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The present work forms the beginning of a series of critical researches respecting the history and doctrines of the ancient Church, which have for several years engaged the author's close attention, and which, should life and health be continued, he intends, from time to time, to lay before the public. He has a two-fold object in view, partly religious and partly critical, in publishing them. He wishes, in the first instance, to contribute his mite, by the most faithful description in his power, of the spirit and efforts of the Church, in the primitive age, towards the revival of that genuine fellowship, of feeling and views in the church of Christ, which, in the present times, is so much impaired. It has proved not only a personal comfort to the author, to be able to take refuge from the theological agitations and party spirit of the age, in the haven of by gone times, when the inspiration of faith and love existed in youthful vigour;—he has not only derived a double personal benefit from these labours, in the field of primitive Christianity; on the one
hand, by increasing his attachment to divine truth and its conveying medium, the Church; and on the other, by preserving his mind from the shallowness of those who, by a pretended refinement of Christianity, evaporate its spirit,—and from the micrological scrupulousness of those who cling to the letter, and fancy that the existence of Christianity is threatened by the omission of an iota;—but he cherishes, likewise, the decided conviction, that the pangs and throes attending the regeneration of the life of the Church, with which, after a long torpidity, the Present appears to be in labour, might be in some measure relieved and accelerated, by calling in the aid of the original Christianity of the Past. Every attempt, therefore, to set clearly before the eyes of the present generation, the spirit of the church in the Ante-Nicene period, in its full vigour and freshness, if it be not an entire failure, has, in the author's opinion, an undeniable merit. It matters here but little whether the portraiture of the ancient Church be given in its totality, or only in some isolated sections: for, in order to render the delineation of the whole effective, it is necessary to individualize; and if the point selected be one of prominent importance in the development of the Church, it will serve to reflect the collective peculiarities of its formation and progress. Besides this ecclesiastical interest, a scientific motive determined the author to publish the present work, and will instigate him to lay before the world other researches, which are completed, or in progress. It is generally acknowledged that many parts of the most ancient Church history are still involved in obscurity; that the ancient Church has always served as a mine and stronghold for many partial
and arbitrary opinions, and that, in particular, the representations of the dogmatics of the Fathers have been most contradictory and perplexing. This confusion, in the author's opinion, can only be gradually removed, by well digested monographs. For such a purpose, works which take in the whole extent of Church history and dogmatics, are far less servicable. For either, as, alas! is too often the case, they are not founded on the study of the original sources, and are nothing better than a heap of superannuated prejudices, or the organs of party views, or if constructed on better principles, and the result of investigation among the original sources, the space allotted to individual points of inquiry is necessarily too limited. Though error may be removed by the mere statement of truth, yet it frequently requires a direct confutation; more especially when the object is to remove deeply rooted errors, Truth must be accompanied by its vouchers. Works of the comprehensive character to which we have alluded, even when founded on a direct appeal to the proper authorities, are necessarily somewhat superficial; since it is impossible for the most persevering and industrious author to read all the original documents; and the multiplicity of images which history, on a large scale, presents, bewilders the greatest acuteness and circumspection, so that the observer is unable to mark and delineate all the essential features which belong to each individual portrait: Consequently, it cannot be the highest and final object of general Church-history, to depict only single columns and pillars belonging to the venerable pile; on the contrary, he must be regarded as a master-builder in Church-history, who has the ability of pre-
senting to our view, the whole Church edifice in its rise and gradual progress towards completion, in its beauty and deformity, with the strictest historical accuracy. An approximation to such a masterpiece, can only be made, as far as the necessary materials are prepared for it, in works devoted to special sections in the history of the Church and of dogmatics. As a preliminary contribution of this kind, the author regards the present Sketch of the life, labours, and doctrines of Justin Martyr. A further and laboured justification of the work will not, he hopes, be thought necessary. Both in an ecclesiastical and dogmatic point of view, Justin merits, in the highest degree, a work specially devoted to himself, though none has yet made its appearance which is adapted to the present position of scientific Protestantism. The earlier works on this Father are mostly unsatisfactory; partly incomplete and superficial, partly written in such a strong spirit of Catholicism as to render even the learning and profundity displayed in them serviceable only to the cause of Catholicism. The modern writings on Justin, with all their unquestionable merits, are still too fragmentary or deficient in critical accuracy. Whether the present treatise will satisfy the just demands of the public, competent judges must decide. All that the author ventures to affirm is, that he has prosecuted his subject as a labour of love, and has spared no pains to render it as complete as his abilities will allow. That he has, on all occasions, betaken himself to the original source of information will be at once perceived. For the rest, he relies on the candour of his readers, who must be aware how frequently the execution of a work falls short of its conception,
and how difficult it is to answer questions in a manner completely satisfactory to other minds, where the peculiarities of the writer’s own mind mingle unconsciously, or even against his will, with the current of his investigations.

The author deemed it advisable to divide the work into two parts. The first and present part contains the life of Justin,—an examination of the writings to which his name has been attached, in which his genuine productions are carefully distinguished from such as are spurious,—and a delineation of his general characteristics, both as a man and an author. The second part will be devoted solely to his doctrines, in which his labours in the several departments of Exegesis, Apologetics, and Dogmatics, will pass under review. After the completion of the present work, the author proposes to compose a Monograph on the evangelical writings which Justin made use of under the title of ἀπομημονωματα των ἀποστόλων; a work for which he has collected the requisite materials, and which would have been published before, if the author had not found himself obliged to discuss subjects in the present work, the results of which form a foundation for the other.

But it is time to close these prefatory remarks. The author thinks it may be acceptable to his readers to give a list of the editions of the Fathers from which he has made his quotations. The best known and most useful editions of Justin Martyr are those of Sylbergius and Prudentius Maranus. The numerals enclosed in brackets give the pages of the Sylburgian edition, (Paris, 1636,) and the figures which precede them denote the corresponding chapter and page of
the Benedictine.—(Hag. Com.¹ 1742.) Both editions include the apologetic writings of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and Hermias, to which, therefore, the references of the quotations from these authors are also made. The Fragment on the Resurrection is not given by Sylburgius, consequently the references are made only to the edition of Prudentius Maranus. The following are the editions of the other patristical authors made use of in this work:


¹ In some copies Parisius.—[Tr.]
quot extant Opera. Colon. Agripp. 1617.—EPIPHAN. 
Opera Omnia. Ed. Petavius. Par. 1622, 2 voll.— 
ad Mœn. et Lips. 1684, 12 voll.—AUGUSTIN. Opera 
Omnia. Ed. Lugdun, 1664, 11 voll.—CYRILL. ALEX. 
Opera. Ed. Aubert. Par. 1638, 7 voll.—THEODO- 
RET Opera. Ed. Schulze et Nosselt. Hal. 1768, 
1824, sq. 2 voll.—Richter's editions of Josephus and 
Philo have been used. JOSEPH. Opera Omnia. Ed. 
Lips. 1826, sq. 6 voll.—PHILON. Opera Omnia. Ed. 
Lips. 1828, sq. 8 voll.

Trebnitz,
January 1, 1840.
The present Second Part of the Monograph on Justin Martyr, appears rather later than the author ventured to promise in the Preface to the First. The delay has been partly owing to a severe illness of several months, but chiefly to his dissatisfaction with the plan that he had originally sketched; and which at length determined him to go over the ground once more, and to recast the work as much as possible, in accordance with his new conceptions of the subject. One advantage has visibly resulted to the work from this delay, —it has enabled the author to consult the numerous publications on the history of Dogmatics, which issued from the press at the close of the last, and the beginning of the present year. The author, nevertheless, cannot help lamenting that the work, even in its present re-modelled form, still falls far short of the ideal which filled his mind previous to its execution. Indeed, he frankly declares that he would, without hesitation, have destroyed the form of this Part a second time, if he could have only entertained the hope
of finally approximating to his favourite ideal. Yet, in two points, he trusts that he has in some measure been successful,—in the objective form which he has endeavoured to give to Justin's doctrines, and the genetic process of development, (genetischen Entwickelungsweise), in reference to particular doctrines which he has endeavoured to trace out. In no department has truth been more grossly injured by ecclesiastical or personal biasses, than in that of the doctrines of primitive Christianity; and in none is there more danger of modelling objective history by the compulsory standard of subjective partialities. The author has, therefore, paid the greatest attention to this point, and laid it down as an inviolable law for himself, not to be in the least influenced by professional or personal predilections, but to make his sketches bear the impress, (whether good or bad,) as closely as possible, of their original. His own doctrinal convictions he has everywhere kept in the background. Party-influence he has decidedly rejected and opposed: on critical questions he has not consciously violated, in a single instance, the principles of Philology. Nor has he been less anxious carefully to keep his representations free from rhapsodical or insignificant digressions—a fault which so easily attaches to monographic sketches of doctrinal systems. He has endeavoured, as far as it has been practicable, always to conceive Justin's dogmatic notions, in their connection with the general dogmatic views of the ancient Church. Wherever he possessed adequate data, he has compared Justin's individual doctrines with the views of contemporary or later Church-teachers; and has prefixed to each doctrine a general
description of its process of development, from its rise to the conclusion of the first dogmatic period of the Church. If it be allowed that the author has not entirely failed in his twofold object, and that, if he has not perfectly performed his task, he has at least in some tolerable measure succeeded, he will consider this acknowledgment as an adequate reward for the many years of toil which have been devoted to the work, and indulges the hope that it will not be entirely useless to the philosophical inquirer.¹

Trebnitz,
September 29, 1841.

¹ This Preface, in the original work, is placed at the beginning of Book IV., with which the second volume commences. In the translation a different division has been adopted, in order to equalise the size of the volumes.—[Tr.]
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INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

Justin, the philosopher and martyr, has always ranked among the most remarkable and distinguished Christian teachers in the first age of the Church. Even had his personal character not possessed that importance which, in the judgment of every impartial person, really belongs to it, yet a special consequence attaches to him, from the circumstance that he makes his appearance at a time which, in more than one respect, was a critical point in the developement and formation of the Christian Church,—that he is the most ancient Christian teacher, of whom we possess any considerable written memorials,—and that in those records the ecclesiastical usages of his times are depicted in a manner that, to a certain extent, makes up for the loss of other Christian writings which are not come down to us. Justin flourished at an epoch when Christianity, after having been for many years mingled and associated with Judaism, asserted its independence, and began to be dreaded by Hellenism as a power by which its very existence was endangered,—when that mighty conflict between Heathenism and Christianity commenced in right earnest, which was carried on for more than a century, partly by physical force, partly by the weapons of philosophy, till at length the passing over of the civil power to the new faith achieved the victory for Christianity. It was an epoch when the fellowship of Christians had acquired a more settled form;—when the Christian communities had advanced from a state of isolation to a closer union; and, in the provinces at least, an ecclesiastical system began to be formed; when the details of public worship
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assumed a more regular shape, and advanced from their originally local casualty to a more universal definiteness: and when the Christian faith combined itself with the elements of philosophy; for owing to the opposition of learned heathens to Christianity, as well as the conversion of educated Greeks or of professed philosophers, the necessity arose of moulding the simple religious faith into a theology. It was natural for Justin to sympathize deeply with all these struggles and movements:—he entered, indeed, as an essential factor into the process by which a new order of things was forming; and his writings are, for the greater part, almost our only guides in tracing the progress of this new creation. Hence the strong claims of Justin Martyr on the student of Ecclesiastical history are sufficiently evident; and it is somewhat strange that, among modern writers, no one has been found to make the agency of Justin Martyr the special subject of a biographical representation. We believe that, in attempting to perform this task, we are meeting a want of the present times.

Of preceding writers who have either treated of the whole life and agency of Justin Martyr, or have only discussed particular points, besides the well known literary or ecclesiastical histories, the following may be mentioned as the most important:—

I. Works relating to the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of Justin Martyr.


CLERICUS.—Unpartheische Lebensbeschreibung einiger Kirchenväter und Ketzer (Impartial Bio-

PRUDENTIUS MARANVS.—PROLEGOMENA IN OPERA JUSTIN. HAG. COM. 1742. P. 1—6, 8—22, 25—38, 42—49, 51—60, 63—97.

LUMPER.—HIST. THEOL. CRIT. DE VITA, SCRIPTIS ATQUE DOCTRINA SANCTORUM PATRUM ALIORUMQUE SCRIPTORUM ECCLES. TRIM PRIORUM SECULORUM.

GOTZ.—JUSTIN'S DES MARTYRER ZWEITE APOLOGIE UND BEWEIS DER ALLEINHERSCHAFT GOTTES. NEBST EINEN ANHANGEN ÜBER DAS LEIBEN, DIE SCHREIBEN UND LEHREN DIESSES KIRCHENVATERS. NÜRNBERG. U. ALTER. 1796. (JUSTIN MARTYR'S SECOND APOLOGY, AND PROOF OF THE SOLE SUPREMACY OF GOD, WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE LIFE, WRITINGS, AND Doctrines OF THIS FATHER.)

II. WORKS WHICH RELATE ONLY TO THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JUSTIN.


GRABE.—SPICILEGIUM PATRUM UT ET HERETICORUM PRIMI ET SECundi SECULI. T. II. P. 133, SEQQU.

FABRICIUS.—BIBLIOTHECA GRAeca, ED HARLES. T. VII. P. 52—75.

III. WORKS WHICH TREAT PRINCIPALLY OF JUSTIN'S DOCTRINES AND MODE OF TEACHING.

REUCHLIN.—DISSERTAT. TRES DE DOCTRINA JUSTIN MART. ARGENT. 1474.

ÖBERTHUR.—DISSERT. EXPOENVS JUSTINI DE PRECIPUIS RELIGIONIS DOGMATIS SENTENTIAM. WIRCUB. 1777.

SEMMLER.—GESCHICHTEN DER CHRISTLICHEN GLEBENSLÈHRE.—VOR BAUMGARTEN'S UNTERSUCHUNG THEOLOGISCHER STREITIGKEITEN. HALLE 1763. T. II. P. 42, 70. (HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES BEFORE BAUMGARTEN'S EXAMINATION OF THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES.)

(GAAB.)—ABHANDLUNGEN ZUR DOGMENGESCHICHTE DER ÄLTESTEN GRIESCHISCHEN KIRCHE. JENA 1790. (ESSAYS ON THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE ANCIENT GREEK CHURCH.)
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.


LANGE.—Ausführliche Geschichte der Dogmen. Jena 1796. Thl. I. s. 91—189. (Full History of Doctrines.)

IV. Works which relate to special Points.

a. Relating to the Life of Justin.

GERCKEN.—De Justini Mart. ad religionem Christianam conversione admodum memorabili. Lips. 1753.


b. Relating to his Writings.

HERBIG. — Comment. crit. de scriptis, quæ sub nomine Justini philos. et mart. circumferuntur. Vratis. 1833.


c. Relating to his Teaching and Doctrine.


REHLING.—De Samaritanismo et Hebraismo Justini Mart. Vitemb. 1729.

J. E. HAHN.—De Platonismo Theologiae veterum ecclesiæ doctorum, nominatim Justini Mart. et Clementis Alex. corruptore. Vit. 1733.

TZSCHIRNER.—Geschichte der Apologetik Lpz. 1805. Thl. 1. (History of the Apologies for Christianity.)

Fall des Heidenthums. Lipz. 1829. Thl. 1. s. 204. (Fall of Heathenism.)

EISENLOHR.—Comment. de argumentis ab apolo-

WURM.—Die Apologie des Christenthums von Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus und Hermias, in Klaiber's Studien der evangelischen Geistichkeit Wirtembergs I. 2. s. 1—34. (The Apologies for Christianity by Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Hermias, in Klaiber’s Studies of the evangelical clergy of Wirtemberg.)


ZASTRAU.—Dissertt. 2 de Justini Mart. bibliis studiis. Vratislavie 1831-32.


RODHE.—Justini Mart. de theopneustia librorum sacrorum judicium. Lund. 1830.

CREDNER.—Justin's Vorstellungen von der Inspiration; in den Beiträgen zur Einleitung in die bibl. Schriften, Halle, 1832. Thl. 1. s. 108.

(Justin's Views of Inspiration in Credner's "Contributions to an Introduction to the Holy Scriptures."

SEILER.—Christologia Justini Mart. Erlang. 1775.


STAUDLIN.—Moral Justin's des Martyrers in der Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu. Götting. 1802. Th. II. s. 93—121. (Justin Martyr's sentiments on morals, in the History of the Moral Doctrine of Jesus.)
BOOK I.

THE LIFE OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

CHAPTER I.

HIS CONVERSION TO CHRISTIANITY.

Justin Martyr was born at Flavia Neapolis (the ancient Sichem, and the modern Naplous,) a Roman colony, in which the Grecian manners and culture prevailed. The year of his birth is not precisely known. He was brought up in the religious faith of

1 This fact is mentioned by Justin himself in the superscription of the Apology which he presented to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and his adopted sons Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Apol. I. i. p. 44, (p. 53, B.) Ἰουσίανος Πρίσκου τὸν Βαγγέλιον, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ Φλωνίας τίς τίλλις τῆς Συρίας Παλαιστίνης. We learn also, at the same time, that his father's name was Priscus, and his grandfather's Bacchius. The mistake of Jerome (de vir. Illustr. c. 23, T. i. p. 178,) and of Photius (Biblioth. Cod. 125, T. i. p. 95,) that Justin's father was called Priscus Bacchus has been corrected by Valesius (Annot. in Eureh. Hist. Eccl. 4, 12, p. 66). Compare Tentzel's Exercitat. toilet. T. i. p. 167.


3 Many attempts have been made to fix it. See Halloix Vit.
the Greeks, to which his parents belonged. As he grew up, his natural love of knowledge and thirst after truth, led him to the most noted schools of Grecian philosophy, which he looked upon as the repositories of true wisdom. At the beginning of his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, he describes the hopes with which he entered on the study of philosophy, and the disappointments in which his highly raised expectations issued, till, in the Christian faith, he found that certainty and truth, which had been the constant aim of his inquiries. Justin first joined himself to a disciple of the Stoa, but after a short time left him with the bitterness of blighted hopes, since of the Deity, (in whose nature and being Justin wished, above all to be instructed), he could say little, and, indeed,


1 Justin himself frequently refers in his writings to his heathen descent; it is presupposed, too, in the history he gives of his conversion to Christianity. See Dial. c. Tryph. c. 28, p. 126, (p. 245, C.) τῷ ἀστερίτητι ἰμάτι—c. 41, p. 138, (p. 260, B.) ὑπ’ ἰματί τῶν ἱστορ. —c. 120, p. 213, (p. 349, C.) ἀνε ἐκ τῆς γίνεσιν τῶν ἰμάτων, λίγω ἅ τὸν Ἐμμαγήν. See also Apol. i. 53, p. 74, (p. 83, B.) Dial. c. T. c. 64, p. 161, (p. 287, D.) c. 120, p. 213, (p. 348, C.) and Epiph. adv. haer. 46, i. T. i. p. 391, ἤ ιστορίας Ἐμμαγήν ἦ τὸ γίνεσιν. But when the same Epiphanius makes Justin also a fellow-believer with the Samaritans, τῇ ἄνθρωπος Ἐμμαγήν ὡς Χριστὸς πνευματικὸν, this statement is one of those assertions hastily taken up, which are not wanting elsewhere in the writings of this Father, and it would be fruitless labour to attempt to justify it by exegetical refinements as Halloix has done, (Vit. et Document. Justin, p. 277.) and Oudini Comment. de Scriptorib. Eccles. antiquissim. T. i. p. 180. See Arendt’s Krítische Untersuchungen, p. 277.

spoke of this subject as holding a very subordinate place in philosophical discussions. But still keener was the disappointment which our inquirer met with from a Peripatetic, who debased philosophy into a mere instrument of secular advantage, and concealed under his philosopher’s cloak, a sordid love of gain; after giving a few lessons, he demanded of Justin the fee.

1 Justin accuses the Philosophers of his times in general of indifference in relation to the theological parts of philosophical speculation, Dial. c. Tryph. c. i. p. 102, (p. 217, E.) οἱ σκληροὶ οὐδὲ τοῦτον κατηγοροῦσιν. οὐκ οἷς οὐκ ἔχουσισ οἰο! ἔτι, ὥσπερ ἔντεοτω ἡμῶν ἔστιν οὐκ οὐκ ὡς μιᾶς πῆς ἐνδομοίων τῆς γνώσεως, τῶν συνεπελόγησεν. "Most of them have never been anxious to ascertain whether there is one God, or a plurality of gods—whether their providence extends to each one of us, or not—as if the knowledge of such points had no connection with our happiness."—Compare Lucian’s Icaramenipp. c. 9.

2 Tatian Orat. c. Gr. c. 19, p. 260, (p. 157, D.) εἰ τε μὲν φιλόσοφοι τοιούτου ἐπεδίωσε τῆς δικαιοσύνης, οὐτὶ παρὰ τοῦ Πομπανίου βασιλέως ἔνισεν χρήσιμος ἤρεμος λαμβάνοις τοὺς τιναί σιών χρήσιμον ὅσον μηδὲ τῷ γίνεται διαρκῶς καθημέρως αὐτῶν ἱκονισμόν ἐκεῖνον. "So far are your philosophers from practising the self-contemptment (τὴν αὐτοκίνησιν) which they recommend to others, that some of them receive from the Emperor a yearly pension of 600 aurei, for no better reason than that they may be well paid for the length of their beards."—The confirmation of the historical facts contained in this accusation, see in Lucian’s Eunuch. c. 3. Dio Cassius’ Hist. Rom. 71, 31. Capitolin. vit. Marc. Anton. c. 23. Clement, Homil. 4. 9, T. i. p. 652: Πεπωλώντας καὶ τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ καθημερινῷ μεγαλομερέτῳ κειμένῳ ἡ χειραπτίμων χάρις τερματικήν τόν τεμπέλαν καὶ τίνα αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν ἐνείη, εἰτέ, ἐὰν μὴ εἰσῆλθεν, δι’ ἐκ φιλοσοφίαν ἑαυτὸν χαίρων τεθνοται. "We know many even of those that make great pretensions to philosophy, who, impelled by vanity, or the love of gain, and not for the sake of virtue itself, have put on the Pallium, and who, unless they can turn philosophising to account, treat it with derision."—Lucian also frequently lashes the avarice of the philosophers of his time; thus, in the Hermot. c. 9. Niger. c. 25, vit. auct. c. 6. Piscal. c. 34, sqq., c. 40, οἰ ἐκλεκτοὶ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ εχελλὸν ἐγγονιστὶ ἀμφοτερὸς πλησίον ἐχοντες. Icaramenipp. c. 5, more especially for the majority of the Grecian-Roman Philosophers, as in other times, so also in Justin’s age, the philosopher’s cloak was a mere pretence; their whole philosophy often consisted only in maintaining, along with the deepest moral corruption, an appearance of sanctity in the eyes of the people. On this point the complaints of all the
the payment of which he made indispensable to a continued attendance on his philosophical lectures and exercises. Provoked by such grovelling meanness, Justin immediately quit this pretended philosopher. But these untoward events in no degree weakened his attachment to philosophy. On the contrary, with the same confiding spirit as at first, he betook himself to the school of a Pythagorean, whose reputation for philosophic depth and refinement was not inferior to his own high self-estimation. Here, again, Justin’s hopes were deceived, and the truth he sought for was still involved in darkness. The philosopher launched out into the praises of music, geometry, and astronomy, and prescribed an acquaintance with these sciences as the indispensable preliminary of all philosophic inquiry, as the best means of withdrawing the

earnest moral writers of that age are unanimous. In this respect Lucian is the most copious, who, perhaps, here and there with some exaggeration, asserts the corrupt morals of the philosophers of his time, and points them to the life. Isocrates, c. 29.: γίνει γὰρ τι άνθρώπων ἵστοι, οὐ πρὸ πολλὰ τῷ βίῳ ίσωσθεῖν, οὐ πρὸ φιλομορφίας, οὐ πρὸ φιλοσοφίας, οὐ πρὸ σοφίας, οὐ πρὸ σκέψεως, οὐ πρὸ συνεξυπνίας τούτων. ... Ἕμενα σπουδαῖα τὰ νόμισμα ποιεῖν ἀνίσον ἀνάπτυγμα. ... c. 30, πρός τινι ποιοὶ μεθανόεται καρπισκότα ἀλλὰ καὶ συμμετέχοντες ἱκανοὶ καὶ πλοῦτοι καὶ ἱδίαις καταστάσεις, μένοι καὶ παρ’ ἑαυτοῦ γενέσθεν. εἰ ἂν λίγον τις, ἢν μὴ λείνουσιν ἢν ἂν ἄφετον ἀνικηθησθήναι, ἢν ἂν παρελθήσθη πᾶς ἢ ἄλλοι τὸ μέτρον; “A race of men have lately made their appearance, idle, contentious, vain, irritable, lickerish, empty-headed, inflated, overflowing with insolence,—appropriating the honourable name of virtue—raising their eyebrows and streaking their beards—they gad about, concealing their abominable propensities under this assumed garb. Before their disciples they are for ever lauding self-restraint and temperance; and pouring contempt on wealth and pleasure; but, alone and in their own practice, who can describe their voracity, their lewdness, their eagerness to lay hold of every dirty obolus that comes in their way!”—See also c. 21 and 31. Nigr. c. 25. Timon. c. 54, sqq. Piscat. c. 31, sqq.; c. 37, 44, sqq. Hermotim. c. 11, sqq.; c. 16, 18. Bis acus, c. 7, 11. Conniv. c. 6, sqq. Compare, besides, Philostrat. de vit. Apollon. (ed. Morell. Par. 1608.) 1, 5, p. 8—2, 12. p. 91.—Clem. homil. 4, 19, sqq. T. I. p. 654. Lactant. institut. divin. 2.
soul from sensible objects, and rendering it capable of apprehending super-sensual truth; and at last excluded Justin from the circle of his scholars, when he confessed his ignorance on these subjects. Justin was almost in despair of ever satisfying, in the schools of the philosophers, his ardent longing after truth, when the great repute in which the Platonic philosophy was held, and the circumstance, that just at that time a very noted Platonist had opened a school in the place where he was then residing, induced him to make one more attempt. And here, indeed, his wishes were gratified even beyond his expectations. The conversations with the philosopher furnished his inquisitive mind with the richest materials; the Platonic philosophy, and especially the doctrine of ideas, powerfully impressed him; his philosophic knowledge increased daily; and he now believed himself on the verge of the consummating height of the Platonic philosophy, the intuition of the deity; when a seeming accident gave an entirely different direction to his energies, and, from a contemplative Platonist, changed him into a happy Christian believer. That he might surrender himself undisturbed to contem-

1 In the schools of the Pythagoreans music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy were universally considered as preparadigmatic studies to philosophy. See Meiner's Geschichte des Ursprungs, Fortgangs, und Verfalls der Wissenschaften in Griechenland und Rom. (History of the origin, progress, and decline of the sciences in Greece and Rome.) Lemgo 1781, t. p. 512, 516, 554. Lucian. Vit. auct. c. 2, sqq. amuses himself in his usual style with this requirement of the Pythagorean school. In ridicule he represents a Pythagorean as exposed to sale, and to the buyer's question ὃ φοινίκας ἔχεις, he gives this reply; ἄφιλτον μᾶλλον ἀφροδίς, τεχνικῶν, γ μαθημάτων μελετῶν γραμματικῶν, μεταφυσικῶν. On the other hand, Origen also taught those whom he wished to induct into philosophy, in the first place, arithmetic and geometry, (Euseb. hist. eccles. 6, 18. T. II. p. 198), and recommended the study of the remaining sciences, which, in many quarters, were considered as the necessary preliminaries to the full understanding of philosophy, namely, astronomy, music, grammar, and rhetoric. (Origen, Epist. ad Gregor. c. 1. T. I. p. 30.)
plation, Justin one day resorted, as was his wont, to a lonely spot on the sea-shore. But scarcely had he begun to be absorbed in the speculation to which his thoughts were turned, when happening to look back, he saw coming behind him, an aged man of gentle, venerable aspect. Surprised at this unexpected and unwished for meeting, he stopped till the stranger came up to him, and found, on inquiry, that he had come down to the beach, to wait for some absent relations, whose return he was anxiously expecting. Justin could not help giving an explanation of his own presence on that spot, and after stating that he had chosen that place for the purpose of speculation, he was not a little astonished, when the aged man said in reply; φιλολόγος οὗ τις εἶ σὺ, φιλεργός δὲ οὐδαμῶς οὐδὲ φιλαληθής; οὐδὲ πειρὰς πρακτικὸς εἶναι μάλλον ἡ σοφιστής; "You are then a lover of discourse, but no lover of deeds, nor of truth, nor do you attempt to be a man of action, so much as a clever disputant?"—To

1 Halloix (Vit. et document. Justin, p. 17, and 286)—is doubtful, whether this aged person might not be an incarnate angel, but at last decides in favour of the opinion, that he might be one of the saints living at that time, who was brought to this interview with Justin, by a divine impulse, or rather by the actual guidance of an angel. Tillemont (Memoires pour servir a l'histoire eccl. des six premiers siecles, A. Bruxell 1793, T. II. p. 161.) considers the first supposition highly probable. Ziegler, (Theologische Abhandlungen. Gött. 1791. I. p. 91.) supposes that the old man was a hermit. Zastrau (de Justin Mart. Biblic. stud. I. p. 9, sq.) thinks he must have been a philosophically educated Jewish Christian, and Fabricius (Bibliothec. Graec. ed. Harl. t. vii. p. 52) that he was the Bishop Polycarp.

2 Tertull. apolog. adv. gent. c. 46. t. v. p. 87. quid adeo simile philosophus et Christianus? . . . . . fama negotiator et vita? verborum et factorum operator? et rerum aedificator et destructor? interpolator erroris et integrator veritatis? "What is the likeness then, between a philosopher and a Christian? the one an aspirant for fame, the other for (eternal) life?—the one laborious in words, the other in deeds?—the one a destroyer, the other a builder of things?—the one an embellisher of error, the other a renovator of truth?"—Athenag. legat. pro Christ. c. 11. p. 288 (p. 11. D.) Minuc. Fel. Oct. c. 38. p. 144. Cyprian, de bono patient. c. 3. T. ii. p. 242. Epiphan. ancorat. c. 107. T. ii. p. 107.
this unjust and unfair judgment, (as it appeared to him,) passed on his philosophical studies, Justin replied, that, in his opinion, no employment could be more worthy and urgent, than to make it manifest, that intelligence was the presiding principle of all things, and by means of this intelligence, to discern the erroneous, and the undivine, in all other pursuits. Without philosophy there could be no clear understanding, or prudence. Philosophical knowledge, ought, therefore, to be an object of universal attention; all other pursuits should retire into the background before it,—or be altogether renounced, if they could not be brought into connection with philosophy.

After this enthusiastic eulogium on philosophy, the aged man inquired, whether philosophy led to happiness, and what was the proper definition of philosophy; he was told that “Philosophy was the science of being, and the knowledge of truth,—but that happiness was the reward of this knowledge and wisdom.” He then endeavoured to convince this eloquent advocate, that philosophy, as long as it depended purely on its own resources, was utterly incapable of solving such a problem. For a knowledge of God, who is the highest object of all, and especially of Platonic speculation, could not be acquired by an empirical method, or by discursive contemplation, like the knowledge of Music, Arithmetic and Astronomy, or an acquaintance with the healing art and military tactics. Only that know-

Compare Köpke de statu et conditione christianorum sub imperatoribus Romanis alterius post Christum seculi (Berol. 1828) p. 11. sq.

1 Very similar is an assertion of Origen, only in the passage to which I refer, he understands by philosophy, chiefly the speculative conception and settlement of the Christian faith. Origen c. Cels. 1, 9, T. i. p. 327. οἱ μὲν οὖς τι πάντας καταλαύνας τά τοῦ βίου σχέδια καὶ διά της φιλοσοφίας, άλλα ὄπι οἷς μεταδιδότως οὖδεὶς η τά τούτων μένων. “If it were possible for all men to relinquish the daily pursuits of life, and employ their leisure in philosophy, no one would need to pursue any other method than this.”—Clem. Strom. 4, 8, 63, T. ii. p. 312, 4, 8, 71, p. 316.
ledge of God could claim truth and certainty, which had for its origin an immediate view of the divine, or the instructions of one who enjoyed such a view. But to such an origin, philosophy in all its extent could make no pretensions. For when the Platonic philosophy asserted, that a power resided in the human reason, (νοῦς) to rise to this vision of God, the assertion was a mere postulate without any foundation. Reason might certainly ascertain by itself, the reality of the divine existence, and moral principles,—but could not behold the essence of God. If the latter were the case, a vision of the divine essence would be possible for the souls of beasts, since these, according to their measure, are not specifically different from human souls. Besides, this postulate of the Platonic philosophy would be overturned by another maxim of the same philosophy, that not every man, but only the righteous and the pure, can attain to the actual vision of God; for, according to this, the actual attainment of this vision, would depend, not on the intellectual power inherent to man by nature, but on his moral capability. But as to beasts, this subterfuge in reference to moral considerations, fails at once. For it cannot be asserted of them, that they are unrighteous. But if their corporeal organization be available as a ground of hindrance, that they cannot attain to a vision of God, it becomes a question, whether, if they had the power of speech, they might not with greater justice, depreciate human bodies, rather than men theirs.¹

After the aged man, by this line of argument, had

¹ No sooner had the aged man forced Justin to acknowledge the incapability of human reason to behold God in and by itself, than he also set before him the unimportance of such a beholding. For, since it was the express doctrine of the Platonic system, that the soul no more remembers these visions of the deity, as soon as it enters into another human body, after the preceding release from its body; it would be a matter of perfect indifference to the individual, whether a vision of God had ever been imparted to him or not; in the one case it would be no distinction, and in the other no loss. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 4. p. 106, (p. 222, c.)
endeavoured to bring the staunch advocate of Platonism to a conviction that his favourite philosophy failed exactly in the highest point of its professed aim, he adduced two articles of its psychology, in order to show Justin, in these, the unsatisfactoriness of the system; namely, the doctrines of metempsychosis, and the immortality of the soul. In reference to the former, he directed his attention to the complete uselessness of the doctrine. Since it maintained, that the souls doomed to inhabit the bodies of beasts, had neither the consciousness of their former aberrations,\(^1\) nor a sense of their degradation in the present state,—the doctrine was divested of the only consideration which could give it any colour of probability, that, namely, of moral retribution. But the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul, so far was open to censure, that it viewed this immortality as absolute, and necessarily founded in the essential constitution of the soul. That origination in time, which the soul shared in connexion with the world, rather involved the possibility of its destruction. Yet it could not really be affirmed, that it would ever be destroyed; on the contrary, it endures, (in order to realize the idea of retribution), not only from its own nature, but through the will and power of him, who gave it existence.

These statements and reasonings of the eloquent old man, failed not to make a due impression on a mind so susceptible and open to conviction as Justin’s. The unwavering confidence which he had hitherto placed in the correctness of the Platonic theorem was shaken, and he broke out into the bitter exclamation,—

\[\text{τιν οὐν ἐτι τις χρησαίτο διδασκάλω ἥ ποθεν ὧρμηθαι τις, εἰ μὴ δὲ ἐν τούτοις τὸ ἀληθὲς ἐστῖν; — “On what teacher can we rely, or to what quarter can we look for aid, if these are not the doctrines that contain the Truth?” — Dial. c. Tryph. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, c.)}\]

The happy

---

\(^1\) Irenæus brings forward this point; (\textit{adv. haer.} 2, 58, p. 167,) in combating the doctrine of metempsychosis.
moment was now arrived, when he surrendered himself to Christianity. The ancient pillars of philosophical science hitherto deemed immovable, were shattered, and the confidence they had inspired was succeeded by a yearning after some substitute: a consciousness of the insecurity and uncertainty of all mere human investigation was awakened, and gave rise to anxiety for new and satisfactory instruction. Happily, the venerable man knew how to turn to good account these feelings of the perplexed philosopher. He indicated to him by brief hints, that if he would only apply to the right source, he might easily find the Truth which he had hitherto longed for so intensely, but had sought in vain among the Hellenic philosophers. He stated, that, in remote ages, there had appeared men, called Prophets, distinguished above all the philosophers by their antiquity and sanctity, and accredited by miracles and prophecies, as organs of the divine Spirit, in whose extant writings were deposited the choicest treasures of infallible religious truth. If he turned to these records, in them he would find the most satisfactory explanation on all the points which it behoved a philosopher to know. Having thus spoken, the stranger went his way, and Justin saw him no more. But his words had kindled a flame in Justin's heart which nothing could extinguish. He attentively revolved the information he had received: he seized with eagerness the writings of the Prophets: he anxiously sought the acquaintance of those persons who were known by him to be the friends of Christ: and the result of this threefold effort was his passing over to the Christian Church. The quickness with which this transition was made,

1 It is worthy of notice, that the study of the Old Testament, and especially of the Prophets, was the means of leading to the Christian faith, Tatian, (Orat. c. Gr. c. 29, p. 267.) [p. 165, B.] Theophilus of Antioch (ad Autol. i. 14, p. 346, [p. 73, D.] and Hilary, (de Trinit. i. I. p. 1. F. 2 A B.)
cannot be thought strange, if we consider, that his attachment to heathenism depended almost entirely on his faith in the truth and rectitude of certain philosophical tenets, especially of Platonism. This illusion once broken up, the last ties were snapt asunder which had hitherto kept him from joining the Christian community. For some time before, Christianity had exerted a silent influence over him, and had been imperceptibly winning his heart. The intrepidity and cheerfulness with which Christians maintained their faith under all the tortures which the rage and cruelty of their heathen adversaries were ready to inflict upon them; the ready determination with which they met death itself for their profession, had impressed him with the conviction that it could not consist with the secret vices and crimes of which the Christians were accused—since sensual indulgence, and joy in the prospect of death, form the most direct Antipodes—καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔγω τοὺς Πλάτωνας καὶ τὰς διδάγματάς, ἰδαβαλλόμενος ἀκοῦσαι Χριστιανοὺς, ἵνα ἐκ ἀφοῦς πρὸς Ἰάκωβους και πάντα τὰ ἀλλα ομοίως μενοβεβηκαί, ἵναι ἐν καθήμεναι καὶ πεποίηται ἦν ἀνθρώπους. Τί γὰρ φιλόδομος ἦν ἀναφέρῃς καὶ ἀγαθῶς παρχών ἔκρηκτον ἡγούμενον δύνας ἐν Ἰάκωβου ἀστάθειαν, ἐν τούτου ἀκούσαν στερηθῆναι ἐκ παντὸς ζητεῖν ὁμοίως μεν καὶ τὴν ἐνάδοι βιωθῆναι καὶ λαθάναι τοὺς ἂν ἄρχοντας ἐπειγόντο ὑπὸ χρῆμα ἰερολογεῖται ἀνθρώποις; Απολ. 2, 12, p. 96, (p. 50, A.) “For I myself, when an adherent of the Platonic school, heard the imputations cast upon Christians; but when I observed their fearlessness in reference to death, and to all other things that are usually objects of dread, it struck me as utterly impossible, that they could indulge in vice and voluptuousness. A volupatory—a man without self-control—one who could reckon it a luxury to feed on human flesh—how could such a man embrace death, which would deprive him of his indulgences: would he not rather attempt, by every means, to prolong his existence in this world, and avoid falling into the hands of the magistrate? Least of all,
would he by self-impeachment, expose himself to capital punishment." But after this sentiment had once taken root in Justin's mind, it needed in fact, only a confirmed scepticism in the sufficiency of the philosophic doctrines of the Greeks, and the conviction, that Christians, in reference to religious knowledge, were at least, not behind the Greeks, to destroy the last bulwark of heathenism which still remained in his breast; and, thus, it may be very naturally explained, how Justin's accidental conversation with the aged stranger produced the astonishing effect of converting the enthusiastic friend and advocate of the Platonic philosophy, as if by magic, into the equally decided friend and advocate of the Christian doctrine.¹

But in modern times² this whole narrative of Justin respecting the means of his conversion to Christianity, has been treated as a mere fiction, which was simply designed to give interest and point to his apology. But this supposition is itself nothing more than an arbitrary fiction; for we cannot conceive on what grounds this historical credibility of this narrative can be rejected.³ It has no internal marks whatever of unlikelihood, and finds an outward support in several analogous events of that period. Justin was far from being the only individual of his times, who found the truth in Christ after manifold wanderings in the labyrinth of a barren speculation. But who would wish to throw a doubt over the historical reality of all these phenomena? It is not set down for unhistorical, when

¹ In what year his conversion to Christianity took place, in the absence of all documents respecting it, cannot be determined. The attempts which has been made on this point are mere hypothesis. It is difficult to imagine on what grounds, for example, Dommerich (de legge patrum philosophiae fonte, Helmstadt. 1760, p. 5.) fixes on the year 132. Mühler, (Patrologie. Regensburg, 1839, I. p. 191,) on the year 133; and Tzschirner (Fall des Heidentums, I. p. 205,) on 137 A.D.

² Clericus " Unparteiische Lebensbeschreibung, s. 3. Credner, Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen schriften, Th. I. s. 95.

Tatian\(^1\) tells of himself that he travelled through many lands, ransacked the stores of Grecian wisdom, examined the various forms of heathen worship, and sought access to all the known mysteries, before the light of truth in Christianity had risen upon him. Does not everyone recognize it as a painting from life, when the Ebionitish Clementines represent Clement of Rome,\(^2\) as having been tortured with all kinds of philosophical doubts, and even as seeking refuge in the wisdom and magic of the Egyptians, before he found in the Christian faith, the solution of all the harassing questions which had agitated his breast.\(^3\) That Justin, before his conversion to Christianity, had been an adherent of the Platonic philosophy, is testified by himself in the passage already quoted. He also acknowledges, that he had formerly been a friend and admirer of the Pythagorean and Platonic doctrine; ταύτα γὰρ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ μεσίου της ἀληθίας, παρὰ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος ἡκούσας. De Resurrectione, c. 10, p. 595, B. "For these things, even before we learned the truth, we heard from Pythagoras and Plato."—If full confidence may be given to the ancient credible martyrology of Justin,\(^4\) we may derive a con-

---

\(^1\) Tatian, *Orat.* c. Gr. c. 20, p. 267, (p. 166, A.) c. 35, p. 272, (p. 170, B.)


\(^3\) See Kestner—*Die Agape oder der geheime Weltbund der Christen* (Agape, or the secret universal bond of Christians.) Jena 1819, s. 28, &c. a book which, though it certainly must be considered quite erroneous in its leading ideas, contains on particular points much admirable delineation.

\(^4\) As we shall refer more than once in the following pages to this account of Justin's martyrdom, this appears a proper place for mentioning the most essential points, on which we ground our belief in its authenticity and originality. The authority of the person who has preserved it, the metaphrast Simeon, is, we allow, not in itself the most to be depended upon; but the whole complexion of the martyrology is a pledge, that this collector of legends has in this instance really confined himself to the simple task of collecting, and abstained from his usual style of constructing, or at least embellishing stories of the saints to gratify his marvel-loving piety. The supposition too,
firmation from it of the narrative in question contained in the dialogue" with Trypho. In answer to the question proposed by the Prefect before whom he was brought to trial, ποιον λέγους μεταχειρίζεσθε; "what set of doctrines have you been conversant with?"—Just-

that the "Acts" of Justin Martyr did not proceed from Simon, but might have been an apocryphal production, since their fabrication might have occurred in the earliest ages of Christian antiquity, has not much in its behalf. For if the "Martyr's Acts" were the apocryphal production of a mistaken Christian bias, such a bias must have in some way or other shown itself. But throughout no other bias is apparent than that of historical truth. The narrative is, from beginning to end, simple and unadorned, free from all legendary garnish ing with miracles, from all artificial glorification of its principal subject. The questions and answers which the narrative puts in the mouth of the Roman Prefect, and of the Martyrs, have such an air of naturalness and internal truth, as would be hardly possible in a mere fiction. The ecclesiastical allusions, more especially those belonging to public worship, bear the impress of a time when the Christian Church, considered as a social religious institution, was still destitute of a fixed basis and of a definite organic form, and this imperfect state is the acknowledged character of the second century. Compare c. 2. p. 586.—'Ρουστικός ἰππόχρης ἔτη τοῦ εὐνέχειον; 'Ἰωνισίως ἔτην ἦν ἔτοι προφητεύοντος καὶ θυμίζον ἵστατο. Πάντως γὰρ ἤμεθαν, ἵνα τής εὐνέχειας ημῶν πάντας; οὐχ' οὖν ὅτι δεύτερος ἦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν τίμην οὐ περιγράφαται. "Rusticus the Prefect said, where do you meet together? Justin said, 'wherever the choice and ability of each may determine. You take for granted, that we all meet in the very same spot; but it is not so; for the God of the Christians is not circumscribed by place.'—The summary confession of faith which Justin, according to the relation in the Martyrology, made before the Prefect Rusticus, bears in all its leading features the complexion of Justin's doctrinal views, and therefore could only have been written by a person who had received it immediately from the lips of the Martyr himself. Let any one only read with attention the writings of Justin, and then compare the expressions in the Martyrology; "Ὅτε εὑρισκόμενοι εἰς τὸν τῶν Χριστιανῶν Εἰκόνα, οἱ άγγελοὶ ἐν τῷ τόντον ἔδραμεν προσευμα καὶ δημιουργόν τῆς πάσης κυρίας ἐκείνης δραταὶ τι καὶ ἀσφαλές" καὶ κύριον 'Ἰωνισίων Χριστόν παρεδόθη οὖν, ἐς καὶ προεικόμεναι υπὸ τῶν προφητῶν μιλλίων παραγινόμεθα τῷ γὰρ τῶν ἀξιώματος εὐνεχίους κυρίου καὶ διδασκαλίας καλῶν μαθητῶν. . . . "Ieron γὰρ, ἐν τῷ ἱεραρχείῳ προφητεύων οἱ προφητεύων συμπληρώσων τῷ τότε παρευμένος γενομένως ἐν άποκάλυψις, which (i. e. the doctrine δικαίου)
tin replied with his wonted frankness, ΕΝ ΑΑΕΥΤΗ ΜΠΟΤ ΛΟΥΕ ΕΙΣΙΑΟΝ ΜΑΣΙΝ, ΣΟΥΙΛΙΜΝΗ ΟΙ ΤΟΤ ΑΛΤΕΙΝΗ ΛΟΥΕΟΙ, ΠΟΙ: ΤΩΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ, ΚΑΝ ΜΗ ΑΡΕΣΕΙΣ ΤΟΙ: ΨΥΧΟΟΓΟΝΟ, c. 1. p. 585. “I have assayed to learn all varieties of doctrine; but I have at last closed with the true doctrine,

we sacredly hold in relation to the God of the Christians, whom we esteem the one maker from the beginning, and author of the whole creation, visible and invisible, and the Lord Jesus Christ, son (παιδα) of God, who was announced beforehand by the prophets as about to become present among the human race, a herald of salvation, and a teacher of excellent disciples.

For I know that from ancient times the prophets foretold concerning his advent among men.”—The counter-remark, that the doctrinal statements of the martyrology may be only a copy of Justin’s views taken from his writings, is set aside by the circumstance that the martyrology contains also a passage, which stands formally at least in contradiction to a statement on the same point in Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho—which would certainly have been avoided in an unrestricted arbitrary fabrication of the Martyr’s history.


Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ ισια του πνευματικον, άλ- λα άφανεν ου τον υπερ- ριτον και την γυνα- ικα.

“The God of the Christians is not circumscribed by space, but being invisible, fills Heaven and earth.”

Dial. c. Tryph. c. 127, p. 220, (p. 356, sq.)

Ο ἀπίστως παντα... τον πνευματικον ουτω πνευματικον, ουτω Πνευματα, ουτω Θεωσισται, άλλα ί τον άθροο Χωρα, ίταν πασι τοις άπαις έξω τον πνευματικον, ουτω θεολογοι ουδεν άλλη λειψαμεν άλλης ουτω πνευματικον ιν τον άπαις έξω και την πληρων έλα.

“The ineffable Father... neither comes to one place from another,—nor traverses about,—nor sleeps,—nor awakes,—but abides in his own region, wherever that may be, acutely seeing and acutely hearing, not with eyes, nor with ears, but by an indescribable power; nor being moved, but is unlimited by space and by the whole universe.”

Lastly, let us only take into consideration the circumstance, that in the martyrology not a syllable is said of the Cynic Crescens, whom Justin more than once mentions in his writings as a most embittered enemy of his own person, and of the Christians generally, and who must therefore have appeared quite suited to serve to be the foil and embellishment
that of the Christians, though it suits not those who glory in falsehood."

Since therefore it cannot be doubted, that Justin's account of his conversion possesses historical credibility, we are next to enquire, in what place Justin's conversion to Christianity occurred.

This inquiry may at first sight appear rather an idle one, but it is not without its importance. Many learned men are of opinion that Justin first became intimately acquainted with Christianity at his birthplace, Flavia Neapolis, and connect consequences with this supposition, which are not without further influence. By this means Credner would explain Justin's supposed leaning to the tone of thinking prevalent among the heretical Jewish Christians. Stroth would make use of it to support his hypothesis, that the Acts of the Apostles made use of by Justin was no other than the Apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews.\(^1\) Rettig would derive from it an argument for combating the genuineness of the New Testament Apocalypse.\(^2\)

Were we to enquire what, from an à priori consideration of the question, would appear most probable, we should be led least of all to fix on Flavia Neapolis. We cannot suppose that in a city so inconsiderable, all the philosophical schools which Justin visited in succession, could have established themselves. This state of the case would, therefore, confirm the supposition that Justin, soon after the need of settled religious convictions had been awakened in his mind, left his

---

\(^1\) Entdeckte Fragmente des Evangeliums nach den Hebräern in Eichhorn's Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur. Thl. I. s. 33.

\(^2\) Das erweislich älteste Zeugniss für die Aechtheit der Neu-testamentlichen Apocalypse. s. 64.
native land, and, consequently, met in some place beyond its boundaries, with that aged person by whom he was determined to embrace Christianity.

This supposition is favoured by the customs prevalent among educated persons in the heathen world, which rendered it incumbent on all who belonged to the higher circles of society, to visit the most renowned foreign institutions, and particularly philosophical schools. And what an à priori view of the case would render most probable is confirmed and established by Justin's own testimony. His own words, which have been already quoted, "For I myself, when an adherent of the Platonic school," &c. (p. 17), sufficiently indicate that, at that time, when he still adhered to the Platonic school, he was absent from his native land. For, during the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, Palestine could hardly afford him an opportunity to convince himself of the moral integrity of Christians, in opposition to the calumnies which the popular hatred of the heathens heaped upon them, by means of personally beholding the intrepidity and cheerfulness with which they met death. In Greece and Lesser Asia, it is true, but not in Palestine, bloody persecution of the Christians, on the part of the heathen, occurred in Hadrian's time. But a passage in the Dialogue with Trypho testifies still more than this indirect evidence, that Justin's conversion took place beyond the bounds of Palestine. It is this, καὶ δὴ νεωτι ἐπιδημήσαντι τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ τῆς συνεχής ἀνδρὸς καὶ σφούγχαντι ἐν τοῖς Πλατωνικοῖς συνάγοντες ὡς τά μαλακά καὶ σφόντα. Dial. c. Tr. c. 2, p. 103, (p. 219, C.) "I maintained the closest intimacy with an intelligent man, and one of eminence among the Platonists, who had very lately become a resident in our city, and (with him) made great proficiency."—Rettig, indeed, adduces this passage as a proof that Justin had received the last philosophical instruction which immediate-

1 Thus, too, Grabe, Spicilegium Patrum, T. ii. p. 185, and others.
ly preceded his joining himself to the Christian church, in his native city, and, consequently, that he became a Christian in Flavia Neapolis; but without reason. For if the phrase τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ πόλει, &c. referred to Justin’s native place, Justin would not have spoken of himself in the singular (ὑμνίτεθη—προίκο-πτον) or in case he wished to have used exactly this form, he must have also said μοῦ τῇ πόλει instead of τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ πόλει. But the farther notice which Justin gives in a subsequent passage that the aged Christian met with him during his solitary walk near the sea (οὐ μακράν Ἡλάσσης) does not suit Flavia Neapolis. This town was situated, not near any water, but almost five miles from the Mediterranean Sea. Should any one attempt, with Rettig, to obviate this difficulty, by the supposition that Justin did not mean a literal walking on the sea-shore when he met with the aged Christian, but rather had a view to the love of speculation—a longer sojourn in the quietness of a solitary shore; he would have the clear sense of the passage in the Dialogue against him, and do violence to the text. The words are the following,—καὶ μοῦ οὕτως διακειμένω, ἦτα ἠδοξε ποτε πολλὰς ἡμερίας ἐμφανίζεται καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀληθεία πάτων, ἐπορεύόμην εἰς τὶ χωρίον, οὐ μακρὰν Ἡλάσσης. πλησιών δὲ μου γενομένου ἐκείνον τοῦ τόπου, ἦθα ἐμελέλον ἀφίκομενος πρὸς ἐμαυτῷ ἐσθέναι, παλαιός τις πρεσβευτὴς . . . . . . ὅλγον ἀπόδειξιν μου, παραστά. “Such being my state of mind since I was disposed to indulge in much solitude, and to shun the footsteps of men, I went into a certain district, not far from the sea, and when I was getting near the place where I expected to be alone, an ancient man followed me at a little distance.”—Dial. c. Tr. c. 3, p. 104, (p. 219, D). We infer that Justin did not become a Christian in Flavia Neapolis, or in any part of Palestine. Yet as the words τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ πόλει must have some definite geographical reference, according to our view, nothing else remains, except to include the Jew Trypho, to whom the words are addressed in the plural pronoun, and to infer, that the place of their
conference, namely, Ephesus, was the place of Justin's conversion to Christianity.  

CHAPTER II.

JUSTIN'S LABOURS IN THE CAUSE OF CHRISTIANITY.

The new faith, to which, in so natural, and yet so wonderful a manner, the philosopher had been led, from this moment became the mainspring and centre point of all his efforts. To building up the Christian Church, both inwardly and outwardly, his life was henceforward dedicated. It was his desire, that the light which had risen on his own mind, should shine also on others; that the repose and peace which he had found, might also make others happy. Justin considered himself laid under a religious obligation to devote himself to the immediate, incessant propagation of the gospel. He expressly declares, that "every one who is able to speak the truth, and does not speak it, will be condemned by God." After quoting Ezek. iii. 17—19, he adds "Therefore we being moved by fear, we apply ourselves to address [men,] according to the Scriptures, not actuated by the love of gain, or of reputation, or of pleasure; for, of these motives, no

1 In accordance with this result, Bretschneider says, (Probabilia de evangelii et epistolrarum Joannes Apost. indole et origine, Lips. 1820, p. 191.)—Justinus . . . . Ephesi graecA philosophia imbutus, deinde Christianus. Compare Flügge, Versuch einer Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften, (Halle 1796,) i. p. 121. and Winter Kritische Geschichte der ältesten Zeugen und Lehrer des Christenthums nach den Aposteln (München 1814.) s. 258. On the other hand, Prudentius Maranus (Proleg. 3, 1, 5, p. lxvi. lxxvii.) and Junius (de Justino Mart. apolge. adver. ethic. p. 4,) fix on Alexandria.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 8. p. 109, (p. 225. C.) βουλόμενοι δὲ καὶ τάδε τὸν ἰφλαὶ Σωφρονίσσων μὴ ἀφίσσασθαι τῷ τῶν εὐσεβῶν λόγῳ . . . . . ἀνάπτασις ἡδίστη γίνεται τῶν ἐκμιλητικῶν αὐτῶν . . . . πρὸς τοὺς ἱστοροῦντας τοῖς Ἑρωτοῦ τῶν Θεῶν καὶ τιλίχρας νικημένη ἱδαμοποιήσεως.

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 82. p. 179. sq. (p. 308. D. 309. A.)
one is able to convict us."—And in another passage, he says, "I fear the judgment of God although you are unfair, I will proceed to answer all your objections and arguments; and I act in the same straightforward manner towards men of whatever nation, who are disposed to examine or question me on these things." Justin, indeed, made no material change in his outward mode of living; but the spirit that animated him, was a new one; the aim which he pursued, was no longer the same. He continued to wear his philosophical cloak, in order to indicate, symbolically, by his outward appearance, that as a Christian, he was still a friend of philosophy, though no longer a disciple of human, but of heavenly wisdom. He retained, also, his former habits, in


2 The philosopher's cloak afforded the Jew Trypho an occasion for entering into conversation with Justin, Dial. c. Tr. c. 1. p. 101. (p. 217, B. C.) φιλοσόφοι, χαίρε, ἵππος . . . ἰδαί ἰδῷ τὸν ἴππον τῆς σχήματος, ἑσπερίζεται αὐτῷ προερχόμενοι. "Hail Philosopher, said he, whenever I see any one in such attire, I gladly make up to him."—With this agrees the account given by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4. 11. T. i. p. 321. ἵππος δὲ διὰ φιλοσόφον σχῆμα προέρχεται τῷ κυρίῳ λόγῳ. "Justin, in the attire of a philosopher, administered the divine word."—Phot. Bibliothec. cod. 125, T. i. p. 95; φιλοσόφως καὶ τοῖς λόγοις, καὶ τῷ ἱππό τῇ σχήματι; "Being a philosopher both in discourse, and in life, and in attire."—The use of the philosopher's mantle, without doubt, gave facilities to the labours of itinerant evangelists. See Neander's Allgemeine Geschichte, &c. i. 2. p. 310. Besides Justin, many other teachers of Christian antiquity, retained the philosopher's cloak after their conversion to Christianity. Thus the Athenian apologist Aristides, according to Hieronym. De vir. illust. c. 26. T. i. p. 177, thus Tertullian, according to the well-known passage de Pall. c. 6. T. v. p. 175, thus the Alexandrian presbyter Heraclius, Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 6. 19. T. ii. p. 208, and Hieronym. De vir. illust. c. 54. T. i. p. 184, so also Gregory Thaumaturgus, according to the account of his biographer, Gregor. Nyssen. Opp. T. iii. p. 534.

3 With this agrees Tertullian's language (De Pall. c. 6. T. v. p. 175) Gaude pallium et exsulta; melanfam te philosophia dignata est, ex quo Christianum vestire cupisti.
travelling about, teaching and learning, without any fixed dwelling-place, without accepting any civil or church office.¹

That Justin as a Christian, chose for himself the calling of an itinerant evangelist, may be explained, partly from his natural turn of mind, which found satisfaction in a personal acquaintance with interesting localities and memorials—partly from the obstacles of the times, which rendered it almost impossible to gain an intimate acquaintance with the affairs of the church, excepting by personal visits to individual religious communities—and lastly, another reason might be, that Justin believed he could thus, in accordance with his own mental peculiarities, most advantageously propagate that Gospel which he had received and held with such great enthusiasm. By selecting this life of an apostolic itinerant, Justin acquired, in addition to his main and direct object, an-

¹ Only a false conception of some ancient accounts, but especially the misunderstanding of the communicative form of speech which Justin employs, (as on many other occasions) where in speaking of baptism, he says, (Apol. i. 61, p. 79, (p. 93, D.) ἔγινα τοῦ ἀνωτέρου, ἵνα πληρωθέντα καὶ καθαρυσθέντα, ἔγινα τοῦ ἄνωτέρου, ἐπεφέρατο. They, (i. e. the persons whom Justin describes as ' believing the things taught by us, and promising to live accordingly') are led by us where there is water, and are regenerated, according to that mode of regeneration by which we ourselves are regenerated,—and c. 66, p. 82, (p. 97, B. C.) μετὰ τὸ ἔπος λάθους τὸν πνευμόνος καὶ καθαρυσθέντας δικαίως ἐγέρσεν, ὡς καθαροῖς ἐστε. After thus washing, we lead him who has believed and pledged himself, to those who are called brethren, where they are assembled to offer up common prayers, &c.—a form of speech, which he might with perfect propriety use on the Scriptural principles of the universal Christian Priesthood, and as the reporter and advocate of Christian church-usages;—it is on these grounds that Tillemon (Memoires pour servir à l'histoire, t. ii. p. 163.) Prudentius Maranus (Prolegomena, 3, 2, 1, p. lxviii.) and Lumper (De vita scriptis atque doctrina, s. a patrum, t. i. p. 55) have made Justin an ordained Presbyter. Compare also, Möhler Patrologie i. a. 191. Prudentius Maranus speaks of him also, as leading at the same time the life of an Ascetic.
other incalculable and essential advantage. His Christian conviction, which had marked out for him this line of life, developed itself most distinctly under persecution, and gained its full power in overcoming martyrdom and death. Justin, in his travels, necessarily became acquainted with all the varied forms in which the Christian life expressed itself, in the different situations and offices of society; he thus gained the experience, that the Gospel is everywhere another and yet the same; that admitting of the greatest manifoldness and difference in the factors under which the life in Christ presents itself, the products in all essential points, are everywhere equal. As he beheld Christianity embodied in individual instances, he learned how deeply founded in its essential nature were its claims to universality, and this perception could not fail to kindle in his heart, the same enthusiasm with which the unknown author of the Epistle to Diognetus has presented this aspect of the Christian life with so much sober truth, and yet with so much eloquence. But in this enthusiasm, the wish must have found the strongest aliment, to assist according to his ability to promote this universal tendency of Christianity. And for the correctness of the opinion, that the information which Justin gives respecting the Life of the Church and its efforts during his time, possesses not merely local, but universal truth, we have a certain pledge in that constant change of residence which his vocation involved. Justin visited one after another, the most considerable societies which then existed in the Chris-

1 This aspect of the new Institution would indeed be least clearly discerned by the heathen opponents of Christianity. Celsus held it to be unreasonable to suppose that all the nations of Asia, Europe, and Lybia, Greeks and barbarians, could be united to the end of the world, under one faith. Orig. c. Cels 8, 72, t. i. p. 795. μετὰ τέσσαρα εἰκόνα της λατρείας, εἴ τις δὴ εἶν τι εἰς οὐκ ενθρησκευτάναι γίνεται τοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας, καὶ Ἑλλήνων καὶ Λυβίων κακοποιοῦσας Ἑλλάδα τε καὶ βασιλάδας, ἡχεῖ περάτως ἀπαντήσαντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦτο τερμασθεῖσα ἀναλογίαν ἐν Ἀττικῷ, τόσο ὁ τοῦτο εἰρήκουσα πάντα εὐθύς. Compare Euseb. demonstr. Evang. i. 5, p. 9.
tian community; we may, therefore, expect from him the most exact and certain knowledge of church life, as well as of the doctrine and usages of the second century, and can feel assured, that he learned accurately to distinguish the accidental and the individual in the existing constitution of the church and its cultus. Justin visited Egypt, and beheld in the Isle of Pharos, near Alexandria, the remains of the cells in which the Seventy Interpreters, according to the sacred legend, separately translated into Greek, the books of the Old Testament, and yet, with a literal agreement; at Ephesus, he met with Trypho the Jew, and entered into that conversation on religion with him, the substance of which, though modified here and there, is contained in the dialogue now extant. Nor did he overlook the west. At Cumæ, in Southern Italy, he surveyed, with amazement, the massive structure in which the sybil uttered her oracles: and sojourned for a long time in Rome, the metropolis of the world. Indeed, accord-

1 Justin, Cohort. ad Graec. c. 13, p. 17. (p. 14, C.)
3 Nouncl Apparatus ad bibliothecam maximam, I. 377, sq.
4 Justin, Cohort. ad Graec. c. 37, p. 33, sq. (p. 34, E. 35, A. B.)
5 Justin’s residence at Rome is testified in express terms by Eusebius, (Hist. Eccles. 4, 11, T. I. p. 323. ποὺς Ἐφισίως τις διαρθησὶς οὐνίτιξις;) and by Photius, (Biblioth. cod. 125, T. I. p. 95.) Tatian, Justin’s scholar, (Iren. adv. hares. 1, 31, p. 107: ἦς (Tatianus) ἱστηκότας ἱστηκότας γεγονός, ἵππος ἄριστον ἵππον, οὐδὲ ἔκφυσις τεινόν,) according to the report of Rhodon, kept a school at Rome, which he received from his teacher. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 5, 13, T. II. p. 66. Lastly, some passages in Justin’s writing imply his personal residence at Rome. What Justin narrates (Apol. 1, 26, p. 59. [p. 69, D.] of a statue which the Romans had erected to the Gnostic Simon Magus on an island in the Tiber, indicates a topographical knowledge, which only actual observation could have given. The incidents relating to a Roman Christian female who had separated herself from her husband on account of his excesses, and was therefore informed against by him as a Christian, as well as the execution of some Roman
ing to the martyrology before quoted, he paid two visits to this city. 1

In all these journeys, he kept fixedly in view his main object, that of leading other wandering and seeking minds to those fountains of eternal truth, from which he had been able to draw, after long and unsuccessful efforts. By word of mouth and by writing, “in season and out of season,” he laboured for the cause of Christianity. But it is not within our power to give a perfectly satisfactory representation of his agency, since Christian antiquity has left us only a few scanty notices respecting it; and a great part of Justin's

Christians, are mentioned by Justin in his second apology to Marcus Aurelius, in such a manner as was only possible if the events came under his own eyes. When, lastly, Justin speaks (Apol. 2, 3, p. 91. [47, B.]) of his repeated disputations with the Cynic Crescens, when he expresses his anxiety at this circumstance, that he may, perhaps, be a victim of his artifices, (Apol. 2, 3, p. 90. [p. 46, E.] καί γὰρ προδικοὶ ὑπὸ τίνος τῶν ἀποκατηγορούμενων ἡμᾶς καὶ δύναμις ἡμῖν, καὶ καὶ ὅτι ἔχει καὶ τοὺς φιλοσόφους, καὶ φιλοσόφους.) “And I expect to be plotted against by some one of those who have been named, and fastened to the stake; or at least by Crescens, that lover of noise and show.”—And when later, Tatian mentions a real persecution with which Crescens threatened Justin, Orat. c. Grac. c. 19, p. 260. p. 157, D. 158, A.): κρίσιμος, . . . σύνες ἡμῶν τοῖς Θανατοῖς, ὡς καὶ ιωττίτις, πανηγυρίς καὶ μεταφέρονται, ὡς παρέχεται τῇ Θεότητι. ἔργασεις τῇ μπαλάσι προαγματικῶς: this threefold testimony speaks so strongly for Justin’s longer residence at Rome that any further doubt would be purely groundless scepticism. For that this Crescens lived at Rome, Tatian remarks; Orat. c. Gr. c. 19, p. 266, (p. 157, D.) κρίσιμος ἐκ τοιοῦτου. οἱ μεγάλη πόλις ἀντίκτυπα ἄριστην. The expression μεγάλη πόλις marks the city of Rome by a familiar idiom. Compare Porphyr. de abstinent. ab exu carn. 2, 56, p. 203, sq. ed. Rhùr.); Themist. Orat. 94, p. 452, (ed. Dindorf.); Valesius in Euseb. de laud. Constant. c. 18, p. 284. Halloix Vet. et document. Justin, p. 352, sq.

1 Act. Mart. c. 2, p. 586, ἰδικήματα τῇ Ῥωμαίῳ πόλις τοῦ ἱστότορο. This notice receives confirmation by what has been mentioned in the preceding note. For Justin’s testimony respecting the pretended statue of Simon Magnus, implies a residence at Rome under Hadrian, and the remarks on Crescens must allude to the times of Marcus Aurelius.
writings are lost; yet the memorials of it still in existence are sufficient to prove its importance. In conformity to the internal stages of development on which the Christian Church stood in the first half of the second century, and not less in conformity to its outward position, Justin's agency concentrated itself chiefly in opposition to error. Yet the titles that are still left of some of his lost writings, show us that he did not neglect the promotion of the Christian cause by the positive representation and development of Christian doctrine; and, according to the account of the ancient Martyrology,\(^1\) he opened a school at Rome, in which he instructed in the saving truths of Christianity all who were led to him by a sense of their moral necessities; but the most prominent feature of his agency was the polemical and apologetical.

A three-fold opposition claimed the attention of Justin. Considered in relation to its origin, Judaism, from whose bosom Christianity proceeded, and under whose name it might have gained a footing\(^2\) in the heathen world, without exciting any violent opposition—presented itself to Justin as the nearest object of controversy. The reaction which Judaism had from the first maintained against Christianity, was in Justin's days more fierce and bitter than ever. The daily increasing spread of the Christian faith kept alive the Jewish enmity; the political oppression under which, especially since the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews groaned, contributed to render this enmity more intense. They gave vent to their feelings by regular imprecations on the Christians in their synagogues,\(^3\) and showed the greatest zeal in propa-

---

1 Tertull. apolog. c. 21, T. V. p. 41, sub umbrasculo insignissimae religionis, certe licite.
2 Starck's "Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche des ersten Jahrhunderts," (History of the Christian Church of the first Century,) Berlin and Leipsig, 1788, iii. s. 780.
gating the lying reports which accused the Christians of shameless immoralitys and cannibal cruelty.¹ Indeed, whenever it was in their power, they committed

D) c. 117, p. 210, (p. 345, A.) c. 137, p. 228, (p. 366, D.) the last quoted passage, intimates that these imprecations were uttered regularly after the prayers. In the time of Jerome they were repeated three times a day in the synagogues. Compare Hieronym. comment. in Jes. v. 18. T. v. p. 24, in Jes. xlix. 7, p. 151, in Jes. xii. 5, p. 162, in Amos i. 11, T. vi. p. 61, Epiphanius also knew of this practice, and differs from Jerome only in representing it as directed not against the Christians universally, but against the Jewish-Christian party of the Nazarenes. Epiph. adv. haeres. l. 29, 9, T. i. p. 124, "οὐ μόνον στὸν Ἰουδαίου τοῦτος τέρον οὐκέταίναι μένοι, ἀλλὰ ἀντισώμοις λώσει καὶ μάταις ἡμίσες καὶ τίρις τῇ ἤλικος τρίς τῆς ἡμέρας, ἢ τὰς ἁλυκὰς ἴσοτέλουσι τοῖς αὐτῶν συναγωγαῖς, ἵππαται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀνθιματιζόμεθα, φιλεῖται ἐν τοῖς Ἰσραήλισιν. Καὶ γὰρ τούτους σημείωσεν Ἰησοῦς, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸ Ἰουδαῖοι αὐτῶν ἤττας ἥττας κυρίως ἴσοι Χριστῷ." — "Not only the children of the Jews inherit a hatred towards them; but on rising in the morning and at noon, and in the evening, three times a day, when they perform their devotions in their synagogues, they curse and anathematize them, saying, "May God curse the Nazarenes! And they are more virulent against them because having been originally Jews, they proclaim Jesus to be the Christ." Yet this difference, probably, arises only from a misunderstanding on the part of Epiphanius; for Jerome also says, that the Christians were cursed under the name of Nazarenes; and Nazarenes was the common name by which the Christians were designated in derision by the Jews. Tertull. adv. Marc. 4, 8, T. I. p. 172. Nazarens vocari habebat secundum prophetiam Christus creatoris; unde et ipsa nomine nos Judæi Nazarenos appellant per eum. This assertion of Tertullian is confirmed by Galen, in Bar-Hebraeus Chronic. Syriac, (ed. Bruns et Kirsch. Lips. 1789,) p. 55. Prudent. Peristephan. 5, 26; 10, 45. adv. Symmach. 1; 550. Hieronym. de loc. Hebraic. T. III. p. 188. Epiph. adv. haeres. l. 29; 1. T. I. p. 117.

¹ Justin. dial. c. Tr. c. 17, p. 117, (p. 234, E): ἄδειας ἑλλειπον ἀντὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ ἑλλέπων τοῖς ἰσοτελῶν ἢσσας τῶν ἱλήνων, ἀριστον ἄδειας ἑλλειπον τοῖς ἰσοτελῶν ἔλεοις, καταλέγον ἑλλέπων ταῦτα, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦλέπου ἔλεοι τοῖς ἰσοτελῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰσοτελῶν ἀλλοις ἀνθρώποις. — "You have sent out chosen agents from Jerusalem, over all the earth, who report that the impious sect of the Christians has made its appearance, and scatter abroad those slanders which all those utter who know us not." —
violence on the Christians, and particularly when Bar-Kochba, in the time of Hadrian, had roused the glowing embers of rebellion against the Romans into a flame, and had organized a wide-spread insurrection, the Jewish hatred was directed especially against the Christians in Palestine, who would not join the insurgents and deny Christ. This rising antagonism of the Jews against Christianity, must necessarily have engaged Justin's close attention; he who had watched the Christian cause on all sides with such lively sympathy, could not have allowed so embittered and dangerous a faction to escape his observation: his apologetic zeal must have taken Judaism into the


circle of his endeavours. It was not, indeed, always very easy to come at the Jews, since they dreaded the preponderance of the Christian argumentation,¹ and all discussion on religious subjects with Christians was expressly forbidden by their superiors;² but still there were many, who with the independence of Trypho, disregarded this prohibition, and were not entirely inaccessible to Christian communications. In fact, Justin appears to have found frequent opportunities of discussing with the Jews, the points of difference between the Jewish and Christian doctrine. This may be inferred from the language which he puts into the mouth of Trypho; Dial. c. Tr. c. 50, p. 146, (p. 269, C.)—τοιαύτας μοι ἐκ πολλῆς προστέθες τῆς πρὸς πολλοὺς περὶ πάντων τῶν Ἰσχυρότερων γεγονότα καὶ διὰ τούτου ἐτοίμας ἔχεις ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς πάντα, καὶ οὐ ἰπτωθησθῇς.—"You seem to me to have been much exercised in debating with numbers of persons, on all the points under discussion, and are therefore ready with a reply to every question that may be put to you."—If it be asked how Justin, a heathen by birth, and in youth a disciple of the Grecian philosophy, could have acquired a minute acquaintance with Jewish customs and opinions—for this must have been a prerequisite for an antagonist of Judaism³—we have only to recollect his Palestinian origin, and his numerous journeyings, which must have brought him from early times into manifold contact with the Jews.

But with greater zeal than against Judaism, Justin, from the circumstances in which he was placed, was excited to vigorous opposition to Heathenism. For the dangers which threatened the youthful church from

¹ Justin, Dial. c. Tryph. c. 93, p. 191, (p. 321, D.)
this quarter, were incomparably greater, and more numerou
than from the Jews. After Christianity, under
the Emperor Trajan, had once asserted its distinctive
character and independence, after the emptiness and
decolation of the heathen temples in Bithynia had
furnished a sample of what might be feared for the
heathen Cultus from the wide diffusion of Christian-
ity, the reaction of Heathenism against Christianity
began, which continued uninterruptedly, with less or
greater vigour, till the final victory of Christianity.
Interests, religious and political, public and private,
were confederated to suppress the new faith; philoso-
phers and priests, rulers and people, united their en-
gies to blot out the Christian name. The philosophers,
indeed, joined with Christians in despising the popular
faith, but they considered it ridiculous that the know-
ledge of truth, instead of depending on the speculative
reason, was made to rest on the authority of a cruci-
fied Jew, and the tradition of a few uneducated Gal-
leans; they esteemed it absurd, that not only
thinkers and investigators, but even mechanics and
slaves, women and children, might become initiated
into philosophy. The priests, artists, and craftsmen,
saw that their influence and gains were put in ex-

1 Kortholt, de origine et natura Christianismi ex impia
ethniorum sententia. (Kil. 1672.) p. 49, sqq. Seidenstucker
de Christianis ad Trajanum usque a Casaribus et senatu Ro-
mano pro cultoribus religiones Mosaicæ semper habitis.
Helmst. 1790.

2 See Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.
Starek's Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche des ersten Jahr-
hunderts, III. 790. Flügge's Versuch einer Geschichte der
thologischen Wissenschaften, I. 13. Münter's Handbuch der
ältesten Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, herausgeg von Evers.
(Göttingen, 1802.) Kopke de statu et condione Christiano-
rum sub Imperatoribus Romanis alterius, p. ch. seculi. p. 6, sqq.

3 This was frequently mainta ined by Christians in opposi-
tion to the exclusiveness of Greelain Philosophy, Clem. Strom.
4, 8, 69, T. ii. p. 310. Εἰςτε τῇ καὶ ἑκάστῳ πολιτεία καὶ ἅπω
γεγραμμένος φιλόσοφον, καὶ βασιλεῖς οὐ καὶ ἡλπὶ δούλοι καὶ γί-
ρων καὶ πατείς καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ μῆτρας δίκαιον τῷ ἀδελφῷ τῶν γα
ἐλεύθερόν ὁ εὐθεῖον — "It is lawful for one who joins our polity,
treme jeopardy by Christianity: wherever the Christian faith found entrance and acceptance, men ceased to bring sacrifices, they no longer had occasion for statues and paintings; splendid public festivities were at an end. Emperors and statesmen could feel no attachment for a cultus, which not only was destitute itself of the venerableness of antiquity, but also avow-

though destitute of learning, to become an adept in our philosophy, whether barbarian, or Greek, or slave; old man, or child, or woman; for soundness of mind is the common property of all who choose it."—Tatian. orat. c. Græc. c. 32, p. 269, (p. 167, B.)—Euseb. demonstr. evangel. 1, 6, p. 24.—Κύριε ὦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ Θεός ὁ θεοτόκος, τῷ πάντων ταύτης καὶ παναρίτου πολιτισμού καὶ ζώος τῶν ἄνδρων τιμηθείς, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναικίς, πλεονεκρὸς καὶ πίπτοντας, καὶ δουλείας ἐμαύτων διενενόθης—"Our Lord Jesus, the Christ of God, having framed this new and consummated polity for all the world, so that not only men may learn these things and acquire wisdom, but also women, the rich and the poor, slaves and their masters."—Celsius, in mockery, puts a warning into the mouth of a Christian, Origens. c. Celso. 3, 44, T. i. p. 476.—μὴ διέκρισθήτω πνευματικός, μηδεὶς σοφὸς, μηδεὶς φρεάτης (κακὸν γὰρ ταύτα νομίζεται παρὰ ἡμῖν,) ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τις ἁμαρτής, ἐπὶ τις ἁγίος, ἐπὶ τις ἁπάζοντας, ἐπὶ τις νήπιος, Σαβαὼν ἡπίων—"Let no one approach who is well educated, or wise, or intelligent, (for these qualities are in bad repute with us,) but if a man be untaught, unintelligent, uneducated or childish, let him come with confidence."—And a little farther, he remarks, τοὺς γὰρ ἄνδρας τοῦ σκέφτεσθαι ἵνα αὐξίωσιν βαλευμάτως, δύκαι εἰς τὸ, διὸ ἡμῶν συν ἡ λαδός καὶ ἄγιος, καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπος καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ παιδία νυξισμένα ἐνελεύθεροι καὶ ἡπίων—3, 52, p. 482; 3, 55, p. 484—Cyrillus adv. Julian. 1, 6, T. vi. p. 206.—"For confessing that these persons are worthy of their God, they evidently wish and are able to persuade only the foolish, and ignoble and stupid, and slaves and gossips, and little children."—3, 52, p. 432; 3, 55, p. 484. Cyrillus. adv. Julian. l. 6, T. vi. p. 206.

1 Plin. Epistol. 10, 97, neque enim civitatis tantum, sed vicus etiam atque agros superstitiosis istius contagio pervagata est, quae videtur sita et corrigit poss. Certa satis constat, prope jam desolata templo capite celebrari et sacra solemnia diu intermissa repeti, passimque venire victimas, quamnam adhuc rarissimus emtor inveniatur.

2 Tertull. apolog. c. 19, T. v. p. 39, primam instrumentis istis auctoritate summa antiquitas vindicat: apud vos quo-
ed as its precise object, the overthrow of all other religions which were revered for their antiquity; a cultus which aimed not merely at being tolerated along with other modes of devotion, but laid claim to exclusive authority, which enticed the Roman citizens to violate one of their most sacred duties, fidelity to the popular religion sanctioned by the laws. Emperor

que religionis est instar, fidem de temporibus asserere.—Lactan. Institut divin. 2, 6, religiones sibi a

loribus suis traditas . . . . ex hoc probatas atque vera esse confidunt, quod esse veteres tradiderunt, tantaque est ac
toritas vetustatis, ut inquirere in eam scelus esse dicatur; ita

cum creditur ei passim, tanquam cognitus verietati. Compare

i. 23, Arnob. adv. Gent. i. 57, T. i. p. 38, 2, 72, p. 102. The Christians are scoffingly asked; Prudentius, peristephan. 10,

411, sqq.

Ubi iste vester tune erat summus Deus,

Divum favere cum puer Mavortius

Fundaret arcem septicollem Romulus?—Compare 10,

583, 613, 621.


divin. 3, 16, sophiam defendimus qua divina traditio est, samque a

omnibus suscipi oportere testamur. Augustin. de consens. 

evangel. i. 18, T. iv. p. 148. Keil de causis alieni Platoni

corum recentiorum a religione Christiana animi, in the Opusc. 


