

1-1-1997

Customs Which Are Not Lawful: The Social Apology of Luke-Acts

Gregory E. Sterling
gregory.sterling@notredame.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/leaven>



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

Recommended Citation

Sterling, Gregory E. (1997) "Customs Which Are Not Lawful: The Social Apology of Luke-Acts," *Leaven*: Vol. 5: Iss. 2, Article 6.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/leaven/vol5/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Religion at Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Leaven by an authorized editor of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

C

ustoms Which Are Not Lawful

The Social Apology of Luke-Acts

By Gregory E. Sterling

One of the unforgettable stories of Acts is the account of Paul's exorcising a Pythian spirit from a mantic prophet at Philippi. The sudden loss of her power enraged her owners, who hauled Paul and Silas before the city magistrates and charged: "These men are creating havoc in our city; they are Jews and are proclaiming customs which are not lawful for us to adopt or practice since we are Romans" (Acts 16:20–21).¹ The author does not offer any specifics for the charge of introducing "customs which are not lawful"; the juxtaposition of "Jews" versus "Romans" is enough to explain the indictment. Jews were different; everyone knew that.² One need only level the xenophobic accusation; one need not prove it. Yet these Jews were also Christians. What did outsiders say about them when they recognized that they were distinct from Jews?

The earliest observations about Christians from Greco-Roman authors are far from flattering.³ We have a trio of early second-century authors who shared a common opinion. Tacitus, the Silver Age historian who wrote two long histories narrating imperial history from 14 to 96 C.E., includes a brief mention of Christians in connection with the infamous fire of 64. Like the fires that ravaged San Francisco following the 1906 earthquake, this fire decimated large sections of the city. Rumors that Nero, who wanted to rebuild sections of the city on a lavish scale, was the culprit soon began to fly. Tacitus says: "Therefore in order to abolish the rumor Nero substituted culprits and imposed the most torturous punishments on those viewed askance because of their scandalous conduct whom the populace called Christians." He then provides some background on Christianity, which he probably collected from Pilate's official records: "The author of that name, Christus, had been executed by the procurator Pontius Pilate during Tiberius' principate." The execution did not, however, achieve the desired effect: "Suppressed for the moment,

that deadly superstition (*superstitio*) began breaking out again not only throughout Judea, the source of the evil, but also throughout the city where all that is hideous and shameful flows from everywhere else and is practiced."⁴ A friend of Tacitus, Pliny the Younger, served as the governor of Bithynia under Trajan (c. 111–13 C.E.). During his tenure as governor, Pliny found it necessary to write to the emperor for advice on various matters including how to deal with Christians. He explained to the emperor that he was unaware of a precedent established by formal proceedings for dealing with them and wanted to make sure that he was following proper procedure. Although he knew nothing about Christians, he had decided to punish those who would not renounce their Christianity on the grounds of obstinance. Once he began, the number of accusations mushroomed. He then made an effort to discover what the movement was all about. He says that he investigated two women deacons but "found nothing other than a perverse and unrestrained superstition (*superstitio*)."⁵ One of Pliny's traveling companions also mentioned the new movement.⁶ Suetonius makes a reference to them as he describes Nero's reforms. One of Nero's reform efforts was to clamp down on asocial groups.⁷ These included the chariot drivers who, like modern athletes, often acted with impudent immunity; pantomimes whose actions frequently resulted in brawls; and "the Christians, a group of people devoted to a new and wicked superstition (*superstitio*)"—a superstition that Nero deemed worthy of punishment.⁸

The characterization by all three authors of early Christianity as a despised cult or "superstition" (*superstitio*) rather than a formally recognized religion (*religio*) might be dismissed as the bias of elite Romans commenting on a movement popular among those of lower status; other sources, however, provide substantial evidence of a common assumption that Christians were contemptible. The

*The earliest observations about
Christians from Greco-Roman
authors are far from flattering.*

evidence comes both from detractors and from Christians who are anxious to rebut such charges. The exchanges began in earnest in the second century when, on the one hand, Christians began writing defenses of their beliefs and practices and when, on the other hand, Christianity became significant enough that outsiders could not ignore it. There are some first-century documents that also show evidence of concern for outsiders' perceptions of Christianity. One of the most important is the apologetic history we know as Luke-Acts. The work was written to establish the self-identity of Christians within the context of the larger Greco-Roman world.⁹ The perception outsiders had of Christianity was important to a work that attempted to help Christians understand their place in that world.¹⁰

