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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

glorious declaration of the inspired patriarch blend its beams with the kindred declaration of the inspired Apostle: "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose;"[1] and the two together, shine upon this fallen world like the sun in his strength.

ARTICLE III.

LUCIAN AND CHRISTIANITY.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CHURCH HISTORY OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

By Adolf Planck, Dean of Heidenheim in Würtemberg. Translated by Rev. Alvah Hovey, M. A., Teacher of Hebrew in Newton Theological Seminary.

THE rhetorician and sophist Lucian, of Samosata, was born about 120 A. D., flourished in the age of the Antonines, so important for the history of culture and the church, and continued his labors as an author even into the first years of the third century. Among his numerous writings there are particular works which, because of the references to Christianity and the Holy Scriptures found in them, have attracted the attention of theologians, especially during the last century. Of no one is this true in a higher degree than of the treatise which describes the self-burning of the cynic Peregrinus Proteus, at Olympia. For Lucian makes him live in close union with the Christians for a considerable time, and takes occasion from this to describe the life and practices of the Christian churches of that period. The manner in which he speaks of Peregrinus, especially of his strange end, has from the first called forth very diverse opinions from critics. Some have regarded his narrative as throughout historical, others have found in it a caricature and satire upon Christian martyrs. A safe decision on this point naturally depends upon a more careful examination of Lucian's peculiarities as a writer, and especially upon a stricter scrutiny of those treatises which *claim to be historical.* Besides the *Peregrinus Proteus*, there are properly only

[1] Rom. 8: 28.

two of these, namely, the description of the philosopher *Demonax*, and that of the false prophet *Alexander of Abonoteichos;* to which we may perhaps add the *Nigrinus*. But in these also, the ideal or satirical is intermingled with the historical germ in so obscure a way, that, while other accounts of the persons described are wanting, the question, what is true, and what is invented, cannot be so easily answered. The remaining purely satirical writings offer us but an uncertain rule for judging those supposed to be historical.

Lucian has given us proofs of his versatile talents, of his rich and keenly observant spirit, in the most different territories of knowledge as well as of life. As his occupation and his inclinations were variable, so also his several writings exhibit different characteristics. He himself tells us (*Bis Accusatus*, 27. 31), that in his youth he learned rhetoric in Ionia and followed the calling of a rhetorician and sophist, particularly in Gaul (Lyons and Toulouse), with great applause and large profits, until his fortieth year.

From this period, there yet remain some twenty treatises upon rhetorical, grammatical and judicial topics, master-pieces in aesthetic treatment, or in the legal support of a position freely chosen by himself. To present a more particular estimate of these writings does not belong to our present task any more than a perfect classification of Lucian's works, which has never yet been made.

After Lucian had attained to manhood, he became weary of the noise of courts of justice, and, as rhetoric was constantly losing more and more her ancient dignity, he longed for rest, in order to rove in the gardens of the Academy and the Lyceum (*Hermotimus*, 2. 13. 24. *Piscator*, 25. 29). He passed, as we see especially from his *Demonax* (c. 11), a considerable number of years in his beloved Athens, the praise of which he sung with enthusiasm, and in opposition to debased Rome, in his *Nigrinus*. Into this period fall, first, those writings which contain his philosophical labors and views in general, and also a satirical criticism of the schools of ancient and modern time. To these belong the *Nigrinus*, *Cynicus*, *Demonax*, *Hermotimus*, *Vitarum Auctio*, and *Piscator*. Yet Lucian, with a nature critical, sceptical, and more inclined to life than knowledge, found no permanent satisfaction in the study of philosophy. He applied himself, of course on a fundamentally Epicurean view of life, more and more to satire. Yet we think it possible that, in the very evening of life, when we find him occupying an important official post with the governor in Egypt, he returned to philosophy (*Pro Mercede Conduct.* 11, 12). The many satirical writings of this long

period, to which we may also reckon the dialogues *Lucius s. Asinus* and the *Veras Historias*, written it is probable merely for his own amusement, lash, first, the unworthy practices, the ignorance and obscurity of the rhetoricians of his time (*Rhetorum praeceptor*), and then the coarseness and arrogance of the philosophers, especially of the cynics (*Convivium, Eunuchus, Fugitivi*); others relate more to special classes of men (as the writing *De Mercede Conductis* describes the sad lot of the learned who hire themselves out, particularly in Rome, to eminent families), or to the follies of the human heart (*Adversus Indoctum* or the bibliomaniac, *Gallus, De Luctu, Timon, Navigium*); again, others are of a protective character, offensive and defensive writings, which attempt to set in their proper light his own person and business as an author (*Prometheus, Bis Accusatus, Apophras, Somnium Lucians*). The most important for our object are the satires upon the religious faith and superstition, upon the ancient popular belief, as well as upon that of the educated of his day which had lately arisen from religious syneretism and oriental philosophy. To this number belong *Deorum Concilium, Jupiter Tragoedus* and *Confutatus, De Sacrificiis*. The belief in demons and magic, which prevailed particularly among the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophers, is ridiculed in the *Philopseudes*.

The satires naturally give pictures of the age and people rather than historical descriptions of particular individuals. But if in the number of these works such also are found as profess to be purely historical, we shall be inclined, from the character of Lucian's other writings, to ascribe, by conjecture, to these a more general scope. This is true, in my opinion, not only of *Demonax* and *Negrinus*, but very specially of *Alexander*. *Demonax* became, under the hand of Lucian, the ideal of a philosopher after his own heart; just as the *Nigrinus* is a youthful labor of Lucian from that period when the noble and grand, in Plato's view of the world, captivated him for a moment. The writing directed to Celsus, on Alexander's false oracle at Aboniteichos, is certainly nothing but a satire on oracles and the superstition in the highest and lowest classes of the Roman people. Although Lucian relates everything as an ear and eye-witness to his friend Celsus, yet the exaggerations are so great and palpable, that the satire and invented portion outweighs the undeniable historical germ. A particular justification of this view would here take us too far from the main object. But that the same judgment must also be pronounced upon his *Peregrinus Proteus*, in the historical caricature of whose life and death Lucian intends to castigate the philoso-

phical as well as religious fanaticism of his times, and beyond dispute the Christian martyrs, we hope will be manifest to the reader of this examination.

We will draw from this writing what is related of Peregrinus as a cynic; we will then collect his judgment respecting the Christians, and conclude with the question, whether Lucian was acquainted with the sacred writings of the Christians, and has mocked at them in particular treatises.