2 This was a point of peculiar importance to the Romans. It is true the Roman policy practised a kind of toleration in matters of religion, but this toleration never went so far as to permit individual citizens, without limitation, to exchange the cultus of their fathers for a foreign form of religion. A rever

ence (external at least) of their country’s gods, was, according to Roman notions, the indispensable duty of a citizen. Thus Catto expresses himself in Cicer. de nat. Deor. 3, 2: nec me ex ea opinione, quam a majoribus accepit de cultu deorum immortalitum, ullius unquam oratio aut docti aut indocti movebit.—

Cicero (de legibus 2, 8,) himself cautions ; separatim nemo ha

bevit deos; and Mucceus advises Augustus, (Dio Cassius 

hist. Roman. 52, 36,) ut in sevqna autem est insummis geniis sa

vinti ti oin pronti kai proueti ti miv Eiios vinti pantos autiis ti 

eisw kath tiat parimi kai tiv alylyo tymion angykaizai tevov di tis 

jikovandai ti sti auti kai mivna kai xelaizai. “ If you desire to be truly immortal, pursue this course, and moreover pay the utmost reverence to the Deity, according to the institutions of your country, and oblige others to do the same; but abhor and punish those who introduce any foreign notions respecting him.”—From the same point of view, Celsus frames a reproach
and statesmen must have been alarmed at the existence of a community—which in its secret assemblies withdrew from public inspection,¹ which appeared to make

on the Jewish Christians, by the mouth of a Jew, which he introduces in his polemical treatise against the Christians. Orig. c. Cels. 2, 1, T. i. p. 387, τι παθόντες Ιεωλήν, κατελι- παντες τιν πάτριον οίμοι και λόγιον, πολέμων οί άρχοντες ιδου, ἣν χείρισμον ἔχετε. Πάντως γεγονός οικονομίας και ρήματος τῶν ἐπιστολών θεοπομο- λούσης οὐς ἐλλείμμα όμοι καὶ οὐς ἄλλοι βίον; "How comes it to pass, fellow-citizens, that you forsake the institutions of your country, and, captivated by that which has recently perplexed us, are most ridiculously deceived, and have withdrawn yourselves from us to another name and another mode of life?"—The following statements are also very remarkable: Clem. Hom. i. 11, 13, T. i. p. 685, ἐλλείμμα λόγιον καὶ οἰκονομίας, ἣν ἐκ θεραπεύουσα οδίοις ἐν τιμόνις εὐαγγέλισα λαίσμων, ζωής γάρ ἐστιν τῇ παρακαθήκῃ φυλαττεῖ—"Others say, we shall act impiously if we forsake the objects of worship delivered to us by our fathers, which we ought to guard in the same manner as a deposit committed to our trust." Homil. 4, 7, p. 651, sq.—Lactant. institutt. divin. 2, 6; religiones, quas sibi a majoribus suis traditas pertinacissime tueri ac defendere perseverant—5, 19; defendenda sunt, inquiunt, suscepta publice sacra—de mort. persec. c. 34, Prudent. peristeph. 10, 416, adv. Symmach. 2, 277, sq. 309, sqq. 334, sq. 367, sq.—Euseb. praepar. evangel. 1, 2, p. 5. A valuable collection of other proofs is given in Korethol’s De calumniis paganorum in veteres Christianos sparsis (Kil. 1668,) p. 71, sq. Compare also Tschirner’s Geschichte der Apologetik, I. 192. Keil de causis alieni Platon. recent. a religione Christ. animit, in Opusc. acad. p. 405, sqq. Neander’s Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche, i. 1, p. 80. Hahn’s De Religionis et superstitionis nature et ratione, (Vratis. 1834, ) I. p. 35, sq. The reception of foreign gods, or forms of worship was by no means absolutely excluded, but it was not left to the option of individuals, but required the public sanction of the state. Cicero de Legibus, 2, 8, ne novos (deos) sine adverses, nisi publice adscitis, privatis colun- to. The transition to Christianity, therefore, continued to be an illegal step for Roman citizens, as long as Christianity was not recognized by the state. Hence, the constant objection of the heathens against Christians. Tertull. apol. c. 4. T. v. p. 10, non licet esse vos; hence the designation of Christians as homines deporatae, illicitae et desperatae factionis (Minuc. Fel. Octav. c. 6, p. 26.)

¹ Origen c. Cels. 1,1, T. i. p. 319: πρήκτος τῷ Κιλιᾳ καθάλοις ἵναι διάβαλλων Χριστιανομόν, ὡς συνδήκων καθότι πρὸς ἀλλάζων.
use of secret signs\(^1\) in the prosecution of an unknown object (perhaps dangerous to the state,) which brought into danger the supremacy of the ruling powers by withholding the marks of homage, which, since the time of Augustus, it had been customary to pay to the sovereign\(^2\)—which by the refusal of oaths and military service, had set itself in opposition to the existing order of society\(^3\)—and which, especially by its strong (according to appearance) idealistic tendency, seemed to

\[^1\] Minuc. Fel. Octav. c. 9, p. 27, occultis se notis et insignibus nascant et amant mutuo, parsi anteosum norint, c. 31, p. 121.

\[^2\] Theophil. ad Autol. i 11, p. 344, (p. 76, D.) казалось бы, что eis et se secretus ad basiis; Tertull. ad Scarp. c. 2, T. iii p. 138, et circa maiestatem imperatoris infamamur. Apolog. c. 24, sqq. T. v. p. 61, sqq.—ad nat. m. i, 17, p. 126, prima obstinatione est, qua secunda ab eis religio constitutur, et eam illud omnia majestatis quod irreligiosos dicamus in Caesare, neque imaginem eorum repromptiando neque genos dejevando hostes populi inveniamur—Kopke De statu et conditione Christianorum sub imperatori-bus Romanis alterius, p. Chr. occult. p. 16, sqq.

be perfectly unadapted to public life. The common people too, saw in Christians only manifest atheists; in their minds divine worship and a temple-service were inseparable ideas; a religion without temples and altars, without images of the gods and sacrifices, was in their eyes equivalent to no religion at all; the worshipping of God “in spirit” was a complete nonentity. “Away with the Atheists!” was the common expression by which the populace vented their hatred to the Christians. This feeling was strengthened by the wide spread reports of the abominations which the Christians were said to practise in their nightly assemblies; reports which indeed were often despised and allowed to be without foundation, but yet were


2 Tatian. orat. c. Graec. c. 27, p. 267, (p. 164, B.) et άπειρος ἑαυτός λαλημένος.—Tertull. ad Scapul. c. 2, T. iii. p. 158, nos . . . sacrilegos putatis.—Arnob. adv. gent. i. 29, T. i. p. 19; 3, 28, p. 125; 4, 30, p. 158; 6, 27, p. 224. Jugglers, like the Goës Alexander of Abonoteichos in Fontus, confirmed the people in these prejudices, in order to secure their credulous admiration of their deceptive arts.—Lucian. Alex. c. 25, 38.

3 Euseb. hist. eccl. 4, 15, T. i. p. 344: αἶδος τοῦ αἴδου.

4 Justin. dial. c. Tr. c. 10, p. 111, (p. 227, B.) In answer to Justin’s question; μὴ καὶ ἦμις παρανόμως καὶ ψευτώς ἐποιήσαμεν τῷ λύχνῳ τοῦ άδήμων μίξινι εγκυκλίμαεν; the Jew Trypho replies τοι ὁ θεὸς λυχνοποιημένως εὐεργετήσεις πάντας τοὺς ἀθροίσεις φόντως. “Do you believe concerning us that we are cannibals, and that when the banquet is over, we put out the lights, and revel in the vilest lewdness?”—“We have heard
more frequently credited and received as unquestionable.⁰⁰ On these and other grounds, the heathen world, educated and uneducated, rulers and subjects, were combined as a counteractive force against the progress of Christianity. The emperors of the second century did not, it is true, proceed immediately against the Christians, and set on foot no direct persecutions. For Trajan’s rescript to the Proconsul Pliny in Bithynia, ordered the punishment of the Christians only, in case they surrendered themselves and were brought before him, and at the same time forbid the use of spies or criminal proceedings founded on anonymous accusations.²

The laws, moreover, which Marcus Aurelius issued against the Christians, did not, in fact, as we have elsewhere shown, proceed from him.³ But, on the other hand, the Christians felt so much more severely the hatred and vengeance of the populace, and of many provincial governors.⁴ Trajan’s rescript was so

of such things with astonishment, said Trypho, but popular rumours are not deserving of credit; these alleged practices are too revolting to human nature."³

¹ Origen. Cels. 6, 27. T. i. 651. : ἴν τις ἱσθήμια εναλήγης πάλαι μὲν πλείστους ἵκετας ἐποιήσα τοὺς ἀλλήλους τω λόγῳ διὶ γενεῶι τίτι Χριστιανοῖς καὶ τὸν δὲ ἰπτὴν τὰῖς οἰκουμέναις διὰ τὰ τιμώτα καὶ τις ἐναλήγην ἐπαναληφεὶς λόγῳ ἵκετα τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς, "A slanderous report, which formerly, contrary to all reason, gained credit, so that those who were strangers to the Gospel believed that such were Christians; and even now, some are deluded by it, and deterred from entering into familiar communication with Christians."—8, 52, p. 780. Even philosophers, such as Fronto, in the palace of Marcus Aurelius, made use of these reports. Minuc. Fel. Octav. c. 9, p. 30, c. 31, p. 118. Compare Dan. van Hoven’s Epistola historico-critica de vera estate, dignitate et patria Minuc. Felicis, (Camp. 1762,) p. 13, sqq.—Tischirner’s Fall des Heidenthums, I. 323.


⁴ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 3, 33, T. i. p. 268, εἰ γενομένου (when the Emperor Trajan had issued his rescript) ποιῶς μὲν οὐ διωγμῆ σβεθήμας τὴν ἀπαλή σφοδρᾶτα γενομένου, εἰ χείρας γα
general and indefinite, that the application of the harshest measures seemed to be justified by it; and ill-disposed governors could very easily avail themselves of it to affix the stamp of legality on the most arbitrary acts of oppression and persecution. But where the provincial authorities spared the Christians, the popular fury made them the objects of bloody persecution; and the governors were often compelled, at the celebration of the public games, to sacrifice the Christians to the vengeance of the people, though they themselves might be actuated by a more kindly disposition. The desertion of the temples, which


3 Thus the proconsul, from whom the heathen populace in Smyrna demanded the execution of Bishop Polycarp, wished to res cue the accused; but was forced, after he had resolutely withstood the demand made upon him, (πώς ἐνα τῷ δήμῳ,) to yield to the rage of the people.
daily became more visible, and the withholding of public sacrifices;—the withdrawalment of the Christians from the public festivities and games,—the displeasure and abhorrence which the new converts not unfrequently, both by words and looks, frankly expressed against all purely heathenish institutions,—the numerous public calamities by which the reigns of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius were disturbed in an extraordinary degree,—these, and perhaps many other causes, co-operated to influence to the greatest intensity the hatred of the people against the Christians. When all classes hastened to the temples and solemn sacrifices, the Christians only stood aloof; when the population of a city poured into the circus and amphitheatre to witness the games and gladiatorial combats, the Christians were not to be seen;¹ when all, in a frenzy of unbridled joy, tumultuously celebrated their banchalian feasts, the Christian matrons and virgins sat at home, lightening and consecrating the labours of the spinning-wheel and the loom by holy hymns and psalms;² when all the inhabitants of a place, at the celebration of the accession or birth-day of an emperor, illuminated their windows, or adorned their doors with festoons of flowers, the dwellings of


² Tatian. orat. c. Graec. c. 33, p. 270, (p. 168, c.) πάνω αἱ γυναὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ καθορισμοῦ καὶ τηλεῖ τας ἐκκλησίας αἱ πασχοῦν τε καὶ τὰ ἡπείροις ἐπιφευγόμενα. “But our females are all modest; and the virgins, while plying the distaff, utter the language of devotion.”
the Christians alone were unilluminated, unadorned; at funerals or marriages, when the relations of the parties assembled, the Christian members of the family were wanting. These indications exasperated an easily inflamed populace. If, in addition, the Tiber happened to overflow, or the annual inundation of the Nile failed, or extraordinary distress was occasioned by earthquakes, pestilence, or famine, the ill-restrained wrath of an enraged populace broke loose, from time to time, against the Christians, and indulged in the most cruel deeds of violence. They had accustomed themselves to attribute all public calamities to the anger of the gods for the abandonment of their worship, that had been caused by the Christians, and believed that by shedding the blood of these enemies of their gods they presented an acceptable atonement to heaven. Thus the opposition of the heathens

2 Compare the descriptions in Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; Kestner's Die Agape, p. 491; Kopke, De statu et conditione Christianorum sub imperatoribus, Rom. alberius, p. Chr. seculi, p. 13, sqq.; Tzschirner's Full des Heidenthums, I. 226.
to Christianity had already, in Justin's time, risen more than once to a bloody persecution. Justin himself, as he narrates at the beginning of his Second Apology, was more than once a witness of the injuries which were inflicted on the Christians; nothing therefore could be more natural than his attempt to construct the Apology for Christianity, by contrasting it with Hellenism, and to counteract and disarm the physical preponderance of heathenism, by evincing the intellectual and moral superiority of Christianity. It is agreed that, in Justin's time, none among the heathen had appeared as a writer against Christianity, for Celsus is named as the first who composed a treatise expressly against the Christians; yet in the hostile position which the heathen authorities and the people in general had taken against the Christians, Justin found a summons and an adequate reason for becoming the advocate of the misunderstood and oppressed party. Besides the representatives of Hellenic intelligence, the philosophers were sufficiently active in verbal disputation, to do the utmost injury in their power to the Christian cause; and Justin found, in the efforts of the cynic philosopher Crescens, who carried

37, p. 163. The same accusations, it is well known, induced the presbyter Orosius to write his history, and Augustine to compose his treatise *De Civitate Dei*. Gradually the Christians began to resort to the same weapons, and to seek for the causes of public calamities in the indifference or hatred of the heathens to the Christian faith. Cyprian *ad Demetrian*. c. 5, sqq. T. II. p. 212, sq. Euseb. *hist. eccles*. 9, 7, T. III. p. 172, sq. *de vit. Constant*. 2, 24, p. 97.

1 Origen (c. *Cels*. 1, 8, T. I. p. 327,) names the reign of the Emperor Hadrian as the epoch in which Celsus lived; but this opponent of Christianity could not have written his *λέγειν ἄλλας* before the year 160. For, according to another passage in Origen, (c. *Cels*. 5, 62, p. 626,) Celsus refers, in his work, to the Marcellinarians, a branch of the Carpocratians, and from Irenaeus, (adv.-haeres. 1, 24, p. 104,) we know that Marcellina, the foundress of this sect, first came to Rome in the time of Bishop Anicetus, that is, after the year 158. Compare Fenger *de Celso, Christianorum adversario, Epicuraeo*, (Havn. 1828,) p. 7, 24. Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenthums*, I. 326.
on his profession at Rome, the most cogent induce-
ment for defending the Christian faith against the
attacks of Grecian science and philosophy.¹

But there was still a third quarter which demanded
Justin's polemic and apologetic exertions in behalf of
the Christian faith; and this was in the field of con-
flict with the Christian heretics of his age. During
his life-time they flourished; and their head-quarters
were exactly in the places which he principally visited.
With Marcion and Valentine, Justin probably was
personally acquainted.² If we represent to ourselves,
what an impression this mixture of heathenish and
Christian elements, which bore the name of Gnosis,
with its transcendental speculations, its subtilizing or
parodying the deepest Christian doctrines, its falsifica-
tion or distortion of Scriptural passages, and its (on
some points) very lax moral principles—must have
made on the straight-forward mind of Justin; if we
consider, besides, how strongly the speculative pride,
or the moral debasement of this Gnostic tendency in-
creased the bitterness of the heathens against the
Christians, and how the further spread of that idolat-
tic tendency at last threatened to annihilate historical
Christianity altogether, or to split the Church into
a multitude of sects;—we shall not wonder, when we
see that Justin opposed the efforts of these heretics
with uncommon energy.³ He refers to the heretics in
several passages of his writings that are still extant,
and always with deep displeasure.⁴ Whenever an op-
portunity presented itself, he deals a polemical side-

¹ Justin, Apol. 2, 3. p. 91. (p. 47, A. B.) Compare 2, 11,
p. 96, (p. 49, B.)
² Apol. i. 26, p. 59, (p. 70, A.): Μετέξων της Παπυρών ἤτοι ἀληθινῆς ἡ ἐπιστήμης, compare Apol. i. 58, p. 78, (p. 92, A).
³ Tertull. adv. Valent. c. 2, T. II. p. 110. Simplices nota-
mur apud illos.— adv. gnost. c. 15, T. II. p. 303. Justin. apol.
i. 58, p. 78, (p. 92, A). Ἰ (Μαρκιανοὶ) τολλοὶ των Μαρτυρίων ἐν τοῖς ἀληθεῖς ἐπιστήμοις.
⁴ Justin., Dial. c. Tryph. c. 35, p. 132, (p. 253, C. D.) sic οἱ
blow at their theories; besides that he devoted two writings exclusively to their refutation, one of which included all the heretics; but the other was directed
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principally against Marcion, the most systematic and influential of all the Gnostics. If it be asked, why Justin selected Marcion as the special object of controversy, the reason of this procedure is to be found partly in the extensive spread of the school of this Gnostic, partly in the circumstance that Marcion had expressed most strongly the antijudaic character of Gnosticism, and thus had impugned in the most decided manner, a doctrine which Justin in a special sense held to be fundamental.

The success of Justin's exertions in these three directions for the cause of Christianity, cannot be exactly determined in the absence of historical documents respecting it. But in all probability those persons are equally far from the truth who estimate his agency so low, as to deny that it had any permanent influence on the outward and inward development of the Church, and regard it as no more than as a transient meteoric phenomenon; and those who, on the other hand, attribute so high a value to it, as to consider it the cause of the milder treatment which the Christians received under the reign of Antoninus Pius.

It is impossible that Justin's agency could have

_Basil._ 1566, p. 205.) Justin's Treatise against all heretics was written in the reign of Hadrian, and this opinion is probably correct, for Justin refers to the work in his larger Apology, which was composed soon after the accession of Antoninus Pius.


2 Rhode's Prolegom. ad questionem de evangelio apostolico Marcionis, (Pratist. 1834), p. 5.

3 This appears very characteristically from a remark of Justin, in his Treatise against Marcian, which has been preserved by Irenæus, _Adv. haeres._ 4, 14, p. 233. καλὸς Ἰουνίων ἦσαν ὁ πρὸς Μαρκιανὸν ἐντράγματα φυσίν ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπ' αὐτῷ ἐστὶν ἐν Ἰουνίων, ἄλλον τὸν καταγγειλομενὸν παρὰ τὸν δημόσιον.

4 Thus Orosius, _hist._ 7, 14, p. 491. Justinus Philosophus librum pro Christiana religione compositum Antonino tradidit benignumque eum erga Christianos seicit.—After him, _Zonar. annal._ T. II. p. 206, and still more recently Köpke de statu et
THE CAUSE OF CHRISTIANITY. 49

passed away in its whole peculiarity without leaving any trace, and if its effects outwardly were less visible, they were perhaps so much the greater internally; and though few new professors of Christianity might be won by it, yet it would strengthen and confirm those who were already won over to the faith. But against the opinion that the heathen government was rendered favourably disposed towards the Christians by Justin's apologetic efforts, it is to be considered that in Justin's days, the opposition of the old and new faith was still too direct, the odious imputations made against the Christians were still too new, the exasperation of the heathen was too fresh, for any individual to succeed in essentially altering the public opinion, and to mediate a real approximation of dispositions so widely separated. The transient repose which the Christians partially enjoyed under the reign of Antoninus Pius, is explicable on grounds entirely distinct from any personal regard of the Emperor for them. Moreover, Justin was often led away by his zeal for the Christian faith, in his attacks on heathenism, Judaism, and heresy, to make attacks on heathens, Jews, and heretics; his opposition against error changed into bitter personal invectives against the erroneous; and his plain dealing not seldom degenerated into insolence; a line of conduct which would naturally be far more likely to repel than to attract.

conditione Christianorum, etc. p. 27, and Mohler's Patrologie, I. 219. Compare, on the other hand, Stubenrauch, De verâ indole ac causis calamitatum quibus saeculo, 1 et 2, p. Ch. n afficiunt Christiani. Hal. (without date,) p. 16, sq.

1 Lactant. (Institutt. divin. 5, 1,) says in reference to his own apologetic labours; si lucari has (paganos) a morte, ad quam concitatissime tradunt, non potuerimus . . . nostros tamen conferemus, quorum non est stabilis ac solidis radicibus fundata et fixa sententia.

2 Sulpicius Severus is incorrect when he says, (Histor. Sacra, 2, 32, p. 246, ed. Lips. 1709), without any qualifying expression, "Post Hadrianum, Antonio Pio imperante, pas ecclesie fuit."

3 Tzschirnner's Fall des Heidentums, I. 27.
It could only aggravate the existing antipathy to the Christians, when Justin said to the heathen magistrates.1 "You seem to be afraid lest all men should act aright, and there would be no longer any one for you to punish; these are feelings that befit an executioner rather than good governors. Yet it is our conviction that it proceeds from the suggestion of evil demons, who require sacrifice and worship from the irrational; but we have not believed that ye who profess to be the friends of religion and philosophy, would do anything irrational. But if you, like men without understanding, pay more regard to custom than to truth, do what is in your power; but governors who honour opinion before truth, are no better than robbers in the desert." In like manner, the breach between Jews and Christians would only be widened, the stubbornness of the Jews would be made still more stubborn, when Justin, with ill-timed severity, exclaimed, "You understand all things in a carnal manner, and think that you are practising piety if you perform these (outward) ceremonies, while your souls are full of nothing but deceit and wickedness,"—and in another

1 Apol. 1, 12, p. 50, (p. 59, C. D.)—This impetuous warmth of controversy, is found not in Justin alone. Other Apologists weaken the force of their vindications by the same fault. Thus Minucius Fel. Octav. c. 25, p. 92. "Quidquid Romani tenent, colunt, possident, audacia praeda est. Tempa omnia de manubiiis, id est de ruinis urbium, de spoliis deorum, de credibus sacerdotum. Hoc insultare et illudere est, victis religiionibus servire et captivas eae post victorias adorare. Nam adorare que manu cepitis, sacrilegium est consecrare, non numina. Toties ergo a Romanis impiatum est, quoties triumphatum: tot de diis spolia, quot de gentibus et tropea. Igitur Romanis non ideo tanti, quod religiosi, sed quod impune sacrilegi." Tertull. apolog. c. 25, T. V. p. 58.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 14, p. 114, (p. 231, D.)—"Therefore by the leaven of repentance and of the knowledge of God, which has been made for the iniquities of the people of God, as Isaiah cries, we have believed and make known that this is that baptism which he foretold, that alone can cleanse those that repent, this is the water of life. But the cisterns you have dug
passage, 1 "But you are a people hard of heart, and without understanding, and blind, and lame, sons in whom there is no faith, as he himself (God) declares: honouring him only with your lips, but in heart far from him,"—or in a third passage, 2 "You have never shown yourselves possessed of friendship or love either towards God, or to the Prophets, or to yourselves,—but always worshippers of idols and murderers of the righteous, until you laid your hands on Christ himself, and to the present, remain in your wickedness, cursing those who demonstrate that he whom you crucified is the Christ." His attempts to produce a salutary impression on heretics must have totally failed, since Justin cannot spare them one kind word; he heaps them together without any distinction, puts them all under the same anathema,—treats all their thinking and acting as blasphemous, atheistical and dæmonical, and allows them no other way of coming to terms with the Catholic Church, than an unconditional surrender of their philosophizing.

Most probably, therefore, Justin's labours conduced far more to the internal edification of the Christian Church, than to its extension outwardly; but at all events, they were influential enough to secure that importance to his character which has ever since been attached to it. This influence derived a great accession of strength from the manner in which our Apologist closed his life.

for yourselves are broken, and can be of no use to you. For what is the use of that baptism which only cleanses the flesh and the body? Be baptized in soul, from anger and covetousness, from envy, from hatred; and behold the body is clean. For this is the meaning of the unleavened bread, that ye may not perform the old works of the wicked leaven. But you understand all things, &c."

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 27, p. 125, (p. 245, A.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 33, p. 191, (p. 321, C.) and many other passages.
SECTION III.

JUSTIN'S MARTYRDOM.

Justin at last verified in his own person, what had so often been the subject of his boast, both to Jews and Gentiles, respecting his fellow-Christians, namely, the steadfastness of their faith, and their cheerfulness in meeting death. He became a martyr to Christian truth. This fact is most satisfactorily attested, apart from the martyrology, by the unanimous voice of the Christian Church. None of the ancient fathers, indeed, gives a complete account of Justin’s martyrdom; but a casual intimation of Irenæus, who was almost

1 Dial. c Tr. c. 110, p. 203. (p. 337. B.) Κεφαλαοτρομησθε και σταφυλισθε και Σαρίας παραβαλλόμεθα και διηρεύονται και παρθενοί τοις ήλευσι βασιλείς οι ηκον αφουσάμεθα της ιστολογίας ούκ εστιν ηνια "Beheaded and crucified, and delivered to wild beasts, to chains, to the flames, and to all other modes of torture, still it is seen that we flinch not from our confession."—c. 46. p. 142. (p. 265, c.) ἢμεις οὖν τοῖς μη Σωτῆρις, οἵ τέκλης Θεόνομος οὐκεῖνος εἰς εὐχάριστης εἰς αἰτίας τής τεταμένης τεταμένης καὶ Σωστομένης χρίσματι.—"Because we will not sacrifice to the former objects of our worship, we endure the extreme of punishment, and surrender our lives with joy."—Apol. 1, 11, p. 49. (p. 59. A.) 1, 39, p. 67. (p. 78. B.) 1, 57, p. 77. (p. 91. D. E.) 2, 4, p. 91. (p. 43. E.) Dial. c Tr. c. 96, p. 193. (p. 323. D.) c. 121, p. 214. (p. 349, D. 350, A.) and other places. Similar assertions abound in all the Apologists, Tertull. ad Scapul. c. 1. T. III. p. 157, magis damnati, quam absoluti gaudemus, c. 5. p. 163, crudelitas vestra gloria est nostra. Even heathen opponents have, on these points, borne an unwilling testimony for the Christians. Lucian de mort.; Poregin. c. 13. παναίσχυναι αὐτῶς εἰ ἀπαλλαγών. τὸ μὲν θᾶντα έν οὐναν καὶ βιωσίας τὸν αἰτίων χρόνιον τῷ θάνατι καὶ παναίσχυναι τῷ Ζευσίῳ καὶ ιναντία αὐτῶς ἠταλλάσσει. "The miserable creatures persuade themselves that they shall be altogether immortal, and live through an endless duration, and so they despise death, and many voluntarily surrender themselves."

2 Iren. odo. haeres. 1, 31, p. 107, ἢ (Tatian) Ἰσωτόνων ἀκολούθον τῆς γραμμῆς, ἢν διὰ τοῦ τούτο ιδαίτερα. οὔτως ξέφων τοῖσι μετὰ ἕκκλης μακροῦ ἰσαντικός τῆς ἱστολογίας... Ποιον χρειάζεται εἰς ἄλλων εἰς αὐτούς.
a contemporary of the apologist,—the later testimonies in all the more credible ecclesiastical histories, 1—and lastly, the title of "Martyr," which Christian antiquity, from Tertullian's time, has constantly attached to Justin's name, 2 furnish a warrant, that Justin really sealed his Christian profession with martyrdom. The martyrology alone, contains a detailed account of the close of his life. According to this account, Justin suffered death in company with six other Christians. Cheerful and undaunted as in life, when death was in sight, he bore his testimony for evangelical truth. The answers which he gave to the questions proposed to him by the prefect Rusticus, who tried him and his companions, breathes entirely the same spirit which emanates from his writings that still remain, the spirit of the most unshaken love and fidelity to the Christian faith. To the questions of the prefect respecting the doctrines held by Christians, he simply and comprehensively replied: "We believe in one God, the original creator and framer of all things, visible and invisible, who is not enclosed in any space, but invisible as he is, fills heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ the Son of God, whom the prophets announced beforehand, as a teacher of truth, and herald of salvation. Of his eternal godhead I am not able, in my weakness, to speak satisfactorily; this is the function of a prophetic power, as likewise in truth the

1 Euseb. hist. eccles. 4, 16, T. i. p. 364: ἐὰν τούτους ταῖς ἑωνείοις... Στίγμα πασαριστώς μάρτυρις—Chronic. ad. Olymp. 232, 2. p. 168; Crescens Cynicus agnoscitur, qui Justino nostri dogmatis philosophhe... persecutionem suscitavit, in qua ille gloriosae pro Christo sanguinem sudit. Hieronym. de vir. illust. c. 23. T. i. p. 178. Epiph. adv. har. 46. T. i. p. 391; ἡ ἑωνεία Χριστιανή... τι... τὸ... ἑωνεία... frank... ἑωνεία... Phot. biblioth. cod. 125, T. i. p. 95.

prophets in former ages, prophesied of his becoming man." When the prefect asked the accused the question which would determine his fate, "Art thou then a Christian?" he replied with firmness, "I am a Christian." To the jeering observation of the prefect, "Thou believest then, in thy ascension to Heaven, when I have caused thee to be scourged and beheaded?" Justin answered with the distinctness of a spirit full of faith, "I hope that I shall receive the gift of Christ's grace, when I have suffered that." The fresh inquiry of Rusticus, whether he really thought that he should go to Heaven, and be rewarded there, was met by Justin with a still more decisive declaration,—"I not only think so, but I know it with a certainty that does not admit of a doubt." The patience of the prefect was now exhausted. In a threatening tone, he called out to the accused, "Join together and offer a unanimous mind to the gods." On Justin's rejoining, "No reasonable man will abjure godliness and embrace impiety;" the prefect said with increased warmth, "If ye will not obey, ye shall be chastised without mercy." But this threatening, so far from daunting the accused, only made his courage rise higher. "We wish nothing more," said he, "than to suffer for our Lord Jesus Christ, for this will give our salvation and joy at his dread tribunal, before which all the world must appear." With this declaration the trial closed. Forthwith the prefect passed sentence of death on the accused, and ordered him, after being scourged, to be beheaded.

Thus died Justin. It is not improbable that the cynic philosopher Crescens was the mediate or immediate cause of his death. Of all the philosophical schools which set themselves in array against Christianity, as soon as it had openly asserted its claims, none

persecuted the Christians with more bitter, more intense hatred, than the Cynic.

The reason of this fact is very apparent. The Cynic school, in the second century of the Christian æra, was in the last stage of its decline. The various noble traits by which the earlier and earliest advocates of this philosophy, notwithstanding all their singularities, had been honourably distinguished, had almost entirely vanished in the later adherents of the school; the cynics of the second century had barely retained the public side of their philosophy, and reduced even this to a caricature. Their outward appearance had in it something frightful. The pallium was carelessly thrown over one shoulder, and left one half of the body naked, their hair hung down long and shaggy, their nails were like the claws of wild beasts. Begrimed with dirt, girt with a large knapsack, in one hand a formidable cudgel, and in the other a book written on the back, they wandered about in swarms through the most frequented parts of populous cities. But this sordid, uncouth exterior, was nothing in comparison with the internal abominations which went along with it. A fawning servility to gain the favour of the powerful, immeasurable vanity, an unrestrained fondness for detraction, a gluttonous appetite, insatiable avarice, and the most shameless unchastity, were the characteristic features of most cynics. Religion and morality had, in general, for them, only a relative


value, as vehicles of vanity and self-interest.\footnote{1} What wonder then, if to people of this class, the quiet dignity of the Christian conduct, the holy seriousness of Christian men and women gave peculiar offence? what wonder if, with all the irritation of a caste threatened in their reputation and influence, with all the turbulence of a conscience violently aroused, they attacked the professors of a new faith so dangerous to themselves? \footnote{2} The philosopher Crescens at Rome was a microcosm of this degenerate cynicism.\footnote{2} Faithful to the character of his party, he made the Roman Christians the objects of his calumnies and slanders. Himself without religion, he indulged, to the delight of an applauding multitude, in hypocritical laments over the irreligiosity of Christians. \footnote{3} It was natural that Justin, when, during his second residence at Rome, he became acquainted with the proceedings of this abandoned philosopher, should feel compelled to defend the Christians by showing that the charges brought against them were utterly unfounded. He forced this boastful and hypocritical philosopher to a tacit admission of his ignorance\footnote{4} and disingenuousness. He showed that Crescens was either totally unacquaint-


\footnote{3}{Lucian. \textit{Fugit.} c. 19, οὔτε γάρού οὔτως ἱδρῆς ἄλλα ἄλλη ἰματιόν, ὡς τοῦ λόγου αὐτού καὶ τὰ ἱερα.\footnote{4}{Ignorance was a special prerogative of the Cynics. Lucian. \textit{Fugitio.} c. 13. σῶμαν καὶ ἄμαθαν καὶ ἀναίσθητικαν προκαλεσάσθαι, ὁτις αὐτοίς μάλιστα εὐφαγονίζεται—\textit{Vit. Auct.} c. 11. οὔ γάρ σοι διανέμεις παιδίαν καὶ λόγον καὶ λόγον, ἀλλ' ἴσισεμαντα σας τοῖς διδάγαν η διδ. καί ἰδιαίτερην εὐκοσμήθην ἡ ταιρία πάση ἡ τίμια ἡ τραπέζης, οὗτοι σε καλοίς Σικουρίου ἰδιοὶ—\textit{Julian Orat.} 7, T. i. p. 225, ἱρμόνειν ἐν τοῖς κυνερίν· βανταίζει, τρίζον, κήρη· τὸ ιστιέβου ἄμαθα, Θρίασος}}
ed with the Christian doctrine which he slandered, or that, if made acquainted with it, he understood it not, or that, if he not only knew it but had a perception of its excellence, he had been deterred by the fear of men from avowing this conviction. In every possible view he satisfactorily proved that Crescens had no right to the title of a philosopher; that he was no more than an aspiring charlatan, to whom the praise of men was everything, and truth nothing. This bold language of course exasperated the cynic to the highest degree, and Justin had everything to fear from his malice, for the revenge of a cynic was as insatiable as his vanity. Justin was not unaware of his danger for one moment; he said that the pride of the mortified philosopher would, perhaps, require his blood as an atonement. With a strong presentiment, he said in his Second Apology to Marcus Aurelius; Apol. 2, 3, p. 90, (p. 46, E.) καὶ γὰρ προσδοκῶ ὑπὸ τίνος τῶν ὑπομισμένων ἐκδοθολυθῆναι καὶ ξύλῳ ἔμπαγχῃν, ὡς ἐν ἑαυτῷ Κρισθίνος τοῦ μιλοψφαρ ταῖς συλλογικοῖς οὐ γὰρ φιλόσοφον εἰπεῖν ζητεῖν τὸν ἄνδρα. "And I expect to be plotted against, and fastened to the stake by some one of those whom I have named, or at least by Crescens, that lover of noise and braggadocio, for the man is not worthy the name of philosopher." Nor did Crescens allow him to be long in suspense. As Tatian, a disciple of Justin, informs us, the philosopher attempted to get

1 Justin gives a summary of his disputations with Crescens, Apol. 2, 3, p. 91, (p. 47, A—C.) Elsewhere the Apologist has expressed himself in strong and unmeasured terms on the corruption of the philosophers in general. Tatian remarks that Justin excited the ill-will of Crescens by attributing deception and gluttony to the philosophers. Tatian. Orat. c. Gr. c. 19, p. 260, (p. 158, A.)

2 Lucian. Fugitio. c. 15, ἄρχον οἶαι τὴν ἱλαρετὴν διαφοράν, ἢ ἵνα μή τις ποιημένοι παι παρὰ βραχώ, ἀλλ' εἴναι βοώις καὶ οὐ τὴν ἄχριστα τὴν ἱωτὴν ἀναφηγοῦσι τὴν λαβομεν καὶ πρίγγους τὸ ξύλῳ. "In the first place, they will not listen to an argument, if one questions them ever so moderately and briefly, but straightforward bawl out, and defend themselves with their favourite weapons, abuse and a handy cudgel." Vit. Auct. c. 10.

rid of his mortal enemy. Under these circumstances, it is not improbable, though not certain, that Crescens was the prime instigator to Justin's martyrdom, and several of the fathers have asserted that he was so: but their accounts have no historical foundation, but rest on a misinterpretation of Tatian's language.

If it be asked when did Justin suffer martyrdom, the accounts of antiquity are tolerably unanimous in

.. . οὕτως αὐτῷ θεώσι τῷ Σάτανα, ὡς καὶ Ἰωσήφιος, Ἰωσήφιος καὶ Ἰσαί, ὡς καὶ ὁ Σατάνης περιβαλὼν πραγματικῶς εἰς τοὺς καθά πρὸς τοῦ Κρίνθους κεραυνοῦς ζῆσε λεγόμενοι (ὁ 'Ἰωσήφιος.) Ταύταις ... ἢ τῷ πρὸς Ἐλληνας ἰστορίας λόγως ἢ δὲ ποιοὶ ... Κρίνθουρα ἡτοὶ ... οὕτως θεώσι, &c.


2 Eusebius, whom later writers have copied, gives us complete certainty; he says, 4, 16, T. i. p. 367: οὕτως καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν περιβαλὼν πρὸς τοῦ Κρίνθους κεραυνοῦς ζῆσε λεγόμενοι (ὁ 'Ἰωσίφιος.) Ταύταις ... ἢ τῷ πρὸς Ἐλληνας ἰστορίας λόγως ἢ δὲ ποιοὶ ... Κρίνθουρα ἡτοὶ ... οὕτως θεώσι, &c.

3 Euseb. h. e., 4, 16, T. i. p. 364. Hieronym, de vir. Illust. c. 23, T. i. 178. Chronic. Alexander, p. 606, (ed. Rader). When the Chronicle of Eusebius appears to contradict the account in his Ecclesiastical History, it is only in appea-
pointing to the reign of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, and his associate in the government Lucius Verus. These testimonies are confirmed by the contents of the Second Apology, which imply the existing sovereignty of Marcus Aurelius. Lastly, the ancient martyrlogy narrates, in agreement with Epiphanius, that Justin was put to death by order of the Praefect Rusticus, which must have, therefore, been in the time of the double sovereignty of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus; for Junius Rusticus was Praefect of Rome under both these emperors, as appears from a rescript of the two imperial brothers; and, from an accidental remark of the orator Themistius (in the middle of the fourth century).
Of the year of Justin’s death there is only the solitary notice of the Alexandrine Chronicle. Chron. Alex. p. 606.

If the authority of the Alexandrian Chronicle be thought sufficient, then the year A.D. 166, may be considered as the year of Justin’s death.\(^1\)

BOOK II.

THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin was distinguished not only as an advocate of Christianity by word of mouth, but by his writings. He composed a considerable number of works, and the express assertions of subsequent teachers of the church, indicate the high estimation in which they were held. Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 4, 18, T. i. p. 376.) says: πλείστα εὖτε καταλύλοντες ἡμῖν πεπαιδευμένης διάνοιας καὶ περὶ τὰ Θεία ἐποιεῖσθαι ὑπόμνημα, πάσης ὑφειλίας ἐμπλαι: "He has bequeathed us numerous memorialis of an understanding well trained and deeply versed in divine subjects, which are replete with all manner of instruction."—But the esteem in which Justin was held as a writer has not saved the majority of his works from destruction. Of many we have little more than the title, and of others the title is all we possess. Among them are two philosophical treatises, of which one belongs to the department of metaphysics,¹ the other to psychology.² Besides these there were several apologetic writings; one, probably of a more general kind, which attempted summary solutions of the objections to the Christian faith;³ two others were designed to oppose the Greeks, namely, a treatise on the Monarchy of God;⁴ and a

¹ Phot. Bibl. Cod. 125, T. i. p. 94.
³ Phot. l. c.
⁴ Euseb. l. c. p. 377, and Phot. l. c. p. 95; περί Θεοῦ μοναχίας.
discourse to the Greeks,\textsuperscript{1} which discussed particularly the nature of demons; also, two books against the heretics, of which one was directed against all heretics,\textsuperscript{2} and the other principally against Mar- cion.\textsuperscript{3} And lastly, there is a work of Justin's known to us only by the title, of which the subject was probably Christian psalmody.\textsuperscript{4} No student of Ecclesiastical history can help deploring deeply the loss of so many treatises, for certainly they would have been most valuable contributions to our attaining a more accurate knowledge of the Church in the second century. But as the esteem which Justin has enjoyed in all ages of the Church, has, on the one hand, not preserved several of his writings from destruction, so, on the other hand, the reputation of his name has occasioned the forgery of a multitude of spurious works. Many of these bear the marks of spuriousness in their front; in others, the question of genuineness is involved in more or fewer difficulties. It is the office of the critic to bring this question as far as possible to a decision. In modern times, critical investigations of this kind have not been wanting; but the results have hitherto given only partial satisfaction. Hence we shall not hesitate to enter on a fresh investigation. With this examination, we shall connect the questions respecting the place and time of the composition of the works which are acknowledged to be genuine, as far as we possess the data for answering them.

\textsuperscript{1} Euseb. l. c. p. 376, and Phot. l. c. 6 λόγος προς Ἑλλήνως.

\textsuperscript{2} Justin. Apol. 1, 26, p. 60, (p. 70, C.)

\textsuperscript{3} Iren. adv hæres. 4, 14, p. 233, and Phot. l. c. p. 95, comp. Euseb. h. c. 4, 11, t. i. p. 321.

SECTION I.
JUSTIN’S GENUINE WRITINGS.

CHAPTER I.

THE TWO APOLOGIES.

In all ages, the two apologetic treatises which bear Justin’s name, and which vindicated Christianity before the Emperors Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius, have been acknowledged as genuine. The Jesuit Hardouin alone has indulged in the whim of mooting the question. Their genuineness rests on the strongest grounds.

The two Apologies are ascertained to be productions of the second century, by numerous internal particulars belonging to the departments of History, Archæology and Dogmatics, which presuppose the writer to have occupied the standing point of that period, and are explicable only on that supposition. This result, in reference to the Larger Apology, is tacitly confirmed and established by those Fathers of the same century, who quickly made use of the Apology, and transferred many passages from it, in part verbally, to their own writings. This remark applies to Tatian, Irenæus, Minutius Felix, and Tertullian.


2 The Apologies of Athenagoras and Theophilus of Antioch, also contain passages which, not improbably, may be considered as borrowed from Justin’s Larger Apology.


Justin. Apol. 1. 27, p. 60, (p. 70, D.)

ὁ τρόπον λάγονται οἱ παλαιοὶ ἀγέλας βοῶν ἄγων ἢ προβάτων τρέφειν ἡ ἱστοὺς χορήγας ὁμοῦν καὶ παίδας εἰς τὸ ἀίσχρῶς χειμῶν ὁμοῦν.

Justin. Apol. 1. 22, p. 57, (p. 68, A.)

ὁ κριττών ἐκ τῶν πράξεων φαινεται.

Justin. Apol. 1. 15, p. 52, (p. 62, A.)

ὁ μόνον ὁ μοχεύων ξένων ἐπὶ θείαιν παρ' αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μοχεύως βουλόμενος.

Justin. Apol. 1. 12, p. 50, (p. 60, B.)

ἐστι γνωσίς ὅμοιος ὑπὸ δῶν ἀγνὸς παραγωμένον ἡμιχνήν εὐτύμως μεσανθάλειν, ὡς τοῦ πετασίους ρίπαλής εἰς, μικρὰ προσθήκαι πρὸς ὡμοίημας εἰδότις, δότι οὐκ ἀδικάτου ἀληθείας παρατεθεῖσθαι ἐγνοιαν φυγεῖν.

Justin. Apol. 1. 43, p. 69, (p. 81, B.)

οὕδ᾽ ὁμοῖος εἶναι ἐπερῶν, παρ᾽ ὧ ἐγείρων.

Tatian. orat. c. Gr. c. 28, p. 267. (p. 165, A.)

ταύδιαστία . . . . προομίας ὡς Ὀρμαίων ἡ χώιται, παιδων ἀγέλας ἀστεῖς ἵππων φοβάδων συναγεῖσθεν αὐτῶν πεφωμένων.


Qui melior est, ex operibus ostenditur.


Apud quem non solum qui meçatur expellitur sed et qui meçhari vult.

Iren. adv. Hæres. 3, 2, p. 175.

Si non facile est, ab errore apprehensam resipiscere animam, sed non omnimodo impossibile est, errorem effugere apposita veritate.


Qui nihil aliud esse possunt, praterquam quod facti sunt.
THE TWO APOLOGIES.

Justin. Apol. 1. 55, p. 76, sq. (p. 90, C—E.)

Κατανοήσας τὰν τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, εἰ ἁνεὺ τοῦ σχῆματος τούτου (τοῦ σαμωροῦ) διοίκηται ἡ κοινωνία ἕξιν δύναται. Θάλασσα μὲν γὰρ οὐ τέμνεται, ἢν μὴ τούτῳ τοῖς τρόποις, ὁ καλεῖται ἱστιον, ἢν τῇ νῆτι ὀὼν μὲν ἐγεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἀροῦναι ἀνέκαυτον ἐκατανοεῖ τὴν ἐγκαταστασία οὐδὲ ἐκατανοεῖν ὀρμίσκει, εἰ μὴ διὰ τῶν τὸ σχῆμα τούτῳ ἐχθρῶν ἐγκαταστήσει. Τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπων σχῆμα ὑπάρχει ἄλλῳ ἄλλῳ τῶν ἁλογῶν ἔως διαφημι, εἰ τῷ ὀμον τῷ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκατάστην χειρῶν ἐχειν καὶ ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ ἄντω τοῦ μιστών τεκταμένον τῶν ἠγόμων μεγά-ληκα φέρειν, δι' οὗ ἔτι ἀναπτύσσεται τῇ ἐν τῇ ἀνωτέρω ἐν τῷ ἠλών καὶ οὕτω ἄλλο διάκυκλον ἢ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σατυροῦ... καὶ τὰ παρ' ὑμῖν ἰενὲς καὶ συμβολα τὴν τοῦ σχῆματος τούτου δύναμιν δηλοῖ, λέγω δὲ τὰ τῶν πάρ' ὑμῖν καλομένων ὑπὲρ-ζηλωμένα καὶ τῶν τροπαίων, δι' ὅτι αἱ σφοδροὶ ὑμῶν παν-ταχεῖ ὕπονται... καὶ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν ἀποδημοσίων


Crucis nec colimus nec horremus. Vos plane qui ligneos deos consecratis, cruces ligneas, ut deorum vestrorum partes, forsitan adoratis. Nam et signa ipsa et cantabra et vexilla castrorum quid aliud quam inaccurate crucis sunt et ornatae? Tropææ vestrae victoriae non tantum simplicis crucis faciem, verum et adfixi hominis imitantur. Signum sane crucis naturaliter visimus in navi, quum velis tumentibus vehitur, quum expansis palmulis labitur; et quum erigitur jugum, crucis signum est, et quum homo porrectis manibus deum pura mente veneratur. Ita signo crucis aut ratio naturalis inmititur aut vestra religio formatur.

Tertull. ad nation. 1. 12, T. v. p. 12, sq.

Ipsi quoque corpori nostro tacita et secreta linea crucis situs est; quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur quod humerorum oblquatio... Si statueres hominem manibus expansis, imaginem crucis feceris

1 The reading ἐπέλει λίγω δὲ τὰ τῶν παρ' ὑμῖν καλομένων rests on a conjecture of Thir- by, for the manuscripts have a hiatus in this passage. ἐπέλει...
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ἀὐτοχθόνων τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπι-
τούτω τῷ σχήματι ἀνατίθει
καὶ θεοῦ διὰ γεγαμμάτων
ἐπομένως.

... Cruces erunt in-
testina quodammodo tro-
poorum. Itaque in vic-
toriiis et cruces colit cas-
trensis religio ... Sed
ille imaginum suggestus et
totius auri cultus monilia
crucum sunt. Sic etiam
in cantabris atque vexillis
quae non minore sanctitate
militia custodit, siphara
illa vestes crucum sunt.

Translation of the Latin.

"We neither venerate nor dread crosses. But you,
who consecrate wooden gods, perhaps adore wood-
en crosses as parts of your gods. For the very stand-
ards, and cantabra, and banners of the camp, what
else are they but gilded and ornamented crosses?
Your victorious tropæa imitate not only the appear-
ance of a simple cross, but of a man fastened to it.
We see, indeed, the sign of the cross naturally form-
ed in a vessel when it is borne along with swelling
sails, when it glides along with expanded oars; and
when the yoke is set up, it is the sign of a cross,
and when man, with outstretched hands, worships
the Deity with a pure mind. Thus, either natural reason
rests on the sign of the cross, or your religion is
represented by it."

"Our own bodies contain a silent and secret outline of
the cross: it is shewn in the erect position of the
head, the perpendicularity of the spine, the curvature
of the shoulders. If you place a man with expand-
ed hands, you form the image of a cross. Crosses
will be, as it were, the intestines of trophies. There-
fore, on occasions of victories, military devotion
honours crosses.—That pomp of images, and those
ornaments of pure gold, are the necklaces of crosses.
Thus even in the cantabra, and the banners which the soldiery guard with not less sanctity, the cloths (on their summit) form the vestment of crosses."

*Translation of the Greek.*

"For observe all the things in the world, whether they can be managed, or can hold intercourse without this sign: for the sea is not traversed, unless that trophy which is called a sail remain uninjured in the ship: and the earth is not ploughed without it: and the ditchers do not perform their work, nor the handicraft-men, unless by instruments which have this figure. And the human form differs in no respect from that of the irrational animals, except in being upright, and forming a transverse line by stretching out its hands: and in the face, the nose, by which respiration is carried on, projects from the forehead, and thus it shews no other than the form of the cross. And the symbols you employ, manifest the power of this form—I mean the *vesilla* and the *tropœa*, which are always used in your processions, and you consecrate images of your departed Emperor in this form, and call them gods by the superscriptions."

Justin¹ distinctly names himself as the author of the Larger Apology. Apol. 1. 1. p. 44, (p. 53, B.) Αὐτοκράτωρ Τίτων Αἰλίων Ἄδριανω Ἀντωνίων Ἐπισκεῖ... [, ύπερ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀκρότων ἀδίκως μισούμενων καὶ ἐπιθετικομένων Ἰουστίνως Πρίσκου τοῦ Βασιλεύος τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαουίας νέας πόλεως τῆς Συρίας Παλατίνης, ώς αὐτῶν τῆν προσφέρουσαν καὶ ἐντυμέναι πεποίημαι. "To the Autocrat Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Pius, I Justin, son of Priscus, grandson of Baccheus of Flavia Nea-

¹ The hypothesis that the passages above mentioned were not borrowed by Tatian, Irenæus, Minucius Felix, and Tertullian, from the author of the Apology, but, on the contrary, taken by that writer from them, is, on account of the whole historical and dogmatic circumstances under which they wrote, compared with the position of the author of the Apology, simply impossible.
polis in Syria, Palestine, have made this appeal and supplication on behalf of men above every other race, unjustly hated and traduced, being myself one of them.” And this declaration is confirmed by a passage in the Dialogue with Trypho, which contains a distinct reference to the Apology, and marks its author as a Samaritan, which Justin was by descent; *dial. cum Tryph. c. 120, p. 214. (p. 349, C) οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἐμοῦ, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρείων, τινὸς φροντίδα ποιόμενος ἐγγράφως Καίσαρι, προσωπικῶς εἶσεν πλανάομαι αὐτούς πειθόμενος τῷ ἐν τῷ γένει αὐτῶν μάγῳ Σίμωνι, ἵνα ἐνευρέϊ ἀνώ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἰδιωτικῶς καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσι. “And not taking account of any of my own race, I mean the Samaritans; but addressing Caesar in a public document, I said, that they were led astray by confiding in the magician Simon of their race, who they say is a god, above all government and authority, and power.” Compare this with *Apol. 1, 26, p. 59. (p. 69, D. E.) But if Justin be the author of one Apology, the other also belongs to him. By their form and contents, both these writings bespeak themselves unequivocally to be the productions of one and the same mind. The dictation, the method, or, rather, the absence of logical arrangement, the doctrinal mode of representation is perfectly the same. Besides this, the second or shorter Apology shows that it is the composition of the same person who wrote the first, by repeated references to sentiments contained in the first, with the use of the formula ὡς παραφέρειν. Compare *Apol. 2, 4, p. 91, (p. 43, D.) with *Apol. 1, 10, p. 48, (p. 58, B.)—*Apol. 2, 6, p. 93, (p. 45, A.) with *Apol. 1, 23, p. 57, (p. 68, C.) 1, 63. p. 81, sq. (p. 96, A. D.) *Apol. 2, 8, p. 94, (p. 46, C.) with *Apol. 1, 46, p. 71, (p. 83, C.) The two Apologies contain abundant internal evidence of their genuineness. But this evidence is corroborated by the testimonies of Eusebius and Photius, who both, in the enumeration of Justin’s writings, reckon two

1 This passage loses nothing of its force as evidence, even if the genuineness of the Dialogue be called in question.
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apologetic compositions. Eusebius Hist. Eccles. 4, 18, T. I. p. 376. ο μεν τις ἐστιν αὐτῷ λόγος πρὸς Ἀντωνίου τὸν Ἑραδήν προσαγωγικὰ καὶ τοὺς τούτου πατέας τιν τῳ Ἄρωμαίων σύγχρητον προσωρινοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς δογμάτων ὁ δὲ δεύτερα περί ποιῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας σιστῆς ἀπολογίας, ἵνα πεποίηται πρὸς τοῦ διδηλουμένου αὐτοκρατορὸς διάδοχον το καὶ ἐμὸνυμον Ἀντωνίου Οὐήνον. "The one is his discourse addressed to Antoninus Pius and his sons, and to the Roman Senate, in behalf of our principles; but the other comprises an apology for our faith, which he presented to the Emperor Verus his successor, and bearer of the same name, Antoninus." To the same purport Phot. Biblioth. cod. 125, T. I. p. 94. These statements perfectly suit the two Apologies now extant under Justin’s name. Besides, in the latter are found, also, all the extracts which Eusebius gives from the Apologies of Justin which were known to him. Compare, in reference to the longer Apology, Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 8, T. I. p. 312, sqq. with Justin’s Apol. 1, 29, p. 61, (p. 72, A.) 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, E.) and 1, 68, p. 84, (p. 99, C.) Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 11, T. I. p. 321, sqq.\(^1\) with Justin. Apol. 1, 26, p. 59, sq. (p. 70, A. C.) Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 12, T. I. p. 323, sqq. with Justin. Apol. 1, 1, p. 44, (p. 53, B.); and, in reference to the shorter Apology, Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 8, T. I. p. 312, sq. with Justin. Apol. 2, 12, p. 96, (p. 50, A.)—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 16, T. I. p. 365, sqq. with Justin. Apol. 2, 3, p. 90, sq. (p. 46, E.) Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 17, T. I. p. 369, sqq. with Justin. Apol. 2, 2, p. 88, sq (p. 41, E.) also the objection against the superscription which the second Apology bore at the time, περὶ τῆν Ἄρωμαίων σύγχρητον, "to the Roman Senate," is cleared up by Eusebius. For, although he asserts that it was addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Verus, he also

---

\(^1\) Eusebius, instead of the Apology, refers to the treatise against Marcion as the source from which he had derived his statement.

\(^2\) Owing to another lapse of memory, Eusebius calls it the first instead of the second Apology; in ἥ προς Ἰησοῦν αὐτῷ μπορεῖν ἄκολογος.
speaks of it elsewhere as an appeal to the Roman Senate. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 4, 11. T. I. p. 323. Ιουστίνος πρὸς Ἐλλήνας ἰκανόντας σονήσας καὶ ἱεροὺς λόγους ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμιτίθες πίστεως ἀναλογιαὶ ἵθοντας βασιλεῖς Ἀντωνίων τῷ δὴ επικληθέντι Εὐσθείᾳ καὶ τῇ Ρωμαιῶν συγκλήτω βουλῇ προσφώνει.1 "Justin having written powerfully against the Greeks, addressed discourses of a similar kind, respecting our faith, to the sovereign Antoninus Pius, and to the Roman Senate." From internal and external evidence, therefore, the two Apologies are, indubitably genuine productions of Justin.

These writings, as defensive and justificatory of the much hated doctrines and practices of the Christians, were intended for public presentation to the Roman government, and were actually thus presented. If, in modern times, this has been frequently2 treated as improbable, and even incredible, it can have been for no other reason, than that the objectors felt it difficult to transport themselves into the primitive age of Christianity,—that they expected to find Christians of the first century, employ the style of modern servility, and that they forgot every effect must have a cause, but not inversely, every cause must have an effect. We subscribe to Tzscheriner's opinion, "that nothing but the stupidity of a cowardly pedant could maintain; that Justin's frank and bold Apologies, were only rhetorical exercises, which he composed without any intention of presenting them to the Emperors. The times of danger and persecution, are not the most favourable for mere rhetoricians; nor could men, who only spoke for the sake of speaking, express the truth and earnestness which we find in these writings, and certain it is, that, from the beginning of the world, no rhetorician or declaimer, has died a martyr."3

3 Fall des Heidentums, I. 209, compare also Geschichte der
As to the place where Justin composed his two Apologies, Eusebius states that it was at Rome, though he only gives it as a supposition, yet it is a very probable one. Several hints in the Apologies, really imply that Justin resided at Rome when he wrote them.

Respecting the date of the Apologies, opinions have been very much divided from the earliest times. With respect to the first Apology, by far the greater number of learned men, such as Scaliger, Petou, Dodwell, Pagi, du Four de Longuerne, Tentzel, Le Clerc, Gallandi, Lumper, Winter, Rettig, Neander, and Mohler, fix its composition in the year 138 or 139;

Apologetik, I. 233. Kestner expresses himself very decidedly on the absurdity of this supposition, "the beautiful conjecture of illiterate literati, (ungelehrten Gelehrten), who suppose that the Christian apologies never came under the notice of the heathen emperors,—since it must have been impossible—need not be refuted. He who knows not how to distinguish, at the first glance, the inspired language that depicts to the life, from the cold artificial tone of the Rhetorician, cannot make himself acquainted with the internal relations of any age, which alone can furnish a clue to the possibility or impossibility of a historical fact."

1 Euseb. hist. eccl. 4, 11, T. I. p. 323.
2 Justin. apol. 2, 6, p. 93, (p. 48. A.), and other passages.
4 Annotationes ad Epiph. hares. 46, Opp. T. II. p. 82.
6 Dissertat. hypotica, (Lugdun. 1682), 2, 3, 9, p. 114, sq.
8 Excercitationes selectae, T. I. p. 175, sq.
11 De vita, scriptis et doctrina patrum, T. II. 61.
13 Das erweislich älteste Zeugniss, &c. p. 39.
15 Patrologie, I. 192.
others, as Koch,¹ and Augusti,² prefer the year 140; others, as Massuet,³ place it in 145; and lastly, others, as Halloix,⁴ Tillemont,⁵ Nourry,⁶ Grabe,⁷ Prudentius Maranus,⁸ Gercken,⁹ and Ritter,¹⁰ refer it to the year 150. In our opinion, the date may be decisively fixed to be the year 138 or 139, principally on account of the inscription with which it begins, which is as follows. Αὐτοκατορχ Ἀλίψ Ἀδριαν ρ Ἀντωνίνῳ Ἠσαίανδρῳ Σίβαστῳ Καίσαρι καὶ Οὐχισίμῳ υἱῷ φίλοσόφῳ καὶ Λουκίῳ φιλοσόφῳ Καίσαρος φύσι υἱῷ καὶ Ἔυσεβοῖς εἰσποιητῷ, ἵσαστὶ παιδίας ἵσαβα τι συγκλήτῳ καὶ παντὶ Ὀλμῷ Ῥωμαίοι. From the circumstance, that in an address, in which, by naming the imperial personages according to the laws of convenience and propriety, the complete enumeration of these titles would be given, and every attention would be paid to etiquette,—the adopted son of the Emperor Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, or (as Hadrian had named him,) Verissimus, only bears the surname of philosopher, the inference is direct, that the Apology must have been presented at a time, in which the individual so named, had no other title.

But soon after the accession of Antoninus Pius, that is, in the course of the year 139, he received the title of Caesar, consequently this Apology must have

¹ Justini Mart. cum Tryphone Judæo dialogus, (Kil. 1700) p. 32 and 37.
² Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archaeologie, VI. p. 36.
³ Dissertat. in Iren. 1, 2, 5. T. II. p. 3.
⁴ Vita et documenta Justini Mart. p. 28 and 332.
⁵ Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire, T. II. p. 172, 269, sqq. 313.
⁶ Apparatus ad bibliothecam maximam, I. p. 367, sqq.
⁹ De Justin. Mart. ad religionem Christian. conversione admodum memorabili, p. 17.
been composed and presented in the interval between the accession of Antoninus Pius, and the elevation of Marcus Aurelius to the dignity of Cæsar, that is, in 138 or 139. Certainly, a favourable juncture! If at any time whatever, the Christians might venture to entertain some hopes for their cause on the accession of a new prince who was confessedly gentle and philanthropic!

It has been attempted to set aside the evidence in favour of this conclusion in various ways, partly by representing it as insufficient in itself, and partly by direct counter-arguments. It has been repeatedly asserted that the predicate "Cæsar" belonging to Verissimus, might have been omitted by an oversight either of a transcriber or of Justin himself, and it has been proposed to read the superscription thus, Αὐτοκράτορ Τιτῳ ΑΙΛῳ Ὁ Αἰσχρῷ Ἀντωνίῳ Εὔσεβῃ Συμβασάῳ Καῖσαρι καὶ Καῖσαρι Οὐρασίων καὶ φιλοσόφῳ, &c. But this assumption is so purely arbitrary and improbable, that it is sufficient to have mentioned it. More plausible is the attempt recently made by Ritter, to bring the title of Cæsar before the name of Verissimus. Ritter considers it surprising, that in this superscription, as it stands in the editions of Justin, the predicate Καῖσαρ is not immediately after αὐτοκρατορ, but stands after the

1 Capitolin. vit. Mrci. c. 6. Consulem secum Pius Marcus designavit et Cæsares appellacione donavit. Marcus Aurelius held his first consulship with Antoninus Pius in the year 140; he received the appellation of Cæsar a year earlier, as is proved by coins. See Gruter's Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani ed Græv. T. i. p. 260. No. 6.

2 The opinion of Eusebius differs only a little from this result, in the chronicle (ed. Mai and Zohrab, p. 384,) he places the presentation of the Apology in the third year of the reign of Antoninus Pius, therefore in the year 140.


4 Animad. etc. p. 3, sqq.
name and title of Antoninus Pius; a position for which neither a sufficient reason can be found in the meaning of the word Cæsar, nor a parallel in other inscriptions. But the whole difficulty would be removed if, as Sylburg has suggested, we separate the word Καίσαρι from the title of Antoninus Pius, and join it to Οὐσιοσίμω. If the particle καὶ appear to stand in the way of this alteration, it may be remarked, that it originally stood before the word Καίσαρι (Ἄντωνίῳ Ἐυσεβίῳ Σεβαστῷ καὶ Καίσαρι Οὐσιοσίμῳ) and was subsequently placed after Καίσαρι either by some one who was fond of euphony, and thought, by this transposition, to lessen the cacophony καὶ Καίσαρι, or by the accidental omission of a transcriber, in consequence of which, another who no longer found the particle in the text, and yet perceived that it was required by the laws of Greek construction, restored it, but in the wrong place. A reviewer of Ritter’s Programme,¹ finds the proposed alteration of the inscription necessary on another account, since otherwise the word Καίσαρι would have another meaning in the first clause of the address, than in the third member, where Lucius Verus is called Καίσαρες φίλου νῦν. For while, according to the common reading of the superscription, the title Καίσαρ in the latter place would be the predicate of the successor in the government, the same predicate would immediately before be attributed in another sense to the emperor himself. These remarks are, as we have said, not without plausibility, but they are also without truth. As to the last surmise, it would not have been entertained, had the person who originated it been better acquainted with Roman inscriptions in the times of the emperors. For it is not unusual that in one and the same inscription the title Καίσαρ is repeated, and that in one instance it is the title of honour belonging to the reigning emperor, and in another that

¹ Theologisches Litteraturblatt zur allgemeinen Kirchen-Ausgabe, 1839. No. xii. p. 94.
of his appointed successor. For the purpose of comparison, we will give an inscription, which is a very exact parallel to the case in hand, for here the person of the Cæsar is the same:

L. AELIO. CAESARI. IMP. CAES. TRAIANI.
HADRIANI. AUG. PONT. MAX. TRIB. POT.
XXI. IMP. II. COS. III. FILIO. DIVI. TRAIA
NI. PARTHICI. NEP. DIVI. NERVAE. PRONEP.

But against Ritter’s objections let us recollect: even supposing that the form of the address with which Justin’s Apology opens, could be found in none of the ancient Roman inscriptions of which we have copies extant, yet it would not argue the least against the correctness of the address, for Justin wrote not as a diplomatist, but as a private man, who might adhere to the customary form of inscriptions, but who might also equally well depart from it. The superscription in, and for itself, gives a perfectly satisfactory sense, if it be translated, “To the Autocrat Titus Elius Hadrian Antoninus, to the pious, august Caesar.” Eusebius, among whose quotations from Justin’s writings the superscription of the Apology is included, evidently found it, as far as the point we are discussing is concerned, in the form which it is at the present time; for he gives it exactly as it is always read in the edition of Justin, with the exception of transposing the word Καισάρι before Σεβαστῷ.


2 Inscriptions justify the use of the epithets, Εὐσεβῆς, Σεβαστῷ as adjectives, as in the following from Gruter’s Inscriptiones Antiquae, T. i. p. 277, No 8:

IMP. M. AUR. CARINO
NOBILISSIMO
CAES. PIO. FELICI
INVICTO. AUG.
PONT. MAXIMO.

and in this passage in the second Apology, 2, p. 90, (p. 43, B.) οἱ περὶ οὗτον Εὐσεβῆς Αὐτοκράτορος οἱ δὲ Φιλοσόφῳ Καισάρει πατὶ οἷοί τι ἡγῆντο οἰκεῖον κοίνου, ές Εὐσεβίου.
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(‘Αυτωνίς καὶ Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ καὶ Οὐχισσίμῳ.) In the inscriptions on public monuments the word Καίσαρ, when beside the predicates Αὐτοκράτωρ and Σεβαστὸς, it is ascribed to a reigning emperor, has no fixed position. Very frequently it stands at the head of the inscription, immediately after the word Αὐτοκράτωρ, as in the following example:—

ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΑ. ΚΑΙΣΑΡΑ.
ΜΑΡΚΟΝ. ΑΥΡΗΑΙΩΝ. ΚΑΠΟΝ
ΕΥΣΗΒΗ ΕΥΤΥΧΗ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΝ
ΙΕΡΑ ΔΕΑΦΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΚ
ΕΔΩΚΕΝ.

But in another instance it is again separated from Αὐτοκράτωρ and placed next to the title Σεβαστὸς, as:—

IMP. NERVAE. CAES.
AUG. PONT. MAX.

Or this:³

TI. CLAUDIO. CAESARI
AUG. GERMANICO
IMP.

or it is sometimes placed between the emperor’s names, and then separated from Αὐτοκράτωρ as well as from Σεβαστὸς, thus:⁴

IMP. TITUS. CAESAR
VESPAIANUS. AUG.

Lastly, it is found also at the close of the name and title of imperial personages; thus:⁵

CLAUDIO. INVICTO
PIO. FEL. IMP. CAES
PONT MAX
TRIB. POT. III. COS.
II. PROCOS.

¹ Gruter’s Inscript. Antiquæ, T. i. p. 277, No. 4.
³ Gruter’s Inscript. Antiq. T. i. p. 238, No. 3.
⁴ Gruter, T. i. p. 244, No. 5. Compare p. 189, No. 6, and 11.
⁵ Gruter, T. i. p. 276, No. 2. Compare, No. 1.
The objection to the position which the word Καίσαρι occupies in the address of Justin’s Apology, thus vanishes entirely, and the attempt which Ritter has made to remove the supposed difficulty is rendered unnecessary. Besides, the method of proof by no means recommends his solution. For if we were willing to allow the possibility of an intentional or unintentional omission of the particle καί, and, moreover, to consider it probable that a later reader had supplied the deficient particle; yet it would be far more credible that he had introduced it before the word Καίσαρι, and thus assigned this title to Οὐρισσίμως, than the contrary. It must also appear wonderful that the insertion of the particle καί has been so extended and universally admitted, that in none of the existing manuscript copies of Justin can a trace be found either of the supposed omission of καί, or of the pretended genuine and original reading, according to which καί must have stood before Καίσαρι (Σεβαστῷ καὶ Καίσαρι Οὐρισσίμως). After all, it can scarcely admit of a doubt, that we have the superscription of the Apology exactly in the form which it originally received from Justin—that Marcus Aurelius did not yet possess the title of Cæsar when the Apology was written, and therefore that its date may on good grounds be placed in the year 138, or 139. With these results, it is by no means inconsistent that in the same Apology we met with the following statement. Apol. i. 46, p. 71, (p. 83, B.) Ἰνα μὴ τίμησαι πρὸ ἐτῶν ἵκασθιν αὐτής ἡ γενεισάμας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου, διδαχόμεθα δὲ τοὺς διδάσκαι αὐτὸν ὑπὲρτον χρώμον ἐπὶ Παντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπικαλοῦμε, ὡς ἀνειθάντων ὑπὲρ τῶν προγεγεγενημένων πάντων δι’ ἁγίων, φθάσαντες τὴν ἀποκάλυσιν λυσόμεθα. 

"Lest some should say, that we assert that Christ was born 150 years before in the time of Cyrenius, and that he afterwards taught the things we say that he taught after that time under Pontius Pilate, and hence object that the men of all preceding generations were free from guilt,
we will at once explain the difficulty." In the first place, it is uncertain in what year the Christians of the second century placed the birth of Christ, and consequently from what point they reckoned the 150 years;¹ and then Justin, on points of chronology, is every where uncertain and not to be depended upon. David, for example, according to his opinion, (Apol. i. 42, p. 68, [p. 80, B.]) lived 1500 years before Christ. Lastly, the connection shows that the term of 150 years is only a very general and vague expression, in which a Decennium, more or less makes very little difference. It only serves to compare the short period of time that had elapsed since the incarnation of Christ with the long ages which had preceded that event. It is instructive to notice the uncertain manner in which Tertullian expresses himself in a similar instance relating to a measure of time. While in Ad Nat. i. 7, T. v. p. 107, he says; igitur ætati nostræ nondum anni ccl.—He soon changes the 250 into 300; Ad Nat. i. 9, T. v. p. 122, ut supra edidimus, ætatis nostræ nondum anni trecenti. The freedom, also, is deserving of notice, with which Arnobius fixes the distance of time in which that Apologist lived from the first publication of Christianity. While Arnobius mentions, as an exact reckoning, the number of 300 years, (Adv. Gentes. i. 13, T. i. p. 11; trecenti sunt anni ferme, minus vel plus aliquid, ex quo cæpinus esse Christiani;) these 300 years are raised by the heathen opponents whom he introduces speaking, to four hundred, (Adv. Gent. ii. 71, T. i. p. 101) ante quadringentos annos religio, inquitis, vestra non fuist. Compare also Cyrill. adv. Julian l. 6. T. vi. p. 191.

Nor is there a more valid objection in the remark, that if the Apology was already composed and presented in the year 139, the designation of Lucius Verus, as φιλίσωφος and παιδίας ἔγασθης would have been un-

¹ Acknowledging the correctness of this remark, Tillemont has, on that account, given up the argument, Memoires pour servir a l'histoire, T. II. p. 291, 313.
suitable, because he was then only eight years old. We do not wish to avail ourselves of the circumstance that in Eusebius, (Hist. Eccles. 4, 12, T. i. p. 323) the superscription is given thus, Λουκίῳ φιλοσόφου Καίσαρος φύσει u. f., according to which the title of philosopher is not given to Lucius Verus, but to his father, the Caesar Ælius Verus; and that this reading in Eusebius might be preferred to the common one in the editions of Justin, Λουκίῳ φιλοσόφῳ Καίσαρος φύσει u. f.; it is on the other hand to be recollected, that we have before us the address of an apologetic supplication, in which it was not to be expected that every title would be weighed with scrupulous anxiety, and that Capitoli- nus, (Vit. Luc. Ver. c. 2), narrates of Lucius Verus, "amavit in pueritia versus facere, post orationes, et melior quidem orator fuisset dicitur quam poeta, ino—ut verius dicam—pejor poeta quam rhetor; nec desunt, qui dicunt, eum fuisset adjectum ingenio amicorum atque ab illis ei illa qualiaunque sunt, scripta; siquidem multos disertos et eruditos semper secum habuisse dicitur."

Lastly, no argument can be drawn against the date we have fixed for the composition of the Apology, from the circumstance that Justin in this piece makes mention of the Marcionites, as a tolerably powerful and wide-spread sect. ¹ It cannot indeed be disputed, that most of the Fathers transpose the first appearance of Marcion, whom they make a disciple of the Syrian Gnostic Cerdo, to the reign of the Emperor Antoninus Pius; ² but it requires only a moderate acquaintance

¹ Apol. 1, 28, p. 59, (p. 70, A.) Μαρκιών τινά Ποτετίκων, ος καὶ τών ἐν τοις θεοφανείς τῶν ζυγωμάτων...; οὐκ εἰς τῶν γίνονται ἐνθροφών διὰ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων πυλήσεως πελλάς πιστώσιμος βλασφημος λόγον. —Apol. 1, 58, p. 78, (p. 92, A.) οὐ πελλὰς ιεριστὴς...; οὐκ εἰς τὴν κανονλογίαν.

² Iren. ad. haeres. 1, 28, p. 105, Κόπων ὤ τις...; οὐκ δὲ λαταγήθη ἐν τῇ Τουρήσῃ. (Hyginus, according to Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 4, 10, T. I. p. 316, became bishop of Rome in the first year of the reign of Antoninus Pius.)...; διδαχῇ —1, 29, p. 106, διαδιδομένου αὐτῶν Μαρκιών τινά Ποτετίκων, ἰδίᾳ τῇ
with the Fathers to know how little they are to be trusted in their chronological decisions. 1 Chronological accuracy was not their province. In the present instance, the information they supply leads us in general to the belief that the doctrine and sect of Marcion had spread considerably in the reign of Antoninus Pius, but by no means to suppose that Marcion first appeared in public under Antoninus Pius. Certainly Marcion had long been spreading his heretical views before he met with the counteraction which the Catholic Church began against him in the reign of Antoninus Pius. At least Tertullian affords sufficient room for this presumption, in his statement: quoò quidem anno Antoninii Majoris de Ponto suo exhalaverit aura canicularis, non curavi investigare, de quo tamen constat, Antonianus haereticus est, sub Pio impius,—and a passage of Clement of Alexandria may be adduced as a historical testimony for it, if we are willing to admit the competency of this Father on such subjects. The result, therefore, remains invul-

1 Epiphanius, for example, involves himself in a palpable contradiction respecting the time of Marcion’s appearance. According to Har. 48, 1, T. I. p. 402, this event happened under the Emperor Hadrian; on the contrary, according to Har. 42, 12, T. I. p. 364, it was in the time of the Bishop Anicetus.

nerable on all points, that Justin’s longer Apology was composed soon after the accession of Antoninus Pius, that is, in the year 138 or 139.

We cannot form an opinion with equal certainty and exactness respecting the date of the second or shorter Apology. But no well-founded doubt exists that this document was prepared under the reign of the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and therefore between the years 161—166. Eusebius, with whom Jerome, Photius, and others agree, distinctly asserts this; and the grounds on which Valerius, Dodwell, and Neander think themselves justified in placing the composition of this Apology in the reign of the Emperor Antoninus Pius, are either unimportant, or are in favour of the contrary opinion. After all, the precise date of the second Apology must remain undetermined.1

The times of the Emperor Hadrian, the inventors of heresies flourished, and continued to the age of Antoninus the Elder, as Basilides, and thus they report that Valentinus had listened to Theodas, and that he was known to Paul. Marcion, in the same age, associated with them as an elder with his juniors.”

1 A minute examination and refutation of these grounds is contained in our Essay on the year of Justin’s death, in the “Theologischen Studien und Kritiken,” 1836, Part IV. p. 914. What Kestner, (Dis Agape, p. 457,) has adduced to support his individual opinion, that the Apology was not composed till after the year 176, under the joint government of Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, is only the product of deceptive hastiness and arbitrary combination. But the hypothesis of Daniel von Hoven, (Epistola historico-critica de vera aetate, dignitate et patria Minucii Felici, ut et de nativo ordine apologiarum Justini Mart. Camp. 1762, p. 6, sqq.) is perfectly absurd; it throws historical relations into the utmost confusion, maintaining that the longer Apology was written and delivered under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and his imperial partner Lucius Verus, and the shorter, on the contrary, under the reign of Antoninus Pius.
CHAPTER II.

THE DIALOGUE WITH TRYPHO.

Like the two Apologies, the conversation with Trypho the Jew, which has been handed down to us under Justin's name, bears the most decided stamp of genuineness. And yet it is this work which has been most violently attacked, as late as the year 1636, Tentzel wrote, "Dialogus cum Trypho quum a nemine in dubium haecenus vocatus fuerit, sed ab omnibus antiquitatis aestimatoribus in summo pretio habeatur, nihil de eo restat, nisi ut inquiramus, quo tempore dispositionem illam instituerint Justinus et Trypho;" but in little more than 10 years, very different opinions became current. In 1700, Koch made an attack on the genuineness of the Dialogue, less on purely critical grounds, than from a theological bias, and a wish to support Justin's orthodoxy. The principal arguments he employed to prove its spuriousness were, the silence of Irenaeus respecting it—the name of Trypho, which it carries on its front—the mention of the Marcionite heresy, and the supposed

2 Justin. Mart. cum Tryphone Judaeo dialogus secundum regulas criticas examinatus et in Siviri... convictus, Kil. 1700. Kestner's Die Apo. p. 342, says, "The evidence for the spuriousness of the Dialogue fails both in its premises and conclusions."
3 Epistola de dialogo Justin. Mart. cum Tryphone Judaeo, Slesv. 1700.
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assertion of doctrines later than the time of Justin—
apparent difference of sentiment between it and the
Apologies—internal self-contradictions—and, lastly,
peculiarities of diction which were not customary in
the second century. Its real author was supposed by
Koch to have been the Trypho of the third century,
who is mentioned as a learned pupil of Origen.
These objections, of which some are very weak, and
the rest perfectly groundless, were answered in the
same year by Albert a Felde, in a very unpreju-
diced, learned, and in the main, conclusive Epistle.
It were only to have been wished that, in his refuta-
tion, he had not slavishly confined himself to the spe-
cial points of controversy in his opponent's treatise, but
had taken a more comprehensive view of the question.
But the discussions were by no means brought to a
close by this epistle; on the contrary, the attack and
defence gave occasion to a succession of writings for
and against the Dialogue, which was continued for se-
veral years, but with more warmth than ability. After
the conflict had ceased on this question, it was unex-
pectedly renewed in another direction. Wetstein1
noticed that the Old Testament citations in the Dialogue
varied from the present Septuagint version, and agreed
with the reading of the translations of Theodotion and
Symmachus, who, according to historical tradition,
lived after the time of Justin, and on this observation
he grounded the conclusion, that the author of the
Dialogue must have had before him, not the com-
mon Septuagint, but the text of the Hexapla. Now,
if Wetstein represented the state of the case to be
much worse than it was in reality, and, in part,
very erroneously,2 yet it cannot be denied that the
Old Testament citations of the Dialogue, which
generally have the Septuagint for their basis, con-
tain also readings which, contrary to the Septua-

2 Krom's Diatribe de authentia, &c. p. 81, sqq. has proved
this in particular instances.
giant, agree with the translations of Theodotion and Symmachus. To explain this fact, and to rescue the genuineness of the Dialogue with Trypho from Wetstein’s objections, Gallandi, first of all, entered the lists. But he was not equal to the task, and was unable to settle the question. Some of his remarks are altogether erroneous, and his attempt to explain the agreement of the Dialogue with the readings of Theodotion and Symmachus, in part from the circumstance that Justin had in his hands the version of Aquila, from which Theodotion and Symmachus had borrowed much, must be considered a failure, since it cannot be proved that Aquila’s version was really known to Justin. Nor was Stroth more successful in finding the solution of the difficulty. His attempt to place Theodotion’s translation (contrary to the received opinion) some ten years earlier, and thus to make it possible and conceivable that this version was used by Justin, or that he had a copy of the Septuagint, to which the reading of Theodotion were already transferred:—this attempt was entirely opposed by chronological data, and the difficulty in relation to Symmachus remains just as it was before.