The Older the Better

There is an aphorism in New Testament studies that captures a sentiment widely held in antiquity, but foreign to us today: "What is new is not true and what is true is not new." Euripides, the last of the three famous Greek tragedians, expresses the ancient perspective in a couple of lines he places on the lips of Teiresias the prophet:

As for the ancestral traditions which, old as
time itself,
we have inherited, no argument can overthrow them—
not even the most subtle discovered by the sharpest
mind.¹¹

Antiquity, rather than reason, validated religion for both Greeks and Romans.¹² This criterion, however, was a source of embarrassment for the Greeks when they realized that they were relative latecomers in comparison with the people of the East. Plato captures the awkwardness Greeks felt in his narration of Solon's visit to Egypt. When the Greek legislator recounted the Greek view of origins to an Egyptian priest, the priest responded by saying: "You Greeks are always children; there is no old Greek."¹³

The conquests of Alexander transformed this sense of embarrassment into cultural conflict. Just as some modern Europeans react to American political and economic dominance by pointing out the upstart and "inferior" nature of

American culture, so people from the East began using their antiquity as a reflex against Hellenistic military and cultural hegemony. Josephus captures the view of the conquered when he writes: "One finds that everything about the Greeks is new, or dates—so to speak—to yesterday or the day before."¹⁴ Diodorus Siculus, the first-century B.C.E. author of a world history, summarizes the cultural debate: "Concerning the antiquity of race, not only do the Greeks lay claim (to being the oldest), but many of the barbarians as well." He then spells out their specific affirmations: "[T]hey claim that they are autochthonous and the first of all people to be discoverers of those things which are useful in life, and that the events which have transpired among them were considered worthy of record from the earliest period of time."¹⁵ The rationale for these competitive claims was that every nation wanted to argue that they were the source of culture. Josephus summarizes the point nicely in his discussion of the law: "In point of fact, all nations attempt to trace their customs back to the most ancient time so that they will not appear to imitate others but to have instructed others on how to live lawfully."¹⁶ We have a number of examples of this phenomenon. So Berossos, the Babylonian priest, claims that his history of Babylon spans more than 150,000 years.¹⁷ Much more modestly, Josephus states that his *Antiquities of the Jews* covers a period of five thousand years.¹⁸

Such a viewpoint placed early Christians in a vulnerable position. How could they compete with races of people whose traditions extended back for centuries, or even millennia? Justin Martyr, the second-century Christian philosopher who lived over a bath in Rome, was well aware of the charge. He introduces it by having his interlocutors turn the statements of Christians against themselves. The Christian apologist promises to solve the problem "so that some may not act unreasonably in an effort to overturn the things taught by us and object that we say that Christ was born a hundred and fifty years ago at the time of Quirinius and that the things which we say he taught took place somewhat later at the time of Pontius Pilate," statements that permit the interlocutors to "accuse us (of holding) that all people born previously were irresponsible."¹⁹ Several years later, Celsus, the first pagan intellectual who took Christianity seriously, levels the same accusation by pointing out that Christians are an offshoot of Judaism from which they have rebelled.²⁰

The author of Luke-Acts was also sensitive to this charge. We have a hint when the evangelist redacts Mark's confirmation of the first exorcism. Mark expresses the re-

action of the crowd in the synagogue with a reference to the newness of Jesus' teaching: "What is this? It is a *new* teaching with authority. He commands the unclean spirits and they obey him" (Mark 1:27). The third evangelist worries about the reference to *new*; he writes: "What kind of a statement is this? He commands the unclean spirits with authority and power and they come out" (Luke 4:36). The hint embedded in this redactional omission becomes explicit in Paul's encounter with certain Epicurean and Stoic philosophers who say: "We want to know what is this *new* teaching which is being spoken by you?" (Acts 17:19). The author turns the tables on them several verses later with an aside: "All the Athenians and the strangers who reside there spend their time in nothing other than to say or hear something *new*" (Acts 17:21).

