

PORPHYRY, JULIAN, OR HIEROKLES? THE ANONYMOUS HELLENE IN MAKARIOS MAGNĒS' *APOKRITIKOS*

IN 1876 a long-forgotten disputation in Greek between a Christian and an unnamed Hellenē resurfaced in an edition by Charles Blondel.¹ The *Apokritikos* of Makarios Magnēs sets an articulate, educated Hellenē, scathing in his attacks on the New Testament, against a Christian author. The text clearly preserves two independent voices,² but to whom did they belong? Since the Hellenē's arguments constitute one of the longest, most sophisticated anti-Christian attacks still extant, most readers of the *Apokritikos* have concentrated on identifying him and situating his ideas in the context of Rome's Christianization. Among the first were L. Duchesne and T. W. Crafer who claimed that he was Sossianus Hierokles, the judge whose anti-Christian pamphlet, *A Truth-Loving Discourse* (Φιλαλήθης λόγος), circulated just before the emperor Diocletian issued his general edicts of persecution in 303.³ Adolf von Harnack, however, had been compiling fragments of another work from the same era, *Against the Christians* (Κατὰ χριστιανῶν) by the philosopher Porphyry of

¹ I am grateful to Hal Drake and PENATES, the Late Antiquity Research group of Southern California, for their willingness to wrestle with the issues in this article, versions of which I also presented at the UC Santa Barbara Interdisciplinary Humanities Center (May 2000) and at an 'Archaeological Monday' at the Musée des Beaux Arts in Montréal (February 2002). The American Council of Learned Societies partially funded the research. I would also like to thank Courtney Konshuh and Janet Fuchs, for their help in this article's last stages, and McGill University for its financial assistance.

² *Macarii Magnētis quae supersunt ex inedito codice*, C. Blondel (ed.) (Paris, 1876). The curator of Athens' National Library had shown Blondel an early modern copy. Fortunately he quickly transcribed it; for he soon died, the text disappeared, and no other copy has materialized. The last scholar to write about the *Apokritikos* before Blondel was the Jesuit, Francisco de la Torre ('Turrianus'). Blondel, v-vii; G. Schalkhauser, 'Zu den Schriften des Makarios Magnes', *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 31.4 (1907), pp. 1-218 at 5-81; T. W. Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes, A Neglected Apologist', *JTS*, NS, 8 (1907), pp. 401-23 and pp. 546-71 at 401; and P. Frassinetti, 'Sull'autore delle questioni pagane conservate nell' *Apokritico* di Macario di Magnesia', *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 3 (1949), pp. 41-56 at 41.

³ A. von Harnack, 'Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts', *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 37.3-4 (1911), pp. 1-144 at 96-107.

⁴ Lact. *Inst.* 5.2; Eus. *Hierocl.* 1; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes'; L. Duchesne, *De Macario Magnete et scriptis eius* (Paris, 1877).

Tyre. Convinced that Porphyry was the anonymous Hellenē, Harnack used the pagan's speeches in the *Apokritikos* as fragments of *Against the Christians*, a classification that scholars long accepted.⁵ In 1973, however, T. D. Barnes rejected this identification because Makarios, in referring to Porphyry (*Apok.* 3.42), treated him as someone other than his opponent.⁶ Barnes's study has been influential,⁷ but the argument against associating Porphyry with the Hellenē can be further strengthened. At the same time, others have suggested that the Hellenē was the emperor Julian, an argument that raises different problems.⁸ Thus the present study reopens the question of the Hellenē's identity by comparing the *Apokritikos* against the work of Porphyry, Julian, and Hierokles. In so doing, I will argue that Makarios' anonymous Hellenē is neither Porphyry nor Julian, but that he was identified correctly more than a century ago as the famous anti-Christian judge, Sossianus Hierokles. The

⁵ A. von Harnack, 'Porphyrius, 'Gegen die Christen.' 15 Bücher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate', *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1916), Nr. 1. The *Apokritikos* contributed 51 out of 97 fragments to Harnack's edition. Those following Harnack include P. de Labriolle, 'Porphyre et le christianisme', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie* 3 (1929), pp. 385-440; P. Benoit, 'Un adversaire du christianisme au III^e siècle: Porphyre', *Revue Biblique* 54 (1947), pp. 543-72; R. Beutler, 'Porphyrios', in *Paulys Real-Enzyklopädie* 22 (1953), pp. 275-313; J. M. Demarolle, 'Un aspect de la polémique païenne à la fin du III^e siècle, le vocabulaire chrétien de Porphyre', *Vigiliae Christianae* 26 (1972), pp. 117-29; R. M. Grant, 'The *Stromateis* of Origen', in J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts à Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972), pp. 285-92; W. den Boer, 'A Pagan Historian and his Enemies: Porphyry *Against the Christians*', *Classical Philology* 69 (1974), pp. 198-208; J. Sirinelli, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique*, SC 206 (Paris, 1974), p. 33; H. O. Schröder, 'Celsus und Porphyrius als Christengegner', *Die Welt als Geschichte* 17 (1957), pp. 190-202; G. Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico* di Macario Magnete', *Studi e Testi* 95 (1941), pp. 49-74; F. Scheidweiler, 'Zu Porphyrios *Katà χριστιανῶν*', *Philologus* 99 (1955), pp. 304-12; M. V. Anastos, 'Porphyry's Attack on the Bible', in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition* (Ithaca, 1966), pp. 421-50; and Robert Waelkens, *L'Economie, thème, apologetique, et principe herméneutique dans l'Apocritique de Macarios Magnes* (Louvain, 1974), pp. 8-9, 30.

⁶ 'Porphyry *Against the Christians*: Date and Attribution of Fragments', *JTS*, NS, 24 (1973), pp. 424-42.

⁷ Cf. A. Metedith, 'Porphyry and Julian against the Christians', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.23.2 (1980), pp. 1119-49. But see R. Goulet, 'Porphyre et Macarie de Magnésie', *Studia Patristica* 15 (1984), pp. 448-52; C. Evangelidou, 'Porphyry's Criticism of Christianity and the Problem of Augustine's Platonism', *Dionysius* 13 (1989), pp. 51-70; and R. J. Hoffmann, *Against the Christians. The Extracts of Macarius Magnes* (Amherst, NY, 1994), pp. 21-4, which follow Harnack.

⁸ Frassinetti, 'Sull'autore', pp. 41-56.

PORPHYRY, JULIAN, OR HIEROKLES? THE ANONYMOUS HELLENE IN MAKARIOS MAGNĒS' *APOKRITIKOS*¹

IN 1876 a long-forgotten disputation in Greek between a Christian and an unnamed Hellene resurfaced in an edition by Charles Blondel.² The *Apokritikos* of Makarios Magnēs sets an articulate, educated Hellene, scathing in his attacks on the New Testament, against a Christian author. The text clearly preserves two independent voices,³ but to whom did they belong? Since the Hellene's arguments constitute one of the longest, most sophisticated anti-Christian attacks still extant, most readers of the *Apokritikos* have concentrated on identifying him and situating his ideas in the context of Rome's Christianization. Among the first were L. Duchesne and T. W. Crafer who claimed that he was Sossianus Hierokles, the judge whose anti-Christian pamphlet, *A Truth-Loving Discourse* (Φιλαλήθης λόγος), circulated just before the emperor Diocletian issued his general edicts of persecution in 303.⁴ Adolf von Harnack, however, had been compiling fragments of another work from the same era, *Against the Christians* (Κατὰ χριστιανῶν) by the philosopher Porphyry of

¹ I am grateful to Hal Drake and PENATES, the Late Antiquity Research group of Southern California, for their willingness to wrestle with the issues in this article, versions of which I also presented at the UC Santa Barbara Interdisciplinary Humanities Center (May 2000) and at an 'Archaeological Monday' at the Musée des Beaux Arts in Montréal (February 2002). The American Council of Learned Societies partially funded the research. I would also like to thank Courtney Konshuh and Janet Fuchs, for their help in this article's last stages, and McGill University for its financial assistance.

² *Macarii Magnetis quae supersunt ex inedito codice*, C. Blondel (ed.) (Paris, 1876). The curator of Athens' National Library had shown Blondel an early modern copy. Fortunately he quickly transcribed it; for he soon died, the text disappeared, and no other copy has materialized. The last scholar to write about the *Apokritikos* before Blondel was the Jesuit, Francisco de la Torre (Turrianus). Blondel, v–vii; G. Schalkhauser, 'Zu den Schriften des Makarios Magnes', *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 31.4 (1907), pp. 1–218 at 5–81; T. W. Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes, A Neglected Apologist', *JTS*, NS, 8 (1907), pp. 401–23 and pp. 546–71 at 401; and P. Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore delle questioni pagane conservate nell' *Apokritico* di Macario di Magnesia', *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 3 (1949), pp. 41–56 at 41.

³ A. von Harnack, 'Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts', *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 37.3–4 (1911), pp. 1–144 at 96–107.

⁴ Lact. *Inst.* 5.2; Eus. *Hierocl.* 1; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes'; L. Duchesne, *De Macario Magnete et scriptis eius* (Paris, 1877).

Tyre. Convinced that Porphyry was the anonymous Hellene, Harnack used the pagan's speeches in the *Apokritikos* as fragments of *Against the Christians*, a classification that scholars long accepted.⁵ In 1973, however, T. D. Barnes rejected this identification because Makarios, in referring to Porphyry (*Apok.* 3.42), treated him as someone other than his opponent.⁶ Barnes's study has been influential,⁷ but the argument against associating Porphyry with the Hellene can be further strengthened. At the same time, others have suggested that the Hellene was the emperor Julian, an argument that raises different problems.⁸ Thus the present study reopens the question of the Hellene's identity by comparing the *Apokritikos* against the work of Porphyry, Julian, and Hierokles. In so doing, I will argue that Makarios' anonymous Hellene is neither Porphyry nor Julian, but that he was identified correctly more than a century ago as the famous anti-Christian judge, Sossianus Hierokles. The

⁵ A. von Harnack, 'Porphyrius, 'Gegen die Christen.' 15 Bücher: Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate', *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1916), Nr. 1. The *Apokritikos* contributed 51 out of 97 fragments to Harnack's edition. Those following Harnack include P. de Labriolle, 'Porphyre et le christianisme', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie* 3 (1929), pp. 385-440; P. Benoit, 'Un adversaire du christianisme au III^e siècle: Porphyre', *Revue Biblique* 54 (1947), pp. 543-72; R. Beutler, 'Porphyrios', in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie* 22 (1953), pp. 275-313; J. M. Demarolle, 'Un aspect de la polémique païenne à la fin du III^e siècle, le vocabulaire chrétien de Porphyre', *Vigiliae Christianae* 26 (1972), pp. 117-29; R. M. Grant, 'The *Stromateis* of Origen', in J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts à Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972), pp. 285-92; W. den Boer, 'A Pagan Historian and his Enemies: Porphyry *Against the Christians*', *Classical Philology* 69 (1974), pp. 198-208; J. Sirinelli, *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique*, SC 206 (Paris, 1974), p. 33; H. O. Schröder, 'Celsus und Porphyrius als Christengegner', *Die Welt als Geschichte* 17 (1957), pp. 190-202; G. Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico* di Macario Magnete', *Studio e Testi* 95 (1941), pp. 49-74; F. Scheidweiler, 'Zu Porphyrios *Κατὰ χριστιανῶν*', *Philologus* 99 (1955), pp. 304-12; M. V. Anastos, 'Porphyry's Attack on the Bible', in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition* (Ithaca, 1966), pp. 421-50; and Robert Waelkens, *L'Economie, thème, apologétique, et principe herméneutique dans l'Apocritique de Macarios Magnes* (Louvain, 1974), pp. 8-9, 30.

⁶ 'Porphyry *Against the Christians*: Date and Attribution of Fragments', *JTS*, NS, 24 (1973), pp. 424-42.

⁷ Cf. A. Meredith, 'Porphyry and Julian against the Christians', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.23.2 (1980), pp. 1119-49. But see R. Goulet, 'Porphyre et Macarie de Magnésie', *Studia Patristica* 15 (1984), pp. 448-52; C. Evangelou, 'Porphyry's Criticism of Christianity and the Problem of Augustine's Platonism', *Dionysius* 13 (1989), pp. 51-70; and R. J. Hoffmann, *Against the Christians. The Extracts of Macarius Magnes* (Amherst, NY, 1994), pp. 21-4, which follow Harnack.

⁸ Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', pp. 41-56.

Apokritikos thus preserves about half of Hierokles' *Truth-Loving Discourse*, a pamphlet that played a key role in instigating a persecution, the motivations for which are still widely debated.

THE TEXT

Although Blondel's Athens manuscript was incomplete,⁹ other witnesses contribute fragments of the missing portions and hint at the *Apokritikos*' original length. Nikephoros, the ninth-century patriarch of Constantinople, makes the first extant reference to a manuscript of the *Apokritikos*. Quoting from 'the book of Makarios the high priest (βιβλος Μακαρίου ιεράρχου)', the bishop attacked his Origenism, Manichaeism, and Nestorianism.¹⁰ The text is next attested in fifteenth-century Corigliano and possibly Montesardo,¹¹ and a third Italian library, San Marco in Venice, once owned a copy consulted in the sixteenth century by the Jesuit Francisco de la Torre.¹² All of these manuscripts have since disappeared.¹³ Finally, 65 years after Blondel's publication, Giovanni Mercati discovered a table of contents for books 1–3 in an eleventh-century Vatican codex (Vat. gr. 1650).¹⁴ These

⁹ The Athens MS began in the middle of book 2, broke off at the end of book 4, and the extant books lacked their conclusions; Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis*, pp. vi, 3–4, 227; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 401.

¹⁰ Iconoclasts had circulated selections from it to support their position; the bishop, unfamiliar with it, procured an old illuminated copy to evaluate their claims. In 'Ἐπίκρισις ἣ τοι διασάφησις τῶν οὐκ εὐαγῶς ἐκκληφθεῖσων κατὰ τῶν ἱερῶν εἰκόνων χρήσεων, γενομένη παρὰ τῶν προεστώτων τοῦ ὁρθοῦ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δόγματος' he finds that the iconoclasts quoted Makarios out of context and cites 1.6, 4.20–21, 26–7. Cf. Nikephoros' *Antirrhetic libri* in J. B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata* (Paris, 1876–83), 1:303; Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis*, pp. 3, 199–201, 211–15; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 402, incl. n. 1; and Paul Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople: Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire* (New York, 1980), pp. 165–6.

¹¹ K. K. Müller, 'Neue Mittheilungen über Janos Laskaris und die Mediceische Bibliothek', *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 1 (1884), pp. 403–4 in Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', p. 49, n. 2.

¹² He quoted Makarios' Eucharistic theology (3.23) in *De Eucharistia contra Volanum Polonum* (Paris, 1577), 75f. and his discussion of good works (5) in *Dogmaticus de Justificatione ad Germanos adversus Luteranos* (Rome, 1557), 37 and *Adversus Magdeburgenses centuriatores pro Canonibus apostolorum* (Florence, 1572), 4.7. Blondel and de la Torre saw different MSS but whether the Jesuit's was much more complete is impossible to ascertain since he quoted only a small part of book 5; Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis*, p. 107; T. W. Crafer, *The Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes*, idem, trans. (New York, 1919), p. 164f.; Schalkhauser, 'Zu den Schriften', pp. 18–81, 109–13.

¹³ Schalkhauser, 'Zu den Schriften', p. 15.

¹⁴ Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', p. 52.

sources, taken together, indicate that the *Apokritikos* was originally a work in five books for which the following are now extant: part of chapter 6 (in Nikephoros) and the table of contents for book 1 (in the Vatican MS); the table of contents (in the Vatican MS) and the last 13 chapters for book 2 (in Blondel); books 3 and 4 minus their conclusions (in Blondel); and a fragment of book 5 (in de la Torre).

