of it as the common opinion of christians, 'That^h the gospels were written exactly according to truth, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and that the writers had made no mistakes.' And afterwards, in the same discourse, 'After this Mark says, x. 50: "And he, casting away his garment, leaped and came to Jesus." Shall we say thatⁱ the evangelist wrote without thought when he related the man's casting away his garment, and leaping, and coming to Jesus? and shall we dare to say that these things were inserted in the gospels in vain? For my part, I believe that not one jot or tittle of the divine instructions is in vain.'

^f Και εν τω νομῳ Κυριου μελεταν ημερας και νυκτος, η μονον τα καινα των ευαγγελιων, και των αποπολων, και της Αποκαλυψεως αυτων λογια, αλλα και παλαια. κ. λ. Comm. in Matth. p. 220. C. D.

^g Εχομαι την μναν ειτε ευαγγελισ, ειτε αποπολι, ειτε προφητη, ειτε νομο ποιησαι πολλαπλασιονα. In Jerem. Hom. xix. p. 186. D. Huët.

^h Ειπερ γαρ ακριβως πιτευομεν αναγεγραφθαι, συνεργωντος και τε 'Αγιε Πνευματος, τα ευαγγελια, και μη εσφαλησαν εν τω απομνημονευειν οι γραψαντες αυτα. κ. λ. Comm. in Matth. p. 227. B. Huët.

ⁱ Αρ' εν εδεν εννοησας ανεγραψε περι τε αποβαλοντα αυτον το ιματιον αναπεπηδηκοτα εληλυθεναι προς τον Ιησυν, και τολμησομεν φησαι ματην ταυτα προσεβριφθαι τῳ ευαγγελιω; εγω μεν ιωτα εν η μιαν κεραιαν η πιτευω κεινην ειναι θειων μαθηματων. In Matth. p. 428. E.

2. In another place he argues : ‘ We^k are never to say that there is any thing impertinent or superfluous in the scriptures of the Holy Spirit, though to some they may seem obscure : but we are to turn the eyes of our mind to Him who commanded these things to be written, and seek of Him the interpretation of them : that, if our soul is dis-tempered, He may heal us who healeth all its sicknesses : or, if we be yet children in understanding, the Lord that receiveth little children may train us up, and bring us to the perfection of mature age.’

3. Again, he speaks of it as a common opinion, ‘ That^l the sacred books are not the writings of men, but have been written and delivered to us from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by the will of the Father of all, through Jesus Christ.’

4. In answer to some objections of Celsus, Origen^m says, ‘ With his good leave he will venture to affirm, that the disciples of Jesus, after their understandings were enlightened by the grace of God, knew better than Plato what to write, and how to write, and what things were fit to be published to the world, either by writing, or discourse, and what not.’

5. In a Latin Homily upon Jeremiah : ‘ Theⁿ sacred scriptures come from the fulness of the Spirit : so that there is nothing in the prophets, or the law, or the gospel, or the apostle, which descends not from the fulness of the divine majesty.’

6. In a Homily upon the same prophet, still extant in Greek : ‘ If^o the oracles of God are contained in the law

^k Sed non possumus hoc dicere de Sancti Spiritûs literis, quod aliquid in eis otiosum sit aut superfluum, etiamsi aliquibus videntur obscura. Sed hoc potius facere debemus, ut oculos mentis nostræ convertamus ad eum qui hæc scribi jussit, et ab ipso horum intelligentiam postulemus : ut, sive infirmitas est in animâ nostrâ, sanet nos ille qui sanat omnes languores ejus ; sive parvi sensûs sumus, adsit nobis custodiens parvulos Dominus, et enutriat nos, atque in mensuram ætatis adducat. In Num. Hom. xxvii. T. ii. p. 375. B. Bened.

^l Διοπερ τοις πειθομενοις μη ανθρωπων ειναι συγγραμματα τας ιερας βιβλας, αλλ' εξ επιπνοιας τῃ Ἁγίῳ Πνευματος βεβλη-
ματι τῃ Πατρος των ὁλων δια Ιησοῦ Χριστου ταντας αναγεγραφθαι και εις ἡμας εληλυθεναι, τας φανομενας ὁδου αποδεικτιον. Philoe. c. i. p. 7. Cant. De Prin. l. iv. T. i. p. 166. in Bened.

^m Και, ει μη φορτικον ειπειν περι των τηλικωτων ανδρων το αληθες, φημι, ὅτι μαλλον Ηλατωνος οὔτοι ἔωρων, ἀφ' ὧν ελαμβανον χαριτι Θεου νοημάτων, τινα μὲν τα γραπτεα, και πως γραπτεα, τινα δε βδραμωσ γραπτεα εις τῃσ πολλοις, και τινα μὲν ῥητα, τινα δε ε τοιαντα. Contr. Cels. l. vi. p. 634. A. Bened.

ⁿ Et ideo sacra volumina Spiritûs plenitudine spirant ; nihilque est, sive in prophetis, sive in lege, sive in evangelio, sive in apostolo, quod non a plenitudine divinæ majestatis descendat. In Jerem. L. Hom. ii. p. 577. Basil. 1571.

^o Ει Θεου λογια εστιν εν νομῳ, και προφηταις,

and the prophets, and in the gospels and the apostles, it becomes him, who is instructed in the divine oracles, to own God for his teacher.'

7. In his Commentaries upon St. Matthew: 'These things,' says^p he, 'we must understand in a manner worthy of the wisdom of God, by which the gospels were written.'

8. Speaking of some doctrines he says, 'That^q one and the same Spirit, proceeding from the one God, teaches the like things in the scriptures written before the coming of Christ, and in the gospels and apostles.'

9. All these observations afford abundant proofs of the peculiar authority and esteem of the holy scriptures. It will be easy to add a few passages, where it is asserted that the proofs of doctrines ought to be taken from them.

10. 'We must^r seek,' says Origen, 'for a good proof of this truth. This must be fetched from the scriptures; for our assertions and discourses are unworthy of credit. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.—In order to establish this interpretation, I shall bring two witnesses out of the New and the Old Testament. Yea, I shall bring three witnesses; from the gospel, from the prophet, from the apostle.'

11. In another place and work he speaks^s of the 'scriptures believed to be divine, both those of the Old and New Testament,' which were generally used for confirming any doctrine.

12. Discoursing of the duty of prayer: 'But^t what we have said may be proved from the divine scriptures in this manner.'

13. 'It would^u be tedious,' says he, 'to insist upon all

εναγγελίους τε και αποστολούς, δέησει τον μαθητευομενον Θεος λογίσις διδασκαλον επιγραφεισθαι Θεον. In Jerem. Hom. x. p. 107. A. Huet.

^p *Επει δε πραγματα λαμβανειν δεi απο των λεγομενων αξιας σοφιας Θεου, αφ' ης τα εναγγελια γεγραπται. Com. in Matth. p. 447. E. Huet.*

^q *Ου μονον δε περι των προ της παρωσιας ταυτα το Πνευμα φκονομησεν, αλλ' ατε το αυτο τυγχανον και απο ενος Θεου, το ομοιον και επι των εναγγελιων, και επι των αποστολων. Philoc. p. 12. fin. De Prin. l. iv. p. 174. n. 16. Bened.*

^r *Μαρτυρας δεi λαβειν τας γραφας: αμαρτυροι γαρ αι επιβολαι ημων και αι εξηγησεις απιτοι εισιν. Επι σοματι δυο και τριων μαρτυρων σαθησεται παν ρημα—ινι σησω τα ρηματα της ερμηνειας, λαβων μαρτυρας δυο απο καινης και παλαιας διαθηκης: λαβων μαρτυρας τρεις απο εναγγελιου, απο προφητου, απο αποστολου, ουτως σαθησεται παν ρημα. In Jerem. Hom. i. p. 55. H. Huet.*

^s *Vid. Philoc. p. i. Cant. De Prin. l. iv. sect. 1. p. 156. Bened.*

^t *Κατασκευαστειν δε απο των θειων γραφων τα ειρημνα, τωτον τον τροπον. De Orat. p. 210. F. Bened.*

^u *Longum erit, si ex omnibus evangeliorum locis testimonia congregemus.—Contingemus tamen breviter etiam de Actibus Apostolorum, ubi Stephanus et apostoli*

the texts of the gospels, wherein it is taught that one and the same God is the God of the law and the gospel. I shall nevertheless touch upon a place or two of the Acts of the Apostles, where Stephen and the apostles direct their prayers to that God who is the maker of the heaven and the earth, and who spoke by the mouth of the holy prophets.'

14. He^v says, 'Christians believe Jesus to be the son of God, in a sense not to be explained and made known to men by any but by that scripture alone which is inspired by the Holy Ghost; that is, the evangelic and apostolic scripture, as also that of the law and the prophets.'

15. In his books against Celsus: 'But^w that our religion teaches us to seek after wisdom, shall be shown both out of the ancient Jewish scriptures, which we also use; and out of those written since Jesus, and which are believed in the churches to be divine.'

XX. The respect for the scriptures appears farther in frequent and earnest exhortations to read and study them, taken from the consideration of the benefit of such a practice.

1. Origen does mightily recommend the reading of the scriptures. He^x says, 'That if I the Lord Jesus find us employed in such studies, he will come and partake with us; yea, if he sees such a feast prepared by us, he will bring his Father with him.'

2. He says likewise, 'That^y the greatest torment of dæmons, and above all the other pains they endure, is to see

preces suas dirigunt ad eum Deum, qui fecit cælum et terram, &c. De Prin. l. ii. cap. iv. p. 85. C. Bened.

^v ——— eminentiorem divinioremque rationem de Filio Dei, nullius alterius possibilitatis esse credimus exponere, atque in hominum cognitionem proferre, nisi ejus solius scripturæ, quæ a Spiritu Sancto inspirata est, id est, evangelicæ, et apostolicæ, necnon legis et prophetarum, sicut ipse Christus asserit. De Prin. l. i. cap. iii. p. 60. A.

^w 'Ὅτι δὲ βλεπεται ἡμᾶς εἶναι σοφῆς, δεικτεον καὶ ἀπο τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ ἰσθαικῶν γραμματῶν, οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς χρωμεθα, εἰς ἧπτον δὲ καὶ ἀπο τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦν γραφέντων, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς θείων εἶναι πεπισημενῶν. Con. Cels. l. iii. p. 138. Cant. T. i. p. 476. C. Bened.

^x Ipse Dominus noster Jesus Christus, si nos inveniat his vacantes, et hujuscemodi studiis et exercitiis operam dantes, non solum pasci et refici dignatur in nobis, verum etiam, si has epulas apud nos viderit apparatus, Patrem secum dignatur adducere. In lib. Jesu. Hom. xx. p. 44. A. Bened.

^y Super omnia vero eis tormentorum genera, et super omnes pœnas, si quem videant verbo Dei operam dare, scientiam divinæ legis et mysteria scripturarum intentis studiis perquirentem, in hoc eorum omnis flamma est, in isto uruntur incendio, quoniam quidem ignorantie tenebris humanas obscuraverant mentes, et hæc obtinuerant, ut Deus quidem ignoraretur, ad ipsos vero divini cultus studia transferrentur. In Num. Hom. xxvii. p. 378. D. E.

men reading the word of God, and studying and labouring to understand the divine law, and the mysteries of the scriptures; and that for this reason, because hereby men are delivered from that darkness and ignorance of God and religion, which they had brought into the world, and on which all the interests of their kingdom depend.'

3. Origen is for studying carefully all the scriptures, and every part of them. In a Greek fragment of a Homily upon Ezekiel, particularly upon chap. xxxiv. 17, 18, 19, he^z says, 'there are some who receive the New and reject the Old Testament.—But,' says he, 'never let us tread down the prophetic pasture, nor foul the water of the law. And whereas there are some likewise who offend against the evangelical pasture, and the apostolical water, insomuch that they tread down some parts of the gospels, [or 'some of the gospels,'] and feed on other parts as good pasture; and some either reject the apostles entirely, or take only a part of them; let^a us feed on all the gospels entire, and tread down no part of them; and drinking of all the writings of the apostles, as much as in us lies, let us preserve the water pure that is set before us, and not foul any part thereof with unbelief, which disturbs those who are not able to understand them.'

4. To the like purpose in another place: 'Let^b us read the scriptures of the Old Testament, and imitate the virtues for which any are commended, and carefully avoid the things for which they are blamed. Let us^c also read the books of the New Testament, the words of the apostles; and having read them, let it be our care that they be written in the table of our hearts, that a bill of divorce may not be given unto us, but we may enter into the holy inheritance.'

5. He is for reading the scriptures, though we there find some things which we do not understand: 'Food,' he^d

^z Τουιστοι εη εισιν ουτε την μεν καινην εγκρινοντες, την δε παλαιαν αποδοκιμαζοντες διαθηκην. xx. Tom. Com. in Ez. p. 200. C. Huet.

^a Ημεεις και ολα ευαγγελια νεμεθωμεν, και μηδεν αυτων πατησομεν, και παντα τα αποτοδικα πινοντες, το οσον εφ' ημιν καθεσηκος υδωρ, αυτα τηρσωμεν, και μηδεν των εν αυτοις απιστια ταρασσηση της εκ ειδοτας συνιεναι των λεγομενων ταραξωμεν. Ibid. p. 201. G. ^b In Jerem. Hom. iv. p. 74. B. Huet.

^c — — αναγνωναι τα βιβλια της Καινης Διαθηκης, των αποτολων της λογης. κ. λ. Ibid.

^d Soleat medici præbere interdum cibum aliquem, interdum etiam potum dare, verbi gratiâ ad discutiendam caliginem visûs: nec tamen in edendo ipso cibo, vel in potando, sentimus quia utilis est, et prodest oculis.—Hoc ergo modo credendum est etiam de scripturâ sanctâ, quia utilis est et animæ prodest, etiam si sensus noster ad præsens intelligentiam non capit: quoniam, ut diximus, et bonæ virtutes, quæ nobis adsunt, reficiuntur in his sermonibus et

says, ‘ is eaten, physic is taken : though the good effect is not presently perceived, a benefit is expected in time, and may be obtained. So,’ he says, ‘ it is with the holy scriptures : though at the very time of reading them there be no sensible advantage, yet in the end they will be found profitable for strengthening virtuous dispositions, and weakening the habits of vice.’ This seems to be said particularly for the encouragement of meaner persons ; that, though they should not understand every thing, and there be no interpreter at hand to explain a difficulty ; nevertheless they should read the scriptures with good hopes of more advantage in the end than is perceived at first, and that by continual reading they may improve.

6. Mr Lowth, in a book^e designed for the use of meaner people, says, ‘ The primitive church cannot be accused of ‘ encouraging ignorance in the people ; and yet Origen ‘ informs us that there was a distinction made then between ‘ books of scripture which lay open to every body’s use, and ‘ such as were read only by persons of better understand- ‘ ings : a distinction which, if it had been observed in these ‘ latter days, would have not a little contributed to the ‘ peace of the church.’

But I am apt to think, that learned writer mistook the meaning of Origen’s passage, to which he refers. Celsus had put into the mouth of christians some words, which Origen says were never spoken by any christian, learned or unlearned. ‘ However,’ as Origen^g adds, ‘ it is not in any private books, or such as are read by a few only, and those studious persons, but in books read by every body, that it is written ; “ The invisible things of God, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by things that are made,”’ Rom. i. 20 : so that the epistle to the Romans was a writing open to all sorts of people. And yet from thence disputes have been raised, which have sometimes given no small disturbance to the church ; and christians of^h ancient as well as later times have been

pascuntur ; et contrariæ torpescunt his meditationibus et effugantur.— Non istâ de causâ hæc diximus, nec excusantes nos ista protulimus, sed ut ostenderemus in scripturis sanctis esse vim quandam, quæ legenti etiam sine explicatione sufficiat. In libr. Jesu, Hom. xx. p. 455. A. B. C. Bened.

^e Directions for the profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures, ch. i. p. 9, 10. Third ed. 1726. ^f Cont. Cels. l. vii. p. 356. Cant.

^g Καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἀνακίχωρηκοσι καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένοις ὑπο ὀλίγων μόνον καὶ φιλομαθῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὄημῶδεςτέροις γεγραπταί, ὅτι τὰ ἄορατα τῆ θεοῦ ἀπο κτισέως κοσμοῦ τοῖς ποιήμασι νοημένα καθοραταί. Ibid. p. 720. C. Bened.

^h Omnis quidem ad Romanos epistola interpretatione indiget, et tantis obscuritatibus involuta est, ut ad intelligendam eam Spiritus Sancti indi-

sensible it is a part of scripture in which are many things not easy to be understood. But I apprehend that there is no ground to conclude, from this passage, that there were any books of scripture that were not read by all. The private books, those read by a few only, and those studious men, do not appear to be books of scripture, sacred scripture. So far as I am able to perceive, it would be reasonable to look for all the books of scripture, where we find the epistle to the Romans, among writings used by all mankind.

It is true, Origen allows that there are difficulties in the scriptures; but he does not therefore dissuade any from reading them, but advises them to labour the more to understand their meaning. And if this were a reason against reading any part of scripture, it would hold against all; for Origen was of opinion that there were difficulties in all the books of the New Testament, even the plainest of them, the gospels themselves, as we may see hereafter.

Origen oftenⁱ speaks of a threefold sense of scripture—historical, moral, and mystical; and he^k says that if any sense is difficult to be attained, he will never cease reading, studying, inquiring, and praying, till he has found it. And he exhorts others to do the like, and blames those who never read the scriptures at home, and seldom come to church except on festival days; because in this way they are never likely to attain all these senses, scarce any one of them. Thus argues Origen in his Homilies, to excite the diligence of all sorts of people.

geamus auxilio, qui per apostolum hæc ipsa dictavit. Hieron. Hedibæ, sect. 10. Totus hic apostoli locus, et in superioribus et in consequentibus, imo omnis epistola ejus ad Romanos, nimis obscuritatibus involuta est. Id. Algasia, Qu. viii.

ⁱ Prima enim quæ præcessit, historica est, veluti fundamentum quoddam in inferioribus posita. Secunda hæc mystica, superior et excelsior fuit. Tertiam, si possumus, moralem tentemus adjicere. In Genesim, Hom. ii. p. 65. B. C. Bened. Triplicem namque in scripturis divinis intelligentiæ inveniri sæpe diximus modum—historicum, moralem, et mysticum. Unde et corpus inesse ei, et animam, ac spiritum intelleximus. In Levit. Hom. v. p. 209. C.

^k Si vero non solum secundum literam, sed aliquid et secundum spiritum attingere, biduum videbor fecisse apud puteum visionis. Quod et si moralem locum contigero, fecerim triduum; vel certe etiam si non potuero omnia intelligere, assideo tamen scripturis divinis, et in lege Dei meditor die ac nocte, et omnino nunquam desino inquirendo, discutiendo, tractando, et certe (quod maximum est) orando Deum.—Sin vero negligam, neque domi exercear in verbo Dei neque ecclesiam ad audiendum frequenter ingrediari, sicut nonnullos in vobis video, qui diebus tantummodo solemnibus ad ecclesiam veniunt, qui hujusmodi sunt, non habitant apud puteum visionis, &c. In Gen. Hom. xi. p. 91. D. E.

In his Prologue, as it is called, to the Canticles, if¹ it be his, Origen^m informs us that the wise men among the Jews put all the books of scripture into the hands of young people, except the beginning of Genesis, the beginning and end of Ezekiel, and the book of Canticles: and he himself there dissuades some people, who are, what they should not be, carnal and sensual, from reading that book. Nevertheless it does not appear that any part of scripture, esteemed by christians to be divine, was withheld from persons of any rank or age. I think Origen's writings alone are a sufficient proof, that none of the scriptures were concealed in privacy: for, not to mention now any other things, he wroteⁿ upon the beginning of Genesis, and upon the prophecies of Ezekiel; and upon the book of Canticles he wrote^o two works in the way of tomes, or commentaries, beside his Homilies upon the same book. Jerom^p speaks particularly of one of those Commentaries, which was a large work, consisting of ten volumes; and he admires and commends it, as if it were the best book that Origen ever wrote. He likewise translated, and, as he says, faithfully, two Homilies of Origen upon the Canticles, composed by him in a familiar style for the benefit of people of small proficiencie. But to proceed.

7. 'Every thing,' says^q Origen, 'needs a suitable food for its nourishment: the true food of the rational nature is

¹ See Tillemont, Origene, art. 31. Huet. Or. lib. iii. sect. 3. n. 7.

^m Ob hoc ergo moneo, et consilium do omni qui nondum carnis et sanguinis molestiis caret, neque ab affectu naturæ materialis abscedit, ut a lectione libelli hujus, eorumque quæ in eo dicuntur, penitus temperet. Aiunt enim observari etiam apud Hebræos, quod nisi quis ad ætatem perfectam maturamque pervenerit, libellum hunc ne quidem in manibus tenere permitatur. Sed et illud ab eis accepimus custodiri, quandoquidem moris est apud eos, omnes scripturas a doctoribus et sapientibus tradi pueris, simul et eas quas δευτερωσεις appellant, ad ultimum quatuor ista observari, id est, principium Genesis, in quo mundi creatura describitur, et Ezechielis prophetæ principium et finem——et hunc Cantici canticorum librum. P. 492. T. i. Bas.

ⁿ Ει δε τις βηλεται—λαβητω τα πραγματευθεντα ημιν εις την Γενεσιν, απο της αρχης βιβλια μεχρι τα Αυτη η βιβλος γενεσεως ανθρωπων. Cont. Cels. l. vi. p. 309. Cant. p. 670. E. Bened.

^o See Tillemont, Origene, art. 31. T. iii. P. iii. p. 234.

^p Origenes, cum in cæteris libris omnes vicerit, in Cantico canticorum ipse se vicit. Nam decem voluminibus explicitis, quæ ad viginti usque versuum millia pene perveniunt.—Itaque illo opere prætermissio, quia ingentis est otii, laboris, et sumptuum, tantas res, tanque dignum opus, in Latinum transferre sermonem, quos in morem quotidiani eloquii parvulis adhuc lactantibus composuit, fideliter magis quam ornate interpretatus sum. Hier. Prol. ad Dam. p. 481. Tom. i. Bas.

^q Omnis natura rationalis propriis et sibi competentibus nutriri indiget cibus. Cibus autem verus naturæ rationalis est sermo Dei. In Num. Hom. xxvii. p. 374. A. E. Bened.

the word of God.' And soon^r after he presses the reading of the scriptures, even those books or parts of scripture that appear obscure and difficult. Otherwise, he says, we must lay aside all; for there are difficulties in the plainest book, in the gospels, and the epistles of the apostles.

8. Having argued that^s there were some things in the scriptures mysterious and difficult, others easy and obvious, and understood of themselves without any farther help, he infers: 'if then^t we study the whole scripture, we shall become skilful money-changers.'

9. Because the scriptures are the proper food of our souls, he is for reading them daily. 'Let us,' says^u he, 'come daily to the wells of the scriptures, the waters of the Holy Spirit, and there draw, and carry home a full vessel.'

10. He concludes a Homily upon Jeremiah, which we have in Greek, in this manner: 'These^v things being so, let us recollect the words of scripture, and lay them up in our heart, and endeavour to live according to them; that being purified from sin before our departure out of this world, we may be saved through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and power for ever and ever. Amen.'

XXI. Another proof of a peculiar respect for the holy scriptures, and of the great authority they were in with christians, is, that they were read and explained in their assemblies of public worship. This was common to the books both of the Old and the New Testament.

^r Ita ergo et in cibis rationalibus, divinorum dico voluminum, non continuo aut culpanda aut refutanda est scriptura, quæ difficilior aut obscurior ad intelligendum videtur.—Quamvis, et si diligentius requiramus (verbi causâ) in evangelii lectione, vel apostolicâ doctrinâ, in quibus delectari, et in quibus tibi aptissimum et suavissimum deputas cibum; quanta sunt quæ te latent, si discutias et perscruteris mandata Domini. Quod si ea quæ obscura videntur et difficilia, refugienda sunt protinus et vitanda, invenies etiam in illis, in quibus valde confidis, tam multa obscura et difficilia, ut si hanc sententiam teneas, sit tibi etiam inde recedendum.—Hæc autem in præfatione præmissimus, ut suscitemus animos vestros, quoniam quidem hujusmodi lectio habetur in manibus quæ difficilis ad intelligendum, et superflua videatur ad legendum. Sed non possumus hoc dicere de Sancti Spiritûs literis, quod aliquid in eis sit otiosum aut superfluum, etiamsi aliquibus videntur obscura. Ibid. p. 374. C. D. E. F. 375. A.

^s Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λεγομένων ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, ἃ μὲν εἰν ἀπορρήτοτερα καὶ μυσικώτερα ἃ δὲ αὐτοθεν χρῆσιμα τοῖς νοσοῖ. In Jerem. Hom. xii. p. 123. C. ^t Ὅλην ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἐὰν ἐξετάσωμεν, εὐρισκόμενοι δοκιμοὶ γενομένοι τραπέζονται. κ. λ. Ibid. D.

^u Rebecca quotidie veniebat ad puteos, quotidie hauriebat aquam—animarum est ista eruditio, et spiritalis doctrina, quæ te instituit et docet quotidie venire ad puteos scripturarum, ad aquas Spiritûs Sancti, et haurire semper, et plenum vas domum referre. In Gen. Hom. x. p. 87. F.

^v In Jerem. Hom. ii. p. 67. A. B. Huet.

1. In a Latin Homily upon Exodus: ‘Let^w us therefore take heed, lest not only when Moses is read, but also when Paul is read, the veil be upon our heart. And certainly, if we hear carelessly, if we take no pains to obtain instruction and understanding, not only the scriptures of the law and the prophets, but also of the apostles and gospels, will, as to us, be covered with a thick veil.’

2. When he shows how a christian sabbath ought to be kept, beside meditation upon heavenly and invisible things, he mentions ‘coming^x to church, and hearing the divine readings and discourses,’ or sermons: and says likewise, ‘That on that day the reader of the divine law, and the preacher, does not cease from his labour, and yet the sabbath is not polluted.’

3. In another Homily: ‘And^y this we do, when the scriptures are read in the church, and when the discourse for explication is pronounced to the people.’

4. In one of his Homilies he represents the strange negligence of some in hearing the readings and the expositions of the scriptures. ‘Some^z went away as soon as the readings in the public assemblies were over; some hardly stayed so long; others there were who scarce knew whether the scriptures were read or not, but entertained themselves with secular discourse in the remoter parts of the Lord’s house. Of such,’ he says, ‘he may affirm, that when Moses is read, not a veil, but some partition, or even wall, is upon their heart.’ This comparison, and the foregoing words, ‘the remote parts of the Lord’s house,’ may afford some reason for thinking that the christian churches at that time had very seldom any magnificence. It may be suspected

^w Videamus ergo, ne non solum cum Mōyses legitur, sed et cum Paulus legitur, velamen sit positum super cor nostrum. Et manifeste, si negligenter audimus, si nihil studii ad eruditionem et intelligentiam conferimus, non solum legis et prophetarum scriptura, sed et apostolorum et evangeliorum grandi nobis velamine tegitur. In Exod. Hom. xii. p. 174. A.

^x Si ergo desinas ab omnibus sæcularibus operibus, et nihil mundanum cures, sed spiritualibus curis vaces, ad ecclesiam convenias, lectionibus divinis et tractatibus aurem præbeas, et de cœlestibus cogites—hæc est observatio sabbati christiani.—Lector autem divinæ legis vel doctor non desinit ab opere suo, et tamen sabbatum non contaminat. In Num. Hom. xxiii. p. 358. D. E.

^y Hoc ergo etiam nunc, vel cum scripturæ in ecclesiâ leguntur, vel cum sermo explanationis profertur ad populum, scripturæ auctoritatem sequentes, dicimus, &c. In lib. Jesu. Hom. ix. p. 421. D.

^z Aliqui vestrum, ut recitari audierint quæ leguntur, statim discedunt.—Alii ne hoc ipsum quidem expectant, usquequo lectiones in ecclesiâ recitentur. Alii vero nec si recitantur sciunt, sed in remotioribus dominicæ domûs locis sæcularibus fabulis occupantur. De quibus ego ausus sum dicere, quia cum legitur Mōyses, jam non velamen super cor eorum, sed paries quidem et murus est positus. In Exod. Hom. xii. T. ii. 173. B. C.

that they were only private houses, or buildings very like them, consisting of several rooms, separated from each other by walls and partitions.

5. 'Take^a heed lest by a love of earthly things, or by any other means, you be a stranger to that food of wisdom, which is constantly dispensed in the churches of God. For, if you turn away your ear from hearing those things which are read or discoursed in the church, doubtless you will suffer a famine of the word of God.'

6. I might enlarge very much upon this point out of Origen, but it is not necessary at present: I shall add therefore only a fine passage in the books against Celsus, which I think relates to this matter. Celsus had compared the christians to jugglers and mountebanks, that gathered weak and silly people together to hear their tales. 'But,' says^b Origen, 'how unjust is this reproach! wherein do we resemble those persons? We who, by readings, and by discourses upon them, excite men to piety toward the God of the universe, and to other virtues of a like excellence; and dissuade men from a contempt of the Deity, and from all things contrary to right reason? The philosophers would have been glad if they could have gathered together such [mean] people to hear discourses recommending the practice of virtue.'

XXII. In the next place we are to consider whether there were any other books, beside those in our present canon, for which Origen had the same respect which he appears to have had for these. And, in order to judge of this, we shall first of all observe his quotations of those which we now generally esteem only ancient ecclesiastical writings, such as Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius; then those which we usually call spurious or apocryphal.

It is to be observed that we are now chiefly concerned about books that may be thought to have some claim to be inserted in the canon of the New Testament; for which reason we need not be so particular in our observations upon his quotations of ancient writings, which rather belong

^a Vide ne, — alienus efficiaris a sapientiæ cibus, qui semper in Dei ecclesiis exhibentur. Si enim avertas auditum ab his, quæ vel leguntur in ecclesiis, vel disputantur, sine dubio famem verbi Dei patieris. In Gen. Hom. xvi. T. ii. p. 104. F.

^b — η τι τριστοι παραπλησιον πραττομεν, οι και δι' αναγνωσματων, και δια των εις αυτα διηγησεων, προτρεποντες μεν επι την εις τον θεον των ολων ευσεβειαν, και τας συνθρονικας ταυτην αρετας' αποτρεποντες δ' απο τε καταφρονειν τε θεις, και παντων των παρα τον ορθον λογον πραττομενων; Και οι φιλοσοφοι γ' αν ευξαιντο αγειρειν τοσητες ακροατας λογων επι το καλον προσκαληντων. Con. Cels. l. iii. p. 480. E. T. i. Bened.

to the Old Testament, though we may take some notice of these likewise.

XXIII. I begin then with observing Origen's citations of christian ecclesiastical writings.

1. The epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas is twice or thrice quoted by Origen in his remaining works, either Greek or Latin. In the books of Principles it is quoted in this manner: 'The^c same things teaches Barnabas likewise in his epistle, when he says there are two ways, one of light, the other of darkness, over which also he says some certain angels preside; over the way of light the angels of God; over the way of darkness the angels of Satan.' We may observe here that Origen had just before quoted Tobit and Hermas, after several quotations of the commonly received books of the Old and New Testament.

Celsus had reviled the apostles of Christ, as infamous men. Origen answers: 'It is^d indeed written in the catholic epistle of Barnabas, (from whence perhaps Celsus took occasion to call the apostles infamous and wicked men,) that Jesus chose for his own apostles men who were very great sinners.'

Origen is thought by some to refer also to this^e epistle in his Commentaries upon the epistle to the Romans. But that is not plain: the books he quotes, or refers to particularly, for what he there advances, are such as are universally received as canonical.

2. St. Clement's epistle to the Corinthians is twice quoted by Origen. In the books of Principles^f Origen cites him,

^c Eadem quoque Barnabas in epistolâ suâ declarat, cum duas esse vias dicit, unam lucis, alteram tenebrarum, quibus et præesse certos quosque angelos dicit; viæ quidem lucis, angelos Dei; tenebrarum autem viæ, angelos Satanæ. De Princ. lib. iii. cap. 2. T. i. p. 140. E. Bened.

^d Γεγραπται δη εν τη Βαρναβα καθολικη επιτολη (ὅθεν ὁ Κελσος λαβων ταχα ειπεν ειναι επιβόητους και πονηροτατους τους αποστολους) ὅτι ἐξελεξατο τους ιδιους αποστολους Ιησους, οντας ὑπερ πασαν ανομιαν ανομιωτερους. Contr. Cels. l. i. p. 49. Spenc. T. i. p. 378. B. Bened.

^e Sunt præterea (sicut in multis scripturæ locis invenimus) etiam utriusque partis vel utriusque viæ fautores quidem et adjuutores angeli. Nam carnis concupiscentiæ adversus spiritum favet diabolus et angeli ejus, et omnes spirituales nequitiae in cœlestibus, cunctique, adversus quos hominibus lutamen est, principatus et potestates, et mundi hujus rectores tenebrarum. [Eph. vi. 12. Rom. viii. 38.] In Ep. ad Rom. lib. i. cap. 1. p. 468. Basil.

^f Meminit sane Clemens, apostolorum discipulus, etiam eorum quos *αντιχθονας* Græci nominârunt——cum ait, 'Oceanus intransmeabilis est hominibus, et hi qui trans ipsum sunt mundi, qui his eisdem dominatoris Dei dispositionibus gubernantur.' [Vid. Clem. Ep. ad Cor. c. 26.] Orig. de Princ. l. ii. cap. 3. p. 82. D. Bened. Paulo post. Ex his tamen quæ Clemens visus est indicare, cum dicit, 'Oceanus intransmeabilis est hominibus, et hi mundi qui post ipsum sunt.' Orig. ibid. p. 83. B. C.

calling him Clement, ‘ a disciple of the apostles.’ In the Commentaries^g upon John this epistle is again cited; and the writer is called ‘ faithful Clement, to whom Paul bears testimony, saying, “ with Clement, and other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life,”’ Philip. iv. 3.

I shall here take the liberty to mention an observation which I have met with since I wrote the chapter of Clement of Rome. Mr. Wolff of Hamburg thinks^h him to be different from Clement whom St. Paul mentions in the epistle to the Philippians; so likewise Dr. Wall: they think this last not to have been a Roman, but a Philippian. Saysⁱ Dr. Wall, ‘ This Clement seems to be a Philippian; ‘ yet many ancients take him to be Clemens Romanus, ‘ without any ground but the name, which was a very com- ‘ mon name. Clemens Romanus must have been but a ‘ young man at this time. The most that Irenæus says of ‘ him is, that he had seen, and heard, and conversed with ‘ Paul and Peter, before their death; and that many in ‘ Clement’s time were living who could remember the ‘ apostles. But this Clement had been St. Paul’s fellow- ‘ labourer (at Philippi, I suppose) ten or twelve years before ‘ this time;’ that is, before Paul’s writing the epistle to the Philippians in his imprisonment at Rome.

Upon which I would observe, that these learned men, I think, would not dispute what has been so often said by the ancients, that Clement, bishop of Rome, who wrote the epistle from thence to the Corinthians, was well acquainted with some of the apostles of Christ; whether he be the person mentioned by St. Paul in his epistle to the Philippians, or not. But I see no proof that Clement there mentioned by the apostle was a Philippian; if so, St. Paul’s salutations of Aquila and Priscilla would prove them to be of several places, that is, natives of them. [See Rom. xvi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 19. See likewise Acts xviii. 2, 18, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 19.] And if Paul’s calling Clement his helper or ‘ fellow-labourer,’ in his epistle to the Philippians, is a proof that Clement had laboured with him at Philippi, his salutation of Aquila and Priscilla, in the

^g Και παραδεχεται ταυθ’ ούτως γεγονεναι εκ αλογως πιτευσας ταις ιστοριας ο πιστος Κλημης, υπο Παυλου μαρτυρομενος, λεγοντος, Μετα Κλημεντος, κ. λ. [Vid. Clem. Ep. cap. 55.] Orig. Comm. in Joan. p. 143. A. Huet.

^h De Clemente, qui Romanæ ecclesiæ postea præfuerat, accipit Eusebius, H. E. l. iii. cap. iv. xv. Veri autem similis est, talem hic Clementem intelligi, qui Philippis verbi evangelici præconem egerit, quod de altero illo nusquam memini doceri. Jo. Christ. Wolf. Curæ in N. T. ad Philip. iv. 3.

ⁱ Brief Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 279, 280.

epistle to the Romans, would prove that they had been the apostle's 'helpers' at Rome, before he had been there. Nor is there any weight at all in Dr. Wall's argument from the age of Clement: there is no great distance between the supposed times of his and St. John's death; and yet St. John had been an apostle of Christ some while before Paul was converted. Clement therefore, bishop of Rome, without any inconsistency, may be supposed to have been a companion and fellow-labourer of Paul at several places, and yet live to the end of the first century, or thereabout.

I shall place here also Origen's quotations of the Recognitions, though they are not so generally allowed to be written by Clement of Rome as the epistle to the Corinthians.

In his Commentaries^k upon Genesis, Origen has a long passage out of the Recognitions, which he quotes by the title of Circuits, or Travels, written by Clement the Roman, disciple of the apostle Peter. In another work he quotes^l some words of Peter in Clement, meaning the Recognitions ascribed to him.

3. The Shepherd, or Pastor, of Hermas is often quoted by Origen. The places are too numerous to be all inserted here; and a large part of them may be seen by the learned reader among the testimonies to Hermas, in Le Clerc's *Patres Apostolici*. I shall, however, produce the most remarkable of them.

1.) It is quoted, as I said just now, with Barnabas^m and Tobit. Again,ⁿ in the books of Principles, it is quoted by

^k Και Κλημης δε ο 'Ρωμαιος, Πετρα αποστολε μαθητης συνφρα τριστοις εν τη παροντι προβληματι προς τον πατερα, εν Λαοδικεια, ειπων εν ταις Περιωδοις, αναγκαιοτατον τι επι τελει των τουιστων λογων φησι, κ. τ. λ. [Vid. *Recogn.* l. x. n. x. et seq.] Orig. *Conim.* in *Gen.* T. ii. p. 20. E. Bened. *Vid. et Philocal.* cap. 23. p. 81, 82. Spencer.

^l Tale aliquid dicit et Petrus apud Clementem, quoniam opera bona quæ fiunt ab infidelibus in hoc seculo prosunt, non et in illo ad consequendam vitam æternam. [Vid. *Recogn.* l. vii. n. xxxviii.] Orig. in *Matth.* *Tractatus* 35. p. 172. Basil. 1571. ^m Sed et Pastoris liber hæc eadem declarat, dicens, quod bini angeli singulos quosque hominum comitentur: et si quando bonæ cogitationes cor nostrum ascenderint, a bono angelo suggeri dicit; si vero contrariæ, mali angeli dicit esse instinctum. [Vid. l. ii. *mand.* 6. cap. 2.] Orig. de *Princip.* l. iii. c. 2. p. 140. D. Bened.

ⁿ Quod autem a Deo universa creata sint—ex multis scripturæ assertionibus comprobatur.—Nam et in libello qui Pastoris dicitur Angeli pœnitentiæ, quem Hermas conscripsit, ita refertur: 'Primo omnium crede, quia unus est Deus, qui omnia creavit et composuit,—' Sed et in Enoch libro his similia describuntur. Verum tamen usque ad præsens tempus nullum sermonem in scriptis sanctis invenire potuimus, per quem Spiritus Sanctus factura esse vel creatura diceretur. De *Princip.* l. i. cap. 3. p. 61. C. D. Bened.

Origen as scripture, together with the book of Enoch. In^o the same work it is quoted as scripture together with the Maccabees: it is mentioned by him likewise with the Maccabees in^p his Commentaries upon St. John's gospel.

2.) In the Commentaries upon the epistle to the Romans, at chap. xvi. ver. 14, "Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them," Origen observes, 'To^q these there is only sent a simple salutation, nor is there added any high commendation. Nevertheless I think that this Hermas is the author of the book called the Shepherd; which scripture [or 'writing'] appears to me very useful, and, as I think, divinely inspired. And that he gave them [perhaps it should be 'him'] no commendation, the reason may be this: that he seems, as that book itself shows, to have been converted and brought to repentance after the commission of many sins.'

3.) In other places this book is quoted after this manner: In a Homily upon the book of Numbers he^r says, 'Thus we are taught in this book, in which there is nothing at all that can be questioned. The like things are also to be found in the book of the Shepherd, if indeed any one thinks that scripture [or 'writing'] ought to be received.'

4.) In his Commentaries upon St. Matthew: 'If^s I may dare quote a certain scripture, used indeed in the churches, but not accounted of all to be divine, let us take a passage out of the Shepherd.'

^o Ut autem etiam ex scripturarum auctoritate hæc ita se habere credamus, audi quoque in Macchabæorum libris——sed et in libro Pastoris in primo mandato ita ait: 'Primo omnium crede quia unus est Deus, qui omnia creavit atque composuit, et fecit, ex eo quod nihil erat, ut essent universa.' De Prin. l. ii. cap. 1. p. 79. A. B. Bened.

^p ΑΛΛ' ἔ παρ' ἡμῶν τοῖς πειθομένοις ὅτι ἐξ ἐκ οὐτῶν τὰ οὐτὰ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός, ὡς ἡ μητὴρ τῶν ἑπτὰ μαρτυρῶν ἐν Μακκαβαϊκοῖς, καὶ ὁ τῆς μετανοίας ἀγγέλως ἐν τῷ Ποιμενι εἰδίδασκε. Comm. in Johan. p. 17. E. T. ii. Huet.

^q De istis est simplex salutatio, nec aliquid eis insigne laudis adjungitur. Puto tamen, quod Hermas iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur, quæ scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur, et, ut puto, divinitus inspirata. Quod vero nihil eis [forte 'ei'] laudi adscripsit, illa opinor est causa, quia videtur, sicut scriptura illa declarat, post multa peccata ad pœnitentiam fuisse conversus; et ideo nec opprobrium ei aliquid adscripsit. In Epist. ad Rom. cap. 16. T. ii. p. 630. Basil.

^r Quod autem dies peccati in annum pœnæ reputetur, non solum in hoc libro, in quo nihil omnino est quod dubitari possit, ostenditur, sed et in libello Pastoris, (si cui tamen scriptura illa recipienda videtur,) similia designantur. In Num. Hom. viii. T. ii. p. 294. B. Bened.

^s Εἰ δὲ χρὴ τολμησαντα καὶ ἀπο τινος φερομένης μὲν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ [αἱ τὰς ἐκκ.] γραφῆς, ἔ παρα πασι δὲ ὁμολογῶμένης εἶναι θείας, τὸ τοῖσιν παραμυθησεσθαι, ληφθεὶν ἀν τὸ ἀπο τῶ Ποιμενός. Com. in Matth. T. i. p. 361. E. Huet.

5.) Once more: ‘In^t the little book of the Shepherd, despised by some.’

6.) These, I think, are the most remarkable quotations of this book in Origen, and sufficient to enable the reader to judge for himself in this point. It appears hence that this book was not universally received as divine; that by some it was much despised; that there were in it some things which were not approved by all: and sometimes it is spoken of as if it was received by very few, hardly by any one. Nevertheless Origen quotes it as an useful book, and as scripture, and thinks it divinely inspired. However, upon the whole, he seems to quote it only as scripture in a secondary sense, or lower rank. This may be concluded from his quoting it so often with the books of the Maccabees, and Tobit, and Enoch; which Origen knew very well, and sometimes expressly observes, were not in the Jewish canon. That Origen ought to be so understood, is the more probable, because Eusebius, Jerom, andⁿ others, who were well acquainted with Origen’s writings and opinions, give no higher authority to this book, as we shall see more fully hereafter. In the mean time I shall just observe Rufinus’s account of this matter, who, after he had put down the canonical books of scripture, adds: ‘But^v it ought to be ‘taken notice of that there are other books which are not ‘canonical, but were called by the ancients ecclesiastical, ‘as the Wisdom of Solomon, and another Wisdom of the ‘Son of Sirach. In the same rank are the books of Tobit, ‘Judith, and the Maccabees; and in like manner, in the ‘New Testament, the book of the Shepherd, or of Hermas.’

4. Origen’s two quotations of Ignatius have been sufficiently taken notice of^w formerly. He calls him ‘one of the saints,’ a ‘martyr,’ and ‘the second bishop of Antioch after Peter;’ but without any intimation that his epistles were part of sacred scripture.

XXIV. We now proceed to writings generally called spurious, or apocryphal: and here I shall begin with placing at length the preface to Origen’s first Homily upon

^t Δια τῆτο ἡμεῖς καὶ το ἐν τῷ ὑπο τινῶν καταφρονεμένῳ βιβλίῳ τῷ Ποιμένι, περὶ τῆ προσαρσεσθαι τὸν Ἑρμᾶν ἐνο γραψαὶ βιβλία. κ. λ. De Princip. l. iv. cap. 1. T. i. p. 168. Vid. Philocal. cap. 1. p. 9. ex. ed. Spencer.

^u Vid. Pearson, Vind. Ignat. P. i. cap. 4. p. 274, 275.

^v Sciendum autem est, quod et alii libri sunt qui non canonici, sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt; ut est Sapiientia Salomonis, et alia Sapiientia quæ dicitur filii Syrach.—Ejusdem ordinis est libellus Tobixæ, et Judith et Macchabæorum libri. In Novo vero Testamento libellus qui dicitur Pastoris, sive Hermatis.—Rufin. Expos. in Symbolum Apost.

^w See chap. v. p. 74.

St. Luke's gospel, as it is called; or his observations upon St. Luke's introduction or preface to his gospel.

1. 'As^x of old among the Jewish people many pretended to the gift of prophecy; and there were some false prophets, one of whom was Ananias son of Agor, but others were prophets; and there was among the people the gift of discerning spirits, by which some were owned as prophets, others were rejected as it were by skilful money-changers; so also now under the New Testament, many took in hand to write gospels, but all have not been received. And that not four gospels only, but very many, were written, out of which those we have were chosen, and delivered to the churches, we may perceive even from Luke's preface, which is thus: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration," Luke i. 1. His expression of their "taking in hand," contains a tacit accusation of those who without the gift of the Holy Spirit took upon them to write gospels: for Matthew and Mark, and John and Luke, did not take in hand to write, but being full of the Holy Ghost wrote gospels. "Many therefore took in hand to set forth in order a narration of those things which are most surely known amongst us." The churches have four gospels, heresies have very many; of which one is entitled "according to the Egyptians," another "according to the Twelve Apostles." Basilides likewise had the assurance to write a gospel, and call it by

* Sicut olim in populo Judæorum multi prophetiam pollicebantur, et quidam erant pseudoprophetæ, e quibus unus fuit Ananias, filius Agor: alii vero prophetæ: et erat gratia in populo discernendorum spirituum, per quam alii inter prophetas recipiebantur, nonnulli quasi ab exercitissimis trapezitis reprobabantur: ita et in Novo Testamento multi conati sunt scribere evangelia, sed non omnes recepti. Et ut sciatis non solum quatuor evangelia, sed plurima esse conscripta, ex quibus hæc quæ habemus electa sunt, et tradita ecclesiis, ex ipso procæmio Lucæ, quod ita contextitur, cognoscamus: Quoniam quidem multi conati sunt ordinare narrationem. Hoc quod ait, 'conati sunt,' latentem habet accusationem eorum qui absque gratiâ Spiritûs Sancti ad scribenda evangelia prosilierunt. Matthæus quippe et Marcus, et Joannes, et Lucas, non sunt conati scribere, sed Spiritu Sancto pleni scripserunt evangelia. Multi igitur conati sunt ordinare narrationem de his rebus quæ manifestissime cognitæ sunt in nobis. Ecclesia quatuor habet evangelia, hæreses plurima; e quibus quoddam scribitur secundum Ægyptios, aliud juxta duodecim apostolos. Ausus fuit et Basilides scribere evangelium, et suo illud nomine titulare. Multi conati sunt scribere, sed et multi conati sunt ordinare. Quatuor tantum sunt evangelia, ex quibus sub personâ Domini et Salvatoris nostri proferenda sunt dogmata. Scio quoddam evangelium, quod secundum Thomam, et juxta Matthiam; et alia plura legimus, ne quid ignorare videremur, propter eos qui se putant aliquid scire, si ista cognoverint. Sed in his omnibus nihil aliud probamus, nisi quod ecclesia; id est, quatuor tantum evangelia recipienda. In Procæm. Lucæ, Hom. i. T. ii. p. 210. Basil.

his own name. Many took in hand to write, many also took in hand to set forth in order. Four gospels only have been approved, out of which the doctrines of our Lord and Saviour are to be learned. I know a certain gospel, which is called "according to Thomas," and "according to Matthias;" and many other we read, that we may not seem to be ignorant of any thing, for the sake of those who think they know something, if they are acquainted with these [gospels]: but among all these we approve of none but the four gospels received in the church.'

I have hitherto translated only the beginning of this Homily, as we have it in Origen's Latin works; Mr. Simon has published the same thing in Greek, from manuscripts, at Paris. As there is some small difference between these, I shall now translate the Greek of Mr. Simon.

'As^y among the people of old there were many who pretended to prophecy, but some of them were false prophets, and others truly prophets; and there was the gift of discerning spirits, by which a true and false prophet were distinguished: so also now, in the New Testament, many would write gospels; but skilful money-changers did not approve of all, but chose some of them. Possibly the expression, "they took in hand," contains a tacit accusation of those who set themselves to write gospels without the gift of the Spirit; for Matthew did not take in hand, but wrote, being moved by the Holy Ghost: in like manner Mark and John, as also Luke. But they who composed the gospel, entitled the Gospel of the Twelve, took in hand. There is also a gospel according to Thomas. Moreover, Basilides had the assurance to write a gospel [entitled] according to Basilides. Many therefore took in hand, as the writers of the gospel according to Matthias, and many more; but the church of God approves four only.'

^y Ὡσπερ δὲ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ λαῷ πολλοὶ προφητεῖαν ἐπηγγέλλοντο· ἀλλὰ τῶν τινες μὲν ἦσαν ψευδοπροφῆται, τινες δὲ ἀληθῶς προφῆται, καὶ ἦν χάρισμα διακρίσεως πνευμάτων, ἀφ' οὗ ἐκρινετο ὁ ἀληθῆς προφήτης καὶ ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης· οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ τὰ εὐαγγέλια πολλοὶ ἐβέλησαν γραφαί· ἀλλ' οἱ δοκιμοὶ τραπέζιται εἰς πάντα ἐκρίναν, ἀλλὰ τινὰ αὐτῶν ἐξελέξαντο. Ταχὰ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπεχειρήσαντες ληθῦναι ἐχει κατηγορίαν τῶν χωρὶς χάρισματος ἐλθόντων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων. Ματθαῖος γὰρ ἔκ ἐπεχειρήσειν, ἀλλ' ἐγράψεν ἐξ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος κινούμενος· ὁμοίως καὶ Μάρκος καὶ Ἰωάννης, παραπλησίον δὲ καὶ Λῦκας. Τοῦ μὲν τοὺς ἐπιγεγραμμένους τῶν δώδεκα εὐαγγελίων, οἱ συγγράψαντες ἐπεχειρήσαν. Φερεται δὲ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον. Ἡδὴ δὲ ἐτολμήσει καὶ Βασιλείδης γραφαὶ κατὰ Βασιλείδην εὐαγγέλιον. Πολλοὶ μὲν εἰς ἐπεχειρήσαν, καὶ τὸ κατὰ Μαθθίαν καὶ ἄλλα πλεονα· τὰ δὲ τεσσαράκις μονα προκρίνει ἡ τῆς Θεᾶς ἐκκλησία. Orig. Procem. in Luc. ex Cod. MS. Bibl. Reg. n. 2330. et ex duobus Codd. Bibl. Colb. n. 2259, et 4112. See Simon Hist. Crit. des Comment. du N. T. chap. v. p. 81, 82. à Rotterdam, 1693.

I have thus translated the Greek as it is in Simon's *Critical History of the Commentators of the New Testament*. The reader will observe the differences between this and the Latin preface; particularly, here is no mention of the gospel according to the Egyptians. But I suspect this to be the fault only of Simon's impression; for he puts that gospel there in his French translation together with the gospel according to the Twelve: however, I have thought myself obliged to follow his Greek. I hope Father De la Rue, of whose edition of Origen's works I have as yet seen only the first two volumes, will give us this more exactly; for where the mistake lies I cannot say. It is nevertheless observable, that St. Ambrose, who in his *Exposition of St. Luke's gospel* seems to have copied this preface of Origen, though without naming him, or giving any hint that he copied any author at all, omits^z the gospel according to^a the Egyptians, whilst he mentions those of the Twelve, and Basilides, Thomas, and Matthias.

If this passage be really Origen's, (as I think there can be no reason to doubt but that for the main it is so,) it shows us very much what was his opinion concerning the spurious apocryphal books of the New Testament, and particularly the gospel of the Twelve, or according to the Twelve; which is generally supposed to be the same which is also called the gospel according to the Hebrews. If the gospel according to the Egyptians was not mentioned by Origen in this place, he has^b no where taken any notice of it, that I remember, in his now remaining works. But allowing him to have mentioned it here, still this affords full proof of the obscurity of this gospel, and the vast neglect of^c it by catholic christians, that so little notice is taken of it by Origen, who lived so long at Alexandria in Egypt, and the rest of his days in Palestine, or near it.

2. Origen, in his *Commentaries upon St. Matthew's gospel*, discoursing on the history of the rich man that came to Christ, and having compared the several accounts given by the evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke, adds: 'But let us consider this place otherwise. It is written^d in a certain

^z Et aliud quidem fertur evangelium, quod duodecim scripsisse dicuntur. Ausus est etiam Basilides evangelium scribere, quod dicitur secundum Basilidem, &c. Ambros. Exp. Evang. secund. Luc. init.

^a Mr. Jones says that the gospel according to the Egyptians is mentioned by St. Ambrose in the same manner as by Origen. *New and Full Method*, &c. vol. i. p. 246. But it is plainly a slip of memory. See there, p. 193, 194.

^b Vid. Grabe, *Spicil. T. i.* p. 31; and Jones, as before, p. 246.

^c Compare what is said of Clement of Alexandria, p. 251, 252.

^d Scriptum est in evangelio quodam, quod dicitur secundum Hel-ræos:

gospel, which is called “according to the Hebrews,” if indeed any one is pleased to receive it, not as of authority, but for illustration of the present question: “A certain rich man,” says that gospel, “said to him, Master, what good things shall I do, that I may live? He said unto him, Man, keep the law and the prophets. He answered him, That I have done. He said to him, Go, sell all that thou hast, and distribute among the poor; and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, I have kept the law and the prophets? seeing it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and behold, many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed with rags, ready to perish for hunger, whilst thy house is filled with all sorts of good things, and nothing goes out of it to them. And turning about he said to his disciple Simon, who was sitting by him, Simon, son of Joanna, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.”

This passage is not in the Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew, but only in the Latin translation of them; and^e Huet therefore thinks it an addition of the translator. But perhaps some late Greek copier thought fit to omit it; it might be in the more ancient copy used by the translator.

In the Greek Commentaries upon St. John: ‘But^f if any one admits the gospel according to the Hebrews, where our Saviour himself says, “Just now my mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs, and carried me to the great mountain Thabor.”’ This passage we have also in

si tamen placet alicui recipere illud non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositæ questionis. Dixit, inquit, ad eum alter divitum, Magister, quid bonum faciens vivam? Dixit ei, Homo, leges et prophetas fac. Respondit ad eum, Feci. Dixit ei, Vade, vende omnia quæ possides, et divide pauperibus, et veni, sequere me. Cœpit autem dives scalpere caput suum, et non placuit ei. Et dixit ad eum Dominus, Quomodo dicis, Legem feci et prophetas? quoniam scriptum est in lege, Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum; et ecce multi fratres tui, filii Abraham, amicti sunt stercore, morientes præ fame; et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ad eos. Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo sedenti apud se, Simon, fili Joannæ, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acûs quam divitem in regnum celorum. Tract. viii. in Matth. T. i. p. 73. Bas.

^e Ad hæc vetus ille interpret tract. viii. insignem locum profert ex evangelio secundum Hebræos. Atqui id de suo addidit, quippe quod in exemplaribus Græcis nusquam appareat. Ac proinde temporum illorum, quibus hoc supererat evangelium, æqualis fuit. Origenian. l. iii. sect. 3. n. 12. p. 252.

^f *Εαν δε προσεται τις το καθ' Εβραιως ευαγγελιον, ενθα αυτος ο Σωτηρ φησιν' Αρτι ελαβε με η μητηρ με το Αγιον Πνευμα εν μια των τριχων με, και απενεγκε με εις το ορος το μεγα Θαβωρ.* Comm. in Joan. p. 58. D. E.

Origen's Greek Homilies^g upon Jeremiah, published by Huet.

These two are the only passages of this gospel found in Origen's remaining works, as has been observed by^h Dr. Grabe andⁱ Mr. Jones. However,^k Jerom, speaking of the gospel according to the Hebrews, says that Origen made frequent use of it. If that be true, he must refer to works of Origen now lost. But perhaps Jerom speaks in a careless hyperbolical manner; and, if all Origen's works were now extant, we might not see this gospel very often quoted in them. I apprehend that these remaining quotations are sufficient to show, not only that this gospel was not generally received by christians, but likewise that Origen himself had no great regard to it; if he had, this gospel would have appeared much oftener in his works. It may therefore be concluded that he did not take this gospel according to the Hebrews to be St. Matthew's gospel; or, if he did, he must have supposed it to have been so altered and interpolated, as to be no longer of any authority, and of but little use.

3. In the Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew, says Origen, 'Supposing him to be the son of Joseph, they say, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Matt. xiii. 35; and despising all who seemed to be his nearest kindred, they express themselves in this manner: "Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude? and his sisters, are they not all with us?" Matt. xiii. 55, 56. They thought him therefore to be the son of Joseph and Mary; and some,^l induced thereto by a tradition, in the gospel according to Peter, or the book of James, say, that these brethren of Jesus are sons of Joseph by a former wife, that had cohabited with him before Mary.'

This is the only place in which this piece (or these pieces, if they are two) is quoted in Origen's remaining works; which alone may be reckoned a good argument, that it was not much esteemed by him. The manner likewise in which this gospel is quoted, seems to show that he did not reckon it to have been written by Peter, or James, or by

^g In Jerem. Hom. xv. T. i. p. 148. A. Huet.

^h Spicil. T. i. p. 27.

ⁱ Vol. i. p. 335.

^k *Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, — quo et Origenes sæpe utitur. De Vir. Ill. cap. ii.*

^l *Τῶς δὲ ἀδελφῶς Ἰησοῦ φασι τινεὶ εἶναι, ἐκ παραδοσεως ὁρμωμένοι τε ἐπιγεγραμμένῃ κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίῳ, ἢ τῆς βιβλῆς, Ἰακώβου, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικὸς συνφεκτικῆς αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας. Comm. in Matth. T. i. p. 223. A. B. Huet.*

any companion or disciple of either of them; but that he supposed it to be rather a work composed after their time, containing traditions relating to Christ, of things reported to have been said or done by him. It is not unlikely that here were some discourses ascribed to Peter, others to James, which occasioned different titles of this work.

4. In the preface to the books of Principles, which we have in Latin: ‘But^m if any one should bring an objection out of that little book which is called the Doctrine of Peter, where our Saviour seems to say to his disciples, “I am not an incorporeal dæmon,” I would answer, in the first place, that that book is not accounted an ecclesiastical book; and then make it appear that it is neither a writing of Peter, nor of any other person that was inspired by the Spirit of God.’ This book then is entirely rejected by Origen.

In his Commentaries upon St. John, which we have in Greek, says Origen, ‘But itⁿ would be tedious to transcribe now the words of Heracleon, taken out of the book entitled the Preaching of Peter, and to stay to inquire concerning the book itself, whether it be genuine, or spurious, or mixed.’

We are to observe here, that^o it is supposed by divers learned men, that the Doctrine of Peter, and the Preaching of Peter, are one and the same book, under different titles. If this be so, as is very probable, then in the former place Origen absolutely rejects it; and in this expresses himself in a modest manner as a fair and candid antagonist, because it was not a proper place to prove at large the character of that book: and these quotations afford a good argument, that the Preaching of Peter was not esteemed a book of canonical scripture by Clement, Origen’s master, though^p he has made frequent use of it.

5. In the books of Principles, Origen^q says, ‘Wherefore

^m Si quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libello qui Petri Doctrina appellatur, ubi Salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere, ‘Non sum dæmonium incorporeum;’ primo respondendum est ei, quoniam ille liber inter libros ecclesiasticos non habetur; et ostendendum est, quia neque Petri est scriptura, neque alterius cujusquam qui Spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus. De Princip. in Præf. p. 49. B. T. i. Bened.

ⁿ Ἦολυ δε εσι νυν παρατιθεσθαι τῶ Ἡρακλεωνος τα ῥήτα, απο τῶ επιγεγραμμενῶ Περτῶ κηρυγματῶ παραλαμβανομενα, και ἰσασθαι προς αυτο εξεταζοντας και περι τῶ βιβλιῶ, ποτερον ποτε γνησιον εσι, η νοθον, η μικτον. Com. in Joan. T. ii. p. 211. D. E. Huet.

^o Cav. Hist. Lit. P. i. in Petro, p. 5. Grab. Spic. T. i. p. 56. Jer. Jones, New and Full Method, &c. vol. i. p. 449. ^p See before, chap. xxii. p. 252—255.

^q Unde et recte mihi dictus videtur sermo ille qui in Actibus Pauli scriptus est, quia hic est verbum, animal vivens. De. Princ. l. i. c. 2. T. i. p. 54. E. Bened.

that saying seems to me to be right, which is written in the Acts of Paul: "That this is the word, a living animal."'

These Acts of Paul are allowed by learned men^r to be different from the Acts of Paul and Thecla. So particularly father De la Rue upon this place of Origen, who likewise makes no doubt but this notion is corruptly borrowed from Heb. iv. 12, which is also the opinion of^s Dr. Grabe; if so, it would be a proof that the author of this book had a respect for the epistle to the Hebrews. Besides, we have here only a Latin version, which perhaps is not exact; if we had the Greek, the reference to that epistle might be plainer.

Again, in Origen's Greek Commentaries upon St. John: 'But^t if any one please to admit what is written in the Acts of Paul, as spoken by our Saviour: "I am about to be crucified again."'

Perionius conjectured, that for 'Paul' in this place should be read 'Peter;' and^u Grabe professes himself to be of the same opinion: he therefore, in his collection of these things, has placed this fragment not among those of the Acts of Paul, but of Peter; but^v Huet chooses to follow his Greek copies, and writes 'Paul.' It may be added, that^w in the ancient Latin version of these Commentaries upon John, we have 'Paul.' However, these Acts may have been sometimes called Paul's, and at other times Peter's, as containing some matters relating to both these apostles.

If the Acts cited here be the same with those in the foregoing passage, then, though Origen supposed that saying taken from them to be right, yet it appears from this second passage that the book was of no authority.

I have now put down, I think, all the particular quotations of apocryphal books of the New Testament, found in Origen's remaining works. Beside the general notice taken of these things in the observations upon the introduction to St. Luke's gospel, the pieces of this kind cited by him are, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the gospel according to Peter, or book of James, the Doctrine or Preaching of Peter, and the Acts of Paul.

6. I shall add here a general citation of some book with-

^r Vid. Grab. Spic. T. i. p. 128. Jer. Jones, vol. i. p. 392.

^s Ibid. p. 128. ^t *Εἰ τις δὲ φίλον παραδέξασθαι το ἐν ταῖς Παυλοῦ Πραξεῖσιν ἀναγεγραμμένον, ὡς ὑπο Σωτηροῦ εἰρημένον· Ἀνωθεν μελλῶ σαυροῦσθαι.* In Joan. T. ii. p. 298. E. Huet. ^u Ibid. p. 80.

^v Sed tamen nihil muto, nam Actorum Pauli mentio fit apud nostrum Origenem, lib. i. *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, cap. 2. Huet. not. p. 118.

^w Quod si cui placet admittere quod in Actibus Pauli scriptum est, tanquam a Servatore dictum. T. ii. p. 373. Basil.

out a name. In the Latin Homilies upon Leviticus, Origen^x says: ‘There is also another sort of religious fast, which is commended in the writings of some apostles; for I find in a certain book a saying of the apostles: “Blessed is he that fasts that he may feed the poor.” The fast of such a one must be very acceptable in the sight of God.’ Certainly this manner of quoting affords no ground to think that Origen esteemed this piece of any authority, though he approved the saying.

Thus at length I have given a full and particular representation of the passages of Origen, concerning both ecclesiastical and apocryphal writings; and yet I flatter myself the reader will not complain of prolixity in this article.

XXV. I should now proceed to make remarks upon these citations: but I suppose this work will be more complete, and the sentiments of christians at that time concerning the scriptures be more distinctly understood, if I first take some brief notice likewise of Origen’s citations of apocryphal books of the Old Testament.

1. Origen, in his explication of the first Psalm, or preface to his Commentaries upon the Psalms, in a passage preserved by^y Eusebius and^z others, gives a catalogue of the Old Testament received by the Jews: he says they are in number twenty-two. They are much the same^a with those commonly received by Protestants.

2. Having quoted a text from Tobit, Origen adds:^b ‘But because the Jews reject the book of Tobit as not canonical, [or, ‘no part of the Testament’,] I shall take a passage out of the first book of the Kings.’

In another place he says, ‘The^c Jews do not use Tobit nor Judith, nor have they them at all in Hebrew among their apocryphal books; but the churches made use of Tobit.’

^x Hæc ergo christianis jejunandi ratio est. Sed est et alia adhuc religiosa, cujus laus quorundam apostolorum literis prædicatur. Invenimus enim in quodam libello ab apostolis dictum, ‘Beatus est qui etiam jejunat pro eo, ut alat pauperem.’ Hujus jejunium valde acceptum est apud Deum, et revera digne satis. In Levit. Hom. x. T. ii. p. 246. A. Bened.

^y H. E. l. vi. cap. 25.

^z Origenis Philocal. Suid. v. *Ωριγενης*. Niceph. Hist. lib. v. cap. 16.

^a See Cosin’s Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture, chap. 5.

^b Τη δε τα Τωβιτη βιβλιη αντιλεγασιν οι εκ περιτομης, ως μη ενδιαθηκω, παραθησομαι εκ της πρωτης των Βασιλειων. De Orat. p. 220. v. i. Bened.

^c Ποθεν δε λαβων ελεγεσ το — η, οσον επ’ εμη γνωσει, απο τα Τωβιτι; περι ου ημας εχρημ ενγνωκεναι, οτι Εβραιοι τη Τωβιτι * χρωνται, εδε τη Ιωδηθ. Ουδε γαρ εχρουν αυτα και εν αποκριφοις Εβραϊσι ως απ’ αυτων μισθοντες ενγνωκαμεν. Αλλ’ επει χρωνται τη Τωβιτι αι εκκλησιαι, ιτερον, κ λ. Ep. ad Afric. sect. 13. p. 26. D.

He likewise speaks of ‘ Esther,^d Tobit, Judith, the book of Wisdom, as books of scripture which pleased the common people, because they were easy, or free from obscurity.’ But I think it reasonable to suppose, nevertheless, that an equal respect was not shown to those scriptures which the Jews rejected, as to those they received.

3. In a Latin Homily he quotes Ecclesiasticus cautiously: ‘ In^e a book which among us uses to be joined with the writings of Solomon, and to be called Ecclesiasticus, but by the Greeks is called the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, it is written, “ All wisdom cometh from the Lord.”’ Though, therefore, this was placed, sometimes at least, with the other books of Solomon, it was not reckoned to be his.

And in the prologue to the Canticles, Origen^f says, that neither the Jews nor the christians reckoned any more than three books of Solomon in the canon, meaning the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles. It is here said, likewise, that the ‘ oracles of God,’ in the Old Testament, were derived to the christians from the Jews.