1. *Peregrinus Proteus as a cynic. His death by fire, without doubt, a parody upon that of Christian martyrs.*

The cynic philosopher Peregrinus, called also by himself, Proteus, was born, it is said, in Parium on the Hellespont (14). The strange spectacle of his suicide by fire, Lucian describes to his friend Cronius, as an eye-witness, in the tone of a letter relating simple facts. From an unbounded love of fame, this man had delayed his tragico-comic end until the greatest popular assembly of Greece was collected at the Olympic games. Having notified the public beforehand of this scene, at earlier festival assemblies, he actually carried out the monstrous plan, when Lucian visited for the fourth time the Olympic games (35). Instead of giving us an account confined to the course of the event itself, Lucian lets us hear the speeches delivered in Olympia before the decisive act, from which we must derive the particulars of Peregrinus's life and conduct. First (8—7), a certain Theagenes, the absurd admirer of Peregrinus, delivers a pompous, bombastic eulogy upon him, in which he repels the charge made against him of being ambitious of fame, and justifies his plan by comparing it with the death of Hercules, Empedocles and others. He goes back to his earlier life, during which Peregrinus realized the ideal of a cynic, in giving, from a spirit of magnanimous self-denial, to his native city five thousand talents; in Syria he was imprisoned, in Rome persecuted; in a word, he could not be compared with Socrates, nor even with the sun, but only with Jupiter himself.

To this absurd eulogy, Lucian opposes a speech of invective, which another, whose name he professes no longer to know (31), delivered, and which dilates on the relations of Peregrinus through life, briefly noticed by Theagenes (7—30). The speaker claims to have observed Peregrinus from his youth onward, in part himself, and in part to have received his accounts from fellow-townsmen of the same; and, according to his statements, the life of Peregrinus was full of the most shameful and vulgar crimes: In

Armenia, he was caught in adultery, and suffered therefor the known punishment; at another time he must purchase his freedom on account of Sodomy; then he strangled his aged father in order to inherit his estate. But, since this crime became known, he journeyed from land to land, and came also to Palestine, rose among the *Christians* from dignity to dignity, and became rich by taking advantage of their kindness and simplicity. Yet the Christians excluded him from their number on account of disobedience to their laws. Earlier, he had been imprisoned for his faith, but set at liberty without any punishment, by the philosophically educated proconsul of Syria, who perceived his love of fame and desire for martyrdom. When he returned to Parium, he bequeathed his property, which, however, amounted to only fifteen talents, to his native city, in order to escape prosecution for his father's death; but he afterwards attempted, though in vain, to regain his patrimony. Thereupon he journeyed to the cynic Agathobul, in Egypt, practised publicly in the most vulgar procession the lowest things, as ἀδιάφορα, and also suffered himself to be scourged. In Italy, he slandered every man, and even the Emperor, whose mildness to him was well known, but the city prefect had forbidden him to reside there, because Rome could very well spare such a philosopher; yet Peregrinus had now been produced as a model of candor, and compared to a Musonius, Dion and Epictetus. In like manner Peregrinus, when he came to Elis, defamed every one, and stirred up the Greeks to rebellion against Rome. He made himself everywhere so contemptible, that four years later he found no longer any sympathy. Hence, from an insane love of fame, he had fallen upon the thought of burning himself to death.

After this speech, in the midst of great excitement, was brought to an end, Theagenes came forward a second time to abuse the preceding speaker. The particulars, Lucian says, he did not hear, because he preferred to witness the contests of the Athletae. Yet soon after he heard Peregrinus himself, as he delivered his own eulogy, and boasted of the labors which he had endured in behalf of philosophy, and praised his end as an example of genuine contempt of death.

Then, after these preparations, Peregrinus proceeded, at a time when most of the guests had already left Elis (35), to the fulfilment. He erected, at Harpina, twenty stadia from Olympia, a funeral pile, kindled the same about midnight under the moonlight, and cast himself, surrounded by his scholars and admirers, into the fire, with the cry: "Ye paternal and maternal guardian spirits, receive me in

friendship." When this spectacle was over, Lucian went home. There many persons met him who had expected the scene would occur at sunrise. To these Lucian related what had taken place, and for the particularly simple and superstitious, he added many things from the treasure of his own evil heart, e. g. that an earthquake followed, that a hawk flew up from the funeral pile and cried with a human voice: The earth leave I; to Olympus haste I. Not long after this, a respectable looking man told him again of just these things, protesting that he saw the hawk, and adding, that he had seen Peregrinus, clad in white, going up and down in the hall. It appears probable to Lucian, that a multitude of superstitious admirers will soon consecrate to Peregrinus statues and other symbols of veneration. Cronius ought to laugh at such people, and be assured that Peregrinus was a man destitute of worth and a regard for truth, and that he acted and spoke thus merely from love of fame. He is, therefore, neither to be admired nor blamed, but only to be derided.

This, in brief, is the main part of Lucian's account. That this account professes to be historical, is obvious to every reader of it. Lucian *relates* what he has seen with his own eyes, heard with his own ears; the event took place in Olympia, before many thousand witnesses, so that, as Wieland, the most eloquent defender of the perfectly historical character of the narrative (comp. in his Traslation, the Introduction and Essay added to this part, Vol. III. 93 seq.) supposes, Lucian must have been punished for his lies by the many who resorted to the festival, if he had invented the story. Moreover, he would not have deceived his friend Cronius with falsehoods, etc. But although it is not to be overlooked that Lucian writes expressly to this friend (39) and relates to him the naked facts (*ψίλα*), while he merely for the superstitious served up the history with the hawk, etc. (*ἐρραγῴδουν παρ' ἐμαυτοῦ*); yet every one sees how weak are Wieland's arguments in themselves, before we have formed a judgment upon the general tenor of the composition. It is not in itself absurd to suppose that the whole account is a fictitious romance, like many fictions of modern literature. For what does Wieland or any other man know of Cronius? And if no such event took place (which could easily be ascertained at that time by every one), who would have seen in Lucian's account a lie, and not rather an amusing fiction or romance? Yet Peregrinus is undoubtedly a historical person, as we know from other narratives, and a member of the sect of cynics, so much hated by Lucian. Something real, therefore, lies at the basis of this strange writing. Yet what the real and actual

was, and in particular, whether the death by fire of the strange man is affirmed by writers independent of Lucian, on these points we will hear the writers of the second century itself.