These witnesses also help specify the title, protagonists, dedicatee, and format of Makarios' work. For example, although Blondel's very late manuscript was entitled *Makarios Magnēs' Response (Apokritikos) or the Only-Begotten against the Hellenes*,¹⁵ the much earlier Vatican index lists the work simply as *Makarios Magnēs' Only-Begotten against the Hellenes*.¹⁶ The work thus circulated under two titles, with the latter probably the more familiar.¹⁷ Next, although Blondel himself refers to Makarios' antagonist as a *philosophus*, the Greek text identifies him as a 'Hellene' and a *philologos*, skilled in Attic oratory.¹⁸ Called simply the 'Christian' in the text but a high priest or bishop (ἱεράρχης) by Nikephoros (who may have assumed the title from the illuminated frontispiece),¹⁹ Makarios himself answered the Hellene's questions, given his use of the first person (e.g., 3.7.pr.). Although only the Christian and the Hellene debate, Makarios says that he was helped by a certain Theosthenes, to whom he dedicated the *Apokritikos*.²⁰ Perhaps

¹⁵ Μακαρίου Μάγνητος Ἀποκριτικὸς ἡ Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἑλλήνας περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων introduces book 3 and Μακαρίου Μάγνητος Ἀποκριτικὸς ἡ Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἑλλήνας περὶ τῶν ἀπορουμένων ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Διαθήκῃ ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων introduces book 4; Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis*, pp. 49, 155.

¹⁶ Τοῦ Μακαρίου Μάγνητος Μονογέ|νῃς πρὸς Ἑλλήνας περ|ὶ τῶν ἀπορουμένων| ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ζητημ|άτων καὶ λύσε|ων τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; Mercati 'Per l'*Apokritico*', p. 62.

¹⁷ Mercati ('Per l'*Apokritico*', pp. 60, 62, 74) thought that this was the proper title. Although F. Corsaro, 'Una nuova interpretazione del titolo dell' apologia di Macario di Magnesia', *Acta Philologica* (1964), pp. 115–18 argues that the title should be 'The Only Discourse (Μονογενὴς λόγος) against the Hellenes', he ignores the Vatican MS's title and Makarios' own penchant for *Μονογενὴς* as 'Only-begotten' (e.g., pp. 2.8; 3.14, 40).

¹⁸ *Philosophus*: 2.12; Ἑλληνας: 3.15, 30; 4.1; φιλόλογος: 4.pr.; Πολὺν δ' ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀττικῆς εἴτηρας ἐπικυλίειν ἤρξατο: 3.pr.; Greek text is Blondel's, except where noted.

¹⁹ χρυστιανός: 2.17; 3.7a, 37; 4.10; ἱεράρχης: Nikephoros ap. Pitra, 303f. in Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 404, incl. n. 1.

²⁰ 3.pr.; 4.pr.; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 411; de la Torre, *Adversus Magdeburgenses*, pp. 144f. (in Harnack, 'Porphyrius', p. 52) confused Theosthenes with Makarios' opponent. Regarding de la Torre's general unreliability, see Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 570.

Theosthenes was a stenographer, for the *Apokritikos* claims to record a series of debates, with each book devoted to a day's contest (2.21; 3.pr., 43; 4.pr.).²¹ The format of the dialogue, however, is not what a modern reader expects; for the Hellene and the Christian did not discuss one issue at a time. Rather the Hellene raised six or seven issues to which Makarios responded in order, his adversary then advanced another set, and so on. These issues, numbered in Greek, seem to have been itemized at the start of each book. They are what the Vatican manuscript preserves for books 1 and 2.²² The Christian's responses are much longer than the Hellene's questions, with the former averaging 86 lines per response and the latter 18 lines per query.²³ The lists of issues in both Blondel's codex and the Vatican MS also show that the Hellene's arguments were organized in two major groups, the first concerned with the Gospels and the second with the Book of Acts and Paul's letters. Indeed both sources record a subheading at book 3 issue 14 ('The beginning of other subjects proposed for discussion from Acts and from the Apostle') that would have divided the original five-book *Apokritikos* exactly in half.²⁴

Because the Christian and Hellene do not engage in rapid back-and-forth volleys, Harnack assumed that the *Apokritikos* did not preserve a genuine exchange, but that Makarios had invented a series of fictional debates as a way of organizing his responses to a set of pagan challenges.²⁵ Of course, the suspicion that the debate is a fiction also casts doubt upon the authenticity of the author's opponent. Nevertheless, the Hellene's arguments do come from someone other than Makarios. For Makarios never uses a western scriptural tradition while the Hellene often does,

²¹ Cf. R. Lim, *Public Disputation, Power and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 84, incl. n. 59, 94.

²² See Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis*, pp. 49–50, 155. According to the Vatican MS, book 1 (day 1) dealt with 10 issues and book 2 with 16 (Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', pp. 62–3, 66–7). Blondel's edition begins in the middle of book 2, with Makarios responding to issues 7–11 in the first five extant chapters. Then the Hellene raises issues 12–16 in the next five chapters, and Makarios rebuts him in the last five. Book 3 comprises 22 issues in three pairs of exchanges and book 4 handles 16 in two sets.

²³ Based on the line numbers in Blondel's edition.

²⁴ 'Ἐτέρας ὑποθέσεως ἀρχὴ ἐκ τῶν Πράξεων καὶ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου. Blondel, *Macarii Magnetis*, p. 49, incl. n. 25 notes an ornament in the margin here; Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', p. 70.

²⁵ Harnack, 'Kritik', p. 11; cf. also Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', p. 41; Waelkens, *L'Economie*, pp. 14–16; and F. Corsaro, 'L'*Apokritico* di Macario di Magnesia e le Sacre Scritture', *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 7 (1957), pp. 1–24 at 1–12.

and it is unlikely that an author debating a fictional opponent would employ two different scriptural sources just for verisimilitude.²⁶ Moreover, the Hellene seems frequently to draw upon Celsus' second-century anti-Christian work, *The True Word*, but Makarios did not use Origen's *Against Celsus* in framing his answers, as would be expected if the Hellene was the author's creation—especially given the Origenist sympathies that Nikephoros had observed.²⁷ Finally, in addition to differences in their style and vocabulary, the Hellene raises questions that Makarios never fully answers (*Apok.* 3.20; 4.6).²⁸

THE HELLENE'S CLAIMS

Deploying a sarcastic tone,²⁹ the Hellene derides the New Testament for its inconsistent accounts of Jesus' words and deeds, its portrayal of Peter and Paul, and its record of the apostles' beliefs, expectations, and teachings. As he does so, he contrasts Christian gullibility with the judgement of 'right-thinking' men like himself,³⁰ and he reveals an intimate familiarity with not only Scripture but also Christian traditions from Peter's crucifixion to the training of catechumens (3.22). Saying '*those who relate the truth*' about the Sea of Galilee and claiming that all Moses' 'writings *are said* to have been burnt' (3.3, 6), the Hellene also lets slip that sometimes, at least, he is quoting another.

The Hellene first takes on the Gospel accounts, challenging things that Jesus said and did and how they are recorded. This discussion starts with the first issue addressed in book 1 and continues through the thirteenth issue of book 3 (3.20), all of which cite Gospel passages.³¹ The chapter headings in the Vatican manuscript indicate that book 1 and the early part of book 2 focused on Jesus' miracles (1.6–7, 9; 2.2–3), with other questions addressing his temptation by the devil (1.4) and trial under Jewish

²⁶ Makarios also sometimes alters the Hellene's citations in answering him; Corsaro, 'Apokritico', pp. 12, 17–18.

²⁷ Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 408–9; Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 97–98. See below for the Hellene's use of Celsus and Makarios' Origenism.

²⁸ Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 97–98.

²⁹ E.g., 3.4: ὦ μῦθος, ὦ λῆρος! ... χοίρων πληθος διαχυλίων εἰς θάλασσαν ἔδραμε; See also 2.15; 3.2, 3 among others.

³⁰ 3.4: Εὐθὺς γὰρ εὐθὺς ταῦτ' ἀκούσας εὖ φρονῶν ἔκρινεν αὐτόθεν δικάσας τὴν ἀφήγησιν, καὶ ψήφον ἀνάλογον ἐπῆρε τῷ πρῶγματι λέγων; see also 2.14, 15; English translations are from Crafer, *Apocriticus*.

³¹ Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', pp. 62–71.

law (1.10).³² Next, to judge from the first few extant chapters of Makarios' responses to missing arguments, the Hellene pointed out contradictions in the Gospel in the middle part of book 2, since the Christian explains apparent contradictions between Jesus' sayings and in the Gospel record.³³ In fact, the Hellene's extant comments begin by asking what really happened, given conflicting Gospel accounts: for example, there are differences in the number of demons that Jesus cast into swine (*Apok.* 3.4; *Matt.* 8:31–32; *Mark* 5.1), and contradictory accounts of Jesus' death (*Apok.* 2.12–13).³⁴ Moreover only John reports Jesus' saying 'eat my flesh and drink my blood' (*Apok.* 3.15; *John* 6:54). The Hellene also questions Jesus' behaviour in not appearing to credible people after his resurrection (*Apok.* 2.14; *Matt.* 28:6) and failing to defend himself before Pilate—unlike Apollonius of Tyana's defence before Domitian (*Apok.* 3.1). In taking up Jesus' sayings, the Hellene sometimes questions Jesus' meaning. He asks, for example, how the 'ruler of the world' can be 'cast outside' (*Apok.* 2.15; *John* 12:31). More often he finds Jesus inconsistent: Jesus says not to fear those who kill the body but prays for deliverance from the Passion (*Apok.* 3.2; *Matt.* 26:36); he says that his time is short but that he will remain with his followers until the world ends (*Apok.* 3.7; *Matt.* 26:11; 28:20); he would not jump off a cliff at the devil's behest, even though Scripture says that angels would prevent his dashing 'his foot against a stone' (*Apok.* 3.18; *Matt.* 4:6–7); he says 'Get behind me Satan' to Peter but gives him the keys to heaven (*Apok.* 3.19; *Matt.* 16:23); he says that Moses' followers should believe in him, even though Moses never said that Christ was God (*Apok.* 3.3; *John* 5:46–7); and he says that at the fourth watch he would come for the apostles fishing in the sea of Galilee,

³² 1.6: Πῶς ὑβρισθεὶς καὶ σταυρωθεὶς ὁ Χριστὸς πιστεύειν πρὸς αὐτὸν τοῦς ἀνθρώπους ἐποίησεν; 1.7: Πῶς εἴρηται ἦσαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ 'πεντακισχίλιοι χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδῶν'; 1.9: Τί τὸ ὄνθιν ὑπὸ τῆς σικκῆς: 'Μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα'; 2.2: <Πῶς> εἴρηται ὑπὸ τοῦ 'Ἰησοῦ· 'Οὐκ ἂν <πέθανεν> τὸ κοράσιον ἀλλὰ καὶ θεύδει; 2.3: <Πῶς ὁ Ἀ>δάμας |<τετρα>μέρος ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν; 1.4: Πῶς εἴρηται· 'Καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πειραζόμενος' | ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου'; 1.10: Πῶς ἐξηλθεν Πιλάτος ἀπὸ τοῦ πραιτωρίου εἰρηκῶς τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις: 'Λάβετε ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε'; Mercati, 'Per l'Apokritico', pp. 62–3, 66.

³³ 2.9: Jesus says, 'None is good save God' (*Mark* 10:18), but 'The good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good' (*Matt.* 12:35); 2.10: a man says that his son is a lunatic (i.e., affected by the moon), but he is possessed by a demon (*Matt.* 17:15); 2.11: Jesus says, 'If I bear witness to myself, my witness is not true' (*John* 5:31) but then does so saying 'I am the light of the world' (*John* 8:12–13). Biblical citations are those of Crafer in *Apocriticus*.

³⁴ *Mark* 15:36 and *Matt.* 27:33; *Matt.* 27:46, *John* 19:29, and *Luke* 23:46.

although the lake was too small to fish for ten hours (*Apok.* 3.6; Matt. 14:25; Mark 6:48). The Hellene also finds a number of Jesus' ideas to be morally offensive: these include criticizing the Jews for following their 'father' the 'slanderer' (*Apok.* 2.16; John 8:43-4); doing the demons' bidding by driving them into pigs (*Apok.* 3.4; Matt. 8:31-2; Mark 5:1); telling his followers to eat his flesh and drink his blood (*Apok.* 3.15; John 6:54); and saying that a camel could go through a needle [*sic*] before a rich man could go to heaven—a statement that, he says, the apostles must have made up in order to swindle rich women (*Apok.* 3.5; Matt. 19:24). The Hellene also asks why Christians do not follow Jesus' suggestions more closely, saying that if the faithful can drink poison unharmed or move mountains, then these should be tests for the priesthood or episcopate (*Apok.* 3.16-17; Mark 16:18; Matt. 17:20).

Starting with the fourteenth issue in book 3 and continuing to the end of the extant text (*Apok.* 3.21-4.24), the Hellene turns to the apostles, focusing his attention primarily on the book of Acts and Paul's letters. These issues are introduced by the sub-heading, 'Subjects ... from Acts and from the Apostle', described above. The Hellene often betrays antipathy for the apostles, claiming that they were deceitful drunks who were the inventors, not the historians of Jesus' sayings (2.12-13, 15; 3.2-4, 5, 6, 15, 33).³⁵ Peter and Paul, however, are his favourite targets. Peter's behaviour is reprehensible, and he is easily 'shaken in his judgment' (3.19):³⁶ for example, having been told to forgive 490 times (70 times 7), he cuts off a man's ear and condemns Ananias and Sapphira for keeping their property (*Apok.* 3.20-1; Matt. 18:22; Acts 5:1-11); having been taught to despise death, he escapes from jail, causing the death of Herod's guards (*Apok.* 3.22; Acts 12:5-11); even Paul, he notes, criticizes Peter for eating with Jews and being married (*Apok.* 3.22; Gal. 2:12; 2 Cor. 11:13). For his part, Paul is grossly 'inconsistent' (*ἀσύμφωνος*: *Apok.* 3.35), 'ignorant' (*ἀμαθής*: 3.33-4, 4.8), 'weak in his

³⁵ 2.12: the story of the crucifixion is 'an invention (*μυθοποιία*)'; 2.13: their accounts were 'a matter of guess-work (*κατεστοχάσαντο*)'; 2.15: the 'records are mere fairy tales (*τετρατολογίαν εἶναι τὰ εἰρημένα*)'; 3.4: the story of the demons and the pigs is a *μῦθος* and a *πλάσμα*; 3.5: the story about the camel and the needle is by 'poor men' trying to swindle 'the rich' (*πενήτων τινῶν τὰς τῶν πλουτούντων οὐσίας ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς κενοφρονίας ἀφαιρείσθαι θελόντων*); 3.6: the story of walking on the water is 'absurdly written without any credibility (*τὴν ἔησιν ... τὴν γελοιῶς ... γραφεῖσιν ἀπιθάνως*)'.

³⁶ *Ποῖος γὰρ Πέτρος βαστάσαι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὴν κρηπίδα δυνάμενος ὁ μυριάχως σαλευθεὶς εὐχερέα τῆς γνώμης*.

reasoning' (3.30),³⁷ a liar (*ψεύστης*: 3.31; 4.2, 19), an impostor (3.32),³⁸ and an opportunist: for example, he says he is free but the slave of all, claims to be outside Jewish law but sometimes follows it,³⁹ and he says he is a Roman, then a Jew (*Apok.* 3.31; Acts 22:3, 27); he claims that sacrifices involve demons, but permits eating sacrificial meat if its source is unknown (*Apok.* 3.35; 1 Cor. 8:4, 8; 10:20, 25–6); he praises virginity, but admits it is not necessary (*Apok.* 3.36; 1 Tim. 4:1, 3; 1 Cor. 7:25); he says that circumcision is unnecessary, but then puts Timothy under the knife (*Apok.* 3.30; Acts 16:3); and he manipulates the gospel for his own advantage by saying that a shepherd deserves the milk of his sheep (*Apok.* 3.32; 1 Cor. 9:7). The Hellene concludes by criticizing the apostles' beliefs and expectations (*Apok.* 4.pr.: ἡ ἀποστολικὴ δόξα) in several ways. In some cases, events have proved their assumptions wrong: for example, the world has not ended even though all know about the gospel (*Apok.* 4.1, 3; 1 Cor. 7:31; Matt. 24:14); Jesus said the apostles would not be harmed, but Paul was beheaded, Peter crucified, and many others executed (*Apok.* 4.4; Acts 18:9–10); Jesus also claimed wrongly that many would copy him, but, beyond perhaps Apollonius of Tyana, no one has (*Apok.* 4.5; Matt. 24:4–5). In other cases, the apostles' beliefs regarding physics and cosmology are inaccurate: heaven, for example, is not like a mustard seed, yeast, or pearl (*Apok.* 4.8; Matt. 13:31–33, 45, 46), it cannot be judged along with the earth,⁴⁰ it cannot be dissolved nor will it vanish (*Apok.* 4.7; Isa. 34:4; Matt. 24:35); moreover, dead bodies cannot be resurrected, nor can living beings rise into heaven (*Apok.* 4.2; 1 Thess. 4:15–17). Christians think, he says, that the 'monarchy of God' means that there is only one god, but, like Hadrian's monarchy, it means that God rules beings like himself—gods—who are God's subordinates or even slaves (*Apok.* 4.20, 23). Moreover, he notes that even though God is the Creator of the cosmos (3.32; 4.24), God has limits, since God cannot make 2 + 2 not equal 4 (4.24). The Hellene next challenges the apostles' beliefs on ethical grounds, especially that God hides things from the wise and reveals them to the infantile (*Apok.* 4.9; Matt. 11:25); that Jesus came for sinners and not the righteous (*Apok.* 4.10; Matt. 9:12; Luke 5:31); and that baptism

³⁷ ὑποπύρου δὲ τὰς φρένας καὶ τὸν λογισμόν ἀρρωστοῦντος ἢ τῶν λόγων ὑπόθεσις.