4. As for the history of Susanna, added to the book of Daniel, Africanus, in his letter to^g Origen, tells him he wondered he should not know it was spurious, and says it was a piece lately forged: he observes^h likewise that all the scriptures of the Old Testament generally received were translated from Hebrew. I think this is enough to satisfy us, that this story could not be a part of the christian canonical scriptures: and though Origen says all he can think of to prove this history true and genuine, andⁱ affirms that

^d Apertior scilicet simpliciorque doctrina, ut de moralibus esse solet, quæ præberi consuevit iis qui initia habent in divinis studiis, et prima eruditionis rationabilis elementa suscipiunt. His ergo cum recitatur talis aliqua divinorum voluminum lectio, in quâ non videatur aliquid obscurum, libenter accipiunt; verbi causâ, ut est libellus Hester, aut Judith, vel etiam Tobix, aut mandata Sapientix. Si vero legatur ei liber Levitici, offenditur continuo animus, &c. In Num. Hom. xxvii. p. 374. F. A. T. ii. Bened.

^e In libro qui apud nos quidem inter Salomonis volumina haberi solet, et Ecclesiasticus dici, apud Græcos vero Sapientia Jesu filii Sirach appellatur, scriptum est: Omnis sapientia a Deo est. In Num. Hom. xviii. p. 340. E.

^f Sed nos quomodo recipiemus hujusmodi intelligentiam, cum neque ecclesia Dei ulla extrinsecus Salomonis Cantica legenda susceperit; neque apud Hebræos, a quibus eloquia Dei ad nos videntur esse translata, aliquid præter hos tres libellos Salomonis, qui et apud nos sunt, amplius habent in canone? Prolog. in Cant. Cant. p. 591. T. i. Basil.

^g Θαυμάζω δε, πως ελαθε σε το μερος τω βιβλιω τωτο κιβδηλον ον: η γαρ τοι περικοπη αυτη χαριεν μεν αλλως συγγραμμα, νεωτερικον δε και πεπλασμενον δεικνυται. κ. λ. Afr. ad Orig. p. 10. A.

^h Εξ ‘Εβραιων δε τοις ‘Ελλησι μετεβληθη πανθ’ οσα της Παλαιας Διαθηκης φερεται. Ibid. p. 11. A.

ⁱ Τι χρη ημας πραττειν ο περι των κατα Σωσανναν μονον, εν μεν τη καθ’

it was made use of in Greek by all the churches of Christ among the Gentiles; yet he owns that it was not received by the Jews, nor to be found in their copies of the book of Daniel. They who desire to know more of this matter may consult^k Du Pin.

5. The books of the Maccabees are expressly said by Origen not to be a part of the Jewish canonical scriptures,^l in the passage cited at length by Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History.

6. I think it clear, that none of these books were canonical among the christians. It was well known among them that they were not extant in Hebrew, nor owned by the Jews, from whom the christians received the scriptures of the Old Testament. Nor does it appear that Origen wrote commentaries, or preached Homilies, upon any of these books.

7. Beside these, Origen has cited divers other books in use among the Jews, as he says, and called secret or apocryphal; such as the book of Enoch, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption and Ascension of Moses.

8. In the Commentaries upon St. John: ‘As^m it is written in the book of Enoch, if any think fit to receive that as a sacred book.’

Origen remarks upon a passage of Celsus, in which were some things which he supposes might be taken from the book of Enoch: ‘Butⁿ he questions whether Celsus had read the book itself; and he adds, that Celsus seemed not to know that those books called Enoch’s were not looked upon by the churches as divine.’

Again, soon after: ‘Celsus,^o jumbling together and confounding every thing which he has heard or read, not caring whether the books he quotes are esteemed by christians divine or not, says, “that sixty or seventy of those sons of God, when they had descended, were bound under the earth to be punished for their sins:” and adds, as if taken out of

Ἑλληνας Ἑλληνικῶ φερομένων ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ Χριστῶ, παρὰ δὲ Ἑβραίοις μὴ κειμένων. Orig. ad Afr. p. 13. A.

^k See Dissertation Preliminare sur la Bible, liv. i. ch. 1. sect. 5. p. 15. note (e).

^l Ἐξὼ δὲ τῶν ἐστὶν τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά. Apud Eus. l. vi. cap. 25. p. 226. B.

^m Ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνωχ γεγραπταί, ἐν τῷ φίλον παραδεχέσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον. Com. in Joh. p. 132. C. Huet.

ⁿ Ἄτινα εἰδ’ αὐτὰ φαίνεται ἀναγνῆς, εἰ δὲ γνῶρισας, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἅπανν φερεται ὡς θεία τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τῷ Ἐνωχ βιβλία. Contr. Cels. l. v. p. 619. C. Bened.

^o Εἶτα, φῶρων καὶ συγγεῶν ἃ ὁπῶς ποτε ἠέσσει, καὶ τὰ ὁπῶς ποτ’ ἦν γεγραμμένα, εἴτε δεδογμένα θεία εἶναι παρὰ χριστιανοῖς, εἴτε καὶ μὴ, φησι.—καὶ φερεῖ (ὡς ἀπο τῷ Ἐνωχ ἢ κ. ονομαζῶν αὐτῶν) τὸ, ὅθεν καὶ τὰς θερμοῦς πηγὰς εἶναι τὰ ἐκείνων δάκρυα· πρᾶγμα, ἢ τε λεγομένου ἐπ’ ἀκομῆνον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῷ θεῷ. Ibid. p. 620. B. C.

the book of Enoch, though without naming it, that “from their tears arose hot springs:” a thing neither said nor heard in the churches of God.’

In a Homily upon the book of Numbers, Origen having quoted Psalm cxlvii. 4, “He telleth the number of the stars; he calleth them all by their names,” adds: ‘Of^p which names there are many secret and mysterious things said in the books called Enoch’s; but since those books are not in authority with the Jews, I forbear to allege any thing from them at this time.’ Which shows that the opinion of the Jews, concerning ancient books, supposed to have been derived from their ancestors, was not despised.

The books of Enoch are quoted^q by Origen in some other places. But I have put down already more than enough to show that they were not canonical scriptures.

9. How he quotes the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, was^r shown formerly.

10. Origen has quoted a piece called the Ascension of Moses: we saw an instance, when we considered his citations of St. Jude’s epistle. He is supposed to mean this book in another place, though he does not name it: he calls^s it a ‘certain little book not in the canon.’

11. To proceed. Says^t Origen, ‘We read (if indeed any one pleases to receive such a kind of writing) that the angels of righteousness and unrighteousness disputed about the salvation and damnation of Abraham, each side claiming him to themselves.’ A strange dispute! The title^u of this piece is not certainly known: it is plain it was not canonical, nor much valued.

12. ‘As^v for the change of names, the Jews, I know not well upon what ground, but upon the authority, it is likely, of some secret books or traditions, have a tradition among them, that Phinehas the son of Eleazar, who undoubtedly lived out the time of many judges, as we learn from the

^p De quibus quidem nominibus plurima in libellis, qui appellantur Enoch, secreta continentur et arcana: sed quia libelli ipsi non videntur apud Hebræos in auctoritate haberi, interim nunc ea quæ ibi nominantur ad exemplum vocare differamus; sed ex his quæ habemus in manibus, de quibus dubitari non potest, rerum prosequamur indaginem. In Num. Hom. xxviii. p. 384. E. T. ii. Bened.

^q De Prin. l. i. cap. 3. p. 61. C. D. T. i. Bened. et ibid. lib. iv. p. 193. D. et E.

^r See p. 352.

^s Denique et in libello quodam, licet in canone non habetur, mysterii tamen hujus forma describitur. In libr. Jesu. Hom. ii. p. 400. E. Tom. ii. Bened.

^t Legimus (si tamen cui placet hujuscemodi scripturam recipere) justitiæ et iniquitatis angelos super Abrahamæ salute et interitu disceptantes, dum utræque turmæ suo eum volunt cœtui vindicare. In Lucam, Hom. xxxv. in.

^u Vid. Fabric. Cod. Pseud.

N. T. p. 401, 402.

^v In Johan. p. 108. A. Huet.

book of Judges, is the same as Elias; and that immortality was promised him in the book of Numbers, by the covenant of peace, as it is called, as a reward of his zeal for God.' Origen therefore was not acquainted with the Jewish apocryphal book whence this tradition was taken, if indeed it was recorded at all.

13. I formerly * cited a passage from Origen's letter to Africanus, where he supposes that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews refers to some apocryphal book or books of the Jews. There are some other places in Origen's works where he speaks in the like manner, and supposes that our Saviour and his apostles did refer to apocryphal writings.

14. Upon Matt. xxvii. 9, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah the prophet, saying"—— says Origen, 'This^x prophecy is no where found in the books of the prophecies of Jeremiah, read in the churches, and received by the Jews: however, if any one knows where it is written, let him show it. But I suppose that here has been made a mistake in writing this text, and that 'Jeremiah' has been put for 'Zachariah;' or else that there is some apocryphal book of Jeremiah where this is written: but there is such a text in the prophet Zachariah, ch. xi. 12, 13. If any one does not like this supposition, [of an error in transcribing,] let him see whether this prophecy be in any secret book of Jeremiah; forasmuch as the apostle also alleges some texts of apocryphal books, saying somewhere, that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard," 1 Cor. ii. 9. For this is not found in any canonical book, but only in a secret book of the prophet Elias. Again the apostle says, 2 Tim. iii. 8, "As Jannes and Jambres withstood

* See chap. xxxvii. p. 466, 467.

^x 'Tunc impletum est quod dictum fuerat per Hieremiam prophetam, dicentem,' &c.] Inter ea quæ scripta sunt, non invenitur hoc Hieremias alicubi prophetasse in libris suis, qui vel in ecclesiis leguntur, vel apud Judæos referuntur: si quis autem potest scire, ostendat ubi sit scriptum. Suspicio autem errorem esse scripturæ, et pro Zachariâ positum Hieremiam, aut esse aliquam secretam Hieremiæ scripturam in quâ scribitur. Talis est autem textus apud Zachariam: 'Et dicam ad eos,' &c. [Zach. cap. xi. 12, 13.] Si autem hæc dicens aliquis existimat se offendere, videat ne alicubi in secretis Hieremiæ hoc prophetatur; sciens quoniam et apostolus scripturas quasdam secretorum profert, sicut dicit alicubi, 'quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit;' in nullo enim regulari [in Græco procul dubio fuit *κανονικον*. Grabe, Spic. T. i. p. 136.] libro hoc positum invenitur, nisi in secretis Heliæ prophetæ. Item quod ait, 'sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi,' non invenitur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto qui superscribitur Jannes et Mambres. Unde ausi sunt quidam epistolam ad Timotheum repellere, quasi habentem in se textum alicujus secreti, sed non potuerunt. Primam autem epistolam ad Corinthios propter hoc aliquem refutasse quasi adulterinam, ad aures meas nunquam pervenit. In Matth. Tract. 35. p. 193. Tom. ii. Basil.

Moses." This is not found in the public scriptures, but in a secret book entitled "Jannes and Jambres;" for which reason some have been so daring as to argue against that epistle to Timothy, though in vain. But I never heard of any who pretended to say the first epistle to the Corinthians is spurious because of the fore-mentioned citation.^y

This may be esteemed by some a curious passage, for which reason I have made no scruple to transcribe it so much at length: I would likewise make the following remarks upon it.

1.) It shows that christians read and studied the books of the New Testament with a great deal of care.

2.) It shows the aversion of christians for apocryphal books.

3.) Nevertheless Origen knew of none who had rejected the first epistle to the Corinthians; and possibly few or none ever suspected that citation to be taken from any apocryphal book, as Origen did. The generality of people might suppose those words to be taken from Isa. lxiv. 4; St. Jerom, in his commentary^y upon this text of Isaiah, declares that to be his opinion. As for the citation in St. Matthew, Jerom^z was of the same opinion with Origen, that those words were not taken from some apocryphal piece of Jeremiah, but from the genuine prophecies of Zachariah.

4.) It deserves to be considered, whether the quoting or referring to some apocryphal book, or the supposition of such quotation or reference, was not one reason of suspecting or doubting of the genuineness and authority of several books of the New Testament; particularly the second epistle of Peter, the epistle of Jude, and likewise that to the Hebrews. St. Jerom^a actually says that this

^y Paraphrasim hujus testimonii, quasi Hebræus ex Hebræis, assumit apostolus Paulus de authenticis libris in epistolâ quam scribit ad Corinthios: non verbum ex verbo reddens, quod facere omnino contemnit; sed sensuum exprimens veritatem, quibus utitur ad id quod voluerit roborandum. Unde apocryphorum deliramenta conticeant, quæ ex occasione hujus testimonii ingeruntur ecclesiis Christi. Hieron. hb. xvii. Comm. in Isa. cap. 64.

^z Hoc testimonium in Jeremiâ non invenitur. In Zachariâ vero, qui pene ultimus est duodecim prophetarum, quædam similitudo fertur.---Legi nuper in quodam Hebræico volumine, quod Nazarenæ sectæ mihi Hebræus obtulit, Jeremiæ apocryphum, in quo hæc ad verbum scripta reperi. Sed tamen mihi videtur magis de Zachariâ sumptum testimonium; evangelistarum et apostolorum more vulgato, qui, verborum ordine prætermisso, sensus tantum de Veteri Testamento proferunt in exemplum. Com. lib. iv. in Matth. c. 27.

^a Judas,---parvam---epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in eâ assumit testimonium, a perisque rejicitur. De V. l. cap. 4.

was one reason why many in his time rejected the epistle of Jude.

15. In the long passage formerly cited out of Origen's letter to Africanus, concerning the history of Susanna, Origen argues, that history might have been dropped out of the book of Daniel by some of the Jews, as being dishonourable to their great men; and affirms (as just mentioned) that in the New Testament are references to some Jewish apocryphal book. He writes again much to the same purpose in his Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew: 'And it is related,' says^b he, 'that Isaiah was sawn asunder by the people. But if any one receive not this history, because it is in the apocryphal Isaiah, let him believe what is written in the epistle to the Hebrews, "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted," Heb. xi. 37. For that particular, "they were sawn asunder," relates to Isaiah; as that, "they were slain with the sword," to Zacharias, who was slain between the temple and the altar, as our Saviour has taught; referring, as I suppose, to some scripture, not received indeed in the common and public books, but it is likely to be found among the apocryphal.'

Here is no authority given to this book of Isaiah, for he calls it apocryphal; nor is he certain that our Saviour referred to such a book: nor does it appear that Origen knew of any apocryphal book where that particular, concerning the place of Zacharias's death, was to be found.

16. In the books against Celsus: 'And^c in the Acts of the Apostles, Stephen makes mention of the learning of Moses, which he had learned from ancient writings, and not generally known: "And Moses," says he, "was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians,"' Acts vii. 22.

17. In a Homily upon St. Matthew, which we have in Latin, Origen mentions again all these things together: Our Saviour's saying, Luke xiii. 34, that 'Jerusalem had killed the prophets, and stoned them that were sent unto her,'

^b Και Ησαΐας δε πεπρισθαι δε ὑπο τῆ λαο ἰσορηται. Εἰ δε τις ε προσιεται την ἰστοριαν δια το εν τῷ αποκρυφῷ Ησαΐα αυτην φερεισθαι, πισυεσατω τοις εν τη προς Ἐβραιωσ οὕτω γεγραμμενοις· ελιθασθησαν, επρισθησαν, επειρασθησαν· το γαρ επρισθησαν, επι τον Ησαΐαν αναφερεται· ὡσπερ το, εν φονῷ μαχαιρας απεθανον, επι τον Ζαχαριαν φονευθεντα μεταξυ τῆ ναο και θυσιαστηριω, ὡς ὁ Σωτηρ εδιδαξε, μαρτυρων, ὡς οἱμαι, γραφη, μη φερομενη μεν εν τοις κοινοις και δεδημυεμενοις βιβλίοις, εικος δ' ὅτι εν αποκρυφοις φερομενη. In Matt. p. 225. B. C. Huët.

^c Μαρτυρει δε τη Μωϋσεωσ πολυμαθεια ὁ εν ταις Πραξεσι των Αποστολων Στεφανοσ, παντωσ απο των παλαιων και μη εις πολλωσ εφθακωτων γραμματων λαβων. κ. λ. Cont. Cels. l. iii. p. 139. Cant. p. 478. A. Bened.

though^d the history of these things is not contained in the ancient scriptures read in the Jewish synagogues: What Stephen says, Acts vii. 51, 52, "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One:" What St. Paul writes, 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, and again, 2 Tim. iii. 8, of 'Jannes and Jambres withstanding Moses:;' and the quotation, 1 Cor. ii. 9. And then adds: 'We^e have mentioned all these things by way of argument. Nevertheless, we are not ignorant that many of the secret [or 'apocryphal'] books have been composed by impious men. And the Hypythians use some forged writings, the followers of Basilides others. We ought therefore to use caution, that we neither receive all the apocryphal books which there are in the world, because of the Jews, who perhaps have forged some writings in order to overthrow the credit of our scriptures, and to support error; nor reject all which may tend to confirm our scriptures. It is therefore becoming a great man to attend to and fulfil that direction: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Nevertheless, for the sake of those who are not able, like skilful money-changers, to distinguish words whether they be true or false, nor to secure themselves from all imposition, so as to hold fast that which is good, and avoid every kind of evil; no man ought to allege any books which are not in the canonical scriptures, for the confirmation of doctrines.'

18. In his prologue to the Canticles, (if it be Origen's, as divers critics of no small note suppose,^f) translated by

^d — cum non satis talis prophetetur historia in scripturis veteribus quæ legebantur in synagogis eorum. In Matt. Tr. 26.

^e Hæc omnia diximus discutientes sermonem: non ignorantes, quoniam multa secretorum facta sunt a quibusdam impiis et iniquitatem in excelsum loquentibus: et utuntur quibusdam fictis Hypythiani, aliis autem qui sunt Basilidis. Oportet ergo caute considerare, ut nec omnia secreta quæ feruntur in nomine sanctorum suscipiamus, propter Judæos, qui forte ad destructionem veritatis scripturarum nostrarum quædam finxerunt, confirmantes dogmata falsa; nec omnia abjiciamus quæ pertinent ad demonstrationem scripturarum nostrarum. Magni ergo viri est audire, et adimplere quod dictum est: 'Omnia probate; quod bonum est tenete.' Tamen propter eos qui non possunt, quasi trapezitæ, inter verba discernere, vera habeantur an falsa, et non possunt semetipsos caute servare, ut verum quidem teneant apud se, ab omni autem specie mali abstineant, nemo debet uti ad confirmationem dogmatum libris qui sunt extra canonizatas scripturas. In Matth. Tract. 26. p. 128, 129. Tom. ii. Basil. ^f Vid. Huet. Origenian. lib. iii. sect. 3. n. vii. Pearson, Viind. Epist. Ignat. P. i. cap. vii.

Rufinus, Origen writes to this purpose: ‘ This^s however is manifest, that many passages are cited either by the apostles or the evangelists, and inserted in the New Testament, which we do not read in those scriptures [of the Jews] which we account canonical; but are nevertheless found in apocryphal books, and are evidently taken from thence. But neither will this give authority to apocryphal writings; for the bounds which our fathers have fixed are not to be removed. And possibly the apostles and evangelists, full of the Holy Ghost, might know what should be taken out of those scriptures, and what not. But we cannot without great danger presume to act in that manner, who have not such a measure of the Spirit.’

19. In the Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew’s gospel, Origen has an argument upon those words, Matt. xxii. 29, “ Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God;” where he says, ‘ That perhaps^h some, having recourse to apocryphal books, in which the happiness of the future life is more clearly described, will say that there is a reference to them in these words, “ Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures.” But,’ says he, ‘ they who have recourse to apocryphal books will take a method not approved by the faithful.’ This therefore was not a method approved by the faithful or catholic christians, but only, or chiefly at least, by heretics.

20. From these several passages it appears, that there was in Origen’s time a large number of Jewish secret books, or apocryphal books of the Old Testament. Some of these might be composed by the Jews; others of them probably had been composed, or rather forged, by christians; some by catholics, some by heretics: the Nazarene christians might be the authors of some of them, but not of

p. 300, &c. ap. Cleric. Patr. Apost. 1698. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. iii. p. 234, 235.

^s Illud tamen palam est, multa vel ab apostolis vel ab evangelistis exempla esse prolata, et Novo Testamento inserta, quæ in his scripturis, quas canonicas habemus, nunquam legimus; in apocryphis tamen inveniuntur, et evidenter ex illis ostenduntur assumpta. Sed nec sic quidem locus apocryphis dandus est; non enim transeundi sunt limites quos statuerunt patres nostri. Potuit enim fieri, ut apostoli vel evangelistæ, Sancto Spiritu repleti seiverint quid assumendum ex illis esset scripturis, quidve refutandum; nobis autem non est absque periculo aliquid tale præsumere, quibus non est tanta Spiritûs abundantia. Prolog. in Cant. Cant. p. 501. Tom. i. Basil.

^h Καὶ τρίτος δ’ ἂν τις ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποκρυφῆς καταφυγῶν λογῆς, εἴθα δοκεῖ σαφέστερον τὰ περὶ μακαρίας γεγραφθῆναι ζώης. φησὶ ἐπ’ ἐκείνης τὴν ἀναφορὰν εἶναι τῶν ἐνταῦθα γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ πλανασθε μὴ εἰδοτες τὰς γραφὰς—— ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποκρυφῆς καταφυζέται, καὶ ἐπὶ ὁμολογούμενον πρᾶγμα παρὰ τοῖς πεπιτευκοσιν εὐλεύεται. Comm. in Matth. p. 498. C. D. T. i. Huet.

all. It seems not unlikely that one view of the christians in forging these books, was to verify by clear passages some things said in the New Testament, which were not so found in the ancient scriptures generally received by the Jews as canonical: these passages just cited from Origen give ground for such a suspicion. We actually saw formerly one forgery of this sort; for the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs may be reckoned a work of this kind, as appears from the extracts out of it, and the remarks then made upon it: the collection of Sibylline Oracles is another like work. But I think it evident, that though some considerable number of christians were deceived about the age of those writings, none esteemed them canonical, or of authority. And in many of the passages alleged above, are traces of the peculiar respect which the christians had for those ancient Jewish books which the Jews themselves most respected, and esteemed canonical, and were written in the Hebrew tongue.

XXVI. I am now to make some remarks; but they will chiefly concern the citations of ecclesiastical and apocryphal writings of the christians. And I apprehend that it will appear from several considerations, and from a brief review of the whole which has been here set before the reader, that Origen did not receive as sacred scripture, in the strictest and highest sense of that character, any books beside those we now receive under that character and denomination.

1. And, first of all, this may be argued from the catalogues of the books of scripture found in Origen's works. One of these ought to be reckoned that which we have in Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, though collected by him out of several of Origen's works. Eusebius there mentions not any books beside those in our present Canon; indeed he does not put down all these, because probably Origen did not look upon every one of them as of undoubted authority: but if he had received a great number of ecclesiastical and apocryphal books as divine scripture, Eusebius would have been obliged to take some notice of it. The two other catalogues, transcribed above from Origen's Latin works, deserve likewise some consideration; for though we cannot rely upon them as exactly conformable to the Greek originals, yet it is likely that there would have been particular mention made of several ecclesiastical and apocryphal books, if such had been accounted by him divine scriptures.

2. We have no knowledge or information that Origen wrote commentaries upon any books now out of the canon;

though it is certain he published commentaries or homilies upon all or most of those which are now esteemed canonical.

3. The many passages we have alleged, containing Origen's general divisions of the books of scripture, assure us, he received no other as divine and sacred, in the highest sense, but those we do: his expressions suit these and no other. I need not recollect them here; the reader cannot but remember that common division of 'Gospels and Apostles:' sometimes he is more particular, and mentions 'Gospels, Acts, Epistles of Apostles:' 'Gospels, Apostles, and their Revelation.' The ecclesiastical and apocryphal books sometimes cited by him for the sake of illustration, cannot be comprehended in these divisions of sacred scripture which were of authority.

Mr. Richardson, speaking of this matter, and particularly of the Shepherd of Hermas, the piece cited by Origen more frequently, and sometimes with greater marks of respect, than any other ecclesiastical writing, says: 'We find Origen several times distinguishing the books of the New Testament into the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. Now it is certain that the Pastor of Hermas can be reduced to neither of these heads, and therefore, in the judgment of Origen, was not canonical.' This observation is easily and rightly applied to all the writings of this kind.

I shall add here another passage not yet transcribed, which likewise may be reckoned full to our purpose. It is in Origen's Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew's gospel, particularly these words: "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind," Matt. xiii. 47. Beside other things, Origen here says, 'That^k the kingdom of heaven is compared to a net of various texture, on account of the several parts of the ancient and new scripture: that the sea into which the net is cast, is the whole world; and that some men are

ⁱ Mr. Richardson's Canon of the New Testament vindicated, p. 30.

^k Σαγηνη [al. σαγηνης] δε πλοκη ποικιλη ὁμοιωθη ἡ βασιλεια των ερανων, κατα την πεπλεγμενην εκ πυντοδατων και ποικιλων νοηματων παλαιαν και καινην γραφην.—οὕτως εἶροισ αν και επι των ὑπο την σαγηνην των γραφων εληλυθοτων, τινας μεν κεκρατημενους ὑπο την προφητικην πλοκην, φερ' ειπειν, Ησαΐας, κατα τοδε το ῥητον, η Ιερεμις, η Δαυιηλ' αλλες κατα εναγγελικην, και τινας κατα αποσολικην.—Αυτη δε ἡ σαγηνη προ τῃ Σωτηρος ἡμων Ιησῶ [Χριστῶ] ὅλη μεν πεπληρωμενη εκ ην, ελειπε γαρ τη νομικη και προφητικη πλοκη ὁ ειπων—και πεπληρωται ἡ της σαγηνης πλοκη εν τοις εναγγελιοις, και τοις Χριστῶ δια των αποσολων λογους. Comm. in Matt. p. 215. E. 216. A. B. C. Huet.

taken by one part of the net, some by another; some by the words of Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or Daniel; some by the law, others by the gospels, others by the apostles: and that this net was not completely finished before the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ; for he was wanting to the texture of the law and the prophets, who said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Matt. v. 17. And the texture of the net was completed in the gospels, and the words of Christ [spoken] by the apostles.'

4. There is a passage of Origen which I shall put¹ in the margin, though somewhat obscure, where he makes a great difference between apostles and their disciples; allowing the apostles only to be 'the light of the world,' after Christ, and capable of 'enlightening others,' though their disciples also had been 'enlightened.' I think it may be hence argued, that Origen would scarce receive any doctrinal and preceptive work as of authority, unless it were dictated or written by an apostle; though he might well receive the historical writings of a companion of apostles, containing an account of their preaching; as he undoubtedly received the gospels of Mark and Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles, written also by the latter of these two.

Here it will be objected that Origen received the epistle to the Hebrews, though not written by an apostle, which is inconsistent with the just-mentioned observation. But I do not perceive it to be so; for Origen always quotes the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's: and in the passage preserved in Eusebius, he says it has been handed down to his time by the ancients as Paul's; and though he says the phrase and composition are not the apostle's, he affirms that the thoughts or sentiments are 'admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle:' which is enough to show that he thought the apostle's sentiments had been exactly represented by the writer or composer of this epistle, whoever he was; otherwise it was impossible that the thoughts of this epistle should be equal to those of the acknowledged writings of the apostle Paul. According to this opinion of Origen, the epistle to the Hebrews will be

¹ 'Όταν εν τῷ κόσμῳ ὡ, φῶς εἴμι τῷ κόσμῳ. Ἐπει δὲ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς φησὶν ἡμεῖς εἶτε το φῶς τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ, λαμβανῶ το φῶς ἡμῶν εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων. Το δ' αναλογον εδληγη και ατροις ὑπολαμβανομεν ειναι περι την νυμφην εκκλησιαν, και τες μαθητας εχοντας οικειον φως, η απο τῷ αληθινῷ ἡλιῷ επικτητον ἵνα φωτισωσι μη δεδυνημενες πηγην εν αυτοις κατασκευασαι φωτος· οἶον Παυλον μεν και Πετρον φως ερσημεν τῷ κόσμῳ· τες δε τυχοντας παρ' αυτοις μαθητενομενων φωτιζομενες μεν, ἢ μην φωτιζειν ἑτερες δυναμενες, του κοσμου, οὐ κοσμος φως οἱ αποστολοι ησαν. Comm. in Joh. p. 25. C. d)

of the like authority with the gospels of Mark and Luke, who record the discourses of Christ, which they had heard and received from apostles; or with the book of the Acts of the Apostles, where are discourses of apostles in the style of the historian St. Luke. Just so Luke or Clement, or whoever was the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, has there recorded, in his own phrase and style, the sense or thoughts of the apostle Paul.

However, there can be no ground to conclude from Origen's quotations of the epistle to the Hebrews, that he would receive as of authority the epistle, or any other doctrinal work, of an apostolic man; since, whenever he quotes that epistle to prove any thing, he always calls it Paul's.

5. Origen's quotations of ecclesiastical and apocryphal books, which I have transcribed so largely, show he did not receive those books as scripture. The citations of them are few in comparison of the numerous passages taken out of the commonly received books of the New Testament: and usually these citations are accompanied with some expressions, that show the books from whence they are taken were not received by himself or others as of authority.

6. The distinction which we lately^m observed to be made by Origen, of several sorts of books—some genuine, others spurious, others of a mixed nature—is of great use to satisfy us that he did not esteem all books cited by himself, or used and read by christians, as of equal authority; and there were different degrees of respect due to such writings, according to their several kinds: nor can it be doubted that Origen paid a just regard to writings, suitably to their real character. Another thing which shows the distinction made between writings, and that there were some of superior authority to all others, from whence the christian doctrines were to be learned, is that character frequently used by him, of scriptures 'received in the churches as divine.'

7. It is manifest from the whole strain and tenour of Origen's numerous works, and from his arguments upon any points that come before him, and particularly from his defence of the christian religion against Celsus, that our gospels, and the other books of our canon, are the books which Origen, and all catholic christians, relied upon. To give here one proof: In answer to some reflections of Celsus upon Christ's disciples, whom he calls sailors and publicans, Origen, having observed that Matthew was a publican, and that James and John, the sons of Zebedee,

^m See before in this chapter, num. xxiv. 4. p. 538.

and Peter and Andrew, were fishermen, adds : ‘ As ⁿ for the rest of them, we have not learned what were the employments by which they subsisted before they became disciples of Jesus.’ Which shows that our gospels were the only histories of Christ and his disciples that were reckoned authentic : and that either there were no other pretending to give information about them ; or, if there were any such, they were quite disregarded, or at least esteemed of no authority.

8. There is nothing extraordinary or unreasonable in Origen’s citations of books not in the canon : if those books were still extant, we should still now and then occasionally make use of them. Sometimes we should remark a tradition preserved in them, without giving it more weight than it deserved ; sometimes we should quote a pious or a beautiful saying in them : sometimes we might think proper to take notice of an objection that might be formed from some things contained in them ; and yet all the while preserve that high and peculiar veneration which we now have for the books of the present canon. The great number of books published in those early ages concerning Christ and his apostles, though they were many of them mean and trifling, are an argument of the vast extent and reputation of the christian doctrine. And so long as there were men of judgment in the world to distinguish the real merit of books ; and christians were extremely cautious of receiving any book or epistle as written by an apostle, or an apostolical man, without good evidence of its genuineness ; such compositions were of small consequence, and could do no great harm. However, being in themselves of little value, and not being much esteemed, most of them have been entirely lost, except a few fragments ; whilst all the books of the New Testament, received from the beginning, have been carefully preserved, and frequently copied, because of their real worth, and the great respect paid them by all christians in general.

XXVII. Origen’s works afford assurance of the integrity of our present copies of the New Testament. And, as ^o Dr. Mill says, if we had all his works remaining, who published scholia, or commentaries, or homilies upon almost all the books of the Old and New Testament, we should have before us almost the whole text of the Bible, as it was read in his time. Mr. Wetstein ^p has since expressed him-

ⁿ Των δε λοιπων ε μεταθηκαμεν τα εργα, οθεν προ της μαθητειας τσ Ιησσ περιεποιων εαντοις τας τροφας. Contr. Cels. l. i. p. 376. D. Tom. i. Bened.

^o Mill, Proleg. n. 672.

^p Wetstein, Proleg. cap. vi. p. 66.

self much after the same manner; and says, if we now had Origen's copy, or all his works entire, we might expect thence better help for an exact edition of the New Testament, than from all the fathers besides.

There are in Origen several passages relating particularly to the integrity or corruption of the text of the New Testament: and there are in him divers readings different from ours. It is fit my readers should have some account of these matters.

1. Celsus charges the christians with having often designedly altered the text of the gospels. Origen answers, 'That^a he did not know of any that had altered the text of the gospel, except the followers of Marcion and Valentinus, and perhaps of Lucanus:' therefore the catholics were innocent of this charge. Nor were all heretics guilty in this great respect, so far as Origen knew. And I think that, from the ingenuity of this answer, it may be concluded he spoke the truth, according to the best of his knowledge.

2. Matth. xix. 19, "And thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Origen argues that these words were not originally here, because this precept is not found in the parallel places of St. Mark's or St. Luke's gospels, [see Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20.] and for some other reasons which he there insists upon: but he does not seem able to support his conjecture and reasonings by the authority of any copy. He has however these words, which it is proper for us to put down here at length: 'It^r would be impious,' says he, 'to suspect this commandment, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," to have been inserted, though not spoken by our Saviour to the rich man, if there were not many differences in the copies of Matthew's and the other gospels. But indeed it is manifest that there is a difference between copies, whatever it is owing to; whether to the negligence of transcribers, or to the wicked rashness of some in altering what is written, or to a liberty

^a Μεταχαραζαντας δε το ευαγγελιον αλλες εκ οια, η τες απο Μαρκιωνος, και τες απο Ουαλεντινους ομαι δε και τες απο Λεκανε. Contr. Cels. l. ii. p. 77. Cant. p. 411. B. Bened.

^r Και ει μιν μη και περι αλλων πολλων διαφωνα ην προς αλληλα των αντιγραφων, ωτε παντα τα κατα Μαθθαιον μη συναδεν αλληλοις, ομοιως δε και τα λοιπα ευαγγελια, καν ασεβης τις εδοξεν ειναι ο υπονοων ενταυθα προσεβριθαι, εκ ειρημενην προς τον πλεσιον την, Αγαπησεις τον πλησιον σε ως σεαυτον, εντολην' νυνι δε δηλοοσι πολλη γεγονεν η των αντιγραφων διαφορα, ειτε απο ραθυμιας τινων γραφειων, ειτε απο τολμης τινων μοχθηρας της διορθωσης των γραφομενων, ειτε και απο των τα εαντοις δοκουντα εν τη διορθωσει προτιθεντων η αφαιρωντων. Comm. in Matth. p. 381. C. D. T. i. Huet

taken by some of adding or leaving out some things by the way of correction and emendation, as they apprehend.'

Here seem to be hinted three several causes of various readings, or differences, in the copies of the gospels. The first is the negligence of transcribers, which is very likely to happen, or rather is impossible to be entirely prevented. The second is the wicked rashness of some men, who designedly altered the gospels, to make them agreeable to their own particular sentiments. This, we may suppose, was the fault of a few only: for in the foregoing passage Origen assured us, that he did not know of any who had so altered the gospels, except some of the heretics. In the third place, some differences in the copies of the scriptures might be owing to the critics, who took a liberty of leaving out some things, or adding others, and thus to correct or amend some readings in their copies, which they thought to be wrong. And I think that Origen himself here acts the part of a critic, though perhaps he did not easily take the liberty to alter his copies.

We cannot deny the truth of what Origen says here so positively, that there were then many various readings in the copies of the New Testament. But perhaps he aggravates a little to carry a point, and support a bold conjecture. However, we may hence infer, that these books were much esteemed, and had been often transcribed before Origen's time; otherwise there had not been so many differences in the copies of them; and as it is a thing in itself highly probable, that differences should happen in the copies of books frequently transcribed, so it is no small satisfaction to find that such differences were taken notice of. This would increase the care and concern for the exactness of the copies of books so much valued and revered as those of the New Testament.

3. We may place here, as a general observation of Origen relating to this matter, what he says of the names of places: that^s there were frequent errors of that sort in the copies of the gospels, which were owing to the ignorance of the Gentiles in the geography of the land of Judea. He gives two instances. John i. 28, "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan." In^t most copies in his time

^s Το μεντοιγε ήμαρτησθαι εν τοις 'Ελληνικοις αντιγραφοις τα περι των ονοματων πολλαχθ, και απο τστων αν τις πεισθειη εν τοις ευαγγελιοις. Com. in Joh. p. 131. B. Huet.

^t 'Οτι μεν σχεδον εν πασι τοις αντιγραφοις κειται ταυτα εν Βηθανια εγενετο, εκ αγνοσμεν' και εοικε τσπο και ετι προτερον γεγονεναι' και παρα 'Ηρακλεωνι γυν Βηθανιαν ανεγνωμεν. Επεισθημεν δε μη δειν, Βηθανια, αναγνωσκειν, αλλα Βηθαβαρα. Ibid. p. 130. D. E.

here was Bethany. He observes likewise that this was an ancient reading; nevertheless he prefers Bethabara, for divers reasons which he there mentions.

4. He says likewise, that of the swine^u which ran violently down a steep place, and were choked in the sea, it was written in some copies, that this was done in the country of the Gerasenes: in a few copies, in the country of the Gadarenes; but^v Origen is persuaded that the right name is Gergesenes. He adds, that there were like errors in the Greek copies of the Old Testament. But notwithstanding what Origen says, there does not appear sufficient reason for rejecting Gadarenes, whatever becomes of Gerasenes, as has been shown by^w divers critics. Therefore the readings in our present copies may be all right; Gergesenes in Matthew, and Gadarenes in Mark and Luke.

5. Matt. vi. 33, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Origen in his Treatise of Prayer, discoursing of the proper matter of our petitions, says: "These^x are things we ought to pray for: "Ask great things, and small things shall be added unto you." And, "Ask heavenly things, and earthly things shall be added unto you." And, "Pray for them which despitefully use you," Matt. v. 44. And, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest," Matt. ix. 38. The same direction concerning great and small things, heavenly and earthly things, is alluded to again in the^y Treatise of Prayer, and called an evangelical word; as also in the^z books against Celsus. It is expressly put again in the fragments of^a Origen's Commentaries upon the Psalms: "It is a small

^u See Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26.

^v Αναγεγραπται γεγοναι εν τη χωρα των Γερασηνων—επει δε εν ολιγοις ευρομεν εις την χωραν των Γαδαρηνων, και προς τωτο λεκτεον.—Αλλα Γεργεσα, αφ' ης οι Γεργεσαιοι, πολις αρχαια περι την νυν καλεμενην Τιβεριαδα λιμνην, περι ην κρημος παρακειμενος τη λιμνη; αφ' ου δεικνυται τωσ κοιρες υπο των δαιμονων καταβεβλησθαι. Ibid. p. 131. C. D.

^w Vid. Adr. Reland. Palæst. Ill. p. 774, 806, 807. Wolf. Cur. Whitb. Wall in Marc. v. 1.

^x Το μεν ο δει, αιτειτε τα μεγαλα, και τα μικρα υμιν προσεθησεται; και αιτειτε τα επηρανια, και τα επιγεια υμιν προσεθησεται. Και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας. κ. λ. De Orat. p. 197. F. 198. A. Tom. i. Bened.

^y P. 219. F. 220. A. Ηασ τοιγαρον ο τα επιγεια και μικρα αιτων απο Θεω, παρακει τω εντειλαμενω επηρανια και μεγαλα αιτειν.—εαν δε τωσ ανθρωποφωρη τα κατα σωματικων εκ προσευχησ τοις αγιοις δωρηθεντα, αλλα και την τωσ ευαγγελιωσ φωνην διδασκοντωσ τα επιγεια προσθησθαι και μικρα. P. 224. B. C. ibid.

^z Εμαθε γαρ απο τω Ιησω μηδεν μικρον, τωσ εσιν αισθητων, ζητειν, αλλα μονα τα μεγαλα και αληθωσ ζεια. κ. λ. Con. Cels. l. vii. p. 726. F. ibid.

^a Βραχεια δε πασα φωνη η περι των επιγειων και μικρων, και ταπεινων οικητοσ, και αιτησισ απο Θεω ην

matter to ask of God earthly things. Such a petition our Saviour forbids to be offered to the Father, saying: "Ask great things, and small things shall be added unto you: ask heavenly things, and earthly things shall be added unto you."

These words are found cited in part by Clement of Alexandria, as was^b observed formerly: 'Ask,' says he, 'great things, and small things shall be added unto you.'

Grabe^c supposed this citation might be made out of the gospel according to the Hebrews. Mill^d thinks these words were in Origen's copies, added to Matt. vi. 33, and taken possibly from the gospel according to the Hebrews, or some other apocryphal gospel. Fabricius is unwilling^e to allow, that Origen made this citation out of the gospel according to the Hebrews: he is rather inclined to think that these words were in Origen's copies, having been inserted there by interpolation. Dr. Wall says, that passage^f seems to have been in some old copies, though it is in none now. Mr. Jones^g says, that Clement, in the passage under consideration, respected the sense of Christ's words, without precisely transcribing them: that is, he rather chose to expound the words, than literally cite them. Hence also Origen, says he, who was one of Clement's scholars, does more than once in his works paraphrase these words of Christ in the same manner. Such are the sentiments of these learned writers. It is not fit to be positive in a thing of this nature: but I do not see but Mr. Jones's opinion may be reckoned as probable, and as near the truth, as any. Then this passage is no various reading: however I thought fit to take notice of it in this place, and give such an account of the use Origen has made of it, that every one may judge for himself.

6. Matt. x. 29, "And one of them shall not fall to the ground." Origen read, 'Fall^h into the snare.' So likewiseⁱ Chrysostom: and, as Dr.^k Mill says, the Clementine Homilies; but I cannot find the place. That learned man

απογορευων ὁ Σωτηρ προσφέρειν τῷ Πατρὶ φησιν· Αἰτετε τα μεγαλα, και τα μικρα ὑμιν προσεθησεται· αιτειτε τα εβρανια, και τα επιγεια προσεθησεται ὑμιν.
Select. in Psalmos, p. 560. E. Tom. ii. Bened.

^b Chap. xxii. p. 257.

^c Spicileg. T. i. p. 44.

^d Mill, in loc. Matth. et Prolegom. n. 695.

^e Cod. Apocr. N. T. Tom. i. p. 329. De Dictis Christi, sect. 8.

^f Wall's Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 8.

^g Jones, vol. i. p. 553.

^h Καὶ γὰρ ἕνο τρωθίων—

ἐν εἰς παγίδα ἢ πιπτει ἀνευ τῆ ἐν ἑβρανοῖς Πατρὸς. Con. Cels. l. viii. p. 794. F. Tom. i. Bened.

ⁱ In Matt. x. Hom. xxxv.

^k Mill, Prol. num. 670.

however thinks, that ‘the ground,’ or ‘the earth,’ is the true reading, and ‘snare’ an interpretation. I take this to be a kind of proverbial expression. It might be sometimes said ‘to the ground,’ at other times ‘into the snare.’ Possibly the true reading is as Mill supposes: nevertheless it was very natural for some, in citing this text, to express it after the other form, ‘into the snare.’ There are frequent comparisons in scripture to this ordinary event, of catching a bird in a snare: as Psal. cxxiv. 7; Prov. vii. 23; Eccl. ix. 12. I put down one place, where both the snare and the earth are mentioned. Amos iii. 5, “Can a bird fall in a snare on the earth, where no gin is for him.”

7. Matt. xix. 24, “It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.” See also Mark x. 25; Luke xviii. 26. Some have thought, that instead of ‘camel’ we should read ‘cable.’ Origen¹ plainly read ‘camel,’ speaking of the animal so called, and describing it.

8. Matt. xxv. 23, “Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.” Compare Luke xix. 17. Origen, in his books against Celsus,^m has these words: ‘To whom it may be said, “Thou hast been faithful in a small city: enter thou into a great one.”’ I apprehend here is no proof thatⁿ this was in any gospel; it may be only an expression representing the sense of several places in the gospels.

9. Mark vi. 3, “Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary—?” Celsus^o had reflected upon our Saviour, calling him a ‘carpenter by trade.’ Origen says, ‘That^p nevertheless Jesus himself is never called a carpenter in any of the gospels used in the churches.’ It is not easy to determine what^q was the reason of Origen’s saying this; whether his memory failed him, or whether in his copies of St. Mark’s gospel this place was, “Is not this the carpenter’s son?” as in Matt. xiii. 55; which possibly might be only

¹ *Ευκοπωτερον εστι καμηλον δια τρυπης ραφιδος διελθειν, η πλυσιον εισελθειν εις την βασιλειαν των ηρανων. Εν η παραβολη ο μεν πλυσιος παραβαλλεται καμηλω, ε δια το ακαθαρτον τε ζωε μονον, ως ο νομος ειδαξεν, αλλα και την ολην αυτη σκολιοτητα.* Comm. in Matt. p. 387. E. 388. A. Huet. Vid. et Con. Cels. l. vi. p. 642. A. B. Bened.

^m *Προς ους λεγοιτο αν’ Εν ελαχιστη πολιε πιστος εγενεθ, ηκε και επι την μεγαλην.* Con. Cels. l. viii. p. 798. B.

ⁿ *Uteunque vid. Mill, Proleg. n. 695, 696.*

^o *Η επει τεκτων ην την τεχνην.* Con. Cels. l. vi. p. 299. Cant. p. 659. D. Bened.

^p *Αλλα και ε βλεπων, οτι εδαμ των εν ταις εκκλησιας ζερομενων ευαγγελιων τεκτων αυτος ο Ιησους αναγεγραπται.* Ibid.

^q *Vid. Grot. Annot. ad Matt. xiii. 55. Spencer, in locum Origenis. Mill, Prol. 698.*

an alteration made in St. Mark's gospel by some person out of respect to Christ.

10. The most considerable variation from our copies of the New Testament which I have observed in Origen, is in the Lord's Prayer, as recorded in St. Luke's gospel. In his Treatise of Prayer he has given us distinctly this prayer from Matthew and Luke. The prayer in Matthew is very little different from our present copies; therefore I need not put it down. That in Luke being very different, I shall transcribe it here at length. Says Origen, 'The words in Luke are thus: "Father, hallowed be thy name: thy kingdom come: give us day by day our daily bread; and forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted unto us; and lead us not into temptation."'

Here Origen omits 'our,' and 'who art in heaven;' and from his particular explication of that part of the prayer afterwards, it appears^s again that 'Father' only was in Luke; nevertheless^t Mill supposed that those words, 'our,' and 'who art in heaven,' were in Origen's copies of St. Luke's gospel. This mistake has been already observed by^u the learned author of the Notes upon Origen's Treatise of Prayer, published by Mr. Reading, which ought to be consulted.

Origen afterwards says expressly that St. Luke^v omits these words, 'thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth.' He observes the difference^w between the two evangelists in that which is generally called the fourth petition; and says likewise,^x that 'deliver us from evil' is omitted by St. Luke. So that we have from Origen a most distinct account how this prayer was read in his time, in both evangelists.

The text of St. Luke in the Latin vulgate, agrees with Origen throughout: and^y St. Augustine has informed us,

^t Τὸ δὲ Λῦκα οὕτως· Πατερ, ἁγιασθητω το ονομα σε, ελθετω ἡ βασιλεια σε· τον αρτον ἡμων τον επιωσιον διδου ἡμιν, καθ' ἡμεραν· και αφες ἡμιν τας ἁμαρτιας ἡμων, και γαρ αυτοι αφιεμεν παντι τω οφειλοντι ἡμιν· και μη εισενεγκης ἡμας εις πειρασμον· Orig. de Orat. p. 227. A. Tom. i. Bened.

^s Εἰ μεντοι νοησαιμεν τι εστι το, ὅταν προσευχησθε, λεγετε, Πατερ, ὁπερ παρα τῷ Λῦκα γεγραπται. Ibid. p. 232. A.

^t Vid. Mill, in Lucæ locum, et Proleg. n. 419.

^u Vid. Orig. de Oratione, p. 95. not. 4. p. 108. not. 4. ex edit. Gul. Reading, et p. 919. D. E. 920. C. Tom. i. Bened.

^v Γενηθητω το Ξελημα σε, ὡς εν ορανοις και επι γης. Ὁ Λῦκας μετα το, ελθετω ἡ βασιλεια σε, ταυτα παρασιωπησας, εταξε τον αρτον. κ. λ. p. 240. C. Bened.

^w P. 243. C. ^x Το δὲ, αλλα ῥησαι ἡμας απο τῆς ποιησῆς, παρα τῷ Λῦκα σισιωπηται. p. 256. C. Vid. et p. 265. A.

^y Evangelista vero Lucas in Oratione Dominicâ petitiones non septem,

that in his copies of St. Luke were wanting these words, 'thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth;' and, 'but deliver us from evil.' He likewise makes judicious remarks upon the various readings, as in St. Luke. However^z Whitby defends our present reading in that gospel.

Origen has taken no notice at all of the doxology which we now have in our copies of St. Matthew's gospel, Matt. vi. 13. Whether it was originally there, or a part of the prayer delivered by our Lord, is disputed^a by learned men: but no one, that I know of, has considered this matter more fully and accurately than^b Mr. Hallet.

11. Luke xxiii. 43, "And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise." Origen observes, 'That^c this saying has so disturbed some people, as appearing to them absurd, that they have ventured to suspect that it has been added by some that corrupt the gospels: "To-day shalt thou be with me in the paradise of God." Here we may observe two things: first, that Origen read, 'in the paradise of God,' for so he writes this text several times: secondly, it may be concluded from what Origen says, that these words were in all copies; and that they who objected against them had no copy to allege in support of their suspicion, but only the absurdity of the thing itself in their opinion: for that is all that Origen mentions.

12. John vii. 39, "For the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Origen reads, 'For^d the Spirit was not yet.'

13. 1 Cor. ix. 10, "That he that ploweth should plow in hope: and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." Origen reads the latter part of the verse thus: 'And^e that he that thresheth [should thresh] in hope

sed quinque, complexus est.—Ostendens ergo Lucas tertiam petitionem duarum superiorum esse quodammodo repetitionem, magis eam prætermittendo fecit intelligi. Deinde tres alias adjungit, de pane quotidiano, de remissione peccatorum, de tentatione vitandâ. At vero quod ille in ultimo posuit, 'sed libera nos a malo,' iste non posuit, ut intelligeremus ad illud superius, quod de tentatione dictum est, pertinere. August. Ench. ad Laur. cap. 116.

^z Whitb. Exam. Var. Lect. Mill, p. 31.

^a Vid. Mill, ad Matt. cap. vi. 13. et in Prolegomenis.

^b See Mr. Hallet's Notes and Discourses, vol. i. p. 133—151.

^c Ἄμα τῷ ἐξοδῷ, ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἐμελλεν εἰσεῖναι τὰ θεῶν. Οὕτῳ δὲ ἐταραξέ τινας ὡς ἀσυμφωνον τὸ εἰρημεινον, ὥστε τολμησαὶ αὐτὰς ὑπονοησαὶ προστεθῆσθαι τῷ ἐναγγελίῳ ἀπο τῶν ῥαδιουργῶν αὐτοῦ τὸ Σήμερον μετ' ἐμῆ ἐσθ' ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τὰ θεῶν. Comm. in Johan. p. 421. D. Huet.

^d Οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐπω ἐδόξασθη. Com. in Joh. p. 422. B.

^e Καὶ ὁ ἀλων, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆ μετεχειν. Con. Cels. l. iv. p. 197. Cant. p. 541. D. Bened.

of partaking;’ or, ‘and he that thresheth in hope of partaking;’ which is also the reading^f of the Alexandrian, and several other manuscripts: and so Colinaeus had published this text in his edition of the New Testament; and I do not see but this may be the true reading. I am satisfied our present common reading is wrong, which we have from Robert Stephens: I should think it must appear strange and absurd to every one that looks upon the Greek.

14. I Thess. v. 21, “Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.” 22, “Abstain from all appearance of evil.” Here I propose to transcribe several passages of Origen, in order to judge whether he read this place of the apostle differently from us.

1. In the Greek Commentaries upon St. Matthew’s gospel, Origen has these words: ‘But whether we perceive the fitness and excellence of this law or not,^g in the first place God will see it, and his Christ; and then he who, according to the scripture, is called a skilful money-changer, who knows how “to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good, and to abstain from all appearance of evil.”’

2. In the Greek Commentaries upon St. John’s^h gospel: ‘And observing the command of Jesus, which says, “Be ye skilful money-changers;” and the doctrine of Paul, who says, “Prove all things, hold fast that which is good, abstain from all appearance of evil.”’

3. In a Latin Homily upon Exodus: ‘Butⁱ as the apostle says, “proving all things, holding fast that which is good.”’

4. Again, in a Latin Homily upon Leviticus: ‘Hear^k the prophet, saying, “Your silver is reprobate” [referring to Isa. i. 22, or Jer. vi. 30]. And because some money is good, other bad, therefore the apostle says, as to skilful money-changers, “Proving all things, holding fast that which is good.”’

^f Vid. Mill, in loc.

^g ——— πρωτον μεν θεος αν ειδειη και ο Χριστος αυτη, μετα δε ταυτα και ο κατα την γραφην ονομαζομενος δοκιμος τραπεζιτης, και ειδως παντα δοκιμαζειν, και το μεν καλον κατεχειν, απεχεσθαι δε παντος ειδος πονηρου. Com. in Math. p. 489. C. Huët.

^h ——— και τηρωντων την εντολην Ιησϋ λεγϋσαν· Δοκιμοι τραπεζιται γινεσθε, και την Παυλϋ διδαχην φασκοντος· Παντα δοκιμαζετε, το καλον κατεχετε, απο παντος ειδος πονηρε απεχεσθε. In Joh. p. 268. E.

ⁱ Nec—convenit nos tumere superbiâ, et spernere verba prudentium, sed sicut apostolus dicit: ‘Omnia probantes, quod bonum est tenentes.— In Exod. Hom. xi. Tom. ii. p. 171. B. Bened.

^k Audi prophetam dicentem, ‘Argentum vestrum reprobum.’ Quia ergo est quædam proba, quædam vero reprobâ, propterea apostolus, velut ad probabiles trapezitas, ‘Probantes,’ inquit, ‘omnia, quod bonum est obtinentes.’ In Levit. Hom. iii. p. 199. A.

5. Origen refers or alludes to this saying in several other places; but I think I need not put down any more here at length. It may be proper however to observe, before we proceed any farther, that this same thing is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria¹ as scripture. In the Clementine Homilies it^m is called a saying of Christ; by St. Jerom likewiseⁿ it is ascribed to our Saviour; and by the heretic Apelles,^o in Epiphanius, it is cited as from the gospel: and in a like manner some^p other ancient writers, particularly Chrysostom. But^q Dionysius of Alexandria, and^r other writers, cites this as an apostolical saying, and seem to have read it together with those other directions of St. Paul in his first epistle to the Thessalonians. Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, mentions it^s as the precept both of Christ and his apostle, according as some understand him: but I think he ought to be reckoned with those who seem to ascribe it to Christ, as does^t Fabricius. I shall add no more authors at present. Cotelerius^u and Fabricius^v have large collections of places of the ancients where this saying is quoted or alluded to.

¹ Εικοτως αρα και η γραφη τοις τωσ τινας ημας διαλεκτικωσ ουτως εθελωσα γενεσθαι παρανει, Γινεσθε δε δοκιμοι τραπεζιται τα μεν αποδοκιμαζοντες, το δε καλον κατεχοντες. Clem. Str. l. i. p. 354. D. Conf. Str. ii. p. 365. B. l. vi. p. 655. B. et vii. p. 754. A. B.

^m Ευλογωσ ο διδασκαλωσ ημων ελεγεν· Γινεσθε τραπεζιται δοκιμοι. Clem. Hom. ii. sect. 50. Vid. et Hom. iii. sect. 50. xxviii. sect. 20.

ⁿ — Sciat me illud apostoli libenter audire: ‘Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete:’ et Salvatoris verba, dicentis, ‘Estote probati nummularii.’ Hieron. Ep. 152. ad Minervium et Alex. Conf. eund. in Ep. ad Ephes. v. 10.

^o Ουτως γαρ, φησι, εφη εν τω ευαγγελιω· Γινεσθε δοκιμοι τραπεζιται. Eriph. Hær. xlii. sect. 2.

^p Και γαρ δια τωτο, φησι, Γινεσθε τραπεζιται δοκιμοι, εκ ινα επι της αγορας εσωτες τα αργυρια αριθμητε, αλλα ινα τωσ λογωσ βασανιζητε μετα ακριβειασ απασησ δια τωτο και ο αποσολωσ Παυλωσ φησι· Παντα δοκιμαζετε, το καλον δε κατεχετε μονον. Chrysost. in Sermone. Cur in Pentecoste Acta Apost. legantur, p. 942. D. Tom. v. Ut efficiamur secundum præceptum Domini probabiles trapezitæ. Cassian. Collat. i. 20.

^q Απεδεξαμην το οραμα, ωσ αποσολικη φωνη συντρεχον τη λεγωση προς τωσ εννατωτερωσ· Γινεσθε δοκιμοι τραπεζιται. Ap. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 7. p. 253. C.

^r Τουτωτον τι και ο μακαριωσ Παυλωσ φησι· Γινεσθε φρονιμοι τραπεζιται· παντα δοκιμαζετε, το καλον κατεχετε, απο παντωσ ειδωσ πονηρωσ απεχεσθε. Cyrill. Alex. ad Es. iii. 3. Tom. ii. p. 56. E. Vid. eund. lib. iv. ad Joh. vii. 12. Tom. iv. p. 497. A. et adv. Nestor. l. i. Tom. vi. p. 2. C. Ab his vero qui Origenis libros legunt, istud penitus exclusum putant esse mandatum, quo probabiles jubentur esse trapezitæ, scientes quod bonum est retinere, ab omni specie malâ se abstinere. Pamphil. Apol. pro Origene, init.

^s Αλλωσ τε παρεγγωσιν ημιν ο τε Χριτωσ και ο τωτω αποσολωσ, γινεσθαι τραπεζιται δοκιμοι, ωτε τα παντα δοκιμαζειν, το καλον κατεχοντασ. κ. λ. Soerat. Ecc. II. l. iii. cap. 16. p. 189. B.

^t Cod. Apoc. N. T. Tom. i. p. 331. ^u Coteler. ad Ap. Const. lib. 2. cap. 36.

^v Fa. r.e. Cod. Apoc. N. T. Tom. i. p. 300, &c.

6. The judgments of learned men concerning this precept are different. Archbishop Usher thought it^w was taken out of the gospel according to the Hebrews; whose opinion is approved by^x Valesius and^y Huet. Cotelerius delivers his judgment in this manner: That^z this saying was received by oral tradition, or from some apoeryphal writing of good note, as a divine oracle of the New Testament, 'Be ye skilful money-changers:' whereupon some one put it in the margin of his copy, at Matt. xxv. 27, and Luke xix. 23: another thought proper to place it as a marginal note at the side of a like text of the apostle, 1 Thess. v. 21; and perhaps a third put it down in the margin of all these three places. He suspects likewise that it might be written by some one over against 1 John iv. 1. From thence in time these spurious words were inserted in the sacred context; and afterwards were quoted as words of scripture, of 'Christ,' and the 'gospel;' or of the 'apostle' and 'Paul.' So Cotelerius.

Croius^a and^b Suicer think we ought not to suppose that this precept or saying was read any where exactly in these words; but that it was formed or collected out of the parable of the talents, Matt. xxv. or Luke xix.

7. I would now deliver my own opinion, if it may be of any value. In the first place, I think it plain that Origen had not this saying in his copies of the first epistle to the Thessalonians; for he calls it Christ's, and cites the two verses in that epistle as we have them: I take this also to be very clear concerning St. Chrysostom, and several other authors, that they had not this saying in any of Paul's epistles. Secondly, I am not satisfied that this direction was read as text in any part of the New Testament, either the gospels or the epistles; or if indeed it was inserted in any copies, I think they were very few. My reasons are these: (1.) It appears from divers passages of Origen,^c and

^w Usser, Prolegom. in Ignat. Ep. cap. 8. sect. 7.

^x Vales. Annot. in Euseb. l. vii. p. 142. B.

^y Huet, Not. in Orig. p. 114, 115.

^z Coteler. ut supra.

^a Existimat Croius [Observ. in N. T. cap. 28.] verba hæc non αυτολεξει a patribus Christo tribui, sed e parabolâ de talentis, quæ habetur Matth. cap. xxv. et Luc. cap. xix. sententiam fuisse collectam a patribus et conflata. Huet, Not. ad Origen. p. 114. Vid. loc. Croii, citatum a Suicero. Thesaur. Ec. v. Τραπεζιτης.

^b Vid. Suicer, ibid.

^c — μη δοκιμοι τραπεζιται, μηδε επιταμενοι διακρινειν πνευματα τα ενεργουνα, ποια μιν απο Θεου, ποια δε αφετηκοτα αυτη. Orig. in Matt. Tom. xii. p. 265. De Huet. Multi enim venient in nomine meo, dicentes, Ego sum Christus, et multos seducent. Vere enim qui implet illud mandatum quod ait, Estote prudentes nummularii; et illud quod ait, Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete; ab omni specie malâ abstinete vos: multos videbit seduci

other ancient christian writers, that it was very common to compare truth and falsehood to good and bad coins; and accordingly in recommending inquiry and examination, the trying or discerning of spirits, the^d study of the scriptures, a love of truth, and a care not to be deceived by the specious appearances of erroneous opinions and their abettors, it was very natural to advise men to act like good money-changers, or bankers. Sometimes the advantages or talents vouchsafed men by Providence, are compared^e to good coin; and the right improvement of them called, acting^f the part of a good banker. The scripture led them to these similitudes, and they appear to have borrowed or improved them thence. Moreover Origen says that God^g may be called a banker, on account of his discerning between good and bad, and trying the reins and the heart. St. Jerom^h says, it is difficult for us to fulfil the part of a good money-changer, in judging of the virtues of men. It is possible that this comparison might be in use before the writing of the books of the New Testament, and before the preaching of Christ and his apostles: Fabriciusⁱ has actu-

a multis intellectibus et verbis profitentibus esse se Christum, Dei Verbum. Id. Tract. xxvii. in Matt. p. 132. in Basil.

^d Unde omnes studio legendæ nobis scripturæ sunt, et in lege Domini meditandum die ac nocte: ut probati trapezitæ, sciamus quis nummus probus sit, quis adulter. Hieron. in Ep. ad Ephes. cap. iv. ver. 31.

^e Siclus pecuniæ dominicæ nomen est, et in multis scripturarum locis, diversis appellationum nominibus, pecunia dominica memoratur. Sed quædam bona, quædam vero reprobata dicitur. Proba erat illa pecunia, quam paterfamilias, peregre profecturus, vocatis servis suis dedit unicuique secundum virtutem suam. Proba erat et illa pecunia, quæ denarius nominatur, qui cum mercenariis pactus est, et a novissimis datus est usque ad primos. [Vid. Matt. xxv. 14—30. et Matt. xx. 1—16.] Orig. in Levit. Hom. iii. p. 198. F. Tom. ii. Bened.

^f Verbi gratiâ, cum docet Paulus, et assistunt ei auditores, Paulus est qui pecuniam fœnerat dominicam; auditores autem sunt qui ex ore ejus pecuniam verbi suscipiunt fœneratam. Et si quidem justus sit qui suscipiat ab eo pecuniam, reddet integrum fœnus, et dicet: Quinque minas mihi dedisti, ecce acquisivi alias quinque.—Ecce et nunc vos omnes quibus hæc loquor, pecuniam accipitis fœneratam verba mea: hæc pecunia Domini est. Aut si dubitas, audi prophetam, dicentem, quia ‘eloquia Domini eloquia casta, argentum igne probatum, terræ purgatum septuplum,’ Ps. xii. 6. Si ergo male doceo, pecunia mea reprobata est.—Si autem bene doceo, pecunia vel argentum non est meum, sed Domini est, et probatum est. Orig. Select. in Psalm. p. 669. B. C. Tom. ii. Bened. Vid. et quæ sequuntur.

^g Ὁ Κύριος δοκιμαζει μὲν δίκαια, αποδοκιμαζει δὲ ἀδίκα, καὶ ἐπὶ ἴνα οὕτως ονομασῶ, τραπεζιτης δίκαιων καὶ ἀδίκων. In Jerem. Hom. xix. p. 197. E. Huet.

^h Quis, putas, e nobis probandis numismatibus callidus trapezita, non erabit, in discretionem sanctorum? Hieron. in Ep. ad Philem. ver. 5.

ⁱ Eodem simili utitur Philo Judæus, libro De Judice, p. 557. Ὁ δίκαιων εἰσῶν καθάπερ ἀργυραμοιβὸς ἀγαθὸς, διαριετῶ καὶ διακριετῶ τὰς φύσεις τῶν πραγμάτων. Cebes in Tabula: Δια τῆτο το δαιμονιον κελνευι μη θανμα-

ally alleged two examples from ancient writings. It is an excellent precept, and applicable on many occasions, ‘Be ye skilful money-changers.’ Whenever the comparison was put into this form, it would be much used, especially by christians; it being so suitable to the nature of the christian religion, and so becoming christians of all ranks to put the precept in practice, it being also of so great importance to them to distinguish between truth and error; finally, it being not only so agreeable to divers parables in the gospels, but likewise to numerous cautions and directions of^k Christ, as well as to that of Paul to the Thessalonians, and in other epistles. (2.) If this direction was any where in the text of the New Testament, it was as likely to be in the first epistle to the Thessalonians as any where. But that it was not there, I think to be very plain from Origen, St. Jerom, and St. Chrysostom; not to mention now Socrates or others, who call this a command of Christ. Therefore they who mention this as a precept of the apostle, or of Paul, do not intend to quote it as a text of Paul, but only represent in these words the sense of that text, “prove all things,” or other directions in the apostle’s epistles. Consequently it is likewise probable that the other writers who call this a command of Christ or of the ‘gospel,’ only intend in these words to represent the sense of divers things taught by Christ in the gospels. We have a plain instance of this method in one of the passages before cited from Origen; for though this command, ‘be ye skilful money-changers,’ was not in his copies of the epistle to the Thessalonians, as is most evident, yet he observes that ‘the apostle says, “as to skilful money-changers, proving all things, holding fast that which is good:” and I think that John Cassian, who speaks of it as a precept of the Lord and of the gospel, does in one^l place represent it as a lesson

ζειν, ὁ, τι αν πραττη αυτη, μηδε γινεσθαι ὁμοιος τοις κακοις τραπιζιταις. Και γαρ εκεινοι ὅταν μεν λαβωσι το αργυριον παρα των ανθρωπων, χαιρουν, και ιδιον νομιζουσιν ειναι. Fabr. Cod. Ap. N. T. p. 331.

^k To this purpose may be reckoned the following things: “Beware of false prophets,” Matt. vii. 15—20. See likewise chap. xxiv. 23—26; and the parallel places in other gospels. Of “discerning the times,” Matt. xvi. beginning, and in other gospels. “Search the scriptures,” John v. 39. “If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works,” ch. x. 36, 37. And the saying, “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear:” and many other things, beside the parables, Matt. xx; xxv; Luke xix.