1 Biblioth veterum patrum, T. i. p. 85, sqq.
3 See his contributions to a Criticism on the Septuagint in Eichhorn’s Repertory for Biblical and Oriental Literature, ii. 76.
4 In its essential points Stroth has retracted his own hypothesis, a. o. vi. p. 125.
5 The hypothesis of Petean (animadu. in Epiphan. Opp. T. ii. p. 399) that Symmachus lived before Theodotion, and, therefore, was an earlier translator, is scarcely deserving of
Krom¹ and Eichhorn⁴ came nearer the truth with their supposition, that the readings of the quotations in the Dialogue which agreed with Theodotion and Symmachus were not originally in the text of that work, but were introduced at a later period from copies of the Hexapla, whether they were substituted at once by the transcribers in place of the original text of the Septuagint, or were first placed in the margin, from which they were gradually introduced into the text. Credner⁵ has lately brought this disputed point to a satisfactory conclusion; with much industry and acuteness he has adduced evidence that the text of the Old Testament quotations in Justin exists in essentially the same state, as when first written by the martyr—that its peculiar form is the work of some Christian who, at an early period, undertook a revision of the Septuagint, and that the frequent agreement of the Old Testament quotations in Justin with the readings of Theodotion and Symmachus, in preference to the Septuagint, may be accounted for, in great measure, by the circumstance that these revised copies of the Septuagint, from which Justin made his quotations, afterwards came into the hands of Theodotion and Symmachus, and were made use of in their own labours.⁴ The only fault we have to find with Credner


³ Beitrage zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften (Contributions to an Introduction to the Biblical writings) ii. pp. 83, 256 242, 272, 298, 312, 317.
is, that he has carried his opposition to Krom and Eichhorn's views to an extreme—that he has absolutely excluded every intentional alteration of the readings in the quotations according to the Hexapla, and has granted too largely an accidental and undesigned alteration by the transcriber. For the reasons which seem to justify such an exclusion, apply to individual cases, but not to the whole, and in some passages of the Dialogue, it is beyond all doubt that the original reading of the text has been designedly altered by a later hand. Dial. c. Tr. c. 58, p. 155, (p. 281, A.) all the editions of Justin give the quotations from Gen. xxxii. 24, in the following manner: καὶ ἑπάλαιν ἄγγελος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔως πρωί. But immediately after Justin explains the passage of Christ, who, in his opinion, wrestled with Jacob, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 58, p. 156), ἐν ἱδίᾳ ἀνέδει χ' Ἀβραὰμ φανείς, καὶ ἐν ἱδίᾳ ἀν- Θρώπου αὐτῷ ἐν Ἰακώβ παλαίσας—and, further on, he remarks: λέγει (Moses) μετ' Ἰακώβ ἀνέθρωπος παλαίσας. From the tenor of these passages it is evident that the above citation must originally have been written καὶ ἑπάλαιν ἄνθρωπος μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔως πρωί, and that the reading ἄγγελος was substituted by a transcriber. But another example is still more striking. In Dial. c. Tr. c. 107, p. 201, (p. 334, C.) the history of the Prophet Jonah is given, and, according to the common reading, contains the following passage: τοῦ Ἰωάννε, πρὸς τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτὸν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ ἀρδοῦ Ἰχθύος, ὅτι μετὰ (ἐν ἀλλοις τερέτ) τεσσαρακοστῇ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ παμπληθεὶς ἀπολυῦται, πιστεύεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἴδιον ταῦτα καὶ ἀλήγων. . . . εἰκήρουσιν, πιστεύοντες, ὅτι ἔλθη τὸ Ἰσραὴλ ἵσταται, and a little after he says: τοῦ Ἰωάννα ἀναλιῆτο ἐπί τῇ τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ὡς εἰκήρουσι, ἡμᾶς καταστραφήναι τῷ τὸν πόλιν. . . . οἱ λεγέντες αὐτοῦ (ὁ Ισραήλ). "When Jonah preached after he was ejected, on the third day, from the belly of the fish, that after (in others three) forty-three days they should all perish—they proclaimed forthwith a fast for all living creatures—men and the irrational animals, believing that God is merciful."
In this form of the text, the words in the parenthesis (ἐν ἄλλως τετείχε) betray a marginal gloss inserted in the text; but we could scarcely find out the original reading of the passage, if we merely consider it in itself, and could not gain more precise information respecting it from another quarter. This information is obtained from two manuscripts, compared by Prudentius Maranus. In them the passage reads thus: ἕτε μετὰ ἐν ἄλλως τετσαραχαντατηρίς ἡμέρας παμπαληθεὶς ἀπολούνται. Evidently (as Prudentius Maranus suggests) the space left vacant in the manuscript between ἄλλως and τετσαραχαντατηρίς is to be filled up with the verb γράφεται, and the text will be restored in the following manner: δει μετά (ἐν ἄλλως γράφεται τετσαράχαντα τετείχε ἡμέρας παμπαλὴθεὶς ἀπολούνται. In this form the passage furnishes unquestionable evidence that the original reading of the quotation from Jonah iii. 4, in the Dialogue, was the Septuagint version, and read μετὰ τετείχε ἡμέρας and ἓτε τῷ τῷ τῷ τῷ ἡμέρᾳ, but that a transcriber noticed the various reading of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, by writing the words ἐν ἄλλως τετσαράχαντα in the margin of the Dialogue, whence they afterwards crept into the text, and were mixed with the already existing reading of the Septuagint. But, however we may decide on this point, thus much is evident, that the peculiar character of the Old Testament quotations in the Dialogue tells not in the remotest degree against its genuineness. But scarcely was this question apparently settled, when the genuineness of the Dialogue was again called in question, and threatened from another quarter. Lange¹ believed that he had detected, in the language, as well as in the matter, an essential characteristic difference between the Dialogue and the two Apologies, and on this ground to decide against the former. Strangely overlooking the points of similarity in these works, he finds in the Apologies nothing but a very contracted range of thought, the

¹ Ausführliche Geschichte der Dogmen. I. 139.
most common-place and ill-arranged representations, while the author of the Dialogue appears to him to be a man of sense and information, equally able in thought and language. With palpable extravagance he ascribes to the author of the Dialogue the most accurate acquaintance with the practices and speculations of Judaism, and a pure Jewish style of thought, while he can find nothing of all this in the Apologies. With an intentional heightening of the apparent contrast, he believes that, in the author of the Apologies, he sees a friend of the heathen philosophy, and an enthusiastic admirer of human reason; while the Dialogue expresses contempt of the Grecian philosophy, and an undervaluation of the natural powers of reason. But this attack was ably repelled. Mün- scher, with great acuteness exposed the futility of Lange’s assertions, by an accurate comparison of the Apologies and the Dialogue.

After such ample discussions, it is not our design to undertake afresh, the vindication of the Dialogue against the attacks on its genuineness: for we should be only repeating what has been already said. But we may reinforce the attempts to defend it by some additional evidence, which will not be altogether superfluous, as, even within a recent period, opinions have been expressed which tend to cast doubts on its genuineness.

We shall attempt, therefore, to adduce the positive evidence in behalf of the Dialogue with Trypho. We

---

1 It is curious to notice how Tschirner, in his Geschichte der Apologetik, I. 236, in an undesigned opposition to Lange, extols the Apologies at the expense of the Dialogue.


shall begin with bringing together the particulars by which it is characterised in general as a production of the second century. Such particulars are the historical references and doctrinal statements which the Dialogue contains. The latter, indeed, are tinged with those undefined and changing colours which are so peculiar to the system of Christian belief in the second century—we need only mention the doctrine of the Logos. But the former lead us incidentally to the same period which is implied in Justin's longer Apology. As for example, in the latter, the Jewish war under Bar-Kochba is represented as an event that had just transpired; and in the Dialogue, the same war is spoken of as having taken place not long before.

Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, E.)

Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγενημένῳ. Ἰουδαϊκῷ τολέμῳ Βαρχοχέβας, ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀποστάσεως ἀρχηγός, Χριστιανὸς μόνος εἰς τιμώριας... ἐκέλευεν ἀπάγοσθαι.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 1, p. 102, (p. 217, D.)

Τρύφων, φησὶ, καλοῦμαι εἰμὶ δὲ Ἐβραῖος ἐκ πειγομχῆς, φυγῶν τῶν νῦν γενόμενον πόλεμον.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 10, p. 110, (p. 227, A.)

Οἱ μετὰ τοῦ Τρύφωνος, ἐμπαλόντος τινὸς αὐτῶν λόγον, περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γενόμενον πολέμου διελάλουν.

Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, E.)

“For in the Jewish war that has now occurred, Barchochebas, the leader of the revolt of the Jews, commanded the Christians alone to be led away to punishment.”
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Dial. c. Tr. c. 1, p 102, (p. 217, D.)

"I am called Trypho, said he; I am a Hebrew of the circumcision, a fugitive from the war that has now occurred."

"Trypho's friends were conversing; one of them throwing in an observation about the war then carried on in Judea."

To these internal proofs, external ones may be added, writers of the second century, namely, Irenæus and Tertullian, were acquainted with this Dialogue, and frequently made use of it. Let the following passage be compared:—

Justin. Dial. c. Tr. c. 6, p. 108, (p. 224, B.)

"Ὅτι ἡ Ψυχή, οὐδεὶς ἀντιστοι. Εἰ δὲ ζῇ, οὐ ζωή οὔσα ζῇ, ἀλλὰ μεταλαμβάνουσα τῆς ζωῆς... ζωῆς δὲ Ψυχῆ μετιχεῖ, ἵπτε ζήν αὐτήν ὁ Θεὸς βούλεται οὕτως ἄρα καὶ οὐ μεθέξει ποτὲ, διότι αὐτήν μὴ Σίλου ζήν. Οὐ γὰρ δὲ αὐτῆς ἔστι τὸ ζῆν, ὡς τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ὡσπερ ἀνδρόπος οὐ διαπαντὸς ἡρέμην, οὐδὲ σύνετον ἀσι τῇ Ψυχῇ τῷ σώματι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἄν δὲ ἡ λυξηναὶ τὴν ἀμοιβίαν ταὐτής, καταλίπῃ ἡ Ψυχή τῷ σώματι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἄν δὲ ἡ λυξηναὶ τὴν ἀμοιβίαν ταὐτής, καταλίπῃ ἡ Ψυχή τῷ σώματι καὶ ἀνδρόπος οὐχ ἀσιν, οὕτως καὶ, etc.

Irenæus. adv. hæres. 2, 64, p. 169.

Sicut autem corpus animalis ipsum quidem non est anima participatur autem animam quoad usque deus vult: sic et anima ipsa quidem non est vita, participatur autem a des sibi præstitam vitam.

Translation of the Greek.

Justin. Dial. c. Tr. c. 6, p. 108, (p. 224, B.)

"No one denies that the soul lives. But if it lives,
it lives not as being life, but as a partaker of life. But the soul partakes of life because God wills it to live; therefore it will not partake of it, when God shall not wish it to live. For it does not live by itself like God; but as man does not exist perpetually, so is the body not always connected with the soul; but when it is needful for this harmony to be dissolved, the soul forsakes the body, and the man is not, thus also,” &c.

Justin. Dial. c. Tr. c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, C.)

'Αλλ' ἰδεῖ, φησίν, ἡ πάντες ἐν γαστρὶ ἡς ὡς μεγάλων προγράματας σημανομένων εἰ ἔγενε ἀπὸ συνομσίας τίκτων ἐμελλαν διὸς πᾶσαι αἱ πάντες γυναῖκες σπείρου ἄλην τῶν στερίων.

Justin. Dial. c. Tr. c. 110, p. 203, (p. 337, A.)

'Ὅμως τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς, οἱ τινες, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἤπειροντος ἀπὸ Ἡσυχοσταλῆμα διὰ τῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἀποστόλων τὴν Ἰεοσῆβειαν ἔτιγνόντες, ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦ Χαρίσι καὶ Ἰσραήλ κυριτέργομεν, καὶ οἱ πολέμου καὶ ἀληθοφοιας καὶ τάσεις κακίας μεταστομιένοι, ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς τὰ σοληνικὰ ὀργανά ἔκαστο, τὰς μαχαίρας εἰς ἀφρατα καὶ τὰς κυβέρνας εἰς γεωργικὰ μεταβάλομεν καὶ γεωργοῦμεν, ὑποσῆβειαν, δικαιοσύνη, φιλανθρωπίαν, πίστιν


Quid enim magnum aut quod signum fieret, in eo, quod adolescentula concipiens ex vero peperisset, quod evenit omnibus quae pariunt mulieribus.

Iren. adv. hæres. 4, 67, p. 275.

Si autem libertatis lex id est, verbum dei ab Apostolis, qui ab Hierusalem exierunt annuntiatum in universam terram in tamen transmutationem fecit, ut gladios et lanceas bellatorias in aratra fabricaverit ipse et in falces, quæ donavit ad metendum frumentum, in organa pacifica demutaverit, et jam nescirint pugnare, sed percussi et alteram prebeat maxillam; non de aliquo alio prophetæ dixerunt
Justin. Dial. c. Tr. c. 77, p. 174, (p. 303, A.)

Eβηηχεν ἡ σφοτεία· πρὶν ἡ γνώναι τὸ σαιδὸν καλῶν πε-
tέρα ἡ μητέρα, λήψεται δύ-
ναμιν Δαμασκοῦ καὶ σκύλα
Σαμαρείας . . . . Ἡμεῖς
ἐχομεν ἀποδείξας τοῦτο γενό-
μενον εἰ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χρίστῳ.

Ἀμα χαρ τῷ γεννηθῆναι αὐ-
τῷ, μάγιοι ἅπας Ἀββαίας
παραγενόμενοι προσεύχησαν
αὐτῷ, πρότερον ἐν Ὀντες πρὸς
Ἡρῴδην . . . . , ὅ τὸ λό-
γος καλεῖ Βασιλεία. Ἀσυρίων
dia τὴν ἄγεον καὶ ἄνομον αὐ-
tου γνώμην. Ἡσπάσσοις γὰρ
τοιαῦτα ἐν παραβολαῖς καὶ
ὁμωσυς πολλάκις χαλαῖν τὸ
ἀγιον πνεύμα· οὖν σπειρίζε
καὶ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ἀπαντα
τῶν ἐν Ιεροσόλυμοις, πολλά-
κις φῆσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· ὁ πα-
tής οὐ Δρομβαίος καὶ ἡ μη-
tης οὐ Χετταία· . . . .

Dial. c. Tr. c. 78, p. 176,
(p. 304. D. 305, A.)

Καλγαρτὸ εἰσεύηθεν Ὡσαίαν·
λήψεται δύναμιν Δαμασκοῦ
καὶ σκύλα Σαμαρείας, την
tοῦ πονηροῦ βασιλείου τοῦ ἡ
Δαμασκοῦ οἰκουμένος δύναμιν
ισόμαιν νικηθησθαι τῷ
Χριστῷ, ἀμα τῷ γεννηθῆναι

haec, sed de eo, qui fecit
ea.

Tertull. adv. Marc. 3, 13,
T. i. p. 125.

Quoniam prīsquam cognoscat voeare patrem et
matrem, accipiet virtutem
Damasci et spolia Sama-
risei adversus regem Assy-
riorum . . . . p. 126,
serva modum ēstatis et
quære sensum prædicationi-
nis, imo redeevangelio ve-
ritatis, quæ posterior de-
traxisti, et tam intelligitur
prophetia, quam renuntia-
tur expuncta. Maneant
autem orientales illi magi,
in infantia Christum recen-
tem auro et thure mune-
rantes et acceperit infans
virtutem Damasci, sine
prælio et armis . . . .

p. 127: de illo autem tunc
auri munere etiam David:
et dabitur illi ex auro Ara-
biae. Et rursus, reges Ara-
bum et Saba munera offe-
rent illi. Nam et magos
reges habuit fere oriens, et
Damascus Arabiae retro
deputabatur, antequam
transcripta erat in Syro-
phœnicen, ex distinctione
Syriarum cujus tunc vir-
tutem Christus acceptit, ac-
ceptando insignia ejus, au-
rum scilicet et odores:
Translation of the Greek Extracts.

1. (N. B.—The Latin of Irenæus is in substance the same as the first quotation from Justin.

2. Dial. c. Tr. c. 110, &c.

"We Christians,—who having learned religion from the law, and the word that came forth from Jerusalem by the Apostles of Jesus, have fled for refuge to the God of Jacob and God of Israel; and who, having been oppressed with war and mutual butchery, and all wickedness, have changed our swords into ploughshares, our spears into implements of husbandry, and who cultivate piety, righteousness, philanthropy, faith, and hope, which comes from the Father himself, through the crucified one," &c.


"The prophecy said, 'before the child shall know to call father and mother, he shall take the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria.' We are able to show that this was accomplished in our Christ. For, at his birth Magi, from Arabia, came and adored him, having first gone to Herod, . . . . whom the Word calls King of the Assyrians, on account of his impious and lawless disposition. For ye know that oft times the Holy Spirit utters such things in parables and similitudes; thus he did to all the people in Jerusalem, oft times saying to them, 'Thy father an Amorite and thy mother a Hititte.'"

4. Dial. c. Tr. c. 78, p. 176, &c.

"And the saying in Isaiah, 'He shall take the power of Damascus, and the spoils of Samaria,' signified that the power of the evil demon that dwelt in Damascus would be conquered by Christ, as soon as he was born, which the event proved. For the magi,
who had been forcibly impelled to all the evil deeds wrought by that demon, by coming and adoring Christ, showed that they had revolted from the power that had enthralled them, which the Word mystically has taught us, dwells in Damascus. But that power being sinful and unjust, is aptly, in parabolic language, called Samaria. But none of you can deny that Damascus was and is a part of the Arabian land, though now it is reckoned to belong to Syrophoenicia."

Compare Dial. c. Tr. c. 90, p. 188, (p. 317, D. 318, A.) and c. 91, p. 188, (p. 318, c. D.) and c. 94, p. 191, (p. 321, D. 322, A.)


Tertull. adv. M. 5, 8, T. i. p. 344.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 87, p. 185, (p. 314, c. D. 315, A. B.)

Tertull. adv. M. 5, 9, T. i. p. 349.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 34, p. 131, sq. (p. 352, E.)

Dial. c. Tr. c. 83, p. 180, (p. 309, B.)

Dial. c. Tr. c. 19, p. 119, (p. 236, c. D.)

Dial. c. Tr. c. 86, p. 184, (p. 313, D. 314, A.)


But the Dialogue with Trypho not merely bears the marks of being in general a production of the second century; it also expressly attributes its origination to Justin. Its author shows himself to have been a Samaritan, and refers to an apologetic composition already presented to the Roman Emperor, in which he had openly and without reserve, exposed the gross delusion of his countrymen, who had been seduced to pay homage to the juggler Simon as the most high
God—the very accusation which is brought forward in Justin’s longer Apology.¹ It is also deserving of notice, that the author of the Dialogue acknowledges that before his conversion to Christianity he had been a Platonic philosopher, which perfectly applies to Justin.² In accordance therefore with the express statements of the Dialogue, Justin must be considered as its author. This evidence is confirmed by the authority of Eusebius.³ This writer, who was so familiar with the history of the early church, ascribes to Justin not merely the composition of a polemic and apologetic conversation with the Jew Trypho, but also brings forward some special points from its contents, which are all found in the Dialogue that has come down to us as Justin’s, so that there cannot be the shadow of a doubt that the account given by Eusebius relates to the work which we possess. Eusebius thus writes; Hist eccles. 4, 18, T. i. p. 378. καὶ διάλογον σὺν Ἰουδαίοις συνέταξεν (ὁ Ἰωσήφος) ὁ τῶν τῶν Ἐβραίων ἐπισημότατον πεποιηταί ἐν ὑπνα τρόπων ἡ Ζεία χάρις αὐτῶν ἐστι τὸν τῆς πίστεως παρόμοιος λόγον, δηλ. ὁποῖον τοῖς πρότερον περὶ τὰ φιλόσοφα μαθηματα σπουδην εἰσαγόνεται καὶ ὁσὸν ἴπτον παρὰ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς ήμετατήν ζήτησιν.⁴ 'Ἰσοροί ὅ ἐν ταύτῳ περὶ Ἰουδαίων, ὡς κατὰ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδασκαλίας ἐπιβουλή συσκευασμένων, αὕτα ταύτα πρὸς τὸν Τρώφωνα ἀποτειμύμενος οὐ μόνον δὲ οὐ μετανοήσατε ἢ ὡς ἐπράξετε χακῶς, ἀλλὰ ἀνδρὲς ἐκλεκτοὺς ἐκλεξάμενοι τὸ άπὸ Ιερουσαλήμ, ἰδεῖτε ὡς τὰ τὰς τῆς γῆς λέγοντες αἰτίαν ἀξίων Ἱσραηλίων πεφάνακα, καταλέγοντες τα ταύτα, ἀπες καὶ ἡμῶν ὁ άγνοοῦντες ἡμᾶς ἀπαντες λέγουσι, ὡςτε οὐ μόνον ἰαυτοῖς ἁδικίας αἰτίας ὑπάρχει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις

¹ Compare Apol. 1, 26, p. 59.² (p. 69, D. E.) and Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 214, (p. 349, C.)
² Compare Apol. 2, 12, p. 96, (p. 50, A.) and Dial. c. Tr. c. 2, p. 103, (p. 219, C.)
⁴ Dial. c. Tr. c. 2, sqq. p. 203, sqq. (p. 218, E. 219, sqq.)
And he (Justin) composed a Dialogue against the Jews, being an argument which he maintained with Trypho, the most distinguished of the Hebrews at that time; in this he shows in what manner the divine favour led him to an acquaintance with the Christian faith; with what earnestness he had before pursued philosophical studies, and had sought for truth with intense eagerness. And in this Dialogue he narrates respecting the Jews, that they had formed a conspiracy against the doctrine of Christ, and presses Trypho with the fact, (saying) so far from repenting of your evil actions, you have chosen select persons, and sent them over all the earth, denouncing the atheistic heresy of the Christians, spreading abroad those things against us, which are said by all those who know us not, so that you are not only guilty of injustice yourselves, but are the causes of it in all other men. And he writes, that even down to his own time, prophetic gifts illuminated the church; and he mentions the Revelation of John, distinctly stating that it was the Apostle's. And he mentions certain prophetic expressions—reproaching Trypho that because Jews had expunged them from the Scriptures.

These testimonies, which even alone are satisfactory, are corroborated by the intimate relationship of the Dialogue with the Apologies, which leaves the critic only the alternative either to acknowledge the Dialogue as well as the Apologies to be composed by Justin, or to deny that he is the author either of the

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 17, p. 117, (p. 234, E.)
2 Diai. c. Tr. c. 39, p. 136, (p. 258, A.) c. 81, p. 179, (p. 308, B.) c. 88, p. 185, (p. 315, B.)
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 81, p. 179, (p. 308, A.)
4 Diai. c. Tr. c. 71, sqq. p. 169, sq. (p. 297, B.)

κ
Apologies or the Dialogues. We do not here refer to the general agreement which exists between these writings in their style, their apologetic principles and methods of proof, and their doctrinal views. For though this agreement is really important, as others have already shown in one respect or another, and as will be rendered still clearer in the following sections of this work, in which the particulars we have mentioned must receive a fuller discussion—yet, on the other hand, it cannot be denied, that such a comparison is not perfectly convincing. At least the objection cannot be altogether set aside, that this coincidence may result in part from the influence of the times, which gave a peculiar character to several doctrinal views prevalent in the church, as well as to the exegetical method of Christian writers in the second century,—or may be ascribed to the intentional imitation of a forger. We are rather inclined to point out the identity of the author of the Apologies and of the Dialogue, by means of certain peculiarities common to both, which, on account of their singularity, cannot be satisfactorily explained, either by the operations of prevailing modes of thinking, nor by the designed attempts of an imitator.

We begin with noticing the peculiar name which is attributed to the canonical gospels, in the longer Apology, (for the shorter contains no biblical quotations,) and in the Dialogue. Although neither in the one nor the other, is the common name τῷ εὐαγγέλειον unknown, yet the Gospels are generally distinguished by the title, ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, a title which


2 For example, Apol. 1, 33, p. 64, (p. 75, B.) l, 66, p. 83, (p. 98, B. D.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 198, (p. 331, B.) c. 107, p. 201, (p. 334, B.)
is not to be found in any other Christian writers, either of the second century, or of any other period.

We would, besides, direct the attention of our readers to the peculiarity of the biblical citations in the longer Apology, and the Dialogue, which, though they differ not unfrequently, from the text of the Septuagint, and of the canonical gospels, agree with one another, in these very passages, in a most extraordinary manner.

Apol. 1, 60, p. 79, (p. 93, A).

Dial. c. Tr. c. 94, p. 191, (p. 321, D. 322, A.)

LXX.

Numbers iv. 21, 8.

"In both these quotations there is a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus; in both πιστεύων, is given as the condition of σώζω·θαι or of σωτηρία, for which, in
the Septuagint, the terms ἰδεῖν and ζητεῖν are used; lastly, in both, ἐπιβλέπειν is used for the προβλέπειν of the LXX."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apol. i. 53, p. 75, (p. 88, D)</th>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c. 140, p.231, (p.369,D.)</th>
<th>LXX. Isaiah i. 9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Εἰ μὴ κύριος ἐγκατέληπτεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σώδομα καὶ Γόμοβα ἄν ἐγενήθη Ἐμεν.</td>
<td>Εἰ μὴ κύριος ἡσαβαωθ ἐγκατέληπτεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σώδομα ἄν καὶ Γόμοβα ἄν ἐγενήθη Ἐμεν.</td>
<td>Εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαωθ ἐγκατέληπτεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σώδομα ἄν ἐγενήθη Ἐμεν καὶ ὡς Γόμοβα ἄν ὦμοι ὦμεν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ποίδον μοι ὁ ἄν οἶκον οἰκοδομήσεις; λέγει Κύριος. Ὅσον οὖν μοι Ἰρώνος καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποστούσιν τῶν ποδῶν μου.</td>
<td>Ποίδον ὁ ἄν οἶκον οἰκοδομήσεις; λέγει Κύριος. Ὅσον μοι Ἰρώνος καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποστοῦσιν τῶν ποδῶν μου.</td>
<td>Οὕτω λέγει Κύριος ὁ οὐρανὸς μου Ἱρώνος καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποστόθιν τῶν ποδῶν μου οἰκοδομήσεί μοι;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither the transposition in the latter passages, nor the abbreviations in the former, has any support in the manuscript of the LXX; both alterations of the original text are entirely accidental and undesigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ὅσε ἄγνωσαν εἰς ἡμέραν...</td>
<td>Εἶπαν τὸν Ἡρακλεῖα ἰσχυρὸν καὶ πειραστήσάν- τα πάσαν τὴν γῆν καὶ αὐτὸν τῷ Δίῳ ἐξ Ἀνκρή- νης γενόμενον καὶ ἀπο-</td>
<td>Καὶ αὐτὸς ἰσχυρὸν καὶ πειραστήσατα πάσαν τὴν γῆν καὶ αὐτὸν τῷ Δίῳ ἐξ Ἀλκμή- νης γενόμενον καὶ ἀπο-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Credner’s Beiträge zur Einleitung, &c. II. 62.
Justin, in his Apology, expresses the opinion, that demons, on the basis of Psalm xix. 6, had invented the Grecian tales of the giant-strength and prodigious labours of Hercules. He lays great stress on the word ἰσχυρος, and so does the author of the Dialogue. This word, moreover, is wanting in the text of the LXX. and is never found as a various reading, or used by any other of the Fathers.

Apol. 1, 15, p. 52, (p. 62, C.)

Διὰ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶς τοὺς μι-
σούσας ὑμᾶς, καὶ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς κα-
ταραμεύουσιν καὶ εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἵπ-
περαζόντων ὑμᾶς.

Apol. 1.16, p. 54, (p. 64, B.)

Πολλοὶ ἔχουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὁνόματι μου, ἐξωθεῖν ἐν ἐν-
δεδυμένοι δέρματα προβάτων, ἐσωθεῖν ἐν ὅπις ὕλοι ἀφ-
σαγεῖς.
---|---|---

These quotations differ, as it appears, more or less from the Biblical text, but agree essentially with one another in these very differences. These differences, too, are confirmed by no authority as more widely extended readings; they have no apocryphal gospel for their source, and in no point betray the marks of design.

Whence then arises this remarkable agreement of the Biblical quotations in the Dialogue and the Apology, exactly in the points where they differ from the received text? Plainly only from the fact, that the Dialogue and the Apology proceed from the same author. Justin quoted the Biblical passages freely from memory, and hence they often differ in form from the Biblical text: at the same time, it happened that many of these self-created anomalies were involuntarily impressed on his memory, and involuntarily recurred on other occasions. All other attempts at explanation are quite unsatisfactory. On the supposition that the Apology and the Dialogue were by different authors, we might admit an accidental coincidence in one quotation or another, but it is impossible that this should have been the case in all, and by no means probable in Psalm xix. 6. Or if we assumed an intentional

---

1 We may be inclined to this opinion by the passage in Isaiah lxvi. 1, which Clement of Alexandria quotes with the same inversion as Justin: Stromat. 5, 11, 76, T. III. p. 54, φυλα, σεισ εἰσε ἐναπθαμακίνε μη, λίγον νάφεις, τά δείνα με ἡμέρας και τά θέσιν. But since Clement was not acquainted with Justin's writings, another supposition remains possible, that he had unconsciously transferred this quotation from Justin's Apology in its unbiblical form, to his own work.
imitation of the citations in the Apology by the supposed different author of the Dialogue; it would still be quite inconceivable, why the forger should carry his imitation to such unessential and absolutely unimportant variations from the Biblical text,—why he should have made one part of a quotation conformable to his original, and left the other different,—and lastly, why he should not have cast by far the greater number of the citations in the Dialogue, into the form which they have in the Apology.

Thus the Old Testament, as well as the New Testament quotations, distinctly mark the identity of the Apology and the Dialogue.

The same result is obtained if we compare the peculiar mode of interpreting Scripture, which is found in both works. We do not here insist merely on a similarity or identity of exegetical principles, in which many of the Fathers agree, but in the explanation and application of individual Biblical passages, which are so unique that it cannot be presumed that several persons could have independently fallen on the same. We will give only one specimen of this sort, and since the agreement extends to the words, we shall present it in the original. It contains an exposition of the prophecy in Genesis xlix. 11.

Apol. 1, 32, p. 63, (p. 74, A. B.)

Τὸ πλῦνον τὴν σολήν αὐτοῦ ἐν αἷματι σταφυλῆς προαγωμένον ἦν τοῦ πᾶσος, ὦς πάσχειν ἐμελλε, διὶ αἴματος καθαρῶν τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῶ. 'Η γὰρ κειλημένη ἦν τὸ Χῖου πνεύματος διὰ τοῦ προφήτου σολῆν ὡς πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ εἰσὶν ἀδιστώτως, εἰς δὲ οἶκαὶ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Ισραήλ σπέρμα, ὁ λόγος. Τὸ δὲ εἰς-

Dial. c. Tr. c. 53, p. 149, (p. 273, D. 274, A.)

Τὸ ὕπο τοῦ παπρᾶσχον Ἰακώβ προαγωμένον, τὸ πλυνεῖν ἐν οἴνῳ τὴν σολῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν αἷματι σταφυλῆς τὴν περιβολήν αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἐκ αἷματι αὐτοῦ ἄποθεν μᾶλλον τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ ἐδήλου· σολῆν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ἄγνωμα τοῦς δι' αὐτοῦ ἄφενν ἀμαρτίων λαβόντας· ἐν δὲ
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μένον αἵμα τῆς σταύρυλῆς, σημαντικόν τοῦ ἔρχεσθαι μὲν αἵμα τὸν φανησάμενον, ἀλλὰ οὺς ἐξ ἀνθρωπίαν σπέρματος ἀλλ' ἐκ Δειος δυνάμεως... Οὐ γὰρ τοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου αἵμα οὐκ ἀνθρωπος πεποίηκεν, ἀλλ' ὁ Δειος οὖν τῶν καὶ τούτῳ ἐμπνευστο, οὕς ἐξ ἀνθρωπία ἀποκάλυπτος σπέρματος, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Δειος δυνάμεως.—“Ον γὰρ τοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου αἵμα οὐκ ἀνθρωπος ἐγέννησεν, ἀλλ' Δειος οὖν καὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ αἵμα ἐκ ἀνθρωπίαν γένους ἐσπάθαι, ἀλλ' ἐκ Δειος δυνάμεως προειμηνύσω.

Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 1, 32, p. 63.

“This expression, ‘washing his garment in the blood of the grape,’ was predictive of the passion he was about to suffer, making expiation by his blood for those who believe on him. For the garment named by the divine Spirit through the prophet, are the men who believe him, in whom the Word, the seed from God dwells. And the expression ‘blood of the grape,’ is significant of him who was to appear, having blood, but not of human seed, but of divine power. For in the same manner as ‘the blood of the grape’ is made not by man but by God, thus it is signified that his blood was produced not by human seed but by the power of God.”

Dial. c. Tr. c. 53.

“As to what was prophesied by the patriarch Jacob, ‘He shall wash his robe in wine, and his vesture in the blood of the grape,—it signifies, that he would cleanse by his blood those who should believe on him;
for the Holy Spirit calls those who receive remission of sins through him, his robe, in whom he is always present by his inworking, and will be so manifestly at his second appearing. And by the expression, blood of the grape, the word intimates that Christ has blood by the divine power, and not of human seed. For in the same manner as the blood of the grape is not produced by man but by God, thus also the blood of Christ (it is presignified) would not be of human origin, but by the power of God."

Surely no one would maintain that this exposition can be the production of men independent of one another. But the supposition of the imitation of one exposition by the other is excluded, since the Dialogue in many other places, where it agrees with the Apology in the meaning of Biblical passages in the leading points, yet differs from it in subordinate particulars. Thus, for example, in Apol. 1, 32, p. 63, (p. 73, E. 74, A.) the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy, Gen. xlix. 11, ἐσεμένων πρὸς ἀμπλίον τῶν πῶλον αὐτοῦ, is found simply in the event that Christ ordered his disciples to bring the foal of the ass, which was bound at the entrance of Bethphage, and made his entrance upon it into Jerusalem; on the other hand, in Dial. c. Tr. c. 53, p. 148, (p. 272, C. D. 273, A. B.) peculiar stress is laid on the circumstance, that Christ ordered the ass to be brought along with the foal, and it is remarked, that this was an intimation, that heathens as well as Jews would be brought to Christ. By the term πῶλος, the Old Testament had already referred to the Gentiles, who, first through the gospel, were brought to wear the bit and bridle, but by the term ὐνος, to the Jews, who had already been accustomed to the yoke of the law.¹ It is perfectly incredible that

¹ Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, E), and Dial. c. Tr. c. 16, p. 117, (p. 234, C.) c. 95, p. 192, (p. 323, B.) c. 133, p. 226, (p. 363, C.)
any man who intended to foist a work of his own, under the name of another person, should have made to the original, whose style he intended to imitate, such enlargements and additions, as the Dialogue offers to the exposition given in the Apology of Genesis xlix. 11. The agreement in some points, and the licence in others, which the Apology and the Dialogue exhibit in the Old Testament, force us to adopt the opinion, that both were the work of the same author.¹

This identity of authorship, is further evident, from several notices in themselves, indifferent and accidental, which belong equally to the Dialogue and the Apologies. In both writings, it is observed, that the Jews hate, and consider as enemies, all Christians, and whenever political relations is allowed, persecuted them bitterly, and that the head of the demons in the sacred books, is called the Serpent, Satan, and the Devil.²

Apol. 1, 28, p. 60, (p. 71, A.)

Translation of the Greek.
Apol. 1, 28, p. 60.

“Among us the leader of the evil demons is called Serpent, and Satan, and Devil, as you may learn by examining our writings.”

¹ Apol. 1, 63, p. 81, (p. 95, D.) and Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 151, sq. (p. 275, C. 276. C.)
² Apol. 1, 40, p. 67, (p. 78, E,) and Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 198, (p. 330, C.)
Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 198.

"The Devil, whom Moses indeed calls Serpent, but in Job and Zechariah, is called Devil, and by Jesus is addressed as Satan."

Also, that Christ is called ἄγγελος in the Old Testament, because he announced to men, what God wished to be revealed to them. The Dialogue shares even its historical mistakes with the Apologies, the false designation of king of the Jews given to the tetrarch Herod Antipas.

Nor is the agreement between these compositions less in individual remarks belonging to the department of apologetics. In both, for example, almost in the same expressions, the assurance is given, that the faith of Christians, not only is not weakened by the calamities which the church endured, but rather confirmed, since all these calamities only befell it in conformity to the distinct predictions of Christ.

Apol. 1, 12, p. 50, (p. 60, A.)

Διὰ τὸ ἐξήγεσις τοῦ νόμου ἄνθρωποι πάντως ἔδησαν τὴν ἡμέραν τὸ διδασκαλίαν τοῦ Βυζαντίου. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τινὶς τοῦ κυρίου συμβιβάζει καὶ ἀναγινώσκει τὰ διδασκαλία τοῦ Βυζαντίου, τότε γίνεται ἀνωτέρω, καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν τὰ διδασκαλία τοῦ Βυζαντίου.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 35, p. 132, (p. 253, B.)

Ἡμεῖς, οἱ τῆς ἁγίασίας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ καθά πᾶσας διδασκαλίας μαθηταί, πιστότεροι καὶ βεβαιότεροι γινόμεθα ἐν τῇ ἑλπίδι τῇ καθηγησίᾳ γελούνδε ἡμῖν αὐτῶν. Σε γὰρ προλαβόντας μίλλοις γίνομεν ἐν δύναμι αὐτῶν ἐφε, ταῦτα ἐζητεῖται ἔργα ἡμῶν τελοῦμεν.

Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 1, 12, p. 50.

“Our teacher foretold that all these things would come to pass, whence also we are confirmed in all that
he has taught, since whatever he foretold would come to pass has manifestly become a reality.”

Dial. c. Tr. c. 3, p. 132.

“We who are disciples of the true and pure doctrine of Jesus, have become more trustful and more confirmed in the hope announced by him. For what he said (by anticipation) would come to pass in his name, this we have seen accomplished visibly and powerfully.”

In both writings, it is represented, that the divine punishment must fall on Jews and Gentiles, for their estrangement from God, and their persecuting spirit, but that it was hitherto delayed, because souls from among them were still daily converted to Christ, and saved by the faith of the gospel.

Apol. 1, 28, p. 61, (p. 71, B.)

"Ον (διάβολον) είς τὸ πόρον πεμφθείσας δια μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιάς καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων ἀνθρώπων, κολασθήσας τὸν απέβαλλεν αἰώνα, προεμήνυσεν ὁ Χριστός. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιμονὴ τοῦ μηδέστω τούτῳ πράξαι τὸν οἶκον, διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπων γένος γεγένηται. Προ-γενώσχει γὰρ τινὰς ἐκ μετανοιας σωθησόμει μέλλοντας καὶ τινὰς μηδέστω ἦσας γεννηθέν- τας.

Apol. 2, 7, p. 93, (p. 45, B)

'Ἐπιμένει δὲ Ἰσσος τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσαι τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ σιωπᾶσαι, ἵνα καὶ οἱ φαύλοι ἀγαλ- λοι καὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἀνθρώποι μη- κέντη ὅσι, διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὁ γεγένηκεν ἐν τῇ φύσει ὦτι αὐτίον ἐστίν.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 39, p. 136, (p. 258, A.)

Καὶ γὰρ ὁ οὐδέστω τὴν κρίσιν ἐπήνεγ- χεν ἡ ἐστάσει, γη- νώσχειν ὦτι καὶ ἠ- μέραν τινὰς μαρτυ- ρισμένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χρισ- τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολέσθωσα τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης.
Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 1, 28, p. 61.

"Christ foretold that he (the devil) would be sent into the fire with his host, and the men who follow him, and would be punished for an endless duration. For the reason why God has delayed to do this, is his regard to the human race. For he foreknows that some will be saved by repentance, and that some are not yet born."

Apol. 2, 7, p. 93.

"God delays the breaking up and dissolution of the whole world, that the bad angels, and daemons, and men, may no longer be, on account of the seed of the Christians, which he knows is causal (of this delay) according to the constitution of nature."

Dial. c. Tr. c. 39, p. 136.

"And now he has not yet inflicted, nor is inflicting judgment, knowing that now daily some are made disciples in the name of his Christ, and are forsaking the way of error."

In both writings, the confessedly partial resemblance of the Grecian myths, with some incident in the life of Christ, is attributed to daemons. These, so it was said, in order to render innoxious the coming of Christ, foreseen by them as pregnant with danger to themselves, on the ground of the Old Testament prophecies, had typically expressed the most important events of the life of Christ, and the principal usages of the Christian Church, in caricature, in the facts of the Grecian mythology, and the usages of the heathen cultus, under the foolish presumption that men, if they noticed, after the actual advent of Christ, the resemblance of the scriptural narratives to these fables might look upon the whole evangelical history as nothing more than a myth. Thus the daemons had taken occasion, from Gen. xlix. 10, &c. to make Bacchus the
son of Zeus, and discoverer of the vine, to invent the story of his ascension to heaven after being lacerated, and to introduce the use of wine in his mysteries. Thus, in reference to the prophecy in Isaiah vii. 14, they had framed the story of Perseus, born of a virgin, and had founded on Is. xxxv. 6, the myth of healing the sick and raising the dead by Esculapius. The agreement of the longer Apology and the Dialogue in the representation of these views is so great, that it is partly apparent in the words; but, on the other hand, it is not so complete as not to allow of some differences. In both respects the supposition of a designed imitation is excluded. For a copyist, if he had intended a verbal imitation, would have adhered more closely to his original; or, if he had thought a partial deviation necessary, he would have made it more considerable.  

Apol. 1, 54, p. 75, (p. 89, D.)

Τούτων τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων (Gen. xlix. 10.) ἀκούσαντες οἱ δαίμονες Διὸς, μὴ ἔφασαν γεγονέναι υἱὸν τοῦ Διὸς, εὐφημεῖ δὲ γενέσθαι ἀμπελῶν παρέδωκαν καὶ οἶνον ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις αὐτοῦ, ἀναγράφουσι, καὶ διασταραξθέντα αὐτῶν ἀνελημέναι εἰς οὑρανὸν ἰδιαῖαν.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 69, p. 167, (p. 294, D. 295, A.)

"Ὅταν Διὸς υἱὸν τοῦ Διὸς ἐν μύξεις ἤν μεμβραχθεὶς αὐτὸν τῇ Σεμέλῃ, γεγενέθαι λέγωσι καὶ τοῦτον εὐφημεῖ ἀμπελῶν γενόμενον καὶ διασταραξθέντα καὶ ἀναγράφουσι ἀνελημέναι εἰς οὐρανὸν ἰδιαῖαν."  

1 He would indisputably have, above all, retained the freedom with which the parallel is carried out between the mysteries of Mithras and the Christian supper, Apol. 1, 66, p. 83, (p. 98, C.) and Dial. c. Tr. c. 70, p. 168, (p. 296, B.)
Apol. 1, 54, p. 76, (p. 90, A.)

"Orê di ἧκουσαν διὰ τοῦ ἄλλου σφορήτου Ἰσαίου (Is. vii. 14.) λέγων, ἵνα διὰ ταξινόμου τεχνηταὶ καὶ διὰ ἰαυτοῦ ἀνελύσονται· εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, τὸν Περσία λιθάθηναι, προσβάλλοντο.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 70, p. 169, (p. 297, B.)

"Οραν ἐκ σαββίνου γεγενηθειν ἐς τὸν Περσία ἀνωθέν, καὶ τούτῳ μμαθεῖαι τὸν πλάνον ὅριν αὐνῆμι.

Apol. 1, 54, p. 76, (p. 90, B.)

"Ορε δὲ πάλιν ἤμαθον σφορήτως Ἰσαακίππου αὐτοῦ πάλιν νῦν καὶ νεωτέρος ἀνεγίησις, τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν παρήγγειλαν.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 69, p. 167, (p. 295, B. D.)

"Οραν τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν νέως ανεγίησιν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τάξει Ἰσαακίππου ἀναφημενα, οὐχὶ τὰς περὶ Χριστοῦ ἀμοίβας προφητείας μεμιμήθηται τούτοις καὶ ἐπὶ τούτω φημι;"

Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 1, 54, p. 75.

"When the Demons heard these prophetic words, (Gen. xlix. 10,) they said that Dionysus was a son of Zeus, but gave out that he was inventor of the wine, and prescribe the use of wine in his mysteries, and taught that after he had been torn in pieces he returned to heaven."

Dial. c. Tr. c. 69, p. 167, &c.

"When they say that Dionysus was a son of Zeus, the offspring of his intercourse with Semele, and that he was the inventor of the wine, and was torn in pieces, and dying, was restored to life and returned to heaven, and introduce wine in his mysteries, do I not perceive an imitation of the prophecy delivered by the patriarch Jacob, and recorded by Moses?"
Apol. 1, 54, p. 76.

"And when they heard it said by another prophet, Isaiah, that he should be born of a virgin, and by himself return to heaven, they pretended that Perseus was spoken of."

Dial. c. Tr. c. 70, p. 169.

"But when I hear that Perseus was born of a virgin, I understand that the old serpent has imitated this also."

Apol. 1, 54, p. 76.

"And when they found it predicted that he would cure all manner of diseases, and raise the dead, they brought in Esclapius."

Dial. c. Tr. c. 69, p. 167.

"But when he brings in Esclapius raising the dead, and healing all diseases, may I not say, that in this instance, the prophecies concerning Christ are imitated?"

We think it therefore fully proved that the Dialogue with Trypho is a genuine work of Justin. It would be easy to enlarge the proofs adduced for this position, by the addition of a great many more; but it would be merely an ostentatious accumulation of matter which is uncalled for.

We now proceed, without further delay, to a discussion of the question, whether we have before us, in this Dialogue, (considering it genuine), an account of a real conversation between Justin and the Jew Trypho, or whether the conversational form is only a mode of representation arbitrarily chosen. Many learned men have maintained the first.¹ Others consider the se-

¹ Krom's Diatribe de authentia, p. 26. Lumper, De vita scriptis et doctrina sanctorum patrum, T. ii. p. 90, sq. Winter's
cond opinion as more probable. If we view the question without prejudice, we cannot hesitate to decide in favour of the former. The work itself, throughout, professes to be the representation of an actual conversation: thus Dial. c. Tr. c. 80, p. 177, (p. 306, D.: ἢ εἰ εἰς ἤμων μόνων τούτο λέγειν με ἵστοσαμι, τῶν γεγενημένων ἡμῖν λόγων ἀπαντῶν, ὡς δύναμις μου, σύνταξιν ἀποίσομαι, εἰν οἷς καὶ τούτῳ ὁμολογοῦντά με, δὲ καὶ σὺν ὑμᾶς ὁμολογῶ, ἵγγεις. "And that you may know that I do not say this to you alone, I will make a compilation of all our discourses, as far as I have ability, in which I will represent myself as making the same profession which I make to you." Eusebius also maintains the historical reality of the conversation, and in doing so, follows not a mere probability, but a historical (though somewhat wavering) tradition. Lastly, this opinion is strongly supported by that zeal for disputation, which Justin on other occasions manifested in the cause of the Christian Faith. We need not indeed suppose, that the Dialogue is a verbally accurate re-


2 Hist. eccles. 4, 18, T. i. p. 378.

3 Thus the Martyr in his shorter Apology (Apol. 2, 3, p. 91, p. 47, B.) after he had spoken of his intercourse with the Cynic Crescens, makes this offer to the Roman Emperor: εἰ μὴ οὕτως ἔσθην ὑμῖν αἱ κανόνια τῶν λόγων, ἵστοσε καὶ ἢ ὁμοίως κανόνια τῶν ἱερεσίων τάξιν βασιλικὰ ὥς ἐν καὶ τούτῳ ἤγερον ἐν — "If those disputations have not been communicated to you, I am prepared to discuss the question again with you, and this would be an employment worthy of a sovereign."
port of the conversation actually held, although it tends to give us that impression. Nor is it of any use curiously to enquire who this Jew Trypho was, for on this point all information is wanting. The statement of Eusebius that Trypho was τοῖς Ἐβραῖοις ἐπισημοτάτος, and the vague supposition grounded upon it,¹ that he was identical with the famous Rabbi Tarpho, the teacher or colleague of Rabbi Akiba, is most conclusively refuted by the Dialogue itself. For Trypho not only never appears in it under the character of a Rabbi, but many passages necessarily lead to a directly opposite conclusion. Thus Justin says to Trypho and his companions: (Dial. c. Tr. c. 62, p. 159, (p. 285, B.) οὖν μὴ ἦν ἐκεῖνα λέγητε, ἐὰν οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν λέγουσιν “that you may not say the same things which your teachers say,” and to Trypho alone, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 9, p. 110, p. 226, C.) οὐ γὰρ ἤδης ἐστὶ λίγετε ἀλλὰ πεπόνησας τοῖς διδασκάλοις, οὗ οὐ συνίασι τὰς γράφας, καὶ ἀποκατευθύνεις λέγεις, ὃ τι ἂν σοι ἐπὶ Ἡμῶν ἐλεηθεί—

“For you know not what you say; but, trusting to teachers who do not understand the Scriptures, you speak by guess whatever may come into your mind;”

and Trypho himself acknowledges, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 38, p. 134, (p. 256, B.)—καλῶν ἦν πιστῖν τὰς ἡμᾶς τοῖς διδασκαλοῖς ὑποτάσσοντες, μηδενὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑμίλης, μηδὲ σοι τούτων κοινωνήσαι τῶν λόγων. “It would have been well if we had obeyed our teachers, who have forbidden us to have intercourse with any of you, or to converse with you on this subject.”

As to the place in which the conversation with Trypho was held, Eusebius² names Ephesus, certainly not without the authority of a historical tradition. Credner³ thinks it more probable, from Trypho’s ac-

³ Beiträge, &c. I. 99.
count of himself, Dial. c. Tr. c. 1, p. 102, (p. 217, D.) εἰμὶ Ἑβραῖος ἐκ περιτομῆς, φυγὼν τοῦ νῦν γενόμενον πτέρευς, ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καὶ τῇ Καριά τὰ πολλὰ διάγων. "I am a Hebrew of the circumcision, a fugitive on account of the recent war, and have spent much time in Greece and Corinth;"—that Justin met and disputed with Trypho at Corinth;¹ but Lücke has justly remarked,² that in this case, Justin would have rendered his topographical reference more definite by using the particle ἵνα, or some other equivalent word, and this objection is not so trivial, nor the required addition of the particle ἵνα so unmeaning as Credner³ imagines. Certainly Trypho, if he met with Justin at Corinth, at the very time when he gave this account of his usual residence, could not have expressed himself otherwise than, "Since I escaped from the recent war, I have lived for the most part in Hellas and here in Corinth." At least in this accidental mention of Corinth, there is as little an intimation that Tryphon was with Justin in that city when he made the assertion, as it could be rationally inferred, from hearing a Polish exile say, "Since the last political change in my fatherland, I have lived chiefly in France, and in Paris;"—that he was actually living in Paris, when he uttered those words. The Dialogue itself does not indicate that it took place in Ephesus, but then it contains, in general, no definite local allusion; and thus we must be satisfied with the statement of Eusebius till its incorrectness can be demonstrated.

The time when this Dialogue with Trypho was held and committed to writing, cannot be exactly determined. Thus much is certain, that it was composed after the longer Apology, therefore after A. D. 139, for it contains a passage in which there is a distinct reference

¹ Some years before, Rettig had expressed the same opinion, but soon discovered its unsoundness, and gave it up.
² Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannes, p. 274.
³ Einleitung in das N. T. I. 735.
to the Apology. Prudentius Maranus believes, also, that it may be inferred, from a passage in the Dialogue, where Justin reproaches the Jews: c. 16, p. 117, (p. 234, C.) οὐ γὰρ ἰδούσιαν ἔχετε, αὐτὸχειες γενέσθαι ἡμῶν διὰ τοὺς νῦν ἐπιχρηστῶντας· ἰδακίς δὲ ἐν ἐθνήθησεν, καὶ τούτο ἑσπέρατε,—"for ye have not the power to become our masters, on account of those who now have the rule; but, as often as you are able, you do this;"—that the Dialogue took place before the accession of Marcus Aurelius, and therefore before A. D. 101, because in the phrase διὰ τοὺς νῦν ἐπιχρηστῶντας, there is a manifest allusion to a prince who had taken the Christians under his imperial protection, which could never be said of one so unfavourably disposed to them as Marcus Aurelius. But the words adduced by no means say this. The whole passage contains an allusion to the insurrection of the Jews under Bar-Kochba, in which the bloody hatred of the rebels turned also against the Christians; and the expression τοὺς νῦν ἐπιχρηστῶντας merely marks in general the Roman government, under whose restraint it was impossible for the Jews to vent their malice on the Christians whenever they were disposed. In fine, Lücke may justly assert "that the Dialogue cannot have been written before A. D. 139; but it was not written much later;" he gives, however, no evidence for the correctness of this date.

Lastly, as to what concerns the integrity of the Dialogue; though we cannot say that it contains direct interpolations, such as Rettig imagines he has found, and of which, by the help of an ill-directed acuteness, he has attempted to give an instance, namely, in the testimony of the Johannean origin of the New Testament

1 The passage has been quoted already, *Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 214, (p. 349, C.) and Apol. 1, 26, p. 59, (p. 69, D.) Cumpare Buddeus, *De haeresi Valentin*, in the Appendix to his *Introductio ad historiam philosophiae Hebraorum*, (Hal. 1702), p. 416, sq.


3 *Versuch*, &c. p. 275.
Apocalypse, still it appears that the Dialogue has not come down to us altogether perfect. For, according to several statements in it, the conversation between Justin and Trypho lasted two days, and yet no passage can be found which precisely indicates where the conversation of the first day breaks off and that of the second begins. There are also references to discussions that had already taken place, of which the Dialogue, in its present state gives no further account.¹

If it be asked in what part there is probably a hiatus where the close of the first day's conversation and the beginning of the next are lost;—it must be looked for within the portion c. 70, p. 168, p. (p. 296, B.) c. 78, p. 175, (p. 304, A.) for, at the latter point, Justin remarks ὡς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ σωμάτου τοῦ κατὰ τὸ σπήλαιον ἐπανεκπερισσέως, ἀνιστόρητος ὑμᾶς, καὶ δει αὐτοῖς δὲ τοὺς σήμερον σὺν ὑμῖν ἱλάτος τά διὰ συνικατοποιήσωμαι, ἵππωκατο καὶ ἀνιστόρητον ἂν καὶ συνέγεραν αὐτὸ τὸ Ἰσαὰκ περιγράφειν, εἰπών, διὰ τοὺς λόγους ἰσαίνοντος τοὺς τὰ Μελέτῃ μεταφρασμένα παραδοθόντας ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαλομένως παρά αὐτοῖς σπηλαίῳ μνείασαν ὧν ἀποκαθιστήσω, ὧδε τὸ διαβόλου ἐνεργηθῆναι εἰπεῖν;²—"I have repeated to you that Isaiah prophesied concerning the symbol which related to the cave, but, on account of those who came with us to-day, I will repeat the passage, and I have repeated the passage which I before copied from Isaiah, saying, 'that thou who taught the mysteries of Mythra were impelled by the devil to say, that in a place named a cave by them, they were initiated by them;’

—and the discussion to which he refers in these words is in c. 70, p. 168, (p. 296, B.) Also in c. 74, p. 172, (p. 300, A.) there is an evident hiatus between the words ὡς καὶ δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς, εἰς ὑπὸ οὗ τοῦ ἐσοφρεύεται.

¹ *Diāl. c. Tr. c. 85, p. 182, (p. 311, D.) ὡς καὶ σπῆλαιον ἐπανεκπερισσέως, διὰ τοῦτο τός μὲν καὶ ἵππωκα ἐπικαλομένως ἠμᾶς. Compare c. 78, p. 175, (p. 304, A.) c. 85, p. 183, (p. 312, B.) c. 92, p. 190, (p. 320, B.) c. 94, p. 191, (p. 322, B.) c. 118, p. 211, (p. 346, C.)


³ Justin speaks of the cave near Bethlehem, in which he supposed that Christ was born,
CHAPTER III.

THE EXHORTATION TO THE GREEKS.

This piece also merits a place among the genuine works of Justin, though its claims have not been left undisputed. After it had been marked as suspicious by Hülseman,1 Oudini2 first made the attempt to prove its spuriousness. This first attempt, however, was rather superficial, on which account it could not have been difficult for the learned Prudentius Maranus3 to have briefly shown its essential unsoundness. Nevertheless, the doubts that had been once raised continued for a long time, and no one thought of giving them a second and deeper investigation. Thus Ziegler4 treated this piece, without scruple, as a forgery, although he could not deny that it displayed the mode of thinking prevalent in the second century. In modern times Herbig,6 Arendt6, and Möhler7 were the first who, with critical skill, repeated the attempt to confirm its spuriousness. In opposition to these latest attempts, which display both industry and acuteness, and render one another mutual aid, embracing everything essential which, with any appearance of reason, can be urged against the genuineness of "the Exhortation," we shall develop the grounds on which we believe that we ought to abide by the ancient opinion of Justin’s authorship.

1 Patrologia ed. Scherzer, Lips. 1670, p. 983.
3 Prolegomena in Opp. Justin. 3, 1, 5, p. lxix, sqq.
5 Comment. de scriptis qua sub nomine Justini. . . . circumstantur, p. 501, sqq.
7 Patrologie, I. 224.
The first objection which Arendt\(^1\) and Iherig\(^2\) have started against the genuineness of "the Exhortation," that its title is not found in any of the catalogues which Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius have given of Justin's writings, is without weight, and more than that, completely unfounded. Let it be granted that the authors just named do not mention this piece, yet this circumstance is of no real importance. For Eusebius\(^3\) confesses, after recounting a series of Justin's works, "several other works of his are extant among the brethren." But Jerome, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, seldom gives more than a translation of the materials he found in Eusebius. Lastly, Photius, in his Bibliotheca merely intended to give the titles and abstract of the books which he read during the continuance of his mission in Assyria. From the mere silence of these three writers no inference can justly be drawn. But this silence does not exist; for the Exhortation is actually mentioned by all three, though under another title. Eusebius,\(^4\) after naming Justin's two Apologies, says; καὶ Ἁλλαξ ὁ πρὸς Ἐλλήνας, ἐν ὧν, μαχαρὺς περὶ πληθὺς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν τι καὶ τοῖς Ἐλληνῶν φιλοσόφοις ἡ πολιτικὴ λόγον, περὶ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων διαλαμβάνει φύσις .... καὶ αὐθίνες ἐπεραν πρὸς Ἐλλήνας εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐκλήθη ἐν αὐτοῦ σημαίνομεν, καὶ ἐπιγράφων Ἐλεγχον. —"And another against the Greeks, in which he treats at large most of the points at issue between us and the Grecian philosophers, and gives his opinion respecting the nature of Dæmons,—and another work of his against the Greeks has come into our hands, which he entitled "A Confutation." Jerome\(^5\) states the same, almost word for word. Lastly, Photius\(^6\) tells us τίσασας πραγματείας κατὰ τῶν Ἐννὼν συνετὰς ...., ἐν δὲ τῇ τρίτῃ περὶ φύσις δαιμόνων διιλείχας ὃς τάγας 

---

1 Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 269.
2 Comment. de Scriptis, p. 51.
5 De vir. illustr. c. 23, T. I. p. 178.
6 Biblioth. cod. 125, T. L p. 94, sq.
He composed four treatises against the Gentiles,—in the third he discourses concerning the nature of Dæmons; but the fourth treatise, in like manner, against the Greeks, which bears the title Ελεγχος.—In these accounts the title "Ελεγχος means the writing which, incorrectly, though commonly, has the inscription λόγος παραπεμφτος τῷ Ἑλληναῖς, and corresponds with the character of the composition, which is by no means paraenetic, but argumentative. The author wished to determine the Greeks to receive the Christian religion. This object he pursues by a destructive method. He attempts, philosophically, to annihilate the Hellenic religion, in order to force them to the reception of the new and better faith; he aims to destroy the objects of Hellenic devotion, in order to awaken a longing after another and a more satisfying one. For this purpose he adduces the fables of the poets and the contradictory opinions of the philosophers, especially of Plato and Aristotle, those pillars of Grecian philosophy, in evidence that hitherto the Greeks had been destitute of all true knowledge of God. He did not, indeed, conceal that the Grecian poets and philosophers had sometimes brought forward doctrines, which approximated, or wholly corresponded to the Christian faith, but which he proceeded to show could by no means belong originally to Hellenism, and possessed only a relative truth; for the Grecian poets and philosophers had obtained those fragments of religious truth, not from themselves but from the perusal of the Old Testament, whose origin reached far higher than the beginning of Grecian literature. After the author had pursued this train of thought in detail, for the purpose, as he expressly declared, of convincing the Greeks that religious knowledge was utterly unattainable by means of their teachers;¹ he then briefly mentions the fountain at

¹ Cohort. ad Græc. c. 34, p. 31. τῶν χάριν μοναστησάσα τῆς τῶν ποιήσαντος, οὗ ἔνθις Ἠλληνα; ἦσα γραμματεῖα τῆς ἁγίας διαθήκης ἐκ διαλείμματος παρὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μαθητῶν, τῶν μηδὲ ἐστὶ ὡς ὑπὸ τῶν
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whose waters the Greeks might quench their religious thirst, namely, the Hebrew prophets, who were enlightened by the Divine Spirit, and thoroughly imbued with a full and pure knowledge of God; he declares that even by the Grecian oracles, the exclusive possession of true wisdom had been confessed to belong to the Hebrews. On this statement, the author finally grounds a short exhortation, not to neglect the study of the prophets, and to connect with it the reading of the Sybilline Oracles, which were in harmony with the prophets, and, indeed, contained distinct and clear prophecies of Christ. It is plain that a composition of such contents, and for such an object, could only, with the greatest impropriety, be called hortatory. Exhortation, it is true, was its final aim, but not its fundamental character, not that which formed its main substance; it was only the conclusion that resulted from developed premises. The groundwork of the piece is an argument or refutation of the supposition that Hellenism, as such, was in possession of the true religion. So that, as far as the contents are concerned, there is nothing to prevent our taking the falsely called λόγος παραιτητικός πρὸς Ἔλληνος" to be the Ἔλληνος which Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius, reckon among Justin's works. The correctness of this opinion is indubitably confirmed by a passage in Photius. Photius therein gives a thesis of Stephen Gobarus, in which this Tritheist wished to prove that what is changeable by nature cannot become unchangeable by
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"On what account am I now induced to mention these things, O Grecians? that you may know that it is not possible to learn the true religion from these men, who, even in works which excited admiration among those who were foreign from our religion, could not write any thing strictly their own."

The piece itself shews that this is its object, by the use of this very word ἔλληνος. Thus, at the close of an important proof for the subject of the piece, it is said:—ἄλλῳ ἐν τούτῳ ὑπατημάτῳ γενομένῳ ἄλλῳς ἑλληνικοῖς ἐλάχιστοι, c. 7, p. 12, (p. 8, A.) and in c. 11, p. 15, (p. 12, A.) ἐναντίον τῶν παραθεμάτων τῆς ἐπεξηγήσεως ἑλληνικής πρὸς ὑπατηματο οὖσαν ἀναφορά καὶ ὑπάτης ἑλληνικὴ τιλήν.
the will of God; ὅτι πάντα γενητὸν φαρέται ἐστὶ καὶ ζητόν, βουλῆσαι δὲ θεοῦ διαμένει ἄλον καὶ ἀφφαστον καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐναντίας, ὅτι τὸ φύει φαρέται οὐ δύναται ἀφφαστον εἶναι βουλῆσαι θεῷ ἐναντία γὰρ δοξάζει ἦνατο τὸ τοῦτο λέγων καὶ ἀδύνατα χαίρεται τῷ δημιουργῷ. "That every thing produced is corruptible and mortal; but, by the will of God, it remains undissolved and incorrupt; and, on the contrary, that what is corruptible cannot be incorruptible by the will of God; for he who says this makes opposite supposition, and attributes impossibilities to the Creator."—(Photius remarks on this;) τὰυτὰς τῆς δόξης χρήσαι μὲν παξίθηκεν ἐκ τῆς Μάρτυρος Ἰουστίνου τῷ δὲ πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν μὲν δόξαν συνεννυκτο μάχη καὶ τοῦ Πλατωνικοῦ ἐλεγχος καθεσκευάζοντο, εἰρηνικοῦ ἐπίτευρο ἐγένετο, ἀδάνατοι μὲν εὑρὶ ἐστὶ δὲ ἄλον σώματα ἵνα γε μὴν λυθήσοντο ὑπὲρ τεῦξεις θεᾶτοι μορίας, τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως ἰσχυροσέρου δεσμὰ λαχώντες. Καὶ ὁ μὲν μάρτυς, τὸ Πλατωνικὸν διαλέγχων σώφωμα, ἐπιδεικνύσε τὸν Πλατώνα τοῦ τε δημιουργὸν ἐπισάγοντα τα' αναινεία λέγοντα ἦνατο. —"He adopted the use of this opinion from Justin Martyr, who carried on a dispute against the Grecian opinion, and prepared a confutation of Plato, 'since you are brought into being, you are not altogether immortal nor indissoluble; yet you will not be dissolved nor obtain the lot of death, receiving a stronger bond by my counsel.’ (Platon. Timæus. 41, B.) And the Martyr, confuting the Platonic sophism, proves that Plato introduces the Creator contradicting himself."—

This thesis of Stephen Gobarus, as well as the additional quotation from Photius, is to be found, the greater part literally, and some things according to the sense in the Exhortation to the Greeks.¹ Not only Stephen Gobarus,² but also Photius, was acquainted

¹ Cohort. ad Graec. c. 23, p. 23, sq. (p. 21, c. D. 22, A.)
² This tritheist lived in the sixth century; at this time, therefore, “the Exhortation” must have been generally known and circulated. But proofs of the existence and universal reputation of this piece may be traced much farther back. Cyrill the bishop of Alexandria (†444) makes repeated use of it in his books against the imperial apostate Julian. It will be sufficient to quote a few passages, and briefly to point out others.—
with the writings from actual perusal; and the latter expressly declares that it was a work of Justin Martyr. But now, as we have already remarked, Photius, (at the wish of his brother Tarasius,) set himself the task

Justin. Cohort. ad Gr. c. 6, p. 11, (p. 7, B. C.)

Τὸ γὰρ Πλάτωνος τρίς ἄρχεσ τῷ πατῶς ὤναι λίγοντος, Σιου καὶ ὠλυ χαὶ ὅπερ,  Ἡδον μὲν, τὸ ἐντός ποιήσαντος ὄλυος δὲ, τὸν ἐν τούτῳ μήν τη διαιρε- 

μίσθῳ τῇ πτώτῃ τῷ γεωργίῳ γενέσθαι καὶ τῇ πρόθεσιν αὐτῷ τῇ ἐξαιρετικῇ παρουσιάν οἴκει δὲ, τὸ ἱκάνον τῷ γραμμίσει παρασκευήμα 

Ἀντικεντάς οὖν μὲν ὅπερ ὁ ἄρχων ὁ δὲ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ ἐν τῷ γραμμίσει παρασκευήμα. Ἀντικεντάς δὲ παλαιᾷ ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ 

τῇ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ περιβάλλοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ περιβάλλοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ περιβάλλοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ περιβάλλοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρχηγῷ περιβάλλοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρ χηγῷ περιβάλ λοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρ χηγῷ περιβάλλοντες, τῇ τῷ ἀρ χηγῷ περιβάλ 

L. 1, T. vi. p. 33, A. B.

Καὶ μὲν καὶ Ὁρθός ἀρχεῖ ὅπως ἑνὸς ἐν τῷ φυσικῷ

Οὐκ ἦν ἄρχεσιν ὅπως ἑνὸς ἐν τῷ φυσικῷ

᾽Αλλ᾽ ἄρχεσιν ὅπως ἑνὸς ἐν τῷ φυσικῷ

'Ἡμᾶς κόσμος δικαίον ἑαυτῆς συμβαίνειν βελαίον. Εἰς τοὶς ἕως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔρθαι ἑαυτ ῖ.
of inserting, in his well-known and famous Bibliotheca, at length, though not in a very orderly manner, the title and some outlines of all the heathen and Christian writings which he had read during his Assyrian em-

c. 20, p. 21, (p. 18, D. E.)

Πλάτων, ἀντιδιάμονος μὲν, ὡς Ἕλλην, τὴν πρειζον ἰδιαῖον μόνον Σίων Μακρίνου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν ἱστοριαλῶς . . . . διὰ δὲ τὰ συμβεβηκὼς Σωκράτους διδόμενοι, μήτε καὶ αὐτῷ 'Αντώνος τινὰ καὶ Μίλητος καὶ Σίων ἱστορίας διδασκαλίαν τε καὶ εἰσίν οἷον τὰ παρακεκολομμένα καταγεγραμμένα αὐτῷ παρ' Ἑθνολογῶς . . . . φήβον τῆς 

Justin. Coh. ad Gr. c. 6, p. 11, p. 7, B. C.

"For Plato said that there were three principles of the universe; God, and Matter, and Form: God indeed, the maker of all things, but Matter a substratum to the primary generation of the things made, and furnishing him with the occasion of his workmanship; but Form the pattern of each of the things made. Aristotle indeed makes no mention of Form as a principle, but affirms that there are two principles, God and Matter."

c. 7, p. 12, (p. 8, A. B.)

"Plato sometimes says, that there are three principles of the universe, God, and Matter, and Form, and sometimes four; for he adds the Soul of the world. And again, having first said that Matter is unbegotten, he afterwards says, that it is begotten, and having first allowed Form to be a separate principle, and declared that it has an independent subsistence, he afterwards reckons it among the notions of the mind."

Justin. Coh. ad Gr. c. 15, p. 19, (p. 16, B.)

"Orpheus in his 'oaths' thus speaks,
"'I adjure thee by heaven, the work of God, great and wise.'
"'I adjure thee by the voice of the Father, which he first uttered when he established the whole world by his own counsels.'

"He here terms voice that word of God, by which heaven and earth, and the whole creation, was made."
bassy; we might accordingly expect that the work read by him, and spoken of as a work of Justin's, the so called λόγος παραμένων τοῦ Ελλήνας would appear in his catalogue of Justin's works. But this is not

Justin. Coh. ad Græc. c. 20, p. 21, (p. 18, D. E.)

"Plato having received, as is probable, the doctrine of Moses and the other prophets concerning the one and only God—but alarmed by the fate of Socrates, lest he should excite some Anytus or Melitus against himself, who would accuse him to the Athenians—from dread of the hemlock, constructed an obscure and artificial discourse concerning the gods."


"Plato lays down that there are three principles of the universe, God, and Matter, and Form. And God (he affirms) is the maker, but Matter the substratum and Form, the pattern of each of the things that are made. And again, Aristotle is opposed to him, and does not agree with him throughout. For he did not think or affirm Matter to be a principle at all. But he says, that there are two principles, God and Matter. Plato again, while he affirms that the three principles of the universe are God, and Matter, and Form, joins to them a fourth, which he calls the Soul of the universe. And, moreover, though he says that Matter is unproduced, he says also that it is produced. Then Form, whatever it is, allowing it to subsist by itself is at variance with his own inventions. For he said that it existed among the divine notions, and had not an existence of its own, a separate entity."

Cyrill. adv. Julian. l. 1, T. vi. p. 33, A. B.

"And Orpheus thus says in some part of his writings:—

"I adjure thee by heaven, the wise work of the great God, I adjure thee by the voice of the Father, which he first uttered when he established the whole world by his own counsels."

"But by the voice of the Father which he first uttered, he means his only begotten Word, always existing with the Father."

Cyrill. adv. Julian. T. vi. p. 34, E.

"But he (Plato) was not altogether ignorant of the truth. But I think that he would have spoken and thought soundly, and manifested to all others what he correctly knew concerning the glory of God, if he had not stood in immediate fear of the accusation of an Anytus and a Melitus, and the hemlock of Socrates."

Besides these passages, compare Justin. Cohor. ad Græc. c. 12, p. 16, (p. 13, A.—C.) with Cyrill. adv. Julian. l. 1, T. vi.
the case; there is a discourse against the Greeks, called "Ελεγχός mentioned, which is not to be met with at present under that superscription, though the title admirably suits the contents of the λόγος παραϊνετικός; under these circumstances, what can be more certain than that the writing with the title "Ελεγχός is the book from which Photius quoted the passage already mentioned, that is, the λόγος παραϊνετικός πρὸς Ἑλλήνας? This conclusion will at least remain in full force till satisfactory grounds can be alleged why Photius should omit, in his catalogue of Justin's writings, one which he had actually read. But now, if the question be asked, why does this piece, which is no longer known by the name of "Ελεγχός, which, according to the report of Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius, it received from its author, but bears the title of an "Exhortation;" Grabe has already given a satisfactory explanation, that the original superscription was altered by the blunder of a transcriber, owing to the words with which the piece begins; ἀρχόμενος τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς παρακλήσεως. Such mistakes are by no means uncommon. Arendt's


1 Spicilegium Patrum, ii. p. 149.

2 In a scholium of Maximus to Dionys. Areopag. de coelest. hierarch. 15, 9, (Opp. ed. Corder. Venet. 1755, ii. p. 50, the treatise is called merely ἐν πρὸς Ἑλλήνας λέγει, supposing that the scholium really refers to the "Exhortation." It is this "καὶ ἐν ο̣ι̣ς ἑνεστῶ ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἑλλήνας λέγει ἑνεστῶ ἑνεστῶ ὀκτάψει φιλοσοφίαν." Compare Fabricius, Bibliothec. Græc. ed. Harl. viii. 54, and Delectus argument. et syllabus scriptt. qui veritatem relig. Christ. asseruerunt, p. 42.

3 Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 273.
objection, that these first words show that the author intended to write a hortatory and not a controversial work, or he would have begun with saying, ἀδοξαστῶς τῷ φὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖς, is altogether without weight. The refutation of the Greeks was, indeed, not the author's final and exclusive object; it was rather a foundation on which he designed to build the Exhortation, and therefore he began with the words, ἀδοξομένος τῷ φὸς ὑμᾶς παραινέσως; but the title of a book is, in general, determined by the main substance of its contents, which, in the case before us, was a refutation. At what period the original title was altered cannot now be ascertained. Only so much is certain, that this alteration must have found its way into some copies 1 in the eighth century; for John of Damascus cites, in his parallels, 2 a passage from it, 3 which introduces the recension of the parallels, as it appears in the Rupefucald manuscript of the ancient college of the Jesuits at Paris, 4 in the following manner: τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωσήφου τοῦ φιλόσοφου καὶ μάρτυρος ἐκ τοῦ φὸς Ἐλληνας παρανύκτη: ἀδύνατον τὰ ὄντως μεγάλα, &c. 5

The external evidence, then, is decidedly in favour of the genuineness of the Exhortation. We now proceed to consider the internal grounds by which the opinion of its spuriousness has been supported; and here the first point that demands our attention, is the question of language. In several quarters it is main-

---

1 Not in all, for the copy which Photius possessed bore the original superscription Ἐλγχεῖς τῷ Ἐλληνας.
3 Coh. ad Græc. c. 5, p. 10, (p. 5, E.) Compare c. 11, p. 15, (p. 11, E.)
4 It is here assumed, that the parallels, as they are given in the above mentioned manuscript, are identical on the whole with the parallels which Lequien (Opp. Joh. Damascus. ii. p. 297—730,) printed from a codex in the Vatican, as a work by John of Damascus, although with an essential resemblance, there are also striking differences.
tained that between the Exhortation and the Apologies, as well as the Dialogue of Justin, such a great difference of language exists that the former treatise cannot properly be the composition of the same author as the latter, and Herbig attempts to point out the difference of language in detail. If we examine the matter closely, it cannot be denied that there is a marked difference in the style of the Exhortation, from that of the Apologies, and the Dialogue. Their difference consists not merely in the greater perspicuity and elegance with which the Exhortation is written, but principally in the very frequent use of certain words and phrases, which are almost entirely wanting in Justin's Apologies and Dialogue, and, on the other hand, in the absence of such expressions as are peculiar to those compositions. We will collect the most important instances. As peculiarities which principally, if not exclusively, belong to the Exhortation, in distinction from the Apologies and the Dialogue, the following offer themselves to our notice: The frequent use of substantives with the ending -όντες; as πολίσιόντες, (c. 15, p. 18, [p. 15, C.] c. 17, p. 20, [p. 17, B.] c. 21, p. 22, [p. 20, B.] c. 25, p. 25, [p. 23, D.] c. 36, p. 33, [p. 34, C. D. E.]) Σίδηντες, (c. 24, p. 24, [p. 22, C.] ἀληθῶντες, (c. 25, p. 25, [p. 24, A. B.] ἀληθευόντες, (c. 28, p. 28, [p. 28, B.] παλαιότερες, (c. 25, p. 25, [p. 24, C.] ἀρχαύοντες, (c. 10, p. 14, [p. 11, A.]) δοξιοῦντες, (c. 35, p. 32, [p. 33, B.] c. 36, p. 33, [p. 34, B.]) Expressions for the idea of the Christian Religion: Ἰησοῦς, (c. 9, p. 13, [p. 9, D.] c. 10, p. 15, [p. 11, D.] c. 11, p. 15, [p. 12, B.] Θεοῦ, (c. 1, p. 7, [p. 2, A. B.] c. 4, p. 10, [p. 5, B.] c. 8, p. 12, [p. 8, E.] c. 9, p. 13, [p. 9, D.] c. 10, p. 14, [p. 11, A.], and Ἁληθῆς or Ἰησοῦς Θεοῦ, (c. 1, p. 6, [p. 1, C.], c. 4, p.


2 This has been already noticed and allowed by many defenders of the genuineness of this treatise. Compare Tillemont's Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire, ii. 310, and Prudent Maran. Prolegomena, p. lxix.
Lastly, the repeated conjunction of the particles οὐχοῦν ἵππιδητες (c. 3, p. 9, [p. 4, C.]), c. 8, p. 12, [p. 8, E.]. c. 11, p. 15, [p. 12, B.]

On the other hand, the following words and phrases, which are very common in the Apologies and the Dialogue, do not appear in the Exhortation. Expressions to designate the Christian religion, Φιλοσοφία, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 109, [p. 225, B.] and οὐσία, (c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, [p. 267, A.]) c. 93, p. 196, [p. 321, A.])

—the address, ἐγὼ...

(Ἀπολ. 1, 9, p. 48, [p. 57, E.], 1, 24, p. 58, [p. 69, A.], 47, p. 71, [p. 84, c.])—the phrases, ὅπως ὑμᾶνες, (Ἀπολ. 1, 13, p. 51, [p. 60, C.], 1, 55, p. 77, [p. 90, E.], 7, 67, p. 83, [p. 98, E.], and ἵππος ἔλθος. (Ἀπολ. 1, 8, p. 47, [p. 57, A.], 1, 40, p. 67, [p. 79, A.], 1, 43, p. 69, [p. 80, D.], 2, 4, p. 91, [p. 43, D.], 2, 15, p. 98, [p. 52, c.], c. Tr. c. 16, p. 117, [p. 234, B.], c. 110, p. 204, [p. 337, C.])—the formula of comparison, ὅν τρόπον...

τον αὐτόν τρόπον, (Ἀπολ. 1, 10, p. 49, [p. 58, C.], 1, 52, p. 73, [p. 87, A.] or ὅν τρόπον,...

ὦτος, (Ἀπολ. 1, 7, p. 47, [p. 56, D.], 1, 32, p. 63, [p. 74, B. C.]) Dial. c. Tr. c. 33, p. 130, [p. 251, A.], or ὅν τρόπον. . . . ὴμος, (Ἀπολ. c. Tr. c. 27, p. 125, [p. 244, E.])—the word αὐτόν as a preposition with a dative following it. (Ἀπολ. 1, 4, p. 46, [p. 55, C.], 1, 48, p. 72, [p. 84, D.], Dial. c. Tr. c. 19, p. 119, [p. 236, D.], c. 77, p. 174, [p. 303, A.], c. 80, p. 178, [p. 307, A.], c. 102, p. 196, [p. 328, D.])

But notwithstanding this difference of style, the Exhortation cannot but be considered as the production of the same individual who composed the Apologies and the Dialogue. Evidently a person’s style always depends on the general development of his mental powers and course of education, it shares in the advance or retrogression of the individual; it cannot therefore be thought strange if it should be different at different periods of life or mental culture. Only in rare cases, it happens that the peculiarities of a writer’s
style have from the first been so firmly fixed, that in all periods of his life it remains essentially the same. Hence arises the very common experiment, which any one may easily make, that the memory is impressed quite unconsciously and involuntarily with certain words or phrases, or combinations of sentences, which recur as if stereotyped in a written representation, until they gradually either wholly or partially glide out of the mind, just as they gradually crept in. Of this kind chiefly are the expressions which recur most frequently in the Exhortation. It is further to be considered, that the difference of the subject, and the kind of representation, as well as the state of the writer's mind, and the greater or less care in the preparation of two different treatises, must necessarily produce a difference more or less important in the language. If we compare, more closely, the style of the Exhortation, with that of the Apologies and the Dialogue, we shall find, notwithstanding the difference, a considerable resemblance, thus in the Dialogue, the word ἴδος is a frequent designation of the Christian faith, and ἴδος the name of Christians; (ἴδος: c. Tr. c. 91, p. 188, [p. 318, D.], c. 110, p. 203, [p. 337, A.], ἴδος: c. 52, p. 148, [p. 272, D.], c. 53, p. 149, [p. 273, D.], c. 110, p. 203, [p. 337, C.], c. 131, p. 224, [p. 361, C.]; thus, also, in the Dialogue, a favourite phrase is, ἰδεῖν ἰδεῖν ἰδεῖν ἰδεῖν (c. Tr. c. 56, p. 151, [p. 276, B.], c. 56, p. 153, [p. 278, C.], c. 58, p. 156, [p. 281, E.], c. 67, p. 165, [p. 292, C.], c. 68, p. 166, p. 293, C.); so also in the Apologies and the Dialogue, the substantives ending in ἰδέας are not unusual; for instance, ἴδονος, (Apol. I, 4, p. 46, [p. 55, C.], Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, [p. 267, A.], c. 120, p. 213, [p. 348, C.]) and ἴδος (c. Tr. c. 3, p. 105, [p. 221, A.]). Also the appeals which are frequently employed in the Exhortation εἰ δὲ παρατείνεις λέγειν (c. 3, p. 8, [p. 4, B.]), εἰ δὲ τίς σχοπτεῖς ἰδίως (c. 7, p. 12, [p. 8, A.], c. 28, p. 29, [p. 28, B.], c. 32, p. 30, [p. 30, D.]), εἰ δὲ τίς πάσχοι, (c. 13, p. 16, [p. 13, C.]), εἰ δὲ καὶ προδείδας δέοι, (c. 18, p. 20, [p. 17, E.]), εἰ τίς
THE EXHORTATION TO THE GREEKS.