If Christianity is not new, then how is it old? The evangelist answers in several ways. The genealogy of Luke 3:23–38 traces Jesus' lineage back to the first human and even to God. While there is a clear christological claim that Jesus is God's Son (Luke 3:22, 38; 4:3, 9) and we might understand the unity of the human race to be a claim for a universal mission, there is something more afoot. Like other historians who root their story in antiquity, I suggest that the author of Luke uses the genealogy to anchor Christianity in the hoary past. This viewpoint becomes more explicit in another connection. The author deliberately imitates the style of the Septuagint (a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures) in an effort to show that he is writing a continuation of the story of Israel. We are not left to infer this; the author makes the connection explicit through a series of statements that affirm that the story of Jesus and the church is a fulfillment of what the Scriptures foretold and Israel anticipated (Luke 24:44; Acts 24:14–15; 26:6–7, 22–23, 27; 28:22–23). We could therefore describe Luke-Acts as a *fulfillment narrative*. Such a position required Christians to maintain Israel's scriptures. Second-century apologetic authors who felt the need to defend Christianity's antiquity made similar arguments. Their claim that Christianity is not new but old—as old as Israel—had a profound impact on Christianity: it is the reason that we have a Bible with two testaments instead of one.

Illiterate Country Bumpkins

Another charge Greek and Roman authors leveled against Christians was their social status. This could take several forms. Lucian of Samosata, the second-century C.E. satirist, ridicules Christians for their naïveté in his account

of the Cynic philosopher Peregrinus (c. 100–165). According to Lucian, Peregrinus was an unprincipled character who was forced to flee his home. Although he had managed to escape the consequences of several notorious affairs, he could not extricate himself from the charge that he had murdered his father. His travels took him to Palestine, where he became associated with Christians. "In no time he made them appear to be children, being himself the prophet, ruler of the cult, synagogue leader, and everything."²¹ His new status as a Christian, however, led to his arrest. Christians began supplying him lavishly in prison. Lucian is almost beside himself at this point. He cannot believe the gullibility of the Christians: "[T]hey despise all things equally and consider them common (property), having received such views without any reliable evidence." Such credulity makes them easy prey: "If any cheat or flimflam person comes to them who is capable of taking advantage of the circumstances, he immediately becomes wealthy by despising simple people (*ἰδιωταῖς ἄνθρωποις*)."²²

Such bemused amazement at the simplicity of early Christians could take on a sinister tone when it came to the evangelistic methods of Christians. Celsus is downright caustic in his critique: "We see in private houses woolworkers, shoemakers, launderers, and the most illiterate country bumpkins who dare not say anything in front of the older and wiser masters." The situation changes, however, when the masters are not present: "But when they get ahold of their children in private and some unintelligent women with them, they make outlandish statements that it is not necessary to pay attention to their father and teachers but to obey them."²³ Just as Origen, who wrote a belated response to Celsus in the third century, could not duck this complaint, neither could his Latin-speaking contemporary Minucius Felix, whose apologetic dialogue, *Octavius*, offers a debate among the author, Octavius (a Christian), and Caecilius (a pagan who may represent the perspective of Fronto, the teacher of Marcus Aurelius). In the exchange, Caecilius characterizes Christians as people "who by means of ignoramuses collected from the lowest dregs and credulous women, who are defective as a result of the heedlessness of their sex, form a motley crew of an impious conspiracy. . . ."²⁴

The fact that our knowledge of this charge comes from the efforts of early Christians to rebut it indicates their concern.²⁵ It is difficult to imagine how they could avoid taking it seriously. After all, one of the leading figures had openly said that "not many wise by human standards, not

The prominence of women within Christianity also helped fuel another set of charges.

many powerful, not many born to noble families” were Christians (1 Cor 1:26). The author of Acts was keenly aware of the social problem. He tells us that the Sanhedrin took note of the fact that Peter and John “were uneducated and simple men (*ἄνθρωποι εἶσιν καὶ ἰδιῶται*)” (Acts 4:13). This was undeniable. Like Justin Martyr, our author acknowledges this only as a means to point out the divine source that empowered them.²⁶ He does, however, do more than make a virtue out of a necessity; he points out that there were a significant number of well-placed individuals within early Christianity. Two individuals had a direct connection to the court of Herod Antipas: Joanna, the wife of Herod Antipas’ manager (Luke 8:3), and Manean, the tetrarch’s childhood companion (Acts 13:1). The author consistently points out the high status of notable converts: a large number of Jewish priests (Acts 6:7); Cornelius, a Roman centurion (Acts 10:1–11:18); Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus (Acts 13:6–12); Lydia, a well-to-do business woman (Acts 16:14–15); the official in charge of the prison at Philippi (Acts 16:27–34); some of the most prominent women of Thessalonica (Acts 17:4) and Berea (Acts 17:12); Dionysius, a member of the Athenian council (Acts 17:34); and Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue in Corinth (Acts 18:8). Besides those directly involved in the movement, there were well-placed supporters such as the Asiarchs who befriended Paul (Acts 19:31). Perhaps this line of defense, more than any other, points to the acceptance of Greco-Roman culture. It is impossible to engage the larger world if you do not belong to it in some meaningful way.

Disturbers of the Social Order

One of the most delicate issues that surfaced in the early centuries of Christianity was the impact of the distinctive social values of early Christians. These became the occasion for the *Second Apology* of Justin Martyr. A female convert to Christianity found herself in a difficult position. Her conversion to Christianity convinced her that she had to alter her lifestyle. She was, however, unable to persuade her husband to give up his accustomed mode of living. His refusal began to erode her affection. Things became tense enough that while he was away in Alexan-

dria, she divorced him.²⁷ When he returned, he denounced her as a Christian. When she won a reprieve to set her affairs in order, her husband turned on her teacher, Ptolemaeus. As a result, Ptolemaeus and two other Christians were executed.²⁸ To many Hellenes her behavior would have been outrageous: a wife should follow the religious practices of her husband, not the reverse.²⁹ Christianity called this into question with results that were often disruptive. Aelius Aristides, the second-century C.E. author whose health forced him from a public career, bitterly denounces Christians for their practices in a telling contrast: “They are the most useless of all people in joining to accomplish anything advantageous.” Yet, “they are the cleverest of all people at ruining a house, at upsetting and setting those within at odds with one another, and claiming that they can manage everything.”³⁰

As is the case with most of the charges directed against Christians, this had a basis in fact. We need only think of the famous “anti-family” sayings of Q, the reconstructed source of the sayings of Jesus preserved in Matthew and Luke but not in Mark, which indicate how the kingdom of God can disrupt the expected values of family life.³¹ These are offset by the examples of household conversions in Acts.³² The key aspect of this concern in Luke-Acts, however, is the role of women. They have an ambivalent role within the text. On the one hand, the historian appears to go out of his way to include references to women. He regularly pairs men and women in an attempt to demonstrate the important place of women.³³ He singles out the conversion of women as worthy of notice.³⁴ He also specifies the roles of women: they are patrons of Jesus (Luke 8:1–3) and early churches (Acts 12:12; 16:15), missionaries (Acts 18:1–4), and prophetesses (Luke 2:36–38; Acts 21:8–9). On the other hand, Luke writes of women who do not step across the boundaries of acceptable behavior in the Greco-Roman world. The point becomes obvious if we compare the presentation of women in the canonical Acts with that of Thecla in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*. The latter is a sometimes independent unit of the larger second-century biographical romance known as the *Acts of Paul*. In the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Thecla does everything Paul does, including preaching. This stands in sharp contrast to the portrait of women in the canonical Acts: Lydia, Priscilla, and Philip’s daughters are all active, but do not violate the accepted values of the larger society by preaching in public. This balancing of both recognition and restriction points to the author’s sensitivity to the role of women in early Christianity: he is aware of the price of violating basic social values.³⁵