Aulus Gellius, who wrote only a very short time before Lucian (perhaps 150—165), has two passages on our Peregrinus. We now have the first only in the *Epitome* of the eighth book of the *Noctes Atticae*. The third chapter of this contains anecdotes respecting the severity with which Peregrinus reproved a young nobleman who was a sluggard. The second passage (XII. 11) is longer, and important for judging Lucian. Aulus Gellius relates that he became acquainted in Athens with a philosopher, named Peregrinus, *cui postea cognomentum Proteus factum est* (*vidimus*), *virum gravem atque constantem*. In frequent visits he had heard from his mouth many beautiful and useful things (*multa*, HERCLE, *dicere eum utiliter et honeste audivimus*). Then follow single specimens in the tone of the Socratic Philosophy; as, The wise man would not sin, although he knew it might remain concealed from gods and men; for not through fear of disgrace and punishment, but from love and duty must we do good and avoid evil.

How do such precepts accord with Lucian's description? If the latter is right, we could perhaps assume with Neander (History of the Christian Religion and Church, I. 269, second edition, 1842), that Aulus Gellius suffered himself to be deceived by a hypocritical appearance of moral earnestness and zeal. Lucian himself says (chap. 3. *τὰ συνήθη ταῦτα, τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐκ τριόδου*), that the cynics in his neighborhood, also in Olympia, prated the common places of virtue. But Aulus Gellius came often to Peregrinus (*frequenter ventitaremus*), and if his earlier life had been so full of crimes, as Lucian says, Aulus Gellius must also certainly have known it. Since the reproof of the young nobleman has not been preserved, we do not find the cynical trait, made so prominent by Lucian, namely, that Peregrinus is always abusive and quarrelsome, properly confirmed. Gellius says nothing of the death by fire, as he doubtless wrote before the event in Olympia, which is assigned pretty unanimously to the two hundred and thirty-sixth Olympiad, that is, to the year 165 A. D. The *Postea Proteus* refers not to the Proteus-like change in fire; for Lucian also asserts that Peregrinus had before been pleased to apply this nickname to himself, though we know not for what reason (1). On the other hand, in the wonder which lies in the *Hercle* (*multa*, HERCLE, *dicere eum utiliter et honeste audivimus*), something might be contained which agrees with the Peregrinus of

Lucian, namely this, that one could not exactly have expected such words from a Peregrinus. In the remaining particulars, this account of Aulus Gellius, who was *well acquainted* with Peregrinus, and who wrote *independently* of Lucian, does *not* agree with that of the latter.

Philostratus, as an additional witness, brings forward that cynical characteristic of Peregrinus — his slanderous disposition. His testimony might appear weighty, because, as a decided enemy of Lucian's way of thinking, he notices, in his *Vitae Sophistarum*, neither him nor his *Nigrinus* and *Demonax* with a single word. According to Lucian (chap. 19), Peregrinus on his arrival in Elis, slandered, together with others, especially a man eminent in rank and culture, who besides other meritorious deeds, built an aqueduct leading to Olympia, thus relieving a great want experienced by visitors to that place. Although Peregrinus partook of the refreshment thereby afforded, he nevertheless reproached that man with rendering the Greeks effeminate by his gift. Four years afterwards, the fickle Peregrinus delivered a eulogy on this same water-giver. According to Philostratus, that man was Herod Atticus, and in another passage, he celebrates his patience (chap. 13) in contrast with the reproaches of Peregrinus. He is also called *τὸν κύνα Πρωτέα*, and described as *οὕτω θαῤῥαλέως φιλοσοφοῦντος, ὡς καὶ ἐς πῦρ ἑαυτὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ῥῖψαι.* Philostratus wrote about forty years after Lucian; it is, therefore, conceivable that he had read the writings of the latter, though he never names him, and drew the story of the death of Peregrinus by fire from his account.

Moreover, it cannot be certainly ascertained, whether the following testimonies respecting the life and end of Peregrinus are to be traced back to Lucian, or referred to tradition. In Lucian's countryman *Tatian*, who died about the year 174, we find nothing of the death by fire, but some unimportant characteristics of the coat and pocket of Peregrinus. Tatian ridicules the philosopher's pretended freedom from wants, which yet needed, according to the example of Proteus (*κατὰ τὸν Πρωτέα*), for their knapsack (*πήρα*) the tanner, for their cloak (*ἱματίον*) the weaver, for their staff (*ξύλον*) the carpenter, and for their daintiness the cook. The last characteristic, *γαστριμαργία*, is not particularly noticed by Lucian, yet he makes his hero (chap. 44) only nine days before his death *πλεῖον τοῦ ἱκανοῦ φαγεῖν*, and therefore fall into a fever. Tatian's *γαστριμαργία* appears to indicate a more accurate knowledge of Lucian's works. The latter often speaks of the *πήρα* of Peregrinus, and, in particular, he says that Peregrinus, before ascending the funeral pile, laid aside

his *πήρα*, his *τριβώνιον* (mantle) *καὶ τὸ Ἡράκλειον ἐκεῖνο ῥόπαλον*. Lucian mentions this rod in another place also (*Adv. Indoctum*, 14). Yet knapsack, cloak and beard were general well-known characteristics of the cynics, and it is surprising that Tatian mentions precisely Peregrinus, unless this man, through Lucian's description or general report, offered a very obvious and striking example. The passage in the *Legatio pro Christianis* of Athenagoras, composed about the year 177, offers us something more. This writer knows a statue which the Parians erected to Peregrinus, and which spontaneously utters prophetic oracles (*λέγεται χρηματίζειν*); and besides *ὁ τοῦ Πρωτέως*, we read: *τοῦτον δ' οὐκ ἀγνοεῖτε, ῥίψαντα ἑαυτὸν ἐς τὸ πῦρ περὶ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν*. This statue of the Parians is remarkable, since Lucian also (chap. 27) lets Proteus hope to obtain altars and golden statues (*βωμῶν ἐπιδυμῶν καὶ χρυσοῦς ἀναστήσεσθαι ἐλπίζων*). If, then, we are unwilling to assume that Athenagoras speaks of this statue from a misunderstanding of the above passage in Lucian (who also [chap. 28] derisively conjectures of the superstitious admirers of Peregrinus, *ὅτι χρηστήριον καὶ ἄδυτον ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ μηχανήσονται*); we can, on the other hand, from the fact of the monumental statue conclude, that Peregrinus was not the base and vulgar man which Lucian makes him to have been. This certainly may be inferred, unless the monument was erected in consequence of the bequest of his property to his native city, which is improbable, if Peregrinus sought to regain the sum thus given (16). Similar to this is the mention of Peregrinus in Tertullian, who, after speaking of several who had immolated themselves (Scaevola, Empedocles, etc.), proceeds: *et Peregrinus qui non olim rogo se immisit*. The citation in Ammianus Marcellinus, who makes mention of a Simonides, *qui Peregrinum imitatus Proteu cognomine, qui Olympiae ascenso rogo, quem ipse construxit flammis absumptus est*, can naturally prove nothing, since Ammianus wrote about the year 370. On the other hand, there may be a reference in Pausanias, who wrote at the same time with Lucian, to the spectacle just become known, which Peregrinus had exhibited or was about to furnish. Pausanias names a superannuated athlete Timanthes, who *πῦρ ἀναιθάσας ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ζῶντα ἐς τὴν πυράν*, and adds the remark: *ὁπόσα δὲ ἤδη τοιαῦτα ἐγένετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἢ καὶ ὕστερόν ποτε ἔσται, μανία μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνδρία νομίζοιτο κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην*. While such events are rare, so that Pausanias can hardly allude to later cases which may perchance occur, it is possible he had in mind the fire-death announced several times by Peregrinus and yet always again postponed. Yet the testimony of Pausanias can prove