³⁸ ἄγαμαι τὸν οὕτω φένακα ...

³⁹ *Apok.* 3.30, 33–4; 1 Cor. 9:19; 15:56; Gal. 5:3; 3:10; Acts 16:3; Rom. 5:20;

7:12, 14.

⁴⁰ *Apok.* 4.6; the *Apocalypse of Peter*; Crafer, *Apocriticus*, p. 129.

can wash away sin (*Apok.* 4.19; 1 Cor. 6.11). Finally, the Hellene criticizes beliefs about ritual: he suggests that since 'angels' are another name for 'gods', whom Exodus says not to revile, statues should be erected and sacrifices performed to them in gratitude for their gifts.⁴¹ All the same, he denies that gods live in statues, although this misconception, he says, is less offensive than the idea that divinity would occupy a woman's womb (*Apok.* 4.22).

INDICATIONS OF DATE

Throughout this very detailed critique of Christian Scripture and belief, the Hellene says little that reflects a precise date. The only unambiguous *terminus post quem* in the Hellene's text, in fact, is his reference to the emperor Hadrian (98–117 CE; *Apok.* 4.20). Nevertheless, other remarks suggest a late third- or early fourth-century date, well after Celsus' *True Word* from which the Hellene has borrowed.⁴² The Hellene's references to Apollonius of Tyana, numerous martyrs, and persecution (2.14; 4.4; 3.1; 4.5), together with his failure to mention church images and monasticism, suggested to Harnack a third-century date after Decius' persecutions (249–51 CE),⁴³ but his description of churches actually seems more appropriate for the very late third or early fourth century. According to the Hellene, Christians built 'very large houses', like temples, into which they congregated to pray, although nothing prevented 'them from doing this' in their own homes.⁴⁴ He could not have said this much before the late third century, since Eusebius of Caesarea says that large churches began to rise just before Diocletian purged Christians from the army (probably in 299 CE), thus initiating the Great Persecution.⁴⁵ At the same time, the Hellene's unquestioning

⁴¹ *Apok.* 4.21, 23; Matt. 22:29–30; Exod. 22:28.

⁴² The *OCD* dates Celsus' text to 178–80 CE. In asking why Jesus did not escape, appeared to untrustworthy women, and prayed for the cup to 'pass him by', in stressing that God cannot do everything, in claiming that God would not favour the poor over the rich (including the story of the camel and the needle) or occupy a woman's womb, and in interpreting the monarchy of God, the Hellene treats issues that Celsus raised. See Or. *Cels.* 2.34, 59, 67, 24; 5.14; 6.16, 73. See also Anastos, 'Porphyry's Attack', p. 444; Schröder, 'Celsus und Porphyrius', p. 198; and J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 303.

⁴³ Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 107–10.

⁴⁴ *Apok.* 4.21: οἱ Χριστιανοὶ μιμούμενοι τὰς κατασκευὰς τῶν ναῶν, μεγίστους οἴκους οἰκοδομοῦσιν, εἰς οὓς συνιόντες εὐχονται, καίτοι μηδενὸς κωλύοντος ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις τοῦτο πράττειν.

⁴⁵ Eus. *HE* 8.1.5–8; T. W. Crafer, 'The Work of Porphyry against the Christians, and its Reconstruction', *JTS*, NS, 15 (1914), pp. 360–95 and 481–512

use of the *Apocalypse of Peter* (4.6), a work that Eusebius had rejected in his *Ecclesiastical History*, has suggested that the Hellene's work could not be dated much later.⁴⁶ Crafer restricted the date still further, on the basis of the Hellene's allusions to persecution. Saying that if Jesus had shown himself to reputable men 'no judge would punish' Christians for 'fabricating monstrous stories' and arguing that neither God nor 'any sensible man' could be pleased 'that many should be subjected' to punishments 'of the gravest kind', the Hellene seemed to Crafer to speak within a context of ongoing or imminent persecution,⁴⁷ perhaps the tense time that Eusebius described before the general edicts of 303, but after the purges from the army.

Despite these hints that the Hellene wrote circa 300 CE, two of his comments have seemed to point toward a later date. According to the text of the Athens MS, the Hellene claims that 'it is thirty (τριάκοντα) years' since Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians said that 'we' who are alive shall 'meet the Lord in the air' (*Apok.* 4.2; 1 Thess. 4:15–17). Three chapters later, after mocking Jesus' prediction that many would imitate him, the Hellene observes that 'three hundred (τριακόσια) years have passed by, and even more, and no one of the kind has appeared anywhere' (*Apok.* 4.5).⁴⁸ The number of years in the first passage is clearly incorrect, so Blondel's edition substituted 'three hundred' for

at 363; idem, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 419–20. Although A. H. M. Jones dated the army purge to 297 (*PLRE* 1.955) (see also D. Woods, 'Two Notes on the Great Persecution', *JTS*, NS, 43 [1992], pp. 128–34 at 128–129), 299 is the more reasonable date. Cf. J. Moreau, *Lactance. De la mort des persécuteurs*, SC 39 (Paris, 1954), p. 266; T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981), pp. 18–19; P. Davies, 'The Origin and Purpose of the Persecution of A.D. 303', *JTS*, NS, 40 (1989), pp. 66–94 at 91–3; and R. W. Burgess, 'The Date of the Persecution of Christians in the Army', *JTS*, NS, 47 (1996), pp. 157–8.

⁴⁶ Eus. *HE* 3.3.2; 6.14.1; Corsaro, 'Apokritico', pp. 18–20. But note the text's continued use well after Eusebius' 306 publication of the *HE* (revised in the 320s); *New Testament Apocrypha*, W. Schneemelcher (ed.) and R. McL. Wilson (trans.) (Philadelphia, 1965), p. 664; Hoffmann, *Against the Christians*, p. 74, n. 55. For the date of the *HE*, see R. W. Burgess, 'The Dates and Editions of Eusebius' *Chronicon canones* and *Historia ecclesiastica*', *JTS*, NS, 48 (1997), pp. 471–504.

⁴⁷ *Apok.* 2.14: Εἰ γὰρ ἦν ἐμφανίσας ἀνδράσιν ἐπισήμοις, δι' αὐτῶν πάντες ἂν ἐπίστευον, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἂν τῶν δικαστῶν ὡς μύθους ἀλλοκότους ἀναπλάττοντας ἐκόλαζεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ Θεῶ δῆπουθεν ἀρεστὸν ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπῳ συνετῶ πολλοὺς δι' αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀνωτάτω τιμωρίαις ὑποβληθῆναι; Crafer, *Apocriticus*, pp. xvii, 44, n. 1. Crafer ('Macarius Magnes', p. 416) also thought that the Hellene's reference to the many who ruled the world (2.15: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀρχοῦσι τοῦ κόσμου) suggested a date during the tetrarchy. But this expression may simply acknowledge the existence of rulers other than those of Rome.

⁴⁸ 4.2: ἔτη γὰρ ἐξ οὗ λέγει τριάκοντα; 4.5: καὶ ἰδοὺ τριακόσια ἦ καὶ περαιτέρω δῆπενυσεν ἔτη καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐδαμοῦ τοιοῦτος ἐπέστη.

'thirty', an emendation that influenced many theories about the *Apokritikos*' date. Arguing for a mid-fourth-century text, for example, Francesco Corsaro simply added 300 to 67 CE (his date for Paul's death).⁴⁹ Crafer, who thought that the Hellene was Hierokles, argued that his rhetoric would lead him to exaggerate the passage of time. Moreover, Crafer thought that adding 300 to c.60 CE imposed a modern historian's sense of time too rigorously onto a late Roman speaker. Since Arnobius, writing during the persecution, says that Christians had existed for about 300 years and other Christians had similarly loose conceptions of time, Crafer dated the Hellene's remarks to c.300.⁵⁰ Harnack took a slightly different tack: identifying the Christian with the bishop Makarios who attended the Synod of the Oak in 403 and the Hellene with Porphyry, he suggested that, to maintain the fiction of his 'debate', the author had altered the original dates in the third-century pagan text better to reflect his own age.⁵¹ P. Frassinetti, conversely, thought that a scribe had failed to copy the words *τριακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα*, and he amended the text to read 'three hundred and thirty years'. Adding 330 to 50 CE (his date for First Thessalonians), Frassinetti concluded that Makarios must have composed the *Apokritikos* around 380.⁵²

Excluding Crafer, all of these studies have argued that the Hellene's reference to 'three hundred years' necessarily situates just Makarios or both the author and the Hellene in the late fourth century. Nevertheless, for both voices the text may actually reflect a date c.300 CE—a context that fits the other features discussed above. Such an argument, however, requires examining the Hellene's remarks at greater length. He quotes Jesus' saying, 'Take heed that no man deceive you; for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ.' And then the Hellene sneers,

⁴⁹ F. Corsaro, 'La reazione pagana nel iv secolo e l' "Apocritico" di Macario di Magnesia', *Quaderni catanesi di studi classici e medievali* 6 (1984), pp. 173–95 at 181–91 preferred 367 to 351 (300 years after 1 Thessalonians) because he thought that the Hellene's phrase 'many ruled the world' (see n. 47) required several emperors to be on the throne.

⁵⁰ Arn. 1.13: *trecenti sunt anni ferme, minus vel plus aliquid, ex quo coepimus esse Christianos*; PL 5; Tertullian's *Ad Nat.* first claimed that not yet 250 years (1.7), then not yet 300 years (1.9) had passed since 'our life began'. Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 546–47 thought it likely that neither speaker would know the precise dates for Jesus' life.

⁵¹ Harnack, 'Kritik'. p. 108; Duchesne argued similarly, although he thought that the Hellene was Hierokles.

⁵² Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', p. 48; idem, 'Porfirio esegeta del profeta Daniele', *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo* 86 (1953), pp. 194–210 at 194.

'Behold! three hundred years have passed by, and even more, and no one of the kind has anywhere appeared. Unless indeed you are going to include Apollonius of Tyana'.⁵³ Reckoning three hundred years since Jesus' birth (the statement does not require starting with his death or even the year of his prophecy) yields a date of c.300 CE, a calculation that Eusebius performed correctly in 306 and of which Porphyry was probably capable as well.⁵⁴ Of course, in the text the Hellene also claims that 'thirty years' have elapsed since Paul talked about meeting 'the Lord in the air' (4.2). Here Blondel had emended 'thirty' to read 'three hundred', and Frassinetti had added 'three hundred and' to 'thirty', changes that both push the text well into the fourth century. But what if 'two hundred and' (διακόσια καί) has dropped out instead of 'three hundred and'? Indeed the Hellene, speaking in round numbers c.300 CE, could justly claim that 230 years had passed 'since Paul said this', for Paul died in the mid-60s (a date more likely to be known than the year of his epistle).

Nothing, then, in the *Apokritikos* requires the Hellene, at least, to have written later than the early fourth century. Indeed the chronological references, together with the sense that persecution is a pressing issue, suggest that the Hellene's arguments could have been assembled between c.299 (the date for the purges of Christians from the army) and 303 (the year that Diocletian issued the general edicts of persecution).

THE HELLENE AND PORPHYRY

Between the late third to early fourth century, one man stands out as the arch-critic of Christianity, namely Porphyry of Tyre (d. c.305).⁵⁵ From Eusebius to Jerome and Augustine, Christian authors condemned him as their faith's most serious critic, and emperors from Constantine to Theodosius II banned his works.⁵⁶ Given the rigor and intensity of the *Apokritikos*' attacks on Christianity and their similarity to some of Porphyry's ideas,

⁵³ 4.5: ἐνθα φησὶν ὁ Χριστός: 'Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι.' Καὶ ἰδοὺ τριακόσια ἢ καὶ περαιτέρω διῴπνευσεν ἔτη καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐδαμοῦ τοιοῦτος ἐπέστη· μή τί γε Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα ...

⁵⁴ For Eusebius, see Burgess, 'Dates and Editions', pp. 479–80; for Porphyry, see B. Croke, 'Porphyry's anti-Christian Chronology', *JTS*, NS, 34 (1983), pp. 168–85; for Porphyry as one of the Hellene's sources see below.

⁵⁵ Suid. s. v. 'Porphyrios' for date.

⁵⁶ Eus. *HE* 6.19.2; Hier. *Vir. ill.* pr.; idem, *Ep.* 48.13; 70.3; Aug. *Serm.* 142.6; Soc. *HE* 1.9; *Cŷ*; 1.1.3; 1.5.6.

Harnack's identification of the philosopher and the Hellene is certainly not surprising.

Similarities do exist between the Hellene's remarks in the *Apokritikos* and the fragments of Porphyry's *Against the Christians* that survive in other sources. For example, both compared Jesus with Apollonius of Tyana (Porphyry lists them among miracle workers; the Hellene compares their behaviour before their judges and thinks that the latter could be considered an imitator of Christ).⁵⁷ Porphyry discerned the conflict between Paul and Peter, then criticized both Peter's behaviour and Paul's reproach of him; likewise the Hellene mentions Paul's criticism of Peter for eating apart from the Gentiles, although his chief complaint is that each man behaves foolishly.⁵⁸ Both Porphyry and the Hellene are unusual in dating Moses before the Trojan War,⁵⁹ and, although their examples rarely overlap, they both accuse the evangelists of being deceitful in their accounts of Jesus' life and their dealings with others.⁶⁰ Porphyry had attacked

⁵⁷ Chr. fr. 4 (=Hier. *Tract. psal.* 81) and *Apok.* 3.1; 4.5. Fragments of *Against the Christians* are from Harnack, 'Porphyrius'. Following Barnes, 'Date and Attribution', this analysis includes only fragments that quote Porphyry by name.

⁵⁸ Hier. *Gal. Prol.*=Chr. fr.21a: *Quod nequaquam intelligens Bataneotes et sceleratus ille Porphyrius in I. operis sui adversum nos libro Petrum a Paulo obiecit esse reprehensum, quod non recto pede incederet ad evangelizandum, volens et illi maculam erroris inurere et huic procacitatis et in commune ficti dogmatis accusare mendacium, dum inter se ecclesiarum principes discrepent*; see also *ibid.*, 2.11; *idem*, *Ep.* 112.6.11; *Is.* 15.54 (=Chr. frs.21c, 21b, 21d); *Apok.* 3.22: Κατέγνω καὶ Παῦλος Πέτρου λέγων 'Πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου τινὰς, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθισεν' ὅτε δὲ ἤλθον, ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ πολλοὶ Ἰουδαῖοι.' For Peter and Paul's foolish behaviour, cf. *Apok.* 3.19, 22, 30, 31.

⁵⁹ Chr. fr.40=Eus. *Chron. praef. ap. Hier.*: *Ex ethnicis vero impius ille Porphyrius in IV. operis sui libro, quod adversum nos casso labore contexit, post Moysen Semiramim fuisse adfirmat, quae apud Assyrios CL ante Inachum regnavit annis. itaque iuxta eum DCCC paene et L annis Troiano bello Moyses senior invenitur*; *Apok.* 3.3: ὅσα δ' ἐπ' ὀνόματι Μωσέως ἐγράφη μετὰ ταῦτα μετὰ χίλια καὶ ἑκατὸν καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἔτη τῆς Μωσέως τελευτῆς, ὑπὸ Ἑσδρα καὶ τῶν ἁμψ' αὐτὸν συνεγράφη. R. Goulet, 'Porphyre et la datation de Moïse', *Revue de l'histoire des Religions* 192 (1977), pp. 137-164 shows how the Hellene's claim accords with Porphyry's.

