The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Die Neronische Christenverfolgung. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur Geschichte der ältesten Kirche von **Lie. Dr. C. Frakklin Arnold. Leipzig: Richter (London: Trübner) 1888. 4 Mk.**

Charles Merk

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 1-2 / February 1889, pp 63 - 64
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194107, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194107

How to cite this article:

Charles Merk (1889). The Classical Review, 3, pp 63-64 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194107

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

that the glosses in Hesychius relating to sacrifices, festivals, epithets of gods, etc., are one and all derived from a single work, a treatise *περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίῃ θυσίων*, written by a certain Sosibius, who lived at the court of Ptolemy II. This suggestion was first thrown out by C. Müller (*P. H. G.* II. p. 628), but proof is out of the question. Sosibius is cited in Hesychius as an authority in one article; a few other articles for which no authority is given coincide in substance with passages in Athenaeus to which the name of Sosibius is attached. This state of things justifies the modest inference that some other glosses in Hesychius may convey the learning of Sosibius. But this will not content the 'Quellenforscher.' Herr Weber seeks to demonstrate—unsuccessfully in my opinion—that the dialect of these glosses and the occasional use of the present tense point to a work composed not later than the end of the third century B.C., and proceeds to construct a series of unprovable hypotheses, that the glosses on religious matters are separable from those explanatory of dialect and political institutions; that these *glossae sacrae* are all to be traced to Sosibius' work *περὶ τῶν θυσίων*, and not to his commentary on Alcman; that the same work *περὶ τῶν θυσίων* was one source of a hypothetical compendium dealing with Sparta only; that this compendium was embodied in an abbreviated and corrupted form in the more comprehensive lexica, and has come down to the present time embedded in the pages of Hesychius. A piece of work far more useful than these speculations is the collection of seventy-six *glossae sacrae* given at the end of the book: the lemmata, it is true, are often corrupt, the explanations miserably meagre, but they are all we have and are very precious. If Herr Weber would get together and purify all the glosses in Hesychius bearing on things Spartan, he would do a real service to the student of Greek antiquities.

W. WYSE.

Die Neronische Christenverfolgung. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur Geschichte der ältesten Kirche von Lic. Dr. C. FRANKLIN ARNOLD. Leipzig: Richter (London: Trübner) 1888. 4 Mk.

DR. ARNOLD has made the passage in *Annals* xv. 44, which contains the only reference to Christianity found in the existing books of Tacitus, the subject of a special inquiry. He examines first the text of that passage (p. 4-11). The text of the whole of *Annals* xi.-xvi. is based on one MS. which was written in Monte Cassino between 1053 and 1087 and which was added by Cosimo to the library he had founded in 1444. This MS. is the Mediceus II. It is written in Longobardian characters. A facsimile of the passage in chapt. 44 is appended; and one expression only appears open to doubt. In the description of 'the live torches' in Nero's garden the Christians are said to be condemned 'ut ferarum tergis contacti laniati canum interient aut crucibus affixi aut flammandi atque ubi defecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis urerentur.' The Codex Agricolaë has *flammati*. The Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus (completed 403), which has here evidently copied the *Annals*, offers the reading *flamma usi*. Both these variations however as well as the suggestion of Nipperdey, that the words may be an interpolation inserted into the text after the Septimian or Decian persecution, and that they speak of punishments inflicted on Christians at a much later date, are discarded by the author. Dr. Arnold proposes to alter the text of the Mediceus into 'aut crucibus affixi sunt flammandi utque, ubi defecisset dies etc.' He maintains (p. 11-30) that neither the context in which chapt. 44 stands, nor its diction, which possesses all the peculiarities of Tacitus' style, give any reason

to suppose that any alteration or addition has been made to the original text.