nothing, because he does not name Peregrinus. Tertullian was too remote from the scene; Tatian appears to have drawn from Lucian, and there remains at most but Athenagoras as a witness, who offers some characteristics not directly expressed by Lucian. The assumption, that these were also derived from Lucian, that readers of Lucian communicated the story of the prophesying statue to Athenagoras, is surely not improbable. At all events, we have no single account of Peregrinus's death by fire, which can be shown to be independent of Lucian. Yet, if we assume that Athenagoras gives his narrative independent of Lucian, the fact, certainly very strange, remains established, that a cynic Peregrinus Proteus cast himself in Olympia into the flames. But all accounts leave us in darkness as to the motive for this strange act. Yet the thing itself argues, that only an inconceivable love of fame, a wild fanaticism, could lead to so desperate a step. But Wieland has again decided too hastily; whoever died thus, must have lived thus. For Peregrinus might have been always a perfectly honorable cynic, and yet have carried so far the dogma of indifference to the blessings of life and life itself, as to have stood not a whit behind the wise men of India in his contempt of life. Antiquity affords many examples of a similar self-sacrifice besides that of Timanthes in Pausanias. The most notorious case, quoted by Lucian himself (25), and known to Strabo and Plutarch from Onesicritus, that of the Indian Calamus, who accompanied the army of Alexander the Great, had certainly a somewhat different motive. According to Arrian, it seems to have been a species of solemn sacrificial rite; and if Aelian has correctly apprehended the mind of the Indian philosopher, the latter wished, according to the Pythagorean-Platonic doctrine, to free himself from the fetters of the body. A similar motive appears also to have influenced the Indian Zarmanochegas, i. e. *the holy*, in the time of Augustus, to a like act. Tatian (*Adv. Graecos*, 19) names one Anaxarchus, who died *διὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην δοξομανίαν*. But how strange does this act appear in Lucian's Peregrinus, who riots away his whole life in the lowest pleasures, and has so childish a fear of death, that he hopes, up to the last moment, the spectators will prevent the execution of his plan! According to the last chapters, Proteus cried like a woman, in a storm which arose during a voyage by sea, which Lucian professes to have made with him (43). Nine days previous to his death, he is made to fall sick of a fever, in consequence of a luxurious meal, to be perfectly unruly in it, and to call for cold water. The physician, Alexander, hearing of his plan, remarks to him, that death comes of itself, and he had no

need to anticipate it. But Peregrinus, it is said, replied, that death by sickness was too common a one for him. So also Peregrinus is said to have anointed his eyes just before his end in order to diminish his pain, which seems to Lucian like a criminal's binding up his finger before ascending the gallows. These traits appear improbable in connection with the death by fire. Had Peregrinus, it may be affirmed, been so low a man, and so indifferent about decency and truthfulness; had he felt so childish a fear of death, he would certainly have made nothing of postponing again and forever his oft-announced self-burning. But if he actually performed it, then he was not so childish as Lucian represents him. The truth is rather this, that Lucian has heaped upon a cynic, who specially provoked him, everything disgraceful which he knew how to repeat of other members of this impure society; for he, at all events, takes this course in his aggressive writings, *Apophras* and *Adversus Indoctum*, and certainly, also, in his *Alexander*.

It is ever to be remembered, that Lucian uses far milder expressions in the remaining passages of his works where he speaks of Peregrinus. The piece written a short time after, and called *Fugitivi*, or run-away slaves, a satire on the ignoble origin of most cynics of his time, begins at once with the scene at Olympia. Zeus says to Apollo, respecting the death of Peregrinus: I would he had not done it. And to the question of Apollo: Was he then so brave a man (χρηστός) as not to deserve the death by fire? Zeus replies: καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἴσως — *perhaps* also that! Jupiter, indeed, does not wish to apologize for the event, but rather complains of the horrible odor of the roasting flesh. But is it not very surprising, this milder judgment thus barely intimated in passing; and may not one infer from it, that Lucian afterwards heard other and better things of Peregrinus, and wished to improve his earlier partial and unjust representation in this way? The self-burning is repeated in this writing (62. 7), but there is left behind, from the visit in Olympia, only the coarseness of the cynics, on account of which, he professes the philosophy. Hence, we conjecture, that Peregrinus, in the piece named from him, must serve only as a foil for personal invectives against cynics of that day, who were bitterly disliked by Lucian. That καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἴσως stands, at all events, in direct opposition to the description in the Peregrinus, according to which this man conducts through his whole life as one mad and possessed (38), so that he deserved the death by fire (τἆλλα ἐμπλήκτως καὶ ἀποστομώτως βεβιωκότι καὶ οὐκ ἀναξίως τοῦ πυρός).

