
SECT. I.

The silence of Josephus proved to be of no force against St. Matthew.

The Objection of the Schematizt, I am now to examine, is the last against St. Matthew, and relates to the Fact of Herod's ordering the children in Bethlehem from two years old and younger to be slain.
Sect. I. That fact, he pretends (a), is also subject to great difficulty. For how could so extraordinary a thing be done, and NO HISTORIAN, but the author of the (supposed) second chapter of Matthew mention it? And PARTICULARLY, how could Josephus be supposed to omit it, if true?

1. Thus the Schematist, to make his pretended difficulty appear the greater, gives his unwary Reader more than a broad intimation, that there are several old Historians still extant, who having writ at large of the Facts belonging to Herod's life; yet say nothing of the Children slain in Bethlehem. I blush for the Objeotor, to be obliged to make here such an observation. Sure he is not so ignorant, as not to know, that in truth there is not one such writer remaining, but Josephus, and even that before this Jewish Historian, there was none, as far as we can tell, but one Nicolas, a Pagan, and intimate friend of Herod; of whom we shall say more by and by.

2. Therefore the pretended great difficulty lies only in the silence of one single Author; as if we should reject all the Facts of those times, which are not supported by the express testimony of Josephus. But if such a method of arguing be admitted, we must also discard the most part of the facts.
facts related by the best Historians Antiquity ever had, and of which yet no man in his wits can form the least doubt. In a case of this nature an Author is generally believed, when he tells, though alone, a thing which he was able to know, either by himself, or by good witnesses; which was transacted in his own time, or not long before, and carries along no absurdity, no impossibility, no inconsistency with other facts well supported; and when the Writer himself is known besides, to be a man of probity, and to have had no apparent reason, interest, or view, whereby he could be prompted to invent a particular fact. Now that all these qualifications are to be eminently met with in the Writers of the New Testament, has been already a thousand times proved beyond all contradiction.

3. And why could not Josephus be supposed to omit that Fact, though true? Has he undertaken to write the Life, or a general History of Herod? If he had, could he not have omitted some fact, or other? He was not an eye-witness of the transactions of that time. When he wrote his Books of the Jewish wars, Herod had been dead fourcore years, and very near one hundred when the Antiquities of the Jews were published. The Chief, and Likely the only Author whom Josephus could
could follow, and whom he quotes sometimes, was one Nicolas of Damascus, a particular friend of Herod (a), and consequently a man byass'd in his favour. And indeed his partiality has been noted by Josephus himself, particularly in his sixteenth Book of Antiq. There he says expressly, that Nicolas living in Herod's kingdom, and together with him, he wrote his history, (of Herod) with a view to please that king, and advance his interest, mentioning those things only, which were honourable to him.

So partial an Historian had then no doubt omitted the Fact of the children slain by Herod: And why could it not also be left out by Josephus, when he did not find it in Nicolas's chief Guide, though it had been a true event of Herod's reign?

4. Nor can we judge otherwise for what the Schematists adds to strengthen his difficulty, viz. That Josephus SEEMS a great enemy to Herod, and to tell EVERY thing he knew to his disadvantage, and especially ALL his various acts of cruelty. For the objector himself seems to confess what is certainly true, that all this is more than he can know and prove. His consciousness of that, is, I suppose, the

(a) See Josephus's Antiq. Book xvii. c. 5, and Book xiv. c. 1, where, besides that great insinuacy, Nicolas is taxed of being a great flatterer of Herod.
the reason of his pointing in that place (a) Sect. L
at Scaliger: See, says he in the margin,
Scaliger's Animadversiones in Chronicon Eu-
sebei, p. 176. But there that great man
proves nothing neither of what is affirm-
ed above, nor does he say, that Josephus
was a great enemy to Herod.

Besides, as Scaliger makes otherwise no
manner of application of his wondering,
why did not the candid Schematist rather
interpret that wondering, as being an in-
timation, that Scaliger suspected in Jose-
phus some want either of knowledge or
sincerity?

The first may certainly be supposed, with-
out any absurdity or unlikelihood. Nor is
it possible to the Schematist to prove on
the contrary, that Josephus must neces-
sarily have known the fact now in question.
And we have already shewn, that it could
not be in Nicolas's history, who was the
chief, if not the only contemporary Writer,
whom Josephus could take for his voucher.
It might be also unknown to, or conceal-
ed by, the persons he consulted, the prin-
cipal of whom were those of Herod's
politerity.

As for Josephus's sincerity on the other
hand, we may have in this case very good
reason to suspect it. He knew without
doubt, that the Christians had already
mentioned this fact, and applied it to
their
Sect. I. their own Affairs, which Josephus seems not to have approved of, as our Objector will easily grant; and consequently that this was a sufficient motive for tempting Josephus to omit the fact. I do not doubt but the Schematist looks upon what is now in Josephus concerning Jesus Christ, as being entirely spurious and mere addition to his Text. If so, we may indeed wonder at his omitting such a transaction, and admire his affected silence. But then it would be unjust and unreasonable to conclude from thence, that all the facts concerning the rise of the Christian Religion, are false or dubious, notwithstanding they are attested by the sacred and pagan Historians.

But let us moreover suppose, that Josephus was very well apprized of the murder of the Babes in Bethlehem, and even that he was a great enemy of Herod, as the Schematist adds of his own; though Josephus tells equally the good and bad of that King's actions: Yet for all that, and all his supposed sincerity, he might easily have passed over this particular instance of Herod's cruelty, having given so many others, which were more, or at least as eminent. Add, that Josephus was not engaged to tell every individual action of Herod.
rod. And he declares himself, (a), That though he looked upon truth, to be peculiarly the duty of an historian, there may be yet some bitter truths, which a grave and a modest author will make some difficulty to mention, even in the case of the worst of men, &c. Which is the very case of Herod.

To inforce those just observations, there is no need to repeat here at large all the objections already made, by several learned men, against Josephus, to shew his unfaithfulness, partiality, &c. in many passages of his books. Nor shall I insist upon what he owns himself (b), that some writers had related many things otherwise than himself; and especially one Justus of Tiberius, a contemporary Jew with him, and who had lived with King Agrippa the younger, as his Secretary, though he published his History after the death of that Prince.

For all that, I easily grant Josephus to be true and sincere enough in the most part of his narrations, particularly in the facts of his own times, and of the latter age before him.

5. But

(b) See Josephus, in his preface to the history of the Jewish wars, and in his life, p. 1013, 1015.
Sect. I. 5. But then it is also certain (and this is a new observation to be added) that for the greatest part of his facts there is no historian to confirm them. Consequently the same pretended difficulty, brought against Matthew from Josephus's silence, may be with greater strength retorted against Josephus himself. And even when some facts of his history are also found in Tacitus, for instance; yet 'tis agreed among men of learning, that Tacitus had borrowed them from Josephus; and so there is for the same, but the single authority of this writer: Which if it be admitted, sure there is no reason why we should not receive St. Matthew's authority, notwithstanding all the silence of Josephus.