Obscene Rituals: Thyestean Banquets and Oedipodean Intercourse

The prominence of women within Christianity also helped fuel another set of charges, charges compounded by the fact that early Christians often met in secret. Just as secretive meetings are an occasion for the wagging of tongues today, so they were in antiquity. Minucius Felix has Caecilius put it this way: “[C]ertainly suspicion goes hand in hand with hidden and nocturnal rites.”³⁶ The common gossip about these furtive gatherings was that Christians ate children and engaged in sexual orgies. Minucius Felix realized he had to face both charges and so placed them on the lips of Caecilius. The first is associated with an initiation rite. An infant covered with meal is set before the initiates who are encouraged to kill it unwittingly through what appear to be harmless blows. “Eagerly they drink its blood, they compete with one another to divide its limbs; they are allied together by means of this victim, they are bound to mutual silence by this private knowledge of crime.”³⁷ While the details vary in other accounts, the same invidious charge is made.³⁸ Caecilius makes the second charge by describing the feasts of Christians: “On an appointed day they assemble for a feast with all of their children, wives, and mothers—people of both sexes and all ages.” It is “there after a good deal of feasting, when the dinner party warms up and the intoxicating heat of incestuous lust flares up that a dog which is tied to the candlestick is provoked to lunge and leap by the toss of a morsel beyond the reach of the cord with which he is bound.” Now the unspeakable—or the greatly rumored—occurs: “Thus with the light which would be witness overturned and extinguished, in shameless darkness they entwine themselves in embraces of shocking passion according to the uncertainties of chance.”³⁹

This scurrilous gossip enjoyed wide circulation in the second century.⁴⁰ For the most part, these were attempts at labeling Christians as a threat to society.⁴¹ There may, however, have been some bases for such accusations. Certainly it is not difficult to imagine how someone on the outside could move from statements like John 6:52–59 to a charge of cannibalism. Similarly, there may have been aberrant Christian groups with libertine practices who helped to fuel

the rumors.⁴² These were, however, later developments. What about the first century? Is there any evidence that such slander was already circulating? Several hints in the text of Luke-Acts suggest that it was. In the Lukan version of the Last Supper, only Jesus is explicitly linked with verbs of eating and drinking (Luke 22:15–20). The Lukan text does not say that the disciples ate or drank as the texts of Mark and Matthew do. Perhaps this is coincidental. The description of the nocturnal worship assembly in Troas leads me to think it is deliberate (Acts 20:7–12). Here we are told there were “large numbers of lamps” in the upper room, not one as the standard rumor had it (Acts 20:8). The activities of the assembly are specified (Acts 20:7, 11). It may well be that the author is telling Christian readers to let outsiders know what transpired in a Christian assembly. Certainly Justin’s description of an assembly in Rome is designed to open the doors to the outside world.⁴³

Conclusion

These and other charges created a negative perception of Christians on the part of outsiders. While perceptions of Christians today differ, the same dynamics we find in Luke-Acts should still be in place. We dare not ignore the perceptions the larger culture has of us. To do so is to isolate ourselves into an secluded sect that has little opportunity of shaping the larger world. This is not the vision of Luke-Acts, which situates Christianity within the larger world. On the other hand, we cannot permit the larger culture to rewrite our values. Excessive acculturation results in a loss of self-identity and eventually leads to extinction. Luke-Acts attempts to set up a dialectical relationship between allegiance to the values of Christianity and a concern to take our place in the world. It is not a question of *either/or* but of *both/and*. This means living with tensions. While such tensions create a degree of discomfort, they are a sign that we are engaged. It is this engagement that Luke-Acts advocates.

GREGORY E. STERLING teaches New Testament studies in the Department of Theology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Notes