Finally, it is to be considered, that if the Exhortation is to be reckoned spurious, because it has certain favourite expressions, which are wanting in the Apologies and the Dialogue, and, on the other hand, has not other expressions which are frequent in these compositions,—the suspicion of spuriousness must be raised against many writings of antiquity, which have otherwise been sufficiently attested as genuine; for discrepancies of style, like those we heard mentioned, are easily found everywhere. The genuineness of the Dialogue, for instance, might by such arguments be again brought in question, since many peculiar words, and combinations of words, occur repeatedly in it, which are totally wanting in the Apologies.
In the latter, the following expressions of the Dialogue would be sought for in vain: σοφίαν ἀτ' αὐτῶν, (c. Tr. c. 30, p. 127, [p. 247, B.]), σοφίαν ἀπὸ τῆς συνταγματικῆς ἔργων, (c. Tr. c. 32, p. 130, [p. 250, C.]), δικαιοσύνα (c. Tr. c. 70, p. 168, [p. 296, B.], c. 102, p. 197, [p. 329, A.], c. 137, p. 228, [p. 366, D.], p. 140, p. 231, [p. 369, D.], c. 141, p. 231, [p. 370, B.]), δικαιοσύνα καὶ ἐμπειρία, (c. Tr. c. 46, p. 142, [p. 265, D.], c. 47, p. 143, [p. 267, A.]), ἰσοπλο- 

Still less can the new argument avail which has been brought against the genuineness of this treatise, and which concerns the personal relations of the author. For it rests on a mistake, when it is maintained that the author of the Exhortation professes to be a Jewish Christian by descent, while Justin was born of gentile parents. Justin was indeed a gentile Christian, but the author of the Exhortation was also a gentle before his conversion to Christianity. This is evident even from the passage, which, strange to say, has been made use of to establish the directly opposite opinion. It is in Cohort. ad Grec. c. i. p. 6, sq. (p. 1, B. C. 2, A.) ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμῶν ὁ τελευταῖος ἔθνους Ἰουδαίους ἰσοπλο- 

...
In the phrases οἱ ἡμέτεροι κατὰ Θεόν πρόγονοι "our progenitors according to God," and τῶν κατὰ Θεόν πρόγονων, there is evidently an implied antithesis, which is no other than οἱ κατὰ σάρκα πρόγονοι, "progenitors according to the flesh." It follows that the author, by distinguishing the Hebrew prophets and lawgivers as his ancestors κατὰ Θεόν, "according to God," meant that they were not so κατὰ σάρκα, "according to the flesh," that they were spiritually, but not corporeally his forefathers. Only a gentile Christian could use this language, in the lips of a Jewish Christian the phrase κατὰ Θεόν would be quite unmeaning. And as the expression οἱ κατὰ Θεόν πρόγονοι, considered simply in itself, supposes the author to be a gentile Christian, so is this supposition strengthened and confirmed by the connection in which the expression occurs. The author is drawing a parallel between the Jewish pro-

1 That the words οἱ ἡμέτεροι κατὰ Θεόν πρόγονοι, must be taken together, is evident, partly from the closing words of the quotation, partly from the circumstance that, to connect the verb μακροθυμεῖν with κατὰ Θεόν, would make the passage altogether paradoxical from the standing point of the author, on account of the antithesis immediately following, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἡμεῖς εἰσπέλεια ἔσεσθε. For then, whether the words κατὰ Θεόν be taken to mean "in consequence of a divine revelation," or, "in a manner worthy of God," in either case they must relate as much to the doctrine of heathen poets and philosophers as of the Jewish prophets; but this would give rise to an interpretation which would directly contradict the views which the author maintains in other passages. The whole quotation is as follows: "Since, then, the subject of our discourse is the true religion, (than which nothing can be more highly prized by those who aim to live free from the peril that may arise from the judgment to come after the end of the present life,) which not only our progenitors according to God, prophets, and legislators proclaim, but also those who have been esteemed wise among you, not poets alone, but philosophers ——it has seemed good to me to investigate the teachers, both ours and yours,——that they who have before received from their forefathers a religion, falsely so called, being now aware of the fact, may turn from that ancient error; and that we may plainly and manifestly show that we follow the religion of our ancestors according to God."
phets and the Grecian sages. In order to contrast the prophets with the ancient heathens, a Jewish Christian needed only to use the simple designation οἱ ἡμεῖς πρόγονοι, "our progenitors:" but the gentile Christian, who, in a corporeal relation, had the same ancestors as the heathen, was obliged, when he wished to describe the Jewish prophets as his forefathers, to characterise them by some predicate, as his spiritual forefathers; the author of the Exhortation does this by means of the words παρὰ Θεῷ, and thus distinctly represents himself to be a gentile Christian. Against this conclusion it can furnish no objection, that in another part of the Exhortation it is simply said, ἀκό- λουθον ἡγούμεθα ἠμιλθέν ἐστι τοῦ ἡμετέρου πρόγονου. 2 "I think it follows that we should return to our progenitors."—For the author, after he had, in the beginning of his treatise, defined the sense in which he uses the term "progenitors," might reasonably omit the qualifying epithet in other instances. Thus also other ecclesiastical writers, whose gentile descent is unquestionable, 3 call the Jews simply their forefathers, as Theophil. ad Autolyc. 3, 20, p. 392, (p. 130, C.) οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, οἱ καὶ προπάτορες ἡμῶν, Αὐτός δὲ καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας βιβλίους ἔχομεν, "the Hebrews, who were also our forefathers, from whom we have received the sacred books,"—3, 21, p. 393, (p. 131, A.) ήσιν δὲνως τομεῖ καὶ προπάτορες ἡμῶν, οἱ παροικίων δὲ ἐν Λιγυρίων—"our forefathers were really shepherds who sojourned in Egypt,"—and Lactantius, Institutt. div. 4, 10, majores nostri, qui erant principes Hebræorum, 5, 22. Judæis, quorum nos successores ac

1 Arendt's doubt (p. 279) whether the expression οἱ παρὰ Θεῷ πρόγονοι, according to Justin's phraseology, could mean "ancestors in a spiritual sense," because Justin, in his other writings, (such as are confessedly genuine) regularly uses for this idea the expression οἱ ἐν Θεῷ πρόγονοι, is completely groundless, for the latter never appears in Justin's genuine writings.

2 Cohort. ad Græc. c. 8, p. 12, (p. 8, E.)

3 In reference to Theophilus of Antioch, compare Ad Autolyc. 1, 14, p. 346, (p. 78, D.)
posteri sumus . . . sicut illi majores nostri. On the other hand, it goes to prove the Gentile descent of the author of the Exhortation, when he says to the heathen: 1 ἀξίλουθον ἡγούμεθα, οὐ χαρίμην πρότερον πρὶν αὐτῶν ἅξιον λεγώντων, ταῦτα ἐν καιρῷ νυν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰπών. "I think it proper to say these things to you at the present opportunity, about which I have before heard persons among you speak."—Moreover, one who had been formerly a Jew, would hardly have established the right of Christians to regard and to use the Old Testament as the source of their religion in the striking and forcible manner employed in this (Cohort. ad Græc. c. 13, p. 17, p. 14, D.). 2 The personal relations likewise to which the author of the Exhortation alludes, agrees perfectly with the person of Justin Martyr; his origination of this treatise cannot therefore on these grounds be called in question.

As little can doubts relative to the authorship of this treatise be supported by the difference, which, according to Arendt 3 and Herbig, 4 exists between the account in the Exhortation of the origin of the Septuagint version, and the narrative given of it in the first Apology; compare Coh. ad Græc. c. 13, p. 16, sq. [p. 13, sq.] with Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, [p. 72, C.] For although it must be confessed, that such a difference certainly exists in minor points, and the narrative in the Exhortation has a far more wonderful and legendary colouring than that in the Apology; the difficulty which seems to be thus created against the genuineness of the former, is removed by supposing that Justin, when he wrote the Apology, was acquainted with the tradition only in its simplest form, and at a later period, by reading the works of Philo and Josephus, and by his personal residence in the Isle of Pharos, of

---

1 Cohort. ad Græc. c. 11, p. 15, (p. 12, A).
2 Tillemont seems to have felt the force of this, for he says, "Il semble qu'un Juif, quoique chrétien, ne se serait pas exprimé en cette maniere." (Memoires pour servir a l'histoire, II. 311.)
3 Kritische Untersuchungen, 282.
4 Comment. de scriptis, p. 60, sq.
which there is notice in the Exhortation, gained a knowledge of the legendary details which his later treatise exhibits. The possibility of this being the case, cannot be denied by maintaining that the Exhortation was written not after but before the first Apology, for such an assertion would be nothing but a purely arbitrary hypothesis.¹

Perfectly nugatory also is the ground for suspecting the genuineness of the Exhortation which Arendt² thinks he has found in the twice repeated but differing quotation of a Greek oracle. The reading of this oracle, as it is given in Coh. ad Græc. c. 11, p. 15, (p. 12, B.)

Μοῖοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίν μάχον ἡδ' ἀρ' Ἐβραῖοι
Αὐτογείνην ἄνακτα σιβαζόμενοι Σεβήν ἀγνῶς.

"Wisdom is the portion of the Chaldeans alone, and of the Hebrews, who worship God, the self-produced King, in purity,"—

is certainly the original and correct one, since in this form it appears in Porphyry and Eusebius; and the reading in another place, (Coh. ad. Gr. c. 24, p. 24, (p. 23, A.) αὐτόν (himself), instead of ἀγνῶς (in purity), is the later and altered one;³ but it may be asked, whether the author of the Exhortation did not meet with both readings, and make use of one or the other as his argument required; or whether the difference of the two readings was not owing to a lapse of memory. How the supposition that the alteration of ἀγνῶς into αὐτόν was intentional, and proceeding from a pious fraud, is opposed by the extreme improbability that the author of this intentional various reading would not better conceal the artifice from opponents whom he unsparingly attacked, than by thus exposing himself to immediate detection by

¹ Compare Neander's Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche, i. 3, p. 748.
² Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 290.
³ Cyril. advers. Julian, l. 5, T. vi. p. 180, has the altered reading Σιβαζόν αὐτόν, which he may have borrowed from the Exhortation.
quoting the genuine along with the forged reading in the very same treatise. Yet if we really could suppose the author capable of such extreme incautiousness, there is as much reason to attribute the supposed falsification to Justin, as to any anonymous writer whatever.¹

Only an apparent difficulty lies in the somewhat different manner in which Plato's supposed obligations to the Old Testament Scriptures are spoken of in the Exhortation and in the longer Apology.² For when, in the former treatise,³ it is maintained that he derived his knowledge of the existence of the Holy Spirit from the Old Testament, but signified it in his writings, not by the Biblical expression πνεῦμα ἀγίον, but (from fear of his fellow citizens) by the word ἀγία; and when, on the other hand, it is asserted in the Apology⁴ that Plato described the Holy Spirit, of whose existence he had become informed from Gen. i. 2, under the phrase τὰ δὲ τῶν μαχα πεζὶ τὸν τρίτον,—there is nothing to prevent our taking these statements as the expressions of one and the same individual; they are views of the same object seen under different lights, which are perfectly consistent with one another. It is also possible that Justin had not discovered one (supposed) proof for Plato's acquaintance with the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit, or perhaps had given it up as unsatisfactory when he made use of the other. Still more easy is it to adjust those passages which relate to the origin of the Platonic doctrine of the formation of the universe. Herbig⁵ is mistaken, when he says that in the Apology, Gen. i. 1, is named as the source of Plato's doctrine of the formation of the visible world from formless matter, while in the Exhortation, Plato's representation of the intellectual world, is deduced from

¹ Compare Eisenlohr's Argumenta ab apologetis seculi secundi, etc. in Vatt and Rupert's Syll. comment. II. 145.
² Herbig's Comment. de scriptis, p. 58, sq.
³ Cohort. ad Græc. c. 32, p. 30, sq. (p. 30. D.)
⁴ Apol. 1, 60, p. 79, (p. 93, B.)
⁵ Apol. 1, 59, p. 78, (p. 92, B.)
the same Old Testament passage. It is more correct to say, that, in the Exhortation, Gen. i. 1, is given as the source of the Platonic doctrine equally of the visible and of the intellectual world. But the reason why, in the passage of the Apology, this invisible world is not spoken of, may be explained from the connection. Justin there speaks of the principles of the Christian faith to which parallels are to be found in the Grecian philosophers, particularly in Plato, and maintains that the philosophers had in part gained the knowledge of the truth by reading the Old Testament. Any reference to the Platonic ideal world would be here out of place. Therefore, on this point, the genuineness of the Exhortation cannot be successfully assailed.¹

¹ We can only briefly touch upon the contradictions which, according to Herbig (Comment. de scriptis, p. 56 and 60) exist between the Exhortation and Justin’s genuine writings, in the description of Prophetic inspiration, and in the philosophical deduction of the namelessness of God. These so-called contradictions are reconciled by one another. The difference in the sentiments on the Prophetic inspiration is only verbal, and does not affect the essence of the subject, (compare Coh. ad Gr. c. 8, p. 13, [p. 9, A.B.] c. 10, p. 15, [p. 11, D.] with Apol. 1, 33, p. 64, [p. 75, D.] 1, 31, p. 62, [p. 72, B.] 1, 36, p. 65, [p. 76, D.] Dial. c Tr. c. 7, p. 109, [p. 224, D.] But the deduction of the namelessness of God, is in part essentially the same. Compare

Coh. ad Gr. c. 21, p. 21, (p. 19, B.)

"Neither was any being pre-existent to give a name to God, nor did he think it proper to name himself."

Apol. 2, 6, p. 92, (p. 44, D.)

"But no name is assigned to the Father of all, who is unbegotten. For he who is addressed by a name, must have some one older who imposes the name."

But when, besides, in the Exhortation, Coh. ad Gr. c. 21, p. 21, [p. 19, B.] and the larger Apology (Apol. 1, 61, p. 80, [p. 94, D.] two other reasons distinct but mutually supple-
More specious than all the objections hitherto alleged against the genuineness of this treatise, are those which are founded on the doctrinal differences which have been thought to exist between this and the confessedly genuine writings of Justin; but when viewed more closely, they likewise are without validity. In truth, such contradictions do not exist. What have hitherto been deemed such, are the results of incorrect representations, or consist only in unessential modifications of the same fundamental views. We shall consider, first of all, the relation in which the Exhortation and the Apologies, as well as the Dialogue, place the Grecian philosophy to the Christian religion. It is maintained by many learned men, and strongly urged by Arendt and Mohler, that the views which the first treatise presents on the nature and importance of the Grecian philosophy, so ill assort with Justin's real sentiments, that it cannot possibly be regarded as a production of his pen. The language it holds respecting the collective philosophic efforts of the Greeks, is almost throughout that of contempt and abhorrence; while, in the Apologies, they are treated with the greatest respect and even veneration. Allowing this representation to be correct, yet it furnishes no argument against the genuineness of the Exhortation. Clemens of Alexandria often passes from the highest eulogium to the severest vituperation of the Grecian philosophy, and yet this striking difference of language has never raised a doubt respecting any of his

menting one another, are adduced for the namelessness of God; this circumstance can create a difficulty only on the supposition that an author in a later writing never ventures to bring forward anything on a subject but what he has already remarked in a former one. We pass over in total silence, several other pretended doctrinal differences which Herbig has stated between the Exhortation and Justin's acknowledged writings, because they carry on their very face the proper solution.


2 *Patrologie*, I. 223.
writings. Thus, (for example) he declares that the Grecian philosophy was of heavenly origin;\(^1\) that it prepared the minds of men by moral culture for the reception of truth;\(^2\) and partially apprehended the truth itself;\(^3\) and yet elsewhere, he accuses the philosophers of ignorance,\(^4\) and a want of the true knowledge of God;\(^5\) and laments that in many ways they distorted the truth from a vain self-love;\(^6\) that from a hollow ambition, they amused themselves with useless dialectic logomachies;\(^7\) and although they could have had only men for their teachers, and knew that the Divine surpassed the reach of the human understanding, they nevertheless carried themselves as haughtily as if they were in full possession of truth;\(^8\) and so we shall find that the perpetual and total contradiction which has been supposed to exist between the Exhortation and the Apologies, as well as the Dialogue, in reference to the Grecian philosophy, proves to be purely superficial and accidental, as soon as the subject is contemplated from the right point of view. In Justin’s opinion, the Grecian philosophy was a mass of gross errors, with a mixture of partial truths. This view prevails in the Apologies and the Dialogue as much as in the Exhortation, but with this difference, that in the Dialogue, and especially in the Exhortation, the first factor is most decidedly prominent, while in the Apologies, the second factor takes the lead. This diversity may be satisfactorily explained, from the difference in the design of these treatises. In the Apologies, where it was proper to take only a defensive


\(^2\) Strom. 1, 7, 37, T. II. p. 27, 1, 16, 80, p. 57, 6, 17, 153, T. III. p. 194, 7, 3, 20, p. 219.

\(^3\) Strom. 6, 10, 83, T. III. p. 148, 6, 17, 160, p. 198.

\(^4\) Strom. 7, 1, 1, T. III. p. 206.

\(^5\) Strom. 6, 17, 149, T. III. p. 191, sq. 6, 17, 151, p. 193.

\(^6\) Strom. 6, 7, 56, T. III. p. 131.

\(^7\) Strom. 6, 1, 1, T. III. p. 296.

\(^8\) Strom. 6, 18, 165, sq. T. III. p. 202, sq.
position, where it was of importance to conciliate the philosophic Emperor to Christianity, Justin, with a strict adherence to the apologetic character, dwelt principally on the partial affinity of the Hellenic and Christian doctrines, while in the Dialogue, where this reference is wanting, and especially in the Exhortation, in which the cause of Christianity was advocated by a systematic demolition of the intellectual supports of heathenism, the reprobation of the Hellenic philosophy was most strongly expressed. The apparent contradiction, therefore, resolves itself, finally, into the most perfect unity, and serves only to evince the clearness and discretion with which Justin knew how to maintain, apart, the two leading points of his judgment on the Grecian philosophy, and to bring them forward as the occasion required. But that this judgment, in all its essential points, is really to be found in all Justin's writings, will be best shewn by a comparative view of the most important passages relating to it. Justin conceded to philosophic heathenism the possession of a knowledge relatively correct, and which approximated to Christian truth.

Apol. 2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, B.)

Οὐχ ἀλληγορία ἐστὶ τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ... ἄλλ᾽ ὅτι οὐχ ἦστι σάν σε ἐνσε... ἀρσεν ὑμῖν τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Ευσεβῶς τι καὶ σωτήρι καὶ συγγραφέων. Compare Apol. 1, 5, p. 46, sq. (p. 55, E.)

Cohor. ad. Græc. c. 22, p. 22, (p. 20, D.)

Ὁ Πλάτων... ἐν τῷ ἤσπερ ἰσοδυναμίαν αὐτοῦ λόγος Τιμάιω... τὸ αὐτὸ, διὰ καὶ περὶ Ἡσιοδος τό καθαρόν. Compare c. 25, p. 25, (p. 23, E.) c. 27, p. 27, (p. 26, D.) c. 36, p. 33, p. 34, D.

Apol. 1, 8, p. 48, (p. 57, B.)

Πλάτων ὁμοίως ἔφη ὁ Ραδαμάστων καὶ Μίως κολάσειν τοὺς ἀδίκους παρ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἐλθόντας... ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Coh. ad. Gr. c. 1, p. 6, (p. 2, A.)

. . . διὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν τοῦ τοῦ βίου ἐσοφαι κρίνειν ὡς οὐ μόνον οἱ ἡμέρες κατὰ ἗ς καὶ
THE EXHORTATION TO THE GREEKS.

Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, B.)

"The doctrines of Plato are not altogether inimical to those of Christ, though they are not all similar, as neither are those of others, the stoics, and poets, and historians."

Apol. 1, 8, p. 48, (p. 57, B.)

"In like manner, Plato said, that Radamanthus and Minos would punish the unjust, when they came before them; and all say that the very same event will happen, but it will be performed by Christ, and their souls and bodies united, will endure an eternal punishment, but not a millenial period alone, as he (Plato) affirmed."

Cohor. ad Græc. c. 22, p. 22, (p. 20, D.)

"Plato . . . . in his elaborate work, the Timæus, has expressed the very same sentiments as Moses concerning God."

Coh. ad Gr. c. 1, p. 6, (p. 2, A.)

"On account of the approaching judgment that will take place at the end of this life; which not only our ancestors, (according to God,) prophets, and law-givers, announced, but also those who are esteemed wise among yourselves, not poets alone, but also philosophers."

But heathenism was by no means indebted to free philosophical enquiry for this approximation to Chris-
tian truth, but to assistance obtained in an extraordinary manner from without. For by itself, philosophy was not capable of comprehending religious truth.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 3, p. 105, (p. 221, B.)

$text in Greek$

Cohor. ad Græc. c. 5, p. 10, (p. 5, E.)

"Adamantōn tòus tâ ôutōs megálα kai Íēma μὴ para tivn eîdōton μεμαθηκότας h àutoùs eîdênaì h ítérous dú-

$\text{h kaos}δαί διδάσκειν ὃ̇ς ὁμι, \text{compare c. 8, p. 12, (p. 9, A.):}$

ôutōs fôtei ôutē dikóstíne ímooth òutōs megalâ kai Íēma

\text{gínōskein dikóstópeis dunamei.}

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 3, p. 105, (p. 221, B.)

"How then, can the philosophers think aright concerning God, or utter anything true, not having a knowledge of him, neither having either seen or heard him?"


"Will the understanding of man ever see God, if not regulated by a holy spirit?"

Cohor. ad Græc. c. 5, p. 10, (p. 5, E.)

"It is impossible that those who have not been taught things so great and divine, by those who know them, can either know them themselves, or teach others aright."

"Neither by nature, nor by human penetration, is it possible for men to know such great and divine things."

That extraordinary method may be, in part, an immediate use of the Old Testament records on the part
of the Grecian philosophers; partly a special individual illumination, by which the divine Logos comes to the aid of the investigating reason. The first view is found almost exclusively in the Exhortation, while the two views are combined in the Apologies.

Apol. 2, 10, p. 95, (p. 48, C.)

*Côsa kalôs éi i̱oΣi̱g̱xanṯo
kai eu̱rou òi̱ filo̱so̱φ̱ẖsanṯes
ẖ nómo̱s̱ẖsanṯes, xaṯa lò̱g̱u̱n méṟo̱s eu̱ṟs̱e̱w̱s kai Θε̱o̱s
i̱sṯi̱ s̱o̱ṉi̱ẖs̱e̱ṉta a̱u̱ṯo̱u̱c̱—

Compare 2, 8, p. 94, (p. 46, B.) 2, 13, p. 98, (p. 51, D.)

Apol. 1, 44, p. 70, (p. 82, A.)

Pánta òsa tẹẹi ἀθανασίας
ψυχῆς ἢ τιμωμένων τῶν μετὰ
Θάνατον ἡ Θεωρίας ὑπάρχων ἢ
τῶν ὑμιῶν δογμάτων καὶ
φιλόσοφοι καὶ τοινητιφάσαν,
παρὰ τῶν προφητῶν τάς
ἀφορμὰς λαβώντες καὶ νοήσας
dedōκησαι καὶ ἐξεγήσαντο.
—Comp. 1, 60, p. 79, (p. 93, C.)

Coh. ad Græc. c 36, p. 33,
(p. 34, D.)

Θείας ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προνοίας
ἐργον γέγονε, τὸ καὶ ἀκοντας
τοῦτος μαρτυρεῖ τὰ υπὸ τῶν
προφητῶν τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς ἔχη-
μέναι ἀληθῆ εἶναι.

Coh. ad Græc. c. 14, p.
(18, p. 15, B.)

Οὗ λακόναν ἔνιους ὑμῶν
ομαί . . . , δεὶ καὶ ὅρμ-
φις καὶ Ὁμήρος καὶ Σόλων
. . . καὶ Πυθαγόρας καὶ
Πλάτων καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς, ἐν
τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ γίνομεν καὶ
ἐκ τῆς Μωσείου Ιστορίας ὁ-
φιλητίνες, ύπερθον ἑαυτία
τῶν προφητῶν ἡ καλῶς περὶ
Θείων διεξάγων αὐτοῖς ἀπερθη-
ναντο.
said concerning the immortality of the soul, or punishment after death, or the contemplation of heavenly things or the like dogmas, they were able to understand and explain by taking their materials from the prophets."

Coh. ad Græc. c. 36, p. 33, (p. 34, D.)

"For it has been effected by divine providence for you, that these men have unwillingly confessed that the things were true which were said by the prophets concerning the one God."

Coh. ad Græc. c. 14, p. 18, (p. 15, B.)

"Nor do I think that some of you are ignorant,—that Orpheus, and Homer, and Solon,—and Pythagoras and Plato, and some others, having been in Egypt, and derived assistance from the history of Moses, afterwards exhibited sentiments opposite to those which they had formerly held, not to their credit, concerning the gods."

Notwithstanding this assistance, the harmony of Grecian and Christian doctrine is only temporary; heathenism has merely isolated truths; but Christian truth is perfection.

Apol. 2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, B.) Οὐχ ἄλλοτριά ἢστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἢστι σάντα ὅμως, etc.

Apol. 1, 20, p. 55, (p. 66, C.) Ὑμώνοις τοῖς σαρξ ὑμωμείνοις στοιχαίς καὶ φιλοσόφοις λέγομεν.

Apol. 2, 13, p. 98, (p. 51, D.) Οἱ συγγραφεῖς πάντως ὑμιν τῆς ινοσπερίας ἰμφύτου τοῦ λόγου στοιχεῖς ἀμυδρῶς ἑδυναμοῦ ὑμᾶς τα ὅτα. Ἡτερὰ χάρις ἢστι στίχωμα τοῖς καὶ μιμητικὰ κατὰ δύναμιν δοξοει καὶ ἐτερον αὐτῷ, οὐ κατὰ χάριν τὴν ὀτὶ ἵκειν ἡ μετουσία καὶ μιμητικὰ γίνεται.

Translation of the Greek.

"The doctrines of Plato are not opposed to those of Christ, but they are not altogether alike," &c.

"We speak some things similar to those uttered by
the poets and philosophers, who are honoured among yourselves."

"For all writers are enabled dimly to see things by the implanted seed of the Logos, for the seed, and imitation given according to a person's ability is one thing, and another of which the communication and imitation is granted according to his grace." Compare with the above passages, Coh. ad Græc. c. 8, p. 12, (p. 9, A.) with c. 14, p. 17, (p. 15, A.) c. 38, p. 35, (p. 36, D.) and numerous other places.

Truly the Greek philosophy radically contradicts itself in the very first principles of knowledge.

Apol. 2, 10, p. 95, (p. 48, C.)

Coh. ad Græc. c. 35, p. 32, (p. 33, B.)

Ἐναντία ἰαυτοὶς σολλάχισι ἑπταν. . . .

Απολ. 2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, C.)

Οἱ τἀναντία αὐτοῖς ποιμνικῶς εἰρηκὼς, εὖς ἑπιστῆμη ὑπὲν ἀποτομον καὶ γνῶσιν τὴν ἀνέγερτον φαίνονται εἰς εὐχείναι. Compare Apol. 1, 4, p. 46, (p. 55, C.) 1, 44, p. 70, (p. 82, A.)

Oι μάτην τὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἕπηκαίζοντες δύναμα . . . . 

. οὐ̂σι ἀλλῆλως συναινεύωμεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἰαυτῶν ἄλλοις ἀλλως ἐκτιθεῖναι δόξας. Compare c. 4, p. 10, (p. 5, B.) c. 7, p. 12, (p. 8, D.)

Translation of the Greek.

Apol. 2, 10, p. 95.

"They often contradicted themselves."

Apol. 2, 13, p. 97.

"Who often contradicting themselves on things of the highest importance, do not appear to have possessed recondite knowledge and indisputable science."

Coh. ad Græc. c. 35, p. 32.

"For they who vainly dishonour the name of phi-
losophy, not only are at variance with one another, but 
also differently expound their own opinions at different 
times."

They had never attained to resolve the problem of 
human nature.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 4, p. 107, (p. 222, E.) 
Coh. ad Graec. c. 6, p. 11, (p. 7, D.)

"Оι υδέν ἵσαι πείρι τούτων ἱκείοι νοι οἱ 
φιλόσοφοι οὐδὲ γὰρ δὲ τι σακτε ἵσαι ὑμίχθη, 
ἐχουσιν εἰπεῖν.

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. e. 4, p. 107.

"Concerning these things those philosophers knew 
nothing, nor could they explain what the soul might 
be."

Coh. ad Graec. c. 6, p. 11.

"Neither concerning the human soul, in the pre-
sent state, are they agreed, as appears from what has 
been said by each of them respecting it."

Hence also the authority of the philosophers could 
be of no consequence in the examination of the more 
important objects of knowledge.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 6, p. 108, (p. 224, A.) 
Coh. ad Graec. c. 14, p. 17, (p. 15, A.)

"Αὐτῆς ὃς ἔνδει 
οὐδὲ Πυθαγόρει μέλει. Πλάτανος 
νομεν οὐδὲ ἀπλῶς 
οὐδενες ἕλως τοιαύτα δοξά-
ζοντος. τὸ γὰρ ἄλλης ὁμοίως 
ἐκεῖ.
Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 6, p. 108, (p. 224, A.)

"I care nought for Plato, nor for Pythagoras, nor for any who hold such opinions, for the truth is as I have stated."

Coh. ad Graec. c. 14, p. 17, (p. 15, A.)

"It behoves you, O! men of Greece, not to abide by the unexamined error of your ancestors, nor, if they have mistakenly handed down to you anything, to consider this as true, but — to inquire and to search out accurately the things said by those whom you call your masters."

He asserts that, strictly speaking, they do not deserve the name of philosophers.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)

Πάντων τῶν τῶν νομίζων ζωμένων φιλοσόφων.

Coh. ad Graec. p. 36, c. 32, (p. 33, C.)

Εἰ ἡ τ'αλήθεια τῆς νόμων καιρὸς ἡ λέγεναι παρ' αὐτοῖς φιλοσοφίας, τῶς ὁ μὴ τῆς πληθυνὼς μὴ τυγχάνοντες γνώσεως τοῦ νομολογῶν τῶν.

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)

"Of all those who are thought philosophers."

c. 35, p. 133, (p. 253, D.)

"Each of those who thought that they philosophised."

Coh. ad Graec. c. 36, p. 32, (p. 33, C.)

"But if the discovery of truth be the final aim of philosophy among them, how can they, who have not obtained the knowledge of the truth, be worthy of the name of philosophy."

These parallels may be sufficient; they furnish evidence that the fundamental view of the Grecian phi-
losophy, which appears in the Exhortation, harmonises in all essential points with that contained in the Apologies and the Dialogue. Even the strongest expressions are not to be excepted, but are echoed if not in the Apologies yet in the Dialogue.¹

Justin was, throughout, no enthusiastic admirer of the Grecian philosophy.² But if the two Apologies be arbitrarily isolated, their expressions in favour of the heathen philosophy rendered unduly prominent, and all that is to the contrary kept in the back ground—if the apologetic design, which gives a colouring to the opinions expressed on philosophy in the Apologies, be altogether overlooked, and no comparative view be taken of the Dialogue with Trypho—the conclusion may be drawn that Justin contemplated the Grecian

¹ Such expressions should not, perhaps, be taken in their utmost force; polemical zeal sometimes give a sharpness to the language which was not designed. Thus, for instance, the assertion (in Coh. ad Grae. c. 11, p. 15, [p. 12, A.]) τα τῶν φιλοσόφων ὑμῶν · · · πράγματα πάντων ἄγονας καὶ ἀπάντης φαίνεται πλήθος, “The opinions of your philosophers are full of all ignorance and deceit,”—cannot be taken literally, without involving its author in the grossest contradiction, since soon after he presents a series of religious truths which serve to show that the philosophers, Plato especially, sometimes had taught in accordance with the Old Testament. It is quite in Justin’s style to speak in hyperbole. Unless we took into account this characteristic of the martyr, it would not be difficult to collect a whole host of contradictions from his writings. Such would be the case with the assertions in Apol. I, 44, p. 70, (p. 82, A.) and Apol. 2, 10, p. 95, (p. 48, C.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 76, p. 173, (p. 301, C.) and c. 107, p. 201, (p. 334, B.) taken literally.

² That passage of the Dialogue which speaks most strongly in favour of philosophy: (Dial. c. Tr. c. 2, p. 102, (p. 218, C.) ἢ σεὶ τῆς ἑαυτῆς φιλοσοφίας μόνης καὶ τιμώτατας θεῷ, ὡς περισσότερον ἢ νῦν ἡμῖν καὶ ἀληθῶς ὑπόθεντι, ἐνείπομεν εἰς τῆς Φιλοσοφίας τοῦ νομοθετικοῦ—“In reality philosophy is the greatest possession, and most esteemed by God, to whom it alone leads and commends us, and these persons are truly holy who apply their minds to philosophy”—relates not to the Grecian philosophy, but speaks of the pure and original knowledge of religious truth, as it assumed a concrete appearance in the Prophets, and above all in Christ.
philosophy with peculiar attachment, and, therefore, that such a treatise as the Exhortation, in which this attachment is so faintly seen, or rather is entirely wanting, could not have been written by him.

Not better founded than this attachment of Justin's to the Grecian philosophy, is the supposed approximation of the Exhortation to a Judaizing style of thinking, in which Arendt imagines he has detected a new doctrinal difference between this and Justin's acknowledged writings, and therefore a new argument against its genuineness. For the summons to a zealous study of the Old Testament, to which this treatise, without mentioning the New Testament, calls the Gentiles, was not owing to a Jewish bias, but to that superiority which the Old Testament, in the opinion of Justin, as well as of the collective ancient Churches, possessed before the New. In the Dialogue, the reading of the Prophets is recommended. without the mention of the New Testament. Tatian also extols the Old Testament without making mention of the New Testament. Athenagoras, also urges on the Greeks, most impressively, the study of the Old Testament, and never lays upon them a similar injunction respecting the New. With a purely Christian purpose he adduces the full evidence of the high antiquity of the Prophets, and especially of Moses. The author thus repels, like the

---

1 *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 292. If those critics were in the right who think they have perceived in the Apologies and the Dialogue an uncatholic tendency to the Jewish mode of thinking, Arendt's objection stated above, instead of being an argument against the genuineness of the Exhortation, would be rather a proof of it.

2 *Cohort. ad Græc.* c. 35, p. 32, (p. 32, D.)

3 Eisenlohr in his *Argumenta ab apologetis*, &c. ii. 176, has briefly stated the most important reasons for this superior regard to the Old Testament.


5 *Orat.* c. *Græc.* c. 29, 267, (p. 165, B.)

6 *Leg. pro Christ.* c. 9, p. 286, (p. 9, D. 10, A.) *Comp.* c. 7, p. 285, (p. 8, A.) c. 24, p. 303, (p. 27, D.) and *Theophil. ad Autol.* 2, 34, p. 373, (p. 110, A.)

7 *Cohor. ad Græc.* c. 9, p. 13, (p. 9, C.)
other apologists, the charge of novelty which was frequently urged by the Greeks against Christianity, and throws it back on the Grecian philosophy. At the same time, he gained thereby a support for the sentiment often expressed by himself and others, that the Grecian philosophers read and made use of the writings of Moses and the Prophets. If, moreover,


2 To justify the persecution of the Christians, the heathen inhabitants of Lyons alleged, ξύπνη τινδ καὶ κατούται ἡμῖν ἱεράρχαις Σεβαστάιωσ. Euseb. hist. eccles. 5, 1, T. ii. p. 35. Compare also, Theophil. ad Autol. 3, 1, p. 381, (p. 117, B.) θείϊ κήρυγμα θαύματον τῶν λόγων τῆς ἀληθείας, οἰμάντως περιπλανοῦμαι καὶ πονηροκατά εἰμι γὰς παρ' ἡμῖν γιαπάς—3, 4, p. 383. (p. 119, B.) 3, 16, p. 390, (p. 127, C.) Arnob. adv. gent. 2, 66, T. 1, p. 97, quod nobis objectare consuetus, novellam esse religionem nostram et ante dies tratam propemodum paucas . . . . . . ratione istud intenditur nulla.—Origen. c. Cels. 1, 26, T. i. p. 344.—Philastr. de haeres. c. 109, p. 217.—Prudent. peristephan. 10, 621—Euseb. hist. eccles. 1, 2, T. i. p. 12, 1, 4, p. 34, sqq. preparat. evang. 1, 2, p. 5, 1, 5, p. 16.—Kortholt, De origine et natura Christianismi ex impia et heathen, sententia, p. 1, sqq.—De calamissni paganorum in veteres Christianos sparsis, p. 69, sqq.

3 Cohor. ad Græc. c. 12, p. 15. (p. 12, c.) ἀναγκαῖον ὑμᾶς καὶ τῶν ἱεράρχων ἑκκλησίας καὶ ὑμᾶς γυναῖκας φιλίτευμα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς σφόδρα καὶ βεβαίως έίσι τούτων ὑμῶν φρονήσων χίλιον Euseb. prepar. evang. 10, 14, p. 502, sqq.

in the Exhortation, the exclusive possession of truth is attributed to the Hebrew Prophets, this implies no Judaizing spirit, for it is only in reference and in opposition to Grecian philosophy. Several other purely catholic fathers have expressed themselves in a similar manner; in fact, the Dialogue with Trypho offers a corresponding parallel:—

Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)  
Coh. ad Græc. c. 38, p. 35, (p. 37, B.)

Ἐξένοιτο τινὲς πρὸ τολλοῦ  
χρόνια . . . . . . με  
κάροι καὶ δίκαιοι καὶ θεοφι-  
λέιν, θεῖων τινῶν και λαλήσαν  
τες . . . προφήτας δὲ πολλο  
τως καλοῦσιν. Οὕτως μόνοι  
τὸ αληθεῖς καὶ έιδών καὶ  
ἐξείπον ανθρώπως.

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)

“And there were, long ago, certain blessed and just men beloved by God,—speaking with a divine spirit,—and these they call Prophets. These alone both saw the truth and announced it to men.”

Coh. ad Græc. c. 38, p. 35. (p. 37, B.)

“It ought, therefore, everywhere to be known, that it is not possible to learn concerning God and true religion, save from the Prophets alone, who teach us by a divine afflatus.”

Lastly, if the doctrine of the Logos is not treated in the Exhortation with the same fulness as in Justin’s other writings, it must not be forgotten that the aim of this treatise is not a developement of Christian doctrines, but the destruction of the Grecian theology. But what is said in it respecting Christ, has no Jewish-Christian colouring whatever. The predicate

1 Cohor. ad Gr. c. 38, p. 34, p. 36, C.
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λόγος ἀκρόσιτος δυνάμει, "Word of God inseparable in power," is given to him, and it is also asserted of him after the manner of St. John, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον δι’ οὗ ὁμοίας καὶ γῆς καὶ πᾶσα ἐγένετο κτίσις, "The Word of God, by whom heaven and earth, and all creation was made." On the other hand, the expression, Χριστὸς . . . τῆς τῶν ἀρχαιῶν ἡμῶν προγόνων ἀληθινής Σωτῆρας. "Christ reminded us of the religion of our ancient progenitors," is not to be taken so strictly as if the whole agency of Christ might be reduced to a renovation of the ancient Hebrew faith; but it presents to us, as the connection teaches, a single but very important aspect of the work of Christ, namely, that through him the ancient original Monotheism would again be generally prevalent. If the literal interpretation be strictly adhered to, it would follow from a passage in the Dialogue with Trypho, (c. 67, p. 165, p. 292, C.) ἵπτεραν διαλήξην ἔσεξαι ο Θεός υπέσχετο . . . . . . δικινοῦσαν, τί· μὲν ὡς αἰώνων καὶ παντὶ γένει ἀγμοῦ καὶ ἐνταλμα καὶ ἔργον ο Θεός ἐπιτάσσεται, τί δὲ πέρα τὸ σκληροκάκιαν τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν ἀρμοσάμενος . . . . ἐστειάλτω, "[why then] did God promise that there

1 Herbig (Comment de scriptis. p. 57), finds a passage in the Dialogue that in his opinion contradicts the predicate ἀκρόσιτος δυνάμει, (c. Tr. c. 128, p. 221, [p. 358, B.]) in which Justin expresses himself displeased with those who maintained, ἄτμητον καὶ ἀκρόσιτον τοῦ πατρὸς τιμῶν τὴν δύναμιν, (the Logos) δυνάμιν. That "this power existed without division and separation from the Father."—But the alleged contradiction could only be real, if the monarchical modalistic view of Christ, which is rejected in the second passage, is contained in the first. For there is a difference between Χριστὸς . . . Θεοῦ λόγος ἀκρόσιτος δυνάμει and Χριστὸς . . . τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκρόσιτος δυνάμει. The first words mean nothing but this, that although Christ became man, he yet remained as the Logos indissolubly connected with God, in reference to his perfection of power; or possibly the words ἀκρόσιτος δυνάμει, as Credner thinks, (Beiträge, &c. 1, 114,) may have a reference to an opinion of Justin's, elsewhere expressed, that the divine Logos before Christ had unfolded a partial and sporadic influence among mankind. The sense would then be, in Christ the divine Logos appeared, not fragmentary, but in its whole fulness.
should be another covenant, showing what command and work God ordains as eternal and adapted to every race, and what he commanded in adaptation to the obduracy of your nation?"—that the author of the Dialogue had, with Jewish narrow-mindedness, looked for the aim of New Testament economy, solely in the exclusion of the accidental and the temporal from the Old Testament legislation, and we might with equal justice, or rather injustice, make him on that account a Judaising theologian. The author of the Exhortation is therefore not in the least degree chargeable with an undue leaning to a Judaising mode of thinking, and his identity with Justin loses on this account nothing of its certainty.

Lastly, this identity is not destroyed by the difference which exists between the statements of the Exhortation respecting the Old Testament theophanies and the polytheistic idolatry and expressions on the same subjects in the Apologies and the Dialogue. For this difference is partly the result of the arbitrary indistinctness with which these doctrines were generally viewed and treated in the ancient Church, and parallels can be found to it in the writings of other Fathers. As to the first point in the Exhortation, it is said that the only (true) God manifested himself to Moses in the burning bush, (Exod. iii. 1) as the "I AM," ὁ ὢν, called him to be his Messenger to the people of Israel, and as the credentials of his divine mission added the declaration, ὁ ὢν ἀπίσταλκε ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, "I AM, hath sent me unto you." On the contrary, in the Apologies and the Dialogue, it is maintained, that he must be altogether unintelligent who could believe that the Creator of the universe forsook his dwelling-place in heaven, and made himself visible on some particular spot of this globe. Christ was at all times the subject of the divine appearances recorded in the

1 Herbig, Comment. de scriptis, p. 55, sq. 58.
2 Coh. ad Gr. c. 21, p. 21, (p. 19, B.) c. 21, p. 22, (p. 20, C.)
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 60, p. 167, (p. 283, B.)
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Old Testament;—it was he who appeared in the name and by the authority of the Father to the patriarchs— who came to Abraham—who wrestled with Jacob, and who spoke out of the burning bush to Moses. Thus this twofold representation only showed the impossibility of consequentially carrying out and everywhere maintaining that view of the Christophanies into which the Fathers of the Church had changed the Old Testament Theophanies. Involuntarily God appeared again as the acting subject, where, according to the theory already adopted, Christ must be expected. Every attempt to infer from this twofoldness of representation, a difference in the author, is refuted by the instances of Irenæus and Tertullian, who, in their confessedly genuine works, exhibit the same ambiguity, as will appear from comparing the following passages:

Iren. adv. hæres. 4, 23, (p. 239.)
Insemianatus est ubique in Scripturis filius dei, aliquando quidem cum Abraham loquens, aliquando cum Noé, dans eis mensuras, aliquando autem quærens Adam, aliquando autem Sodomitis inducens judicium, et rursus quem videretur, et in viam dirigit Jacob et de rubo loquitur cum Mose.

Compare also Irenæus, adv. hæres. 3, 6, p. 180.

Iren. adv. hæres. 3, 3, p. 176.
Unum deum omnipotentem, factorem celii et terræ . . . . qui eduxerit populum de terra Egypti, qui collocutus sit Mosi, qui legem disposuerit . . . . Hunc patrem domini nostri Jesu Christi ab ecclesiis annuntiari, ex ipsa scriptura, qui veluit, discere possint, 3, 12, p. 198; eundem deum annuntiant, qui fuit eum Joseph et cum patriarchis, qui et collocutus est Mosi.

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 113, p. 206, (p. 310, D.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 150, sqq. (p. 275, sqq.)
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 58, p. 155, (p. 281.)
4 Apol. 1, 62, p. 80, (p. 95, A. B.)
With respect to the view of the origin of idolatry.—In the Exhortation, the beginning of Polytheism is dated from the conversation of the serpent with the first human pair in Paradise; — the heathen gods are held to be mere unreal images of the fancy; — the names of the gods are considered as a traditionary communication of an inheritance from the same serpent in Paradise; and the images and statues of the gods as arising from a misunderstanding of Genesis i. 26; while, in the Apologies, it is taught that the heathen gods were real beings, namely, evil demons—

1 According to Tertullian’s constant phraseology, the Creator is always God the Father. Compare, Adv. Marc. 3, 15, T. i. p. 131, 3, 16, p. 132, sq. 4, 3, p. 161, Apolog. c. 42, T. v. p. 80, etc.

2 Coh. ad Græc. c. 21, p. 22, (p. 19, D. 20, A. B.)

3 Coh. ad Græc. c. 34, p. 31, (p. 32, B.)
that from these same daemons idolatry took its rise, since, by personal appearances and terrific images, they compelled men to reverence them,—that even the names and images of the gods must be traced back to the daemons, for the former were communi-
cated by daemons, and the latter were fashioned ac-
cording to their shape.\(^1\) In this delineation there is a mixture of truth and falsehood; and variations of one
and the same theme have been taken for independent
methods. It is incorrect to say, that, in the Exhorte-
tion, the heathen gods are represented as mere crea-
tures of the imagination, without any real being, for
the expression \(\epsilon_{i} \mu\eta \omicron \nu\tau\omicron \varepsilon\), by which they are distin-
guished from the \(\delta \omicron \nu\tau\omicron \varsigma \delta\nu \varepsilon\omicron \varsigma\) denies their reality as divine beings, but not their reality in and for itself.
It is not true that in the Exhortation it is maintained
that the names of the false gods were communicated
to our first parents in Paradise, by the serpent, and
from them have passed to all succeeding generations
of idolators.\(^1\) It is only said, that after the erroneous
idea of the existence of many gods had been received
by the earliest race of men, this sentiment was in-
herited by their posterity. On the other hand, a
difference of opinion entirely prevails between the Exhortation and the (longer) Apology, on the causes
by which men were led to the formation of images of
the gods. Yet these two accounts are not exactly
opposed to one another.\(^2\) They find a very natural
point of connection in the supposition, that men, after
they had first been excited by daemons to the con-
struction of images, believed that they found a con-
firmation of these errors in Gen. i. 26. Thus the
different representations of the origin of Polytheism
may be easily reconciled. Only the facts of which
the Apology speaks must be viewed as a modified re-
capitulation and generalization of those narrated in

\(^1\) Apol. 1, 5, p. 46 (p. 55, D. E.) 1, 9, p. 48, (p. 57, C.) 2,
5, p. 92, (p. 44, B. C.)

\(^2\) Cohort. ad Grac. c. 21, p. 22, (p. 20, A.) \(ετέτοιον θεόν ονμα
καί τούς μετά ταύτα απ' αυτών γνωρίσας ανθρώπους παρέδωκε.
the Exhortation. If it was Justin’s opinion, that by
the sly insinuation of the serpent, “if ye obey me,
and disregard God’s command, ye shall be as gods,”
the first germ of polytheistic notions was deposited
in the hearts of our first parents, and this germ, gradually
developed, appeared in a more advanced shape among
their posterity; still, in order to account for the uni-
versality of the polytheistic belief, it might appear
needful to discover, besides that original cause, another
source of this error, and this the prevalent notion of
the age presented to him in the power of daemons.

Yet if this method of reconciling apparent contra-
rieties should not be deemed satisfactory, the genuine-
ness of the Exhortation cannot be rendered doubtful
by that difference. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, who
held Justin’s doctrine of daemons in its most essential
points—who taught that daemons excluded men from
the knowledge of God—that they had made them-
selves by persuasion the exclusive objects of worship,
and claimed all sacrifices, feasts, songs of praise, and
thanksgiving—nevertheless asserted of Satan, who,
according to a received opinion, seduced our first pa-
rents under the form of a serpent. (Adv. Julian, I.
3, T. vi. p. 91, D.) διαβιβάζεταις (Gen. iii. 5), καὶ
αὐτὴν τὴν ἀνωτάτω καὶ ἀπόξησην φύσιν καὶ τὸ τῆς πολυ-
θεσίας ἀλεθίων μαθήμα ταῦτα τῶν πρώτων ἐνθεαί γενέθησαν. “He
slandered the highest and unspeakable nature, and in-
truded into the souls of the first (human beings) the
destructive knowledge of polytheism.”

We have now brought our apologetic evidence to a
close, and, as we think, have secured the genuineness
of the Exhortation on the negative side. It still remains
to bring together some particulars which may positively
support the conclusion to which we have arrived. We
find these particulars in those individual remarks of
the Exhortation, which, without betraying any design,

---

1 Coh. ad Gr. c. 21, p. 22, (p. 19, D.)
124, B. I. 6, p. 216, E.
connect themselves most closely with expressions in the Apologies and the Dialogue.

Among these we reckon the assertion that the Old Testament may with much more truth be considered the religious code of the Christians than of the Jews.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 29, p. 127, (p. 246, D.)

Εἰ δὲ τις φάσκω . . . . μὴ ἡμᾶς τὰς βιβλίας ταύτας, ἀλλὰ Ἰουδαῖοι προσήκειν . . . καὶ μάθην ἡμᾶς ἐκ τούτων φασκεῖν τὴν Ἰουσίβειαν μεμαθηκίαι λέγοι γνώτα ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλίοις γεγραμμένων, δόθ' οὐκ αὐτοῖς ἀλλ' ἡμᾶς ἐκ τούτων διαφέρει διδασκαλία.

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 29, p. 127, (p. 246, D.)

‘They are deposited in your literature, or rather not yours but ours, for we obey them, but you, when you read, do not understand the mind that is in them.”

Coh. ad Græc. c. 13, p. 17, (p. 14, D.)

“If any one should say that these books do not belong to us, but to the Jews, and that we vainly pretend to be taught our religion from them, let him know from the things written in these books, that not to them but to us the instruction they impart is of importance.”

And that the Old Testament writings on account of their hidden mysterious meaning, present many difficulties in exposition and interpretation.—
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Dial. c. Tr. c. 90, p. 187, (p. 317, C.)

"Оσιά έστω και ἱστοίσαν οἱ προφήται, παραβολάς καὶ τύποις ἀνακάλυψαν, ὡς μὴ ἔρας τὰ πλείστα ὑπὸ πάντων νοηθήναι τριστοιντες τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀλήθειαν, ὡς καὶ ποιέσαι τοὺς ἥσοντας εὑρέθη καὶ μαθεῖν.—c. 112, p. 205, (p. 339,C.): ταῦτα μετὰ πολλῶν νῦν καὶ μυστηρίου γέγονε καὶ ἓσθη διὰ τοῦ μακαρίου προφήτου (Numbers xxii. 8.) καὶ οὐδὲν ἵστον, δ' τις μέμβασθαι δικαιώς ἵχει τῶν λεγεμένων ἢ γεγενημένων ὑπὸ πάντων ἀλλοίως τῶν προφητῶν, ἐὰν τὴν γνώσιν τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔχητε.

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 90, p. 187, (p. 317, C.)

"Whatever the prophets said and did, they\(^1\) enveloped in parables and types, so that the greater part could not be understood by all; they concealed the truth by these means, so as render labour necessary to those who sought to find out and to learn."

"These things were said and done by the blessed prophets with much significance and mystery; and there is nothing whatever of the things said and done by all the prophets in general which can be justly reprehended, if you are masters of their real meaning."

\(^1\) Thirlby conjectures that ἀνακάλυψα is the true reading; "cui equidem assentier," (says Prudentius Maranus,) "si verbum διδακτικόν, non idem interdum esset ac lego."—Tr.
Cohor. ad Græc. c. 29, p. 29, (p. 28, E.)

“Nothing can be clearly known of the Mosaic statements apart from a mystic contemplation.”

C. 31, p. 30, (p. 30, D.)

“But it is necessary for the devout to understand these things anagogically (i.e. ascending to a higher mystical sense) by protracted contemplation.”

Another topic is the peculiar argument with which in some places the eternity of matter, and in others that of the soul is refuted, namely, that the unbegotten stands on a perfectly equal level with the unbegotten, that one has in no point power over the other.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 5, p. 108, (p. 223, E.)

Oùdè μὴν ἀναγγέλλωδεῖ αυτῷ (ψυχάς) τίμῃς, ἵνα τι αὑτοῦ ἄγινηθη πᾶς γὰρ ἀγίνηθη, διομοί ἐστιν καὶ ίδιον καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ οὕτως δυνάμει οὕτως τιμῇ προσχέατθεν ἐν Σατέρω τὸ ἔτερον.

Coh. ad Græc. c. 23, p. 24, (p. 22, A.)

Τὴν τῆς ὑλῆς δύναμιν ἀγίνηθην καὶ ίδιοχρον καὶ ἡλικίωσθαι... τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ὀδύσαν, ἀντικατατίθειν εἰκός τῇ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει τῷ γὰρ μὴ συστηματίζει οὐδεμία ἐξουσία περὶ τὸ μὴ γεγονὸς; ὡς εἰ δὲ βιωτεῖαι αὐτὴν δυνάμεν τῇ ἐξωθεὶ πάσης ἀνάγκης ἐλευθεροὶ ὀδύσαν.

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 5, p. 108, (p. 223, E.)

“Neither would it be right to compel them (i.e. souls, to enter into the bodies of swine, serpents, and dogs,) if they are unbegotten; for the unbegotten is similar and equal to, and the same as, the unbegotten; and neither in power nor dignity can one be preferred to another.”

Coh. ad Græc. c. 23, p. 24, (p. 22, A.)

“The power of matter being unbegotten and equal in duration and age to the Maker, is able to oppose

\[1\] V. Suicer. Theor. s. voce, ἀναγγέλλω. — Tr.
his will, for he who has not created has no power against that which has not been made, (but is eternal); so that force cannot be applied to what is free from all external necessity."

When the Exhortation makes mention of the reputation which philosophy had enjoyed, and continued to enjoy, among the Greeks, the same image is made use of which we find in the Dialogue.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 5, p. 108, (p. 224, A.)

"Ελα立案 Πλάτωνα και Πυθαγοροῦ, σοφοὺς ἀνδρέας, οί δάκτυλοι τείχους ἠμὺν καὶ οἰς εἰς ἑαυτοὺς πιλοσοφίας εξεγερνοῦντο;"

Coh. ad Græc. c. 3, p. 9, (p. 4, C.)

"Τοὺς σοφοὺς πάντως δήτων καὶ πιλοσοφῶν λέγεται ἐπὶ τούτων γάρ ὀστεῖ ὁ τείχος ὀμφαῖς, καταφεύγειν εἰάσωλε, ἐπεὶ δεῖ τις ὑμῖν ταῖς τῶν σωτηρίων περὶ θεῶν ἀπαγγέλλῃ δόξας."

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 5, p. 108, (p. 224, A.)

"Were these things unknown to Plato and Pythagoras, wise men who were to us like a wall and a defence of philosophy?"

Coh. ad Græc. c. 3, p. 9, (p. 4, C.)

"You mention those who were certainly wise and philosophers: for to these, as to a fortified wall, you have been used to fly for refuge, when any one has reminded you of the opinions of the poets concerning the gods."

The picture which the Exhortation draws of the Prophets of the Old Testament, apart from the drapery, reappears in all the most essential points in the Dialogue. Here, as well as there, their high antiquity is set forth; here, as well as there, they are represented as holy men, as organs of the Divine Spirit, and as heralds of the future; here, as well as there, it is maintained that they alone were in possession of
true knowledge, and never delivered their private opinions and fancies, but only what they had received by a higher illumination. And when, in the Dialogue, they are eulogised for having kept themselves always free from the fear of man and the love of fame, there is a secret analogy between the treatise and the Exhortation, for, in the latter, the Grecian philosophers are severely rebuked for these weaknesses.\(^1\)

A decisive argument for the origin of Justin's Exhortation lies in the various reading with which Plato's well-known expression that, "it is very difficult to know God, but altogether impossible to communicate this knowledge to any one,"\(^2\)—is quoted in the shorter Apology, Apol. 2, 10, p. 95, (p. 48, E.) τὸν πατέρα καὶ δημιουργόν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνεξαρτήτως τῆς ἀνάλογης ἀπόφασις, στὸν ἀδιάλειπτον αὐτῆς πάντως ἀσφαλεῖς,—"to know the Father and Maker of all is not easy, nor, having found him, is it safe to tell it to all persons."\(^3\)—No one of all the Fathers besides Justin makes use of the various reading ἀσφαλεῖς; all adhere to the reading of the Platonic text άδιάλειπτον, with the exception of Tertullian, who uses the Latin term difficile.\(^4\) But, in the Exhortation, that various reading makes its appearance. It is true this expression of Plato's is not precisely quoted, but the peculiar sentiment it conveys, that Plato knew and maintained the

---

\(^1\) Comp. Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.) with Coh. ad Graec. c. 8, p. 13, (p. 9, A. B.); c. 10, p. 15, (p. 11, D.); c. 20, p. 21, (p. 18, D. E.); c. 22, p. 22, (p. 20, D.); c. 36, p. 33, (p. 34, C.); c. 36, p. 36, (p. 37, B.)

\(^2\) The Platonic expression in this passage is erroneously put into the mouth of Socrates. Compare Brucker, Hist. crit. philos. T. III. p. 374, and Eisenlohr, Argumenta ab apologetis. T. II. p. 201.


doctrine of one God, but, from fear of the poison-cup of Socrates, did not venture publicly to express it, and therefore has designedly brought it forwards in his writings timidly and covertly, has plainly arisen from the erroneous reading ἀφαλῆς in that confession of Plato's which is specially introduced, Coh. ad Græc. c. 22, p. 22, (p. 20, C. D.) ταῦτα ἐν Αἰγυπτῳ μαθὼν ὁ Πλάτων καὶ σφόδρα ἄφαλῆς τοὺς περὶ Ἰην ιερομενούς, τού μὲν ὅνομας Μωσίως, διὰ τὸ ἑνα καὶ μόνον διδάσκαλον Ἰστών, μνημονεύσας παρὰ ταῖς Αἰγυπτίων ὑπό ἀφαλῆς ἡγαίμονα διδόμενος τὸν Ἀρείου πάγον τοῦ δὲ καλὸς εἰρημένον ύπ' αὐτοῦ, &c. "When Plato had learned these things in Egypt, and had been greatly delighted with what was said concerning the one God, he did not think it safe to mention the name of Moses as a teacher of the one and sole God, being in fear of the Areopagus; but what had been admirably said by him (Moses)," &c. —— This coincidence of the Apology and the Exhortation in the reading ἀφαλῆς, can neither be accidental nor the consequence of designed imitation, but can only be accounted for by admitting the Exhortation to be the work of the same person who composed the Apology, that is, of Justin.  

We do not prolong the discussion respecting the Exhortation, being convinced that its genuineness can not longer be fairly doubted. A determination of the

---

1 Coh. ad Græc. c. 20, p. 21, (p. 18, D. E.) Πλάτων, ἀφαλῆς μὲν, ὡς Ιστών, τοὺς περὶ Ἰστῆ ἱερομενούς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφήτων ἰδακομαίνας ἄν ἐν Αἰγυπτῳ γινόμενοι ἤγον, διὰ τὸ τε συμβασιλέα Σωκράτης ἰδιὼς μένως καὶ αὐτῶς Ἀντωνίου την καὶ Μιλίτου καὶ Ιαμάτη γνώσει παρασκευασμένα κατηγορητα ἀντὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίων . . . . φαίνει τοῦ πανίκος σεικίλεν τινά καὶ ἱσχυρομενοὺς τοῦ περὶ Ιστῶν γυμνὰς λόγον. —— Plato approved, as might be expected, the doctrines of Moses and the other prophets concerning the one and sole God which he learned when in Egypt, but, alarmed by the fate of Socrates, lest he also might excite some Anytus or Miltius to accuse him to the Athenians, from fear of the cup of hemlock, constructed a varied and figurative discourse concerning the gods.”

place and date of its composition is impossible. What Prudentius Maranus has collected on this question is a mere tissue of guesses and improbabilities.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FRAGMENT ON THE RESURRECTION.

The Fragment on the Resurrection was later acknowledged than the other writings of Justin, having been incorporated by John of Damascus in his Parallels, and thus preserved from destruction. Halloix first discovered it in a manuscript of the Parallels which the Cardinal Rupesciadal had given to the Jesuits' College in Paris, and printed it in the Greek and Latin in his Life of Justin. Hence, Grabe transferred it to his Spicilegium, &c., and divided it into chapters. After it had found a place in the Benedictine edition of Justin's works, Teller published it separately in a Helmstadt Programm, under the title of Justin Martyris divi òc resurrectionis carnis. Helmst. 1766.

It was very natural, that soon after this Fragment had been brought to light, the question should be raised, whether, and how far it might be considered a genuine production of Justin's. The answers given were various, and even at the present time, opinions are divided. While many critics, such as Tentzel, Grabe, Teller, Munschér, Dan. v. Köln, are in favour of

1 John Damasc. Opera, T. II. p. 756, sqq.
2 Spicilegium patrum et hereticorum, II. p. 177, sqq.
3 Eserciationes Selectae, I. 198.
4 Spicilegium Patrum, II. 177.
5 Justin. Martyr. òwòps, praf. p. 3, and Fides Dogmatie de resurrectione carnis per 4 priora secula, (Hal. et Helmst. 1766.) p. 81.
6 Handbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, (3. ed.) II. 443.
its genuineness, others, as Tillemont, Nourry, Jebb, Prudentius Maranus, Neander, Mohler, take the opposite side, and Herbig has very lately undertaken to prove its spuriousness. We coincide in opinion with those who receive the Fragment as a genuine production of Justin's, partly because the grounds for the opposite opinion are inadequate, partly because the Fragment in several points shows an essential affinity to the existing genuine works of the Martyr.

First of all, as to the want of external evidence in favour of this Fragment, many persons have strenuously urged that John of Damascus is far too late and uncertain a witness to allow of our attaching any great weight to his testimony. It is true, neither Eusebius nor Photius mentions a treatise of Justin's on the Resurrection; nor would we satisfy ourselves with the supposition which, as far as we are aware, was first brought forward by Grabe, and after him noticed by Daniel v. Cöltn, that this Fragment might be only a part of a larger work, a section of Justin's work against Marcion, for its beginning and end, as well as the title in John of Damascus, τοῦ ἀγίου Ιωσήφου...

.. ἐν τῷ πεῖ ἀναστάσεως, lead us to consider the Fragment as originally a work independent and complete in itself. But, on the other hand, we remark that Eusebius and Photius neither intended nor were able to give a complete catalogue of Justin's works; as for instance, Justin's works against Heresies in general, which the Apologist himself distinctly mentions, is entirely passed over by Eusebius; their silence is therefore not decisive. But notwithstanding

1 Memoires pour servir, &c. II. 170.
4 Opera Justin. Mart. p. 584.
5 Allgemeine Geschichte, l. 753.
6 Patrologie, l. 234.
7 Comment. de Scriptis. p. 74, sqq.
this silence, the Fragment is not entirely destitute of external credentials. Irenæus has a passage which so closely resembles it in sentiment, that it must be considered as a rather free quotation.

Iren. ad hæres. 5, 6, p. 299.

Neque plasmatio carnisipse secundum se homo perfectus est sed corpus hominis et pars hominis. Neque enim et anima ipsa secundum se homo; sed anima hominis et pars hominis. Neque spiritus homo; spiritus enim et non homo vocatur. Com-mixtio autem et unitio horum omnium perfectum hominem efficit.

De Resurrect. c. 8, p. 593, D.

Τί γάρ ἢ στιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἄλλος ἢ τὸ ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συνεστὸς ζῶν λογικὸς; μὴ οὖν καδ' ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή ἄνθρωπος; οὐκ' ἄλλος ἄνθρωπον ἃνθρωπος; οὐκ' ἄλλος ἄνθρωπον σώμα καλεῖται. Εἰτε οὖν καὶ ἰδίαι μὲν τούτων οὐδέτερον ἄνθρωπος ἢ στις, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀμφίτερου συμπλοκῆς καλεῖται ἄνθρωπος, etc.

“For what is man but the rational animal composed of soul and body? Is not the soul then, by itself the man? No, but the soul of man. May not the body be called man? No; but it is called the body of man. Therefore, considered in itself, neither of these is man, but the compound of both is called man.”

Methodius (+ 311) refers in his own lost treatise on the Resurrection, to an expression of Justin's relating to the same subject, which yet is not to be met with in any of the Martyr's extant works, and, therefore, indicates a work in which that doctrine was spec-

1 Photius, Bibliothec. cod. 234, II. 298, has preserved for us this allegation of Methodius, which is as follows: Ἰουστῖνος ὁ Νεάπολιτης . . . . καὶ ἐπισκόπησεν μὲν τὸ ἀνθρώπον, καὶ ἐπιτύμησεν δὲ τῷ ζῷῳ λίγην καὶ ἀπεθάνων μὲν σάρκος, ζῇ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖαν τῶν ἑωραών. Justin of Neapolis says that dying is to be inherited, but living inherits; and that the flesh indeed dies, but the kingdom of heaven lives.
cially treated of. It is not improbable, that the treatise that has been handed down by John of Damascus was this very work, and that the expression was originally in one of the places which is now wanting. Procopius of Gaza (†527), in his Commentary on the third chapter of Genesis,¹ distinctly ascribes to Justin a λόγος περὶ ἀναστάσεως, and remarks that Justin had then rejected the opinion of the Heretics, that by the words ἄνεφη γίνεται in Gen. iii. 21, the human body was intended. There is nothing to prevent our taking the Fragment on the Resurrection to be the λόγος mentioned by Procopius; for though the remark made in reference to Gen. iii. 21, is not found in the Fragment, yet, between the 8th and 9th chapters, there is a hiatus where such a remark as this might be expected to be made.

The Fragment is, therefore, by no means so destitute of external evidence, as some would pretend; and though we are very far from attributing to these testimonies an unlimited authority, yet, in the critical scales, they are in favour of the Fragment.

And with respect to the difference of style between the Fragment and the acknowledged works of Justin, there is not so much in this, as may appear at first sight.² It is granted, indeed, that the Fragment has many peculiar phrases and terms of expression, which may be sought for in vain in the Apologies and the Dialogue. Among these we may mention, designation of God, νους τιλσιος, The perfect intelligence, (c. 1, p. 588, C.), οὐκ ἄφρων ὁ τῶν ολίγων νους.—The intelligence of all things is not thoughtless;³—(c. 8, p. 593, C.)—of Christ, ο σωτής ἡμῶν καὶ δεσπότης, Our Saviour and

¹ Grabe Spicilegium patrum, II. 194.
² Herbig Commentat. de Scriptis, p. 82, sq.
³ The designation of God as τῶν ἵλον νους, is perhaps borrowed from Philo, who, (De Migrat. Abrah. c. 1, T. II. p. 293.), thus calls God, and which Justin uses as his own, Coh. ad Græc. c. 9, p. 13, [p. 10, B.]; c. 10, p. 14, [p. 11, B.]; c. 13, p. 17, [p. 14, C.].
Ruler: (c. 1, p. 588, D.), ὁ ἡμέρησις ἱατρὸς Χριστός, Our Physician, Christ, (c. 10, p. 595, E.) of Satan; ὁ ἀντικείμενος, The Adversary, (c. 1, p. 588, D.), ὁ ἀρχων, the Ruler, (c. 3, p. 589, E.) ὁ τῆς σουντιγμάς ἀρχων, The Ruler of Iniquity, (c. 10, p. 595, C.).—of the future state, ὁ μέλλων αἰών, the coming Dispensation, (c. 3, p. 589, E. c. 3. p. 590, A.B.). Peculiar turns of expression; ναὶ φασίν, (c. 4, p 590, B.), ναὶ φησίν...

ἀλλά, (c. 8, p. 593, A. c. 8, p. 594, A.)—πῶς ὅν ἄτοπον, (c. 2, p. 589, A. c. 7, p. 592, E. c. 8, p. 593, B.D.)—the correlative particles; ὡστὲρ...

(κ., p. 588, B. C. c. 3, p. 589, C.),—for which the Apologies and the Dialogue generally use the phrases ὃν τετέλεσον... τόν αὐτόν τετέλεσον; the statement of propositions; ἠπείδη... δικαίως ἄν, (c. 8, p. 593, B.), ἐκ ταῖς... ὅν τι ἐνδίδως, (c. 8, p. 593, B.), ἐκ τῇ... δικαίως ἄν (c. 8, p. 594, B.),—the verb τυγχάνειν, with a particle, as ὑπά τυγχάνει, (c. 1, p. 588, C. c. 5, p. 591, B.). But what writer has so meagre a vocabulary, as to exhaust it in a single work, so that in a second work, he can use not a word, not a phrase, not a turn of expression, which he has not already employed! If a writer, at one time, has a fixed expression for certain conceptions and ideas, it by no means follows, that at another time he may not express the same ideas in a new form. Yet it is sometimes the case, that in the same compositions, along with a regular expression for a definite idea, sometimes another designation is introduced, which, if it stands in a second, and otherwise doubtful work, may easily be represented as the reverse of the usual phraseology of the former work. Thus, for example, Justin, in the Dialogue with Trypho, uses numberless terms to express the incarnation of Christ, the terms, ἀνάντασιν γενέσαι, and σαρκωτοικίσθαι, (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 45, p. 141, [p. 264, A.], c. 48, p. 144, [p. 267, B.], c. 67, p. 164, [p. 292, A.], c. 84, p. 181, [p. 310, B.], c. 87, p. 174, [p. 314, B.], c. 100, p. 195, [p. 326, D.]) and yet once the word σωματοτετειμεῖν occurs, Dial. c. Tr. c. 70, p. 168, [p. 296, D.]. Lastly, there are not
wanting in the Fragment on the Resurrection, peculiarities of language, which are characteristic of Justin's style. In agreement with the phraseology of the Exhortation, (Coh. ad Græc. c. 11, p. 15, [p. 12, B.], c. 14, p. 17, [p. 15, A.]. c. 25, p. 25, [p. 24, B.]), the heathen are designated by the formula, οὶ τῆς πίστεως ἵκτος, those (who are) out of the faith, (De Resurrect. c. 3, p. 590, B.), and οἱ ἵκωμαι, those (who are) without, (c. 5, p. 591, A. c. 8, p. 594, B.). The expression, τίμιον θεία μα παρὰ Θεῷ, a honourable possession in God's esteeem, (De Resurrect. c. 7, p. 592, E.), is also used in the Dialogue, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 2, p. 102, [p. 218, C.]. The conjunction of the synonyms πιστευώμεθα καὶ πεπιστεύμεθα, those who have believed, and are convinced, (De Resurrect. c. 5, p. 590, D.), occurs several times in the longer Apology, (Apol. 1, 8, p. 47, [p. 57, A.], 1, 10, p. 48, [p. 58, B.], 1, 17, p. 54. [p. 64, D.], 1, 18, p. 54, [p. 65, A.], 1, 61, p. 79, [p. 93, D.]. The limitation, and more precise application of a thought, which had been first expressed in a general form, by the introductory formula, λέγω δὴ ας πολυποθόμω γεννησθη καὶ παρακολούθητε τὴν λογίαν τῆς σαρκὸς πολυτιμᾶτε λέγω δὴ ἐν τραυμασίᾳ, (De Resurrect. c. 3, p. 590, A.), conferring himself in other things to the practices of a corporeal existence, that is to say, in food, &c.; or εἰ ἐκ τῆς αποστασίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῶν, λέγω δὴ τῶν κοσμικῶν λόγων—from unbelief their mother. that is to say, from worldly considerations, (De Resurrect. c. 5, p. 591, B.) Similar phraseology is not unfrequent in the Apologies and the Dialogue, Compare Apol. 2, 1, p. 88, (p. 41, C.), τῶν πιστεύειν . . . . τῶν εἰςανατίους καὶ ὄμοιον Ἀριστοκράτας ἐν ἀνατικὼ συγγενεῖας μὴ ἦσθι τῷ Ἰσω, (λέγω· μὴ τῶν γενεαλογῶν Χριστιανῶν)—those who believe that the virtuous, and the men who live like Christ, will be with God, in a state exempt from suffering, (we speak of those who have become Christians)—Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 142, (p. 265, D.), τῶν ἀλλοιωσάνθρωπος λέγω δὴ τῶι ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδιῶν διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης περιτυμηθέντας,—other men, I mean those from among the Gentiles who have been circumcised.
from error by Christ."—c. 69, p. 167, (p. 295, B.), των ἑρημωτῶν γνώσεως θεοῦ, λέγω δὲ τοῖς ἔλεησιν, — "those who are destitute of the knowledge of God, I mean the Gentiles."—c. 120, p. 213, (p. 349, C.), τοῦ γενοὺς τοῦ ἐμοῦ, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρείων, "My people, I mean the Samaritans." Under such circumstances, the phraseology of the Fragment on the Resurrection, makes it noways inadmissible to recognise in this treatise a work of Justin's.

Nor do we consider it any valid objection, that where the Fragment mentions the docetic view of Christ, it is represented as the opinion of only some persons, de Resurrect. c. 2, p. 589, B. Ἐδώ τινες, οἱ λέγουσι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἰησοῦν πνευματικὸν μόνον παρεἴπαι, μυκτί ἐν σαρκί, φαντασίαν δὲ σαρκὸς παρεσχηκίαι. "There are some who say that Jesus himself was present only spiritually, not in flesh, but assuming the appearance of flesh." For a writer of the second century, at which period docetism was at its height, if he placed the adherents of that doctrine, in contrast with those of the Catholic Church, would speak of them as a little flock, (τινες). But Justin in the Dialogue, says of the Jewish Christian heretics, who denied the preternatural conception of Christ, and whose numbers, in themselves, were not inconsiderable, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 48, p. 144, p. 267, D.) καὶ ἐδώ τινες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμιτέρου γένους ἀμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἀνθρώπον δὲ ἐὰς ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀποραινόμενοι. — "And there are some of our nation who confess that he is Christ, but speak of him as a man, begotten of men."

The doctrinal statement of the Fragment would awaken stronger suspicion of its genuineness, if they differed as widely from those of the Apologies and the Dialogue as has been asserted. But the alleged doctrinal contradiction is partly the pure result of misunderstanding, and partly consists in a different shade of the same fundamental idea.¹ It is a pure

¹ It is singular that among the grounds of suspicion brought against the Fragment by Herbig, (Comment. de Scriptis. p.
misunderstanding when the larger Apology is charg-
ed\(^1\) with maintaining, (Apol. I, 59, p. 78, [p. 92, C. D.]) that Plato taught not only the formation but also the creation of the universe by God; and, in this way, the Apology is made to contradict the Fragment, in which it is said that Plato represented God and matter as the eternal principles of all things. For the parallel drawn in the Apology between the Mosaic and Platonic cosmogonies is not complete. It is, indeed, asserted that Plato borrowed from Moses his view respecting the formation of the universe from formless matter, but it is not said that Plato agreed with Moses respecting the temporal origin of matter.

It is, moreover, a pure misapprehension to maintain that in the Fragment, the human soul is called a part and an inbreathing of God, and therefore considered as absolutely unchangeable, while in the Dialogue only a relative immortality, dependent on the will of God, is attributed to it. (Dial. c. Tr. c. 6, p. 108, [p. 224, B.]) Certainly the Fragment contains the assertion, (De Resurrect. c. 8, p. 594, A.) \( \eta \mu \nu \iota \chi \eta \iota \sigma \iota \nu \alpha \rho \sigma \tau \rho \sigma \omega, \mu \iota \zeta \omega \sigma \alpha \omicron \tau \alpha \omicron \acute{\omega} \tau \omicron \omicron \chi \iota \iota \nu \zeta \iota \mu \acute{\iota} \phi \acute{\iota} \sigma \nu \eta \omega. \) "The soul, indeed, is immortal, being a part and an inbreathing of God."—This, however, does not belong to the author, but is a position of the heretics, with which they opposed the doctrine received by the Church of the resurrection of the body. The author introduces it not as held by

---

\(^{79}\) it is mentioned that the Fragment sometimes adduces arguments of which Justin's other writings know nothing. Has then a writer nothing else to do but to repeat himself? But it is perfectly hypercritical when this opponent objects to the Fragment, that the material out of which the human body was formed is called earth, while the Dialogue with Trypho states that man was originally composed of the earth and other elements. (De Resurrect. c 5, p. 590, E., and Dial. c. Tr. c. 62, p. 159, [p. 285, C.] The Fragment does not concern itself with physiological enquiries, which might have made it necessary to have set down all the elementary parts of which the author supposed the human body to be composed, with scientific exactness.

---

\(^{1}\) Herbig. Comment. de Scriptis. p. 79.
him to be correct, but in order to shew the heretics, that, even on these premises the doctrine of the Church on the resurrection was not in the least endangered.

Again, it is an error to suppose that there is a contradiction in the views taken of the gods of Greece between the Fragment and the other writings of Justin. The Fragment is very far from considering the gods of Greece as dead nonentities; it views them rather as daemons, in the same way as the Apologies and Dialogue. In fact, it speaks of them in almost the same words as the Dialogue, e. g.

De Resur. c. 5, p. 590, E.         Dial. c. Tr. c. 73, p. 170, (p. 298, C.)

Τοῖς εἰδωλοῖς τὰ Θεία τοῖς θεοῖς αὐτῶν, οἳ ὤντα ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, διὸ διαλύοις ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ἢφονται, τὸ πάντα δύνασθαι πεπηρυτέκασιν δαιμονίσως οὗτοι, καὶ διὸς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει ὅτι οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἑδρῶν δαιμονία.

Οὐκ ἦστιν διόνους τοῖς τῶν ἑδρῶν θεοῖς ἔκκεινα γὰρ ἀδικία ἦστι δαιμονία.

c. 83, p. 181, (p. 309, D.)

ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν λόγον τῆς κλήσεως καὶ τῆς μετανοίας ταῦτα ἐν ἰδιαστάσει, ὅποιον τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπεξηγεῖσθαι αὐτῶν ὡς φησὶν Δαβίδ (Psalm xcvi. 5.) οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἑδρῶν δαιμονία.

Translation of the Greek.

De Resur. c. 5, p. 590, E.

“For the Gentiles believe that the idols, their gods, who have ears and hear not, have eyes and see not, can do all things, being demons, as the Scripture saith, ‘for the gods of the Gentiles are demons.”

Dial. c. Tr. c. 73, p. 170, (p. 298, C.)

“He is not like the gods of the Gentiles, for they are the images (idols) of demons.”
c. 83, p. 181, (p. 309, D.)

"He hath sent forth the word of calling and of repentance to all the nations, where the demons lord it over them, as David says, (Ps. xcvi. 5,) the gods of the Gentiles are demons."

The vascillation of the Fragment between ἐῠδωλα and δαίμονια, may be explained by Justin's notion, that the statues of the gods were called and formed after Dæmons, and the conjunction of both words in the Dialogue, which also occurs in Irenæus and Clemens of Alexandria, may have originated in the blending of two biblical passages, 1 Chron. xvi. 26, πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐνεών ἐῠδωλα, and Ps. xcv. 5, πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐνεών δαίμονια.

It would be more than a simple mistake if it were urged against the genuineness of the Fragment, that in it Satan appears as the adversary of Christianity, and the originator of erroneous doctrine, (De Resurrect. c. 1, p. 588, D., c. 10, p. 595, C.) while Justin usually calls the demons the leaders of the heretics and of the enemies of Christianity in general; but this two-fold view is no contradiction; it is nothing but a simple change of representation. Thus the Dialogue (c. Tr. c. 69, p. 167, [p. 294, D. 295, A.] makes Satan the inventor of the Grecian myths, in which Justin saw imitations of the Old Testament prophecies, while the longer Apology (Apol. 1, 54, p. 75, [p. 89, D.] 1, 54, p. 76, [p. 90, A.]) speaks of the demons as the originators. The justification of this variety of expression lies in the notion which Justin favoured: (Apol. 1, 28, p. 60, (p. 71, A.) "σαρκί ἡμῶν ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ρήματος τῆς ἀκατάστασις"
It also furnishes us no room for objection that in the Fragment, a far stricter judgment is passed respecting marriage than in Justin's other writings. For the assertion of the Fragment (De Resurr. c. 3, p. 589, D.) that marriage, on account of the sensual pleasure connected with procreation, borders on what is sinful, has a sufficient point of connection in the zeal with which Justin, in his Apology, commends celibacy, Apol. 1, 15, p. 52, (p. 62, B.) Besides, how often among thinking persons do we find views that at first were mild, gradually acquiring greater strictness and even severity; or inversely the original harshness of an opinion becomes gradually softened down. Tertullian and Origen may serve as witnesses for the truth of this remark. Both these eminent men express themselves in their different treatises in as different a manner respecting marriage, as Justin in the Fragment, compared with the Apologies and the Dialogue.

Another point erroneously brought forward against the genuineness of the Fragment, is, that it is asserted therein that Christ was born of a virgin, in order that procreation, connected with ungodly pleasure, might receive a check, and evidence be afforded that God was far from needing the union of the sexes for the formation of man, (De Resurr. c. 3, p. 589, E.) while in the Dialogue, the reason why Christ was born of a virgin, is stated to be, that the sin of man might

1 Herbig, p. 77.
2 Compare Tertull. ad uxor, 1, 2, T. III. p. 58, De Monogam. c. 1, p. 102, sq. with De Exhort. castit. c. 9, p. 95, sqq. De Monogam. c. 3, p. 104, sq.
3 Sometimes Origen speaks of marriage as in itself perfectly agreeable to nature, and at other times he speaks of procreation as in itself impure and unholy. Compare Homil. in Genes. iii. 6, T. II. p. 69, and Homil. 6, in Num. T. II. p. 288, with Comment. in Matth. xvii. 35, T. III. p. 827.
4 Herbig, Comment. de Scriptis. p. 77.
make its exit from the world in the same way as that by which it made its entrance into it, that, as by the Virgin Eve (παρθένος γὰς οὐσα Εύα καὶ ἄφθορος), Dial. c. Tr. c. 100, p. 195, [p. 327, C.]) disobedience and death were brought into the world, so by the Virgin Mary the Redeemer from disobedience and death was brought forth. But these two views do not nullify but complement one another. And such complements are quite characteristic of Justin's style. He never develops an idea in all its bearings at one time, but, as the occasion varies, presents it first on one side, and then on another, so that it is only by collecting and comparing these scattered representations that we obtain the totality of the idea. Thus, for example, he views the incarnation of Christ sometimes as the destruction of the dominion of Dæmons, sometimes as the sympathising with, and removing human sufferings, sometimes the restoration and reconciliation of the human race, sometimes as freeing men from the fear of death. It is evident that these different objects are so many members that, together, make up one and the same idea. Who would maintain that they suppose the existence of as many different authors?