In short, 'tis a sophistical method, as unjust as unreasonable, to endeavour to discredit the express testimony of an Historian, by objecting only the silence of a later Writer; which might proceed from many causes; though it be impossible at such a distance, as in our case, of above seventeen hundred years, to guess at the true cause and reason, with any certainty. Therefore 'tis equally unjust and absurd to pretend, that no other cause of such a silence, or omission, can be assigned, but the falsehood of the fact omitted.
Sect. II.

The testimony of Macrobius justified.

But is there indeed no Author, besides St. Matthew, who took notice of the murdering the children in Bethlehem? Why, truly 'tis plain the Schematist would fain make his Readers believe it is so. For though he knew there is such an Author, yet he throws his testimony into a marginal note, whereon he may suppose few of his Readers, if any at all, will cast their eyes, after he had assured them in the text, that no historian mentions it. Besides in that note he is positive, that passage alleged, is of no authority, and then makes a shew of proving it, though his objections are as ill grounded, as the former against St. Matthew. I shall demonstrate this after I have represented the passage of Macrobius, as our adversary brings it.

"It is pretended, he says, that this slaughter of the Infants is confirmed by Macrobius; who in a Chapter of the ingenious sayings of Augustus against others, and of others against him, (Saul, 1. 2. c. 4.) tells us, that when Augustus heard that Herod's son was killed..."
Sect. II. "killed among the infants under two years old, whom Herod had ordered to be slain, he said, It is better to be Herod's hog than his son.

Herein an impartial Reader will at first sight perceive it is plain, that Macrobius, as to the fact in hand, says the very same thing we have in Matthew's History; viz. that Herod had ordered some infants, under two years old, to be slain. What then can all the difficulties and objections imaginable avail against so clear an evidence? Can they make Macrobius unfay what he declares so clearly, so positively? Consequently it cannot be true, that when this passage is considered, it will be found to be of no authority, as the Schematist affirms. The contrary of his assertion will clearly appear, if we fairly examine his critical considerations upon that passage.

The first is thus expressed:

1. "Joseph Scaliger tells (a) us, that though Antipater, Herod's son (who was killed about the time when the infants are said to be slain) was convicted of treachery to his father Herod, yet Herod submitted the matter to Augustus, who himself gave orders for his death. Wherefore Scaliger justly wonders, how a

(a) Animad., in Eusebii Chron. p. 177. See also Fri
"a saying could fall from Augustus, which implies his ignorance of his own sentence."

Answer. I will not be so severe upon our Objector, as to make a long expostulation with him, for his representing here the expressions of Scaliger differently from what they were delivered by that great man. I own, that for the main point, Scaliger insinuates that Augustus had approved of the judgement given by Varus governour of Syria, against Antipater. But I maintain that Scaliger is therein strangely mistaken, that his wondering, instead of being just, as our adversary affirms, is built upon nothing; and 2dly, That consequently there is no room in this for the least difficulty, by which Macrobius's authority can be invalidated.

1. Scaliger's blunder has been already exploded many years ago (a); and 'tis indeed

(a) Besides Chriftus Noldius, (Hist. Idum. n. 26. p. 151. Ed. 1. An. 1660. Franeq;) a very learned man of this nation, G. Gregory, has this remarkable passage, which I remembered after I had writ my following observation.

"It is enough to draw some doubt upon the tradition of Macrobius. Joseph Scaliger believeth it all; but yet his wonder is, that Augustus should make such a return upon Herod, seeing that he himself did the murther, not only upon this, but upon all the three sons. I do not perceive that the learned man hath cause enough. Herod did but cast the envious part upon the Emperor, (and officiously too) but left the main and principal guilt upon his own head, and therefore nevertheless, to"
Sect. II. indeed so gross, that it may be easily discovered by any one, who has read in Josephus the account of Antipater's condemnation and death: If our difficulty-maker did not remember it better, than Scaliger, when he was reading this learned man's Animadversions; should he not afterwards have consulted again Josephus himself, when he was arguing in so grave a matter against the authority of St. Matthew? I think really that a lover and searcher of Truth, a free thinker, and a man careful of his own reputation, should have done it.

Josephus then, far from telling, that Augustus had given an absolute decisive sentence of death against Antipater, and had himself given orders for his death; quite contrary he assures us, that Augustus left that business so far to Herod's discretion, as to let him choose either death or exile, for his son: Here are the words of Josephus in his Antiquities, B. XVII. c. ix. When Herod was thus giving his last orders to his kindred, he received letters from his Embassadors at Rome, whom he had sent to Cæsar, [Augustus]. The substance thereof was; that Augustus had been put

"all this the Emperor might very fitly retort as he did, "That it were better to be Herod's hog than his son."

put to death by Caesar's order, for her plotting with Antipater; and that Antipater himself was left to his judgement, as his Father and his King, either to send him into Exile, or put him to Death, as he would (a).

2. The Case being thus stated, how could Scaliger wonder, that Augustus was surprized, when he heard, that Herod, instead of choosing to banish his Son, and acting like a Father, who ought to feel still some pity for one so near him; had rather chosen to slay him, and had thus acted more like a Butcher than a Father? Might not Augustus justly reflect upon the barbarity of such a Father, when he heard the issue of his Permission given to Herod in respect to Antipater? Might he not justly say, it was better to be Herod's Hog than his Son, without having forgot his own Judgement and Sentence? How then could our Objector approve so much of Scaliger's Blunder, and say that his wondering was just upon this matter?

(a) Τοῦτο δὲ εἰσφέρετο εἰς τὸν Σκαλίγερον, γραμ"
Sect. II.

3. Therefore the Schematist could not neither justly pretend that Macrobius's Authority suffers in the least from such a mistaken Difficulty. Does it not rather appear, that his account of Augustus's sharp and severe Reflection upon Herod's cruelty towards his Son, is very agreeable to Josephus's History in this Point, and is thereby strongly confirmed?

4. Besides, Scaliger never intended to carry his wondering far any further, than what relates to Augustus's Joke; and for all that he makes use of Macrobius's Testimony for the slaughter of the Infants (a).

The same Observation is to be applied to Dr. Prideaux, though the Schematist is pleased to join him here with Scaliger, as if both united in rejecting Macrobius's Evidence, or in the same Objection against it. On the contrary, that learned Dean brings in the Testimony of Macrobius, for the slaughter of the Infants, and the Sarcasm of Augustus upon Herod. He finds only some Difficulty therein concerning the Age of Herod's Son, said to be slain with those Infants. His Words are these

(a) Quod puerorum caedes non multò praeeferit Antipatri casum, tum ex Evangelio constat, tum etiam ex Macrobius, qui infantes ab Herode caedi jussos, & interillos filium quoque ipsius Herodis poenas dedisse, restit. Scalig. Ibid.
these following: "Macrobius, a Writer of the fifth Century (a) tells us, that among those Innocents Herod slew a young Son of his own, and thereon Augustus made this Reflection, that it was better to be Herod's Hog than his Son. But it is not likely, that Herod should have a Child so young, as those Innocents, at the Age he was then of. The Death of Antipater, which happened about that time, considered with that of Alexander and Aristobulus, formerly put to Death by him, may rather be thought to have given the occasion for that Sarcasm. (b) Thus the pious Doctor in raising the Difficulty, offers at the same time his Thoughts for its Solution; so far is he from making use of it against Macrobius's Evidence and Authority, as the Schematist does in his next consideration, whereof that Difficulty is the Foundation.