^l Quomodo ergo acquiri debeat, cupimus nobis exponi, aut quemadmodum utrum vera et ex Deo, an falsa et diabolica sit, possit agnosci, ut secundum illam evangelicam, quam superiore tractatu disseruisti, parabolam, quâ jubemur

taught us by the sense and design of the parable of the talents. So Victor of Capua^m supposes Paul to have directed us to be good money-changers, when he said, “ Prove all things, hold fast that which is good ;” plainly ascribing these last words only to St. Paul, and putting the sense and design of them into that precept, ‘ Be ye good money-changers,’ as did Origen in the place just cited from him. (3.) This direction is not now in any Greek copy of the New Testament, nor in any version, that I know of: therefore it never was a part of the text of the New Testament; for if it had, it could not have been lost. If this command had been mentioned but once or twice in all antiquity, this argument perhaps might be of little weight; but since it is found very frequently in the writings of ancient christian authors, in several centuries, I think this argument unanswerable: a saying so often mentioned, and by so many writers, could not have been lost out of all the copies of the New Testament, if ever it had been there. I suppose these considerations may be of use to confirm the sentiment of Croius and Suicer.

15. 1 Tim. iii. 16, “ And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, —received up into glory.” It has been disputed whether the true reading of this text is, ‘ God’ was manifest, or ‘ which,’ or ‘ who’ was manifest. In Origen are these words: ‘ Butⁿ if my Jesus be said to be received up into glory, I perceive the reason of it; that God who wrought this, appointed him master to those who saw it.’ When one reads this place, there arises some suspicion that Origen read Jesus, or Christ, where we now have God: I cannot tell whether it will not be allowed me therefore to put the question, whether *Ἰησους*, ‘ Jesus,’ or *Χριστος*, ‘ Christ,’ written in a contracted manner, has not been read *θεος*, ‘ God;’ which might occasion this last to be so common a reading in our present manuscript copies.^o This remarkable quotation, or reference to 1 Tim. iii. 16, is not placed in the index of texts of scripture by the Benedictine editor of

fieri probabiles trapezitæ, numismati impressam veri regis imaginem, pervidentes,prehendere valeamus, &c. Cassian. Collat. ii. cap. 9.

^m — precautes ut nos in veritate scripturarum suarum erudire dignetur, et discretionis gratiam tribuat, quatenus, ut optimi trapezitæ, omnia probemus, secundum Paulum, et quæ sint bona sectemur. Vict. Præf. in Tatian. al. Ammon. Harm. Bib. Patr. T. iii. p. 266. E.

ⁿ *Ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἐμὸς Ἰησὺς ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι ἐν δόξῃ λεγῆται, ὀφρὴ τὴν οἰκονομίαν οὐ τοῖς θεωρησασὶ συνίστη τὸν διδάσκαλον ὁ τῆς ἐνεργήσεως γενεσθαι Θεός.* Con. Cels. l. iii. p. 467. C.

^o See before, p. 142. a quotation from the epistle to Diognetus.

Origen. I think it should not have been omitted, especially considering how rarely this text has been quoted by the ancient christian writers: which is particularly taken notice of by ^p Mill, though I do not see that he himself has observed this citation of it in Origen.

16. We do not find in Origen the disputed text of St. John's first epistle concerning the heavenly witnesses, I John v. 7, 8. It seems probable that he did not know of it. Having quoted Matt. iii. 11; John vi. 53; Luke xii. 50, he adds: 'And agreeably^q hereto his disciple John writes in his epistle, of "the Spirit, the water, and the blood; these three are made one."'

17. It ought to be observed, that every difference of Origen's citations from our copies ought not to be reckoned a various reading, because, as Huet^r says, Origen often trusts his memory, and writes in haste, without consulting the text, and for that reason quotes differently from himself. I shall give an instance, which perhaps will be allowed to be to the purpose. Our present reading of Gal. iv. 21, is, "Ye that desire to be under the law, do not ye hear the law?" In the books against^s Celsus, Origen twice cites this place thus: 'Ye that read the law, do ye not hear the law?' but in a Greek fragment of the books of^t Principles, he uses and argues upon the common reading. Either therefore Origen's copies differed, and he used at different times different readings; or in one place he quoted by memory, and in the other exactly; which I take to be the case here, and that his reading was the same as ours; and that when he said, 'Ye that read the law,' he depended upon his memory, and quoted wrong.

XXVIII. I must now put down some of Origen's explanations of scripture.

I. He treats those as heretics^u who allegorize the history of Christ's miracles of healing diseases, as if nothing else was

^p Vid. Mill, in notis ad I Tim. iii. 16.

^q Τετρω δε συμφωνως εν τη επισολη μαθητης Ιωαννης το πνευμα, και το υδωρ, και το αιμα ανεγραψε, τα τρια εις εν γενομενα. Com. in Joh. p. 133. D. Huet.

^r Huet, in notis, p. 61.

^s Λεγετε μοι οι τον νομον αναγνωσκοντες, τον νομον εκ ακρετε; Con. Cels. l. ii. p. 388. D. et lib. iv. p. 537. D. Bened.

^t Λεγετε μοι, φησιν, οι υπο νομον θελοντες ειναι, τον νομον εκ ακρετε; γεγραπται γαρ.—Παρατηρητειον γαρ εκαστον των ειρημεων υπ' αυτς' οτι φησιν, οι υπο νομον θελοντες ειναι, ουχ, οι υπο τον νομον ουτες. κ. τ. λ. De Prin. l. iv. p. 171. Tom. i. Bened. et Philoc. p. 10. Cantabr.

^u Και μαλιτα ταυτα προσακτεον τοις ετεροδοξοις, χαιρσσι ταις αλληγοριας, και αναγσσι την περι των ιασεων ισοριαν επι τας της ψυχης θεραπειας, απολυομενς υπο Ιησθ πασης νοσθ, και πασης μαλακιας. Com. in Joh. p. 308. A. Huet.

meant but healing the soul, when it is said, that Jesus healed “all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease.” Matt. iv. 23.

2. Origen himself believes that the ‘demoniacs’ mentioned in the gospels were disturbed by an evil spirit. But^v he says that physicians endeavoured to account for those cases in a natural way; not allowing the agency of any impure spirit, but calling them bodily distempers.

3. He says many unhappy people are called^w lunatics, but he^x thinks that their distempers are not owing to the moon, but that evil spirits, having observed its changes, inflict those distempers at certain times, the better to deceive men, and induce them to ascribe such distempers to that great light in the heaven, which are really caused by themselves.

4. Origen^y seems to have thought that there was really a legion of dæmons in the poor man at the tombs; because when Christ asked him what was his name, he answered, Legion, Mark v. 9, Luke viii. 30. But I should think it had been easy for Origen to perceive, that this is slight authority upon which to build any doctrine; whether we suppose this man to have been distracted, or to have had in him one or more dæmons. If the former, this is only the word of a madman; if the latter, of a dæmon. However, undoubtedly, it was likewise the opinion of many sober and understanding persons, at that time, that dæmons were the causes of divers grievous and tormenting diseases.

There is a place in Origen, where he is supposed to say, by way of objection to somewhat before mentioned, ‘That^z

^v *Ἰατροὶ μὲν φυσιολογείτωσαν, ἅτε μὴδὲ ἀκαθαρτὸν πνεῦμα εἶναι νομίζοντες κατὰ τὸν τοπὸν, ἀλλὰ σωματικὸν συμπτώμα, καὶ φυσιολογούντες τὰ ὕγρα λεγέτωσαν κινεῖσθαι τὰ ἐν κεφαλῇ, κατὰ τινὰ συμπαθειαν τὴν πρὸς τὸ σελήνιακὸν φῶς, ὕγρην ἔχον φύσιν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, κ. λ. Com. in Matt. p. 311. A.*

^w *Ζητήσωμεν προτερον πως σελήνιαζεσθαι λέγεται ὁ ὑπο τινος πνεύματος ἀκαθαρτῆ, καὶ κῶφῆ, καὶ ἀλαλῆ σκοτεμένος, καὶ καταβαλλομένος. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 311. A.*

^x *Τὸ ἀκαθαρτὸν τῆτο πνεῦμα ἐπιτηρεῖ τινὰς σχηματισμοὺς τῆς σελήνης, καὶ οὕτως ἐνεργεῖ, ἵνα ἐκ τῆς τήρησεως τῆ κατὰ τοιοῦνδε τὸν τῆς σελήνης σχηματισμὸν πάσχειν τῆς ἀνθρώπων, τὴν αἰτίαν δοξῇ τῆ τήλικετῆ κακῆ, μὴ τὸ ἀλαλὸν καὶ κῶφον λαμβάνειν δαίμονιον, ἀλλὰ ὁ μέγας ἐν βρανώ φωτῆρ. κ. λ. p. 311. C.*

^y ——— *redeat ad evangelii auctoritatem, et inveniet illum qui in sepulchris habitabat, dæmonem patiens, eum interrogaretur a Salvatore, quod tibi nomen est? respondisse, Legio; ‘Multa enim,’ inquit, ‘dæmonia sumus.’ Quid vero mirum videtur, si per singula genera peccatorum singuli dæmones ascribantur, cum scriptum sit in uno homine integram fuisse dæmonum legionem? In libr. Jesu. Hom. xv. p. 435. A. Tom. ii. Bened.*

^z *Ὁ δὲ περιτταμένος οἷς προειρηκαμέν φησεῖ, ὅτι ἐκ ἀναγκαίων εἶναι δόγμα τὸν τῆς Ῥόδης λόγον. κ. λ. Comm. in Matt. p. 333. A. Huet. Conf. p. 331. C. D.*

it is not necessary to take the speech of Rhoda for doctrine.' Huet says he^a cannot conceive what speech of Rhoda is here meant. But I apprehend that Origen does not intend what Rhoda said, but what was said to her, speaking of Peter, "It is his angel," Acts xii. 14, 15. I think the connection shows it to be very probable that this is Origen's meaning; if so, this passage is applicable to the present subject: perhaps the Benedictine editor of Origen, when he comes to this place, will set it in a clearer light. They might be common notions among the Jews, in the time of our Saviour and his apostles, that divers grievous diseases were caused by dæmons, and that every good man had a guardian angel; but certainly vulgar opinions, though received by some good men, and recorded in scripture as their opinions, need not to be taken for undoubted truths, or doctrines of revelation.

5. Origen supposed likewise that^b some people were possessed and acted by evil spirits from childhood. However, Optatus of Africa, in the fourth century, is yet more out of the way, for^c he supposes every man that is born into this world to have an evil spirit, even though he be born of christian parents: but perhaps he ought to be understood figuratively.

6. By the "wedding garment" in the parable, Matt. xxii. 12, Origen understands a pious disposition of mind, and a suitable behaviour. 'All^d are to be invited,' says he, 'good and bad; but the bad are not to continue so, but changing their garments, and putting off the habit unsuitable to the wedding solemnity, they must put on wedding garments, "bowels of mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering;" for these are wedding garments. Therefore the king comes in to see the guests, before the dinner he has prepared is set before them: and——finding one of them who had been invited indeed, and had come at the invitation, but had not reformed his manners, nor put on

^a Quamnam Rhodes orationem hic significat, non video. Nam, Act. xii. non aliud ipsa dicit, quam 'stare Petrum ante januam: illi dicebant, Angelus ejus est.' Huet, Not. p. 81.

^b Et e contrario parvuli licet, et pene lactantes, malis replentur spiritibus et in divinos atque hariolos inspirantur, in tantum ut etiam Dæmon Pythonicus quosdam a tenerâ ætate possideat, &c. De Principiis, l. iii. cap. 3. p. 145. A. Tom. i. Bened. ex Versione Hieronymi. Vid. et ibid. Rufin. Vers.

^c Nam neminem fugit, quod omnis homo qui nascitur, quamvis de parentibus christianis nascatur, sine spiritu immundo esse non possit, quem necesse sit, ante salutare lavacrum, ab homine excludi et separari. Hoc exorcismus operatur, per quem spiritus immundus depellitur, et in loca deserta fugatur. Optat. lib. iv. sect. 6. edit. Du Pin.

^d Comm. in Matt. p. 473. D. E. Huet.

the wedding garment, he says to him, "How camest thou in hither, not having on the wedding garment?" To the like purpose in another place, [see Rom. xiii. 14, Gal. iii. 27,] 'They^e who are baptized into Christ, put on Christ, that is, 'righteousness and wisdom.' St. Austin discourses largely upon this subject in^f two sermons. He says^g that the wedding garment must be something not common to good and bad; that it is not baptism, nor the eucharist, nor faith, nor prophecy, nor miracles; but^h "charity out of a pure heart, and [out] of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned," 1 Tim. i. 5. It will not displease any, if I add in the margin a reference to a passage of St. Cyril of Alexandria,ⁱ to the like effect.

7. In a Homily which we have now in Latin only, Origen, commenting upon Numb. xxiii. 24, having cited John vi. 54, 55, goes on: 'And indeed he who said these things was wounded for men, for he himself was wounded for our transgressions, as Isaiah says, liii. 5. But^k we are said to drink the blood of Christ not only sacramentally, but also when we receive his words, in which is life, as he himself likewise says, John vi. 63, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."^l He therefore was wounded, whose blood we drink; that is, we embrace the words of his doctrine. But nevertheless they also were wounded, who have preached to us his word. For when we read their words, that is, the words of his apostles, and obtain life by them, we "drink the blood of the wounded," or "of the slain," Numb. xxiii. 24.

8. He argues that the precept, John xiii. 14, 15, "to wash one another's feet," ought^m not to be understood

^e In Psalm xxxiii. p. 651. D. Tom. ii. Bened.

^f August. Serm. 90. et 95. ed. Bened. Tom. v.

^g Quid est vestis nuptialis? Sine dubio aliquid est qued mali et boni commune non habent. Serm. 95. sect. 7.

^h Finis autem præcepti est, apostolus dicit, caritas de corde puro, et conscientiâ bonâ, et fide non ficta. Hæc est vestis nuptialis. Serm. 90. sect. 6. Conf. eund. contr. Faustum, l. xix. c. 12. T. viii.

ⁱ Cyrill. Hom. xxiv. p. 288. C. D. E. Tom. v. P. ii.

^k Bibere autem dicimur sanguinem Christi, non solum sacramentorum ritu, sed et cum sermones ejus recipimus, in quibus vita consistit, sicut et ipse dicit.—Est ergo ipse vulneratus, ejus nos sanguinem bibimus, id est, doctrinæ ejus verba suscipimus. Sed et illi nihilominus vulnerati sunt, qui nobis verbum ejus prædicârunt. Ipsorum enim, id est, apostolorum ejus, verba cum legimus, et vitam ex iis consequimur, vulneratorum sanguinem bibimus. In Numeros, Hom. xvi. p. 334. F. A. T. ii. Bened.

^l Upon this passage of Origen may be seen Dr. Waterland's Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. 6. p. 164, 165.

^m Καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελιστῆς γε ἐν ταῖς μοι δοκεῖ διεγερῶν ἡμῶν τὸν νεν ἐπι

literally. He says likewise that^a it was formerly in use ; but in his time it was practised by very few, and those mean and ignorant people.

9. Origen^o seems to understand the decree of the council at Jerusalem, Acts xv. as binding Gentile christians even in his own time. He^p mentions ‘ things sacrificed to idols, things strangled, and blood.’

10. In a passage before cited,^q Origen intimated, that when Paul in his epistles speaks of ‘ his gospel,’ he means ‘ Luke’s gospel.’ But he seems to depart from that sense in another place: ‘ But,’ says^r he, ‘ that the whole New Testament is gospel, may be argued from words of Paul, when he writes, “ according to my gospel,” Rom. ii. 16, and xvi. 25; for we have no writing of Paul which is wont to be called a gospel, but whatever he preached and said was gospel. And the things he preached and said, these he also wrote; therefore the things written by him are gospel. And if what Paul said or wrote is gospel, consequently what Peter said or wrote is gospel.’

11. I Cor. xv. 7, “ After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles.” I shall transcribe a passage, showing how Origen understood this text. He says that Christ’s divinity, after his resurrection, shone brighter than could be seen by all; ‘ which^s however Cephas Peter might see, as being the first-fruit of the apostles, and after him the twelve, Matthias being added to them in the room of Judas; after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once: after that he was seen of James, then of

τον νοητον των κατα τον τοπον, μη τετηρηκεναι μιν σωματικην περι τω υψασθαι την ακολεσθαι. κ. λ. Com. in Joh. p. 374. E. Huet.

^a ‘Οπερ εθος η ε γινεται, η εις υπερβολην σπανιωτατα, και παρα τοις πανυ απλυστοις και αγροικωτοις γινεται. Ibid. p. 391. A. V. d. Huet, Not. p. 125. Vid. et Orig. in Esaiam. Hom. vi. p. 564. Tom. i. Basil.

^o Cum tam validis præceptis cibus sanguinis interdicatur a Deo, ut etiam nos, qui ex gentibus vocati sumus, necessario jubeamur abstinere, sicut iis quæ idolis immolantur, ita et a sanguine. In Num. Hom. xvi. p. 334. D. Tom. ii. Bened.

^p Το μεν γαρ ειδωλοθυτον θυεται λαιμονοιος — τα δε πικτα, τω αιματος μη εκκριθεντος, — απαγορευει ο λογος. κ. λ. Cont. Cels. I. viii. p. 763. C.

^q See num. iv. p. 494.

^r Εσαι δε προσαχθηναι απο των υπο Παυλω λεγομενων περι τω πασαν την καινην εινα τι ευαγγελια, οταν πω γραφη κατα το ευαγγελιον μω εν γραμμασι γαρ Παυλω εκ εχομεν ευαγγελιον συνηθως καλεμενον. Αλλα παν ο εκηρυσσε και ελεγε, το ευαγγελιον ην α και εκηρυσσε και ελεγε, ταυτα και εγραφε και α εγραφε αρα ευαγγελιον ην. Ει δε τα Παυλω ευαγγελιον ην, ακολυθον λεγειν, οτι και τα Πετρος ευαγγελιον ην. Comm. in Joh. p. 6. C. D.

^s ‘Ηντινα Κηφας ο Πετρος, ωσπερι απαρχη των αποστολων, δεδνηται ιδειν — επειτα ωφθη Ιακωβω, επειτα τοις ετεροις παρα τω δωδεκα αποστολω [forte αποστολοις. Vid. not. Ed. Benedict.] πασι, ταχα τοις εβδωμοηκοντα, εσχατον δε παντων Παυλω. κ. λ. Con. Cels. I. ii. p. 100. Cant. p. 436. B. C. Bened.

all the other beside the twelve apostles, [or rather, “by all the other apostles beside the twelve,”] meaning perhaps the seventy; “and, ver. 8, last of all of Paul, as of one born out of due time.” Compare ver. 5.

12. Phil. ii. vi. Origen understands those words of St. Paul, which we have rendered “thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” of Christ’s humiliation. For thus he writes: ‘But^t we may be bold to say, that the goodness of Christ appeared greater and more divine, and truly according to the image of the Father, when he “humbled himself, being made obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, than if he had affected [or chosen] to be like God,” and had refused to become a servant for the salvation of the world.’

This passage is taken from the Greek Commentaries upon St. John, and does most plainly show Origen’s intention. But it is also evident from a passage^u in the books against Celsus, where this same text is quoted, that he understood these words of Christ’s humiliation. This sense appears likewise in the Latin version of one of Origen’s tracts or homilies^v upon St. Matthew. It is well known how^w Archbishop Tillotson understood this text. Dr. Wall’s note^x is thus: “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:” who, though he was of the divine nature, yet did not, in his conversation on earth, claim or insist upon it to be treated, dealt with, or spoken to as God.’

13. Among the ancients^y Jerom, and Estius^z among the moderns, understand St. Paul to include himself in what is said in those words, Tit. iii. 3: and Dr. Benson^a has lately argued very strongly, that the apostle there particularly represents his own case. I think it will appear that Origen also applies the^b same text to St. Paul, admitting only the

^t Τολμητεον γαρ ειπειν, πλειονα, και θειοτεραν, και αληθως κατ’ εικονα τω Πατρος την αγαθοτητα φαινεσθαι τω Χριστω, οτε εαντον επαπεινωσε, γενομενος υπηκοος μεχρι θανατου, θανατου δε παντος, η ει αρπαγματον ηγησατο ειναι ισα θεω, και μη βεβληθεις επι τη τω κοσμη σωτηρια γενεσθαι δελος. Comm. in Joh. p. 34. E.

Cant. p. 641. C. D. Tom. i. Bened.

^v Et dicet Patrem tanta miranda dignare Filio suo, qui se ipsum humiliavit, et propter dilectionem non rapinam arbitratus est esse se æqualem Deo, &c. In Matt. Tract. xxx. p. 148. Tom. ii. Basil.

^w Sermon xlv. vol. i. folio.

^x Wall’s Brief Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 277.

^y Hieron. Com. in Ep. ad Tit.

^z Estius in loc.

^a See Dr. Benson’s Paraphrase and Notes upon St. Paul’s Epistle to Titus, in imitation of Mr. Locke’s manner, p. 43—45.

^b Οὕτω δε και εσχρατος ην πας [lege Παυλος] και ανοητος, και απειθης, δελεων επιθυμιας και ηδοναις ποικιλαις, — αλλα γεγονε πρωτος. οτε

emendation of one word, which appears to me probable. However I would not be too positive, till I see whether this conjecture be confirmed by De La Rue's edition, or by some manuscripts which he has the sight of. Nor do I adopt that interpretation. But as it is well known that Jerom often inserted in his Commentaries explications of divers more ancient writers than himself, without naming them, it is very possible he might borrow this from Origen.

XXIX. Before I conclude this chapter, I would put down two or three general observations upon the scriptures of the New Testament, which we find in this learned writer of the third century.

1. In the books against Celsus he^e says, 'That christians are induced to believe the writers of the gospels, by observing the evidences of piety and probity that appear in their writings; in which there is no deceit, or artifice, or cunning, or design.'

2. Origen was of opinion, that there are some things obscure and difficult in the scriptures, not only in the Old, but likewise in the New Testament. I have already alleged^d a passage to this purpose from a Latin Homily. We find the same observation in a Greek fragment of his books^e of Principles, where he says, 'There are many difficulties in the scriptures, not only in the prophetic writings, which all allow to have many obscure and enigmatical expressions, but likewise in the gospels, and in the Revelation of John, and the epistles of the apostles.' This passage also serves to show in part what were the scriptures which Origen, and other christians, esteemed divine, and of authority.

3. In his books against Celsus, Origen more than once^f speaks of the simple and popular, or even low style, of the

ἡ χρηστοτης, και ἡ φιλανθρωπια ἐπέφανη τῷ Σωτηρὸς ἡμῶν Θεῷ.—Com. in Matt. p. 397. C. Huët.

^e Πίστευομεν δὲ καὶ ταῖς προαιρέσεσι τῶν γραφάντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια, καταποχαζόμενοι τῆς εὐλαβείας αὐτῶν καὶ συνειδότος ἐμφαινόμενων τοῖς γραμμασιν, ἄθην νοθὸν καὶ κυβερτικὸν, καὶ πεπλάσμενον καὶ πανουργὸν ἐχόντων. Con. Cels. l. iii. p. 473. A. Tom. i. Bened.

^d See num. xx. 7. p. 525.

^e Καὶ τί δεῖ λεγεῖν περὶ τῶν προφητικῶν, ἃς πάντες ἴσμεν αἰνιγματῶν καὶ σκοτεινῶν πεπληρωσθαι λόγων; καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια δὲ φθασωμέν, κερκεῖων ἢ ἀκριβῆς νῆς, ἅτε νῆς Χριστῷ δεῖται χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης· τῷ εἰρηκοτὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ νῆν Χριστῷ ἐχομεν—[1 Cor. ii. 12, 13.] καὶ τὰ ἀποκεκαλυμμένα δὲ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ τις ἔκ αν ἀναγνῆς καταπλαγεῖ τὴν ἐπικρουψὶν τῶν ἀπορόρητων μυστηρίων—; αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπιστολαὶ τινὶ τῶν βασανίζων ἐπιταμμένων λόγους δοξάζειν αν εἶναι σαφεῖς καὶ εὐχερῶς νοημεναί; κ. λ. Philoc. cap. i. p. 8. Cant. De Prin. l. iv. p. 167. Bened. Conf. Orig. p. 38. B. C. p. 39. B. C. Tom. i. Huët.

^f Con. Cels. l. iv. p. 210. Cant.

p. 556, 557. Bened. et lib. vi. init.

writers of the New Testament: which, however, he affirms to be most for the general benefit of mankind: particularly^s he says, ‘That the Jewish prophets, and the disciples of Jesus, renounced all artful composition of words, and what the scripture calls “man’s wisdom,” and “fleshly wisdom,”’ 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. i. 12. In the Philocalia is a fragment of Origen’s fourth tome upon St. John’s gospel, which is introduced, and begins as follows: Then^h after what he had said of the solecism of the gospel, [or the evangelist,] he goes on: ‘But the apostles being sensible of their imperfection in this respect, and that they had not been educated in human learning, own themselves “rude in speech, though not in knowledge.” For these words are not to be understood of Paul only, but likewise of the rest of the apostles: “But though we be rude in speech,” &c.; and, “But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellence of the power may be of God, and not of us,”’ 2 Cor. xi. 6; iv. 7. By this means, he says, the truth of the gospel has been rendered more conspicuous: men have not been allured into it by the elegance of speech, but overcome by the mere force of truth alone.

XXX. It appears to me worth the while to consider, whether Origen thought St. Matthew’s gospel was originally written in Hebrew. We have seen three places where Origen speaks of this matter. In the passageⁱ cited from Eusebius, he says that Matthew ‘delivered his gospel to the Jewish believers in the Hebrew language.’ In the^k second passage he observes, there was a ‘tradition that Matthew wrote first, and delivered his gospel to the Hebrews, that is, the believers of the circumcision.’ In the^l third he says, that Matthew ‘wrote for the Hebrews, who expected him that was to descend from Abraham and David.’ Having thus reminded the reader of these places, I would observe some other passages of Origen.

In his Treatise of Prayer, explaining the fourth petition of the Lord’s prayer, he observes, ‘that^m the Greek word

^s Οἱ δὲ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ προφηταὶ, καὶ οἱ τῶ Ἰησοῦ μαθηταὶ οὐ μακρὰν χαιρεῖν εἰπόντες τῇ ποικίλῃ τῶν λέξεων συνῆσει, κ. τ. λ. Cont. Cels. l. vii. p. 372. Cant. p. 737. Bened.

^h Εἶτα, εἰπὼν τὸν τῶ εὐαγγελιστῆ σολοικισμόν, ἐπαγεῖ ‘Ἄτε δὲ ἐκ ἀσυναίσθητοι ἀποστολοὶ τυγχάνοντες τῶν ἐν οἷς προσκοπτοῦσι, καὶ περὶ ἃ ἐκ ἠσυχολογῆται, φασιν, κ. λ. Philoc. cap. iv. p. 25. Cant. Tom. ii. p. 86. Huet.

ⁱ Num. iv.

^k Num. vii. 4.

^l Num. xvii.

^m Πρῶτον δὲ τὰτ’ ἰστέον, ὅτι ἡ λέξις ἡ, ἐπισησὼν, παρ’ ἑδὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἕτε τῶν σοφῶν ἠνομασται, ἕτε ἐν τῇ ἰδίῳ τῶν συνηθειῶν τετριπται, ἀλλ’ εὐοικε πεπλασθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν. Συνηνεχθησαν γὰρ ὁ Ματθαῖος καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς περὶ αὐτῆς μὴδαμῶς διαφύρεσσης [αἰ. διαφύρεσσην] αὐτῆν ἐξενηνοχοῦσι. Το

ἐπιειστος, which by us is rendered ‘daily,’ is not used by any of the learned Greeks; nor is it,’ says he, ‘in use with the vulgar: but it seems to have been coined by the evangelists; for both Matthew and Luke agree in using it without any difference.’ He goes on to say, that ‘they also who translated the Old Testament into Greek, had some words peculiar to themselves.’ It is somewhat strange that Origen should here take no notice of St. Matthew’s Greek gospel being a translation, if he thought so.

In his commentariesⁿ upon the second Psalm, he makes mention of two Hebrew copies which he had seen, and observes a difference between them in disposing the first two Psalms, and then how they were disposed in the Septuagint version. Again, (to mention no more instances of this sort,) upon Ps. iii. 7, he consults the Hebrew copies,^o and finds a difference from the Seventy. Well, why did not Origen inquire also for Hebrew copies of St. Matthew’s gospel?

In his Commentaries upon St. John he observes, ‘John^p Baptist in the three^q gospels, says, “I am not sufficient;” but in John, “I am not worthy.”’ It is wonderful that Origen, who was so nice and exact, and minded such little things, did not compare likewise the Hebrew of St. Matthew, if he thought this evangelist had written in that language.

It is true that in two or three places of Origen’s works, which^r were transcribed formerly, we find the gospel according to the Hebrews cited; and in one of those places it is brought into a kind of comparison with a history related in the first three evangelists: but then it is in such a manner as to afford no ground at all for supposing he thought that an authentic edition of St. Matthew’s gospel. In the place where he says^s there were many differences in

ὁμοιον δε και επ’ αλλων οι ερμηνευοντες τα Εβραϊκα πεποιηκασι. De Orat. p. 245. D. 246. A. Tom. i. Bened.

ⁿ Δυσιν εντυχοντες Εβραϊκοις αντιγραφοις, εν μεν τω ετερω ευρομεν αρχην δευτερε ψαλμυ ταυτα εν δε τω ετερω συνηπτετο τω πρωτω. Και εν ταις Ηραξεσι δε των Αποσολων το, υιοσ με ει συ, εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε, ελεγετο ειναι τω πρωτω ψαλμυ [Acts xiii. 33.] τα Ελληνικα μεντοι αντιγραφα δευτερον ειναι τωτον μνηνει. In Ps. ii. p. 537. F. Tom. ii. Bened.

^o Ὅτι συ επαταζασ παντασ τωσ εχθραινοντασ μοι ματαιωσ, κ. λ.] Τω Εβραϊκω εντυχοντες, τω ματαιωσ, εδαμωσ ευρομεν δυναμενον δηλασθαι Ibid. p. 554. A.

^p Ὁ τοιουν Ιωανησ φησι παρα μεν τοις τρισι, εκ ειναι ικανοσ, παρα δε τω Ιωανη, εκ ειναι αξιοσ. Comm. in Joh. p. 127. A. Huet.

^q See Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 7; Luke iii. 16; and John i. 27.

^r See num. xxiv. 2. p. 536, 537.

^s Την μεν εν εν τοις αντιγραφοις της παλαιασ διαθηκης διαφωνιαν, Θεσ ειδοντοσ, ευρομεν ιασασθαι, κριτηρω χορησαμενοι ταισ λοιπαισ εκδοσεσιν. κ. λ. Comm. in Matt. p. 382. A. Tom. i. Huet.

the copies of the gospels, he makes mention of what he had done for correcting the errors crept into the Greek edition of the Old Testament then in use; and takes notice of the helps and advantages he had for that purpose, by comparing the Hebrew original and the several Greek versions of it; intimating, at the same time, that he had not such helps for attaining the right readings in the gospels. But certainly, if St. Matthew's gospel had been written in Hebrew, the original edition might have been of great use for correcting the Greek copies of that gospel at least; and it was an advantage very fit to be taken notice of, and could not easily have been omitted.

I cannot but think, therefore, Origen was not fully satisfied that St. Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew. Undoubtedly there was such a tradition, as he^t himself owns; but it is likely he did not altogether rely upon it. This was said by some; but perhaps the account was not so attested as to demand a ready assent. If Origen had believed St. Matthew's gospel to have been written in Hebrew, in all probability he would have been induced to inquire for it; and if his belief had been well grounded, it can hardly be doubted but he might have found it upon inquiry. Origen had an intimate friendship with the chief bishops of Palestine; he could not but be well known to all the christians in general in that country, none of whom would have refused to lend him their copies of any book of the New Testament in their possession. At one word spoken by him, Ambrose, and the notaries employed by him, and many others, would have sought for Hebrew copies of St. Matthew's gospel; and if there had been any such in that country, or near it, there would have been brought to him as many as he desired. Nevertheless Origen does not appear to have ever seen such a copy; therefore there was no such thing in being as an authentic Hebrew gospel of St. Matthew: if there had, how could it have escaped the industry and inquisitiveness of Origen?

XXXI. Origen then received as divine scripture the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, written by the evangelist Luke; thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul; and likewise the epistle to the Hebrews, which he continually quotes as Paul's, though in one place he delivers his opinion that the sentiments only of the epistle were the apostle's, the phrase and composition of some one else, whose he did not certainly know. He

^t Ὁς και παραδεδοται πρωτος λοιπων τοις Ἑβραίοις εκδεδωκεναι το ευαγγελιον, τοις εκ περιτομης πιστευουσιν. In Joh. p. 123. C. See above, p. 499.

received likewise the first epistle of Peter, and the first of John. We learn from him also that the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the epistle of Jude, were then well known, but not universally received as genuine; nor is it evident that Origen himself received them as sacred scripture. He owns the book of the Revelation for the writing of John the apostle and evangelist; he quotes it as his without hesitation; nor does it appear that he had any doubt about its genuineness or authority. Origen does mightily recommend the reading of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, received in the churches as sacred and divine. From the large collection here made of his quotations of ecclesiastical and apocryphal writings, and from the observations that have been made upon them, I presume it appears that none of these were esteemed by him as books of authority, from whence doctrines might be proved; or scripture, in the highest sense of that word. Indeed it is not evident that Origen received, as sacred books of the New Testament, all that we now receive; but that he admitted no other beside those in our present canon, may be reckoned certain, or however in the highest degree probable. If this has been made out to satisfaction, it is a material point, and worth all the labour of this long chapter; though I hope it may likewise answer some other good purposes. Particularly, we may perceive hence, as well as from other parts of this work, that this was not with christians an age of gross darkness; at least the ministers of Christ did not encourage sloth and ignorance in the people, but earnestly excited all men to a diligent pursuit of religious knowledge, according to their several abilities and opportunities, especially by studying the holy scriptures. The various readings, explications of texts, and other matters, are left with the reader who is able to make a proper use of them.

CHAP. XXXIX.

ST. FIRMILIAN.

FIRMILIAN, as we are assured by Eusebius^a in his Ecclesiastical History, and by others, was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. If we may rely upon^b Gregory of Nyssa, he was descended from an honourable family in that country; but that account^c has been disputed. Cave^d supposes that Firmilian was ordained bishop of the fore-mentioned city in the year 233; Basnage^e and Tillemont^f think he obtained that honour sooner. They argue this from some words of^g Eusebius, where he speaks of Firmilian's flourishing at the tenth year of the emperor Alexander, when Origen left Alexandria, in the year 231.

Firmilian was present at a council^h in Iconium, which Tillemont thinksⁱ could not be held later than 232, though Valesius^k and Cave^l place it in 235. There seems to have been a council at^m Antioch in the year 252, on account of Novatus, at which Firmilian was present. He was likewiseⁿ at the council of Antioch, in the cause of Paul of Samosata, in the year 264 or 265. He is said to have been^o twice at Antioch upon that account; but when the council was met at Antioch, in which Paul was condemned and deposed, as he was coming thither, he died at Tarsus,^p in the latter part of the^q year 269, of a great age, as may be well concluded from the commencement of his episcopate.

Firmilian sided with St. Cyprian in the dispute about baptizing heretics that returned to the catholic church, and

^a Διεπρεπε δε εν τετρω Φιρμιλιανος Καισαρειας της Καππαδοκων επισκοπος. Eus. H. E. l. vi. cap. 26. Vid. et lib. vii. cap. 28. init.

^b Φιρμιλιανω των ευπατριδων Καππαδοκω. Greg. Nyss. T. iii. p. 542. C. Vit. Thaummat. ^c Vid. Basn. ann. 269. viii.

^d Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 86.

^e Ut supra.

^f Tillem. T. iv. P. ii. p. 646. St. Firmilien. ^g I have cited Eusebius's words, note ^a. ^h Quod totum nos jam pridem in Iconio, qui Phrygiæ locus est, collecti in unum, convenientibus ex Galatiâ, et Ciliciâ, et cæteris proximis regionibus, confirmavimus, &c. Firmilian. ap. Cyprian. p. 221. ⁱ Tillem. ibid.

^k Val. Not. ad Eus. p. 143.

^l Cav. H. L. P. ii. p. 62.

^m Vid. Euseb. l. vi. cap. 46. p. 247. D. cap. 28.

ⁿ Eus. l. vii.

^o Euseb. ibid. cap. 30. p. 279. D.

^p Ibid. p. 280. A. B.

and Basnage, as before.

^q Tillem. as before, p. 654;

upon that subject wrote a long letter to St. Cyprian, which is still ^r extant; but whereas undoubtedly it was written in Greek, we have now only a Latin translation: however it may be reckoned a good one, since learned men ^s are generally agreed in allowing it to have been made by St. Cyprian himself, whose style it resembles. This letter was written ^t in the year 256, and near the end of it.

St. Basil ^u makes a general mention of writings which Firmilian had left behind him, without saying expressly what they were. It may be argued that they were not very numerous, or not much known, since Jerom had not allotted any distinct article in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers for this eminent bishop.

As the letter to St. Cyprian, the only remaining piece of our author, was not written before the year 256, perhaps I should have chosen to place him about that time: but since Cave, and other learned moderns, speak of Firmilian as flourishing about the year 233, (and according to Eusebius himself he was a person of note at that time, or sooner,) and the matter is of no great importance, I have determined not to innovate.

Firmilian had an earnest zeal for what he thought to be the truth, as his letter to St. Cyprian shows; which is also confirmed by what the council at Antioch, in 269 or 270, say ^v of his condemning the opinions of Paul of Samosata, bishop of that city. He was, besides, a man of prudence and moderation; for to him it is ascribed ^w by the said council, that Paul was not deposed in a former council met at the same place. And who knows whether Firmilian, if he had lived to be present at this last assembly, might not have prevented the deposition of Paul, or at least once more deferred the sentence then pronounced?

Though Firmilian seems not to have made any great figure as an author, he was well known in the world, and highly esteemed by his contemporaries, and by following ages. There is honourable mention made of him by ^x

^r Inter Epistolas Cyprianicas. Ep. 75, p. 217, &c. Oxon. 1682.

^s Cav. Hist. Lit. P. i. Rigalt. notis. Tillem. p. 652.

^t Vid. Basnag. A. 269. viii. Tillem. p. 651.

^u Ταυτην και Φιρμιλιανω τω ήμετερω μαρτυρσει την πισιν οί λογοι ούς κατέλιπε. Basil. de S. Sp. cap. 29. T. ii. p. 360. E.

^v 'Ο Φιρμιλιανος, και δις αφικομενος, κατεγγνω μεν των υπ' εκεινω καινοτομημενων, κ. λ. Ap. Eus. l. vii. cap. 30. p. 279. D.

^w Επαγγελιαμενω [Παυλω] δε μεταθησθαι, πισευσας και ελπισας ανεντινος περι τον λογον λουδοριας το πραγμα εις Θεον κατασθησθαι, ανεβαλετο, κ. λ. Ibid. p. 280. A.

^x Eus. H. E. l. vii. cap. 5. p. 251. D.

Dionysius of Alexandria in one of his letters, and^y by the council of Antioch by which Paul of Samosata was deposed. Theodoret gives this Cappadocian bishop the character^z of ‘an illustrious person, equally master of divine and human knowledge.’ It is a further argument of his great reputation, that^a both Eusebius and Jerom have so particularly insisted upon his respect for Origen, as a considerable testimony to the extraordinary merit of that great man.

This may suffice for the history and character of Firmilian. I proceed to observe the quotations of the books of the New Testament which are to be found in his fore-mentioned letter to St. Cyprian.

I. ‘Hence^b we may be able to understand what Christ said to Peter only: “Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be also bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be also loosed in heaven,”’ Matt. xviii. 18.

II. ‘The^c Lord himself declaring, “Many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many.”’ See Mark xiii. 6. But it must be owned that there are exactly the same words in Matt. xxiv. 5.

III. ‘For^d union, and peace, and concord, afford the greatest joy not only to “faithful men, and those that know the truth,” but also to the “heavenly angels,” who, the divine word says, “rejoice over one sinner that repenteth,”’ Luke xv. 10. And in the preceding words is a plain reference to 1 Tim. iv. 3.

IV. ‘And^e again in the gospel, when Christ breathed on the apostles only, saying, “Receive the Holy Ghost,”’ John xx. 22. He has likewise quoted^f John xvii. 21.

V. ‘Accordingly^g the blessed apostle Paul baptized

^y Ibid. cap. 30. p. 279. D.

^z Καὶ Φιρμιλιανὸς ὁ Καισαρειῶν τῆς Καππαδοκίας ἐπίσκοπος, περιφανῆς ἀνὴρ, καὶ γινώσκων ἑκατέραν ἐχῶν, καὶ τὴν θυραθεν, καὶ τὴν θειαν. Theodoret. Hæret. Tab. l. iv. cap. 8. p. 222. D.

^a See the preceding chapter, p. 476.

^b Hinc intelligi potest quod soli Petro Christus dixerit: ‘Quæcunque ligaveris super terram, erunt ligata et in cœlis; et quæcunque solveris super terram, erunt soluta et in cœlis.’ Inter. Ep. Cyprian. 75. p. 225. Oxon.

^c — Dominus ipse manifestat, dicens, ‘Multi venient in nomine meo, dicentes, Ego sum Christus, et multos fallent.’ Ibid. p. 222.

^d Adunatio enim, et pax, et concordia, non solum hominibus fidelibus et cognoscentibus veritatem, sed et angelis ipsis cœlestibus voluptatem maximam præstat; quibus dicit divinus sermo esse ‘gaudium in uno peccatore pœnitentiam agente.’ p. 217.

^e Et iterum in evangelio, quando in solos apostolos insufflavit Christus, dicens, ‘Accipite Spiritum Sanctum,’ p. 225.

^f P. 219.

^g Secundum quod et beatus Paulus apostolus eos qui ab Joanne baptizati fuerant, priusquam missus esset a Domino Spiritus Sanctus, baptizavit denuo

again with a spiritual baptism those who had been baptized by John, before the Holy Spirit had been sent by the Lord; and then laid his hands upon them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost.' See Acts xix. 1—7.

VI. 'Though^h the Jews were in great ignorance, and guilty of much wickedness, the apostle owns they "had a zeal of God,"' Rom. x. ii.

VII. "Thisⁱ will be the wisdom which Paul writes to be in them that are perfect," 1 Cor. ii. 6. He likewise quotes^k 1 Cor. xiv. 30, and^l 1 Cor. xi. 27.

VIII. 'Nor^m are there many spouses of Christ, since the apostle says, "I have espoused you unto one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin unto Christ,"' 2 Cor. xi. 2. He also refers toⁿ ver. 13 of the same chapter.

IX. 'For^o if the apostle does not lie when he says, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ,"' Gal. iii. 17.

X. 'But^p what says the apostle Paul? "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God,"' Eph. iv. 5, 6. A little before^q he quoted the first four verses of this same chapter.

XI. 'But^r as to what they pretend in favour of heretics, that the apostle has said, "Whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached;" we must answer, that it is impertinently alleged.' Which, he says, will appear to any one who reads the epistle of the^s apostle whence those words are taken.

XII. He says of all heretics in general,^t 'It is manifest they are condemned of themselves, and before the day of judgment they have passed an incontestable sentence

spiritali baptismo, et sic manum imposuit, ut acciperent Spiritum Sanctum, &c. p. 221.

^h Judæos tamen, quamvis ignorantia cæcos et gravissimo facinore constrictos, 'zelum Dei' apostolus habere profitetur. p. 225.

ⁱ Deinde, hæc erit sapientia, quam scribit Paulus esse in his qui perfecti sunt. p. 221.

^k P. 219.

^l P. 227.

^m Neque enim multæ sponsæ Christi, cum dicat apostolus, 'Despondi vos uni viro, virgini castam assignare Christo.' p. 224.

ⁿ P. 229

^o Nam si non mentitur apostolus, dicens, 'Quotquot in Christo tincti estis, Christum induistis:—' p. 223.

^p Sed quid ait

apostolus Paulus? 'Unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus.' p. 229.

^q P. 228.

^r Ad illud autem

quod pro hæreticis ponunt, et aiunt apostolum dixisse, 'Sive per occasionem, sive per veritatem, Christus annuntietur,' ut respondeamus, ineptum est. p. 226.

^s Quando manifestum sit apostolum, in epistolâ suâ, quâ hoc dicit, neque hæreticorum, neque baptismi eorum, mentionem fecisse, sed locutum esse de fratribus tantum.—Nec oporteat hoc longo tractatu excutere, sed ipsam satis sit epistolam legere, &c. Ibid.

^t Quos omnes manifestum est a semetipsis damnatos esse, et ante diem judicii inexcusabilem sententiam adversus semetipsos dixisse. p. 220.

against themselves.' It is very probable he refers to Tit. iii. 10, 11: and we before^u saw a plain reference to St. Paul's first epistle to Timothy.

XIII. This writer says, that Noah's ark was a figure of the church of Christ. He adds, 'As^v also the apostle Peter teaches, saying, "In like manner also will baptism save you:" or us,' as in some copies. 1 Pet. iii. 21.

XIV. 'And^w moreover abusing the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as if they also had delivered this doctrine; though they in their epistles have cursed heretics, and admonished us to avoid them.' This passage may be thought to show that Firmilian owned two epistles of Peter, because he speaks of epistles in the plural number: and, besides, what is here said does well enough suit the second epistle ascribed to that apostle. Here one cannot help wishing that we had this letter in its original language. It would be a particular satisfaction to know, that Firmilian received two epistles of St. Peter.

XV. He seems to refer to the first epistle of St. John, when he says of heretics in general, 'That^x since they have not the true Lord the Father, they cannot have the true Son, nor the true Spirit:' and of the Cataphrygians or Montanists, in particular. That^y they have not the Father, nor the Son, nor the Holy Spirit; and that they^z have not in them the "spirit of truth, but the spirit of error." See 1 John ii. 22, 23; and iv. 6.

XVI. I forbear transcribing any more, though I might insist on some other allusive expressions. Here are sufficiently clear references to the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John; to the Acts of the Apostles; to the epistle to the Romans; the first and second to the Corinthians; the epistles to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians; the first to Timothy, and to Titus; the first, if not also the second, of St. Peter; and the first epistle of St. John: and sometimes the names of the apostles Peter and Paul are expressly mentioned when their words are quoted. And there appear marks of a peculiar respect for

^u At num. iii. p. 580.

^v Quemadmodum et apostolus Petrus posuit, dicens, 'Sic et vos similiter salves faciet baptisma.' p. 224.

^w Adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos, quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint; qui in epistolis suis hæreticos execrati sunt, et, ut eos evitemus, monuerunt. p. 220.

^x Satis est illud in compendio dicere, eos, qui non teneant verum Dominum Patrem, tenere non posse nec Filii nec Spiritus Sancti veritatem. p. 220. fin.

^y Nec Patrem possunt habere, nec Filium, nec Spiritum Sanctum. p. 221. init.

^z In quibus cum animadvertamus non veritatis spiritum, sed erroris fuisse. Ibid.

these books, since they are quoted as writings of authority. It cannot be well questioned but Firmilian's canon of the New Testament was much the same as ours. It is plain that our scriptures were well known at that time in Cappadocia: and in particular it may be observed, that the epistle of St. Paul to the churches of Galatia, and the first epistle of St. Peter, both addressed to christians in that country, or near it, were received as genuine and divine scriptures by this learned and discreet bishop, who had his residence in those parts.

CHAP. XL.

DIVERS WRITERS IN THE FORMER PART OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

I. *Judas.* II. *Anonymous author of the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas.* III. *Proculus.* IV. *Geminianus.* V. *Tryphon.*

I. 'AT that time,' says^a Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, lived also Judas, another writer, who published a Commentary upon Daniel's Seventy Weeks, concluding his computation of the times at the tenth year of Severus; who likewise thought, that the so much talked of coming of Antichrist was then at hand. So strangely did the raising of that persecution disturb the minds of many.'

St. Jerom, likewise, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, has a chapter for this person. But he mentions no other work of his beside this. He says, that^b Judas commented largely upon Daniel's Seventy Weeks, and brought down his Chronology of former times to the tenth year of Severus. This writer is placed by Cave at the year of Christ 202, where his Chronology ended. It is probable, this Commentary would afford many testimonies to the New Testament, if it were still extant. It might be useful also on other accounts.

^a Euseb. l. vi. cap. 7.

^b Judas de septuaginta apud Daniele hebdomadibus plenissime disputavit, et chronographiam superiorum temporum usque ad decimum Severi produxit annum. De Vir. Ill. cap. 52.

II. In that persecution suffered in Africa, at Tuburbium, as^c some have thought, or, as^d others more probably, at Carthage, Perpetua, Felicitas, Revocatus, Saturninus, Saturnus, and Secundulus. The year is not certain, Ruinart^e thinks their martyrdom happened in 202 or 203; Basnage,^f in 203; Tillemont,^g in 203 or 205.

Perpetua is celebrated^h by Tertullian as a martyr who suffered with great firmness. St. Augustine publishedⁱ three discourses pronounced by him on the anniversary of those martyrs, which are still extant^k among his sermons. The day was called by the names of Perpetua and Felicitas, such fortitude being esteemed, as^l he says, more admirable in the weaker sex than the other.

St. Augustine^m has also in other places made mention of Perpetua and her passion. We still have such a piece, entitled,ⁿ *The Passion of the Saints Perpetua and Felicitas, with their Companions.* Basnage^o allows it to be ancient; and^p Tillemont says it is one of the finest monuments of antiquity. Indeed, the story is affecting, and the piece is curious in divers respects: but I must not stay to transcribe particulars; it may suffice to say, that Secundulus^q died in prison; Saturninus, Revocatus, Saturnus, and the two women, according to^r the sentence pronounced by the judge,^s were exposed to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre, on^t the birth-day of Antoninus Geta, Cæsar, and son of the emperor Severus, supposed to be the seventh day of March. Vivia Perpetua^u was about two and twenty years

^c Vid. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Admonit. in Passionem S. Perpetuæ, &c. sect. 2. p. 90.

^d Ruinart. *ibid.* et sect. 3. Basnag. ann. 203. n. iv. Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. Tom. 3. part. i. p. 233. Sainte Perpetue, &c. art. i. et note iv. p. 503. Pagi, 198. n. v. et 203. n. v.

^e *Ibid.* n. iv. p. 91.

^f Basn. *ibid.*

^g Tillem. *ibid.* et note iii. ^h Quomodo Perpetua, fortissima martyr, sub die passionis in revelatione paradisi solos illic commartyres suos vidit. Tertull. de Animâ, cap. 55. p. 353. D.

ⁱ De natali Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, tractatus tres. Possid. Ind. Opusc. S. Aug.

^k Serm. 280, 281, 282.

^l Refulget et præminet inter comites martyres et meritum et nomen Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, sanctarum Dei famularum. Nam ibi est corona gloriosior, ubi sexus infirmior. Aug. Serm. 281. in.

^m Quam multos parentes filii prohibebant mori, sicut novimus et legimus in passione beatæ Perpetuæ. August. in Ps. 47. p. 423. B. T. iv. Bened. Vid. eund. de Animâ. l. i. cap. 10. l. iii. cap. 9. l. iv. cap. 18. T. x. Bened.

ⁿ Ap. Act. Mart. p. 92, &c.

^o Basn. *ibid.* n. viii.

^p As before, art. i. p. 232. xiv. p. 99. Act. Mart. Ruinart.

^q Pass. Perpet. &c. num.

^r *Ibid.* n. vi. p. 95.

^s N. xix. et seqq. p. 100, 101.

^t Munere enim castrensi

eramur pugnaturi. Natale tunc Getæ Cæsaris, *ibid.* n. vii. p. 96.

^u N. ii. p. 93.

of age, of a good family, well educated, honourably married, had a father and mother and two brothers then living, and a young child not yet weaned from her breasts, at the time of her imprisonment: and, as it seems, the^v whole family was christian, except her father, who did his utmost to persuade his daughter to save her life by renouncing her religion.

The author of this history is called Anonymous by^w Cave. Some have^x guessed that Tertullian might be the writer of it. But though that opinion be for the present given up, there is a dispute subsisting among learned men about the character of the writer, whether he was a Montanist or a catholic. Indeed, the composer of this piece is now generally called not an author, but^y a collector; for^z Perpetua here relates her own history herself, with the visions she had in prison, till^a the very day before her passion. Here is besides a^b vision of Saturus, said likewise to be written by himself. Tillemont therefore says, ‘That^c the principal and best part of this piece was written ‘by Perpetua herself on the eve of her martyrdom. There ‘is also a vision written by Saturus himself. The rest is ‘the work of a contemporary author, as appears from the ‘preface; where he professes to write what he knew, ‘appealing to those who were present at the martyrdom.’ So Tillemont, and to the like purpose others. Nevertheless, I do not perceive Augustine to^d allow that Perpetua wrote any part of her passion. However, whether author or collector of these Acts, ^eBasnage, after^f Henry Valesius, contends stiffly that he was a Montanist. And from the character of the writer of the Acts he farther argues, that^g Perpetua, and the rest who suffered martyrdom with her, were all of the same sect. On the contrary, Ruinart^h is

^v Et ego dolebam canos patris mei, quod solus de passione meâ gavisurus non esset de toto genere meo. Ibid. n. v. p. 95.

^w Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 64.

^x Vid. Ruinart, ibid. p. 91. n. v.

^y Inquirendum tandem, quisnam fuerit horum actorum auctor, seu potius collector, cum eorum maximam partem a Perpetuâ et Saturo scriptam fuisse nemo inficiari possit. Ruinart, ibid. Conf. Basnag. 203. n. vi.

^z Hæc ordinem totum martyrii sui jam hinc ipsa narrabit, sicut conscriptum manu suâ, et suo sensu reliquit. Ap. Ruinart, ibid. p. 93. n. ii.

^a Hoc usque in pridie muneris egi; ipsius autem muneris actum, si quis voluerit, scribat. Ibid. p. 98. n. x.

^b Sed et Saturus benedictus hanc visionem suam edidit, quam ipse conscripsit. Ibid. p. 98.

^c Tillem. as before, p. 232.

^d De fratre autem Sanctæ Perpetuæ Dinocrate, nec scriptura ipsa canonica est, nec illa sic scripsit, vel quicumque illud scripsit, &c. Aug. de Animâ. lib. i. cap. x.

^e Basn. ann. 203. n. v.

^f Vid. Ruinart, Act. M. p. 91. n. vi.

^g Basn. ibid. n. vi.

^h Ruinart, ibid.

persuaded the writer was a catholic. Andⁱ Dodwell has argued strongly on the same side of the question.

In this piece there are not many texts of scripture. However, we shall observe a few particulars.

1. Here are words of^k John xvi. 24.

2. The passage of Joel ii. 28, is^l here at length, the same that is cited by St. Peter, Acts ii. 17. But I do not observe any proof of its being taken out of the book of the Acts.

3. If I mistake not, there is an allusion,^m or reference to 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

4. The writer in the preface alludes toⁿ the beginning of St. John's first epistle, and adopts some of the words of it; see 1 John i. 1—3.

III. Proculus has been already^o taken notice of, as mentioned by Tertullian, together with divers other ecclesiastical writers; and on account^p of the dialogue or conference of Caius upon the point of Montanism, I think it proper to take some farther notice of him in this place.

It is undoubted, that the person with whom Caius disputed was then a Montanist. He is expressly called by Eusebius^q a leader or patron of the Cataphrygian sect, and a follower of Montanus by^r Jerom and^s Photius. According to the author of the Catalogue of Heretics at the end of Tertullian's book of Prescription against Heretics, who is supposed by^t Dodwell and^u Pagi to have been contemporary with Tertullian, and by^v Tillemont, to have written about the year 200, there were^w two parties of the Montanists; the one called after Proclus or Proculus, the

ⁱ Diss. Cypr. iv. n. 12, 13. ^k Sed qui dixerat, petite et accipite, petentibus dedit eum exitum, quem quisque desideraverat. Ap. Ruin. p. 100. n. xix.

^l Ibid. p. 93. n. i.

^m Cum semper Deus operetur quæ repromisit, non credentibus in testimonium, credentibus in beneficium. Ibid.

ⁿ Et nos itaque, quod audivimus et contrectavimus, annuntiamus et vobis, fratres et filioli, ut et vos, qui interfuistis, rememoremini gloriæ Domini: et qui nunc cognoscitis per auditum, communionem habeatis cum sanctis martyribus, et per illos cum Domino Jesu Christo. Ibid.

^o See ch. xxvii. num. i.

^p See ch. xxxii. num. i.

^q Προκλῶ της κατα Φρυγας προΐταμενην γνωμης. H. E. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 67. D. προς Προκλον της κατα Φρυγας αίρεσιως ὑπερμαχωντα. id. l. 6. cap. 20.

^r Adversum Proculum, Montani sectatorem.

De V. I. cap. 59.

^s Κατα Προκλῆ δε σπαδαση Μοντανῶν.

Cod. 48. p. 37. in.

^t Diss. Sing. p. 216. ap. Pearson.

Op. Post.

^u Crit. 171. num. iv.

^v Tertull. art. iv. p. 344, et note vii.

^w Accesserunt

alii hæretici, qui dicuntur secundum Phrygas. Sed horum non una doctrina est. Sunt enim qui Kata Proclum dicuntur, sunt qui secundum Æschinam pronuntiantur. ap. Tertull. de Præser. Hæc. cap. 52. p. 254. C.

other after Æschines : and the former are reckoned to^x have been more orthodox than the latter in the doctrine of the Trinity.

It is certain therefore, that there was one Proculus, a Montanist, at the beginning of the third century, with whom Caius disputed. But whether he be the same whom Tertullian mentions and highly commends, together with several ancient ecclesiastical writers, admits a question. Valesius^y thinks they were two different persons; the former an Asiatic, the latter an African. But, by Cave,^z his arguments are reckoned of no great weight : and Tillemont^a allows it to be very probable that one and the same person is intended, and thinks that he whom Tertullian speaks of may have been the means of drawing him into the Montanist scheme.

That Proculus is commended by Tertullian^b as an excellent example of chastity and christian eloquence. He wrote against the Valentinians; and for that reason is joined by him with Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and other the most eminent writers of the church. But the work itself is not in being; nor doth there remain any other account of it, that I remember.

I have all along supposed, that Proclus and Proculus are one name, only written differently; the former chiefly used by the Greeks, the other by the Latins; for, in speaking of the same affair, Caius's antagonist is called Proclus by Eusebius and Photius, Proculus by Jerom.

About this time there were several of this name; as Proculus Torpacion, a christian mentioned by^c Tertullian, as well known to the emperor Severus, of whom we may have occasion to say more at some other season.

There was likewise a proconsul of Asia, named^d Proclus

^x See Caius, in Tillem. Mem. T. 3. P. i. p. 295.

^y Ann. in Eus. l. iv. cap. 20. p. 123.

^z Hist. Lit. p. 65.

^a Tillem. as before. See him likewise in Tertullien, art. viii. p. 363, 364, et note xv. p. 552.

^b ——— quas tot jam viri sanctitate et præstantiâ insignes, nec solum nostri antecessores, sed ipsorum hæresiarcharum contemporales, instructissimis voluminibus et prodiderunt et retulerunt: ut Justinus philosophus et martyr, ut Miltiades—ut Irenæus—ut Proculus noster, virginis senectæ, et christianæ eloquentiæ dignitas; quos in omni opere fidei, quemadmodum in isto, optaverim assequi. Tert. adv. Valent.

^c Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, christianorum memor fuit. Nam et Proculum christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodiæ procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit, et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem.

^d *Ἐπι Προκλῆς Κυρηναίου ἀρχιπατρὸς τῆς Ἀσίας.* Chr. Pasch. p. 270. D. Conf. Act. Mart. Ruinart. p. 138, 149, 151, et Tillemont, note v. Sur S. Pione, p. 450.

Quintilianus, who pronounced sentence against Pionius : but when that excellent martyr suffered, whether in the time of Marcus Antoninus, or of Decius, is a point much contested^e by learned men ; though Eusebius has expressly mentioned his martyrdom in his^f Ecclesiastical History.

Beside these, there is one Proclus, a bishop, who joins with five other bishops in a letter^g to Paul of Samosata, supposed to have been written some time between 264 and 270. But the genuineness^h of that letter has been called in question.

I need not here take notice of any more of this name, who lived a good while before, or after this time : and therefore are in little danger of being confounded with our Proculus, or any of the others just mentioned.

IV. ‘Geminus,’ saysⁱ Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, ‘presbyter of the church of Antioch, composed a few monuments of his wit, flourishing under the emperor Alexander, and Zebennus, bishop of his city, chiefly about the time that Heraclas was ordained bishop of the church of Alexandria.’

In his Chronicle, Eusebius, or rather Jerom, at the sixth of the emperor Alexander, of Christ 227, writes—‘Geminianus,^k presbyter of Antioch ; and Hippolytus, and Beryllus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, are esteemed famous writers.’

Here is a small difference ; for in the Catalogue Jerom says, Geminus or Geminianus flourished in the time of Zebennus ; whereas in the Chronicle he puts him a year before Zebennus was bishop of Antioch, whose ordination is there placed at the seventh year of Alexander. Tillemont^l reconciles this difference thus : that Geminianus appeared in the world at the year 227, but was more especially famous about the year 231 or 232, when Heraclas was bishop of Alexandria. I think, that in the Chronicle, where Jerom was pleased to name several persons together, and put them at one and the same year, it is not to be expected

^e Vid. Ruinart, *ibid.* p. 137, et seqq. Basnag. ann. 269. n. 21, et seqq. 250. n. 7, 8, et Saint Pione, p. 230, et note ii. p. 445. dans Tillemont, *Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii.*

^f Lib. 4. cap. 15. p. 135. C. D.

^g Ap. Labb. Concil. T. i. p. 844, &c.

^h Vid. Basnag.

ann. 264. n. vi. vii. ⁱ Geminus, Antiochenæ ecclesiæ presbyter, pauca ingenii sui monumenta composuit, florens sub Alexandro principe, et episcopo urbis suæ Zebennō, eo vel maxime tempore, quo Heraclas Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ pontifex ordinatus est. De Vir. Ill. cap. 64.

^k Geminianus presbyter Antiochenus, et Hippolytus, et Beryllus, episcopus Arabiæ Bostrenus, clari scriptores habentur. Chron. p. 173.

^l See Saint Urbain. Tillem. Mem. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 46.

that the time should suit them all alike; and he was at liberty to mention their time more exactly in his Catalogue, if he thought fit, and had room. This writer is placed by Cave at the year 232.

I have formerly mentioned ^m the succession of the bishops in the church of Antioch from the time of the apostles to Serapion, the eighth bishop of that church. Asclepiades the ninth succeeded him in 211. The tenth was ⁿ Philetus, ordained about 220. The eleventh ^o Zebennus, or Zebinus, in 288. The twelfth ^p Babylas, who had the honour to die a martyr for Christ in the Decian persecution, in the year ^q 249 or ^r 250: the year of his ordination is not certain; it is supposed by some ^s to have been 237 or 238. He was succeeded ^t by Fabius, who died ^u in the beginning of the year 252. His successor was ^v Demetrian; whom Paul of Samosata succeeded in ^w 260.

V. ‘Tryphon,’ says ^x Jerom in his Catalogue, ‘a disciple of Origen, to whom several of his letters, still extant, were written, was very skilful in the scriptures; as his many pieces every where show, but especially that book which he published about the red heifer in Deuteronomy, [It should be Numbers; see chap, xix.] and the half pieces of the living creatures laid by Abraham’s pigeon and turtle-dove in Genesis.’ See Gen. xv. 9—11. This learned man is placed by Cave at the year 233. His works are not extant.

^m See ch. xx. and ch. xxvi. cap. 21. p. 223. C.

Conf. Eus. Chr. p. 172, 173.

^q Vid. Basnag. ann. 239. num. iii. in Tillem. Tom. iii. P. ii. p. 192.

et Tillem. ib. p. 288. et note i. et. ii. sur Saint Babylas.

ⁿ Eus. H. E. l. vi.

^o Id. ibid. cap. 23. p. 224. C.

^p Ibid. cap. 29.

^r See Saint Babylas,

^s Vid. Basn. ib. n. i.

^t Παραπλησιως εν Αντιοχεια τῶ Βαβυλα μετα την ὁμολογίαν εν δεσμωτηριω μεταλλαζοντος, Φαβιος της αυτοθι προϊσταται εκκλησιας. Eus. l. vi. cap. 39.

^u Vid. Pagi, 252. num. vi. Tillemont, St. Denys d’ Alex. sect. vii. Mem. T. iv. P. ii. p. 563, 564.

^v Vid. Euseb. l. vi. cap. 46.

p. 248. A. et lib. vii. cap. 14.

^w Vid. Pagi, 261. n. vi.

^x Tryphon Origenis auditor, ad quem nonnullæ ejus extant epistolæ, in scripturis eruditissimus fuit. Quod quidem et multa ejus sparsim ostendunt opuscula, sed præcipue liber, quem composuit de vaccâ rufâ in Deuteronomio, et de diehomematibus, quæ cum columbâ et turture Abraham ponuntur in Genesi. De V. I. cap. 57.

CHAP. XLI.

NOETUS, AND OTHERS, CALLED HERETICS, IN THE FORMER PART OF THE THIRD CENTURY, OR SOON AFTER.

I. *Noetus*. II. *Valesians*. III. *Angelics*. IV. *Apostolics*.
V. *Origenists*.

I. **BASNAGE**^a supposeth that Noetus arose about the year 240. **Fabricius**^b about 245. And, indeed, as Epiphanius composed his work against heresies in 375 or 376, and he there says that^c Noetus lived about 130 years before that time, we are carried up to the year 245: but Epiphanius does not pretend to be exact; and since we have supposed Hippolytus, who wrote against the Noetians, to have flourished about the year 220, we cannot place Noetus much later. **Beausobre**^d has argued after a like manner. He says, that Noetus must have published his notion sooner than is intimated by Epiphanius; because Hippolytus, who flourished about the year 222, speaks of Noetus as dead some time before he wrote against him. However, this argument of that learned man depends in part upon the supposition that the work ascribed to Hippolytus is genuine. **Huet**^e observes, that Noetus was contemporary with Origen, which I presume will not be denied by any.

The piece referred to by Beausobre, sometimes called a homily against Noetus, by others supposed to be the concluding article of Hippolytus's work against heresies, begins in this manner: 'Others^f there are who advance ' another opinion, being disciples of one Noetus, of Smyrna, ' who lived not long ago. He, elated with pride, said that ' Christ was the Father himself, and that the Father was ' begotten, and suffered and died. He likewise said, that ' he himself was Moses, and his brother Aaron. When the

^a Vid. Basnag. ann. 256. n. 14.
Hær. 53. not. ^a. p. 105. Ed. Fabr.

^b Vid. Philastr. de

^c Ἄλλ' ὡς προ
χρονῶν τῶν τετῶν ἑκατὸν τριακοντα, πλεω η ελασσω. Epiph. H. 57. p. 479. C.

^d Vid. Hist. de Manich. P. ii. l. 3. chap. vi. p. 533. not. (7.) T. i.

^e Vid. Huet. Origenian. l. 2. c. ii. qu. 2. n. xi. p. 37. c.

^f Ἐτέροι τινες—γενομενοι τινος Νοητῆ μαθηται, ὅς το μεν γενος ην Συμρ-
ναιος, ε προ πολλῶ χρονῶ γενομενος.—Ἐφη τον Χριστον αυτον ειναι τον
πατερα, και αυτον τον πατερα γεγενησθαι και πεπονθειναι και αποτεθνηκειναι.
Hippol. contr. Hær. Noet. n. i. p. 5, 6. T. ii. Ed. Fabric.

‘ blessed presbyters had heard of these things, they called
 ‘ him before the church, and examined him. At first he
 ‘ denied that he held such doctrine; but at length, after
 ‘ having concealed himself for a while, when he had got
 ‘ some few to be of the same erroneous opinion with him, he
 ‘ became more ready to defend it publicly. The blessed
 ‘ presbyters then called him before them again; when he
 ‘ said, “What^s harm do I do in honouring Christ?” To
 ‘ whom the presbyters answered, “We also know there is
 ‘ one God, we own Christ, and know that the Son suffered,
 ‘ died, and rose again the third day, and is at the right hand
 ‘ of the Father, and will come to judge the quick and the
 ‘ dead.” Thus, having convicted him, they cast him out of
 ‘ the church.’ This writer adds soon after, that^h Noetus
 argued in this manner: ‘ The scriptures declare one God,
 ‘ even the Father. This being manifest, and it being
 ‘ acknowledged that there is but one God, it follows of
 ‘ necessity that he suffered; forⁱ Christ was God, and he
 ‘ suffered for us, being the Father, that he might be able
 ‘ to save us.’