⁶⁰ E.g. Porph. Chr. fr. 4=Hier. *Tract. psal.* 81: *concedo tibi, Porphyri, magicis artibus signa fecerunt, ut, 'divitias acciperent a divitibus mulierculis, quas induxerant'*; Chr. fr. 5=Hier. *Ioel.* 2.28: *non quod abuterentur audientium simplicitate et imperitia, ut impius calumniatur Porphyrius*; Chr. fr. 6=Hier. *Matt.* 9.9: *Arguit in hoc loco Porphyrius et Julianus Augustus vel imperitiam historici mentientis*; Chr. fr. 12=Epiph. *Haer.* 51.8: Πῶς δύναται ἡ αὐτῇ ἡμέρα εἶναι τῆς ἐν Βηθλέεμ γεννήσεως, αὐτῇ καὶ περιτομῇ ἔχειν ὀκταήμερον καὶ διὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἄνοδον καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ Συμεῶνος καὶ Ἀννας εἰς αὐτὸν τετελεσμένα, ὅποτε ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἡ ἐγεννήθη πέφηνεν αὐτῷ, φησὶν, ἄγγελος μετὰ τὴν τῶν μάγων ἔλευσιν τῶν ἐλθόντων προσκῆσαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνοιξάντων τὰς πύρας καὶ προσεεγκάντων, ὡς λέγει; *Apok.* 2.12, 13, 15; 3.4-6.

the evangelists for exaggerating the size of the Sea of Galilee in order to 'fabricate a miracle'. Likewise the Hellene, asserting that 'those who relate the truth about the locality' know the Sea of Galilee to be only a small lake, accuses the evangelists of wanting to 'introduce Christ as working some mighty miracle'.⁶¹ Finally, both Porphyry and the Hellene criticize Peter for causing the death of Ananias and Sapphira.⁶²

In addition to these strong parallels between the Hellene and Porphyry, Harnack claimed that other aspects of the *Apokritikos* established the philosopher as the anonymous Hellene. For example, the Hellene wrote in Greek, but had a western sense for ecclesiastical traditions (e.g., Peter's crucifixion), scriptural tradition, and the canon (e.g., the *Apocalypse of Peter*).⁶³ Such attributes also fit Porphyry who was native to the Greek-speaking east and had studied with Longinus in Athens, but had also lived in Italy and Sicily after heading west to study with Plotinus in the early 260s.⁶⁴ Harnack claimed further that the Hellene's religious beliefs were compatible with Porphyry's Neoplatonism, that both admired Judaism, and that the pagan's humane disposition and abhorrence of violence suggested an early flirtation with Christianity, also attested for the author of *Against the Christians*.⁶⁵

Harnack's identification of Makarios' Hellene with Porphyry has clearly influenced scholars up to the present day; nevertheless

⁶¹ *Chr. fr.* 55b=Hier. *Qu. Hebr. Gen.* 1.10: *frustra igitur Porphyrius evangelistas ad faciendum ignorantibus miraculum ... pro lacu Genezareth mare appellasse calumniatur*; *Apok.* 3.6: 'Οι γοῦν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν τόπων ἀφηγούμενοί φασι θάλασσαν μὲν ἐκεῖ μὴ εἶναι, λίμνην δὲ μικρὰν ἐκ ποταμοῦ συνεστῶσαν ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος κατὰ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν χώραν παρὰ πόλιν Τιβεριάδα ... ἢ' ἐκ τούτων ὡς μέγα τι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνεργήσαντα σημεῖον εἰσαγάγῃ χειμῶνά τε πολὺν παῖσαντα καὶ ἐξαίσιον, καὶ βυθὸς καὶ πελάγους σεσωκῶτα τοὺς μαθητὰς μικροῦ κινδυνεύοντας.

⁶² *Apok.* 3.21: ἄνδρα γάρ τινα λεγόμενον Ἀνανίαν καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα Σάπφειραν καλουμένην, ἐπεὶ μὴ τὸ πᾶν τοῦ χωρίου τίμημα κατεβάλοντο, ὀλίγον δ' εἰς ἀναγκαίας ἑαυτοῖς τὰς χρεῖας ἀφώρισαν, ἐθανάτωσε μὴδὲν ἀδικήσαντας; *Chr. fr.* 25b=Hier. *Ep.* 130.14: *Apostolus Petrus nequaquam imprecatur Ananiae et Sapphiraem mortem—ut stultus Porphyrius calumniatur.*

⁶³ Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 98–107.

⁶⁴ Porphyry's birthplace: Porph. *Plot.* 7.51; studies with Longinus: Eun. *VS* s. v. 'Porphyrios'; Suid. s. vv. 'Porphyrios' and 'Longinos'; travels west: Porph. *Plot.* 5.1–5; settles in Sicily: Porph. *Plot.* 6.1–4; 2.31–3; 11.11–19. For Porphyry's use of the western scriptural tradition, see below.

⁶⁵ Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 111–37. For Porphyry's youthful attraction to Christianity, see Socr. *HE* 3.23.7–39; for his supposed regard for Judaism, see Eus. *PE* 9.10.1–2, Aug. *Civ.* 19.23.30–37 and *ibid.* 19.23.107–13=Porph. *Phil. or.* frs. 323, 344, and 346 according to A. Smith's compilation of fragments (*Porphyrii philosophi fragmenta* [Stuttgart, 1993]). Note, however, that Porphyry here indicates his regard for the Hebrews, not the Jews.

it presents significant problems. First, however much Harnack's description of the Hellene's beliefs and temperament may fit Porphyry, it could easily fit many other critics of Christianity.⁶⁶ Next, while Harnack believed that a reference to Porphyry in a tenth-century scholion to Acts indicated his use of a 'western' text, most of Porphyry's fragments are too imprecise to determine which scriptural tradition he used, nor does he appear to have used the *Apocalypse of Peter*.⁶⁷ Even if Harnack's assumption about Porphyry's sources is true, however, it is not particularly helpful in linking Porphyry and the Hellene. For the Hellene may have drawn upon an occidental biblical tradition,⁶⁸ but 'western' texts also circulated in the east (especially in Edessa, Egypt, and Palestine) and so cannot necessarily locate him in the west with Porphyry.⁶⁹ Moreover, some of the Hellene's biblical citations (e.g., in *Apok.* 3.5 and 15) are completely independent of the western tradition.⁷⁰ To address this problem, Richard Goulet argued that Porphyry was Makarios' ultimate source, but the Christian, writing well after his opponent, tried to heighten the debate's drama by freely editing the source text, introducing an eastern scriptural tradition in the process. Goulet does find verbal parallels between the Christian and the Hellene, because of which he also thinks that Makarios invented the pagan's argument about God and natural law (*Apok.* 4.2).⁷¹ Goulet's arguments are ultimately unconvincing, however, because effective apologists often co-opt the discourse of their opponents.⁷²

Another problem in identifying Makarios' Hellene as Porphyry is that important differences exist between what the Hellene says in the *Apokritikos* and what can be independently attributed directly to Porphyry either in *Against the Christians* or other works. For example, Jerome says that Porphyry thought Jesus' miracles to have been really caused by demons (Hier. *Vigil.* 10=Chr. fr.49b), but the Hellene's extant remarks assert

⁶⁶ Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', pp. 44-46; Crafer, 'Work of Porphyry', pp. 363-369.

⁶⁷ Chr. fr.8=Cod. Lawr. [Athos] 184. B. 64, fol. 17^r; Harnack, 'Porphyrius', p. 48.

⁶⁸ Cf. especially *Apok.* 2.15; 3.2, 4, 17, 19, 33; 4.7, and 23; Corsaro, 'Apokritico', pp. 13-16.

⁶⁹ Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', pp. 44-6.

⁷⁰ Corsaro, 'Apokritico', pp. 14-15.

⁷¹ Goulet, 'Porphyre et Macarie', pp. 450-52.

⁷² Compare e.g., Eus. *PE* 1.2 with 1.4.9 and 1.5.1.

that the evangelists fabricated their stories of the miracles (*Apok.* 3.4=*Chr.* fr.49a).⁷³ Moreover, aside from their styles being different,⁷⁴ the Hellene's comments conflict with Porphyry's views and experience: first, the Hellene says that there are no human cannibals, even including the Scythians,⁷⁵ but Porphyry describes several peoples, including the Scythians, as cannibals in *De abstinencia*.⁷⁶ Second, the Hellene did not know the area around the Sea of Galilee,⁷⁷ but Porphyry did—for he visited nearby Caesarea and was sometimes called 'Bataneotes'.⁷⁸ Finally, the Hellene's notion of the gods as beings like God, but ruled by God,⁷⁹ is very different from Porphyry's claim that the gods are really powers of God.⁸⁰

The most serious obstacle, however, in identifying the Hellene of the *Apokritikos* with Porphyry is that Makarios treats Porphyry

⁷³ *Apok.* 3.4: Εἰ γὰρ ὄντως ἀληθὲς τοῦτο καὶ μὴ πλάσμα τυγχάνει, ὥς ἡμεῖς σαφηνίζομεν, πολλὴν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατηγορεῖ κακίαν; *Chr.* fr. 49b=Hier. *Vigil.* 10: *Nisi forte in more gentilium impiorumque Porphyrii ... has praestigias daemonum esse confingas.*

⁷⁴ Geffcken, *Zwei Apologeten*, p. 302, n. 1.

⁷⁵ *Apok.* 3.15: κἄν Σκυθίαν ταῖς ἰστορίαις παρέλθῃς, κἄν τοὺς Μακροβίου διαέλθῃς Αἰθίοπας, κἄν τὴν ὠκεάνιον ζώνην ἐν κύκλῳ διῖππεύσῃς, φθειροφάγους μὲν καὶ ῥιζοφάγους εὐρύσεις, ἐρπετοσίτας καὶ μυοτρώκτας ἀκούσεις, σαρκῶν δ' ἀνθρωπείων πάμπαν ἀπεχομένους.

⁷⁶ *Abst.* 2.8; 4.21; 3.17. Cf. Geffcken, *Zwei Apologeten*, p. 302, n. 1; Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', p. 47. Harnack, 'Kritik', p. 140 argued that *De abstinencia* had been written later, but the reverse is more likely: *Abst.* has no firm date but, since it seeks to recall one of Plotinus' disciples to the ascetic life, seems most appropriate around the time of Plotinus' death (268); *Abst.* 1.1; A. Smith, 'Porphyrian Studies since 1913', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.36.2 (1987), pp. 717–73 at 721 incl. n. 18. Porphyry could have written *Against the Christians* any time after 270; B. Croke, 'The Era of Porphyry's Anti-Christian Polemic', *Journal of Religious History* 13 (1984), pp. 1–14; T. D. Barnes, 'Scholarship or Propaganda? Porphyry *Against the Christians* and Its Historical Setting', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* (1994), pp. 53–65.

⁷⁷ *Apok.* 3.6: Οἱ γοὺν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τῶν τόπων ἀφηγοῦμενοι.

⁷⁸ Caesarea: Eus. *HE* 6.19.16; Bataneotes: Hier. *Qu. Hebr. Gen.* 1.10. The Sea of Galilee is between Tyre (Porphyry's birthplace, cf. Porph. *Plot.* 7.51) and Caesarea, about 30 miles to the east. P. Benoit ('Un adversaire', p. 545 incl. n. 1) calculates that Batanaia was either in the mountains fifteen miles east of Caesarea (toward the Sea) or close to the Sea itself.

⁷⁹ *Apok.* 4.20: Τὸ μέντοι περὶ τῆς μοναρχίας τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πολυαρχίας τῶν σεβομένων θεῶν διαρρηδὴν ζητήσωμεν ... Μονάρχης γάρ ἐστιν οὐχ ὁ μόνος ὢν, ἀλλ' ὁ μόνος ἄρχων' ἄρχει δ' ὁμοφύλων δηλαδὴ καὶ ὁμοίων.

⁸⁰ *Imag.* fr.351=Eus. *PE* 3.7.1: Φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί, θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσε βέβηλοι, σοφίας θεολόγου νοήματα δεικνύς, οἷς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰς δυνάμεις διὰ εἰκόνων συμφύλων αἰσθῆσαι ἐμήνυσαν ἄνδρες, τὰ ἀφανῆ φανεροῖς ἀποτυπώσαντες πλάσμασιν, τοῖς καθάπερ ἐκ βίβλων τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἀναλέγειν τὰ περὶ θεῶν μεμαθηκόσι γράμματα; E. des Places (ed.) (Paris, 1976); numbering of fragments follows Smith, *Porphyrii fragmenta*.

as someone distinct from, but known to, his opponent. In a passage about eating meat from sacrifices, in fact, Makarios urges the Hellene to consult Porphyry and his *Philosophy from Oracles*, using third- not second-person verbs.⁸¹ Harnack tried to circumvent this problem by arguing that someone had epitomized the philosopher's fifteen-volume *Against the Christians*; Makarios then used the epitome as a source for his fictional Hellene without knowing that it was Porphyry's work. Pointing to the shift in the Hellene's concerns halfway through the *Apokritikos*, where he turns from critiquing the Gospel to address Acts and Paul's letters (where the subheading also appears in the Vatican MS and Blondel's edition), Harnack thought that the epitome comprised two books.⁸² It may well be that the Hellene's arguments came from a two-volume work, but Harnack's solution fails to address the other serious differences between the Hellene and Porphyry. Richard Goulet, who thought with Harnack that Makarios was the bishop at the Synod of 403, tried another strategy to preserve Porphyry as the Christian's source. He argued that Makarios used Porphyry's work knowingly as the source of the Hellene's arguments, but referred to the *Philosophy from Oracles* thus in order to veil his dependency on the philosopher—since Constantine's edict had outlawed *Against the Christians*.⁸³ But the *Philosophy from Oracles* is itself an anti-Christian work,⁸⁴ and many people in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, including prominent men such as Augustine and Jerome, were responding anew and openly to the issues that Porphyry had raised. For example, Augustine rebuts Porphyry throughout book 19 of the *City of God*, while Jerome's entire commentary on Daniel is concerned with overturning Porphyry's scholarship. Thus Makarios' reference to the great Neoplatonist shows that he thought his Hellene would be someone familiar with and persuaded by Porphyry's work.⁸⁵

⁸¹ *Apok.* 3.42: ἐπειδὴ πολλὴ καὶ διάφορος πανταχοῦ γῆς γνωμένη τότε τῶν τετραπόδων ἢ σφαγὴ ... Ἐξεστι δέ σοι ταῦτα ἐκ τῆς ἐκ λογίων φιλοσοφίας πιστώσασθαι, καὶ τῶν θυομένων ἀκριβῶς μαθεῖν τὴν ἀφήγησιν, ἀναγνόντι περὶ θυσίας τὸν χρησμὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, ὃν ὁ Πορφύριος ὡσπερ ὀγκυλλόμενος ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ τοῖς οἰκείοις παρέδωκε, μεθ' ὅρκου φρικώδους, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐδοκίμαζε, διαστελλόμενος μὴ πολλοῖς ταῦτα φράζειν ἀνέδην.

⁸² Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 9, 141–4.

⁸³ Goulet, 'Porphyre et Macarie', p. 452.

⁸⁴ Cf. *Phil. or.* fr.345a=Aug. *Civ.* 19.23.43–73: *piissimum igitur virum ... et eius animam ... post obitum immortalitate dignatam, et hanc colere Christianos ignorantes. ... his fataliter dedit iste errore implicari. ... ex eo in eis facile praecepsque periculum;* Smith, *Porphyryii fragmenta*.

⁸⁵ Barnes, 'Date and Attribution', pp. 428–9.

The striking differences between the pagan arguments in the *Apokritikos* and Porphyry's beliefs preclude identifying the Hellene with Porphyry; at the same time, the significant similarities between their ideas in some places suggest that the Hellene drew some, but not all, of his arguments from the famous philosopher. This dependence is strengthened by the Hellene's frank admission that he is quoting someone else (e.g., Porphyry) in two of the closest parallels (the size of the Sea of Galilee and the date of Moses). But the Hellene also draws freely from Celsus. For Francesco Corsaro this dual dependency, together with the mixed biblical tradition meant that there was no 'Hellene', that Makarios had used a compilation of pagan criticisms as the basis for the Hellene's arguments.⁸⁶ Before adopting this conclusion, however, it is necessary to consider whether a pagan critic might have used Porphyry and Celsus as the basis of his own critique of Christianity. In fact, two such pagans are known: the emperor Julian and Sossianus Hierokles.