II. Secondly, says he, Augustus by being acquainted with the Treachery of Antipater, and himself condemning him to Death, (c), knew him to be a Man grown; and therefore could not make a Reflection, which if pertinently understood, implies him

(a) Saturn. Lib. II. Chap. 4;
(b) Pud. Connex. Part II. Book IX. p. 654;
(c) How false this Assertion is in particular, I have just now shewed.
him to conceive Herod's Son to be under two years old.

In my Answer to this Consideration I shall avoid, as much as possible, a tedious Dispute, being willing to make more Concessions than even our Considerer can reasonably desire.

1. I grant then, that Augustus knew certainly Antipater to be at his Death (a) past Childhood; and yet we cannot affirm upon any other historical Ground, that Herod had at that time any Child about two years old (b), or that he was slain among and with the Innocents; as some Popish modern Writers have asserted (c), from Macrobius.

2. The Question and Difficulty only lies about the true meaning of Macrobius's Expressions (d), which indeed seem to signify,

(b) I would not say the thing is impossible, or unlikely, as it has been supposed by Dr. Prideaux, and before him by the famous Casaubon, Exercit. cont. Baron. §. xvi. p. 173. An autem putandus est Herodes, qui septuagenarius, aut non multis mensibus minor obiit, ante bimiumum genuisse filium, qui bimulus cum ceteris fict ostitit. We see every Day Men older than Herod was, at that time, have Children.
(d) In the Original Macrobius has it thus: Com audif unfit [Augustus] inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes Rex Judaeum intru bimatum iujfit interfici, filium quoque ejus ossisum ait; Melius eft Herodis porcum eft, quam filium,
nify, that a Son of Herod was also slain among the Children two years old.

It is stated and answered by the learned J. Gregory, above quoted, in the following manner; "But what Son of Herod's could this be? It must be Antipater, or it must be none at all. But Antipater was more a Man than to be reckoned among the Children of two years old and under. And moreover then that, Antipater was not at Bethlehem, nor thereabouts at that time. "I know not upon what terms to make this hold, unless it be thus. Herod had obtained of Augustus the killing of two Sons already, and now solicited for the third. It was presently upon the killing of the Infants that Herod's Messenger came to Rome with the Accusations of his Son Antipater, and so both the passages came to the Emperor's ear at the same time, and this later, for the earnest, was misreckoned into the bargain."

Which is as much as to say, that there is a mistake in Macrobius's insinuating, that a Child of Herod had been slain among, or with the other Children. To the same confession must amount what Dr. Prideaux advances in his Solution above recited.
Sect. II. 3. Another way has been offer'd by the learned Noldius (a). According to him, Macrobius means only, that the murder of the Innocents, and that of Antipater, having been committed at some few days distance, both were told together at Rome to Augustus; and not that Antipater was kill'd together, and at the same time with the Innocents. As if Macrobius had said, Augustus heard at once, that Herod had, besides those Children, slain also his own Son. And it is not a good consequence, to conclude, that a person is but two years old, because he is reported to have been kill'd, with some others of that age (b).

At least, I am sure, we may affirm, that Macrobius's expression [Inter, &c.] is frequently used by Latin Writers, to signify that when, or while some things had been a doing, others happen'd, or were transacted, tho' of a different nature, and even at some distance, both of time and place. For to prove this,


this, many instances (a), could be brought, if it were necessary. Therefore I hope, that Interpretation will not appear to the Schematist to be forc'd and out of the way. Otherwise he may remember here, what he says afterwards, That Macrobius liv'd in the end of the 4th Century, that is to say, when the purity of the Latin Tongue was almost lost; and also that Macrobius himself expressly declares, he was not a Latin born, and begs his Reader's pardon, if in his Discourses be not found the original Roman Elegancy (b).

4. Nevertheless I am willing to suppose, that Macrobius implies that he, at least, conceiv'd Herod's Son had been kill'd among the Infants, under two years old.

But then I maintain, that nothing is more unreasonable than the consequence our Ob-jector

(a) Among which may be reckoned these two Passages of Macrobius himself: Lib. I. C. VI. INTER HÆC Avi- eni dicta Flavianus & Euslathus —- ingressi alacrionem secere Cæsum, &c. Cap. VII. INTER HÆC Evangelus, petitu omnium temperatus, M. Varronis, inquit, Librum volis arbitror non ignotum, &c. To which I shall add only two more of a much antienter Writer: Vol. Patern- sal. Lib. II. C. 83. INTER hunc apparatum belli, Plan-cus non judicio recta legendi,—transfugit ad Cæsarem. Et C. 45. Peridem tempus P. Clodius, homo nobilis,— Et actus incetti reus, ob finitum INTER religiosissima P. R. facra adulterium, &c.

(b) Macrobi. Saturn. L. I. Pref. Nisi Sicubi nos sub alio ortos Celto Latinæ Linguae venæ non adjuvet. Quod ab his, —petitum imperatunque volumus, ut æqui boni- que consulant, si in nostro sermone nativa Romani Oris elegantia defideretur, &c.
sect. II.jector would draw from thence; as if therefore it follow'd, that Augustus never utter'd such a jest, and that there never was such a slaughter of the Infants. Why do not he rather conclude, that Herod never had a Son, whom he put to death? Sure this consequence would be much more Logical, since that Son of Herod is the principal matter Macrobius has here in view. But then this consequence must affect the authority of Josephus, upon whom the Schematist builds here his chief Objections against Matthew. However, as notwithstanding Macrobius's suppos'd Blunder, in putting two things together, which should be distinguish'd, viz. The slaughter of the Infants, and the death of Herod's Son, who was a man grown; yet it is most certain, he had good authority for the truth of the fact, concerning the killing of Herod's son: So we may very justly believe, that he had also his authority, both for the jest of Augustus on that occasion, and for the fact of the Infants slaughter. And these two facts cannot be rejected, no more than the murder of Herod's son, tho' the Blunder of Macrobius should be never so great. We have in the best Historians many instances of like Blunders, and want of attention; and yet the facts, misplac'd by them, are not, singly taken, the less true for all that misplacing of them. If
the want of memory, or due consideration, were a sufficient ground for casting the reproach of Falseness upon a writer, What would become, for instance, of Scaliger's reputation, whose blunder and want of memory, (tho' he had so vast a one) we have seen in the passage, quoted above upon this very Subject?

III. The following Consideration will not detain us so long, because of its striking weakness, and because the ground of it may be reduced to the former.

Thirdly, says the Schematist, The remarks of Auglus, as Grotius (a) observes, has no relation to the slaughter of the Infants, but only to that of Herod's Son. And I add, that, Augustus reflecting only on Herod's Cruelty to his Son, evinces, that he knew nothing of his Cruelty in destroying the Infants. And as Augustus could not have been ignorant of it, if it had been true, so he could not have omitted the mentioning of it, when he was satyrizing Herod's Cruelty.