This is in short the history of Noetus, which is contained
 in that Homily, or else a fragment of some larger work.
 But here ought to be remembered the account formerly
 given^k of the works ascribed to Hippolytus, and that few
 or none of them can be relied upon as genuine and uncor-
 rupted. If this piece be his, yet it is to be feared that there
 are in it some interpolations. Tillemont’s observation upon
 this piece was, that^l the sentiments concerning the Trinity
 are agreeable to those of the third century. And undoubt-
 edly many things are here expressed after the manner of
 the ancients. But there are also some expressions which
 seem to have prevailed chiefly after the Nicene council.
 Another thing may be fit to be observed. It is allowed
 that Hippolytus did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews
 as the apostle Paul’s. But here is an expression, which
 some may think to be taken from thence, where the writer
 speaks of Christ being^m “without sin;” see Heb. iv. 15.
 However this piece, for the main part, must be reckoned
 ancient, for the sake of several internal characters of anti-

^s Τι εν κακον ποιω δοξαζων τον Χριστον; *ibid.* p. 6.

^h *Ibid.* n. ii. p. 7. ⁱ Χριστος γαρ ην Θεος, και επασχειν
 ει ημας, αυτος ων πατηρ, ινα και σωσαι ημας δυνασθη. *ibid.*

^k See chap. xxxv. p. 424, &c. And be pleased likewise to consult
 Beausobre, as above, p. 553. not. (7.) and p. 534.

^l See chap. xxxv. p. 427. ^m Γεγονως παντα οσα
 ετιω ανθρωπος, εκτος αμαρτιας. Hippol. *contr. Noet.* n. xvii. p. 18. Conf.
 Heb. iv. 15. χωρις αμαρτιας.

quity; and because much the same account is given of Noetus by Epiphanius, though he does not say that he borrows from any other writer.

He is to be produced in the next place. In his work against heresies he says, that^u Noetus was of Ephesus in Asia. In his Summary, or Recapitulation, he says, he^o was of Smyrna, as the above quoted fragment of Hippolytus does. In the large work against heresies, Epiphanius says, ‘ that^p Noetus taught a doctrine not held by the prophets, ‘ or apostles, or the church after them: For such was his ‘ pride, that he dared to say, that the Father suffered. And ‘ with a like arrogance he said, that he himself was Moses, ‘ and his brother Aaron. In the mean time the blessed ‘ presbyters of the church called him before them, and ‘ examined him about these things, and whether he had ‘ uttered such a blasphemy against the Father. At^q first ‘ he denied it, being ashamed to own a horrible and per- ‘ nicious doctrine, never taught by any before him. After- ‘ wards, having propagated his mad opinion, and gained ‘ himself a few followers, about ten in number, he became ‘ more bold and open. Whereupon the presbyters call him ‘ and his adherents before them, and examine him again, as ‘ formerly: then he said, “ What harm have I done? I ‘ worship one God, I acknowledge one God, and no other ‘ beside him: who was born, suffered, died.” As he per- ‘ sisted in that doctrine, they expelled him out of the ‘ church, together with those who were of the same opinion ‘ with him. Soon after which he and his brother died; ‘ and^r they were left as apostates and outcasts, for none of ‘ the pious would bury them. After this his followers ‘ endeavoured to uphold the same doctrine, induced thereto ‘ by the like considerations with their master; for when, ‘ being examined by the presbytery, he answered, I worship ‘ one God, they replied, “ Truly, that is well said, for we ‘ also worship one God, but as he ought to be worshipped. ‘ And we have also one Christ, as we know him to be, the ‘ Son of God, who suffered, died, rose again, ascended to ‘ heaven and is at the right hand of the Father, and will ‘ come to judge the quick and the dead. This we say,

^u Epiph. H. v. 57. n. i. p. 479. c.
p. 145. T. 2.

^o Anaceph. n. xi.

^p Adv. Hær. 57. num. 1.

^q — και ες ταυτην βλασφημιαν περι πατρος προηγαγετο, ο δε τα πρωτα μεν ηρκειτο, επι τα πρεσβυτηρικα αγομενος, δια το μηδενα προ αυτε εξεμισαι ταυτην την δεινην και ολετηριον πικριαν. Ibid. p. 480. A.

^r Εφορησαν γαρ, ως παραβαται, και εδεις αυτες των θεοσεβων περιετειλε. Ibid. C.

‘ according as we have been taught by the divine scriptures.’”

In his summary, Epiphanius says, ‘ that Noetus, with a few that followed him, taught Christ to^s be Father and Son; that the same was Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. [Or, ‘ that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are the same.]’ He said, likewise, ‘ that he himself was Moses, and his brother ‘ Aaron.’ Afterwards, in the same work, in^t the article of the Sabellians, Epiphanius says, they held the same doctrine with the Noetians, except that they denied the Father to have suffered.

Philaster writes, that^u Noetus said, ‘ The Almighty Father ‘ himself was Christ, and that he was born, and suffered, ‘ and died. This person likewise said, that he was Moses, ‘ and his brother Elias the prophet.’

St. Augustine, who had read Philaster, and Epiphanius’s Recapitulation or Summary, but not his Panarium, or large work against heresies, writes in his book of Heresies, ‘ that^v ‘ the Noetians were so called from one Noetus, who said ‘ that Christ was also the Father himself and the Holy ‘ Ghost.’ This is Augustine’s whole article of the Noetians. But afterwards he enlarges in the article of the Sabellians; ‘ who,’ he^w says, ‘ are reckoned to have borrowed their opinion from Noetus. Nor does he know any ‘ good reason why Epiphanius should make two heresies of ‘ them, for their opinions seem to be the same; only Sabellius was better known than Noetus: for very few, at that ‘ time, knew any thing of the Noetians; but Sabellians ‘ were often mentioned. He adds, that some call them ‘ Praxeans, from Praxeas: and they might also be called ‘ Hermogenians, from Hermogenes, for they were both of

^s Ὑποπατορα τον Χριστον εδιδαξε, τον αυτον ειναι πατερα, και υιον, και αγιον πνευμα. Epiph. Anaceph. p. 145. n. xi.

^t Ib. p. 146. n. xvi.

^u Alii autem Noëtiani, insensati cujusdam nomine Noëti, qui dicebat Patrem omnipotentem ipsum esse Christum, et ipsum natum, et ipsum passum fuisse in corpore. Hic etiam dicebat se Mosen esse, et fratrem suum Heliam prophetam. Philast. H. 53. p. 107. Ed. Fabric.

^v Noëtiani a quodam Noëto, qui dicebat Christum eundem ipsum esse Patrem et Spiritum Sanctum. Aug. de Hær. n. xxxvi.

^w Sabelliani ab illo Noëto, quem supra memoravimus, defluxisse dicuntur. Nam et discipulum ejus quidam perhibent fuisse Sabellium. Sed quâ causâ duas hæreses eas Epiphanius computet, nescio; cum fieri potuisse videamus, ut fuerit Sabellius iste famosior, et ideo ex illo celebrius hæc hæresis nomen accepit. Noëtiani enim difficile ab aliquo sciuntur; Sabelliani autem sunt in ore multorum. Nam et Praxeanos eos a Praxeâ quidam vocant; et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene vocari potuerunt; qui Praxeas et Hermogenes eadem sentientes, in Africâ fuisse dicuntur. Nec tamen istæ plures sectæ sunt; sed unius sectæ plura nomina, ex his hominibus qui in eâ maxime innotuerunt. Aug. ibid. c. 41.

‘ the same opinion. Augustine farther^x blames Epiphanius
 ‘ for making any difference in opinion between the Noetians
 ‘ and Sabellians. For instance, where he says, that the
 ‘ Sabellians agreed with the Noetians, except that they
 ‘ denied the Father to have suffered; Augustine thinks that
 ‘ not rightly said; and affirms, it was so well known that
 ‘ the Sabellians taught the Father to have suffered, that
 ‘ they were oftener called Patripassians than Sabellians:’ so
 Augustine in his book of Heresies. He does also^y else-
 where treat the Sabellians as Patripassians. Rufinus,^z upon
 the Creed, likewise says, that the Sabellians were called
 Patripassians. Moreover,^a Augustine blames Philaster also
 for making two several heresies, or sects, of the Noetians
 and Sabellians, though he was sensible of their great agree-
 ment together, and with the others above named by Augus-
 tine, and allows the Sabellians to be Patripassians as well
 as the Noetians.

And certainly it is fit to be observed by us, that Phi-
 laster, as well as Augustine, computes Praxeas, Hermo-
 genes, Noetus, and Sabellius, to have all had the same
 doctrine concerning the Deity.

Theodoret writes to this purpose: ‘ Noetus^b was of Smyrna.
 ‘ He revived the heresy which one Epigonus first published,
 ‘ and Cleomenes maintained after him. The sum of their
 ‘ heresy is this: they say, that there is one God and Father,

^x Unde ergo sit factum, ut Noëtianos et Sabellianos, non unius hæresis
 duo nomina, sed tanquam duas hæreses supradictus Epiphanius poneret,
 liquido invenire non potui.—Loco quippe isto,—Sabelliani, inquit, similia
 Noëto dogmatizantes, præter hoc quod dicunt Patrem non esse passum.
 Quomodo de Sabellianis intelligi potest, cum sic innotuerint dicere Patrem
 passum, ut Patripassiani quam Sabelliani crebrius nuncupentur? Vel quo-
 modo possunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem passum fuisse non dicere, cum
 dicant eundem ipsum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum? Id. *ibid.*

^y Nam Sabelliani dicti sunt quidam hæretici, qui vocantur Patripassiani,
 qui dicunt ipsum Patrem passum. Aug. Tr. 36. in Joh. Ev. p. 548. A. T. 3.
 P. 2. Bened. Breviter ergo hesterno die insinuavimus caritati vestræ esse
 hæreticos qui vocantur Patripassiani, vel a suo auctore Sabelliani. In Joh.
 Tr. 37. p. 552. F. *ibid.*

^z ——— hæreseos causâ
 Sabellii, illius profecto quæ a nostris Patripassiani appellatur; id est, quæ
 Patrem ipsum vel ex virgine natum dicit, et visibilem factum, vel passum
 affirmat in carne. Rufin. in Symb. ad Artic. Credo in Deum Patrem.

^a Philaster autem Brixianus episcopus—Sabellianos continuo post Noë-
 tianos ponens, Sabellius inquit, discipulus ejus, qui similitudinem sui doctoris
 itidem secutus est, unde et Sabelliani postea sunt appellati, qui et Patripassiani,
 et Praxeani a Praxeâ, et Hermogeniani ab Hermogene, &c. Et tamen
 Noëtianos et Sabellianos sub duobus numeris tanquam duas hæreses posuit;
 quia causâ, ipse viderit. Aug. de Hær. cap. 41.

^b ‘Ο δε Νοητος Σμυρναϊος μεν ην το γινος ανανωσατο δε την αιρεσιν, ην
 Επιγονος μεν τις οὐτω καλεμενος απεκυησε πρωτος, κλειομενης δε παραλαβων
 εβηβαιωσε. κ. λ. Theodor. H. F. l. 3. c. 3. p. 227, 228.

‘ the Creator of all things; not appearing when he thinks
 ‘ fit, appearing when he pleaseth; and that the same is
 ‘ invisible and visible, begotten and unbegotten; unbe-
 ‘ gotten from the beginning, begotten when he pleased to
 ‘ be born of a virgin; impassible and immortal, and again
 ‘ passible and mortal. For when he was impassible, they
 ‘ say, he willingly suffered on the cross. Him they call
 ‘ both Son and Father, as occasion is. They who embraced
 ‘ this heresy were called Noetians. After Noetus it was
 ‘ maintained by Callistus, who made some additions to that
 ‘ impious doctrine.’

I need not translate the article in *Prædestinatus*. But there is a particular omitted by other writers; that^c Noetus was condemned by Tranquillus, bishop of the Chalcedonians, in Syria.

These are accounts of Noetus and his opinion, which we find in ancient writers; from whence it appears probable, that he and others who agreed with him believed one divine person only, and denied a distinct and proper personality of the word and spirit: but their doctrine seems to be set in a bad light. It is affirmed, that they said, the Father was born, and suffered, and died, and was Christ. Beausobre, who shows a great deal of candour and equity in his judgment of those called heretics, declares, ‘ that^d this is
 ‘ so absurd, and so manifestly contrary to many texts of the
 ‘ New Testament, that it appears scarce possible it should
 ‘ be maintained by any reasonable man; which makes him
 ‘ suspect, that this was not the opinion of those persons, but
 ‘ a consequence, which the orthodoxy drew from their prin-
 ‘ ciples.’ This appears to me not unlikely: a passage of Augustine will confirm the supposition; for he argues and affirms, ‘ that^e all who are of that opinion, that the same is
 ‘ Father, Son, and Spirit, must also say, that the Father
 ‘ suffered.’ This seems to show, that he had no proof from their own writings, or expressions, that the Sabellians, and others, whom he charges with that opinion, were Patripassians, but he inferred it from their doctrine concerning the unity and simplicity of the Deity.

Whereas it is related, that Noetus said he was Moses, and his brother Aaron; Beausobre^f thinks this to be ‘ an ex-

^c Hic damnatus est a Tranquillo episcopo Chalcedoniorum Syriæ, &c. *Prædestin.* H. 36. ap. *Bibl. Patr. Max.* T. 27. p. 544. F.

^d See his *Hist. de Manichée*, &c. as before, p. 533.

^e Vel quomodo possunt intelligi quilibet eorum Patrem passum fuisse non dicere, cum dicant eundem ipsum esse et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum? *Aug. De Hær.* cap. xli. Vid. etiam supra, not. ^v. p. 446.

^f See him, as before, T. i. p. 534, 535.

‘travagance, that is not at all credible, and that renders the rest of the history more than suspected: the truth,’ says he, ‘is this; Noetus and his brother pretended to defend the doctrine of the unity of God taught by Moses and Aaron, and to be sent to cleanse the church from the heathen error of the plurality of gods.’ So Beausobre. It is observable that Theodoret makes no mention of this particular: and Philaster differs from Hippolytus and Epiphanius, who may be considered as one. They say, he declared his brother to be Aaron; but Philaster, that he was Elias the prophet. This story seems to me to have no other foundation but this; that some of their enemies said of Noetus and his brother, that they acted as if they had been, the one another Moses, and the other another Aaron; whilst some other people said of them, they behaved as if they were another Moses and Elias.

Another observation of Beausobre may be inserted here: ‘When,’ says ^s he, ‘the ancients describe Sabellianism, they perpetually confound the Word and the Son of God. In the theology of the church, the Word and the Son are the same person; but in the Sabellian theology they are two very different things. The Word is not the Son of God; he is only an attribute, a faculty, a property of the divine nature. It is ^h the man Jesus Christ, who became the Son of God by the communication of the Word, as Marcellus says in Eusebius. Hence it came to pass, that the Noetians reproached the orthodox with ⁱ introducing a strange and new language in calling the Word the Son of God. That appellation [of Son of God] agrees only to the man Jesus, mere man, as to his nature, how great soever he was by his gifts.’ So that learned writer describes the Sabellian, or the Noetian theology, which are both one.

What Epiphanius aims at, when he says the faithful, or more orthodox christians, refused to bury Noetus and his brother, I cannot tell. Noetus had friends and followers; whose business, I think, it was to bury him and his brother when they died, as I suppose they did.

Once more: Epiphanius said that Noetus was the first who advanced the opinion he maintained: but Philaster and Augustine say, that it was the same opinion that was before taught by Praxeas and Hermogenes, and afterwards by

^s See Beausobre, as before, Hist. de Manichée, T. i. p. 539.

^h *δια την προς αυτον κοιινωναν (τη λογος) υιον θεου γενεσθαι.* ap. Euseb. de Ecc. Th. l. ii. c. 8. p. 113. ⁱ *ΑΛΛ’ ερει μοι τις Ξερον μοι φερεις, Λογον λεγων υιον.* [id est; sed dicit mihi aliquis: Novum mihi affers, eum Verbum Filium vocas.] Hipp. contr. Noet. n. xv. p. 16.

Sabellius: and Theodoret still increases the number of those who were of this opinion about that time; for, besides those mentioned by the Latin writers, he speaks of two others, predecessors of Noetus, and another after him. And indeed learned moderns are now sensible, that what Epiphanius says is a mistake. He is^k corrected for it by his editor and commentator Petavius. And^l Huet says, that Noetus rather propagated an old heresy than invented a new one.

That there were such people as these among christians about that time, we have clear evidence from Origen's writings, and Eusebius's History of him. I formerly^m gave an account of Beryllus, once of this opinion, afterwards converted by Origen. And Origen himself refers to Beryllus, or Noetus, or some others of this sentiment, in several places of his still-remaining works; particularly in his Greek Commentary upon St. Matthew, published by Huet, whereⁿ he speaks of 'some who confounded the 'notion of Father and Son, making the Father and Son to 'be one subsistence, differing only in thought and names. 'Which sentiment, he says, is false; though those persons 'think thereby to do honour to the Deity.' Of these^o Origen is supposed to speak in a passage of his Commentary upon Titus, preserved in Pamphilus's Apology for him, which we now have in Latin only. An anonymous author of an Apology for Origen, in^p Photius, speaks of Origen's having opposed, or written against the Sabellian heresy; which, as^q Huet explains it, ought not to be understood of Sabellius himself, who did not appear till after Origen, but of Noetus, or some other persons who held the like unitarian sentiment. And^r in his Greek Commentary upon St. John's gospel, Origen says, that many well disposed persons went into that opinion to avoid polytheism. Perhaps Origen has an eye to this same thing in his books against Celsus. That Epicurean had ridiculed the venera-

^k Petav. Animadv. p. 224.

^l Origen. l. ii. qu. 2.

n. xi. p. 37.

^m See chap. xxxviii. p. 477, 478.

ⁿ — φαντασια τῆ δοξαζειν αυτον, οποιου εισιν οι συγγειοντες πατρος και υιου εννοιαν, και τη υποστασει ενα διδοντες ειναι τον πατερα και τον υιον, τη επινοια μονη και τοις ονομασι διαφεντες το εν υποκειμενον. Orig. in Matt. Huet. T. i. p. 450. D. Conf. Huet. in loc.

^o Sed et eos qui hominem dicunt Dominum Jesum præcognitum et prædestinatum, qui ante adventum carnalem substantialiter et proprie non extiterit: sed quod homo natus patris solam in se habuerit deitatem, &c. Vid. Pamph. Ap. ap. Hieron. T. v. ed. Bened. p. 226. Conf. Origen. Huet. ubi supra, p. 37. Vid. etiam Origen. in Rom. cap. x. p. 588. m.

^p Cod. H7. p. 296.

^q Huet, Origen. p. 37.

^r Και το πολλης φιλοθεας ειναι ευχομενης παρασσον. κ. λ. Orig. Comm. in Joh. p. 46. D. T. 2. Huet.

tion which christians had for the Son of God. Origen, in his answer,^s says, ‘ Grant, that in a vast multitude of believers, some, different from the rest, should rashly affirm our Saviour to be the great God over all: nevertheless, we do not hold any such thing, believing what he himself says, “The Father that sent me is greater than I.”’ See John xiv. 28. Cyprian^t likewise, among other heretics, mentions Patripassians.

Though the writers above transcribed may have been guilty of some mistakes in their History of Noetus, and in their representation of his sentiment; yet we are very much indebted to them, upon the whole, for the accounts they have left us, and in particular for the testimony they bear to Noetus and his followers, that they received the holy scriptures, and depended upon them; how much soever in the judgment of these writers they may have misunderstood and misinterpreted them. Of this we are now to take notice.

In the piece ascribed to Hippolytus, of which we have already made so much use, it is said, the Noetians argued for their opinion in this manner: ‘ It^u is written in the law; “ I am the God of your fathers, ye shall have no other gods beside me.” See Exod. iii. 6; xx. 3. And^v again in another place: “ I,” saith he, “ am the first, and the last, and beside me there is no other.” Thus^w they say they prove there is but one God.’ See Isa. xli. 4; xliv. 6; xlv. 5. They insisted likewise upon Isa. xlv. 14. ‘ You^x see,’ say they, ‘ how the scriptures declare one God.’ They add, ‘ We^y can go no farther, for the apostle also acknowledgeth one God, saying, “ whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.”’ The^z like things are to be seen in Epiphanius. The author, supposed to be Hippolytus, replies to the foregoing argument: ‘ The^a scriptures speak

^s Επω δε τινας, ως εν πληθει πιστευοντων, και δεχομενων διαφωνιαν, δια την προπετειαν υποτιθεισθαι τον σωτηρα ιναι τον μεγατον επι πασι θεον· αλλ’ επι γε ημεις τοιουτον. κ. λ. Or. contr. Cels. l. 8. p. 387. Cant. sect. 14. p. 752. E. Bened. ^t Vid. Cypr. ad Jub. Ep. 73. p. 200.

^u Οί γαρ δεξαι ββλονται συρασιν τη δογματι, λεγοντες, ειπεν εν νομη· Εγω ειμι ο θεος των πατερων ημων, κ. λ. Hippol. contr. Noet. n. ii. p. 6.

^v Ibid. p. 6, 7.

^w Ούτω φασκασιν συνισαν ένα θεον. ibid.

^x Όρας, φησιν, πως ένα θεον κηρυσσασιν αι γραφαι. ibid. p. 7.

^y Αλλο δε, φησιν, ε δυναμεθα λεγειν· και γαρ ο αποστολος ένα θεον ομολογει, λεγων· ών οι πατερες, εξ ών ο Χριστος το κατα σαρκα, ο ών επι παντων θεος ευλογητος εις τας αιωνας. ibid. p. 7. ^z Vid. Epiph. H. 57. num. ii. iii.

^a Αι μιν γραφαι ορθως λεγασιν, αλλα αν και Νοητος νοει· Ουκ ηδη δε ει, Νοητος μη νοει, παρα τωτο εκβλητοι αι γραφαι. ibid. num. iii. p. 7.

‘ truth, but Noetus does not understand them ; but though
 ‘ Noetus does not understand, the scriptures nevertheless
 ‘ are not to be laid aside.’ In this piece against the Noe-
 tians, there are many texts alleged out of the gospels, and
 Paul’s epistles, and the book of the Revelation, and some
 out of the^b book of the Acts of the Apostles ; which shows,
 that these people received the scriptures of the New Testa-
 ment, as other christians did.

In the same piece against Noetus, is this remarkable
 passage : ‘ There^c is indeed, brethren, one God, whom we
 ‘ can know no otherwise but from the holy scriptures. For,
 ‘ as he who is desirous to learn the wisdom of this world,
 ‘ must acquaint himself with the sentiments of philosophers,
 ‘ if he would obtain his end ; in like manner, whoever of
 ‘ us are desirous to understand religion, and be truly pious,
 ‘ should apply ourselves to the oracles of God. Whatever
 ‘ therefore the divine scriptures declare, that let us em-
 ‘ brace ; what they teach, let us learn ; and as the Father
 ‘ willeth we should believe, so let us believe ; as he willeth
 ‘ [or requireth] the Son should be honoured, so let us
 ‘ honour him : as he willeth^d the Holy Ghost should be
 ‘ given, so let us accept ; not according to any particular
 ‘ preconceived opinion, nor according to any particular
 ‘ notion of ours, nor wresting the oracles given by God ;
 ‘ but so understanding things as he has been pleased to
 ‘ show them to us by the holy scriptures.’ In a note upon
 this passage, Fabricius observes, that it contains a signal
 testimony concerning the sufficiency of scripture. I think
 it likewise to be herein implied, that the Noetians were
 strenuous assertors of the authority of holy scripture.

Epiphanius confirms our allegations from the fore-men-
 tioned writer : for in his article of the Noetians he quotes
 many books of the Old and New Testament, and has this
 passage, with which I conclude this article. ‘ So that,’
 says^e he, ‘ the writings [or oracles] of the prophets agree
 ‘ with those of the apostles, and the apostles agree with the
 ‘ evangelists, and the evangelists with the apostles, and the
 ‘ apostles with the prophets.’

After this there can be no reason to think, that the Noe-
 tians rejected any books of scripture generally received by

^b Vid. ib. num. vi. p. 11. n. xiii. p. 15. n. xviii. p. 19.

^c Ibid. n. ix. p. 12, 13.

^d ——— και ως

θελει πνευμα άγιον δωρεισθαι, λαβωμεν μη κατ’ ιδιαν προαιρεσιν, κατ’ ιδιον
 νεν, μηδε βιαζομενοι τα υπο τς Θεσ δεδομενα, αλλ’ ον τροπον αυτος εββληθη
 δια των άγιων γραφων δεϊζει, ούτως ιδωμεν. Ibid.

^e όπως συναδη τα προφητικα τοις αποτολικοις, κ. λ. Epiph. II. 57. p. 486. B.

christians at that time, or that they showed a less regard to them; though they did not understand them altogether as some others did.

One thing should be observed here: if the piece against Noetus be really a work of Hippolytus, the extracts now made out of it afford additions to his testimony to the scriptures, as^f formerly exhibited by me: but when I composed that chapter, I doubted the genuineness of this piece, and therefore was cautious of making much use of it; nor am I yet fully satisfied in that point. I have therefore quoted this fragment, or homily, as an ancient piece ascribed to Hippolytus; but possibly interpolated in some places since its original composition.

It was fit I should give the history I have now done of Noetus and his followers. There follow some articles in Epiphanius, which appear to me to be but inconsiderable. Nevertheless I shall give some account of them likewise. If I should quite omit them, they might be thought by some to be more material than they are.

II. The next article in Epiphanius is that of the Valesians. They dwell, as^g he guesseth, at Bacathus, a considerable village of Philadelphia in Arabia. He says, they are most of them eunuchs, and make those so who come over to them: they have also, as he adds, some other heretical notions and shameful practices: they^h reject the law and the prophets: so writes Epiphanius in his Summary or Recapitulation.

In his larger work against heresies he says, ‘ Weⁱ have often heard of the Valesians; but we could never learn who their leader Vales [or Valens] was, where he lived, whence he came, what were his principles, precepts, or sayings: but his name being Arabic, I suspect him to be of the same opinion with some who live at Bacathus in Philadelphia beyond Jordan, and are called Gnostics by the people of the country; although they are not Gnostics, for their opinions are different. What we have learned of them is to this purpose: at first they were of the church, but after a while, when they were increased, they separated from it: they are all eunuchs: when they embrace their institution, they are obliged to forbear all flesh, till they have been made eunuchs, either with their own consent, or by

^f See chap. xxxv.

^g Epiphanius. Anaceph. T. 2. p. 145.

^h — αφανίζοντες τον νομον και της προφητας. Ibid.

ⁱ Περὶ Ουαλισηων ακρομεν πολλακις, ε μεν τοι εγνωμεν περ, τισ, η ποθεν ωρματο, η τι λεγων, η γεθητων, η φθειγγομενος ο Ουαλης ετος. Adv. H. 58. p. 489.

‘force; then they may eat what they please. Nor do they ‘serve only their own people in that manner, but others also, ‘strangers and travellers, as is commonly said.’ Epiphanius, having given that account of this sect and their principles, proceeds to argue against them from the New Testament.

These people are not mentioned by Philaster, nor Theodoret.

Augustine^k agrees with Epiphanius; and it is manifest he had no other knowledge of these people than what he had from him.

The author of *Prædestinatus* follows Augustine; but he adds one thing omitted by the other two; that^l the Valesians were condemned by a synod of Achaia. I wish that author had told us whence he had this particular.

Damascen has nothing beside what is in the Recapitulation of Epiphanius.

It is plain that this was a very obscure sect, if ever there was such an one. Epiphanius indeed says, he had often heard of them: however he seems not to have known any thing in particular concerning them, but what he had received by doubtful and uncertain information. If ever there were such people, they seem to have received the books of the New Testament without scruple: for, though Epiphanius says they rejected the law and the prophets, he brings no charge against them with regard to the New Testament, either adding to it, or detracting from it; and in his brief confutation of them, he alleges divers texts of St. Matthew’s gospel, and another from the first epistle to the Corinthians. I do not pretend to assign any particular period to these heretics, whose very existence is uncertain.

III. The next article in Epiphanius (whose order is followed likewise by Augustine, the author of *Prædestinatus*, and John Damascen) is that of the Pure, or Novatians. But of them I say nothing now, intending to speak of them in the history of their founder Novatus; or, as he is more commonly called, Novatian. After them follow Angelics: of whom Epiphanius says, in his Summary, that^m they were then no where to be found, but had entirely ceased. They seem to have been so called, either because they

^k Valesii et se ipsos castrant, et hospites suos, hoc modo existimantes Deo se debere servire. Alia quoque hæretica docere dicuntur et turpia: sed quæ illa sint, nec ipse commemoravit Epiphanius, nec uspiam potui reperire. Aug. de Hær. cap. 37.

^l Hi a synodo sunt damnati Achaicæ. *Prædestin.* l. i. cap. 37. ^m — — οὗτοι παντελως ἐξελιπον, αυχεντες δε ησαν αγγελικην ταξιν εχειν, η δια το αγγελως προσκεκλησθαι. Epiph. Anac. p. 146. n. 14.

boasted of their having an angelical institution, or else because they invoked angels.

In his larger work Epiphanius says, ‘Weⁿ have heard of the heresy [or sect] of the Angelics, but it is by name only: for we could never gain any certain information wherein their heresy consisted; probably because it hastened to its period soon after it had sprung up. Nor do we so much as know, certainly, what was the original of the name: whether it was, because they said the world was formed by angels, as some have done, or^o that they boasted of being an angelic sort of people, and that they lived a most excellent life; or whether they had their name from some place; for^p there is a country beyond Mesopotamia, called Ingilin [or Angelia]. About this we can say nothing positively.’

This is the account which Epiphanius gives of these people. It is his usual method to add, after the history of any heretics, a confutation of them. But he forbears to attempt any thing of that nature here, not knowing what their principles were.

Philaster makes no express mention of these Angelics. Nor is there any thing concerning them in Theodoret.

Augustine^q says, ‘They were inclined to the worship of angels, and that Epiphanius assures us, they had ceased in his time.’ This shows that Augustine had no particular knowledge of this sect.

Let us however take the account in Prædestinatus: it may serve to convince us that he is an author not to be relied upon. ‘The thirty-ninth heresy,’ says^r he, ‘is that of the Angelics. They chose to be so called: for they say that angels ought to be adored and revered in the mind, and that prayers ought to be presented to them; that, as they are able, they may be induced by the petitions of men to give them help. Epiphanius assures us that these people had quite ceased, having been overcome by Theophilus, bishop of Apamea.’ So this writer. But Epiphanius says no such thing, nor yet Augustine, nor^s John Damascen; who has nothing more relating to this

ⁿ H. 60. p. 505.
σεμνονειν, κ. λ. ib. c.

^o Ητοι δια το εν ταξι αγγελων ιαυτες

^p — επειδη χωρος τις εστιν Ιγγιλινη. ib.

^q Angelici, in angelorum cultum inclinati, quos Epiphanius jam omnino defecisse testatur. Aug. de Hær. c. 39. ^r — Hi angelicos se vocari voluerunt. Dicunt enim angelos debere adorari et excoli animo, et ipsis preces effundi.—Hos Epiphanius jam omnino defecisse testatur, victos a Theophilo, Apameo episcopo. Præd. l. i. h. 39.

^s Vid. Joh. Dam. de Hær. cap. 60. ap. Coteler. Mon. Gr. T. i. p. 295

sect, than what was transcribed above from the Summary of Epiphanius.

The reader has a right to think for himself: but possibly some will be of opinion, that there never was any sect of this name distinct from all others; and that Angelics is only an appellation, sometimes bestowed in the way of ridicule, upon some rigid and conceited sect, which ordinarily went under another denomination.

IV. The people next mentioned by Epiphanius, are ‘ the^t ‘ Apostolics; who,’ as he says, ‘ are also called Apotactics ‘ [or Renouncers]. They are to be found in Pisidia. They ‘ receive none but Renouncers [that is, such as are of the ‘ same opinion with themselves]. They mightily resemble ‘ the Eucratites, though they have some notions different ‘ from theirs.’ So writes Epiphanius in his Recapitulation. And^u the Eucratites are summarily described by him in the same work after this manner; ‘ That they condemned ‘ marriage as proceeding from Satan, and forbid the eating ‘ any kind of animal food.’

In the Panarium he writes: ‘ Others there are who call ‘ themselves Apostolics and Apotactics: for this is their ‘ darling maxim, to possess^v nothing. They are a sort of ‘ sprout from Tatian’s sect, partaking of the principles of ‘ the Eucratites, Tatianists, and Pure. They divide and ‘ wound the holy church of God by their superstition and ‘ will-worship. They likewise overthrow the divine cle- ‘ mency; for they no more receive any one that has once ‘ offended. With regard to marriage and other matters, their ‘ sentiments have a near affinity with those of the people ‘ before spoken of [that is, the Novatians]. But whereas ‘ the Pure are contented with the scriptures commonly ‘ received, these are very fond of the Acts of Andrew and ‘ Thomas, and^w are altogether averse to the ecclesiastical ‘ canon.’ He afterwards says, that^x this sect is confined to a very small tract, and are no where to be found but in Phrygia, Cilicia, and Pamphylia.

In his confutation of these people, Epiphanius quotes the gospels, the Acts, and divers of St. Paul’s epistles, very freely. He argues, from reason and scripture, that marriage is not defiling or abominable; and that there is no crime in being rich, when an estate has descended to any by legal inheritance, or has been gained in the way of honest indus-

^t Anac. p. 146. n. xv.

^u Ibid. p. 144. n. i.

^v — φυλαττεται δε παρ’ αυτοις το μηδεν εκκτησθαι. Adv. H. 61. n. i. p. 506. B.

^w — πανταπασιν αλλοτριου τε κανονος τε εκκλησιαστικη. ibid. c.

^x N. ii. p. 507.

try and fair dealing, and is employed in good uses. However the church, too, as he adds, has its renouncers; but then it does not teach them to be proud and arrogant, and to despise and condemn all others. If^y any are disposed to part with their goods, and aim at an apostolical life, they are at liberty; provided they still maintain favourable sentiments of other men, and keep up a friendly correspondence with them. The same is to be said of those who forbear marriage, provided they do not look upon it as a thing abominable in itself, and refuse not communion with those who are so contracted. The church, says he, may be compared to a ship, which does not consist of one plank only, but of many: beside the keel, it has its fore-castle, and stern, masts, and sails, and anchors; its company too is various, and it refuses none but robbers and pirates. In like manner the church excludes none but great and scandalous sinners: it receives all who are sincerely desirous to be saved, and^z conducts them all to salvation in the way suitable to their several capacities, stations, and conditions. So Epiphanius.

The Apostolics are not mentioned in Philaster or Theodoret.

Augustine^a says, ‘that these people arrogantly called themselves Apostolics, or Apostolical, because they received not any into communion who lived in the marriage state, or that possessed any thing of their own. Indeed, the catholic church has many such, both monks and clergy: but these are therefore heretics, because they separate themselves from the church, and allow no hopes of salvation to those who enjoy such things as they have not. They resemble the Encratites, and are likewise called Apotaetics; but they are also reported to teach some other, I know not what, heretical things peculiar to themselves.’

The author of *Prædestinatus*^b so agrees with Augustine, that no particular notice needs to be taken of him.

Damascen has nothing beside the Recapitulation of Epiphanius; and entirely agrees with it, except that, whereas

^y Ibid. n. iv. p. 508.

^z Ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ μὲν παντας σωζέω, ἕκαστον δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν πραγματείαν καὶ σωτηρίαν. *ibid.* n. iv. p. 509. B.

^a Apostolici, qui se isto nomine arrogantissime vocaverunt, eo quod in suam communionem non recipierint utentes conjugibus et res proprias possidentes: quales habet catholica et monachos et clericos plurimos. Sed ideo isti hæretici sunt, quoniam se ab ecclesiâ separantes, nullam spem putant eos habere, qui utuntur his rebus, quibus ipsi carent, &c. Aug. de Hær. cap. 40.

^b Hær. 49. apud Bib. Patr. T. 27. p. 549. H.

it is there said, the Apostolics are to be found in Pisidia, he says, they ^c had their rise again.

The time of this people does not appear: however, it is observable, that the Apostolics, as well as Angelics, are placed after the Pure, or Novatians, and a great way below Tatian and the Encratites, both in Epiphanius and the other writers that mention him. They renounced the world, and condemned all others that did not: this was their peculiar principle, against which Epiphanius has argued very well; his confutation of them is a rational and sensible performance. But perhaps it may be questioned, whether there ever was any sect of this name different from all others. The reasons of this doubt are such as these: they are not mentioned by Philaster, or Theodoret. Augustine seems not to have known any thing of them, but what he had learned from Epiphanius. Whereas if there had been any such people, who arose after the Novatians, one would think they should have been well known to those learned ancients. According to all the accounts we have of them, they mightily resembled the Encratites and Novatians. Possibly therefore, Apostolic, or Apostolical, is nothing but a different appellation of some rigid sect, that ordinarily went by another name; whose rigid sentiment too, as may be supposed, is here aggravated beyond truth and reality. If, after all, there ever was such a sect, it made little progress, and had but a short duration. What Epiphanius says, therefore, of their admiring the Acts of Andrew and Thomas, needs not to give us much concern.

V. The next article in Epiphanius, and the writers that follow him, is that of the Sabellians; of whom I have already taken some notice in this chapter, in the article of Noetus, and shall be obliged to say more in the ^d history of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. After them follow two distinct articles, concerning two different sorts of people, called Origenists; the former generally called impure, or infamous Origenists: of whom, in his Recapitulation, Epiphanius says, that ^e they were so called from a certain Origen. In his Panarium, or larger work against heresies, he declares, that he ^f did not know from whom they were so called, whether from Origen Adamantius, or from some

^c Και οὗτοι περι Πισιδίαν ὀνομαζόμενοι. Joh. Dam. ap. Cotel. Mon. G. T. i. p. 296.

^d See chap. xliiii. num. vii.

^e ——— τινος Ὀριγενῆς. Anaceph. p. 146. n. xvii.

^f Καλεῖνται δὲ Ὀριγενεῖς ἢ παννὴν δὲ σαφῶς ἴσμεν τινος ἕνεκα, ἢ ἀπο Ὀριγενῆς τῆς Ἀδαμαντίας, καλεσμένης Συντακτῆς, ἢ ἀλλῆς τινος εἶναι, ἀγνοῶ. κ. λ. Adv. H. 63. n. i. Vid. etiam H. 64. n. iii. p. 526. D.

other; all he could say was, that he understood they were called Origenists. The others^g he plainly speaks of, as so named from Origen, called Adamantius, the famous writer, and son of Leonides, the blessed and holy martyr. Of these last I say nothing here, not choosing to give any farther account of the opinions of Origen, or his followers and admirers, than I have already done in the history of him: it is no necessary part of my design, nor will it be expected of me by any body.

Of the former Origenists, Epiphanius says, they^h were guilty of things not fit to be mentioned. He charges them with licentious principles, as well as shameful practices; and says that they resembled those called Gnostics. Theyⁱ received and read, as he adds, divers scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and also some apocryphal scriptures, particularly those called the Acts of Andrew, and of some others. Augustine, who had read only the Recapitulation of Epiphanius, follows that work, saying, that^k these Origenists were not so called from that Origen, who was well known to almost every body, but from some other, he knew not whom: then he adds in general, as from Epiphanius, that they were guilty of shameful actions. Augustine plainly had no knowledge of this people, beside what he had from that writer. The author^l of Prædestinatus follows Augustine, but adds a particular of his own head; that this sect had its original from a wicked Syrian, named Origen. John Damascen^m has nothing different from the Recapitulation of Epiphanius.

It is disputed by learned moderns, whom these people followed, and from whom they were named. Basnageⁿ thinks it likely, that there was some other Origen, unknown to us, who was the author of this sect. I do not perceive that^o Tillemont determines this question one way or other. Baronius^p thought there was but one Origen about this time, and that these Origenists had their name from him:

^g Vid. Anaceph. p. 146. num. 18. Adv. Hær. 64. n. i.

^h Vid. Anac. ubi supra. Adv. H. 63. p. 520—524.

ⁱ Γραφας δε οὔτοι αναγιωσκουσι διαφορας καινης και παλαιας διαθηκης. Adv. H. 63. n. i. p. 520. Κεχρηνται δε, ως εφην, διαφοροις γραφαις, και καινης διαθηκης, και αποκρυφοις τισι μαλιστα ταις λεγομεναις Ηραξεσιν Ανδρεα και των αλλων. Ibid. n. ii. iii.

^k — a quodam Origene dicti sunt, non illo qui fere omnibus notus est, sed ab alio nescio quo, &c. Aug. de H. c. 42.

^l — sed ab alio Syro quodam sceleratissimo. Præd. ib. c. 42.

^m Dam. de Hær. c. 63. n. s.

ⁿ Quidni igitur ignotus et Origenes aliquis turpibus Origenistis se fontem præbuit? Basn. A. 203. n. 25.

^o Tillem. Origene, Art. 26.

M. E. T. iii. P. 3. p. 209, 210.

^p Baron. Ann. 256. n. 47.

of this opinion too are ^a Huet and ^r Pagi; who deserve to be consulted; comparing likewise a note of the Benedictines, upon the forty-second chapter of Augustine's book of Heresies, I cannot but own, that I am much inclined to be of the same opinion: and, if I may be allowed to proceed somewhat farther, I would say, it seems to me that this whole story of the impure Origenists is without foundation. For, first, it depends entirely upon the authority of Epiphanius: this appears from what was observed before. Secondly, the account is in itself improbable; there are wicked people at all times: but it exceeds all bounds of probability, that men should avow principles and practices so absurd and shameful as those imputed to this people. Farther, thirdly, these people made high pretensions to strict piety: for, as ^s Epiphanius says, they spoke disadvantageously of marriage, as not sufficiently pure; and ^t they had among them men and women who professed a monastic, or solitary life; and ^u they sometimes censured the looseness of other christians, finding fault with those ecclesiastics who had subintroduced women in their houses. The account thereof in Epiphanius is inconsistent, and overthrows itself. Fourthly, if Epiphanius had had any certain knowledge, or good information, concerning this people, as a distinct sect, he would have been able to say whom they followed: but he owns he was an absolute stranger as to that point. This sect, therefore, of impure Origenists, is a fictitious and imaginary sect; owing its supposed existence to the calumnies of some bitter enemies of Origen and his admirers; the credulity of Epiphanius, and his too great facility in receiving the stories brought to him; together with his favourable sentiments of the virtue of the great Origen: for, being persuaded that ^v Origen was a good man, when some angry, not to say wicked, people brought him the relations he refers to, he concluded there was some sect called Origenists, whose rise and original he could not account for: whereupon he makes a distinct heresy of them.

It is easy to suppose there were shameful things done by some called Origenists; but so there were likewise by those who were for appropriating the title of good catholics to

^a Origenian. l. i. c. i. n. vii. p. 5.

^r Pagi, 253. n. 25.

^s Αθετησι δε γαμον. H. 63. n. i. p. 520. D.

^t Οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰσι προσχηματι μοναζοντων, αἱ δὲ συν αυτοις ἕσαι προσχηματι μοναζουσων. *ibid.*

^u Κατηγοροσι δε δηθεν των εν τη εκκλησια τας αγαπητας λεγομενας συνεισακτες γυναικας κεκτημενων. *ibid.*

n. ii. iii.

^v Vid. Epiphani. H. 64. n. ii. iii.

themselves : and perhaps such things were no where more frequent than among those who affected a monastic life. But I can see no good reason to make a new sect, for the sake of accounts which have so much the appearance of proceeding from the enmity and bitterness of a party spirit.

We need not labour to settle the time of these people ; they were in being in the time of Epiphanius, and probably had their beginning when some persons were first distinguished by the name of Origenists. I have spoken of them here out of regard to the order in which they are placed by Epiphanius, and because I was willing to put together some things of a like nature, and which are not of the utmost importance.

Nor need we to be at all concerned about what is said of their making use of some apocryphal scriptures, particularly the Acts of Andrew, and of some others ; for they who forged the other calumnies against this people, that is, the Origenists, or some of the followers of the great Origen, would make no scruple to add a particular or two of this sort ; and yet perhaps they did use some such writings, but not as writings of authority, any more than other christians did.

Next after the two last-mentioned articles, succeeds in Epiphanius, and divers other authors who write of heresies, that of Paul of Samosata. I shall have occasion to take notice of this in the history of the above-named ^w Dionysius.

CHAP. XLII.

ST. GREGORY, BISHOP OF NEOCÆSAREA.

- I. *His history.* II. *Testimonies to him.* III. *His time.*
 IV. *His works.* V. *His character.* VI. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament.*

I. I HAVE already mentioned Gregory of Neocæsarea in Pontus, as^a one of Origen's most noted scholars, and an account of Origen's letter to him. It is fit we should now have a more particular history of this renowned convert

^w See chap. xliii. num. viii.

^a Chap. xxxviii.

and bishop, of the best times, or near them; who is usually called *Thaumaturgus*, or the Wonder-worker, for the many and great miracles wrought by him.

Says^b Jerom, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, 'Theodore, who was afterwards called Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea in Pontus, being yet very young, for the sake of Greek and Roman learning, came with his brother Athenodorus from Cappadocia to Berytus, and thence to Cæsarea in Palestine. Origen, perceiving their fine genius, recommended to them the study of philosophy, with which he gradually instilled into them the faith of Christ, and took them into the number of his disciples. Having staid with him five years, they returned to their mother [perhaps it should be country]. Theodore, before he went away, composed a panegyric oration, to thank Origen, and recited it in a numerous audience, Origen being present; which is still extant. He wrote likewise a short but very useful paraphrase upon the book of Ecclesiastes. There are also several of his epistles to be found. But he is chiefly famous for the miracles he wrought when bishop, to the great honour of the churches.'

That is a summary of Gregory's whole life. There is an authentic history of the former part of it in the farewell, or panegyric, oration at Cæsarea, just mentioned, which was spoken in the year 238 or 239, as is generally supposed; though perhaps some may place it a few years sooner.

Gregory's parents^c were Gentiles. He lost his father when he was not more than fourteen years of age. Having received those rudiments of learning which are usually taught young persons of a plentiful condition, his^d mother sent him and his brother Athenodorus to a master of rhe-

^b Theodorus, qui postea Gregorius appellatus est, Neocæsareæ Ponti episcopus, admodum adolescens, ob studia Græcarum et Latinarum literarum, de Cappadociâ Berytum, et inde Cæsaream Palæstinæ transiit, juncto sibi fratre Athenodoro. Quorum cum egregiam indolem vidisset Origenes, hortatus est eos ad philosophiam: in quâ paulatim fidem introducens, sui quoque sectatores reddidit. Quinquennio itaque eruditi ab eo remittuntur ad matrem, e quibus Theodorus proficiscens *πανηγυρικον ευχαριστίας* scripsit Origeni, et convocatâ grandi frequentiâ, ipso quoque Origene præsentem, recitavit, qui usque hodie exstat. Scripsit et *μεταφρασιν* in Ecclesiasten, brevem quidem, sed valde utilem. Et aliæ hujus vulgo feruntur epistolæ, sed præcipue signa atque miracula, quæ jam episcopus cum multâ ecclesiarum gloriâ perperavit. Hieron. De Vir. Ill. c. 65.

^c Gregor. Orat. Paneg.

ad Orig. p. 55. B. Ed. Paris. 1621. ^d Εδοκει τη μονη εκ των γονεων κηδεσθαι ημων παραλειπομενη μητρι, τ' αλλα εκπαιδευομενης, οια παιδας εκ αγενεις δηθεν και φυντας και τρεφομενης, φοιταν και ρητορι, ως δε ρητορας εσομενης. ib. p. 56. B.

toric. He had besides another master to teach him the Latin tongue; not indeed with a design he should speak it, but that he might not be altogether ignorant of the language of the empire. This master was well skilled in the Roman laws. He earnestly recommended that study to his scholar: Gregory complied, and his master taught him with great application. It happened that at this time Gregory's sister, married to a lawyer, in esteem with the governor of Palestine, and chosen by him to be one of his assessors or counsellors, was sent for by her husband to come to him at Cæsarea. The^e officer, who came to conduct the lady to her husband, brought with him a good number of carriages, more than sufficient for her and her necessary attendants; and Gregory was induced to accompany his sister to Cæsarea, partly with a view of accommodating her, and rendering her journey more agreeable, partly because of the convenience that offered for going to Berytus in Phœnicia, where he might improve himself in the law under the celebrated professors of that science who resided there. Thus Gregory, by attending his sister, was conducted not to Berytus, but to Cæsarea, where^f Origen was newly arrived from Alexandria, as if on purpose to meet them.

As soon as Origen saw Gregory and his brother Athenodorus, he was desirous of retaining them with him, and he neglected no means to inspire them with a love of philosophy, as^g a foundation of true religion and piety. At length they were persuaded by the force of his arguments, and the charms of his conversation. Of^h Origen they learned logic, physics, geometry, astronomy, ethics. Heⁱ encouraged them likewise in the reading of all sorts of ancient authors, poets, and philosophers, whether Greeks or barbarians, restraining them from none but such as denied a deity or a providence, from whom no possible advantage could be obtained. But^k above all he inculcated

^e P. 57. B. C.

^f Τον δὲ ἱερον τῆτον ἀνδρα ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτῶ ἐκ τῆς Αλεξανδριῶν πολέως, ἐνθα τὴν ἐξίαν ἐχων ἐτύχε προτερον, καὶ αὐτον ἐκινεὶ καὶ μετανιῆσθ ἐπὶ τοῦ το χωριον, ὡσπερ ἀπαντησοντα ἡμιν, ἕτερα πραγματα. p. 57. B.

^g Οὐ τοιουν εἰς εὐσεβειν ὄλωσ δυνατον εἶναι ἐφασκεν, ὀρθως λεγων, μὴ φιλοσοφησαντι. p. 59. C.

^h P. 63, 64, 65.

ⁱ Φιλοσοφειν μὲν γαρ ἤξις ἀναλεγομένων τῶν ἀρχαίων πάντα ὅσα καὶ φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ἡμῶδων ἐπὶ γραμματα πάσῃ ἐνάμει, μῆδεν ἐκποιεμένους, μῆδ' ἀποδοκιμαζόντας—πλὴν ὅσα τῶν ἀθίων εἶη, ὅσοι—ἐκ εἶναι θεῶν, ἢ προνοίαν, λεγῶσι—τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πάσιν ἐντυγχάνειν καὶ προσομιλεῖν, γένος μὲν εἰς ἓν, εἰς λόγον φιλοσοφῶν προσημασάντας, ἐπεὶ αὐ ἀποδοκιμασάντας ἐπεὶ Ἑλληνικοῖν, ἐπεὶ βαρβαροῖν, πάντων δὲ ἀκροντας, p. 69. C. D.

^k μόνῳ δὲ προσεχέιν θεῶν, καὶ τοῖς τῆς προφηταῖς, αὐτός ὑποφητεύων καὶ σαφηνίζων, ὅτι ποτε ἴσκοτεινον καὶ αἰνιγματώδες γ, οἶα πολλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπὶ φωταῖς. *ibid.* p. 72. D.

a diligent attention to the mind of God, as revealed in the prophets; he himself explaining to them the obscure and difficult passages, when any such occurred: as certainly, says Gregory, there are many such in the sacred scriptures.

This is a very brief abstract of that oration, which, I think, if read throughout, must appear a monument of the composer's eminent abilities, and demonstrate likewise Origen's excellent method of educating those who were under his care; which indeed is honourable both to himself and the christian profession of that age.

Gregory now left *Cæsarea* with much regret. What was the reason is not certain, though there are some expressions¹ near the conclusion of the oration, which may lead us to think that some affairs of the family required his presence at home.

Gregory of Nyssa in Cappadocia, brother of St. Basil, who flourished^m about the year 372, and about a hundred years after *Thaumaturgus*, has left us a panegyric upon him, entitled, *An Oration upon the Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus*. We can by no means omit to take particular notice of this piece: but I shall transcribe only the most material things, and in as brief a manner as is suitable to our design.

The native country of our author, whom Nyssen calls the Great Gregory, was Pontus, his city *Neocæsarea*, and his family was rich and noble. Butⁿ these things, the advantages of that country, the splendour of his city, the honourable offices and titles of his ancestors, he forbears to insist on, having more important things to mention. His parents were involved in the error and folly of idolatry, which^o Gregory abandoned and became a disciple of the gospel, when he was enriched with the treasures of all the Greek learning; herein resembling Moses, of whom the scripture says, that "he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," Acts vii. 22. Thus our Gregory^p renounced heathenism, at a time when he was able to judge of the

¹ Φεροντες εκ των σπερματων και της καρπης και τας δραγμαδας, τελειας μεν εχι, πως γαρ; οιας δε δυνατον ημιν απο των εν πολιτεια πραξεων. κ. λ. p. 76. C. D.

^m Vid. Pagi, Crit. in Baron. 369. xvii.

ⁿ Αλλ' εδε των προγονων αυτη των προκαθηγησαμενων της κατα σαρκα γενεσεως μνημην επι τη λογη ποιησομαι, πλεστον και φιλοτιμιας, και τας κοσμικας περιφανειας αυτων εισηγησομαι. Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. Tom. iii. p. 537. D. vid. ib. A. B. C. et p. 536. D.

^o P. 538, 539. ^p Ούτως και ο μεγας βτος δια πασης ελθων της των Έλληνων παιδευσεως, και γνες τη περιρ των παρ' αυτοις δογματων το ασθενες και ασυστατον, μαθητης τε ευαγγελιω καθισταται. p. 540. A.

strength or the weakness of all the Gentile philosophy and theology.

Nyssen says, that^a Gregory studied secular learning for some time at Alexandria, where there was a great resort of youth from all parts for the sake of philosophy and medicine. Our young Gregory^r was even then distinguished by the sobriety and discretion of his behaviour. And a lewd woman having been employed by some idle people to disgrace him by indirect but impudent insinuations of intimacy with her, his reputation was vindicated in a remarkable manner: for the woman was immediately seized with such horrible fits, as demonstrated them to be a judgment of Heaven; nor^s was she relieved from the dæmon that had taken possession of her, till Gregory had interceded with God for her, and obtained the pardon of her fault.

Hitherto Gregory was a heathen; but his conversion was near: for soon after this he^t was conducted to Origen, then the chief master of the christian philosophy, and still celebrated for his writings. To his instructions Gregory now committed himself; and when he returned into his native country, as Nyssen says, he retired from the world to a private life in a desert place.

His ordination was very remarkable, if not singular. Phedimus, bishop of Amasea, knowing the worth of this young man, and being grieved that a person of such accomplishments should live useless in the world, was desirous to consecrate him to God and his church. On the other hand, Gregory was shy of such a charge, and industriously concealed himself from the bishop of Amasea, whose design he was aware of. At length Phedimus, tired of his fruitless attempts to meet Gregory, and being blessed with the gift of foreknowledge, looking^u up to God, to whom they were both present, instead of laying his hands upon Gregory, addressed a discourse to him, and consecrated him to God, though bodily absent; assigning him also a city, which till that time was so addicted to idolatry, that in it, and in all the country round about, there were not above seventeen believers.

^a Εἰς ἣν καὶ ἡ πανταχοθεν συνέβρι νεότης τῶν περὶ φιλοσοφίαν τε καὶ ἰατρικὴν ἐσπᾶδακῶτων. p. 540. B. ^r P. 540, 541, 542.

^s Καὶ εἰς προτερον ἀνηκεν καταπιγιον αὐτὴν τὸ δαιμονιον, πρὶν ἢ τὸν μεγαν ἐκεινον επικαλεσασθαι τὸν Θεον, καὶ ὑπερ αὐτῆς ἰλεωσασθαι. p. 541. B.

^t Καταλιπων πασαν τὴν περὶ τῆς ἐξω φιλοσοφίας σπᾶδην, προσφοῖτα μετ' ἐκεινῶ τῷ κατα τὸν χρόνον ἐκεινον τῆς τῶν χριστιανῶν φιλοσοφίας καθηγμενῶ ὀριγενῆς δε οὗτος ἦν, εἰ πολὺς ἐπὶ συγγραμμάσι λόγος. p. 542. D.

^u P. 544. D. 545. A.

Gregory was then at the distance of three days' journey. Nyssen does not inform us how Gregory came to the knowledge of what had been done: however, he says, that now Gregory thought himself obliged to acquiesce; and that afterwards he was ordained with the usual ceremonies. He only desired ^v of him, by whom he had been ordained, a short time to prepare himself for the office to which he was appointed: nor ^w had he courage to undertake the work of preaching, till he had been informed of the truth by revelation. And, ^x whilst he was engaged in deep meditation, he had a magnificent and awful vision in his chamber: two persons appeared, one in the habit of a man, the other of a woman; encompassed also by a bright light, too strong for him to look upon directly. He heard these persons discourse together about the doctrines in which he desired to be informed: and he perceived who they were; for they called each other by name. The person in the habit of a woman desired that John the evangelist would teach that young man the mystery of piety: and he replied, that he was not unwilling to do what was desired by the mother of our Lord. John then gave him the instruction he wanted; which, when they had disappeared, Gregory wrote down. According to that faith he always preached, and ^y left it with his church, as an invaluable treasure, a doctrine received from heaven: by which means his people from that time to this were preserved pure from all heretical pravity. Nyssen then puts down the faith or creed which Gregory received from John; of which I shall speak more distinctly hereafter. And then he adds, 'If ^z any are desirous of farther satisfaction about this matter, let him inquire of the church, in which Gregory preached that doctrine, and with whom it is still preserved in the handwriting of that blessed man.'

Gregory, being now qualified for his work, both by a certain knowledge of the truth, and a sufficient degree of assurance, left ^a his solitude, and went directly toward the

^v Και βραχυν χρονον αιτησαμενος παρα τε την ιερωσυνην επικηρυξαντος. ε. λ. p. 445. A.

^w Και ε προτερον επεθαρσησε τω τε λογω κηρυγματι, πριν δια τινος εμφανειας εκκαλυφθηναι αυτω την αληθειαν. *ibid.* B.

^x P. 545. C. D. 546. ^y Τον δε παραχρημα την θειαν εκεινην μυσταγωγίαν γραμμασιν ενσημηνασθαι, και κατ' εκεινην μετα ταυτα κηρυσσειν εν τη εκκλησια τον λογον' και τοις εφ' εξης, ωσπερ τινα κληρον, την θεοσδοτον εκεινην διδασκαλιαν καταλιπειν' δι' ης μυσταγωγεται μεχρι τε νυν ο εκεινος λαος, πασης αρετικης κακιας διαμεινας απειρατος. p. 546. B. C.

^z 'Οτω δε φιλον περι ταυτων πεισθηναι, ακρω της εκκλησιας, εν η τον λογον κηρυττεν, παρ' οίς αυτα τα χαραγματα της μακαριας εκεινης χειρος εις ετε και νυν διασωζεται. p. 547. A.

^a *Ib.* D. 548, 549.

city that had been assigned him, and in which he was to form a church to God. As he was in his journey, being benighted, and overtaken by a violent storm, he and his friends with him were obliged to take shelter in a heathen temple. It was a temple of great fame, in which the dæmon who was there worshipped used to appear evidently to the priests, and deliver oracles. Gregory having gone away early in the morning, the priest performed the accustomed rites: but he was answered by the dæmon, that he could no more appear in that place, because of him that had lodged there the foregoing night. The priest, greatly enraged at hearing this, pursued Gregory; and, having overtaken him, threatened to inform the magistrates against him: but Gregory, not at all dismayed, told the priest, that he had such confidence in the power of the Being whom he served, that he not only relied upon his protection from men, but was also persuaded, that with his assistance he could expel dæmons from any place, and re-admit them as he saw fit. And as a demonstration of such power, he took a slip of paper, and^b wrote upon it, ‘Gregory to Satan: Enter.’ This paper being laid upon the altar, and the accustomed rites performed, the dæmon appeared as usual. The priest was now convinced that Gregory was guided by a power superior to dæmons: he therefore returned to him, relating what had happened, and desired to be farther instructed in the christian religion. But some doubts still remaining, Gregory wrought another evident miracle: at his command^c a large heavy stone lying before them moved, as if it had life, and settled again in the place Gregory directed. The priest was now fully satisfied; and, forsaking all things, wife, children, relations, his priesthood, home, and all his possessions, followed Gregory; esteeming his company, and fellowship with him in his divine philosophy, instead of all other things. This priest^d was afterwards one of Gregory’s deacons.

The^e fame of these great works outwent Gregory, so that the city was before-hand provided for his reception; and he entered in the midst of a vast crowd of people, who even came out to meet him with their wives and children. Gregory, as^f Nyssen says, had before now disposed of all his estate, and at this time had nothing of his own; no land, no house, no habitation. His friends therefore, who accompanied him, were in pain for him; but he trusted in God;

^b *Ἦν δὲ τὰ γραμμάτια ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς λέξεως ταῦτα· Γρηγόριος τῷ Σατανᾷ Εἰσελάθε.* p. 549. C.

^c P. 550. A. B.

^d Vid. p. 569. D.

^e P. 551, 552.

^f Ibid.

and when he entered the city he had many kind and pressing invitations made him. He took up his abode with one Musonius, a man of the greatest distinction in the city for his quality, estate, and authority, and who had made the first offer of entertaining our young bishop. That very day, before sunset, he had made many converts. Early the next morning, men and women, of every rank and age in the city, were before the door of the house; and his success continued. Every one who had need of help was relieved, whether possessed with dæmons or afflicted with any bodily distemper; and all were admonished of the duties peculiarly suited to their age, relation, or station in life. He^ε preached, he argued, he persuaded, he healed.

The number of believers being greatly increased, in a short time he^h formed a design of building a church, to which all readily contributed by their labour or their purses. Tillemontⁱ observes, that this is no unlikely thing, the christians enjoying all manner of liberty under Philip, who began his reign in the year 244. But, as he adds, this is the first church of which history gives us any certain and express information. This church, as^k Nyssen says, was standing in his time: it must therefore have escaped the general demolition of churches in the Dioclesian persecution; as it did likewise a terrible earthquake afterwards, in which, as Nyssen^l affirms, almost all the other buildings of the city, public and private, were overthrown.

Gregory being in great reputation for wisdom, abundance of people referred their differences to him, who readily acquiesced in his determinations. But^m there were two brothers whom he could by no means reconcile. A certain lake was the matter in dispute. When they were about to decide the cause by arms, the tenants of the two brothers fighting on each side, Gregory went to the lake the night before, and at his prayers it was dried up. The riverⁿ Lye, or Lycus, often overflowing, to the great damage of the neighbouring country, at the desire of the people who suffered by those inundations, Gregory prescribed it proper limits, which it never passed afterwards.

Gregory Nyssen^o then relates the story of our Gregory's remarkable ordination of Alexander, called the collier, at

^ε Και εν μεσοις εκεινος προς την εκατθ των συνειλεγμενων χρειαν αρμοδιως τη δυναμει τθ πνευματος μεριζομενος, κηρυσσων, συνεξεταζων, νθετων, διδασκων, ωμενος. p. 553. D. ^h P. 554. B.

ⁱ S. Gregoire Thaumaturge. Art. vii. Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 679.

^k P. 554. A. B.

^l Ibid. C.

^m P. 555, 556.

ⁿ P. 558, 559, 560.

^o P. 561, 562.

Comana. As Gregory was returning home from thence, two men agreed to put a trick upon him. One of them laid in the road as dead; the other begged of the bishop to give him somewhat to bury his poor companion. As Gregory passed by, he threw his cloak upon the pretended dead man. As soon as Gregory was out of sight, the other called to his companion to get up; but he had expired at the very instant Gregory cast his cloak upon him, which therefore now served for his burial cloth. Sozomen,^p relating a like story concerning Epiphanius, recollects this also of Gregory, and he thinks they may be both true.

After his return to Neocæsarea, Gregory^q cured a young man possessed of a dæmon: and^r many people were delivered from dæmons, and relieved of their diseases, by only having pieces of linen brought to them, which had been breathed upon by him.

During the episcopate of Gregory, a^s persecution of the christians was ordered by imperial edicts, which was very severe in those parts. It is universally allowed that Nyssen means the Decian persecution, though he does not name the emperor. Gregory,^t considering the weakness of human nature, advised his people, as many as could, to save themselves by flight: and, to remove all scruples, he gave them an example by retiring into a solitary place, taking with him the priest before mentioned, now his deacon. Here Gregory was sought for, but was miraculously preserved: for though his pursuers came to the place where he and his companion were, they did not see, or did not know, them. In short, their eyes were so withheld, that they could see nothing but two trees. However, notwithstanding the fore-mentioned good advice of Gregory, many^u of his people were taken up, and imprisoned, and endured divers torments, and even death itself; he assisting them by his prayers, and by the counsel which he sent to them.

When the persecution was over, Gregory returned to Neocæsarea; and peace being restored to the church about the year 253, as may be supposed, he visited the several parts of his diocese, and^v transferred the bodies of divers

^p Sozom. l. vii. cap. 27.

^q Nyssen. p. 566.

^r Ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖν πρὸς τε τὴν τῶν δαιμονίων ἀπαλλαγὴν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἰασὴν τῶν ἀρρώγηματων τῆς σωματὸς τοῦ ἐκ τῆς σωματὸς αὐτῆς ἀσθμα δια τῆς οἰουμένης τῆς καμνόντι προσαγομένον. p. 567. A.

^s P. 567, 568.

^t P. 569. C. D.

^u P. 570, 571, &c.

^v Τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνηθλοκῶτων τῆς πίστεως πανηγυρεῖς νομοθετήσας· καὶ διαλαβόντες ἄλλοις ἀλλαγῆ τῶν μαρτύρων τὰ σώματα, κατὰ τὴν ἐτησίον τῆς ἐνανσιαίας κυκλικῆς περιόδου συνιόντες ἠγαλλόντο, τῆς τιμῆς τῶν μαρτύρων πανηγυρίζοντες. p. 574. A. B.

who had suffered martyrdom in the late persecution to several places at proper and convenient distances; where he appointed anniversary festivals and solemnities in memory of the martyrs, indulging the people upon those occasions with a little more than ordinary mirth: which, says Nyssen, was wisely done, for many weak and ignorant people being fond of the heathen superstition, because of the diversions it allowed of, Gregory approved that people should be merry and divert themselves on the memorials of the martyrs; hoping by that means to bring them off from idolatry to the general principles of religion, and gradually to more complete virtue.

In some part of Gregory's episcopate the country of Pontus was afflicted with a sore and terrible plague. As Gregory ^w gave some intimations of it beforehand, and he was helpful to many, not only by the charitable relief he afforded, but ^x likewise by the miraculous cures he wrought, great numbers were brought to the profession of christianity at that season. In a word, ^y when this bishop was near his death, reflecting upon his labours, and hearing there were still seventeen unbelievers in that country, it gave him no small concern: however, he thought it matter of much joy and thanksgiving, that he left his successor no more idolaters than he had found christians.