But if we assume, what will become much more probable on a stricter scrutiny of the testimonials now adduced, namely, that Lucian is *the first and only narrator of the death by fire;* that thus all the remaining writers took the story of Peregrinus's death from Lucian, and, indeed, without perceiving the tendency of it, then the whole assumes an entirely new aspect. The death by fire, so highly improbable and incredible in itself, and especially with Lucian's description of the character of Peregrinus, would then be perhaps a *mere fiction*, and, as will appear quite likely from the following, a fiction sprung from the *tendency to make the Christian martyrs an object of satire.* Although this is our firm opinion, yet, not to appear hypercritical, we will permit the other, which regards the death of Peregrinus by fire as a fact, to stand beside it at present, as equally authorized; yet Lucian's whole description abounds in traits which point to a satirical fiction, and make the historical fact improbable. To these traits we reckon first the long speeches. Lucian does not, indeed, profess to repeat these verbally, but only according to their general contents (3. 7). But the first speech of Theagenes is so perfectly absurd, and the design to make the cynics ridiculous in their pride of sect and rudeness, is so obvious, that not only extravagance, but malicious invention, on Lucian's part, are certain. Is it not a palpable fiction, that this Theagenes, after delivering with much sweat and many tears his lamentable speech, pulls his hair in agony, but, as Lucian pretends to have seen, is very careful at the same time not to pull so hard as to hurt himself? The second speech is manifestly Lucian's own work. For why should he have forgotten the name of the orator, while he remembers that of Theagenes? (*οὐ γὰρ οἶδα, ὅστις ὁ βέλτιστος ἐκεῖνος ἐκαλεῖτο*, 31. 7). It makes known, also, Lucian's opinion of the matter. We are not, it is true, able to give with certainty the reason for his not mentioning himself. Perhaps it was because he did not wish to put himself forward, or because he was conscious of having exaggerated many things in the speech, or in general, because he could use more freedom in his representation under the *firman* of an unknown orator. It is enough that the speech is too long for Lucian to have retained in his memory; and, what is more important, it digresses in so surprising a manner from its principal subject, the description of Peregrinus, to a description of the Christians, to reflections on the hurtfulness of such a contempt of death for robbers and murderers, etc., that we cannot think of a mere repetition of something heard. It is plain that Lucian himself composed the oracles of the Sybil on Peregrinus here quoted (chap. 29), in six

hexameters, and those of Bakis in nine hexameters, since he could not have retained them on a first hearing, just as he composed the many verses from the false oracle of Alexander of Aboniteichos. That Peregrinus is represented as so fickle in temper, at one time greatly afraid of death, at another full of courage, the very ideal of firmness, who finishes a deserving work for mankind by his death, and desires to place a golden crown upon a golden life (23. 33), all this could certainly have been grounded in the strange and foolish nature of the man himself. Yet there is a want of harmony. Still more improbable are the particulars which immediately precede the self-burning. Lucian stood firm as the only mocker among the admiring crowd, and he, it is represented (37), dared to utter his jibes in the face of the cynics, so well armed with staves, on the bad odor of the burning flesh, and, when they made signs of treating him with blows, to threaten that he would cast them also into the fire! They were silenced by so impotent a threat, and made peace with him! One can very well play such a part in his study and on paper, but not in actual life. Just as great an exaggeration appears, when Lucian at an earlier meeting makes the admirers and despisers of Peregrinus fall to fighting at once (32), and when he lets every one in Parium be instantly stoned who mentions the patricide of Peregrinus (15). Moreover, there is certainly exaggeration, when Peregrinus is made to carry his folly so far, that he desires to be called Phoenix, because this bird also burns itself, and that he promises to become a guardian-spirit of the night (27).

Yet such traits are regarded, perhaps, as merely innocent exaggerations, which belonged to the decoration of the story, without vitiating its historical character. But when so many single traits unite, we must gradually arrive at the conviction, that still other things in the portrait may be satirical invention rather than historical truth. This opinion appears fully established, when we pass to the strangest and most enigmatical feature of this narrative, the *connection of Peregrinus with the Christians.* We mention here only that which belongs to the history of his life, and defer a critical examination of particulars to the second section.

Immediately after he strangles his father, the fugitive Peregrinus meets with the Christians. Lucian, without ascribing to him, as he does to Alexander, distinguished powers of mind, makes him rise from step to step among the Christians, a majority of whom are held to be simple people, become bishop, as well as write and explain books. And, at his imprisonment, Asia Minor falls into commotion,

and Christians vie with each other in sympathy and actual assistance. Now, if we recollect the high claims made upon bishops by Clemens Romanus and Ignatius (see in the second section), is it conceivable that the Christians of *that time* made thus a vagabond cynic their bishop? Is it conceivable that the prefect of Syria allowed a man of such importance, and who promoted Christianity itself by writings, thus to escape from prison, not thinking him even worthy of punishment, and this at a time, when we see Polycarp, and with him so many others, executed for this very faith, and when we learn that a raging persecution broke out against the Christians in Gaul? We know, to be sure, that many a milder or severer measure towards the Christians proceeded from the personal character of the prefects; but so important a head of the party could not have remained unpunished under the Antonines. Further: why are the church writers silent in respect to this highly renowned man? Because he was excluded on account of using the *εἰδωλόθυτα*? If this were a reason for the exclusion (see below), yet was it none for relating nothing of the fallen.

Also in the *Adversus Indoctum*, Peregrinus is mentioned without any hostility (chap. 14). The ignorant antiquarian there ridiculed is said to have paid a talent for the stick which Peregrinus threw away before his death by fire, and to show the same now, as the inhabitants of Tegea exhibit the skin of the Calydonian boar. A milder and dispassionate judgment is also pronounced upon Peregrinus in the *Demonax*. According to chap. 21, Peregrinus reproved Demonax for his inclination to jokes and fun with the words: *οὐ κυνᾷς*, you are no true cynic. To this Demonax replied: *καὶ σύ, Περεγρῖνε, οὐκ ἀνθρωπίζεις*, you do not play well the part of a man. Perhaps this answer contains merely the thought, that Peregrinus was too stern and earnest a man, or was aiming at singularity. As an assertion of vulgarity and viciousness in Peregrinus, the reply of Demonax would be, to say the least, rather insipid. This latter passage comes nearest the description of Aulus Gellius; and we mention it therefore beforehand as probable, that Lucian transferred to Peregrinus, whom he may have known personally, traits which did not belong to this man alone or particularly, but to the cynics generally, a class of men hated by him. The *Martyrium Polycarpi* (4) does not shun to speak of that apostate Quintus from Phrygia, who at first was eager for martyrdom. Justin (*Apol.* 1. 7) confesses, without hesitation, that there are false nominal Christians, and that some have already been caught in crime. He also knows that such cases