We are now come to the last scruple which has been raised against admitting this Fragment to be a work of Justin's. It relates to the image of God impressed on man at his creation. It has been supposed that a contradiction exists, because the Fragment seeks for this likeness in the human body, while in Justin's

1 Apol. 2, 6, p. 93, (p. 45, A.) and Dial. c. Tr. c. 45, p. 141, (p. 264, A.)
2 Apol. 2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, D.)
3 Apol. 1, 23, p. 57, (p. 68, C.)
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 48, p. 141, (p. 264, A.)
6 De Resurrect. c. 7, p. 592, D. φησὶν ὁ λόγος: σωτηρέως καὶ οἱ οἰκεῖοι εἰς ἐσχάτας εἰς ζωὴν ἐν τοῖς εἰς ἐπιλαμβανομένους. Φησὶ γὰς ὁ λόγος καὶ ἐκλάβιν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐκλάβιν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐκλάβιν ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἐπιλαμβανομένους. Φησὶ: καὶ οἱ οἰκεῖοι εἰς ἐπιλαμβανομένους.
other writings, not only the likeness of man to God appears to be placed only in the moral freedom of choice,¹ but the Jews are severely blamed for attributing to God human hands, and feet, and fingers;² and the Greeks are reproached with resting their whole system of idolatry on an erroneous interpretation of Gen. i. 26, according to which they believed that man resembled God in outward form. But the supposed contradiction does not, in fact, exist. For, let it be granted that Justin, in his Apologies and Dialogue, had placed the likeness of man to God in the freedom of the will, although he has never expressed himself clearly and distinctly upon it, it does not follow that he did not at the same time consider the human body as a reflection of the divine image.³ The passage in the Exhortation could only be construed as really contradicting the sentiments of the Fragment if the former denied all affinity to God in the human body, and the latter meant that God had a figure allied to the form of the human body. But neither of these is the case. The Exhortation only combats the notion that the statues of the heathen gods, since they had the human form, were also real copies of the divine being, since the likeness between

¹ Apol. 1, 44, p. 69, (p. 81, B. C.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 62, p. 159, (p. 285, C.)
² Dial. c Tr. c. 114, p. 207, (p. 341, D.)
³ Coh. ad Grac. c. 34, p. 31, (p. 32, B.) θαυμάζειν τοῦτο ἵνα γνωρίζωμεν τὰ ὑπόσωμα κατασκευασμένα ἐν χρώματι πεπραγμένοι. Εἰ τις καὶ τῶν Σαμιούννων Ἰταλοῖς τοῖς σώμασις ἐν ὑπόσωμα κατασκευασμένοις ἵνα γνωρίζωμεν θαυμάζειν τοῦτον ἀπὸ τῆς Συμβολῆς ἡμῶν καθένος μετὰ τῆς σειρᾶς ἱερατικῆς καθένος χρώματι.

"If any one should investigate the reason of images, whence it was that the inventors of your gods, assigned to them the forms of men, he will find that this too was learned from the divine history; for the Mosaic history, speaking of the countenance of God, 'Let us make man after our image and likeness,' understanding by it that men were made in the form of God, they began to frame their gods, forming them on such a model."
God and man consisted not in form. It nevertheless allows that the human body bears the divine likeness, and only leaves it undetermined in what the affinity consists; (Coh. ad Græc. c. 38, p. 34, (p. 36, C.) (Χριστοῦ) τὸν Χαὶ σῖχονα καὶ ὑμοίωσεν Θεοῦ πταλαιόν ἐν τῇ ἁναλαβοῦν ἁσαθων τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων ἡμᾶς προγόνων ἀντικροτεῖς Σιωτῆσιάς. “Christ taking man created after the image and likeness of God, recalled us to the piety of our ancient progenitors.”—The Fragment does not mention the form of the human body, and, agreeably to the connection of its argument, means to say nothing more than that God originated not only the soul but the body of man, and has impressed upon it something divine, and allied to himself, and that hence the body shall hereafter rise again. But it leaves undetermined in what this likeness to God in the human body consists. Probably Justin had formed no clear views on the subject, and intended only to say that the bodily organization of man, though of a material substance, possessed a relative value in this respect, that, both generally and particularly, it stood nearer the idea and being of God than the organization of the inferior animals. Perhaps he might have a reference to the form of the human body, but not so as with an anthropomorphic limitation to attribute to God limbs like those of the human body. There must have appeared to Justin something sacred in the human structure, since he traced in it a resemblance to the cross of Christ. Apol. 1, 55, p. 76. (p. 90, C. D.)

From the whole, we infer that there is nothing which really invalidates the genuineness of the Frag-

1 That in this passage the divine likeness of human nature is to be looked for in the body, is evident from the verb ἀλάσθην, which, both in general phraseology and in Justin’s, refer solely to the corporeal structure. Compare Coh. ad Gr. c. 30, p. 30, (p. 29, D.) Μωυσῆς... τοις ἀλάσθης ἅσθι ἀνατολεῖ ἀλάσθην μὴν μιαν, εἴπτων λέγων καὶ ἰσχίαν ἐν Σίθες ἐν ἀνατολήν, χωδε ἀπέ τῆς γῆς λαβόντω... ἐν γῇς ἅσθι ἀνατολεῖ. “Moses has recorded the formation of man, saying thus, ‘And God made man, taking dust of the earth’—man has been formed of the earth.”—Apol. 1, 9, p. 48, (p. 58, A.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 40, p. 137, (p. 269, A.)
ment on the Resurrection; while, on the other hand, there are several things in its favour. In several points a striking agreement is found between the Fragment and Justin's other writings. We would not lay too much stress on the coincidence, that both in the Fragment and the Dialogue, man is designated a λογικὸν ζῶν, (De Resurrect. c. 8, p. 593, D. and Dialog. c. Tr. c. 93, p. 190, p. 321, B.), and the body is represented as the house of the soul. (De Resurrect. c. 10, p. 595, A. and Dial. c. Tr. c. 40, p. 137, (p. 259, A.); and a tripartite division is attributed to human nature. (De Resurrect. c. 10, p. 595, A. and Dial. c. Tr. c. 6, p. 109, (p. 224, C.) But the following particulars appear important.

The Fragment, in common with the Dialogue, teaches that revealed truth, as such, requires no evidence.

De Resurrect. c. 1, p. 588, A. | Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)

'O μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγος ὃς ἀποδείξεως πε- ἔστιν ἐλέεις ὑπὸ τοὺς λόγους, ἵνα ἐκπνεύσην τοὺς λόγους, οἱ σιωπηταὶ ἀληθείας, μηδὲ σιωπηταὶ ἀποδείξεως ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας.

Translation of the Greek.

De Resurrect. c. 1, p. 588, A.

"The word of truth is free and independent, it is not disposed to submit to any trial of argument, nor to sustain an examination, by proof, from its hearers."

Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)

"Nor did the Prophets make discourses with a regular deduction of proofs, since they were credible witnesses of the truth above all demonstration."
The Fragment, like the longer Apology, meets the objection against the resurrection of the body, which the heathen drew from the supposed impossibility of the fact, with the singular remark, that the formation of the human body from so small a quantity of a fluid secretion, would in itself appear equally impossible, and yet it is actually the case.

Both the Fragment and the Dialogue attribute the wonderful works which Christ wrought on the blind, the lame, and the deaf, and especially his raising the dead, to the design of thus leading men to belief in their future resurrection, and to the conviction that at the second coming of Christ, the awakened body would have none of its present blemishes, but possess all its members in their full integrity.

De Resurrect. c. 4, p. 590, C.  
Χριστός . . . τοὺς ἐκ γνησίως και κατὰ τὴν σάρκα και τοὺς ἐκ γνησίως και κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τῷ δὲ καὶ ἀκούον, τῷ δὲ καὶ ὄρατι τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τῶν ἐγγὺς ἐνσώματα τούτων, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν, εἰς τὸν ἄγιον και αὐτοῦ

Dial. c. Tr. c. 69, p. 168, (p. 295, D. p. 296, A.)  
Εἴδον ἐκ τῆς γῆς τυφλοὺς αναβλέποντας, καὶ κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκ γνησίως και κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν, εἰς τὸν ἄγιον και αὐτοῦ.
De Resurrect. c. 4, p. 590, C.

"They have beheld on earth the blind with recovered sight, the lame walking, at his word; all which things the Saviour did, first indeed, that what was said by the Prophets concerning him might be fulfilled, that the blind see again and the deaf hear; but also to produce the belief, that at the resurrection the flesh shall be raised complete. For if on earth he healed the infirmities of the flesh, and made the body complete, much more shall he do this at the resurrection, so that the flesh shall arise pure and complete."

"If there was no need of the flesh, why did he heal it? And what is the most powerful (argument) why did he raise the dead? why? unless to show what the resurrection would be?"

Dial. c. Tr. c. 69, p. 168, (p. 295, D. p. 296, A.)

"Christ—healed those who, from their birth, and according to the flesh, were blind, and deaf, and lame, causing by his word the one to leap, the other to hear, and the other to see,—also raising the dead and causing them to live, and by his works he caused the men of that age to know him—and he himself did these things, to persuade those who would believe on him; that if any one labouring under any bodily defect, should become a keeper of the precepts delivered by him, he would raise him complete at his second coming, and then make him immortal, incorruptible, and impassible."

The coincidence in so many peculiar lines of argument cannot be accidental; that this argumentation has been traditional, is also not allowed, the genuineness of the Fragment is consequently sufficiently established.
SECTION II.

SPURIOUS WRITINGS.

As the result of the investigations hitherto carried on, we conclude that the two Apologies, the Dialogue with Trypho, the Exhortation to the Greeks, and the Fragment on the Resurrection must be regarded as the unquestionable productions of Justin; on the other hand, all the other writings which still pass under the Martyr's name, must be considered spurious. On the greater number of these, a decisive judgment has already been passed, and no further discussion is required. To this class belong the "Refutation of some Aristotelian doctrines," the "Questions and Answers to the Orthodox." "The Questions of a Christian to the Greeks," and "Of a Greek to the Christian." "The Representation of an Orthodox confession of Faith," and "An Epistle to Zenas and Serenus." Of three pieces, again, the judgment already passed is not decisive, and the general belief in their genuineness which anciently prevailed, has still its advocates. A revived examination is therefore necessary.


2 In these questions and answers, express mention is made of Irenæus, Origen, and the Manicheans.

3 In these questions also the Manicheans are mentioned.

4 The representation presupposes the monophysical controversy, therefore belongs probably to the second half of the fifth century.

5 This Epistle presupposes the existence of Christian monkery.
CHAPTER I.

THE DISCOURSE TO THE GREEKS.

It would be offering no dishonour to the memory of Justin if we could venture to ascribe to him the λόγος σημείον Ἐλληνάς, which, to the present time, has been included, by many persons, among his works. For the task proposed by the author, to vindicate the rationality of his conversion from heathenism to Christianity, by a representation of the immoral tendencies of the former contrasted with the morality of the latter, is executed, though briefly, yet not unsuccessfully. But a closer critical examination of the work shows that it cannot have proceeded from Justin. We acknowledge, indeed, that the same demonstrative force does not belong to each of the proofs we are about to adduce; and we know that against two of them the same remarks may be made with which we refuted similar objections in reference to the Exhortation and the Fragment on the Resurrection; but the force of the evidence is not thereby weakened, for it lies in the combination of all the proofs, and is not a little strengthened by the circumstance that the Discourse to the Greeks, (besides the points of difference,) bears only some slight resemblance to Justin’s genuine writings.

1 We mention only Tentzel’s Exercitationes selectae, I. 174, 426, sq. Nourry’s Apparatus ad biblioth. max. I. 354. Ruhnert’s Acta Martyrum, 47. Prudent. Marani, Prolegomena, 3, 2, 2, p. lxix. Kestner’s Die Agape, 333. Tscharner’s Fall des Heidentums, I. 206. Junius, De Justino Mart. apologeta adv. ethnios;—of an opposite opinion are Grabe, Spicilegium Patrum, ii. 149. Oudin, De Scriptoribus ecclesiis antiquis, I. 189. Herbig, Commentaris, &c. 65. Mohler, Patrologie, I. 224. Neander says, (Allgemeine Geschichte, &c. I. 748.) "'Under Justin’s name we have a short discourse (λόγος σημείον Ἐλληνάς) to the heathen, which is not found in any catalogue of his writings, but which, if it did not proceed from him, for its style is more rhetorical, bears at least the impress of the same age'—v. Ruy. H. J. Rose’s Transl. vol. ii. p. 343.
The first consideration against the authenticity of the Discourse is the absence of historical evidence for Justin's authorship. It is true, Eusebius and Photius mention, among the works of Justin, a piece entitled λόγος στός Ἑλληνικος, but the sketch of its contents, which these writers also give, does not suit the Discourse to the Greeks, for in this latter daemons are not mentioned, nor is there a discussion of the points in dispute between Christians and the Grecian philosophers.

The style of the Discourse differs throughout from the complexion of Justin's genuine writings. Justin in general writes negligently, loosely, in the language of common life; the style of the Discourse to the Greeks is compressed, nervous, full of life and historical colouring. The latter has also a multitude of peculiar and artificial expressions, which are quite foreign to Justin's writings; thus, for instance, Patronymics instead of proper names, Πηληιαδης (c. 1, p. 2, [p. 37, Ε.]); δ Παυκηιος Δασειαδης, (c. 1, p. 2, [p. 38, Α.]); δ μεγαλωμαις Δασκοιδης, (c. 2, p. 3, [p. 38, Δ.]); δ Δηλειδης, (c. 3, p. 3, [p. 39, Α.]); and the words τα των σωιητων συνηιματα, (c. 1, p. 1, [p. 37, Δ.]); σοφία ἀπαραιμιλητοι, (c. 5, p. 4, [p. 40, Β.]); η των ευμορφη, c. 5, p. 4, [p. 40, B.]); το ευγενειας φιλαγγιαμ, (c. 5, p. 4, [p. 40, C.]); φυγαδευτηριον and φυγαδευτηριον, (c. 5, p. 4, sq. [p. 40, C. D.]); των ως παιδιων

1 Hist. eccles. 4, 18, 1, 376. ο σοφις "Ελληνας, ει το μακεων τωι παλαιτων παιδεις, αμων η και τωι Ελληνων φιλοσοφων ζητουμαις υπαντηναι λογος, περι των των δαιμονων διαλαμβανει φυτων.

2 Bibliothec. cod. 125, 1. p. 94, τεσσερα περιγραμματια και των ισων συνιατησι . . . . ει τη τεττη τωροι φυτως δαιμονων διιλητευμα.

3 Justin, 'Οδοιοις (Apoll. 1, 18, p. 54, [p. 65, B.]) Yet in the discourse to the Greeks, this name is also used, c. i. p. 2, (p. 38, B.)


5 Justin, το ελληνικιον (Apoll. 1, 18, p. 54, [p. 65, B.]) 1, 14, p. 52, [p. 61, D.]

6 In Justin the word τωμας has almost constantly the metaphorical meaning of the image of some future event.
What the author tells us of the causes that produced his conversion to Christianity does not agree with the character of Justin. For it was not the immorality of the Grecian mythology, as it appears in the poems of Homer and Hesiod,—it was not the low and degrading qualities which these poets attribute to the Grecian deities and heroes,—it was not the shameless debauchery with which the national feasts were celebrated,—none of these things were the occasion of Justin's joining himself to the Christian community; it was the perception of the intrepidity with which the Christians met death: it was the conviction he had attained, that the full knowledge of religious truth could only be found in the bosom of the Christian Church—which withdrew him from heathenism and led him to the Church. While still a heathen, he had long raised himself in the schools of philosophy above the common popular heathenism; he had already learned to forget what was contemptible in the common heathen Cultus, in that more becoming devotion which speculation presented to him.

There are also contradictions between the Discourse to the Greeks, and Justin's acknowledged writings. The author of the Discourse boasts of Christianity, that it formed no philosophers; Justin avows that he

---

1 Justin, τὰ ἱδαμάτα μετεχθεῖσα (Apol. 1, 4, p. 46, [p. 55, D.])
2 Yet in the discourse to the Greeks the word περίτης once occurs, (c. 5, p. 5. [p. 40, D.])
3 Kestner (Die Agape, p. 333, 337.) has not noticed this contradiction, and as the Discourse is occupied exclusively with stating the grounds of the writer's change of religion, it is of opinion that Justin delivered it first in a philosophical school at Athens, and afterwards circulated it as a treatise.
4 Apol. 2, 12, p. 98, (p. 50, A.)
5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224.)
6 Orat. ad Graec. c. 5, p. 5, (p. 40, C.) ὑπὸ τις . . . . οὗ φιλοσόφους κατασκεύαζε.
became a philosopher by means of Christianity. The author of the Discourse holds the opinion, that the soul immediately after death goes to God; Justin teaches, that at the instant of death, the soul is found in a kind of intermediate state; he believes in the millenarian reign of Christ, and refuses to consider those persons as Christians who maintained that souls immediately after death would be received into heaven.

From these particulars taken together, the conclusion, we think, may be drawn with certainty, that the Discourse to the Greeks improperly bears Justin’s name.

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 109, (p. 225, B.) ταύτης μόνην ὑμῖνοι φιλοσοφίας καθισταὶ τέλειοι ὑμῖνοι. Οὕτως δὲ καὶ διὰ ταύτης φιλοσοφεῖ ἵππα. — This I found to be the only safe and profitable philosophy. And thus, by these things, I became a philosopher.”

2 Orat. ad Graec. c. 6, p. 5, (p. 40, E.) ηρεμάκης τοῖς σκότοις κατὰ καιρὸν τις εστὶν ἄνεκος τῆς θάνατος αὐτῶς. — “Being released from the evils that flow around its neck, it departs to him who made it.”

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 5, p. 107, (p. 223, B.) φημι ... τὸς τοῦτος γὰρ ὁ προτέρων ἡμεῖς ἡμῖν, τὰ δὲ ἀδικίαι καὶ συνεχής ἡμῖν, εἰς τὸν πρόσωπον ἡμῶν σκέψεως τὸν τίτικα ἀνάδεικτον ἔσται. — “I say that the souls of the pious remain somewhere in a better place, but the unjust and the wicked in a worse, waiting for the time of judgment.”

4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 80, p. 177, (p. 306.)

5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 80, p. 178, (p. 307, A.) οὐκ ἔχειν ἀκάκην, μὴ ἔχειν ἀλήθειαν ἀλλὰ ἔκλεις τῷ ἀληθεύειν τὸν ὑμᾶς τῶν ἡμῶν ἀνακαθαρβάνθησαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, μὴ ὑπολήψαντι ἀναδυόσαντα Χριστιάνον. — “As for those who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that at death, their souls are taken up again into heaven,—do not consider them as Christians.”

6 Herbig has accumulated a multitude of other proofs, but they either are based on error, or are altogether futile. So, for example, the circumstance that the author of the Discourse to the Greeks makes use of two passages of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, (c. 5, p. 5, [p. 40, D. E.]) compare Gal. iv. 12; v. 20, could only be employed as an argument against the genuineness of this Discourse, if the Apostle had been expressly named; for the mention of the Apostle’s name is contrary to Justin’s usual custom, but not the use of passages from the Pauline Epistles. Compare Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, (p. 266, D.) with Romans ii. 4.— c. 110, p. 203, (p. 336, D.) with 2 Thess. ii. 3.— c. 111, p. 204, (p. 336, C.) with 1 Cor. v. 7.
CHAPTER II.

THE TREATISE ON THE MONARCHY OF GOD.

The Treatise on the Monarchy of God, in which a multitude of (spurious) expressions of the Grecian poets are collected, in order to prove that Christian monotheism had already been known and acknowledged by the Coryphæi of Grecian literature, wrongfully maintains a place among Justin’s works; and it is strange that it has gained the favour of the learned to that degree that to the present time it has been held by the majority to be a genuine production of Justin’s.¹ Justin, indeed, wrote a treatise on the monarchy of God, but the piece now extant under that title cannot be considered as his. This is evident at once from the manner in which Eusebius speaks of Justin’s work:² καὶ παρὰ τοῦτον (εἰς ήμᾶς ἰλήλυτν αὐτὸν σύγγραμμα) ἄλλο περὶ ᾽Ησιοῦ μοναρχίας, ἡν οὐ μόνον εἰς τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν γραφῶν, ἄλλα καὶ εἰ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν σωστησι βιβλίων. “And, besides these, (his own composition has come down to us) another concerning the monarchy of God, which he composed, not only from the writings among ourselves, but also from the Grecian books.”—We would not lay any weight on the circumstance that Eusebius (with whom Jerome and Photius agree) gives


to Justin's work the title of περὶ Σωτοῦ μοναξίας, while the title of the treatise is simply περὶ μοναξίας; for the genitive Σωτοῦ might easily have been dropped, since the word μοναξία, as used by Ecclesiastical writers, already by itself denoted the sole government of God. But the remark of Eusebius that Justin's treatise drew its proofs of the sole government of God from biblical as well as heathen witnesses, is decisive. For in the work now under consideration this is not the case; we find in it merely a succession of quotations from the Greek poets; and citations from the Scriptures are entirely wanting. The advocates of its genuineness have endeavoured to meet this difficulty in two ways. Some, such as Tentzel and Grabe, with whom Neander is inclined to agree, though hesitatingly, suppose that the treatise may not have come down to us in a perfect state; that the biblical citations were originally placed at the beginning, and were omitted by a transcriber, who thought it useless to transcribe a succession of long passages from the Bible, which any one might easily find by looking into his Bible. They attempt to support this opinion by the following passage in the treatise, (De Monarch. c. 1, p. 36, (p. 103, E.), ἐγώ, ὡς και ἐφεύρειν ὑπόθεσιν, φιλοδέων τῇ γνώμῃ προκεχηρίσας, φιλανθρώπῳ χρησμαί τῇ φωθε και παρπόνσια τοῖς ὑστήρεσι ἐκ τῶν γε νῦν ἔχουσι .... ἀπεστάτην ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν πάντων γνώσιν ἰησοῦχιαν,—I, as I had a little before proposed, having expressed a devout

1 The editions of Justin's works, till that edited by Prudentius Maranus, had erroneously τις Σωτοῦ μοναξίας; in the manuscripts Σωτοῦ is entirely wanting. Robert Stephens, in his edition, first inserted it in the margin.


sentiment, will employ a philanthropic voice, and show to those who have understanding, — that an immutable devotion is due to him who knows all things.”— These words they interpret as meaning, that the Author, after he had used the divine (biblical) witnesses, wished to turn to those that were human, (heathen). But this is a purely gratuitous assumption. The treatise declares itself to be a perfect whole. The words adduced have not the meaning which is attempted to be imposed upon them. They contain only a direct reference to the sentiments shortly before expressed; De Monarch. c. 1, p. 36, (p. 103, C.), φιλανθρωπίαν ἡ μᾶλλον φιλοσοφίας ἕργον ἐστίν, ὑπομνήματα τού γάρ ὠριμον εἰδεναι παρεκκλησίας. “It is the part of a man, who loves his fellow-men, or rather who loves God, to give information to those who have missed what they ought to know.”—The author expressly remarks, at the beginning of his treatise, that he wished to trace to the heathen, the sole sovereignty of God, only by the expressions of their own writers; De Monarch. c. 1, p. 36, (p. 103, E.), φράσεω, αποδεικτε ση εἰς τῶν πατρῶν ἐπ΄τό παντελῶς κτεῖν ἡ Εὐληπτικής ἱστορίας παρήγαγε — κεχρηματίζον, εἰς τῶν πάντων κοινῆ δεδομένων γεγομενῶν. “I will speak, using an argument taken from the ancient poetry of Grecian history, from documents given to all in common,”—and at the conclusion of his task, he says, (De Monarch. c. 6, p. 42, (p. 110, A.), ἀναγγέλλει τῇ τῷ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τῷ ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν), οὐ διὰ τῆς ἠμῶν φωνῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν εἰσαγαγόντων ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀρχήν τῆς καθιστάς κηρύσσομεν. “It behoves you to embrace the true and immutable name (of God), not only on account of what I have said, but from what has been proclaimed by those who have led you into the elements of instruction.”

Not more fortunate was the attempt made by Prudentius Maranus, to render nugatory, the account of Eusebius. He maintained that the words οὐ μόνον must be taken according to the analogy of the Latin language, in the sense of οὐ μόνον οὐ, and that the
meaning of the passage was, "there is also another book come down to us, on the monarchy of God, in which that doctrine is not only not proved from the Scriptures, but rather from heathen works." One sees plainly, that this interpretation is a mere make-shift! How unnatural, if Eusebius had really so expressed himself! Moreover, allowing that οὗ μόνον, in Ecclesiastical writers, is sometimes used in the sense of οὗ μόνον οὗ, yet this phraseology is foreign to Eusebius. As often as οὗ μόνον appears in his writings, with the ἀλλὰ καὶ following it, it has always its ordinary meaning, "not only — but also," compare Hist. Eccles. 4, 23, T. I. p. 388, 6, 3, T. II. p. 151. De Martyr. Palæst. c. 8, T. III. p. 113. Hist. Eccles. 10, 4, T. III. p. 229. De Vit. Constant. 1. 58, p. 71, 2, 27, p. 99, 3, 6, p. 133, 4, 69, p. 326. That, particularly, the above-mentioned passage is to be taken in this sense, is unquestionably evident from the parallel remark, both in language and meaning, which Eusebius makes in another place on the Stromata of Clemens of Alexandria. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 6, 13, T. II. p. 181, ει μὲν τῶς συνομπατέων οὗ μόνον τῆς Σιάς κατάστρωσιν πετούσαι γραφήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πασ" "Ελλησ- σίων, εἰ τι άξια ώρθίμον έδόκει αύτῶς ειδήσας, μημονών. "In the Stromata, he not only made an exhibition of sacred Scripture, but also commemorated the Grecian writers, if anything useful appeared to be said by them."—Accordingly, the judgment of Eusebius respecting Justin's (supposed) treatise on the Monarchy of God, remains a sure witness against the genuineness of the treatise in question.

This testimony is strengthened by the foreign garb which the style of the treatise appears to wear, when

---

1 The examples which Prudentius Maranus has adduced from Tatian, Orat. c. Græc. c. 36, p. 272, [p. 170, D.], and Athenagoras, (Legat. pr. Christ. c. 1, p. 280, [p. 2, D.]), are, if the reading be correct, really demonstrative. The case is quite different with the passages from Justin. Justin makes no use of such an idiom. Compare Apol. 1, 39, p. 67, (p. 78, B.), 1, 57, p. 77, (p. 91, D.); Dial. c. Tr. c. 108, p. 202, (p. 335, B.), c. 122, p. 215, (p. 350, D.)
compared with Justin’s usual mode of representation. Though the amount of what the author has written himself, is small, since his labours consisted, for the most part, in quotation,—yet this little portion contains no inconsiderable number of peculiar words and phrases, which do not occur in Justin’s writings; for example, συζυγία συνέσεως και σωτηρίας, (c. 1, p. 36, [p. 103, B.]), η τῆς συζυγίας καινονία, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 109, C.]), προσάραξα ισανόν συνέσει εἰς σωτηρίαν, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 109, C.]), τὸ περισσὸν ἤδος, (Superstition, c. 1, p. 36, [p. 103, C.]), τὸ ἄγιον καὶ τέλειον ὄνομα, (God, c. 5, p. 39, [p. 107, B.]), τὸ ἄληθεν καὶ ἀτρεπτον ὄνομα, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 110, A.]), τὰ λεγόμενα Θεῖα, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 109, E.]), τὰ Θεῖα τολμήματα, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 110, A.]), οἱ μελογράφοι, (c. 1, p. 36, [p. 104, A.]), οἱ πάνιν, (c. 1, p. 36, [p. 104, A.]), αγνώτες νοῦ, (c. 1, p. 36, [p. 104, A.]), αγνώτες τῆς οὐρανοῦ δίξης, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 110, B.]), τὸ κανώσταυν, (c. 6, p. 42, [p. 109, D.]), τοκαταξήν, (c. 1, p. 36, [p. 103, B.D.]).

In addition to the difference of style there is also a difference of sentiment. Though this is shown only on one point, yet it is very important, since the author brings forward but an extremely small number of his own thoughts and convictions. The difference also affects a fundamental principle, the view, namely, of the origin of Polytheism. While Justin, as we have already intimated, and as will be shown more fully in the sequel. deduces the formation of polytheistic representations from the conversation of the serpent with Eve in Paradise, (Coh. ad Graec. c. 21, p. 22, [p. 19, D. 20, A.]) while in the Grecian deities he sees the daemon-genus of angels and the daughters of men; and ascribes to their manifold agency on men the continued spread and establishment of idolatry, (Apol. 1, 5, p. 46, [p. 55, D. E.]) 1, 9, p. 48, [p. 57, C.] 2, 5, p. 92, [p. 44, B. C.]); on the other hand, the author of this piece sees in polytheism nothing more than the apotheosis of distinguished human beings. Although, (such are his views,) the being of God may be known from the works of nature, yet men, never-
THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

theless, gradually forgot God, and transferred to mortals the names that belonged to the true God; individuals most distinguished in history, such as princes, in the course of time, had various honours paid to them, which, at last, in the popular opinion, was changed into deification; and the honour originally conferred on them as men, was gradually converted into idolatry.

These reasons, taken together, justify us in concluding that the treatise on the Monarchy of God must be struck out of the list of Justin's writings. Indeed this result will remain unaffected, even if we do not take into account the difference of style and sentiment between this and the genuine productions of Justin. The testimony of Eusebius is alone of sufficient weight.

CHAPTER III.

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

One of the most valuable remains of Christian antiquity is the Epistle to Diognetus, an individual of whom nothing more is known. The vividness and beauty of the delineation forms a suitable ornament to the depth of Christian conviction, and the solidity of thought with which it is filled. The picture which the author gives of the excellence of the Christian life is, beyond measure, captivating. The Epistle, soon after it was published by Henry Stephens, in 1592,

1 *De Monarch.* c. 1, p. 36, (p. 103, C. D.) c. 5, p. 39, (p. 107, B.) c. 5, p. 40, (p. 107, C.) c. 6, p. 42, (p. 109, C.)

2 It is a mere assumption to suppose that the receiver of the Epistle was identical with the Diognetus who was the instructor and friend of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius; for there is no other ground for it than the accidental sameness of the names. But it is perfectly absurd to build, as Kestner has done, one hypothesis upon another, and to suppose that the Epistle was written at the secret wish of the Emperor himself.
gained many friends, but almost immediately became
an apple of discord for the learned in reference to its
authorship. Several critics, such as Cave, Tentzel, Fabricius; and, in modern times, Kestner and
Baumgarten-Crusius, have considered the title which
ascribed it to Justin as correct, and numbers it among
the works of the Martyr. Others, on the contrary, (and these form the majority,) as Tillemont, Nourry, Grabe, Oudin, Gallandi, Böhl, Neander, Tzscherner, Herbig, Mühler; and, (in a special essay on the subject,) C. D. v. Grossheim, deny Justin's au-
thorship; lastly, some, as Du Pin and Prudentius Maranus, leave the question undecided. We have
no hesitation in taking part with those who deny the
Epistle to be the genuine production of Justin. Its
spuriousness may be determined to a degree of cer-
tainty that is seldom attainable in critical inquiries.
We do not rely upon the reasons which the ancient
impugners of the Epistle generally made use of, for

1 Scriptorum eccles. hist. litteraria, p. 38.
2 Exercitationes Selectae, T. i. p. 189, sqq. 438, sqq.
3 Bibliotheca, Graec. ed. Harl. T. vii. p. 68, and Delectus ar-
gument. et syllabus scriptorum qui veritatem religionis Christ.
asseruerunt, p. 48.
4 Die Agape, p. 394.
5 Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Jen. 1881, I.
171.
6 Memoires pour servir, &c. ii. 170, 228.
7 Apparatus ad biblioth. max. i. 445.
8 Spicilegium Patrum, ii. 165.
9 Comment. de script. eccles. antiquis, I. p. 262.
10 Bibliotheca veterum patrum, I. p. lxviii. sqq.
11 Opuscula patrum selecta, (Berol. 1826,) I. 110.
12 Allgemeine Geschichte, &c. I. 753.
13 Fall des Heidentums.
14 Comment. de scriptis. p. 83.
15 Ueber den Brief au Diognetos. In Mohler's collected
writings, (Regemb. 1839,) I. 19, and in the Patrologie, I.
164.
16 Commentatio de epistola ad Diognetum, qua furtur Jus-
tini. Mart. (Lips. 1826.)
17 Nouvelle biblioth. des auteurs eccles. I. 61.
18 Opera Justin. prolegomena, 3, 3, 5, p. lxxiv.
they have little argumentative power. The Epistle might have been a production of Justin's, without having come to the knowledge of Eusebius or of succeeding literary historians. The author does not really claim the title of "A disciple of the Apostles, and a teacher of the heathen?" for that part of the Epistle in which this designation occurs is a spurious addition not belonging to the original writer; and, if the author had claimed

1 In later times these grounds have generally been rejected, yet Mohler still thinks them valid (Patrologie, I. 164.)

2 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 11, p. 239, (p. 501, C.) ἀπεστηλὼν γενήσεων μαθητὴς, γίνομαι διδάσκαλος Ἰδιάτως.

3 The theme of the Epistle has its key-stone in c. 10, (p. 239, [p. 501, C.]) What follows has no intimate connection with what precedes, and has in itself no unity: the particular discussion on the relation of γενήσεως to ζωή (c. 12,) is entirely irrelevant. The emphatic exaltation of γενήσεως, c. 12, p. 240, [p. 502, B. C.] opposes the explanation given respecting πίστις; c. 8, p. 238, (p. 499, C.) αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦσαν ἱερεῖς ἵνα πίστις ἦν μέσα Ἰδιάστι διὸς συναγωγῆς. "He has shown himself, but he has shown himself by faith, by which alone it is permitted to see God."—The outward circumstances which the Appendix supposes, are not those of the Epistle. The Epistle speaks of Diognetus as its receiver, (c. 1, p. 233, [p. 494, B.]) and always addresses an individual, c. 2, p. 233, [p. 494, C.] c. 3, p. 234, [p. 495, D.] c. 7, p. 237, [p. 499, A.] c. 10, p. 239, [p. 500, D. 501, A. B.] The author of the Appendix, though he professed to write to an individual, c. 11, p. 240, [p. 502, A. C.] c. 12, p. 240, [p. 502, C.] had a greater public before his eyes, c. 11, p. 238, [p. 501, C.] εἰς ζωὴν ζωλῶ... ἄλλα ἀπεστηλὼν γενήσεως μαθητὴς, γίνομαι διδάσκαλος Ἰδιάτως τὰ παράδειγμα. Σιναι ἐκλείπει διαγωγὴ γενήσεως ἐκ Ιδιάτης μαθησιού. —"I am not treating of a subject that is strange to me, but having been a disciple of the Apostles, I am become a teacher of Gentiles: I minister the things delivered (to me) to those who are become worthy disciples of the truth."—c. 11, sq. p. 240, [p. 502, A.] έσπερ... ἀποκαλοῦντοι γεγονός... γεγονές ἡμᾶς καὶ πρόετοι; εἰς ἰστορίαν καὶ ἱστορίαν μηδὲ σαφεῖ, μεταξίθεν ἐστι παραλληλοί τῷ τῆς τινος ἱστορίαν ἰσοτρίης. "Whatever we have been excited to utter, we are partakers with you; which having read and heard with attention, you will know what God bestows on those who love him aright."—The Epistle professes to be an answer to several questions proposed by Diognetus relative to Christianity, c. 1, p. 233, [p. 494, B.] The author of the Appendix, on the contrary, remarks, that he writes from the impulse of the divine
it, it would not, taken in a wider sense, been inapplicable to the person of Justin. Nor do the chronological references contain any thing which can serve as evidence against its being composed by Justin. For if the writer of the Epistle, when he speaks of the Jewish sacrifices, laws relating to food, circumcision, and other rites, makes use of the present tense, (c. 3, p. 235, [p. 496,]) προσάγουσιν . . . . παρὰ, &c., this mode of speaking will not fix the date to have been before the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem; even after that event the author, in a lively delineation of Jewish affairs, might speak of the Jewish Cultus as an existing institution; for many usages of Judaism, as circumcision, were observed after the national catastrophe in A. D. 70; and, for those that necessarily ceased after this time,—the sacrifices in the temple,—a kind of substitute was found; sacrifices resembling those of the national temple were performed in private houses. If, moreover, Christianity

Logos, and from his own free motion, (c. 11, p. 240, [p. 502, A.] ἰσχύος & λόγος ἐμεῖς, ἦν ἄνθρωπος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὡς ἥν ἐπλευκότας τὴν περιποίησιν τῶν ἡλεκτρίων, ἐφοβήτω διὸ, καὶ τῶν ἐρεθίσμων ἰδίως ἐξευτελοῦσα, καὶ τῷ πάντων ὑπὲρ ἀνεμειλησθήσαι ἡμῖν καταλατρεύσα, &c.) "You shall know what the Word communicates, by whom he wills, and when he pleases. For whatever at the will of the commanding Word we are impelled to utter, we become sharers with you of the things revealed with labour and from love."—The contrast of the συγγραφέας and the ἀσώτητος according to the analogy of the division of the Old Testament, into the νόμος and the πρόφητα, the allusion to the rules of the Faith, (ἐλεγχονίας) and the rules of the Fathers (ἐκ τοῦ πάτερος), which we find in the Appendix, betrays a much later date than the second century. Lastly, there are also differences of style between the Epistle and the Appendix. We mention only the use of the word ἰματια, c. 11, p. 239, (p. 501, C.) c. 11, p. 240, (p. 502, A.) Compare C. D. v. Grosheim’s De Epistola ad Diognetum, p. 30, sqq. and Böhl’s Opuscula Patrum selecta, I. 115. It is an unfortunate attempt of the latter, to represent the Appendix as a mixture of genuine and spurious passages.

1 The necessary proofs for this statement are produced by Prudentius Maranus, from several ancient writers, especially Hilar. in Psalm. ix. 16, p. 221, F. and Julian in Cyril. adv. Julian, l. 9, T. vi. p. 305.
is represented in the Epistle as a new phenomenon, making its first appearance at that time (ὡς), this will not prevent our considering it as a production of the middle of the second century. For ὡς, in connection with a past tense, sometimes indicates a fact situated far back in the past, and Justin himself, and even Eusebius, in the fourth century, expresses himself just in the same manner. 

1 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 1, p. 233, (p. 494, B.) ταὶ δὲ σήματα ἔτοιμα γέγονεν τοῖς ἂρχοντις ἔτοιμοι εἰς τὸν βίον τῶν, καὶ ἐπετέραν; c. 2, p. 234, (p. 494, D.) ; c. 9, p. 238, sq. (p. 500, C.); and why this new kind or institution has made its appearance among men now, and not before? 


It is to be observed that ὡς, according to the ancients, expresses three tenses, the present, the past, and the future. It may appear singular that the particle ὡς, which, in itself, expresses the idea of the present, is capable, in connection with a past tense, to denote the time of an event long past. But this is really the case, and the particle loses by it nothing of its original meaning. The writer who, by means of the particle ὡς, refers to a past event, enlarges in imagination the circle of the present to the point where this event is situated, and thus includes it in the present. The possibility and justification of this extension of the idea rests on the liveliness of the view, which alters not a little the bounds of time, but brings the distant near. Moreover, the event which this contemplation embraces develops consequences which reach into the actual present, or this event is compared in thought with another analogous one, which is more ancient than itself, (in the case before us Christianity is compared with heathenism), it then happens, that by means of the particle ὡς an event is depicted as present, which belongs to the distant past. Compare Hoogoveen, Doctrina, particular. Graec. ed. Schulte (Dessau et Lips. 1782) p 641, sq. Viger de principiis Graec. Dictionis Idiotsimis, ed. Herman, (Lips. 1813,) p. 435. Bohl's Opuscula Patrum selecta, 1. 110. Ritt.r's Animadversiones in primum Justin. Apol. p. 8, sq.

3 Apol. 1. 63. p. 81, (p. 96, A ) Χριστός. τῶν εὐαγγελισμῶν καὶ θεός ἤσαι Πνεύματος τῷ ἐν οἷς ἐνθρόνισεν θύμιν ἐνθρόνισεν γενέσις. "Christ being before the word, but now by the will of God becoming man on account of the human race."

As we decline employing those weapons which hitherto have been principally or exclusively used to evince the spuriousness of this Epistle, and which are all more or less unfit for the purpose, we now turn to those proofs, against which, in our opinion, no substantial opposition can be made. Among these, we reckon, first of all, the style of the Epistle. This differs so essentially from Justin's, that the difference has been perceived and acknowledged, on all hands, and Du Pin\(^1\) probably is the only person, who, instead of a difference, has asserted an essential identity of the two.\(^2\) While Justin's composition wears that mixed character, which the Greek language, since the time of Alexander the Great, had almost universally acquired, the style of the Epistle approaches to the purity of classical diction; while Justin, in general, writes negligently and incorrectly, the expressions of the Epistle are selected with great care: while Justin, for the most part, keeps within the circle of conversational and popular language, the author of the Epistle takes a wider range, and, by well chosen antitheses, renders his representations constantly attractive; while Justin frequently interrupts the subject of which he treats, with awkward parentheses, and neglects logical arrangement, the author of the Epistle pursues his object with a suitable logical development.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) We wish only to name the two writers who have particularly examined this point, C. D. v. Grossheim, De. Epist. ad. Diognet. p. 17, and Herbig's Comment. de Scriptis. p. 91.

\(^2\) Nouvelle Bibiloth. des auteurs. ecles. 1. 61.

\(^3\) The pictures which the author of the Epistle gives of the character and lives of the Christians, are full of such contrasts. See the Epistle to Diognetus, ch. 5, p. 236, (p. 497.). Χριστίανοι . . . παρείσιμον εἴκοσι πενήντα, ἀλλ' ὁ πάροικος μιτῆρες πάντων, ὁς πολίτες καὶ πάντες ὑπομίσθως ὁ ἔνθισεν τῶν ἔνθισεν, παρείσιμον αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν παρείσιμον . . . . οἱ εἰς εἰς την ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄτοικον ἔχοντα ἐκ τῆς διαφέροντος, ἀλλ' οἱ συνεργοὶ πολιτείαν παρείσιμον τοῖς ἐκείνων τής ἐκείνων τής ἐκείνων τῆς ἐκείνων.
Add to this, that Justin's favourite expressions are wholly wanting in the Epistle, and, on the other hand, many words and phrases are used, which are not found in Justin. On the last-mentioned point, notice the designations of God, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, The Creator of all things, (c. 7, p. 237, [p. 498, B.]), ἄγγελος, wrathless, (c. 8, p. 238, [p. 499, C.]), and of Christ, ὁ ἀσκοτός ὁ λόγος, The incomprehensible Word, (c. 7, p. 237, [p. 498, C.]), ὁ τιμωρός τῶν ὅλων, The framer of all things, (c. 7, p. 237, [p. 498, C.]), the representation of the Jewish piety, as διαδικαιοντας, Superstition, (c. 1, p. 233, [p. 494, B.], c. 4, p. 235, [p. 496, B.]); and the maxims of the Grecian philosophy, as τεταγμένη καὶ πλάνη τῶν γονέων, The wonders and impostures of Goēlæ, (c. 8, p. 238, [p. 499, C.]) —the words φιλοσοφία, (c. 1, p. 233, [p. 494, B.]), διάμορφη, (c. 3, p. 235, [p. 496, A.]), c. 4, p. 235, [p. 496, D.], c. 7, p. 237, [p. 499, B.]), λόγιον, (The gift of speech, c. 10, p. 239, [p. 500, D.]), ψυχοδύος, (c. 4, p. 235, [p. 496, B.]); the phrases, κύριον ὑπερσεβόν, (c. 1, p. 233, [p. 494, B.]), νοσον τῆς δικαιοσύνης Δηλησύλων, (c. 9, p. 238, [p. 500, A.]).

Next to the evidence against Justin's authorship of...
this Epistle, arising from the style, is that furnished by its doctrinal views, which are quite different from Justin’s. There are not wanting, indeed, apologetic and doctrinal remarks, in which the author of the Epistle agrees with Justin. In both, we find it remarked, that, as persecutions abounded, so the number of the Christians increased: when they speak of the moral pre-eminence of Christians, they both mention their abstaining from the practice of exposing new-born children; they both mention, as a proof, that the statues of the heathen gods could be nothing but inanimate dead masses — the protection which they required from human guardians, particularly if they were made of valuable materials, such as silver and gold; they both ridicule the Jewish notion, that God had ordained the sacrificial institute, on account of his own necessities; they both favour the view, that God created the world for the sake of man, and had appointed man to be the lord of the earth; lastly, they both seek for the ground of the delay with which God had deferred the expected destruction of the world, in the regard which he has for Christians. But these observations are to be met with in

7 Epistol. ad Diognet. c. 6, p. 236, (p. 498, B.), c. 7, p. 237, (p. 499, A.), and Dial. c. Tr. c. 110, p. 203, (p. 337, B.).
2 Epistol. ad Diognet. c. 5, p. 236, (p. 497, B.), and Apol. 1, 27, p. 60, (p. 70, C.).
3 Epistol. ad Diognet. c. 2, p. 234, (p. 494, D.), and Apol. 1, 9, p. 48, p. 58, A.
5 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 10, p. 239, (p. 500, D.), and Apol. 1, 10, p. 48, (p. 58, B.), 2, 4, p. 91, (p. 43, D.).
6 Epist. ad Diognet. c 10, p. 239, (p. 500, D, and Apol. 2, 5, p. 92, (p. 44, A.).
7 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 6, p. 236, (p. 498, A.), and Apol. 2, 7, p 93, (p. 45, B.). We may also notice the similar expressions of admiration employed by Justin and the author of the Epistle, respecting the wonderful effects of Christianity. — ταῦτα ἀπόδειξες ου δικαιὸν ζητεῖ, οὐκ ἔχεις ἐπηρεάσει Διότω. Epist. ad Diognet. c. 7, p. 337, (p. 499, A.). “These do not appear to be the works of men, they are the power of God.” —
many of the Fathers; they are not the private sentiments of an individual, but the common property of the ancient church in general, materials which most of the ancient Apologists made use of, for the vindication of Christianity. From them, therefore, nothing can be inferred. But the difference which exists between Justin and the author of the Epistle, in several doctrinal points of view, is very weighty. If we consider, in the first place, their views respecting the heathen idolatry, the author of the Epistle reduces the religion of the Greeks to pure fetichism; their gods are to him nothing but inanimate figures of wood, clay, stone, and metal; their whole worship is, in his eyes, an absurdity, since they bring material objects as offerings to lifeless forms, which want all susceptibility of enjoyment. Justin, on the contrary, considers the Grecian deities to be real, (though not divine) natures, in short, daemons; according to him, the statues of the gods bear the names and forms of these daemons, and form for them a kind of audience-chamber, in which they received the offerings presented by man at their command, which they required since their fall. Nor is the difference of sentiment less in reference to the religious services of the Jews. The author of the Epistle places the Jewish sacrifices on a level with the heathen Cultus, and sees in it no act of piety, but mere folly, since the same notion is common to both, that the Deity is in need of sacrifices; he, therefore, contemplates the Jewish sacrificial system, not as a divine institution, but as an arbitrary and superstitious human invention. Justin, on the contrary, deduces the Jewish sacrifices from divine appointment, and maintains especially that it was enjoined upon the

Δύναμις ἰσοὶ τῶν ἐφήτων κατεις καὶ εὐχὰς ἄφθερων λόγου νὰ εἰς τὸν. “This is the power of the ineffable Father, and not the instruments of human reason.”

1 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 2, p. 234, (p. 494, D. 495.)
2 Apol. 1, 5, p. 46, (p. 55, D. E.) 1, 9, p. 48, (p. 57, C.) 1, 12, p. 50, (p. 59, D.) 2, 5, p. 92, (p. 44, B.)
3 Epist. ad Diognet c. 3, p. 235, (p. 496, A. B.)
people in consequence of their idolatrous worship of the golden calf in the wilderness, as a means of maintaining the remembrance of the true God, and as a corrective against further acts of idolatry.\textsuperscript{1} The author of the Epistle treats the Jewish strictness in the observance of particular meats, and of the Sabbath—an anxiety in the observance of fasts and new moons, and their pride respecting circumcision, as ridiculous and hardly worthy of notice; he calls it mischievous, arbitrarily to make a distinction in those things which God has given for the use of men, to accept one thing as useful and to reject another as useless; he marks it as wicked to maintain that God had forbidden to do good on the Sabbath day; he treats it as contemptible arrogance to boast of the mutilation of the flesh as a mark of God’s special choice and favour.\textsuperscript{2} Justin, on the contrary, acknowledges the whole Mosaic ritual to be of divine institution, without exactly seeing in this institution an act of absolute divine freedom; he regards the ceremonial of the Jewish worship as a yoke that was laid on the people of God in order to preserve them from forgetfulness of God, and impiety. The observance of the Sabbath, and the distinction of meats directed the thoughts to God. Circumcision, the only outward sign by which the Jews were distinguished from heathens and Christians, would serve as a means of causing the judgment to fall more certainly and exclusively on the Jews, which they had rendered necessary by their long continued unfaithfulness against God. The all-wise God had ordained circumcision, that the Romans, by this outward sign, might be enabled to banish and exclude the Jews from their native soil without exception, on which, according to the divine counsel, they were no longer to dwell.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Diai. c. Tr. c. 19, p. 119, (p. 237, A.) c. 22, p. 120, (p. 238, D.) c. 67, p. 164, p. 292, B.) c. 92, p. 189, (p. 329, A. B.)

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Epist. ad Diognet. c. 4; p. 235, (p. 486, B. C.)

In reference to the person and work of Christ, the author of the Epistle holds convictions different from those of Justin. He considers the work of redemption to begin actually and historically with the incarnation of Christ, while he views the divine counsel of redemption as eternal; he knows nothing of Old Testament revelations of it; but confines the antecedent knowledge of it to Christ alone; to him alone the Father had imparted the ineffable design. If, by this long mysterious silence of God, apprehensions had been excited in men's minds that the Highest had forgotten them, all such doubts would be allayed in the most satisfactory manner by the personal appearance of Christ.\(^1\) Justin, on the contrary, places the commencement of the redeeming work of Christ far back in the patriarchal—he makes Christ as Logos, the performer of the Old Testament Theophanies—he supposes the whole plan of salvation which was to be effected by his personal incarnation to have been unfolded to the world through the prophets, and hence gives to Christ, after his incarnation, only the part of an interpreter and fulfiller of Old Testament prophecy.\(^2\) As to the person of Christ, the fundamental representation which the author of the Epistle gives respecting it, does not differ from Justin's, but the mode in which he expresses himself on particular points is very different from Justin's conceptions. However highly Justin exalts Christ, the author of the Epistle glorifies him still more.\(^3\) Justin reproaches the Jews for not knowing Christ;\(^4\) the author of the Epistle calls him \textit{incorrigible \textit{αυτογενής}}; Justin represents the impression

\(^1\) \textit{Epist. ad Diognet.} c. 8, p. 238, (p. 499, C. D.)
\(^2\) \textit{Apol.} 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 73, A. B.) 1, 32, p. 63, (p. 73, C.) 1, 33, p. 64, (p. 74, E.) 1, 52, p. 73, (p. 87, A.) 1, 62, p. 80, (p. 95, A.) 1, 63, p. 81, (p. 96, A.) 2, 10, p. 95, (p. 48, E.) \textit{Diak. c. Tr.} c. 66, p. 150, sqq. (p. 275, sqq.) c. 56, p. 156, (p. 281.) c. 113, p. 206, (p. 340, D.) c. 136, p. 228, (p. 366, C.) and other passages.
\(^3\) \textit{Epist. ad Diognet.} c. 7, p. 237, (p. 498, B. D.)
\(^4\) \textit{Apol.} 1, 63, p. 81, (p. 90.)
of Christ's second coming to judgment as powerful, the author of the Epistle declares that no one will be able to endure it. The remark which the Epistle makes respecting Christ: —ἀυτὸς ὁ Σιώς . . . αὐτοὶ ὠφαρ-νῦν τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὸν λόγον . . . τὸν ἀνθρώπου εἰ- δοντα . . . οὐ, καθάπερ ἐν τις εἰκάσει, ἀνδρώπους ἑπι-ρένη τινὰ τίμησας ἡ αγγελία ἡ ἀφέντη ἡ τινὰ τῶν δια-πόντων τὰ ἐπίγεια . . . ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸ τὸν τεχνίτην καὶ ἰδειογραφόν τῶν ὄλων, could not have proceeded from Justin, since, on numberless occasions, he represents Christ as God's ὑπηρέτης, or ἀγγελος, or as an ἀρχων. Nor is it altogether unimportant that the author of the Epistle refers the words in Is. lii. 4, τὰς ἡμερίας ἀμαρτίας ἀνείγατο to God, while Justin views the whole chapter as relating to the Messiah.

If we inquire into the grounds which the author of the Epistle adduces for the delay in carrying into effect the divine plan of redemption, contrasted with the fearfully increasing demoralization of the human race in the ages preceding the appearance of Christ, we


2 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 7, p. 237, (p. 499, A.)

3 “God himself imparts to men from heaven the truth and the word—not, as some one might suppose, sending a servant to men, either an angel or a ruler, or some one of the beings who manage the affairs of earth, but the Framer and Creator of all things himself.”


5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 86, p. 184, (p. 313, C.) αὐτὸς ἀνείγατο τῷ πατρὶ πλάβε τῷ βασιλία . . . καὶ ἀγγελος (ὁ θεος) καὶ οὐκ ἄλλα τυσάνων Ἰσχια, ἢ ἰδειόγραφος. —See c. 56, p. 161, (p. 275, C.) καὶ ἀγγελος παραδέχεται, καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵππῳ βουλήται αὐτοῖς ἀγγελικαὶ τῷ ἰδειογράφῳ —Compare c. 127, p. 221, (p. 357, B.)

6 Apol. 1, 12, p. 50, (p. 51, E.) ὁ λόγος . . . . καὶ βασι-λείαται καὶ διακινώται ἄρχοντα μετὰ τῶν γενικάντων ἦν ὁ θεός εὐθύνα ὁ θεός ἦν.
find that they differ widely from Justin’s mode of thinking.\textsuperscript{1} For while the former teaches that God had left men, until the coming of Christ, to the unreasoned indulgence of their sensual gratifications, not from approbation of their sinful courses, but in order, by his indulgent long-suffering to give evidence that if they inherited eternal life, it would not be owing to the worthiness of their disposition, but purely to the divine mercy, and that men universally would be capable of entering the kingdom of heaven, not by their own indwelling power, but by the power of God; so far from anything analogous to this representation being found in Justin’s writings, we rather find in them a justification of the delay of Christ’s advent, on the ground that God had given man a free moral power of choice,\textsuperscript{3} and that he had besides elevated this natural power by the support of his Logos, who already had been influential among men in the times preceding Christ, so that men could well perform their task if they were only willing, and were entirely without excuse if they nevertheless perished in their sins and vices.

Lastly, we come to the anthropological and soteriological representations which are approved by the author of the Epistle,\textsuperscript{3} and find that, in several points, they differ from Justin’s views.\textsuperscript{4} Justin attributes to the soul only a relative immortality, dependent on the will of God,\textsuperscript{5} the author of the Epistle considers that, in the souls of the good, this immortality is perpetual and self-subsistent.\textsuperscript{5} Justin, in reference to the generations before Christ, expresses his conviction that as many

\begin{enumerate}
\item Epist. ad Diogn. c. 9, p. 238, (p. 500, B.)
\item Apol. 1, 50, p. 72, (p. 85, C.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 13, p. 113, (p. 229, D.)
\item Ep. ad Diogn. c. 9, p. 238, (p. 499, D. 500, A.)
\item Dial. c. Tr. c. 5, p. 107, (p. 223, B.) c. 6, p. 108, (p. 224, B. C.)
\item Epist. ad Diogn. c. 6, p. 236, (p. 497, D. 498, A.)
\end{enumerate}
of them as conscientiously employed the moral power granted to all, and did not oppose the invisible operation of the divine Logos, by this fidelity to the eternal moral law; and this ready application to the invisible heavenly helper, were justified and saved; 1 on the contrary, the author of the Epistle maintains that men, before Christ, from the impossibility of rendering themselves worthy of entering the kingdom of God by their own natural powers, and in the absence of special divine support, could indulge no definite hope of being made partakers of eternal life. 2 Justin considers the punishment of the damned as endless; 3 the author of the Epistle sets a limit to it. 4

If, by the preceding investigation, it has been satisfactorily shown that Justin could not be the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, the question then arises, when and from whom did it originate? But on these points we regret that no certainty can be obtained. The attempts at such a determination, which have been hitherto made, rest altogether on insecure premises, and have led to untenable conclusions. However ill founded Gallandi's 5 opinion may be, that the Epistle was written in the Apostolic century, and proceeded from the pen of the Alexandrian Apollos, (Acts xviii. 24,) there seems no better reason for Böhl's hypothesis, 6 that its date approaches that of the Apos-


2 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 9, p. 238, (p. 500, A. C.) τι καὶ ἦν τοῦ ἀθάνατον ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς βασιλείας τοῦ Σιῶ... καὶ εἰς τὸν τέλος χρόνον τῶν ἀδιάφορος φόροις καὶ τοῦ τυχόν τοῦ γίγνεται, τῶν ἰησοῦν καὶ τῶν ἀδιάφορες.

3 Apol. 1, 29, p. 69, (p. 71, B.) 1, 52, p. 74, (p. 87, B.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 45, p. 141, (p. 264, B.) c. 130, p. 223, (p. 359, D.)

4 Epist. ad Diognet. c. 10, p. 239, (p. 501, C.)

5 Bibliotheca veterum patrum, I. p. lxviii. sqq.

6 Opuscula Patrum selecta, I. 113.
tolic age, or for the assertion of Mohler\(^1\) and Hefele,\(^2\) that it belongs to the time of Trajan; or for Herbig's\(^3\) confident opinion that it was written before the outbreak of the Jewish war under Hadrian. We must content ourselves with Tzschirner's decision:\(^4\) "This piece was, with great probability, written in the age of Justin, as it has been ascribed to him, and contains nothing which can be referred to a later age. Its tone of vigorous piety, and the delineation it gives of the Christians, as a persecuted and yet widely spread community, justify us in assuming that it belonged to an age when the new faith had begun to raise its voice more distinctly, and to make more observable progress."

\(^1\) *Patrologie*, I. 166, and *Collected Writings*, I. 22.
\(^2\) *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, (Tubing. 1839,) p. xxi.
\(^3\) *Commentat. de scriptis*, p. 87.
\(^4\) *Fall des Heidentums*, I. 218.
BOOK III.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin has not often been estimated as his character and performances really warrant. Sometimes he has been eulogised above his merits; at other times depreciated as much below them. Those in whose representations a Father of the Church appears only as a saint, have found in Justin nothing but what was distinguished and excellent; those, on the contrary, according to whose preconceptions the idea of a Father of the Church is associated with the ideas of mental obtuseness, ignorance, and hierarchical arrogance, have been disposed to see in Justin only a vulgar-minded discoursor, and a brainless zealot. Ecclesiastical antiquity invariably speaks of the Martyr with unlimited commendation,¹ while some modern writers, such as Gaab²


² Abhandlungen, &c. p. 68.
and Lange\textsuperscript{1} can hardly find terms strong enough to expose his mental deficiencies. As in most cases, so here, the truth lies between the extremes.\textsuperscript{2} Justin certainly was not possessed of a commanding intellect, but neither does he stand among the lowest order of minds; he was not a man of creative powers, but receptive, and fitted to be an organ for conveying divine truth to others; he does not present himself as the ideal of a finished holiness, but he exhibits a life imbued and actuated by Christian love. His zeal sometimes overshot the mark, but, in general, kept itself within due bounds, its flame was, on several occasions, injurious, but, for the most part, it glowed with a salutary enlivening warmth; his piety might be sometimes chargeable with extravagance, but, generally, both in its nature and its manifestations, it was pure and temperate. Philosophical powers cannot be attributed to him in the modern sense of the terms, but we must remember that Justin expended his activity, not in the schools, but in social life; that he first introduced philosophy into the Church, and that the present idea of philosophy, was in no degree applicable to the collective ancient Church. Novelty and acuteness may be sought for in vain in Justin, but here and there are gleams of thought, of more than ordinary brightness, and the Apologist never fails to present Christian truth in a clear and impressive manner. In his writings there is a total absence of logical consecutiveness of develope-

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Ausführliche Geschichte}, &c. I. p. 92.

\textsuperscript{2} Tzschirner (\textit{Geschichte der Apologetik}, p. 237,) has hit this mean, when he says, "If we combine the traits of Justin's character, as they may be called, from his writings, we must recognize in him a thoughtful man, furnished with various knowledge, and animated with zeal for the cause of Christianity, but yet under the influence of the spirit of his times." Nor is the portrait which Kistner draws of him incorrect, (\textit{Die Agape}, p. 460,) supposing those traits to be withdrawn, which the artist has inserted in favour of his hypothesis of a secret confederation of Christians, in which Justin is supposed to take a part. See also Mohler's \textit{Patrologie}, I. p. 218.
ment, of a strictly defined terminology, and of a satisfactorily filling up of a doctrinal system; but it must not be forgotten, that he wrote under circumstances, in which objects of deeper interest than rhetorical attainments, occupied him, and that it is agreeable to the nature of the human mind, that the first efforts in any important undertaking, have much that is wavering, uncertain, and defective. Justin is thoroughly practical in life, as well as in cogitation. He withdrew himself from all modes of exertion, which had not an immediate connection with the Church; all speculations which did not proceed from the faith, and stand in an essential relation to it, he rejected and shunned; every intentional effort to give a philosophic form to the peculiar truths of Christianity was foreign to his mind. He was, therefore, indisputably more distinguished for his apostolic activity, than for his philosophical achievements; he contributed more to the edification of the Church, than to the advancement of speculative theology. Yet even in the latter respect, his services are not unimportant. Even those persons who are ready to deny him all merit in this department, may here, at least, acknowledge his historical importance. It is a fact not to be denied, that Justin exercised a very great influence, in reference to theoretical truth, both on his contemporaries and the succeeding Fathers of the Church.¹ The type which he impressed on Christian theology, and especially in the Apologetic department, reappears in the writings of later Apologists;² the proofs employed by them are frequently

¹ Lange's "Dissertatio, in qua Justini Mart. apologia prima sub Examen vocatur," I. 7. "Justinus ipse fundamenta jecit, quibus sequens actas totum illud corpus philosophatum de religionis capitibus, quod nobis hodie theologa thetica vocatur, superstruxit."

² Whether Justin himself originated this type, or whether he himself was under the influence of an earlier Apologist, namely, Aristo of Pella, (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 6, T. I. p. 299. Maximus in Dionys. Areopag. de mystic. theolog. c. i. T. II. p. 234,) and of Aristides (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4, 3, T. I.
identical with his, and not seldom they make use of his very words. This is particularly the case with Tertullian.

These few traits may suffice to give a probable likeness of Justin's character. Yet, after all, they furnish only a very imperfect and superficial notion of the man: we shall, therefore, attempt, without leaving the field of general observation, to trace his peculiarities more minutely, and to examine them in a twofold light, first, as it regards his religious and moral character, and then in a literary point of view.

SECTION I.

JUSTIN'S RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CHARACTER.

However different the rank which has been assigned to Justin, when viewed from this or the other standing point, one distinction has been awarded him p. 292,) cannot be ascertained, since the apologetic works of these writers are not extant. That he made use of these, his predecessors, is neither impossible nor improbable. The Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, which is ascribed to Aristo of Pella, consisted principally of an attempt (as we learn from Origen, c. Cels. 4, 52, T. I. p. 544,) to prove to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ, by means of an allegorical interpretation of the prophetical parts of the Old Testament—and Justin confessedly followed the same object and method in his Dialogue with Trypho. But there seems to be some historical proof that Justin made use of Aristides. Jerome says, (Epist. 84, ad Magm. T. II. p. 219.) "Aristides philosophus, vir eloquentissimur aedem principi (Hadriano) apologeticum pro Christianis obtulit contextum philosophorum sententiaris; quem imitatus postea Justinus et ipse philosophus Antonino Pio et aliis eis senatuque librum contra gentiles tradidit, defendens ignominiam crucis et resurrectionem Christi tota praedicandis libertate." Still, on the other hand, it is possible that this coincidence of Justin with Aristo and Aristides in the method of arguing for Christianity, was only accidental; and even if we give full credit to Jerome's account, we gain only the very unimportant result, that Justin imitated Aristides in referring to the opinions of the Grecian Philosophers.
without dispute,—his deeply seated enthusiastic love for the Gospel. Whether with pleasure or not, all have concurred in Tryphon's testimony, "I am astonished at your devotedness to divine things!" ἀγαμαί τῆς πειρὰς Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογεῖ. And truly, if by anything whatever, Justin was distinguished by the warmth and decidedness of his Christian convictions. We hear the confession of his inmost heart, when he says of Christianity, "ταύτην μόνην εὔφισμον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τοι καὶ σύμφωνον," "This alone I have found infallible and profitable philosophy!" Christianity was in truth, esteemed by him as the only philosophy that produced real happiness; he had proved this sufficiently by experience; and his martyrdom more than all testified, that he deemed his faith among all good things to be the highest and most valuable good. But in his writings also, this his love for Christianity is expressed with a freshness and intensity, that only he who has never felt anything of the unction of the Holy Spirit in his own heart, can suppose to be a fictitious enthusiasm. To the Roman Emperor Justin avowed, "I have despised the judgment of the multitude, and have wished most ardently, and striven with all my power, that I might be found to be a Christian." He assured the Jew Trypho, "To us, who are enlightened by the Word of God, this is sweeter than honey, as you may perceive from this, that we do not deny his name even in death itself." In a third passage he again exclaims to the Emperor, "If the soldiers enrolled by you, who have taken the military oath, consider this solemn engagement more dear to them than their own life, or parents, or father-land, and all kindred, although you can offer them nothing that is unchangeable—how truly ridiculous would it be, if we, whose aim and hope is immortality, were

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 109, (p. 225, D.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 109, (p. 225, D.)
3 Apol. 2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, B)
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 30, p. 127, (p. 247, P.)
5 Apol. 1, 39, p. 67, (p. 78, C.)
not willing to endure all things, in order to gain the object of our desire from him who is able to bestow it?" Hence this love for Christian truth, this inspiration of Faith, was no barren blossom without fruit. Justin's faith was not a mere admission of intellectual truth, an idle zeal for dogmatic formula, a fruitless indulgence of extravagant expectations; it was a moral principle producing a renovation of the life. Justin distinctly referred everything to a moral purpose, as the last and highest aim of human endeavour. He dwelt with peculiar pleasure on the delineation of the moral effects of Christianity, and spoke with intense delight on the complete transformation which generally took place in the dispositions of the converts to the Christian faith. "Those of us," he says, 1 "who formerly delighted in impurity, now practise chastity; we who before used magical arts, now devote ourselves to the good and unbegotten God; we who valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and property, now part with what we have for the common good, and share it with every indigent person; we who formerly hated and killed one another, and would have no communication with strangers and foreigners, now, since the appearance of Christ, live together at one table and pray even for our enemies." And in another passage, he says, "We Christians, through the law and the Word which proceeded from Jerusalem, by means of the apostles of Jesus, have attained to a knowledge of true religion, and have taken refuge in the God of Jacob and the God of Israel; and though before, we delighted in war and murder and all wickedness, yet now in every place, swords are beaten into ploughshares, and spears into agricultural instruments, and now we cultivate piety, righteousness, humanity, faith, and hope which comes from the Father himself through the crucified, and each one sits under his own vine, that is, we solace ourselves each one with his own wedded wife." Justin distinctly

1 Apol. 1, 14, p. 51, sq. (p. 61, B. C.)
shews, in opposition to the "much talking" of the heathen, that the essence of Christian piety consists not in words but in deeds;¹— and, in contrast to Jewish formality, that Christians honoured God and Christ till death, not merely with their lips but with their hearts and actions.² He impressively declares, that Christians, whenever the baptismal rite was performed, prayed for the newly baptized, and for themselves, for since they learned to know the truth, they might also have the power to prove themselves by their works to be good stewards and conscientious guardians of the commandments they had received.³ He repeatedly expresses his firm conviction, that God accepted only those who imitated the moral perfection that dwelt essentially in him, who copied his purity, righteousness, and philanthropy:⁴ that the only means for attaining the forgiveness of sins, and a participation of the heavenly inheritance, was the actually becoming free from sin after the knowledge of Christ and baptism. Everywhere he considers the hope of eternal felicity to be limited by moral fitness.⁵ "We hold the belief," (says he) "that only those will attain to a happy immortality who lead holy and virtuous lives according to the image of God; but all who go hence in unrighteousness, and without renovation of life, will be punished with eternal fire."⁶ (ἐν αἰώνιῳ πνεύμ.) Thus, according to Justin, the faith and the life stood in the most intimate connexion; his morality was entirely supported by his faith, and then

² Dial. c. Tr. c. 39, p. 136, (p. 268, B.)
³ Apol. 1, 65, p. 82, (p. 97, C.)
⁴ Apol. 1, 1, 10, p. 48, (p. 58, B.)
⁵ Dial. c. Tr. c. 44, p. 140, (p. 263, B.)
⁶ Apol. 1, 21, p. 56, (p. 67, D.) Compare 1, 8, p. 47, (p. 57, A.)
again, he acknowledged no faith as genuine without morality.

As a branch of the morality thus founded on the Christian faith, Justin’s character was pre-eminentely distinguished by the strictest love of truth, and the most fearless courage in the profession and vindication of the truth. In reference to the first, the Martyr says, not merely of Christians in general, but including himself: ¹ — “When we are examined (judicially) we deny not, for we are conscious of nothing wicked, and hold it impious not to speak the truth in all points,”—and,² “It is in our power to deny when examined, but we would not purchase our lives by a falsehood.”—And again,³ —“We formerly persecuted one another even to death, but now, not only do we not fight with our enemies, but are ready to die, confessing Christ.” In reference to himself he avers,⁴ —“I am anxious for nothing but to speak the truth, and therefore fear no one, even if you were to tear me in pieces.” And when the Jew Trypho proposed the question in reference to the millenium, in which Justin had professed his belief, whether he really held this doctrine with full conviction, or whether he professed his belief in it at the moment as a polemical artifice, Justin answered him indignantly,⁵ —“I am not so contemptible as to say anything different from what I think.”⁶

¹ Apol. 2, 4, p. 91, (p. 43, E.)
² Apol. 1, 8, p. 47, (p. 57, A.)
³ Apol. 1, 39, p. 67, (p. 78, B.)
⁴ Dial. c. Tryph. c. 120, p. 213, (p. 349, C.)
⁵ Dial. c. Tr. c. 60, p. 177, (p. 306, D.)
⁶ How different from Jerome, (pro libri adv. Justin. apolog. II. p. 73, didicimus, plura esse genera dicendi, et inter cetera alii dicere, alii γράμματα scribere, alii διαλογισμος. In priori vagam esse disputacionem, et adversario responsum nunce hae, nunce illa proponere; argumentari ut libet, alii loqui, alii agere, panem ut dicitur ostendere, lapidem tenere. In sequenti autem aperta frons, et ut ita dicam, ingenuitas necessaria est. Alii est querere, alii definire; in altero pugnandum, in altero docendum est. Origines, Methodius, Eusebius, Apollinaris, multis versuum millibus scribunt adversus Celsum et Porphyrium. Considerate, quibuscumque argumentis et quam lubricis
Along with this uncompromising veracity, Justin's character was marked by a noble courage, with which, in the noblest manner, supported by the consciousness of their innocence, he vindicated the Christians from their oppressors. It is worthy of admiration with what unfettered openness he admonishes the Roman Emperors of their duty towards the Christians. His longer Apology opens with an address to the Emperor:¹ "Everywhere you are called pious and philosophic, guardians of justice, and friends of learning; it will now be shown whether you are really such; for we do not approach you in order to flatter or please you by this address, but in order that, after a strict and careful examination, you may do us justice, and not condemn yourselves by yielding to prejudice, or to the desire of pleasing superstitious men, or to irrational feeling, or to long standing calumnies. For we hold that no one can do any evil against us if we are not convicted of a misdeed, or convicted as evildoers. You are able indeed, to kill us, but you cannot injure us." Further on, Justin appeals to the conscience of his judges² in a still more impressive and urgent manner: [Christ said,] render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," hence we worship God alone, but we gladly serve you in all other respects, acknowledging that you are kings and rulers of men, and pray that you may exercise regal authority temperately and prudently. And if you should despise our petition, and all our explanations, this will not injure us, since we believe, or, rather, are firmly convinced that each,

¹ Apol. 1, 2, p. 44, (p. 53, D. E.)
² Apol. 1, 17, p. 54, (p. 64, D. E.) See 1, 45, p. 71, (p. 83, A. B.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 213, (p. 349, C.)
according to the deserts of his actions, shall be punished by eternal fire, and that an account will be required according to the powers which he has received from God: as Christ has intimated, "to whom God hath given more, from him more will be required." We feel that these, and similar declarations, are the outgushings of a soul which had attained true spiritual freedom by faith in the Son of God; we hear in them the language of a man, who, even in beggar's attire, dared to approach the throne of the mightiest of earthly sovereigns; who, since he possessed the certainty of eternal life, could hazard his bodily life for the truth's sake. Justin was, indeed, "a living epistle of Christ;" he was governed throughout by Christian principle;—his life, both in a religious and a moral point of view, was manifestly regenerated. It may be considered as Justin's voice, as a passage from the experience of his own life, though the words are not his own, when in the discourse to the Greeks, it is said;¹ "Come, ye Greeks, and be partakers of this incomparable wisdom: be instructed by divine discourses, and learn to know the immortal King; and honour not those heroes who dealt destruction among the people. He regards neither strength of body, nor beauty of form, nor pride of rank, but a pure soul fortified by holiness. The divine Logos is our constant leader, and the watch-words of our King are divine acts; the power of the Word penetrates the soul like a trumpet of peace which calms the distracted soul. O beautiful instrument, that calms the wildest passions! O school that quenches the fire of the soul! which forms no poets, trains no philosophers, no powerful orators; which, by its instructions, changes mortals into immortals, men into gods; and transports from the earth above the summit of Olympus! Come and be taught; become as I am, who was once as you are! These have won me over: the divinity of the doctrine, and the power of the Logos. As a skilful enchanter

¹ [Justin.] Orat. ad Graec. c. 5, p. 4, (p 40, B. D.)
draws from its retreat and then puts to flight a fearful serpent, so the Logos expels the fearful sensual desires from the innermost depths of the soul; especially, those desires from which all that is fearful is produced—enmities, variance, envy, ambition, wrath, and the like."

But the divine always expresses itself imperfectly in the temporal; as the rays of heavenly light, which gleam on man, are generally dimmed in the earthly atmosphere, so Justin's Christian piety was subject to two aberrations, which, in their consequences, were necessarily injurious. Since Justin did not duly distinguish the idea and the reality, the beginning and the final aim of moral developement, since he forgot that the Christian spirit can only make its way gradually, that Christian principles can attain the predominance in the world, only by a progressive conquest of the undivine, he required and attempted, like many other Fathers of the first century, the transference of the Christian law of morals, into the life, according to a standard, which would only suit the position of perfectly advanced Christians, and thereby brought himself, and the young Church, into unavoidable collision with the regulations of civil society. By a literal interpretation of Christ's saying, Matth. v. 34, 37, Justin pronounced an oath to be absolutely inadmissible among Christians.1

But still more injurious was another extravagance in morals, which, in proportion as it gained ground, obscured or corrupted true morality. Before the existence of Christianity, the notion was formed and firmly established, both among Jews and heathens,

that the greatest heights of moral excellence were to be attained by the utmost possible separation from the operations of matter, by the severest confinement and repression of the animal instincts, above all, of the sexual passion; accordingly, a strict discipline, which planted the strongest barriers round the sensual part of human nature, and especially opposed the union of the sexes, found many friends and adherents; marriage, in its physical relations, was gradually regarded more and more with an unfavourable eye, and by many persons was treated as an abomination; in fact, by confounding the outward and the inward, asceticism and morality,—sexual abstinence and celibacy was considered as in itself, a very high degree of sanctity, as the summit of morality. The Indian gymnosophists, according to the report of Clemens of Alexandria, had already abjured sexual intercourse, on the express ground that it was unnatural and immoral, (παρὰ φύσιν γὰς τοῦτο καὶ παράνομον δοκοῦσι,) and admitted no marriages. 1

Among the Jewish Essenes, according to one account of Josephus, 2 a part of the sect refrained from marriage, and adopted the children of strangers, but, according to another passage of the same historian, 3 with which the statements of Philo 4 and Pliny 5 agree, the whole sect practised celibacy. Of the Egyptian therapeutae, Philo says, that "the females join in their meals, of whom the greater number are aged virgins, not by constraint, like some of the Grecian priestesses, but from their own choice; their earnest desire after wisdom, which occasions their living in these societies, causes them to despise corporeal pleasures." Philo 6

6 Philo de vit. contemplat. c. 8, T. V. p. 318.
himself, though he allows that the married state is necessary for continuing the human race, considered it as something that rendered the soul impure.

Such notions of the superiority and sanctity of a single life, and the immorality of the sexual connection, found an early entrance into the Christian Church. Many causes co-operated to render the first Christians favourable to these views. The shameful degeneracy into which the marriage institution was sunk throughout the Grecian and Roman world, at the time when Christianity was founded—the misunderstood passages of Scripture, such as Matth. xix. 12. 1 Cor. vii. 7; viii. 38.—the principles of the heretics, who considered matter as the source of all evil, and consequently the human body as the seat of sin, and whose influence the young Church, with all its precautions, could not wholly exclude—the extensively spread and received notions, that the human body was under the special influence of Satan and other evil spirits, and was the medium by which they sought to destroy the soul—the endeavour to set in a conspicuous light the purity of the Christian life, contrasted with the moral corruption of the Jews and heathens—all these influences combined to warp the judgment of the first Christians respecting marriage and a single life, and to gain admission into these views, which gradually changed life into death, and a free morality into a hypocritical sanctity, and finally, became the inexhaustible fountain of the most fearful demoralization. Already the Shepherd of Hermas enjoined to consider the wife only under the idea of a sister, and made the hope of the forgiveness of sins to depend on rigid continence. Ignatius, likewise, is not averse to the single

1 Quod deter. pot. insidiatur, c. 27, T. I. p. 295.
2 De Monarch. 2, 9, T. IV. p. 307.
3 Staudlin's Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, (Götting 1802,) ii. 432, J. A. und August. Theiner die Einführung der erwun- genen Ehelankheit bei den christlichen Geistlichen. 1. 7.
4 Herm. Past. 1, 2, 2, I. 76, conjugi tuae, quae futura est soror tua . . . . . Continebit se et consequetur misericordiam, 1, 2,
life, as his declaration shows; εἰ τις δύναται ἵνα ἁγνεῖ µαίνεται, εἰς τιµὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου, εἰς ἁγιωτάτης μεταώντος, "If any one be able to remain in purity to the honour of the flesh of the Lord, let him remain without boasting." But how deeply, even in his time, the notion of the merit of celibacy had taken root in the minds of Christians, how very much individuals must have pleased themselves with the apparent sanctity of their abstinence, is very apparent from the emphatic warning which the Bishop of Antioch adds to the preceding exhortation, ἵνα καυχήσεται, ἀτελέστω καὶ ἵνα γνωστῇ πλεον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἐφησάρει, "If he should boast of himself he is lost: and if he should be more known than the bishop, he is utterly ruined."—According to this, the splendour of a single life surpassed sometimes the respect paid to the bishop. To this progressive high estimation of celibacy, and the under-valuation of the married life that necessarily accompanied it, to this merging of true morality into a mere outward sanctity, Justin lent powerful assistance, by entering into this tendency of the times, though in his own person he preserved the spirit along with the form. He extols celibacy, and expresses a wish for its general adoption. He even considers marriage in its physical relation as something sinful and punishable, as far as any pleasure of the senses is connected with it.

3, I. p. 77.—3, 9, 11, p. 115, nobiscum dormies ut frater non ut maritus.—It is interesting to compare with this severe requisition, the similar, but milder expressions of the Alexandrian Clement. Strom. 6, 12, 100, T. iii. p. 159.

1 Epist. ad Polycarp. c. 5, T. ii. p. 42.

2 Apol. 1, 15, p. 59, (p. 62, B.) For many men and women, sixty and seventy years old, who were disciples of Christ from childhood (ἐν παιδείᾳ) remain incorrupt (ἐφησα) and I wish I could show such through the whole race of men. See de Resurrect. c. 3, p. 589, D.

3 See the story of a young man of Alexandria, of whose singular conduct he expresses no disapprobation, but rather glories in it. Apol. 1, 29, p. 61, (p. 71, D. E.)

He particularly refers to the example of Christ, that he submitted to all the necessities of human nature, but wholly repressed the indulgence to the sexual principle.\textsuperscript{1} He maintained that Christ was born of a virgin, for no other reason than that he might put a check to procreation connected with impure desire, and give practical proof that God, for the production of man, nowise needed the union of the sexes.\textsuperscript{2}

SECTION II

JUSTIN'S INTELLECTUAL AND LITERARY CHARACTER.