This is the account which Gregory of Nyssa has given of his namesake of Neocæsarea; upon which many remarks might be made. It is plain it is a panegyric, not a history. Nyssen is so intent upon the marvellous, that he has scarce any regard to common things: he relates distinctly the mysterious faith which Gregory received one night from John the evangelist; but he despatches in a very few words the instructions which Gregory received from Origen: though he was five years under his tuition, and had before him excellent materials to enlarge upon concerning that part of our bishop's history. Then he takes little or no notice of circumstances of time and place, or the names of persons; these he omits as things of no moment. Indeed he has been so good as to inform us of Gregory's native city and country, and that he studied some while, as he says, at Alexandria; but he does not let us know where Gregory was acquainted with Origen, whether at Alexandria, or at Cæsarea. He has not once named the city where Gregory was bishop: and in the description of Gregory's arrival in the city assigned him, and where he was to reside, there is no notice taken that it was his native

^w P. 576^x P. 577.^y P. 574, D. 575. A.

place: nay, one might be almost apt to think he was an absolute stranger there, and unknown to every body. He does not inform us of the temple where Gregory lodged and silenced the *dæmon*; neither where it stood, nor to what god it was dedicated. He has not so much as once mentioned the name of the priest who was converted in so extraordinary a manner; who, so far as appears, was our bishop's first convert, and was afterwards a deacon of the church. Nor has he mentioned the name of any one of the many persons, subjects of Gregory's miraculous works. However, it should be owned that he has not concealed the name of the river, whose inundations are said to have been restrained by this mighty man. As before observed, he omits the name of the emperor, author of the persecution that was so severe, and which was so remarkable for Gregory's flight and preservation, and many glorious martyrdoms. Finally, perhaps, it may be reckoned by some an inexcusable defect, that in this long oration not any the least notice is taken of Athenodorus, Gregory's brother, and the companion of his travels and studies and conversion to the faith, and afterwards bishop likewise in the same country of Pontus. All these omissions seem unaccountable.

Possibly it will be said, that it was contrary to the rules of rhetoric to be more particular in an oration. If that be so, and all that Nyssen aimed at was to entertain his hearers or readers with a fine piece of oratory, we must consider it as such; but then, though it may afford us some good entertainment, it will hardly be a ground of much faith: for a story to be amusing is one thing, to be credible another.

Farther, the relations of most of the miracles are liable to some other exceptions. The story of the woman at Alexandria, is trifling and unlikely. Nay,² Basnage says, Gregory never studied at Alexandria. And he may be in the right as to this, so far as I know; then this is a mere fiction, as the same learned writer argues. The moving of the stone at the command of Gregory is silly and romantic, or at least vain and insignificant, and therefore also improbable. The silencing the *dæmon* by a message sent in writing must surely appear absurd, though it should be allowed to be referred to by some other^a writers. Besides,

² Quæ igitur de meretrice Alexandriæ, quæ sese cum Gregorio consuescere simulavit, et numeratâ scorto pecuniâ, et *dæmone* in fauces ejus involante, narrantur, lepidæ sunt fabulæ, quæ fractis illabentis Alexandrinæ professionis rudibus obruuntur. Basn. ann. 240. iv.

^a Socrates certainly refers to it. L. iv. cap. 27. And Basil is thought to do so likewise, when he says Gregory had a power terrible to *dæmons*: *ὄγ*

Gregory leaves Satan in possession of the temple, which I think was not well done, if he was able to send him away : and this continuance of Satan at the temple confutes the former account ; it seems to show it to be a mere fiction. If Gregory had once dispossessed Satan, he would not have allowed him to resume and keep possession afterwards. Basnage, though he does not dispute every thing related by Nyssen, greatly dislikes this^b story.

I do not intend to deny that Gregory wrought miracles ; for I suppose he did, as I shall acknowledge more particularly by and by : nevertheless, there is no harm in making these remarks, if they are just ; or in showing that Nyssen's relations are defective, and want some tokens of credibility, with which we should have been mightily pleased.

As for what he says of Gregory's appointing anniversary festivals and solemnities in honour of the martyrs that had suffered in his diocese, and allowing people upon those occasions some unusual mirth and rejoicings, I am sure this is no apostolical method of making conversions ; nor was it practised in the most primitive times next after the apostles ; and I am not satisfied of the truth of what Nyssen says. As I am unwilling to lay hold of every thing he writes to advance this bishop's honour, so neither do I take this particular upon his credit, which tends to diminish that honourable idea I am willing to have of him, and for which I think I have good ground. This childish method of making converts appears unworthy of so wise and good a man as Gregory. Nor is it likely that those festivals should be instituted by one who had the gift of miracles, and therefore a much better way of bringing men to religion and virtue.

We have now perused the summary of Gregory's life in Jerom : the history of the early part of his life we have had from himself ; and Gregory of Nyssa has afforded us an entertaining account of this great man from the beginning to the time of his death.

φοβερον μὲν εἶχεν ἐκ τῆς τῆ πνεύματος συνεργίας κατὰ δαιμονῶν τὸ κράτος. De Sp. S. cap. 29. p. 62. D. But here the reference to this matter is not clear and certain. Basil might intend some of Gregory's miracles, dispossessing dæmons out of the bodies of men.

^b Fidem tamen a nobis non impetrat festiva Nysseni narratio. Nempe quod dæmoni, quem templo suo expulerat, rogatus a sacerdote, ut rursus in ædem suam exulem introduceret, in exiguo libri frustulo scripserit : Gregorius Satanæ ; Intra. Quæ licentia vix absque peccato dari potuit, neque vel ad eam concedendam, missâ ad diabolum epistolâ opus fuit. Quod sane mirum est scribendi genus, ac indignissimum viro sancto commercium. Basn. ann. 240. vi.

II. Gregory is mentioned by many ancient writers. I shall here add some of their passages; they may be considered as testimonies. The writers I shall cite are, Origen, Eusebius, Jerom again, Basil, Theodoret, and Socrates; omitting some others, as not so material witnesses, and for avoiding too great prolixity.

Origen, in his letter to Gregory, probably written not many months after his return home, tells him, ‘His^c capacity was such, that he might be either a Roman lawyer of the first rank, or a celebrated Greek philosopher.’ But he adviseth him to make the christian religion his chief study.

Eusebius, speaking of Origen’s scholars, says, ‘The^d most noted of them were Theodore, called also Gregory, the most renowned bishop of our time, and his brother Athenodorus; whom when Origen observed to be too fond of Greek and Roman learning, instilling into them a love of philosophy, he drew them off from their former studies to divine things. Having stayed with him five whole years, they made such progress in the knowledge of the divine oracles, that whilst they were yet very young they were both appointed bishops in Pontus.’ In another place, relating things under Gallienus, about the year 260, he says, ‘At^e that time Gregory and his brother Athenodorus governed the churches in Pontus.’ And among the bishops assembled from several parts in the first council at Antioch in 264, ‘The most considerable,’ he^f says, ‘were Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the two brothers Gregory and Athenodorus, pastors of the churches in Pontus, Helenus of Tarsus, and some others.’

Jerom, in his letter to Magnus, so often cited already, among other eminent christian authors, mentions^g Theodore, afterwards named Gregory, and calls him a man of apostolical signs and wonders.

What Basil, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, has written of our Gregory, may deserve some special notice.

In his Treatise of the Holy Spirit, after having mentioned divers ancient ecclesiastical writers of chief note; such as

^c Δυναται εν ἡ ευφρυνια σα Ῥωμαιον σε νομικον ποιειν τελειον, και Ἑλληνικον τινα φιλοσοφον των νομιζομενων ελλογιμων αιρεσεων. Orig. Ep. ad Greg. T. i. p. 30. D. Bened.

^d Ὁν επισημιες μαλιτα εγνωμεν Θεοδωρον,—ὅς ην αυτος ούτος ὁ καθ’ ἡμας επισκοπων διαβοητος Γρηγοριος, κ. λ. H. E. l. vi. cap. 30.

^e L. vii. cap. 14.

^f Ibid. cap. 28.

^g Exstant et Julii Africani libri, qui temporum scripsit historias; et Theodori, qui postea Gregorius appellatus est, viri apostolicorum signorum atque virtutum. Hieron. ep. 83. [al. 84.] p. 656. m.

Irenæus, Dionysius of Rome, and him of Alexandria, Origen, Africanus, and others; he adds; ‘But^h where shall I place the great Gregory, and his words? Ought he not to be ranked with the apostles and prophets; a man who walked in the same spirit with them, who always followed the footsteps of the saints, and in the whole of his conduct was a complete model of the evangelical life? 2 Cor. xii. 18. For my part, I must say, we should be injurious to the truth, if we do not reckon that soul in the number of those who were dearest to God, who shined in the church as a large burning lamp, who by the mighty operation of the Spirit had a power terrible to dæmons, who received such grace of the word “for the obedience of faith among all nations,” (Rom. i. 5,) that though at first he found only seventeen christians, he brought over to the acknowledgment of God all the people both of the city and the neighbouring country. He also turned the course of rivers, commanding them in the all-powerful name of Christ; and dried up a lake, which was the subject of contention between covetous brothers. His predictions of things future are such, as not to be inferior to those of other prophets. But it would be too long to reckon up all the miracles of this person, who, for the abundance of the gifts wrought in him by the Holy Spirit, “in all power,” [or, mighty deeds] “signs and wonders,” (2 Cor. xii. 12,) was called a second Moses by the enemies of the truth. Such was the grace of all his words and actions, that he appeared to be adorned with a peculiar light and splendour, and indication of the heavenly power by which he was conducted. He is still the admiration of all the people of that country; and the memory of him is ever fresh and lively in the churches, not at all abated by length of time; forⁱ which reason they have not taken up any custom, word, or mystical rite, beside what they received from him. Insomuch, that that church appears defective in many respects, because they have nothing but what is ancient; for they who have succeeded him in the government of the churches would admit of none of those things that have been since invented, but have kept entirely to the first institutions, as derived from him.’

^h Basil, De Sp. S. cap. 29. T. iii. p. 62, 63. Bened.

ⁱ Ουκεν η πραξιν τινα, η λογον, η τυπον τινα μυτικον, παρ’ ον εκεινος κατελιπε, τη εκκλησια προσεθηκαν. Ταυτη τοι και πολλα των παρ’ αυτοις τελεμενων ελλειπως εχειν δοκει, δια το της κατατασεως αρχαιοτροπον ουδεν γαρ ημεσχοντο οι κατα διαδοχην τας εκκλησιας οικονομησαντες, των μετ’ εκεινον εφευρεθειτων παραδεξασθαι εις προσθηκην. Ibid. p. 63. A. B.

This is the great character which Basil gives of Gregory, and this is what he says here of his people. Nevertheless, this church of Neocæsarea, the people of Gregory, were very troublesome to the same Basil, or he gave himself a great deal of trouble and uneasiness about them; for in divers of his letters he complains that they were all Sabellians; and he laments the strange aversion they had for him; which appears to have been general in the bishop, clergy, people, and even the near relations of Basil in that church.

In a letter to the Neocæsareans, written about the year 375, entreating their good will and reconciliation to him, he says, ‘That ^k one thing which should unite them in affection is, that he and they had the same instructors in the mysteries of religion, and the same spiritual fathers: I mean, says he, the great and admirable Gregory, and those who have succeeded him in the episcopal chair with you, as stars arising one after another, all walking in the same steps, leaving to all who are disposed to attend manifest traces of an heavenly conversation.’ Afterwards, in the same letter, ‘And^l what stronger proof can there be of [the orthodoxy of] our faith, than that we were educated by our grandmother, that blessed woman sprung from among you? I mean the celebrated Macrina, by whom we were taught the words of the most blessed Gregory, as she had received them and preserved them in her memory, when she taught us in our childhood the principles of religion and virtue.’

In another letter written to the clergy of Neocæsarea, after complaining of their ^m universal agreement with their bishop in an opposition against him, he writes, ‘Doⁿ not follow those who introduce among you impious doctrines; nor do you sit still whilst in your sight the people of God is subverted by corrupt principles. Sabellius, an African, and Marcellus of Galatia, are the only persons that have taught and written those things, which some leading men among you now produce as inventions of their own; talking, indeed, with much assurance, but

^k Ep. 204. [al. 75.] p. 303. C. D. *ibid.*

^l Πιστως δε της ημετερας, τις αν γενοιτο εναργεστερα αποδυξις, η οτι τραφεντες ημεις υπο τιθη μακαρια γυναικι, παρ’ υμων ωρημενη; Μακριναν λεγω την περιβοητον, παρ’ ης ειδαχθημεν τα τε μακαριωτατα Γρηγοριου ρηματα, οσα προς αυτην ακολουθια μνημης διασωθεντα αυτη τε εφυλασσε, και ημας επι νηπιωσ οντας επλαττε και εμορφη τοις της ευσεβειας δογμασιν. p. 306. B.

^m Η μεν συμφωνια τε καθ’ ημων μισωσ, και το μεχρισ ενωσ παντασ ακολουθησαι τω προεστωτι τε καθ’ ημασ πολεμω. κ. λ. Ep. 207. [al. 63.] p. 309. D.

ⁿ *Ibid.* E.

‘ bringing no plausible arguments for what they say. ‘ These men reproach us without any regard to truth, but ‘ will not come to discourse with us.—Yea, they are arrived ‘ at such impudence as^o to calumniate our doctrine as ‘ pernicious.’ He goes on: ‘ And^p what is the ground of ‘ this implacable hatred of me? They say that I have ‘ introduced psalms and a method of singing different from ‘ your custom; and other such like things they say, which ‘ they might be ashamed to mention. We are likewise ‘ accused that we have among us men who “ exercise them- ‘ selves unto godliness,” who have renounced the world and ‘ all earthly cares, which the Lord compares to “ briars and ‘ thorns, which suffer not the word to bring forth fruit to ‘ perfection;” men who “ bear about the dying of Jesus in ‘ their body,” and “ take up the cross, and follow God,”’ 1 Tim. iv. 7; Matt. xiii. 22; Luke viii. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 10; Matt. xvi. 24. Basil adds, he hears there are already such men in Egypt, and perhaps likewise in Palestine and in Mesopotamia, and more than in his diocese. ‘ Moreover,’ says he, ‘ if some women, choosing an evangelical life, prefer ‘ virginity to marriage, bringing into subjection the desires ‘ of the flesh, practising that mourning on which a blessing ‘ is pronounced; (Matt. v. 4.) blessed are they for this ‘ their purpose, in whatever part of the world they are.— ‘ For^q I would have you to know that we glory in this, ‘ that we have societies of men and women whose “ con- ‘ versation is in heaven,” (Philip. iii. 20.) who “ have cru- ‘ cified the flesh with its affections and lusts, (Gal. v. 24.) ‘ who are not solicitous about meat and dress, but are ‘ “ without distraction,” (1 Cor. vii. 35.) and constantly ‘ attend on the Lord, and “ continue in supplications night ‘ and day,” (1 Tim. v. 5.) whose mouth speaketh not the ‘ works of men, but they sing hymns to our God without ‘ ceasing, “ working with their own hands, that they may ‘ give to him that needeth,”’ Eph. iv. 28. Then he re- turns to the charge brought against him for the new psalmody, by which especially, as^r he says, they terrified

^o Διαβαλλοντες ἡμῶν τας διδασκαλιας, ὡς βλαβερὰς. Ibid. p. 310. B.

^p Καν την αιτιαν ερωτηθωσι τε ακηρικτα τετα και ασπονδὸς πολεμοι, ψαλμοι λεγεται και τροπον μελωδιας, της παρ’ ἡμιν κεκρατηκυιας συνηθειας παρηλαγαμενον, και τοιαυτα τινα, εφ’ οἷς εχρην αυτες εγκλυπτεσθαι. Εγκαλεμεθα δε, οτι και ανθρωποις εχομεν της ευσεβειας ασκητας, αποταξαμενος τῷ κοσμῳ, και πασαις ταις βιωτικαις μεριμναις. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 310. C.

^q Γινωσκειν δε ἡμας βελομαι, οτι ἡμεις ευχομεθα και ανδρων και γυναικων συσηματα εχειν. κ. λ. p. 310. E. 311. A.

^r Προς δε το εν ψαλμοδιαις εγκλημα, ὡ μαλιτα της ἀπλευστερης φοβωσιν οἱ διαβαλλοντες ἡμας. p. 311. A.

the more simple people, and exasperated them against him. Here Basil describes that new way of singing which gave offence, and then goes on again: ‘But^s these things, they say, were not in the time of the great Gregory. To which I answer, Nor yet the litanies [penitential prayers] you make use of: not that I blame you for that, for I could wish that you all lived in tears and in continued penance. —But after all,’ says Basil, ‘you retain nothing of Gregory; for^t he did not pray with his head covered.—He did not swear.—He did not call his brother fool.—He did not come to the altar before he had been reconciled to his brother.’ Thus Basil goes on, giving these men hard words, when perhaps the same, or like things, might be said too truly of Basil’s own friends and admirers, or any other people; especially if a man is out of humour with them because they do not submit to his will and pleasure. ‘But,’ says^u he, ‘we forgive every thing; only let the great things of religion be preserved: let there not be any innovations made in the faith: do not overthrow the subsistences, [hypostases,] do not deny the name of Christ: do not misinterpret the words of Gregory.’

From these several passages I think it appears, that Gregory’s church at Neocæsarea were now an old-fashioned people, christians of the primitive sort. There were some new hymns, or psalms, begun to be made use of by others which they did not approve of. They likewise disliked the new psalmody, which was a more artificial way of singing than was heretofore in use in the churches of Christ. Monasteries of men and women were another innovation which gave them offence: and when it is considered that Basil was fond of all these things, particularly of monasteries, and was the^v first person who introduced them into the countries of Cappadocia and Pontus, some will be able to account for the angry and contemptuous treatment which Basil gives the Neocæsareans. The opposition which those good people made to his new schemes was, it seems, a high provocation. But some may think that those christians had good reason to oppose some of his measures, and take offence at them; and not a few persons of good judgment may still be displeased, when they observe how he debaseth

^s Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἦν, φησι, ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῆ μεγάλῃ Γρηγορίᾳ. p. 311. D.

^t Γρηγορίου οὐ κατεκαλυπτετο ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν. *ibid.* E.

^u Μόνον ἐρῶσθω τα προηγουμένα, καὶ τὰς περὶ τὴν πίσιω καινοτομίας κατασιγάσατε· τὰς ὑποτάσεις μὴ ἀθετεῖτε· τὸ ὄνομα τῆ Χριστοῦ μὴ ἀπαρνείσθε· τὰς τῆ Γρηγορίου φωνὰς μὴ παρέξηγησθε. *ibid.* p. 312. C.

^v *Vid.* Vit. St. Basil. cap. vi. num. i. p. 53. B. C. D. Bened.

the sublime sense of many texts, and perverts the scriptures in support of his monastic institutions.

Basil says, that the Neocæsareans then had litanies, or penitential prayers, not used in Gregory's time: and insinuates, that they prayed with their heads covered. What they would say for themselves with regard to these two points, I cannot tell; but as for their doctrine about the hypostases, or subsistences, it is plain from Basil, that they defended their sentiment out of Gregory's writings. What Basil says of their having nothing of Gregory left among them, is extravagant. He has himself bore them his testimony, that they had a vast respect for the founder of their church; and that they were so shy of admitting later inventions, that they appeared defective and antiquated, in comparison of many other churches of that age.

We must make extracts out of another letter of Basil, written to the chief men of Neocæsarea. Basil was then at a place in the neighbourhood of that city: his coming so near them put the whole city into confusion: to abate their resentments, he reminds them of his education^w by his grandmother, in that very place, and assures them that he came thither now for retirement. He reminds them also of the respect they formerly had for him, when their whole city invited him and pressed him with much earnestness and importunity to undertake the education of their youth. 'But,' says he, 'I will tell you what is the ground of this animosity against me, which prevails to such a degree in your city. It is no other than this: there^x is among you a design to overthrow the faith, in opposition to the apostolical and evangelical doctrine, and the tradition of the truly great Gregory, and all his successors to the blessed Musonius, whose words must still sound in your ears. For the heresy of Sabellius, which some now endeavour to revive, was formerly extinguished by the tradition of that great man.—Sabellianism^y is judaism, brought into the church under the name of christianity.—These^z men

^w Ἐνταυθα γὰρ ἐτραφὴν παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς μητρὸς. Ep. 110. [al. 64.] p. 313. D.

^x Πιτρώως διαστροφή παρ' ἡμῶν μελετάται, ἐχθρὰ μὲν τοῖς ἀποστολικοῖς καὶ εὐαγγελικοῖς δογμασίν, ἐχθρὰ δὲ τῇ παραδόσει τῆς μεγάλης ὡς ἀληθῶς Γρηγορίου, καὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ἀπ' ἐκείνων, μέχρι τῆς μακαρίου Μουσωνίου· οὐ τὰ διδάγματα ἐναντὶ ἡμῶν ἐσὶν ἐτι καὶ νῦν δηλονότι· τὸ γὰρ Σαβελλιῶν κακόν, παλαι μὲν κινήθη, κατασβεσθέν δὲ τῇ παραδόσει τῆς μεγάλης ἐπιχειροῦσι νῦν ἀνανεῶσθαι οὗτοι. p. 314. D. E.

^y P. 315. A.

^z Καθῆκαν δὲ τίνα πειραν εἰ ἐπιτολῆς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὁμοψυχὸν ἡμῶν Ἀνθιμον τῶν Τυανῶν ἐπισκοποῦν· ὡς ἀρα Γρηγορίου εἰπόντος ἐν ἐκθεσὶ πιτρώως, πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἐπινοῶν μὲν εἶναι δύο, ὑποτάσει δὲ ἓν. Τῆσο δὲ ὅτι καὶ δογματικῶς ἐρητῆται, ἀλλ' ἀγωνιστικῶς, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Αἰλιανὸν διαλεξίῃ, οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν συνιδεῖν οἱ ἐπὶ λεπτοτητῇ τῶν φρενῶν ἑαυτῶς μακαρίζοντες· ἐν ἣ πολλὰ τῶν

‘pretend, in a letter to Anthimus, bishop of Tyanna, who is of the same mind with us, that Gregory says, in his Exposition of the Faith, that the Father and Son are two in our conception, but one in hypostasis. These acute and subtle people, it seems, cannot see that this is not spoken dogmatically, [or as a point of doctrine,] but agonistically, [or, in the haste and fervour of disputation,] in conference with Ælian; in which too there are many faults of the transcribers, as I will show, if God permit. Besides, teaching a Gentile, he did not think it necessary to be accurate in his expressions; for it was fit to yield a little to a man that was to be brought over to the faith, that he might not reject the chief things: insomuch, that you may find three several words which afford the greatest advantage to the heretics of this time; such as creature, made, and the like.’

Thus writes Basil. Certainly this is a slight apology: no one can think that Gregory owes any thanks to the author of it. However, let us make a few remarks.

I. Basil says, the people of Neocæsarea had been taught the right faith by all their bishops down to Musonius; whose successor therefore, their present bishop, was the first person who taught among them the doctrine which Basil dislikes: and Basil here says fine things of that Musonius, and calls him a blessed man, now he was dead and gone; but when he was living, Basil did not agree with him; no better, perhaps, than with his successor, the present bishop. That they differed to a great degree Basil owns in a letter^a written soon after the death of Musonius; though he says it was not about doctrinals that they differed, but only about some matters relating to the discipline or peace of the churches.

In that letter, which is a consolatory epistle to the Neocæsareans upon occasion of the death of their pastor, and written six or seven years before this, he gives such an account of Musonius, that I cannot forbear inserting it in this place. He says, ‘he was an ornament of the churches,

απογραφωμενων εστι σφαλματα, ως επ' αυτων των λεξεων δειζομεν ημεις, εαν ο θεος θελη. Επειτα, μεντοι τον Έλληνα πειθων, εκ ηγχειτο χορηγει ακριβολογεσθαι περι τα ρηματα' αλλ' εστιν οπη και συνδιδουαι τω εθει τω εναγομενω, ως αν μη αντιτεινοι προς τα καιρια. Διο δη και πολλας αν εδρους εκει φωνας, τας νυν τοις αιρετικοις μεγατην ισχυν παρεχομενας' ως το κτισμα, και το ποιημα, και ει τι τωτων. ibid. p. 316. C. D.

^a Τωτο δε ειδεναι ημας βελομεθα, οτι ει και προς την ειρηνην των εκκλησιων συντρεχοντα ημιν εκ ειχομεν τον μακαριον.—αλλ' εν γε της προς αυτον ομοδοξιας, και τω αι κοινωνον επικαλεισθαι των προς τω αιρετικω αγωνων, —ωδενα καιρον απειλειφθημεν. Ep. 28. [al. 62.] p. 108. E.

“ a pillar and ground of the truth, a support of the faith which is in Christ Jesus;” (1 Tim. iii. 15; Col. ii. 5;) an^b enemy of all novelty; showing in himself a pattern of the primitive constitution of the church, so that they who conversed with him, might imagine to themselves that they saw one of the lights that shined two hundred years ago and more.’ This is a most glorious character! *Heu pietas, heu prisca fides!* If Musonius was such a man, how can it be for Basil’s honour to have disagreed with him? May there not be some reason to apprehend that, by this commendation of another, Basil has passed a censure upon himself, who seems to have countenanced all the innovations of the times?

2. Basil says, the heresy of Sabellius had been extinguished by the tradition of Gregory: but what is meant by this I do not know. Gregory was at the first council against Paul at Antioch, but Paul was not then deposed; nor was Gregory at the second council. Besides, by his tradition, I guess to be intended not Gregory himself, whilst living, but rather his doctrine after his death. But what Basil refers to in that expression I cannot say.

3. Basil does not deny that Gregory used the words alleged by the *Neocæsareans*.

4. Basil labours extremely in the rest of his answer. Since the passage insisted upon is genuine, what does it avail to say, there are faults of transcribers, perhaps in things of little moment only? Then he owns that Gregory spoke inaccurately, at least in his judgment: nay, he makes Gregory disguise or conceal the truth, and thus cast a mist before an honest heathen, in order to make a proselyte of him. This is not defending Gregory, but abusing him: that the *Neocæsareans* may be confuted, Gregory is vilified.

5. As for the doctrine now held by the *Neocæsareans*, whether downright Sabellianism, or somewhat differing from it; I think that, considering the passages before alleged, and the great respect they had for Gregory, it seems probable that there must have been some grounds in his writings for the doctrine which now obtained among them. It is not easy to suppose that a sentiment entirely different from Gregory’s, in a point of importance, should universally prevail in a church that greatly respected his

^b ——— νεωτεροποιῶας εχθρος· εν ἑαυτῷ δεικνυς το παλαιον της εκκλησιας σχημα, οἶον απο τινος ἱεροπρεπης εικονος, της αρχαιας καταστασεως, το εἶδος της ὑπ’ αυτον εκκλησιας διαμορφων ὡτε τος αυτω συγγενομενης, τοις προ διακοσσιων ετων και επεκεινα φωστρηων τροπον εκλαμψασι συγγεγονεσαι δοκειν. *Ibid.* p. 106. D.

memory; who were averse to novelty in all other matters, and had been all along blessed with bishops, who were great admirers of antiquity, and tenacious of ancient doctrines and customs.

We have now seen Basil's passages relating to our bishop, and have made some remarks upon them.

Theodoret, who flourished about the year 423, speaking of the council of Antioch in 264, says, 'They^c of the first rank among those who assembled there were, Gregory the great, the renowned, who by the indwelling grace of the Spirit performed those wonderful works which are celebrated by all mankind; his brother, Athenodorus; Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, an illustrious person, equally master of divine and human knowledge; and Helenus, who presided in the metropolis of the Cilicians,' meaning Tarsus.

Socrates, who flourished before the middle of the fifth century, speaks of our Gregory after this manner: That^d he was born at Neocæsarea, and that to his time Gregory was famous at Athens, and Berytus, and in all Pontus, and in a word, all over the world. Having been some while at Athens, he went to Berytus for the sake of the law. Being informed that Origen explained the sacred scriptures at Cæsarea, he went immediately thither; and, giving over the study of the Roman laws, became a disciple of Origen. Having learned of him the true philosophy, he returned home at the desire of his parents. 'There^e he did many miracles, even^f whilst he was yet a layman, healing the sick, and driving away dæmons by his letters. He converted many Gentiles by his discourses, and yet more by his works. Pamphilus the martyr makes mention of him

^c Των δὲ συνελθυθῶτων ἐπρωτερον Γρηγοριος τε ὁ μεγας, ὁ περιθρυλλητος, ὁ τας παρα παντων ἀδομενας θαυματουργιας ἐπιτελεισας δια της ενοικβσης τῆ πνευματος χαριτος.—Hær. Fab. l. 2. c. 8.

^d Soer. l. 4. c. 27.
^e Κακει πρωτον μεν λαϊκος ων, πολλα σημεια ἐποιησε, νοσηντος θεραπειων, και δαιμονας ἐν ἐπισοδων φηγαδενων, και τῆς ἑλληνιζοντας, τοις τε λογοις, και πλεον τοις γινομενοις υπ' αὐτης, προσαγομενος. Ibid. p. 244. C.

^f [Even whilst he was yet a layman.] I have translated agreeably to Valesius, whose words are: Ubi primo quidem dum adhuc laicus esset, multa fecit miracula, &c. But I would propose that the Greek should be rendered thus: "And there, having been first for some while a layman, he wrought many miracles, healing the sick, and driving away dæmons by his letters, and converting Gentiles by his words, but more especially by his works." If the words are so understood, Socrates agrees with Gregory of Nyssa, and likewise with Jerom in his Catalogue. See above, p. 609. According to this sense Valesius's version may be amended with only a small alteration in this manner: Ubi, quum aliquamdiu laicus fuisset, multa fecit miracula, &c.

in his Apology for Origen; to which he added Gregory's farewell oration, spoken in praise of Origen.'

III. These I suppose to be the most valuable, as well as most ancient, accounts of our author. We will now, so far as we are able, collect from them his age, and some other particulars, which have not been so distinctly expressed by the ancients as might be wished.

Dr. Cave, in his *Historia Literaria*,^s placeth Gregory at the year 254; but for what reason he has set him so late I do not know, when he usually placeth ecclesiastical writers, if they are bishops, about the time they were ordained; and he supposeth that Gregory was a bishop before the Decian persecution. He digests the history of Gregory in this order: after the rudiments of learning received at home, he went to Alexandria; thence to Athens; afterwards to Berytus; and at last, about the year 234, he came with his brother Athenodorus to Origen at Cæsarea in Palestine, where he stayed five years; having been at the council of Antioch in 265, he died the same year.

Du Pin^h says, Gregory was ordained about the year of Christ 240: that having been present at the first council in the affair of Paul of Samosata, he died a short time after, in the year 265.

Basnageⁱ thinks that Gregory came to Cæsarea in 231, the same year that Origen arrived there from Alexandria: that he took his leave of Origen in the year 235, at the beginning of the persecution under the emperor Maximinus, having been with Origen five years, the first and last years both incomplete. It is true, Eusebius says, that Gregory and his brother were^k five whole years with Origen: nevertheless, Basnage thinks those years may be understood as just now explained. He farther^l argues, that Gregory did not study at all at Athens, nor Berytus, nor Alexandria; but only at Cæsarea, whither he came direct from his native country: from which place also he returned home, according to Gregory's own history of himself in the panegyric oration; which, as that learned writer supposeth, confutes the stories of all the other journeys. He says Gregory was ordained in 240, and died in 265.

Tillemont^m supposeth that Gregory came to Origen at Cæsarea in 231: that in 235, Origen being obliged to retire,

^s Part i. p. 93.

^h Nouv. Bib. St. Greg. Thaumaturge.

ⁱ Basn. ann. 240. n. iii.

^k Πεντε δε ὅλοις ἐτεσιν αὐτῶ

συγγεγομενοι. Eus. l. vi. cap. 30. p. 230. A.

^l Basn. ibid. n. iii. iv. v.

^m Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii.

St. Greg. Thaum. Art. iv. p. 669. et note i. p. 903, &c.

upon occasion of the persecution under Maximinus, Gregory took that opportunity to go to Alexandria, where he was in 235, 236, and 237; and returning thence to Cæsarea, he completed his five years with Origen, or made up eight years from the time he first came to him, and then left him to go home in 239; and ⁿ Fabricius appears to approve of this method of removing the difficulties relating to this matter. As for the time when Gregory was made bishop, Tillemont thinks it not easy to be determined: all that we can find, says ^o he, is, that Gregory left Origen in 238 or 239, and that Nyssen gives us ground to think he had laboured a good deal, when his church was tried by the Decian persecution in 250; and ^p he observes, that ^q Baronius computes the death of Gregory to have happened soon after the first council relating to Paul, for no other reason but this, that we have no particular account of him after that; whereas the modern Greeks say, he lived and flourished under Aurelian, who did not begin his reign till 270: and, adds Tillemont, perhaps we ought to read Aurelian in Suidas, where the printed editions of that author say Gregory died under Julian. This may be reckoned a happy conjecture; for Kuster says, that two manuscript copies of Suidas have Aurelian in that place instead of Julian, which manuscripts he has followed in his edition. And Fabricius^r declares it to be his opinion, that Gregory died in the time of Aurelian, not before the year 270. However, Pagi^s gives it as his judgment, that Baronius was in the right to conclude that Gregory died soon after the fore-mentioned council, since his attendance there is the last thing we hear of him.

Such are the opinions of learned moderns, very skilful in these matters; and though these things may appear to some of no importance, I must own I should be glad to settle the time of this great man, or come near it, upon probable grounds. As for Gregory's journey to Athens, it is mentioned by Socrates only, who makes many mistakes in what he says of this writer; as all may perceive from what has been taken from others, without our staying here to show those mistakes distinctly. Therefore I think there is no reason to suppose that Gregory ever studied in that city. The journey to Alexandria likewise I could willingly set aside with Basnage; for neither Eusebius or Jerom make any mention of it. It seems to have been put down

ⁿ Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 247.

^p Ibid. Art. xi. p. 691.

^r Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 248.

^o Ibid. Art. vi. p. 675.

^q Baron. Ann. 266. n. xiv.

Pagi, Crit. in Baron. 265. n.

by Nyssen without any ground. But Alexandria was a flourishing city, and much resorted to. It cost him little or no labour to send Gregory thither, and tell a strange adventure or two of him whilst there; or perhaps Nyssen thought Origen was still at Alexandria; though if he did he was plainly mistaken, it being very evident from Gregory's Oration, that Origen was settled at Cæsarea before he became acquainted with him: but as for the journey to Berytus, methinks there is somewhat to be said for it; because it is particularly mentioned by Jerom, and Socrates, and Suidas; though it must be owned, that this last only transcribes Sophronius's Greek translation of Jerom's Catalogue. It is true likewise, that Gregory in his Oration affords us no authority for this supposition. Nevertheless, perhaps, this opinion is not inconsistent with the oration; for Gregory there mentions a term of eight years; and yet Eusebius, who could not but be well informed, speaks of Gregory's being with Origen but five years. There was therefore in that space of eight years room for him to make an excursion from Cæsarea. And Berytus appears to me as likely a place as any, because it is mentioned by the authors before cited; and because, though at Origen's request Gregory laid aside his first intention of being a lawyer, yet he might think it not improper to visit the place, for the sake of which he left his native country, and stay a short season there. This might be thought likewise a piece of respect due to those who had recommended to him the study of the Roman laws. Nor was Berytus far from Cæsarea. Finally, it may be thought by some, that what Origen writes to Gregory, of his ability to become a lawyer of the first rank, implies, that his scholar at his return home had gained some farther knowledge of the law than he brought thence, which yet he could not receive from him at Cæsarea.

As Origen was settled at Cæsarea, when Gregory arrived there, he could not come thither before 231, if so soon. Since that is the earliest date possible of his arrival, and he mentions a term of eight years in his oration, I think he could not leave Origen before the year 239. And since from Origen's letter to Gregory, written some while after his return home, he was a mere layman, and there appears no prospect of his being immediately devoted to the service of the church; and since Nyssen says, Gregory lived retired for some time, and when Phedimus sought for him he kept out of the way; it appears to me probable, that he could not be ordained before the year 243, if so soon: I am in-

deed inclined to a later date, and should choose to place him at 245. And supposing him endowed with extraordinary gifts, (of which I make no doubt but he was at the time of his ordination, or soon after,) he would convert many Gentiles, and make large additions to the small church he at first found in Neocæsarea, before the persecution in 250, when he retired; and afterwards, peace being restored, he returned to his people. He was certainly at the first council of Antioch in the cause of Paul in 264. Eusebius and Theodoret put that out of question. I do not at present recollect any learned moderns, who say he was at the second council in that city. Undoubtedly the generality of learned men have not been of opinion, that Gregory was present at that second council, because they have supposed he died very soon after the first. And Fabricius, who thinks he lived to the year 270, mentions only his presence at the first^t council, as having no ground to say he was at the second. However, Tillemont^u observes, that there is one Theodore among the bishops of the last council; and, as he adds, he may be our saint. But I think that to be very improbable; for, in the account which^v Eusebius gives of the first council, he calls our bishop Gregory, not Theodore; and placeth him and his brother Athenodorus next after Firmilian, who is the first. But in his catalogue of the names of those who were present at the second council, Theodore, meant by Tillemont, is the fourteenth; and the next is Malchion, a presbyter; therefore he cannot be our bishop: that Theodore was either a presbyter, or the youngest of the bishops expressly named as present. In the account which Theodoret gives of the bishops at the first council, Gregory is first, his brother next, and after him Firmilian, as we saw^w before. I think, therefore, that our Gregory did not attend at the second council of Antioch.

And perhaps some will here recollect what was said formerly^x concerning the different results of those two councils. At the first, when Firmilian was present, and by his advice Paul was spared; at the second, when Firmilian was dead, he was deposed. If it be now farther considered, that those other two great lights, Gregory and his brother, were wanting in the second council, perhaps we may still better account for the sentence then pronounced, which by some has been reckoned indiscreet, and not for the honour of the christian name at that time.

^t Fabr. *ibid.* p. 248.

^u *Ibid.* Art. x. fin.

^v Vid. Euseb. l. vii. c. 28, 29, 30.

^w See before,

p. 628.

^x See this vol. chap. xxxix.

The exact time of Gregory's death cannot be determined. I have mentioned two opinions; one supposing that he died in 265, soon after the first council at Antioch; the other supposing him to have lived till the reign of Aurelian, and not to have died before the year 270. I must leave it to every one to judge for himself, which of these two opinions is the more probable. I have before mentioned the reasons for each of them, and have nothing farther to add.

IV. Gregory's works, so far as we know any thing of them, are such as these.

1. A Panegyric Oration, in praise of Origen, pronounced in 239, still extant, and unquestionably his. Du Pin^y says of it, 'that it is very eloquent, and that it may be reckoned one of the finest pieces of rhetoric in all antiquity.' It is the more admirable, because perhaps it is the first thing of the kind among christians.

2. A Paraphrase of the Book of Ecclesiastes, mentioned by Jerom in his Catalogue, and quoted by him^z in his Commentary upon that book, and still extant.

3. Jerom afterwards adds in his Catalogue, that Gregory wrote several epistles; of which, however, we have now only one remaining, called a Canonical Epistle to an anonymous bishop, written^a in 258 or^b 262; consisting, as we now have it, of eleven canons, all allowed to be genuine, except^c the last, which is doubted of, or plainly rejected, as no part of the original epistle, but since added to it.

These are all the works of Gregory taken notice of by Jerom.

4. To these may be added the Creed, or Faith, before referred to in Gregory Nyssen; and which, he says, our Gregory received from John the evangelist, before he began to act in his episcopal character. Of this Du Pin^d speaks after this manner: 'St. Gregory of Nyssa, in his Life of this father, puts down a formulary of faith, which he pretends [or affirms] our saint received from St. John in a vision which he had in the night, and was preserved till that time, as he says, in the hand-writing of St. Gregory

^y As before.

^z Vir sanctus, Gregorius Ponti episcopus, Origenis auditor, in Metaphrasi Ecclesiastæ, ita hunc locum intellexit. Hieron. Comm. in Eccl. cap. iv. v. 13—16.

^a Vid. Fabr. Bib.

Gr. T. v. p. 253. et Tillemont, as before, Art. xii.

^b Basnag. ann. 240. n. vii. et 262. n. ii.

and Tillemont, as before.

^c See Fabricius

^d Saint Grégoire de Nysse rapporte, dans la Vie de ce Père, une formule de foi qu'il prétend que ce saint avoit reçu de Saint Jean dans une vision qu'il avoit eue pendant la nuit, et qu' on conservoit encore, à ce qu'il dit, écrite de la main de Saint Grégoire Thaumaturge. Bib. T. i. p. 184, 185.

‘the wonder-worker.’ It seems to me, therefore, that Du Pin was not satisfied of the genuineness of this creed. But that others who are able may with the less trouble judge of the force of his expressions, I have put the original French in the margin. It is, however, received as genuine by ^e Fabricius, ^f Bull, and many others. Basnage^g says, it may be supposed to have been written in the year 240. He owns that Jerom’s silence might occasion some doubt, in that he has not mentioned it with Gregory’s other pieces. But since it is in Nyssen and Rufinus, he readily allows it, with other learned moderns, to be genuine. Frederic Spanheim, if I understand him, rejects^h not only the Particular Exposition of Faith, to be mentioned hereafter, but likewise this creed. Mr. Lampeⁱ seems to reject both the creed and the history of it; for he says, if those things related by Nyssen were true, and John had been sent from heaven on purpose to deliver this Formulary, it ought to be esteemed at least equally with his other writings.

For my part, I think this creed can by no means be relied upon as Gregory’s. I shall mention the following reasons :

1. The account which Nyssen gives of the revelation of this creed is altogether improbable. Gregory, as he says, would not preach till he had a revelation of the faith made to him. But what need could Gregory have of such a thing? had he not been taught the christian faith by Origen, under whose instruction he sat five whole years? If he still needed some farther light, was not Phedimus, bishop of Amasea, were not other bishops able to inform him? Not to add, that Gregory had before him continually the sacred scriptures, in which all necessary truths are clearly revealed; and that he had been trained up by Origen in a high veneration for those divine writings. There is, therefore, no reason to think that Gregory would desire

^e Ut supra, p. 249.

^f Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. p. 136, 137.

^g Mystica igitur expositio hæc anno 240 videtur exarata. Num adscribenda sit Gregorio, movere scrupulum potest silentium Hieronymi, qui Gregorianis operibus illam non inseruit. At cum a Nysseno et a Rufino vindicetur, recentiores ut prætereamus, faciles largimur esse Gregorii. Basn. ann. 240. n. vii.

^h Plurima tamen Gregorii hujus nomen falso præferunt, ver. gr. Expositio Fidei, adversus Arianos, seu Symbolum quoddam ex revelatione scilicet Johannis, et Mariæ Virginis, in quo expressa vox *τριάδος*, et quod in apparitione tradiderint Gregorio, ut Nyssenus et hodieque MSS. exstat in Græcorum monasteriis, teste Sponio. Itin. Spanh. Hist. Ecc. p. 778.

ⁱ Hæc si vere ita gesta essent, formula talis, ab ipso Johanne apostolo cœlitus misso communicata, merito omnibus ejus scriptis mortali digito exaratis esset aut preferenda, aut saltem æquiparanda. Jo. Frid. Lampe, in Evang. Johan. Prolegom. l. i. cap. vi. p. 102.

a particular revelation; and still less to suppose it would be granted, if desired; and that in so profuse a manner, and without any occasion for it; by sending to him not only John, (though^k he by some people has been thought better acquainted with the doctrine of the Trinity than any other apostle or evangelist,) but likewise our Lord's mother; as if John, or any other evangelist, could not have been sufficient. This overdoing ruins the credit of a relation with men of judgment and sedate thought. And Bagnage, though he allows the creed to have been composed about the year 240, as before shown, disputes^l the account of this revelation by a variety of arguments, and seems to give no credit to it. It follows therefore, I think, that Nyssen is not to be relied upon in this matter.

2. The whole history of this matter is more suitable to the affairs of the fourth than of the third century, and that the middle or even former part of it. This creed contains nothing but the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity. But why should Gregory desire information about that only? Was there nothing else to be taught by a christian bishop? This shows that this story is a fiction of the fourth century, when the controversy about the Trinity filled all men's heads. In the early times of christianity, the creeds, though short, usually contained in them, beside the doctrine of the one God, divers historical matters relating to our Lord's life, death, resurrection, exaltation, and other important articles, concerning future retributions; as, our Lord's second coming to judgment, the resurrection of the body, and the like; of all which things there is not one article, one tittle, in this creed.

3. This creed is not taken notice of in Jerom's Catalogue. Indeed, in some copies of that work there is added after Gregory's Epistles, and Of the Faith [et de Fide]. But it is allowed^m by the best critics that those words are not genuine: whereas, if Jerom had known of that creed, and believed it to be genuine, he could not have omitted it. Would any author, writing the life of Moses, though in the most brief and summary way conceivable, take no notice of the ten commandments delivered to him in so honourable a

^k ΑΛΛ' ὁμως ὁ τοιαυτος, ὁ ἀγραμματος, — ἰδε ποιη τετυχηκε πνευματος, ὡτε ἂ μὴ εἰς των ἀλλων ἐναγγελιστων ἡμας εἰδαξεν, αὐτος ταυτα βροντησαι. Theophyl. Proleg. in Joh. Evang. Conf. Lampe, Prolegom. in Joh. Ev. l. 2. cap. ii. init. et cap. iii. p. 178.

^l Revelationis ejusmodi nobis est difficillima fides. Tanto nil opus miraculo fuit ad indicandum beatissimæ trinitatis mysterium, quod oraculis scripturæ diserte panditur. Neque Deo moris est, sanctos e cælo mittere, qui scripturarum contenta consignent in animo, &c. ibid. n. v.

^m Vid. Fabr. ibid. p. 251.

manner? Nor could any writer of Gregory's life omit to mention a creed received from John the evangelist, and preserved in his own hand-writing in the records of his church, and published, and often copied thence, undoubtedly, if there was any such thing. Whether this argument be decisive or not, it is of some force. They who made the interpolation before mentioned did not like this omission.

4. If Basil may be relied on, in a dialogue now lost, Gregory expressed himself inaccurately about the doctrine of the Trinity. This may be thought to weaken, if not to overthrow, Nyssen's relation; for if, as he says, Gregory wasⁿ particularly solicitous to have information in that doctrine, before he began to preach, and did actually receive a^o distinct revelation of it, he must have discoursed accurately upon that head at all seasons, when arguing with heathens, and upon every other occasion; nor could he ever be at a loss for the greatest propriety of expression. One would think, likewise, that Basil should not have dared to censure any expressions of Gregory relating to the Trinity, if it had been a thing well known in those times, that he had been instructed in that doctrine by express and particular revelation.

5. St. Basil, in all his disputes with the people of Neocæsarea, says nothing of any written creed of our Gregory. He reminds them, over and over, of his grandmother Marcellina, that blessed and famous woman, sprung from among them, who had the doctrine of Gregory safely preserved in her memory, which she likewise as carefully delivered to him in his childhood; but not one word of a written creed deposited with the Neocæsareans. This argument appears to me unanswerable: and every one is able to judge of it from St. Basil's epistles, which have been so largely transcribed. It appears to me to a great degree probable, that either there was no written creed at Neocæsarea reputed Gregory's, or that it was not to Basil's purpose; otherwise he must have referred to it. What good reason can be assigned why, in so warm a dispute, Basil should so often appeal to the instructions he received from his grandmother when he was a child, but say nothing of a written creed in Gregory's hand-writing, which he had, or might have seen and read, when a man, if there had been any such thing? Basil, who made so good use of that circumstance, that he had been educated by a relation, his grandmother, sprung from among them, to show the Neocæsareans that his faith

ⁿ Vid. Greg. Nyss. de Vit. Greg. Thaum. p. 545. A B.

^o Vid. *ibid.* p. 546. B.

was the same with that of their great Gregory, would have triumphed much more if there had been an authentic written creed, and his sentiments had been agreeable to it. Nyssen, in an oration delivered we know not where nor to whom, talks of a creed at Neocæsarea in Gregory's handwriting: but Basil, in his epistles to the Neocæsareans themselves, mentions no such thing, though extremely to his purpose, much more than any thing said by him. I think it not difficult to know who ought most to be regarded, Basil, or his brother Gregory of Nyssa.

The creed then in Nyssen is not the creed of our great Gregory, but a fiction of the fourth century, after the rise and heats of the controversy about the Trinity; when the whole church was divided upon that head, and some people were willing to have Gregory on their side, to support their doctrine, or their manner of expression.

6. There are some other pieces which have been published as his; as, A particular Exposition of the Faith, three or four Homilies, and some other things. But^p learned men being now generally agreed that they are supposititious, I need not take any farther notice of them.

7. However, there are some Fragments in a Greek chain, which Fabricius^q seems to allow to be Gregory's: they are four in number; I intend to make use of three of them hereafter in the article of Testimonies to the books of the New Testament.

V. Having seen such a history, and such testimonies to Gregory, as time has spared us, and having likewise observed what are his genuine works, we are better able to form to ourselves some idea of him; and may now take at least his more remarkable features, which are extremely beautiful.

His farewell Oration at Cæsarea is the monument of a bright genius improved by education: here likewise appears a mind of a fair and candid complexion, with a grateful temper toward the conductor of his studies. The nobility of his family is unquestioned. Origen himself, who was well acquainted with our Gregory, and was no flatterer, bears witness to his excellent capacity, which he consecrated to God and true religion, abandoning all earthly pursuits and expectations. He was a bishop of singular

^p Vid. Cav. Hist. Lit. Du Pin, Biblioth. Fabr. ib. p. 253, 254. Tillem. ib. Art. xii.

^q Fragmenta quædam Gregorii Thaumaturgi occurrere in Catenâ ad Jeremiam Ghislerianâ, Tom. i.—jam notavit præstantissimus Caveus. Illa non ex Commentario in prophetam, sed ex Homiliâ quâdam vel epistolâ videntur esse repetita. Fabric. ib. p. 254.

note and eminence, as appears from Eusebius and the concurring testimony of many other ecclesiastical writers. His history, as delivered by authors of the fourth and following centuries, particularly by Nyssen, it is to be feared, has in it somewhat of fiction; but there can be no reasonable doubt made but he was very successful in making converts to christianity in the country of Pontus, about the middle of the third century; and that, beside his natural and acquired abilities, he was favoured with extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, and wrought miracles of surprising power. The plain and express testimonies of Basil and others, at no great distance of time or place from Gregory, must be reckoned sufficient grounds of credit with regard to these things. Theodoret, mentioning Gregory, and his brother, and Firmilian, and Helenus, all together, ascribes miracles to none but him alone. They were all bishops of the first rank: nevertheless Gregory had a distinction even among them. It is the same thing in Jerom's Letter to Magnus: there are mentioned Hippolytus, Julius Africanus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and many others of great note and eminence for learning and piety. But Theodore, afterwards called Gregory, is the only one who is called a man of apostolical signs and wonders. Jerom's words^r likewise in his Catalogue, though somewhat obscure, are very remarkable. I have rendered them thus: 'he is chiefly famous for the miracles he wrought when bishop, to the great honour of the churches.' They imply, if I mistake not, that Gregory was in his time the admiration of all mankind, not only in Pontus and the neighbouring countries, but also in other parts. The extraordinary gifts of the Spirit had not then entirely ceased: but Gregory was favoured with such gifts greatly beyond the common measure of other christians or bishops at that season. This was much taken notice of, and it was greatly to the honour of the christian profession all over the world. So Jerom. I see no reason, therefore, why we may not adopt the words of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the fifth century, as containing in short a just and true character of this person: 'that^s he was at first great and eminent in the world for philosophy and eloquence, but afterwards greater and more eminent for his virtues,' or miracles.

His church continued stedfast in the faith after his death:

^r See before, p. 610.

^s Gregorius, e Ponto sacerdos, philosophiâ primus apud mundum et eloquentiâ præstans; sed postea major præstantiorque virtutibus. Eucher. ad Valerian. ap. Bibl. Patr. Max. T. vi. p. 859. H.

and near the end of the fourth century the *Neocæsareans* were all christians, having been all along to that very day blessed with pastors who were men of true worth. As Gregory therefore was an honour and ornament to the churches in his time, so his church continued to be an honour to him. The people of *Neocæsarea* retained for a long while remarkable impressions of religion; and they had an affection for the primitive simplicity, very rare and uncommon, almost singular at that time, when innovations came into the church apace. In particular, they could by no means approve of the common zeal for the monastic life. Those good people must have been apprehensive of the bad consequences of that institution, if they did not actually see some inconveniences attending it: for^t Basil complains that they made reflections upon the conduct of the women in those societies; which it is not easy to think they would do without ground. It seems that they made the best stand they were able against that and other innovations. But popular things will have their course, notwithstanding the most judicious reasons and the most pathetic remonstrances to the contrary. Every age of the world seeth examples of this kind both in the church and in civil life.

And now I cannot but think there is reason to lament two things:

1. That no more of this great and excellent man's works are come down to us. It is plain some of his writings are lost; for Jerom speaks of his epistles, whereas we have no more than one remaining. And Basil mentions an Exposition of Faith, or a Dialogue with a Gentile, which is not in being.

2. That we have no history of his life, written by some contemporary in the plain and simple way he lived. This I take to be the greatest loss of the two: for though he might leave behind some letters and some other pieces, which were both edifying and instructive, yet it is likely, as Jerom intimates, that he was more eminent for his signs and wonders than his writings. It may be well supposed that this apostolical man was chiefly employed in increasing his church, or in building it up in knowledge and virtue, by oral instructions and works of goodness, charitable or miraculous. Possibly such a history as we now wish

^t *Εἰ δὲ τίνα ἀκοσμίαν τῆ βίῃ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπιφερῶσιν, ἀπολογισθαὶ μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἢ καταδεχομαι. Ἐκεῖνο δὲ ὑμῖν διαμαρτυρομαι, ὅτι ἂ μὲχρι νῦν ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πατὴρ τῆ ψευδῆς, εἶπειν ἢ κατεδέξατο, ταῦτα αἱ ἀφοβοὶ καρδίαι, καὶ τὰ ἀχαλινῶτα ἑσώματα αἰε φθεγγεται ἀδεῶς. Basil. Ep. 207. [al. 63.] p. 310. E.*

for was composed, but was seldom transcribed, and therefore soon lost, as not suiting the taste which not long after prevailed in the church. This may be thought very probable, that if such a relation had been then drawn up, and still preserved, it would be more valuable than any thing written afterwards. A father of the fourth century, destitute of the gifts of the Spirit, whose chief talent is oratory, whose mind is heated with the controversies, and tainted with the credulity and partiality of his age, is not fit to write the life of a man of primitive simplicity, endowed with a large measure of apostolical gifts and virtues.

VI. Nothing farther remains, but that we observe Gregory's testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament.

1. And here, since nothing appears to the contrary, it ought to be taken for granted, that he had the same or very near the same canon of scripture with his master Origen. However, I shall take notice of some particulars, though much cannot be reasonably expected in the few and short pieces of his which we now have.

2. When Gregory came to Origen he was ignorant of the scriptures, as he plainly^u intimates; but when he left him he was well acquainted with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as appears from his quotations and allusions to them in his Panegyric Oration.

3. In his Canonical Epistle are these words: 'The^v apostle says: "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them:" I Cor. vi. 13. And our Saviour also, purifying all meats, says: "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth,"' Matt. xv. 11.

4. The Fragments, formerly mentioned as preserved in a sort of Greek chain, are fine sentences. It is not certain from what work they are taken; but if they are genuine, it appears not improbable that they are taken from some homily or epistle of our Gregory.

In one of those fragments he says: 'The^w scribes and pharisees of the Jewish people would never have received

^u Τετο ανεγνων μεν ὑπερον εν τοις ἱεροῖς γραμμασιν. Orat. ad Orig. p. 60. A. ^v ὁ δε αποστολος φησι, Τα βρωματα— Αλλα δε ὁ Σωτηρ ὁ παντα καθαριζων τα βρωματα. κ. λ. Ep. Can. cap. i. p. 38. A. ^w Ουκ αν οἱ γραμματεις και οἱ φαρισαιοι τβ λας των Ισδαιων πολυ το και παρα τβ Σωτηρος εκληρονομησαν, ει μη δια την ὑποκρισιν· εν γαρ τοις ελεγχοις ἁμαρτιων αυτων εκ επαυσατο κατα πασαν αιτιαν προλεγων ὁ Κυριος· και ὑμιν, γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι ὑποκριται, κεκονιαμενης ταφης αποκαλων αυτες· οἱ ἐξωθεν μεν φαινονται τοις ανθρωποις ὠραιοι, εσωθεν δε γεμισιν οσειων νεκρων, και πασης ακαθαρσιας. ap. Mich. Ghislerium in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 4. T. i. p. 788, 789. Lugdun. 1623.

such repeated woes from our Saviour, if it had not been for their hypocrisy: for our Lord's reproofs of their faults continually begin and are prefaced in this^x manner: "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites." And he calleth them "whited sepulchres, which indeed appear to men beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness," Matt. xxiii. 27.

5. In another of these fragments he says: 'For^y if we do any good to our neighbour out of sincere and undissembled love, we shall hear from our Saviour: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me,"' Matt. xxv. 40. What follows in this fragment is a fine reproof of false pretences of kindness, and the practice of artifice and deceit toward honest and undesigning persons. But I must not allow myself to transcribe it here at length.

6. In his Panegyricial Oration he refers to and enlarges upon the history of the poor widow which we have in Mark xii. 41—44; Luke xxi. 1—4; which he says is in the^z sacred books: referring however, perhaps, more particularly to St. Luke's than St. Mark's gospel; and calling again our Lord's estimation of that poor widow's gift^a a determination of the divine word.

7. In the same Oration he has a beautiful allusion^b to the parable of the prodigal, which is in Luke xv. He there also alludes to^c Luke x. 30.

8. It is very probable, from that Oration, that he was acquainted with^d St. John's gospel, particularly the beginning of it.

9. In the Canonical Epistle he says, 'It is not easy^e to represent in one letter all that the divine scriptures have said, not only against so horrible a sin as robbery, but even against covetousness, or the love of filthy lucre.' However, he largely quotes one place of scripture, thus: 'But^f "fornication," says he, "and covetousness, let it not be

^x See Matt. xxiii. 13—15, 23, 25, 27.

^y *Εαν γαρ τι εις το πλησιον αγαθον εργασωμεθα δια της ανυποκριτης αγαπης, ακκομεν παρα τω σωτηρος, Εφ' οσον εποιησατε ενι τωτων των αδελφων με των ελαχιτων, εμοι εποιησατε.* κ. λ. ap. eund. in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 8, 9. p. 796.

^z *Ουτως εν ιεραις βιβλοις φερεται, οτι δη μικρα τις και πτωχη γυνη.* κ. λ. Orat. ad Orig. p. 60. A.

^a *Ο ιερος λογος εσαθμισατο.* ib. D.

^b Vid. p. 75. A. B.

^c Ib. p. 76. B.

^d Ib. p. 53. D. 54. A.

^e *Δεινη δε πλεονεξια, και εκ εστι δι' επισολης μιας παραθεσθαι τα θεια γραμματα, εν οίς.* κ. λ. Ep. Can. ii. p. 38. C.

^f *Πορνεια γαρ, φησι, και πλεονεξια μηδε ονομαζεσθω εν υμιν—(ο γαρ καρπος τω φωτος εν παση αγαθοσυνη, και δικαιοσυνη, και αληθεια)—Τοιαυτα γαρ αποσολος.* ib. p. 38. D. 39. A. B.

named among you: for which things' sake the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them: for ye were sometime darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord. Walk as children of the light, (for^s the fruit of the light is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth,) proving what is acceptable to the Lord. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret. But all things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light." These things says the apostle.' Eph. v. 3—13.

10. Origen, in his Epistle to Gregory, refers to several texts of scripture, and among others to^h Heb. iii. 14.

11. In the third of the fragments before mentioned it is said, 'Prideⁱ cannot but be evil, it being founded in much false conceit. For it is most manifest, that every perfect good cometh from God: nor is it otherwise to be obtained by man.' Here seems to be a reference to James i. 17. and if this fragment is genuine, it may be reckoned a proof that Gregory was acquainted with the epistle of St. James, and had a respect for it.

I have now quoted three of the fragments which I spoke of formerly. I have no occasion at present to make any use of the fourth.

12. In Gregory's Panegyric Oration is supposed to be a reference^k either to Rev. iii. 7; or to Isa. xxii. 22.

13. He speaks of Origen's advices^l to attend to God and his prophets. He there likewise makes mention of the assistances Origen gave him for understanding the difficult places of the sacred scriptures. His veneration for which scriptures has appeared in several passages above cited.

14. If the last, or eleventh canon of the epistle had been genuine, I should here have observed somewhat in it: but since it is an addition of later times, it ought not to be taken notice of in this place.

It is needless to add any thing more, considering the re

^s Fruit of the light.] This reading deserves to be taken notice of. It is no uncommon reading, but is found in MSS. versions and writers. Perhaps it is the true reading. See Mill, Grot., Beausobre, and L'Enfant, upon the place.

^h Orig. Ep. ad Greg. T. i. p. 32. C. Bened.

^l Ουκ αγαθον η υπερηφανα, ψευδοδοξιαν εχουσα πολλην· Δηλον γαρ, δηλον ως παν αγαθον τελειον θεοθεν ερχεται· και εκ εσι λεπτον αλλως ανθρωπω. κ λ. ap. Ghisler. in Jerem. cap. ix. v. 23, 24. p. 831.

^k P. 73. B.

^l Μονη δε προσεχειν Θεω, και τοις τῆς προφηταις, αυτος υποφητευων και σαφηριζων, οτι ποτε σκοτεινον και αινηματωδες η, οια πολλα εν τοις ιεραϊς εσι φωναϊς. ib. p. 72. D.

lation Gregory had to Origen, and his respect for him. They must both have had the same canon of scripture, or very much alike, as was observed before; and undoubtedly they agreed in a peculiar regard for those writings, which they received as sacred and divine.

CHAP. XLIII.

DIONYSIUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA.

I. *His history in general.* II. *Some revelations vouchsafed to him.* III. *More select passages.* IV. *His concern in the controversies of that time, as Novatianism.* V. *The Millennium.* VI. *The baptism of heretics.* VII. *Subellianism.* VIII. *The affair of Paul of Samosata.* IX. *Dionysius's works.* X. *His character.* XI. *His testimony to the books of the New Testament, as the four gospels.* XII. *The Acts, Paul's epistles, and to the Hebrews.* XIII. *The Catholic epistles.* XIV. *The Revelation, and other books of the New Testament.* XV. *What Dionysius writes of the Revelation largely examined.* XVI. *A brief review of that whole argument, with remarks.* XVII. *The sum of his testimony.*

I. UPON the promotion of Heraclas to the bishopric of Alexandria, in the year of Christ 231 or 232, Dionysius^a succeeded him in the chair of the catechetical school of that city; and Heraclas having died in the year 246 or 247, Dionysius was chosen bishop in his room, in the year^b 247, or^c 248, and died in the twelfth of the emperor Gallienus, in the year of Christ 264, or at the utmost in^d 265. He

^a Dionysius, Alexandrinæ urbis episcopus, sub Heraclâ scholam κατηχησέων presbyter tenuit, et Origenis valde insignis auditor fuit.—Moritur duodecimo Gallieni anno. Hieron. de V. l. cap. 69. Conf. Euseb. H. E. l. vi. cap. 29, et 35. vii. cap. 28.

^b ——— tandemque anno 247, mortuo Heraclæ in sede Alexandrinâ successit. Cav. Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 95. Heraclæ, qui superiore anno mortem invenerat, successit Dionysius, qui annis xvii. Alexandrinæ præfuit ecclesiæ, initio corrente deducto. Basn. ann. 247. n. v.

^c See Tillemont, Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 539, 540. St. Denys d' Alexand. Art. ii. and Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 263.

^d Vid. Pagi, Crit. 265. n. iv. et Fabric. ibid.

is ^e reckoned the thirteenth bishop of Alexandria. He was succeeded by Maximus.

We may observe some passages of ancient authors concerning the time of his death. Eusebius, speaking of the first council of Antioch in the affair of Paul, bishop of that city, computed to have been held in ^f 264, says, ‘ At ^g this time died Dionysius, in the twelfth year of the reign of Gallienus, having been bishop of Alexandria seventeen years. His successor was Maximus.’ Theodoret ^h says, ‘ That Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, a man of uncommon learning, in a letter excused his coming thither, because of the infirmities of age.’ The bishops of the second council of Antioch, assembled in ⁱ 269, speak of Firmilian and Dionysius as dead, calling ^k them men of blessed memory. Moreover, Eusebius assures us, that their synodical epistle was ^l sent to Dionysius bishop of Rome, and Maximus bishop of Alexandria, and to all the provinces of the empire. This latter council therefore was not in the time of Dionysius himself, but of his successor.

It is generally taken for granted that he was an Alexandrian: and from some things said by himself it has been concluded that he ^m was of an honourable and wealthy family, and that ⁿ for some time he was involved in the darkness and errors of gentilism. He had Origen ^o for his master, and was one of the most noted of his scholars. His episcopate was full of troubles; there having happened in the time of it the two persecutions of Decius and Valerian, beside a pestilence that ravaged the whole Roman empire, and other calamities in common, and some civil commotions with which Alexandria in particular was affected. It was likewise a busy and active period, on account of the controversies about Novatianism, the millennium, the baptism of heretics, and the doctrine of the Trinity, in all which Dionysius had some concern, and signalized himself by his learning, zeal, moderation, and prudence. This is a sum-

^e Alexandrinam ecclesiam tertius decimus episcopus tenuit Dionysius ann. xvii. Euseb. Chron. p. 174.

^f Vid. Basn. ann. 264. n. iii. &c.

^g Eus. l. vii. cap. 28.

^h — ανεβαλλετο μεν την

εκδημιαν, δια την τε γηρωσ ασθειειαν. Hær. Fab. l. ii. c. 8. Conf. Eus. H. E. l. vii. c. 27. p. 277. D.

ⁱ Vid. Pagi, Crit. 269. xii.

271. ii. iii. Basn. ann. 269. n. iv.

^k — της μακαριτας.

ap. Euseb. ib. c. 30. p. 279. D.

^l Ibid. B.

^m — πολλα γε ειπειν εχει καθ' εαυτη γενομενα, οσας αριθμησαι δυναται περι ημων αποφασεις, δημευσεις προγραφας, υπαρχοντων αρπαγας, αξιωματων αποθεσεις, δοξης κοσμικης ολιγωριας, επαινων ηγεμονικων και βδελυτικων καταφρονησεις. κ. λ. Dionys. ap. Eus. l. vii. c. xi. p. 260. A. B.

ⁿ Και σοι γεγονε τετο εξαρχης, και της πιτωεωσ αιτιον. ap. Eus. l. vii. c. 7. p. 253. C.

^o See before, note ^a.

mary account of the life of this bishop of Alexandria; but his eminent merit, and the time in which he flourished, require of us a more particular history.

The Decian persecution^p began in the year 249, or the beginning of 250: but there was a persecution raised against the christians of Alexandria in the year^q 248, whilst other churches enjoyed great peace under the emperor Philip. This persecution^r lasted a whole year, and was concluded by nothing but a sedition and disturbance among the Gentiles themselves. In a fragment of a letter of Dionysius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, is an account of several who^s suffered martyrdom in that popular persecution, and of the breaking open and plundering the houses of christians in that city. ‘Nor^t had we,’ says Dionysius, ‘a safe passage any where, through high streets or narrow lanes, neither by night nor by day; but continually, and every where, the people were universally crying out, “If any one refuse to pronounce such or such impious words, let him be immediately taken up and thrown into the fire.”’ So things went for a long time, till a sedition among themselves, and a civil war, returned this cruelty upon them. We^u had then a little breathing time: but presently news came of the end of that reign which had been favourable to us, and all were seized with fears of an impending storm. Then came the edict;’ that is, Decius’s edict of persecution, published at Alexandria in the beginning of the year 250.

Soon^v after the arrival of that edict, as Dionysius writes to Germanus, Sabinus, prefect of Egypt, gave orders for apprehending him. The officer, supposing he must needs have fled and absconded in such a time of manifest danger, made a diligent search every where, excepting only the bishop’s own house, where Dionysius continued four days after the prefect’s order for taking him up; but on the fifth day, having received a special direction from God, who likewise opened a way for his escape, he removed, accompanied^w by his servants and many of the brethren. He was

^p Vid. Pagi, 250. num. iv. Basnag. ann. 250. num. ii. iii.