1. To shew, how little pertinent all this is to the purpose, we need but to join with it the consequence intended by the Objector, and which ought to contain the Position he has undertaken to prove, viz. That the Fact of the Infants slain by Herod's order is not confirm'd by Macrobius; and that

(a) Ad. Matt. ii. 16.
that his Passage, wherein however it is certainly found, is of no authority. For how, pray, does this follow from what Macrobius says not, or from what he should have said more, according to the fancy of any one, who has a strong itch of contradicting? Why forsooth, because Macrobius, as his design, in the Chap. quoted, required it, relates only the Sarcasm of Augustus upon Herod's cruelty to his Son; does it therefore follow that Augustus knew nothing of the Infants' slaughter, which yet Macrobius assures that Emperor heard at the same time; or that he said nothing at all of it then? Who in cold Blood can draw such Inferences from Macrobius's silence; when it does not appear, he was obliged, by the design of his Narration, to tell more Circumstances? Who can reasonably, from that silence, affirm what Augustus omitted, or omitted not, and what he should have added to the only reflection Macrobius thought fit to record? How then can the Objector be so positive, that Augustus reflected only on Herod's cruelty to his Son, and that this reflection evinces, that Augustus knew nothing of Herod's cruelty in destroying the Infants? And why, pray again, could not Augustus have omitted reflecting upon this Fact, when he was satyrizing Herod's Cruelty,
mony, not in general, as the Obje\nector so fairly
insinuates, but in particular to his Son?

In short, Macrobius is at present the on-
ly Ancient Writer, who speaks of this fa-
tyrical Jest, and his Design in relating it with
some other witty Sayings, was not to give
us all the Circumstances attending every
one of those Jest. He does not neither
tell us, whether Augustus uttering the same
was standing, sitting, or lying down upon
his Couch; and yet he must have been in
one or the other Posture. Why then does
not the Considerer conclude, that the omis-
sion of such a necessary Circumstance evi-
dences, that Macrobius knew nothing of the
matter, and that Augustus never made any
of those Jest? This Consequence would
certainly be as reasonable, as any of the
Schematist's Inferences.

2. For what concerns Grotius, whose
Authority is here brought in, he neither
argues against the Fact itself, nor reasons
against Macrobius, as the Schematist does.
It seems, indeed to him, that Macrobius,
by a mistake, has put together two dif-
ferent Stories of the same time. But to
make that Conjecture of his likely, instead
of affirming with our Objector, That Au-
gustus could not have been ignorant of the
Infants' Slaughter, if true; quite contrary he
assures, That it was too inconsiderable, to
have reach'd Augustus's Ear; "because it
"was
was done in a place of few Inhabitants
or it might be pretended to have hap-
pened in a Tumult and Sedition, with-
out the King's Command; or lastly, be-
cause it was obscur'd by other much
greater Crimes of Herod. Then Gro-
tius adds, that the killing of Herod's Son
was alone to the purpose, and not the
killing of the Infants, which could not
oblige Augustus to say, That it was bet-
ter to be Herod's Hog, than his Son.

There is no need, I am sure, I should
enlarge here in shewing, what every in-
telligent Reader can at first sight perceive;
that those suspicions and assertions of Gro-
tius are groundless, and too weak for pro-
ving that suspected Mistake of Macrobius.
Which after all is only pretended to be in
his putting wrong together two Things,
whereof one was foreign to the other; but
not in having invented both, or either of
them. Let any one judge of the goodness
and strength of Grotius's reasoning, when
he reads his Words, I have put in the Mar-
gin (a); remembering at the same time,

(a) Grot. in Matt. ii. 16. Latinè admodum quisquis
sit eis ex quo Macrobius Augusti dicit decriberr, inra
bimatum: Nifi ab ipso Macrobio, qui Theodosianis tem-
poribus vixit honorequ; gestit, ac prind et aut Christianus
fuit, aut certe legit Apollonior. Libros, hoc additum ma-
lumus, quod est credibilius,quia non fatis recte dicit potest
Ariipater Herodis filius, jam prorectae atatis, quique
Bethlehemi non fuit, inter infantes Bethlehemeticos oc-
culius,
that tho' he has been a very Learned Man, yet he was very far from being infallible, or without prejudice.

3. And even supposing, that Macrobius was really thus mistaken, yet the Schematist cannot reasonably make use of it against the Truth of the Facts now in hand, which is not doubted of by Grotius, and cannot be justly question'd by any Body else, notwithstanding all the suspected Mistakes in Macrobius, as I have demonstrated above in Confuting the second Consideration. So that I need not here say any thing more about it.

I will only give one Instance or two of such Mistakes in Macrobius, which yet cannot hurt the Facts he mentions. Thus Lib. I. c. xxiii. He cites a place from Plato, as being in his Timæus; and yet it is not to be found there, but in his Phædrus;

eius, Adder quod Antipater occisus 50. ante mortem Herodis die, haec autem laniae ante aliquanto contigit, ut docent, quae sequuntur infra. Com. 19. Videtur ergo Macrobius errore quodam Historias duas ejusdem temporis misceuisse. Certe laniae illa infantum, aut ob variorem habitantium in eo loco, aut quia tumultus Seditionis iuxta obtentu, dissimulato Regis imperio, fuit peracta, aut de nique quod majoribus Herodis Sceleris. obscuraretur, minus nobilis fuit, quam ut ad Augusti aures perveniret; Quippe cum nec Josephus, scriptor tam diligens, ejus meminerit. Deinde sola filii caedes ad rem pertinent: Sunt vitia aeternis, et regi, nihil posse, efficere non potuit, ut dicaret Augustus malle se Herodis porcum esse quam filium,
Sect. II. as the most learned John Rainold (a) served 130 years ago. Again, Macrobius Lib. II. c. xii. quoting a Passage of Pliny the Elder, who wrote under Vespasian, he puts him under Trajan, and so confounds him with Pliny the younger, the form Nephew and adopted Son; in which mistake he follows a much older Writer of the Emperor Severus his Reign; one Sammonicus Serenus (b). But for all that, it is a matter of Fact most certain, that very Things and Passages cited by Macrobius are in those Authors he names.

IV. The Schematist's last Consideration against Macrobius, runs thus:

1. "Fourthly, Macrobius liv'd in the end of the 4th Century, and is no Evidence for any Fact done in the beginning of the 1st Century, or any Sayings of Augustus. And it is an unanswerable Objection to the Authority of Macrobius, that what he says occurs in no other before him."

2. "Nor is the Authority of Macrobius the better for being a Christian, as some [Barthii Adversaria, p. 2258. & Grotius ad Matth.] suppose he might be."

Here

P. 156.
Here we have two different Objections heap'd together, which I have distinguisht'd, and shall answer distinctly one after another.