THE HELLENE AND JULIAN

P. Frassinetti has most systematically argued the thesis that Julian was the anonymous Hellene.⁸⁷ Beginning from the assumption that Makarios was the bishop from the 403 Synod of the Oak and that he was more likely to have responded to a near contemporary, Frassinetti applied these premises to his reconstruction of the *Apokritikos*' text at 4.2. As we have seen, he amended the Greek to read 'it is three hundred and thirty years' since Paul spoke about the second coming, concluding that Makarios must have composed the *Apokritikos* around 380. The Hellene, accordingly, was the emperor Julian (d. 363), the only notable pagan to have more or less recently written extensively against Christianity. There are indeed two direct parallels between the Hellene's statements and those of Julian: both used Exod. 22:28 ('thou shalt not revile gods') to argue against Christian exclusivity, and both used 1 Cor. 6:9-12 ('such were some of you') to ridicule the notion that criminals could be cleansed by baptism.⁸⁸ To bolster his argument, Frassinetti claimed that the table of contents from the Vatican MS listed issues that Julian had addressed in his

⁸⁶ Corsaro, 'Apokritico', p. 16. Cf. also idem, 'La dottrina eucharistica di Macario di Magnesia', *Convivium Domenicum* (1959), pp. 69-86 at 69, n. 1.

⁸⁷ Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore'.

⁸⁸ *Apok.* 4.23, 19; *Juln.* in *Cyr. Juln.* 238c, 245c.

Contra Galilaeos. He argued further that the Hellene shared Julian's noble, Attic style and regard for law and order.⁸⁹

Frassinetti's arguments for identifying the Hellene with Julian, however, also encounter difficulties. First, as discussed above, Frassinetti's textual emendations are not necessarily the best way to correct the *Apokritikos* at 4.2. Indeed, evidence within the Hellene's remarks, including his comments about persecution (the last of which ended in 313), suggests a date much earlier than Julian's lifetime. Next, the parallels between the texts are overdrawn. Long before Frassinetti, Crafer had already argued that the passages in Exodus and 1 Corinthians were too obvious to suggest borrowing.⁹⁰ Frassinetti also relies too heavily on the tables of contents for the missing books of the *Apokritikos*. The numbered issues merely identify the target of the Hellene's criticism; they do not show how his argument will proceed. For example, in *Apok.* 3.1 the Hellene unfavourably compares Jesus' behaviour before Pilate with that of Apollonius of Tyana before Domitian, but the description from the table of contents is simply, 'How Christ allowed himself to be crucified with insult'.⁹¹ Moreover, Julian probably wrote three books against the Christians,⁹² not the two that seem likely for Makarios' source—a discrepancy that Frassinetti conceded.⁹³ The Hellene also never uses Julian's signature term 'Galilaiοι' for 'Christianοι',⁹⁴ and, despite his Attic style, he expresses himself differently than the emperor.⁹⁵ Given these discrepancies, the Hellene is not Julian; rather, both seem to have used the same sources: Porphyry's *Against the Christians* and Celsus' *True Word*.⁹⁶

⁸⁹ Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', pp. 48–56.

⁹⁰ Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 547.

⁹¹ Πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἠνέσχετο μετ' ὕβρεως σταυρωθῆναι; Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', p. 69; Blondel's edition is similar.

⁹² Wilmer Cave Wright, *The Works of the Emperor Julian* (Cambridge, MA, 1990), p. 314.

⁹³ Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', p. 48.

⁹⁴ Cf. *Apok.* 3.17; 4.10, 21 and Gr. Naz. *First Inveictive against Julian* 76 for Julian's exclusive use of this term; Wright, *Emperor Julian*, p. 313.

⁹⁵ C. J. Neumann, *Iuliani imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 18–21. He agreed that the Hellene resembled Julian, but on closer inspection rejected their identity.

⁹⁶ See Geffcken, *Zwei Apologeten*, p. 304 and Meredith, 'Porphyry and Julian', pp. 1136, 1139–40 for Julian's dependence on Porphyry, pp. 1141–2 for his dependence on Celsus, and pp. 1130, 1143, 1147 for his dependence on both.

Being neither Porphyry nor Julian, could the Hellene of the *Apokritikos* be Sossianus Hierokles, the man whose name Duchesne and Crafer proposed long ago? Hierokles was the magistrate and anti-Christian author whom Lactantius had identified as one of the chief instigators of the Great Persecution and against whom a certain Eusebius had written a treatise commonly known as *Contra Hieroclem*.⁹⁷ Hierokles had been governor (perhaps in Augusta Libanensis) c.293, then he became *vicarius*, probably of Oriens, next he served as governor of Bithynia (303), and finally as prefect of Egypt (310).⁹⁸

Aside from the inscriptions that track Hierokles' career, the only information about him comes from Christian accounts. The first is probably the *Contra Hieroclem*. Long attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea, the *Contra Hieroclem* is now sometimes ascribed to another Eusebius.⁹⁹ The *terminus ante quem* for the *Contra Hieroclem* is 303 because Eusebius says that Hierokles has taken over the supreme courts, a task he would have conducted as *vicarius*, his position before this date.¹⁰⁰ Addressed

⁹⁷ Lact. *Inst.* 5.2.12; idem, *Mort.* 16.4; Crafer ('Macarius Magnes' and 'Work of Porphyry'); Duchesne, *De Macario*.

⁹⁸ Governor (of Augusta Libanensis?): *CIL* 3.133=6661; *AE* 1932.79=SEG 7.152; *vicarius*: Lact. *Mort.* 16.4; governor of Bithynia: Lact. *ibid.*; prefect of Egypt: Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 5.3; T. D. Barnes, 'Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the Great Persecution', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976), pp. 239–52 at 243–245 and idem, 'Scholarship or Propaganda', p. 60, n. 5 posits that Hierokles was either *vicarius* of Oriens or Pontica. But if Lactantius is correct about Hierokles' urging the onset of the persecution, which the professor himself seems to have linked with the purges from the army, then Hierokles' post is likely to have been in Oriens, whence Diocletian issued this order. See n. 45.

⁹⁹ See T. Hägg, 'Hierocles the Lover of Truth and Eusebius the Sophist', *Symbolae Osloenses* 67 (1992), pp. 138–50; Barnes, 'Scholarship or Propaganda', p. 60.

¹⁰⁰ *Hierocl.* 4: τοῦ τε Φιλαλήθους τὰ ἀνωτάτω τε καὶ καθ' ὅλων δικαστήρια διειληφότος; cf. also 19.1–2; Barnes, 'Sossianus Hierocles', pp. 243–4. Eusebius says (*Hierocl.* 4) that Jesus 'is the only example of a teacher who, after being treated as an enemy for so many years ... by all men, subjects and rulers alike, has at last triumphed and shown himself far mightier, thanks to his divine and mysterious power, than the infidels who persecuted him so bitterly, those who for a season, rebel against his divine teaching being now easily punished by him, while the divine doctrine which he firmly laid down and handed on has come to prevail for ages without end over the whole inhabited world (οὐδ' ὡς τῶν πώποτε μόνος πρὸς ἀπάντων σχεδὸν εἶπεν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχομένων, πλείστοις ἔτεσιν ἤδη πολεμούμενος, κρείττων καὶ πολὺ δυνατώτερος τῶν πικρῶς ἐλανόντων ἀπίστων ἀποδέδεικται θεῖα καὶ ἀρρήτων δυνάμει, τοὺς μὲν κατὰ καιρὸν ἐπανισταμένους αὐτοῦ τῇ θεῖα διδασκαλίᾳ ῥαδίως μετῴων, τὸν δὲ παγέντα πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ παραδοθέντα θεῖον λόγον εἰς ἅπειρον αἰῶνα καθ' ὅλης κρατύνων τῆς οἰκουμένης)'; F. C. Conybeare (Cambridge,

to Eusebius' friend (*Hierocl.* 1.1), the text is concerned above all with subjecting Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* to a rigorous critique intended to parallel Hierokles' approach to Christianity.¹⁰¹ Throughout his work Eusebius seeks both to undermine Philostratus' credibility by showing him to be a drunken, deceitful, and inconsistent historian whose beliefs do not accord with natural law,¹⁰² and to tarnish Apollonius' reputation by criticizing his words and deeds,¹⁰³ finding him inconsistent,¹⁰⁴ and by claiming that demons were really responsible for his miracles (*Hierocl.* 25, 31). Along the way, Hierokles' claims to 'good sense' are used as a foil to Eusebius' own arguments

MA, 1989). This passage led E. Schwartz, *RE* 6 (1909), 1394 (in Barnes, 'Sossianus Hierocles', pp. 240–1) and Brian Croke ('Polemic', pp. 4–5) to date the work to 311–313 because it seemed to describe the illness that drove the emperor Galerius to end the Great Persecution (Lact. *Mort.* 33). But Eusebius 'consistently fails to mention contemporary persecution or martyrdom in contexts where it would aid his argument'; thus Barnes thinks that it refers to Decius' death in battle and Valerian's capture by the Persians (Barnes, 'Sossianus Hierocles', p. 241).

¹⁰¹ *Hierocl.* 4: 'So we will merely examine the work of Philostratus, and by close scrutiny of it show that Apollonius was not fit to be classed, I will not say among philosophers, but even among men of integrity and good sense, much less to be compared with our Saviour Christ, so far as we can depend on the work of a writer who, though according to the "Lover of Truth," he was highly educated, was in any case no respecter of truth. ... For when we have thoroughly examined these facts, we shall no doubt obtain a clear demonstration of the *solidity and*, as he imagines to himself, *the accuracy in detail of the condemnation which the "Lover of Truth,"* who has at the same time taken possession of the supreme courts ..., *passes on Christians, and at the same time of what they are pleased to call our reckless and facile credulity* (μόνην δὲ ἐπισκεψόμεθα τὴν τοῦ Φιλοστράτου γραφὴν, δι' ἧς εὐθυναοῦμεν, ὡς οὐχ ὅτι γε ἐν φιλοσόφοις, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν ἐπιεικεσι καὶ μετρίοις ἀνδράσιν ἄξιον ἐγκρίνειν, οὐχ ὅπως τῷ σωτῇρι ἡμῶν Χριστῷ παρατιθέναι τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον, ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ τοῦ παρὰ τῷ Φιλαλήθει παιδεύσεως μὲν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἥκοντος, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς μὴ τιμῶντος συγγραφέως. ... τούτων γὰρ ἡμῖν διευκρινηθέντων ὁμοῦ, τοῦ τε Φιλαλήθους τὰ ἀνωτάτω τε καὶ καθ' ὅλων δικαστήρια διεληφότος, ἡ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν βεβαία καί, ὡς αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ δοκεῖ, ἀκριβὴς ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ κρίσις φανερά καταστήσεται, ἡμῶν τε αὖ, οἱ μωροὶ καὶ βεβουκολημένοι νονομίσμεθα παρ' αὐτοῖς, ἢ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπικαλουμένη εὐχέρεια τε καὶ κοινότης); emphasis added.

¹⁰² Drunken (μέθῃ): 39; deceitful (ψεύστας): 39 (cf. also 8, 11, 12, 22); inconsistent: 7, 12, 23 (for treating Apollonius as divine, but imparting human attributes to him); 11 (in the accounts of his Pythagorean studies); 29 (for discussing his prescience but showing him needing information); 40 (in accounts of his death); beliefs contrary to natural law: 6.

¹⁰³ He behaves questionably and unethically by allowing a drunken king at a meeting of philosophers (20), boasting before Vespasian (28), praising and criticizing the same person (29), bragging (38), and acting the hypocrite with Domitian (39); many of his esteemed utterances are merely banal (15, 21), but others, such as saying that the richer are better, are offensive (15).

¹⁰⁴ He claims to understand all languages, but needs teachers (8–11); he claims to know what people are thinking, but needs interpreters and is astonished by things that people say (8, 14–15); he forbids his student Damis to go to the

that only gullible people would see Apollonius as divine (e.g., 19, 39). The chronologically second account of Hierokles is from Lactantius' *Divine Institutes*, the first edition of which is usually dated between 305 and 310 CE.¹⁰⁵ Called to Nicomedia to chair a position in Latin rhetoric, Lactantius had been in the audience here when Hierokles presented his *Truth-Loving Discourse* in Greek just before Diocletian issued the general edicts of persecution in February 303 (*Inst.* 5.2.12; 5.4.1–2; *Mort.* 11–12, 16). His account of the work takes up several chapters in a seven-book treatise devoted to rebutting pagan attacks and demonstrating the harmony of Christianity with long-held Roman beliefs.

Together Eusebius and Lactantius set out the attributes of Hierokles' work from its probable time of composition, title, and number of volumes, to its technique and contents. In virtually all cases, what they say finds a parallel in the *Apokritikos*. First, the two Christian authors indicate that Hierokles wrote between 299 and 303. As just noted, Eusebius mentions that his opponent, who has just recently composed his work,¹⁰⁶ is in charge of the 'highest and general courts' (*Hierocl.* 1.29; 4.48–49; 19.1–2), a responsibility of a *vicarius* who would hear provincial appeals.¹⁰⁷ Lactantius supports Eusebius, saying that when he heard Hierokles, he 'was then of the number of the judges'. But he adds that Hierokles 'was especially the advisor of enacting persecution'. 'Not contented with this crime', Lactantius continues, the judge 'also pursued with writings those whom he had persecuted' (*Inst.* 5.2.12).¹⁰⁸ Lactantius is usually taken to mean that Hierokles wrote after the edicts of persecution in 303, but this assumption is probably wrong. Lactantius did not see 303 as the start of the persecution, since he says that he himself arrived in Nicomedia as the church was being overturned (*Inst.* 5.2).¹⁰⁹

Persians, but does so himself (11); he allows Damis to eat meat, but his teacher Pythagoras forbids it (13); he praises things that he refuses to imitate (22); he subscribes to Fate, but tries to change events (41); and his own words convict him of wizardry (38).

¹⁰⁵ Eberhard Heck, *Die dualistischen Zusätze und die Kaiseranreden bei Lactantius* (Heidelberg, 1972), pp. 37–46.

¹⁰⁶ *Hierocl.* 1: *νῦν τοῦτω γέγονεν*, a statement describing Hierokles' comparison of Apollonius with Jesus.

¹⁰⁷ Barnes, 'Sossianus Hierocles', p. 245; Hägg, 'Hierocles', p. 145.

¹⁰⁸ *Qui erat tum e numero iudicum et qui auctor in primis faciendae persecutionis fuit, quo scelere non contentus etiam scriptis eos quos adflixerat insecutus est*; CSEL 19; trans. NPNF.

¹⁰⁹ *Ego cum in Bithynia oratorias litteras accitus docerem contigissetque ut eodem tempore dei templum everteretur, duo extiterunt ibidem qui iacenti atque abjectae veritate nescio utrum superbius an infortunis insultarent.*

Like Eusebius of Caesarea, Lactantius probably dated the start of persecution with the eviction of Christians from the army, an event directed from Antioch, as we have seen, at the very end of the third century. As *vicarius Orientis*, Hierokles would have governed from Antioch and could have been involved in the decision to take this action. Hierokles thus probably wrote between 299 (the army purge) and 303 (when he delivered the treatise and became governor of Bithynia), a period that accords very well with the internal evidence in the Hellene's portion of the *Apokritikos*, including the way it refers to persecution.