^q Vid. Pagi, Crit. 248. n. viii.

^r εκ απο τῆ βασιλικῆ

προσταγματος ὁ διωγμος παρ’ ἡμιν ηρξάτο, ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὄλον ἐνιαυτον προύλαβε. Dionys. in Ep. ad Fab. ap. Eus. l. vi. c. 41. m.

^s Ibid. p. 236, 237.

^t Ib. p. 237. D.

^u καὶ σμικρον μὲν προσανειπνευσαμεν—ευθὺς δὲ ἡ τῆς βιουδειας ἐκείνης τῆς ἐμμενεπέρας μεταβολῆ ἐσηγγέλται—καὶ δὲ καὶ παρήν το προσταγμα. Ib. p. 238. A.

^v Vid. Eus. l. vi. cap. 40.

^w ἐγὼ τε καὶ οἱ παιδῆς καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀμα συνέξηλομεν. Ib. p. 235. C.

nevertheless very soon after, that very night as it seems, apprehended by a band of soldiers, and carried to Taposyris, a small village in that part of Egypt which was called Marcotis. Then he was taken out of their custody by some country people in a very odd and unexpected manner, and against his own consent. Being thus rescued out of the hands of that strong guard by which he had been first taken, he retired and lived privately in a desert part of Libya, distant three days' journey from Parætonium. The Decian persecution being over, Dionysius returned to his charge at Alexandria some time in the year 251.

Gallus succeeded Decius before the end of the year 251; and Dionysius speaks of a persecution in his reign: for he says expressly, that^x 'Gallus banished those holy men that offered up prayers to God for his peace and safety.' Whether any suffered at this time in Egypt is not certain; nor is there much notice taken of this matter in ancient ecclesiastical writers. Pagi^y therefore concludes, that this was only a local persecution, and that it was felt in few places except Rome, where Cornelius, and afterwards Lucius, were banished by this emperor.

In the year 253, Valerian and his son Gallienus succeeded Gallus and Volusian. The persecution began in the year 257, and ended in other parts of the empire in 259, when Valerian was taken captive by the Persians; but at Alexandria it continued till the year 261, when Gallienus overcame Macrian, in whose power Egypt had been till that time. Then Gallienus sent the same favourable edicts to Alexandria which had been sent before to several other parts of the empire. Our Dionysius speaks of this persecution having lasted^z forty-two months, or three years and a half; which ought to be understood of Egypt only, not of the rest of the empire. The difficulties relating to this point have been finely cleared up by Pagi, to^a whom I refer, and^b to Basnage, who does not much differ from him.

Soon after the arrival of the edict at Alexandria, before the end of the^c year 257, as seems most probable, Dionysius was summoned before Emilian, then prefect of Egypt. He went to him, as^d Dionysius himself writes, 'attended by his fellow-presbyter Maximus, and by Faustus, Eusebius, and Cheremon, deacons, and a christian brother from Rome, then at Alexandria. Emilian requiring

^x Eus. l. vii. cap. i.

^z Ap. Euseb. l. vii. cap. x. in.

^b Basn. 257. n. iii.

Basn. 247. n. vi.

^y Pagi. 252. n. x. xii. xvi.—xxi.

^a Pagi, 261. n. viii. et seq.

^c Vid. Pagi, Crit. in Bar. 257. n. iv.

^d Ap. Euseb. l. vii. cap. xi. p. 251.

‘ him to renounce the christian religion, Dionysius answered
 ‘ without delay, that “ we ought to obey God rather than
 ‘ men,” (Acts v. 29) and assured the prefect that he was a
 ‘ worshipper of the one God, and could worship no other,
 ‘ nor could he ever cease to be a christian. Whereupon he
 ‘ ordered them to a place called Cephro, in Libya, forbid-
 ‘ ding them to hold any assemblies. Nor could Dionysius
 ‘ obtain a delay of one day, though he was sick.’

In his banishment he retained a tender affection and concern for his people, and watched over them, carefully convening them, as he^c says, “ absent indeed in body, but present in spirit,” 1 Cor. v. 3. At Cephro he had a large number of the faithful, partly such as came to him thither from Alexandria, partly such as came from other places of Egypt. ‘ And here,’ says^f he, “ God opened a door to us for preaching the word,” 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12. At first the people of the place were rude, and ready to pelt us with stones, but afterwards not a few of the Gentiles, “ forsaking idols, turned unto God,” 1 Thess. i. 9. Then first the seed of the word was sown among them by us; for hitherto it had not been preached unto them: and, as if for that purpose God had brought us to them, when we had “ fulfilled that ministry,” he removed us, Acts xii. 25. For Emilian, as if desirous to send us into some more uncomfortable place than Libya itself, gave orders for dispersing some others in several villages of Mareotis; and us he commanded to reside in the district of Colluthio, near the great road, that we might be the nearer at hand to be brought to Alexandria, if he should think fit.’

How long this banishment lasted, is not absolutely certain. Tillemont^g says, it is evident that Dionysius continued in this exile about two years at least, because in that time he wrote two festal epistles, concerning the observation of Easter, as^h Eusebius relates. One of those epistles was directed to Flavius, the other to Domitius and Didymus. I would just observe, that in the same place Eusebius adds: ‘ Beside these, Dionysius wrote another letter to his
 ‘ fellow-presbyters of Alexandria, and other letters to
 ‘ divers other persons, the persecution still raging.’ Pagiⁱ has taken notice of several of the letters written at that time. Basnage^k computes Dionysius’s exile to have lasted

^c Ib. p. 259. A.

^f Ib. p. 259. A. B. C.

^g Mem. l. iv. p. ii. p. 588. S. Denys d’Alex. Art. xiii.

^h L. vii. cap. 20.

ⁱ Crit. 257. n. iv.

^k Pace apud Ægyptum constitutâ, post extinctum Macrianum, ejusque liberos Macrianum et Quietum, Dionysius, quadriennii exilium passus, edicto Gallieni Alexandriam, anno 261, revocatur. Basn. A. 247. n. vi.

four years, supposing him to have been banished in 257; as does^l Pagi: but I do not see any proof of so long a continuance of that exile; though it might be full three years, or somewhat more.

In the year^m 261, ifⁿ not before, Dionysius returned to his people at Alexandria, and officiated again among them, to their great satisfaction and profit. But, as^o Eusebius observes, the peace was of short duration at Alexandria; for that city was again afflicted with sedition and war, and then^p with pestilence. The disturbance here intended, ^q Valesius, and ^r Pagi, and ^s Basnage, suppose to be the rebellion of Emilian, which broke out in the latter part of the year 261. The Festal, or Paschal epistle of Dionysius to Hierax an Egyptian bishop, of which^t Eusebius has preserved some fragments, describing the unhappy circumstances of Alexandria in the time of that sedition, is supposed by ^u Pagi and ^v Basnage to have been written in the year 262. There follow in^w Eusebius fragments of a letter to Dionysius, giving an account of the pestilence in that city, which letter appears plainly to have been written in^x the year of Christ 263. Tillemont^y thinks this may be the same that Jerom calls^z the Letter concerning the mortality. After this Eusebius^a mentions one more Festal epistle of Dionysius, and consequently written in the year 264. Eusebius^b particularly observes, that the city of Alexandria then enjoyed peace. And thus we have brought down our general history of this great man to the end of his life, or near it; for it is not improbable that^c he died in this very year 264.

II. Dionysius was favoured with some revelations from heaven: We^d formerly saw an account of a special direction he received^e from God to leave Alexandria, at the

^l Vid. Pagi, 257. n. iv.

^m Vid. Basn. ib. et Pagi, 262. n. ii.

ⁿ *Επιλαβεισης δε οσον επω της ειρηνης, επανεισι μεν εις την Αλεξανδρειαν.* Euseb. l. 7. cap. 21. in.

^o Vid. Euseb. ib.

^p Ibid. cap. 22.

^q Vales. Ann. in Eus. p. 151.

^r Pagi, 262. n. ii.

^s Basn. 247. vi.

^t L. vii. cap. 21.

^u Pagi, 262. n. ii.

^v An. 247. n. vii. sub fin.

^w Ib. c. 22.

^x Vid. Basnag. an. 247. n. vii. sub fin. Tillem. St. Denys d'A. Art. xiv. p. 593.

^y As before.

^z Et alia

de Mortalitate. De. V. I. cap. 69.

^a Ibid. p. 269. D.

^b *Ειρηνευσαντων των κατα την πολιν.* ibid.

^c See

Tillemont, p. 594. Basn. 247. n. vi. and before, page 644, noteⁱ.

^d See p. 646.

^e *Και μοις μετα την τεταρτην ημεραν κελυσαντος μοι μεταστηναι τω Θεω, και παραδοξως οδοποιησαντος.* — *Και οτι της τω Θεω προνοιας εργον εκεινο γεγονε, τα εξης εδηλωσεν.* Eus. l. vi. c. 40. p. 235. C.

beginning of the persecution under Decius. He had another like direction, to encourage him to try all things, and to read all sorts of books. For Eusebius informs us, that Dionysius, in his third letter concerning baptism sent to Philemon, presbyter at Rome, writes after this manner: ‘As^f for me,’ says he, ‘I have read the works and the traditions of the heretics; defiling my mind undoubtedly, for a while, with their execrable opinions. But then I have had this advantage in the end, that I have been more fully convinced of their falsehood, and my detestation of them has been increased. One of the brethren, a presbyter, would have dissuaded me from this course, fearing the consequence, and telling me that my mind would be defiled: and indeed I am sensible he spoke truly: nevertheless, I thought I ought to proceed as I had begun: and^g I was confirmed therein by a vision from heaven; for a voice came to me, expressly commanding me to this purpose; “Read whatever comes to your hands, for you are able to examine and try all things; and this was the first occasion of your embracing the faith.” I therefore gladly received the vision, as agreeing with^h the apostolical precept, directed especially to such as are strong: “Be ye skilful money changers,”’ or, inⁱ other words, “prove all things,” and what follows, I Thess. v. 21.

Nothing certainly more worthy to be the matter of a revelation than this command; nor could any thing be more honourable to Dionysius than this vision. Here is an admirable argument for freedom of inquiry; it had been the first occasion of Dionysius’s becoming a christian; it must therefore be advantageous afterwards. By this means christianity was spread at the beginning; and by this means it cannot be obstructed: the reason is, because it is true; and examination and inquiry are prejudicial and detrimental to error, beneficial and friendly to truth. Such christians, therefore, as discourage inquiry in matters of a religious

^f Εγω δὲ καὶ τοῖς συνταγμασι καὶ ταῖς παραδοσεσι τῶν αἰρετικῶν ἐνετυχον. κ. λ. l. vii. c. 7. p. 253. A.

^g Ὅραμα θεοπέμπτου προσελθόν ἐπεβόησε με. Καὶ λόγος πρὸς με γενομένος προσεταξέ διαρρήδην λεγῶν· πᾶσιν ἐντυχάνε οἷς ἀν εἰς χεῖρας λαβοῖς· διενθνεῖν γὰρ ἕκαστα καὶ δοκιμαζέιν ἴκανος εἶ· καὶ σοὶ γέγονε τὸ ἐξάρχης καὶ τῆς πίστεως αἰτιον. Ἀπέδεξαμην τὸ ὄραμα, ὡς ἀποστολικῆ φωνῆ συντρέχον τῇ λέγειν πρὸς τὰς ἐννατώπερος. Γινέσθε δοκιμοὶ τραπέζιται. Ibid. p. 253. B. C.

^h Mr. Whiston supposeth that Dionysius refers to the Apostolical Constitutions, Lib. ii. cap. 36. See his Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, chap. iv. sect. 24, in his Primitive Christianity, &c. vol. iii. p. 425. But Mr. Whiston’s arguments have been fully confuted by Mr. Robert Turner, in his Discourse of the pretended Apostolical Constitutions, ch. xiv. p. 134—136.

ⁱ See before, ch. xxxviii. sect. xxvii. 14.

nature, disparage their religion or their judgment. They give men ground of suspicion, that the christian religion will not bear examination; or that they do not know it to be so excellent and so well founded as it is. For if they are persuaded that their religion is true and excellent, and supported by sufficient evidence, why are they afraid it should be tried and examined? If it have those properties, it must be the more respected the more it is examined and considered. I would therefore humbly recommend to these persons, for their improvement, the observation of the apostle's precepts, referred to likewise by Dionysius, and which are directed to such as were already christians: "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good; abstain from all appearance of evil:" I Thess. v. 21, 22; that is, examine all things that are proposed to you; embrace that which is good, and reject every thing that is evil.

III. Alexandria^k seems to have had a large share in the affliction of the plague that raged about this time in the Roman empire. In the fragments of the Festal Epistle of Dionysius,^l before mentioned, there is a description of the very laudable temper and behaviour of the christians in that time of distress; which I could gladly have inserted here, but shall content myself with this^m reference to it.

I hope therefore it will be allowed me to transcribe a part of another letter, containing some account of the persecutions, and likewise taking some notice of the plague at that time. The letter just mentioned was written, asⁿ was formerly shown, in the year 263. But that which I now intend to make some extracts out of, is the letter to Domitius and Didymus, written in the time of the persecution under Valerian, in the year 259 or 260, certainly before Dionysius's return home, and before the peace granted to the church of Alexandria by Gallienus. Since therefore here likewise is notice taken of that pestilence, it must have raged a great while at Alexandria, or have broken out there more than once. I would premise one thing more for preventing scruples; that though this letter was written about the year 260, before the end of the persecution ordered by Valerian, yet Dionysius may possibly in the former part of it refer to the sufferings and fortitude of christians under Decius. It is to this purpose: 'Moreover,'

^k Pestilens morbus multas totius orbis provincias occupavit, maximeque Alexandriam et Ægyptum, ut scribit Dionysius, et Cypriani de Mortalitate testis est liber. Euseb. Chron. p. 175.

^l See p. 648.

^m Vid. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 22. p. 268, 269.

ⁿ See p. 648.

says^o Eusebius, ‘the same Dionysius, in his Letter to
 ‘ Domitius and Didymus, writes again of the persecution
 ‘ after this manner: “It is needless to mention the names
 ‘ of all our people that have suffered, since they are many,
 ‘ and most of them unknown to you. It may suffice there-
 ‘ fore to assure you that^p persons of both sexes, and of
 ‘ every age and condition, and soldiers and country people,
 ‘ have been victorious in this combat, and been crowned;
 ‘ some by scourging, some by fire, others by the sword.
 ‘ Nevertheless, in all this space of time, some there are who
 ‘ do not yet appear to be acceptable to the Lord. Me, in
 ‘ particular, he seems pleased to reserve for some other
 ‘ season, according to the words of the prophet, Is. xlix. 8,
 ‘ “In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day
 ‘ of salvation have I accepted thee.” Then, after a few
 ‘ words intervening, he says: “At present I have with me
 ‘ only Caius and Peter, deprived of the rest of the brethren.”
 ‘ And soon afterwards: “Some have hid themselves in the
 ‘ city, that they may privately visit the brethren; as Maxi-
 ‘ mus, Dioscorus, Demetrius, and Lucius, presbyters: for
 ‘ Faustinus and Aquilla, being much known, travel up and
 ‘ down Egypt. The deacons that survive, after those that
 ‘ have died of the plague, are, Faustus, Eusebius, Chære-
 ‘ mon: Eusebius, I say, whom God qualified from the
 ‘ beginning, and furnished with great resolution and ability,
 ‘ for fulfilling the office of ministration to the confessors in
 ‘ prison, and for burying the bodies of the perfect and
 ‘ blessed martyrs, not without the utmost peril. For to this
 ‘ very day the prefect does not cease to treat our people in
 ‘ the most cruel manner, killing some, torturing others,
 ‘ making others pine away in fetters and dungeons; forbid-
 ‘ ding any one to be admitted to them, and strictly inquiring
 ‘ likewise whether his orders be obeyed. Notwithstanding
 ‘ which, such is the courage and alacrity with which God in-
 ‘ spires the brethren, that the afflicted are not without the con-
 ‘ solation suited to their exigence.” So writes Dionysius.’

What follows in Eusebius appears very affecting. ‘It^q
 ‘ ought to be observed,’ says he, ‘that Eusebius, whom
 ‘ Dionysius mentions as deacon, was afterwards bishop of
 ‘ Laodicea in Syria. Maximus, whom he speaks of as
 ‘ presbyter at that time, succeeded Dionysius himself in the
 ‘ care of the brethren at Alexandria. And Faustus, who

^o L. 7. cap. vi. p. 260. C. D. 261.

^p Here may be a reference to some things that happened under the Decian persecution. Comp. Euseb. H. E. l. 6. cap. 40, 41, 42.

^q Ibid. p. 261. C.

‘ had then the honour to be a confessor together with Dionysius, having been preserved to the persecution in^r our time, when he was very old, and full of years, was persecuted by martyrdom, having been beheaded.’

Certainly these were honest and upright men. They were fully persuaded of the truth of the christian religion; for they suffered for it, and yet continued to make a profession of it, till their life was taken away. By such as these was the christian doctrine received at that time, and by such has it been delivered down to us.

IV. I shall in the next place give some account of the several controversies before mentioned, and the part Dionysius had in them.

Cornelius was chosen bishop of Rome in^s June, 251. Soon after, Novatus, presbyter in the same church, got himself also ordained bishop of Rome: and beside the schism he is charged with on that account, he set up a rigid notion against all who had lapsed in time of persecution, not allowing any such to be again restored to the communion of the church, whatever tokens of repentance they might show: whereas all other christians in general allowed those who had fallen to be restored to such communion, either in the approach of death, or when they had performed penance, proportioned to the nature or aggravations of the fault they had been guilty of.

Of the part which Dionysius acted upon this occasion, and in his controversy, there is the following account in Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History*. He^t wrote a letter to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, who is supposed to have been too favourable to Novatus, or Novatian, as he is often called, and his rigid sentiments concerning the discipline of the church. Basnage^u thinks it probable that this letter was written some time before the end of the year 251. Dionysius also sent a letter to Novatus himself, in answer, as is supposed, to one received from him. Eusebius has preserved a copy of that epistle. The letter to Fabius seems to have been upon the point of penance, confuting Novatius’s rigid notions relating to that matter. The letter to Novatus himself concerns rather his schism. Novatus, as Eusebius^v says, endeavoured to cast the blame of all he had done upon some of the brethren, by whom, as he pretended, he had been constrained to take the course he did, to whom he had yielded unwillingly, and as it were

^r Dioclesian’s persecution.

^t Vid. Euseb. II. E. l. 6. cap. 42, 43, 44

^u Vid. Basn. 247. n. vii. init.

^s Vid. Pagi, 251. n. xix.

^v Euseb. ib. cap. 45. in

by compulsion. The answer therefore returned by our bishop was this: ‘Dionysius^w sends greeting to our brother Novatus. If, as you say, you have been ordained unwillingly, you will make it appear by a voluntary resignation; for a man should undergo any thing rather than divide the church of God; and the martyrdom you should suffer rather than make a schism would in my opinion be more glorious than a martyrdom for not sacrificing to idols: for in this case a man suffers for his own soul only, in the other for the sake of the whole church. Now, therefore, if you can persuade or oblige the brethren to reunite, your merit will exceed your crime. This will be no longer imputed to you; that will be applauded. If there remain any whom you cannot persuade, however, save your own soul.’

Dionysius must have written many letters upon this argument: for, as Eusebius^x adds, immediately after having transcribed that letter to Novatus, ‘he also wrote a letter to the brethren throughout Egypt concerning repentance, in which he delivered his opinion concerning those that had fallen, distinguishing the several degrees of offences. There is likewise a distinct piece concerning repentance, directed in particular to Conon, bishop of Hermopolis, and a letter of reproof to his flock at Alexandria. Here may be mentioned his epistle concerning martyrdom, sent to Origen. He wrote also to the brethren of Laodicea, over whom presided Thelymidres as bishop; and in like manner concerning repentance to the Armenians, who had Meruzanes for their bishop. He wrote also to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, after he had received his letter against Novatus; in which he informs him, that he had been invited by Helenus, bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia, and by others with him, and by Firmilian of Cappadocia, and Theoctistus of Palestine, to meet them at a synod at Antioch, where some endeavoured to establish the schism of Novatus. He writes likewise, that he had heard that Fabius was dead, and that Demetrian was appointed bishop of Antioch in his room. Here is another letter of his sent to the brethren at Rome by Hippolytus, concerning the office of a deacon; another letter to the same persons concerning peace and repentance; and again another to the confessors of the same city, who still favoured the opinion of Novatus; and two more to the same persons, after they were returned to the church. He wrote, as Eusebius there

^w Ap. Euseb. L. vi. cap. 45. Hier. De V. I. cap. 69.

^x Ibid. cap. 46.

‘ adds, many other letters to divers persons, from which
 ‘ they who are curious to inquire after his labours, (as
 ‘ certainly many are,) may receive much profit.’

The fore-mentioned letter to Cornelius is supposed to^y have been written in 252, and most of the others relating to penance, and to Novatianism, in the same or the foregoing year. The letter to Origen was^z probably written in the Decian persecution, in the year 250, to comfort, animate, and encourage him when^a in prison.

Finally, in a letter to Stephen, bishop of Rome, (probably^b written in 256,) as Eusebius assures us, he acquaints him, that all^c the churches, having rejected the novel principles of Novatus, with regard to the treatment of such as had lapsed, were come to an unanimous agreement with each other. ‘ Know, brother,’ says^d he, ‘ that
 ‘ all the churches of the East, which before were divided,
 ‘ are now united.’ And a little lower he says: ‘ And all
 ‘ the presidents of the churches are of one mind, and are
 ‘ beyond measure filled with joy for the unexpected peace:
 ‘ I mean Demetrian, bishop of Antioch; Theoctistus of
 ‘ Cæsarea; Mezabanes, bishop of Ælia since the death
 ‘ of Alexander; Marinus of Tyre; Heliodorus of Laodicea,
 ‘ successor of Thelymidres; Helenus of Tarsus; and all
 ‘ the churches of Cilicia; and Firmilian, and all Cappadocia
 ‘ with him: for I mention the names of the principal
 ‘ bishops^e only, that I may not be troublesome by the too
 ‘ great length of my letter. But I would be understood to
 ‘ mean the churches throughout all the provinces of Syria
 ‘ and Arabia, whom^f you often relieve in distress, and to
 ‘ whom you have lately written: as also, Mesopotamia,
 ‘ Pontus, and Bithynia. And in a word, all every where
 ‘ rejoice and praise God for the unanimity and brotherly
 ‘ love which reign among them.’

V. It is not easy to say the exact time of Dionysius’s dispute about the millennium. But it was occasioned by the writings of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, then dead; who flourished, as^g Cave thinks, about 244, or as^h Basnage, about 241. Baroniusⁱ supposed this opinion to have

^y Basnag. ann. 247. n. vii.

^z Id. ib.

^a Vid. Euseb. L. 6. c. 39.
 et conf. Pagi, Crit. An. 256. n. xiv. xv.

^b Vid. Basn. ut supra.

^c Eus. l. vii. cap. iv.

^d Eus. ib. cap. v. init. ^e This letter of our Dionysius, written in the year 256, is an authentic witness of the vast progress which christianity had made in the East. It had had a like progress in the West.

^f Οἱς επαρκεῖτε ἕκαστοτε, καὶ οἱς νῦν ἐπεσεῖλατε. *ibid.* p. 252. A.

^g Cav. H. L. P. i. p. 86.

^h Ann. 240. n. viii.

ⁱ Ann. 264. n. i. et seq.

given disturbance to the church in 263. Accordingly, it is spoken of by^k Pagi at the same time. Tillemont^l says, that Valerian, who began his reign about the middle of the year 253, was very favourable to the christians, till the year 257. These first three years of his reign, in which it seems that Egypt, as well as the church, enjoyed great tranquillity, are therefore very proper for considering the affair of Nepos; the time of which we do not know, but which seems to suit a time of peace. So that learned writer just mentioned.

Nepos wrote a book entitled, A Confutation of the Allegorists. This being in great repute with some persons, who had too carnal notions of an expected millennium, Dionysius wrote a confutation of it in two books, entitled, Concerning the Promises. St. Jerom makes particular mention of this work in his^m Catalogue. I say no more of this matter here; I shall give a particular account of it from Eusebius, in the article of Dionysius's testimony to the books of scripture.

VI. When there arose a controversy between Stephen of Rome, and Cyprian of Carthage, about the baptism of heretics, Dionysiusⁿ wrote a letter to Stephen. It is the same letter, a part of which was before transcribed, where Dionysius informs Stephen of the peace of the eastern churches, with regard to Novatianism, and is supposed to have been written in 256. The second letter concerning baptism was sent to Xystus, or Sixtus, successor of Stephen, as^o Eusebius expressly says. This letter must have been written in 257, or 258. And herein, as^p Eusebius likewise informs us, Dionysius referred to his letter to Stephen, and then adds: 'I^q wrote likewise to our beloved and fellow-presbyters, Dionysius and Philemon, who were of the same mind with Stephen, and wrote to me upon that question. To them I wrote formerly in a few words, but now largely.' And the letter now sent to Philemon I suppose to be that which Eusebius afterwards^r calls Dionysius's third letter upon baptism. The^s fourth, concern-

^k Crit. An. 263. ii.

^l St. Den. d'Alex. Art. ix.

^m Et duo libri adversum Nepotem episcopum, qui mille annorum corporale regnum suis scriptis asseverat: in quibus et de Apocalypsi Joannis diligentissime disputat. De V. I. cap. 69.

ⁿ Euseb. l. vii. cap. 4, 5.

^o Τετάρτην δὲ Διονύσιος περὶ βαπτισματος χαραξας ἐπιτολὴν. κ. λ. ib. p. 252. A.

^p Ib. A. B.

^q Ib. C.

^r Καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ δὲ τῶν περὶ βαπτισματος, ἣν Φιλημονι τὴν κατὰ Ῥώμην πρεσβυτέρῳ ὁ αὐτὸς γραφεὶ Διονύσιος' ib. cap. vii. in.

^s Ἡ τετάρτη αὐτῆ περὶ βαπτισματος ἐπιτολῶν πρὸς τὸν κατὰ Ῥώμην ἐγραφή Διονύσιον, τότε μὲν πρεσβυτεὶς ἠξιωμένον' κ. λ. ib. p. 254. A.

ing the same matter, according to Eusebius's way of computing, is that sent to Dionysius, then presbyter, afterwards bishop of Rome. Jerom^t likewise reckons two distinct letters, one to Philemon, another to Dionysius. In this letter, as Eusebius says, Dionysius writes of Novatus to this purpose; 'We^u do with good reason abominate Novatus, who has divided the church, and drawn some of the brethren into impiety and blasphemy, and has calumniated our most gracious Lord Jesus Christ as unmerciful.' Afterwards Eusebius adds, 'that^v Dionysius's fifth letter concerning baptism was written to Xystus, bishop of the 'Romans:' out of which Eusebius transcribes a passage relating to that matter, and then adds; 'There^w is extant 'yet another letter of the same person concerning baptism, 'as from himself and his people, to Xystus and the church 'at Rome, in which he treats largely of this question.' Thus, according to Eusebius, there were at least six letters of Dionysius upon this point sent to Rome; three of which were to Xystus, though Jerom in his Catalogue,^x among the works of Dionysius, reckons but two letters to that bishop. And immediately after the words last cited from Eusebius it is added, that^y beside these there is another letter of this Dionysius to Dionysius of Rome, concerning one Lucian.

What was our Dionysius's own opinion in this controversy is not certainly known. Jerom^t says plainly, 'that^z 'Dionysius, agreeing with Cyprian and the African synod 'in the opinion of rebaptizing heretics, wrote to divers 'persons a great number of letters, still extant.' And^a Valesius and^b Pagi allow, that Dionysius^c was somewhat inclined to Cyprian's side of the question. Nevertheless, there are some learned moderns who venture to contradict St. Jerom; though one would think he might be better able to judge of this matter than we at this time, who have so small a part of those letters come down to us. The learned moderns whom I mean are^d Du Pin and^e Basnage, whom any may consult that are so disposed. However it may be

^t Et ad Philemonem et ad Dionysium, Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyteros, duas epistolas. De V. I. cap. 69.

^u Ibid. cap. viii.

^v Ib. cap. ix. in.

^w Ib. p. 255. C.

^x Ad Xystum, qui Stephano successerat, duas epistolas. ib. cap. 69.

^y Euseb. ib. p. 255. C.

^z Hic in Cypriani et Africæ

synodi dogma consentiens de hæreticis rebaptizandis, ad diversos plurimas misit epistolas. De V. I. c. 69.

^a Vales. An. in Eus. I. vii.

c. v. p. 141.

^b A. 256. n. xii.

^c In Afrorum et Orientalium sententiam magis propendebat.

^d Bibl. Tom. i. p. 188.

^e Basn. A. 247. n. x.

observed here, that the former of those two learned writers says, ‘Dionysius was of opinion that all churches should be at liberty to follow their own customs. Some only required heretics to abjure their errors upon returning to the church: others, as the Africans, and divers churches in the East, had a different method of receiving heretics, not without baptism; and every one should do as he saw fit. This,’ says Du Pin, ‘was Dionysius’s sentiment; and Jerom is to blame for saying that he sided with Cyprian.’ Cave^f expresseth himself after this manner; ‘That Dionysius, together with Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and a great many others in the East, stood on Cyprian’s side, maintaining that heretics ought to be baptized. But, however, he carried himself with great temper and moderation. Besides that, he engaged more as a mediator than a party, writing to Pope Stephen to use moderation in the case; as he did also to Sixtus his successor, and most other bishops of that time.’ This may be the truest judgment; for Dionysius’s moderation is manifest. He is^g against excommunicating churches upon this account: but what was his own opinion any farther in this point, does not appear clearly from the fragments or history in Eusebius.

VII. In the first letter to Xystus before mentioned, the second upon the subject of baptism, written in 257 or 258, Dionysius, as^h Eusebius says, informs him of the great increase of the Sabellian heretics at that time, in these words: ‘For as concerning the opinion now advanced in Ptolemais a city of Pentapolis, which is full of impiety and blasphemy against God Almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; containing likewise much infidelity toward his only-begotten Son, and the first begotten of every creature, the word that became man, and a stupid notion concerning the Holy Spirit; there having been brought to me letters from both parties, some also having come from thence to discourse with me; I sent thither some letters, written according to the ability which God has given me, wherein I have spoken largely. Herewith you receive copies of them.’

Afterwards, in another chapter, Eusebius speaks after this manner: ‘Besideⁱ these, there are many other epistles

^f See Cave’s Life of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, p. 289, in his History of the Lives of the Primitive Fathers. London, 1677.

^g Vid. Eus. H. E. L. vii. cap. v. p. 252. B. C.

^h Σημαινων δε εν ταυτη και περι των κατα Σαβελλιον αιρετικων, ος κατ’ αυτον επιπολαζοντων. κ. λ. H. E. L. vii. cap. 6.

ⁱ L. vii. cap. 26.

‘ of Dionysius; as those against Sabellius, written to Ammon, bishop of Bernice; and that to Tellesphorus, and that to Euphranor; and again to Ammon and Euporus. He^k composed likewise four other pieces upon the same subject, which he addressed to his namesake Dionysius of Rome.’

Concerning this matter, St. Jerom in his Catalogue^l makes no additions: he only recites, as it were, the same words of Eusebius, or part of them at least; for he omits somewhat, and scarce expresseth himself so clearly as Eusebius. However, in another place,^m he speaks again of four volumes of Dionysius against Sabellius.

Sabellius, as is supposed, published his peculiar notions a little beforeⁿ the year 257,^o about 255, or^p in 256. Dionysius’s letter before mentioned to Xystus was written in 257 or 258. The books inscribed to Dionysius of Rome could not be sent to him before 259; probably^q not till 260, or a short time after.

But Athanasius informs us of particulars omitted by both Eusebius and Jerom. It seems, some Arians of that time endeavoured to support their doctrine by some passages of Dionysius in his writings against Sabellius. This gave occasion for the Treatise, or rather Epistle of Athanasius concerning the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria. Here then Athanasius writes to this purpose: ‘ In^r Pentapolis, of the Upper Libya, at that time some bishops went into the notions of Sabellius.—Dionysius hearing of it sent to them, admonishing them to renounce their error. But they persisting in it, he was compelled to write that epistle;’ which the Arians made use of to support their doc-

^k Συνταττει δε περι της αυτης υποθεσεως και αλλα τεσσαρα συγγραμματα, α τω κατα Ρωμην ομωνυμω Διονυσιω προσφωνα. ib. p. 277. A.

^l Et adversus Sabellium, et ad Ammonem Beronices episcopum, et ad Telesphorum, et ad Euphranorum, et quatuor libri ad Dionysium Romanæ urbis episcopum. De V. I. cap. 69.

^m Et Dionysium Alexandrinæ urbis episcopum, virum eruditissimum [scribit] contra Sabellium quatuor voluminibus disputantem, in Arianum dogma delabi. Hieron. adv. Ruf. l. 2. p. 409. m.

ⁿ Il commença, un peu avant l’ an 257, à troubler la Pentapole, dans la Libye Cyrénaïque, en combatant la distinction des trois personnes divines. Tillem. Saint Denys d’ Alex. Art. xv. T. iv. P. ii. p. 595.

^o Sabellius n’ a commencé à decouvrir son hérésie que vers l’ an 255, dans le tems que l’ église jouissoit de la paix sous Valérien. Tillem. Les Sabelliens, ibid. p. 531.

^p Vid. Basnag. 247. n. ix. ^q Vid Basn. 247.

^r Εν Πενταπολει της ανω Λιβυης τηνικαυτα τινες των επισκοπων εφρωνησαν τα Σαβελλις—τριστο μαθων Διονυσιος—πεμπει και συμβλεγει τοις αιτιοις πανσασθαι της κακοδοξιας· ως δε εκ επαυοντο—ηναγκασθη προς την αναιδειαν εκεινων γραψαι την τοιαυτην επιτολην, κ. λ. Athanas. de Sent. Dionys. sect. 5. p. 240. D. E. T. i. Bened.

trine. In this piece Athanasius often mentions the Letter^s to Ammonius, and^t the Letter to Euphranor and Ammonius; meaning, I suppose, either one and the same letter, or two letters, and the same that are mentioned by Eusebius.

Farther, Athanasius informs us, that after Dionysius had written that letter to Euphranor and Ammonius, ‘some^u of the brethren of the church, of orthodox sentiments indeed, but without consulting him, that they might understand from himself the true meaning of what he had written, went to Rome, and accused him to his namesake Dionysius, bishop of Rome—who then wrote to Dionysius, to inform him of what had been laid to his charge. He^v soon replied, entitling his books a Confutation and Apology.’ Afterwards Athanasius calls this work^w an Epistle. He likewise^x quotes the second book of it. By this work, entitled in Athanasius a Confutation and Apology, or Accusation and Apology, I suppose to be intended the four pieces mentioned by Eusebius, as sent to Dionysius of Rome. For it is upon the same argument of Sabellianism, and sent to the same person. And though Athanasius in one place calleth it an Epistle, it appears from him to have consisted of several parts: and St. Basil quotes as he expresseth himself, Dionysius’s^y second epistle to his namesake concerning the Confutation [or Accusation] and Apology. I think learned men do generally allow that^z Eusebius and Athanasius speak of the same writing.

The learned Benedictine editor of St. Athanasius’s works, in the advertisement before the epistle of Athanasius, concerning the opinion of Dionysius, passeth a severe censure upon Eusebius; ‘That,^a being an Arian, he has been silent

^s *Εἰ δὲ γραφᾶς τὴν πρὸς Ἀμμωνίου ἐπιστολὴν ὑποπτεύθη*, κ. λ. *ib.* p. 247. B.

^t *Οὕτως ἔκ Ἀρειανὸς ὁ Διονύσιος, διὰ τὴν πρὸς Εὐφράνορα καὶ Ἀμμωνίου κατὰ Σαβελλίου ἐπιστολὴν*. p. 249. B. *vid. etiam* 251. C. 252. B. 261. C.

^u *Ib.* p. 252. B. C. *conf. eund. de Synodis*, &c. p. 757, 758.

^v *Καὶ ἀντεγράψεν εὐθὺς αὐτὸς, καὶ ἐπιγράψε τὰ βιβλία ἐλεγχῶ καὶ ἀπολογίας*, *ib.* p. 252. C.

^w *Πρῶτον μὲν ἐν ἐλεγχῶ καὶ ἀπολογίας ἐγράψεν ἑαυτῆ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν*. p. 253. A. ^x *Ὅρα παλιν πῶς ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ βιβλίῳ γράφει περὶ τούτων*. p. 260. E.

^y —*ἐν τῇ δευτέρῃ πρὸς τὸν ὁμόνυμον ἑαυτῆ ἐπιστολῇ περὶ ἐλεγχῶ καὶ ἀπολογίας*, κ. λ. *Bas. de Sp. S. cap. 72.* p. 60. E. *Tom. 3.* Ben.

^z *Apud Eusebium vii. 26.* *Hist. ubi librorum quatuor Dionysii Alex. ad Dionysium Rom. adversus Sabellium mentio, (ἐλεγχῶ καὶ ἀπολογίας vocat Athanasius,) &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 264. conf. Cav. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 96. de Dionys. Alex. Tillemont, Les Sabelliens, Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 535.*

^a *Quod autem Eusebius, qui Dionysii gesta fuscè satis prosequitur, ne verbum quidem de hac historiâ fecerit; hinc sane augetur jam vulgata de ipso, nimisque firma, Arianismi suspicio. Callide profecto tacuit hæresi suæ exitiosam historiam, quam incautius, ut ait Athanasius, alii Ariani, in suamque perniciem, evulgarunt.* *ap. Athanas. ib.* p. 243.

‘about this history, because it is prejudicial to his cause.’ But, in answer to this, several things may be said. First, Eusebius has made mention of Dionysius’s writings against Sabellius, and particularly the pieces sent to Dionysius of Rome. Secondly, the design of Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History might not lead him to give a more particular account of that affair, or of the works composed upon that occasion, or to transcribe any passages from them. Though Eusebius enlarges considerably upon Dionysius, he has not written a complete history of him, or his works. Besides, Jerom was no Arian, and yet he adds nothing to Eusebius: scarcely says so much. And Theodoret, having given an account of Sabellius himself, and his doctrine, adds only in these few words; ‘Against^b him wrote ‘Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria.’ Thirdly, allowing Eusebius to have been an Arian, he might be well enough satisfied with Dionysius’s sentiments relating to the doctrine of the Trinity: and there is at least as much reason to think he was so as not; for the great respect he has shown for Dionysius affords an argument that he did not look upon him to be a man of the adverse side. It is plain from Athanasius, that some Arians did boast of Dionysius as a favourer of their doctrine: and why may not Eusebius form the same judgment of that great man? St. Basil, too, who is generally allowed to be orthodox, says, he^c does not like every thing in Dionysius; that^d he had given encouragement to the Anomæan doctrine; and^e that he expresseth himself differently in speaking^f of the Trinity.

^b Κατα τετρα συνεγραψε Διονυσιος, ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείων ἐπίσκοπος. Theod. H. E. l. 2. cap. ix.

Basil. Ep. ix. [al. 41.] p. 90. c.

^c Οὐ πάντα θαυμάζομεν τ’ ἀνδρος.

^d Σχεδὸν γὰρ ταυτησι τῆς νῦν περιθρυλλομένης ἀσεβείας, τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀνομοίον λεγῶ, ἅτος ἐστίν, ὅσα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν, ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώποις τα σπέρματα παρασχών. *ibid.*

^e Καὶ παντοδαπὸς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασιν. *ib.* E.

^f After all these, and other things, said by St. Basil in his Letter to Maximus, it appears to me very strange, which is said by Theodorice Ruinart: Ex his fuit Basilius Magnus, qui in Epistolâ 41, ad Maximum philosophum, proferre non dubitavit, Dionysium, quantum sibi liqueret, primum hominibus impietatis Anomæanæ seminaria præbuisse, non ex malitiâ quidem, sed quod Sabellio obluetari cuperet. At paullo ante fassus fuerat, se nullum ex Dionysii libris legisse. Venerunt quidem ad nos, inquit, illius admodum multa, libri vero nondum adsunt. Ruinart. Act. Mart. Sinc. et Select. p. 181. Here, to vindicate Dionysius’s reputation upon this head, and invalidate the character which Basil gives him, Ruinart is pleased to say, that Basil had never read any of his works; whereas it is plain from that letter to Maximus, that Basil was well acquainted with them; otherwise he could not have spoken of them as he does. Nor is the passage, on which Ruinart builds that strange supposition, at all to his purpose. He understands Basil according to the Latin translation of Godfrey Tilman: libri vero nondum adsunt. But if he had

Gennadius^g calls Dionysius the fountain of Arianism, speaking very agreeably to St. Basil. Rufinus endeavours to defend Dionysius, by saying that^h his works had been interpolated by the Arians: though this is now esteemed a groundless assertion by learned moderns, particularly byⁱ bishop Bull. Undoubtedly the above-mentioned piece of Athanasius is well written. It is the work of one who knew how to manage an argument to the best advantage. But, as Dionysius had expressed himself differently, there might be ground for debating what was his real sentiment. And Eusebius might think Dionysius held the same doctrine that he did. But it was not proper to be more particular than he has been in his Ecclesiastical History, where he was to write of general things, about which christians for the most part were agreed; not of points controverted by the christians of his time. This is said in defence of Eusebius, not of Arianism, with which I have no particular concern in this work, no more than Eusebius had in his Ecclesiastical History.

Bishop^k Bull has no scruples here. But Basnage says, that^l though Dionysius thought justly and orthodoxly, he expressed himself improperly. Le Moyne^m likewise, another defender of Dionysius, says, his expressions need and ought to be mollified to make sound divinity.

This is what we have to say of Dionysius's conduct in the affair of Sabellianism; which, as Eusebius informed us, spread greatly at that time in Egypt.

looked upon the Greek, he would have perceived that Basil only said he had not Dionysius's works with him, and therefore he could not send them to Maximus, as he had desired, *ε παρ επι γε μην τα βιβλια, διοπερ εκ απεπειδαμεν*. Cæterum quæ postulas Dionysii scripta, venere quidem illa ad nos, et valde multa: sed non adsunt libri, et ideo non misimus. Basil. T. 3. p. 90. B. C. Ed. Bened.

^g Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credendum, ut vult Dionysius, fons Arii. Gennad. de Ecc. Dogm. cap. iv. ap. Aug. T. 8. Append. p. 75. Bened.

^h Dionysius quoque, Alexandrinus episcopus, eruditissimus assertor ecclesiasticæ fidei, eum in quamplurimus in tantum veritatem atque æqualitatem Trinitatis defendat, ut imperitioribus quibusque etiam secundum Sabellium sensisse videatur: in his tamen libris suis, quos adversus Sabellii hæresim scribit, talia inveniuntur inserta, ut frequenter Ariani auctoritate ipsius se defendere conentur. Rufin. de Adult. libr. Orig. ad Macar. sub fin. ap. Hieron. T. v. p. 250, 251. Bened.

ⁱ Deceptus vero in eo est Rufinus Aquilensis, dum existimavit Dionysii scripto ab Arianis fuisse corrupta et depravata, &c. Bull. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 2. cap. xi. p. 129.

^k Vid. Bull. *ibid.* ^l Rem quod attinet, de augustissimo Trinitatis mysterio vera sensisse Dionysium existimamus; incommodam tamen duramque locutionem ipsius prorsus improbamus. Basn. ann. 247. n. ix.

^m Cui licet quædam excederint minus veritati congrua, ea sunt tamen benigniori interpretatione mollienda et condienda. Le Moyne, Notis ad Var. Sacr. p. 236.

But before we leave this article it will not be improper to take some further notice of Sabellius and his opinions.

Dionysius himself, as ⁿ before quoted, speaks of the rise of that doctrine in Ptolemais, a city of Pentapolis. Theodoret says, Sabellius ^o was an African, [or Libyan,] of Pentapolis. St. Basil likewise calls ^p Sabellian a Libyan: and Isidore of Pelusium says Sabellianism ^q had its rise in Libya.

With regard to his notions, Epiphanius says, ‘that,’ ‘excepting a few things only, Sabellius agreed with the Noetians: that ^s Sabellius and his followers teach that the same is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so that there are only three denominations in one hypostasis; [or subsistence;] or, as in man, soul, and spirit.’ In that which is called his Recapitulation, Epiphanius says, ‘the ^t Sabellians agreed with the Noetians, except in this one thing, that they said the Father did not suffer.’ This is Epiphanius’s whole article concerning the Sabellians in that work.

Damascenus says, ‘The ^u Sabellians agree with Noetus, except that they do not say the Father suffered. They speak of the Word brought forth and again resumed.’ This is the same as the Summary, or ^v Synopsis, of Epiphanius.

The last sentence is difficult to be rendered in our language. I am far from thinking there is any particular propriety or exactness in my translation; but it was necessary that I should put down some English words instead of the original. What I have translated ‘the Word brought forth’ might perhaps be as well rendered ‘the Word pronounced, or uttered, spoken forth, showed, or discovered.’

In order to judge of this matter, it should be observed, that *logos* [word] in the Greek language has two senses; reason or thought, and speech. They therefore sometimes speak of *λογος ενδιαθετος*, inward, or internal *logos*, or word, that is, thought; and *λογος προφορικος*, outward, or declared *logos* or word, that is, speech. With regard to God, there-

ⁿ See p. 657.

^o Hæret. Fab. L. ii. cap. 9.

^p Bas. Ep. 207. [al. 63.] p. 210. A.

^q Lib. i. Ep. 247.

^r Hæret. 62. n. i. p. 513. A.

^s —τον αυτον ειναι πατερα,

τον αυτον ειναι αγιον πνευμα' ως ειναι εν μιγ υποσασει τρεις ονομασις, η ως εν ανθρωπω σωμα, και ψυχην, και πνευμα. κ. λ. ib. B.

^t —τα ομοια Νοητιανων δοξαζοντες, παρα τωτο μονον' λεγβσι γυρ μη πεπονθεναι τον πατερα. Epiph. Anac. T. ii. p. 146. n. xvi.

^u Οι τα ομοια Νοητε δοξαζοντες, παρα το μη τον πατερα λεγειν πεπονθεναι' λεγοντες προφορικον και παλιν αναχειρομενον τον λογον. J. Dam. de Hæret. n. lxii. p. 296.

^v Vid. Epiph. T. i. p. 398.

fore, the Word is either the reason, thought, wisdom, counsel, power of God within himself; or his reason, wisdom, power, displayed and manifested; or, in other words, the command, the will of God, active and effective. Beausobre, speaking of this matter, and particularly of the sentiment of the Sabellians concerning the Word, expresseth himself thus: ‘The^w Word never proceeds out of the Father but ‘as our reason proceeds, as I may say, out of us, when it ‘makes known by words and commands what are our ‘thoughts and our desires. So the word, which was in ‘Jesus Christ, is only a declarative Word, which manifested ‘to Jesus the knowledge of salvation, and an operative ‘Word, which conferred upon him miraculous power. It ‘is only an operative of the Deity, a full effusion of the ‘divine wisdom and power in the soul of our Lord.’ So that learned writer.

Perhaps some may be of opinion that some ancient christians, by *λογος προφορικος*, outward word, when applied to our Saviour, endeavoured to express and explain “God was manifested in the flesh;” 1 Tim. iii. 16. Compare John i. 14; xvi. 28; Prov. viii. 25; Is. lv. 11.

Epiphanius intimates, that the Sabellians embraced that which was their peculiar opinion out of a dread of polytheism: for, as he^x says, when they met with other christians, especially such as were unlearned, they would put this shrewd question to them; ‘Well, good friends, what ‘is our doctrine? Have we one God, or three Gods?’

Philaster^y calls Sabellius a disciple of Noetus: but possibly he meaneth no more than that, as to his doctrine, he agreed with or followed Noetus, who was more ancient. But I shall not stay to transcribe him here, nor^z Augustine, at large. The reader may remember that I some time ago quoted^a Augustine’s article of the Sabellians in his book of Heresies.

St. Ambrose says, in short, ‘that^b the error of Sabellius ‘lay in confounding the Father and the Word.’

^w Le verbe ne sort jamais du Père, que comme notre raison sort, pour ainsi dire, hors de nous, lorsqu’ elle fait connoître, par des paroles et par des commandemens, quelles sont nos pensées et nos volontés. Ainsi le Verbe, qui a été en J. Christ, n’est qu’ un Verbe declaratif, qui a manifesté, à Jésus la science du salut, et un Verbe opératif, qui lui a conféré une puissance miraculeuse.—Ce n’ est qu’ une opération de la Divinité, une pleine effusion de la sagesse et de la vertue divine dans l’ ame du Seigneur. Beaus. Hist. de Manich. P. ii. l. 3. ch. 6. n. ix.

^x —την πνευσιν αυτοις ὑφηγονται παντην· τι αν ειπωμεν, ω στοι; ένα θεον εχομεν, η τρεις θεος; Epiph. Hær. 62. n. ii. p. 514. B.

^y Phil. H. 54.

^z Aug. de Hær. c. 41.

^a See p. 593.

^b Neque,

St. Basil represents Sabellius and the Sabellians as teaching the^c Father, Son, and Spirit, to ‘be three persons ‘in one hypostasis,’ or subsistence. To^d the like purpose Isidore of Pelusium.

If the author of the Conference between Zachæus and Apollonius may be relied upon, the^e Sabellians said, that by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament ought not to be understood a person, but a gift; being spoken of as given and received. They argued particularly, as he says, from John xx. 22, and Acts xix. 2.

Sabellianism must have been very agreeable to the apprehensions of many people. Eusebius^f speaks of its increasing very much in Egypt, when Dionysius of Alexandria opposed it. According to Athanasius, the occasion of Dionysius’s writing upon that head was, ‘that some^g ‘bishops of Africa followed the doctrine of Sabellius, and ‘they prevailed to such a degree, that the Son of God was ‘scarce any longer preached in the churches.’ Perhaps this passage may give some ground to think that Sabellius himself was a bishop, though none of the authors I have quoted or referred to expressly say any such thing. Isidore, before cited, says, that^h Sabellianism spread to a great degree. Epiphanius, in 375, says thereⁱ were then many of that opinion in Mesopotamia and at Rome. Tillemont^k concludes that these people had a body of communion in 381, because the council of Constantinople^l rejects their baptism. The frequent notice which^m Augustine

ut Sabellius, Patrem confundamus et Verbum; ut eundem Patrem adseramus et Filium. Ambr. de Fide, l. 1. c. 1. T. ii. p. 445. A. Bened.

^c Ὁ γὰρ ἐν πραγμα πολυπροσωπον λεγων πατερα και υιον και ἅγιον πνευμα, και μιαν των τριων την ὑποστασιν εκτιθεμενος. κ. λ. Basn. Eph. 210. [al. 64.] p. 315. A.

^d Την προσκυνητην και μακαριαν τριαδα μιαν τινα τριπροσωπον ὑποστασιν ἐξεληρησεν. Isid. l. 1. Ep. 247.

^e Credo teneas in præcedente titulo prenotatum, a Sabellianis præcipue Sanctum Spiritum denegari, et donum potius quam donatorem impiorum traditionibus dici; malique hujus auctoritatem sacris vel maxime testimoniis usurpari, quia et dari legatur et accipi, Salvatore ad apostolos sic loquente. et insufflans eis dixit: Accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Quidam etiam discipulorum a Paulo interrogati, An accepistis Spiritum Sanctum? neque accepisse, nec, si esset, scire se, dixerunt. Consulta. Zach. et Apoll. l. 2. cap. 14. in. ap. Acherii Spicileg. T. x. p. 81. 4to.

^f Eus. l. 7. c. 6.

^g—τηρικαυτα τιμες των επισκοπων εφρονησαν τα Σαβελλιου και τοςετων ισχυσαν ταις επινοιας, ως ολιγη δειν μηκειτι εν ταις εκκλησιας, κηρυττεσθαι τον υιον τῃ Θεῳ. De Sent. Dionys. p. 246. D.

^h Ἡ Σαβελλιου κακονοια, εκ Διβυης απαρασα, εις πολλας δε κωμωσασα. Isid. l. 1. Ep. 247.

ⁱ Πολλοι δε εν τη Μεση των Ποταμων, και ετιν τα μερη της Ρωμης, τῃ αυτη δογματος ὑπαρχουσιν. Har. 62. p. 513. B.

^k Les Sabelliens, p. 535.

^l Can. vii. Labb. T. ii. p. 951.

^m I quoted some such passages from Augustine in Ch. xli. p. 593. note w.

takes of Sabellians, in his tracts and sermons to the people, is an argument that in his time there was some considerable number of persons who maintained this opinion.

Of the scriptures received by Sabellius, and others of his sentiments, we have the following information. Epiphanius expressly says, thatⁿ they used all the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and that there were some texts which they principally insisted on for the support of their doctrine. Nevertheless he afterwards adds, that^o their whole error, and all the strength of it, is taken from some apocryphal writings, especially from the gospel according to the Egyptians. Moreover Epiphanius argues against them from many books of the New Testament, particularly^p from the Acts of the Apostles, (ch. i. and vii.) and complains of them, not that they rejected scripture, but that^q they did not understand the meaning of the scriptures.^r

Theodoret's account of Sabellius is, 'that^s he taught the ' Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be one hypostasis, [subsistence,] and one person with three names; that ' he speaks of the same sometimes as Father, sometimes as ' Son, and sometimes as Holy Ghost; and says, that in the ' Old Testament he delivered the law as Father, and in the ' New dwelt among men, [or was incarnate,] as the Son, ' and descended on the apostles as the Holy Spirit.' This passage confirms what Epiphanius said, that Sabellius received all the scriptures.

It appears likewise from the arguments of^t Athanasius, and others, that the Sabellians received the holy scriptures as other christians did.

I was obliged just now^u to give a hint of the time of Sabellianism. I would here add^v in the margin the sentiments of divers learned men upon that point.

They who are desirous of seeing more may consult the Index to T. iii. P. ii. and T. V. Ed. Bened. V. Sabelliani.

ⁿ Κεχρηται δε ταις πασαις γραφαις παλαιας τε και καινης διαθηκης. κ. λ. ib. p. 513. D.

^o Την δε πασαν αυτων πλανην, και την της πλανης αυτων δυναμιν εχουσιν εξ αποκρυφων τινων, μαλιζα απο τε καλεμενης Λιγυπτιω Εναγγελιαι, ω τινες το ονομα επεθεντο τετο. ib. p. 514. A.

^p P. 518. A.

^q Μη νοησας την φωνην των αγων γραφων. ib. B.

^r Non exstet evangelium Johannis, ne Sabellius discat: "Ego et Pater unum sumus." Joh. x. 30. Hilar. De Synod. n. lxxxv. p. 1199. A.

^s Μιαν υποστασιν εφησεν ειναι τον πατερα και τον υιον, και το αγιον πνευμα, και εν τριωνυμιον προσωπων' και τον αυτον, ποτε μεν ως πατερα καλει, ποτε δε ως αγιον πνευμα, και εν μεν τη παλαια, ως πατερα νομοθετησαι, εν δε τη καινη, ως υιον ενανθρωπησαι, ως πνευμα δε αγιον τοις αποστολοις επιφοιτησαι. Theodoret. II. Fab. l. 2. cap. 9.

^t Vid Athan. de Sent. Dionys. p. 261, 262. et Or. iv. contr. Arian. p. 636. E. F. 637. T. i. Bened.

^u See p. 658.

^v Sed Libycus [Sabellius] ab illo Pentapolitano nequitquam diversus est, qui

VIII. Before Dionysius died there arose another dispute of a like nature about the doctrine of the Trinity. The principal person concerned herein was Paul of Samosata, who had been bishop of Antioch from ^w about the year 260. We have already had divers references to this affair. I think it may now be proper to take Eusebius's account of it pretty much at length.

Says our ecclesiastical historian, 'Xystus,^x bishop of the church of Rome, was succeeded by Dionysius, of the same name with the bishop of Alexandria. About the same time Demetrian^y bishop of Antioch dying, Paul of Samosata succeeded him in the episcopate of that city. He^z having a low and abject opinion of Christ, contrary to the doctrine of the church, as if he had been no more than a man, a synod was appointed. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, when invited, excused his coming thither on account of his age and bodily infirmity: however, he sent a letter containing his opinion upon the point in question. The rest of the pastors of the churches from all parts hastened to Antioch, and were convened there as against a destroyer of the flock of Christ. The^a most eminent of which were Firmilian, bishop of the church of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; Gregory and Athenodorus, brothers, pastors of the churches in Pontus; and, beside these, Helenus, bishop of the church in Tarsus; and Nicomas, of Iconium; Hymenæus, bishop of the church at Jerusalem; Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea in the same country; Maximus, who with great reputation presided over the brethren at Bostra; with many others, beside presbyters and deacons. These had divers meetings, and in every assembly there were many questions and disputes; Paul of Samosata on the one hand endeavouring to conceal his heterodox notion, they on the other hand striving to detect and expose his heresy and blasphemy against Christ. In the mean time Dionysius dies, in the twelfth year of the reign of Gallienus, having been bishop of Alexandria seventeen years.

hæresim præceptoris sui Noëti disseminare latius cœpit, A. C. 257, ut notârunt Benedictini notis ad S. Ambrosium, T. ii. p. 445. [circiter annum 257.] Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. ii. p. 33. seq. et Rev. Christianus Wormius in Historiâ Sabellianismi, editâ Francof. 1698. capite 3. Idem de Marcello Ancyrano videntus, capite 5. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 23. Tom. viii. p. 335. Conf. Philastr. de Hær. n. liv. p. 108. not. ^a. Ed. Fabric.

^w Vid. Pagi, 261. num. vi.

^x Eus. H. E. l. 7. cap. 27.

^y Demetrian had succeeded Fabius in 252. and was succeeded by Paul in 260. Vid. Pagi, 261. n. vi. Basnag. 261. n. iii.

^z Τὰς δὲ ταπεινά καὶ χαμαιπετὴ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διδασκαλίαν φρονησαντος, ὡς κοινῆ τὴν φύσιν ἀνθρώπου γενομένου. *ib.* p. 277. C.

^a *ib.* cap. 28.

‘ His successor was Maximus. Gallienus, having reigned fifteen years, was succeeded by Claudius; he having been emperor two years was succeeded by Aurelian. In^b his time the last synod was convened, consisting of a very great number of bishops.’ In this synod, as Eusebius proceeds to relate, Paul was evidently convicted of the heresy laid to his charge, and was excommunicated from the whole catholic church under heaven. The chief author of the conviction and condemnation of Paul was Malchion, presbyter in the church at Antioch. ‘ The^c pastors of the churches, then assembled together, with one consent wrote an epistle to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, and Maximus, bishop of Alexandria, which was also sent to the churches all over the provinces.’ In this epistle, written in the name of Helenus, and^d the other bishops, and of the presbyters and deacons and the churches of God, an^e account is given of their own labour and pains, of the perverse and obstinate heresy of Paul, their convictions of Paul, and conferences with him, and of his life and morals. Here the fathers of this council say, ‘ they had sent to many bishops of the remotest provinces to come to their assistance upon this occasion; particularly to Dionysius of Alexandria, and Firmilian of Cappadocia, men of blessed memory; that the former had sent a letter to Antioch, but did not so much as vouchsafe a salutation to the author of that heresy; nor did he write to him by name, but to the whole church [of Antioch]; of which letter we here subjoin a copy.’ Firmilian, they say, had been twice at Antioch; and condemned, as they are well assured, Paul’s novel doctrine. ‘ But,’ believing and hoping the matter might be determined without bringing any reproach upon the christian religion, he deferred the sentence, being deceived,’ as they say, ‘ by him who had denied his God and Lord; and he was willing to come once more to Antioch, but when he was got as far as Tarsus he there died.’ The^z council then proceeds, blackening Paul’s character, charging him with pride, avarice, exaction, an exorbitant love of praise and

^b Cap. 29.

^c Cap. 30.

^d — και οί λοιποι παντες, οί συν ήμιν παροικωντες τας εγγυς πολεις εθνη, επισκοποι και πρεσβυτεροι και διακονοι, και αι εκκλησιαι τῶ θεῶ, αγαπητοις αδελφοις εν Κυριῳ χαιρειν. p. 279. C.

^e την αυτων σπαθην τοις πασι φανεραν καθισταντες, και τῶ Παυλῶ την διαστροφον ετεροδοξίαν, ελεγχῶς τε και ερωτησεις ἄς προς αυτον ανακεκίνηκασι, και επι τον παντα βιον τε και τροπον τῶ ανδρῶς διηγουμενοι. *ibid.* p. 279. B.

^f επαγγελιαμενῶς δε μεταθισσῶσαι, πιπυσας και ελπισας ανευ τινος περι τον λογον λαιδωριας το πραγμα εις εἶον κατασησῶσαι ανεβιβετο. κ. λ. *ib.* p. 280. A.

^z *Ib.* p. 280. B. C. D. 281, 282. A. B.

applause from all sorts of people. They say ‘ that^h he
 ‘ accepted secular dignities and chose rather to be con-
 ‘ sidered as a judge [or officer of the revenue] than a bishop.
 ‘ He has been used to walk through the high streets, re-
 ‘ ceiving letters, and dictating answers as he went along,
 ‘ attended by a great number of people as his guards, some
 ‘ going before, others following him. It is not necessary,’
 they say, ‘ to insist on his vain-glorious behaviour in the
 ‘ ecclesiastical assemblies, where he affects all imaginary
 ‘ pomp proper to amaze and astonish weak, ignorant people ;
 ‘ for he has erected to himself a tribunal and lofty throne,
 ‘ not like a disciple of Christ, but after the manner of civil
 ‘ magistrates, with a closet as he calls it. It has been usual
 ‘ for him also to clap his hand upon his thigh, and stamp
 ‘ with his feet. Andⁱ if there are any who do not applaud

^h κοσμικα αξιωματα υποδυμενος, και δεκηναριος μαλλον η επισκοπος θελων καλεισθαι. p. 280. C.

ⁱ An excessive fondness for praise and commendation is far from being justifiable in any man. But, if Paul’s whole fault consisted only in receiving and encouraging applauses and acclamations, when he spoke in public, the fathers of the council may be reckoned to have aggravated to a great degree ; for it is certain that these things were common in church assemblies in the fourth and fifth, and following centuries. The passages of authors relating to this matter are too numerous to be inserted or referred to in this place. It has been observed by some learned moderns, that Chrysostom, a man of a severe temper, reproved and checked those acclamations, but that Augustine received them very willingly. *Ac videtur admirandæ sanctitatis vir B. Augustinus eum morem tulisse non invitus, atque adeo non improbasse: quod ex libro iv. de Doctrinâ Christianâ, cap. 26. aliisque locis licet intelligere. Non ita Joannes Chrysostomus; qui vir divinus, ut erat austiore ingenio, morem tot seculorum improbavit, damnavitque. Is. Casaub. Not. in Vulcat. Gallicani Avid. Cass. cap. 13. p. 467. Conf. Ferrar. lib. v. cap. 2.* There is scarce any kind of acclamation or applause here mentioned by this council but was in use in Chrysostom’s time. The people applauded his sermons by shaking their loose garments, moving their plumes, waving their handkerchiefs. *Vid. Ferrar. l. v. c. 9.* Jerom reminds Vigilantius that, when he preached upon the resurrection, Vigilantius himself had applauded him with hands and feet, leaping up and down, and crying out orthodox. *Recordare quæso illius diei, quando me de resurrectione et veritate corporis prædicante, ex latere subsaltabas, et plaudebas manû, et applodebas pedem, et orthodoxum conclamabas. Ad Vigilant. Ep. 36. [al. 75.] p. 277. m.* In another place Jerom speaks of his being present at a sermon where the people applauded a certain interpretation of a text by stamping with the feet: *Scio me audisse quendam de hoc loco in cœlestâ disputantem,—certe tunc in populo dicta placuerunt, et quodam plausu ac tripudio sunt excepta. In Ep. ad Eph. cap. 5. 14.* It appears from Augustine that the acclamations of the people were very customary in Africa: *Unde autem crebro et multum acclamatur ita dicentibus, &c. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. l. 4. c. 26.* How can it then be thought strange by any, that this practice should prevail in the East, where it had its original? Concerning the acclamations of the ancients, may be seen, beside others, *Fr. Ferrarius de Veterum Acclam. et Plausu; Suicer. Thes. V. Κροτος; J. Bingham*

• him, nor, as it is customary in the theatre, shake their
 • handkerchiefs, nor make loud acclamations, nor leap up
 • and down as some of his creatures do, but^k hear with a
 • composed attention and reverence, as becometh the house
 • of God, he reproveth and abuseth them.’ Afterwards they
 insinuate, that from views of interest he neglected to keep
 up a strict discipline among his clergy. ‘What^l shall we
 • say of his^m subintroduced women, as the Antiochians call
 • them, and of those belonging to his presbyters and deacons?
 • with regard to whom he conceals and tolerates this, and
 • many other crimes, which he knows very well, and of
 • which he has convicted them, that he may keep them in
 • dependence, and that, standing in fear of him on their
 • own account, they may not dare to bring accusations
 • against him for his unrighteous actions; moreover, he has
 • enriched them; for which reason he is beloved and admired
 • by men of covetous and worldly dispositions. But why
 • do we write these things? We are persuaded, brethren,
 • that a bishop and all the clergy are bound to give the
 • people an example of all good works. And we are not
 • ignorant, that by introducing women, some have fallen
 • into sin, and others have been suspected. Althoughⁿ
 • therefore it should be granted, that he has done nothing
 • contrary to modesty, yet the very suspicion that arises

Antiquities of the christian church, B. xiv. ch. 4. sect. xxvii. Casaub. ut supra; Neocori Bibl. Librorum Novorum. p. 18, &c. A. D. 1697.

^k τοις δ' εν, ως εν οικω Θεου σεμνοπρεπως, και εντακτως ακεβησιν, επιτιμων και ενυβριζων. p. 281. A.

ως Αντιοχεις ονομαζουσι. κ. λ. ib. C.

^l τας συνεισακτες αυτες γυναικας

^m According to this account, Paul's conduct was not exemplary, scarce reputable; but yet I am apt to think it was not criminal. The women here spoken of were not wives, nor concubines, but persons maintained as objects of charity, or else for the sake of domestic affairs. The thing was disliked by many, but nevertheless it was practised by some virtuous ecclesiastics. Vid. Epiphani. Hær. 63. n. ii. Cyprian. ad Pompon. Ep. 62. al. 4. It seems that Paul was not the first person who begun this practice at Antioch. This may be argued from the name by which the Antiochians called such women, which appears to have been then common and well known. And as much might be argued from some other considerations. That Paul was innocent, or free from crime, is probable, in that the fathers of the council do not charge him directly with unchastity or immodesty; which they would not have failed to do if there had been any ground for it, as we may be assured from the temper of the composer or composers of this Synodical epistle: and I think that Paul's open way of acting, without reserve, must be of great use to prevent suspicion, or to remove it if it should arise in the mind of any one. The third canon of the council of Nice in 325, is to this purpose: ‘That no bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the clergy, should have an introduced woman, unless she be a mother, or sister, or aunt, or however a person liable to no suspicion.’ Vid. Mosheim. de Reb. Christian. p. 703, 704.

ⁿ Ως ει και δοιη τις το μηδεν ασελγες ποιειν. p. 281. D.