prove nothing against the excellence of the thing itself. To be sure, these reasons are not in themselves alone decisive; but that which is adduced respecting the Christianity of Peregrinus looks as if Lucian had transferred many things which he did not himself know, but which were currently reported of other much-named Christians, to his hero, who may possibly for some time have been a Christian, yet without playing so important a part among his brethren. While, at the same time, Lucian in this writing ridicules the superstitious admirers of Peregrinus, but superstition in his opinion was specially prevalent *among the Christians*, it seems possible, that, although Lucian does not bring forward the Christians among the admirers of Peregrinus, nor let him die as a Christian but as a cynic, yet many things are related of his end which were meant to contain also a satire upon the Christians. Among these we reckon the above-mentioned story of the hawk, the resurrection of Peregrinus, and his walking in a white robe. When Lucian had related such things to the weak heads, then, says he, they were filled with wonder, and began to worship, seized with a holy fear (39. *ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἐτεθήπεσαν καὶ προσεκύνουν ὑποφρίττοντες*). We might find in this narrative reminiscences of N. T. expressions. At the death of Peregrinus, we find the *σεισμὸς μέγας*, as in Matt. 27: 51. Peregrinus walking in the hall (uninjured by the fire), suggests, though but remotely, the *ἔνδυμα λευκὸν* of the angel in Matt. 28: 4. More significant appears the declaration, so strange in the mouth of Peregrinus (33), that he would place a golden crown upon a golden life (*βούλεται χρυσῷ βίῳ χρυσῆν κορώνην ἐπιθεῖναι*).

In this there might be a reference to the crown of life (Rev. 2: 10, *στέφανος τοῦ βίου*, or to the *στέφανος τῆς ἀφθαρσίας* in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 17, 19), or to the *στέφανος τῆς ἀθλήσεως* in Ignatius (Mart. 5), in a word, there might be contained an allusion to Christian martyrs, which appears also in the expression. Yet these resemblances to Christian accounts would be of themselves much too remote and obscure to found a judgment upon. They first become worthy of notice in connection with the further description of Peregrinus, which, indeed, led earlier readers to this view. In the forty-first chapter, namely, Lucian foresees that a multitude of statues will be erected for Peregrinus by the citizens of Elis as well as by the other Greeks to whom he directed letters (*οἷς καὶ ἐπεσταλκέναι ἔλεγον*). Lucian proceeds: *φασὶ δὲ πάσαις σχεδὸν ταῖς ἐνδόξοις πόλεσιν ἐπιστολὰς διαπέμψαι αὐτόν, διαθήκας τινὰς παραινέσεις καὶ νόμους· καί τινας ἐπὶ τούτῳ πρεσβευτὰς τῶν ἑταίρων ἐχαιρόνησε, νεκραγγέλους*

καὶ περιοδρόμους προσαγορεύσας. That a cynic sent letters to the most renowned Greek cities, which letters contained admonitions, directions and regulations, being, so to speak, bequests (διαθήκη) of his last will, is very surprising. We read, to be sure, of an Apollonius of Tyana, also, that he attempted to reform Sparta by means of letters. But in Lucian there are many cities, and the contents of the letters, setting aside the word διαθήκη (of whose earliest use as a title of the New Testament I know nothing certain), agrees too well with many of the Christian Scriptures to permit a comparison of the two to be avoided. Still, it is not to be mistaken, that many things are opposed to this view. The first, that Lucian, as it seems, had no reason, if he wished to compare the voluntary death of Peregrinus by fire with that of Christian martyrs, for not doing this without disguise. He lets his Peregrinus (chap. 12) be imprisoned as a Christian, and says then, that this event contributed much to increase his desire for strange notoriety. In chap. 13, contempt of death is brought forward as an essential characteristic of Christians, and the governor of Syria (14) allows Peregrinus to escape, just because he sees through his eagerness to become distinguished by martyrdom. On the other hand, after Peregrinus is separated from the Christians, he is represented only as a cynic. The examples of self-immolation, mentioned in chaps. 22. 25, say not a word of Christians. And yet the same speaker adduces these examples, who in chap. 14 had mentioned the Christians' contempt of death. He merely says of Peregrinus (23), that he gives out ὅτι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦτο δρᾷ, ὡς διδάξειεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ θανάτου καταφρονεῖν καὶ ἐγκαρτερεῖν τοῖς δεινοῖς. In like manner chap. 33, χρῆναι τὸν Ἡρακλείως βεβιωκότα Ἡρακλείως ἀποθανεῖν καὶ ἀναμιχθῆναι τῷ αἰθέρι, καὶ ὠφελῆσαι, ἅφη βούλομαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, δείξας αὐτοῖς, ὃν χρὴ τρόπον θανάτου καταφρονεῖν.

If, therefore, no reason be discovered why Lucian did not name the Christians in the last scene of Peregrinus, we might, inasmuch as the passage only through such a reference affords a good sense, ascribe the defect at the end to the unskilfulness or haste of the author. But the circumstance can be better explained. That is, if we presuppose, according to our first assumption, the *fact* of Peregrinus's death by fire, then Lucian was reminded of the Christians by just this similarity in the manner of death. He held their joy in death and the admiration which they reaped from it, for as great fanaticism and folly, as were manifest in the case of Peregrinus. But yet his sense of truth told him, that the character of these Chris-

tians was elevated so far above that of Peregrinus, that the comparison could be carried out only at the expense of truth. But if he would lash the fanaticism of the martyrs, at the same time with that of the cynic Peregrinus so hated by him, in one and the same writing, he could do this, without falling into the great injustice of a complete identification, or, on the other hand, destroying the unity of his work, which related merely to Peregrinus, only by some such loose connection of the cynic and Christian characteristics. But if we assume that Peregrinus's death by fire is a *mere fiction*, then all is much simpler. Christianity appears to Lucian in *its* martyrs only as a *new form* of *cynicism*, as ignorant fanaticism; the whole is therefore presented in the looser form of satire; the individual features mingle more easily, and the image of the cynic is only a foil for jeering at the Christian martyrs so highly venerated at that time. Yet, be the death of Peregrinus by fire as it may, who is that leader of the Christians from whose life Lucian has borrowed the characteristics lent to Peregrinus, namely, the eminent and high position (that of bishop), the composition and exegesis of sacred writings, the imprisonment in Syria, the sympathy of the Asiatic churches through messengers especially sent (chapters 11—16)? Who wishes to place a golden crown upon his life? Who received high veneration after death? From whose funeral pile did a hawk, as was supposed, fly upward? Who wrote (for the above passage, chap. 41, is certainly to be referred to Christianity) letters to the most famous Grecian cities with directions and laws, and, finally, who sent the death-messengers and death-runners (*νεκράγγελοι* and *νεκροδρόμοι*, 41)? Every one sees that the choice for single traits may be easily made, and if all do not suit any individual, the case is the same with the Christians as with Peregrinus the cynic, to whom, as we have seen, peculiarities are transferred which belong to the whole cynic sect. Thus, if we suppose the *ἐπιστολαὶ*, mentioned chap. 41, to be Christian, they may well be identified with the *πολλοὶ βίβλοι* named in chap. 2, which were written by Peregrinus. For Lucian does not say that the letters mentioned chap. 41, were written but just before his death. Only the death-runners, it appears, were to make known the decision of Peregrinus to sacrifice himself. Now, while admonitions and laws were given in these letters, a reference to *the Apostle Paul* and his letters would be pretty obvious. If one thinks, further, on the imprisonment of the apostle, and the sympathy of which he boasts, the letter to the Ephesians, 4: 1, 6: 20, and that to the Philippians, 1: 7, and for the sympathy shown to him, Phil. 4: 10, 14,