Not only is the date for Hierokles' work appropriate for the Hellene's portion of the *Apokritikos*, but parallels also exist between their titles and the number of books they composed. According to Lactantius, Hierokles 'composed two books, not *against* the Christians, ... but *to* the Christians' and he 'dared to give' them 'the title of "truth-loving (*Φιλαληθεῖς*; note the plural)'" (*Inst.* 5.2.13; 5.3.22).¹¹⁰ Eusebius, however, refers to Hierokles' statements 'in his discourse (*λόγος*) against us which he has entitled "Truth-Loving (*Φιλαλήθει*; note the singular)'"'.¹¹¹ Realizing that Lactantius had simply used the adjective 'truth-loving' to modify the number of books (information that Eusebius did not include), Tomas Hägg resolved the discrepancy between the plural title in the former and the singular in the latter, to produce *A Truth-Loving Discourse to the Christians* (*Φιλαλήθης λόγος πρὸς Χριστιανούς*).¹¹² This title, in fact, parallels the likely title of the *Apokritikos*, namely *The Only-Begotten to the Hellenes* (*Μονογενὴς πρὸς Ἕλληνας*). Moreover, as we have already seen, the subheading at the fourteenth issue of *Apok.* 3 suggests that the Hellene's questions probably came from a text in two volumes—the same length as the *Truth-Loving Discourse*.

Although Eusebius devotes an entire book to refuting Hierokles, Lactantius describes more directly the contents and methods of Hierokles' work. According to the latter, Hierokles, in an acerbic tone, talked about 'so many and such secret things' that he seemed to have been Christian himself. Moreover, he tried 'to prove the falsehood of sacred Scripture, as though it were altogether contradictory to itself', an effort in which, Lactantius claims, Hierokles primarily 'assailed Paul and Peter, and the other

¹¹⁰ 5.2.13: *Composuit enim libellos duos, non contra Christianos, ... sed ad Christianos*; 5.3.22: *ausus est libros suos ... Φιλαληθεῖς adnotare*.

¹¹¹ 1: ἐν τῷ Φιλαλήθει, οὕτω γὰρ εὖ ἔχειν αὐτῷ τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν ἐπιγράφειν ἐδόκει λόγον; trans. Hägg, 'Hierocles', pp. 140–3.

¹¹² Hägg, 'Hierocles', pp. 140–3.

disciples'. For the judge, these men were not only 'disseminators of deceit' but also 'unskilled and unlearned' (*Inst.* 5.2.12–14, 17). Adding the charge that the apostles were 'wizards (γόητες)', Eusebius, quoting Hierokles verbatim, corroborates Lactantius (*Hierocl.* 2.32–33, 39–41).¹¹³ Lactantius then says that Hierokles 'attempted to overthrow' Jesus' 'wonderful deeds'. He did so by showing how 'Apollonius performed equal or even greater' miracles (*Inst.* 5.3.7) and then by arguing that, nevertheless, most right-thinking people did not regard Apollonius as divine, despite the statue erected to him at Ephesus.¹¹⁴ Eusebius quotes Hierokles making the same argument.¹¹⁵ According to Eusebius, Hierokles' comparison between Apollonius and Jesus was so seductive that it motivated him to subject Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* to the same type of textual criticism that Lactantius

¹¹³ *Inst.* 5.2.12 *Alius* [Lactantius had heard two speakers] *eandem materiam mordacius scripsit ...* (13) *Conposuit enim libellos duos ... in quibus ita falsitatem scripturae arguere conatus est, tamquam sibi esset tota contraria.* (14) *Nam quaedam capita quae repugnare sibi videbantur exposuit adeo multa, adeo intima enumerans, ut aliquando ex eadem disciplina fuisse videatur ...* (17) *Praecipue tamen 'Paulum Petrumque' laceravit 'ceterosque discipulos tamquam fallaciae seminatores', quos eosdem tamen 'rudes et indoctos' fuisse testatus est. ...; Hierocl. 2: τὰ μὲν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος καὶ τινες τούτων παραπλήσιοι κεκομπάκασιν, ἀνθρώποι ψευδοῦνται καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι καὶ γόητες.*

¹¹⁴ 5.3.7: *Idem eum facta eius mirabilia destrueret nec tamen negaret, voluit ostendere 'Apollonium vel paria vel etiam maiora fecisse';* 5.3.14: *'eum' dicas 'et adoratum esse a quibusdam sicut deum et simulacrum eius sub Herculis Alexicaci nomine constitutum ab Ephesiis etiam nunc honorari.'* See also *Inst.* 5.3.16: *'Non' inquit 'hoc dico, idcirco Apollonium non haberi deum, quia noluerit, sed ut appareat nos sapientiores esse, qui mirabilibus factis non statim fidem divinitatis adiunximus, quam vos, qui ob exigua portenta deum credidistis.'*

¹¹⁵ *Hierocl. 2:* ἄνω δὲ καὶ κάτω θρυλοῦσι, σεμνύνοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὡς τυφλοῖς ἀναβλέψαι παρασχόντα καὶ τινα τοιαῦτα δρᾶσαντα θαυμάσια ... ἐπισκεψάμεθα γὰρ μὴν, ὅσῳ βέλτιον καὶ συνετώτερον ἡμεῖς ἐκδεχόμεθα τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ ἦν περὶ τῶν ἐναρέτων ἀνδρῶν ἔχομεν γνώμην ... ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν Νέρωνος βασιλείαν Ἀπολλώνιος ἤκμασεν ὁ Τυανεύς, ὃς ἐκ παιδὸς κομιδῇ νέον καὶ ἀφ' οὗπερ ἐν Αἰγαῖς τῆς Κιλικίας ἱεράσατο τῷ φιλανθρωπῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ, πολλὰ καὶ θαυμαστὰ διεπράξατο, ὧν τὰ πλείω παρὲς ὀλίγων ποιήσομαι μνήμην ... τίς οὖν ἕνεκα τούτων ἐμνήσθη; ἢ ἐξ ἡ συγκρίναι τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀκριβῆ καὶ βεβαίαν ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ κρίσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν κουφότητα, εἴπερ ἡμεῖς μὲν τὸν τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκότα οὐ θεόν, ἀλλὰ θεοῖς κεχαρισμένον ἄνδρα ἡγούμεθα, οἱ δὲ δι' ὀλίγας τερατείας τινὰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν θεὸν ἀναγορεύουσι ... καὶ ἐκεῖνο λογισασθαι ἄξιον, ὅτι τὰ μὲν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος καὶ τινες τούτων παραπλήσιοι κεκομπάκασιν, ἀνθρώποι ψευδοῦνται καὶ ἀπαίδευτοι καὶ γόητες, τὰ δὲ Ἀπολλωνίου Μάξιμος ὁ Αἰγίεὺς καὶ Δάμις ὁ φιλόσοφος ὁ συνδιατρέψας αὐτῷ καὶ Φιλόστρατος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, παιδεύσεως μὲν ἐπὶ πλείστον ἤκοντες, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς τιμῶντες διὰ φιλανθρωπίας, ἀνδρὸς γενναίου καὶ θεοῖς φίλου πράξεις μὴ βουλόμενοι λαθεῖν.' Cf. also *Hierocl.* 2, 4.

says Hierokles had applied to Scripture.¹¹⁶ Eusebius says that the comparison of Apollonius and Jesus was the only original element of the *Truth-Loving Discourse*, most of which Hierokles had stolen from other authors (*Hierocl.* 1). Finally, according to Lactantius, Hierokles concluded by promoting the worship of both the Supreme God and the other gods, whom he called God's ministers and subordinates (*Inst.* 5.3.25–6).¹¹⁷

The foregoing description of the *Truth-Loving Discourse* presents compelling evidence that Makarios' Hellene should be identified with Hierokles. Like Hierokles, the Hellene, in a very acid style, argues that Scripture is false by pointing out a wide variety of arcane inconsistencies. Moreover the Hellene uses the same techniques that Eusebius, in responding to Hierokles, used against Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius*: first tarnishing the reputation of the 'divine man', criticizing his words and deeds and finding him inconsistent; then undermining the authors' credibility by painting them as drunken, deceitful, and inconsistent men whose beliefs violate standard notions of natural law. Indeed, as Pierre de Labriolle noticed long ago, the Hellene's contention that humans could not ascend directly to heaven during the second coming (*Apok.* 4.2) parallels Eusebius' argument that Apollonius' divinity would violate natural law (*Hierocl.* 6), and it employs very similar vocabulary (see Appendix). Given that Eusebius likes to quote the judge only to undermine what he says, is it not likely that here too he has quoted Hierokles, who should be identified with Makarios' Hellene?¹¹⁸ Likewise, the Hellene skewers the evangelists for deceitfully inventing their stories, but he saves his principal criticisms for Peter and Paul, as crude, ill-mannered, and ignorant opportunists—tactics that Lactantius condemns in Hierokles. Just like Hierokles, the Hellene compares Apollonius and Jesus, to the disadvantage of the latter (*Apok.* 3.1; 4.5). And, significantly, the contrast that the Hellene draws between Apollonius and Jesus before

¹¹⁶ *Hierocl.* 1; *Inst.* 5.2.12–14, 17; note also Eusebius' proper title: *Πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Φιλοστράτου εἰς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα διὰ τῆν Ἱεροκλεῖ παραλήφθεισαν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ συγκρίσιν*.

¹¹⁷ *Prosecutus enim summi dei laudes, quem regem, quem maximum, quem opificem rerum, quem fontem bonorum, quem parentem omnium, quem factorem altoremque viventium confessus es, ademisti Iovi tuo regnum eum ... depulsum in ministrorum numerum redigisti* (26) ... *Adfirmas enim deos esse et illos tamen subiecis et manicipas ei deo* ...

¹¹⁸ De Labriolle, 'Porphyre', p. 413, n. 2, thinking that the *Apokritikos* Hellene was Porphyry, assumed that Eusebius had used Porphyry against Hierokles. This parallel challenges Goulet's claim that Makarios had written this passage (see n. 71).

their judges, Domitian and Pilate, is one that Hierokles made, according to Lactantius.¹¹⁹ Like Hierokles, the Hellene contrasts Christian gullibility with the sensible judgement of others. Finally, both Hierokles and the Hellene of the *Apokritikos* thought that the gods were beings like God who were subordinated or even enslaved to the Creator.

The Hellene and Hierokles also depend on the same sources. In his *Demonstratio evangelica*, Eusebius of Caesarea points to Porphyry and Apollonius as Hierokles' chief teachers,¹²⁰ while the *Contra Hieroclem* claims that the *Truth-Loving Discourse* so resembled Celsus' *True Word* that Origen's response to the earlier work could serve as a rebuttal (*Hierocl.* 1).¹²¹ Like Hierokles, the

¹¹⁹ *Apok.* 3.1: Τίνος ἕνεκεν ὁ Χριστὸς οὔτε τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ προσαχθεὶς οὔτε τῷ ἡγεμόνι ἄξιόν τι σοφοῦ καὶ θείου ἀνδρὸς ἐφθέγγετο δυνάμενον καὶ τὸν κριτὴν καὶ τοὺς παρεστῶτας παιδεῦσαι καὶ βελτίους ἐργάσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἡνέσχετο καλὰ μὴ τύπτεισθαι καὶ περιπτύεσθαι καὶ στεφανοῦσθαι ἀκάνθαις, καὶ μὴ καθάπερ Ἀπολλώνιος μετὰ παρηγορίας τῷ αὐτοκράτορι λαλήσας Δομετιανῷ τῆς βασιλικῆς αὐτῆς ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο, καὶ μετ' ὥρας οὐ πολλὰς ἐν πόλει Δικαιοαρχείᾳ νῦν δὲ Ποτιόλοις καλουμένη ὁφθεὶς ἐπιφανέστατος; *Inst.* 5.3.9: *Si magus Christus, quia mirabilia fecit, peritior utique 'Apollonius', qui ut describis 'cum Domitianus eum punire vellet, repente in iudicio non comparuit', quam ille qui et comprehensus est et cruci adfixus.*

¹²⁰ Eusebius observes that many of the unbelievers have called Jesus a wizard and a deceiver (γόητα καὶ πλάνον), but he wonders at these labels, since any *lover of truth* (πᾶς ὁ φιλαλήθης) must admit that Jesus was the author of a holy and divine (θείας, καὶ εὐσεβοῦς) and not a common and vulgar philosophy (κοινῆς καὶ πανδήμου φιλοσοφίας). Clearly, Eusebius is alluding to Hierokles. Then he asks whether these accusations stem from Jesus' strictures against sacrifice, a notion that would displease the teachers of any Hellene who thought so (εἰ δὴ ταυτὰ τις Ἑλλήνων αἰτιῶται, ἵστω μὴ φίλα τοῖς οἰκείοις διδασκάλοις φρονῶν). These teachers are Apollonius and Porphyry of Tyre (*DE* 3.2.102a; 3.3.103c, 104d, 105a-c); *PG* 22. Lactantius corroborates Hierokles' dependency on Porphyry by saying that the judge wrote 'non contra Christianos ... sed ad Christianos' (*Inst.* 5.2.13), thus contrasting the *Truth-Loving Discourse* with Porphyry's *Against the Christians* (*Contra Christianos* in Latin). Harnack thought Hierokles had depended more on Celsus than on Porphyry, but then listed Hierokles as a 'witness' to Porphyry; Harnack, 'Porphyrius', pp. 21, 27–28. Barnes, 'Date and Attribution', p. 440 also downplayed Hierokles' dependence on Porphyry by noting that the resemblance between Apollonius and Jesus and the rusticity of Jesus' disciples 'might occur to more than one pagan independently'. But this argument ignores the rigorous deconstruction of Scripture that Lactantius says was Hierokles' chief object (*Inst.* 5.2.14), textual criticism that was also Porphyry's claim to fame (cf. e.g., *Hier. Ep.* 112.6.11).

¹²¹ 1: μὴ αὐτοῦ ἴδια τυγχάνοντα, σφόδρα δὲ ἀναιδῶς ἐξ ἑτέρων οὐκ αὐτοῖς μονονοῦχί νοήμασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑήμασι καὶ συλλαβαῖς ἀποσεσλημμένα· ἃ τύχοι μὲν ἂν καὶ αὐτὰ τῆς προσηκούσης κατὰ καιρὸν ἀπελγέσεως, δυνάμει δ' ἤδη, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἰδίας κατ' αὐτῶν γραφῆς, ἀνατέτραπται καὶ προσηλῆλεγκται ἐν ὅλοις ὀκτὼ συγγράμμασι τοῖς Ὡριγίνει γραφεῖσι πρὸς τὸν ἀλαζονικώτερον τοῦ Φιλαλήθους ἐπιγεγραμμένον. Κέλσου Ἀληθῆ λόγον ... ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνω παρὰ τοὺς πώποτε καθ' ἡμῶν γεγραφὸτας ἐξαίρετος νῦν τούτω γέγονεν ἢ τοῦδε πρὸς τὸν ἡμέτερον σωτήρα παραθέσεις τε καὶ σύγκρισις.

Hellene too has borrowed from Porphyry and Celsus, citations borne out by the mixed biblical traditions in his speeches. One could also say that Origen had answered the Hellene in advance; for Origen did respond to Celsus, and Porphyry's *Against the Christians* drew upon Celsus and Origen.¹²² Hierokles' title, *Φιλαλήθης λόγος* does recall Celsus' *Ἀλήθης λόγος*, but this parallel does not prevent identifying him with Makarios' Hellene.¹²³

Lactantius and Eusebius do quote passages from Hierokles' *Truth-Loving Discourse* that are not extant in the *Apokritikos*,¹²⁴ but they all concern Jesus' actions and miracles—topics that the Hellene addressed in the books now missing. For example, according to Lactantius, Hierokles claimed that Jesus was a robber king with 900 followers put to flight by the Jews (*Inst.* 5.3.4).¹²⁵ Although nothing like this statement occurs in the extant *Apokritikos*, the Hellene did raise the issue of Jesus' trial under Jewish law (*Apok.* 1.10) and the Vatican manuscript's headings for book 1, issues 2 and 3 record his questions about how Jesus chose his followers and the meaning of 'Follow me and I will make you fishers of men'.¹²⁶ Makarios' response is not extant either, but it is possible that the Hellene gave such a connotation to being 'fishers of men', especially since he later says that the apostles swindled rich women (*Apok.* 3.5). Also absent from the extant *Apokritikos* are Eusebius' and Lactantius'

¹²² Despite Schröder's observation ('Celsus und Porphyrius', pp. 200–2) that Celsus emphasized morality while Porphyry concentrated on philology, both criticize allegorizing (e.g., *Cels.* 1.17; *Chr.* fr.39=Eus. *HE* 6.19.2), both ask why Jesus came so late (e.g., *Cels.* 8.12; *Chr.* fr.79=Aug. *Ep.* 102.8), both accused the evangelists of 'falsity' (e.g., *Cels.* 5.18; *Chr.* fr.6=Hier. *Matt.* 9.9), and both pointed out the discrepancies in the infancy narratives (e.g., *Cels.* 1.58; *Chr.* fr.12=Epiph. *Haer.* 51.8). Cf. Geffcken, *Zwei Apologeten*, pp. 298–300; J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (Ghent, 1913), 74; A. B. Hulén, *Porphyry's Work Against the Christians* (New Haven, 1933), pp. 38–55; and A. Meredith, 'Porphyry and Julian', p. 1130. For Porphyry's dependence on Origen, note Jerome's remark (*Ep.* 112.6.11) that Origen was the first to point out the conflict between Peter and Paul in Galatians (*Stromateis* 10), a close reading of the text upon which Porphyry capitalized in *Against the Christians* (fr.21).