‘ from such a practice, ought to be guarded against, for fear
 ‘ of giving offence or a bad example to any. For how can
 ‘ he reprove another, or admonish another not to^o converse
 ‘ frequently with a woman, and to “ take heed lest he slip,”
 ‘ as^p it is written; who, though he has sent away one, still
 ‘ has two in his house that are handsome and in the flower
 ‘ of their age; whom he likewise carries about with him
 ‘ wherever he goes; at the same time living well, and in-
 ‘ dulging himself in a plentiful diet?’ At^q the close of the
 epistle they say; ‘ Having therefore excommunicated this
 ‘ contumacious enemy of God, we have been obliged to
 ‘ ordain another bishop in his stead in the catholic church,
 ‘ and, as we are persuaded, not without the providence of
 ‘ God. The person we have ordained is son of Demetrian,
 ‘ of blessed memory, who formerly presided so well in this
 ‘ see, by name Domnus, a man endowed with all the accom-
 ‘ plishments requisite in a bishop. To him therefore you
 ‘ are to write. Paul, having fallen from the faith and the
 ‘ episcopate,’ as Eusebius adds, ‘ Domnus took upon him
 ‘ the care of the church of Antioch. But when^r Paul re-
 ‘ fused to leave the house of the church, a petition having
 ‘ been presented to the emperor Aurelian, he rightly deter-
 ‘ mined the matter, giving orders that the house should be
 ‘ delivered to them, to whom the bishops of the christian
 ‘ religion in Italy and at Rome should write. Thus the
 ‘ forementioned person, with the greatest disgrace, was
 ‘ thrust out of the church by the secular power.’

So writes Eusebius. There were therefore^s at least two
 councils at Antioch upon this occasion; one, at which Fir-
 milian was present, when Dionysius likewise was living,
 and sent a letter, supposed to have been convened in 264;
 another, and the last, when Paul was excommunicated,

^o ——— μη συγκαταβαίνειν επιπλεον εις ταυτον γυναικι μη ολισθη φυλατ-
 τομενον, ως γεγραπται. p. 282. A.

^p Valesius thinks the council intends somewhat in the xxvth chapter of the
 book of Ecclesiasticus: but it does not clearly appear to me what text is here
 referred to. Intelligit locum qui habetur in cap. 25, Ecclesiastici. Vales. in
 Euseb. p. 157. n. ^q P. 282. B. C.

^r Αλλα γαρ μηδαμως εκτηναι τα Παυλι τα της εκκλησιας οικια θελουτος,
 βασιλευς εντευχθεις Δερηλιανος, αισιωτατα περι τα πρακτα διεδηψε, τατοις
 νεμια προσαπτων τον οικον ος αν οι κατα την Ιταλιαν και την Ῥωμαιων πολιν
 επισκοποι τα λογηματος επιτελλοιεν. Ουτω δητα ο προδηλωθεισ ανηρ μετα της
 εσχατης αισχυνης, υπο της κοσμικης αρχης εξελαννεται της εκκλησιας. Ib.
 p. 282. D.

^s Ainsi il faut admettre trois conciles au moins sur cette affaire; celui qui
 la commença à la fin de l'ann 264; un second, dont on ignore le tems; et
 le dernier, qui la termina à la fin de 269, ou tort peu apres. Tillem. Paul de
 Samosates, Art. iv. Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 624. Conf. Basn. A 264. n. vi.

computed to have been held^t near the end of 269, and beginning of 270. Eusebius indeed seems to say, that the last council was held in the time of Aurelian, who did not^u begin his reign before November 270; whereas^v this council most probably was begun and ended in the time of Claudius. For the synodical epistle is sent to Dionysius of Rome, who died in December 269, and must therefore have been drawn up before the news of his death arrived at Antioch. But Paul, though excommunicated by the council in 269 or 270, could not be removed till 272 or 273, after^w Aurelian became master of that country, upon the conquest of Zenobia. For Paul, as^x is said, was favoured by Zenobia, and would not yield the house of the church, meaning either the bishop's dwelling-house, or the house in which the christians held their assemblies, till compelled by the authority of Aurelian. And^y perhaps Eusebius ought to be understood to mean as much: that when the council had been held under Claudius, its result had not its full effect till the reign of Aurelian, when Paul was actually thrust out of the church.

It may be best for us, in the next place, to take Theodoret's account of this matter, but briefly. He says, 'Paul^z of Samosata was bishop of the church of Antioch. At that time Zenobia reigned.—He went into the heresy of Artemon^a in complaisance^b to her who followed Jewish notions.' Then, having mentioned the names of the principal bishops present at the first council, he adds; 'And at first

^t Secunda Synodus Antiochæna adversus Paulum Samosatenum celebrata est autumnæ anni ducentissimi sexagesimi noni, sequentique continuata; quod colligitur ex epistolâ Synodicâ, quam episcopi ad Dionysium Romanum pontificem scripsere. Dionysius autem, ut mox videbimus, die vicesimâ octavâ Decembris illius anni ad Deum migravit. Quare hæc Synodus ad eum annum retrahenda. Pagi Crit. in Bar. A. 271. ii. Conf. Tillemont. Paul. de Sam. p. 625, 626.

^u Vid. Pagi, 270. n. iii.

^v Hactenus creditum fuit, Synodum hanc, Aureliano imperante, habitam fuisse; nisi quod Valesius in notis Eusebianis eam partim sub Claudio, partim sub Aureliano celebratam autumnavit sed principatûs Aureliani initio temporis suo reddito, constat, illam Claudio imperante inchoatam et finitam, &c. Pagi, 271. n. iii. Vid. Till. ib. 625, 626.

^w Sed Paulus anno tantum 273, quo Zenobia ab Aureliano capta, ab ecclesiâ penitus exturbatus; non vero eodem anno, ut videtur existimâsse Baronius. Pagi, ib. n. iv.

^x *Ἰσδαία ἢν Ζηνοβία, καὶ Παυλὸς προσῆ*

τὸ Σαμοσατεύως. Athan. Hist. Arian. n. 71. p. 386. D. Bened.

^y Vid. Pagi, 271. n. iii. iv. Conf. Tillem. ibid. note iv. sur Paul de Sam. p. 897.

^z Theodoret. H. Fab. L. 2. cap. 8.

^a *Εἰς Ἀρτεμωνος αἵρεσιν, ταυτῆ νομιζῶν θεραπευεῖν ἐκείνην τὰ Ἰσδαίων φρονῶσαν.* ib. init.

^b St. Chrysostom speaks to the like purpose, *ὅτω καὶ τῆτον γυναικὶ τινὶ χαρίζομενον, τὴν σωτηριαν φασὶν ἀποδοσθαὶ ἑαυτῶ.* Chrys. in Joli. Hom. vii. p. 57. A.

‘ they endeavoured by entreaties to induce Paul to renounce
 ‘ his false doctrine. But when he openly denied that he
 ‘ held any such opinion, and affirmed that he adhered to the
 ‘ apostolical doctrines ; praising God for the common agree-
 ‘ ment, they returned to their several flocks. But when
 ‘ some time had passed, fame again published every where
 ‘ Paul’s perversion. Nevertheless, even then, those excellent
 ‘ men did not immediately proceed to his excision ; but first
 ‘ of all endeavoured to remedy the evil by letters. But when
 ‘ they saw the case to be desperate, they readily came again
 ‘ to Antioch ; applying, however, still healing medicines,
 ‘ exhorting and admonishing the man, and reminding him
 ‘ of former promises and agreements. At length, he denying,
 ‘ and the accusers being positive, and engaging to make
 ‘ good their charge, they convened in council. Here Mala-
 ‘ chion, formerly a sophist, now honoured to be a presbyter,
 ‘ disputing with Paul, he^c was convicted of saying that
 ‘ Christ was a man eminently favoured with the divine grace.
 ‘ Then they unanimously pronounced sentence, striking him
 ‘ out of the sacred registers. But when he refused to yield,
 ‘ and retained the government of the church ; informing
 ‘ Aurelian, who then reigned, of Paul’s obstinacy, they pe-
 ‘ titioned him to expel him the church. And even an
 ‘ idolater judged it fit, that a man who refused to submit to
 ‘ the determination of those who were of the same religion
 ‘ should be separated from their communion.’

Thus ended that affair ; in which Firmilian was shy of pronouncing any sentence, fearing some bad consequences of it, and that thereby a reproach might be brought upon the christian church : and, in all probability, it must have made a great noise in the world at that time. But the presbyter Malchion having been disobliged, as it seems, could not be satisfied, till his bishop was removed. I do not justify Paul in withstanding the decree of the council ; so far as I am able to judge, he ought to have yielded, for peace sake, and should have submitted to the determination of the majority ; especially if the majority of his own people, the church of Antioch, concurred with the synod ; which, however, I think is not certain. Nor do I absolutely blame^d the bishops of that time, who applied to a heathen

^c Εφωραθη, τον Χριστον ανθρωπον λεγων θειας χαριτος διαφεροντως εξιωμενον. ib. p. 223. B.

^d Bishops of that time, &c.] It does not certainly appear who those bishops were. They could not be the bishops assembled in council, by whom Paul was deposed ; for their Synodical Epistle was drawn up in 269, or the beginning of 270, soon after which the council broke up. But this application to Aurelian could not be made till 272 or 273.

emperor to expel one of their brethren out of the church, provided they freely allowed Paul and his followers to worship God, according to the best of their knowledge, in separate assemblies, as perhaps they did. Much less would I take upon me to judge of the reasons or policy of his imperial majesty's determination. But for the vast disgrace of being thrust out of the church by the secular power, I should think the justness of that remark of our ecclesiastical historian may be disputed. If Aurelian condemned Paul, Zenobia favoured him; and her protection may be reckoned no small honour, if she was so excellent a princess as fame proclaims her. A learned writer, who styles himself Phileleutherus Dubliniensis, has lately given Zenobia this short character: 'That^e she was the greatest woman of her own, or perhaps of any other age.' To the many other things that have been said in her commendation, it may be added, that she was no persecutor. Du Pin^f says; 'Of all the councils held in the first three ages, the most famous are the two councils of Antioch, assembled against Paul of Samosata, bishop of that city.' They must have been both held under Odenatus or Zenobia; the last undoubtedly in her time. And the numerous bishops, and other clergy, and all other christian people, belonging to that council, had come to Antioch, and returned without hindrance or molestation. They likewise issued out their Synodical Epistle, and sent it abroad all over the provinces without control or opposition: for we have received no complaints of any obstruction whatever; no, though a sentence too had been pronounced against that princess's favourite divine. It is true, we do not know that she ratified that sentence; nor did she compel Paul to leave the house of the church. What were her reasons I cannot say: perhaps, being in the main of the same opinion with Paul, and being likewise a woman of solid virtue, she could not in conscience join with his adversaries. Possibly she was not satisfied that the fathers of the council had any proper authority out of their own dioceses: or there might be danger of disobliging a large part of her subjects, and she might be apprehensive of creating divisions among her own people: nay, she might not be fully convinced of her right to interpose in such ecclesiastical affairs. That these were the reasons of her conduct I do not affirm; but I make no question that her majesty was governed by reasons and considerations of no small importance.

^e See Reflections upon Polygamy; by Phileleuth. Dublin. London: 1737. p. 166—168.

^f Nouv. Bib. T. i. p. 213.

After all, human judgments, unless impartial, and well informed of the point in debate, are of little value. And if Paul had been respected by Zenobia, he could look for no favour from Aurelian, let his merit be ever so distinguished, and his cause ever so just. There are, I suppose, few christians but regret Aurelian's putting to death that incomparable critic Longinus; though it ought to be remembered, that^e he died so nobly as to comfort those who lamented his calamity. Nor does Eusebius vindicate all Aurelian's resolutions; but, presently afterwards, when that emperor's favourable dispositions toward the christians were altered, and he was preparing his edicts to be published against them, Eusebius plainly says, that^h 'divine vengeance laid hold of him.'

Eusebius informs us, that upon this occasion were assembledⁱ very many bishops: St. Athanasius^k says, they were seventy in number; St. Hilary^l eighty. Some later writers may mention a larger number: but it may be supposed that^m Athanasius, from whom Hilary differs very little, is as much to be depended on as any one. Perhaps they were between seventy and eighty.

One thing principally to be observed, as concerning the person whose history we are writing, is Dionysius's letter, containing his opinion upon the question, and sent by him at the time of the first council. It is mentioned, as we have seen, by Eusebius, and by the fathers assembled in the last council; and it was subjoined by them to their Synodical Epistle. It is also taken notice of by St. Jerom, whoⁿ says it was written by Dionysius a few days before his death. He likewise calls it an excellent epistle. Whether it be still extant will be considered hereafter.

In the fragments of the Synodical Epistle itself, preserved in Eusebius, and undoubtedly genuine, out of which I have already made large extracts, the fathers of the last council say, 'that^o Paul had departed from the canon, or^p rule^q of 'faith.' They presently afterwards charge him with^r es-

^e —ήν ετω γενναως ηνεγκεν ο Λογγινος, ωπει και σχετλιαζοντας επι τη παθει παραμυθισθαι. Zosim. l. i. p. 659. v. 21, 22.

^h L. vii. cap. 30. p. 283. A.

ⁱ —πλειτων οσων επισκοπων.

ib. cap. 29.

^k Athan. de Syn. p. 757. E. F.

^l Hilar. de Syn. p. 1200. B. ed. Bened.

^m Vid. Benedictin. Not. in. loc. Athanasii.

ⁿ Sed et adversus Paulum Samosatenum, ante paucos dies quam moreretur, insignis ejus fertur epistola. De V. I. cap. 69. fin.

^o αποσας τη κανονος—H. E. l. 7. c. 30. p. 280. B.

^p Vid. Vales. Annot. p. 156.

^q Compare Dionysius of Corinth, ubi supra, ch. xii.

^r P. 280. C.

teeming “gain to be godliness;” referring to I Tim. vi. 5. But I need not stay to insist upon such references, or allusions to scripture.

Beside those fragments in Eusebius just mentioned, we have an^s epistle written to Paul of Samosata in the name of Hymenæus, Theophilus, Theotecnus, Maximus, Proclus, and Bolanus. Baronius has inserted this epistle entire into his^t Annals: and^u Tillemont says, he does not know that the genuineness of it is contested by any one; but whereas Baronius ascribes it to the first synod, he thinks it more probable, with^v Valesius, that it was written by the last council, at the beginning of their assembling, before Malchion had fully convicted Paul. Of this opinion too is^w Pagi. But^x Basnage thinks that, if it be genuine, it was written some time between the first and last council. However he denies it to be genuine, and alleges divers^y arguments, which I refer to the reader’s consideration. Du Pin^z likewise declares it to be his opinion that this letter is supposititious.

I only observe therefore briefly, that in this epistle are cited many texts of scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, particularly^a Luke i. 2. And^b the doctrine of the apostles, the law and the prophets, the Old and New Testament, are more than once mentioned as the rule of judging concerning the controverted question.

Here some notice must be taken of Paul’s opinions, according as we are informed of them in the accounts given by ancient writers; though, perhaps, we now have nothing remaining of Paul himself, or any of his followers.

Eusebius, as we have already seen, assures us, that^c ‘Paul had low and abject thoughts of Christ, as if he was no more than a man.’ In another place of his Ecclesiastical History he says, that^d Paul of Samosata had endeavoured to revive the heresy of Artemon. In the like manner, again, in^e his

^s Vid. Concil. ap. Labb. T. i. p. 844, &c.

^t A. 266. n. iv. &c.

^u As before, art. 4. p. 627.

^v Ann. in Eus. p. 157. C. D.

^w A. 265. n. iii.

^x A. 264. n. vi.

^y Ib. n. vii.

^z Bibl. T. i. p. 214. Amst.

^a Και εχομεν παραδοθεισαν, και τηρημενην εν τη καθολικη και αγια εκκλησια μεχρι της σημερον ημερας εκ διαδοξης υπο των μακαριων αποστολων, οι και αυτοπται και υπηρεται γεγονασι τε λογω, καταγγελλομενην εκ νομου και προφητων, και της καινης διαθηκης, ταυτα εκθεισθαι. Ep. miss. ad Paul. Sam. ap. Labb. Conc. T. i. p. 848. E.

^b Εν τε παλαια και νεα διαθηκη εγνωκοτες ομολογημεν και κηρυσσομεν. ib. p. 845. A. Vid. etiam supra, not. ^a.

^c L. vii. cap. 27.

^d L. v. cap. 28. in.

^e Paulus Samosatenus a cunctorum prædicatione desciscens Artemonis hæresim suscitavit. In cujus locum Antiochenæ ecclesiæ sextus decimus ordinatur episcopus Domnus. Euseb. Chr. p. 176.

Chronicle, as we now have it in Latin from St. Jerom; where it is also said, that Domnus, ordained in Paul's room, was the sixteenth bishop of the church of Antioch.

The fathers of the second council, by whom Paul was deposed, write in their Synodical Epistle, 'that^f he had laid aside the hymns usually sung in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, as modern, and the compositions of modern men—that^g he refused to acknowledge, with them, that the Son of God came down from heaven—that^h he had abjured the mystery of our religion for the accursed heresy of Artemas.' And at the conclusion they say, 'Letⁱ him write to Artemas, if he pleaseth; and let the followers of Artemas hold communion with him.'

St. Athanasius represents Paul's sentiments after this manner: 'That^k he believed Christ to be God from a virgin: God from Nazareth, seen there and taking there the beginning of his existence, and of his kingdom. And he acknowledged in him the powerful Word from heaven, and Wisdom; by predetermination before all ages, in fact manifested at Nazareth. So that, as he says, there is one God over all, even the Father. This is his impiety.' In other places he speaks of^l Paul's thinking 'Christ to be a man, and different from God the Word; and^m that he was as to his nature a mere man, but after his birth as a man he became God by his advancement in virtue.' In a piece ascribed to Athanasius, butⁿ now generally supposed to be the work of a later writer, the followers of Paul are spoken of as believing, that^o God dwelled in Christ, or the man Jesus, in an especial manner.

^f ψαλμους δε τας μεν εις τον Κυριον ημων Ιησεν Χριστον παντας, ως δε νεωτερας και νεωτερων συγγραμματα. Ad. Eus. H. E. l. 7. c. 30. p. 281. A.

^g Τον μεν γαρ υιον τς Θεου βδλεται συνομολογειν εξ θρανς καταληλυθεναι. Ib. C.

^h Τον δε εξορχησαμενον το μυστηριον, και εκπομπευοντα τα μιαρα αίρεσει τη Αρτεμα. Ib. p. 282. B.

^k επειδη και παντες αιρετικοι τωτο λεγειν ειωθασιν, ως Παυλος ο Σαμοσατευσ Θεον εκ της παρθενου ομολογει, Θεον εκ Ναζαρετ, οφθεντα, και εντευθεν της υπαρξίως την αρχην εσχηκοτα, και αρχην βασιλειας παρειληφοτα· λογον δε ενεργον εξ θρανς, και σοφίαν εν αυτω ομολογει· τω μεν προορισμω προ αιωνων οντα, τη δε υπαρξει εκ Ναζαρετ αναδειχθεντα· ινα εις ειη, φησιν, ο επι παντα Θεος ο πατηρ. Ath. contr. Appollim. l. 2. T. i. p. 942. A. Bened.

^l Γνα μη ο Σαμοσατευσ προφασιν ευρη, ανθρωπον αυτον λεγων, ως αλλον οντα παρα τον Θεον λογον. Ath. Ep. ad Max. T. i. p. 920. A.

^m Οποιοι εισω οι απο Παυλε τς Σαμοσατεως, υπερον αυτον μετα την ενανθρωπησιν εκ περικοπης τεθειοποιησθαι λεγοντες, τω την φυσιν ψιλον ανθρωπον γεγονεναι. De Syn. T. i. p. 739. E. Conf. Socrat. H. E. l. 2. c. 19. p. 98. D.

ⁿ Vid. Admon. in Ep. de Incarnat. Dei Verbi, T. ii. p. 33.

^o Ει γαρ και Θεον εν οικειν εν τω ανθρωπω λεγοιεν, μη παραδεχωμεθα. De Incarnat. ap. Ath. Op. T. ii. p. 35. A.

St. Epiphanius says, that^p Paul revived the heresy of Artemon: that^q he taught God the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, to be one God: that^r the Word and Spirit of God are always in God, as reason in the heart of man: and that the Son of God has no distinct subsistence, but subsists in God himself: that^s the Word came and dwelled in the man Jesus: that^t in the main he agreed with Sabellius, and Novatus, and Noetus, and others; though in part he differed from them: and that^u upon the doctrine of the Deity his followers said no more than the Jews.

Philaster says, beside other things, ‘that^v Paul taught ‘that Christ was a just man, not the true God, thus judaizing, ‘and likewise teaching circumcision. He also converted Zenobia, a certain queen of that time in the East, to judaism.’

But it is supposed that^w Philaster is mistaken in saying that Paul taught circumcision; neither Eusebius, nor the fathers of the second council at Antioch, charging him with such a doctrine. It is not improbable, that this is a mere innocent mistake of Philaster; for as Arianism is^x sometimes compared to heathenism, so it was likewise common with some christians to call Unitarians Jews, or judaizers. We^y formerly saw how St. Basil writes, that Sabellianism is judaism, brought into the church under the name of christianity. In another place he says, we^z abhor Sabellianism, as we do judaism. So Epiphanius, who^a had more learning than Philaster, said just now that, ‘upon the doctrine of the ‘Deity, the followers of Paul said no more than the Jews.’

^p Και ανεκαινωσε την αίρεσιν τῆς Ἀρτεμονος. Adv. Hær. lxx. p. 608. A.

^q Φασκει δὲ οὗτος, Θεὸν πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα εἶνα Θεὸν. Ibid.

^r Ἐν Θεῷ δὲ αἰονοῦντα τὸν αὐτῆς λόγον, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, ὡσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ καρδίᾳ, ὁ υἱὸς λόγος· μὴ εἶναι δὲ τὸν υἱὸν τῆς Θεῆς ἐνυπόστατον, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. Ibid.

^s Ἐλθούτα δὲ τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐνοικήσαντα ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι. Ib. B.

^t Ib. A. B.

^u Οὐδὲ πλεον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὡς ἐφην, δοξαζόντες. p. 609. B.

^v Hic Christum hominem justum, non Deum verum prædicabat, judaizans potius; qui et circumcisionem docebat. Unde et Zenobiam quandam reginam in oriente tunc temporis ipse docuit judaizare. Philast. Hær. 17.

^w Vid. Basn. ann. 264. n. v. Tillemont, et supra, Art. ii. p. 619.

^x Εκείνοι δὲ κτισμα λεγόντες τὸν ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς υἱὸν τῆς Θεῆς καὶ λόγον, εἶδεν διαφορᾶσιν ἐθνικῶν, κ. λ. ap. Athanas. de Vit. Anton. p. 848. Ed. Bened. Fit igitur Ario—ad familiaritatem Constantii imperatoris promptus aditus et facilis via. Suadetur Constantio, ut quosdam in Deo gradus credat: et qui per januam ab errore idololatriæ fuerat egressus, rursus in sinum ejus, dum in Deo deos quærit, tanquam per pseudothyrum inducitur. P. Oros. Histor. lib. ii. cap. 29. p. 542. ed. Havercamp.

^y See p. 625.

^z Ὅτι ἐπισης τῷ ἰσδάϊσμῳ καὶ τὴν τοιαυτὴν αίρεσιν φηρττομεν. Ep. 80. [al. 189.] p. 277. D.

^a Cum Epiphanium longe Philastrio doctiorem invenerimus. August. Ep. 222. T. ii. p. 878. Bened.

And again he says, ‘that^b the Paulians, introducing judaism, and teaching nothing more than them, are Jews, and ‘ought to be so called:’ though, as he adds, ‘to^c speak the ‘truth, they do not practise circumcision, nor keep the sabbath, nor follow any other Jewish customs.’ And St. Chrysostom, at the same time that^d he says the followers of Paul resembled the Jews, allows they differed from them in the point of circumcision.

We have farther to observe from St. Chrysostom, that he supposeth the followers of Paul to deny that^e the only-begotten pre-existed before all ages.

St. Augustine writes, ‘The^f Paulians, so called from Paul ‘of Samosata, deny Christ’s eternity, and affirm that he then ‘began to be when he was born of Mary: nor do they think ‘him any thing more than a man. This heresy of Artemon, ‘which was in a manner extinguished, was revived by Paul, ‘and since by Photinus; so that now the Photinians are better known than the Paulians:’ or, they are now oftener called Photinians than Paulians.

What Marius Mercator writes of Paul’s sentiment at the beginning of the fifth century deserves notice; I therefore put his words in the^g margin for the sake of the learned, by whom they will be more easily understood, than they

^b ‘Ουτοι δε τον ιωδαϊσμον παραφθειροντες, εδεν περισσοτερον των Ιωδαιων κεκτημενοι, δευτεροι Ιωδαιοι κληθησονται. κ. λ. Hær. 65. p. 608. D.

^c Τ’ αληθη δε, ότι ετε περιτομην εχουσιν, ετε σαββατον. κ. λ. *ibid.*

^d Αλλα προς μεν Ιωδαισ αρκει και ταυτα’ επειδαν δε οι χωρις περιτομης τα εκεινων μιμεμενοι και ζηλευτες οι Παυλε τε Σαμοσατεως. κ. λ. Chrys. in Ps. viii. p. 120. C. T. Tom. iii.

^e Ενταυθα και τες απο Παυλε τε Σαμοσατεως επεσομισεν ικανως, οι την προαιωνιον υπαρξιν αναιρουν τε μονογενεσ. Ει γαρ προ τε τοκς της Μαριας εκ ην, εδε υπηρχε πριν η φανηται εν σαρκι, πως ενομοθετει ο μη ων; Serm. 24. T. V. p. 347. B. C.

^f Pauliani, a Paulo Samosateno, Christum non semper fuisse dicunt; sed ejus initium, ex quo de Mariâ natus est asseverant: nec eum aliquid amplius quam hominem putant. Ista hæresis aliquando cujusdam Artemonis fuit; sed cum defecisset, instaurata est a Paulo; et postea sic a Photino confirmata, ut Photiniani quam Pauliani celebrius nuncupentur. Aug. de Hær. cap. 44. T. viii. p. 13. Bened.

^g Nestorius circa Verbum Dei, non quidem ut Paulus sentit, qui non substantivum, sed prolativum potentia Dei efficax Verbum esse definit. Mar. Mercat. de Discrim. Pauli et Nestorii, num. i. p. 17. Ed. Jo. Garner. Verbum autem Dei Patris, non substantivum, sed prolativum, vel imperativum sensit, atque pronuntiavit, [P. Samos.] non ut fides habet catholica, Verbum in substantiâ, vel essentiâ, consubstantivum, id est, ὁμοσιον Filium Dei Patris. Id in Diss. de xii. Anathem. Nestorii, num. xvi. Differentia itaque inter Samosatenum et Photinum ista sola est, quâ Paulus Verbum Dei προφορικον, και πρακτικον λογον και ενεργητικον, id est, prolativum et potestatis effectivum Verbum sensit, non substantivum, quod Græci σιωδες dicunt. Id. *ib.* num. xix.

can be translated by me. They seem, however, to amount to this : That by the Word, Paul understood the displayed, manifested, effective power of God, not a personal subsistence or real substance distinct from the Father.

I would likewise refer to^h Damascenus, though his article contains nothing but theⁱ Synopsis of Epiphanius.

Theodoret's account of Paul and his sentiments was transcribed above : nothing needs to be added here.

All these are manifestly the accounts of enemies, as it was before hinted they would be, no other being now remaining. Though therefore they may be, for the main, just and right; yet possibly some things may be expressed harshly, if not improperly : nay, some of the accounts seem to differ; there must therefore be some mistake or misrepresentation; or else the seemingly opposite expressions must be understood with some qualification on one side or the other, or reconciled by a distinction. Paul is said to teach that Christ was a mere man, and nothing more than a man; and yet he is also allowed to have taught the indwelling of God in him, and that the Word came and dwelled in the man Jesus. He is said to have denied the pre-existence of the First-begotten, and of Christ, but yet he is said to have taught, that the Word was always in God. It is said he refused to acknowledge that the Son of God came down from heaven; and yet he acknowledgeth in him the powerful Word from heaven, and Wisdom. These last expressions, seemingly contradictory, may be reconciled perhaps after this manner: Understand by the Word a distinct subsistence from God, he denied his coming down from heaven: but understand by the Word the^k Reason, the Wisdom, the Power of God, he taught that the Word from heaven came and dwelled in the man Jesus. This distinction may likewise be of some use elsewhere.

What became of Paul after his removal by Aurelian, in 272 or 273, is not known; but he had good opportunities for spreading his doctrine. His episcopate must have lasted twelve or thirteen years, nine years at least before he was deposed, and about three years afterwards, between the time of his deposition and final removal. The fathers in the second council^l speak of his having flatterers among the

^h Damasc. Hær. 65. p. 296.

ⁱ Epiph. T. i. p. 605.

^k Hic est virtus Dei, h.c. ratio, hic sapientia ejus, et gloria. Illic in virginem illabatur, carnem, Spiritu Sancto cooperante, induitur. Cypr. de Idolor. Van. p. 15. Et ipse a Patre exaltatus sit, quia se in terris serwo, et virtus, et sapientia Dei Patris humiliavit. Id. De Unit. Ecc. p. 118.

^l Οία και τες θωπευοντας αυτον επισκοπους των ομορων αγρων τε και πολεων και πρισβυτερες. κ. λ. ap. Eus. L. 7. cap. 30. p. 281. B.

bishops and presbyters of the neighbouring cities and villages about Antioch, and ^m of his being beloved and admired by others: though indeed they ascribe that respect for him to the presents he had made those persons. Since, then, Paul was of an active temper, and a man of popular gifts, as it seems, and his episcopate was chiefly under the mild governments of Odenatus, and his wife and successor Zenobia, it may be concluded, he had in that time made a considerable number of proselytes. And, very probably, he at first found some christians in his diocese of the same sentiments.

Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, affirms that ⁿ Lucian, who afterwards suffered martyrdom in 312, adhered to Paul, and separated from the church; or was held excommunicated from the church during the time of three bishops of Antioch. One might be almost apt to suspect, from Alexander's words, that he thought Lucian had succeeded Paul in the episcopal care and oversight of those who were in Paul's sentiments at Antioch.

The council at Nice, in one of their canons, ^o appoint, that the Paulianists should be rebaptized when they return to the catholic church. St. Augustine ^p has taken particular notice of that canon. And yet it appears from ^q Athanasius, that the Paulians baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Paulians ^r are mentioned with others in an edict of Constantine against heretics. St. Chrysostom ^s often argues against the Paulians, and, I think, as then in being. Theodoret writes about 450, that ^t there were then no remains of them. And Pope Innocent the first, about 414, as ^u Tillemont observes, speaks of them as ^v if they subsisted no longer. However, St. Augustine, as we have seen, mentions them as if they were in being in his time, but the people of that sentiment were then oftener called Photinians than Paulians.

^m Ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεοῖσις ἀπεφηνεν· ἐφ' ᾧ πρὸς τῶν τοιαύτα ζηλευτῶν φιλεῖται καὶ θαυμάζεται. *ibid.* D.

ⁿ — Παῦλος τῆς Σαμοσατεύως συνοδῶν καὶ κρίσει τῶν ἀπανταχῆς ἐπισκοπῶν ἀποκηρυχθέντος τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὃν διαδέξαμενος Ἀσκιανὸς ἀποσυναγωγὸς ἐμείνε τριῶν ἐπισκοπῶν πολυετέας χρόνας. *Apud Theodoret. H. E. L. i. cap. iv. p. 15. B.* ^o Can. 19.

^p Istos sane Paulianos baptizandos esse in ecclesiâ catholicâ Nicæno concilio constitutum est. *Aug. de Hæc. ib.*

^q Οὕτω Μανιχαῖοι, καὶ Φρυγες, καὶ οἱ τῆς Σαμοσατεύως μαθηταί, τὰ ὀνόματα λεγοντες, ἅδεν ἦττον εἰσιν αἱρετικοί. *Ath. Orat. 2. contr. Arian. p. 510. E.*

^r Euseb. de Vit. Constant. L. iii. cap. 64. ^s Vid. Chrysost. in Ps. viii. T. iii. p. 120. B. C. et T. v. Serm. 20. p. 300. Serm. 24. p. 347. *Ed. Front. Duc.*

^t Vid. Theod. H. Fab. l. 2. cap. xi. de Photino.

^u See Paul de Samosates, Art. vi.

^v Quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti minime baptizabant. *Innocent. i. Ep. 22. ap. Labb. Conc. T. ii. p. 1275. B.*

Neither Eusebius, nor the council of Antioch, nor Athanasius, that I remember, have any where charged Paul, directly or indirectly, with rejecting any books either of the Old or the New Testament. Epiphanius expressly says, that ^w Paul endeavoured to support his doctrine by texts of scripture. Vincentius Lirinensis speaks of ^x this as a common method of heretics; and ^y says particularly of the works of Paul, and some others, that there was scarce a page without citations out of the Old or New Testament. Paul then, and the Paulians, used the same scriptures with other christians.

This is a summary account of what the ancients write of Paul and his followers. It ought to be observed, that I have made no use of ^z the epistle to Paul ascribed to Dionysius, nor of the questions and answers joined with that epistle. If my account therefore of Paul's opinions appears defective, when compared with that given by ^a Tillemont, or some other moderns, I had rather it should do so, than run the hazard of deceiving my readers by borrowing from suspected or manifestly spurious pieces, whose testimony is not to be relied upon.

There can be no question but Paul was an author. It is very likely he would publish some vindications of himself and his opinions. Vincentius actually makes mention of his writings, as we observed just now. But, as I take the above-mentioned questions to be spurious, I suppose none of his works to be now remaining.

As we have not now before us any of Paul's writings, and have his history from adversaries only, we cannot propose to judge distinctly of his talents, nor draw his character at length: however, from the several particulars before put down, and collected from divers authors, some things may be concluded; and I apprehend that, laying aside for the present the consideration of his heterodoxy, we shall not mistake much if we conceive of him after this manner: he had a great mind, with a mixture of haughtiness, and too much affection for human applause. He was generally well respected in his dioecese, and by the neighbouring

^w Epiph. ib. p. 608. B.

^x Hic fortasse aliquis interroget, an et hæretici divinæ scripturæ testimoniis utantur? Utuntur plane, et vehementer quidem. Nam videas eos volare per singula quæque sanctæ legis volumina—Vincent. Comm. cap. 35. p. 356. Ed. Baluz. Paris. 1669.

^y Lege Pauli Samosatani opuscula, Priscilliani, Eunomii, Joviniani, reliquarumque pestium: cernas infinitam exemplorum congeriem, prope nullam omitti paginam, quæ non Novi aut Veteris Testamenti sententiis fucata et colorata sit. Id. ibid.

^z Ap. Labbei Concil. T. i. p. 849—893.

^a Vid. Paul de Samosates, Art. ii. Mem. Ecc. T. iv. P. ii. p. 615, &c.

bishops ; in esteem with the great, and beloved by the common people. He preached frequently, and was a good speaker. And from what is said by^b the fathers of the council, of^c his rejecting or laying aside some hymns, as modern, and composed by moderns, it may be argued, that he was a critic ; which is a valuable accomplishment at all times, especially when uncommon.^d

I have now given a sufficient history of the controversies of those times, and of the part Dionysius had in them.

IX. I need not enlarge in the account of Dionysius's works, several learned men having already composed catalogues of them, so far as we are informed of their titles by ancient authors ; as Cave in his *Apostolici*, or *Lives of the Primitive Fathers*, vol. i. and in his *Historia Literaria* ; and Fabricius in his^e *Bibliotheca Græca* ; both dividing his works into treatises and epistles, and the latter disposing his epistles in the alphabetical order of the names of the persons or people to whom they are directed. Tillemont^f likewise, as usual, is exact and particular upon this head. Basnage^g digests our author's works in the order of time, which also

^b See before, p. 676.

^c Possibly those hymns were partly ancient, partly modern ; having been altered and interpolated since their first original : and some of them might be entirely modern. Dionysius speaks of the many hymns [*της πολλης ψαλμωδίας*] composed by Nepos, with which many of the brethren were mightily pleased. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 24. Dionysius does not expressly say that those hymns were sung in the public assemblies of christians ; but it is very probable they were. And so Cave supposeth ; for thus he writes, *Hist. Lit. P. i. p. 86. de Nepote* : *Scriptis adhuc Nepos in ecclesiæ usum psalmos atque hymnos quam plurimos, pios admodum et ab ipso Dionysio celebratos.* And in his *Apostolici*, p. 194, in the Life of Dionysius, he says of Nepos ; ‘ That he was ‘ a man eminent for his skill in the holy scriptures, and for the many psalms ‘ and hymns he had composed, which the brethren sung in their public meetings.’ *Conf. Vales. An. ad. Eus. l. vii. c. 24. p. 153. C.* Such hymns as these, composed by private persons, are the hymns which Paul rejected, or laid aside, that is, would not allow to be used in public worship. And the 59th canon of the council of Laodicea forbids that any psalms or hymns composed by private persons should be sung in the church. So that what was reckoned in Paul to be a great fault, afterwards obtained general approbation.

^d A learned writer among the moderns, whom I did not think of when I drew the above character, confirms almost every part of it ; for he allows Paul to have possessed the third see in the church, and to have had the patronage of a great princess, an appearance of piety, reputation for learning, flowing eloquence, and the favour of the multitude. *Ex infimæ sortis homine factus est Antiochenus episcopus, et tertium ecclesiæ thronum iisdem artibus conscendit, quibus hæretici solent, feminæ principis potentiâ, specie pietatis, doctrinæ famâ, dicendi facilitate, et multitudinis factiosæ gratiâ.* J. Garner. *Diss. i. de Hær. et Li. Nestor. cap. iii. sect. iii. p. 307.*

^e T. v. p. 263—267.

^f *Mem. Ecc. T. iv. p. ii.*

^g *Ann. P. E. 247. n. vii.*

is^h Du Pin's method. And Pagiⁱ has judicious observations relating to the time of some of Dionysius's writings.

I have quoted several of his epistles, and mentioned some others, observing likewise sometimes the most probable date of them. It is necessary, however, that I add here a few things.

1. Particularly I would transcribe a passage of Eusebius, following what was formerly taken from him concerning Dionysius's writings against Sabellius. Says Eusebius; 'And^k beside these he wrote many other epistles, still extant, and^l some large treatises in an epistolary form: as the books concerning nature, inscribed to his son Timothy, and the book of Temptations, inscribed to the fore-mentioned Euphranor. Moreover, in a letter to Basilides, bishop of one of the churches of Pentapolis, he mentions^m a Commentary he had written upon the beginning of the book of Ecclesiastes. And there are many other letters of Dionysius to the same Basilides.'

From this passage it appears, that many of Dionysius's letters were of a great length; indeed they were properly treatises inscribed to friends, or others; and in some of them he displayed his copious learning without reserve, though without ostentation. His two books concerning the Promises, mentioned above, the fragments of which are to be transcribed hereafter, wereⁿ letters, or written in an epistolary form.

2. In Eusebius's Evangelical Preparation^o are large and noble fragments of the books concerning Nature, which show the author's excellent capacity, and his great learning, and intimate acquaintance with the Greek poets and philosophers, as well as with the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. If there were nothing else remaining, this fragment alone would be sufficient to show that Dionysius was a fine writer.

3. St. Jerom confirms what Eusebius writes of the Commentary upon Ecclesiastes; for, enumerating this bishop's works, he says, 'there^p were many letters to Basilides, in one of which he tells him, he had begun to write a Commentary upon the Ecclesiastes.' In another place Jerom

^h Nouv. Bib. T. i. p. 187, &c.

ⁱ Vid. Pagi Crit. 257. n. iv.

^k H. E. l. vii. c. 26.

^l Καὶ δὲ καὶ πολυεπεὶς λόγοι ἐν ἐπιτολῆς χαρακτηριστῶν γραφέντες ὡς οἱ περὶ φύσεως Τιμοθεῶ τῷ παιδί προσπεφωνημένοι. ib. B. 277. A. B.

^m Φησὶν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξηγησὶν πεποιησθαι τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστῆς. ib. B.

ⁿ Conf. Euseb. l. vii. cap. 26. in. et cap. 25. Vid. Vales. Annot. p. 154. B.

^o L. xiv. cap. 23—27. p. 772—784.

^p Ad Basilidem quoque multæ epistolæ: in quarum unâ se asserit etiam in Ecclesiasten cœpisse scribere commentarios. De V. i. cap. 69.

mentions Dionysius, with several others, who, he says, had^q largely explained the first epistle to the Corinthians.

4. We still have one letter to Basilides, now generally called a canonical epistle. It is supposed to have been written^r about the year 262. Fleury^s says; ‘Of all the writings of St. Dionysius of Alexandria, the only one that remains entire and unquestionable is the canonical epistle to Basilides the bishop, who had consulted him upon several points of discipline.’ But perhaps we may add to this the epistle to Novatus, which, as recorded in^t Eusebius, seems to be entire. I shall make use of that epistle to Basilides by and by, when I come to observe our author’s testimony to the scriptures.

In the mean time, as the conclusion of it is too signal a proof of prevailing humility to be omitted, it shall be here transcribed. ‘You^u asked these questions, my dear son, not through ignorance, but only to do honour to us, and to cultivate our unanimity and friendship. And I, for my part, have declared my opinion, not as a teacher, but making use of that freedom with which it becomes us to speak to each other. Do you judge according to the understanding that is in you: and write me word what is best in your opinion.’ Dionysius writes thus, says^v Fleury, out of humility: for indeed his authority was very great, on account of the dignity of his see, his age, and the glory of his having been twice a confessor, as well as on account of his virtues and learning.

5. Eusebius has preserved^w large and valuable fragments of a letter of Dionysius to or against one Germanus, a bishop of those times: who had calumniated Dionysius, as if he had not taken due care of his people, or not shown sufficient courage in time of persecution. This obliged Dionysius, in defence of himself, to relate his own sufferings at several times. This letter, according to Basnage’s^x computation, was written in the year 259. I have made use of the fragments of it in the history I have given of Dionysius.

I would here put down a passage of Eusebius not yet transcribed. ‘Beside^y the fore-mentioned letters, in that time [the persecution under Valerian, and Dionysius’s

^q Origenes, Dionysius, Pierius, Eusebius Caesariensis, Didymus, Apollinaris, latissime hanc epistolam interpretati sunt. Ep. 31. [al. 52.] p. 243. fin. Bened.

^r Vid. Basn. a. 247. n. vii. ^s Fleury’s Ecclesiastical Hist. B. vii. ch. 56. Vol. i. p. 470. in the English edition.

^u Ap. Labb. Conc. T. i. p. 836. D. E.

^t Eus. l. vi. cap. 45.

^v Ib. Vol. i. p. 471.

^w Eus. H. E. l. vi. cap. 40. l. vii. c. 1.

^x Dum exulem agit Dionysius,

A. 259, ab Æmiliano pulsus, adversus Germanum scripsit epistolam, quæ gravia passusest, complectentem. Basn. ibid.

^y Lib. vii. cap. 20.

‘exile] he wrote those Paschal epistles, which we still have. —Of these, one is written to Flavius, another to Domitius and Didymus, in ^z which also he published a canon [or cycle] of eight years: after having shown that Easter ought not to be kept till after the vernal equinox.’ I have put down this passage, as affording an argument of Dionysius’s skill in mathematical learning, and astronomical computations.

They who are desirous of being informed of the nature of those Paschal epistles may consult ^a Valesius, ^b Du Pin, or ^c Tillemont.

7. It has been disputed, whether Dionysius ever wrote against Origen. Cave ^d declares himself with some positiveness on the affirmative side of that question. Nevertheless, ^e at this time, learned men are for the most part clearly of opinion, that he did not. We ^f have formerly observed Dionysius’s discourse of martyrdom, inscribed to Origen, supposed to have been written in the time of the Decian persecution, when our author had been bishop several years. And Stephen Gobar, in Photius, ^g says, ‘that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, wrote to Origen, and commended him after his death in a letter to Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea.’ Dionysius therefore always retained a high respect for his master Origen.

8. There remains still one particular more to be considered in this place; whether Dionysius be author of ^h the epistle to Paul of Samosata, containing likewise ten questions of Paul, with answers to them. That he wrote a letter relating to that affair a little before his death, is out of question. We saw the proofs of it formerly. The only dispute is, whether what we now have with the above-mentioned title be rightly ascribed to Dionysius. By ⁱ Cave it is called doubtful, or rather supposititious. By Valesius ^k it is rejected in a like manner. Du Pin ^l is of the same opinion, which he supports by the difference of style from Dionysius,

^z *Εν ἧ καὶ κανὼνα ἐκτίθεται οκταετηρίδος.* ib. 266. A. B.

^a Annot. in Eus. p. 151.

^b Bib. des Ant. Ecc. i. p. 188.

^c Mem. Ec. T. iv. P. ii. p. 588, 589. Saint Den. d’Art. 13.

^d Scripsisse Dionysium adversus Origenem exinde liquet, quod fragmentum profert Anastasius Sinaïta, quæst. 233, p. 266. *ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Ὀριγενεῖς*, quo de situ paradisi agit. De hoc opere silent Eusebius et Hieronymus. Cav. H. L. P. ii. p. 51.

^e Vid. Pagi Crit. in Baron. Ann. 246. n. iii. iv. Fabr.

Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 267. in Tillemont, ib. p. 610. Du Pin, ibid. p. 190.

^f See p. 653.

^g Cod. 232. p. 904.

^h Ap. Concil. Labb. T. i. p. 849, &c.

ⁱ See Cave,

as above mentioned.

^k Ann. in Euseb. l. vii. cap. 30.

^l Bibl. p. 190.

and by other considerations: as does ^m Basnage likewise. Pagi ⁿ allows the epistle not to have been written by Dionysius; but yet he thinks it might be written by some other bishop of that time: which supposition Basnage ^o endeavours to confute, by arguments tending to show it was written by some impostor a good while afterwards. Tillemont ^p doubts, whether the reasons of Valesius and Du Pin are of sufficient weight to induce us to reject that piece, as not written by Dionysius: and in a distinct note he treats of this point with a great deal of labour and learning, as well as modesty. Fabricius ^q is willing to allow the genuineness of that work, moved, as it seems, by Tillemont's arguments, and those of bishop Stillingfleet, to whom he refers. It is certain, however, that this epistle is now, and has been for a good while,^r generally rejected by learned men as spurious: though ^s bishop Bull (good man!) was so happy as to know nothing

^m Ann. 247. n. xi.

ⁿ Crit. 264. n. iii.

^o Ut supra.

^p St. Denys d' Alex. Art. 17. p. 606, and note viii.

^q Nec tamen suppositam [Vide Tillemontium nota viii. ad Vitam Dionysii Alex. et Stillingfleeti Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 31.] illi videri, sed potius genuinam ejus esse Epistolam ad Paulum Samosatenum, et responsionem ad decem ejus propositiones; licet eam rejiciunt viri doctissimi, Valesius ad Euseb. p. 155. seq. Elias Du Pin, Guil. Caveus, aliique etiam Harduinus ad Epistolam Chrysostomi ad Cæsarium, p. 9. qui Eutychemo alicui tribuit. Fabric. B. Gr. T. v. p. 263.

^r This appears from the names above mentioned. See likewise note ^q, what is there is transcribed from Fabricius. I would add here some words of Dom. Bernard de Montfauçon. *Haud leve item illud est $\nu\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ indicium, quod ementitus ille Athanasius Epistolam Dionysii ad Paulum Samosatenum mittat ad Persas, quæ jam communi eruditorum calculo inter supposititia computatur. Vid. Monitum apud Athanas. Op. T. ii. p. 716. Ed. Bened. From which passage I also conclude, that Montfauçon himself likewise rejects this piece, as clearly supposititious.*

^s Tillem. in his note before referred to, p. 886. observes, 'That bishop Bull often makes use of this as a certain and undoubted work of Dionysius, and says, that Dionysius there speaks almost divinely of the divinity of Jesus Christ. He likewise is very angry with Sandius who rejects it.' This remark is too just; for bishop Bull does quote that piece as Dionysius's. Vid. Defens. Fid. Nic. sect. ii. cap. 11. sect. xi. p. 134. al. 148. And whereas Sandius had alleged an argument from Brockmand, a German writer, to prove it spurious; Bull answers that he does not know, nor care, who Brockmand is. Ibid. sect. 12. p. 135. And at last says, that all writers, ancient and modern, except perhaps that fore-mentioned Brockmand, did unanimously ascribe it to Dionysius.—Epistolam contra Paulum Samosatenum; quam reverà scripsisse Dionysium, auctores cuncti, tam veteres quam neoterici, (si unum fortasse Brockmandum illum excipias,) unanimi consensu agnoscunt. ib. p. 135. Inasmuch that, in the late edition of bishop Bull's works, Dr. J. E. Grabe thought himself obliged to add from Cave, by way of correction, the following note: *Multis suspecta est hæc epistola, quod Patres Antiocheni in Epistolâ Synodicâ apud Euseb. l. 7. cap. 30. diserte affirmant Dionysium quidem ad universam Antiochensium ecclesiam literas direxisse, Paulum vero ne salutatione dignatum. Vid. Cav. in Dion. Alex.*

of it; for which reason he securely quotes this piece as the genuine and undoubted work of St. Dionysius of Alexandria.

For my own part, I acquiesce in the reasons of the learned men before mentioned, so far as to think it highly probable that the piece in question is not the work of Dionysius, nor of any of his contemporaries, but of a much later date. For which cause I shall make no use of it in what follows in this chapter, as I have hitherto omitted to take any thing out of it. Indeed, if the probability of its spuriousness were somewhat less than it is, that might be a sufficient reason for an entire omission, or very slight notice of it in this work.

9. I need not stay to show, that our Dionysius of Alexandria did not write any notes or commentaries upon the pretended Dionysius the Areopagite, (as some have thought,) it having been already done by^t others. And, as ^uTillemont says, there are now scarce any persons, of ever so little learning, who believe the works ascribed to St. Dionysius the Areopagite were composed so early as the third century.

10. It has been observed, how few of Dionysius's works, either tracts or epistles, have come down to us entire. Du Pin^v says, the loss of his works is one of the most considerable of this kind which we could suffer. We have, however, divers fragments, which are very valuable, and some of considerable length.

X. It may be now expected, that I should attempt the character of Dionysius, of whom so much has been said. He has the title of Great given him by ^wEusebius, ^xBasil, ^yGregory of Nyssa, and^z other ancient writers. I scarce need to say, that ^aDionysius is in Jerom's Letter to Magnus, among other christian writers; who, he says, were equally admirable for secular learning and the knowledge of the scriptures. In^b another place he calls him the most eloquent bishop of Alexandria. When Theodoret nameth the principal bishops who were present at the first council against Paul, or invited to it, the character he gives Diony-

^t Vid. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 5, et 253.

^u St. Den. d' A. ait. 18. p. 610.

^v Bibl. ib. p. 190.

^w Ὁ μέγας ἡμῶν Ἀλεξανδρείων ἐπίσκοπος Διονύσιος. Eus. l. viii. in Procem.

^x Τὸν μέγαν Διονύσιον. Bas. p. 269. D. Ep. 188. [al. Canon. i.]

^y Gr. Nyss. de Vit. S. Gr. Thaum. p. 536. D.

^z Vid. Vales. in notis ad Eus. l. vii. in Pr. et Pagi Crit. An. 265. n. iv.

^a Ep. 83. p. 656.

^b Vir eloquentissimus Dionysius

Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ pontifex. In Is. l. xviii. pr. p. 478.

sius is, that^c he was a man illustrious for his learning: and certainly this part of his character is justified by the remaining fragments of his works, though, in all probability, his learning would be much more conspicuous if his works were extant entire. The many epistles sent by him to so many different persons in several and remote parts of the world, upon the various points in question at that time, assure us of the general repute and esteem he was in. He was a person^d of undissembled humility and modesty, and of great^e simplicity, to a degree uncommon in men of his extensive learning, and long and wide experience. He had^f a great deal of natural good humour, cultivated by the principles of religion; by which means he excelled in that moderation and charity, which the christian religion so earnestly recommends. His undisguised probity, or some vehemence of natural temper, rendered him liable to be sometimes off his guard, insomuch that in disputes he was apt to go into extremes; for, as St. Basil^g says, a man who intends to make a crooked plant straight, sometimes-bends it too much the other way: so Dionysius, in opposition to Sabellianism, asserted not only a distinction of subsistences, but a difference of essence, and an inequality of power and glory. And perhaps some may think they see another like instance in the argument to be hereafter produced concerning the revelation; where Dionysius disputeth the genuineness of that book, when it might have been sufficient to confute the false interpretations which some had put upon it. We must not forget his generous zeal for truth, for the sake of which he practised much self-denial, renouncing the honours, and riches, and grandeur of this world; thereby showing true greatness of mind, and acquiring to himself glory and riches, preferable to all the advantages of a transitory life. He had a quick apprehension, and a lively fancy. His style is usually florid, and he wrote with spirit to the last; which, after the fatigues of above thirty years' public service in the church, as catechist, or bishop, and after two confessions before heathen magistrates, and the sufferings that followed; beside the malicious calumnies, or false and unfair insinua-

^c *Αιτηρ επισημος εν διδασκαλια γενομενος.* Theod. Hær. Fab. l. ii. c. 8.

^d See before, p. 684, and other places.

^e For this I would refer to the history which Dionysius gives of Scrapion in a letter to Fabius. Eus. l. vi. cap. 44, and to another history in a letter to Xystus, bishop of Rome, l. vii. cap. 9; and I suppose that this quality appears in some of the passages of Dionysius which I transcribe at length.

^f Dionysius's good humour, moderation, and charity, are manifest in the fragments of the books concerning the promises, to be transcribed hereafter, as well as elsewhere.

^g Vid. Ep. 9. [al. 41.] p. 90. C. D.

tions, at least of some of his brethren, and the unkind and unfriendly charges and accusations of some other christians; may be reckoned the proof of a firmness of mind, which is very glorious; for it could be founded on nothing so much as the consciousness of his integrity, and other supports and consolations of religion. To conclude, Dionysius fulfilled the duties of his station, and shined in his sphere. Unquestionably he was one of the ornaments of that age; and he^h may be esteemed the chief glory of the see of Alexandria for three centuries, from the time of the first founder of that church, who, as is generally supposed, was St. Mark, or, if not, very probably some other eminent christian of the apostolic age; who, by the abundance of his spiritual gifts, which were common at that time, would have a distinction and pre-eminence above the greatest of his successors.

XI. Finally, we proceed to observe this writer's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

I begin with the Letter to Basilides, which we still have entire. In answer to a question sent him by that bishop, Dionysius observes; 'Byⁱ what you write you show that you well understand the divine evangelists, and that they have not precisely related the hour when the Lord arose; for the evangelists have expressed themselves differently concerning the time when those persons came to the sepulchre, and all of them say that they found the Lord already risen; "And in the end of the sabbath," as Matthew says, chap. xxviii. 1. "And early when it was yet dark," as John, chap. xx. 1. "And very early in the morning," as Luke, chap. xxiv. 1. "And very early in the morning, at the rising of the sun," as Mark, chap. xvi. 2. But when he arose, no one has expressly said—And let us not think^k that the evangelists disagree, or contradict each other, although there be some small difference. Let us therefore honestly and faithfully endeavour to reconcile them.' Then Dionysius recites those several places of the four evangelists more at large, with some remarks, and in the same order.

This passage is extremely valuable. It shows there were four evangelists, or sacred authentic historians of the life and doctrine of Jesus Christ, received by christian people, and no more, and who they were. The order likewise in

^h See Tillemont, S. Den. d'Alex. art. 1. at the beginning.

ⁱ Labb. Con. Tom. i. p. 832. Can. i.

^k Καὶ μὴδε διαφωνεῖν, μὴδε ἐναντιοῦσθαι τὰς εὐαγγελιστὰς ὑπολαβόμεν· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μικρολογίᾳ τίς εἶναι δοξᾷ περὶ τὸ ζητούμενον—ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς εὐγνωμονῶς τὰ λεχθέντα καὶ πιῶως ἀρμοσαί προσημιθώμεν. 1b. E. et. p. 833. A.

which they are quoted is observable; first, the two apostles, Matthew and John; then the two companions or fellow-labourers of apostles, Luke and Mark. Very probably this was the order of many codes, or volumes, of the four gospels.

In this Epistle,¹ Dionysius refers to the woman cured of her infirmity by touching the hem of Christ's garments, recorded by more than one of the evangelists.

Here^m also is quoted Rom. xiv. 23; and, lastly, someⁿ words of 1 Cor. vii. 5, expressly as Paul's.

XII. In the passages formerly transcribed from Dionysius we saw divers texts of the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's epistles, expressly quoted or clearly referred to. I might here observe some other like quotations, or references, to several of St. Paul's epistles in other remaining fragments of Dionysius; but it is needless: and, besides, some more instances will appear in a long passage, which must be necessarily produced hereafter. I would therefore only observe here, that Dionysius received the Epistle to the Hebrews as the apostle Paul's. This appears evident, I think, from what he writes to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, relating the early sufferings of the christians at Alexandria before the publication of Decius's edict. Says he, 'The^o brethren withdrew, saving themselves by flight; and "took joyfully the spoiling of their goods," like unto those whom Paul commends;' Heb. x. 34.

Here it should be observed again, that I do not make use of the forementioned epistle to Paul of Samosata, with the questions and answers. There^p is quoted Heb. x. 28, 29, as the apostle's, meaning Paul, and other texts of that epistle. But as we have very probable arguments to induce us to think that piece is a composition much later than the age of Dionysius, I take nothing out of it.

XII. I do not recollect any thing in the genuine fragments of Dionysius, that shows his opinion about the controverted catholic epistles, except what we shall see presently in the passage concerning the book of the Revelation, where St. John's three epistles are expressly mentioned. However, in another passage cited by Athanasius, Dionysius observes, that^q the apostle has the expression of "doer of the law;

¹ Ib. Can. ii. p. 836.

^m Ib. Can. iv.

ⁿ Can. iii.

^o Εξεκλινον δε και υπαρεχωρων οι αδελφοι, και την αρπαγην των υπαρχοντων, ομοιως εκεινοις οις και Πανλος μαρτυρησε, μετα χαρας προσεδεξαντο' αρ. Eus. H. E. l. vi. c. 41. p. 237. B. C.

^p Conc. T. i. p. 868. A.

^q Και ποιητης, ο αποστολος ειπε, νομω. αρ Athan. De Sent. Dionys. T. i. p. 257. E.

which expression is in Rom. ii. 13, and James iv. 11. And therefore both these texts are put in the margin by the Benedictine editor of St. Athanasius's works; but it is well known, that by the apostle, in ancient ecclesiastical writers, is to be understood Paul, therefore it cannot be well doubted, but Dionysius intends the text in the epistle to the Romans: and if he had designed to refer also to the text of James, he would have signified it some way or other.

XIV. In the time of Dionysius's episcopate there were great numbers of christians in the district of Arsinoe in Egypt, who were very fond of the millenary notion, expecting a kingdom of Christ here on earth, in which men should enjoy sensual pleasures. These persons were much confirmed in this opinion by a book of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, entitled, A Confutation of the Allegorists. Dionysius had a disputation or conference with those christians, of which he gave an account in one of his books, written upon that subject. In a fragment, which we have in Eusebius, he writes to this purpose: 'When,' says he,^r 'I was in the province of Arsinoe, where you know this opinion has for some time so far prevailed as to cause divisions and apostasies of whole churches; having called together the presbyters and teachers of the brethren in the villages, admitting likewise as many of the brethren as pleased to be present; I advised that this opinion should be publicly examined into. And when they produced to me that book as a shield and impregnable bulwark, I sat with them three whole days successively, from morning to evening, discussing the contents of it.' He goes on, highly applauding the good order of the dispute, the moderation and candour of all present, their willingness to be convinced, and to retract their former opinions, if reason so required: 'With a good conscience,' says he, 'and unfeignedly, and with hearts open to the sight of God; embracing^s whatever could be made out by good arguments from the holy scriptures. In the end, Coracio, the chief defender of that opinion, engaged and promised, in the presence of all the brethren, that he would no longer maintain nor defend, nor teach, nor make mention of it, as being fully convinced by the arguments on the contrary side. And all the brethren who were present rejoiced for the conference, and their mutual reconciliation and agreement.'

^r Ενθα, ως οιδας, προ πολλη τμητο επεπολαζε το δογμα, ως και σχισματα και αποστασις όλων εκκλησιων γεγονεναι συγκαλεσας της πρεσβυτερης και διδασκαλης των εν ταις κωμαις αδελφων. κ. λ. αρ. Eus. l. vii. c. 24. p. 272. A.

^s —τα ταις αποδειξεισι και ειδασκαλιαις των αγιων γραφων συνιζανομενα καταδεχομενοι. ib. p. 272. B. C.

This was the dispute. Of the books written by Dionysius upon this subject, Eusebius speaks after this manner, and gives us farther the following passages, which we are now to transcribe, and make the best use of we are able. ‘ Beside^t all these [before mentioned by Eusebius] there ‘ are two books of his Concerning the Promises. The occasion of them was Nepos, a bishop in Egypt: who taught ‘ that the promises made to the saints in the divine scriptures ‘ were to be fulfilled in a Jewish sense; affirming, that ‘ there would be a certain thousand years of bodily pleasures upon this earth. He,^u thinking that he could support this opinion by John’s Revelation, wrote a book upon ‘ this argument, with the title of A Confutation of the Allegorists. This book Dionysius answers in his books Concerning the Promises. In the first book he lays down his ‘ own opinion. In the second he discourseth of John’s Revelation. And at the beginning of this book he speaks of ‘ Nepos to this purpose: “But because they produce a book ‘ of Nepos, on which they mightily rely, as if he had beyond ‘ all contradiction demonstrated, that there shall be a kingdom of Christ upon this earth: on many other accounts ‘ truly I respect and love Nepos; for his faith, and industry, ‘ and study^v of the scriptures, as well as for the many hymns ‘ composed by him, with which not a few of the brethren are ‘ still much delighted. And I reverence him the more because he is dead. But truth is to be preferred and esteemed ‘ above all things; and as we ought without envy to approve ‘ and readily commend what is well said, so have we also a ‘ right to examine and censure whatever appears otherwise. ‘ Since, then, the book is public, and by some thought to be ‘ plausibly written, and^w there are some teachers who look ‘ upon the law and the prophets to be of no value, and ‘ neglect to follow the gospels, and despise the epistles of ‘ the apostles; whilst at the same time they extol the ‘ doctrine of this book, as containing some great and hidden ‘ mystery, and suffer not the weaker of our brethren to conceive any thing great and magnificent, either of the glorious and truly divine “appearance of our Saviour,” (Tit. ii. ‘ 13,) or of our resurrection from the dead, and “our gather-

^t T. vii. c. 24. in.

^u Δοξας εν ούτος εκ της Αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννης την ιδιαν κρατυνειν υποληψαι, ελεγχον αλληγοριστων λογον τινα περι τστσ συνταξας επεγραψε προς ον ο Διονυσιος εν τοις περι επαγγελιων ενισταται. ib. p. 271. A.

^v Και της εν ταις γραφαις διατριβης, και της πολλης ψαλμωδιαις, η μεχρι νυν πολλοι των αδελφων ευθυμουνται. ib. 271. B.

^w —και τινων διδασκαλων τον μεν νομον και της προφητας το μηδεν ηγμενων, και τοις ευαγγελιοις επισθαι παρεντων και τα, των αποστολων επισολας εκφραυλισαντων. ib. C.

‘ing together,” (2 Thess. ii. 1,) and “likeness to him,” (1 John iii. 2,) but only to expect in the kingdom of God ‘poor and mortal things, and such as we now enjoy in the ‘present state; it is necessary that we enter into dispute ‘with our brother Nepos, as if he was present.’

‘Afterwards,’ says ^x Eusebins, ‘of the Revelation of John ‘he writes thus: “Some ^y who were before us have utterly ‘rejected and confuted this book, criticising every chapter, ‘[or paragraph,] showing it to be throughout unintelligible ‘and inconsistent; adding, moreover, that the inscription is ‘false, forasmuch as it is not John’s: nor is it a revelation ‘which is hidden under so obscure and thick a veil of igno- ‘rance; and ^z that not only no apostle, but not so much as ‘any holy or ecclesiastical man, was the author of this writ- ‘ing; but ^a that Cerinthus, founder of the heresy called ‘after him Cerinthian, the better to recommend his own ‘forgery, prefixed to it an honourable name. For ^b this ‘(they say) was one of his particular notions, that the king- ‘dom of Christ should be earthly; consisting of those things ‘which he himself, a carnal and sensual man, most admired, ‘the pleasures of the belly, and of concupiscence; that is, ‘eating, and drinking, and marriage; and for the more ‘decent procurement of these, feastings, and sacrifices, and ‘slaughters of victims. But, ^c for my part, I dare not re- ‘ject the book, since many of the brethren have it in high ‘esteem: but allowing it to be above my understanding, I ‘suppose it to contain throughout some latent and wonder- ‘ful meaning; for though I do not understand it, I suspect ‘there must be some profound sense in the words; not ‘measuring and judging these things by my own reason, but ‘ascribing more to faith, I esteem them too sublime to be ‘comprehended by me. Nor do I condemn what I have ‘not been able to understand: but I admire the more, be- ‘cause they are above my reach.” Then, examining the ‘whole book of the Revelation, and showing it impossible it ‘should be understood in the obvious meaning of the words, ‘he goes on: “And having finished in a manner his pro-

^x Ib. c. 25. in.

^y Τινες μὲν ἐν προ ἡμῶν ἠθετησαν καὶ ἀνεσκενασαν παντὴ το βιβλιον, καθ’ ἑκάστον κεφαλαιον διευθυνοντες. ib. p. 272. D. 273. A.

^z Καὶ ἐχ ὄπως τῶν ἀποστόλων τινα, ἀλλ’ ἐδ’ ὅλως τῶν ἄγιων ἢ τῶν ἀπο τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰς γεγονέναι ποιητὴν τῆ γραμματος, Κηρωθον δὲ—ἀξιοπιστον ἐπιφημισαι θελησαντα τῷ ἑαυτῆ πλασματι ονομα. ib. 273. A.

^a Conf. Eus. l. iii. c. 28. p. 100. B.

^b Τετο γὰρ εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλιας αὐτῆ το δόγμα, ἐπιχειον εἰσεσθαι τὴν τῆ Χριστῆ βασιλειαν. 273. A.

^c Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀθετησαι μὲν ἐκ ἀν τολμησαμι το βιβλιον, πολλων αὐτο εἰα σπεδῆς ἐχοντων ἀδελφῶν. B.

‘ phecy, the prophet pronounceth those blessed that keep it,
 ‘ and also himself. For, “blessed is every one,” says he,
 ‘ “that keepeth the words of the prophecy of this book ;
 ‘ and I John, who saw and heard these things :” Rev. xxii.
 ‘ 7, 8. I do not deny, then, that his name is John, and that
 ‘ this is John’s book ; for I acknowledge it to be the work
 ‘ of some holy and divinely inspired person.^d Nevertheless,
 ‘ I cannot easily grant him to be the apostle, the son of Ze-
 ‘ bedee, brother of James, whose is the gospel inscribed
 ‘ according to John, and the catholic epistle ; for I conclude,
 ‘ from the manner of each, and the turn of expression, and
 ‘ from the conduct [or disposition] of the book, as we call
 ‘ it, that he is not the same person : for^e the evangelist no
 ‘ where puts down his name, nor does he speak of himself
 ‘ neither in the gospel nor in the epistle.” Then a little after
 ‘ he says again : “John no where speaks as concerning him-
 ‘ self, nor as concerning another. But he who wrote the
 ‘ Revelation, immediately at the very beginning prefixeth his
 ‘ name ; “The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave
 ‘ unto him to show unto his servants things which must
 ‘ shortly come to pass. And he sent and signified it by his
 ‘ angel unto his servant John, who bare record of the word
 ‘ of God, and his testimony, the things which he saw,” Rev.
 ‘ i. 1, 2. And then he writes an epistle : “John unto the
 ‘ seven churches in Asia. Grace be unto you and peace,”
 ‘ v. 4. But^f the evangelist has not prefixed his name, no
 ‘ not to his catholic epistle ; but, without any circumlocu-
 ‘ tion, begins with the mystery itself of the divine revelation :
 ‘ “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard,
 ‘ which we have seen with our eyes,” I John i. 1. And
 ‘ for the like revelation the Lord pronounced Peter blessed ;
 ‘ saying, “Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and
 ‘ blood has not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which
 ‘ is in heaven,” Matt. xvi. 17. Nor^g yet in the second
 ‘ or third epistle ascribed to John, though indeed they are
 ‘ but short epistles, is the name of John prefixed ; for with-
 ‘ out any name he is called the Elder. But this other person
 ‘ thought it not sufficient to name himself once and then

^d Ἅγιος μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τίνος καὶ θεοπνευστῆς συναίνῃ· ἢ μὴν ῥᾶδιως ἀν συν-
 θεῖμην τῶτον εἶναι τὸν ἀποστόλου, τὸν υἱὸν Ζεβεδᾶου, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου· ἢ τὸ
 εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐπιγεγραμμένον, καὶ ἡ ἐπιτολὴ ἢ καθολικὴ. p.
 273. D.