In Justin's intellectual, no less than in his moral character, there is a mixture of light and shade, and here, if in any department, we perceive the influence

\textsuperscript{1} De Resurrect. c. 3, p. 590, A.—καὶ γυναῖκι καὶ σαλπιτσάμοις τὴν λοιπὴν τῆς σαρκὸς σαλπιτσέως λίγην ὅπως ἰδίᾳ σφοδρῶς καὶ ποτεῖς καὶ ἰδάμας, ταύτῃ δὲ τὴν διὰ συνεπείας μήν δὲ εἰσεχαίρου ἀλλὰ τὰς τῆς σαρκὸς ἑνδυσίας, ίδὲ μὴ ἀναγκάσεις ἄταρχον καθιστᾶται, Ἰανὶ δὲ μὴ ἀναγκάσεις ὑπὸ προκήρυκος. Τε ἔφη μὲν γὰρ καὶ ποτεῖς καὶ ἱδάμας στεφασμὸν σαφὲς καὶ διαφανής ἐστὶ συνεπιάς δὲ στεφασμὸν ἀύρων οὖν ἢ, ταύτῃ καὶ πιὸ.—Clemens of Alexandria mentions a heretical sect who appealed to the celibacy of Christ in justification of their entire rejection of marriage, and to whom he replies: οὐκ ἐναπέτην τὴν αἰνίαν του μὴ γίνεται τὸ κόσμον· πρὸς τὸν μὲ γὰρ τὸν διὰ νῦν ἐὰν τὸν ἐκπλήθει· ἵππων δὲ οὖν ἐναπάσεις ἀναγκαῖος ἄταρχος εἶναι καὶ μὴν αὐτῷ γιαγοῦσιν οὖν καὶ βοηθοῦ τινος κατὰ σάρκα δική· οὔτε τικοτικοτικεῖται δὲ διὰ αὐτῷ ἀναγκαῖον ἄταρχος μίνειν καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐκατοχοῦσιν

\textsuperscript{2} De Resurrect. c. 3, p. 589, B. ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὦ, ἀλλὰ τι ἐν παρθένῳ ἑνεργεῖ. ὡς ἐν καταραγμῷ γίνεται ἐνσωμάτωσιν ἄνεμος καὶ διήργηται διὰ σωματικοῦ δώρου ἐνεργείας τῇ ἁπάντῃ ἀνέμῳ πλήθος.
of the spirit of the age. The excellencies and defects of his times, and of Christian antiquity, are visibly blended in his person. While we cannot hesitate to admire the rapidity of his investigations, and the proportionately great extent of his learning, yet, on the other hand, a want of genuine mental completeness is perceptible in several respects. We shall illustrate both points, by considering Justin in the capacity of a writer and of an investigator.

CHAPTER I.

JUSTIN AS A WRITER IN GENERAL.

It is an acknowledged peculiarity of the Ecclesiastical writers of the first century, with only a few exceptions, as Athenagoras among the Greeks, and Lactantius1 among the Latins, that matters of language, both logical and rhetorical, are treated in their writings with neglect. This neglect arises from two causes. By degrees, philosophers, rhetoricians, grammarians, and other professed advocates of heathenism, passed over to Christianity; yet these new converts in general wanted that pre-eminence of refinement by which the Greeks and Romans were so eminently distinguished; or if they were in themselves sufficiently educated to enable them to vie with the ancient masters of Grecian and Roman literature in the beauties of style, or of oratorical composition, yet they designedly divested their writings of all ornament and splendour of diction, from a mistaken regard to Christian truth. Irenæus2

1 Lactant. Institut. Divin. i. 1. Causam veritatis peroremus, quæ licet possit sine eloquentia defendi, ut est multis sepe defensa, tamen charitate ac nitore sermonis illustranda et quodammodo disserenda est, ut potentius in animos influat et visua instructa et luce orationis ornata.

2 Irenæus, adv. haeres. l. i. prop. p. 4, εὼν εἰς ἱστορίας ἴδιον ἔργον, εἰς τὸ Καλλον εἰκασίας καὶ παρὰ ἑαυτὸς ἔχοντο τὸ πλῆθος ἰσχυλομενον, λόγω ἀγαθών, ἐὰν εἰς ἵστορίας, ἐὰν δὲ συγγραφίας, ἐὰν εἰς ἱστορίας, ἐὰν καλ...
artlessly acknowledges the former, as it regards himself, and Lactantius, reports it of others; the latter Arnobius expresses most distinctly. This practice arose from the belief that revealed truth possessed an intrinsic power that would enable it to dispense with all the embellishments of language, and command respect on its own account; that it would be only obscured and falsified by the addition of art; that error at all times has made use of the glosses and ornaments of rhetoric in order to obtain acceptance and notoriety.\(^3\)

\[\text{\ldots}\]

\(^1\) Lactantius, *Instit. Divin.* 5, 1, non credunt (the heathen) divinis quia fuco carent, sed ne illis quidem, qui ea intrepretantur, quia sunt et ipsi aut omnino rudes aut certe parum docii; nam ut plane sint eloquentes, perraro contingit . . .

\(^2\) Arnob. *adv. gent.* 1, 59, T. i. p. 40, cum de rebus agitur ab ostentatione submota, quid dicatur spectandum est, non quali cum amanitate dicatur, nec quid aures commulcet, sed quas afferat audientibus utiitates; maxime cum sciamus, etiam quosdam sapientiae deditos non vantum abjecisse sermonis cultum, verum etiam, cum possent ornatus atque ubernus eloqui, trivialem studio humilitatem secutos. See 1, 58, T. i. p. 39, 2, 6, p. 50, sq. Clemens expresses himself in a similar manner. *Strom.* 1, 10, 48, T. ii. p. 35, 2, 1, 3, p. 123, 6, 17, 151, T. iii. p. 198.

\(^3\) Lactant. *Institut. divin.* 3, 1. Deus hanc voluit rei esse naturam ut simplex et nuda veritas esset luculentior, quia satis ornata per se est ideoque, ornamentis exir succession additis fuacata, corruptum; mendaciurn vero specie placet aliena, quia per se corruptum vanescit ac diffudit, nisi ornatu aliiunde quesoito circumliuncto fuerit ac politum.—5, 1, et in hoc philosophi et oratores et poetae perniciosi sunt, quod incertas animos facile irreire possunt suavitatem sermonis et carminum dulcia modulatione currentium.—Theophil. *ad AutoL.* 2, 12, p.
and that eloquence, and all the elegancies of style, only serve as a mental amusement, and as aliment for literary vanity. 1 The Fathers were strengthened in this their aversion from all artificial, or even simply correct diction, by the unadorned simplicity in which the greatest part of the books of Scripture are composed, 2 as well as by the severe judgment which the Apostle Paul passes on the Grecian arts of eloquence, I Cor. ii. 4; i. 17—19.

We might then anticipate that in Justin’s writings little of that perfection of style 3 would be discernible which characterises most of the written productions of the ancient Greeks. And, in fact, Justin’s compositions, logically and oratorically considered, are very negligent, as was remarked long ago by Photius. 4 Both the causes which occasioned this negligence of style in the Fathers, operated in Justin’s case. He had not a complete command of language, as he himself frankly allows, 5 and he regarded an ordinary unadorned phraseology, in contrast with the Grecian eloquence, as an attribute of Christian discourse. 6

357. (p. 91, C.): ἵνα τὰ υἱὰ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν ἐν συνεργασίᾳ καὶ ποιήσει εἰρημένα ἐχόντες μὴ τίνι, σάρκι τα φανερά μηκελαπώς. Τα γὰρ οὐκ άναστήναι: "For the things said by philosophers, and writers, and poets, appear worthy of credit, because they are in ornamented diction, yet their discourse is shown to be foolish and vain."

1 Theoph. ad Autol. I. I. p. 338, (p. 69, A.)
2 Tatian (Orat. c. Græc. c. 29, p. 267, [p. 165, B.]) mentions among the reasons which decided his conversion to Christianity, the unadorned, simple style of the books of the New Testament.
3 The style of the Apostolic Fathers, as Photius remarks, (Biblioth. Cod. 126, T. i. p. 96,) of the Epistle to the Corinthians by Clemens of Rome, is simple, artless, and ordinary.
4 Biblioth. Cod. 125, T. i. p. 94.
5 Dial. c Tr. 58, p. 154, (p. 280, A.)
6 Cod. ad Græc. c. 35, p. 32, (p. 32, D.) καὶ τὰς ἡμᾶς ὑμῖν, ἢς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς, ἢς τὸν ἤγοτον ἵμαραν ὡς ταλλὸς προφητικός Μωσῆς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ προφῆται γεγονά τοίς ἔρευν ἐκατέργασαν καὶ τούς ποιητὰς καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας ἐκτοιχίζουσι, καὶ ταλαίπως μὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ προφητῶν ἀντιστράτον ἱλασθεὶς, ἢ τοιχών ταῖς Θείαις τῶν προφητῶν ἤμελιν καὶ γεμάθεια τοῖς ἄγνωστοι τῷ Ἁδῷ Ἐποίησεν, ὡς λόγω ἐμίν ἄρα γεγελέντων.
If we examine Justin's diction, we shall find it to be
in general incorrect, rugged, tame, and common-place.
Syntactical rules are often grossly violated,—the
clauses are separated by immense parentheses, or
strangely involved,—the expressions and comparisons
are not raised above the language and sphere of com-
mon life;—the periods are tedious. Syntactical ano-
malies like the following are frequent; Dial. c. Tr.
53, p. 149, (p. 273, B.) προαγίλια ἢ καὶ τῶν ἀστ
τῆς συναγωγῆς ἕμων ἁμα τοις ἄστ τῶν Ἕλλην ἔστησεν ἐν'
αὐτῶν μέλλουσαι.—c. 62, p. 159, (p. 285, B. C.) ἢ ὅτι
ἐλεγεν ὁ Ἐσι.; . . . . ἢ ὅτι.; . . . ιΩν ᾨγηκανι.
198, (p. 331, B.)—c. 110, p. 204, (p. 337, C.)
Equally numerous are inadmissible separations of
words and clauses agreeing together, as Dial. c. Tr. c. 3,
p. 104, (p. 220, A. B.) χαίρω ταῖς τιμιάταις διασχισάς,
ἀνεμοτόδοσος γὰρ μοι ὁ διάλογος πρὸς ἐμαύτου γίνεται,
ὡς ἐναντία δεότατος ὑπανεί. Compare c. 86, p. 183, (p. 312,
D.)—c. 111, p. 204, (p. 338, A.) Awkward, unwieldy,
and intricate expressions and combinations, as Dial. c.
Tr. c. 107, p. 201, p. 334, B.) καὶ ὅτι τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας
ἐκεῖλαν ἀνακτήσας μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι, γέραται τοις
αὐτοῖς ἀπομημονεύσας, ὅτι οἱ ἄστ τοῦ γένους ἕμων

τίχνης ἢν περικεφάλαιοι λεγόντων: τότε γὰρ θεω τῆς
τὴν ἐλλάκτων κλέπτων Ἐλέατον ἄλλα ἐπέλευς τοῖς ἀνθρώπων ὑμεῖς
τα καὶ ἰδιεῖς χρημάτων. "The time is now come, O Greeks,
for you (having been convinced from external evidence that
Moses and the other prophets existed long before, who are
esteemed wise men among yourselves,)—to secede from the
ancient error of your ancestors, and to read the divine histories
of the prophets, and to learn from them the true religion,—
though they do not address you with the artifices of words,
nor speak with persuasive skill, for this belongs to those who
wish to steal the truth, but simply use names and words that
occur to them."—c. 36, p. 34, (p. 36, B.)—c. 36, p. 33, (p. 34,
C.) οἱ προειδότες ἄδεις, (the Grecian philosophers, particular-
ly Plato and Aristotle,) ἄστος τι ἥλιας τῆς ἐνυπνίαν προει-
δοτες, πεζόντων ἀπέθετο τῇ ὑπῆς οἰκείωσεν προει-
δοτες.—"The men before mentioned presenting eloquence as a bait, have
endeavoured to seduce many from true religion."—c. 4. p. 10,
(p. 5, C.)
Justin as a writer in general.

Apol. 1, 13, p. 50, (p. 60. C. D.)—1, 3, p. 45, (p. 54. C.)
Dial. c. Tr. c. 49, p. 136, (p. 259, A.)—c. 131, p. 223,
(p. 360, C. D.) Antecedents without consequents, as
Dial. c. Tr. c. 78, p. 174, (p. 303, B.) where the
clause καὶ οὕτως ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν, &c., is interrupted
by a number of interpolated remarks, and then is re-
sumed, c. 78, p. 175, (p. 304, B.) with the words,
καὶ ὁ ἡμῶν μὴ ἐπανελθόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνάμνεσιν
μάγων. Sometimes, indeed, he takes a higher
flight, as in Dial. c. Tr. c. 29, p. 126, sq., (p. 246, C. D.)—c. 110, p. 203, (p. 336, D. 337, A. C.)¹ and
here and there we meet with an oratorical painting,
as in Dial. c. Tr. c. 12, p. 112, (p. 229, B. C.)² but

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 29, p. 126. ἡμᾶς συναντήσαι, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἐσαντιόμεθα ἐξίσονινα καὶ συναντήσαι ἰδίως διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
του Σιών, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου του ἐνεμόμενον ὑπάρχων γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ
tοῦ Θεοῦ ἤλθεν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἡ παρ’ ὑμῶν λαμβάνον. Τις ἐν ὑμῖν με
περιποιήσει λέγει ὅταν τοῦ Σιών μακρινωθηθεῖ, τις ἤχων τοῦ βασιλεύσυν
τοὺς χριστίανορ κατοικίας βιβλιασμοῦ. “We will glorify God
with the assembled nations, because he hath visited us. We
will glorify him by the King of Glory, by the Lord of powers.
For it hath pleased him among the nations, and he receives
sacrifices more willingly from us than from you. Of what account
is circumcision to me, who am approved by God? What
need of that baptism to me, who have been baptized with the
Holy Spirit?”

² Dial. c. Tr. c. 12, p. 112, (p. 229, B. C.) πάσης ὁ πατρὸς, καὶ ὄχλος ἰθαν. ἐκάθεν γίνηται, καὶ καθ’ ἀνναίρεσις ἐπούλλεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν ἀληθῶς αὐτὸς
καὶ ὁ καθ’ ἀναθεματικὸς Θεός, καὶ ὁ καθ’ ἀναθεματικὸς ἡμών, εἰς ὑποκλίσεως δωρεάν, καὶ εἰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, διὰ τοῦ ὑμῶν προσώπη-
θαντικοῦ ἡμῶν τόπον φάγνας, καὶ καθέσταται τοῦ Σιών τοῦ Θεοῦ
κατ’ ὅποιαν τῶν ὑπάρχοντα τοῖς Θεοὶ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐν 
τοῖς ἐν ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ
τὰ τετραγώνα καὶ ἐκάθεν σάββατα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ τῶν πανδοκαὶ
καὶ ἐκάθεν χριστίανορ, καὶ καθ’ ἀναθεματικὸς. “The law-giver
is present and ye see him not; the poor have the Gospel preach-
ed to them, the blind see, and ye understand not; there is need
of a second circumcision, and ye glory in the flesh. The new
law wishes you to sabbatize continually, and ye think to show
your piety by being idle one day (in seven), not under-
standing why it was commanded to you. And if ye eat un-
leavened bread, ye say that ye have fulfilled the will of God;
the Lord our God is not pleased with these things. If any
such passages are rare; in general, the conversational or narrative tone prevails.

The same want of care and precision which we have noticed in the diction, marks Justin's writings in their logical relation. The Fragment on the Resurrection excepted, we never meet in them with a principle of classification consequentially carried out, a firmly compacted logical scheme, an organic whole. Justin frequently brings forward a distinct topic, (as in Apol. 1, 23, p. 57, [p. 68, B.C.]), but the discussion is always incomplete. See Apol. 1, 27-29, p. 60, sq. (p. 70, C. 72, A.), 1, 43, sq. p. 68, sqq. (p. 80, D. sqq.). One glaring defect in Justin's compositions, is the incredibly frequent interruption of the logical connection by totally irrelevant, or at least ill-treated digressions and episodes, which are often connected with what immediately precedes, or with the general subject, in the slightest possible manner, by the association of ideas. Thus, for example, the evidence for the high antiquity of Moses, as well as of the whole Jewish history, (Coh. ad Græc. c. 9, p. 13, [p. 9, C.]), and the recentness of the Grecian philosophers and writers generally, (Coh. ad Græc. c. 12, p. 15, sq. [p. 12, D.]), is interrupted by an attempt to show, that the exclusive possession of wisdom was conceded to the Hebrews by the Grecian oracles, (Coh. ad Græc. c. 11, p. 15, [p. 11, E. 12, A.B.]), and again, the discussion on the antiquity of Moses and the Jewish nation, is itself only an ill-timed parenthesis, by which the argument, that neither the Grecian poets and philosophers, nor their oracles, were repositories of religious truth, is interrupted, (Coh. ad Græc. c. 9, p. 13, [p. 9, C.]); so, likewise, the enumeration of the doctrines which Justin supposed Plato drew from the Old Testament, is injured by the insertion of representations and descriptions, which Homer, he con-

among you be a perjured person or a thief, let him cease. If any among you be an adulterer, let him repent and celebrate rich and true Sabbaths to God. If any one has not pure hands let him wash and be pure."
309, B. D.), c. 43, p. 139, (p. 262, A. C.), and c. 66, p. 163, (p. 291, A.); c. 63, p. 160, (p. 286, C.), and c. 76, p. 172, (p. 301, B.); c. 68, p. 166, (p. 294, A. B.), and c. 71, p. 169, (p. 297, B.C.); c. 90, p. 188, (p. 317, D.), 318, A.), and c. 111, p. 204, (p. 338, A.).

In the Dialogue with Trypho, Justin is aware of these repetitions, and labours to justify them. Several times he excuses himself, from a consideration of those hearers of his conversation with Trypho who were not present at the first day’s disputation, and therefore required a recapitulation of what had passed in their absence. Dial. c. Tr. c. 85, p. 182, [p. 311, D.], c. 92, p. 190, [p. 320, B.], c. 118, p. 211, [p. 346, C.], c. 128, p. 221, [p. 358, A.]. On one occasion he defends himself by a singular declaration; Dial. c. Tr. c. 85, p. 182, (p. 311, D. 312, A.) “If I now say to you, what I have often repeated, I do not consider myself as acting absurdly, for it would be ridiculous, if he who makes the prophetic writings the subject of conversation with others, did not always bring forward the same prophetic passages, but should pretend that he could produce something better than the Scriptures; for the sun, and moon, and stars always keep the same course, and effect the changes of the seasons; and if a person were asked the question, how many twice two make? he would always answer four; so, in the case before us, the same answer must be repeated, and in all similar instances where a repeated profession is to be made.”

Yet this wavering in the justification he thought necessary—but still more the fact, that the repetitions occur as much in the Apologies, and in the first half of the Dialogue, as in the second half,—satisfactorily shows that this tautological method of Justin's writings has its foundation rather in the defect of severe mental training, than in conscious design. To this defect, it must be ascribed, that Justin mingles together his materials. He discusses without logical sequence, and sets down the separate proofs of his demonstrations without the slightest logical connection. To substan-
tiate the first remark, we refer to Coh. ad Græc. c. 38, p. 35, sq. (p. 36, sq.) Apol. 1, 27, sqq. p. 60, sq. (p. 70, C. 71, E.) 2, 5—7, p. 92, sq. (p. 44, sq.) especially 2, 7, p. 93, (p. 45.) and for the second remark, Apol. 1, 9, p. 48, (p. 57, C.) 1, 14, p. 51, (p. 61, A.) 1, 59, p. 78, (p. 92, C.) 2, 11, p. 96, (p. 49, B.)

Upon the whole then, our estimate of Justin must be unfavourable, if his performances as a writer only be considered. His education was too defective in critical accuracy, to make him master of the art of authorship; and, besides, he surrendered himself so entirely to the prejudices of the early Christians, according to which, indifference to literary excellence was reckoned almost essential to an ecclesiastical writer, that he felt under no obligation to correct in this point the deficiencies of early life.

CHAPTER II.

JUSTIN AS AN INVESTIGATOR IN GENERAL.

The extent of Justin's acquirements was not small, if estimated by the standard of the second century. Justin had evidently been an extensive reader in Grecian literature, since, in his writings, he makes express and repeated references to the principal writers of Greece, namely, the historians and philosophers. He was acquainted with the works of Alexander Polyhistor, Apion, Castor, Diodorus, Hellanikus, Philochorus, Ptolemaeus, and Thallus, and gives quotations longer or shorter from them. He also refers to many of the poets, as Orpheus, Homer, and Sophocles, and quotes passages from their writings. He had also read the Jewish writers Josephus and Philo, and appeals to their testimony. But he shews a peculiarly accurate and extensive acquaintance with the Grecian philosophers; the doctrines of the most distinguished schools were familiar to him, and he employs them in the service of Christian Apologetics.
Justin as an Investigator in General.

We do not mean here to refer to his hortatory address to the Greeks, since, in the exposition it contains of the doctrines of the Grecian philosophers, he has confined himself to the sketches which Plutarch gives of them in the books ascribed to him, "On the Doctrines of the Philosophers." Justin's other writings afford a sufficient pledge that he had ex-

1 A comparison of the passages that most strikingly parallel will suffice.


Θαλῆς ο Μιλήσιος, έ πρώτος της φιλοσοφίας έξελε, έχοντι ταύτα διαταγμάτων τη υδάτων ἀπεφύγοντα. Ἐξ οὖν τούτου ζωήν καὶ ζώει ταύτα ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῆς υδάτων ὑπολείπονται.

c. 5, p. 11. (p. 6, E.)—Θαλῆς ἀρχὴ τῶν ὑδάτων ὑδημεν ἕνας ἔχει: ἕξ οὖν τούτου μετά ταύτα εἰμι καὶ εἰς ταύτα ἀναλύμεθα ταύτα. Στράτησεν δὲ ταύτα ψωπον ψωπον, ὡς ταύτα τῶν ζώων καὶ γωνίαν ἀρχήν ἔγρα, ὡς ταύτα τῶν ὑδάτων καὶ ταύτα τῆς ὑγείας, καὶ περιβάλλει ταύτα ἡ ὑγεία τῶν ὕδατος καὶ ταύτα τῶν ὑδάτων, ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων· ἀνακύκλωσαν ταύτα εἰς ταύτα ταύτα.

"Thales the Miletian, who took the lead in the study of natural philosophy, declared that water was the first principle of all things. From water, he says, all things are, and can be resolved into water."

"Thales says that water is the beginning of things; from water, he says, all things are, and into water all things are resolved. And his reasons for this opinion are, first, that all living creatures are produced from the seminal fluid; and, secondly, that all plants are nourished and bear fruit by the aid of moisture, but wither when deprived of it."

"Thales the Miletian declared that water was the first principle of things; but this man appears to have taken the lead in philosophy—who says that all things are from water, and are resolved into water. And his reasons for this opinion are, that the seminal fluid is the first principle of all animals, and thus it is probable that all things arise from moisture; secondly, that all plants are nourished and bear fruit by the aid of moisture, but wither when deprived of it."
tensively studied the systems of the Grecian philosophers. Nor was Justin less intimately acquainted with the contents of the Scriptures; it is indeed truly astonishing to what extent he knew the Old Testament especially; he cites an immense number of passages from it in his writings, many of them of great length, and yet almost entirely from memory. The proportionate abundance of Justin’s learning was noticed by Photius, who says, ἡς φιλοσοφίας ὁ ἄνθρωπος πεποιημένος πολύμαθης τε καὶ μάλιστα γε τῆς Ἡβραίας εἰς ἄρξον ἀνθρώπους πολυμαθεῖς τε καὶ ισόπον περίποθομνος πλούσιον. “This man rose to the summit of the philosophy known among us, and particularly of that which is foreign; and was affluent in various kinds of learning, and in the treasures of historical knowledge.”—It is true, this knowledge of Justin’s, according to our idea of learning in the present day, was very limited; we have therefore used the term proportionate in reference to his acquirements. Justin, like the ancient Christians in general, confined his inquiries to what would serve the single purpose of building up the Christian Church. He was as little disposed as the other Fathers to accumulate knowledge for its own sake, hence his investigations were naturally incomplete and defective. In fact, his studies did not even include some departments of knowledge which stood in immediate connection with the interests of the Church; though Justin occupied himself particularly with the interpretation of the Old Testament, he never became acquainted with the Hebrew language. This has been considered so improbable, that the knowledge of Hebrew has been de-

Compare also Coh. ad Gr. c. 3, sq. p. 9, (p. 4, D. E. 5, A. B.) with Plutarch, de placit. philos. l, 3, T. v. p. 231—236. On the other hand, the representation in Cohor. ad Gr. c 6, p. 11, (p. 7,) with the exception of some single words or sentences, differs from Plutarch’s, and contradicts his statements respecting the opinion of the philosophers.

1 Zastrau, de Justinī Mart. biblicis studiis, I. p. 8, sqq.

2 Bibliothec. cod. 125, T. i. p. 94.
cidedly attributed to Justin, but the result of a closer inquiry proves that he did not understand the Hebrew idioms. As this inquiry is in many respects very important, we are desirous not to pass it over. It cannot be denied that there are several circumstances which seem to justify, and even to require the admission of Justin's acquaintance with the Hebrew language. Justin gives the etymology of several Hebrew words, which, however incorrect and ridiculous, seem to indicate some knowledge of the Hebrew idiom; Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 198, (p. 331, B.) τὸ γὰς σατὰ τῇ Ἰουδαίῳ καὶ Σωτῆρ φωνῇ ἀποστάς ὦν ἵνα τὰ δὲ νὰς υἱὸν, ὡς ἡ ἱερατεία δορις ἐνικήθη, ὡμοίως τοῦσ ἄγα τὴν Ἑβραίων ἱερατείαν φωνὴν ἵνα δὲ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν εἰσηγημένων ἐν υἱοῖς γίνεται σατανᾶς. c. 125, p. 218, (p. 354, C.) τὸ οὖν Ἰσραὴλ υἱὸν τούτῳ σημαίνεται ἀνδρομέος νικῶν δύναμιν τὸ γὰς ἱερὰ ἀνδρομέος ἵνα (νικῶν) τὸ δὲ ἥλ δύναμις. “For Sata, in the language of the Jews and the Syrians, means an Apostle; and the word Nas is that which is interpreted Serpent; from both the terms the word Satanas (Satan) is formed.—The word Israel therefore means the power-conquering man, for Isra is a Man (conquering) and El is power.” Farther, among the Old Testament citations contained in Justin's writings, there are several quotations which, while they differ from the Septuagint translation, keep close to the sense and expression of the Hebrew text, or even according to a freer reading of the Seventy, give a second verbal translation of the Hebrew original. The most striking examples of this kind are the following:

Dial. c. Tr. c. 118, p. 211, (p. 346, A.)

Hebrew Text. 1 Chron. xvii. 14. LXX.

Καὶ σὺν τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ οἴχῳ μου.

רְעֵמָה תייר הָבִיתָנִי.

Καὶ πιστῶσω αὐτῶν ἐν. οἴχῳ μου.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c.</th>
<th>Isaiah iii. 12.</th>
<th>LXX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133. p. 225,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 362, D.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὴν τρίβον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν</td>
<td></td>
<td>τὴν τρίβον τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ῥάτασσοι.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ποδῶν ὑμῶν τα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γάςσουσιν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c.</th>
<th>Is. lviii. 13.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121, p. 214,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 350, C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέθεικα σε εἰς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φῶς ἵλιν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c.</th>
<th>Is. lviii. 13.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27, p. 125,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 244, B.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐχ ἔχεις τὸν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα σου ἐπὶ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐργον, ἀδια-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λήσης λόγον ἐς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῇ στοματίς σου.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c.</th>
<th>Amos v. 23.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22, p. 121,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 239, A.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπόστησον αὐτ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἕλθης μὴ διδά-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάν σου.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c.</th>
<th>Amos vi. 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22, p. 121,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 239, C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ πιστεύεις ἐν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλάλαις οίνον.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dial. c. Tr. c.</th>
<th>Amos vi. 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22, p. 121,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p. 239, C.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ πιστεύεις τῶν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διοικημένων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dial. c. Tr. c. 109, p. 202, (p. 336, A.)

Micah iv. 1.

Kaip to prokento, hliob othe to kai
Hlipm YMTHR
BHTBHJW

LXX.

Kaip to prokento, hliob othe to kai

Dial. c. Tr. c. 109, p. 203, (p. 336, B.)

Micah iv. 5.

Dti, pannotes oi laoi, proswstota in onomati geouw autw.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 26, p. 125, (p. 243, E.)

Is. lxiii. 3.

Amos vi. 1.

Pher druchth lohri
Meuph'm A'A'myi

Oai tois ekoum-

Vasi geouw kai tois

Ssclo Dsiv eti to
Let it be considered, also, that Justin was born in Palestine, and, therefore, had various opportunities of acquiring a knowledge of Hebrew; and, finally, that his controversies, in after years, with the Jews, seem to have made it absolutely necessary for him to understand the original language of the holy books, which were the chief weapons of his warfare; and the opinion that Justin possessed a knowledge of Hebrew appears well established. Yet this opinion is, after all, a mere deceptive appearance. The reasons urged in its behalf partly neutralise themselves, and are partly invalidated by counter-arguments. Justin’s Palestinian origin is nothing to the purpose, for the ancient Hebrew idiom had, long before the birth of Christ, ceased to be in popular use, and was only kept alive among the learned. Even the knowledge of the Syro-Chaldaic dialect was no longer indispensable for an inhabitant of Palestine in the second century after Christ; for, about the time of Christ and the Apostles, the Greek language had become so prevalent in that country, that, even in the intercourse of common life, it was as much used and understood as the native idiom;¹ not to add, that in Flavia Neapolis the Greek

¹ See Cicero, pro Arch. c. 10. Seneca, consol. ad Helv. c. 6, Tacitus, de orat. c. 29. Juvenal, Satyr. 6, 185, sqq. Mar-
manner and language quite predominated. And, in his controversies with the Jews, Justin could not very much feel the need of Hebrew learning, since he had mostly to do with Jews living out of Palestine, who spoke Greek, and themselves used a Greek translation of the Old Testament; and he also argued on the notion that the translation of the LXX. was a verbally correct copy of the Hebrew original; a notion which necessarily resulted from his belief in the wonderful origin of the translation. With respect to the Old Testament citations, which differ from the present text

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 68, p. 166. (p. 294, A. B.) όχι . . . ἱσωτήρων ὡμοι, μὴ τιθέομαι τοῖς ἑδαυσάλοις ὡμοί, δι' τινος τελμάτων λίγης, τιν ἔχοντας, ἦταν ἀποτάσσων οἱ ἱσωτήρων . . . μὴ ὑπαν τειν ἀλήθεια: Α' γας δ' διαφέρουσιν οἱ τοῖς γραφαῖς φράσεωι ἐλεγχων οὕτως προς φίλον και φίλον τελμάτων γεμαίρω, ταῦτα τελμάτων λίγης, μὴ ὑπάρχουσαν. "Shall I not prevail upon you not to believe your teachers, who dare to say that the narrative told by the Seventy was not true in certain points? For, what in the Scriptures appears expressly to reprove their foolish and fond opinion, this they dare to say is not so written." See Zastrauf de Justin Mart. bibl. stud. i. p. 9, sqq. 27.
of the Septuagint, and agree with the Hebrew, they will prove nothing, (in reference to Justin's knowledge of Hebrew,) unless on the supposition that Justin himself compared the Septuagint with the Hebrew, and corrected the former by the latter. But this supposition is wholly erroneous. For, had Justin understood so much Hebrew as would have enabled him to institute such a comparison, and had he really made it, how can we explain the circumstance, that he only had recourse to the Hebrew text instead of the Septuagint in a few isolated and not very important passages, and, in by far the greater number of citations, adheres to the readings of the Septuagint, even when its deviations from the Hebrew text are perfectly arbitrary and mistaken; in fact, on such various readings he builds important conclusions, as in Dial c. Tr. c. 99, p. 195, (p. 326, B.) where, in quoting Ps. xxii. 2, he follows the reading of the LXX, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄνοιαν ἵμων, instead of the Hebrew לְיָלִין, and then makes the following remark: ἤκα μὴ τις λέγῃ, ἢγνὸς οὖν (ὁ Ησυχός) ὅτι μίλλει πάσχειν, ἐπάγει ἐν τῷ γὰρ ἑαυτῷ ἑνῶς καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄνοιαν ἵμων;—"Lest any one should say, therefore, Jesus knew not that he was about to suffer, he adds immediately in the Psalm, and not for my ignorance."—The true reason of the circumstance that Justin's readings of the Old Testament citations sometimes agree with the Hebrew text and differ from the Septuagint, and that in others of these citations we sometimes find along with the reading of the LXX. another verbal translation of the Hebrew, partly consists in this, that a reader or transcriber of Justin's writings marked, in the margin, the reading that corresponded to the Hebrew text, which he had in his memory, and thence it was afterwards inserted in the text;¹ but principally in this, that Jus-

¹ The writings of Philo present a similar appearance. This learned Jew, it is acknowledged, possessed no knowledge of the Hebrew language. The quotation, Genesis ix. 25. (De sobrietat. c. 7, T. ii. p. 239,) besides the reading of the LXX,
tin made use of a copy of the Septuagint, which, on the one hand, presented many of the original readings of the LXX. which were conformable to the Hebrew text, but afterwards lost,¹ and, on the other hand, that he was acquainted with a fragmentary version of the LXX. according to the Hebrew, so that the before-named corrections were first placed by their author in the margin of a copy of the LXX., but afterwards introduced into the text by transcribers, so that the old

οὕτως αἰκίνας has also another translation suited to the Hebrew words שָׁבַר יִבְעַי, namely, δούλος δούλων. How is this to be explained? The words δούλος δούλων are neither more nor less than a marginal gloss, which gradually crept into the text without expelling the original reading of the LXX. See Amersfoordt, De varis lectionibus Holms: locorum quomodum Pentateuch. Mosaici. (Lugd. Bat. 1815.) p. 94.

¹ According to Capellus (Crit. sacra, Par. 1650, p 526, sq.) Justin found the readings of his citations, which differ from the text of the LXX. and agree with the Hebrew,—among the marginal glosses of his copy of the LXX. and copied them from thence into the text of his citations. But Credner (Beiträge, &c. II. 129, 230, 245, 284, 289, 298,) on account of the confidence with which Justin every where speaks of the genuineness of his text of the LXX. infers that the corrections of the LXX. according to the Hebrew were already received into the text used by Justin. Stroth's opinion is altogether untenable, (Beiträge zur Kritik über die LXX.in Eichhorn's Repertorium, II. 84,) that Justin, in his citations from the minor prophets, made use, not of the common version of the LXX., but of another which was distinguished by a closer conformity to the Hebrew text. For, in the first place, we do not find in Justin's writings the slightest trace of the use of such a translation; and, moreover, a conscious voluntary departure from the text of the LXX. would not have been possible for Justin, consistently with his belief in the divine origin of that version; lastly, he could have felt no need of a new translation, since he had no suspicion of the frequent variation of the text of the LXX. from the Hebrew original, and declared it audacious to accuse the LXX. of incorrectness. Dial. c. Tr. c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, C.) ὅτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς περιγράφονται τις ἤφαντος, διε ἤφαντον οἱ προβολέων ὁμιλ. τεταλείπεται λίγοτερε, ἰδί ἤφαντο τιν ἐκεῖ, ὅποιον ἤφαντον. "But in these instances you have dared to alter the interpretations which your elders gave . . . . saving that we have, not the Scripture as they interpreted it?"
genuine reading of the LXX. was retained along with the new reading made in conformity with the Hebrew. Lastly, the etymologies of Hebrew words which Justin gives are of no importance: they prove neither for nor against his knowledge of Hebrew.¹ For even with a knowledge of the Hebrew language, Justin might still adopt a false etymology, and inversely, without this knowledge, he might possess a (probably traditional) notion respecting the construction of a Hebrew word. His frequent intercourse with the Jews must have given him ample opportunity for storing his memory with etymological curiosities. All the reasons then by which it has been sought to prove Justin’s acquaintance with Hebrew, amount to nothing. On the other side, the following considerations incontestably prove his total unacquaintance with this language: The remark which the Apologist makes on the subject of the typical reference of the 22d Psalm to Christ, (verse 14,) could proceed only from a person who had never read the Old Testament in the original.—Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 198, (p. 331, A.) λέοντα τὸν ὄρμημένον ἐκ αὐτῶν ἐλεγε τὸν διάβολον ὧν Μωσῆς μεῖν ὅφιν καλεῖ, ἐν δὲ τῷ Ἰαβαὶ καὶ τῷ Ζαχαρίᾳ διάβολος κάιληται καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἱησοῦ σατανᾶς προσηγόμεναι, ὑμωμα ἀπὸ τῆς πραξιὼς, ἢς ἐπηγγέει, σῳδετὸν κτισμάμενον αὐτῶν μην ὁμοιοῦ.—“The lion roaring against him he said was the Devil—whom Moses calls a serpent, but in Job and Zechariah he is called Devil, and by Jesus is addressed as Satan, showing that he possessed a name derived from the action which he had performed.”—For not only Jesus used the appellation σατανᾶς, but also the Hebrew text of Job and Zechariah has the term יָטַש which the LXX. translate by διάβολος. Job i. 6; ii. 1. Zech. iii. 1. But those passages of the Dialogue with Trypho, are of peculiar importance, in which the variations between the text of the LXX. used by Justin and the Codex of his Jewish opponent are brought

¹ Coh. ad Gr. c. 28, p. 28, (p. 28, B.) τῷ ἰχθύω τῷ ἀκοκκόε. τηθὼ δὲ διάβολον αἱ θεῖαι γραφαι καλῶν.
under discussion. Here the Martyr never settles the point in dispute in a critical manner, by recurring to the Hebrew text, not even when his Jewish opponent charges the LXX. with manifest incorrectness. He supports his cause simply with weapons from the armoury of philosophy and exegesis, and either silently gives his LXX. the credit of exclusive correctness, or without hesitation accuses his adversary of falsifying the original reading, or even of cancelling whole

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 213, (p. 348, D.) ὑπακοῖον ὃν μᾶλλον ἔτη παρέχεται τῆς λίγῳς, πρὸ ὃς ἔρχεται ἴησοςς, λίγων-τεις εἰρηκόμεθα ὅπως ἐλθῇ τα ἀκολούθων αὐτῷ (Iren. c. ix. 10), αὐλόν ὡς ἴησος ἔρχεται οἱ ἱδρυμένοι εἰρηκόμεθα, ἄλλα ὡς ἴησος γιὰν αὐτόν τεις. Ἐτέρος δὲ τὰ ἀκολούθων μιν τοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σηκῶται . . . . . . ἐν τῷ τοῦ τοῦ λιβροῦν εὐαγγελίζεται ὅπως ἰησοῦς — c. 43, p. 139, (p. 262, C.) ἴησος ὡς καὶ οἱ ἵδρυμενοι ὅπως τεις λίγων, μιντὶ εἰρηκόμεθα ἀναπεφίλει τῷ Ἱσαάῳ (Iv. viii. 14). Ἡδὲ ἐντοῦτοι ἐν γαστί ἵησος, ἄλλῳ ἤδε ἡ γαστὶ ἐν γαστί: λήφυται καὶ σηκῶται ὅπως καὶ ἴησοῦς. Ἐπεὶ τὸ σηκύνησι ὡς εἰς ἡ ἴησοῦς τὸ ψυχάμον ὅπως βασιλεῖα, ἐπικυρωμεν καὶ τὸν τούτῳ καὶ βασιλεῖα ἴησοῦς εἰκονομοῦν ἤ μοί αὐτοῦ ἵηρα. — I might contend with you about the word, which you interpret, asserting that it is said, until the things reserved for him shall come, since the Seventy do not thus interpret it, but, till he come for whom it is reserved; but since the sequel shows that it is said concerning Christ. I am not come to dispute with you about a little word. — Since you and your teachers dare to affirm that it is not said in the prophecy of Isaiah, ' Behold the virgin shall conceive,' but ' Behold the young woman shall conceive and bear a son,' and you explain the prophecy as if it referred to Hezekiah your king, I will attempt briefly to explain this against you, and demonstrate that it is said in reference to this Christ whom we confess." — Compare c. 124, p. 217, (p. 353, D.) c. 131, p. 223, (p. 360, B.) c. 137, p. 228, (p. 367, A.) In reference to the first passage, we may here remark that Justin (Dial. c. Tr. c. 52, p. 148, (p. 271, D.) himself adheres to the reading τα ἀκολούθων αὐτῷ, and this must have been the original reading of the LXX. Compare Grabe's remark on Gen. xlix. communicated by Bruns in Eichhorn's Repertorium, iv. 20. Michaelis Orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek. ix. 217. Credner's Beiträge, &c. II. 52.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, C.) ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐν τούς τεῖς (Iv. vii. 14,) παραγάρησεν τὰς ἱδρυμένες, ὡς ἵησος εἰς τούς τεῖς μιντὶ τοῦ τοῦ λίγων, τοῦ τοῦτο τοῦ τοῦ γραφήν καὶ
passages from the Scriptures. From this designed avoidance of a critical method—from this absolute silence respecting the Hebrew original of the Old Testament, in questions where the necessity of a reference to it was so palpable, the conclusion is direct, that Justin must have been utterly ignorant of the Hebrew language. When, for example, Trypho raises the objection, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 67, p. 163, (p. 291, A.)) ἢ γάρ ἦν ἑξυγάσατο — "You also in these pervert the interpretations which your elders have interpreted—you dare to say that the Scripture is not as they explain it, &c."  

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 71, p. 169, (p. 297, B.) ἀλλ' εὐχα τῷ ἄνδρῳ καλῶς ὁμών πιστῶν, ῥᾳ τοις ἑκατοντάκοποις καλῶς Εὐαγγέλιοι ὡς ὅπῃ τῷ παρέ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Α' χριστίῳ γεγομένῳ βασιλεῖ ἑβδομάδας προσευχήσαντο ἀλλ' αὐτῷ εὐαγγέλια προσέβαζεν καὶ ὅτι πολλὰ γραφάς τιλῆς περιέλθεν ἄντω τῷ Εὐαγγέλιῳ τῶν γεγομένων ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ γεγομένων προσευχήσεως, ἵνα δὲ διαφέρων ἔντος ἀλλ' ὁ πρίγγος, ὑπὸ τῆς καὶ ἄνθρωπος καὶ σταυροῦντος καὶ ἀπο-θέουσαν παυσαρμαίον ἀντιδίδονται, ἵνα δὲ καὶ βούλευσαι. — "But I am not disposed to agree with your teachers, who will not allow that the Seventy elders employed by Ptolemy king of Egypt interpreted correctly; but they themselves attempt to interpret. And I wish you to know, that many passages are wholly taken away from the translation made by the elders who were with Ptolemy, in which it is expressly shown that this crucified One has been announced as God and Man, as crucified and dying."—Compare c. 72, p. 169, (p. 297, D.) c. 120, p. 313, (p. 349, A.) On the groundlessness of this charge, see Nitzsh De Testamentis duodecim Patri-archarum, p. 10.

2 This is most clearly indicated in the question to Trypho; Dial. c. Tr. c. 68, p. 168, (p. 294, A.) ἢ ἂν ἀνελθόντα, τὴν προφη-τίαν τούτην (12. vii. 14.) τῷ Ἰσαάκ ἐν τῷ τῆς ἡμέρας Χριστοῦ οἰκομένης, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ τῆς Εξανθή, ἢς ἄπε προφητεία, εὐχαίρει τοῖς τοῦ ἐν τῷ οἰκοδόμησι κρατεῖται μὴ πιστεύει τῷ διαδόθεντος ὁμών, ἢ τοῖς τελευτη-σίν πλήσεις, τῇ Εἰκονίδε, ἢ τῷ Προφητείῳ τοῖς ἱερομό-νυμοις . . . . . . . μὴ ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῷ ἀναστ. "If I should show that this prophecy (12. vii. 14.) of Isaiah was given in reference to this our Christ, and not to Hezekiah, as you say, shall I not prevail on you not to believe your teachers, who dare to affirm that the interpretation given by the Seventy is not true in certain points?"—c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, C.) c. 131, p. 223, (p. 350, B.)
Justin as an investigator in general.

Justin was so imperatively required to compare these renderings with the original text, that his omitting to do so must have been owing only to entire ignorance of the Hebrew idiom.

Justin's talent for literary, and especially biblical investigation, must accordingly be pronounced incomplete and defective, even if we take into account the limited means of the second century, and the relative social position of the Martyr himself. And it was not merely incomplete, but partial and uncritical. As was the case with the ecclesiastical writers of antiquity in general, so Justin often accepted much as undoubted truth, without careful examination, which bore on its front, in characters not hard to be deciphered, the marks of improbability, and even relative impossibility; he allowed himself to be governed in his inquiries by his own peculiar leanings, to such a degree, that impartiality of judgment was quite lost: on points of chronology and history he indulged in a carelessness which led him into the most egregious mistakes. To notice first, what we have last mentioned, he makes, for example, Jethro the priest, who, according to Exodus ii. 21, the father-in-law of Moses, to be also his maternal uncle;¹ thus he supposes a king Herod to be reigning at Jerusalem in the time of the Egyptian Ptolemies.² Thus he speaks of the Ethnarch Archelaus, without any limitation, as the successor of Herod the Great; and since he seems to know nothing of the deposition of Archelaus, and of the immediate occu-

¹ Apol. 1, 62, p. 80, (p. 95, B.) Thirlby's supposition is not improbable, that this mistake arose in Justin's mind from confounding Moses with Jacob. For Jacob also had a theophany while he was watching his father-in-law's sheep, and his father-in-law was also his maternal uncle.

² Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, C.) The attempt of Nourry (Apparatus, &c. l. 394,) of Grabe (in a note on the passage,) and of Tschirner to remove this anachronism from Justin, is quite a failure.
pany of his territories by the Romans, he makes the Tetrarch Herod Antipas the successor of Archelaus, and gives him also the title of king.¹

In reference to the first point, (Justin’s want of critical impartiality,) it is worthy of notice that Justin received the Sybilline books, though he was aware that they contained the most special prophecies of Christ,² without the slightest suspicion of their falsification;³ and that, in the same way, he made use of the ancient poetical works of Orpheus or Sophocles, with all the interpolations by which an ill-judged Christian zeal had foisted into them Christian ideas and doctrines; in fact, he makes an attempt to reconcile the contradiction which these Christian insertions present to the heathen sentiments that pervade the other parts of the interpolated works,⁴ without indulging the least surmise of the spuriousness of such additions. We must also notice the believing confidence with which Justin copies the legend of the Cumæan Sybil, whom he considers to be the authoress of


² Coh. ad Graec. c. 38, p. 35, (p. 37, A.) τὴν Σίβυλλην . . . τινὶ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἢμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μελλόντι οἰκεῖαι παρείσχες καὶ τινὶ πάντως τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γίνομαι μελλόντων εἰρήνης καὶ θανάτου πεσομαθείοις.—“(Believe, O Greeks) the Sybil who clearly and plainly foretells concerning the future advent of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and concerning all things about to be done by him.”

³ The heathen, at an early period, detected this falsification, and were not slow to charge it upon the Christians. Celsus made this objection to the Christians, Origen, c. Cels. 7, 53, I. 732, ὅμως καὶ τὴν Σίβυλλαν. ἂς χρηστάναι τις δὲν, εἰκότως ἢ τὸ μέλλον προφητεύεις ὦς τοῦ Θεοῦ παιδί τῷ ἀνθρώπου. —“Probably you would bring forward as a child of God the Sybil, to whom many of you appeal; but into her writings you are able to interpolate many blasphemous things.”

⁴ Coh. ad Graec. c. 15, p. 18, (p. 15, B. C.)
the Sibyline books. He confidently affirms that she was supposed to be the daughter of the Chaldean historian Berosus, and came from Babylon to Campania. In Cumæ she dwelt in a cave hewn out of a rock, like a palace, and sat in its innermost chamber, on a lofty throne, whence she communicated her oracles, after having performed certain lustrations. Her remains were still preserved there in a large brazen chest. Even Plato and Aristophanes knew the sybil. Her oracles were uttered by a real divine revelation. But since the sybil, when out of the state of inspiration, retained no recollection of what she had uttered in the moments of ecstasy, and unlearned priests did not always understand and write down the oracles correctly, it happened that her oracles were sometimes deficient in rhythmical correctness. For the verification of all these particulars, Justin appealed, in part, to his own personal observations at Cumæ, and in part to the authority of the guides who had explained to him the Cumæan wonders. It never entered his thoughts to inquire how far devout superstition or self-interested fraud might have had a share in these depositions, but whatever was shown or reported to him, he received without the slightest hesitation. This uncritical credulity appears in his narrative of the well-known extraordinary story of the origination of the Septuagint version. ¹ He assured the Greeks, with all seriousness, that the Egyptian king, Ptolemy, in order to enrich his newly-formed library at Alexandria

with the literary treasures of the Jews, had received manuscripts of the Old Testament from Jerusalem, accompanied by seventy persons acquainted with the Greek and Hebrew languages, who were to translate the Hebrew original into the Greek. Soon after their arrival, the seventy interpreters, that they might perform their task undisturbed, and accomplish it in the shortest time, were removed to the island of Pharos, seven stadia from Alexandria, and shut up in seventy separate cells built for the purpose. This separation, which was enforced with such strictness, by the express command of Ptolemy, that the translators could not exchange a word with one another, had for its object to gain a more certain judgment on the faithfulness and accuracy of the proposed translation. After the completion of their task, Ptolemy instituted a comparison of the several translations, and found, to his astonishment, that the translations agreed with one another to the very letter. Convinced by this result that the translators must have written under the special influence of the Divine Spirit, Ptolemy honoured them in every possible way; and, having loaded them with costly presents, dismissed them to their native land, but retained the books as divine witnesses, and deposited them in his library. At the close of this narrative, Justin guards especially against the supposition that it was nothing more than a myth or a fabricated story. He adduces as evidence in its favour, that he saw, with his own eyes, the ruins of the 70 cells in the island of Pharos,—that the account had, for its

---

1 Jerome sarcastically remarks, (Pref. in Pentateuch. Opp. T. III. p. 10,) in reference to this part of the legend, "Nescio quis primus auctus septuaginta cellulas Alexandrias mendacio suo estrinxerit quibus divisae eadem scriptaarent, cum Aristaeas ejusdem Ptolemcei θυσαρασίος et multo post tempore Josephus nihil tale retulerint, sed in una basilica congregant, nullius scribant, non prophetasse. Aliud est enim vatem, aliud est esse interpretem. Ibi spiritus ventura predict, hic erudito et verborum, copia ea quae intelligit, transferit."

2 Coh. ad Grec. c. 13, (p. 14, B.) τραυμα εν μεθο δοριω οι αρπασε "Ελληνως, οδη τη πτωλεμειας ισχυς εκαγγήλλην.
immediate source, the verbal testimony of the inhabitants, and was, besides, confirmed by the corresponding representations of the trust-worthy historians Philo\(^1\) and Josephus. Not a single doubt of the credibility of the legend can enter his mind. Indeed the monstrous and paradoxical form it assumed only served to render it more acceptable to him. The love of the marvellous, by which Justin, like all his contemporaries, was governed, led him to receive the most improbable legends as true history, if they fell in with his prepossessions as a Christian. Thus he not only relates, according to a literal construction of Deuter. viii. 4; xxix. 5, that during the forty years’ sojourn of the Israelites in the wilderness, neither the thongs on their sandals were torn, nor the sandals themselves, or their garments waxed old; but must needs add the Jewish fable, that the clothes of the younger Israelites increased in size as they grew up.\(^2\) Justin’s investigations are even wanting in the necessary truth and impartiality, when nothing more was requisite than a good pair of eyes. The illusion which befel the martyr is well known in reference to the statue which he represents the Roman senate as having erected to the Gnostic Simon Magus on an island in the Tiber.\(^3\) The whole mistake simply arose from a too hasty reading of the inscription which a pillar in Rome bore that had been erected to the honour of the sabine god Sancus.\(^4\) The statue found in the year 1574 in the place mentioned

---


\(^4\) Lact. Institutt. divin. 1, 15.
by Justin, in the island on the Tiber, with the inscription SEMONI SANCO DEO FIDIO SACRUM, puts this out of all doubt.  

As an investigator in general, Justin does not satisfy the expectations which we might be disposed to form respecting him. His inquiries are partly deficient in the extent to which they might have been carried, and partly in the circumspection, which will accept nothing but what is thoroughly verified.


At first sight, it may appear strange, that the learned and accurate chronographer Julius Africanus should make use of a writer who treats the historical question in reference to the age of Moses only superficially and cursorily, but it is to be recollected, that Justin's name stood so high in the ancient church, that even a Julius Africanus could have no hesitation in referring to the

Martyr on a chronological point. Besides, this deference is quite accidental and slight, and rests on nothing less than the want of independent examination. Julius Africanus might have read Justin's Exhortation shortly before writing his own work, and thus the chronological recollections flowing from it would imperceptibly mingle with his statements. He could not have wanted opportunities for becoming acquainted with Justin's treatise, since he himself stayed for a longer or shorter time in the very places where Justin chiefly resided. See Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 6, 31, T. II. p. 235. Hieronym. de vir. illust. c. 63, T. I. p. 186, Phot. bibl. cod. 34, T. I. p. 7.

Page 173, at the close of the first remark.—The author of the fifth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, says with a similar inconsistency, in one and the same chapter; Constitut. Apostol. 5, 7, T. I. p. 306, ὁ τοῦ Ἀδάμ τὸ σῶμα ἐκ γῆς ποίησε, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ τοῦ πρώτου μετὰ διάλυσιν τὸ σῶμα ἀναστήσει, and 5, 7, T. I. p. 308, ἐκ διαφόρων ἐπύησεν ἀνθρώπων, δοὺς αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκ τοῦ μηδ' οὖνος. Are we to infer that this chapter had more than one author?
BOOK IV.

THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

To develope the doctrinal character and contents of Justin’s writings is by no means an easy task. Justin’s style is frequently deficient in the distinctness and precision which say neither more nor less than ought to be said, and hence we are frequently in danger of inferring more from his words than they really contain. His language often struggles with the new ideas to which it has to give a form and a body, and it is not always easy to ascertain when the author has found expressions corresponding to his ideas, and when not. His doctrinal convictions, as might be expected from his mental formation, and his singular position, as the founder of a Christian theology, were very unsteady and fluctuating, and want that firm impress which remains essentially the same, independently of casual influences. Thus, Justin never develops his doctrinal views in a separate form, but only as they are required for an Apologetical purpose. Hence it is, that they are seldom presented in their full extent, but generally under some particular aspect; in such a state they appear sometimes quite detached from one another; and in the heat of polemical zeal, they are in danger of being literally lost. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that correct conceptions have not been always formed of Justin’s doctrinal views, and that, according to the individual bias of the reporter, they have been supposed to favour sometimes this, and sometimes the other system. Christianity has been discovered in his writings sometimes in a state of purity, sometimes more or less debased
by a heretical admixture; sometimes they have been adduced as evidences for, and sometimes against a later orthodoxy. Both are erroneous. By all parties the proper point of view has been lost, by taking for granted that Justin’s doctrinal convictions could be forced into a definite system. Justin’s doctrinal views are not colourless, but their character is necessarily defaced, when it is attempted to give the colours of later systems. It is our design to give a delineation of Justin’s leading doctrines, with the utmost objectivity, and with a careful attention to the difficulties we have pointed out.

SECTION I.

SOURCES OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

The canonical writings of the Old and New Testament were considered by Justin, as the exclusive source of Christian doctrine. The suffrages of the Apocrypha and Tradition, were not admitted; their use was confined to furnishing some slight information, either historical, or not materially affecting any doctrine.¹ It may appear extraordinary that Justin never

¹ In reference to the Old Testament history, the legend of the peculiar death of the prophet Isaiah, which Justin, Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 213, [p. 349, A.], mentions in the words, ἐφέσιν ἐξελεύσασα, “whom ye sawed with a wooden saw,” we might be disposed to consider as taken from an apocryphal document; for the Ascensio Jesuus vatis, discovered in Ethiopia, and published by Dr. Lawrence at Oxford, in 1819, contains this legend, (see Gfrörer’s prophetae veteres pseudopigraphi, Stuttg. 1846, c. 5, p. 11, sq.), and possibly it was already extant in the time of Justin, as it is mentioned expressly with him, by Epiphanius, (adv. haeres. 40, 2, T. I. p. 292, 67, 3, p. 712.), and Jerome (Comment. in Is. 64, 4, T. V. p. 202,) and by Origen, (Epist. ad African. c. 9, T. I. p. 20.), Comment. in Math. x. 18, T. III. p. 465.), the identical ἀναβαςεν Ἰησοῦς is pointed out. Compare Nietzsche on the ἀναβαςεν Ἰησοῦς,
makes use of the Apocrypha (strictly so called) of the Old Testament, since these writings were frequently employed by the Church Fathers immediately succeeding him, and though not included in the Canon of the Alexandrian Jews, yet in general appended to copies of the Septuagint. Yet this exclusion could not be without a reason. Perhaps a purely external circumstance occasioned it, that Justin never found them used by Philo, whom, in a certain sense, he followed as an authority. Also the little esteem in which these writings were held by the Palestinian Jews, which would be his own feeling, in part, towards their contents, might bias him against their use. At all events, their want of prophecies gave the finishing stroke,

in Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1830, Part 2, p. 210, and Lucke’s Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, 125. But Justin maintains that the narrative of the execution of Isaiah, by means of a wooden saw, formed originally a part of the Canonical text of the Old Testament, and was first expunged by the Jews. It is, therefore, not impossible that he had really read it in an interpolated copy of the Septuagint. On the other hand, Justin has taken several details from tradition, or New Testament Apocrypha, relating to the history and doctrine of Christ, and if they were authentic, complementary. See Credner’s Beiträge, &c. I. 157, 165, 181, 186, 192, 199.

1 Only a single allusion occurs to the Apocryphal addition to Daniel, the song of the three Jews in the furnace. In one passage of the longer Apology, where Justin mentions a number of righteous and devout men, we meet with the names of Ananias, Asaria, and Misael. Credner (De librorum N. T. inspiratione quid statuerint Christiani ante seculum tertium medio, Jena, 1828, I. p. 42.), believes that he can point out a distinct assertion of Justin’s, that he made use only of the Old Testament books that were received in the Palestinian Canon. He appeals to the words, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 32, p. 129, (p. 249, D.), ἀνέ τὸν πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀγίων καὶ προφητικῶν γραμμών καὶ πάσας ἀποδίδεις σοιώμας.—“I draw all the proofs from the holy and prophetic writings (in use) among you.”—But in these words there is not a distinction made between the Palestinian and Alexandrian Canon. Justin refers in general to the Old Testament, in distinction from merely rational arguments.

which confirmed the Palestinian Jews in denying that their authors were organs of the divine Spirit, and rendered it an imposibility to make use of these writings in behalf of Christianity.\(^1\)

Of the Canonical books of the Old Testament, Justin makes use of about two-thirds, mostly in the way of direct quotation, but sometimes in more general references to their contents. The books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, but especially Isaiah,\(^2\) are most frequently employed. The books that are passed over in entire silence, are, of the historical books, Judges, the second book of Chronicles, Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther; of the Prophets, Haggai, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Nahum and Obadiah; of the didactic poetical books, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. Those passages of the Old Testament of which Justin makes use, are uniformly quoted in the translation of the LXX. It was indeed not unknown to him that the Old Testament was originally composed in the Hebrew idiom; he himself mentions, that till the time of the Egyptian Ptolemies, it existed exclusively in that language, and first under the reign, and by the desire of one of these Ptolemies, was translated into Greek, by Palestinian Jews;\(^3\) while, by the divine providence, it was always preserved in the original language in the Jewish synagogues.\(^4\) But though he could not read the original text of the Old Testament, for want of acquaintance with Hebrew, he could dispense with this accomplishment, since, in consequence of his faith in the miraculous origin of the LXX., he retained the conviction, that the translation corresponded most accurately to the Hebrew text, and

---

\(^1\) Joseph. c. Apion, 1, 8, T. VI. p. 176.
\(^2\) Zastrau, (De Justin. Mart. Bibil. Stud. 1. p. 15.), has given a register of the quotations from the Old Testament in Justin, whose correctness we leave undetermined, since it would be hardly worth the labour of collation.
 indeed, had persuaded himself, that the Jews everywhere made use of the LXX. instead of the Hebrew text.¹ He felt, therefore, an unbounded esteem for this translation, and deemed it an act of temerity to maintain that in many passages it was not correct.

Of the New Testament writings Justin knew only about one half. He was altogether unacquainted with the Catholic Epistles; at least, his writings now extant, contain no reference to them. The Acts of the Apostles is equally unknown to him. Lardner² and Zastrauf have indeed believed that they have found allusions to it in Justin, but these are so indistinct, that it is quite inadmissible to trace their origin to the Acts. It is more probable that Justin was acquainted with the Epistle to the Hebrews; not, perhaps, because in his writings, as in this Epistle, Christ is called an Apostle, but from the following passage, compared with Heb. ix. 13, 14.³

Dial. c. Tr. c. 13, p. 113,
(p. 229, D.)

Οὐ γὰρ εἰς Βαλανέδων ὑμᾶς ἔπεμψεν Ἰσαὰς, ἀπολυσομένος ἠκές τού φόνου καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀμαρτίας . . . ἄλλα ὡς εἰκός, πάλαι τούτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ σωτηρίου λουτρόν ἦν, ὁ ἐπὶ τοῖς μεταγινωσκοντι καὶ μηχανί τε καὶ τάγμων καὶ προβάτων ὁ ποτὸς δαμάλεως ἡ σωματικῆς πρόσφορας καὶ ὅριος ὁμοίως, ἀλλὰ τίτοι διὰ τοῦ αἰματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἱανάτου αἰτοῦ.

“For Isaiah has not sent you to a bath, there to wash away murder and other sins....but, as was likely, this was of old the same saving laver which he announced to those who repent, who are purified no longer by the blood of goats and of sheep, or by the ashes of a heifer, or by oblations of flour, but by faith through the blood of Christ and his death.”

¹ Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, D.) ἢμισυν ἡ βίβλοι (the LXX.) ἁ εἰς Ἰωάννας μικρὸ τού δῶρος, καὶ πεπαλαιω τες τοῦ νεοτιν βιβλίου
² Credibility of the Gospel History, Part II, ch. 10.
³ Compare Apol. 1, 12, p. 50, (p. 60, A.) and 1, 63, p. 81,
Yet we would not confidently infer from this passage Justin’s acquaintance with this Epistle, as is done by Müncher, Munter, and Bähr. Rather we are ready to acknowledge, that Justin might write those words without any knowledge of the Epistle to the Hebrews; indeed, the parallel drawn is of a sort that must present itself to him unsought, and by a kind of necessity. More certain, and beyond all reasonable doubt, is Justin’s acquaintance with the other books of the New Testament. To the Revelation he appeals expressly as a work of the Apostle John. The Gospels he never quotes indeed, under the names of their authors, but regularly avails himself of the general designation ἀποκριμήνωνά τῶν ἀποστόλων; but a close examination of individual quotations has led to a result by no means uncertain, although lately again disputed, that this title designates the canonical gospels; and Justin has distinctly asserted that his gospels were composed by Apostles, and the immediate disciples of the Apostles.

(p. 95, D.) with Hebrews iii. 1. This is the opinion of Grabe (in his ed. of the Larger Λπ. c. 82, p. 121,) and Lardner.

1 Handbuch der Christ. Dogmengeschichte, II. 211.

2 Handbuch der ältesten Christ. Dogmengeschichte, II. 1, p. 317.

3 Die Lehre der Kirche vom Tode Jeni in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, Sulzt. 1832, p. 52.

4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 81, p. 179, (p. 308, A.) τῶν ἀποκριμήνων, τῶν ἀποστόλων τῷ χριστῷ, ἐν ἀποκριμήνων γνώμῃ αὐτῶν χίλια ἵνα πώλειν ἐν Πιερσαλίῳ τοῖς τῷ ἱστορίᾳ Χριστῷ πνεύμασι τοῖς προφήταις. —"A certain man among us, named John, one of the Apostles of Christ, in a revelation (Apocalypse) made to him, prophesied that those who believed in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem." —According to Jerome, Justin wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse. Joannes Apostolus, in Patrum insulam relegatus, scripsit Apocalypsin, quam interpretatur Justinus Martyr et Irenæus. (De vir. illust. c. 9, T. i. p. 174.) But this account is certainly nothing more than a mistake, though inexplicable. See Grabe, Spicilegium Patrum, T. ii. p. 170. Lardner, and Lucke's Versuch, &c. p. 284.

5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 199, (p. 331, C.D.), ἐν τοῖς ἀποκριμήνωνά τίνας οὕτω τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν κύριων παρακολουθοῦντος συντιμάχθαι.
name of the Apostle Paul does not occur in Justin’s writings, nor even an express quotation from a Pauline Epistle; yet, on the other hand, there are phrases so strongly resembling those used by Paul, that we must admit that Justin had known and read some of Paul’s Epistles.¹ We may here mention Justin’s frequent designation of Christ, as ἁρμότοκος τῷ ἄγεν-νητῳ Σωφ., (Apol. 1, 53, p. 74, [p. 88, A.]) ἁρμότοκος τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 84, p. 181, [p. 310, B.]), ἁρμότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 85, p. 182, [p. 311, B.]), c. 138, p. 229, [p. 367, D.]), ἁρμότοκος μὲν τοῦ Ἰσωυ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, (c. Tr. c. 100, p. 195, [p. 326, D.]), τίπον ἁρμότο-κον τῶν ὀλίων κτισμάτων, (c. Tr. c. 125, p. 218, [p. 354, C.]),—compare the passages with Coloss. i. 15, 17, ἢ ἰσόν ἐκώ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ αἰώνατου, ἁρμότοκος πάσης κτίσεως . . . . καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων. The following passages are also deserving of notice:—

Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, (p. 266, D.)

¹Ἡ χριστότης καὶ ἡ φιλαν- Σωφία τοῦ Ἰσωυ καὶ τὸ ἀμε- τρον τοῦ πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ τῶν μετανοουντα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρ- τημάτων . . . . ὡς δίκαιον καὶ ἀναμάζητην ἢκει.

Romans ii. 4.

¹Ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χριστ- τότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς αὐτο- χῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονείς ἁγνοοῦν, ὅτι τὸ χριστόν τοῦ Ἰσωυ εἰς μετανοι- αν σε ἀγει;

Translation of the Greek.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, (p. 266, D.)

“For the kindness and philanthropy of God, and the immensity of his riches, esteems him who repents of his sins as just and blameless.”

Dial. c. Tr. c. 111, p. 204, (p. 338, C.)

“For Christ was the passover, who was afterwards offered.”

Dial. c. Tr. c. 39, p. 136, (p. 258, A.)

“One receives a spirit of wisdom, and another of counsel, and another of strength, and another of healing, and another of knowledge, and another of teaching, and another of the fear of God.”

Dial. c. Tr. c. 110, p. 203, (p. 336, D.)

2 Thess. ii. 3.

“Christ shall come with glory from heaven, when the man of the apostacy, who utters strange things on earth against the Most High, shall dare unlawful deeds against us Christians.”

But on this point some of Justin’s quotations from
the Old Testament are very decisive. They coincide when they vary from the text of the LXX, exactly in these variations, with the form of the text in the apostolic quotations; a coincidence, of which no satisfactory explanation can be given, excepting an actual use of the Epistles of Paul. Compare Dial. c. Tr. c. 27, p. 125, (p. 244, D. E.) καὶ τάντας γὰς ἐξείληκαν, πάντας ἀπὸ ἡρεσίαςσαν ὅπως ἦστιν ὁ σωμών, ὃς ἦστιν ἰς ἵνα 
ταῖς γυλόσας αὐτῶν ὑδαλάδαν, τάφος ἀναγγέλεις ὁ λόγους αὐτῶν ἵς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν σύντρημα καὶ 
ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὄδος εἰςήνγος ὅπως 
ἐγνωσαν. This quotation is composed of four passages of the Bible, namely, from Psalm xiv. 3; v. 10; cxl. 4, and Isaiah lix. 7, and some unimportant variations and transpositions excepted, appears exactly the same as in Romans iii. 12—17. In the Old Testament the four passages are never found together. In the common edition of the LXX. they follow one another in Psalm xiv. 3, in the same order as that in which we find them in Romans iii. 12—18, but without any certain manuscript authority. The Vatican text of the LXX. has them only in the margin, and subjoins the remark, οὐδαμοὶ καὶται τῶν φαρμάν, πτιν ἐν ὅ 
ἀνάστασις εἰληψεν αὐτούς, ἡπτητιν, "they occur no where in the Psalms, and whence the Apostles took them is 
to be sought for." It is sufficiently evident, from this 
remark, that the moulding of the four passages into 
one, marks them as borrowed from the Epistle to the 
Romans, and as such alone can they be considered in 
Justin.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 39, p. 136, (p. 258, B.)

᾿Ανάβας εἰς ὕψος, ἡχυμαλώτευται οἱ—
χυμαλωσιαν, ἐνδυκὲ 
δώματα τοῖς ἀνθρώ—
ποις.

Eph. iv. 8

᾿Ανάβας εἰς ὕψος, ἡχυμαλώτευται οἱ—
χυμαλωσιαν, καὶ 
ἐνδυκὲ δώματα τοῖς 
ἀνθρώποις.

LXX.

Ps. lxviii. 19

᾿Ανάβας εἰς ὕψος, 
ἡχυμαλωτευτα οἱ—
χυμαλωσιαν, ἐν 
δώματα ἐν ἀν—
θρώποις.
This quotation also departs from the LXX., (which is conformable to the Hebrew text,) and essentially agrees with the passage as it stands in Paul. It is of greater importance, because it appears twice in this form in Justin, (the other place where it occurs, is c. Tr. c. 87, p. 185, (p. 315, A.), only with the unimportant change of τοίς αὐθρωποῖς into τοίς νοσί των αὐθρωπών, and, besides, is taken in a Messianic view, and exactly as by Paul, is referred to the spiritual gifts which Christians received from Jesus after his ascension to heaven.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 95, p. 192, (p. 322, C.)
Gal. iii. 10.
LXX.

Κατὰ τὸν νόμον
Μωυσέως ἐπικατά-
βατος εἶχεν πάντα,
δὲς οὐκ ἐμεῖνεν ἐν
τοῖς γεγραμμέ-
νοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ
τοῦ νόμου, τὸν ποιή-
σαι αὐτά.

Γέγρασται ἐπὶ-
χατάρατος πᾶς, ὡς
οὐκ ἐμεῖνεν ἐν πά-
σι τοῖς γεγραμμέ-
νοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ
τοῦ νόμου, τὸν ποι-
σαι αὐτά.

'Επικατάρατος
πᾶς ὁ αὐθρωπός,
δότις οὐκ ἐμεῖνεν
ἐν πάσι τοῖς λόγοις
τοῦ νόμου τούτου,
τὸν ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς.

Dial. c. Tr. c. 96, p. 192, (p. 323, B.)
Gal. iii. 13.
Deut. xxi. 23.

Το ἐγγεγραμμένον ἐν
τῷ νόμῳ ὁτι ἐπι-
κατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρε-
μάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου.
—c. 89, p. 187,
(p. 317, A.)

Γέγρασται ἐπὶ-
χατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρε-
μάμενος ἐπὶ ξύ-
λου.

'Ωσὶ κεκατηρα-
μένοις ὑπὸ θεοῦ πάς
κρεμαμένοις ἐπὶ ξύ-
λου.

But these citations are evidently taken from Paul. In the latter, the omission of the phrase ὑπὸ Ἰσωῦ is very important. On this phrase the Jews lay great stress in their later controversies with Christians.¹

¹ Hieronym. Comment. in Galat. 3, 13, T. IX. p. 137, famo-
Justin calls the Prophets and Apostles, together with the disciples of the Apostles, *Authors of the holy Books*.

The word *Prophet* has, in Justin, a wider and a narrower acceptation. Sometimes it denotes all the persons who were called and enlightened by God, to serve as interpreters of the divine will, as forerunners and heralds of the Messianic times. In this sense it is used when Justin says, that the appearance of Jesus had been foretold by the Prophets, 5000, and 3000, and 2000, and 1000, and 800 years before his actual incarnation, and that the appearance of the prophets had continued in uninterrupted succession until John the Baptist. On other occasions, the name prophet is specially applied to the authors of the Old Testament writings. In this sense Moses is called the first of all the prophets, the prophets collectively, are said to be more ancient than the Grecian philosophers, and are described as righteous, holy, pious men, beloved by God, who allowed neither ambition nor the fear of man to seduce them from proclaiming the truth, and that alone. All these prophets, taking the word

sissima question est et nobis solit a Judaeis pro infamia objici, quod salvator noster et dominus sub dei fuerit maledicto.

1 *Apol.* 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 73, B.)
2 *Dialog. c. Tr.* c. 52, p. 148, (p. 271, D. 273, A.)
3 *Coh. ad Gr.* c. 9, p. 13, (p. 9, C.)—c. 10, p. 15, (p. 11, C. D.)—*Apol.* 1, 32, p. 63, (p. 73, B.)—1, 59, p. 78, (p. 92, C.)
4 *Dialog. c. Tr.* c. 7, p. 100, (p. 224, D.) according to Origen the distinction of being the conveyers and organs of the divine Spirit was granted to the prophets, on account of the purity of their moral life; *Cels.* 7, 18, T. I. p. 707, *οἱ ψεφητές, καὶ διὰ τὸ Καθαρές βασιλείας τὸ Πάνω πνεύμα χαρίσματι, παρερχόμενοι.*—In a similar manner Theophilus expresses himself, *ad Autol.* 2, 9, p. 354, (p. 87, D.) and Tertull. *Apol.* c. 18, T. V. p. 37, *viros, justitiam et innocentiam dignos deum nosse et ostendere, a primordio in seculum emisit spiritum divinum inundatos.* It was also Philo's conviction, that divine revelation could be imparted only to the good; *Quis rer. divin. Narr.* c. 52, T. 111. p. 57, *καὶ οἱ ἐν ζωή πρῶτοι λόγος ἡ ἐν εἰρήνη προφητείαν μαρτυρεῖ*—καὶ ἐν ζωή πρῶτοι γενόσθαι Σωτῆρ, &c. "To every good man the sacred word testifies prophecy; but it is not lawful for the bad to be an interpreter of God, &c."
in a larger and a more limited sense, were considered by Justin as divinely enlightened; yet with an important difference, he speaks only of the inspiration of the authors of the Old Testament writings. This inspiration was held by him on a two-fold ground. He proceeded on the supposition, that besides the reality of God, and the principles of morality, no (religious) truth could be known independently by man; it follows, that wherever true religion is found, an extraordinary operation of the divine Spirit must be presupposed; on the ground of this supposition, he further maintained, that a special illumination, partly mediate, and partly immediate, must have been imparted by the divine Logos to the Heathen, among whom scattered fragments of religious truth are to be found. He deemed harmony, self-consistency, to be the criterion of the full possession of truth, and such harmony met his view in the writings of the prophets, in the Old Testament. Here he found all the writers, though belonging to different times and places, unanimous throughout, on the most important problems of inves-


2 Apol. 1, 46, p. 71, (p. 83, C.)—2, 10, p. 95, (p. 48, C.)—2, 13, p. 97, (p. 51, C.)

3 Coh. ad Gr. c. 8, p. 12, (p. 8, D. E.) ἡλική ἅτακτίς τις καὶ ἀνόητης ἢ παρ' ἄνθρωπος (the Grecian philosophers) πιστεύειν δεῖ, ἵνα μόνον ταῖς ἰδέαις προφθασμένης κατὰ τῆς ἰδεομονίας τυχόντως ἀξία φανερώσει, ἢν πιστευόμενοι καὶ μὴ τάλιθα λίγος τὰς ἀλλήλους ἰδίας τυχόντως προφητεύσεις . . . . οὖν δεῦτε της Ἀκαδημίας παρὰ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφόν ἀνέδεικτοι δι' ἀναμνήσεως ἀγάπης, ταὐτάς ὑμῖν ἀντέδειξαμεν τὰς ἰδεατὰς ἀγαπητὰς καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους τάς τε καταντωμεν.——"A disordered and unharmonious opinion has prevailed among them, which, in one respect only appears meritorious to persons capable of forming a correct judgment, that these philosophers have charged each other with error and falsehood.—Nothing true concerning religion can be learned from your teachers, who furnish you with ample evidence of their ignorance, by their disagreement with one another."—c. 4, p. 10, (p. 5, C. D.)—c. 5, p. 10, (p. 6, A.)—Apol. 1, 44, p. 70, (p. 89, A.)
tigation, on God, the creation of the universe, the formation of man, the immortality of the soul, and the future judgment. 1 This harmony so powerfully impressed his mind that he declared to the Jew Trypho: 4

"If you believe that your discourse can so perplex me that I shall say that the Scriptures are contrary to one another, you are mistaken, for this I shall never dare either to think or say; but if a passage of this kind be brought forward, which has the appearance of contradicting another, being firmly convinced that no such contradiction really exists, I will rather confess that I do not understand it, and shall labour to bring to the same conviction those who maintain that the Scriptures are contradictory." Justin must therefore have esteemed the prophets, on account of their perfect harmony in the doctrine necessary for the possessor of the true religion, as likewise divinely inspired. 2 He attained the same results by a second

1 Coh ad Graec. c. 8, p. 13. (p. 9, C.) ἢ σοι τίς τιμᾶτο καὶ μήν γλύττων καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας πάντως καὶ τῆς συριστῆς καὶ τῆς θλίψεως καὶ τῆς ἀδικίας ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς μιᾶς τῶν βίων τῶν μελλόντων. Τις δεινός ἢ μίας ειλήθεις, απολαξίως καὶ εὐφράσιος ἀλήθειαν ἴδωμαι, καὶ χρέος ἢ διαφόρως τίνος τι καὶ χρέως. — 4 As with one mouth and one tongue, in succession and in harmony with one another, concerning God, and the creation of the world, and the formation of man, and the immortality of the human soul, and the judgment that will take place after this life, and concerning all things which it is necessary for us to know; this, too, in different places and times.


Credner, De Librorum N. T. inscriptions quid statuerint
method. He saw the Old Testament full of the most distinct and special prophecies, and these prophecies had, for the most part, been already fulfilled in the history of Christ and of the Christian church. But the power of prophesying was considered by all antiquity as a prerogative of the Deity. 1 and Justin himself was of opinion that the foretelling of an event which corresponded with the issue, was a work of God. 2 Hence he felt the conclusion with irresistible force, that the men who wrote those prophecies must have been under the special influence of the Divine Spirit. 3 Through these prophecies it was at the same time determined what was the kind of this influence. They were believed to prefigure every important circumstance in the life of Christ, and in the development of the Church, with a definite though partially obscure outline, in order that, when the fulfilment of a thing in itself incredible had transpired, it might be no longer regarded by men as impossible; but, on the ground of the foregoing prophecy, might be acknowledged in its reality and truth. 4 Under such circumstances there was evidently needed, on the part of the


2 Apol. 1, 12, p. 50, (p. 60, A.)—1, 33, p. 64, (p. 75, D.)


4 Apol. 1, 33, p. 64, (p. 74, E.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, B.) η δὲ ἀκοή καὶ ἠδύνατα νεμώνεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς ἀδερφαῖς γνώσεσθαι, ταῦτα δὲ οἰκομέναι δίὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος
interpreters of the divine will, the greatest fidelity in the presentation of what they had received by means of a special divine revelation, since only a slight error in the prophetic picture might easily occasion the frustration of the whole design of the prophecy. An arrangement was therefore to be made, which would render such an error impossible; it was to be so ordered that the design of the revelation could not be altered by human interference. Hence the prophetic inspiration could not consist in a mere general advancement and productiveness of human intelligence, nor could it be the impartation of materials of knowledge, while the receivers were left to give a form and shape to the new ideas. It is rather to be thought that, during the period of inspiration, there was a check in the minds of the prophets to all human productiveness, they became a channel through which what was divine passed without mingling with what was human;—the revelation made to them must have been a verbal and literal one. Such was Justin's view of prophetic inspiration. He did not confine himself to the simple statement that the prophets were inspired by God,¹ or moved by the divine Logos;² that they spoke by the Holy Spirit,³ and wrote their books under the influence of that spirit;⁴ but he asserted, emphatically, that they never delivered their own thoughts, but only what they had received by divine

¹ Apol. 1, 33, p. 64, (p. 75, D.)—1, 35, p. 65, (p. 76, A.)
² Apol. 1, 36, p. 65, (p. 76, D.) κρητεται οὕτως Σιών λόγος.
³ Apol. 1, 36, p. 65, (p. 76, D.)—DiaL. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)
⁴ Coh. ad Gr. c. 12, p. 16, (p. 13, A.) μᾶν ἐν τῷ προφήτῳ Μωϋσίων ήθελα τεχνην ιστορίαν, καὶ τῇ Σιών ἡ ιστορία μωυσίως γέγραφεν τοῖς τῷ Ἐβραίον χειμάρρου. "The only history extant was that of the prophet Moses; which Moses wrote by Divine afflatus, in the Hebrew language."—Apol. 1, 36, p. 65, (p. 76, D.)
revelation;¹ he compared their state during the period of inspiration to the image of a cithara or a lyra struck by the plectron, and maintained that they were subject, as simply and unconditionally to the influence of the Holy Spirit, as these instruments to the will of the player;² in fact, he denied that they retained their natural consciousness during inspiration: he considered their inspired state as an ecstasy.³

1 Coh. ad Gr. c. 8, p. 12, (p. 9, A.) μετὰ αὐτων φαντασιας οιδάκατε ήμεις . . . . ἄλλοι φιλοσοφοι καὶ δισώσιαι τὴν σχέσιν ἡμῶν γυναῖκα καὶ ταύτην οἴονται ήμεις. “Teaching us nothing from their own fancy, but teaching us the knowledge which they received, not contem- tionally nor disorderly, from God.”—c. 16, p. 15, (p. 11, D.) c. 35, p. 32, (p. 32, D.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)—Hieronym. Comment. in Jer. 28, 10, T. V. p. 278.  
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 115, p. 208, (p. 343, A.) ὑπὸ διάβολον καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγγεγυμον ἡμᾶς αὐτοψίᾳ, η ἀναφέρεται ἃν, ἔσω,
tin's notion of inspiration is no other than that which prevailed in Montanism, which was1 disapproved by almost the whole ancient Church.2 All attempts which have been made to modify these views, are

"He (Zechariah) beheld the Devil and the Angel of the Lord, not with his bodily eyes, when unexcited, but in ecstasy, a revelation being made to him."—There seems no reason for confining this statement to Zechariah's prophetical vision, to which it happens to refer, but it marks the general character of prophetic inspiration. That this is the case is proved by the silent approbation with which Justin, in his Exhortation to the Greeks (Coh. ad Graec. c. 37, p. 34, [p. 35, C. D.] 36, B.) refers to the heathen representation of the prophetic Sybil, and especially to Plato's opinion, that the inspired Seers were unconscious of what they announced.