The Roman historian did not consider the Christians guilty of having caused the fire, which raged from the 19th to 24th July 64, and laid waste more than half of the city. His own estimate of them however he shows sufficiently when he introduces them as 'quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat.' The meaning of *flagitia* in this phrase is rendered clear by *Germania* (chapt. xii.) where we are told the Germans punished treason with hanging, cowardice and adultery with drowning, 'tanquam scelera ostendi oporteat, dum puniuntur, flagitia abscondi,' and from Plin. x. 96, 'nomen ipsum si flagitiis careat, an flagitia coherentia nomini puniantur.' As Pliny remarks especially that the food of which the Christians partook at their *agapes* was 'promiscuus tamen et innoxius,' there can be no doubt that he is alluding to the Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean marriages (referred to in the dialogue of Minucius Felix, chapt. 9), which were supposed to have taken place at their nocturnal assemblies. That Tacitus makes indirectly the same allegations against the Christians, is shown from the manner, in which he describes the early spread of Christianity. That pernicious superstition, he says, found its way to the city of Rome, 'quo cuncta undique atrocitas aut pudenda confluent celebranturque. Celebrare means here to imitate, as in *Histor.* ii. 49, where after the account of Otho's suicide we read: 'ac postea Bedriaci Placentiae aliisque in castris celebratum id genus mortis.' And *atrox* is in an especial sense applied to deeds of blood: *Ann.* i. 45 and iv. 11. *Atrocitas* were the banquets, *pudenda* the marriages, of which the Christians were accused. These accusations rendered them liable to the punishments which the Lex Cornelia (Sullae) de sicariis et veneficis directed against murder and magical arts as well as against incendiarianism. Persons found guilty of the first two of these crimes were condemned (Paulus lib. v. *Sententiae ad L. Corn.*) 'summo supplicio affici, id est bestiis obijci aut crucibus suffigi—ipsi autem magi vivi exuruntur.' These are the forms of punishment which according to Tacitus were inflicted on the people 'convicted of hatred of the human race.' The conviction was secured by torture (p. 64). Dr. Arnold does not agree with Nipperdey and Dräger, that the first of those who were accused confessed their religion. The sentence 'primum correpti qui fatebantur' requires as subordinate clause, he maintains, not 'se Christianos esse,' but 'se incendium fecisse,' or simply 'incendium.'

He next discusses (chapt. iii. p. 30 sq.) the arguments with which Gibbon and lately H. Schiller (*Gesch. des röm. Reichs unter Nero*, p. 431) have impugned the accuracy of the account given in the *Annals*. Both historians agree that Tacitus was unable to distinguish between the Christians and the Jews, and that the persecution of which he speaks and which he greatly exaggerates was directed against the latter. Schiller's opinion is, that the wooden booths, inhabited by Oriental traders, which surrounded the Circus Maximus, formed a ghetto, in which Jews and Christians lived promiscuously, worshipping in the same synagogues, observing the same feast days and keeping the same laws. It was in these booths that the fire broke out on July 19. The suspicion as well as the resentment of the people was directed against the 'Orientals.' To this popular feeling Nero, whose 'heart was ever open to the sorrows and pleasures of the multitude,' gave way. Schiller's opinion appears to be without foundation. According to Schürer (*Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, p. 16), the Jews did not inhabit a separate quarter: they were scattered over the city. Hebrew families

were found in the fourteenth district beyond the Tiber, which was not touched by the fire, as well as on the Campus Martius and the Subura, that is in the ninth and fourth districts. But the conflagration first broke out in that part of the town which lies between Mons Caelius and the Palatine, that is between the eleventh and second districts. The Jews, so far from being made by Nero the victims of unjust accusations, possessed considerable influence with the emperor, through Poppaea—one of their proselytes—the actor Aliturus and many other Orientals, who had access to his court. They, 'the real persecutors of Christianity before the destruction of Jerusalem,' may have, as Renan thinks (*Orig. du Christ.* iv. p. 156), suggested to Nero the first idea of offering the Christians as a sacrifice to the anger which the fire had created. The main question however is whether Tacitus, like Pliny and Suetonius, knew Christianity to be a '*superstitio*' distinct and different from that of the Jews. The author points out that the passage in the 44th chap. of the *Annals* is undoubtedly the first in which the historian speaks of the '*auctor nominis ejus, Christus*', but possibly not the last. The lost portion of the *Hist.* which contained the destruction of Jerusalem has formed the source, on which Sulpicius Severus drew in his record of that event. His chronicle shows here, ii. 30. 6 (according to J. Bernays, *Ueber die Chronik des Sulp. Sev.* Berlin, 1861, p. 57), the same unmistakable traces of Tactician diction, which it displays in the passage quoted above. The chronicler states that in the council of war in Titus' camp one of the members expressed his opinion in favour of the destruction of the temple on the ground that not merely the Jewish but also the Christian superstition would thereby be destroyed. '*Both these errors, although contrary to one another,*' he said, '*had sprung from the same authors; the Christians had come from the Jews. If the root were once destroyed, the plant would soon wither.*'