^e Ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς εἰς αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα παρεγγράφη·
 ἢ δὲ κηρυσσεῖ ἑαυτὸν, ἢ διὰ τῆς εὐαγγελίας, ἢ διὰ τῆς ἐπιτολῆς. p. 274. A.

^f Ὁ δὲ γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς εἰς τὴν καθολικὴν ἐπιτολὴν προεγγράφη ἑαυτὸν τὸ
 ὄνομα. B.

^g Ἄλλ’ ἢ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένῃ Ἰωάννη καὶ
 τρίτῃ, καὶ τοῖς βραχυσταῖς ἢ ἐπιτολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ προκρίεται· ἀλλὰ
 ἀνωμύτως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γεγραπταί. C.

‘ proceed, but he repeats it again ; “ I John, who am your
 ‘ brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom
 ‘ and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that was called
 ‘ Patmos for the testimony of Jesus,” Rev. i. 9. And at the end
 ‘ he says ; “ Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the pro-
 ‘ phecy of this book ; and I, John, who saw and heard these
 ‘ things,” chap. xxii. 7, 8. Therefore that it was John who
 ‘ wrote these things ought to be believed, because he says
 ‘ so. But who he was is uncertain ; for he has not said, as
 ‘ in the gospel often, that he is “ the disciple whom the Lord
 ‘ loved ;” nor that he is he “ who leaned on his breast ;”
 ‘ nor the “ brother of James ;” nor that he is one of them
 ‘ who saw and heard the Lord ; whereas he would have
 ‘ mentioned some of these things if he had intended plainly
 ‘ to discover himself. Of these things he says not a word :
 ‘ but he calls himself our “ brother and companion, and
 ‘ witness of Jesus,” and “ blessed,” because he saw and
 ‘ heard those revelations. And I suppose there were many
 ‘ of the same name with John the apostle, who for the love
 ‘ they bore to him, and because they admired and emulated
 ‘ him, and were ambitious of being beloved of the Lord
 ‘ like him, were desirous of having the same name : even
 ‘ as many also of the children of the faithful are called by
 ‘ the name of Paul and Peter. Moreover, ^h there is another
 ‘ John in the Acts of the Apostles, surnamed Mark, whom
 ‘ Paul and Barnabas took for their companion : concerning
 ‘ whom it is again said ; “ And they had John for their
 ‘ minister,” Acts xiii. 5. But that he is the person who
 ‘ wrote this book, I do not affirm. Nor is it written that he
 ‘ came with them into Asia. But it is said ; “ Now when
 ‘ Paul and his company loosed from Paphos, they came to
 ‘ Perga in Pamphylia : and John, departing from them,
 ‘ returned unto Jerusalem :” v. 13. I ⁱ think, therefore, that
 ‘ he is another, one of them that dwelleth in Asia ; forasmuch
 ‘ as it is said, that there are two tombs at Ephesus, each of
 ‘ them called John’s tomb. And from the sentiments, and
 ‘ words, and disposition of them, it is likely that he is dif-
 ‘ ferent from him [who wrote the gospel and epistle]. For
 ‘ the gospel and epistle have a mutual agreement, and begin
 ‘ alike. That says ; “ In the beginning was the Word.”
 ‘ This, “ That which was from the beginning.” That says ;
 ‘ “ And the Word was made flesh, and dwelled among us,
 ‘ And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begot-
 ‘ ten of the Father.” This has the same with little variation ;

^h *Ἐπι μὲν ἐν καὶ ἑτέρως Ἰωαννῆς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὁ ἐπικλη-
 θείς Μάρκος. p. 275.* ⁱ *Ἄλλον δὲ τινὰ οἰμαί τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων. 275. B.*

‘ “ That which we have heard, which we have seen with our
 ‘ eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have
 ‘ handled of the word of life. For the life was manifested.”
 ‘ These things he says by way of preface, pointing, as he
 ‘ afterwards shows, at those who asserted that the Lord was
 ‘ not come in the flesh. Therefore he also presently sub-
 ‘ joins; “ That which we have seen we testify, and declare
 ‘ unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and
 ‘ was manifested unto us. That which we have seen and
 ‘ heard declare we unto you.” He is uniform throughout,
 ‘ and wanders not in the least from the points he proposed
 ‘ to himself; but prosecutes them in the same sentences
 ‘ [literally, chapters] and words, some of which we shall
 ‘ briefly observe: for whoever reads with attention will often
 ‘ find in both, “ life;” frequently, “ light; avoiding of dark-
 ‘ ness;” oftentimes, “ truth, grace, joy, the flesh, and the
 ‘ blood of the Lord; judgment, forgiveness of sins, the love
 ‘ of God towards us, the commandment of love one toward
 ‘ another; the judgment of this world, of the devil, of anti-
 ‘ christ; the promise of the Holy Spirit; the adoption of the
 ‘ sons of God; the faith required of us in all things; the
 ‘ Father and the Son,” every where. And, in a word,
 ‘ throughout the gospel and epistle it is easy to observe one
 ‘ and the same character. But the Revelation is quite dif-
 ‘ ferent and foreign from these, without any affinity or resem-
 ‘ blance, not having so much as a syllable in common with
 ‘ them. Nor does the epistle (for I do not here insist on the
 ‘ gospel) mention, or give any hint of the Revelation, nor
 ‘ the Revelation of the epistle. And^k yet Paul in his epis-
 ‘ tles has made some mention of his revelations, though he
 ‘ never wrote them in a distinct book. Moreover, it is easy
 ‘ to observe the difference of the style of the gospel and the
 ‘ epistle from that of the Revelation; for they are not only
 ‘ written correctly, according to the propriety of the Greek
 ‘ tongue, but with elegance of phrase and argument, and the
 ‘ whole contexture of the discourse. So far are they from
 ‘ all barbarism and solecism, and even idiotism of language,
 ‘ that nothing of that kind is to be found in them: for he,
 ‘ as it seems, had each of those^l gifts; [or^m words, I Cor.
 ‘ xii. 8, 10,] the Lord having bestowed upon him both these,
 ‘ knowledge and eloquence. As to the other, I do not deny

^k Παυλος δια των επιστολων υποφημαντος τι και περι των αποκαλυψεων αυτου, ως εκ ενεγραψε καθ' αυτας. p. 276. B.

^l Ἐκατερον γαρ ειχεν ως εικει, τον λογον. C.

^m Compare I Cor. xii. 8. “ To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge.” v. 10—“ to another prophecy.”

‘ that he saw the Revelation, or that he had [the gift of]
 ‘ knowledge and prophecy. But I do not perceive in him
 ‘ an accurate skill in the Greek tongue; on the contrary, I
 ‘ observe in him barbarisms, and some solecisms, which it is
 ‘ necessary I should now show particularly, for I do not
 ‘ write by way of ridicule; let no one think so. I only
 ‘ intended to represent, after a critical manner, the difference
 ‘ of these pieces.”’

XV. I have now transcribed the whole of this argument, so far as it is preserved by Eusebius: it may afford occasion for many remarks; and I would hope for my reader’s patient attention, whilst I mention these following observations.

1. We have here a proof of the great respect shown to the scriptures by all christians in general. Dionysius, describing the good temper of those who entered into conference upon the millenary doctrine, says, they were disposed to embrace whatever could be made out by good arguments from the holy scriptures. It was the temper of all parties; and Dionysius himself approved of it, for he mentions it by way of commendation. Moreover, this is one thing he says in praise of Nepos, and for which he highly esteemed him, that he was much addicted to the study of the scriptures.

2. We cannot but observe the general division of those scriptures, which were so greatly respected: The law and the prophets, for the Old Testament: gospels and epistles of the apostles, for the New. This is very remarkable, and entirely agreeable to several ⁿ passages already alleged. It shows that no epistle, or treatise, or doctrinal work, was esteemed by christians as of authority, but what was supposed to be written by apostles. When Dionysius censures some teachers, who had too great a regard for the doctrine contained in the book of bishop Nepos, he blames them for undervaluing the law and the prophets, for neglecting the gospels, and despising the epistles of the apostles. If there had been any other sacred books among christians, which had been of authority, as a rule by which opinions were to be judged, tried, and determined, he would have mentioned them also by their general title and character. This shows, that writings of prophets, or other inspired persons of low rank, in the time of the gospel dispensation, were not canonical, or of authority; excepting only the historical writings of Mark and Luke, which undoubtedly were universally received, as has been shown abundantly; and we have in particular seen that they were received by our great author.

3. In the passages just cited we have seen a very valua-

ⁿ See p. 404, 408, 551; and see hereafter in St. Cyprian, ch. 44. numb. 10.

ble testimony to divers parts, or books, of the New Testament : as, the gospels of Matthew and John, particularly the beginning of this gospel ; the Acts of the Apostles also distinctly cited by Dionysius, and express mention of St. Paul's epistles. He likewise assures us, that the first catholic epistle ascribed to John was written by the apostle and evangelist. He so describes the second and third epistles ascribed to John, as to satisfy us he meaneth the same we still have. And he speaks of these three epistles in such a manner, as to confirm the testimonies of other writers about this time ; that they were all well known ; the first universally acknowledged as the apostle John's ; and the other two also ascribed to him, but not altogether received without dispute. Lastly, with regard to the book of the Revelation, Dionysius bears witness, not only that Nepos founded his doctrine upon it, but likewise that it was in high esteem with many other of the brethren.

4. We have seen Dionysius's observations upon the book of the Revelation, which I think must be allowed to be a good critique for those times. Dionysius was a learned man ; and perhaps he had some considerable assistance from ancient writings of the same kind. He actually speaks of some before him, who had criticised every period of this book. Whether he means Caius only, or some others likewise ; I believe my readers may join with me in wishing, that we had them all before us, together with Nepos's book against the Allegorists, and Dionysius's answer in his books of the Promises, entire. However, we should be thankful for what we have, and duly improve it.

5. It may be questioned, whether this critique of Dionysius, about the middle of the third century, or any other critique whatever, can be sufficient to induce us to doubt of the genuineness of the Revelation, which by many ancient authors is expressly ascribed to John the apostle and evangelist. Besides, Dionysius's critique may be criticised, and perhaps the force of several of his observations may be abated. There are divers learned men, who have professedly examined Dionysius's argument, to whom^o the reader is referred ; though I intend to borrow some of their remarks, as well as add some of my own.

^o See Mill. Proleg. n. clxii.—clxxx. The bishop of London's third Pastoral Letter, 58—60. Mr. Leonard Twells's Critical Examination of the late New Text and Version of the New Testament, Part. iii. p. 105—121. Beausobre et L'Enfant, leur Preface sur L'Apocalypse, p. 606—608. Du Pin, Diss. Prelim. sur la Bible, Liv. ii. ch. ii. sect. 13. p. 68, 69. Fr. Ad. Lampe Prolegom. in Joann. l. i. cap. 7. n. xxvi.—xxviii. p. 126—130.

6. Here I desire to begin with considering what Dionysius alleges from others, which consists of several particulars.

For, 1. he says, that some before him had utterly rejected this book, criticising every period or section, and showing it to be throughout unintelligible. Here I cannot but say it appears to be a defect in Dionysius, that he has not named some of these critics, nor informed us of their character nor time; unless we could suppose that he had done this in some other part of his work not transcribed by Eusebius; or that there were some reasons to think he might suppress their names out of tenderness, it being not very popular to write against the book of the Revelation; or those authors having expressed themselves in an offensive manner, and taken too great liberties in opposing that book. Mill^p thinks, that Caius only is intended, though Dionysius speaks in the plural number; and he flourished not above forty years before our author; and indeed part of what Dionysius allegeth afterwards from the writings before him, suits what^q Eusebius has in another place transcribed from Caius; but as Dionysius speaks in the plural number, I think it reasonable to understand him of more than one; for though we know not at this time of any one catholic writer by name, before Dionysius, who had disputed the genuineness of the Revelation, except Caius, it is not unlikely there might be more. It is not very easy to be supposed that Caius should be altogether singular; if he was the first, so plausible a writer would not be without followers. That there had been some controversies about the book of the Revelation before the time of Dionysius, may be argued from a work of Hippolytus, formerly^r taken notice of, supposed to be written in defence of St. John's gospel and the Apocalypse; or possibly to show, that both these books came from that apostle, and that the Revelation was written by no other than him who wrote the gospel. It seems to me to be to very little purpose to say, that no catholic authors had written against the genuineness of the Revelation before Dionysius, except Caius only, because neither Eusebius nor Jerom has mentioned them; for Jerom had his chief dependence on Eusebius; and if they were not mentioned by him, we have no great reason to expect them in Jerom. It ought farther to be observed, that scarce any beside Eusebius have taken particular notice of that passage of Caius against the book of the Revelation; and that Eusebius, who here transcribes this passage of Dionysius, does not contra-

^p Caium intelligit, &c. Mill. Proleg. n. clxiii. Vid. ibid. clxi.

^q See p. 400.

^r See p. 436, 437.

dict him. Once more, it ought to be observed that Dionysius did not, so far as we know, mention Caius by name. As he omitted a particular mention of him as a catholic writer, though probably he had some assistances from him, there may have been other writers of the church to whom he refers, though he has not named them.

2. They objected against the title, that it is improperly called a Revelation, which is so obscure; but I take this to be a trifling objection. The author, if he pleased, might call that a revelation which had been communicated to him in an extraordinary manner, though he had received it, and was to represent it, in a figurative and emblematical style. Besides, it is often spoken of as a prophecy; see ch. i. 13, xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19. And it is no strange thing, that prophecies should be obscure when delivered, and for some time after. See 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, 12, and Luke xxiv. 25, 26, 27, 32, 44, 45, 46.

3. They said that the inscription is false, for the book was not written by John, nor by any apostle, nor by any holy and ecclesiastical man, but by Cerinthus. But all or most of these assertions are without ground and reason. The author was certainly a holy man, and the book is a truly pious and religious book. I suppose I may appeal to every man of taste, if the book is not written in a high strain of piety; and therefore it follows that the writer's name is John, as he calls himself; for so good a man could not be a downright liar and impostor. Consequently, likewise, Cerinthus could not be the author, unless he also was called John.

But there are other things, chiefly two, which are usually said by learned men in answer to that assertion, that Cerinthus was the author of the Revelation; first, that^s the Revelation contradicts many of Cerinthus's opinions, and therefore could not be the work of Cerinthus. Irenæus^t informs us that, among other things, Cerinthus denied that God made the world; whereas the writer of the Revelation often teaches the contrary; See Rev. iv. 11; x. 6. Another point of Cerinthus was, that Christ did not suffer, but Jesus only. But the author of the Revelation calls Jesus, Christ, not Jesus alone, the first begotten of the dead; and adds, that the same Jesus Christ washed us from our sins in his own blood; Rev. i. 5. Again, v. 7, he says of the entire Jesus Christ, that he was pierced. It is therefore improbable to the highest degree, that Cerinthus should write the

^s Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. clxvii. Mr. Twells, as before, p. 109.

^t Iren. lib. i. cap. 26. al. 25.

Revelation under the name of John; for had he meditated such a fraud in favour of his millennium, he would have so contrived it as not to hurt his other equally favourite opinions. Secondly, it is said, that the Revelation does not establish Cerinthus's notions of the millennium, as it is described by the objectors, but directly contradicts and overthrows them; for^u the author of the Apocalypse expressly tells us, that fleshly impurity shall keep men from entering into the New Jerusalem; or,^v in other words, St. John describes his Jerusalem as inhabited by none but pure and holy persons; Rev. xxi. 27, xxii. 14, 15, while Cerinthus's Jerusalem was to be the residence of the earthly and the sensual. His citizens were to serve their passions and their pleasures; whilst the men of John's Jerusalem were to serve God, and the Lamb, Rev. xxii. 3; or, as it is happily expressed by a great^w author, 'His millenary state was not the life of saints, as the Apocalypse represents it, but the life of libertines.'

As for the first of these reasons, it appears to me not only just and solid, but alone sufficient to overthrow the objection, and to show that Cerinthus did not compose the Revelation. But with regard to the second answer, with all due submission I would say, that I am not fully satisfied that it is just; for, allowing the character here given of Cerinthus by enemies to be in the main right and true, that he was a carnal man, and too fond of sensual enjoyments, still there is nothing impure or vicious in their description of his millenary state. They do not say he taught that the kingdom of Christ should consist in riot and excess, and intemperance, adulteries, and all manner of uncleanness; but in eating and drinking, and nuptial entertainments, and other festivities; none of which are unlawful. It is true, this was low and mean, but such was the notion of all the Chiliasts at that time, so far as appears. Eusebius says: Nepos taught that the promises made to the saints in the divine scriptures were to be fulfilled in a Jewish sense; affirming that there would be a certain thousand years of bodily pleasures upon this earth: and he supposed he could defend that notion by the book of the Revelation. Dionysius likewise assures us, that they who admired Nepos's book suffered not the weaker of the brethren to conceive any thing great and magnificent, either of Christ's future glorious appearance, or of our gathering together and likeness to him; but only to expect in

^u Mr. Twells, as before, p. 110.

^v Mr. Twells, p. 101.

^w My Lord of London, in his Third Pastoral Letter, p. 58.

the kingdom of God poor and mortal things, and such as we now enjoy in the present state.

Here is a fair occasion for me to consider, what was the notion of the Chiliasts, or Millenarians of that time, who in other respects were orthodox : and likewise, whether Cerinthus was a Chiliast, of which, though it is generally taken for granted, I have some doubt, because Irenæus^x says nothing of it. But though I defer a particular discussion of those points, there are some things to be taken notice of here, and which I have reserved for this place ; otherwise I should have observed them before, either in the history of the affair of Nepos, or in the account of Dionysius's works.

For Theodoret expressly^y says, that, beside Caius and others, our Dionysius likewise wrote against the heretic Cerinthus. But it is^z very probable, that Theodoret means only these two books of the Promises, or some part of them.

On the other hand, Jerom says, that Dionysius wrote against Irenæus, who is among the most orthodox writers of the church ; intending nevertheless, as is^a supposed, the same books that Theodoret does, those written against Nepos : for the two books against Nepos being against the Millenarians in general, as^b Tillemont says, they were by consequence against Irenæus, who was one of the most celebrated defenders of that opinion. And it is likewise easy to suppose, that he was here confuted by name.

Jerom's words in his Commentary upon the prophecies of Isaiah are so remarkable, and so much to our present purpose, that I shall venture to transcribe them. ' If^c we understand the Revelation literally, we must judaize ; if ' spiritually, [or figuratively,] as it is written, we shall seem

^x Vid. Iren. Con. Hær. l. i. cap. 26. [al. 25.] et lib. iii. cap. 11. init.

^y Hær. Fab. l. 2. cap. 2.

^z Vid. Tillem. S. Den. d' Alex. art. 10.

^a Vid. Pagi Crit. 263. n. 2.

^b Tillemont, as before.

^c —et quâ ratione intelligenda sit Apocalypsis Johannis, quam si juxta literam accipimus, judaizandum est ; si spiritualiter, ut scripta est, disse- rimus, multorum veterum videbimur opinionibus contraire, Latinorum, Tertulliani, Victorini, Laetantii ; Græcorum, ut cæteros prætermittam, Irenæi tantum Lugdunensis episcopi faciam mentionem ; adversus quem vir eloquentissimus Dionysius, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ pontifex, elegantem scribit librum, irridens mille annorum fabulam ; et auream atque genuatam in terris Jerusalem ; instauracionem templi ; hostiarum sanguinem ; otium Sabbati ; circumcisionis injuriam, nuptias, partus, liberorum educationem, epularum delicias, et cunctarum gentium servitutem : rursusque bella, exercitus, ac triumphos, et superatorum neces, mortemque centenarii peccatoris. Cui duobus voluminibus respondit Apollinarius, quem non solum suæ sectæ homines, sed et nostrorum in hac parte dumtaxat plurima sequitur multitudo ; ut præ sagâ mente jam cernam, quantorum in me rabies concitanda sit. Hieron. in Es. l. 18. in Procem. p. 477, 478. Ed. Bened.

‘ to contradict many of the ancients, particularly Latins,
 ‘ Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius; and Greeks likewise,
 ‘ especially Irenæus bishop of Lyons, against whom Diony-
 ‘ sius bishop of the church of Alexandria, a man of uncom-
 ‘ mon eloquence, wrote a curious piece, deriding the fable
 ‘ of a thousand years, and the terrestrial Jerusalem, adorned
 ‘ with gold and precious stones; rebuilding the temple,
 ‘ bloody^d sacrifices, sabbatical rest, circumcision, marriages,
 ‘ lyings-in, nursing of children, dainty feasts, and servitude
 ‘ of the nations: and again, after this, wars, armies, triumphs,
 ‘ and slaughters of conquered enemies, and the death of the
 ‘ sinner a hundred years old. Him Apollinarius answered
 ‘ in two volumes, whom not only the men of his own sect,
 ‘ but most of our own people likewise follow in this point.
 ‘ So that it is no hard matter to foresee, what a multitude of
 ‘ persons I am like to displeas.’ Thus writes Jerom.

And it must be owned, that the orthodox Chiliasts, or Millenarians, do speak of a thousand^e years’ reign of Christ before the general resurrection; which good men, having been raised up from the dead, should spend on this earth; when there shall be^f an extraordinary plenty of the fruits of the earth; when also^g they shall feast upon them; when^h Jerusalem shall be rebuilt; when likewise there will be marriages and bringing forth of children: but that they believed marriage and fruits of marriage to belong to any of the raised saints, does not appear to me a clear point.

^d Bloody sacrifices.] Those words deserve to be taken notice of, as affording a remarkable instance of agreement between the millennium of the orthodox christians (of which Jerom here speaks) and of Cerinthus, as above described. See p. 693.

^e Verum ille, cum deleverit injustitiam, judiciumque maximum fecerit, ac justos, qui a principio fuerunt, ad vitam instauraverit, mille annis inter homines versabitur, eosque justissimo imperio reget. Lactant. l. vii. cap. 24. p. 722. Eodem tempore fiet secunda illa et publica omnium resurrectio, in qua excitabuntur injusti ad cruciatus sempiternos. Id. cap. 25. p. 728. f. Conf. Iren. l. v. cap. 31. et seqq.

^f Sol autem septies tanto, quam nunc est, clarior fiet. Terra vero aperiet fecunditatem suam, et uberrimas fruges sua sponte generabit. Rupes montium melle sudabunt: per rivos vina decurrent, et flumina lacte inundabunt. Lact. b. cap. 24. p. 724. Conf. Iren. ib. cap. 33. n. 3.

^g —Non facient omne terrenum opus, sed ad jacentem habebunt paratam mensam a Deo, pascentem eos epulis omnibus. Iren. ib. n. 2. Tales itaque promissiones manifestissime in regno justorum istius creaturæ epulationem significant, id. cap. 34. n. 3. Et hoc est trichnium, in quo recumbent ii, qui epulantur vocati ad nuptias. cap. 36. n. 2. Vident itaque homines tranquillissimam vitam, et copiosissimam. Lact. ib. cap. 24. p. 726. in.

^h Hæc autem talia universa non in supercelestibus possunt intelligi—sed in regni temporibus revocatâ terrâ a Christo, et reedificatâ Hierusalem, secundum characterem quæ sursum et Hierusalem. Iren. ib. cap. 35. n. 2.

Origen,ⁱ and^k some others, speak as if this was the expectation of the Chiliasts, even of such as were orthodox, as it seems, at least of^l some of them: which Origen therefore^m mentions with great concern of mind, being apprehensive that such an opinion, if known by the heathens, might be a reproach upon the christian religion. Andⁿ St. Jerom, immediately after the words just cited from him, insinuates the same thing of the orthodox Millenarians of his time: for which reason he reminds them of the saying of our Lord and Saviour, Matt. xxii. 29, 30, “Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage: but are as the angels of God.” Jerom^o writes to the same purpose in another place of his Commentaries upon the same prophet: but^p Irenæus and^q Lactantius, who were Millenarians, do not express themselves in that manner: what they say is, that at the time of the first resurrection there will be found

ⁱ Vid. Orig. de Princ. l. ii. cap. 11. n. 2. p. 104. Bened. et Comm. in Matt. p. 498. E. Huet.

^k Ap. Phot. Cod. 232. 4. 893. n. 10.

^l Καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀναστασιν—ἐσθίειν ἡμᾶς μέλλειν τὰ τοιαῦτα βρώματα, καὶ πίνειν· τινες δὲ καὶ τεκνοποιοῦν. Philoc. cap. 26. p. 99. Cantabr. Select. in Psal. p. 570. B. C. Bened.

^m Ταῦτα δὲ φθασάντα καὶ εἰς τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, μεγάλης εὐηθείας δοξᾶν ἀπενεγκασθαι ποιήσει τὸν χριστιανισμόν, πολλὰ βελτίονα δόγματα ἐχόντων τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τῆς πίστεως. Orig. ib.

ⁿ Quibus non invideo, si tantum amant terram, ut in regno Christi terrena desiderent; et post ciborum abundantiam, gulæque ac ventris ingluviem, ea quæ sub ventre sunt quærant. De quibus apostolus Paulus: ‘Esea,’ inquit, ‘ventri; et venter escis: Deus autem et hunc et illas destruet.’ [1 Cor. vi. 13.] Et, ‘non est regnum Dei cibus et potus.’ [Rom. xiv. 17.] Et Dominus atque Salvator: ‘Erratis,’ inquit, ‘nescientes scripturas, neque virtutem Dei. In resurrectione enim neque nubent, neque nubentur: sed erunt similes angelorum.’ Hieron. ibid.

^o Nunc breviter perstringendum est, quid plurimi de hoc loco sentiant,—Judæi et nostri Semijudæi, qui auream atque gemmatam de cælo exspectant Jerusalem, hæc in mille annorum regno futura contendunt: quando omnes gentes servituræ sunt Israël—et omnes oves Cedar congregentur; arietesque Nebajoth veniant, ut immolentur super altare templi, quod fuerit extractum. De insulis quoque, et maxime navibus Tharsis, volare filias illius et columbas, auri et argenti divitias conferentes—Hæc illi dicunt, qui terrenas desiderant voluptates, et uxorum quærent pulchritudinem, ac numerum liberorum. Hieron. Comm. in Is. cap. 60, 1, 2, 3, &c. p. 446, 447.

^p —et illos quos Dominus in carne inveniet, expectantes eum de cælis, et perperossos tribulationem, qui et effugerint iniqui manus: Ipsi sunt, de quibus ait propheta: ‘Et derelicti multiplicabuntur in terrâ.’ Et quotquot ex credentibus ad hoc præparavit Deus, ad derelictos multiplicandos in terrâ, et sub regno sanctorum fieri, et ministrare huic Jerusalem, &c. Iren. l. v. cap. 35. sub init.

^q Tum qui erunt in corporibus vivi, non morientur; sed per eosdem mille annos infinitam multitudinem generabunt; et erit eorum soboles sancta, et Deo cara. Qui autem ab inferis suscitabuntur, ii præerunt viventibus, velut iudices. Laet. ib. cap. 24. init. p. 722.

some good men living upon the earth, and that of them in the space of a thousand years shall be born a numerous race, a godly seed; over whom likewise the raised saints are to reign, and by whom they are to be served. Pleasing delusion!

But I add no more at present relating to this matter. I shall only refer in the margin ^r to some ancient writers, beside those already cited, who may be consulted by such as have leisure.

However, I would now mention a few observations relating to the passage of Dionysius under consideration.

1. I am now better satisfied than ^s formerly, that when Cains spoke of a book of Revelations, which he ascribed to Cerinthus, he meant our Revelation written by John.

2. I take it for granted, that by some of the arguments above alleged, it has been fully shown, that the supposition of the Revelation having been written by Cerinthus is without foundation.

3. The descriptions of the millennium of Cerinthus and of the catholic christians, as given by those who were not Millenarians, is much the same.

4. Therefore it is of no importance to show, that the Revelation does not establish Cerinthus's notion of the millennium; for neither does it, in the opinion of most learned men among the moderns, confirm the notions which some ancient catholics had of a millennium: though they certainly grounded their sentiments upon the Revelation, and upon other books of the Old and New Testament, universally received.

5. It follows likewise, that there is not, as ^t Mr. Lampe thought, any good ground to conclude, that Cerinthus corrupted and interpolated the genuine Revelation of St. John, to support his fond expectation of a thousand years to be spent in nuptial festivities, and other such like sensual enjoyments: for many catholic, or orthodox christians, had

^r Vid. Just. M. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 307, et seq. Paris. Euseb. H. E. l. iii. cap. 24. Gennad. de Ecc. Dogm. ap. August. in app. T. iii. cap. 55. Ed. Lovan. in app. T. viii. cap. 25. Ed. Bened. Tertullian. Contr. Marc. l. iii. cap. 24. Philastr. Hær. 59. De Chilionetitis, p. 119. Ed. Fabric.

^s See ch. xxxii.

^t Hanc inter alia inde subnatum auguror, quod Cerinthus hæreticus Apocalypsin apostoli quibusdam in locis, præsertim ubi ultima ecclesiæ fata proponuntur, corruerit, quam corruptam alii cum ipsâ Joannis Apocalypsi confuderunt. Fr. Ad. Lampe, Proleg. in Joann. l. i. cap. 7. n. 29. p. 129. Jam vero nostra Apocalypsis nihil habet de regno millenario Hierosolymis erigendo neque de voluptatibus corporis aut festis nuptialibus mille annorum spatium continuandis.—Neque tamen prorsus aliam, sed certis tantum locis corruptam, atque ad Cerinthi mentem accommodatam fuisse colligo. ib. p. 130.

the same expectations, though they used our book of Revelation pure and uncorrupted. There might be likewise other arguments insisted on to show, that this supposition is groundless and fictitious; as, that Cerinthus is not charged by the ancients with this crime of interpolating the Revelation; and, that if he had interpolated and altered this book to make it favourable to his notions about an expected millennium, he would also have made it agreeable to his other peculiar sentiments, of which he was equally fond.

We have now considered the objections of some before Dionysius, which he does not adopt.

7. We are in the next place to consider Dionysius's own objections, which seem to be more material.

The general design of Dionysius's argument is, that the writer of the Revelation is not John the son of Zebedee, one of Christ's twelve apostles, writer of the gospel and the first catholic epistle, because the Revelation differs, very much, from those other pieces in several respects.

1. The evangelist no where puts down his name, neither in the gospel, nor in the epistle: but the writer of the Revelation mentions himself by name more than once. To this it is answered as follows;

1.) Though St. John has not expressly named himself in his gospel, he has there so^u described himself, as that it is impossible not to know him: and, as for the epistles, they to whom they were sent could not be ignorant from whom they came.

2.) The other evangelists have forborne to mention their names, as well as John: nor is there any name prefixed to the epistle to the Hebrews.

3.) The character of a prophet is different from that of an evangelist. The apostle might omit his name in his other writings, and yet put it here; where, indeed, he was obliged to put it in conformity to the ancient prophets, who had inserted their names at the beginning, and in other parts of their prophecies: and above all, Daniel frequently mentions himself, whose manner the apocalyptic writer useth more than that of any other ancient prophet whatever.

But I question whether this last observation can be allowed, as fully satisfactory; for if the apostle, who had omitted his name in his other works, mentioned it here in imitation of Daniel, and other ancient prophets, why did he not also specify the time of his prophecies or visions, by declaring the reign, and year of the reign, of the prince or

* See John xxi. 24, and other places.

emperor in whose time they were received, as is usual with the ancient prophets, and ^v Daniel in particular ?

2. Dionysius objects, that though the writer of the Revelation calls himself John, yet he has not shown us, that he is the apostle : for he does not say, as in the gospel, that he is the disciple whom the Lord loved, nor who leaned on his breast, nor the brother of James, nor that he is one of them that saw the Lord ; whereas he would have mentioned some of these particulars, if he had intended to discover himself, and to have it thought that he was the apostle of that name. To this several things may be ^w replied.

1.) The author of the Revelation calls himself John, without any farther distinction, and therefore he is likely to be the principal person of that name then living ; that is, John the evangelist : for such an one is ordinarily and sufficiently distinguished by his bare name, and needs no additions ; but when a person inferior to others of the same name is mentioned, common perspicuity requires an additional title to prevent mistake. Since, therefore, throughout the Apocalypse, the person that saw the visions, and committed them to writing, is barely styled John, it is obvious thence to imagine, that none but John the apostle and evangelist is meant by that name.

2.) The ^x author of the Revelation was one who had “ borne record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus, and of the things which he had seen :” Rev. i. 2. It is added, ‘ That ^y the concluding words of this verse, “ the things which he saw,” undoubtedly appropriate all that goes before to John the apostle ; for had any John then living seen the transactions of the gospel, save John the apostle ?’

So Mr. Twells. But all those words may be very properly understood ^z of this book, the Revelation, or the

^v See Daniel, ch. vii. 1, 2 ; viii. 1 ; ix. 12 ; x. 1 ; xl. 1.

^w See, beside Mill. Prolegomena, n. 174.—Mr. Twells, as before, Part. iii. p. 21, &c. ^x See Mr. Twells, as before, p. 22, 23. ^y Ibid.

^z The note of Mrs. de Beausobre and L'Enfant upon those words is this ; “ Who bare record of the Word of God and of the testimony of Jesus Christ.” See I John i. 1, and John xxi. 24. For though it is not certain that the gospel of St. John was then written, it suffieeth, that the apostle had by word of mouth preached the same things that are in his gospel. “ This place,” says St. Ambrose, “ shows, that this book was not written by any other John than he who wrote the gospel.” Nevertheless these words may be also applied to the Apocalypse itself. On peut pourtant aussi rapporter ces paroles à l'Apocalypse même.’ It ought to be remarked, that the piece from whence that observation is taken, is not really St. Ambrose's, though some times ascribed to him, but the work of some writer of the eighth century, or later, as those commentators well knew ; but, for brevity sake, I suppose,

things contained in it ; for the book begins thus, chap. i. v. 1, “ The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass : and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.” Then in the second verse the writer says, that he discharged his office in this book, having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jesus Christ, and all the visions he had seen ; v. 2, “ Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw.” This seems a very natural and obvious sense of these words ; and that it is the real design and meaning of them, may be confirmed by comparing them with the beginnings of some of the books of the ancient Jewish prophets ; as Is. i. 1, “ The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amos, which he saw——” Ezek. i. 3, 4, “ The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest,——and I looked.”—In these words therefore the writer, after the manner of many other good writers, sets before his readers, in brief, the design and substance of the whole book.

3.) ‘ The^{zz} Revelation is the work of that John who was
 ‘ in the isle of Patmos for the testimony of the gospel,
 ‘ which was then the peculiar case of John the apostle ;
 ‘ which circumstance not only agrees with the history of
 ‘ John the evangelist, but is also peculiar to him, and marks
 ‘ him out as effectually as if he had been expressly so
 ‘ called ; for^a the ancients declare, that this John was
 ‘ banished in the latter end of Domitian’s reign to that island ;
 ‘ but we do not find, from ecclesiastical monuments, that
 ‘ any other named John was at that time banished into the
 ‘ isle of Patmos.’

I have been unwilling to omit this observation ; but perhaps some will think it not very properly mentioned in this place. They may say, that this serves to show that some ancient writers did own the Revelation was written by the apostle John ; and it would be fitly enough insisted on in an account of their testimonies concerning it ; but it ought not to be mentioned as a distinct consideration ; for those writers, supposing this book to have been written by John

they quoted it by the name of St. Ambrose. Vid. Ambrosii Opera, T. ii. p. 497, 498, 499, in App.

^{zz} Mr. Twells, as before, p. 24.

^a ‘ See Clem. Alex. in his book, *Quis Dives salvetur ?* cap. 42. p. 959. ‘ Tertul. de Præser. Hær. c. 36. Euseb. Chron. ad ann. Domit. 14. and H. ‘ E. l. iii. c. 18. 20. Of the same mind were Epiphanius and Sulpitius Severus, ‘ and Jerom. in Cat. V. l. and in l. i. contr. Jovin. c. 14.’ So Mr. Twells in a note, p. 24.

the apostle, concluded thence that he was banished into the island of Patmos.

4.) ‘The^b epistle of John to the seven churches of the Minor or Proconsular Asia, and consequently the Revelation itself, was most probably written by that John who had the immediate and particular care of those churches; namely, John the apostle: for the presidency of our apostle is a fact attested by early antiquity. Eusebius^c tells us from tradition, that, upon the dispersion of the apostles, Asia fell to John’s lot; and as Ephesus was the principal city of the province, there John chiefly resided; visiting and directing the neighbouring churches, as occasion required.’

These things therefore may be reckoned sufficient to signify to every one who is the author of this book. He calls himself John; he is one who bore record of the word of God; he had been in the isle of Patmos for the testimony of Jesus; he writes to the seven churches of Asia, where the apostle and evangelist is supposed to have presided.

So it has been argued by learned men: and certainly these are particulars that deserve consideration, though they be not all of equal importance, as has been shown in passing along. They are of use to weaken this objection of Dionysius; but whether they confute and overthrow his argument, I cannot certainly say. It had been very easy, in my opinion, for the apostle to design, or describe himself in a more peculiar and distinguishing manner, if indeed he was the author of this book: and since the writer of the Revelation, as Dionysius observes, nameth himself more than once, and calleth himself our brother and companion, and says he was in Patmos for the testimony of Jesus; why did he not somewhere say, that he was the disciple whom Jesus loved, or who leaned upon his breast; and that he was an eye-witness of the word, or of the sufferings of Jesus; or plainly call himself apostle? As the writer seems willing enough to characterize, and describe himself, it may be thought somewhat strange that he has not plainly expressed some such characteristics as these, if they belonged to him.

3. Dionysius objects, that the Revelation does not mention the catholic epistle, nor the epistle the Revelation.

But I think this observation to be of little moment; for, not to say any thing here about the exact time of writing any of these pieces, of the gospel, or the fore-mentioned epistle of St. John, or the Revelation, nor which was first or which last written; it is not the custom of the sacred writers

^b Mr. Twells, p. 25.

^c Hist. Ec. l. iii. c. 1.

to quote themselves, or refer to their own works. When they write more than one epistle to the same churches or persons, they make mention of their former epistle to those churches or persons; this is natural, and it is done by St. Paul: but in his epistle to the Romans, though he had then written several epistles, he does not there say any thing of those former epistles.

4. Dionysius argues, that there is a great likeness of sentiment and expression between the gospel and catholic epistle of John; but that the Revelation is quite different, without any affinity or resemblance, not having so much as a syllable common to them. By way of reply to this, several things have been said.

1.) As, that ^d this argument, taken from the difference of style, is altogether insignificant, and of no consequence; for allowing it to be true, that there were as great a difference as Dionysius asserts, every body knows, that the style of history is different from that of an epistle or a prophecy. The style of history is simple; of an epistle, familiar; and that of prophecy is grand and sublime, as certainly is the style of the Revelation.

2.) Another ^e part of the answer is, by denying the fact. The difference between the Revelation and the acknowledged writings of St. John is not so great as represented by Dionysius. Nay, it is said, ‘ There ^f is in many instances a conformity both of sentiment and expression between the Revelation and the uncontested writings of John the apostle: and ‘ this agreement is so remarkable, as to be itself no bad argument, that they were all written by one hand; for how else ‘ could there be any tolerable resemblance of this sort in ‘ writings of so different a nature?’ Divers such coincidences have been observed by ^g learned men. ‘ In ^h the Revelation, ‘ (chap. xix. 13,) it is said of Christ, that “ his name is called ‘ the Word of God;” and in the gospel of St. John he is ‘ styled the Word, (ch. i. 1,) and in his first epistle “ the ‘ Word of life:” ch. i. 1. In the Revelation he is called the ‘ Lamb, (ch. v. 6, 12,) and in the gospel of St. John, the ‘ “ Lamb of God;” ch. i. 29, 36. In the Revelation the ‘ name of Christ is, “ He that is true:” (ch. iii. 7.)—“ he that ‘ is faithful and true:” (xix. 11.) and in the gospel of St. ‘ John, “ he that is true—full of truth,” (ch. i. 14,) and the ‘ “ truth:” xiv. 6; 1 John v. 20. In the Revelation, manna

^d See Beausobre and L’Enfant, Préface sur l’ Apocalypse, p. 607.

^e Mr. Twells, p. 112.

^f Mr. Twells, as before.

^g Vid. Mill. Proleg. n. 176, 177.

^h See the bishop of London’s Third Pastoral Letter, p. 59, 60.

‘ is applied to spiritual food ; and so it is applied in the
 ‘ gospel of St. John : Rev. ii. 7 ; John vi. 32. In the Reve-
 ‘ lation it is said, “ And every eye shall see him, and they
 ‘ also which pierced him ;” (Rev. i. 7.) and in the gospel of
 ‘ St. John, from the prophet Zachary, “ They shall look on
 ‘ him whom they pierced :” John xix. 37. In the Reve-
 ‘ lation Christ saith, “ If any man hear my voice, and open
 ‘ the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he
 ‘ with me :” Rev. iii. 20. In the gospel of St. John, “ If a
 ‘ man love me, he will keep my words ; and my Father will
 ‘ love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode
 ‘ with him :” ch. xiv. 23.’

These are instances of agreement between the Revelation and the confessed writings of St. John, which are commonly insisted on ; but I own I have scruples with regard to divers of these instances. May I then be allowed to propose some difficulties upon this head, and go over again each of these particulars ? When I have done so, I will add a few other.

1. ‘ In Rev. xix. 13, Christ is called “ the Word of God.” ’ But there is no parallel to that expression that I know of in St. John’s confessed writings. Indeed, at the beginning of his gospel, he speaks of the Word, and at the beginning of his first epistle of the Word of life ; but still here is a difference, Mr. Twellsⁱ says, ‘ in Rev. xix. 13, Christ is termed “ the word of God ;” and every one knows that he is more frequently so styled in the uncontested writings of St. John than elsewhere.’ But though Mr. Twells says ‘ every one knows this,’ I must entreat him to make an exception for me till somebody has shown me the several texts of St. John’s uncontested writings, where Christ is so called, for at present I do not know of one.

2. ‘ Then Christ is called the Lamb of God in the gospel of St. John, and the Lamb in the Revelation.’ But here is no exact resemblance ; for in the gospel Christ is called the Lamb of God ; in the Revelation the Lamb. In the gospel Christ is but twice only called the Lamb of God, and that by John the Baptist ; but in the Revelation he is very frequently called the Lamb. And besides, he is compared to a lamb in other books of the New Testament ; as I Pet. i. 19. See likewise Acts viii. 32.

3. ‘ In Rev. iii. 7, 14, and again ch. xix. 11, Christ is^k ‘ emphatically styled *ὁ ἀληθινός*, he that is true. And the ‘ very same character is given to him, I John v. 20. See ‘ also John i. 14, and xiv. 6. But such expressions occur

ⁱ As before, p. 28.

^k See Mr. Twells, p. 28.

‘no where else.’ So argues Mr. Twells. And it may be owned that this is somewhat remarkable: but still, as Dionysius observed, the word Truth, so common in St. John’s gospel and epistles, is wanting in the Revelation. And it may be said, that equivalent things are found in the writings of St. Paul, and other books of the New Testament; as when Paul says of Christ, (1 Tim. vi. 13,) that “before Pontius Pilate he witnessed a good confession;” and when the gospel is called the truth, or word of truth, as it often is. And even insidious enemies were obliged to give our Lord the character of a sincere teacher of truth, as recorded, Matt. xxii. 16, “Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth.” See also Mark xii. 14.

4. ‘In Rev. ii. 17, are these words; “to him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the hidden manna.” And ‘spiritual food is spoken of under the image of manna in ‘John vi.’ But I cannot perceive these texts to be parallel; however,¹ Mr. Twells lays a good deal of stress upon this coincidence.

5. ‘In Rev. i. 7, “Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail, because of him.” ‘In Zech. xii. 10, are these words; “And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him.”—And that text is cited, John xix. 37, “And again, another scripture saith: They shall look on him whom they pierced; but no^m where else in the New Testament.’ But I would observe, that in the Revelation there is no citation as in St. John’s gospel: and the text of the Revelation suits as well a text of St. Matthew’s as of St. John’s gospel; “And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory:” Matt. xxiv. 30.

6. ‘In Rev. iii. 20, our Lord promiseth the obedient; “I will come unto him, and sup with him, and he with me.” And so in the gospel of St. John, xiv. 23, “I and my Father will come unto him, and will make our abode with him.’ It must be allowed that here is some resemblance: nevertheless, it would have been a great pleasure to see in the Revelation the word abode, or abide, so common in St. John’s gospel and first epistle.

7. Farther, ‘Rev. i. 5, “Unto him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” So the

¹ See him, 27, 28.

^m See Mr. Twells, p. 27.

‘ apostle John, 1 John i. 7, “ And the blood of Jesus Christ
 ‘ his son cleanseth us from all sin.”’ But this coincidence ap-
 pears to me to be of very small moment ; because the love
 of Christ in washing, or cleansing, or redeeming, or saving
 us from our sins by his blood or death, is a subject insisted
 on in every book of the New Testament, and could not be
 omitted by any christian writer or speaker in the early days
 of the gospel.

To these coincidences, insisted on by others, Mr. Twells
 has added several more. And, besides, he proceeds still
 farther, adding some propositions, and supporting them by
 various examples under each. His propositions are these :
 ‘ First, the ⁿ sameness of construction and acceptation of
 ‘ words in the Revelation, and the unquestionable writings
 ‘ of St. John, and which are less frequent with the other sa-
 ‘ cred penmen, makes it extremely probable that one person
 ‘ was the author of them all. Secondly, there ^o are many
 ‘ instances in the Revelation, of construction and accepta-
 ‘ tion of words altogether peculiar to John the evangelist,
 ‘ which demonstrate he wrote that book.’ So Mr. Twells.
 But I have not room for his particular instances ; and he
 may be read, not only in his own English, but likewise in
 Mr. Wolff’s fourth ^p volume of *Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ*
 upon the New Testament ; Mr. Wolff having translated a
 large part of Mr. Twells’s work into Latin entire, and the
 rest of it in the way of a copious abridgment.

I shall, however, transcribe here a particular or two.

8. One of the coincidences observed by Mr. Twells, ad-
 ‘ ditional to those above mentioned, is this : ‘ In Rev. iii. 21,
 ‘ Christ ^q says, *Εγω ενικησα*, “ I have overcome.” Just as he
 ‘ declares, Joh. xvi. 33, *Εγω νενικηκα τον κοσμον*, “ I have
 ‘ overcome the world.” Again, christian firmness under
 ‘ trials is frequently called “ overcoming” in the second and
 ‘ third chapters of the Revelation, as it is also, 1 Joh. ii. 13,
 ‘ 14 ; iv. 4 ; v. 5 ; language peculiar to St. John.’

I would add likewise two instances of construction and
 acceptation of words, which ^r Mr. Twells reckons altogether
 peculiar to John the evangelist.

9. ‘ In Rev. ii. 26, “ He ^s that keepeth my works unto
 ‘ the end.” Here ^t works, says Mr. Twells, is plainly put
 ‘ for ^u words ; and so Grotius upon the place ; but we no
 ‘ where find the like acceptation of this word, save in John

ⁿ As before, p. 30.

^o Ib. p. 32.

^p P. 387, &c.

^q See Mr. Twells, p. 29.

^r Ib. p. 32.

^s ‘ Ο τηρων αχρι τελους τα εργα μου.

^t Εργα.

^u Λογεις.

‘ xiv. 10, “ The^v words which I speak unto you, I speak
 ‘ not of myself; but my Father that dwelleth in me, he doth
 ‘ the works.” Here is an opposition of sense, which cannot
 ‘ be made out, unless we suppose, that speaking words and
 ‘ doing works mean the same thing. The sense therefore
 ‘ of the passage is this; The words which I speak are not
 ‘ merely my own, but my Father which dwelleth in me, he
 ‘ is the joint author of them. And this sense our Lord gives
 ‘ us in express terms, v. 24 of this chapter: “ The word,
 ‘ which ye hear, is not mine, but my Father’s which sent
 ‘ me.” And again, ch. viii. 28, “ I do nothing of myself,
 ‘ but as my Father has taught me, so I speak.”’

10. ‘ Keeping^w the word, or words, is an expression not
 ‘ uncommon in the Revelation; see ch. iii. 8, 10; xxii. 7, 9.
 ‘ But in no other book of the New Testament do we meet
 ‘ with it, except in St. John’s gospel and first epistle; see
 ‘ John viii. 51, 52, 55; xiv. 23, 24; xv. 20; xvii. 6; 1 Joh.
 ‘ ii. 5.’ So^x Mr. Twells. However, the phrase, “ keeping
 the commandments,” is in Matt. xix. 17. St. Matthew has
 the same verb in other places, and particularly xxviii. 20,
 “ Teaching them to observe” [or keep] “ whatsoever I
 have commanded you:” that verb is also in other books of
 the New Testament, and “ keeping Christ’s commandments”
 is in John’s gospel, as xiv. 15, 21; xv. 10; and often in his
 first epistle, and sometimes in the Revelation, as ch. xii. 17;
 xiv. 12. So that the verb Keep, τηρεω, is oftener used by
 St. John than any other writer of the New Testament, and
 the phrase “ keeping Christ’s word,” or words by him
 alone; but yet, perhaps, this peculiarity is not very re-
 markable.

3.) I have now enlarged upon this part of the answer to
 Dionysius’s argument, which consists in denying the fact,
 and in showing that the difference between the Revelation,
 and the acknowledged writings of St. John is not so great
 as he has represented it. Nevertheless it must be owned,
 as I apprehend, that this part of his critique is just and true
 in the main; for Dionysius observed, that there are certain
 words, or expressions, such as “ light,” “ life,” “ truth,”
 and several others, very common in St. John’s gospel and
 epistle, but not to be found at all, or very rarely, in the
 Revelation. Nor have any of our modern sharp-sighted
 critics been able to show those expressions in this last-men-
 tioned book, nor with all their industry directly to confute
 and overthrow that observation.

^v Τα ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ ὑμῖν ἀπ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ἢ λαλῶ ὁ δὲ πατήρ, ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ
 μενοῖ, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα. ^w Τηρεῖν λόγον ἢ λόγους. ^x Ib. p. 33.

And perhaps Dionysius's collection of this kind might be enlarged; for the verb *μενω*, "abide," or "dwell," is very common in St. John's gospel^y and first epistle, but scarce occurs at all in the Revelation, except one place, ch. xvii. 10, which I suppose does not deserve particular notice here. Moreover, as Mr. Blackwall says, 'St. John often takes one thing two ways, both in the affirmative and negative; 1 Joh. v. 12, "He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life."' This is the only example alleged by Mr. Blackwall; but he says St. John does so often; and it is certain there are several such instances in his^z first and^a second epistle, and others in his gospel. Thus, of John the Baptist he writes; (Joh. i. 20;) "And he confessed, and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ." And our Lord says to Thomas, (chap. xx. 27,) "And be not faithless, but believing;" but I do not remember such forms of speaking in the Revelation.

It may be also said to the advantage of Dionysius, that his critique does not consist of minute particulars, but of such things as are very considerable, and must hold, I think, as proofs of a great agreement of sentiments and expressions between St. John's gospel and first epistle, and of a remarkable difference of the Revelation, and the unquestioned writings of the evangelist.

Mr. Blackwall however says, 'The^b Revelation is written much in the same style with St. John's gospel and epistles.' On the contrary, Joachim Camerarius says, 'The^c difference of the style of the Revelation from that of the gospel and epistle is manifest, and may be easily perceived by any one who has attained to only a moderate knowledge of the Greek language.' And he^d speaks of these critical remarks of Dionysius in terms of great respect.

Beza, likewise, in his preface to the Revelation, having answered divers objections to the genuineness of this book, concludes, 'that^e he cannot but think it most probable,

^y See Sac. Classics, Vol. i. p. 333.

^z See 1 John i. 5, 6; iv. 2, 3,

6, 7, 8.

^a 2 John, ver. 9.

^b As before, p. 334.

^c Sane orationem hujus dissimilem esse ejus, quâ conscripta extat evangelii expositio et epistolæ compositio, evidens est, atque perspicitur facile ab aliquo, qui non etiam peritissimus linguæ Græcæ, sed illius medioerem saltem notitiam consecutus est studio suo. Joach. Camer. ad Apoc.

^d Sed nihil est opus nostrâ disputatione longiore, cum, ut opinor, ea, quæ debeant et possint dici de hoc libro, exstent commemorata in libro. vii. Historiæ Eusebii, excerpta ex quâdam epistolâ Dionysii Alexandrini. Id. ib.

^e Quæ cum ita se habeant, quamvis non censuerim quidem ego pertinacius de scriptoris nomine litigandum, tamen Johanni apostolo potius quam cuiquam

‘ that it was written by John the apostle ; but that if a conjecture was to be made from the style, who else could be reckoned most likely to be the writer ; he should think of Mark, who was also called John, there being a great resemblance in words, phrases, and manner of writing, between this book and Mark’s gospel.’

And this I suppose to be the more general opinion of learned men, that there is a considerable difference of sentiments, and words, and manner, in the Revelation and the acknowledged pieces of the apostle John, whatever this difference is owing to ; whether it be that these writings are not all the compositions of one and the same author ; or that it is entirely owing to the diversity of subject and design, which was mentioned ^f formerly, or to some other cause. I shall, however, mention another thing to be considered. If there were any reason to think that there was some considerable distance of time between the composing of any of these books, that might be one good way of accounting for differences of style : for it is not unlikely that one and the same person, writing upon different arguments, and at a great distance of time, especially if he be one who does not frequently exercise his style, or write in the intermediate space, should have a very different manner in his several performances.

Thus far then of the argument concerning difference of sentiment and expression.

5. Dionysius’s last objection is founded upon the diction or language of the Revelation : for he says that the gospel and epistle of John are written correctly, and not only according to the propriety of the Greek tongue, but with elegance of phrase, argument, and composition ; quite free from barbarism and solecism, and even idiotism of language : but the writer of the Revelation discovers no accurate skill in the Greek tongue ; on the contrary, he has barbarisms, and some solecisms.

In answer to this, several things have been said by learned men of late times ; for Mill^g allows that there are solecisms in the Revelation. It is a thing, he says, too manifest to be denied ; but then, as he adds, the other writers of the New Testament are not free from the like defects : no, not John

alii hunc librum tribuerim.—Quod si quid aliud liceret ex stylo conjicere, nemini certe potius quam Marco tribuerim, qui et ipse Johannes dictus est : adeo non in verbis tantum, sed etiam in formulis dicendi plerisque similis, ac pene idem est evangelii Marci et hujus libri character. Bez. Pr. in Apoc.

^f See p. 710.

^g Et certe Apoclypten subinde minus Græce scribere, etiam et *σολοικιζειν*, notius est quam ut negari possit. Proleg. n. 179.

the evangelist, the purity and elegance of whose language is so commended by Dionysius. Mr. Twells's^h answer here is to the like purpose. 'We do not pretend,' he says, 'to assert that the language of the Revelation is pure Greek.' But he is persuaded that it is now much worse than when Dionysius passed his censure upon it: nay, he supposeth that there were not half the solecisms in the copies of Dionysius's times that now occur in the printed copies; and that our printed copies abound with solecisms. But then, as the Greek of the Revelation was always far from being pure, so Dionysius has beyond measure extolled that of St. John's gospel and canonical epistle, which has its faults likewise.

So write those two learned men. But Mr.ⁱ Blackwall blames Dr. Mill for striking in so far with Dionysius as to allow there is false Greek and solecisms in the Revelation; and he offers solutions of several constructions in that book which have been supposed ungrammatical; and Mr. Wolff, in a note^k upon his Latin translation of this part of Mr. Twells's work, gives a caution against receiving that supposition, that there are solecisms in the Revelation.

Thus critics are divided upon points of this nature. I think, therefore, we may set aside this part of the argument until they are better agreed among themselves.

Before that is done it seems needless to inquire after the reasons of the imperfections of the language of the Revelation, or to examine those reasons which have been assigned. However, to observe somewhat briefly relating to this matter may not be amiss. Mr. Twells^l says, 'That if this book be found to have rather more of these imperfections than St. John's other writings, two causes may be assigned for it. First, that being of the prophetic sort, the Holy Ghost thought it most congruous to use the same forms of speech as the prophets of the Old Testament do, which occasions more Hebraisms in it. Secondly, as prophetic language is generally least cultivated in point of beauty and perspicuity, so we are not to wonder if the same negligence should appear in the grammar of it. A writer, big with the mysteries he relates, may well be supposed less attentive to diction, than when he draws up a history or an epistle.' So Mr. Twells. 'As for the language of the

^h As before, p. 113, 114, 115.

ⁱ See Sacred Classics, Vol. i. p. 140—142.

^k Cave, heic Twellsii judicium probes. Omnem enim solœcismorum suspensionem ab illis, qui illorum postulantur, locis alienam esse infra ex notis apparebit. Wolf. Cur. T. iv. p. 417.

^l As before, p. 115, 116.

‘ Revelation,’ says ^m Tillemont, ‘ beside other reasons that might be alleged, may it not be said, that, being banished into Patmos, St. John had not by him the same persons he had at Ephesus to assist him in the choice of terms and expressions? And possibly, too, the power of the Spirit of God constrained him to write quickly what he had seen, without concerning himself about purity and elegance of speech, which are of no value in the sight of God.’

I own I have no great opinion of these reasons; but, as before observed, since learned men are not as yet agreed about the fact, there is no immediate necessity that we should scrupulously examine the supposed causes of it. I therefore pass on.

8. We are now to observe, after all, Dionysius’s own opinion of the author of this book.

In his critique upon the Revelation he says, he dares not reject it, and we find that he actually made use of it in his writings. Eusebius informs us, that in a letter to Hermamom, speaking of Valerian and his persecution, Dionysius saith: ‘ And ⁿ John had a revelation to this purpose: “ And there was given unto him,” saith he, “ a mouth, speaking great things, and blasphemies: and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.” Rev. xiii. 5. It is wonderful to see both these things in Valerian.’ So Dionysius. This passage is a proof that the Revelation was then well known, and in great reputation.

Among these his critical observations he likewise acknowledgeth this book to be the work of some holy and divinely inspired person; but, he thinks, not the work of John the apostle the son of Zebedee; but, rather, of some other John who had his chief residence in Asia.

And, certainly, Dionysius is in the right to own, that the writer was a truly good and holy man. I think the book itself puts that out of question.

Consequently also, he was divinely inspired; for he says he “ was in the spirit;” Rev. i. 10. And the book is declared to be, or contain, (v. 1,) “ the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.” It is added afterwards, (v. 19,) “ Write the things which thou hast seen—and the things which shall be hereafter.” Again, (chap. iv. 1,) “ I will show thee things which must be here-

^m See Mem. Ec. T. i. P. iii. p. 1089. St. Jean l’Evangliste, note ix.

ⁿ Καὶ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ δὲ ὁμοίως ἀποκαλυπτεῖται· Καὶ ἐδόθη γὰρ αὐτῷ φησι, σομα. — Ἀμφότερα δὲ εἰσιν ἐπὶ Οὐαλεριανῷ θαυμάσια. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 10. init.

after." It is also called^o a "prophecy." Now prophecy is not an human attainment, but the gift of God.

Nevertheless, Dionysius thinks it not the writing of the apostle, but of some other John, whom he does not certainly know, but probably of that other John who is said to have had his residence in Asia, there being two tombs at Ephesus with that name.

Against this supposition should be observed all the arguments above mentioned relating to the inscription ; that there are many ancient writers who receive the Revelation as the writing of John the apostle and evangelist ; that we have no particular account of any John having been an exile in the isle of Patmos about that time except John the apostle, and the writer calling himself John, without any particular characteristics, gives ground to conclude he is the principal person of that name then living : and it may be judged very unlikely, that the Spirit of God should admonish and reprove the seven churches of Asia by John the elder, (allowing that there was such a person,) whilst John the apostle was living and presided in those parts.

XVI. I suppose I have now paid a due regard to this critique of Dionysius : but before I proceed, I will take a brief review of it, and add two or three remarks.

This whole critique may be said to consist of three parts : objections of some before Dionysius ; then his own objections ; and, lastly, his own judgment or opinion.

The objections of those before Dionysius I suppose to have been fully answered ; and their opinion, that Cerinthus was the writer of the Revelation, confuted.

But Dionysius's own objections are more material : they are five in number. First, that the evangelist John has not named himself, neither in his gospel nor in his catholic epistle, but the writer of the Revelation nameth himself more than once. Secondly, that though the writer of the Revelation calls himself John, he has not shown us that he is the apostle of that name. Thirdly, that the Revelation does not mention the catholic epistle, nor that epistle the Revelation. Fourthly, that there is a great agreement in sentiment, expression, and manner, between St. John's gospel and epistle ; but the Revelation is quite different in all these respects, without any resemblance or similitude. Fifthly, that the Greek of the gospel and epistle is pure and correct, but that the Revelation has barbarisms and solecisms.

These are Dionysius's objections. The third we have supposed to be of little force. The fifth depending upon a

^o See Rev. ch. i. 3 ; xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19.

matter of much niceness, about which very few are able to judge, and about which even the learned are not agreed, we have not much insisted upon it; nor did Dionysius enlarge, or enter into, particulars here. As for the first, several things have been alleged by way of answer to it; but whether that answer be full and complete, may be questioned. As for the second objection, several things also have been observed sufficient to weaken, if not to confute and overthrow it. With regard to the fourth objection, it has been observed, that the subject matter and design of the Revelation being very different from those of the acknowledged pieces of the evangelist John, that must needs occasion some considerable difference in sentiment and expression; but that the difference is not so great as represented by Dionysius. Nevertheless, I am of opinion, that this difficulty has not been quite removed: and I must acknowledge, that the Revelation, when compared with the apostle's unquestioned writings, has an unlikeness not easy to be accounted for.

Dionysius's own opinion is, that the Revelation was written by some holy and inspired person named John; but who that John was he does not know; he might be John the elder, said to have resided for some time at Ephesus in Asia; but the reasons before mentioned satisfied Dionysius he could not be John the apostle. Of this judgment of our author we have lately spoken; and have now nothing more to add, beside the two following general remarks.

First, If the writer of the Revelation be supposed not an apostle, then this book is greatly degraded, its authority is lessened, and it can no longer be reputed canonical. Doubtless, Dionysius knew what he was about; he did not take all these pains to show that the Revelation was not written by an apostle for no end and purpose. If the book of the Revelation was not the writing of an apostle, but of some other John, who at the most was only an elder, or a prophet, its authority would be diminished; the Millenarians themselves, if they could be persuaded to come into this opinion, would not have retained the same value for it they had formerly, nor would they be quite so diligent in the study of it; nor would their adversaries, the Allegorists, pay so great a regard to any arguments or particular opinions founded upon it. In one word, then, this book would be no longer a part of the rule of faith and practice to christian people.

Learned men therefore are in the right, to produce every thing tending to justify and support the common opinion

concerning the writer of this book, and to observe all evidences internal and external of its being the work of John the apostle.

Secondly, as^p I said before, It may be questioned whether this critique of Dionysius, or any other critique whatever, can be sufficient to create a doubt concerning the author of this book; which was owned for a writing of John the apostle and evangelist by many ancient writers before Dionysius, and before Caius, and, so far as we know, before the most early of those who disputed its genuineness. This observation is agreeable to the judgments of several very eminent men, ^q Grotius, ^r Flacius Illyricus, and ^s Socinus; whose words, in part at least, have been alleged by ^t Mr. Simon in a like argument, and cannot be omitted in this work. It is likewise agreeable to the sentiment of ^u Stephen Le Moyne, ^v Mill, and other learned men, whose words need not to be transcribed at present.

XVII. Dionysius then received, as sacred and divine scriptures, the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Paul, and particularly the epistle to the Hebrews, as a writing of that

^p See p. 698.

^q Apostoli Johannis esse hunc librum credidere illi, quibus merito creditur, Justinus contra Tryphonem, Irenæus, Tertullianus adversus Marcionem iv. et aliis multis in locis; quibus consentiunt Clemens Alexandrinus, Origenes, Cyprianus, et post eos alii multi. Grot. Annot. in Tit. Apocal.

^r Si iis habeatur fides patribus, qui proprius ad hoc accesserunt seculum, uti certe æquissimum est, quales sunt Justinus, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Apollonius Theophilus, Antiochenus—affirmari poterit eam ut Johannis apostoli illo primo seculo habitam. Cur enim tam certo Johannis apostoli esse confirmarent, si dubias de eâ extitisse sententias antecessorum cognovissent? Flac. Illyr. Arg. in Apoc.

^s Non videtur propter parvam aliquam, aut etiam magnam dissimilitudinem rationis scribendi in universum ac styli ab aliis ejusdem Johannis scriptis longe diversi generis debere aut posse dubitari, quin ejus sit opus, maxime cum simul adsint tot alia testimonia. Socin. Lect. Sacr. p. 306. Quocirca non videtur, propter parvam, aut etiam magnam dissimilitudinem rationis scribendi in universum, ac styli ab aliis ejusdem Johannis scriptis longe diversi generis, (quæ omnium fortasse rationum potissima est, quæ afferuntur ad probandum scriptum illud non esse ipsius,) debere aut posse dubitari quin ejus sit opus. Id. De Auct. Sacr. Scrip. cap. I. n. ii. p. 269.

^t Hist. Crit. du Texte du N. T. c. 19.

^u Quod mirum, cum reverà aliter senserint viri et antiquitate et meritis gravissimi ante Dionysium. Sic enim Justinus Martyr, exeunte seculo secundo. Sic labente et fere lapso eodem seculo Theophilus Antiochenus, Clem. Alexandrinus, et Irenæus. Sic ineunte seculo tertio Origenes. Sic adulto eodem seculo Melito Sardensis episcopus. Qui omnes, Dionysio Alexandrino priores, et superiores, et ætati Johannis apostoli viciniore et propiores, illi Apocalypsim constanter tribuerunt. Sic etiam Hippolytus noster, qui annis etiam plurimis ætatem Dionysii superavit. Le Moyne, Var. Sacr. T. ii. p. 1014.

^v Mill. Prol. n. 227—229.

apostle. Concerning the seven catholic epistles, we do not certainly know his judgment; but he has mentioned expressly and often the three epistles of the apostle John; the first as unquestionably genuine and received by all, the other two as well known. And it may be justly taken for granted that he received the first epistle of the apostle Peter, it having been all along universally received by catholic christians. As for the rest we can say nothing positively of his opinion about them. The Revelation he allowed to be the work of John, a holy and divinely inspired person; but he was not satisfied that it was written by John the son of Zebedee, apostle and evangelist. However, in his argument concerning that book, he lets us know that it was then generally received by christians as written by John the apostle. In Dionysius we have seen, likewise, evidences of that peculiar respect showed by christians to the sacred scriptures: which they looked upon as the rule of judgment in things of religion, by which all points in controversy were to be decided. And what those scriptures were, he shows by these general titles and divisions of them: 'The Law and the Prophets, the Gospels and Epistles of Apostles.' Nor have we perceived, in the remaining works and fragments of this great and learned bishop of Alexandria, any marks of respect for any christian apocryphal writings.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

23651C

LBC

03-03-05 32180

bb

MC



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01255 0903