¹²³ Both may have been inspired by Plato's contrast of the *ἀλήθης λόγος* with the *λόγος ψευδής*; cf. Schröder, 'Celsus und Porphyrius', p. 191.

¹²⁴ Evangeliiou, 'Porphyry's Criticism', p. 67 n. 59 claimed that Hierokles' verbosity meant that he could not be Makarios' Hellene. But he must be thinking of Hierokles the philosopher, since there are no other extant works by Sossianus Hierokles.

¹²⁵ 'Ipsū autem 'Christum' adfirmavit 'a Iudaeis fugatum collecta nongentorum hominum manu latrocinia fecisse.'

¹²⁶ 1.2: Πῶς ὁ Κύριος ἐπελέξατο τοὺς μαθητὰς | καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὸν προδότην ...; 1.3: Τίς ὁ λόγος· Δεῦτε ὁπίσω μου καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων'; *Matt.* 4:10 and *Mark* 1:17; Mercati, 'Per l'*Apokritico*', p. 62. For 1.10, see n. 32.

remaining quotations from Hierokles, all of which compare Jesus and Apollonius, especially with regard to their miracles (*Hierocl.* 2.26–9; *Inst.* 5.3.7). But the Vatican manuscript indicates that the Hellene treated Jesus' deeds primarily in books 1 and the first half of book 2, so these parallels to Apollonius could have been discussed in books now missing.¹²⁷ The *Apokritikos* need not have made a sustained comparison of Apollonius and Jesus, for Eusebius does not say that Hierokles drew out the parallel over a long discussion, only that the judge was the first to have advanced it (*Hierocl.* 1). Moreover, the *Apokritikos*' first extant reference to Apollonius occurs without an introduction (*Apok.* 3.1), as Crafer observed, so it was probably not the first time the miracle-worker was mentioned.¹²⁸ Accordingly, comments about Jesus, Apollonius, and miracles (*Hierocl.* 2.6–29) and any reference to Apollonius' image at Ephesus (Lact. *Inst.* 5.3.14) could well have occurred in the first portion of the Hellene's work, along with charges of wizardry against Jesus (*magus*: *Inst.* 5.3.9) and the apostles (γόητες: *Hierocl.* 2.33)—other obvious parallels with Apollonius (Philostr. *VA* 8).¹²⁹

Since Hierokles' statements, recorded in Eusebius and Lactantius but absent from the *Apokritikos*, reflect topics discussed in the book's missing portions, the strong similarities between the descriptions of the *Truth-Loving Discourse* and the Hellene's text suggest that Hierokles is in fact Makarios' anonymous pagan. This thesis is hardly new, since Crafer and Duchesne had identified Hierokles with the Hellene a century ago. Nevertheless, once Harnack had asserted that the Hellene was Porphyry, the force of his authority encouraged scholars to go to increasingly elaborate lengths to preserve his thesis. For example, as we have seen, Harnack thought that Makarios had used a two-volume epitome of Porphyry's *Against the Christians*

¹²⁷ Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 556–8.

¹²⁸ Crafer, 'Work of Porphyry', pp. 380–2.

¹²⁹ Note the Hellene's early question about Jesus and the devil (1.4) (see n. 32). Moreover, when he asks why Jesus failed to defend himself verbally before Pilate, Makarios (somewhat off the point) says that if Jesus had performed miracles here, he would have been accused of wizardry and, in acting like Apollonius, 'the world would really have been justly deceived' (*Apok.* 3.8: ὅντως ἂν κόσμος ἐν δίκῃ πεπλάνητο). His phrasing not only suggests that the Hellene may have accused Jesus of being a deceiver and a wizard, but it also echoes Eusebius of Caesarea's claim that the 'lover of Truth' was one of those unbelievers who saw Jesus as a deceiver and a wizard (*DE* 3.2–3). Likewise in addressing the deaths of Peter and Paul, Makarios argues that avoiding their demise would 'really have smacked of wizardry', a statement that again suggests a charge that was set out earlier (*Apok.* 4.14).

as a source for the Hellene's questions. De Labriolle accepted this thesis, but also saw close parallels between the Hellene's arguments and what Lactantius reported about Hierokles. So he concluded that Hierokles must have used the 'two-volume epitome' as a source for the *Truth-Loving Discourse*.¹³⁰ Finally, Pezzella realized that Crafer's and Harnack's theses differed only with regard to the name of the two-volume epitomist: Crafer argued that the Hellene, i.e., Hierokles, had essentially created a two-volume epitome of Porphyry, preserved in the *Apokritikos*; Harnack claimed that Hierokles had drawn upon Porphyry for his two-volume *Truth-Loving Discourse*, and he maintained that someone else (at just the same time) had epitomized Porphyry in the two volumes subsequently used by Makarios as the source for the Hellene.¹³¹ Accordingly, it seems more economical to conclude that the Hellene's two-volume text and the *Truth-Loving Discourse* are one and the same, and that Hierokles is Makarios' anonymous Hellene.

HIEROKLES AND MAKARIOS

Although my intention in this article is to identify the anonymous Hellene in the *Apokritikos*—a task made possible by the unambiguous presence of two voices in the text—I would be remiss if I did not at least sketch out this study's implications for determining the identity of Makarios Magnēs and the occasion that gave rise to his work. If the anonymous Hellene is Hierokles and if his references to the time elapsed since Paul and Jesus do place his remarks c.300, then Makarios is more likely to have been a contemporary of the judge and his text more probably records a genuine debate. For Hierokles is likely to have been *vicarius Orientis* at Antioch when he wrote the *Truth-Loving Discourse*, and Makarios' remarks reflect just that locale.

Various elements of the *Apokritikos* had led Harnack and others to assume that it was a late fourth-century project of the bishop Makarios who had attended the Synod of the Oak in 403. Most

¹³⁰ De Labriolle, 'Porphyre', p. 436; see also M. Frede, 'Eusebius' Apologetic Writings', in M. Edwards, M. Goodman and S. Price (eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford, 1999), p. 234.

¹³¹ S. Pezzella, 'Il problema del *Katὰ χριστιανῶν* di Porfirio', *Eos* 52 (1962), pp. 87–107 at 88, 98, 99 went on to argue that the Hellene was a montage of several anti-Christian authors, but he identified only two of them—Hierokles and Porphyry. His approach was driven by his (incorrect) assumption that books 2 and 5 were written *against* Theosthenes and that the other three books were written against other people; cf. also Waelkens, *L'Economie*, pp. 8–9.

importantly, the Hellene's claim that 300 years separated him from Jesus and Paul (*Apok.* 4.2, 5) seemed to place the text well into the fourth century.¹³² As we have seen, however, the Hellene's remarks about date could just as easily place the text around 300 CE. Moreover, a close examination of other 'late' aspects of the text—monasticism, Manichaeism, and Cappadocian theology—shows that they are also open to question. For example, where Harnack saw developed monasticism (*Apok.* 2.7), Makarios himself describes women becoming martyrs or taking 'virgins' vows' and 'sons of great men' leaving 'their family customs to practice abstinence'. These are individuals adopting celibacy, a Christian practice common since the second century.¹³³ Manichaeism, to which Makarios alludes in two places (3.43; 4.15), was an issue in the late fourth century but was also pervasive a hundred years earlier, as Diocletian's edict against it attests.¹³⁴ And the three post-Cappadocian elements of the *Apokritikos* are overstated. First, Makarios and Epiphanius (d. 403) do discuss the Encratites (a group of Gnostics) in similar terms; but such similarities are to be expected in accounts of the same people. Makarios' description is also more detailed, so Epiphanius cannot be his source.¹³⁵ Second, Makarios and Gregory of Nyssa both say that Jesus, tempting the devil to attack him during the Passion, tricked Satan into swallowing

¹³² Harnack, 'Kritik', pp. 12–14; cf. also Frassinetti, 'Sull' autore', p. 47–8; Corsaro, 'Apokritico'; Pezzella, 'Il problema', p. 87; Anastos, 'Porphyry's Attack', p. 423; Waelkens, *L'Economie*, pp. 9, 30; and Goulet, 'Porphyre et Macarie', p. 448. Neumann dated Makarios even later because he describes Babylon in ruins (*Apok.* 4.11), which he thought Makarios had confused with Ctesiphon (Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 405).

¹³³ "Ἄλλαι παρθενίας καὶ ἀγνείας ἔνεκεν ἐπαινετῆς ἐρασθεῖσαι ἦθος μητέρων καὶ τρόπον ἡγήσαντο δίκην μαχαίρας λόγον διδασκαλίας τμητικὸν ἀσμενίσασαι· υἱοὶ δὲ καὶ κριτῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ ναῖδων πόλεων οἰκήτορες ἑνδοξοί; cf. also 3.43 and Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 549–50.

¹³⁴ 3.43: Τοιοῦτοι δὲ Μανιχαίων παῖδες ἐξεφοίτησαν; 4.15: Αὐτίκα γοῶν ὁ Μανῆς ἐν Περσίδι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑποκρινάμενος πολλὴν μὲν σατραπείαν, πολλὴν δὲ τῆς ἀνατολῆς χώραν τῇ πλάνῃ διέφθειρε καὶ μέχρι τήμερον φθέρει λυμαντικοῖς ὑφέρπων τὴν οἰκουμένην σπέρμασιν. FIRA, 2:544–589.

¹³⁵ Makarios says that heretics come from Pisidia, Isauria, Cilicia, Lycaonia, and Galatia and that some of these are Encratites. He identifies a certain Diositheus (otherwise unknown) as their leader, and he quotes from one of the heretic's eight books (*Apok.* 3.43). Epiphanius locates the Encratites in Pisidia, Phrygia, Asia, Isauria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, Galatia, and Antioch, but does not name their leader (*Haer.* 48); cf. Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 547–9; idem, 'Apocriticus', p. 115, nn. 4–6.

the bait of Jesus' humanity and getting caught on the hook of his divinity; but both probably depend directly on Origen.¹³⁶ Third, Makarios' strongest 'post-Cappadocian' attribute, his 'Trinitarian language' (4.25), is likely to be an interpolation.¹³⁷ All of this evidence thus indicates that Makarios need not have written the *Apokritikos* in the late fourth century.

At the same time, elements of Makarios' text suggest that his venue was really the environs of Antioch in the late third or early fourth century. Our Makarios is unlikely to have been the bishop

¹³⁶ *Apok.* 3.9: Τοῦτο ἀλιεὺς πολλάκις ἔμπειρος ἐποίησεν ἰχθὺν ὀγκώδην λαβεῖν ἐκ τοῦ βυθοῦ βουλόμενος· βραχὺν σκώληκα τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιθεῖς λιχνεία γαστρός ἀπατώμενον ἔλαβεν. Οὕτω τὸν ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ τοῦ βίου κρυπτόμενον ἀρχέκακον καὶ πανοῦργον καὶ δόλιον δράκοντα θέλων ὁ Χριστὸς ἀνασπᾶσαι τοῦ φάνυγγος δίκην σκώληκος τῷ τῆς θεότητος ἀγκίστρῳ περιβάλλει τὸ σῶμα, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ φθεγγόμενος δελεάζει τὸν νοητὸν καὶ πνευματικὸν ὄφιν; Gr. Nyss. *Or. Catech.* 24: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ, καθὼς ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν εἴρηται, φύσιν οὐκ εἶχεν ἡ ἐναντία δύναμις ἀκράτῳ προσμίξει τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ παρουσίᾳ καὶ γυμνὴν ὑποστῆναι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐμφάνειαν, ὡς ἂν εὐληπτον γένοιτο τῷ ἐπιζητοδντι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὸ ἀντάλλαγμα, τῷ προκλύμματι τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν ἐνεκρῦφθη τὸ θεῖον, ἵνα κατὰ τοὺς λίχνους τῶν ἰχθύων τῷ δελεᾶτι τῆς σαρκὸς συγκατασπασθῇ τὸ ἀγκίστρον τῆς θεότητος; R. Winling (Paris, 2000); Or. *Sel. in Ps.* 21.7: Ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ, ἄνθρωπος, κ. τ. ἐ. Ὁ σκώληξ οὐκ ἐκ συνδυασμοῦ γεννᾶται, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ ξύλου, καὶ κατεσθίει ξύλα, χόρετον, καλᾶμην. Τάχα καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ ἐστι καταναλίσκον τὴν μοχθηρὰν καὶ εὐπρηστον ὕλην. Εἰ δέ ξύλα καὶ αἱ λογικαὶ ὀνομάζονται φύσεις: 'Σε' γὰρ, φησὶν, 'ἐξήλωσαν πάντα τὰ ξύλα τοῦ παραδείσου,' ἐν δὲ ταῦταις πέφυκε γεννᾶσθαι Χριστὸς ὡς σοφία, καὶ δικαιοσύνη· καλῶς ὁ Χριστὸς ὀνομάζεται σκώληξ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ξύλοις γενόμενος. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς σκώληξ δέλεαρ γέγονε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ· καὶ εὐρίσκεται μὲν τῷ σοφῷ εὐθὺς, τῷ δὲ ἄφρονι σκολιός. Γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτάνουσι σκώληξ, τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν διελέγχων καὶ κατατρώγων; PG 12; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 550; idem, 'Apocriticus', p. xix.

¹³⁷ *Apok.* 4.25: τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ἐν οὐσίᾳ μιᾷ. Although Jonas Palm, *Textkritisches zum Apokritikos des Makarios Magnes* (Lund, 1961) did not give it special attention, this portion of Makarios' text differs significantly in phrasing, vocabulary, and content from the rest of his work. For example, the average sentence length in the 'post-Cappadocian' section (4.25.111–126) is twenty-three words, whereas in the paragraph above it is twenty-nine and below it is thirty-one—just what would be expected if this section incorporated a gloss, a likely possibility in such a recent manuscript. Moreover, Makarios did not use such language in his discussion of the Eucharist, where it would have supported his argument (Corsaro, 'Dottrina eucharistica', p. 73), and it is odd that he would broach the subject of the Trinity just before he went on to explain the absolute monarchy of God (*Apok.* 4.26). Other glosses have been identified in the *Apokritikos* (e.g., in 3.23); cf. Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 553; idem, *Apocriticus*, pp. xviii, xxviii, 142, n. 1. Corsaro, 'Dottrina eucharistica', pp. 82–86 has given Makarios a late date based on parallels between his eucharistic theology and that of Augustine, but the similarities are overdrawn (e.g., Aug. *Trin.* 3.4.10: *corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus ... illud tantum quod ex fructibus terrae acceptum et prece mystica consecratum rite sumimus ad salutem spiritualem in memoriam pro nobis dominicae passionis* and *Apok.* 3.23: τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ γῆς, ἀπὸ γῆς δ' ὁ ἄρτος ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ οἶνος).

at the Synod of the Oak, since the former was an Origenist,¹³⁸ while the latter condemned Herakleides for these very beliefs.¹³⁹ One would also expect that a bishop writing after 380 would have listed Arians among heretics who 'appropriated to themselves the name of Christianity' (*Apok.* 4.15).¹⁴⁰ Throughout the text, in fact, Makarios' tone is hardly that of a Christian living in a Christian empire. Rather, unlike Prudentius who sneered at his late fourth-century pagan contemporaries, Makarios seems consistently on the defensive against the Hellene and the pagan crowd.¹⁴¹ Moreover, Makarios claims that the Ethiopians are still not Christian (4.13), but bishop Frumentius had initiated missionary activities there in 316 and they had converted by 356.¹⁴² The same chapter also helps locate Makarios geographically, since he locates Ethiopia in the southwest—a true statement only for residents of Oriens and Pontus.¹⁴³ He also refers to places around Antioch and Palmyra, cities with which Hierokles would have been familiar as *vicarius Orientis*.¹⁴⁴ His allusion to Antioch is particularly relevant, since he says that those assigned to govern the city, as Hierokles would have been as *vicarius Orientis*, must often render judgement when Christians take up celibacy.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ Nikephoros seems to have labelled him an 'Origenist' for his rejection of eternal punishment (4.16) and his use of allegory (2.7; 3.13, 23, 25, 38; 4.12, 16); Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 405 incl. n. 5; 'Porphyry's Criticism', *Apocriticus*, pp. xx incl. n. 1; 132, incl. n. 5.