The first is properly built upon the want of an older Author to support the Testimony of Macrobius, who liv'd so long after the Fact in question. So this is the very same Objection made at the beginning against St. Matthew; and therefore our former answer thereupon may serve here, without any further trouble. Especially if we observe, that the Schematist uses here the same Art, supposing again, what he must know to be absolutely false, viz. That we have still all the Authors, who wrote before Macrobius, since the beginning of the first Century. The falsehood of which supposition being so generally known, if it be but remember'd here, it would be sufficient for the discovery of the Fallacy lying in that first Objection.

However, I am willing to add some particular Observations in relation to Macrobius; that our Reader may the better know the Character of some Men, who now a days have such an unhappy fecondity of Imagination, in making groundless Objections.

1. It is certain that Macrobius cannot be brought in, as an Eye-witness of the Facts done some Centuries before him. Nor is the
he cited as such in the Controversy before us. But what then? Could he not have what he says upon it, from some of those many Authors extant in his time and lost since? Does he not expressly acquaint his Readers, that this Work of his is nothing but a Collection taken out of the Books he had read, either Greek or Latin, which he had made for the use of his Son Eustathius (a)? And even he assures his Son, that (b), often he produces his matters in the very Words of the Authors he had read, desiring that he would not blame him for it, when he shou’d find it out in his Studies, since it was done with a Design.

Hence it is, that not only he names at every Page the ancient Authors, whose Passages he alludes to; but he often transcribes Word for Word some others, whose Names he does not mention. This is discover’d in several Instances, by the help of some of the few Books, which are now preserv’d (c); and had we more still, no doubt, but we shou’d


(b) Nec mihi vino vertas, si res, quas ex Lectione variæ mutuabor, ipsis sæpe verbis, quibus ab ipsis Authoribus exarrata sunt. Præf.

(c) Thus Macrobius transcribes often Word for Word long Passages of Aulus Gellius, whom he does not name. The first part, for Instance, of Macrobius’s third Chapter, Book
Shou'd find out larger Proofs of the same kind; and of Macrobius's Carefulness to mention nothing of old times, but with the Authority of some or other good Writer.

2. Therefore nothing is more unreasonable, than our Objector's Pretension, that it is an unanswerable Objection to the Authority of Macrobius, That what he says occurs in no Other before him. How could it be found now after the loss of so many Writers, whom Macrobius had in his time, whereof we have not at present the hundredth part?

And consequently the Objection is by that Observation answer'd, as easily, as reasonably. For, tho' we have lost so many ancient Authors quoted by Macrobius; yet besides his Affirmation, that he collected the various matters of his Work out of former Authors, and often in their very Words; we have moreover a demonstration of his veracity and faithfulness, by the concurrence of some Writers now preserve'd, in a great number of the Things he treats of.

3. It is then very reasonable to believe, that in other Places, and other Facts, where Macrobius omits the Name and Quotation of his Authors, yet he had certainly

Book 1. is copied out of Gallus. Noef. Att. L. III. c. 2. Syr. Lib. VI. c. 8. from Gellius Lib. V. c. 84. The 7th Book is taken from Plutarch; and in other Places he follows Alexander Aphrodis, verbatim, &c.
Sect. II. some good ones, for what he says concerning the Times so long before his Age; tho' now we cannot discover and prove it, for want of those many Writers extant in his time, but entirely lost at present.

4. Otherwise the same Objection may destroy for ever the authority of all the best Historians Antiquity had, who have luckily escaped the fate, which abolished so many other Books. Tacitus, for instance, and Suetonius, must not be believe'd in any thing they write of Augustus above a hundred years after his death; and much less Credit must have Dion Cas- sius, a Man of so high a rank, and so justly esteem'd, who compos'd his History above two hundred years after that Emperor, and who has so many Facts, not to be found in any other Author.

S E C T. III.

The suspected Christianity of Macrobius groundless.

As for the other Objection, taken from the suspected Christianity of Macrobius, it is worded somewhat strangely and ambiguously, to say nothing worse. I would in Charity suppose, the Schematist means
means only, that if Macrobius had been a
Christian, his Testimony is not the better
for that; because in that case, what he says
of the Innocents, might be taken from St.
Matthew, and therefore cannot be a new
Evidence, different from that of our Ev-
angelist. Otherwise, if the Schematist
knows anything of the Christian Religion,
he must know, that a true Christian is an
enemy to lies, forgeries, impostures, occa-
sional conformity for a place of Honour,
or profits, &c.

But let the Schematist's meaning be what
it will, I may aver, that every impartial
Reader thinks, it was the Duty of a candid
Objector, before he vented such a reflex-
tion upon Macrobius, as a Christian, to
have offered some better Proof, than a sin-
gle might be; which is all the Schematist
brings in, and borrow'd too from a cou-
ples of modern Writers, who neither give
any reason for their suspicion. Grotius, at
least, in the passage above recited has none;
and I may suppose the same of Barthius,
without inquiring further about his Book,
seeing the Schematist puts him with Gro-
tius, as fancying only, that Macrobius
might be a Christian.

Instead of that, I shall here clearly prove
the reverse of that groundless suspicion, by
solid and strong reasons, taken from Ma-
crobius himself.

C 2

1. The
Sect. III. 1. The first is from the Nature and Design of his Book, in which we find the Fact in question, without touching the other concerning Scipion’s Dream, tho’ it be written with the same Heathenish Notions, and in the same Stile.

Now then in that Work of the Saturinals, Macrobius writes chiefly of Religious Heathenish Matters; and, like a thorough good Pagan, zealously vindicates Heathenism, as much as he can. In this view he endeavours, with all the artifice and learning possible, to make it appear more reasonable, than Christians represented it, when they traduc’d the gross Idolatry of Pagans. This (a), Macrobius would fain extenuate, by pretending to shew, that their thousand different Gods and Goddesses were nothing, but the Sun, the Moon, the Earth, &c.

Is all that stuff, and the like, a fit Work to prove, that the Writer of it was, or might be a Christian?

2. Does he speak like one breathing Christianity in the least, when he says, for instance: In our sacred Ceremonies WE WORSHIP Janus with a double Face, &c. In sacris quoque INVOCAMUS Janum Geminum, Janum Patrem, &c.

(a) According to the Method of Porphyry before him, quoted Lib. I. c. 17. Sicus & Porphyrius vestatur Minorum esse virtutem solis, &c.
exc. (b): WE ADORE Apollo; that is Sect. III. to say, the Sun;—Apollo, id est solinem, modò hospitatem modò pœlem signifi-cantibus cognominibus ADORAMUS (c).

I could produce a hundred such Expressions, if it were necessary. But I shall only add, that I am ready to submit, if, by some other clear Passages, the Schematist be ever able, with all his cunning, to prove Macrobius a Christian.

3. In the mean while I shall put in here another Consideration, to shew the contrary: Which is, that Macrobius in the Conversations, or Dialogues, whereof his seven Books are compos'd, has chosen, for his Interlocutors and Speech-makers, some Men, we certainly know to have been the most rank and obstinate Heathens of his time.

Let us begin with VETTIUS AGORIUS PRÆTEXTATUS, in whose House the Conversations are suppos'd to have been held, during the Saturnalia, those fine Heathenish Holy-Days, dedicated to Saturn (d). His Paganism cannot be more open, than it is in Macrobius, who not only makes him set forth
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(c) Ibid, Lib. I. C. 17.
(d) Saturnalibus apud VETTIUM PRÆTEXTATUM Romanæ Nobilitatis Processus doctique aliis congregantur, etc. Macrobi.L. I. C. 1, in Argum. Oper. Vid. et Cap. 2,
that long Discourse containing about XX Chapters, wherein he explains the nature of the Heathenish Gods and Religious Ceremonies; but besides, he has pointed out very plainly the sacred Offices and Dignities he was indow'd with (a). These are particularly recited in the Marble, which was, it seems, the Basis of the Statue dedicated to him by publick Authority, according to the Prayer of the Senate made in their Name by Symmachus (b), to the Emperors Theodosius and Valentinianus. The Inscription still extant has among the rest the following remarkable Words: VETTIO AGORIO PRAETEXTATO V. C. PONTIFICI VESTAE PONTIFICI SOLI- QVINDECIMVIRO AVGVRIT AVE ROS VEL LOATING CVRIALI NEOCORO HIEROPHANTAE PATRI SACRONVM, &c. (c). It was dedicated the first of February in the IIId Consulship of Valentinianus II. with Eutropius, i.e. An. Dom. 387.


(b) Sym. Ep. 32. Lib. X. Edit. Parci.

(c) Gruter. Inscr. p. MCII. n. 2a.
Another Statue had been intended by the Vestals, he having been a Priest of Vesta, as we read in Symmachus (b), who did not spare his praises in his Letters to him alive, and after his death to the Emperors (c).

No wonder then if St. Hierom calls him a sacrilegious Man, and a worshipper of Idols (d), and acted so severely against the Christians, in that Dispute between Damasus and Ursinus, about the See of Rome, he being then Governour and Prefectus of the City (e).

Symmachus himself, whom we have already often quoted, is another of the Interlocutors in Macrobius. His Heathenism would sufficiently appear by his intimacy with Pretextatus, had we no other Evidence. But it fully appears thro' all his Epistles, and especially by that famous Petition (f), which in the Name of the Senate he presented to the Emperors
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(b) Epist. 36. Lib. 2.
(c) See Lib. I. Ep. 44.—55. & Lib. X. Ep. 30.—32.
(f) Lib. X. Ep. 61. DDD. Valentiniano, Theodosio & Arcadio.
Sect. III. In behalf of the Vefials, and for the reftoring of Pagan Ceremonies, and was fo zealously oppos'd by St. Ambrofius and Prudentius, the Christian Poet of that Age. We have also a shorter Demonstration in a Marble preferved to this time at Rome in the Villa Casali. Having described it my self better than it had been published before (a), the curious Reader will not be sorry to see it here.

Q. AVR. SYMMACHO \textit{VC} QVAEST. PRAET. PONTIFICI MAIORI CORRECTORI LVCANIAE ET BRITTIORVM COMITI ORDINIS TERTII PROCONS. AFRICAE PRAEF. VROB. COS. ORDINARIO ORATORI DISSERTISSIMO Q. FAB. MEMM. SYMMACHVS \textit{VC} PATRI OPTIMO.

At the top in the Cornish this Word is read EVSEBII. Which I take to signify, that this Inscription, tho' erected at the ex-pence of Symmachus's Son, had been com-piled by Eusebius. And this may be the fame Man with that brought in by Mac-robius

among his Interlocutors, and praised as a famous Professor of Rhetorick of those times (a).

I shall omit another Inscription (b) which I have copied in the same Villa, and was dedicated by the same Symmachus the Son, to the Grandfather of his Wife, Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, who had the same Religious Dignity of Pontifex Major, and who seems to have been the Father of Flavianus, another of Macrobius’s Speakers, whom he makes Symmachus (c), to extol much above the Father (d), whereby alone

(a) Facundum & eruditum virum EUSEBIUM Rhetorem, inter Graecos praestantem omnibus idem nostrae aetatise professi; doctrique Latiris haud inincum Praetextatus, utum in Locum [Peshumiani] invitati imperavit; Saturn. Lib. I. C. I. Vid. c. 6.


(c) The Character of Flavianus, drawn by Symmachus himself, has been already observed by the learned Reinhold, Epist. 69. p. 624. & Inscription. p. 78. Flavius quem dixi, Pontificis erga Ceremonias Deorum & festa Divinitatis imperata solennias; Religio & Pietas, ex Epist. 34. & 53. Lib. 2. Symmachii, sgnoici potest: Qua munus fuum, in sacris Matris Magna Deus celebrandis, imprimis caium feui ejunium Symmacho, ceu Colligae (nam & hunc Pontifex) suisse apud ex Ep. 41. L. I. 31. L. II. & 99. L. IX.) eum mandaviisse, quod absens istarum feriarum diebus effet, legimus.

(d) Tum Symmachus, ne quid ad perfectionem Coenae desideretur, invitandos ad eundem congressum convicturnque conueni FLAVIANUM, qui quantum sit, mirandum! Viro venuto PATRE praestantium, non minus ornatu morum, gravitatisque vitae, quam copiis profundar eruditionis, asseruit, etc. Saturn. L. I. C. 8. Vid. Symmachii Epist. L. II. integ. Flaviano script.
Sect. III. Ione we can easily conclude, that he was of the same stamp, without enlarging upon what Symmachus himself says of him in his Epistles.

The like conclusion must be drawn concerning another of the Interlocutors, COECINA ALBINUS, whom Macrobius represents, as most united with Symmachus, having both the same Age, Manners, and Studies: Et venerunt Aurelius Symmachus, et Coecina Albinus, cum ætate, tum etiam moribus, ac studiis inter se conjunctissimi; Satur. L. I. c. ii.

But to shorten this tedious examination, if those Inflances seem not yet sufficient to the Schematist, there is a general Character of all the Interlocutors, given by Macrobius, Lib. I. c. xxiv. where he makes them ALL admire and applaud Prætextatus, after his long Discourse of the Heathenish Gods, and praise his Religion, Piety, profound Learning in their Theology, and great Eloquence, &c. *Hic cum Prætextatus fecisset finem loquendi, OMNES in eum affixiis voluntibus admirationem stupore prodebant: dein Laudare, hic memoriam, illæ doctrinam, CUNCTI RELIGIONEM, affirmantes hunc esse unum arcanè DEORUM naturæ conscium, qui solus Divina et assequi animo et eloqui posset ingenio.*

Having
Having thus defeated the pretended Christianity of Macrobius, and, I hope, to the Satisfaction of the Readers, who are sincere lovers of Truth; I shall conclude with another Remark, to shew that Macrobius did not take from St. Matthew what he says upon the slaughter of the Innocents. This appears from the difference, which is in their accounts. For St. Matthew tells us, it was done in a particular Town of Judæa call'd Bethlehem; and Macrobius speaks of the whole Province of Syria in general, as if it had been all affected thereby, and Herod could have extended his Kingly Power over all that Province, where yet he had none. Had Macrobius been a Christian, he would certainly have been better instructed, by his frequenting the Christian Churches, where the Gospels were continually read. Nevertheless this inaccuracy of Macrobius, or of the Pagan Author, he follows, does not in the least hurt the chief Matter, we are concern'd for, the truth of the Fact, which for all that is so clearly deliver'd in Macrobius, as well as in St. Matthew, and some of the first Christian Writers, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, &c.

POSTSCRIPT
POSTSCRIPT
CONCERNING
Virgil's IVth Eclogue.

The Author of the Scheme, arguing (a) against my Lord Bishop of Coventry's Conjecture, (for he gives it for no more) concerning the grounds of Virgil's IVth Eclogue, has done me the Honour of putting my Name in a Marginal Note, as if I were one of those, who had beforehand confuted the Bishop's Notions.

There reciting in part the Title of a Manuscript Dissertation, I had mention'd in the Preface of my Book about the pretended Universal Peace, at the Birth of our Saviour (b), the Schematist adds, that my Dissertation being yet unpublished, the Bishop has the peculiar advantage of consulting it, for his own Conviction.

This, and the whole Note, I ought, without doubt, to take, as one of those extremely

(a) Pag. 50, 51.
(b) Jani Templum Christo nascente Referat, &c. Roter, An. 1700.
extremely witty Sneers, so common in the Stile of the Schematist. For I suppose, he does not really believe, that so learned a Person as my Lord Bishop, wants my poor help for his own Conviction upon any Subject; or that I am so foolishly conceited, as to think his Lordship does want it.

1. To give him a serious Answer, I shall first observe, that this very Learned, Sagacious, and Polite Schematist must know, that the Bishop could find nothing in my Manuscript Dissertation for his Conviction, against his own Conjecture. For since the Schematist says expressly, that, if he mistake not, the Bishop (p. 14.) highly Commends that Manuscript Tract on another account; he must therefore be conscious, that the Bishop having read my Dissertation, he had also seen what the Schematist thinks to be therein against the Bishop's Notions on this matter, if in reality my Dissertation contain'd any such Confutation. Or at least in this supposition, the Schematist might naturally imagine, that the Bishop had not found therein any thing strong enough for a contrary Opinion; and consequently, that no better Conviction could be got by reading again my Dissertation either in Manuscript or in Print. To what purpose then does that Author bring me, and my Writings into this Dispute?

2. Besides,
2. Besides, the truth is, that my Dissertation confutes nothing like my Lord Bishop's Conjecture. For in a sort of Preamble I mention only the Interpretation of some Ancient Writers, who look'd upon this Piece of Virgil, as a true Divine Prediction; such especially is the Explication given by Eusebius, under the Name of Constantinus the Great: Of which a Learned Jesuit (a) speaks thus: Constantinum certè tantum Imperatorem non puduit Bucolicum istud, non pro vulgari profanove, sed pro sacro Cælestive, sanctis Nicæa Synodici Patribus, cæu Prognosticum, prælegere & explicare, &c.

I mention at the same time another Interpretation borrow'd of Servius, that old Commentator of Virgil, and improv'd by most part of the Modern Grammarians and Criticks, particularly by David Blondell, tho' he confuted the former. They pretend that Virgil wrote that Eclogue after the Birth of a Son of Pollio, taking this opportunity for praising both Augustus and Pollio.

Having refer'd my Reader to Blondell's Book (b) for a further Confutation of the first Opinion, I propose another Method for entirely demolishing all, and especially the

(b) DEI Sibyl. L. 1. C. 13, 14, 15.
the last Interpretation; viz. in giving what I thought to be a true Historical Explication of Virgil's Poem.

In this View there was no need for me to determine, what might be the Poet's true Mind and Notion, when he brought in the pretended Cumean Predictions, on which he builds the Application he makes to the Subject, or Person, he had in his Eye.

Let it be a real Oracle of the Sibyls then extant and preserved among those, which had been gather'd in Foreign Countries, after the last burning of the Capitol, wherein the Sibylline Books were kept. Or let it be only a Traditional Notion, handed about from old times, and grounded upon, I do not know what. I may for all that search out what is the true Object, to which Virgil applies all the great and happy Things suppos'd to be hoped for, and expected by the Roman People, on either of those two grounds.

Nevertheless, in a short account of the fatal Accidents suffer'd by the Sibylline Books, I venture to observe, that Virgil by his Cumean Verses, Cumaen Carmen, seems rather to mean the predictions of the Sibyl in general, or of that in particular, who had her Seat and Oracle at Cumea, near Naples.
And indeed, to say here something more of that, it is certain that in ancient writers that *Epithet* is constantly used for what belong'd to the *Sibyl*, and not to describe *Hesiod*. This Father of the most ancient *Greek* Mythology is commonly pointed at by the Sir-name of *Ascreus*, a Town in *Beotia*, wherein he was suppos'd to be born or educated. It is used in particular by *Virgil* himself, signifying, that in his *Georgicks* he had imitated *Hesiod's Poem* of *Rural Affairs* (a):

*Ascreumque cano Romano per oppida Carmen.*

On the other hand *Propertius*, a Cotemporary Poët, gives the *Sibyl* the Name of *Cumæan Prophetes*, Lib. ii. Eleg. ii. fin.

*Hanc utinam faciem nolit mutare senectus,*

*Etsi Cumææ secula Vatis aget.*

The same Phrase was not long after borrow'd by *Valer. Flaccus* (a):

*Phœbe, mone, si Cumææ mihi Constia Vatis fiat casta Cortina domo.*

---


— Hos tibi dans calamos, en accipe, *Munæ,*

*Ascreo quos ante sens, &c.*

(a) *Argonaut.* Lib. i. ver. 5, 6. Cum quibus confers

*Claudian in Imp. Honorii Con lul. IV. ver. 147.*

*Chaldæi humili fames, Cumanæq; redux,*

*Intonnis Rupes, rabida delubra Sibyllæ.*
From whence some learned Men (a) have justly concluded, that this Poët was one of the Quindecimviri, under whose peculiar Care and Inspection were the Sibylline Books.

My next step is to fix the time of Virgil's Writing his 4th Eclogue, which I shew to be after Pollio had enter'd into the exercise of his Consulship, that is to say in Autumn, the Year 714. of Rome, (the 40th before our Vulg. Aera) immediately after the reconciliation between M. Antony and the young Caesar Octavianus, call'd afterwards Augustus. This remarkable Circumstance fill'd Rome and all Italy with the joyful hopes of a lasting Peace, Plenty, and Happiness, after several years of Civil Wars; tho' it happen'd that the next following years did not very exactly answer their expectation.

These Chronological Observations, concerning Pollio's Consulship, I have since inserted in the Life of Horace (b).

Having thus settled the true Epoch of Virgil's 4th Eclogue, and paved my way, I proceed to propose my two Historical Explications.

D

(a) F. Fred. Gresovius de Pecun. veter. Lib. IV. C. X. p. m. 333. seq. & post Nic. Heinsius ad L. C.
(b) Horat. Vita, ad An. V. C. 714. p. 77—81.
1. In the first I endeavour to shew, that the Poet's Application and Encomiums can exactly fute the young Caesar [Augustus.] Among the rest, comparing what is said there of the happy Golden Age beginning again, with what Virgil elsewhere [Eclog. ix. & Aen. L. VI.] lays in express Terms of Augustus; I apply, to the Subject, the Testimony of many ancient Authors concerning the new Star, or Comet, which appeare'd soon after Julius Caesar's death, when this young Heir and Successor of his was giving to the Roman People some fine Shews and Games in honour of the deces'd Julius Caesar. Above all the rest the Passage of Pliny (a) is to be remark'd, being express most in Augustus his own Words. I shall repeat here only the latter part: Sed Augustus interiore gudio SIBI illum [Cometem] NATUM, SEQUE in eo NASCI, interpretatus est. Et sanè, si spectetur Octaviani seculi felicitas, salutaris Cometes ille fuit.

Hence easly appears, why Virgil might fitly represent the young Caesar, as in a manner a new born Child, besides the Reason taken from his being a mere Youth, which made them both, his Friends and Enemies call him so commonly a Child.

(a) Hist. Natur. Lib. II. Ch. 25.
II. Notwithstanding the great probability and fitness of that first Historical Explication, I propose yet another, by which I suppose, that Virgil, besides the Praises of Augustus, had also in his view to flatter him with foretelling the speedy Birth of a Son, by his Wife Scribonia, who was then with Child.

This I easily prove by good Authority, and that instead of a Son, there came the next year into the World the Daughter of his call’d Julia, who afterwards by her infamous Life, caus’d so much Grief and Shame to her Father Augustus.

III. What follows in my Dissertation is by much the longest part. Therein I fully overturn the other current Opinion concerning Pollio’s Son, suppos’d to be born a little before, and nam’d Salinus from Pollio’s having taken Salona in Dalmatia, when he was commanding the Troops in that Province.

To demonstrate how groundless that is, I give an exact Chronological account of Pollio’s Life, for many years before; which I have collected from his own Epistles and those of Cicero, as well as from other Historical Monuments. I make it thereby most evident, that Pollio never had any Command, nor made any War in Dalmatia, but after his Consulship.
I had by that an opportunity of speaking of Horace's Ode to Pollio, [Lib. ii. Od. i.] and so of confuting what Dacier had said upon the matter in his Notes. And this also I have inserted in my Life of Horace (a), referring at the same time (b) my Reader to the Life of Pollio, for a further Confutation of what concerns Pollio's pretended Son Saloninus, and Virgil's IVth Eclogue. For then I had resolv'd to change the Plan of my Dissertation, because this last and longest part of it seem'd much fitter for Pollio's Life. Into such a Work I had a mind to turn the whole Dispute about that Eclogue, as well, as all the rest found in Ancient Authors, relating to this Illustrious Man, so considerable by his Noble Birth, High Dignities, Great Achievements, and Extraordinary Parts, as an Historian, and a Poët.

Till this be publish'd in a Chronological Order, as I have done in the Lives of Horace, Ovid and Pliny, or the Dissertation it self be printed; I hope the short account, I have here offer'd, will be thought sufficient, to answer that sort of Call in the Scheme, without which I had never given

(a) Horat. Vita p. 91.—105.
(b) ibid. p. 99. in the Margin vide Nosfr. Pollionis vitam, ad Aug. V. C. 714.
given this trouble, neither to the Reader, nor to my self.

Addition for Page 35.

Having at last, got a sight of Barthius's Book, I am bound to tell the Reader, that I am convinc'd, the Schematist never read the Passage concerning Macrobius. For Barthius roundly affirms, he was a Christian, as a thing known to every Body. And yet he confesses, That there is scarce in his Writings the least footstep of his Christianity; so great is the Judgement of Barthius. No doubt, but the Schematist borrow'd this Authority of Fabricius, tho' a little too hastily, according to his wonted Method. For this Learned Man speaks thus, Bibl. Lat. Lib. III. c. 12. (N.) Non minus incerta res de Religione Macrobi. Christianis eum annumerat Barthius, p. 2258. Adversar. Contrà homo Ethnicus dicitur Spanhemio Dub. Evangel. T. I. p. 533. Cui assentiri malim. Ambiguæ hencerent Grotius ad Matth. ii. 16. & Huetus, p. 789. Demonst.

However, here are the Words of Barthius, Advers. Lib. 48. C. 8. Col. 2258. in fol. Ubi agens de Chalcidio, cui cenfet in rebus
rebus Philosophicis, etiam Christiano, fidendum; addit: Quod si facere noluerimus, sani cum eo Macrobius etiam, et Boethium, et alios nonnullos tales abjiciamus, qui cum Christiani fuisse omnibus noti sint, tali tamen temperatione Philosophica Scripta promulgarunt, ut Ægrè in illis vel aliquot Vestigium Christianismi appareat.

I leave to the Reader to determine who is the most Judicious of these two Writers, either Barthius, who can reason so, or the Schematist, who dares produce such an Evidence for proving that Macrobius might be a Christian; even supposing that the Schematist had read Barthius.

FINIS.
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IN the Title Page, of the Slaughter, &c. read Dubius.
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A Sermon preach'd to the Societies for Reformation of Manners, at St. Mary Le Bow, on Monday, January 4, 1724.


A Paraphrase on the Four Evangelists: Wherein, for the clearer understanding the Sacred History, the whole Text and Paraphrase are printed in separate Columns over against
Books Printed for J. and J. Knapton:


A Letter to Mr. Dodwell; wherein all the Arguments in his Epistolary Discourse against the Immortality of the Soul are particularly answered. Together with four Letters in Answer to the Author of Remarks on the Letter to Mr. Dodwell. To which are added, some Reflections on that Part of a Book calledAmyntor, or the Defence of Mil-son's Life, which relates to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, and the Canon of the New Testament. The Fifth Edition. By Samuel Clarke, D.D. Rector of St. James's Westminster. Price 4s.


The true Grounds of the Expectation of the Messiah. In two Letters: The one printed in the London Journal, Apr. 1. 1727; and the other in Vindication of it. Being a Reply to the Answer published at the End of a late Letter to Dr. Rogers. By Philalethes, Bvo. price 1s.

A Chronological Treatise upon the Seventy Weeks of Daniel. With Chronological Tables suited to the whole. By Benjamin Marshall, M.A. Rector of Naunton in Gloucestershire.

In the Press, and will be speedily publish'd,

Three Letters in farther Vindication of the late Bishop Lloyd's Hypothesis of Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. One to the Reverend Mr. Lancaster, Vicar of Bowdon in Cheshire: In Answer to his Remarks on the said Hypothesis. Another to Mr. Whiston, occasioned by his latter Hypothesis of the said Weeks. The Third to the Author of the Scheme of Literal Prophecy consider'd: Wherein are examined and refuted the said Author's Pre-tenences for referring this Prophecy of the Weeks to the Person and Times of Antiochus Epiphanes: And it is proved, that the said Prophecy, in its Literal Sense, is applicable wholly and only to the Messiah of the Christians, and the Times of their Messiah. By Benjamin Marshall, M.A. Rector of Naunton in Gloucestershire, and sometime Student of Christ-Church in Oxford.