These words appear to be in exact keeping with the knowledge which Tacitus, to judge from his *Annals*, possessed of the new religion. He was at the same time acquainted with the Jewish system; he had no doubt read Josephus (comp. *Hist.* v. 13 with *Jos. Bell.* J. vii. 5, 4), and he knew the conditions on which proselytes were admitted into the Hebrew community (*Hist.* v. 5). There can hardly be any doubt that Tacitus clearly distinguished between the two religions, and that he did not commit the error which Gibbon and Schiller have ascribed to him and which, if true, would contain a serious reflection on his character as a historian.

In the remaining chapters (V, VII-IX) Dr. Arnold discusses the various references to the Neronian persecution found in later writers, and he describes the different shapes which the record of that event gradually assumed in ecclesiastical tradition.

In the summary thus far given we have been obliged to confine ourselves to certain points. It is to one only of these that we venture to take exception. In quoting (p. 58) Renan's remark, that Jews who had '*secret entrées*' at Nero's court had really instigated the persecution, Dr. Arnold justly says that so grave an accusation should not have been brought without sufficient historical evidence against the Hebrew community in Rome. But the evidence which he adduces (p. 62) only shows that Jews may have, as the Christian writers of the second century averred, circulated false rumours about Christians, but not that they abused their influence in the manner indicated. And in the passage (I Clem. Rom. V. VI.) where Clement warns the Corinthian congregation against that jealousy and envy, the fruitful source of calamities as recorded in the Old Testament, and the cause in his

own age of the death of the two great Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul as well as of many saintly women, he evidently refers to divisions which must have taken place within the Christian community, and which found vent perhaps in denunciations.

Altogether Dr. Arnold's treatise appears to us valuable as bringing together all the references found in ancient writers bearing on *Annals*, xv. 44, and throwing light on a passage which is of great importance to the history of early Christianity.

CHARLES MERK.

Die Stellung Augustins in der Publicistik des Gregorianischen Kirchenstreits, von CARL MIBBT, Privatdocent der Theologie in der Universität Göttingen. Leipzig, 1888. Pp. 113. 3 Mk.

THIS essay starts from the 'indisputable fact' that Luther and Augustine are the two men who have exercised the most influence upon the development of the Christian Church. A scientific investigation of this influence in the case of Augustine is still a desideratum, and the essay is a contribution towards supplying the want. It consists mainly of an analysis of the literature of the second half of the eleventh century, with a view to estimating the influence which the writings of Augustine had upon both sides in the great controversy between the Papacy and the Empire. The analysis is worked out in a very thorough way, and the results are tabulated in a convenient summary. This summary shows a very large number of quotations from S. Augustine's works, and from a great variety of them: quotations from his *Epistles*, *Sermons*, the *City of God*, the *Tractates on St. John*, and the treatise on *Baptism against the Donatists*, being specially abundant. But, of 371 citations, only 222 are given with a correct reference to the source, 29 being given with a false reference, and 120 with no reference at all. Not only the same treatises, but the same passages, are frequently quoted. This fact, coupled with the frequent absence of references, tends to show that *collections of extracts* were in use, and that the controversialists rarely drew directly from the works of Augustine. Great as was the desire of both parties to have him as an authority for their own side, few of them were at the pains to study him for themselves. The only Father who is quoted as frequently as Augustine is Gregory the Great. But that does not prove that his influence was equal to that of Augustine; for Gregory was much more of an ecclesiastical politician than Augustine, and therefore frequently treats of the subjects so hotly debated in the eleventh century, where Augustine is entirely silent about them.

A. PLUMMER.

A Collation of the Athos Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas. Together with an Introduction by SPYR. P. LAMBROS, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Athens. Translated and Edited with a Preface and Appendices by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Christ's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1888. 8vo. Pp. xii. 36. 3s. 6d.

THIS book adds another to the remarkable list of documents illustrative of early Christian history discovered within the last few years. Its history partakes of the character of romance. Some of our readers may require to be reminded that the book called the *Shepherd of Hermas* is a work of the early part of the second century, and contains a series of visions followed by a series of 'Mandata,' or preceptive discourses, and a series of similitudes.