¹³⁹ Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 405, incl. n. 5; for Corsaro, 'Dottrina eucharistica', p. 77, n. 19 he would not have been the first such hypocrite.

¹⁴⁰ He does use the term *χριστομάχος*, employed by Athanasius against Arians, but he does so to criticize monarchism; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', p. 417.

¹⁴¹ E.g., 4.11.pr.: 'After all this boasting and terribleness of speech, the ears of those who stood by were full of fear, and the understanding of our chosen witnesses was contracted (*Μετὰ τοσαύτην κομψείαν καὶ δεινότητα λόγων, πᾶσα μὲν ἔπτηξεν ἡ τῶν παρόντων ἀκρόασις, πᾶσα δὲ συνεστάλη ἡ τῶν λογάδων αἴσθησις*'); Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 415–16. See also 3.pr.1; 4.pr., 16. Waelkens, *L'Economie*, pp. 14–18 thought Makarios was being ironic.

¹⁴² Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 416–17; Believing that Makarios is the bishop at the 403 Synod, Corsaro, 'La reazione pagana', p. 193 finds this reference strange and claims that the author must be 'poco informato'.

¹⁴³ Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 421–2.

¹⁴⁴ *Apok.* 1.6: Edessa's Queen Berenice; 2.7.13–14: the effects of Christianity in Antioch; 4.11.19: eastern cities decaying; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 403, 413–14.

¹⁴⁵ *Apok.* 2.7: "Ἐξεστὶ σοὶ τὰς πόλεις τῆς Ἑώας δρᾶμειν καὶ συλλήβδην Συρίας τὰς ἐπαρχίας, καὶ μαθεῖν ἀκριβέστερον τῶν λεγομένων τὸ πᾶγμα. Αὐτίκα γοὺν οἱ τὴν Ἀντιόχου Βασιλικὴν οἰκεῖν λαχόντες μητροπόλιν μυρίαὶ μερίζονται κατορθωμάτων γνώμαις· οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν γαμήλιον ζυγὸν ἀσμενίζουσιν, οἱ δὲ κοινωνίαν γυναικὸς οὐ λαμβάνουσιν· ἄλλοι τὸν τρυφήλὸν βίον περιέπουσιν, ἕτεροι τὸν ἀχμυρὸν ἐν αἰστιά κάματον; emphasis added.

If Makarios wrote before Arius and before Frumentius' mission to Ethiopia, the *Apokritikos* is more likely to record a genuine debate. Because issues were considered in series and not argued one at a time, Harnack had argued that Makarios had simply used the fiction of a debate to frame his responses to a published set of pagan challenges.¹⁴⁶ But he presented no evidence that such alternation was the customary practice in antiquity. On the contrary, Richard Lim has shown that a series of questions followed by a series of responses was a format followed just as often as back-and-forth exchanges.¹⁴⁷ Makarios also describes the Hellene as seated (4.11.pr.), the posture he would have adopted to read a prepared text from a scroll (as Hierokles would have read from his *Truth-Loving Discourse*). Conversely he represents himself as standing (4.19.pr.), the preferred posture for those speaking extemporaneously.¹⁴⁸ Moreover, as Crafer observed, Makarios does appear to describe a genuine face-to-face encounter over five days much like Augustine's two-day contest with the Manichee Fortunatus: For example, the Hellene asks follow-up questions (3.30.6; 3.15, 30; 4.24) and Makarios challenges the Hellene's answers (3.14) or offers to pursue his explanation farther (3.29).¹⁴⁹ Makarios also refers to the times of the encounter (4.11) and says that he responded to the Hellene with the help of his dedicatee, Theosthenes (4.pr.), which is an odd thing to say unless it were true.¹⁵⁰ The Hellene and Makarios both even comment on the serial nature of the exchange (e.g., 3.36 and 3.8.pr.). This is not to say that the *Apokritikos* is a transcript of the debate. Makarios often describes the Hellene in the third person and forgets about him entirely in the course of a long passage.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁶ Harnack, 'Kritik', p. 11.

¹⁴⁷ Lim, *Public Disputation*, 3; cf. Plutarch's *De sollertia animalium*. The courtroom *narratio* proceeded similarly (Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.82).

¹⁴⁸ H. Gregory Snyder, *Teachers and Texts in the Ancient World. Philosophers, Jews, and Christians* (Routledge, 2000), p. 1. Reading Lactantius (wrongly) to say that Hierokles wrote after the persecution, Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 409–10 assumed that the judge had delivered orally the book he later published and that Makarios, writing before the persecution, had relied solely on memory for the Hellene's arguments. The differences between the Hellene's and Makarios' biblical citations, however, show that the author of the *Apokritikos* probably did not rely on memory; he is more likely to have used a stenographer. See Lim, *Public Disputation*, p. 84 incl. n. 59, 94.

¹⁴⁹ Aug. *Fort.*; Lim, *Public Disputation*, 94; Crafer, 'Macarius Magnes', pp. 409–10.

¹⁵⁰ τετάρτον, ὃ Θεόσθενες, ἀγῶνα τοῦτον ἡμῖν σφοδρῶς κατεπήγαγεν ὁ φιλόλογος, ὡς εἶπεν, ὃν σοῦ συναγωνιζομένου μόλις ἐθαρήσαμεν. Harnack, 'Kritik', p. 10, n. 1 claims that this was a 'courtesy'.

¹⁵¹ Waelkens, *L'Economie*, pp. 14–18.

Nevertheless, it was not at all unusual for a participant in a debate to record at his leisure what he had said—and perhaps wished he had said—to an opponent's challenges. Such texts, like Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, usually amplify the answers of the author.¹⁵² We know that Hierokles had presented his *Truth-Loving Discourse* orally in Nicomedia just before the edicts of persecution were issued in 303; is it not likely that the *Apokritikos* records another such reading—and a Christian response—at about the same time?

Identifying the anonymous Hellene of the *Apokritikos* with Sossianus Hierokles, the *vicarius Orientis* who may well have used his *Truth-Loving Discourse* to debate one of the Christians from his diocese, has important implications for understanding pagan-Christian relations within the context of the Great Persecution. Since both Porphyry's *Against the Christians* and *Philosophy from Oracles* are almost entirely destroyed, the *Apokritikos* thus contains the only anti-Christian treatise from this period. According to Lactantius' testimony in the *Divine Institutes*, Hierokles presented this work at Nicomedia, then the seat of Diocletian's court, to an audience composed of both pagans and Christians (*Inst.* 5.2–3). Since Diocletian, just before issuing the general edicts of persecution, had called a conference of 'civil magistrates and a few military officers' to advise him and some of them called for getting rid of the Christians 'as enemies of the gods and opponents of the state religion' (Lact. *Mort.* 11.6; trans. Creed), Hierokles very likely delivered his work at the emperor's behest. The text of the *Apokritikos* thus not only opens a window onto the attitudes and opinions of the pagan ruling élite on the eve of the Great Persecution, the debate it preserves also illustrates the tactics and techniques that the Tetrarchy advocated in their efforts to restore Christians to the religion of Rome.

ELIZABETH DEPALMA DIGESER

APPENDIX

Hierocl. 6: There are bounds of *nature* which prescribe and circumscribe the existence of the universe in respect of its beginnings and of its continuance and of its end, being limits and rules imposed on everything. By these this entire mechanism

¹⁵² Lim, *Public Disputation*, p. 7 incl. n. 22.

and edifice of the whole universe is constantly being brought to perfection; and they are arranged by unbreakable *laws* and indissoluble bonds, and they guard and observe the all-wise will of a Providence which dispenses and disposes all things. Now no one can change or alter the place and order of anything that has been once arranged; and if anyone is so venturesome as to wish to transcend his limits, he is restrained from transgressing divine law by the rule and *decree of nature*. So it is that the fish that *lives in the waters* is unable in defiance of *nature* to change on to *dry land* and live there; and on the other hand the creature bred on *dry land* will not plunge into the *waters*, and embrace there any permanent repose or abode; nor by any huge leap can any tenant of earth raise himself aloft into the *air*, from a desire to soar about with the eagle; and in turn, although of course the latter can alight upon the earth, by depressing and lowering their faculty of *flight*, and by relaxing the working of their wings, and renouncing the privilege of *nature*,—for this too is determined by the divine *laws*, namely that beings able to soar aloft are able to descend from on high,—yet the converse is not possible, so that the lowly habitant of earth should ever raise himself into the welkin. In this way then the mortal race of man, while provided with soul and *body*, is yet circumscribed by divine bounds. Consequently, he can never traverse the *air* with his *body*, however much he scorns to linger upon the paths of earth, without instantly paying the penalty of his folly; nor by spiritual exaltation can he in his thinking attain to the unattainable, without falling back into the disease of melancholy.¹⁵³

Apok. 4.2: This boast is a mighty piece of quackery, that living things, pressed down by the burden of *physical* [i.e., *bodily*] bulk,

¹⁵³ ὅροι φύσεως ἀρχὰς καὶ μέσα καὶ τέλη τῆς τῶν ὅλων οὐσίας περιειληφότες, μέτρα καὶ θεσμοὶ ἅπασιν, δι' ὧν τότε τὸ πᾶν μηχανήμα τε καὶ ἀρχιτεκτόνημα τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τελεσιουργεῖται, διατέθινται νόμοις ἀλύτοις καὶ δεσμοῖς ἀρρήκτοις, τῆς τὰ πάντα οἰκονομοῦσης προνοίας τὸ πάνσοφον βούλημα διαφυλάττοντες. οὐκ οὐκ κινήσειε τι καὶ μεταθεῖη τις ἂν τῆς τάξεως τῶν ἅπαξ διατεθειμένων. κεκράτῃται δ' οὐδὲν θεσμῷ φύσεως τὸν θεῖον υπεραναβαίνειν νόμον πᾶς, ὅτῳ τις θρασύτερος τῶν ἐπέκεινα ἐπιβαίνειν ἐνεστι πόθος. οὐτ' οὐδὲν παρὰ φύσιν ὁ ἐνδρος ἐπὶ τὴν χέρσον μεταβὰς βιώωνι δυνήσεται ἰχθύς, οὔτε τὸ ἐν χέρσῳ τραπὲν τοῖς ὕδασι ἐγκαταδύσεται, τὴν ἐκέεισε διηρεκὴ μόνῃν ἀσπαζόμενον, οὔτε μέγα πηδήσας μετέωρός τις τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀρθῇσεται πρὸς ἀέρα, συμπεριπολεῖν αἰετοῖς ἐπιθυμῶν· καὶ μὴν ἐκεῖνοί γε κἂν ἐπὶ γῆς ἔλθοιεν βίωσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ κάτω τὴν δύναμιν καὶ τοῦ περὶ χαλάσαντες καὶ ἀνέντες τὴν φύσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο θεοῖς ὤρισται νόμοις, ἐκ τοῦ ὕψους τὸ μετέωρον ὑποκαταβαίνειν δύνασθαι, οὐ μὴν καὶ ἔμπαλιν τὸ ταπεινὸν καὶ γεῶδες ἐπὶ τὸ μετέωρον αἰρῆσθαι. ταύτη δὴ καὶ τὸ θνητὸν ἀνθρώπων γένος, ψυχῆς μετέχον καὶ σώματος, ὅροι περιγέγραπται θεοῖς. οὐτ' οὐδὲν τῷ σώματι δι' αἴρος ἔλθοι ποτέ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς τις καταφρονήσας διατριβῶν, μὴ οὐκ τοῦπιτίμιον αὐτίκα τῆς ἀνοίας παρασχών, οὔτε τὴν ψυχὴν ἀρεθεῖς φρονήματι καθίξεται τῶν ἀνεφίκτων, ἢ μελαγχολίας νοσήματι ἂν περιπέσοι.

should receive the *nature* of *winged* birds, and cross the wide *air* like some sea, using the cloud as a chariot. Even if such a thing is possible, it is monstrous, and apart from all that is suitable. For *nature* which created all things from the beginning appointed places begetting the things which were brought into being, and ordained that each should have its proper sphere, the sea for *water creatures*, the land for those of the *dry ground*, the *air* for *winged* creatures, and the higher atmosphere for heavenly bodies. If one of these were moved from its proper abode, it would disappear on arrival in a strange condition and abode. For instance, if you wanted to take a creature of the *water* and force it to live on the dry land, it is readily destroyed and dies. Again, if you throw a *land animal* of a dry kind into the *water*, it will be drowned. And if you cut off a *bird* from the *air*, it will not endure it, and if you remove a heavenly body from the upper atmosphere, it will not stand it. Neither had the divine and active Word of God done this, nor ever will do it, although He is able to change the lot of the things that come into being. For He does not do and purpose anything according to His own ability, but according to its suitability He preserves things, and keeps the *law* of good order. So, even if He is able to do so, He does not make the earth to be sailed over, nor again does He make the sea to be ploughed or tilled; nor does He use His power in making virtue into wickedness nor wickedness into virtue, nor does He adapt a man to become a *winged* creature, nor does He place the stars below and the earth above.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁴ Πολὺς γὰρ οὗτος τῆς ἀλαζονείας ὁ κόμπος, ζῶα τῷ φόρῳ πεπιλημένα τῶν σωματικῶν ὄγκων φύσιν ἀναλαβεῖν πτερωτῶν ὀρνέων καὶ διαπερᾶν ὥσπερ τι πέλαγος τὸν πολλὸν ἀέρα, δρχήματι νεφέλης ἀποχρησάμενα. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ δυνατὸν, ἀλλὰ τερατῶδες καὶ τῆς ἀκολουθίας ἐστὶν ἀλλότριον. Ἡ γὰρ δημιουργὸς ἄνωθεν φύσιν τόπους ἀρμόζοντας τοῖς γινομένοις συναπεκλήρωσε καὶ κατὰλληλον ἐνομοθέτησεν ἔχειν ἐναύλισμα, ἐνύδροις θάλασσαν, χερσαίοις ἥπειρον, πτηνοῖς ἀέρα, φωστήρεσιν αἰθέρα. Ἐν γούν ἐκ τούτων ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας ἂν μετάρη μονῆς, ἀφανισθήσεται εἰς ξένην μετελθὼν δαίταν καὶ μονήν· οἷον εἰ τὸ ἐνύδρον βουληθῆις λαβεῖν καπὶ τῆς ξηρᾶς διάγειν βίαν, φθίρεται ἄαν ἐξαπολλύμενον· εἰ δὲ χερσαῖον αὐθις καὶ ἀνχηρόν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ βάλλῃς, ἀποπνιγθήσεται· κἂν τοῦ ἀέρος χωρίσῃς πτηνὸν, οὐχ ὑπομενεῖ· κἂν ἀτέρειον ἐξ αἰθέρος σῶμα μεταβιβάσῃς, οὐχ ὑποστήσεται. Ἄλλ' οὐδ' ὁ θεὸς καὶ δραστήριος τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος τοῦτ' ἐποίησεν ἢ πράξει ποτέ, καίπερ δυνάμενος τῶν γινομένων τὰς μοίρας ἀλλάττειν· οὐ γὰρ καθ' ὃ δύναται πράττει τι καὶ θέλει, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὃ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν σώζει τὰ πράγματα, τὸν τῆς εὐταξίας φυλάττει νόμον. Οὐδὲ γούν τὴν γῆν, εἴ γε καὶ δυναται, ναυτίλλεσθαι ποιεῖ, οὐδ' ἀροῦσθαι πάλιν καὶ γεωργεῖσθαι ποιεῖ τὴν θάλασσαν, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν καθ' ὃ δύναται ποιεῖ κακίαν οὐδὲ τὴν κακίαν αὐθις ἀρετὴν, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀνθρώπον παρασκευάζει πτηνὸν γενέσθαι, οὐδὲ τὰ ἄσπρα κάτω καὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνω.