

1-1-1933

## Studies in Eusebius

E. G. Sihler

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Sihler, E. G. (1933) "Studies in Eusebius," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 4 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol4/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

licher Weise zu besehen und zu beseitigen. Dafür sei Gott bei einem solchen Ruhepunkt in der Flucht der Zeit, wie es dieses Jahr des sechzigjährigen Bestehens ist, von Herzen Dank gesagt. Er wolle nach seiner Gnade mit uns sein, wie er gewesen ist mit unsern Vätern, und weiterhin Treue, Einigkeit, Brüderlichkeit, Liebe geben und erhalten! Und dazu dienen ganz besonders auch die zweijährlichen Versammlungen, wie wir zu einer solchen jetzt wieder zusammengelommen sind. Das ist die Erfahrung aller, die diesen Versammlungen wiederholt beigewohnt haben.

Gott sei uns gnädig und segne uns; er lasse uns sein Antlitz leuchten! Er lehre uns tun nach seinem Wohlgefallen, denn er ist unser Gott; sein guter Geist führe uns auf ebener Bahn! Sein Wort sei unser Fußes Leuchte und ein Licht auf unserm Wege! Amen.

L. Fürbringer.

---

## Studies in Eusebius.

---

The slurs of Gibbon have been answered by many Christians, especially by Milman, Dean of St. Paul's. The chief aim of Gibbon was to belittle the motives and heroism of the martyrs, to call in question the accounts of witnesses like Lactantius and Eusebius, and to excuse or mitigate the action of those responsible for the persecutions. In the present paper my aim is to examine with care the procedure and methods of Eusebius. The most striking feature of his manner of work is this: He has preserved for us many contemporary documents, the value of which cannot be belittled or explained away by any fair criticism. It is true, we should like to know more of the common Christians, of the laity, of the actual services of the Christian congregations. The incessant series of heresies and heresiarchs, in my opinion, would have been impossible if the Bible had been as common and familiar to all as it came to be after the invention of printing by Gutenberg, before the Reformation. Also the development of hierarchy gave a dangerous preponderance to the rulers of the churches, who really were not less subject to the authority of the Word than the common Christians. The bishops gradually became dynasts and the laymen subjects. I will now merely transcribe some of the passages from Gibbon, chaps. XV and XVI, without any comments or polemic, in which the real attitude of the famous Voltairian<sup>1)</sup> reveals itself.

But first I must copy Dean Milman's note, appended to the beginning of Gibbon's chaps. XV and XVI: "The art of Gibbon, or at least the unfair impression produced by these two memorable chapters, consists of confounding together in one undistinguishable mass the

---

1) See Leslie Stephen on Gibbon, in *British Biography*. On this whole subject compare my work *From Augustus to Augustine*, Cambridge, 1923, especially the chapters dealing with Diocletian, Julian, and Augustine.

*origin* and *apostolic* propagation of the Christian religion, as dexterously eluded or speciously concealed. His plan enables him to commence his account, in most parts, *below the apostolic times*; and it is only by the strength of the dark coloring with which he has brought out the failings and the follies of the succeeding ages that a shadow of doubt and suspicion is thrown back on the primitive period of Christianity. Divest this whole passage of the latent sarcasm betrayed by the subsequent of the whole disquisition, and it might commence a Christian history in the most Christian spirit of candor."

Now a few passages from Gibbon: "The Jewish converts, who acknowledged Jesus in the character of the Messiah foretold by their ancient oracles" . . . "the doubtful and imperfect faith of modern ages." "It is this deep impression of supernatural truths which has been so much celebrated under the name of faith—a state of mind described as the surest pledge of the divine favor and of future felicity and recommended as the first or perhaps the only merit of a Christian." Now follows a passage almost identical with one written by Julian the Apostate (*From Augustus to Augustine*, p. 214): "Whatever corrupter (*φθορεῖς*), whatever blood-guilty person there be, let him come forward with confidence; for with this water here [of Baptism] having washed him, I will at once exhibit him as clean; and if for a second time he becomes liable for the same things, I will grant to him that, after beating his breast and striking his head, he may become clean."

Does Gibbon allude to this passage in Julian? "It is a very ancient reproach, suggested by the ignorance or the malice of infidelity, that the Christians allured into their party the most atrocious criminals, who, as soon as they were touched by a sense of remorse, were easily persuaded to wash away, in the water of Baptism, the guilt of their past conduct, for which the temples of the gods refused to grant them an expiation." Again, he says in the same chapter (XV): "Very different was the reasoning of our devout predecessors. Vainly aspiring to imitate the perfections of angels, they disdained, or they affected to disdain, every earthly and corporeal delight." "The ecclesiastical governors of the Christians were taught to unite the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove; but as the former was refined, so the latter was insensibly corrupted by the habits of government." Gibbon computes that before the "important conversion of Constantine" only one-twentieth part of the population of the Roman Empire had turned Christian. (P. 152, Vol. 2, Bigelow & Co., New York.) I consider this estimate wildly improbable.

Again (p. 156): "The names of Seneca" (who defended the matricide Nero), "of the elder and younger Pliny, of Galen, of the slave Epictetus, and of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus adorn the age in which they flourished and exalt the dignity of human nature."

Of Gibbon's chapter XVI Milman wrote (p. 160): "The sixteenth [chapter] I cannot help considering a very ingenious and specious, but very disgraceful extenuation of the cruelties perpetrated by the Roman magistrates against the Christians. It is written in the most contemptibly factious spirit of prejudice against the sufferers; it is unworthy of a philosopher and a man of humanity. Let the narrative of Cyprian's death be examined. He [Gibbon] had to relate the murder of an innocent man of advanced age and in a station deemed venerable by a considerable body of the provincials of Africa, put to death because he refused to sacrifice to Jupiter. Instead of pointing the indignation of posterity against such an atrocious act of tyranny, he dwells with visible art on the small circumstances of decorum and politeness which attended this murder and which he relates with as much parade as if they were the most important particulars of the event."

But let us now turn to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*) directly. It was finished after July 25, A. D. 325, and published before the end of A. D. 326 (Fynes Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, Vol. I, p. 379. Oxford, 1845), at a time coincident with the Council of Nicaea, when the position of the Christian religion had become free, at least officially so, by the Decree of Milan, 313.

There are two characteristic features in the favorite interests of Eusebius, chronology and, as I intimated, actual citation of contemporary documents, such as letters of churchmen. A church, or episcopal district, is often designated not as *ἐκκλησία*, but as *παροικία*, a place of "sojourning" among strangers, a passing home in a strange land, for which we may compare the situation of Israel in Egypt, Acts 13, 7. (Cf. 1 Pet. 1, 17.) He eagerly uses Josephus, especially when he can find a confirmation or illumination of Christian history, as, e. g., II, 10, the death of Herod Agrippa at Caesarea, in 44 A. D., Acts 12, 19—23, where Eusebius makes a heavy citation from Josephus, *Antiq.*, XIX. The greater detail in the Jewish historian curiously confirms and illumines the briefer narrative of Luke. We learn this: Herod Agrippa gave games in honor of Emperor Claudius. On the second day of the festival Herod Agrippa entered the theater, early in the morning, clothed in a garment of silver texture, which reflected the rays of the morning sun. "At once the flatterers from one or the other side cried out utterances not good, even for him, *calling him god*, adding, *May you be generous unto us!*" (Clearly these were *not Jews*, but Greeks. — *E. G. S.*) "If up to now we feared you as a human being, from now on we confess that you are superior to mortal nature." After five days of intense abdominal suffering the king died, in his fifty-fourth year, having ultimately ruled over the tetrarchy of Philip and the district governed by Herod, both under Caligula and Claudius. The famine in Judea, also under Claudius, relieved from Antioch,

through Paul and Barnabas (Acts 11, 29. 30), Eusebius sees confirmed by Josephus. Like Justin, Eusebius confounded the figure of Semo Sancus at Rome with Simon Magus of Samaria. Justin, when at Rome, misread the inscription at the base of the statue.

Eusebius, *H. E.*, II, 15, Peter and Mark at Rome, now, as by Zahn, set not so early, but in 64 A. D., under Nero, when the great conflagration was followed by the cruel persecution under Nero. (Cf. 1 Pet. 5, 13.) Neander assumed "Babylon" to be that on the Euphrates and *συνηλεκτή* to be the wife of Peter. Cf. also 1 Cor. 5, 9.

The digressions by Eusebius (II, 17, 18) on certain works by Philo Judaeus I have read and reread, but I cannot understand the pertinency of this excursus — in the history of the New Testament, or that Philo met Peter at Rome, a tradition it is true (Eusebius II, 17), but exceedingly unlikely. We read also (E., II, 18) that the works of Philo, by action of the Senate, under Claudius, were placed in libraries (at Rome — perhaps the Apollo library on the Palatine?).

One outstanding feature in the studies of Eusebius: He does not seem to have been familiar with *Latin* documents or authorities, such as Tacitus, *Annals*, XV, 44, when relating the fire at Rome and the terrible persecution through Nero of the Christians, 64 A. D. When we examine Eusebius, II, 25, he incorrectly combines the martyrdom of both Paul and Peter with that conflagration. The Vatican region and the Via Ostiensis were indeed always associated with the martyrdom of both, but Paul seems to have visited Spain after his acquittal in the first trial.

Let us now turn away to the general estimation of the Christians as presented by Tacitus and his younger friend, Pliny the Younger. I have discussed the former's record (*Ann.*, XV, 44) quite fully in *Biblical Review*, April, 1928, and must now limit myself to a few phrases: "*Quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat.*" "Shameless deeds," or "practises" — what did the pagan public mean? The fraternal kiss? or the *agapae*, the love-feasts? or that they scrupulously refused to appear at games, theaters, and the endlessly recurring festivals which marked the Roman calendar? Thus "*odio generis humani*" might be understood, perhaps, from this rigorous abstention. More light may come from the official correspondence between Emperor Trajan and Pliny, then proconsul of Bithynia and Pontus, probably 104 A. D. (Fynes Clinton). Eusebius, III, 33, does report the matter, but at second hand (from Tertullian, says Fynes Clinton; still I find that Tertullian reproduced Pliny's report very exactly and correctly). On the whole, it seems best to present completely my own version of this famous document in the history of early Christianity (*Plin. Ep.*, X, 96): —

"It is a customary matter with me, O Master, to refer to you all things about which I am in doubt. For who can better either direct

my hesitation or equip my ignorance? I have never been officially present [*interfui*] in trials concerning Christians;<sup>2)</sup> therefore I do not know what and how far it is wont to be either punished or investigated. And I have hesitated not a little whether there is some distinction of ages or whether persons of no matter what tender age should not differ from the stronger; whether pardon should be given to repentance or whether to him who altogether has been a Christian his having ceased to be shall not be advantageous; whether the name itself, if it be free from the shameless practises associated with the name [*flagitia cohaerentia nomini*; cf. Tacitus, above, *Ann.*, XV, 44]. Meanwhile I have in the case of those who were reported to me as Christians followed this procedure: I asked them personally [*ipsos*] whether they were Christians. If they confessed it, I asked them again, and for a third time, threatening them with execution [*supplicio*]. When they persevered, I ordered them to be led to execution. For I did not doubt, no matter what it was they had confessed, that their stubbornness surely and their inflexible obstinacy must be punished. There were others of similar folly, whom, because they were Roman citizens, I marked as people who should be sent to the City [Rome].<sup>3)</sup> Soon in the very prosecution, as is wont to come about, the charge spreading, more forms occurred. There was published a pamphlet [*libellus*], anonymous, containing the names of many. Those that denied that they were Christians or had been, when, on my uttering the form, they accosted the gods and with incense and wine made worship to your image, which on this account I had ordered to be brought in, together with figures [*simulacra*] of the gods, and furthermore blasphemed Christ, none of which things, it is said, they can be compelled to do who really are Christians, I thought they must be discharged. Others, named by an informer, said that they were Christians and soon denied it, [saying] they had been, but had ceased to be, some three years ago, some more years, certain ones even twenty years before. These also, all of them, worshiped both your image and the figures of the gods and blasphemed Christ. They deposed that this had been the total of their guilt or error, that they had been accustomed on a stated day to meet before daylight [*ante lucem*], to utter a chant to Christ, as to a god, in turn [*invicem*],<sup>4)</sup> and to bind themselves by an oath, not to some crime or other, but that they would not commit theft, highway robbery, adultery, that they would not break their word, that they would not deny a deposit when called upon.<sup>5)</sup> Having done this, it had been their custom to separate and

2) Since 64 A. D. or even before? The persecution under Domitian also had preceded.

3) Like St. Paul, by Festus, Acts 25, 12.

4) Probably antiphony and responsorium; cf. 1 Tim. 3, 16.

5) Perhaps the recitation of the Ten Commandments.

meet again to take food,<sup>6</sup>) but of a kind that was common and harmless; which itself they had ceased to do after my edict, in which, according to your orders, I had forbidden that there be any association [*hetairias*]. The more necessary I deemed it to inquire from two maids, who were called deaconesses [*ministrae*], even by torture [*per tormenta*], what was true. I found nothing but silly and boundless superstition. Therefore, postponing trials, I have resorted to consult you. For the matter seemed to me worthy of consultation, especially on account of the number of those who are endangered [in Eusebius, from Tertullian, Pliny: *ταραχθεῖς τῷ πλῆθει*, III, 25, who are endangering themselves]. For many of every age, of every social grade, of both sexes also, are incurring risk and will do so. The contagion of that superstition has spread not only through towns, but also through villages and the open country [*agros*], which, it seems, can be stopped and reformed. Surely it is a well-established fact that temples, almost now forsaken, have begun to be attended, and the stated sacrifices, long dropped [*diu intermissa*], are again being performed and that the grazing of sacrificial animals has a market [once more], of which until now a very rare purchaser was found. Hence it is easy to form an opinion what a multitude of men [*turba hominum*] can be set right [*emendari*] if there be space for repentance."

Of the emperor's decision I will quote but a main point: "They must not be looked up; if they be brought before you and found guilty on examination, they must be punished, thus, however, that he who denies that he is a Christian and makes it concretely [*re ipsa*] clear, that is, by worshiping our gods, although he was suspected in the past, shall obtain pardon upon his repentance."

So it is clear that under Trajan consistent confession of Christ was no more nor less than a capital crime, or high treason against the state. We see distinctly how the precedent was set by Trajan (considered one of the best emperors in the Roman annals), how political and civil loyalty was now bound up with the traditional idolatry; to deny these gods was to deny the authority of the state, deified since Augustus in the deceased emperors.<sup>7</sup>)

But to return to our special task. The chief concern of Eusebius, or one of his chief concerns, is this: to keep a list of bishops, with the greatest possible accuracy of names and the chronology of their sequence on their "thrones," whereas we evangelical Christians would be more interested to learn of the practical spread of the Scriptures in the congregations. Returning now to some important data, we observe that for the fall of Jerusalem, 70 A. D., Eusebius (III, 6) makes heavy

6) The *agape*? or Communion?

7) Exceptions: Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, the three pretenders who preceded Vespasian, and the last of the Flavians, Domitian.

citations from Josephus and tells us that the Christians in time had withdrawn to Pella in Perea<sup>8)</sup> (III, 5). Eusebius quotes the words of our Lord, Matt. 28, 19, and also τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, the prediction of all the horrors by the Savior Himself, Matt. 24, 15,<sup>9)</sup> forty years before the catastrophe, as Eusebius computes the chronology.

His great interest is in "succession," as in III, 4, — Gentile Christians in the New Testament are generally called οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, while Jewish Christians are designated as οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, — and he cites the introductory words of 1 Pet. almost verbatim: "the diaspora of Pontus and Galatia, Cappadocia and Asia" (the Roman province of which Ephesus was the capital).

He calls the persecution under Domitian the second (III, 17). Now it seems from secular authors that Domitian was always afraid of a new "king" and that he turned against the Christians because they considered Christ their King, in a spiritual, not in a political sense. So he summoned to Rome some descendants of King David from Palestine (Eusebius, III, 20, from Hegesippus). *Delatores* had informed against them as being grandsons of James, the brother of Christ. (On this nuisance of the *delatores*, the professional informers, see Tacitus, *Annales*, IV, 30.) They were conveyed to Rome; but when the tyrant learned of their modest little farms and saw their horny hands, he abandoned his fear and suspicions. These farmers confessed Christ as the future Judge of the quick and the dead. Hegesippus said that Domitian issued a decree to stop the persecution in 95 A. D. or so, not long before he himself was slain and the Roman aristocracy was freed from its cruel oppressor. St. John then returned from Patmos to Ephesus. The term "synoptic" gospels may be due to a view long established before the time of Eusebius. (I quote from III, 24: "The other three evangelists one may survey jointly [συνιδεῖν πάρασι].") They begin with John the Baptist and chiefly relate the happenings occurring after the imprisonment of the Baptist. It is an odd idea of Dean Alford that John was not acquainted with the three other gospels. Passing here over Eusebius, III, 25: the "homologumena" and "anomologumena," the *Antilegomena*, the spurious (*νόθοι*) and the "fraudulent" books, we clearly realize that the dates of death or martyrdom of the leaders became soon, of course, a part of the Christian calendar and that their burial-places were an object of veneration, as the tomb of St. John at Ephesus. The term *ἐνδιάθηκος* (III, 25) of a canonical book — what does this adjective mean?

8) Named from the town of Macedon.

9) When we reflect on the data which I cited from Tacitus and Pliny, we are arrested by the prediction of the Master made in the very last days before His suffering, Mark 13, 13: "You will be hated by all on account of My name."



Perhaps this: a book which is in, which belongs to, the New Testament, the *καινή διαθήκη*.

I now come to the long list of the bishops of Jerusalem (Euseb. IV, 5). Eusebius says that the dates of the incumbency and succession of fifteen bishops were not recorded. Beginning with James, the brother of the Lord, the list ended with the siege of Jerusalem in Hadrian's reign, the furious insurrection under Barcochba, 132—135 A. D., at the conclusion of which Jerusalem was renamed Aelia Capitolina. Now, Eusebius collectively calls these fifteen bishops "the bishops from circumcision." Are we to assume that circumcision was actually practised up to 132 A. D. among Palestinian Christians alongside of baptism? It is not credible. It seems wiser to interpret that term as an ethnic designation; they were of Jewish descent, they were nationally Jews.

Now, one of Gibbon's favorite theses is to reduce the difference of Jews and Christians as much as possible, whereas the Jews under privileges decreed in writing, from Caesar and Augustus onward, had a *religio licita*, the Christians, *not*; the Jews, *qua* Jews, were not subjected to persecution, the Christians were. Stephen the deacon, the first Christian martyr, was slain — by whom? Not by the Romans; no, by the Jews. In like manner both James, the son of Zebedee, and James the Just, brother of the Lord, were executed, one by Herod Agrippa, 44 A. D., the other by the high priest Annas, a few years before the Jewish War. I will now give the list of the fifteen bishops, from Eusebius, IV, 5: James, "said to be the brother of the Lord," Symeon, Justus, Zacchaeus, Tobias, Benjamin, John, Matthias, Philip, Seneca (a curious appropriation of the name made famous for the first time by the Roman Stoic and author), Justus, Levi, Ephres, Joseph, Judas. They cover not much more than eighty years or so, the episcopate of them all averaging not much more than five to six years. Excepting the first, no writing seems to have come from any of them. Did Hadrian make a law that Aelia Capitolina should be inhabited only by non-Jews?