- ¹All translations are my own.
- ²On Jewish strangeness see J. N. Sevenster, *The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World*, NovTSup 41 (Leiden E. J. Brill, 1975), 89–144.
- ³For a collection of texts see M. Whittaker, *Jews & Christians: Graeco-Roman Views*, Cambridge Commentaries on Writing of the Jewish & Christian World 200 B.C. to A.D. 200 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). For analyses of the early Christian period see S. Benko, “Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the First Two Centuries A.D.,” *ANRW* 2.23.2 (1980): 1055–1118; idem, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); and R. L. Wilken, *The Christians as Romans Saw Them* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).
- ⁴Tacitus, *Annals*, 15.44.
- ⁵Pliny, *Letters*, 10.96.8. Cf. 10.97 for Trajan’s reply.
- ⁶See Pliny, *Letters*, 10.94.1.
- ⁷Suetonius, *Life of Nero*, 26.2.
- ⁸*Ibid.*, 16.2.
- ⁹For details see my *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, NovTSup 64 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 311–89.
- ¹⁰This topic has not been examined in detail. For an earlier study see A. Malherbe, “‘Not in a Corner’: Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26,” *Second Century* 5 (1985/1986): 193–210.
- ¹¹Euripides, *Bacchae*, 201–3.
- ¹²Cicero, *On the nature of the gods*, 3.1.5–6. Cf. also *On Laws*, 2.10.27.
- ¹³Plato, *Timaeus*, 22b; cf. 21e–23c. For a similar story see Herodotus 2.143, who describes Hecataeus’ visit to Egypt.
- ¹⁴Josephus, *Against Apion*, 1.7.
- ¹⁵Diodorus, 1.9.3.
- ¹⁶Josephus, *Against Apion*, 2.152.
- ¹⁷Berosos, *Babyloniaka* (FGrH 680 F 1).
- ¹⁸Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 1.13; cf. also *Against Apion*, 1.1.
- ¹⁹Justin Martyr, *1 Apology*, 46.1.
- ²⁰Celsus, *The True Doctrine*, in Origen, *Against Celsus*, 5.33.
- ²¹Lucian, *On the death of Peregrinus*, 11.
- ²²*Ibid.*, 13.
- ²³Celsus, 3.55. Cf. also 3.44.
- ²⁴Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, 8.4. Cf. also 5.4.
- ²⁵Cf. also Tatian, *Address to the Greeks*, 32.
- ²⁶Justin Martyr, *1 Apology*, 60.11; *2 Apology*, 10.8.
- ²⁷This is a classic example of the situation envisioned in 1 Cor 7:12–16.
- ²⁸Justin Martyr, *2 Apology*, 2.1–20.
- ²⁹E.g., see the advice Plutarch offers to a bride in *Moralia*, 140b.
- ³⁰Aelius Aristides, *On behalf of the four*, 672. Cf. also Celsus, *True Doctrine*, in Origen, *Against Celsus*, 3.55, cited above, and Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, 9.14.
- ³¹Matt 8:18–22/Luke 9:57–60; Matt 10:34–36/Luke 12:51–53; Matt 10:37–38/Luke 14:26–27; Matt 24:40–41/Luke 17:34–35.
- ³²Cornelius (Acts 11:14); Lydia (Acts 16:15); the jailer (Acts 16:31); and Crispus (Acts 18:8).
- ³³In Luke there are two annunciations (1:5–23, 28–38), two songs (1:46–56, 67–79), two prophets (2:25–35, 36–38), two precedents (4:25–26, 27), two miracles (4:31–37, 38–39), two miracles (7:1–10, 11–17); two accusers (11:29–32), two miracles (13:10–17; 14:1–6), two parables (13:18–19, 20–21), two parables (15:1–7, 8–10), and two taken at the parousia (17:34, 35); in Acts there are two miracles (9:32–35, 36–43).
- ³⁴Acts 5:14; 8:12; 13:50; 17:4, 12, 34.
- ³⁵For a detailed analysis see M. R. D’Angelo, “Women in Luke-Acts: A Redactional View,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 441–61.
- ³⁶Minucius Felix, 9.4.
- ³⁷*Ibid.*, 9.5.
- ³⁸The earliest is Pliny, *Letters*, 10.96.7.
- ³⁹Minucius Felix, 9.6.
- ⁴⁰E.g., Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, 9.14.; Celsus, *True Doctrine*, in Origen, *Against Celsus*, 5.63 and the widespread concern among Christian authors to renounce it.
- ⁴¹A. McGowan, “Eating People: Accusations of Cannibalism Against Christians in the Second Century,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2 (1994): 413–42.
- ⁴²E.g., the Carpocratians (Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies*, 3.25; Irenaeus, *Against All Heresies*, 1.25.1–6; Eusebius, *History of the Christian Church*, 4.7.10) and Borborites (Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 26.3.3–5.8).
- ⁴³Justin Martyr, *1 Apology*, 67.1–8.