would offer themselves for comparison. The liberation of Peregrinus in Syria would find its analogy in similar events in the life of Paul (Acts 16: 26 seq., 34). In like manner, though we know nothing particular of the last events of the Apostle John's life, yet his seven letters in Revelation may be compared with those of Peregrinus.

Still, too few traits here conspire; and we anticipate in a satire some reference to the relations or facts which lie nearer the time of the writer. Brucker and Walch have therefore thought of *Apollonius of Tyana*, from the history of whose life by Philostratus we could, at all events, bring forward the letters to Sparta, already mentioned, his repeated appearance in Olympia (4. 1, where he delivers a speech on the four cardinal virtues, as the cynics in *Peregrinus*, chap. 3; further, chap. 8, where the multitude at the festival is carried away by the man), and also the remarkable words on this miracle-monger from the temple of Artemis in Crete (8. 29), *στεῖχε γᾶς, στεῖχε εἰς οὐρανόν, στεῖχε*, which remind us of the words of the hawk in Lucian (39), *ἔλιπον γᾶν, βαίνω δ' ἐς Ὄλυμπον*, and, finally, the wonderful appearing of the one believed to be dead (8. 31). But, while the account of Philostratus was not composed till about the year 212, and it cannot be determined how far the story respecting Apollonius, who was certainly not unknown to Lucian (*Alexander*, 5, *Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ Τυανεῖ τῷ πάνυ συγγενομένων καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τραγῳδίαν εἰδότων*), was developed in the time before Philostratus's account, it seems more judicious to disregard this conjecture and assume the more ingenious and striking one which makes Lucian refer to *St. Ignatius*. The first, so far as we know, who offered this conjecture was *Pearson*, who was of the opinion that Peregrinus imitated Ignatius for the sake of becoming renowned in the same way. But with Baur (the quoted treatise, p. 142), we find the assumption much more natural that "Lucian decorated his Peregrinus with a trait borrowed from Ignatius, in order to parody the Christian martyrs." What first led to this view was the expression of Lucian (41): *πρεσβευτὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐτωίρων ἐχειροτόνησε, νεκραγγέλους καὶ περιοδρόμους προσαγορεύσας*, words which by their form and import make it probable, that they are not original with Lucian, but rather an imitation. The original may be found in the epistles of Ignatius, not only the *χειροτονεῖν* (*ad Philad.* 18), but *πρέπει χειροτονῆσαι θεοπρεσβύτην* (*ad Smyrn.* 11), and yet more manifestly *πρέπει χειροτονῆσαί τινα, ὃς δυνήσεται θεοδρόμος καλεῖσθαι*. To be sure, Ignatius, as it appears, does not speak of such as should announce his own near

end, and *ad Phil.* 2, Ignatius seems to call himself a runner of God, as he hastens to God, *ἵνα θεοῦ ἐπιτύχῃ*, as it is so often said; but the expression *νεκροδρόμοι*, death's runners, is evidently an imitation of *θεοδρόμοι*, God's runners, since it is not elsewhere found in the *usus loquendi*. And, in fact, the time when these letters, remarkable in so many respects, and the contents of which might in some way have become known to Lucian, were composed, coincides entirely with the time when the death of Peregrinus by fire was described. Düsterdieck also supposes Lucian referred to Ignatius, and finds this reference confirmed by the expression *κακοδαίμων*, used by Trajan against Ignatius, according to the *Martyrium Ignatii*, chap. 2, which expression Lucian uses at the very outset of Peregrinus, and by the further traits, that Peregrinus appears as bishop, *ἐν Συρίᾳ δεθείς*, and is consoled by the hearty sympathy of the churches of Asia Minor. Yet the word *κακοδαίμων* proves nothing, not only because Lucian elsewhere often uses it (e. g. in the Peregrinus itself, chap. 13, of Christians on account of their belief in the doctrine of immortality), but because it also often occurs in other Greek writers. Still, by a stricter comparison with the letters of Ignatius, manifold analogies may be pointed out which we will here collect. *Ad Eph.* 1, Ignatius denominates himself *δεδεμένον ἀπὸ Συρίας*, as Lucian names Peregrinus (4), *τὸν ἐν Συρίᾳ δεθέντα*. That the Christians wished to liberate Peregrinus (12), reminds us of the so oft repeated prayer of Ignatius, that the churches would forbear anything which could hinder him in his way to martyrdom (*ad Rom.* 1. and elsewhere), while the joy of enemies at his death, *ad Trall.* 8, reminds us of the enemies of Peregrinus (38, they cry: *τέλος τὰ δεδογμένα*). The tender sympathy of the Christians, the messengers from the Asiatic churches, who, according to chaps. 12, 13, visit Peregrinus, have, in all the epistles of Ignatius, the most striking analogies (*ad Eph.* 1, 2. *ad Magn.* 2, and in other places). As Lucian says of the Christians (12), *πάντα ἐκίνουν ἐξαρπάσαι αὐτὸν πειρώμενοι*, so Ignatius regards such attempts to free him, as Satan's work (*διαρπάσαι με βούλεται* in the *Martyr. Ignatii*, 6). As Lucian speaks of bribing the keepers of the prison (12), so were the soldiers on watch, Ignatius *ad Rom.* 5, bribed (*ἐνεργουμένοις χείρους γίγνονται*). Further, like Peregrinus, he not merely composes sacred writings himself, but also interprets them (11. *τῶν βίβλων τὰς μὲν ἐξηγήσεως*). The phrase respecting the letters of Peregrinus which contain *νόμους καὶ παραινέσεις καὶ διαθήκας*, might be most strikingly confirmed by the contents of the Ignatian epistles, which everywhere exhort to unity