One of the barest forms of classical paganism is the deification and worship of Hadrian's favorite Antinous; a town named for him, temples, and games (Euseb., IV, 8). I myself in Rome (1912) read inscriptions dealing with this worship. "All began," wrote Justin, quoted by Eusebius, "from fear to worship him as a god, knowing who he was and whence he came."

This was the time when the Platonist Justin, just referred to, began to change to Christ. Eusebius cites him directly: "For I myself, too, rejoicing in the teachings of Plato, hearing the Christians abused and seeing them also fearless in facing death and all things considered dreadful, conceived the idea that it was impossible that they lived in wickedness and love of pleasure. For what voluptuary or person that

is incontinent or deems good the devouring of human flesh would be able to welcome death in order to be deprived of his own appetites, but would not endeavor in every way always to live the life here and to escape the notice of the rulers, let alone reporting himself as one that was to be put to death?"

Here I may add to the full account what Minucius Felix says in his *Octavius*, IX, 2 sqq. (cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, pp. 51—53). "We, too," says the Christian Octavius, "believed the monstrous stories about the Christians, stories which were so bruited about, but never investigated or proved." And the pagan point of view or attitude is well set forth also: "Do not the Romans hold sway and rule without your God, do they not enjoy the whole world and are your masters? But you are in suspense and anxiety, you do not visit shows, you do not share in parades." . . . We begin to understand why the Christians were not understood, nay, hated by the pagan world in which they lived, striving to keep themselves spotless from it. In IV, 9 Eusebius presents in a Greek version a decree of the emperor Hadrian advising the proconsul of Asia (the province) at Ephesus, Minucius Fundanus, not to listen to professional informers making accusations against the Christians. We have every reason to believe that such governmental documents were copied, preserved from bishops to bishops, throughout the Roman Empire.

Justin's *First Apology*, drawn on by Eusebius, is dated by Fynes Clinton 151 A. D. (under Antoninus Pius). Dr. Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins, in 1877 (Harper's), published both *Apologies*, and I take great pleasure in quoting from his Introduction (p. XXII): "The bold, as some might think, the audacious, tone of the *Apologies* has led some to fancy that they are not what they claim to be, actual documents intended for the eye of the emperor and the senate; but Justin was no holiday Christian, and it is inconceivable that a man who vindicated his faith with his blood should have shrunk from utterances which, after all, did not go beyond the boldness of a Peregrinus, to say nothing of the imaginary speeches of Apollonius of Tyana. To suppose that these *Apologies* are mere academic performances is to overlook the license accorded to the philosopher; is to shut the eyes to the earnestness of the Christian life of the century." Justin's description of the Gnostic leader Marcion of Pontus, in chap. 26 of the *First Apology*, is notable, but we cannot dwell on it now.<sup>10</sup> The familiarity of Justin with the history, the religion, and the philosophy of the classical world is impressive; it is precise, fair, and comprehensive and cannot but command the admiration of every classical scholar. The references and quotations from the New Testament are frequent and striking. The virgin birth of Christ is spoken of in

10) Cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, 1923, pp. 127, sqq. 134 sqq.

chaps. 22 and 46. A few citations are offered. He writes: 'We alone are hated on account of the name of Christ, and while doing no wrong, we are put to death as criminals, while others elsewhere worship even rivers<sup>11)</sup> and mice and cats, and not the same ones honored by all, but by some here and by others there, so that they all are impious to one another because they do not worship the same. That alone have you to charge against us, viz., that we do not worship the same gods as you do nor bear to the dead libations and incense and to paintings<sup>12)</sup> wreaths and sacrifices. For the same objects with some are esteemed gods, with others wild beasts, and with others sacrificial animals,<sup>13)</sup> as you know precisely.' Of the outrages on elementary moral sense conveyed in many elements of Greek mythology (Ganymede, Adonis, etc.) he wrote with great freedom (chap. 25). Sometimes a definite Scriptural reminiscence seems to guide his pen, as when he speaks of this, that men, with their deep recognition of good and evil, cannot have any excuse (Rom. 1, 20; 2, 1, ἀναπολόγητον). The reference to Barochba and the hatred of the Jews for the Christians is found in chap. 31; Bethlehem and the assessment records under Quirinius, chap. 34; the prophecy of the Lord's Passion in Ps. 22, chap. 35. All, says he, may be learned from the Acts (*Acta*) of Pontius Pilate (chap. 48). He dwells much on Is. 53 (chap. 51). The bulk of actual Christians came from the pagans (chap. 53). Of many direct and indirect quotations from John's gospel (as in chaps. 61—63) we have no time to speak nor of what he says about Baptism (chap. 61), the eternal Godhead of Christ (chap. 63), and the Eucharist (chap. 66). But I will close this digression on Justin by presenting an important passage which may serve as a complement to Pliny's report to Trajan (X, 96) presented below (chap. 67): "And on the so-called Sunday a meeting of all who dwell in towns or country takes place in the same spot, and the records of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the leader (ὁ προεστώς) in a discourse presents the admonition and call for the imitation of these noble things. Then we all jointly arise and utter prayers. And as we have said before, when we have ceased our prayer, bread is served and wine and water, and the pastor (ὁ προεστώς) equally sends up prayer and thanksgiving as far as he is able, and the people (ὁ λαός) give assent by uttering the amen, and the distribution and the sharing in the food that has been blessed takes place for each one, and to those not present a part is sent through the deacons. Of those who are wealthy and are willing each gives according to his own purpose (προαίρεσιν), and what is gathered is deposited with the pastor,

11) In Egypt.

12) The text has γραφαῖς. Perhaps we should read ταφαῖς.

13) Perhaps Justin had in mind the Apis of the Egyptians.

and he himself aids the orphans and the widows and those in prison and strangers sojourning there; in a word, he [the pastor] becomes a caretaker for all who are in need. On Sundays we all jointly hold our meeting, since it is the first day on which God, changing darkness and matter, created the world and Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose from the dead; for on the day before, that of Saturn, they crucified Him, and after the day of Saturn, which is Sunday, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them those things which for your consideration we have presented to you, too."

In 161 A. D. Marcus Aurelius, the Stoic, succeeded to the imperial throne at Rome. It was becoming more and more difficult to guard the frontier of the Danube and the Euphrates. The emperor's night thoughts *To Himself* are before us; among the elements of his self-examination he mentions his "reverence for the gods."<sup>14</sup> During his reign, in 166, occurred the martyrdom of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who was then eighty-six years of age. Polycarp had in his youth heard the Word of God from the Apostle St. John. Eusebius has preserved for us a precious document, the official narrative drawn up by the church at Smyrna for the churches in Pontus. As Polycarp entered the city, some of his pagan friends tried to save him, urging him to utter simply the words "Lord Caesar" and to sacrifice to Caesar. In vain. He was then conducted to the Stadium. The arrest of Polycarp made a great sensation. The proconsul made the usual efforts to make him recant. "Swear by the Emperor's fortune," he told him. Say, "Away with the atheists!" This particular sentence Polycarp indeed repeated, but refused to blaspheme Christ; he cut short all further insistence on the part of the proconsul to deny Christ by saying, "I am a Christian." The proconsul threatened to have him cast before the wild beasts and then to have him burned at the stake. The aged bishop replied by referring to the Judgment and what will follow it. The proconsul then had the herald proclaim to the people assembled in the Stadium, from the center, "Polycarp has confessed that he is a Christian," whereupon the multitude of pagans and Jews cried out, "This man is the teacher of Asia, father of the Christians, destroyer of our gods, who teaches many not to sacrifice nor to worship." Then they all shouted and demanded that he be burned. The crowd surged in from the workshops and the baths, bringing fuel; especially the Jews were eager to see him suffer such a death. He was tied to the stake. He then uttered his last prayer, which ended thus: "through the eternal High Priest Jesus Christ, Thy blessed Son, through whom to Thee with Himself and the Holy Spirit be glory now and in all eternity. Amen." As the burning lasted long, the "confecter"<sup>15</sup> was called and told to stab him to death. Polycarp

14) Cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, p. 45.

15) *Qui bestias in amphitheatris conficiebat.*

was the twelfth martyr at Smyrna. The anniversary of his death became a holiday for the Christians at Smyrna and in the province.

The exact year of Justin's martyrdom at Rome is not known, but it seems to have occurred in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (Eusebius, IV, 16). The cynic Crescens was the bitter enemy of Justin, who had defied him in his *Second Apology*, chap. 3, which Eusebius cites. It seems that Justin had had public disputes with him at Rome.

New York, N. Y.

(To be concluded.)

E. G. SIHLER.

---

## Luther und das Sub Utraque.

Unter den Vorwürfen, die gegen Luther erhoben worden sind, findet sich auch die Anklage, daß er starrköpfig und rechthaberisch gewesen sei, und daß darum nur wenige mit ihm hätten auskommen können. Dem gegenüber ist aber geltend zu machen, daß sein Verhältnis zu seinen Mitarbeitern ein überaus herzliches und inniges war. Die Schilderungen von Veit Dietrich, Georg Rörer und besonders von Johann Mathesius geben uns eine wesentlich andere Vorstellung von dem Reformator, nämlich die eines Mannes, der im wahren Sinne des Wortes demütig und selbstverleugnend war.

Auf der andern Seite wird Luther aber auch, und zwar gerade von manchen seiner Freunde, verdächtigt, als habe er den Irrtum zu lange getragen, so daß er sich dadurch schließlich fremder Sünden teilhaftig gemacht habe. Da dieser Vorwurf gegen Luther sonderlich wegen seiner Stellung in der Lehre von beiderlei Gestalt erhoben worden ist, wird es sich der Mühe lohnen, die in Betracht kommenden Stellen in seinen Schriften sowohl wie in seinen Briefen etwas näher anzusehen. Dies gibt uns zugleich einen Einblick in den theologischen Werdegang des Reformators, eine Riesenleistung, die bisher von nicht allzu vielen Lutherforschern recht eingeschätzt worden ist.

Die erste Behandlung der Frage vom heiligen Abendmahl findet sich in Luthers „Sermon von dem hochwürdigem Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den Bruderschaften“. Diese Schrift war laut eines Briefes vom 29. November 1519 an Spalatin an diesem Tage im Druck (XXIa, 207) und erschien Anfang Dezember 1519 in Wittenberg bei Johannes Grunenberg. Hier spricht sich Luther gleich in den ersten Paragraphen über das sub utraque aus, und zwar in einer Weise, die anzeigt, daß er damals selber noch nicht zur Klarheit in der Frage gekommen war. Er schreibt: „Denn das Sakrament oder Zeichen muß empfangen oder je begehrt werden, soll es Nutzen schaffen. Wiewohl man jetzt nicht beider Gestalt dem Volk alle Tage gibt wie vorzeiten — ist auch nicht not —, so niehet ihrer doch alle Tage die Priesterschaft vor dem Volk, und ist genug, daß das Volk sein täglich begehre und zur Zeit e i n e r Gestalt, so viel die christliche Kirche ordnet