1 Thus Montanus supposes the Holy Spirit to speak. Epiph. adv. haeres. 48, 4, T. i. p. 405, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔκτασις, ἀκαλύπτως αὐτῷ γεγονότοις. "Behold man as a lyre and I strike it as a plectrum. The man sleeps and I am awake, behold it is the Lord who shaketh the hearts of men and giveth hearts to men"—and Tertullian says in a Montanist spirit—adv. Mar. 4, 22, T. i. p. 232, in spiritu homo constitutus presertim cum gloriam dei conspicvit cum per ipsum deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina. See Neander's Antiquissimi Geist des Tertullianus, Berlin, 1825, p. 384.

2 Besides Justin and the Montanists, only Athenagoras maintained that the prophets, during their inspiration, were in a state of ecstatic unconsciousness. The other Fathers usually adhered to the simple notion of a verbal inspiration; many indeed express themselves decidedly against the supposition of an ecstatic rapture. Thus Origen (c. Celc. 7, 3, T. i. p. 696,) ἠθεί ἡθεότης καὶ μνησθή ἡγείται ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἀνατέναι τὰς ἡγείται προφητεῖς, ὡς ἐρμηνεύεις αὐτὸν ἱεροτηπᾶ ἱεροτεῖμα, οἵ δὲ ἐπωμονίος ἔγειρε ἵπποι—and Jerome, (Prof. in Jes. T. v. p. 5,) neque ut Montanus cum insania feminis somniat, prophetarum in euctatis sunt locuti, ut nescirent quid loquerentur et quum alicem erudirent, ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent.—In Jes. 1. 1, T. v. p. 6, prof. in Habac. T. vi. p. 145, in Ephes. 3. 5, sq. T. ix. p. 172.—Epiph. adv. haeres. 48, 3, sqq. T. i. p. 404, sqq. Milliades wrote an Essay on this subject, μετανοεῖ ἐρμηνεύειν αἰσθήσεις καλὴς, (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 5, 17, T. ii. p. 82.) See Rudelbach on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, in the Zeitschrift für d. gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, edited by Rudelbach and Guerike, (Leipzig. 1840,) I. 1, p. 28.
founded on a misapprehension of that train of thought by which they were necessarily developed in Justin, and on entire unacquaintedness with those passages of the Dialogue in which Justin represents the situation of the prophets during inspiration, in plain terms as ecstatic.\footnote{No one of all the writers who have discussed Justin’s views of Inspiration, have to our knowledge been acquainted with this passage. But on no one has this ignorance avenged itself more than on Meier; who writes, “The strong images of which Justin and Athenagoras made use, can hardly be explained as an expression of the strict idea of inspiration, as developed in Montanism.” — (Lehrbuch. d. dogmengeschichte, Giesen. 1840, p. 66.)} They generally support themselves on the image of the Cithara and the Lyra, which, even as an image, allowed of some modification,\footnote{When Rördam (De fide patrum ecclesiæ christ. antiquissimæ in iis quæ de origine evangeliorum canonicorum, maxime Matthæi, tradiderunt, Hafn. 1839, p. 142, sq.) believes that a less literal interpretation of that image is required, which would leave room for the free agency of the inspired prophets, since otherwise the doctrine of inspiration would come into collision with that of the freedom of the individual, has given this freedom a latitude which Justin by no means allowed, and has left unnoticed, that the strictest idea of inspiration presupposes a voluntary self-surrender of the inspired person to the inspiring Pneuma. But when Hagenbach (Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Leipsig 1840, I. 85.) remarks on that image, “Did Justin maintain a pure passivity on the part of the writer? Still in the Lyra is supposed the acoustic structure and its tuning, from a piece of wood the Plectron could draw forth no tones.” — it must be replied, the Apologist compares the prophets so far to a Lyra, as they contribute nothing either in substance or form personally to the revelations which they receive, although they must have a natural capability of faithful receiving and communicating these revelations. The intellectual and moral capabilities of the prophets correspond to the acoustic structure and tuning of the Lyra, without which they could as little serve for organs of prophecy as a common piece of wood for a Lyra. Rudelbach also, has not formed a perfectly correct conception of this image, at least his protest against the meaning is irrelevant to a motionless and unconscious passivity.}
to be not only in a state of complete passivity, but also to have lost for a time his natural consciousness, was by no means peculiar to Justin; long before it had been adopted, and was predominant throughout the heathen world, and in later Judaism. The Grecian priestesses communicated their oracular responses in an unconscious state of sacred frenzy; they uttered what their God gave them to utter; and after the restoration of their natural consciousness they knew not what they had been saying.¹ The same idea of μαντική is found in Plato. He remarks, that the divinely inspired Seers are mere instruments of God, that it is not they who speak, but God speaking through them;² he maintained that they, being deprived of their natural consciousness, knew nothing of all the admirable truths which they announced; and went so far as to assert that the complete disappearance of the natural consciousness in the moment of inspiration, was something essential to genuine μαντική, so that the true μαντική could not co-exist with clear consciousness. From the Greeks this idea of inspiration passed over to the Jews. The narrative of the wonderful origin of the LXX. rests on this foundation. But Philo in

¹ Thus said the Sybill; Sybill. oracul. l. 2, p. 189, (ed. Gall. Amstell. 1689.) . . . . . .

"Ο τι λέγω, μάλλα τι Θεὸς τὰ ἴκανα ἀγνοεῖν and similarly l. 2, p. 314—l. 3, p. 351—l. 3, p. 465—l. 3, p. 483, sq. Justin himself says, in reference to the Cumean Sibyll (Coh. ad Græc. c. 37, p. 34, (p. 35, D.) ὡς οὖν, οὐχ ὡσιμεν οἱ ποιηταὶ καὶ μετὰ τὸ γράψαι τὰ κατηματα όχις ἐξελώσασιν ὑπὲρ ἔννοιας καὶ ἱστολογίας καὶ καὶ ἄλλος πρὸς τὸν προφητικὸν ἐκλήθην πανορμομένος ἐπὶ τὸν ἤτοι νοοίας ἔπειπάτως καὶ η τῶν ὤνομαίος μνήμη. —" She had not, like the poets after writing their compositions, the faculty of correcting her effusions, and particularly of adjusting their metrical accuracy; but while under the afflatus performed the prophetic function; and when the afflatus subsided, the remembrance of what she uttered ceased also.

plain terms expresses himself in favour of it. He declares that the true prophet says nothing of his own, but only delivers what has been given him by another; he sees in the prophet merely an interpreter of God, to whom God inwardly communicates what he is to express; he calls him in so many words a stringed instrument, which is invisibly struck by God, and adds that he is completely passive even when he appears to speak; that he only surrenders his organs of speech, his mouth and his tongue to the service of God, who performs through them whatever he wills. He describes prophecy, in short, as a divinely inspired madness; he denies that the inspired prophet is master of himself, or possesses a clear consciousness, and endeavours to support these views by saying:—

"When the divine light shines forth, human light becomes dim: and when the former becomes dim, the latter appears and shines forth. This is the case in prophecy. When the Divine Spirit enters, our own inward sense withdraws; but when the former departs, the latter resumes its place; for it is inadmissible, that the mortal should reside with the immortal. On this account, the oblivion of consciousness, and the darkness around it, give birth to an ecstasy and a divinely inspired madness." Josephus also adopts this view of prophetic inspiration, though he does not so expressly assert it. On mentioning the


4 Quis rer. divin. har. c. 53, p. 59.

5 Quis rer. divin. har. c. 51, p. 55.

blessing which Balaam was forced, against his inclination, to pronounce on the people of Israel, he makes this remark.—" He prophesied this, not being master of himself, but moved to utter it by the Divine Spirit,—and puts these words into Balaam's mouth,—" O Balak, dost thou really believe that it is in our power to speak or to be silent when the Spirit of God has taken possession of us? He calls forth sounds and words without our knowing anything of it. As soon as he enters, nothing within us is our own." 1

We shall not greatly err, if we assume that these views of prophetic inspiration, held by heathens and the later Jews, contributed to form that idea of inspiration which prevails in Justin's writings. The theological standing-point in which Justin was placed, merely rendered it needful to consider inspiration as free from all injury and falsification by human agency; whatever went beyond this, was only an accidental addition to these premises, and is deducible, not improbably, from a foreign, external influence. As a positive argument for thinking so, it may be remarked, that Justin in his Exhortation to the Greeks, notices the Platonic doctrine of μαντική with manifest approbation.

That Justin held the Old Testament prophets to be divinely inspired, is evident from the fact, that he never adduces arguments in support of their declarations, but presents their language without any artificial argumentation, simply and dogmatically; 2 as the organs of the Divine Spirit, they were perfectly trustworthy in themselves, and above all demonstration. 3

The Apostles, like the Prophets, were esteemed by

---

2 Ἡ βάλαμα φησὶν περὶ τῶν ἔλεγχων ἔλεγχων καὶ δικαίων οἷς ἐμεῖς εἰσιν περὶ τῶν τοιούτων σιγάνη λόγων, ἢτοι ἡμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ λάβῃ πνεῦμα, φωνᾶς γὰρ ὡς βουλήται τῶν καὶ λέγοις εὐθίᾳ ἡμῖν ἡμῶν ἑδικών ἡμᾶς . . . εὐθίᾳ ἢ ἡμῖν ἢς, φθάσαντες εἰς τὸν θυγατρὶν θεὸν, ἡμῖν, ἡμῖνοι, ἡμῖνοι.
3 Coh. ad Graec. c. 8, p. 13, (p. 9, B.)—c. 35, p. 32, (p. 32, D.)
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 7, p. 109, (p. 224, D.)
Justin as divinely inspired; and as he considered the Old Testament writings to be the dictates of the Divine Spirit, so he referred the writings of the New Testament, as far as he was acquainted with them, to a special Divine inspiration. In modern times, attempts have been made to deny this, particularly as it regards the Gospels. Credner has maintained that Justin, from his standing-point, not only needed no inspired Gospels, but could not have admitted the inspiration of these writings. This critic deduces the absence of such necessity from the circumstance that Justin already possessed a sufficient guarantee for the truth of the Evangelical history, in the presupposed agreement of the doctrine of Jesus and the Apostles with the contents of the Old Testament, which, in Justin’s belief, embraced in their predictions everything that related to the person and doctrine of Christ.

But he maintains the impossibility of Justin’s believing in the inspiration of the Evangelists, in consequence of an expression, which the Apologist accidentally uses, that in the written account of the Apostles and their followers, everything is to be found which relates to Christ and his doctrine, (Apol. I, 33, p. 64, (p. 75, B.))—οι ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. For all this cannot be found in any single Gospel, but only in the assemblage of all the written Gospels, and in their common use; and to this assemblage Justin must have been directed by his system. If, therefore, he had believed in the inspiration of the Gospels generally, he must have regarded as inspired, all that was contained in the Gospels then extant; but this must have been impossible, since Justin beheld in the unity of the doctrine, an essential mark of the divine origin of a writing, and between the numerous Gospels then in existence, a very impor-


tant difference existed,—a difference which Justin must have learned (if from no other quarter) through Marcion. The inspired Gospels might have been mentioned as a selection from the Gospels in general; but such a selection Justin had not yet known. It is not to be denied, that these remarks have at first sight something plausible; but a closer examination shows that they are only plausible. As to the first, it is indeed true that Justin never rests the truth of the evangelical doctrine on the inspiration of the Apostles, but principally on its harmony with the Old Testament prophecy, which he expressly asserts in reference to the miraculous conception.—Apol. 1, 33, p. 64, (p. 75, B.) ὡς οἱ ἄπωμνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν δὲ ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵπτε καὶ διὰ Ἰσαίου τὸ προφητικὸν στείρμα τοῦτον γεννήσώμενον, ὡς πρεβεβήκομεν, ἐπη. "As they who record all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ have taught: whom we believe, since the prophetic spirit by Isaiah the prophet, said that he would be born as we have indicated."—But this circumstance finds a satisfactory explanation in the peculiar character of the Apologetic line of argument which Justin adopted; and only proves that the Apologist did not consider an appeal to the inspiration of the Apostles sufficient, in arguing with Jews and heathens, to evince the truth of the Christian doctrine, not that he did not on other occasions feel it needful to consider the Apostles as divinely inspired. Tertullian, exactly like Justin, found a powerful support for the divine truth of Christianity in the Old Testament, and yet he believed in the inspiration of the Apostles: for example,

Tertull. Apol. c. 21, T. v. p. 45.

Prædixerat et ipse (Christus) ita facturos; parum hoc, si non et prophetae vetro.

Tertull. de Anim. c. 28, T. iv. p. 234.

Nullus sermo divinus nisi dei unius, quo prophetae, quo apostoli, quo ipse Christus intonuit.—De Exhor. castit. c. 4, T. iii. p. 7.
The same may be affirmed of Origen; compare c. Cels. 1, 49, T. i. p. 365. 2, 28, p. 411, 2, 48, p. 422, with de Princip. præf. c. 4, 8, T. i. p. 48, sq. 2, 7, p. 92. With respect to the other point, all its force depends on the supposition that Justin, in the words ὡς οἱ ἀπομημονευόμενοις πάντα τὰ κεφάλα τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰδίδαξεν, referred, not to a specific gospel, or collection of gospels, but to the writings in general of that class which were extant in his time. If this supposition be ill-founded the whole conclusion falls to the ground. It is remarkable that Credner has not brought forward the slightest argument in support of this supposition, for the word πάντα, in itself, proves nothing. Justin not unfrequently uses it so that it must be taken hyperbolically in order to give any tolerable sense to his words. Indeed this hypothesis has nothing to support it; it is quite untenable. Justin marks the source from which he draws his evangelical citations when he quotes it usually under the title ἀπομημονευόμενα τῶν ἀποστόλων; how can it be supposed that, if this name indicated the whole existing evangelical literature, he would have introduced single quotations under so general a title? Justin, moreover, reports that the Ἀπομνημονευματα of the Apostles were read in the religious assemblies of the Christians; this certainly implies a precise selection of gospels. Therefore, we must at all events suppose that the denomination, "Ἀπομνημονευματα of the Apostles," means a select cyclus of evangelical narra-


tives, which might be divided into particular ones. We recognize under this title the Canonical Gospels. Accordingly, the πάντα refers to the complex whole of the four Gospels, and by this rather hyperbolical expression is meant, that the four Gospels taken together, form a complete image of the life and actions of Christ, though without excluding the possibility of adding some traits to the delineation both of the one and the other. Therefore, from this quarter, there is nothing to prevent our ascribing to Justin a belief in the inspiration of the Apostles if this notion can be otherwise supported. And this is certainly the case. Justin naturally held that the doctrine of Christ was divine: that the Apostles were appointed to promulgate this doctrine verbally and by their writings: it was of importance that this promulgation should be perfectly correct, since, among the sayings of Christ, there were prophecies, which, by the slightest alteration, would totally fail of their object, and if the rest of the contents were somewhat altered by the mistake of the reporter, the harmony with the Old Testament, and consequently his own credibility, would be destroyed; care must be taken lest any contradiction should creep into the narrative, since otherwise, the divine origin of Christianity would be rendered doubtful, for, as we have remarked, in Justin's opinion, harmony, or the absence of contradictions, was a criterion of Divine truth.

But this could not be attained without a special operation of God on the Apostles; it is beyond the unassisted natural power of man to represent the Divine with purity and faithfulness; for the heathen philosophers, before the advent of the Saviour, there was a special instruction by the Logos, and the reading of the Old Testament, and yet, since the right conception of what they thus received was not insured in particular cases, contradictions of various kinds occur in their representations; and besides this, the Apostles were illiterate men, and not powerful in speech; and

1 Apol. 1, 39, p. 67, (p. 78, A.) οὕτω διόγενος, λαλῶν μὴ
among the Evangelists, there were two who never were personal attendants of Christ, but only disciples of the Apostles. In order to render the Evangelists and Apostles useful organs of Christ, it was requisite to secure their oral and written instructions from error by means of inspiration. Moreover, the New Testament writings contain also Apostolic prophecies, Rom. xi. 25; 2 Thess. ii. 3, 8; 1 Tim. iv. 1, and the whole of the Apocalypse. On account of these prophecies, Justin must have held the Apostles to be inspired, as he expressly ascribes prophetic inspiration to the author of the Apocalypse, whom he considers to have been the Apostle John. And indeed he must have done so, if he had met with no special prophecies in the New Testament; for he remarks, that the gift of prophecy had continued to his time in the Christian Church; and it is not to be credited that he would have allowed to ordinary Christians the possession of a power which he would not have ascribed in an equal, or rather in a higher degree, to the Apostles.

It is worth while to compare with this, what Origen says of the success which attended the Apostolic publication of the Gospel; he ascribes it to the higher Divine power with which the Apostles were armed: c. Cels. 8, 47, T. I. p. 776: ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ Ιησοῦ ἐξωτερικῶν, ἀδέσποτας ἀγαθομνήμονες καὶ ιδιώται, ἐλληνικοὶ τῷ Χριστῷ πρὸς τῷ καταγγέλλων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῶν ἔθεσιν, ἡ τῇ δεύτερῃ αὐτοῖς δυνάμει καὶ τῇ αὐτῆς λόγῳ εἰς τὰ ἁπλάματα πράγματα χάριν. It is not credible that the Apostles of Jesus, unlettered and un instructed men, could have been emboldened to preach Christianity to men in any other way than by power given to them, and by ability in discourse for the discharge of their ministry."

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 199, (p. 331, C.—in τοῖς ἀναμμένωσις, ἔφη καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἰδιώτων παρακολουθήσαντων εὐαγγέλιας, γίγασται. "In the ἀποτελεσματα, which, I say, were composed by his Apostles, and by those who followed them, it is written."

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 81, p. 179, (p. 308, A.)

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 82, p. 179, (p. 308, B.) παρ' αὐτῶν καὶ μικρῶν ἔφη παρεθερμάτων ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἱεράς νίκην ἐτησίως—c. 88, p. 185, (p. 315, B.)

4 Justin, certainly, was not of a different judgment from Clement of Alexandria, who says, (Strom. 4, 21, 136, T. II.
seems to be a necessary consequence of premises contained in Justin’s works, is confirmed by a positive assurance from the Martyr. He maintains, that when the Apostles were sent forth to publish the Gospel, they were rendered capable, by the power of God, notwithstanding their natural unfitness, of fulfilling the commission they received from Christ; and he marks this power, with an evident, though silent reference, to the effusion of the Spirit at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 1), expressly as an extraordinary one granted to the Apostles from above. There cannot then remain a doubt that Justin considered the Apostles, in reference to the oral as well as written publication of the Gospel, as being under the special influence of the Holy Spirit.

If this inspiration of the Apostles does not appear to be

p. 352.) Ἰησοῦς Πνεύμα χάρισμα ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὁ μὲν οὗτος ὁ δὲ οὕτως, οἱ ἀπόστολοι δὲ ἐν ταῖς πυπαραγωγαῖς.—or from Tertullian, who asserts, (De Exhort. Castit. c. 4, T. III. p. 86,) proprie Apostoli spiritum sanctum habent, qui plene habent in operibus prophetaet efficacia virtutum atque documentia linguarum, non quasi ex parte quod ceteri.

1 Apol. 1, 39, p. 67, (p. 78, A. B.) ἡδέ Ἰησοῦς Ἀνάστασις Ξενοφών ἔρχεται ἐν ἀνάπτυξιν τοῦ Ξενοφών εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ οὗτος ἡμᾶς. ἀκαλλήλως διὰ δὴ Ἰησοῦς ἑσυχίας ἅπαντα γίνει αἰθρίως, ὡς ἐπαναλαμβάνει ὁ αὐτὸς τοῦ Κυρίου διδάσκαι πάντας τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον; “From Jerusalem twelve men went forth into the world, and these too illiterate, not able to speak; but, by the power of God, they testified to men of every race that they were sent by Christ to teach all mankind the word of God.”

2 Apol. 1, 50, p. 73, (p. 86, B.) μετὰ τοῦ εὐαγγέλου αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς ἁγίασμα αὐτοῦ πάντας ἐκπέμπει. ἀνεφάπτει αὐτὸν ὁ οἶκος διὰ τοῦ ἀναμνήσατος καὶ ἐφημερίζει αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς περιφερείας ἐστιν, ὡς μὴ πάντα ταῦτα προξενεῖται εἰς ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸς ἐκπρότειναι καὶ συνάψεις καὶ ἕπεμεν εἰς αὐτοῦ παθήματα. Ιησοῦς παρ’ αὐτῷ λαμβάνει καὶ τοῖς τοῦ γίνει αἰθρίως ἑλθίσσας, πάντα ἔλησεν καὶ ἀνεφάπτει περιφερείας. “At his crucifixion, all his disciples forsokk and denied him; but after he had risen from the dead and appeared to them, and instructed them to read the prophecies, in which all these things were foretold, and they had seen him ascending into heaven, and believed, and received from him power sent to them from thence, and went forth to every race of men,—they taught these things, and were called Apostles.”—Had Credner rescollected this passage, (Beitrag, &c. I. 127,) he would doubt-
so strongly conceived of by him, nor brought forward with such distinct allegations, as the inspiration of the prophets, this may be explained from the peculiarity already noticed of his position as a Christian Apologist. The Old Testament expressions were regarded by him as the peculiar proof of his argument, while he generally employs the New Testament quotations simply as illustrations.¹ It served, therefore, for the apparent corroboration of his argument, to refer again and again to the divine origin of the Old Testament, while he could not hope, in the position he occupied, for such an advantage, from the emphatic assertion of the inspiration of the Apostles.

SECTION II.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE ORIGINAL RECORDS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Justin applied himself with earnestness to the examination of Scripture: Apologetics, which in his public character were his principal employment, consisted for a great part, especially in reference to the Jews, in the interpretation of Scripture. Justin was of opinion

less not have expressed a sentiment so utterly erroneous. "This power or ability (namely, by which the Apostles, according to the belief of the ancient Church, were qualified for publishing the Gospel) was not obtained in an extraordinary manner, but by zeal for the cause, industrious application, and intimate acquaintance with the Old Testament."

¹ Justin asserts this very unambiguously. Apol. 1, 14, p. 52. (p. 61, D.) ἢ τὰ μὴ συνεχόμενα ἀμῖν δέχόμεν, ἓλπιζον τινὰ τοῖς ἀντί τις ἐπὶ Χριστὸν ἐδαγμάτως ἑπιμένοντι καλῶς ἴχνων πρὸ τῆς ἐκπολέμου ἠγειρόμενα, καὶ ὡς τῶν ἤκατων βασιλείων, ἔκτοτε ἐν ἐλπίδι τῶν θείων διδασκαλίαν καὶ διδάσκαλον.—

"That we may not appear to be deceiving you, we think it well to adduce some of the precepts of Christ himself, before we proceed to the demonstration; and be it your part, like powerful kings, to examine whether we have been taught and teach these things truly."
that Scripture proofs alone had perfect clearness and force of evidence. In coincidence with this sentiment, he represents Trypho as saying,¹ "we shall not listen to thee unless thou referrest everything to the Scriptures," and he himself concedes,² — "If I did not point out to you, O men, from the Scriptures, that his (Christ's) appearance would be mean, and his origin indescribable, that for his death the rich would be given up to death, but that we by his wounds must be healed, and that he would be led away as a sheep, and that he would have a double advent—I might appear to speak darkly and doubtfully; but since I have brought all my proofs from your holy and prophetical books, I hope that some one of you will be found among those who will attain to eternal life through the grace of the Lord of Sabaoth," — and in another passage,³ — "If I had attempted to demonstrate it (the incarnation of God) by human doctrine or argument, it would not have been your duty to listen to me; but when I present to you, and reiterate the passages of Scripture relating to this truth, in order that you may understand them, you are obdurate and shut yourselves out from the knowledge of the divine mind and will." It is deserving of notice that Justin's Exegesis does not extend over the whole of the Canon of Scripture, but is confined to the canonical books of the Old Testament. The reason of this fact appears to be, that Justin, as far as can be judged from his extant writings, interpreted the Bible not for the simple purpose of understanding its contents, but with a constant reference to its use in Apologetics, and that he considered the argument arising from prophecy as of fundamental importance in this service. But this argument was to be drawn almost entirely from the canonical books of the Old Testament. Of the unserviceableness of the Apocrypha we have already

¹ *Diæl. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 153, (p. 277, D.)* ηλιος λυγοντος εικα
² *Diæl. c. Tr. c. 32, p. 129, (p. 249, C. D.)*
³ *Diæl. c. Tr. c. 68, p. 165, (p. 292, D.)*
spoken. The writings of the New Testament, it is true, contain prophecies, but of these the greater part were not yet fulfilled, and were therefore of no apologetic use; a few only had already been accomplished. It was natural then, for Justin to abstain from exerting his exegetical skill on the New Testament writings, in order to devote it exclusively to the canonical books of the Old Testament. We might be pleased with this limitation, if Justin's exegetical labours within these self-appointed bounds had been of a kind that really and essentially promoted the understanding of the Scriptures. But Justin's age was deficient in too many of the most necessary conditions of sound biblical interpretation, and he was too much under the influence of his age, to render any real service in the department of exegesis. It was no slight defect, that in general he wanted that measure of impartiality and acuteness of judgment without which a full understanding of Scripture is impossible, and this defect was aggravated by three prejudices, in which he had blindly given himself up to the spirit of the times.

First of all, he esteemed the Greek version of the LXX. to be throughout a faithful copy of the Hebrew original, and therefore made it the basis of his biblical interpretation. Hence it came to pass, that when the LXX. departed from the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, he also left it, and not unfrequently arrived at results that were totally unsupported by the Hebrew text. We have already seen a specimen of the kind, in the explanation of Psalm xxii. 2, where Justin inferred from the reading of the LXX., ἄνω οὐχ εἰς ἄνων εἴμοι, (instead of which we find in the Hebrew text ויהי הרומיו ל) that Jesus was aware beforehand of his sufferings. It will suffice, to adduce one instance more. Dial. c. Tr. 49, p. 146, (p. 269, C.)

1 Rosenmüller has expressed himself too strongly on Justin's Exegesis. See Hist. interpret. libr. sacrorum. I. p. 161.
Justin by adhering to the LXX. (which departs widely from the Hebrew and reads ἐν χειρὶ χερσαῖα ὤλοσαταὶ τολμαῖτε νῦν ἕν ἀμαλήκτην) proves from Exod. xvii. 16, that according to the Old Testament prophecy, the first advent of the Messiah would be without any outward splendour, since it is declared that he would accomplish the war (in a spiritual sense) with Amalek ἐν χειρὶ χερσαῖα, and that this prophecy was fulfilled by Jesus, in as much as he had already (spiritually) subdued the race of the Amalekites by virtue of the hidden power of God, working in him at his first mean appearance.

Another prejudice by which Justin was prevented from apprehending the Old Testament in its true character and spirit, is the unrefined view which he held respecting the inspiration of the Old Testament prophets. His Exposition was thus deprived of all freedom: for criticism, in the strict sense of the word, there could be no scope, since the immediate work of God admitted of no critical correction. The discernment and estimate of the literary peculiarities of the various biblical writers would not be attempted, since, in the productions of one and the same Divine Spirit, no variations could be sought for. To every iota of the Old Testament writings an undue weight was attached, since it could not be admitted that the Holy Spirit had used even a single letter without some deeper meaning than appeared on the surface.¹

Finally, Justin precluded himself from all possibility of a sound interpretation of the Old Testament, by an assumption, which gives a peculiar colouring to his whole scheme of interpretation, that the New Tes-

¹ Irenæus distinctly states his own adoption of this sentiment, (Adv. haeres. 4, 34, p. 250,) nihil otiosum nec sine signo neque sine argumento apud eum (Deum); and Origen (in Exod. homil. 1, 4, T. ii. p. 131, says, "Ego credens verbis domini mei Jesu Christi, in lege et prophetis iota quidem unum aut unum spicem non puto esse mysteriiis vacuum."
tament, in its outlines, was already fully contained in the Old,¹ that hence Christ, strictly considered, was nothing more than the personal interpreter of Old Testament prophecy.²

This assumption was the grave of grammatical and historical exegesis.³ The art of exposition was thereby reduced to an empty play with arbitrary combinations; the superiority of an expositor consisted in the dexterity with which he discovered the references in the Old Testament to the Christian history; the

¹ Apol. 1, 52, p. 73. (p. 87, A.) ἵνα τούτων τὰ γεγομένα ἄνω
πάντα τοις ἀνθιδύναμοι πρὸς τὴν γνώμην προειδοποιήσωμεν διὰ τῶν προφη-
τῶν, ἀνάγκη καὶ τιρί τῶν ὀρθῶν προφητῶν Ἱσόων, μετάλληξιν δι’ ἱναγ-
θαι, πιστεύειν εἰς τὰ πάντα γινομένα — l. 61, p. 80, (p. 94, E.) Ἰ (ἀνώτερα ἄργους) διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προειδοποιηθῆναι κατὰ τόδε Ἰσαών
πάντα — Dial. c. Tr. c. 131, p. 224, (p. 361, A.) ἵνα τοῖς σαλομ-
βάνοις πρὸς τῶν Πλατανίων κατέχω τὰ μυθικὰ χαράζως ὅπως τῷ Ἰσαώ.

“Since then we have shown that all these events were predicted by the prophets, before they came to pass, we are compelled to believe, that events similarly predicted, but not yet accomplished, will also come to pass.—The Holy Spirit announced beforehand, by the prophets, all things pertaining to Jesus.—God by anticipation favours you with all mysteries before the proper time.”

² Apol. 1, 32, p. 63. (p. 73, C.) Ἰσαὼχριστῷ . . . τῶν
ἀγιοσμένων προφητῶν ἰσός πρῆτος.

³ The Apologetic dangerousness of this prejudice is represented by Isidore of Pelusium, when he says: ὅ τις ἐν τῷ σα-
λαία μὲν ἱδανίνῃ σετὶ τὸν χριστὸν ἂν εἰσῆλθῃ σαρώματι οὐκ ἔχειν αὐτῷ ἀναφέ-
τειν, ἵνα καὶ Ἠλληνικὸς καὶ τοῖς μὴ ἱδανιοῖς αὐτῶν αἰετισμένοις ἰσχύς ἐν τῇ ἢ ἄλλῃ ἄλλῳ ἱδανίᾳ μάχῃ. Τά τοῦτο μὴ εἰς αὐτῶν ἂν ἅρμανα ἢ ἰδανίαν ἢ διαβάσεις ἢ διανομόντος ἢ ἱδανίον ἢ διαβάσεις ἢ διανομόντος, ἤ ἰδανικὰ πρὸς τοῖς διαθέμας στῇ αὐτῶν ἂν ἅρμανος ἢ ἱδανικὸς ἢ διατέθηκεν. —

“Those persons who have attempted to apply every part of the Old Testament to Christ, are not free from blame, since they furnish weapons for the Greeks and the heretics, who do not receive it in their controversy with us. For by wresting from their proper meaning, the passages which do not relate to the Messiah, they prepare the way for disputing passages that are without violence, applicable to him; for their opponents think that they can overcome them in the passages that distinctly speak of him, by the same arguments which convict them of having put a false sense on other passages.”
result of the exposition, in every instance, was fixed beforehand; there must be contained a reference to Christ or the Church; in a word, the exegesis was absolutely and entirely Messianic. But according to Justin, the prophecies of the Old Testament are of a twofold kind; partly verbal, which, in words more or less clear and explicit, declared the coming of the Messiah and of his kingdom; partly real, or in matters of fact, which are given in the form of history, or under the garb of outward forms.

Justin adverts to both kinds of prophecy, when he says; 1 ἵν' ὅτι τὸ ἄγιον σπώμα καὶ ἱναγών σφάτεσθαι τί, ὁ τύπος, τοῦ μὴλλοντος γίνεσθαι ἡν, ἐποίην ἢδ' ὅτι δὲ καὶ λόγους ἑρθέν γετον περὶ τῶν ἀποσταίνειν μελλόντων.

"Sometimes the Holy Spirit evidently causes something to be done, which is the type of what is to be; sometimes utters words concerning future events."

Of the latter he takes special notice, when he says;

"τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ ὑπὸ Μωσίων διαταχθέντα δύναμαι καταργηθῶν ἀποδεικνύει τύπως καὶ σύμβολα καὶ καταγελάς τῶν τῷ Χριστῷ γίνεσθαι μελλόντων καὶ τῶν ἵς ἀυτοῦ πιστεύειν προεγγυημένων καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑμοίως γίνεσθαι μελλόντων."

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 114, p. 207, (p. 341, B.) Yet compare Dial. c. Tr. c. 68, p. 166, (p. 294, A.) σελλός λόγων τοὺς ὑπε-

καταλαμβάνων καὶ ἐν παραβολαίς ἡ μυστηρίων ἐν συμβόλως ἔργων ἁλκηνίμιν ποιόν ἀπ' ἐν' ἑμῶν τοὺς συνάπτους ὅ παραβολαίς γίνεσθαι ἐξαίρεσιν — c. 90, p. 187, (p. 317, C.) ὡς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐντεινειν εἰς ἐρεύνης παραβολαῖς καὶ τῶν ἀπεκάλυψεν, ὡς ὅποι μέ-

δικὼς τὰ παλαιότα ὑπὸ παλαιῶν τοῦ ἱερείου, ἠρώτησαν τίνι ἓν ὑπὸ ἀνθρώ-

πον, ὡς καὶ ποιούσα τοῦ ζυγού τόσον ἴσιον καὶ μαζίν. "Many things uttered darkly, and in parables, or mysteries, or in symbolic actions, the prophets have explained, who existed after those who had said or done them. — Whatever the prophets said or did, they involved in parables and types, so that the greater part could not be understood by all, and thus concealed the truth, so that those who endeavoured to find out and to learn, were obliged to toil."

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 42, p. 138, (p. 281, B.), and all the other Mosaic institutions, I am able to enumerate, and to show that they were types, and symbols, and announcements of things
The passages which contain prophecies of the first kind, allow of no other reference and application than the Messianic; those passages, on the contrary, in which prophecies of the second class are involved, have a twofold sense; an outward literal sense, which is founded on the historical relations of an earlier period (than the Messianic), and a deeper spiritual sense, which is referrible to the Messianic kingdom of Christ. Justin's Messianic scheme of interpretation therefore is twofold, the Messianic in a stricter sense, and the typological. Yet both modes of interpretation often merge into one another. For besides the results, the method of arriving at these results is frequently common to both. According to Justin's representation, the prophetical passages, in which the peculiar Messianic meaning is admissible, are often so clear and determinate, that this reference is apparent at first sight, by a simple attention to the language of the Holy Spirit, and to the inadmissibility of the pure historic interpretation; but not unfrequently the prophecy is veiled under images; in the typological passages this is constantly the case: here the truth is always concealed under a sensible covering. Both modes of exhibiting prophecy are expressed by Justin under the general title μυστήριον,¹ and συμβολον,² though, for each, he had also special designations; for the prophetical passages which admitted of a strictly Messianic interpretation, and spoke in images, he used the word παραβολή,³ and for Old Testament

that would happen to Christ, and of those who were foreknown as believers in him, as well as of things that would be done by Christ himself.

persons, events, and ceremonies which might be used as prefiguring the New Testament economy, the word τύπος.\footnote{Apol. i, 60, p. 79, (p. 93, A.) Dial. c. Tr. c. 40, p. 136, (p. 259, A.) c. 114, p. 207, (p. 341, B.) c. 134, p. 226, (p. 364, B.) c. 140, p. 230, (p. 369, B.)} In both classes of passages those which, in a stricter sense, are called Messianic, and the typological, a peculiarity instrument is required to extract the spirit from the letter, the truth relating to the Messiah from its sensible covering, and this is called \textit{allegory}.\footnote{The word διάλυσις denotes, in Justin, the intentional alteration which the Greek poets and philosophers adopted in the biblical narratives and doctrines which, in his opinion, they borrowed from the Old Testament; see Coh. ad Græc. c. 28, (p. 28, A.) c. 32, p. 31, (p. 31, B.) c. 34, p. 32, (p. 32, C.) What, with an exegetical reference, we term allegory, he calls προσολογία, (Dial. c. Tr. c. 57, p. 154, [p. 279, D.] c. 114, p. 207, [p. 341, D.] c. 129, p. 222, [p. 359, A.]) The method of extracting the allegorical meaning from single passages is, according to him, the μετα φυσικά, or the μετα εκατωμένη; Coh. ad Græc. c. 29, p. 29, (p. 28, E.) c. 31, p. 30, (p. 30, D.)} In the investigation of the secret allegorical sense, accordingly, consists almost entirely Justin's exegetical talent. The investigation of this secret sense was originally, as may be gathered from what we have already stated, a matter of pure necessity. It was the inevitable consequence of the belief that the Old Testament was, throughout, a prophecy of Christian times. Innumerable passages of the Old Testament, taken

\[\text{(De originibus et principiis allegoricae sacrarum litterarum Interpretationes. Tubing. 1795, p. 10, sq.) that Justin distinguished a three-fold secret sense of the Old Testament, the allegorical, the tropological, and the analogical, as he has expressed his assertions without closer investigation. He thus presents the naked sentiment; Sub allegiorum nomine simpliciter tantum parabolas et figurae comprehendebat, quamae significatione, non valde occulta erat; tropologicum vero sensum in typica inprimis veteris testamenti oratione quarendum esse putavit; anagogicum denique sensum res terrenas ad superna et coelestia trahentem, propterea adjunxisse videtur, ut Platonis sententias tanto facilius cum Christiana doctrina conciliare posset.}\]
literally, presented no prophecy; therefore the kernel hidden under this shell was to be sought for; what was not visible on the surface was to be drawn from the depths. But what originally was only an act of necessity, must soon have become, for Justin, an object of free choice, or rather of decided preference, from the circumstance that, in the whole body of heathen, Jewish, and Christian literature, both in his own and preceding times, he found scarcely any other mode of interpreting sacred books but the allegorical. ¹ Among the Greeks it was principally the Homeric poems that called for the allegorical interpretation. ² Theogenes of Rhegium, a contemporary of Cambyses, is mentioned as the most ancient writer who explained the myths of Homer physically and ethically. ³ After him, Metrodorus of Lampsacus, Stesimbrotus of Thasus, and Glaukon, are reported as allegorical interpreters of Homer. ⁴ The same method of treating the Grecian myths was adopted by the earliest philosophers, Parmenides, Heraclitus, Democritus, Empedocles, and Anaxagoras. ⁵ Plato also was acquainted


⁵ Diogen. Laërt. De vit. dogmat. et apophthegm. clar. philos.
with the allegorical treatment of Homer’s poems, yet he neither practised it himself nor recommended it to others; he was rather for excluding Homer altogether from his republic.\(^1\) On the other hand, the Stoics, especially the founders of that school, earnestly sought for a delineation of the powers of nature, and their mutual relations in the Hellenic mythology, especially those of Hesiod and Homer, and imagined that by this expedient they could harmonize the popular belief with the results of philosophy.\(^2\) Also the friends and abettors of ancient Platonism in the age of Justin, who made it a principal object of their lives to counteract the far-spread irreligiousness and immorality of their times. Plutarch of Chæronea,\(^3\) and Maximus of Tyre,\(^4\) founded their attempts at a reformation, among other things, on the allegorical meaning of scandalous and seductive myths. Lastly, the

---

\(^1\) De Republica, i. 2, T. V. p. 74, (ed. Tauchn.) “Hecas διαρκε γιαγιαν υγε νις και ἤματα μίσους υγε ναπρές, μᾶλλον τη μητρί την εὐστομία τουλάχιστον, καὶ Θερμακίας, ἦσα “Ομηρος πιστικός, εύ παράκαιντι εἰς την πόλην, ὅτι τι οὐδείς πιστικομίας οὔτε ἀποταμίων. ‘Ο γὰρ νῦς οὐχ ὁδὸς τι κρίνει δὲ, τι τι οὕτως καὶ δ μή. Compare Euseb. præp. Evangel. 2, 7, p. 77. “The narrative of the binding of Hera by her son, and the hurling from heaven of Hephaistos by his father, when about to defend his mother, beaten (by Zeus), and the battles of the gods, as described by Homer, ought not to be admitted into the state, neither with nor without a symbolical interpretation—for the young are not capable of judging what is and what is not symbolical.”


Alexandrian grammarians considered the poems of Homer as a repository of all imaginable wisdom, and extracted these fictitious treasures from them by forced allegorical explanations. As among the heathens, so also among the Jews, allegorical interpretation was held in the highest esteem, and was applied in a variety of ways to the sacred books. The authors of the Septuagint version appear to have been familiar with it, as may be inferred from their peculiar translation of several passages of the Hebrew text. The Alexandrian Jew Aristobulus, a contemporary of Ptolemy Philometor, in a fragment of his allegorical commentary on the books of Moses, more explicitly states: "Our lawgiver, Moses, oftentimes communicates his views respecting the order of nature and the formation of the universe, as if speaking of other, that is, of visible things. Those who look below the surface admire his wisdom and the Divine Spirit, on account of which he is also called a prophet. But to those who do not possess capacity and insight, and who confine themselves to the letter, he appears to

---

3 Euseb. *Præpar. Evangel.* 8, 10, p. 376. συλλαχῶς ο θεός λέγει λαβεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ Μωσῆς, άν οί χριστοί σφαγμάτων λόγως συνώμοιο, λέγει δὲ τοῦ κατὰ τον ἑαυτόν, φυσικά διαίσθησι καταγγέλλει καὶ μεγάλων σφαγμάτων καταπνίσει. Ου μὲν οὐλο 
πάγω τό χαλέπ τοῖν διαφάνειας τοις χειρισμόν καὶ το θείν στυλή, καθ' οἱ καὶ προφήτης ἀνακατευρεῖ τοῦ ὁ 
τοι. δὲ μὴ 
μετίχαις δυνάμεις καὶ συνίστως, ἀλλ' τοῦ τραυματικοῦ προσκυνή 
say nothing of importance.” The author of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom (xviii. 24), proves his acquaintance with the typical interpretation of Scripture, among other instances, by the reference in which he compares the garment of the Jewish High-priest to the universe. Among the Essenes, the allegorical interpretation of Holy writ made a part of their esoteric doctrine. “The greater part,” says Philo, “is symbolically conceived by them in the ancient method.”

In like manner, the Egyptian Therapeutes, in the interpretation of the sacred books, took the verbal expression for the mere symbolic covering of the truth, concealed in a deeper meaning; compared the Old Testament giving of the law with a living being, the words resembling the body, and the hidden sense concealed in the words the soul: they maintained that it was needful to look through the words as through a glass, in order to discover the rare beauty of the thoughts; to strip off the symbolic guise, in order to bring to light the living heart; and appealed to the writings of the ancient founders of their sect, which were full of allegorical senses, and furnished them with patterns of interpretation. Philo likewise refers to the writings of his predecessors, who occupied themselves with allegorical interpretations of Scripture, and served him as models. He himself made the mystical interpretation of the Mosaic books a principal object

---

1 Sapient. 18, 24, κινδυνεύειν ἰδήματος ἐν ἔλος ἐν κόσμῳ. See very similar interpretations by Philo, De profug. c. 20, T. III. p. 133, and De vit. Mos. 3, 12, T. IV. p. 209.—Gfrörer a. O. II. 207.


of his studies. This seemed to him necessary, because the literal sense often involved absurdities, and gave unworthy and impious representations of God; it was suited only to the gross illiterate multitude, and could scarcely avoid shocking even their minds: the relation of the literal sense to the inward mystical sense of the law, appeared to him like that of the shadow to the body, or of the body to the soul; in every word of the Pentateuch he looked for a hidden spiritual meaning beneath the outward literal sense, though this latter he by no means undervalued, or wished to be despised: he even enlisted etymologies in this service: and availed himself of the mistakes of the Septuagint as points of connection for his allegorical exegesis. Josephus also shows himself favourably inclined to the same mode of interpreting the Sacred books, though he has not expressed his opinion at length on particular points. He merely says in general, in the introduction to his Jewish Anti-


quietyes, "Moses has indeed represented all things, conformable to their nature, so that he indicates one thing more intelligibly, another in a figurative but becoming representation, and likewise expressly mentions what may be drawn from it. Those who wish to examine the grounds of all things require a comprehensive and deeply penetrating contemplation: for the present I omit this, but will attempt it hereafter, if God permit." According to this statement, Josephus evidently thought that the Scriptures were to be truly understood, not in their verbal meaning, but in a mystical sense. This method of interpreting the Sacred writings, as it had been practised by heathens and Jews for different ends and with various modifications, was adopted also by the Christian Church, as soon as an attempt was made by its members to expound the Old Testament. The Apostles made use of allegory, in order to prove the close connection between the Mosaic and Christian economy, and particularly to show that the former was, though a necessary, yet only a preparatory stage of revelation. The Epistle to the Hebrews is throughout typological: especially ch. iv. vii. ix. x. Paul also applies the Old Testament under the idea of a type to Christ, (2 Cor. iii. 14; 1 Cor. v. 7, 10; Eph. v. 31, &c.) and makes an application of the allegorical method to a concrete case, the Old Testament narrative of Hagar (Gen. xvi. 1,) and affirms in so many words, ἄ τνὰ ἐστὶν ἀληθινὰ ἡγοθέουσα Gal. iv. 21.¹

Next to the Apostles, the Epistle erroneously ascribed to Barnabas, a disciple of the Apostles, which if not written within the precise limits of the apostolic age, is certainly a production of the first decennary of the second century²—gives us sufficient evidence of the

¹ Besides Paul, the other Apostles also were familiar with the allegorical and typological method of treating the Old Testament: See Olshausen's Ein Wort ueber tiefer Schrifitsinn, p. 59.

² The genuineness of this Epistle cannot be substantiated, though in recent times, not to mention earlier advocates, Henke (De Epistolæ quae Barnabæ tribuitur authentia, Jens
early use of allegorical interpretation in the Christian Church; it is exhibited there in a state of perfection, or, more properly speaking, carried to an extravagant length, which could hardly have been expected at so early a period. The author of this Epistle does not confine himself within the same limits as Philo, (allowing for the difference of their points of view,) but goes far beyond him. He considers not only the whole Old Testament as a continuous type of Christ,\(^1\) makes the true Gnosis to consist in the allegorical interpretation,\(^2\) and lays claim to the possession of wisdom and knowledge as a personal prerogative on account of his skill in this art— but evaporates the historical truth of the Old Testament into a purely typological idea, does not allow the literal sense to occupy even a subordinate place to the mystical; but maintains that Moses spoke only ἵνα πνεύματι. Thus, for example, he not merely considers the fleshly circumcision of the Jews as a type of the spiritual circumcision of the heart belonging to Christians—he not only declares that Abraham circumcised his 318 servants with a mysterious reference to Christ, but denies that circumcision was a peculiar rite of the theocratic nation, and maintains that it was raised to a religious and political institution through the perverseness of men under the influence of an evil demon; that originally God spoke

1827,) and Rödäm (de authentia Epistolæ Barnabæ, Part. I. Hafn. 1828,) have attempted to vindicate it. Very lately this has been satisfactorily shown by Hefele (das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas. Tubing. 1840, p. 147.) The accommodating attempt which not long ago Schenkel made at the expense of the unity of the Epistle, (Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1837. Part 3, p. 652,) though acute, cannot be considered successful. See Hefele, Patrum Apostolorum Opera. (Tubing. 1839), p. v.— Tubinger theologische Quartalschrift, 1839. Part 1, p. 66, and Das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas. 196.

\(^1\) Epist. Barnab. c. 7, T. I. p. 20.—πάντα ἵνα πνεύματι προφανείως ἐκμετάλλευσιν ἕμι.  
\(^2\) He introduces an allegorical explanation with the words 

vi λίγον ἀ γίνωσι, μάθετε. (c. 6, p. 18.) Compare c. 10, p. 35. 

—c. 1, p. 56  

\(^3\) See c. 6, p. 18.—c. 9, p. 30.—c. 10, p. 36
of circumcision only in a spiritual sense, as he had enjoined it.\(^1\)

Thus he does not regard the Mosaic laws respecting food as really a divine institution, but sees in them merely the symbolic envelopment of certain moral truths which Moses wished to impart to the nation; it was through the mistake of a carnal disposition, and contrary to the design of the lawgiver, that the Jews considered the tasting of certain meats to be inadmissible.\(^2\)

After such precedents, which seem to give, as it were, the historical justification for using the allegorical mode of interpretation, (which, besides, seemed to be required by the presupposed connection of the Old and New Testament,) we cannot wonder that this method, so extensively adopted, found in Justin a zealous adherent. Nor did he want opportunities of becoming familiar with it. He had investigated a large

---

\(^1\) c. 9, p. 26, sqq.—πιετηµὴν ἕχεται, οὐ σαρκὶς γεννηθῆναι ἄλλα παρέβουν, ὅτι ἄγγισεν τον ἄγιον κοσµὸν µόνως... ἄλλα ἥς καὶ µὴν περιτύμησεν ἡ λαᾶ ἐν σφαγίῳ ἄλλα καὶ τὰς Σόφες καὶ Ἀρχι καὶ πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς τῶν ἑδονῶν... ἄλλα καὶ σέβασµα ἐν τοῖς διαθηκαῖς αὐτῶν ἔχει... ἄλλα καὶ ἀνεύρων ἐν πεπερατµαῖς. Μάκιος ἕως τίτανος πτερονισός... τι Αβραάµ, ὁ πρῶτος πιετηµήν ἐν δοὺς, εἰ πνεύµατι, προεβηλίζεις οὐ οὐκ οἴων, πιετήµατα. "He spoke of circumcision, not which is produced in the flesh, but they transgressed, for an evil angel seduced them.

... But you say the people (of Israel) are circumcised for a seal (of the Covenant); but so are all the Syrians and Arabians, and all the idolatrous priests; therefore, are they included in the covenant? The Egyptians too, are circumcised. Learn then, my children, fully concerning all things that Abraham, who first practised circumcision, circumcised in spirit, having a regard to the son."

\(^2\) c. 10, p. 30.—ἐκα σῶν ἄνω ἱεροῦ ἑνὸς καὶ τῆς τράχειας... Μωυ yAxis ἐν πνεύµατι ἑλέσσω... p. 35.—τῶν βεβαιῶν µὲν οὖν Μωυσῆς φρειµάτω τοῖς πνεύµατι ἑλέσσων... οι δὲ καὶ ἱεροί ἑνὸς σαρκῶς ἐν πνεύµατι ἑρηµίζονται.——"There is not a divine command to abstain from certain kinds of food, but Moses spoke spiritually. Concerning meats, Moses uttered three precepts spiritually, but they received them as if concerning meats according to the desires of the flesh."
portion of Grecian literature, and for a long time had been a disciple of the Stoic philosophy: of the Jewish writers he had read Philo and Josephus, and speaks of them in the highest terms; he had, moreover, visited Alexandria, the seat of allegorical interpretation, where the Homeric allegorists vied with the philosophic Jews in adducing whatever was possible from their sacred books. The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians also, which seemed to give the Apostolic sanction to the mode of interpretation that was approved and practised both by heathens and Jews—and the pretended Epistle of Barnabas, which had already carried that method to an extravagant length, were not unknown to Justin. Thus, we may easily conceive how Justin adopted the allegorical interpretation with

1 Cod. ad Graec. c. 9, p. 13, (p 10, B.)—οἱ εὐφώτιστοι Φίλων τι καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ τὰ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἱστορικάς, ὡς ὁ Φίλων ἠρχαίος καὶ παλαιός τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἠρχιερῶν Ματθαῖος, μίμηται.—c. 10, p. 14, (p. 11, B.)—c. 13, p. 17, (p. 14, C.):—οὐκ ἔνα ἔνα πρῶτον ἀδελφόν, Ἡλίας τι καὶ Ἰωάννης. There is perhaps also a direct reference to Philo in Justin's notice of the Jewish micrology, in reference to the names Ἀβεγάνως and Σαμώς. Compare Dial. c Tr. c. 113, p. 206, (p. 340, B.) with Philo De unitat. nomin. c. 9, sqq. T. III. p. 170.—According to Photius (Bibliothec. cod. 105, T. I. p. 36), Philo's authority principally contributed to the reception and practice of allegorical interpretation in the Christian church:—ἐὰν οὖ οὖν καὶ τῶν ἀλληγορίων τῆς γραφῆς ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ λέγεις ἄκακος ἐκεῖς ἦσαν ἄρεστοι.

2 Tertullian (adv. Marc. 3, 8, T. I. p. 109), and Origen (c. Cels. 4, 49, T. I. p. 541), justify their allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament by the example of the Apostle.

such decided partiality, especially if we add to this, that he believed the Old Testament contained a sanction and a demand for it,¹ and that it could not escape him what excellent service this mode of interpretation might render him in his apologetics. By means of it he could prove to unbelieving doubters his principle, (which partly proceeded from the allegorical interpretation,) that the Old Testament contained the New in its main outlines,—even to its minutest ramifications,—and thereby gave the greatest extension to the evidence from prophecy for the divinity of Christianity;² he thus gained the advantage of being able to present his faith to the heathen as consecrated by the highest antiquity; and, on the other hand, to maintain before the Jews, that a transition to the Christian church in-

Epistle in the unbiblical remark, that the two goats (Lev. xvi. 5.) which were to be set apart on the great day of atonement, the one as a sin-offering, the other to be driven away into the wilderness, were generally alike, (ἀκοινος.) Compare Justin. Dial. c. Tr. c. 46, p. 137, [p. 259, C ] with Epist. Barnab. c. 7, T. I. p. 21. Hefele indeed, thinks otherwise, (Das Schreiben des Apostels Barnabas, p. 67, 185.) This learned writer prefers explaining Justin’s coincidence with Barnabas in the instances alleged, from their common but independent use of a traditionary scheme respecting typological interpretation of particular Old Testament passages, and the Jewish festival of atonement which had obtained currency among the Christians of the second century. But he is wanting in evidence that this scheme ever existed, and has no argument against Justin’s use of the Epistle of Barnabas more weighty than that it is not slavish, and that Justin makes no mention of it.

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 77, p. 174, (p. 303, A.) ἱερατεύς ὁ ματὴς ἐν τῷ ἐδρασθείσα καὶ ἡμιώνοις πολλάκις λαλῶν τὸ ἄγνων αὐτόμα: ἐν ὑπεράπνσα καὶ τῷ τῶν λαῶν ἀπαντάντα τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἡ ἁλάς φίλων τῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐν πάντες ἐν Ἀμαθίας καὶ ἡ μάτης ἐν Χαναία (Ezech. xvi. 3.)

² See what Meyer has said on this point, in his Geschichte der Schriftverklärung seit der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften. Gotting. 1802, 1, 36. We are frequently reminded of the judgment passed by Jerome on his youthful labours: Prof. in Obad. T. VI. p. 91. Allegorice interpretatus sum Abdiam prophetaem, cujus historiam nesciebam.
volved no apostacy from the faith of their fathers,—that in assuming the Christian profession, they neither received nor rejected any thing beyond what was sanctioned and required by the Old Testament itself. By means of it, he could meet all the difficulties which the Old Testament presented. Thus he could defend it from all the charges of self-contradiction, free it from all anthropomorphisms, and purify it from all immoral imputations. Justin, therefore, prided himself not a little on his expertness in discovering the allegorical meaning, and even laid claim to a special divine charisma for understanding the scriptures, and main-

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 113, p. 206, (p. 340, A. B.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 112, p. 205, (p. 339, C.) οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν τῷ μεριμνώμενον δικαίωμα ἡ γνώμη ἡ γεγονημένων, ὥστε πάσης ἀπόλυμος τοῦ προφητῶν ἢ τῆς γνώμης τῆς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ.—c. 57, p. 154, (p. 279, D.) ἐντὸς ἀναθεμάτων ἐν περὶ εὐθυνῆς, καὶ προφητευμάτων ἑαυτοῦ ὑπερήφανος.—"There is nothing of the things said or done by the prophets, which can be justly blamed, if you are masters of the (hidden) knowledge contained in them."—"Nor can we be in a state of doubt on any point, if we possess only a moderate skill in tropology."
3 Thus, for instance, Justin notices the (apparent) contradiotion between the Mosaic prohibition of images (Exod. xx. 4), and the Divine command respecting the uplifting of the brazen serpent in the wilderness (Numbers xxii. 8); between the curse originally passed on the serpent (Gen. iii. 14), and the later declaration of God, that whoever looked on the brazen serpent should live (Numbers xxii. 8); he obviates these difficulties, simply, by considering the erection of the serpent in the wilderness as a type of the elevation of Christ on the cross. Dial. c. Tr. c. 112, p. 205, [p. 339, A. B.]
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 114, p. 207, (p. 341, D.)
5 Thus, on the incest of Judah with Thamar (Gen. xxxviii. 1), Dial. c. Tr. c. 86, p. 184, (p. 314, A.)—and on the polygamy of the patriarchs, c. 134, p. 226, (p. 364, A. B.) c. 141, p. 232, (p. 371, A.)
6 Dial. c. Tr. c. 85, p. 154, (p. 280, B.) ἐδίκουμεν ἵνα τοιῶν τῆς ηνῶν, ἀλλὰ χρῖσιν παρὰ Θεῷ μᾶρτυς ἢ τῷ εὐήγερῳ τᾶς γενεᾶς κἀντὶ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ ζωῆς καὶ πάντως κοινωνίας ἀμαρτοῦντι καὶ ἢθίμων παρακλῆς γίνεσθαι.—"Nor was such ability my own; but grace alone from God has been granted me to understand his Scriptures; of which grace I exhort all to become partakers, without price, and in abundance."
tained, that without such aid it was impossible to enter into the meaning of the prophets.¹

Having thus ascertained Justin's scheme of interpretation, in its general outlines, we have, finally, to exhibit it in its concrete application. Both the outlines and the application have this in common, that they are perfectly arbitrary. As to the so-called Messianic interpretation, in a stricter sense, Justin attri-

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 91, p. 189, (p. 319, B.), ἐκ τῆς μὴ μεταμεταλθεῖσας χάριν τῶν προφητῶν λάβεις νοεῖς τὰ ἄγνωστα καὶ ἀγώνιστα τῶν προφητῶν. Ἆλλως δὲ τῆς μὴ μετατειλθεῖσας χάριν, ἐκ τῆς μὴ μετατειλθεῖσας χάριν καὶ τῶν προφητῶν ἀναλόγως ἰδιοτικότερα δίξει τῶν πολλῶν ὑπὸ τῶν μὴ κοινωνῶν ἀνθρώπων:— "If, therefore, any one has not received this great favour from God, to understand the things said and done by the prophets, those words and actions of which he cannot give an explanation, will be of no use to him, and will not the same things appear to many contemptible, when stated by those who do not understand them?"—In another passage Justin gives Trypho the following advice, (c. Tr. c. 78, p. 176, (p. 305, A.), καλὸν ἐν ἰδίῃ ἐμαῖς, ἐν μὴ κοινωνίᾳ, ταραττῶν τῶν ἀκατάληπτων χάριν ἀνὴρ τῶν Σιων ἡμῶν τῶν χριστιανῶν μαθητῶν. ἐλλὰ μὴ κατὰ πάντα ἐκπαιδεύθης χρή τι διάκρισις καθολικοῦ, ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Σιων ὑπὸ καὶ ἐν ἰδιᾳ μετατιθειτι χάρις αὐτῷ. — It would be well if you would be taught what you do not understand, by us Christians, who have received grace from God, instead of labouring to the utmost to establish your own doctrines, while you despise those that come from God, for to us is this grace imparted!"—and in a third passage he asks, (c. Tr. c. 119, p. 211, (p. 346, D.), ὅπως ἐν ἱδίᾳ κατὰ τὰ ἄκριτα, εὐκρινῶς διακρίνω καὶ τοῖς γεγονημασίς ταῦτα, ἐν πατρίδοις τῶν Σιωναστῶν αὐτῶν ἱλασμῶν χάριν τῇ νοεῖς;— "Do you imagine, O men, that we ever thought of mastering these things in the scriptures, unless by the will of their author we received grace to understand them?"—The Essenes also held a special divine illumination or inspiration to be necessary, in order rightly to understand the Scriptures. Philo says of them, (Quod Omn. prob. lib. c. 12, T. V. p. 286, τῷ Ἡσιᾶν ὕστατα διακοσμεῖσθαι, ἀλλήλους χρηματίζοντας τοῖς ποιημασίοις νόμισμα, ὡς ἐν καιροῖς ἀναφέρων ἐντολὰς τοιαύτας ὑπὸ τοῦ πατράρχατος Ἡσιᾶν. — "But they cultivate morals with great care, making use of their country's laws, as instructors, which it surpasses the human mind to understand without a divine influence."—Philo himself adopts this view, De Cherub. c. 9, T. I. p. 205.
butes importance to it by prosecuting it according to
determinate laws, for he propounds a kind of herme-
neutical rule: he says, "When in the words of the
prophets, a person comes forward as speaker, believe
it is not the inspired persons who speak, but the Di-
vine Logos who moves them; for sometimes he speaks
as foretelling things to come, sometimes he speaks in
the person of God, the Lord and Father of all, some-
times in the person of Christ, sometimes in the person
of the people replying to the Lord or to his Father, as
you may see in your own writers, where one composes
the whole, but different persons are introduced as
speaking."—and then he points out particular pas-
sages of the Old Testament, composed in the manner
thus described: thus the Holy Spirit speaks, Isaiah i.
3, 1—15; lviii. 6; lxvi. 1; in the person of the
Father, Is. x. 6, lxv. 1; Ps. iii. 6, xxii. 8, 17, 19; in
the person of Christ, Is. liii. 1, &c. in the person of
the Apostles, Is. i. 9; lxiii. 15; lxiv. 12; in the
person of the people; thus he depicts, (Is. ii. 3; liii.
1, 7; lxv. 2; Ps. xcvi. 10.) the advent of the Mes-
siah, though, according to the peculiar prophetic phra-
seology, he makes use of the past tense. Justin also en-
deavours, among other things, to point out the propriety,
or rather the necessity, of understanding the expressions
of the prophets as applying to the Messiah; with this
view he adopts the Canon, that every Old Testament
passage of which the fulfilment cannot be pointed out
in the period before the coming of Christ, but only in
the history of Christ, or of the Christian Church, is
Messianic. But in the particular application of the

1 Apol. 1, 36, p. 65, sq. (p. 76, D. E.)
2 Apol. 1, 37, p. 66, (p. 77, A. B.)
3 Apol. 1, 38, p. 66, (p. 77, C. D.)—1, 49, p. 72, (p. 84, E.)
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 42, p. 138, (p. 260, D.)
5 Apol. 1, 47, p. 71, (p. 84, A.)—1, 53, p. 75, (p. 88, D.)
Dial. c. Tr. 25, p. 123, (p. 242, C.)
6 Apol. 1, 39, p. 66, sq. (p. 77, E.)—1, 42, p. 68, (p. 80, B.
C.)—Dial. c. Tr. c. 114, p. 207, (p. 341, C. D.)
7 Apol. 1, 36, p. 63, (p. 76, B. C.)—1, 42, p. 68, (p. 80, B.
rule thus laid down, Justin binds himself to no law. Who the speaker is in any portion of Scripture, or who is spoken of, is mere matter of opinion; of the 96th Psalm, one half is applied to God, and the remainder, from the 10th verse, to Christ. In order to make out the nonfulfilment of a prophetical expression in the period before Christ's appearance, and its real fulfilment at or after that event, historical relations are set aside, or placed in a false light; passages are torn from their natural connection, and then explained in a one-sided manner; artificial and unfounded combinations are made, and the more obscure passages interpreted allegorically. To exhibit all these peculiarities of Justin's Exegesis, the following examples may suffice. In the words (Is. v. 20.) ὄψιν τοῦ λέγοντα τὸ γλυκὺ πικρὸν καὶ πικρὸν τὸ γλυκὼν, Justin sees a prophetic intimation of the slanderous reports which would be spread by the heathens against the Christians; Is. liv. 1, he interprets as meaning, that far greater numbers would be converted to Christianity from the heathen than from the Jews and Samaritans. Psalm xxiv. 7—10, he takes to be a prophetic representation of Christ's ascension. The Jewish application of it to the transference of the ark of the covenant to the temple of Solomon he considers inadmissible, because neither of Solomon nor of the ark could it be said, τις ιστιν οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς τις δόξης; the Psalm, in his opinion, prophetically delineates the scene of Christ's reception in heaven. The words ἄφατος πῦλας οἴ ἄξωνος ὑμῶν contain a summons to the heavenly powers to open the gates of heaven, that the King of Glory might enter in; and since, on earth, they had seen Christ only in a mean, inglorious form, and not in a state of glorification, they put the question, "Who..."
is this king of glory?" and then receive from the Holy Spirit the answer, "The Lord of hosts—he is the King of Glory!" Not more successful is the interpretation of Is. lix. 22, from which passage, taken in connection with Gen. ii. 17, and v. 5, Justin infers the duration of the millennial reign. His argument is this, in Is. lix. 22, the days of God’s people are determined according to the days of the tree of life in paradise. Death was denounced on Adam the very day on which he ate of the tree of knowledge, (Gen. ii. 17.), nevertheless he attained the age of nearly 1000 years (Gen. v. 5.) A day, therefore, is in God’s sight as a thousand years, and Christ will reign with his chosen a thousand years in Jerusalem. But more arbitrary than all is the interpretation of the two passages, Gen. xlix. 10, and Is. vii. 14. viii. 4. Justin quotes the former passage according to the LXX. in the following manner, ὁ θεός ἔσται μεγαλὸν τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐν τῷ Μωσέα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς ἔργου τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ του Θεοῦ του Θεοῦ του Θεοῦ. In this form the passage was considered by him as a prophecy of Christ’s messianic reign, his miraculous conception, bloody death on the cross, and acknowledgment by the heathen. To make this interpretation probable, the name of the tribe of Judah is arbitrarily considered as equivalent to a general name of the Jewish nation; and, contrary to historical fact, it is maintained that the Jews, till the time of Christ, had always been governed by their own princes; to meet the objection that Herod the Idumean could never be considered as the rightful successor of the Jewish dynasty, it is affirmed that the high priests and prophets are to be

1 *Diæt. c. Tr. c. 36, p. 134, (p. 254, D. E. 255, c. 85, p. 182, sq. (p. 311.)

2 *Diæt. c. Tr. c. 81, p. 179, (p. 308, A.) Corrodj’s representation is obscure in his *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasticum*, II. p. 461.
regarded as the ἀγγέλων who, according to the prophecy, should never be wanting to the Jews till the time of Christ. It is overlooked that the high priests could not be considered in this light, since that order existed even after the death of Christ, and the assertion, however confidentially made, is false, that the prophets continued in uninterrupted succession to the time of John the Baptist. The words καὶ αὐτὸς ἢσται προφῆτα Ἰωνᾶ are understood as referring to the twofold advent of Christ, and the conversion of the heathen. A double sense is attached to the following clause; δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἰσραήλ. . . . ὃν τὸν αὐτόν. First of all, Justin finds in it a prophetic reference to the ass and its colt, which, according to Matthew, Christ made use of on his entry to Jerusalem from Bethphage, and, in order to render the fulfilment of the prophecy more striking, he adds an unauthorised particular to the evangelical history, that the ass at Bethphage was bound to a vine; and, afterwards, he infers from the same words, that both Jews and Gentiles would become subject to Christ. The foal signifies the Gentiles, for, as this animal had not submitted to any yoke, so the Gentiles were first brought under subjection by Christ; in order to partake of the blessings promised by Christ, they submitted to the restraints of the gospel; but the saddled ass denoted the Jews, for these had already been placed under a law by the prophets. The words, καὶ πλην ἐν ὀνήστη τῆς σολήν αὐτοῦ Justin believes are intended to express that Christ washes and purifies his people by his blood: the Holy Spirit calls believers σολήν, because the divine Logos continually dwells in them. Lastly, the expression αἵμα τῆς σοφυλῆς is referred to the miraculous conception: Justin asserts that the prophet means that Christ would be a partaker of human flesh and blood, yet not in the usual course of generation, but by the power of God; he would receive it in the same

1 See Paulus, Exegetisches Handbuch über die drei ersten Evangelien, (Hiedelb. 1833,) III. 2, p. 695.
way as the vine receives its sap, that is, immediately from God. The passage Isaiah vii. 14. Justin very naturally considers as a prediction of the miraculous conception of Christ, as indeed the most direct and absolute prophecy of that event. In order to fix the Messianic character of the passage, he draws the attention of his readers to the fact, that, excepting Christ, no one of Abraham's descendants, according to the flesh, had been born of a virgin. In opposition to the assertion of the Jews, that in the passage under consideration ναυς ought to be read instead of παυς, and that the prophet's announcement refers to the birth of Hezekiah, in whom the prophecy was actually fulfilled—he proceeds to remark that the reading παυς of the LXX. was perfectly correct, and that the reading substituted by the Jewish expositors originated in a wilful attempt on their part to expunge all direct prophecies of Christ from the Old Testament. It was also expressly announced by the prophet as a sign σημεῖον, and the birth of a man in the ordinary natural mode of generation could be no σημεῖον. But Justin finds the chief support for the Messianic application of Is. vii 14, in Is. viii. 4, which latter passage on that account he connects immediately with the former, and lays a peculiar emphasis on the words πρὴ Ἕ γνώναι ὅ παιδιόν καλεῖν παντεῖα ἡ μητέρα: This expression makes it evident, he thinks, that Is. vii. 14, cannot apply to Hezekiah, but must be understood of Christ. For when Hezekiah, as the Jewish expositors suppose, fought against Samaria and Damascus, he was not of an age when he could not call father and mother, but Christ as an infant would be a conqueror of Samaria and Damascus, in the sight of the king of Assyria. Damascus and Samaria would become his prey, in the person and oblations of the wise men of the east, when they came to Bethlehem, under the direct notice of king Herod, in order to do homage to

1 Apol. 1, 32, p. 63, (p. 73, sq.)—Dial. c. Tr. c. 52, sq. p. 148, sq. (p. 272, sqq.)—c. 76, p. 173, (p. 301, B.)
the new born child. Herod would be called king of Assyria in the prophecy, on account of his reckless impious disposition. But with the wise men Christ received the power of Damascus, because, before their journey to Bethlehem, they served the demons who dwelt in Damascus with the utmost obsequiousness, and their visit to Jesus implied their revolt from the demons. The wise men might also be considered as a trophy from Samaria, as far as the power of the Damascene demons, who through Christ had been vanquished in the persons of the wise men, had been wicked and lawless.\footnote{1} When it happens that Justin is doubtful respecting the allegorical sense of a prophetic passage, he represents several methods of interpretation as possible and admissible. Thus in explaining the words, Ps. xxii. 14, ἡνοίξαν ἐπ' ἐμὶ τὸ στῆμα αὐτῶν, ὡς λέων ὡς υμνημος, he does not venture to decide who is intended by the roaring lion, and leaves his readers to make their choice between the Tetrarch Herod Antipas, to whom Pilate sent Christ bound, and the Devil, who as he seduced our first parents, so also attempted to seduce Christ in the wilderness.\footnote{2}

These peculiarities of Justin, which are shown in his exposition of passages strictly Messianic, especially as far as it has to do with allegory, recur (in all essential points) in the second class of his expository labours, namely, the typological. Here, as in the first class, he shows an arbitrariness in explaining the supposed mystical sense. There would be no difficulty in adding a multitude of proofs of the correctness of this asser-


\footnote{2} Dial. c. Tr. c. 103, p. 198, (p. 330, D. 331, A. C.)—In this opinion, that one and the same Old Testament passage may have a manifold allegorical sense, we recognize the influence of Philo's writings. Compare Phil. leg. Allegor. 1, 19, sqq. T. i. p. 76. sqq. 1, 24, p. 79.—De cherub. c. 7; sqq. T. i. p. 203, sqq.
tion, but a few will suffice, to mark Justin’s method of proceeding.

The circumcision of children on the eighth day after birth, as appointed by the law, Gen. xvii. 12. Lev. xii. 3, he considers to be a symbol of the spiritual circumcision of Christians by Christ, who rose on the eighth day, according to one method of computation. In the twelve golden bells which were fastened to the border of the high priest’s robe, he finds a type of the twelve Apostles, since they were dependent on the power of Christ, the eternal High Priest, and their announcement of the grace and glory of God and of Christ had resounded throughout the globe. The double marriage, and other occurrences in Jacob’s life, he viewed as a typical representation of certain events relating to Jesus. Leah signified the Jewish nation, and Rachel the Christians. Christ still performs service for both as well as for the two handmaids; for since Noah predicted that the posterity of his third

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 41, p. 138, (p. 260, C.): ἡ ἀναλή τῆς περιτμήματος, καλύπτει τῇ ἁγίᾳ ημίχει ταννάνες περιτμήματος τα γυναικεῖα, τότες δὲ τῆς ἀλλ. ἡμίχεις περιτμήματος, ὁ περιτμήματος ἀπὸ τῆς πλάκας καὶ συνειδής διὰ τῶν ἀπὸ νηπίων ἀναστάσεως τῇ μνή μας τῶν σαββατον χάριν ἐποῦ... Ἔμα γὰρ τῶν σαββατῶν, πρώτη μίν ἡμῶν τῶν παιῶν ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὸν άυθαν τῶν παιῶν ἡμῶν τῆς κυριολειπονθεοῦν ἁγίων καλλιτείας καὶ πρώτῃ οὕτω μίν. — The precept of circumcision which commanded that infants were to be always circumcised on the eighth day, was a type of the true circumcision, by which we are circumcised from error and wickedness, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week; for the first of the week, being the first of all the days, if reckoned in rotation, after the completion of a week, may be called the eighth, and yet remains the first.”—Cyprian Epist. 64, 4, T. i. p. 170.—Lactant. Instit. divin. 4, 17.

2 That the bells on the high-priest’s garment were exactly twelve is neither affirmed in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, (Exodus xxviii. 33; xxxix. 25. Sirach xlv. 11,) nor by Josephus, (Antiq. Jud. 3, 7, 4. Bell. Jud. 5, 5, 7.) Justin therefore, either arbitrarily fixed on this number to suit his Apologetical interpretation, or confounded the bells with the precious stones on the high-priest’s breast plate. Tertullian (adv. Marc. 4, 13,) sees in the latter a type of the twelve Apostles.

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 42, p. 138, (p. 260, C.)
son would be in subjection to his two other sons, so has Christ appeared for the restoration both of the free children and of their bondmen. All who obey his commands, will partake of the same glory, even as Jacob granted equal privileges to all his children, whether they were the offspring of his two wives or of their handmaids. Moreover, as Jacob served Laban for "the ring-straked, speckled, and grisled" cattle, (Gen. xxxi. 35; xxxi. 8—12,) so Christ was obedient even to the death of the cross for men of all nations, whom he won for himself by his blood, and the mysterious power of his cross. The eyes of Leah were weak, and the spiritual sight of the Jews is also weak. Rachel stole Laban's gods and hid them; while Gentile Christians have given up their fathers' gods of wood and stone; Jacob was the object of his brother's constant hatred; and Christ and believers are hated by the Jews and the rest of mankind, though all are, by nature, brethren; Jacob received the name of Israel, and Christ is called Israel. Dial. c. Tr. c. 134, p. 226, (p. 364.)—c. 140, p. 230, (p. 369. B.) Sometimes Justin considers an Old Testament type (Vorbilde) more as a copy (Nachbilde.) Thus, for example, we find the counterpart (Gegenbild) to the circumcision which Joshua (v. 2,) caused the Israelites to perform with stone knives after their passage over Jordan, partly in the fact that the heathen, on their conversion, surrender their stone idols to the service of Christ; partly in this, that Christ effects the spiritual circumcision of his people by means of (the stone knife) his word. Dial. c. Tr. c. 113, p. 207, (p. 341, A. B.)

After these specimens of Justin's method of interpreting Scripture, no one can doubt that Celsus was not entirely unjust, when he expressed himself somewhat bitterly respecting the exposition of the Scriptures by the Christians of his time. What Arnobius observed on the allegorical interpretation of the Grecian myths, may be applied to Justin's Exegesis: "cum rebus occlusis omnis ista que dicitur allegoria sumatur
nec habeat finem certum, in quo rei quae dicitur sit fixa et immota sententia, unicumque liberum est, in id quod velit attrahere lectionem et affirmare id positum, in quod eum sua suspicio et opinabilis conjectura duxerit. —

"All that we term allegory, is founded on subjects involved in obscurity, and has no well defined aim, which allows of a fixed and certain opinion, so that every one is at liberty to give what interpretation he pleases, and to affirm that the story is meant to convey whatever may suit his own surmises or plausible conjectures."

SECTION III.

APOLOGY FOR THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE.

Apologetics constitute the very heart and core of Justin's intellectual labours. Impelled by his love of Christianity, the extension of which filled his soul with joy, while he watched the dangers that threatened it with fearful anxiety,—fired too, by the example of eminent men, such as the Athenian bishop Quadratus and the Athenian philosopher at one time, and Aristo of Pella at another, he undertook, in addition to the oral publication of Christian truth, its vindication and advocacy, against the powers which sought

1 Origen. c. Cels. 1, 17, T. I. p. 336.—4, 48, p. 540.—4, 51, p. 542.—δει τι μεν καὶ ἀπαραξία, δει ἴσως συγγράμματα πιρίοντα τὰς τῶν ἰσομερῶν ἀλληγοριῶν ᾿Αντών οἰ ἀναγκάζει, ἢ χαὶ ᾿Ηλιός οὐ ποτέ δεικνύει παρί αὐτῶν ἀλληγοριῶν γραφῆς, πολὺ τῶν μὲν ἢχεναύτων ἥσοι καὶ ἀποκάλεσαι, τὰς μεταφράζων μὲν ἀμφότερα ἐν ἰδίαις ἡπάτοις, ἀναμείνεται καὶ καὶ παντὸς τινα ἀπεισθή μοιμἱς συνάπτωσιν. —"And he appears to me to have heard that there are compositions containing the allegories of the law, which, if he had read, he would not have said, 'therefore the noted allegories written concerning them are much more shameful and absurd than the myths, and collect together things that can by no means be made to harmonise, with a stupidity perfectly marvellous and inconceivable.'"
to check and suppress it. It was not a purely specu-
lative interest which led him to take this direction, 
but the necessities of the Church; it was therefore, 
not the calm, deliberative, measured circumspection 
of cool investigation which guided him in the choice of 
his terms, but the glow of enthusiasm, which felt it-
self indignantly compelled to defend the divine against 
the mean and debased, and rectitude against unright-
eousness—it was the impetuosity of innocence, injured 
in the persons of his brethren, which, in raising its 
voice against injustice, not seldom became itself un-
just—it was the confidence of personal conviction, 
which, since for itself there was no room left for doubt, 
sometimes neglected to satisfy the doubts of others. 
Justin's Apology was peculiarly a production of the 
second century. Many a point which we must re-
gard as of essential importance in the justification of 
Christianity, even what may be regarded as the most 
striking feature in its delineation as the divine and abso-
lute religion, is passed over, because the opposition of 
its adversaries, in the second century, did not immedi-
ately demand its consideration. Much, which inse-
curely rested on the erroneous prejudices and fancies 
of the second century, was, without hesitation, made 
the basis of an argument, because it was current, and 
at that time was not called in question by either friend 
or foe. But a double office was imposed on Justin as 
an Apologist—partly to procure toleration for the 
Church, and a recognition of its claims from hostile 
governments, and partly to promote its increase by the 
conversion of unbelievers. Like the other Apologists, 
he prosecuted both objects, and while he invalidated 
the objections against the Christian faith and practice, 
he exposed the unsatisfactoriness of heathenism and 
Judaism, and, on the other hand, developed the relation 
as well as absolute excellence and divinity of Christianity. 
He did this in opposition to three religious parties. 
Of his methods of proof against the Jews and hea-
then we have tolerably complete specimens; while, of 
his mode of argumentation with heretics, we have only
his Fragment on the Resurrection, in which he vindicates that doctrine against their attacks. With great force and acuteness, Justin shows in opposition to both Jews and heathens, that the vindication of the gospel, and its claim to toleration, rest on its specific peculiarity. He develops, impressively and eloquently, the superiority of Christianity to Judaism and heathenism, and then charges it on the consciences of Jews and Gentiles to embrace this disowned and persecuted religion. We shall consider both lines of evidence in the following representation, taking separately the refutation of the objections of the Jews and of the Gentiles, since the position of Christianity to each of them was perfectly distinct. On the third head, which concerns the divine origin of Christianity, we need not make this distinct reference, since the proofs which Justin adduces are of a general character, applicable to both Jews and Gentiles, and indeed to every conceivable class of opponents.

CHAPTER I.

EVIDENCE FOR CHRISTIANITY IN OPPOSITION TO JUDAISM.

ARTICLE I.

REFUTATION OF JEWISH OBJECTIONS.

The opposition which Judaism originally, and (as it were) almost unconsciously, made to Christianity, by degrees expressed itself in definite considerations, and produced a kind of scientific combating of the new faith. In the writings of Justin, Trypho the Jew is the representative of this opposition.\(^1\) He partly disputes

\(^1\) Compare Flugge's *Versuch Einer Geschichte der Theolo-
the Messiahs of Christ,\textsuperscript{1} and partly accuses Christians of treason against the theocracy.