and obedience of the bishop, and warn against Docetism. Finally, as Peregrinus, according to the assertion of the respectable looking man, walks about in the hall radiant with joy and adorned with an olive wreath (40), so do the companions of Ignatius see this man, though only in dreams, after his death in a glorified form (*Mart.* 7). And the extraordinary honor which Lucian predicts for his cynic after death, reminds one of the reverence felt for the martyrs, whose sacred relics appear an invaluable treasure (according to *Martyr. Ignat.* 6). To be sure, Ignatius died in Rome and not in Greece, and Lucian has done him injustice if he has compared his holy zeal with the mad folly of Peregrinus. For Ignatius is plainly full of humility when he writes, *ad Trall.* 4, ἵμαντὸν μετρῶ ἵνα μὴ ἐν καυχήσει ἀπόλωμαι, ἀγαπῶν τὸ παθεῖν ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδα, εἰ ἄξιός εἰμι. But Lucian looked upon the matter with his own eyes; and that the desire for martyrdom is uttered too frequently by Ignatius and often in surprising expressions, no one surely will deny.

We believe we have proved by these citations, that a parody on the Christian martyrs is very probable in Lucian's Peregrinus. This view finally gains in probability, also, by the circumstance, that the renowned bishop Polycarp, of Smyrna, suffered death by fire in the same decade in which the death of Peregrinus falls. Lucian may therefore have easily borrowed some traits from the history of this martyr. The *Martyrium Polycarpi* itself intimates (19), that the end of this man was everywhere discussed among the pagans (ὥστε καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ λαλεῖσθαι). Moreover, the relics of Polycarp were solicitously collected and honored (17, 18), and the proconsul labored hard to make him yield (7. 9, as in Lucian, chap. 14). Yet the most remarkable circumstance from this account of Polycarp's end, is the dove, which, according to chap. 16, when Polycarp had expired, flew up from the burning pile (ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος). It is to be regretted that the reading is here questionable, and Eusebius (4. 15), as well as Rufinus and Nicephorus, know nothing of the dove, although Eusebius gives the rest of the account as in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. If the omission in Eusebius were to be traced, not to his more accurate text, but to his more modest judgment, we should have in the hawk of Lucian a parody so much the more striking, because the year of Polycarp's death is perhaps exactly the same as that of Peregrinus, namely, 165. Polycarp was also burned in a public assembly, according to Jerome, *universo populo in amphitheatro adversus eum personante.* But if the hawk flew out of Lucian's head, and the dove

of Polycarp first came into the text by the hand of some wonder-seeking transcriber, then the hawk of Lucian might be an allusion by way of joke to the custom on the apotheosis of Roman emperors, when (as Herodion, in his History of the Emperors, relates 4. 2, and Justin, Apol. 1. 21, confirms), after the mask of the emperor was burned, an eagle was let fly for a symbol of the soul of the emperor borne away to heaven.

The following propositions contain our judgment of Lucian's Peregrinus Proteus. This man, whom Lucian personally knew and with whom he doubtless had fallen into contention, was a cynic not unknown at that time. But what Lucian says of his character, and especially of his connection with the Christians, needs critical examination, which is facilitated partly by the statements of other writers respecting Peregrinus, and partly by the opinions of Lucian himself in other writings. Yet, for criticism, the internal reasons are the more important, while the accounts from other sources are, with the exception of Gellius, to be referred back to Lucian's narrative. Peregrinus was manifestly not the shameless man which Lucian represents him. The more particular statements relating to his connection with the Christians, are manifestly unhistorical, and the description of his death contains perhaps throughout a satirical transfer of peculiar traits from the death of Christian martyrs. The combination in Peregrinus of the cynic and Christian, so enigmatical to us, may be explained from Lucian's tendency to castigate the Christian fanaticism of the martyrs at the same time with the love of fame characterizing the cynics, which tendency, as far as the Christians, whose more innocent fanaticism he wished to treat gently, were concerned, he must mask by transferring to Peregrinus, who was to be the hero of his piece, Christian peculiarities in a manner not easily misapprehended at that time. The way in which Lucian does this, is an evidence to us, that we have, in the whole writing, rather a satirical than a historical painting.

In conclusion, we will adduce the views of other critics upon this piece. *D. Baur* first saw most correctly through the scope of the writing. In the relation of Peregrinus to the Christians he sees a historical fiction; in the description of Peregrinus as a whole, a generalization and magnified view of many eccentric phenomena of the times, which were designed to make the picture more comprehensive. Lucian was only induced by the scene of the death by fire to bring his Peregrinus into connection with the Christians. The form of the composition, especially the reply of the unknown speaker, was chosen

by Lucian mainly in order to have greater freedom in the use of his materials. *Brucker* had apprehended many things correctly. He says, in his powerful way: *Lucianus cum omnia inter se misceat, rectius rem omnem* (this relation to the Christians) *negari putamus cunctaque partim ex incerto rumore, partim ex malevolo Luciani calamo profluxisse putamus —— totamque fabulam de Peregrini christianismo ex historia sacra et philosophica ejiciendam esse. Digna haec omnia nugatoris calamo et tam misere cohaerent!* In a similar manner speaks *Walch* (see the second section): *finxit Lucianus Peregrini ad Christianos transitum, honores, vincula, liberationem.* Walch sees in the suicide of Peregrinus a satire upon Christian martyrs. *Tzschirner* perceived in the *Peregrinus* a caricature-painting, combined from historical elements, of a fantastic philosopher. *Neander*, also, holds criticism to be necessary in this piece; and believes that Lucian invented the relation of Peregrinus to the Christians in order to make these the objects of his satire. *Schlosser* supposes that in Peregrinus the hypocrisy and vanity of devotees, fanatics, penitents, and philosophical prophets, are mocked. *Preller*, too, says that Lucian made of Peregrinus a caricature. *Dahlmann's* opinion, finally, is the more important, because he enters into the character of Lucian's writings in general, without a knowledge of which our question cannot be safely answered. He says: A lawless use of the scenes of fable or of history served his genius for ends of the present time, to which a medley of negative teaching was to be offered in an attractive style. History served as a facile and pleasant garb. Of Peregrinus, Dahlmann remarks, that very much depends upon this, whether he was the perfect fool, and at the same time rascal, which Lucian makes him. We close with an excellent remark of Ranke, who, in connection with another of Lucian's works, declares, that Lucian has spoken things of individuals after the manner of ancient comedy, which things, as the public must know, were true, not exactly of this person, but of a great whole, of a community, or of society in general.

[To be concluded.]