He denies the Messianic character of Jesus, because his outward appearance, so destitute of outward splendour, and ending with the ignominious death of the cross, was in direct opposition to the predictions of the Old Testament Prophets, who had promised that the Messiah would appear with external pomp and glory,\textsuperscript{2} and because Elias, the appointed forerunner of


\textsuperscript{1} The Messiahs of Christ was at all times the apple of discord between Jews and Christians; whether the Messiah were already come, and was embodied in Jesus of Nazareth, or whether he was still to be expected, these questions constitute the gist of the controversy between the two parties Tertull. \textit{Apologet.} c. 21, T. V. p. 44, sciebant et Judei venturum esse Christum, scilicet quibus prophete loquebantur; nam et nunc adventum ejus expectant nec alia magis inter nos et illæ compulsatio est, quam quod jam venisse non credunt. By the predictions of the Prophets, the Jews knew that the Messiah was to come; and the great point of dispute between them and ourselves is, that they do not believe that he has come.—\textit{Clem. recognit.} I, 50, T. I. p. 498, erraverunt Judei de primo domini adventu, et internos atque ipsos de hoc est solum dissidium. The Jews have erred concerning the first coming of the Lord, and the only controversy between them and ourselves is on this point, 1, 43, p. 497.—Hieronym. \textit{prol. in Jerem.} c. 30, sqq. T. V. p. 282, nos ... monstramus ..., nec inter Judeos et Christianos ullum aliud certamen nisi hoc, ut cum illi nosque credamus Christum dei filium remissum, eaque futura sunt sub Christo a nobis expleta, ab illes explenda dicantur.\textsuperscript{—} “We show, that between Jews and Christians there is no other contest than this, that while both believe that Christ the Son of God has been promised, those things which were to take place under Christ, are considered by us as having been fulfilled, and by them still to be fulfilled.”

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Dial. c. Tr.} c. 32, p. 129, (p. 249, B. C.), \textit{\delta} Τρύφων \textit{οὖν} ἦν ἄγραντι, αὐτικὴ ἐρμάς καὶ γραφὴ καὶ τοιαύτας ὒδεξις καὶ μὴν ἀναφέρειν τὸν στόχον τοῦ συλλαβοῦ τῶν ἔργων διὸ οὐδὲ ἄγαντες παραλαμβάνεται τῇ αἰώνιῳ βασιλείᾳ, ἀναγκάζοντος εὗτος διὸ ὅμοιος λαῖκος καὶ ισόμοιος καὶ ἀδέξιος γίνομαι. ὡς καὶ τῇ ἀναφάει κατάρα τῆς τῆς ἐρμαί τοῦ ἤτοι περὶ τῶν ἵστορεων ἵστορεων γεγονα, c. 89, sq. p. 187,
the Messiah, had not yet appeared. The advent of the Messiah he speaks of as still to be expected, and remarks, that although he were already born, and living somewhere in privacy, he must be still unknown, and, in fact, would be unaware of his own character, and possess no power, till solemnly anointed and proclaimed by Elias. Trypho charges the Christians with treason against the theocracy, as far as, by a wilful surrender of the Mosaic law, they threatened the outward permanence of the theocratic kingdom, while they endangered monotheism, by the irrational exaltation of a crucified man to the rank of a second God. We pass over, for the present, the objections which relate to the Messiaship of Jesus, since these will more properly be canvassed in the section in which the positive dogmatic evidence will be produced for Christianity; our business, at present, is to show how Justin defended the Christians from the charge of an outrage on the theocracy—how he constructs a justification of Christianity from the Old Testament theocratic point of view, by proving that it was intended to be a peculiar religious institution, and that it was not merely allowable, but necessary.

The Jews grounded a leading objection to the lawfulness of Christianity, on the apostacy of its adherents from the use of circumcision and the ceremonial law

(p. 317, A.C.)—"Trypho said, O men, these very Scriptures, and other similar passages, oblige us to wait for him as glorious and great, receiving as the Son of Man, the everlasting kingdom from the Ancient of Days; but he whom you call the Messiah lived dishonoured and inglorious, so as to fall under the last curse in the law of God; for he was crucified."

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 49, p. 145, (p. 268, A). ως ηυτος · · · πρωτοπασιν · · · τειν ηλιαν χρονις αυτον (Χριστον) ις Σιντα· · · ις τε σαν ηλιαν ικλοδιαι, ικα των εποιηθησεις ικει.

"We all expect that when Messiah comes, Elias will anoint him, and since Elias has not arrived, infer that Messiah is not yet come."

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 110, (p. 226, B.)—c. 110, p. 203, (p. 330, C.)
in general. Trypho thus inveighs against the Christians; "We cannot conceive how you can boast of your superior piety, where you differ in nothing from heathens; you observe neither feasts, nor Sabbaths, nor circumcision." Dial. c. Tr. c. 10, p. 111, (p. 227, C.); and he particularly advises Justin, "if you will hearken to me, you will allow yourself to be circumcised, and then observe, as they are presented, the Sabbaths and feasts and new moons, and in short everything which the law enjoins, and thus perhaps you will find favour with God." Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 110, (p. 226, A.)

To this advice of Trypho's, Justin — although he had already allowed that the Mosaic ritual might be still observed by Christians, provided it did not endanger their faith in Christ, and fidelity to the eternal laws of morality, and provided it was not considered as an indispensable condition of salvation, nor imposed on Gentile Christians;¹ — replies by adverting evidence, that the law had attained its end, had fulfilled the purpose for which it was given, and had lost all binding force; that according to its primary and original design it was only temporary. The proof of this he lays down in the following manner:—There

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 142, (p. 265, D).—c. 47, p. 143, (p. 266, B.) with equal mildness, yet under the same limitations, Augustin allowed to Jewish Christians the combined observation of the law of their forefathers in a letter to Jerome. Hieronym. Epist. 87, T. ii. p. 223; Judæorum sacramenta—ideo susceperat celebranda (Paulus) cum jam Christi esset apostolus, ut doceret, non esse perniciosa his, qui ea vellent, sicut a parentibus per legem acceperant, custodire, etiam cum in Christo credissent; non tamen in eis jam constituerem spem salutis, quoniam per dominum Jesum salus ipsa, quam ipsa sacramentis significabatur, advenerat.—"Paul, even when he had become an Apostle of Christ, so allowed the celebration of the Jewish sacraments, as to teach that they were not injurious to those who were disposed to observe them, as they had received them by the law from their parents, even after they had believed in Christ; yet I would not place the hope of salvation in them, since by the Lord Jesus that salvation is come which was signified by those sacraments."
is a twofold law: the one is ancient, given on Mount Horeb, amidst thunder and lightning and other appalling circumstances, and intended only for the Jews; the other is new, introduced with breathless silence, binding upon all men, of abiding supremacy, the only medium of salvation. A second law, after and contrary to an earlier given law, deprives that of all power; a second covenant after an earlier covenant, of which the conditions have been fulfilled, disannuls it. But the new law and the new covenant have been made to supersede the law that proceeded from Mount Sinai, and it is this last, everlasting law, this new, firmly guaranteed holy covenant, after which no law, no prescription, no commandment, will again be issued; there will never be any other than the law of Christ. For this new law has been foretold by the prophets, who were members of the old covenant, and under the control of the old law, (Isaiah li. 4; lv. 3. Jer. xxxi. 31, &c.) and their predictions, (since they described the new law as a light for the Gentiles) are fulfilled by the establishment of the Christian Church, for into it the Gentiles principally have entered. 1

After this general argument, Justin grounds his conviction of the merely temporal design of the Mosaic

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 11, p. 111, sq. (p. 228, B—E.) οὐκ ἀνίκοιον γὰρ, οὐκ ὑποκείμενον πάντες συνετῶν νόμος καὶ διαθήκη νησίων ἑταῖρα ἔργον ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ φυλακτῷ πάντας ἄνθρωποι, διότι τὸν Θεόν ἀληθείας ἀντιτιμῶν. Ὅ γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ παλαιός θεὸς νόμος, καὶ ὑμῖν μόνον ὢ δι’ ἰδίῳ φυλακτῷ, νόμος δι’ θεοῦ νόμον τιθεὶς τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ ἑκατέρω, καὶ διαθήκη μετ’ ἑαυτής γεμάτης τῶν προερχομένων ἱματίων ὡσεις: αἰώνιος το σήμερον νόμος, καὶ τελευταίως ἐν Χριστῷ ἔθηκε, καὶ ἡ διαθήκη πρῶτη, μετ’ ἑαυτῆς ὑπέρ νόμου, ἐν πράσαρμαι, ὡσει ἐκτελεῖ.—

"For I have read, O Trypho, that there would be a final law, and a covenant superior to all others, which now it behoves all men to observe, whoever are anxious to obtain the inheritance of God. For the law promulgated on Horeb is now ancient and for you (Jews) alone, but this is for all without restriction; but a law opposed to a law nullifies the one before it; and a covenant made after a former one puts a stop to it; and Christ has been given to us an eternal and final law, and the faithful covenant, after which there is no law, nor ordinance, nor commandment."
ceremonial law, principally on two points; first, on the impossibility of still observing it completely after the appearance of Christ, and then on the special design which the lawgiver, as he believed, had in view, in introducing it. In relation to the first point, the Apologist remarks, God had interdicted the Jewish nation from offering sacrifices, especially that of the Paschal Lamb, and of the goat on the great day of atonement, in any other place than his chosen sanctuary, (Levit. xvi. 4. Deut. xii. 5. 1 Kings xii. 27,) with the express design, that when the observance of this law should cease to be possible by the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, it might be understood that the sacrificial rites would no longer be maintained after the death of Christ.\(^1\) In reference to the second point, he maintains that the whole system of the Mosaic ritual had a typical aspect to Christ, and that this Messianic significance involved its cessation after the actual appearance of the antitype.\(^2\) Thus the custom of roasting the Paschal Lamb whole, (Exodus xii. 9,) typified Christ’s hanging on the cross. (Dial. c. Tr. c. 40, p. 137, (p. 259, B.); the offering of fine flour which persons were to present when cured of the leprosy, (Lev. xiv. 10,) pointed to the bread of thanksgiving in the Lord’s Supper. (Dial. c. Tr. c. 41, p. 137, (p. 259, D.) At the same time Justin recognized in the Mosaic ritual, only a disciplinary and corrective institution for the Jews, which, considered in itself, was without any significance for true religion and morality,\(^3\) for Noah, Job, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and other righteous persons, as well as the pious women


\(^3\) Dial. c. Tr. c. 46, p. 142, (p. 265, C. D.) οὕτως εὐμβάλλει τῷ διανοητῷ ἔγγει καὶ ἀνανεώσει τά διὰ τῷ εἴλημαλίᾳ το λαῷ ἑμῶν διαταχθείναι γινώσκεις. “We know that the regu-
Sara, Rebecca, Rachel, and Leah, could be saved without the knowledge and observance of the Sabbaths, new moons, and washings that were afterwards instituted. In saying this, he does not mean to deny that the Mosaic law contained in itself the principles of true morality, and enforced on men the adherence to absolute goodness: but he denies that the ceremonial part of the law had one and the same origination (Genesis) and purpose with the purely ethical part, and was essentially connected with it. He regarded the ceremonial law simply as a bridle which was laid upon the Jews in order to keep them from total apostacy. After the people, in spite of the various merciful interpositions and miracles by which God glorified himself on their behalf, had, with un-

lations made on account of the hardness of heart of your people, contributed nothing to the practice of righteousness and piety.”

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 67, p. 164, (p. 292, A.) oí τοίς Μωισίως γενόμενοι δίκαιοι καὶ πατριάρχαι, μοῦνα φυλάκεις τῶν ἰδίων ἀντιδίκων ἰ λόγω Άρχην διαγγελλονεί διὰ Μωισίως, αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ τῶν μακαρίων πληροφορίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἦν; Καὶ ὁ Τρόφων ἤτο τῇ γεγαμείᾳ ἀναγνώστη καὶ ἔμελλεν.—1 The righteous men and patriarchs who lived before Moses, and observed none of those things which the Scripture shows us were instituted by him, do they attain to salvation in the inheritance of the blessed, or not? And Trypho said, the Scriptures oblige me to acknowledge the affirmative.”—c. 46, p. 142, (p. 264, D.)—c. 92, p. 189, (p. 319, C.)

4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 44, sq. p. 140, sq. (p. 263, A. D.) Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Μωισίως νῦν τὰ φύλακα καὶ λαθαὶ καὶ εἰσβολὴ καὶ δίκαια νεμοθεία ναντεῖται πρὸς τῶν τῶν διδάσκων αὐτούς.—4 For in the law of Moses, things that by nature are gracefull, and pious and just, are enjoined to be done by those who obey it.”—c. 67, p. 165, (p. 292, C.)—Constitut. Apostol. 6, 20, T. i. p. 350.

3 According to Dial. c. Tr. c. 67, p. 165, (p. 292, C.) it is one of the tendencies of the Christian doctrine to point out what parts of the law are to be regarded as eternal and unchangeable, and what were only temporary, and, particularly, corrective provisions. The author of the Apostolic Constitutions, (1, 6, T. i. p. 205. 6, 20, p. 350,) distinguishes, in the Old Testament legislation, between the natural law (νόμος φυσικὸς) by which he means the Decalogue, and the later additions to it, (τὰ ἐν στίρισι, τὰ τῆς διερμενῶσας), which were imposed upon the Jews as a punishment for their idolatry in worshipping the golden calf. Compare Krabbe, Über d. Ursprung u. d.
grateful hardness of heart, fallen into the idolatry of worshipping the golden calf, God imposed upon them a burdensome ritual, in order, at least, to preserve them from further idolatry, and, even against their will, to keep up their remembrance of himself, the only true God.¹ For a preservative against idolatry he established the temple at Jerusalem,⁴ and the sacrificial cultus;⁵ and, for keeping alive the remembrance of himself, he ordained the fringe on the garments (Numbers xv. 38.), and the phylacteries,⁶ as well as the rigid observance of the Sabbath,⁷ and the distinction of meats.⁸ Finally, circumcision answered the secret purpose of being a mark of recognition, so that when the time should arrive when, through their continual perversity and faithlessness, the infatuated people would bring down deserved and unavoidable judgments, the Jews would be known and chastised as such by the Romans, the scourge of God.⁹ Justin


² Dial. c. Tr. c. 22, (p. 122, (p. 240, C.)—c. 92, p. 189, (p. 220, A. B.)
⁴ Dial. c. Tr. c. 46, p. 142, (p. 265, B.)
⁵ Dial. c. Tr. c. 19, p. 119, (p. 237, A.)—c. 27, p. 125, (p. 244, E.)
⁷ Dial. c. Tr. c. 16, p. 116, (p. 234, A ) ἡ ἄνδρα ἀλεξίου καὶ τὸ τίμημα τοῦ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἱδίων καὶ ἰδίων.
probably thought that the view he took of the design of the Mosaic law was a startling one; he exerted himself, therefore, to the utmost in supporting it. His views on this subject appeared to him absolutely necessary, since, otherwise, the Divine Being could not be justified from the imputation of having given ordinances contradictory and unworthy of himself,—and the ridiculous and absurd notion must be entertained that He did not foresee the future,—or, that in the days of Enoch, when the fleshly circumcision, and the external celebration of the Sabbath, and the other prescriptions of the Mosaic cultus, were entirely unknown, He was a different being from what He was in the time of Moses,—or, that He did not wish the same

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 30, p. 127, (p. 247, A.) τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἰδίατα ἤναλαίτο, ὅτι καὶ ἑνακατεστασθεὶς δυνότερός ἐστίν ἐν Σιών ὅπως ἐν κοῖνῳ μὴ ἰχθυνότα, ὡς τὰ αὖθις δίωμα μὴ σέπτατα οἷς ἤδη ἐπελεύσεται τοῦ δόλου τὸν ἱερὸν διὰ ταύτα διάματος Θεου ἢμα, μὴ ἀπαλαμβάνεις χάρις τοῦ γενέσεως, ὅτι τὸν λαὸν ἡμῶν παραφυλακίζως καὶ ἐν νόμῳ φυλακῆς ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἐντολῆς καὶ μετανοίᾳ τοῦ πατρός αἰσθάσομαι.—“Ascribe it to your wickedness that God can be calumniated by men void of understanding, as if he had not instructed all in the same rules of justice; such ordinances appeared irrational and unworthy of God to many men who had not received the grace of knowing that he called your people, when acting wickedly and in a state of spiritual disease, to conversion and repentance.”

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 92, p. 190, (p. 320, B.) εἰ μὴ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς ἑνακατεστασθεῖσιν ἐν Σιών, ἐὰν μὴν πρόγνωσεν ἵκων.—“Unless it be thus, God will be calumniated as not having foreknowledge.”

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 23, p. 122, (p. 240, D.) ἐὰν ταύτα ὅτι χρηστὸς ἐς ἐκεῖνα ἱστοικτείνην νόμον, ὡς ὁ τῶν
moral laws to be known and obeyed at all times and in all places, and thus the Scriptures would be false which call Him true and righteous. Against sacrifices, and especially against the notion that God had appointed them because he stood in need of them, Justin urges that God himself had declared them to be displeasing to him, and only an institution rendered necessary by the transgressions of the people. Ps. l. 9; Jer. vii. 21; Amos v. 21; Mal. i. 10. The merely relative necessity of the Sabbath he deduces from the circumstance, that it was generally unknown to the patriarchs and mankind before Moses; 

αὕτοις Ἰησοῦς μὴ οὕτως τὸν κατὰ τὸν Ἐνόχ, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ζῶντας, οἱ μὲν περιτιμῶν τὸν κατὰ σάκκα ἐπεστρεφόντας μὴς σάββατα ιδρύλεχον, μὴς δὲ τὰ ἄλλα, Μωυσέως ἡμετέρας ταύτα τοιοῦτα — “Unless we admit these views we shall fall into absurdities, as if God himself were not the same being in the times of Enoch, and of all the other ancients, who neither practised circumcision according to the flesh, nor observed the Sabbath and other things commanded by Moses.”


2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 92, p. 190, (p. 320, C. D.) This passage, according to the common reading—καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν λόγον ὡς λόγον, ὡς εἰς ἀληθινὸς ἡ Σατὰ καὶ δίκαιος, &c. is perfectly unmeaning, and must, therefore, be altered according to Thirlby’s conjecture, καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀληθινὸς λόγος ὡς λόγον, ὡς ἀληθινὸς καὶ δίκαιος καὶ δίκαιος, &c.


4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 19, p. 119, (p. 236, E.) μὴ σαββατισμόν τοὺς τάντας δίκαιος, τῷ Ἡρῴδῃ συνείπετο, καὶ μη αὐτῶς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ τούτοι εἰς άπαντας μίκροι Мωυσῆs.—(p. 245, B.)—“All the righteous men before mentioned pleased God, though they observed not the Sabbath; and after them Abraham, and all his sons, until the times of Moses.”—c. 27, p. 126, (p. 245, B.) Tertullian. adv. Jud. c. 4, T. II. p. 220. Justin adds this remark,—c. Tr. c. 23, p. 123, (p. 241, B.) οὐκ ἐν χρίσ. ὡς αὐτῶς καὶ λατρεύουσα καὶ προσε-φερέως, εὐθεῖα τῷ κατὰ τὴν βουλήν τῷ Ἑβραίῳ ἀρχαίος τοῖς ἀκοῦσιν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ παραδίδων γεννήσεται καὶ ἤμων ἰσοτύ χριστοῦ ἰδίως ἐν χρίσει.—“If there was no need before Moses of Sabbatism, and feasts, and oblations, neither now likewise is there need after, according to the council of God, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, has been born without sin, of a virgin, of the
that the same God who had promulgated the strict law of the Sabbath, at the same time commanded the priests to present the sacrifices on the Sabbath, and required the circumcision of children on the eighth day, making no distinction whether this day fell on a Sabbath or not;¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 27, p. 125, sq. (p. 245, A. B.)—c. 29, p. 127, (p. 246, E.) and he grounds, moreover, the justification of Christians to release themselves from the duty of the scrupulous observance of the Mosaic law on the Sabbath, on the evident fact that the elements do not celebrate a Sabbath,² and that God himself carries on the affairs of the universe on the Sabbath as well as on other days.³ Dial. c. Tr. c. 23, p. 122, (p. 241, A.—c. 29, p. 127, (p. 246, E.) He also infers that the distinction of meats had the ground of its institution solely in the sins of the Jews, from the permission which Noah received from God to eat of all kinds of animals, excepting such as were strangled (Gen. ix. 3); and to him he thinks that this permission was granted on account of his righteousness.⁴ In support of his peculiar view of the

race of Abraham."—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 1, 4, T. I. p. 36. Demonstr. Evangel. 1, 7, p. 28. To meet Trypho's attempt to support the absolute validity and permanent obligation of the Mosaic ordinance of the Sabbath, by a reference to Isa. viii. 13, 'If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath,' in which passage the sanctification of the Sabbath is insisted upon, Justin rejoins, that though all the Prophets enforced and promoted the observance of the Mosaic Law, they did so, only on account of the ingratitude and stubbornness of the Jewish nation, since their improvement could be attained in no other way, and concludes with the declaration; Dial. c. Tr. c. 27, p. 126, (p. 244,) ἁμα δὴ ἡ κακία τῶν ἁρχῶν διὰ τὰς κακίας ὑμῶν ἀναδόθη ἐντελῶς, ἵνα διὰ τὴν ἐν ἧν ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑπιτέλουσθος, διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἡ ἀδιάφορες αὐτῶν καὶ γράμμων ὑμῶν ξαλλαθ—⁵ As at first he prescribed these things on account of your wickedness, so, on account of your endurance of them, or rather overstrained attachment to them, he calls you by them, to remember and know him.”

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 27, p. 125, sq. (p. 245, A.B.) c. 29, p. 127, (p. 246, E.)
² Dial. c. Tr. c. 23, p. 122, (p. 241, A.)
³ Dial. c. Tr. c. 29, p. 127, (p. 246, E.)
⁴ Dial. c. Tr. c. 20, p. 119, (p. 237, B.) ᾿τCBD ἄνασκεμα.
design of circumcision, he attempts to prove that circumcision could be neither the symbol nor the cause of righteousness. For this purpose, he reminds his opponents that the Egyptians, Moabites, and Edomites, all practised circumcision (Jer. ix. 25), and yet did not obtain God’s approbation; and inversely, that Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah, and Melchisedek were uncircumcised, and yet in a peculiar manner were distinguished by God,—Abel, by the gracious acceptance of his sacrifice,—Enoch, by his mysterious translation.—Lot, by his wonderful deliverance from Sodom,—Noah, by the honour of being the progenitor of a new race of men,—and Melchisedek, by the reception of tithes from the hand of the first circum-

achinery οὐδὲ τῷ Ἱῳ, ἰεραίῳ ὄντι, πάντα ἰμανθέω λεισθήν, πάλιν αὐταίς ἐν ἀμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ὑπὲρ ἕκκλητόν, διὰ Μωυσέως ἀνεπαφῆς ὀμαῖς ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς γραφῆς.—“You are told by Moses in the book of Genesis, that God permitted Noah, being a just man, to eat of every animal, excepting flesh with the blood, whatever was strangled.” Trypho rejects the inference which Justin draws from Gen. ix. 3; by denying that permission to eat every kind of flesh without distinction was granted to Noah in this passage. The clause, ὡς λάχανα χέρτα, “as the green herb,” contains rather a designed limitation; for it makes the eating of flesh parallel with the eating of vegetables. But as Christians do not eat all vegetables, but reject many, so also on Noah was imposed the restriction to eat only a selection of the productions of the animal kingdom. Justin endeavours to defend his assertion against this objection, by asserting, that when Christians refrain from various kinds of vegetables, they do this, not from any religious scruples, as if they considered the excepted plants as common or unclean, but because they were bitter, or prickly, or deadly. All sweet and nutritious fruit, whether land or water plants, they eat. Their selection of vegetables was therefore altogether accidental, or rather pointed out by nature, and allows the passage in Gen. ix. 3. to stand in all its universality. Lastly, the words, ὡς λάχανα χέρτα, appear to have had, in the ancient Church, the character of a sarcastic phrase. Thus, Julian, when alluding to the freedom of Christians in eating food, says, μοι ἐνθεσάσθη τῷ τῷ ψευδείᾳ λεισθήν, ὡς λάχανα χέρτα.—“Ye alone possess the liberty of eating all things as the green herb.” (Cyrill. adv. Julian. I. 7, T. VI. p. 238, D.)

cised person, Abraham. Further, he remarks, that Abraham himself was pronounced righteous when still uncircumcised; therefore, not on account of the circumcision afterwards enjoined, but on account of his faith. Lastly, he makes use of the necessary exemption of the other sex from this rite, as a proof that circumcision in and of itself cannot be productive of righteousness; for if it were, he doubts not that both sexes would have been rendered capable of receiving it, since both are under equal obligations to be righteous and devout. *Dial. c. Tr. c. 23, p. 123, (p. 241, C. D.)*

After Justin had in this manner evinced the admissibility, and to a degree the necessity of Christianity, from a view of the social relations established in the Jewish theocracy, and had also taken away the last apparent support for the perpetual and absolute value of the Mosaic ritual, which the Jews attempted to find in the voluntary submission of Christ to its prescriptions, by shewing that this submission was not founded on the assumption of a justifying power in the law, but on obedience to the Divine dispensations;—he then advances to consider the objection raised by the Jews against Christianity, on the monotheistic principles of their theocracy; and which proceeded from the view taken by Christians of the person of Christ.

In this view Trypho beholds a palpable apostacy from God, and an arbitrary apotheosis. He thus appeals to Justin: "After you have forsaken God, and placed your hope in man, how can you still expect salvation? . . . . . You rely upon a mere hearsay, and form a Christ according to your fancy, for whose sake you thoughtlessly plunge yourselves in de-


3 *Dial. c. Tr. c. 8, p. 110, (p. 226, A. B.)*
struction!"— and in another passage, 1 "those persons seem to me to have something more credible to say than what you have, who maintain that Christ was born as a man, and in consequence of the divine choice was called and consecrated to be the Messiah; for we also all see in the Messiah who is to come, only a man of human descent." 2 The doctrine that Christ was God,

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 49, p. 145, (p. 268, A.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 48, p. 144, (p. 267, A. B.) τὸ λέγειν σε περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν "καὶ γεννηθήναι ἀνθρώπως γίνεσθαι καὶ υἱὸν ἁγίασθαι οὗτος ἐν ἁγίῃ, οὗτος ἀλλὰ καὶ μορφήν. Justin opens his refutation of this objection with stating; ἕκτασται τοῦτον ἵνα Ἰησοῦς τὸν Χριστὸν τῷ θεῷ λέγαται ἐν οὕτως μὴ ἰδονομαζόμενος, δι' αὐτῆς καὶ τροποποιήσωμεν τινὰ τοῦ πιστοῦ. "Εις τότε, οὗτος ἰδόμενος, καὶ ημῖν ὄρθως ἑκατοστῇ ἡμῖν ἑκατοστῇ, ἄλλα μὴ ἀνθρώπως καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ γεννηθήναι καί ἀνθρώπῳ ἀνθρώπως ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἴσως ἀνθρώπως. —" That this is the Christ of God is not nul-
lied, even if I am not able to show that he pre-existed, the Son of the Maker of all things, being God, and was born a man of the virgin; but having fully demonstrated that this is the Christ of God, whoever he may be; if I do not demonstrate that he pre-existed, and became a man of like infirmities with ourselves, and having flesh, endured according to the counsel of the Father, in this it is just to say that I have erred, but not to deny that this is the Christ, if he appeared as a man begotten of men, and became the Christ by divine election. This statement has not unfrequently been made use of, to prove that Justin regarded the doctrine of the person of Jesus as an adiaphorism, that he considered only the acknowledgment of his Messiahship as indispensable, and, on the other hand, though for himself he firmly adhered to faith in his pre-existence and miraculous conception, he did require that belief from others. But this is altogether wrong. That apparent indifference of Justin's is nothing but the result of polemical cautiousness. On account of the tenacity with which Trypho clung to his Jewish prejudices, on account of the unsteadiness with which he quickly denied what he had before acknowledged. (Dial. c. Tr. c. 63, p. 160, [p. 286, B. C.] c. 67, p. 164, [p. 291, C.]) Justin thought it necessary by the above-mentioned statement, to bind his opponent to at least an acknowledgment of the Messiahship of Jesus, in case he should not succeed in convincing him of the Redeemer's pre-existence, that he might not be
and as such existing before all worlds, he calls incredible and undeniable, in short, an absurdity, and appeals to Isaiah xi. 2, in which passage the sevenfold power of the Holy Spirit is promised to the Messiah,¹ as a clear testimony to his purely human necessities, and equally of his purely human origin. Finally, the assertion that Christ spoke with Moses and Aaron from the cloudy pillar, (Ps. xcix. 7,) as well as the requirement to worship him, appeared to him nothing less than blasphemy.²

In order to arrive at a right understanding on this point, Justin begins with assuring him that Christians in the most decided manner held fast the Jewish monotheism. "There has been from eternity no other God," he says,³ "nor will there ever be any other than the Creator and former of the universe. We believe also in no other God than him—namely, in him who led your fathers out of Egypt with a strong hand and an outstretched arm; we hope also in no other, for there is no other; we hope in him, in whom you also hope, namely, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; only our hope is not through the medium of Moses and the law."⁴ He then sets himself to prove that the Old Testament monotheism must not be conceived of, as if there were only one divine person; on the contrary, the Old Testament itself clearly⁵ and ir-


¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 87, p. 184, (p. 314, B. C.)
² Dial. c. Tr. c. 38, p. 135, (p. 256, B. C.) ἀληθείας αὐτῆς τῆς σωματικῆς τῶν ἄξων πάσης ἡμᾶς μηροτάται τοῖς Homoιοῖς καὶ λαμψάνων λαμπάδας αὐτοῖς ἐν στούλοις φίλιστοι εἴη τοῖς ἴδρυμα τσακχαρίας καὶ σταυρολωγίας ἠρμονίας καὶ ναοκοιμητήσις.⁶
³ Dial. c. Tr. c. 11, p. 111, (p. 228, A.)—Origen c. Cels. 6, 29, T. i. p. 653.
⁴ Dial. c. Tr. c. 55, p. 150, (p. 274, D.) προσεχετέ χριστίνω
refigrably, obliges us to acknowledge a second divine individuality besides the Creator of the universe. The account of the three men who appeared to Abraham at the oak of Mamre, is peculiarly important, he says, in reference to this subject, Gen. xviii. 1; from that narrative, it appears most distinctly that the Scriptures recognize, besides the Creator of all things, another, numerically different God and Lord; who at the same time is called a messenger or angel, (ἀγγέλος) because he brings to men the messages of the Creator. One of the three men was God. This follows unquestionably from Gen. xxii. 12, as it is universally acknowledged by you Jews, for in the passage one of the three, who according to his promise (Gen. xviii. 10, 14,) came again to Sarah after the birth of Isaac; is expressly called God. The objection, that a God could not have eaten, as is narrated of the three strangers, (Gen. xviii. 8,) signifies nothing: for in the passage it is simply said βεβρωκαί (τηλείη) which does not forbid one, supposing that only the two companions of the third, who were angels, and as such might really eat, partook of the food set before them; and it is possible to explain the word “eat” not as meaning the act of masticating and swallowing food, but as we say of fire that it devours every thing. But if it must be admitted, that one of the three men who appeared to Abraham was God, the passage in Gen. xix. 24, furnishes a necessary corollary to this admission, that this God was numerically different from the

1 ούσις μείλεν ἀναμιμητήκαν ἐκ τῶν ἀγίων γεραφῶν. ὦ θάλει εὐθυγνώμονα θεόμενον, ἀλλὰ μόνον δικαιώματι. “—Pay attention then to what I am about to mention from the Holy Scriptures, which need not to be explained, but only to be heard.”

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 150, (p. 274, C.) οὐ τιθάσθαι μία τέκνοι ἀνεμοῦν ἰμαλλον φίλοι. . . . ἀλλὰ τοιαύτα, γενεὰς ἄνεκταιν μὲν ὑδας ὄψιςαται. “—I am not about to offer these proofs, but such as none will be able to gainsay.”

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 151, sq. (p. 275, C. 276, C.)

4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 152, (p. 276, C. D.)

5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 57, p. 154, (p. 279, C. D.)
Creator of the world. For this passage distinctly points out two Lords; one on earth, who was come to Sodom in order to examine more closely "the cry" of that city (Gen. xviii. 20,) and who called down fire from heaven; and the other Lord in heaven, who sent down the fire.\(^1\) It is inadmissible to oppose to this interpretation, the supposition that the second Lord (Gen. xix. 24,) mentioned in connection with the Lord in heaven, might be one of the two angels who came to Sodom (Gen. xix. 1;) for the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament calls no one a Lord besides the Creator of the universe and the Messiah;\(^2\) and the Lord, at whose desire the fire fell from heaven, is specially distinguished from the two angels, and even marked as their Lord. When the two proceeded towards Sodom, he remained behind, and talked alone with Abraham, (Gen. xviii. 22,) and when he himself entered Sodom, the other two left off conversing with Lot, and resigned the discourse to him, Gen. xix. 12.\(^3\) Besides Gen. xix. 24, Justin quotes the passages Gen. i. 26, and iii. 22, as well as Proverbs viii. 22, in proof that the Old Testament points out another God besides the Creator of the universe. In the word τωνονομαν (τὰ Ἑβραία) Gen. i. 26, he sees the address of the Creator to his divine associate (seinen Mitgott), and, to meet the objections of those who would regard the plural form only an animating address to himself, or an apostrophe to the elements, out of which man was


\(^2\) Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 154, (p. 279, A. B.)
formed, he appealed to the words, Gen. iii. 22, Ἰδού θάνατον γιγαντιανὸν ὧς εἰς ἐν ημῶν (Ῥωμ. iii. 19) as an unquestionable proof that the Creator spoke to a rational being, numerically distinguished from himself. He deduces from the term γεννᾶς, under which is represented the procession of the divine reason (Vernunftkraft), from the essence (Wesen) of God, which incarnates itself as Logos in the person of Jesus Christ, that a personal being is intended. In addition to these proofs Justin deduces the being of a second God, besides the Creator, from the theophanies (divine appearances) recorded in the Old Testament. He denies that the most high God ever appeared as a man, and maintains that all the divine appearances (theophanies) of the Old Testament were appearances of Christ (Christophanies).

1 Dial. c. Tr. c 62, p. 158, sq. (p. 285.) λόγος τοῦ εἰρημένου ὃν οὗτος εἰς Μούσιος τάλα τεσσάρων, εἰ δὲ ἀναμεμελήθη τύχι τινα καὶ ἀρνησθεῖσα ἡμῖν Ἱσραήλ, λόγῳ ἐκάρπους. ἡμικανίας αὐτὸν ἐνγεμνόνοις ἔχωμεν, (Gen. iii. 22). . . . . Οὐκ οὖν ἔστιν ὃς ἔστι εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀρνησθεῖσα τῶν ἀληθῶν συνόντων, καὶ το θαλάσσων δύο, μερίσθησαν; "And I will again relate the words spoken by Moses himself, from which incontrovertibly we recognize him as holding converse with another being numerically distinct and rational. .

. . . Did he not, in saying 'as one of us,' indicate a number of persons associating, and at least two.—c. 129, p. 222, (p. 359, A.) Tertull. adv. Prax. c. 12, T. II. p. 164, sq. The counter-remark of a heretical party of the Jews, that the Creator (Gen. i. 26.) rather spoke to angels, and that the human body is organized like an angel's, Justin mentions without a word of contradiction. Compare Tertullian, adv. Prax. c. 12, T. II. p. 165, and Cyrill, adv. Julian. lib. 3, T. VI. p. 96, B. Lastly, the Syrian Gnostic Saturninus (v. Neander's Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Religion, vol. I. Part 2, p. 760, 761, Tr.) cherished this as a Jewish view. According to Irenæus, adv. haeres. 1, 12, p. 100, he also taught; hominem angelorum esse facturam, desumsum a summa potestate lucida imagine apparente, quam quam temere non potuissent, inquit, eo quod statim recurrerit sursum, adhortati sunt semel ipso, dicentes; faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c 61, p. 158, (p. 284.)—c. 129, p. 222, (p. 359, A. B.) το γεννήματος τοῦ γεννήματος ἀρνητικόν Ἱσραήλ. "And I will again relate the words spoken by Moses himself, from which incontrovertibly we recognize him as holding converse with another being numerically distinct and rational. .

3 Dial. c. Tr. c 127, p. 221, (p. 357, B.) ὅτι Αβραὰμ οὗτς
sonal revelation of the most high God to men appeared to him as in its very nature an impossibility. He expresses himself on this point, first of all, in general terms; "No one will be inclined to say, unless he has entirely lost his understanding, that the Creator and Father of the universe left his habitation yonder in the heavens, and appeared in a little corner of the

'Ἰσαὰ καὶ Ιακὼβ ἐστιν ἡ δυνατότης τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἀνάμιστος κύριος τῶν πάντων, ἐκεῖς καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐκεῖς ἐπεστάλη ἐκεῖνες καὶ διήγησαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐνθυμητικοῖς τῷ γενέσθαι αὐτόν.—" Neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other of mankind have seen the Father, and ineffable Lord of all things in general, and of Christ himself; but [they have seen] him, who, according to his counsel, is his Son and God, and angel because he ministers to his will." In the larger Apology Justin reproaches the Jews for holding the opposite opinion, that they knew neither the Father nor the Son, and maintains that the same reproach had been already cast upon them by God, (Isaiah i. 3,) and Christ, (Matt. xi. 27.) Apol. 1, 63, p. 81, (p. 96, C.) As the source of this, their opposite opinion, he points out the gross anthropomorphic conception of the nature of God; Dial. c. Tr. c. 114, p. 207, (p. 341, D. 342, A.) ὡσεὶ ὁ ἡδασμαλος ἄξιον. . . . χαῖρες καὶ πεῖδαι καὶ τακτολογος καὶ ψυχὴ ἢ χαῖρε, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν κύριον ἐπικατέχατες καὶ ἐκτὸς ἐπηρεασμένοις ἡμᾶς καὶ αὐτὸ τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸ Ἰακώβ αὐτὸν τῷ πατρῷ ἡδασμαλο. . . ." Your teachers think that the Father of the universe and the unbegotten God has hands, and feet, and fingers, and a soul like a compound animal; and who, on this account, teach that the Father himself appeared to Abraham and Jacob."—Like Justin all the other anti-Nicene, and many later Fathers, believed all the Old Testament theophanies to be Christophanies. Compare Theophil. ad Autol. 2, 22, p. 365, (p. 100, A.) Irenæus adv. haeres. 4, 11, p. 232. 4, 17, p. 236, especially 4, 23, p. 239.—4, 37, p. 266, sqq. Tertull. adv. Marc. 2, 27, T. I. p. 98.—3, 6, p. 111, sqq. De praescriptione haeret. c. 13, T. II. p. 13.—adv. Pras. c. 14, p. 170, sqq.—c. 16, p. 175.—c. 16, p. 176, sqq.—adv. Jud. c. 9, p. 242. Euseb. hist. eccles. 1, 2, T. I. p. 16.—demonstrat. evangel. 1, 5, p. 10, sq. 5, 9, sqq. p. 233, sqq. Prudent. apologet. v. 28, sqq. A copious collection of other passages may be found in Biel’s Defensio fidei Nicenea. 1, 1, 3, sqq. opera ed. Grab. p. 8. Clark’s Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity. Millow, über Jesus und dessen Person und Amt nach der Meinung der alten Kirchenälter, in Henke’s Magasin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte, 111. 2, p. 414.
earth,"—and, afterwards, more particularly; "when my God says, God went up from Abraham, or, the Lord talked with Moses,—and the Lord came down to see the tower which the children of men had built,—or, God closed the ark from without, do not imagine that the unbegotten God himself ever went up or came down; for the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither moves to and fro, nor sleeps, nor rises up, but remains in his place, where he also is, hearing and seeing with perfect clearness, not with eyes and ears, but with inexpressible power he sees and knows all things, and no one of us remains concealed from him; how, therefore, could he, who never moves, whom no space, not even the universe, holds, who was before the universe existed, how could he speak or appear to an individual, or become visible in an insignificant corner of the earth?" Justin also considers the appearance of the most high God as inadmissible on account of men. For, already, the people had not been able to bear the sight of the glory of his messengers on Sinai. Moses himself could not enter the tabernacle which he had constructed, when it was filled with the glory of God; the priests were not able to remain standing before the temple, when Solomon brought the ark into the house built by him at Jerusalem, (1 Kings viii. 11.); so the sight of the Creator of the universe could not be otherwise than purely destructive to the beholders, add to this, that the belief in the appearance of the most high God would compel to the contradictory supposition that he was not in heaven at the time when fire fell on Sodom from the Lord in heaven.

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 60, p. 157, (p. 283, B.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 127, p. 220, (p. 356, D. 357, A.) A remark of Philo's is very similar, (in Exod. Fragm. T. VI. p. 44.) when he says; ἰονέσθησθα διωτικῇ τοῖς θυγγας ὡτε ἀκμάζω σπεθ. Πιττίκης ἰονέσθησθα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν και προσκυνημένος κυνήξικας ἔσται στῷ τῷ Σωτήρ. Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ημανεῖν ὕψιν ὑπὸ εὐνειδῆ Θεοῦ, τὸν κατὰ τὰ λόγια μένος ἐπικοινωμένος, καταλληλοθείς φιλεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸν δήμαν αὐτοῦ.
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 127, p. 220, (p. 357, A. B.)
(Gen. xix. 24.) ; when the King of Glory entered into heaven, (Ps. xxiv. 7,) and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, (Ps. cx. 1.) And what Justin found impossible on account of these metaphysical difficulties, he knew likewise how to refute in an exegetical manner. For this purpose he brought forward those Old Testament passages, in which the subject of the theophanies is called both θεός and ἀγγέλος, and hence draws the conclusion, that not the Creator, but Christ his messenger, must be considered as the person appearing. Thus in reference to the theophanies which Jacob was permitted to behold, Gen. xxxi. 11, compared with Gen. xxxi. 13; Gen. xxxii. 24, compared with xxxii. 28; thus in reference to the appearance which Moses in the burning bush, Exod. iii. 1, on which Justin remarks: ὃλεγει Μωσῆς ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ φλόγας λειληκίωτα αὐτῷ (v. 2;) οὐος, αὐτὸς θεός ὦν, σημαίνει τῷ Μωσῆ ὅτι αὐτῷ ἠστιν ὁ θεός ὁ Αδραμά καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, (v. 6, and 16.) “The Angel of whom Moses says, that he talked with him in the burning bush,—this Angel being God himself, signified to Moses that he was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.”

But not only does Justin prove to Trypho the necessity of acknowledging a second God besides the Creator, on the grounds taken from the Old Testament, he also gives his opponent a hint how the monotheistic unity might be held consistently with this duality. “He,” he remarks. “who appeared to Abraham, and Jacob, and Moses, and is called God, is indeed numerically distinguished from the Creator, but not as regards disposition or intention: for I assert, never has he done anything, but what he who made the universe, above whom there is no other God, wished him both to do and to say.”


2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 56, p. 152, (p 270, D.) οὕτως ὃς τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ Ἰακώβ καὶ τῷ Μωσῆ ἄρσα ιεράμων καὶ γηγερμένος θεὸς ἅπατος ὁ ὁ πάντα κατόντως θεός, ἄρσα λάμβ. ἀλλ' ὁ
Rebuttal of Jewish Objections.

Thus was the acknowledgment of Christ as God, treated in reference to the objections brought against it from monotheism. But it seemed, as if the Old Testament was only thereby involved in contradiction with itself; for Trypho grounded his protest against the divinity of Christ, directly upon the Old Testament; from Isaiah xi. 2, where the powers of the Holy Ghost are promised to the Messiah, he had inferred that the Messiah was not in possession of these powers at the time that prophecy was written, and thus could have no divine pre-existence. Justin could not regard his cause as properly secured, as long as this consequence, which he himself acknowledged, pressed forcibly upon him, remained unanswered; and he felt it needful to fortify and complete his proof by its refutation. He remarked, therefore,¹ that Christ certainly received the powers of the Holy Spirit at his baptism in Jordan, but not as if he required them for his own person: but on the one hand, in order that, by this solemn public act, it might be manifest to the bystanders, that not John the Baptist, as the people erroneously supposed, but Jesus, was the Christ;² on

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 37, sq. p. 185, sq. (p. 314, C.—316, B.)—
Tertull. adv. Marc. 5, 8, T. I. p. 344, adv. Jud. c. 8, T. II.
qvūmēn. Odýs, gær fymi avtōn, pερασάναι autēn. h Aνα antē év tin
άμωμοι πανταῖα ἐνι; de ἄλλος ἐν ἑστι Θεός, μηθυλικὴ καὶ πράξιν
καὶ ἔσησιν.—Oriæon also seeks for the reconciliation of the
Christian trinity with monotheism in the oneness of will
between the Father and the Son: c. Cels. 8, 12, T. I. p. 741,
θεολογίας τῷ πατίρᾳ τῆς Ἁγίας καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ἁγίας
ἐνα πᾶς τῷ ὑποκάτω καὶ ἐνα τῇ ὑποκάτω καὶ τῇ ἐν
τῇ ταυτῇ τῷ θεολογίᾳ._"We worship the Father
of truth, and the Son, the Truth, being two in hypostasis,
but one in mind and expression, and sameness of will._" In a
similar manner Tertullian, adv. Præx. c. 22, T. II. p. 190.

² For the elucidation and confirmation of this point, Justin
adds, that Christ's birth and crucifixion took place, not on his
own account, but out of kindness to the human race; and his
public entrance into Jerusalem on an ass, was not to make
him the Messiah, but only to serve as a sign for the people
the other hand, that the prophetic gifts of the Old Testament epoch might attain in Christ their end and consummation; for it was the divine purpose that the powers of the divine spirit, which were imparted to the Old Testament Prophets, in a partial and divided manner, were to be again concentrated in Christ, and through him, agreeably to the prophecies in Ps. lxviii. 19, and Joel iii. 1, be communicated after his ascension, to believing Christians; for it was a fact, that at the birth of Christ, the prophetic gift had ceased among the Jews, and displayed itself among Christian men and women, who possessed the charisms of the divine spirit. As a special proof that Christ did not receive the power of the Spirit at his baptism, on account of his own necessities, Justin, in the last place, adduces the coming of the wise men to Bethlehem; for, from the circumstance that these personages appeared at Bethlehem so soon after the birth of Christ, in order to do homage to the new-born child, it is incontrovertibly evident that Christ already, as a child, possessed and exercised divine power.  

After Justin, in the manner we have described, had settled the doubts raised by Trypho against the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, and by the aid of premises, no longer disputed, had shown, on the ground of the Old Testament, the validity and correctness of the christology of the church, only a few deductions from these premises were necessary, in order to bring his Jewish opponents to a conviction of the necessity of adoring the crucified. Justin, however, does not take this method, he prefers drawing his proofs of this point immediately from the treasury of the Old Testament. He begins with observing, that Christ, conformably to the prophecy, Psalm cx. 1., had sat down, after his ascension at the right hand of God, and that he was the Messiah. (Dial. c. Tr. c. 88, p. 186, [p. 315, D. 316, A.B.])

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 88, p. 186. (p. 315, C.) ἀμέ τῷ γαννόδιαι τῷ πατίνε. ἦδη ίνα αὐτόν παράγαγων αὐτῷ καὶ γας γαννόδιε, δύναμη τὸν αὐτοῦ ίοχε.
from this seat of his glory, ruled and overpowered his enemies;¹ that he is called the King and Lord of the pious men, Moses, Aaron, and Samuel;² yea, even the Lord of Hosts.³ As direct proofs of the obligation to worship Christ, he quotes Psalm lxxii. 2—19,⁴ and Psalm xlv. 7,⁵ and removes the difficulty which Trypho raises against this worship from Isaiah xlii. 8, “I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another,” with an observation which strikingly exhibits the arbitrariness of his exegesis,—that God, in this passage, is not laying claim to exclusive adoration generally, but that, agreeably to the connection, only means to assert, that he will give his glory to no one save his Christ.⁶

Had Trypho been a more acute and dexterous disputant, than from this Dialogue he appears to have been, he would unquestionably have raised more numerous and weighty objections against the conclusions which Justin, taking his stand on the Old Testament theocracy, drew against the perpetuity of the Mosaic law, and for the admissibility of Christianity. It was indeed a happy thought which seized Justin, to meet the attack of his Jewish opponent with weapons furnished by Judaism itself; the justification of the claims of Christianity to occupy the place of the Mosaic economy, by a reference to those passages of the Old Testament which declared the peculiar design of the law, is admirably established. But it borders on a contradiction, that Justin attaches a typical meaning to the collective Mosaic ritual, and yet views it as a merely disciplinary and primitive institution. It is strange that he grounded the necessity of this latter view on the idea of the Divine Being, and gave to circumcision, in particular, the character of a mere mark

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 32, p. 129, sq. (p. 249, E. 250, C. 251, B.)
² Dial. c. Tr. c. 37, p. 134, (p. 255, D.)
³ Dial. c. Tr. c. 36, p. 134, (p. 255, B.C.)
⁴ Dial. c. Tr. c. 34, p. 131, (p. 252.)
⁵ Dial. c. Tr. c. 63, p. 160, (p. 287, A.B.)
⁶ Dial. c. Tr. c. 65, p. 162, sq. (p. 289, B.D. 290, B.)
of distinction; in a quite arbitrary manner, he deduced the divinity of Christ from such passages as Gen. i. 26; iii. 22; xviii. 1; xix. 24; changed all the Theophanies of the Old Testament into Christophanies, and founded the propriety of this change on the idea of God, and on incorrectly translated passages of the Septuagint, which his ignorance of Hebrew prevented his detecting. Yet Trypho admitted this method of proof in all its extent, and for the Jewish people in general it might not be altogether useless: many might be conciliated by it to the new faith, and become inclined to connect themselves with the Christian body. We may infer this with a degree of confidence, from the circumstance, that half a century later, Tertullian was induced to bring again into practice the same mode of vindication against the Jews. But a partiality for its use must have been not a little strengthened, when it could be further shewn, that the Jews were prevented from approaching the Christian church owing to misunderstanding and delusion, Justin, therefore, was not satisfied with the mere vindication of Christianity; from defensive he advanced to aggressive measures; and with the refutation of objections raised against Christianity, he connected,

ARTICLE II.

THE ATTACK ON JUDAISM.

This attack relates rather to persons than to things: it is directed less against Judaism in itself, than against the representation and discussion of it by its professors. Justin acknowledges Judaism to be a divine institution, but vehemently denounces the want of sense in its adherents, who asserted its claim to perpetuity. He attacks them on two sides, and aims at pressing them into the Christian church. In
the first place, he censures their mode of expounding and handling the Holy Scriptures; and then points out how nugatory those representations were, on the ground of which their national vanity believed their eternal salvation could rest.

As to the interpretation of the sacred writings, Justin accuses the Jews of totally misapprehending their real meaning. "You understand nothing of the Scriptures," 1 "they are strange to you, although you read them daily." 2 "Your expositors are without understanding." 3 Such are the terms in which he addresses them; and the ground on which he founds his reproaches, is, that they avoid the Messianic interpretation. Justin considered the true understanding of Scripture to rest on the Christological mode of viewing it: every scheme of biblical interpretation which did not include this element, appeared to him essentially erroneous. "Christ," said he, in reference to this point, 4 "remains concealed from thee, and when thou readest the Scriptures thou understandest not." For the same reason he calls the interpretation of the Jews, carnal. 5 low, and meagre, which does not seize the power of the Divine word. 6 The source of this aberration from the true Messianic sense of the Old Testament, he traces in part to the general depravity of human nature, and especially to contractedness of mind, and in part to the manifest wickedness of the Jews. "God" (he reproaches them on the first point) "has excluded you, on account of your sins, from understanding the hidden wisdom of his Word!"

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 34, p. 130, (p. 251, B.)—Apol. 1, 31, p. 62, (p. 72, E.)
2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 55, p. 150, (p. 274, C.)
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 36, p. 133, (p. 254, D.)
5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 14, p. 114, (p. 231, D.)
—and, "Like flies, you buzz about and settle on sore places; if any one speaks to you ten thousand excellent words, and among these there is one little word, which you do not quite like or understand, or is not perfectly correct, you overlook all that is excellent, seize hold of this little word, and try to extract from it something criminal and impious."—To this petty mode of thinking prevalent among the Jews, Justin ascribes it, that instead of apprehending the true divine meaning of Scripture, they never penetrate below the surface; instead of entering into its spirit, they stop at the letter, and preclude themselves from the better instruction which would be offered them by Christians.  "Your teachers," he says, "explain to you, since they knew not how to rise from the ground, why in this, or the other passage, female camels are not mentioned, or what is signified when these animals are introduced; or why exactly such a quantity of flour and oil were ordered to be used in the offerings: but what is great and deserving of investigation, they neither explain nor exhort you to listen to us who would explain it, or to converse with us respecting it. Unless, therefore, you renounce those teachers who exalt themselves, and wished to be called Rabbi, and read the prophetic writings with such a determination, and such a mind, that you will suffer from your people what the prophets suffered, you will be able to derive no advantage from the prophetical books."—A little further on he thus speaks: "Why an alpha was added to Abraham's name, you examine as if it were a solemn question of religion; or you discuss with high-flown terms, why Sara's name contains a rho; but why the name Auses, which the son of Nave received from his father, was changed into Jesus (Joshua), you leave unexamined." With this censure of that micrology, that petty criticism which expends itself on the shell and letter of

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 55, p. 150, (p. 274, D.)
the Scriptures, and in so doing loses the kernel and the spirit, Justin connects a far more vehement accusation of intentional misinterpretation and falsifying of the Divine Word. This accusation embraces three particulars, which Justin sums up in the following statement: "Passages of Scripture which, in plain terms, contradict their false and selfish notions, of these they dare say that they were not thus written; but passages which they think can be applied to human relations and occurrences, these they will not allow to be prophetic of our Jesus Christ, but explains them of some one else; but when we bring forward passages which I have before quoted, and which expressly treat of the Christ as suffering, and adorable, and God, they are forced to allow that these relate to the Christ, but they dare to say that this (Jesus) is not the Christ, while they confess that God will come to suffer, and to reign, and to be adored." On the latter point Justin lays little weight, and does not press it farther; he only remarks by the way on Micah iv. 1—7, the reference of this passage to the Messiah was acknowledged by the Jews, but the fulfilment of the prophecy it contained was still expected as future. The two other points he brings impressively on several occasions, sometimes in the form of complaint, sometimes in the tone of warning. Of the latter kind, the following is an example: "Do not dare to tamper with the prophecies, or to wrest them from their real meaning; since you will wrong yourselves alone; but

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 68, p. 186, (p. 294, A.—C.) ἡ τοῖς γραφαῖς φαίνεται ἔλεγχοντα αὐτῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ φίλανθον γνώμην, ταύτα τελείως λίγον μὴ οὗτος γνησίᾳς; ὡς ἢ ἐν καὶ ἠλπίζων πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀληθινὸς ἀλήθειας ἀλήθειας, ταύτα εἰς τοὺς τῶν ἁμαρτάνοντα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔποιεις λίγον, ἄλλ' εἰς ἐν αὐτῷ ληπτόν ἐμαυθαίρετον . . . ὡς ἢ ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῖς γραφές, ταύτα τοῖς Χριστῷ καὶ θανάτῳ καὶ προσκυνήσεως καὶ θεοῦ ἐξοδομών . . . , ταύτα εἰς Χριστῷ μὴ τίθηθαι ἀπαγορευμένοις οὐκ ἔκκει, τούτων δὲ μὴ ἔσται τοῦ Χριστοῦ τελείως λίγον ἐλεημοσύνη; ταύτα καὶ παθῶν καὶ βασιλείας καὶ προσκυνήσεων γενεῖς θεοῦ ἐμαυθαίρετον.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 110, p. 203, (p. 336, C.)
God you will not injure." He endeavours also to fortify this point by proofs. As evidence of the falsification of the Scriptures by the Jews, he brings forward all those passages in which the Jews adopt a reading that differs from the Septuagint. As the leading proof to which he returns again and again, he refers to the reading τεκνίς in Isaiah vii. 14, which the Jews use instead of that given in the Septuagint, and defended by the Christians, παράκολος. From this, also, he chiefly takes occasion to mark the whole mode of handling the Scriptures by the Jews as bold impertinence. He also calls his Jewish opponents to account for two other discrepancies between the Christian and the Jewish text of the Scriptures. The passages in question are Gen. xl. 10, and Isaiah iii. 9. In reference to the first passage, he complains that the Jews, instead of the text of the Seventy, ἵως ἄκατη ἡ ἀπόκειται, "until he come for whom it is reserved, or kept in store," adopt the reading ὅμως ἂν λάθη τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὑτῷ, "until the things reserved, or kept in store for him, come;" and in reference to the latter,

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, D.) μη παραγγέλω τὸ τεκνίς διοικεῖν τὸ ταχείτερον, εἰπι καθοκὴς μόνος ἀδικῶς, τὸ δὲ δὲν ὑπὲρ βλάψις.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 43, p. 139, (p. 262, C.) ωμοὶ καὶ οἱ παραγγελοῦντες διὰ τολούμενος λίγους, μεθε ἐξῆκεν οὐ τῇ συνόρεσι τῷ ἔσορε. δεδομέναν εἰς γαρ διεῖς, ἄλλῃ οὖν δὲ ταῖς εἰς γαρ συνορίας ταῖς τέξεσις."—c. 84, p. 181, (p. 310, C.) ωμοὶ καὶ οἱ τοῖς παραγγελοῦσιν τὰς ἥραμαις, ἐς ἀποκλήτων οἱ παράμετροι, ὥσπερ Πολυμ. τῷ τοῖς Ἀλφόντων βασιλεῖ γνωμονεῖ, ἱσομαύτα λίγους, ὡς ἱσομαύτα τῇ γραφῇ ὃν ἴσον αὐτοῖς ἐξηγήσατο, ἄλλῃ, ἰδ. φολε, δὲ ταῖς εἰς γαρ διεῖς.

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 213, (p. 348, D.) In all probability Justin was mistaken in considering the words τεκνίς to be the original reading of the LXX, as we have already remarked.

4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 137, p. 228, sq. (p. 367, A.) In the existing manuscripts of the Septuagint, there is not a trace of the reading ἄγνωμαι; they all have δύναμαι, as also Barnabas (Epist. c. 6,) on the other hand, ἄγνωμαι is accredited as the true reading, by three of the Fathers, namely by Hegesippus (in Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 2, 23, T. I. p. 170,) Clemens (Strom. 5, 14, 109,
that they have changed the words of the Seventy, 
ἀρμαν τὸν δίκαιον, ὡτι δισχεχρηστὸς ἡμῶν ἡσυχίαν, “let us take away the just, because he is troublesome to us,” into 
δῆσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον, ὡτι δισχεχρηστὸς ἡμῶν ἡσυχίαν, “let us bind the just, because he is troublesome to us.” Nor does he allow the matter to rest here; he is not satisfied with accusing the Jews of wilfully altering single readings in the text of the Old Testament, but he farther maintains, that they have also cancelled whole sections from the Scriptures. As a motive for this act of violence he suggests the distinctness and evidence of the prophecies which were contained in the cancelled passages. This evidence, he supposes, they had no means of evading, while persisting in their denial of the Messiahship of Christ, except by striking out the prophecies.¹ He enumerates four such cancelled passages of the Old Testament. One, which contained a distinct reference to the crucifixion of the Messiah, must have existed (he asserts) in the book of Ezra;² the other, which was an announcement of the

T. III. p. 77.) and Tertullian (adv. Marc. 3, 22, T. L p. 147.) Hence it is impossible to decide with certainty, which of the two readings is genuine. See Thirlby, (Dial. c. Tr. p. 429,) and Stroth's Beiträge zur Kritik der LXX. in Eichhorn's Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur, III. p. 236.

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 71, p. 169, (p. 297, B.) ὡτι σῳλλας γραφάς τίλων περιέλθατε, ἄνδ τῶν ἱεραγμάτων τῶν γνησιμάτων ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίων γνησιμάτων πρεπεσφόροι, ἵνα δὲ διαρρήσατο εὑτος αὐτὸς ὁ σαμωθησίς, ὡτι δὲ καὶ ἀκροκοτος καὶ ταχυδρόμος καὶ ἀναδεντικος κεκελημένος ἀπεδίλατο, ὡδένω χρῆτε βούλημα — “For I wish you to know that they have taken away entirely many passages of Scripture from the translation prepared by the elders at the command of Ptolemy, by which it would be plainly shown that of him whom they crucified it was foretold that he would be God and man, and crucified, and die.” — c. 120, p. 213, (p. 349, A.) Corrodi's Kritische Geschichte der Chiliasmus, iii. p. 97.

² Dial. c. Tr. c. 72, p. 169, sq. (p. 297, D. 238, A.) ἄνδ τῶν ἱεραγμάτων, ἤτι οὐκ ἤσαν ἐπὶ ἑορτασμόν ἐς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ παίχα τὴν ἱεραγμα νοιτιν κατὰ ἀφάλλων: καὶ ἤτι τού το εἰς τὴν ἱεραγμα: ὡδε ἔφεσεν ἡμῶν καὶ μακαπογά μεν καὶ ἰᾶ.
descent of Christ into Hades under the form of a prophecy, must have been cancelled from the prophet Jeremiah; the third, which admitted of a reference to the sacrificial death, and especially to the crucifixion.
of Christ, is declared to have been a part of the same prophet;¹ the fourth, which comprises only the few words ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλου, and equally points to the crucifixion of Christ, before its exclusion, followed the words in Psalm xcvi. 10, ἐξαιτὶ εἰς τοῖς ἔθεσιν ὁ κύριος ἤβασιλεύει.² Justin knew very well what he intended by the accusation. After Trypho had asserted what God only could know, whether the heads of the Jewish people (ὡς ἄγγος τοῦ λαοῦ), had struck out any passages from the scripture, but that for his part, it seemed to him incredible; and added, by way of strengthening his assertion,³ that "such an act would be more fearfully impious (φοβερῶς) than the worship of the golden calf by those who had partaken of the manna, and the offering of children to demons, or even than killing the prophets." Nevertheless, Justin persisted in making this charge, without bringing any further confirmation of it than his personal conviction

¹ Dial. c. Tr. c. 72, p. 170, (p. 298, A.) ἀπὸ τῶν διὰ 'Ἰεριμίου λεχθέντων ταῦτα περιλαβαίνει τι πώς ἄγγος φθοράματο τοῦ Ἑσοθαϊντο τι τι πληγήματο λαγνοῦντι. Δῆνται ἤβασιλεύει ἤλθος οὗ τῶν ἄγγον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπιέψατο συνεικόλικος αὐτῶν ἐν γης ἔστωσαν καὶ τὸ ὄψης αὐτῷ ὥς μὴ μὴ ὠντεί. — "From the things uttered by Jeremiah they abstracted the following: 'I was as a lamb carried to be sacrificed; they formed a plot concerning me, saying, Come, let us thrust wood into his bread, and let us expel him from the land of the living, and his name shall not be remembered any more.' Our present manuscripts of the Septuagint show no traces whatever of an omission; and all agree in the rendering of Jer. xi. 19.

² Dial. c. Tr. c. 73, p. 170, (p. 298, C.) In the existing manuscripts of the Septuagint no traces can be found of the clause ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλου. That it was the production of a Christian hand, admits of no doubt. But it is remarkable that it is found in none of the Greek fathers except Justin, while almost all the Latin fathers are aware of its existence, and make use of it. Compare Nourry, Apparatus ad Bibliothec. max. i. p. 398. Thirily, Dial. c. Tr. p. 294. Semler, Apparatus ad liberalem V. T. interpretationem (Hal. 1773,) p. 32. Ittig, exercit. ad verba Davidis Ps. xcvi. 10, a nonnullis Interpretibus et eccles. patribus interpolata; Opusc varia, (Lips. 1714,) p. 1, sqq.

³ Dial. c. Tr. c. 73, p. 171, (p. 299, B.)
of its truth; nor does he allow himself to be led to reflection and caution by the circumstance, that all the Jews denied the genuineness of the sections in question, which were regarded and explained by the Christians, as originally parts of the canonical scriptures;¹ and he was unable to point out that these sections, (excepting the third, of which he asserted that it was still read in some manuscripts of the synagogues)² could be found in any of the Jewish manuscripts of the LXX. With the same severity and bitterness Justin examines the Jewish expositions of particular passages, and represents how arbitrary and defective they were, according to the standard of his own interpretation. The specimens which he selects, embraces all those Old Testament passages which were especially important in relation to the Messiah. Thus he blames the Jews for referring the prophecy in Gen. xlix. 10. to Judah, instead of Jesus, though they might see that Jesus, not Judah, would be the hope of all the Gentiles.³ He thinks it wonderful that they apply Isaiah xlix. 6. to the proselytes, a passage in which he sees a reference to Christians. For Christ spoke (as is also clear from Isaiah xliii. 16.) to believers, but the proselytes were not only not believers; but reproached the name of Christ still worse than the native Jews, and inflicted death and martyrdom on the Christians.⁴ He terms it a great deception, and the mere love of controversy to maintain that God (Mal. i. 10.) rejected only those offerings which were presented to him by the inhabitants of Jerusalem at the time when this prophecy was altered, and that, on the contrary, the prayers of the Jews, at that time scattered abroad, were sacrifices well-pleasing to him, for neither in the times of the prophet Malachi, nor even of Christ, were the Jews scattered over all the earth, so that God, from the rising of the sun, to its going down,

¹ Diai. c. Tr. c. 71, p. 169, (p. 297, B.)
² Diai. c. Tr. c. 72, p. 170, (p. 298, A.)
³ Diai. c. Tr. c. 122, p. 215, (p. 350, C.D.)
could receive pure offerings from them; there will still be many nations among whom a Jew had never dwelt.\(^1\) He represents it as a specimen of superficial thinking, that the Jews believed that the seventy-second Psalm was composed upon king Solomon; he avers, that they maintained this opinion for no other reason than the accidental circumstance that Solomon was a king;\(^2\) and expresses his astonishment that they did not perceive how little the Psalm suited Solomon; for though Solomon was a great and renowned monarch, yet neither did all kings bow before him, nor was his sovereignty extended over the whole earth, nor did his enemies lick the dust; indeed, towards the close of his life, owing to the influence of his Sidonian wife, he was an idolater.\(^3\) Lastly, Justin zealously opposes the reference of Psalm cx. 1, to king Hezekiah, and particularly the forced supposition, that the words ἔδειξον ἵνα δεσμῶν μου, “Sit thou on my right hand,” expressed a command to king Hezekiah, to betake himself to the temple, and there, sitting on the right side, to expect the divine aid against the threatened invasion of the Assyrian king, (2 Kings xviii. 16. Isaiah xxxvi. 37); for neither was Hezekiah “a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec,” or even a priest at all, nor had he stretched the rod of his power over Jerusalem, delivered the city, and ruled in the midst of his enemies;

---

\(^1\) *Dial. c. Tr. c. 117*, p. 210, sq. (p. 344, D. 345.) King Agrippa expresses himself differently in *Joseph. de bello Jud.* 2, 16, 4, T. V. p. 250, \(δὲ γὰρ ἵνα ἵνα τὴν εἰκώνας ἔχομεν, ὃ ἡ μητέρων ὑμῶν ἦσθε\)—“For there is not a people on the habitable globe, which does not contain a part of you.”

\(^2\) *Dial. c. Tr. c. 34*, p. 130, (p. 251, C.) Ἰσραήλ ἄκουσεν καὶ εἰς τὸ κράτος αὐτοῦ ἀνεῖλε διὸ ἐκάθεν βασιλεὺς Σαλμὼν ζήσαι, εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν ψαλμὸν δεσμῶν ὑμῶν Converts—“Where it is said, ‘O God, give thy judgment to the king,’ because Solomon was a king, you say that the Psalm was intended to apply to him.”

\(^3\) *Dial. c. Tr. c. 34*, p. 130, sq. (p. 251, D. 252.) *Tertull. adv. Marc. 5, 9, T. I. p. 350, sq.*
he rather mourned and lamented, while God drove away his enemies.¹

While Justin, by these remarks, endeavoured to convince the Jews, that their mode of treating the sacred writings, by which they sought to exercise and justify their opposition to the Christian Church, was entirely to be rejected, and even impious,—that Judaism in general could prolong its existence only by a continued misunderstanding of the Old Testament, and hence, must be broken up as soon as this aberration from the true meaning of their sacred books ceased:—he at the same time gave them to understand, that their continued self-exclusion from the Christian Church was at the risk of nothing less than their salvation. There was, he declared to them, no other way² of obtaining the forgiveness of sins, and the inheritance of spiritual blessings, than that they should acknowledge Christ, receive the baptism announced by Isaiah for the forgiveness of sins, and lead holy lives. If they objected, that as worshippers of God who created all things, and therefore created Christ, it was needful neither to confess nor to worship Christ, they were mistaken.³ In the ages preceding the Christian dispensation, salvation depended on fidelity to the eternal moral law, which was possible for men by the aid of the divine Logos;⁴ but after this Logos had become man in the

³ Dial. c. Tr. c. 64, p. 161, (p. 287, C.) καὶ ἐξώθη... ἡμῖν τῇ ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατάλογον λαμβάνειν ἰστορίαν, ἐν δεύτερῃ τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῇ ἦν τῆς ποιητικῆς.
⁴ Justin very clearly and unequivocally asserts this in the following passage of his Dialogue; c. Tr. c. 45, p. 141, (p.
person of Jesus Christ, no one, not even a Jew, could
be saved, if he did not, before death, confess Christ.\textsuperscript{1}
The Scriptures expressly inform us, (Ps. lxxii. and xcix.) that as many as are saved of your nation, will
be saved only through Jesus.\textsuperscript{2} What you allege in
order to justify your unbelief, and on which you ima-
gine that you can build your hopes of salvation, is no-
thing better than a miserable delusion. You rely on
your legality; you are proud of your punctiliousness
in observing the Mosaic ritual. But the law has a
totally different design than that of being the basis of
justification. Bodily circumcision profits nothing
where that of the heart is wanting; legal fasts are
not the fasts which are acceptable to God;\textsuperscript{3} all cor-
poreal washings do not atone for transgression; with
all the blood of beasts it is impossible to purchase the
forgiveness of sins.\textsuperscript{4} You depend on your descent ac-

\textsuperscript{1} Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, (p. 266, D.) τε να πρόονα και προέων χαλαρεύων,
ομάστρον αυτῷ τὴν θυσίαν, και διὰ τὸν Χριστόν τούτον η ἡ διάσπασιν ἰδούς τὸν παρθενοὴν ἰδοὺς
τῶν παρθενῶν αὐτῶν ἰδοὺς, Ναοὶ καὶ Εσώχα καὶ Ιουκαν, καὶ Η ἤτοι ἄλλοι γεγονός, εὐθυνόμενος ἐν τῷ ἱκνήματί τοῦ Χριστοῦ
τούτον τοῦ Σωτῆρ νῦν — “They who do the things that are
universally and naturally and eternally good, are well pleasing
to God, and by this Christ will be saved at the resurrection
with the just who lived before them, Noah, and Enoch, and
Jacob, and others like them, with those who acknowledge this
Christ as the Son of God.”—See also Apol. 1, 46, p. 71, (p. 83,
C. D.) and Casaubonus de reb. sacr. et eccles. exercitatis. (Pref.
1615), 1, 1, p. 3, sq.

\textsuperscript{2} Dial. c. Tr. c. 47, p. 143, (p. 266, D.) τοῦ ἄνευ τοῦ σπέρματος του Ἀβρααμ ποιεῖν κατὰ τὸν οἶκον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ
σπέρματος πρὸς τὸν ὑλικὸν τοῦ βίου, ἐν εἰσαγωγής ἰδοὺς ἰδοὺς ἰδοὺς ἰδοὺς.

\textsuperscript{3} “In the same way I declare that those of the seed of Abra-
ham, who live according to the law, and believe not on this
Christ before the end of life, will not be saved.”—c. 64, p. 161,
(p. 287, D. 288, A. B.)

\textsuperscript{4} Dial. c. Tr. c. 64, p. 161, (p. 288, A. C.) οἱ συζύμων ἀνεὶ
tοῦ γίνοντα διὰ τοῦτον (Χριστοῦ) ποιοῦσα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτο μερίδι
ἀνεὶ—“Those who are saved of your race, are saved by this
(Christ) and belong to him.”
cording to the flesh from Abraham and Jacob; indeed, so much worth do you attribute to this circumstance, that by means of it you imagine that you can enter the kingdom of God, though you are despoiled with sin, and are unbelieving and rebellious against God. 1 But this hereditary connexion with Abraham and Jacob, cannot compensate for the want of genuine piety. Know you not what God said by Ezekiel, (xiv. 14, xviii. 20,) " Though Noah, Jacob, and Daniel interceded for sons or daughters, it would be denied them: neither father for son, nor son for father, but each one shall perish by his own sin, and each one shall be saved by his own righteousness." 2 Only those persons can obtain the favour of God, who always perform what is right. 3 To those only is God a friend, who have received spiritual circumcision,— who, after the knowledge of God and of Christ has been imparted to them, fulfil also the eternal laws of morality, whether they are Scythians or Persians. 4 Salvation thus always remains connected with the seed of Abraham; but not all are the genuine seed of Abraham, who trace their descent from him,—only those belong to him who resemble Abraham in his disposition and his faith. 5 The Old Testament plainly dis-

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 125, p. 219, (p. 355, B.) ἅπαξ καὶ τὰ τέσσερις στείραμα τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ τίχα τίξει, πάντως σωσθεὶς οἱ στρατιώται.


3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 45, p. 141, (p. 263, D.)

4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 28, p. 126, (p. 246, A.)—Compare c. 139, p. 230, (p. 369, A.)

5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 44, p. 140, (p. 263, A.) οἴδας εἰς ἁπαντα ἀπελθόντα καὶ ἀποφεινέται ἡμῖν τιμῶν, τῆς ἐντονοῖς τῆς ἀμαρτίας.
tistinguishes (Isaiah ii. 5; xix. 24; lxv. 9; Jerem. xxxi. 27; Ezek. xxxvi. 12.) two families of Judah, and two houses of Jacob,—the one the offspring of flesh and blood, the other of faith and the Spirit;—the one comprising the true children of Abraham, who join themselves to the Messiah, the other composed of those children of Abraham, who are like the sand which lies in countless heaps on the sea-shore, but barren, and only imbibing the sea-water. These barren descendants of Abraham are you, who carry in your mouths, it is true, the name of your progenitor, but not his faith and his fidelity in your hearts. That you have no faith, God himself complains. Your righteousness at all times is purely external. You have need of another circumcision, but you glory in the flesh; the new law commands you to keep a perpetual Sabbath, and you imagine you are pious if you keep one day; ye eat your unleavened bread, and boast of having fulfilled the will of God. No injustice is done you, when it is affirmed that you are altogether destitute of genuine morality and piety. You esteem and honour the word of man, but you neither understand nor practise God’s word; you imbibe doctrines of bitterness and impiety (πιγλαθ μὲν διδάχ- μανα καὶ ἄθροις), but abhor the word of God; you honour God with your lips, but in practice you are always backsliding from him; you think yourselves wise and prudent, but in reality you are obstinate fools; your wisdom consists in craftiness, your

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 213, (p. 348, B.)
3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 123, p. 216, (p. 351, D. 352, A.)
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 12, p. 112, (p. 229, C.)
5 Dial. c. Tr. c. 12, p. 112, (p. 229, C.)
6 Dial. c. Tr. c. 46, p. 144, (p. 267, B.)—c. 140, p. 230, (p. 369, B. C.)
7 Dial. c. Tr. c. 120, p. 213, (p. 348, C.)
sagacity shews itself in devising mischief; you are more adulterous than even the Ninevites.\(^1\) The height of your wickedness is shewn in killing the just, and persecuting Christian believers. You do not not indeed, like your fathers, sacrifice to Baal; you no longer bring offerings in high places and groves to the host of heaven; but you have rejected the Christ of God, and every insult offered to him is an insult against that God who sent him.\(^2\) With such dispositions you remain the children of Abraham according to the flesh, but you are no longer his children according to the Spirit; the Christians have become so in your stead. They are the genuine children of Abraham, the true spiritual Israel; they form, collectively, the many nations who were promised to Abraham; they are the true priests of God, the true sons of the Most High. Christians are the genuine children of Abraham, because, as Abraham, at the call of God, left his own country, so they have forsaken the service of sin, in which they lived with the rest of mankind,—because, as Abraham believed the word of God, and found in this faith his justification, so they have hearkened to the voice of God, which resounds to them from the lips of prophets and apostles, though with the loss of all earthly goods, and even of life itself.\(^3\)

---

1 Dial. c. Tr. c. 123, p. 216, (p. 352, B.)—c. 107, p. 201, (p. 334, C.)

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 136, p. 228, (p. 366, B. C.)

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 119, p. 212, (p. 347, B. 348, A.)—ἡμᾶς & μὴν λάμες, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαὸς ἀγίου λαμβ. (Is. lxii. 12.) . . . ἐκὸν ἐν ἑπαναφέροντοι δέ μεθαμφέραντο ἐδόξασεν ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέα τοῦ φύλου, ὑπὸ ἑποίη τοῦ Καρόν ἦ Θεογόν Ἱσραήλ. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς εἰσεισάγεταί ις Ἰσρ. . . . Τυγχάνει καὶ τὴν ἀποθέσεις τὴν Ἰσραηλ. ἠτῶν ἄγιον λαοῦ ἦν Ἡσυχαστικὸν καὶ πολιτικὴ παλατία Ἰσραήλ. Ἡσυχαστικὸν . . . ἔδω τὸς ἐπαναφέροντος λαοῦ; φωνὴ ἐξάλλου αὐτῶν (Ἀβραὰμ) ἔποιη ἡμᾶς εἰσεισάγεται διὰ τῆς γῆς ἐν ἡ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἡμᾶς ἦν ἀποθέσεις δι᾽ ἑποίησιν τῆς φωνῆς ἐναλλάξας, καὶ ἡμῖν ἐσμὲν ἡ ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς, ἐν τῇ ἑποίῇ κατὰ τὰ πολυν τῶν ἐκακίων γῆς ἐνεποίησεν καὶ ἔστησε . . . τοῖς τὶς Ἀβραὰμ διὰ τῆς ἑποίης ἐναλλάξας τῆς φωνῆς. ἢ ἐν τῇ ἑποίης τῶν τῶν ἐναλλάξας τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ Ἑβραῖοι κατὰ τὴν ἀποθέσεις τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑποίης καὶ ἀποθέσεις τῇ ἑποίης ἔποιης διὰ τῆς ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης ἐν τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης, τῇ ἑποίης τῇ ἑποίης.
The true spiritual Israel, the true children of the Most High, are Christians, since they are spiritually begotten by Christ, who, in Scripture, is parabolically called Jacob and Israel, have received the spiritual circumcision like Enoch and other righteous men, and obey the will of God through Christ. Christians are the true priests of God, since they present the only pure and acceptable sacrifice to God in all places with the bread and wine of the Lord’s Supper. Under these circumstances, they alone will rejoice with God’s people, with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with all the Prophets and other righteous men, will be raised again through Christ, and receive the Holy Land for an everlasting possession, while you, who have hardened yourselves in your unbelief, will become the prey of the worm and the unquenchable fire.

Justin carries on this controversy with the deep feeling and earnestness of a mind strong in faith; it is pervaded with a glowing zeal for true morality and

That Christ is called Jacob and Israel, Justin infers from Isaiah xiii. 1. The etymology of the word Israel, in his opinion, conveyed the same meaning. The word 'Israel, he remarks, signifies Ἰσραήλ ναοιν ἰδρυμιν, "a man-conquering power:" such a combatant Christ proved himself to be, since he conquered in the wilderness the antagonist power of Satan, (Matt. iv. 1,) and this conflict and victory had been already typically represented in Jacob’s wrestling by night, in consequence of which he received the name of Israel.

2 Dial. c. Tr. c. 43, p. 139, (p. 261, C.)—ἡμέρα, οἱ διὰ τόν (Χριστὸς) προσχωρήσαντας τῷ θεῷ, οὗ εὐφημία τών κατὰ σάμα ψαλισάμεν τεgmenta, ἀλλὰ σωματικά, ἢ Εἱρήμ καὶ οἱ ήμοιοι φυλάχθησιν.

3 Dial. c. Tr. c. 130, p. 223, (p. 360, A.)
4 Dial. c. Tr. c. 116, p. 209, (p. 344, C.)
piety. In many respects, it was admirable and suited to the subject. He was very successful in exposing the baselessness of the Jewish confidence in outward prerogatives, and the insufficiency of mere legality; nor less so, in illustrating the necessity of an adhesion to the Christian church. But he was partial in condemning entirely the interpretation of the Jews on account of their opposition to the Messianic meaning of the Old Testament; there was a want of justice and candour in accusing the Jews, without exception, of petty criticism, and in representing them as mere hypocritical legalists; and it was completely without foundation, that he accused them of falsifying the Sacred writings. No one can approve this polemical extravagance, though it may be explained from the hostile position which the Jews, in the time of Justin, assumed against the Christians. Many Jews made it their principal business to persecute the Christians both in word and deed; who could think it unnatural for a mind so ardent as Justin's, and so devoted to Christianity, to forget for a time the moderation which was due to his adversaries? In making this charge, he might, in part, be stimulated by a wish to make the difference between the Christians and the turbulent Jews more strongly marked to the Gentiles, in order that the political suspicion with which the Roman authorities regarded the Jews, might not be extended more and more to the Christians; for to justify and recommend Christianity to the heathen, was one great aim of Justin's Apologetic labours.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY J. THOMSON, MILNE SQUARE.